Master's Theses

Master's Theses and Graduate Research

1999

Authoritative voice in literature : a literary and technical rhetorical analysis

John Cyril, III Doiron
San Jose State University

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI®

AUTHORITATIVE VOICE IN LITERATURE:

A LITERARY AND TECHNICAL WRITING RHETORICAL ANALYSIS

A Project

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of English

San José State University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

by

John Cyril Doiron III

December 1999

ABSTRACT

AUTHORITATIVE VOICE IN LITERATURE:
A LITERARY AND TECHNICAL WRITING RHETORICAL ANALYSIS

by John Cyril Doiron III

This project analyzes authoritative voice in literature from a literary and technical writing rhetorical perspective. The two literary foci used to illustrate the analysis are Herman Melville's *Moby Dick* and Edgar Allan Poe's *The Narrative of Arthur Gordon Pym of Nantucket*.

Additionally, the issue of authenticity and inauthenticity is studied. Research on authenticity in authoritative voice shows that while a number of rhetorical elements used in literary writing to effect a speaker's authoritativeness are exclusive to that genre, a number of other authorial rhetorical machinations can be used to this same end from both literary and technical writing. Further analysis of literary and technical texts' speakers reveals that the aforementioned exclusive and parallel correlative dynamics described for authentic authoritative voice also exist between these two writing genres.

Acknowledgements

.

And finally, my most sincere thanks go out to all of those in my personal life who have given me their unwavering support and nurturing encouragement during the course of my master's curriculum, of which process this project is the capstone:

Table of Contents

List of Illustrations

List of Tables

Introduction

For small erections may be finished by their architects;
grand ones, true ones, ever leave the copestone to posterity.
God keep me from ever completing anything. This whole
work is but a draught—nay, but the draught of a draught.
(*Moby-Dick*, 148)

I am a hands-on type of person. One hands-on activity I enjoy is working on my

own vehicles, whether they be bicycles, motorcycles, cars, or trucks. As such, I have had

more than frequent occasion to consult repair and parts manuals. In addition to the more

mechanically focused diversion of vehicle repair, I also enjoy fishing: it combines

elements of sociological, spiritual, emotional, psychological, *and* mechanical

machinations, into an activity in which the rewards are manifold. Once again, as with my

vehicular repair interests, in gaining—or in at least attempting to gain—a greater

expertise in this pastime, I have read numerous "how-to" books from cover to cover; for

example, *How to Land the Really Big Ones*, or *How to Tie Fly Fishing Knots*, etc.

Sometimes these books have proven invaluable: The *Idiot's Guide to Volkswagen*

Repair kept my '69 Beetle "Beatrice" up and running long after by rights she should have

been compacted into a neat little metallic block and sold to a steel recycling concern.

On the other hand, sometimes these books have proven worthless: if it were not

for the kindness of a few fellow fishermen, I would still be going after the "big ones"

with worms and a hook, instead of a #22 Blue-Winged Olive dry fly.

Regardless of either their efficacy or lack thereof, all of these books have had one

thing in common: a writing "voice" which, when initially encountered, elicited in me an

immediate reaction lending itself toward believing that the person who had done the writing knew the subject matter of the book, both intimately and with an especially educated insight, that is, an *expertise*. The tone, the esoterica employed, the confidence, the emphaticism, the expert sources, the satisfied customer testimonials, the imperative language, all of these nuances—if done skillfully—led me immediately to presume that the author had a special knowledge-set which allowed for such knowledgeable-sounding writing to come from the writer's mind and onto the page where I, as the reader, received it . . . and even more importantly, accepted it as *fact* until proven otherwise. Thus, my initial impression of these seemingly sound manuals—based upon the rhetoric chosen by the author to convey the "wisdom" therein—was that the writer was an "authority" upon the subject being discussed.

As I mentioned earlier, sometimes this was pleasantly the case, but at other times it could just as disastrously be not so. As my studies of both technical writing and the literary arts progressed (I am a technical communicator with over ten years experience in that field, as well as having a Bachelor of Arts in English with a concentration in creative writing), and my sensibilities regarding the more refined aspects of rhetoric became more finely honed, I started encountering many of the same elements of this authoritative voice-effecting rhetoric in literature which I had previously only experienced in technical documentation.

This dynamic interested me for a number of reasons. As a technical communicator, I have always felt it incumbent upon myself to do all that I can to improve my communications skills. One of the lessons I have had drummed into my head over

the years—at school, in the workplace, and among colleagues—was that certain rhetorical stances containing elements of this authoritative voice could be either "authentic" or "inauthentic," that is, either a true indicator of expertise, or equally as important, an indicator of a façade meant to obfuscate a lack of knowledge. The old joke for describing those who employed the authoritative voice in the latter method was that "If you can't dazzle 'em with brilliance, then baffle 'em with bull . . . ," etc. Of course, this obfuscating usage of an authoritative voice was to be avoided like the plague. However, the flip side of this coin was that if one's technical writing was sound throughout, that is, contained correct factual data; gave clear and concise instructions or information; used appropriate and consistent word choice and level of diction; and was short and to the point, an authoritative voice became a natural occurrence within it.

But how did this relate to literature?

Just as I enjoy the two hands-on activities I started this piece referring to—vehicle repair and fishing—I also enjoy two different areas of writing: technical and creative. As I mentioned earlier, my undergraduate degree is in English with a concentration in creative writing, and now, this project is being written for completion of a master of arts in English with a concentration in technical writing. Owing to this dual sensibility as it pertains to writing, I have maintained a keen and undying interest in the literary arts, even though I currently make my daily bread through technical communication endeavors.

What I have discovered in pursuing the issue of authoritativeness across these two writing disciplines is that, contrary to much popular opinion, there are some exact

similarities in how this is successfully—and conversely, unsuccessfully—accomplished between these two types of writing.

It is the initial and primary premise of my project then, that there exists in both technical and literary writing an element of craft known as the authoritative voice.

Secondarily, I further contend that the authoritative voice manifests itself in either an authentic or inauthentic manner.

The third element of my project is that this voice is employed in ways that are both common and unique to each of the these genres.

Authentic authoritative voice is the result of authorially generated language that incorporates technically accurate information with formally correct and rhetorically proficient writing. It demonstrates true authority, that is, a knowledgeable information source, communicating to its audience in a meaningful and positive fashion, which by virtue of this intelligence, is capable of backing up any position of power it may also have when putting forth its premise. In conjunction with its solid database, authentic authoritative voice also employs an array of complimentary rhetorical elements which naturally develop its message. These elements include word choices which are emphatic, self-assured, and indisputable, strategically combined and syntactically placed to effect an overall tone of confidence and veracity. Authentic authoritative voice elicits acceptance of its message from its readers. This acceptance is based upon both its informational validity and overall rhetorical stance.

Technical writers usually express authentic authoritative voice in their works by employing solid technical writing skills, such as communication of technically or scientifically correct data, proper grammar and punctuation, succinctness, concision, and a level of diction designed for the intended audience.

Literary authors also demonstrate authentic authoritative voice by conveying technically or factually accurate information.[1] However, while this use of data and facts to foster authenticity is somewhat analogous to technical writers' methodology, it differs substantially because literary authors' main use of this device is to develop characters, rather than purely to convey information. Literary authors may also uniquely use authentic authoritative voice in establishing their characters and/or narrators as being true to form, that is, remaining within the believable boundaries of their personae. It is my intent for this project to illustrate how Melville and Poe combined elements from each of these different sets of authorially generated rhetorical writing techniques—technical and literary—to effect an authentic authoritative voice within literature, in *Moby-Dick; or, the Whale* and *The Narrative of Arthur Gordon Pym of Nantucket*, respectively.

Inauthentic authoritative voice is the result of authorially generated artifices and contrivances. It is the mere verisimilitude of a knowledgeable information source.

---

[1] Technical concision is not always critical in developing authentic authoritative voice in all types of fiction. It is, however, critical in those works such as historically based, locationally specific, or scientifically/technologically centered pieces that require its presence in order to sustain the main focus of the story. This type of accuracy, however, is not required in other, non-technically critical fiction, for instance, fantasy, or character-focused stories, for an authentic authoritative voice to occur. An example is Willa Cather's *My Antonia* which, while factually inaccurate in some instances as to time and place, retains an authentic authoritative voice throughout; the veracity of the narrator's depiction of Antonia and her circumstances, the focus of the story, is never in dispute.

It uses rhetorical devices misappropriated from authentic authoritative voice to give itself an air of credibility. It may either fool its less educated readers into acceptance, or cause its more educated readers to question its ostensibly authoritative base.

While both technical and literary writing share some common ground insofar as how inauthentic authoritative voice is used, it is only positively employed in the latter genre. This is due to literary authors most often deploying it, when they do use it, as a device of character development. When inauthentic authoritative voice is used in technical writing, it is almost never positive; it is nearly always done to hide an author's lack of expertise in a subject.

Of course, this is not to say that all inauthentic authoritative voice in literature is used solely for character development, nor that this voice in technical writing is exclusively used to obfuscate. Literary authors might also use it to cover their own ignorance of a subject; technical writers might use it to highlight or poke fun at previously written inaccurate information.

In its positive literary application, I will demonstrate how Poe used inauthentic authoritative voice to develop the main character in *The Narrative of Arthur Gordon Pym*.

In so doing, Poe actually used the inauthentic authoritative voice to create an authentic persona in his main character. Poe accomplished this by having Pym make inaccurate statements throughout the novel, but these inaccuracies are extremely subtle and sometimes so esoteric as to require extensive research by most readers to reveal their erroneousness. The genius of Poe is that as he simultaneously has Pym making these incorrect remarks, he also has him use inherent in the authoritative voice the authentic

rhetorical elements of craft, which gives this inaccurate information an air of veracity. Of course, since the data are inaccurate, this faux-authenticity in the voice eventually is realized by readers as being inauthentic.

Such blatantly evident, yet confidently expressed errors as impossible latitudinal and longitudinal citation, vis-à-vis the climatic conditions for the specified region Pym specifies, moves readers to deductively recognize the character's delusional belief in his own warped perceptions. This leads the audience to recognize the poor man's mentally affected state, which ultimately culminates in a profound appreciation of Pym's characterological authenticity as a madman. Of course, Poe has done this not as an end unto itself, but rather as the means to an even greater end concerning his perspective on the issue of American enslavement of African-blooded peoples, that is, to use Pym as the stereotypical representative of what he feels are deluded Northern abolitionist concerns; I discuss this throughout my project, but especially in "Authenticity and Inauthenticity," section 2.C.

In its negative literary application, I will show how Melville in *Moby-Dick* created an inauthentic authoritative voice in Ishmael, which instead of giving correct information, unintentionally conveys inaccurate and incomplete information that to the uninformed reader seems factual.

Melville's choice of using the rhetorical elements of the authoritative voice was obviously conscious. But Melville, unlike Poe, did not employ this misinformation for the purpose of character development. Melville oftentimes simply did not know his subject matter. But in choosing this rhetorical stance, Melville, like Poe, assumed a

position of authority which leaves both works open to scrutiny. And with Melville, this scrutiny reveals an inauthenticity the existence of which the author attempts to hide behind authoritative voice.

Melville did, in point of fact, have some whaling and nautical experience. In 1837, he served as a cabin boy on a ship bound for Liverpool, England. In 1841 he sailed on the whaling vessel Acushnet, but deserted in the Marquesas Islands within a year, living with the allegedly cannibalistic Typee peoples; this experience eventually translated into his first published novel *Typee*. Upon leaving the Typees a short time later, he then served in the U.S. Merchant Marines for about six months. After that, the future author joined the U.S Navy and sailed with them until 1844.

The fact that Melville did have this empirical experience with his subject matter begs the question as to why there are so many glaring scientific and technical errors, even by contemporaneous standards, in *Moby-Dick*. Some answers for this might be that perhaps Melville's information sources outside of his own personal whaling and nautical experience were inaccurate; additionally, it had been seven years since he had actually been at sea at the time of *Moby-Dick*'s publication, and his memory may have faded. Of course, it must also be taken into account that much of even the best knowledge of Melville's day has since been proven inaccurate.

A word about these literary and technical writing rhetorical elements I use to explore the dynamic of authenticity and inauthenticity in literary authoritative voice: There are an abundance of these, more than I have been able to discern in so short a treatment of this subject. Literary interpretation is ever expanding; if it were not, literary

criticism would have long ago gone died. As such, I do not intend this study to be viewed as an all encompassing and comprehensive treatise on its focal subject; rather, it should be viewed it as an appetizer which whets the intellectual curiosity of readers and elevates their awareness of this dynamic.

Secondly, many of the literary quotations I use simultaneously contain a number of the rhetorical elements I define in this project; oftentimes, it is impossible *not* to acknowledge this concomitant dynamic within the context of one or the other of their particular sections without being remiss in offering a more complete critical understanding of the situation. Naturally, when this sort of melding of two or more types of these devices occurs in a referenced passage, a choice needs to be made as to which becomes the focal point. I have done this with an eye toward illustrating each specific element with the strongest example I could find; indulgence is requested then, when it might seem to some readers that an equal or even greater amount of argumentative weight could have been given for having a particular passage analyzed from any of the other coexistent rhetorical devices the extrapolated texts I cite also contain.

Additionally, the definitions I ascribe to some of the tenets of these elements are my own. They are as well, of course, based on accepted definitions, but as any student of semantics knows, language is oftentimes *not* exact in its specific meanings, nor is it static, nor limited to only one valid interpretation. The reader should then approach the definitions I give within this project with the recognition that they are designed to fit the application they serve within the context of this study. To be sure, many passages can be interpreted in a number of other ways; however, an effort toward giving them parameters

which render them useful here has been put forth by the author; I hope it serves its audience well, and that they will once again be indulgent as to any definitions which can be interpreted as having other meanings.

My own personal study of the authoritative voice in literature includes close readings of the two novels I have targeted. I have also informally developed this thesis during my ten years as a professional technical writer, as well as during the course of my studies for my BA in English, concentration in Creative Writing, from San Francisco State University, and my current course of studies for a MA in English, concentration in Technical Writing, at San José State University.

I have approached the subject of the literary and technical writing rhetoric of authoritative voice in literature as follows:

My initial area of examination is "On Authority," section 1. A detailed explication of the dual nature of authority is offered in the following subsections of this section, "The Authority of Knowledge", section 1.A, and "The Authority of Power," section 2.B, in which an in-depth look at the bond between these two distinct, yet oftentimes concomitant types of authority operating within the authoritative voice is rendered. In these sections I emphasize that even though these two kinds of authority often go hand in hand, it is equally important to note that a balanced approach to the study of their relationship needs to be cognizant of the converse dynamic of authoritative knowledge and authoritative power being by no means axiomatically coincidental; indeed, it is their distinct independence which gives them their impact—both separately, as well as when they operate in unison.

I then give a short treatise on authenticity and inauthenticity as they pertain to authoritative voice in literature in "On Authenticity and Inauthenticity," section 2.

Following this discourse on authority and its authenticity or inauthenticity, the groundwork laid out in the two sections and their subsections referenced in the previous paragraph is applied to an in-depth study of the two literary foci, "Authoritative Voice in *Moby-Dick* and *Arthur Gordon Pym*," section 3. This section is then broken down into a bifocal exploration of what literary and technical writing rhetorical devices are employed by authors to effect authoritative voice in literature, first in, "Literary Writing Rhetoric And Style," section 3.A, and then in "Technical Writing Rhetoric And Style," section 3.B; a detailed list of what rhetorical devices are examined can be viewed in the Table of Contents, and/or at the beginning of each of these sections.

Insofar as how I arrived at how I would assign which of the rhetorical elements I would use in explicating authoritative voice to the larger sets of literary or technical writing, it is important to note that some of these rhetorical devices could be viewed as coming from either a literary or technical writing perspective. Once again, as occurred in the process of distinguishing how passages taken from the focal literary works of this study were to be analyzed, a decision had to be made concerning into which larger group the author would place these rhetorical elements. In making these decisions, I tried to discern which placement would more readily get my point across concerning authoritative voice in the given examples; once again, I beg indulgence in any decision regarding placement of an element in either genre which could be viewed as being equally appropriate in another group.

After listing and providing in situ examples of the rhetorical devices described above, this study explicates how to evaluate whether or not an authoritative voice in literature merits belief via the exemplification of the two focal novels in "Authenticity and Inauthenticity in *Moby Dick* and *Arthur Gordon Pym*," section 4.

Finally, my conclusion delineates in summary fashion, the logic used to evaluate Ishmael's narrative voice in *Moby-Dick; or, the Whale* as being inauthentically authoritative, an unintentional consequence of the author, Herman Melville's, lack of technical expertise. It further concludes that Arthur Gordon Pym's narrative voice in *The Narrative of Arthur Gordon Pym of Nantucket* is also inauthentically authoritative; however, in this case, not due to Edgar Allan Poe's lack of technical expertise, but rather, to conscious character development by the author of his narrator.

The cornerstone of this study is that in certain forms of written expression, a voice exists which gives the initial impression that its speakers know what they are talking about. This voice, called the authoritative voice, while always an elemental structure of correct technical writing, can also be, in ways both similar and dissimilar to its technical writing manifestation, an integral part of certain works of literary writing.

This of course begs the question of what is meant by the term "authoritative voice."

In answering the preceding query, an explication of the root nominative form of the operative word "authoritative," that is "authority," offers the foundation for the definition of the focal adjectival permutation.

"Authority," within the context of this examination, actually has two valid and interrelated meanings. The first of these, as defined by *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*, regards an attribute of a person's, or number of persons', sociological status: "The power to enforce laws, exact obedience, command, determine, or judge" (124). This definition views authority as being primarily power-based. It also defines it as being a *characteristic* that a person *possesses*, as indicated by the usually accepted manner in which it is incorporated into speech, e.g., "They *have* the authority to do so," the form of the verb *to have*, of course, being the operative word indicating possession.

The second salient definition of authority pertains to the existence within a person of a certain level of expertise in a particular area of learning. This expertise in turn bestows upon that person both the titular as well as de facto endowment of *being* an authority. Once again, as defined by *The American Heritage Dictionary*, this form of authority is defined as someone or something who or that is: "An accepted source of expert information or advice" (124). This definition regards the meaning of that word not as an attribute of the person or thing to which this term is applied, but rather as their *state of existence*, per se, as indicated by the usual manner in which it is expressed, "They *are* all authorities on the subject," the cooperative word here indicating the subject's or subjects' condition being, of course, the form of the verb *to be*.

Returning then to the postulation of what is meant by the term "authoritative" within the context of this study, the answer is that, in its best form, "authoritative" is an amalgam of both power- and knowledge-based positions and states implying status and expertise.

As an extension of this definition, then, an initial definition of what is meant by authoritative voice can be derived: Authoritative voice is the rhetorically effected manifestation of the collaboration of the authorities of knowledge and/or power as a written dialogue (either narrative and/or characterological), conveying both veracity and the associated sociological wherewithal to support whatever contentions it is putting forth.

The principle of the authority of knowledge, or *expertise*, is based upon a person's, or number of persons', outward manifestation of an inner intellectual embodiment which causes them to be viewed by others as authoritative regarding a particular area of study.

Regardless of its distinctness, the authority of knowledge can also exist—and is most effective—combined with the authority of power. Examples of a manifestation of this concord of knowledge- and power-based authorities where the former was the catalyst for the latter are such historical figures as Socrates, Leonardo da Vinci, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, and Albert Einstein. Each one of these persons had a far superior understanding of a particular discipline—in some cases such as da Vinci and Goethe, more than one—which gave him a position of elevated sociological status during his life. In point of fact, the former (authoritative knowledge) was causative agent of the latter (authoritative power).

Of course, for some of these people as well—as particularly exemplified by Socrates and Einstein—this authoritative power was at points eroded, or altogether reversed, by the overriding political structure during their lives in which undermined their positions of authority. In Socrates' case, this was when the Athenian political power structure condemned him to death, forcing him to take his own life; in Einstein's, it occurred when the Nazis made the threat of imminent death for Jews in continental Europe such a reality that it forced the renowned scientist to leave for safer ground in the United States of America.

Regardless what their sociological position within the particular paradigm of power-based authoritative structure was however, both Socrates and Einstein never ceased to retain their authority of knowledge: Socrates still understood his philosophical tenets while drinking the hemlock which ended his life, and Einstein still understood his theory of relativity as he fled from the impending era of Hitler's Germany.

This ability to remain endowed with the authority of knowledge regardless of one's position within a hierarchy of authority of power, is what makes the authority of knowledge the more meaningful form of authority: Its existence can transcend that of the authority of power.

1.B.   *The Authority of Power*

Like the authority of knowledge, the authority of power is also most valid when it goes hand in hand with its counterpart, the authority of knowledge. Sublime examples of this marriage of authoritative power and knowledge where possession of sociological strength is the originating force, are such historical luminaries as Julius Caesar, Cleopatra, Elizabeth I, and Winston Churchill. Each of these people had an authority of power: Caesar as Roman Emperor; Cleopatra as Queen of Egypt; Elizabeth I as Queen of England; and Churchill as British Prime Minister. Additionally, in tandem with their positions of power-based leadership, each also was an acknowledged authority within their particular area of study: Caesar with his military acumen and parliamentary politics; Cleopatra in her diplomacy; Elizabeth in her courtly politics and imperialist expansionism; and Churchill in his national and global political perceptions and perspectives.

But how did these people get to their positions of authoritative power? Did all of them—as had all of their knowledge-base authoritative counterparts—actually earn their position by virtue of their own intellectual superiority? And what of the overriding issue this line of questioning implies: "Was their native state causal of their acquired status?"

Of course the answer varies. Caesar wrested his authoritative power from Pompey through both his military and political acumen. Churchill, similarly, ascended to his position as Britain's Prime Minister by virtue of his political abilities. But was this acquisition of power-based authority based purely on the merits of these men's knowledge-based authority? In both cases, the answer is no. Both Caesar and Churchill came from families already established in positions of power; the advantage they had over other lesser-connected yet equally or perhaps better qualified individuals is obvious. And what about Cleopatra's and Elizabeth's ascent to authoritative power? Both were granted theirs by virtue of royal parentage sans any other attribute or effort on their part. Yet both Queens had a native intelligence which they used throughout their lives both to maintain and strengthen their positions.

Still, the authority of power is ultimately based on the principle that "might makes right." As such, it is not the causative agent in its relationship with knowledge authoritativeness when the two meld. As illustrated by any number of tyrants who have existed throughout the ages, "might does not necessarily make bright." Conversely, the authority of knowledge, when the primary authoritative factor, is almost always the catalyst for ascension into authoritative power—those rare instances when the authority of power precedes the authority of knowledge but the two coincide, notwithstanding.

A critical component of understanding authoritative voice in literary writing includes comprehending the entire dynamic of how that voice manifests itself as either *authentic* or *inauthentic*. It would stand to reason, then, that the next terms that need to be defined relative to their meanings within this study are "authenticity" and "inauthenticity."

Once more, *The American Heritage Dictionary* establishes a basis. Authenticity is defined as "The quality or condition of being authentic, trustworthy, or genuine." Authentic is defined as "Conforming to fact and therefore worthy of trust, reliance, or belief . . . " (124). Inauthenticity, on the other hand, is defined merely as being, "Not genuine or authentic" (910).

Distilled, reliability is the salient factor as regards these definitions. Reliability is also the main issue when it comes to how authoritativeness should be evaluated as either authentic or inauthentic. Such criteria as background of sources, experience, trustworthiness, conflicting information, common sense, etc., all come into play. A reader, though initially won over by rhetorical devices designed to instill in the narrator an air of confidence, must nevertheless examine the content of the voice's exposition beyond its surface-level seeming veracity. The old adage of not judging a book by its cover can be extended here to cover not judging a book's reliability by its verisimilitude.

Of course, this is not to imply that all texts that use the authoritative voice will prove false; this voice is germane to all good technical writing texts, after all. The point

is that while it can be a native rhetorical consequence catalyzed within and by the development of good literary writing, authoritative voice can also be an authorially contrived and exploited rhetorical ruse to obfuscate misinformation. As such, the authenticity of a voice needs to be examined just as thoroughly as its authoritativeness to establish its meaning and value to literature.

3. Authoritative Voice in *Moby-Dick* and *Arthur Gordon Pym*

Now that a theoretically working model for analyzing the authoritative voice has been established, it is time to apply this it to the "real world," so to speak, that is, to established literary models.

In the study two focal pieces for this application are Herman Melville's *Moby-Dick; or, the Whale* and Edgar Allan Poe's *The Narrative of Arthur Gordon Pym of Nantucket*. The main reasons for these choices are two-fold in nature:

First, both novels have within their cumulative texts all of the inherent rhetorical elements this study examines.

Secondly, since this project proposes that the authoritative voice exists in similar ways in literary and technical writing and seeks to prove that it therefore helps facilitate this process to use literary pieces which contain technical writing styles and methods. Both *Moby-Dick* and *Pym* have such styles and methods incorporated into their texts.

Section 3, "Authoritative Voice in *Moby-Dick* and *Arthur Gordon Pym*,"
beginning of page 7, elaborates with specific examples from the chosen texts on both
literary and technical writing rhetorical elements of authoritative voice, as listed below:

Additionally, in each of these sections, there is analysis of authenticity and inauthenticity within the context of the chosen passages.

Finally, "Authenticity and Inauthenticity in *Moby-Dick* and *Pym*," section 3.C, page 143, elaborates on the overall authenticity and inauthenticity of each of the novels and how each is representative of the voice throughout other similar works of literature.

3.A.   *Literary Writing Rhetoric and Style*

As previously defined in "On Authority," section 1, page 1, fully developed authoritative voice is the manifestation of the collaboration of the authorities of power and knowledge expressed in literature as a written dialogue (either narrative and/or characterological), or as the voice of the author in technical writing, which conveys both veracity and an associated sociological puissance to support whatever contentions that voice puts forth. Furthermore, vis-à-vis this criteria the authoritative voice can be evaluated as either authentic or inauthentic.

But just how is this manifestation constructed? What are the building blocks which, when put together, effect the end result? And when are these elements, when taken in toto, considered successful or unsuccessful, that is authentic or inauthentic, respectively?

In analyzing the authoritative voice from a rhetorical perspective, one first needs to define the terms, parameters, and scope of the study.

Since a basic definition of authoritative voice has already been established, the next term which needs to be set is *rhetoric*. Murphy defines it as ". . . analytical, expository treatises that attempt . . . to discover the actual basis for human communication" (3). As an extension of this definition, it can be deduced that these treatises contain elements or devices pertaining to rhetorical structure. Certain of these rhetorical elements and devices can be used to clarify how the authoritative voice is employed—either authentically or inauthentically—within both literary and technical writing.

As such, the first-level headings of the rhetorical elements germane in literary writing that are to the development of the authoritative voice are listed below in the order that they appear in this examination:

The categories and subcategories of different rhetorical elements listed above are distinct areas of usage insofar as effecting authoritative voice in literary writing technique is concerned. This individuality notwithstanding, there is also much crossover, and many of the passages used to illustrate one element oftentimes simultaneously contain several other elements as well. Additionally, more often than not these separate but concomitant rhetorical attributes are equally weighted insofar as their value is concerned regarding their effect on successfully manifesting the authoritative voice. Therefore, a certain degree of arbitrary assignment to a specific category, has taken place in this study; additionally though, wherever possible, other relevant devices, acting within the text aside from the focal one, are also noted.

In *A Synoptic History of Classical Rhetoric*, Murphy defines *logos* as "thought and expression" (7). As such, it can be included within the broader framework of rhetoric. Within the scope and context of this study, several rhetorical dynamics have been identified which can be used to effect an authoritative voice, and which best fall within the parameters of logos.

The elements of logos which pertain to authoritative voice manifestation explored in this examination are as follows:

Section	Title	Page
3.A.I.i.	Stylistic Affectation	12
3.A.I.ii.	Syntactical Variance	18
3.A.I.iii.	Foreshadowing, Allusions to the Future, and Prophecy	21
3.A.I.iv.	Timelessness, Eternity, and Infinity	26
3.A.I.v.	Scripture, Religion Theology, Cosmology, and Mythology	33
3.A.I.vi.	Faith-Based Omnipresence and Secrecy Symbology	41
3.A.I.vii.	Obviously False Antithesis Juxtaposed With A Contrary Thesis To Establish Or Reinforce The Latter's Validity	49

Stylistic affectation is a literary-based rhetorical device which contrives narrative or characterological voices to speak in ways that do not fall within the norm for the average person of the time and place of a fictional work's setting, or which are inappropriate to what is expected of the characterological or narrative speakers due to their socio-economic status, age, or circumstance. This device may oftentimes imply

authority, or attempt to posture the person behind the voice into a position of authority, vis-à-vis that person's articulation of the authoritatively affected style being spoken.

Melville uses stylistic affectation often in *Moby-Dick*. For instance, Ishmael, quoting an unrevealed source, states:

> [I]t *maketh* a marvelous difference, whether *thou lookest* out
> at it from a glass window where the frost is all on the
> outside, or whether *thou observest* it from the *sashless*
> window, where the frost is on both sides of which the *wight*
> *Death* is the only *glazier*. (10-11) [italics mine]

In employing the archaic and often-times Biblically associated word-form choices of "thou lookest," "maketh," and "thou obserbvest," Melville stylistically alludes to both historical wisdom and Biblical scripture simultaneously. Normally, Ishmael would not speak in this manner; he rarely does in other passages throughout the novel. It is only periodically, when trying to infuse authority into his speech, that he does—or more accurately, that Melville has him do so.

Suddenly then, a normal pattern of speech which readers have grown accustomed to hearing from the speaker is radically changed. This change, of course, is acutely noticeable to these readers; it immediately draws attention to itself. As such, it begs explanation. But *how* does Melville substantiate this sudden shift in style? He does so by embedding it into a "quotation," a citation of an unnamed, but presumed "expert" source, further imbuing it with more authoritativeness. And *why* should readers presume this source's expertise? By mere virtue of the fact that Ishmael is citing it, it becomes so—who would quote someone who is not an authority when trying to bolster a point?

This use of historically or Biblically imitative semantic style draws readers into associating the substance of the quotation with the language with which it affects itself, that is, one of authoritativeness by virtue of its perceived historical value and/or its status as a direct passage from God to Biblical human authors. This authoritativeness is further strengthened in the previous excerpt by the reference to "Death," an ultimate power-authoritative element, and by use of elevated diction in such word choices as "wight," "sashless," and "glazier."

Poe, in constructing his narrator/main character/protagonist Arthur Gordon Pym, also uses stylistically affected variance from both the manner in which common people contemporaneous to the story's setting spoke, and, as well as on occasion, from that way in which Pym himself usually presents himself.

The first type of stylistic affectation cited in the previous paragraph is designed to effect an image of Pym as above the norm, that is, a member of the moneyed Northern gentry. It was Poe's overall intent in the novel to argue the point via Pym's incompetence in his nautical/expeditionary skills, that Northerners were remiss in their minds as a whole. This primary characterization of his narrator was the groundwork which eventually leads to and supports Poe's nefarious authorial intentions for Pym, that is, to use him as a representative of all Yankee incompetence in evaluating matters concerning Southern enslavement of Africans and African-Americans. Throughout the novel then, Poe has Pym speak in the unmistakable manner of the Northern gentrified merchant class. The following passage provides text by which this can be explicated:

I now asked my companion what course he intended to steer, and *what time he thought it probable we should get back.* '*I* am going to sea—*you* may go home *if you think proper.*' Turning my eyes upon him, I perceived at once that in spite of his *nonchalance*, he was greatly agitated. I could see him distinctly by the light of the moon—*his face was paler than any marble*, and his hand shook so excessively that he could *scarcely retain hold of the tiller.* I found that something had gone wrong, and became seriously alarmed. *At this period I knew little about the management of a boat*, and was now depending upon the nautical skill of my friend. The wind, too, had suddenly increased, and *we were fast getting out of the lee of the land—still I was ashamed to betray my trepidation*, and for almost half an hour maintained a resolute silence. I could stand it no longer, however, and *spoke to Augustus about the propriety of turning back.* As before, *it was nearly a minute before he made answer, or took any notice of my suggestion.* (7) [second, third and fifth italics group ("*I*," "*you*," and "*nonchalance*") Poe's formatting; all other italics mine]

In the first italicization of this study's author, "what time he thought it probable we should get back," Pym's rather refined syntactical variance[2] and word choice immediately speak of his socio-economic class; in contrast to this, the indicator of a non-elitist lower to petit-bourgeois speech pattern, and as such, the more common way of expressing the same meaning would be, of course, "what time he thought we would probably be back." The choice of "thought it probable," as opposed to "thought we would probably," is one of the stylistic affectations in this passage which give Pym away as gentrified: Both the choice of employing the adjectival form of "probable" as opposed

---

[2] n.b. Syntactaical varaiance, when employed with authorial intent, is always an example of stylistic affectation.

to the adverbial form "probably," and the subsequent forced syntactical repositioning of the pronoun "we" indicate this.

When writing "if you think proper," Poe omits the words "it is" between the "you" and "think," indicating a more sophisticated level of speech pattern in the voice of the speaker. Once again, this gives the style an attribute of authoritative intelligence.

The next italicization, "his face was paler than any marble," while not an indicator of any stylistic contrivance to effect an elevated tone to the voice per se, for all classes of people use this simile as a form of comparison, is rather a sophisticated indicator of an elevated social position, in that it uses the comparative image of "marble," which becomes a pointer to the speaker's knowledge of, and assumed familiarity with, that sort of valuable stone and the level of works of art most usually wrought from it. The affectation comes not so much from the stylistic rhetorical elements then, but rather, from the content of the rhetoric.

The next indicator of stylistic affectation highlighted in the previously quoted passage is, "scarcely retain hold of the tiller." Here Poe combines the use of an elevated level of diction in "scarcely," and with the technical term "tiller," to give his speaker's voice a tonal quality associated with an authority of both class and knowledge.

Poe then has Pym state, "At this period I knew little about the management of a boat." Here the author again switches from purely stylistic rhetorical indicators of Pym's authoritativeness, to that which is content-based, but this time, he does so to undermine the previously designed rhetorical stance ostensibly geared toward building up

the narrator/character, by insinuating that refined and sophisticated gentleman has the financial wherewithal to own a sailing vessel, but not the authoritative knowledgeability to be able to pilot it. It is one of the first indicators of Pym's true nature, that of an inauthentic authority.

The clause "we were fast getting out of the lee of the land" also indicates Pym's ineptness, and by extension, the inauthenticity of his authoritativeness; he has after all, gone sailing in a high wind, in the dark, with a drunken man at the helm.

And what does he then do when he realizes his folly? Nothing of course, as he states that, "still I was ashamed to betray my trepidation." Here Poe is revealing a bit more of Pym's character: Not only is his narrator oftentimes unthinking to the point of foolishness, but he is also irresolute in rectifying the dire situations he finds himself in as a consequence of weakness. Once again, this serves to subtly chip away at Pym's facade of authoritative knowledge.

Eventually, Pym decides to act, as he recounts that he "spoke to Augustus about the propriety of turning back." Here Poe, by having Pym speak with a rather nonchalant lack of urgency, shows that his narrator is either not appropriately concerned by his situation, or is trying to effect a type of thinly veiled bravado which is outright foolish in the face of the inherent danger of the situation.

Finally, as a means of absolutely driving home the point that Pym is not as authoritative as he would portray himself via his rhetorical posturing, Poe has his narrator recount the observation about Augustus that "it was nearly a minute before he made

answer, or took any notice of my suggestion." This sure sign of intoxication is another indicator of his friend's ineptitude, something which Pym neglected to notice previously as a harbinger of disaster, and something upon which he here again seems to pay only passing comment. This reiterates Poe's intent to show Pym as a person *not* to be trusted in word, thought, nor action. In portraying him thusly, Poe uses Pym to facilitate the author's intent as representative of inept and failed Northern mentality, a mentality not equipped to handle the complex issue of Southern slavery.

Syntactical variance is another literary rhetorical affection which can be used by authors of fiction to construct authoritativeness, or at least its semblance, into their works. Varying the syntax of a sentence from the accepted norm infuses the voice with a sophistication which speaks to authoritativeness in its ability to articulate above and beyond what is considered average lingual proficiency.

The use of syntactical variance is the deliberate artifice of an author to place words in an order within a sentence which is not the usual and contemporaneous way of otherwise expressing an equivalent idea. This device operates on two levels.

The first of these is that certain syntactical models have been established throughout time which evoke a specific type of characterological ideation when encountered by readers. Varying the syntax of a sentence from the accepted norm in a refined manner gives the voice a sophistication which speaks to authoritativeness in its ability to articulate above and beyond average proficiency. Contrarily, voices which

employ less than refined syntactical construction, for example, those which end sentences with a preposition, especially when combined with other literary elements of the character's development, might tend to affect the reader's perception of the character as being of a certain regional affiliation or class strata. Consequently, when the same speaker suddenly then starts *not* speaking in the same anticipated pattern, the attention of the reader is drawn to this. If the new pattern indicates an increase in the speakers sophistication, i.e., a "correct" syntactical structure, the reader will then associate the speaker with the speech, evaluating both as being more authoritative. Conversely, if the speaker's articulation becomes less refined, readers notice that as well.

Compare and contrast the following sentences: "What time do you get off work at?" with "At what time do you get off work?" Both sentences are conveying the same request: Both sentences use exactly the same words. However, the first sentence implies a certain lack of education on the part of the speaker, owing to its violation of the rather prescriptive, yet sill adhered to, grammatical rule of not ending a sentence with a preposition. One can also hear some regional inflection associated with this type of syntactical structuring: a Southern drawl; a Bronx accent; perhaps an intonation of any number of immigrant groups. On the other hand, the second example is also immediately evocative of a certain type of characterization; the its formality might suggest a person affecting upper socio-economic status, perhaps a voice of someone representing an elitist status such as that of the British gentry.

Examples of this in *Moby-Dick* abound. The following excerpt typifies Ishmael as narrator changing normal syntax for effect:

> In judging of that tempestuous wind called Euroclydon,"
> says an old writer—of whose works I possess the only *copy*
> *extant*— . . . (10) [my italics]

The reversed noun/adjective syntax of "copy extant" from the normal way of modifying a nominative object adjective/noun gives the entire sentence a rather refined tone. Coupling elevated diction ("tempestuous," "extant,") and rarified subject matter ("Euroclydon"), Melville attempts to elevate Ishmael's voice to give it, overall, an air of authoritativeness.

Poe does this in *Pym* as well. The passage below is an example of the narrator using a syntactical variance from the norm of society at large, much in keeping with his position as a Northern gentleman:

> Notwithstand this representation, I did not make up my mind to do as he suggested. *He afterward proposed* (finding that I would not stir in the matter) that I should allow him to draw up, in his own words, a narrative of the earlier portion of my adventures, from facts *afforded by myself*, publishing it in the Southern Messenger *under thegarb of fiction.*" (2) [all italics mine, except the final phrase]

The clause, "He afterward proposed," is a syntactical variant of the more usually expressed, "Afterward he proposed." This variation is in keeping with the linguistic sophistication expected of a person of the gentry class; as might be expressed from a member of this set: "If one has it, why not use it?"

Likewise, the clause "afforded by myself" is both a syntactically variant of the more commonly stated "by which I afforded him," and a stylistic affectation in its omission of the words "which" and "him," as well as the substitution of "myself" for "I."

20

This sophisticated sort of language might be commonly ascribed to someone in a position of authority, who by virtue of it, also has the educational experience which affords an authority of knowledge.

Poe has Pym employ many such of syntactical variants from the norm throughout the novel. As such, he remains in character, that is, a Northern, gentrified, educated, and ostensibly reasonable man. Of course, with Poe, this is just the surface of Arthur Gordon Pym; the illusion that Poe so deftly reveals throughout the novel is that beneath this veneer of seeming finesse, there lies an infrastructure compromised by inherent structural deficiency.

3.A.1.iii.   FORESHADOWING, ALLUSIONS TO THE FUTURE, AND PROPHECY

Foreshadowing, allusions to the future, and prophecy are all interrelated literary rhetorical elements of craft which speak to a time which has not yet come. As such, they all infuse a voice which uses any one of them singularly or in unison with an innate sense of authoritativeness; being able to "see" into the future implies a wealth of both knowledge- and power-based authoritativeness.

Foreshadowing is that element of literary logos which suggests to a reader a forthcoming event in the fictive piece being read. It is used by authors to infuse a state of suspense, expectation, or anticipation into their works. It is related to allusions to the future and prophecy because it speaks to a time yet to come, but insofar as it is generally designed to be somewhat cryptic in nature, it is the least specific of this set.

Allusions to the future also indicate a heightened sense of awareness by the speaker above and beyond the norm concerning things to come; that is, that persons behind these types of voices have special powers which enable them to commune with a time not accessible to others.

Prophecy is by its very nature a corollary of allusions to the future, but there is a salient difference which distinguishes the former from the latter: prophecy is an outright prediction of *specific* events which will transpire in the future, versus the mere allusion to *possible* future occurrences. Prophecy implies the greatest degree of authority of knowledge, insofar as it suggests an ability to predict exactly future events, a facility to which ordinary people are not privy. As an extension of that special expertise, it also implies a heightened authority of power; being able to predict events gives people with that power control over at least their own, if not others' destinies.

Melville's simultaneous use of foreshadowing, allusions to the future, and prophecy in *Moby-Dick* is exemplified by Chapter 19, "The Prophet" (95-8). The power- and knowledge-based authoritative concept of the "prophet" Elijah in the Bible who foretold of the disobedience of King Ahab, resonates within the context of the novel by infusing into it a parallelism with the name of the Biblical seer and the wanderer of the Nantucket wharf area, as well as the King of Israel and the captain of one of the novel's main symbols, the ship *Pequod*. This allusion to prophecy infuses the text with attributes of the future in that all prophets are privy to times yet to come. Additionally, this prophecy also builds foreshadowing into the text by alerting readers to a possible forthcoming situation similar to what occurs within the Biblical allusion.

22

Foreshadowing by itself is also used by Melville:

> . . . to lay the world, Black Little Pip—he never did! Poor
> Alabama boy! On the grim *Pequod*'s forecastle, ye shall ere
> long see him, was bid strike in with angels; beating his
> tambourine, prelusive of the eternal time, when sent for, to
> the great quarter-deck on high, he was bid strike in with the
> angles; and beat his tambourine in glory; called a coward
> here, hailed a hero there! (123)

Here Ishmael is subtly revealing to his audience that Pip will meet with a fatal situation sometime in the future. This concept of revelation, is what distinguishes foreshadowing from mere allusion to the future; however, foreshadowing is by definition inherently associated with future considerations.

Melville is also aware that his use of foreshadowing is an authoritativeness-enhancing device, and wants to exploit it to that end, as well as ensure that his audience is keenly aware of it. The passage below is indicative of this:

> For me, I silently recalled the mysterious shadows I had
> seen creeping on board the *Pequod* during the dim
> Nantucket dawn, as well as the enigmatical *hintings* of the
> unaccountable Elijah. (224) [italics mine]

This allusion actually refers back to several passages in which the author employed foreshadowing; it is almost as if Melville through Ishmael needs to validate his abilities as a writer by pointedly saying, "See, remember this device I used? How clever . . . I knew how to use it then, and I still know how to use it now," which by virtue of its obviously insecure foundation brings into doubt the authenticity of the voice.

In Chapter 71, "The Jeroboam's Story" (321-25), the crew believes in Gabriel's

ability to project the future because they have witnessed him "foretelling," that is,

prophesizing, the Jeroboam's first mate Macey's doom by Moby Dick:

> This terrible event clothed the archangle with added
> influence; because his credulous deciples believed that he
> had specifically *fore-announced* it, instead of only making a
> general *prophecy,* . . . (326) [my italics]

This is different than the narrative foreshadowing we have been discussing.

In alluding to future-attuned characters, Melville infuses them with the same type of

authoritativeness inherent in his foreshadowing narrator, but uses a different path to

do so. Typically, foreshadowing is a tool that works better in narrative; attributes of

futurism work best with characterological dialogue.

Poe also uses foreshadowing throughout *Pym.* From the very first page of the

novel in the excerpt from the "Preface" below, Pym is excusing his reluctance to have

previously published an account of his journey:

> Another reason was that the incidents *to be narrated were of a*
> *nature so positively marvelous* that, unsupported as my
> assertions must necessarily be (except by the evidence of a
> single individual, and he a half-breed Indian), I could only hope
> for belief among my family and friends who have reason,
> through life, to put faith in my veracity—the probabilty being
> that the public at large would regard what I should put forth as
> merely impudent and ingenious fiction. (1) [italics mine]

Poe heightens the expectation of the reader of things to come by building up the

tale with the qualification that without his explanation here, "the public at large

would regard what I should put forth as merely impudent and ingenious fiction" (1).

In so doing, he implies that Pym has a special insight into reality not afforded to ordinary people.

Poe also combines prophecy with foreshadowing in *Pym*, as illustrated in the following passage:

> My visions were of shipwreck[3] and famine; of death or captivity among barbarian hordes, of a lifetime dragged out in sorrow and tears, upon some gray and desolate rock, in an ocean unapproachable and unknown. Such *visions* or desires—for they amounted to desires—are common, I have since been assured, to the hole numerous race of the melancholy among men—at the time of which I speak I regarded them only as *prophetic* glimpses of a destiny[4] which I felt myself in a measure bound to fulfill. (15) [italics mine, refers to prophecy; underlining mine; refers to foreshadowing]

When Pym uses the words "visions" and "prophecy," he is telling his readers that what he is talking about, that is, "shipwreck and famine; of death or captivity among barbarian hordes, of a lifetime dragged out in sorrow and tears, upon some gray and desolate rock, in an ocean unapproachable and unknown," are futuristic faits accomplis; these things are going to happen to him. He predicts this with a specificity which transcends mere foreshadowing. Later in the same passage he embellishes his previous prophecy with an additional element of foreshadowing, one might suppose to emphasize

---

[3] n.b.: Poe infuses elements of eternity and timelessness in this passage as well; i.e., "shipwreck," "famine," "death," "lifetime," "tears," and "sorrow" are all images or symbols which transcend time; all of these experiences and emotions have always been with mankind, and they always will be (see "Timelessness, Eternity, and Infinity" section 3.A.I.iv, page 26, for greater detail).

[4] The concept of "destiny" is comprised of both futuristic and nonanthropromorphised religious/ theological mythological/cosmological attributes. Futuristic attributes speak to inevitable events which will happen in the future; nonanthropromorphised attributes speak to how oftentimes destiny is viewed as being the wilfull manifestation of authoritative powers.

further the point of his inevitable fate, but also one gets the sense, to mute the element of destiny; this dilution of the fatalism of the previously described prophecy is done so that the future of the novel is not so certain that the story fails to retain a sense of mystery, driving readers' desires to continue, while simultaneously instilling anticipation.

Timelessness, eternity, and infinity are all interrelated abstract concepts which can be translated into literary rhetorical devices used by authors of fiction to give authoritativeness to narrative and/or characterological voices within their works. The interrelationship between them comes from their mutual ability to ostensibly being able to control various aspects of time, yet each of them has distinctive qualities which distinguishes them.

The concept of timelessness within the scope of this study refers to those images or symbols which transcend the passage of time, that is, those objects which have always been in existence from *before* time can be *calculated* with *certainty*. Equally important is the belief that not only have these entities always been in existence from time immemorial, but that they will continue to be so into the unforeseeable future. Examples of timeless symbols are such enduring existences as mountains, oceans, stars, etc. The ability to transcend the ravages of time gives timeless objects their sense of authoritative power.

Eternity, a concept closely related to timelessness, is more specific, and differentiates itself from its root by virtue of an inherent *calculable starting point*

assumed within its definition. This renders it as not tied to a past defined by an *immemorial* genesis, but rather, by an extended everlasting time from a *particular* starting point. It should be noted, however, that this starting point does not necessarily need to be *exactly* identifiable, but there needs to be at least a definable *calculation* of its inception, be this in any scale from the tiniest fraction of a second, to millennium, era, or even beyond. As with timelessness, an object viewed as eternal is assumed to be everlasting. An example of eternity symbology is the Christian concept of the eternity of salvation through Christ's death and resurrection. Previous to Jesus' crucifixion and subsequent rising from the dead, original sin had not been forgiven; his defeat of death on the cross was the chronological nexus and conceptional point of a redemption which now exists forevermore.

More abstract, but equally eternally omnipresent throughout the experience of our species' sensibilities, are such symbolically laden experiences as death, sorrow, joy, fear, etc., which have also always been a part of the human experience. All of these abstractions are life experiences, either on the grand scale such as death which is a factor in all biological existence, or on the more human scale, such as with the emotions of joy, sorrow, fear, etc., ergo, the categorization of this set of experiences as *eternal* versus *timeless*.

What makes eternal concepts by nature authoritative is the continuum of their existence which indicates a form of power: neither death nor the capricious nature of the passage of time can touch them.

Finally, there is infinity. Like timelessness and eternity, infinity speaks to an everlasting quality of the object associated with its essence, but its application is usually

more focused upon the element of power derived from the incalculability of its *never ending, constantly growing* numbers.

Size has always indicated power-based authority. The more of any item a particular authority figure has, the greater that figure's authority of power: More military resources means a greater advantage in war; more financial wealth indicates a better position from which one might either protect vested interests, provide enhanced or expanded services, or profit through investment. All of these indicators rely on *quantitative* measurement as evaluative criteria insofar as the *quality* of the authoritativeness is concerned. As such, quantitative evaluations of objects' numbers as *infinite*—whether this evaluation relates to such intangible abstracts as time or an attempt to quantify the measure of one's love for another, or those objects which are more concrete such as currency, armaments, people, etc.—are the ultimate expression of this dynamic.

References which either directly state or allude to timelessness, infinity, or eternity create a symbology which infuses a timeless, infinite, or eternal quality into the voice of a speaker, and/or the essence of a character or narrator as an associative extension of the reference. As such, authoritativeness is infused into the character's voice by virtue of the inherent enduring and immutable characteristics of these concepts, all of which can be applied to tenets of knowledge-based authoritativeness, juxtaposed over the character or narrator whose voice is speaking.

Melville uses all three of these elements—timelessness, eternity, and infinity—in plentitude throughout *Moby-Dick*, attempting to imbue his narrator and characters with

authoritativeness.   Sometimes he effects each separately; sometimes, he uses them in combination with each other.

An example of Ishmael citing infinity and eternity to effect an authoritative position of both the speaker and the character being spoken about, can be seen in the following excerpt which were used previously in "Foreshadowing, Allusions to the Future, and Prophecy," section 3.A.I.iii, page 21, to explicate authoritativeness in those literary rhetorical devices referenced in that section title:

> Captain Ahab stood erect, looking straight out beyond the ship's *ever pitching prow*. There was an infinity of the firmest fortitude, a determinate, unsurrenderable willfulness, in the fixed and fearless, forward dedication of that glance. (126) [italics, indicating eternity, mine; underlining, indicatin infinity, mine]

The words "ever pitching prow" infuse the passage with an element of eternity: ships prows have always been pitching in some sea from such time as ships have existed; furthermore, save for some unpredictable cataclysmic environmental disaster which would render waterways no longer navigable, they always will be. This frames the scene in a type of everlastingness which elevates it. In so doing, Melville associates the subject he is speaking of with an aura of importance and meaning which includes an authority of power: Images and symbols of this nature are usually framed in this way because they have a significance which comes from their eternal potency. By extension, Ishmael as a speaker who it is assumed is qualified to speak of such authoritatively inherent concepts, becomes part and particle of their authoritativeness as well.

In using the word "infinity," Ishmael also sets himself up as being authoritatively knowledgeable through his ability to discern this rare insight in Ahab. Simultaneously, he infuses Ahab (of whom he speaks) with a sense of both power- and knowledge-based authority by alluding to the infinite. This leaves readers free to associate the reference with both wisdom (knowledge) and/or chronological transcendence (an incalculable amount of power—unaffected by the wearing powers of time), ultimately attributing the power of this abstract to the captain as well.

The concept of timelessness is yet another symbol which speaks to authoritativeness. Melville uses this device throughout his novel to infuse both his narrator and chosen characters with heightened power and knowledge. For example, here he associates Ahab through Ishmael's narrative with timelessness and a elevated sense of knowledge:

> Nevertheless, the *old* sea-traditions, the *immemorial* credulities, popularly invested this Manxman with <u>preternatural powers of discernment</u>. (125-26) [my italics indicating timeless elements; my underlining, referencing authoritative knowledge]

Here, not only does the character of Ahab enjoy an increase in his authoritativeness, but so does Ishmael for being "astute" enough about human nature to discern these qualities of timelessness and their association with intelligence-based authoritativeness in Ahab.

Melville continuously mixes timelessness with authority throughout his work; in some cases he simultaneously cites infinity as well. The passage below, shows Melville not only infusing his narrative voice with the two aforementioned authoritative rhetorical enhancements, but also details how he masterfully overlays it with numerous other

30

rhetorical elements of authoritativeness; the bullet list before the excerpt details how these attributes used to explicate various kinds of authoritativeness built by rhetorical devices are identified:

- Timelessness is *italicized bold*
- Infinity is dotted-underlined
- Eternity is in (parenthesis)
- Authoritative Reference (authority per se and/or authoritative figures) is in double-underlined
- Heroic attributes in the classic Greek mythological sense are single-underlined
- Religiosity is *italicized*
- Secrecy is in **bold**

> Captain Ahab stood erect, looking straight out beyond the ship's (ever pitching prow). There was an infinity of firmest fortitude, a determinate, unsurrenderable willfulness, in the *fixed* and fearless, forward dedication of that glance. Not a word he spoke; nor did his officers say aught to him; though by all their minutest gestures and expressions, they plainly showed the uneasy, if not painful, consciousness of being under a troubled master-eye. And not only that, but moody stricken Ahab stood before them with a *crucifixion* in his face; in all the nameless overbearing dignity of some woe. (126)

As one can see, timelessness, infinity, and eternity not only work together to give a voice a sense of authoritativeness, but do so in unison with a number of other authoritativeness-building literary rhetorical devices. Readers view the image of Ahab perched upon the deck of the *Pequod* as it eternally cuts through an equally eternal ocean, heroic in his appearance and demeanor, fixed there not in any particular time but in such a way that his image is frozen in a transcendent timelessness, for all intents and purposes elevated to the status of a Christ-like figure in the way his countenance bespeaks of the

great nobility with which he carries his immense sorrow. And what does all of this

rhetoric in toto effect? What else but authoritativeness, great and never ending—

eternal—and incalculable—*infinite*.

Poe also uses timeless, eternal, and infinite images in *Pym*. An example of

timelessness in this novel is seen below:

> Not a scream arose from the deck of the victim—there was
> a slight grating sound to be heard mingling with *the roar of*
> *wind and water* . . . (10) [italics mine]

"The roar of the wind and water" have always existed, not only within the history

of the human race, but since the beginning of earthly time itself; as far as can be

predicted, they will exist forevermore as well. Since there is no calculable nativity for

wind and water—other than that of the Earth itself—it falls under the concept of

timelessness, rather than eternity. What gives it an authoritative sense is, once more, its

continuum from the point of its inception to the present, and furthermore, to its

anticipated continuance beyond the foreseeable future.

Contrast this with Poe's citation of the eternal concept of "death":

> In regard to myself—I was resucitated from a state
> bordering very nearly upon death (and after every other
> means had been tried in vain for three hours and a half) by
> vigorous friction with flannels bathed in hot oil—
> a proceeding suggested by Augustus. (13)

Death has a definite point at which it becomes a reality to the object it affects; in

Pym's case, it is that point which would have followed immediately after the time of

which he is speaking, had not the intervention of a "vigorous friction with flannels bathed

in hot oil" occurred. Not only does the particular instance of Pym's own near-demise

have this inceptive delimiter, but the very overall concept of death itself does as well: it did not occur until after the first living creature existed on Earth, yet as well, it did not exist coincidental to the formation of our planet; as such, it is categorized as eternal rather than timeless. The same sort of paradigm is, of course, also applicable to all other eternal concepts, for example, as previously mentioned, it might include joy, sorrow, fear, etc. Eternity's an inherent genesis notwithstanding, such eternal concepts as death, sorrow, joy, fear; all have existed only as long as either life or people have. What gives each of these abstractions their authoritativeness is, once again, their power to transcend time itself—the past, the present, and the future—without any change. As such, any voice speaking them immediately associates itself with an authority of power, at the very least, and when the voice states a thought related to an understanding of something deeper than the existence of these eternal experiences, an authority of knowledge as well.

Pym in the quotation on the previous page accomplishes both of these, having transcended death and illustrated a power over it, as well as having an associate (Augustus) who knew the machinations involved in accomplishing this. Yet—as was Poe's plan—there remains the inherent disassociation of Pym with authentic authority insofar as death is concerned, for after all, who among mortal men can control it? It is arrogant to think so, let alone intimate one has actually accomplished it.

3.A.I.A.   SCRIPTURE, RELIGION, THEOLOGY, COSMOLOGY, AND MYTHOLOGY

Since scriptural, religious, theological, cosmic, and mythological references, allusions and language are all inherently associated with an almighty figurehead or

figureheads, and since this omnipotence is always viewed within scriptural, religious, theological, cosmic, or mythological contexts as being the expression of an ultimately authoritative figure, these images, allusions, symbols, and quotations, etc., are, by definition, always inherently authoritative.

Examples of these types of rhetorical implementations are allusions to textual passages and narrative substance, direct scriptural quotations, elevated and archaic diction of the kind usually employed in the writing style of scriptural literature, and references to religions, cosmic entities, mythological gods, and deities.

Furthermore, the deity used in these instances can be either a monotheological god such as in Judeo/Christian or Islamic religion, or any of a number of mythological gods or goddesses such as Odin, Jove, Cupid, etc. Even nonanthropomorphised cosmic and theological forces, such as fate, destiny, damnation, and reward can be viewed as manifestations of the wills the greater figureheads, infusing a text with attributes of authoritativeness.

There are numerous examples of this type of religio-cosmic-mythological rhetoric throughout *Moby-Dick*. The very name of the narrator himself, "Ishmael," and this name's Biblical allusion to the outcast son of Abraham in the Judeo/Christian tradition, triggers a sort of resonating association on an subconscious level in readers' minds to the inherent power- and knowledge-based authoritativeness of the Biblical Ishmael as the son of the founding patriarch of the Jews. This primary-level association is then extended, to the narrator of *Moby-Dick*, whose voice throughout the work thereby becomes authoritative.

Overlaying Ishmael's Biblically name-associated authority, is a set of pan-experiential authoritativeness, which Melville infuses into his narrative voice via a dialogue which constantly melds other-than-Judeo/Christian representations of authority with that same tradition's authoritative images:

> [T]his is the invisible police officer of the *Fates*, which has the constant surveillance of me and secretly dogs me and influences me in some unaccountable way—he can better answer that than anyone else. And doubtless my going on the whaling voyage, formed part of the grand programme of *Providence* that was drawn up a long time ago. (6) [italics mine, indicating such references]

In referring to the two nonanthropomorphised authoritative elements of the "Fates" and "Providence," Ishmael correlates the cosmic (Fates) with Judeo-Christian theology (Providence). This juxtaposing of two similar types of authoritativeness, which are individually based in two vastly different, mystical milieus causes an unexpected, yet subconsciously accepted, associative correlation between them, broadening the scope of the authoritativeness of Ishmael as a result.

In the excerpt at the top of the next page from *Melville and Authority*, Nicholas Canaday expounds further about the religious elements of authoritativeness in *Moby-Dick*:

> Ahab participates in several pseudoreligious ceremonies: the perverted sacrament of the harpoons, the fashioning of a special harpoon in the fiery forge and the baptizing of it with blood, and the defiant worship of the lightening that strikes the *Pequod*. (44)

Canaday's observation that the harpoon baptism is an allusion to religiosity, and that this is "pseudoreligious," implies by extension that the authoritativeness under which Ahab

35

conducts the ritual is inauthentic. Once again, we see Ahab's authority undermined; his voice, already suspect, is further undercut.

In *Pym*, while Poe does not rely so continually on scriptural, religious, theological, cosmic, or mythological language, allusion, or reference as does Melville in *Moby-Dick*, this type of rhetorical presence is, nonetheless, sustained throughout the novel, and definitely exists in profusion enough to be noticeable to readers—as it obviously was intended to by the author.

One way Poe infuses religious/theological rhetorical authoritativeness into his novel is by using the term "God" as a petition to the power-based authority of the ultimate divine; this invocation of divine intervention is used throughout the novel, in such examples as those shown in the excerpts below:

> 'For God's sake, Augustus,' I screamed, now heartily
> frightened, 'what ails you—what is the matter?—what *are*
> you going to do?' (7) [italics mine]

> Having thus arrainged everything as well as I could in my
> chilled and agitated condition, I recommended myself to
> God, and made up my mind to bear whatever might happen
> with all the fortitude in my power. (9) [italics mine]

In both cases, Poe is attempting to give the speaker's voice more authority through invoking the name of God. Similarly, Poe uses divine petition not only through the voice of his narrator, but the voices of other characters as well, as exemplified in this passage where Augustus replies to his friend Pym's frantic callings:

> 'Hush—for God's sake be silent!' he replied in a voice
> trembling with agitation. (39)

Poe also uses nonanthropomorphised cosmic and theological forces to effect the

same result of enhancing the authoritativeness of his narrator's voice:

> Yet as the reader has seen, both Augustus and myself were
> resuced; and our *deliverence* seemed to have been brought
> about by two of these inconceivable pieces of good *fortune*
> which are attributd by the *wise* and *pious* to the special
> interference of *Providence*. (11) [my italics]

Even the name of Pym's close companion, Augustus—with its Latin-based

semantic association to authority as meaning "dignitary," or "magnificent" in that

language, and its further historical correlation to the Roman Caesar of the same name—

can subconsciously imbue the speaker's voice with further authoritativeness, via the

narrator's intimate relationship with the character of this name.

Another name which evokes reference to Judeo-scriptural context is that of Pym's

sloop, *Ariel*, its Hebraic meaning being either "Lioness" or "Lion of God." Additionally,

Ariel was also the name of both Shelly's ill-fated boat and Milton's rebel angel in

Paradise Lost (Pollin, 219). Especially relevant to Poe's thematic intent of showing Pym

as inauthentic is this name's Biblical association as an alternative name for Jerusalem and

the stated wrath of God upon its namesake city as given in Isaiah 29: 1-4, below:

> Woe to *Ariel*, to *Ariel*, the city where David dwelt! add ye
> year to year; let them kill sacrifices.
>
> Yet will I distress *Ariel*, and there shall be heaviness and
> sorrow: and it shall be unto me as *Ariel*.
>
> And I will camp against thee round about, and will lay
> siege against thee with a mount, and I will raise forts
> against thee.

> And thou shalt brought down, and shalt speak out of the
> ground, and thy speech shall be low out of the dust, and thy
> voice shall be, as of one that hath a familiar spirit, out of
> the ground, and thy speech shall whisper out of the dust.
> (King James, 531)

This Biblical excerpt is indicative of the repercussive meaning of the name of

Ariel within the context of *Pym*: it suggests revenge from the Lord. Poe meant for his

narrator—as well as all he represented and was associated with—to be portrayed

throughout the novel as inauthentically authoritative, and as such, to be courting divine

retribution for their transgressions.

And what was this great violation? Abolitionism, of course. Arthur Gordon Pym

represented in his Nantucket elitist roots all Northern Yankees who for the author,

also symbolized of all those with an abolitionist turn of mind. Edgar Allan Poe, as an

antebellum Southerner, was a staunch adherent to African-American slavery. To quote

Sidney Kaplan:

> Poe was a Biblical fundamentalist of the most orthodox
> sort. . . . In a piece of hack-work on 'Palaestine,' written a
> few months before [the publication of *Pym*], he had blasted
> the Holy Land as 'the visble effects of divine displeasure.'
> Now, speaking with approval of Alexander Keith's
> *Evidence of Prophecy*, which defended 'the long continued
> slavery of Africans' as the curse of Ham, Poe saw . . . an
> argument for 'the *literallness* of the understanding of the
> Bible predictions as an *essential* feature of prophecy.'
> But there was in the Bible no prophecy of black damnation
> clear enough for his needs and he therefore wrote his own:
> '*I have graven it within the hills . . .*' (xxiii) [my brackets]

The fact that Poe has Pym appear to be, on the surface of things, authoritatively

enlightened, but eventually reveals him to be insane—and therefore ultimately

inauthentic—is a part of the author's agenda to show how the anti-slavery position will in the end evoke the wrath of God and cast the white man into the dust of hell.[5]

Both Pym and Augustus set out in the sloop in a fashion that defines much of their characterological makeup for the remainder of the novel, that is, they are thoughtless, often bordering upon foolish. The fact that it is the *Ariel*—its name resonating with religious, theological, and scriptural correlative value—that carries these two characters into the defining premier episode of the novel, aids Poe in establishing and reinforcing both of these characters' inauthentic authoritativeness, with a special emphasis upon Pym's as the main focal voice, both as a narrator, and as the novel's ostensible protagonist.

Interestingly, Poe and Melville both allude to the Christian Biblical symbolism of entombment/resurrection, using many of the same rhetorical devices to instill authoritativeness into their separate pieces. This set of symbols can be interpreted from a number of angles vis-à-vis authoritativeness. Here, the subject is examined with a main view toward Biblical perspective in examples in *Pym*; later this study looks at the same subject from the primary perspective of "Faith-Based Omnipresence and Secrecy Symbology," in section 3.A.I.vi, page 41 within both *Moby-Dick* and *Pym.*.

Pym relates the following passage starting at the top of the next page regarding his initial time in the hold of the ship where he has stowed away:

---

[5] See "Authenticity and Inauthenticity in Moby-Dick and Pym," section 3.C, page 143, for further elaboration upon this.

> I remanied *three days and nights* (as nearly as i could
> guess) in my *hiding place* without getting out of it at all . . .
> (21) [italics mine, highlighting Christian entombment/
> resurrection symbolism]

The duration of Pym's first period of sequester from any human contact, buried

within the tomb-like confines of his hiding place, is not merely coincidental to that of

Christ's burial in his sepulcher; it is a device Poe uses to liken Pym to Jesus in an attempt

to infuse the former with the latter's authoritativeness, or at least so it seems on the

surface of things. Obviously, such a comparison of Pym to Christ is blatantly

ostentatious. Readers discern this, and what results is, rather than an elevation of

estimation for the narrator, a disdain for the author for trying to liken his character to

Jesus, and by extension, a suspicion concerning Pym's authority.

After three days, Augustus returns; as he is preparing to leave Pym for a second

time, he makes this statement:

> I shall not have a chance of coming down again for some
> time—perhaps for *three* or four *days* more. All is going on
> right above-board. After I go up and close the trap, do you
> creep along the whipcord to where the *nail is driven in.*
> (21) [my italics, highlighting Christian entombment/
> resurrection symbolism]

Again, Poe uses allusions to the divine crucifixion: the "whip-" of "whipcord,"

with its resonance of the scourging of Jesus by Pilate; the "nail is driven in," immediately

evoking the image of Christ being hammered to the cross on Calvary. Such word choice

decisions by Poe reveal the author's masterful way of subconsciously associating Pym's

situation with that of Jesus' in the minds of his readers. In so doing, Poe infuses a sense

of religious/theological/scriptural authoritativeness into his narrator's voice.

But all this building up of Pym's authoritativeness is merely a contrivance which Poe fully intends to use to drive home his point at the end of the novel: He builds Pym's ostensible authoritativeness, all the while subtly making it clear to the more astute reader that the narrator/protagonist is actually insane. This serves the author's purpose of the delivered in the final passages of the narration that what on the surface may appear to be authentic, namely abolitionist sentiment, is so inauthentic to incur eternal damnation from God.

3.A.1.v.i. FAITH-BASED OMNIPRESENCE AND SECRECY SYMBOLOGY

An extension of the scriptural, religious, theological, cosmic, and mythological rhetorical devices used to give a work of literature authoritativeness is the concept of faith-based omnipresence and secrecy symbology.

Faith-based omnipresence is a belief within a speaker that an authoritative presence exists, which facilitates a speaker's access to things beyond the perception of another person of lesser authoritativeness. Examples of such empowering presences are God, angels, spirits, ghosts, etc. The specific word choices and the symbols created through this dynamic serve then to form an indirect association with an authority figure.

An incorporated element in of faith-based omnipresence is secrecy. This element subliminally references both the omnipotence of authoritative figures, in that they have the power to elude non-authoritative perception, but also the requirement of faith concerning that knowledge which authority figures reserve from those who view this

41

superior Other as the ultimate expression of authoritativeness. All of this, of course, creates fertile ground in which an author can develop a symbology.

In *Moby-Dick*, we see many examples of this dynamic between secrecy, faith and authority:

> Yes, their supreme lord and dictator though hitherto *unseen* by any *eyes not permitted to penetrate* into the now *sacred retreat* of the cabin. (124) [my italics, indicating elements of secrecy, faith and/or authority]

This excerpt alludes to how authoritative forces are hidden from earthly sensibilities, requiring a faith on the part of the believer in the authoritative figure, the "supreme lord" and "dictator." Once more, resurrection/entombment symbolism is used, but this time Melville effects a resonance of Christian entombment (secrecy symbology) and resurrection (faith-base omnipresence) as it pertains to those qualities in Ahab. The captain is unseen by Ishmael, as Christ was to his followers after his crucifixion. Yet Ishmael believes the captain is still present, just as Christ's followers (at least at first) believed he would rise from the dead. Ishmael's faith in Ahab's resurrection is ultimately rewarded by the captain's near-miraculous reappearance, just as the Resurrection on Easter Sunday rewarded the first Christians.

This symbology of entombment/resurrection creates an image parallel to Christian gospel, though in the case of Ahab's "burial," Melville makes it a more protracted time period than Christ's. This time differential notwithstanding, the most critical elements of the parallelism of the entombment/resurrection symbolism still remain, i.e., apparent death eventually defeated by resurrection.

Entombment/resurrection symbolism is then recapitulated as the narrative continues, reinforcing the image into readers' minds:

> Ere long, from his first visit in the air, he withdrew into his
> cabin (entombment). But after that morning, he was visible
> to the crew (resurrection) . . . (126) [parentheticals mine]

In the excerpt below, Melville further reinforces this Biblical allusion by using such words as "shrouds" and "crucifixion" (126), and gives it a final touch of association with the season of Spring in the last paragraph of the chapter:

> Nevertheless, ere long, the *warm, warbling* pervasiveness
> of the *pleasant, holiday weather* we came to seemed
> gradually to charm him from his mood. For, as when *the
> red-cheeked, dancing girls, April and May*, trip home to the
> wintry, misanthropic woods; even the barest, ruggedest,
> most thunder-cloven old oak will at least *send forth some
> few green sprouts*, to welcome such glad-hearted visitants;
> so Ahab did, in the end, a little respond to the playful
> allurings of that *girlish* air. More than once did he put forth
> the faint *blossom* of a look, which, in any other man, would
> have *flowered* into a smile . . . (127) [my italics indicating
> words associated with Spring]

The many symbols of Spring, with its inherent association with religious (Easter) and secular (biological) rejuvenation, further drive home the point of an authoritative power (that which gives life), secreted away (in winter), but nonetheless, believed by people to be powerful enough to transcend dormancy and overcome the death symbol of Winter, this faith ultimately being validated through the appearance of new life.

Melville uses this parallel consciously, highly aware of the symbology of secrecy he is constructing in his work and making it clear to his readers as well. Early in *Moby-Dick*, the author through Ishmael indicates this by conjecturing about the elusive symbolism regarding Father Mapple dragging his pulpit's rope ladder up behind him:

No, thought I, there must be some sober reason for this
thing; furthermore, it must *symbolize something unseen*.
(41) [italics mine highlighting secrecy symbology]

Faith-based omnipresence and secrecy symbology are also a constant dynamic

throughout *Pym*. From the very beginning of the novel, the narrator/protagonist displays

a near-blind faith in other ostensibly authoritative forces who behave in ways beyond his

own grasp.

The middle-of-the-night voyage of the *Ariel* is a case in point:

Here I became intimate with the son of Mr. Barnard, a sea
captain, who generally sailed in the employ of Lloyd and
Vrendenburgh—Mr. Barnard is also very well known in
New Bedford, and has many relations, I am certain, in
Edgartown. His son was name Augustus, and was nearly
two years older than myself. He had been on a whaling
voyage with his father in the *John Donaldson*, and was
always talking to me of his aventures in the South Pacific
Ocean. (5)

Here Poe develops the relationship of Pym to Augustus: one of a younger

subordinate to an older, respectably pedigreed, more experienced mentor. The fact that

Poe makes references to "Lloyd and Vrendenburgh" (the "Lloyd" most surely alluding to

Lloyd's of London [Pollin, 226]), to Mr. Barnard being a sea captain and well know in

the most famous of American whaling regions, to the southern cape area of

Massachusetts, and to the fact that the son had been with the father on a whaling

expedition to the South Pacific, steeps Augustus in both authorities of power

and knowledge. The groundwork laid for his narrator to follow the lead of an ostensibly

authoritative figure, Poe sets Pym on a near-fatal course in the following excerpt:

44

One night there was a party at Mr. Barnards, and both Augustus and myself were not a little intoxicated towards the close of it. As usual, in such cases, I took a part of his bed in preference to going home. He went to sleep, as I thought, very quietly (it being nearly one when the party broke up), and without saying a word on his favorite topic. It might have been half an hour from the time of our getting into bed, and I was just about falling into a doze, when he suddenly started up, and swore a terrible oath that he would not go to sleep for any Arthur Gordon Pym in Christiandom, when there was so glorious a breeze from the southwest. I was never so astonished in my life, not knowing what he intended, and thinking that the wines and liquors he had drunk had set him entirely beside himself. He proceeded to talk very cooly, however, saying he knew I supposed him intoxicated, but that he was never more sober in his life. He was only tired, he added, of lying in bed on such a fine night like a dog, and was determined to get up and dress, and fog out on a frolic with the boat. I can hardly tell what possessed me, but the words were no sooner out of his mouth than I felt the thrill of the greatest excitement and pleasure, and thought his mad idea one of the most delightful and most reasonable things in the world. It was blowing almost a gale, and the weather was very cold—it being late October. I sprang out of out of bed nevertheless . . . (6)

Pym, against all reason, follows a drunken Augustus out at 2:00 A.M., in late October, to go sailing in a light sailboat, in near gale force winds . . . why? Of course, bravado is one answer: Augustus is in a sense Pym's idol, and he would not want to be viewed by him as fearful. But even more than that, as an idol, Augustus has been elevated in his idolater's eyes, as a person imbued with an expertise beyond Pym's comprehension; that is to say, the older of the two an experienced whaler; he knows something the younger man does not: There exists in young Barnard *secret* information, *unknown* to his devotee. Using Pym's logic here, this must be true, for after all, does not Augustus speak so confidently? Is he not insistent upon the matter? He also, while brave, is certainly no fool, having survived

one treacherous whale hunting voyage already. And since Augustus is the offspring of one who has made so many of these voyages, is it not logical to reason that some of his progenitor's common sense has passed down in the blood line to him? So Pym follows Augustus into the night, full of *faith* in the *omnipresence* of the other's authority of knowledge concerning such matters, a knowledge *secreted* away within the sensibilities of the more authoritative of the two.

Poe also uses an entombment/resurrection symbols to effect a faith-based omnipresent/secrecy symbology symbiosis in tandem with, and complimenting, the authoritative rhetorical attributes previously discussed in "Scripture, Religion, Theology, Cosmology, And Mythology," section 3.A.I.v, page 33. Two inherent elements of entombment/resurrection (aside from its religiosity and scriptural association), are the *secrecy* of the entombment—that is, one who is entombed is hidden away from the rest of the world—and the *faith* that the power-authoritative presence is present therein— and not only merely existing in any benign way, but rather with the full force of his powers intact—that is *omnipotently omnipresent*—the result of which omnipresent omnipotence eventually manifests itself as resurrection.

In *Pym*, there is also an added element of critical personal importance relative to entombment/resurrection in that he is the one entombed. Additionally, the omnipotence to resurrect does not come from him, but rather, from an external other, his ally Augustus. In a sense, in order to effect Pym's resurrection, Augustus must first reappear to his friend, in essence, effecting a double resurrection. From Pym's perspective, Augustus represents a hidden authoritative force who has the power to reappear, causing

Pym to do so to the above-deck world as well. Both characters then, embody the element of secrecy and reappearance, and therefore an authority of power; in Pym's case, the power of being able to effect his will to voyage on the *Grampus*, his father's protestations to the contrary notwithstanding; but for Augustus, the power he has is more meaningful: that of being able to rescue Pym's life from the tomb of his below-deck confinement. Of course, neither one of these premises prove to be fully true: While Augustus does eventually reappear and free Pym from below decks, he does not do so of his own volition; and while Pym is resurrected from his tomb-like confinement, it is directly into the jaws of a full-blown mutiny.

Once again, Poe clothes his narrator in power-based authoritative garb, only to reveal his authority as being ultimately inauthentic insofar as this is concerned.

Faith-based omnipresence and secrecy plays a part at the end of the novel as well. The final entry in Pym's journal reveals much which speaks to this:

> *March* 22. The darkness had materially increased, relieved only by the glare of the water thrown back from the white curtain before us. Many gigantic and pallidly white birds flew continuously now from beyond the veil, and their scream was the eternal *Tekeli-li!* as they retreated from our vision. Hereupon Nu-Nu stirred in the bottom of the boat; but upon touching him, we found his spirit departed. And now we rushed into the embraces of the cataract, where a chasm threw itself open to receive us. But there arose in our pathway a shrouded human figure, very far larger in its proportions than any dweller among men. And the hue of the skin of the figure was the perfect whiteness of snow. (195)

47

Here Poe's use of such words and phrases as "darkness,"[6] "glare," "curtain," "veil," "retreated from our vision," "departed," "shrouded,"[7] work in unison to form a secrecy symbology: All of these objects or situations indicate their obfuscating powers or speak to a hiding of one entity from another.

Poe completes the construction of a symbiotic dynamic between faith-based omnipresence and secrecy symbology here by engendering authoritative resonance through such words and phrases as "materially increased,"[8] "Many gigantic,"[9] "continuously,"[10] "eternal,"[11] "rushed into the embraces," "very far larger,"[12] and "perfect," each infusing the passage with authoritativeness through those annotated elements above as described in the footnotes, and through the two non-annotated items, with the implied longing of Pym to be "embraced" by this perfection; both of these latter images in unison imply an ultimate authoritative figure who is, by definition, omnipresent.

---

[6] An eternal image (see "Timelessness, Eternity, And Infinity" section 3.A.I.iv, page 26 for more detail on this).

[7] Ibid.

[8] Large numbers associate themselves with authority; the furthest reaching extension of this being infinity (see "Timelessness, Eternity, And Infinity" section 3.A.I.iv, page 26 for more detail on this).

[9] Ibid.

[10] Eternity is a an authority-associateive rhetorical device (see "Timelessness, Eternity, And Infinity" section 3.A.I.iv, page 26 for more detail on this).

[11] Ibid.

[12] Ibid, footnote 8.

When a literary author wishes either to establish or reinforce the validity of a

position being put forth by a narrator or character, one way to do this is to first cite, then

deconstruct an obviously false antithesis, then juxtapose it with the thesis actually

being argued. This rhetorical tactic strengthens the authoritativeness of the narrator's or

character's voice by showcasing the deductive and analytical reasoning of the speaker.

The contrast of blatant inaccuracy within the antithesis, juxtaposed against the alleged

accuracy of the thesis—especially when clearly articulated by a speaker who, by virtue of

a strong argument against the antithesis in the subsequently thesis, can demonstrate a

virtuosity of debating skills founded upon a special and informed knowledge set—is both

impressive to a reader and oftentimes difficult to refute. This leads to an enhanced level

of authoritativeness on the part of the speaker.

What also supports the development of an authoritative voice within this dynamic

is that these types of refutations exhibit a certain aura of confidence which, at the very

least, should be conveyed by the speaker as well—and as an extension of this, be

discerned by the reader as well (that is, if the speaker is convincing enough). The sense

that the voice is authoritative, then, comes from the audience reasoning that the person

behind the voice is qualified to make the challenge to the antithesis; that is, a degree of

expertise empowers the speaker.

Melville uses this device throughout Moby Dick. When Ishmael as narrator says

"The *devil* fetch that harpooneer, . . . " (18) [italics mine for emphasis], he is referring to

49

Queequeg as a devil, or antithesis of God, ergo, less authoritative—in fact, anti-authoritative. Melville uses this as a psychological set-up for readers, embedding this stereotype into their minds, only later to show the limitations of Western biases against non-Western peoples by portraying Queequeg as far better than the common Western stereotype of him. This tactic of exposing prejudice as inauthentic authoritativeness emphasizes the quality of the South Seas Islands man against the previously alluded to antithesis of this stance.

Once again, Ishmael speaks of his South Seas associate: "Better sleep with a sober *cannibal* than a drunken *Christian*" (26) [italics mine for identification purposes]. Though "cannibal" in and of itself is not a Biblical reference, its immediately juxtaposed comparison to "Christian" induces readers to see the two as opposites, therefore creating a simultaneously *religious* and *anti-religious* association of the words. This simultaneously humorous and erudite insight by Ishmael into the humanity of all people—effaced of their socially imposed suppositions and augmented by the reference to religiosity—bestows upon this particular line a multi-dimensional range of authoritative attributes: insight, wisdom, and deductive reasoning . . . to name a few.

In choosing the Biblical story of Jonah for Father Mapple's sermon, Melville associates the inherent authority of Father Mapple as a man of the cloth with that of God, in such a way that it directly addresses the issues of truth and untruth. Melville accomplishes this by having this character sum up his sermon by focusing on the parabolic message of that scriptural piece which begins at the top of the next page:

> ... when the word of the Lord came a second time; and Jonah,
> bruised and beaten—his ears, like two sea-shells, still
> multitudinously murmuring of the ocean—Jonah did the
> Almighty's bidding. And what was that, shipmates? To preach
> the *Truth* to the face of the *Falsehood*! That was it! (50)
> [my italics to highlight thesis and antithesis]

Once more, Melville uses an example of obviously erroneous antithesis, the

"Falsehood" of Jonah's attempt to flee the Lord, to reinforce the veracity of the thesis the

minister propounds: that the Biblical character in question could not outrun God to

escape the "Truth." By associating one of the characters in the novel with this derived

verity—in this case Father Mapple—the author further endows that character with

authoritativeness. Melville quite craftily augments this "true"/"false" tactic by making

the subject of this example the very principles of "Truth" and "Falsehood."

Continuing with Father Mapple's sermon), Melville offers this:

> Screwed at its axis against the side, a swinging lamp
> slightly oscillates in Jonah's room; and the ship heeling
> over towards wharf with the weight of the last bales
> received, the lamp, flame and all, though in slight motion,
> still *maintains a permanent obliquity with reference to the
> room; though in truth, infallibly straight itself, it but made
> obvious the false, lying levels among which it hung.* (46)
> [italics mine showing antithesis and thesis]

Here Melville uses the skewed appearance of Jonah's room against the true orientation of

the flame in the lamp to illustrate that not all things are as they appear.

In so doing, Melville, through Father Mapple, reinforces this character's authoritativeness

by showing readers his astuteness in realizing the importance of this distortion of the

truth, even when those who loaded the boat—perhaps even Jonah himself—do not.

Furthermore, Father Mapple via Biblical citation is showing his authoritativeness by

offering the imbalance in the ship as a metaphor for the imbalance in Jonah's life. Once again, this illustrates his erudite powers of observation, powers that imbue him with authority, that is, an elevated knowledge of a given subject.

Melville often tries to establish Ishmael's authoritative authenticity by having him refute other alleged authoritative sources. Chapter 55, "Of the Monstrous Pictures of Whales" (268-272), contains prime examples of this:

> All these are not only incorrect, but the picture of the Mysticetus or Greenland whale (that is to say, the Right Whale), even Scoresby, a long experienced man as touching that species, declares not to have its counterpart in nature. (270-71)

Following this passage, Ishmael then offers yet another set of examples to validate his refutation of those against whom he has just argued, by citing the works of those who have written illustrative books on whales which he feels are "less erroneous" than the first set of incorrect cetologists, devoting a whole section to this in Chapter 56, "Of the Less Erroneous Pictures of Whales, and the True Pictures of Whaling Scenes" (273-276). Still, the fact that he qualifies the title with "Less Erroneous," rather than with "True," intimates his own view that he is more qualified than these others by virtue of the fact that he may critically comment upon them.

This tactic of juxtaposing obviously false antithesis with valid thesis argued pro is also employed in *Pym*, not so much so in case-by-case fashion as in *Moby-Dick*, but rather on the much grander scale of the entire book being one continuously cryptic development of the deconstruction of the false antithesis of abolitionism.

This antithesis is illustrated by the slowly revealed insanity of its metaphorical representative, Arthur Gordon Pym of Nantucket, which reaches its breaking point as the narrator/main character comes face to face with the representation of himself and his race in the guise of the metaphorical ". . . shrouded human figure" (195), whose "skin . . . was of the perfect whiteness of snow" (195), trapped in the hell of the Antarctic isolation and surrounded by dark-skinned enemies.

The thesis being argued pro by Poe, of course, was that slavery was necessary, or as J. Gerald Kennedy frames the author's intent in *Pym* by quoting an article in the April 1836 edition of the *Southern Literary Messenger* more than likely written by Poe under the guise of his friend Judge Beverly Tucker, Poe was "defending the 'much abused' practice of slavery the basis of all our institutions.'"

RHETORICAL DEVICES DIRECTLY RELATING TO AUTHORITATIVENESS

Another way writers effect the authoritative voice is through language and references which relate directly to authoritativeness. Authoritatively relative language is language which comes from established rhetorical models that automatically associate themselves with authoritative entities.

References relating to authority overlay a writer's voice with an association to the authoritative figure being referenced, in turn giving the voice the authoritative attributes of the reference.

Specific examples of how language and reference relating to authoritativeness

manifest themselves in literature within the framework of this study's two literary foci

are detailed in the following subsections:

3.A.II.i.   AUTHORITY PER SE

Authority per se speaks to the implied and alluded to instances of authority itself

which an author may use immediately and concretely to associate a voice within a literary

work with authority. This device pervades both *Moby-Dick* and *Pym*.

Melville has Ishmael reference authority per se, or some permutation thereof,

throughout *Moby-Dick*. These excerpts offer typical examples of this:

> Now when I looked at the quarter-deck, for someone
> having *authority*, . . . " (71) [my italics, indicating
> references to authority per se]

> It is a thing well known to both American and English
> whale-ships, and as well a thing placed upon *authoritative*
> record years ago by Scoresby, . . . (184) [my italics,
> indicating references to authority per se]

In one instance, Melville even has his narrator reference "authoritative" and

"voice" together:

> Father Mapple rose, and in a mild *voice of* unassuming
> *authority* ordered the scattered people to condense. (42)

Canaday states the following about the type of authority he feels Melville is exploiting:

> The term *authority* is here used to mean the power, vested
> by the warrant of moral right or legal right, in persons or
> groups, which coerces those subject to it in the spheres of

belief and action. Authority cannot function—although it may exist—without power. Alternatively, the coerciveness of power may be based upon force operating without authority. Authority implies right, but there is a latent ambiguity in the term *right*: it may mean 'that which is warranted by moral approval' or a 'power vested by law or custom' (*Black's Law Dictionary*, 4th ed., 1951). It will be seen that Melville explored these and other complexities inherent in the concept of authority and man's response to it. (end of first page through to top of second page in "Preface;" not numbered)

Canaday goes on to say that "Ahab's authority is evil; Ishmael indicates that Ahab is aware of his Satanic quality" (41).

While Canaday's interpretation is not contrary to this author's, it does fail to take into account the knowledge-based variant which completes the authenticity of an authority. Canaday correctly identifies one element of Ahab's authoritativeness, that is, corrupted power, as being inauthentic, but in his further assessment of the *PECO's* captain's flawed authoritative base, he neglects to factor in the reason this authority is "evil." Such authority is evil because it does not operate in unison with its complimentary coefficient, the authority of knowledge. Ahab has forsaken reason in his irrational zeal for vengeance against an animal whom he has anthropomorphised into a demonically possessed personification of his own personal arch nemesis, that is, a usurper to his authority of power. The white whale is one of the few things that Ahab has not been able either to control or deal with. Such a challenge to his authority is unthinkable to him. Moby Dick, then, must die to reaffirm the captain's perception of his own authoritative position in life. Of course, this is insane, and as such, is antithetical to authentic authoritative knowledge.

The symbolism of "whiteness" relative to authoritativeness is another allusion to authority per se used by both Melville and Poe in their works. Whitness is so important in *Moby-Dick*, that Melville devotes the whole of Chapter 42, "The Whiteness of the Whale" (189-198), to expounding upon its importance at length.

Canaday states Ishmael's perspective of whiteness and its relationship to the authority of knowledge below:

> Knowledge is based upon predicates, that which is affirmed
> or denied. But what can be predicated of this faint and
> mystical hue? Reflecting all the rays of the spectrum
> combined, whiteness is at once the visible presence and the
> absence of color. In short, whiteness is inscrutable, the veil
> of God. . . . Man cannot fathom the mystery because he
> cannot penetrate the veil, whiteness. With the authority of
> the Creator, God has willed it so. (50)

Ishmael in narration sets up the questioning of Ahab's position with a mocking statement regarding the contemporaneously held belief of the "superiority" of whiteness which was ". . . giving the white man ideal mastership over every dusky tribe . . . " (190), when in point of fact, Melville was acutely aware of the storm clouds that were brewing regarding this very issue in his own country—harbingers of the most bloody war his country had ever fought—which would occur only ten years after the writing of this novel, rendering this statement sublimely ironic. Indeed, his audience would also have been cognizant of the contentious nature of this statement, and probably would have been divided as to their sensibilities regarding it: fully supporting it as being legitimate fact (authentically authoritative), or fully attuned to the irony inherent in the pomposity and arrogance of its faulty premise (inauthentically authoritative).

Poe also emphasizes the authoritative association of whiteness in *Pym*, though not as directly as Melville in *Moby-Dick*, but rather through subtle suggestions which indicate that it symbolizes authority, that is, the "white" man's global-socio-military-economic power in the mid-nineteenth century.

Such statements as "We were the only living white men upon the island" (169), are indicative of the author's position that only white men are authoritative enough to tell the story. This noting of whiteness of skin which the preceding focus exemplifies, emphasizes Poe's well known racist views. The "only living white men" reference parallels the isolation of Pym and his compatriots in the strange land of Too-Wit and his people with the isolation Poe and other adherents to antebellum southern racial paradigms were beginning to feel against growing antislavery sentiment.

Of course, this race-based authority is one of might (power) rather than right (knowledge), which ultimately renders it inauthentic due to its incomplete nature. And even though Poe was trying to create Pym as an inauthentically authoritative voice for reasons of character development, it is highly unlikely that the reasons stated as to the inauthenticity of these two citations—that is, their inherent racist flaws—were a part of that plan.

From the time Pym and his companions pass the Southern Cross, whiteness is a theme. This, of course, culminates in the final line of the Pym's actual narrative which undoubtedly states Poe's own personal color philosophy in toto: "And the hue of the skin of the figure was of the perfect whiteness of snow" (195). This stance alludes to a restoration of Pym's senses as he goes from the darkness around him— including that of

57

the black natives of the strange place in which he had found himself—and into the whiteness, that is, the perceived authentic authority of a perfect supreme being. This whiteness is, of course, the thesis to that antithetical authoritativeness which Pym and all he represents—Northern abolitionist sentiment—has deluded himself into thinking he has at his disposal (and by extension of his representational status, that Northerners collectively have as well). That Poe would put forth whiteness as being "perfect" insofar as skin color is concerned, speaks for itself regarding the author's racist philosophy and authorial agenda with this novel.

Edward Davidson speculates on the difference between what white represents in each novel. Davidson describes the culmination of whiteness in *Pym* as follows:

> . . . that whiteness whose center lies beyond first things and
> whose nexus may be the creative impulse of the universe.
> Faced with this bewildering and ultimate reduction, Poe can
> only use one word, and idea of whiteness, the negation of
> fact and shape. Melville's Ishmael came back from this side
> of the ultimate illumination; but Pym went all the way
> through and never returned. He, like the primal order of
> matter itself, was reduced to a blinding One—or chaos.
> There was no word or term which could further report the
> vision of nothing on the other side. Nothing at all; there
> was no other word for it but 'white.' (xvi)

But did Poe really view the concept of whiteness as "chaos," "a blinding One?" Once again, he was an avowed racist. His concept of "the negation of fact and shape" would more than likely have been that of black rather than its opposite. What Poe is trying to do by having Pym end up facing total whiteness is, in effect, to show him the way out of the insanity of darkness into which he has fallen into, and instead, to come into the light of white reason. But Pym fails to see this owing to his Northern origins—

and this is Poe's intent: to show how Northern anti-slavery sentiments are driving the white race into isolation at the bottom of the earth, or metaphorically speaking, in hell. (see "Scripture, Religion, Theology, Cosmology, And Mythology," section 3.A.I.v, page 33, and "Authenticity And Inauthenticity In *Moby-Dick* and *Pym*," section 3.C, page 143, for further elaboration upon this subject).

Harold Bloom, expounding upon John Irwin, offers a much better explanation of Poe's point of view regarding whiteness:

> Irwin demonstrates Poe's reliance upon the Romantic topos of the Alpine White Shadow, the magnified projection of the observer himself. The chasm Pym enters is the familiar Romantic Abyss, not a part of the natural world but belonging to eternity, before the creation. Reflected in that abyss, Pym beholds his own shrouded form, perfect in the whiteness of the natural context. Presumably, this is the original Gnostic self before the fall into creation. (12)

Such topos as the mythological stature inherent to the "Alpine White Shadow," the continuity regarding the significance of "eternity," the finality and heroism of the "Romantic Abyss," and the Biblical tone of the word choice "creation," all speak to Poe's perception of authentic authority, as contrasted to Pym's view of authority in the majority of his narrative—indeed, right up to the end. Even as Pym approaches Poe's "corrected" interpretation of authority—that is, "perfect . . . whiteness,"—he remains only at the edge of entering into its exalted realm, and even then, only as a neophyte.

Davidson is also incorrect in his assessment of Ishmael's perception of whiteness. In point of fact, the whale Moby Dick does not represent a whiteness of oblivion,

but rather, the pure and complete authority of God, as represented by one of the most established western symbols for divinity, whiteness itself.

Ahab and Ishmael are divided concerning the true nature of authority as it relates to the White Whale. Canaday twice, summarizes this difference between the antagonist (Ahab) and protagonist (Ishmael) as follows, beginning with Ishmael's position:

> Ishmael's task at hand is to narrate the terrible story of
> Captain Ahab, the true telling of which imposes certain
> responsibilities. . . . He must guard against emphasizing
> Ahab's stature and authority and minimizing the wrath of
> God. . . . Furthermore, Ishmael himself must accept the
> authority of God while demonstrating it to others. (52)

Ahab on the other hand, as Canaday puts it, has a totally opposite point of view regarding authority:

> Overbearing pride is the key to Ahab's character. He is
> proud of his own authority and enraged that anyone has
> authority over him. (45)

Ultimately then, what Melville is trying to do through Ishmael, Poe is attempting to accomplish through Pym—that is, convey a sense of authentic authority via the symbolism of whiteness. Melville does this by attempting to elevate his narrator to the level of the messenger of the supreme being, i.e., God; Poe on the other hand does just the opposite: He slowly shows Pym to be inauthentic in his authority, which forces him in to seek enlightenment from its true source, the perfect white self.

In literary writing, references to authority figures can overlay the voice with an association to the authoritative figure being referenced, giving the voice the authoritative attributes of the reference.

Melville provides many examples of references to authority figures throughout *Moby-Dick*. The following quotations by Ishmael in narration provide some excellent illustrations of this:

> . . . this is the invisible *police officer* of the Fates, which has the constant surveillance of me and secretly dogs me and influences me in some unaccountable way—he can better answer that than anyone else. (6) [italics mine, highlighting these references]

> Now that Lazarus should lie stranded there on the curbstone before the door of *Dives*, this is more wonderful than that an iceberg should be moored to one of the Moluccas. Yet *Dives* himself, he too lives like a *Czar* . . . (11-12) [italics mine, highlighting these references]

> Yes, their supreme *lord* and *dictator* though hitherto unseen by any eyes not permitted to penetrate into the now sacred retreat of the cabin. (124) [italics mine, highlighting these references]

Additionally, characters in the novel are themselves authority figures. Father Mapple is one such character. He is an ordained minister, a man on orders from God, someone with more authority than the people of his congregation, or as he states,

> 'Shipmates, God has laid but one hand on you; both his hands press upon me . . . How being an anointed pilot-prophet or speaker of true things, and bidden by the Lord to sound those unwelcome truths in the ears of a wicked Nineveh, Jonah' . . . (49)

Ahab is another inherently authoritative figure by virtue of his position as captain

of the *Pequod*, as well as the many years of experience he has in whaling expeditions.

His expertise in maritime and cetological matters is vouched for by Ishmael, identifying

him as both a power- and knowledge-based authority, as the excerpt below shows:

> Now, to anyone not fully aquaitnted with the ways of the
> leviathan, it might seem an absurdly hopeless task thus to
> seek out one solitary creature in the unhooped oceans of the
> planet. But not so did it seem to Ahab, who knew the sets of
> tides and currents; and thereby calculating the driftings of
> the sperm whale's food; and, also, calling to mind the
> regular, ascertained seasons for hunting him in particular
> latitudes; could arrive at reasonable surmises, almost
> approaching to certainties, concerning the timeliest day to be
> upon this or that ground in search of his prey. (200-201)

But this surface-level knowledge and power which Ahab possesses on account of his

nautical position and experience is just the tip of the iceberg in illuminating the

authenticity of his authoritativeness. Canaday gives deeper insight into Ahab's

authoritativeness, acknowledging it, but qualifying its authenticity as well:

> The depth of Ahab's character, revealed by a great art,
> makes him a figure of Satanic proportions. More than a
> symbol of authority, Ahab proudly and consciously
> assumed whatever authority derives from the power of the
> evil will. The possessor of this kind of dark authority,
> invested with demonic power, transcends the world of
> human experience ('grand, ungodly, god-like man') and
> ultimately finds himself in opposition to the authority of
> God. (46)

Continuing, Canaday details Ishmael's role as narrator concerning this duality in Ahab

authoritativeness, using the metaphor of whiteness to frame it:

> The important problem, according to Ishmael, is therefore
> to explain the duality of whiteness, the good and the evil
> of it. (49)

In analyzing the responsibility of Ishmael as regards the nature of Ahab's in toto authority, that is, to explain its duality to the audience of *Moby-Dick*, Canaday perceives Melville's intent of vesting an overriding authority of both knowledge and power in his narrator rather than the captain. This authentic authority is developed throughout the novel: As Ishmael accrues more intelligence through both experience and expert sources, his knowledge-based authority increases; the direct result of this, Melville would have readers believe, is that as Ishmael's knowledge-based authority grows, his power-based authority grows as well—the more Ishmael knows about Ahab and Ahab's milieu, the more the narrator is capable of intelligently analyzing the captain of the *Pequod* and effecting an escape from the power-based authority of this man obsessed with revenge upon the White Whale.

But does Ishmael ever truly rise to that position to which Melville would have him ascend, transcending the power of the authority figure which is Ahab? Does the narrator/protagonist accrue the knowledge necessary to understand and free him from his antagonist? The answer to these questions is, of course, no. Ishmael has analyzed Ahab throughout his living experience with him, right up to the point of the captain's death, and beyond that into the epilogue. Yet for all of this analysis, Ishmael is still a captive of the authority that Ahab held over him in life . . . his epic story is testimony to that.

Pym is also rich in references to both knowledge- and power-based authority figures. From the very beginning of the novel—indeed, in the "Preface" itself—Poe has Pym attempt to associate himself with authority figures who have both knowledge and power, as the excerpt at the top of the next page shows:

> Upon my return to the United States . . . accident threw me into the society of several gentlemen in Richmond, Virginia, who felt deep interest in all matters relating to the regions I had visited, and who were constantly urging it upon me, as a duty, to give my narrative to the public. . . . Among those gentlemen in Virginia who expressed thge greatest interest in my statement, more particularly in regard to that portion of it related to the Antarctic Ocean, was Mr. Poe, lately editor of the Southern Literary Messenger, a monthly magazine, published by Mr. Thomas W. White, in the city of Richmond. (1-2)

It is immediately apparent that Poe intends that his audience see his narrator for who he is: someone who aspires to authoritative authenticity via a number of transparent devices, such as here where he is attempting to associate himself with other acknowledged authority figures, to elevate his own authoritative value.

It is also clear that Poe wishes for his audience to see this to further their understanding of what this novel, ultimately, is intended to be: It is a blatant parable by the author, not to be believed on the level of its surface details, but to be read as allegory for the much deeper meaning the author is trying to convey. Why else would he have his narrator almost immediately reference himself within the context of the story, then have him refute his own validity, as seen in the following passage:

> He strongly advised me, among others, to prepare at once a full account of what I had seen and undergone, and trust to the shrewdness of the public—insisting, with great plausability, that however roughly, as regards mere authorship, my book should be got up, its very uncouthness, if there were any, would give it all the better chance of being received as truth.
>
> Notwithstanding this representation, I did not make up my mind to do as he suggested. He afterward proposed (finding that I would not stir in the matter that I should allow him to draw up, in his own words, a narrative of the

earlier portions of my adventures, from facts afforded by
myself, publishing it in the Southern Messenger *under the
garb of fiction.* . . .

The manner in which this *ruse* was received has induced
me to undertake a regular compilation and publication of
the adventures in question; for I found that, in spite of the
air of fable which had been so ingeniously thrown around
that portion of my statement which appeared in the
Messenger (without altering it or distorting a single fact),
the public were still not disposed to receive it as fable, and
several letters were sent to Mr. P's address distinctly
expressing a conviction to the contrary. (2) [italics Poe's]

Obviously, Poe wants his audience to know these are his words, his own true
feelings; Pym's reference to the author's hand in what is supposedly Poe's own narrative
account of Pym's experience shows this intent. But the author also wants to entice his
readers into scrutinizing the character of Pym; in so doing, the correlative effect would be
their discovering the narrator's authoritative inauthenticity, explicating Poe's own
personal agenda of exposing the group Pym represented—Northern abolitionists—as
authoritatively inauthentic as well. This is made clear by the way the author has the
narrator ingratiate himself to "Mr. P.," stating that the author's account was authentic,
that is, it was written "without altering or distorting a single fact," and in having the
narrator attempt to associate himself with "the society of several gentlemen in
Richmond," publisher "Mr. Thomas W. White," and indeed "Mr. Poe, lately editor of the
Southern Literary Messenger" himself.

Poe continues by having Pym cite—and by extension of these citations identify
himself with—authority figures throughout the novel. An example of this is the
numerous references to ship's captains: Barnard of the *Grampus* (5, 6, 18, 39, 40, 95);

E.T.V. Block of the *Penguin* (10); Guy of the *Jane Guy* (118, 119, 126, 127, 131, 133, 143, 145, 146, 147, 149, 150, 152, 155, 159, 176); Kerguelen (122); Cook of the *Resolution* (122, 133, 135); Patten of the *Industry* (129); Colquhoun of the *Betsey* (129); Heywood of the *Nereus* (129); Jeffrey of the *Berwick* (130); de Oyarvido of the *Princess* (131); Weddell of the British Navy (131; 135; 137) Johnson of the *Henry* (132); Morrell of the *Wasp* (132, 136); Kreutzenstern and Lisiausky (135); and Briscoe (sic)[13] of the *Lively* (137).

All ship captains including Ahab, have an inherent degree of, at the very least, power-based authority; most as well are presumed to be knowledgeably authoritative. In having his narrator reference these ship captains, then, Poe is intimating that Pym is knowledgeable enough about them to make these citations; this assumed knowledge in turn gives Pym an authoritative power insofar as readers are to coerced into believing him. This power-based authority can then be used by Pym to make statements ad infinitum which he may suppose will not be questioned by his audience. And he does make many statements of purported fact which on their surface sound authentically knowledgeable, but upon closer scrutiny, reveal inauthenticity.

But once again, this was Poe's intent in designing Pym's character: to show how something which on its surface seems reasonable or true is, once it is investigated more closely, found neither rational nor genuine.

---

[13] Pym incorrectly references Captain John Biscoe as "Briscoe" throughout (Argentine Islands web site).

Language eliciting active response consists of rhetorical devices used by an author to give either the speaking writer, narrator, or character language which commands a response from either other characters within the texts (in literature) or the reader (both in literature and in technical writing). In turn, such language and devices imply authoritativeness.

Rhetorical devices used by an author which give either the speaking writer (in technical writing), or narrator or character (in literature) language which commands a response from either other characters within the texts (in literature) or the reader (both in literature and in technical writing), also give that voice at the very least an authority of power—and if authentic—an authority of knowledge as well.

The following items relate to language eliciting active response used in developing the authoritative voice in literary writing and are discussed in the following sections:

Interrogatives *usually* require an active response from characters within a literary work. A question is asked by one party of another. The party doing the

questioning is, by virtue of asking it, asserting the authority of power to do so. A questioner may not know information which the interrogated person might. Sometimes though, it is oftentimes implied that the speaker knows the answer and is merely posing the question as a means of discerning the interrogated person's honesty and/or knowledge. Interrogation can also be used by a speaker as a way of stimulating a keener interest in the person being spoken to about a subject matter at hand. Interrogation may also be used upon oneself by oneself as an element of the process of deduction.

All of these instances of interrogation, with the exception of the first and last, also imply an authority of knowledge on the part of the speaker. As such, many authors of literature use interrogatives in their works to define an authoritativeness in their narrators and characters. Additionally, they may use the reflective type of interrogation in characterological or plot development.

Melville employs all of these types of interrogative rhetorical devices in an effort to build authentically authoritative voices, especially for Ishmael as both narrator and character, but also for other characters such as Peleg, Ahab, Stubb, Flask, etc. in *Moby-Dick*.

When Ishmael and Queequeg go to the *Pequod* and encounter Captain Peleg for the first time, what follows is an interesting dynamic between one prospective employee and his employer in which the latter strives to establish his authority of power over the former via a demonstration of his authority of knowledge. Ishmael is the first speaker in the passage at the top of the next page:

'Is this the Captain of the *Pequod*?' said I, advancing to the
door of the tent.

'Supposing it be the Captain of the *Pequod*, what dost thou
want of him?' he demanded.

'I was thinking of shipping.'

'Thou was, wast thou? I see thou art no Nantucketer—ever
been in a stove boat?'

'No sir, I never have.'

'Dost know nothing at all about whaling, I dare say—eh?'

'Nothing , Sir . . . ' (75)

Immediately, it becomes apparent that Ishmael is at a knowledge-based

authoritative disadvantage to the captain, and by extension, a power-based one as well:

He is soliciting employment and his bargaining position has just been undermined.

Ishmael's lack of knowledge concerning whaling is interrogated out of him by Peleg,

who then deductively concludes this and gets Ishmael to acknowledge it by posing the

final question above and receiving the expected result. In so doing, Peleg establishes

himself as the authoritatively knowledgeable superior to Ishmael through demonstrating

his ability to perceive the aspiring whaler's lack of acumen concerning whaling.

This in turn implies that the captain possesses the knowledge-set about which he poses

his questions.

Ishmael, sensing this tactic and not wishing to subordinate himself, counters with

the dialogue below in an attempt to win over the captain from his reservations:

. . . but I have no doubt I shall soon learn. I've been several
voyages in the merchant service, and I think that—
. . . (75)

Peleg deftly reasserts his position with the following rejoinder:

> Marchant service be damned. Talk not that lingo to me.
> Dost thou see that leg?—I'll take that leg away from thy
> stern, if thou ever talkests of the marchant service to me
> again. (75)

Now Peleg uses interrogative language to draw his audience's attention to the deeper subject at hand. It is quite certain that Ishmael is aware of his own leg, yet Peleg asks him if he sees it to give greater impact to his next statement which is that he has the power to take it away from him if he attempts to usurp that type of captain's authority again. Of course, whether he does is open to conjecture; but Ishmael, for one, does not seem to be ready to test the statement's authenticity.

In other instances, as in the passage which follows this paragraph, Melville illustrates Ishmael's accrual of the authority of knowledge through interrogative, both in dialogue and narrative, asking first Queequeg, then Stubb, and finally Flask for their opinions regarding the swamping of the whaleboat, and Starbuck's opinion regarding chasing a whale in a squall:

> 'Queequeg,' said I, when they had dragged me, the last
> man to the deck, and I was still shaking myself in my jacket
> to fling off the water; 'Queequeg, dear friend does this sort
> of thing often happen?' Without much emotion, though
> soaked through just like me, he gave me to understand that
> such things do often happen.
>
> 'Mr. Stubb,' said I, turning to that worthy, who, buttoned
> up in his oil-jacket, was now calmly smoking his pipe in
> the rain; 'Mr. Stubb, I think I have heard you say that of all
> the whalemen you ever met, Mr. Starbuck, is by far the
> most careful and prudent. I suppose then, that going plump
> on a flying whale with your sail set in a foggy squall is the
> height of a whaleman's discretion?'

'Certain. I've lowered for whales from a leaking ship in a gale off Cape Horn.'

'Mr. Flask, said I, turning to the little King-Post, who was standing close by; 'you are experienced in these things, and I am not. will you tell me whether it is an unalterable law in this fishery, Mr. Flask, for and oarsman to break his back pulling himself back-foremost into death's jaws?'

'Can't you twist that smaller?' said Flask. 'Yes, that's the law. I should like to see a boat's crew backing water up to a whale face fore-most. Ha, ha! the whale would give them squint for squint, mind that!'

Here then from three impartial witnesses I had deliberate statement of the entire case. (232)

Here is an example of the previously postured authentically authoritative Ishmael seeking advice from others on a subject about which he has been implying his own expertise for some time. This begs several questions: Was the interrogation session in the previously cited passage a part of Ishmael's learning process? It is possible that the entire tale could be a recounting by Ishmael of an earlier time before he gained his alleged authoritative knowledge. Yet nowhere does Ishmael state that this particular episode is astride the contemporaneous present to the rest of the story; as such, it dilutes his authoritative stance regarding whaling. So then, is Melville trying to establish Ishmael's authoritativeness here by showing how this accrued knowledge was validly gained from other authentic sources? Without any clarification, which Ishmael never offers, the entire authorial intent is vague and convoluted; all in all, there is a weakness in cohesiveness which once again causes speculation about Ishmael's authoritative authenticity.

This continual questioning by Ishmael to no clear end throughout the novel in conjunction with the other ineffectually employed rhetorical devices explicated throughout this project, reinforces the undermining of the narrator's vocal authoritativeness, ultimately rendering it inauthentic.

Poe also uses interrogative rhetoric in *Pym*. But owing to the dearth of dialogue in this mainly narrative work, there is little if any direct questioning of people by either the narrator or any of the other characters. Instead, Poe gives Pym interrogative authority in different ways.

The following passage portrays Pym with the authoritative attributes of an examining veterinarian, examination of course being an investigative process which involves posing questions within a deductive paradigm, then seeking their answers though scrutiny. But note the rhetoric with which Pym qualifies his own postulations and observations, weakening his voice's authoritative authenticity in the process:

> Upon reaching out my hand towards him, I then invariably found him lying on his back, with his paws uplifted. This conduct, so frequently repeated, appeared strange, and *I could in no manner account for it.* As the dog *seemed* distressed, I concluded that he had received some injury; and, taking his paws in my hands, I examined them one by one, but found no sign of any hurt. I then *supposed* he was hungry, and gave him a large piece of ham, which he devoured with avidity—afterward, however, resuming his extraordinary manuvers. I now *imagined* that he was suffering, like myself, the torments of thirst, and was *about* adopting this conclusion as the true one, when the idea occurred to me *that I as yet had only* examined his paws, and that there *might* be a wound upon some portion of his body or head. (28-9) [my italics indicating qualifying rhetoric]

Qualifications such as those italicized above only create the impression that the speaker needs to make excuses for his ignorance or mistakes. In point of fact, even though Pym postures himself as being knowledgeably authoritative about the medical diagnosis of dogs, he makes a number of rudimentary mistakes in examining Tiger.[14]

After manually investigating the animal's paws, which would be a correct initial procedure given the circumstances described—uncharacteristic behavior of the dog; examination conducted in the dark precluding any assessment of the eyes and jowls;— the very next step would have been to continue this tactile exploration of the rest of the body including the head. Instead, Pym gives the dog a piece of ham, which, interestingly enough, he has not mentioned earlier as being among his provisions, in spite of the great pains he took to list these on page 20. Furthermore, since the mutton he had mentioned as among his food supply had earlier succumbed to "putrefaction" (22), one would think that any other meat would have as well; not a wise choice then, to feed a possibly toxic substance to an animal already acting out of sorts. And why does he opt for feeding Tiger instead of further exploration for injury? Because he "supposed him hungry," projecting his own wants and needs onto the dog, instead of using sound empirical veterinarian procedures to determine the animal's sources of distress.

Pym then continues to "imagine . . ." Tiger to be "suffering, like [him] . . . self, the torments of thirst," and had almost "adopt[ed] . . . this conclusion," when it strikes him to feel around the remainder of the dog's body for any other sign of injury. Both of

---

[14] Verified in conversation with Dr. Fiona Thresher, 9/9/99, regarding standard veterinary procedures.

these factors combined—the self-excusing and the ineptitude in examining Tiger—serve

to reduce Pym's alleged authoritativeness as regards his animal care skills to a level of

inauthenticity, his initial portrayal to the contrary notwithstanding.

Throughout the novel, Pym continually explicates the investigative machinations

of his own deductive reasoning processes to effect the impression that he possesses a

thoughtful intellect, a prime example of which is given at the top of the next page:

> At length, while groping about . . . I perceived a faint
> glimmering of light. . . . Now, moving my head with
> caution to and fro, I found that, by proceeding slowly, with
> great care, in an opposite direction to that in which I had
> first started, I was enabled to draw near the light, still
> keeping it in view. Presently I came directly upon it
> (having squeezed my way through innumerable narrow
> windings), and found that it proceeded from some
> fragments of my matches lying in an empty barrel turned
> upon its side. I was wondering how they came in such a
> place, when my hand fell upon two or three pieces of
> taperwax, which had been evidently mumbled by the dog. I
> concluded at once that he had devoured the whole supply of
> my candles, . . . (30-1)

The fact that Pym wonders, then concludes, indicates a questioning of something, in this

case, the source of the faint light.

This sort of inner interrogation continues throughout the story. But to what end?

Though Pym is continually asking questions and inquiring into the true meaning of that

which he experiences, seldom does he know anything for certain; he *assumes* the dog has

eaten his supply of candles, but for all he *knows*, he might have eaten them himself in his

starving delirium.

All of this questioning of Pym by himself puts readers in a speculative mode regarding the narrator's authoritative authenticity, and the result is one of eventual doubt. But of course, as previously stated, this is Poe's intent with Pym: slowly to reveal his unreliability. And what better device to do so, than by self-interrogation?

IMPERATIVES AND DELIMITERS

Imperatives are rhetorical devices which *always* require *immediate* active response by characters within a literary work. They can be used by a narrator or character when addressing another character to command an immediate and unquestionable acceptance of the authority of the speaker by the characters being addressed, and by extension, an acceptance by readers as well. Imperativeness can also be constructed out of a narrator's or character's own self-reflection or self-realization.

Delimiters are words which belong to a part of speech which restricts the limits of the word or words it modifies. The fact that these words have the power to limit or restrict indicates the authoritative power of the voices which speak them. The relationship between imperatives and delimiters is that both preclude—or at least attempt to preclude—any other action on the part of the party addressed than that which the speaker dictates.

Melville uses both imperatives and delimiters throughout *Moby-Dick*; the following passage exemplifies this:

> 'Landlord,' said I, going up to him as cool as Mt. Hecula in a
> snow storm, 'landlord, *stop whittling*. You and I *must*
> understand one another, and that too without delay.' (19) [my
> italics highlighting imperatives; underlining, delimiters]

75

In addition to their inherent authoritativeness, the effect of imperatives when accompanied by images reflecting the speaker's own authoritative temperament, demeanor, or attitude, is another authority-reinforcing device; for example, in the passage above where Ishmael describes his own demeanor as "cool as Mt. Hecula in a snow storm." This added image of Ishmael's controlled temperament strengthens his authoritativeness, in that grace under fire is a attribute usually associated with power-based authoritative persons. The words "stop whittling" constitute a command; it is imperative that the landlord cease this activity. In making the statement, the voice is implying that it has a certain degree of power-based authority to do so. In the same passage, the words "without delay" delimit the time frame in which the cessation is expected to be accomplished to be acceptable to the speaker. Once again, this restriction placed upon the object of the speaker's voice implies an authority of power; the word "must" insists upon this.

Melville uses this melding of imperative and delimitation as a rhetorical ploy to enhance Ishmael's power-based authoritativeness throughout *Moby-Dick*. But ultimately, Ishmael has no authority of power over anyone other than himself; and ultimately, it would seem that he lacks it even in this regard as well. He can neither flee from the madness of Ahab as it is imperatively evident he should, nor can he find a way to limit the near-fatal control the captain of the *Pequod* has over him. This control Ahab has over the narrator extends beyond Ahab's life; the very fact that Ishmael is compelled to write the tale is evidence of that.

Poe also uses imperative and delimitation in *Pym*, not only through direct language per se, but also through the situations the language creates:

> *Had a thousand lives hung upon* the movement of a limb or the utterance of a syllable, I could have <u>neither</u> moved <u>nor</u> spoken. (24) [my italics indicating imperative, underlining indicating delimitation]

The situation of having "a thousand lives hung upon" anything, implies an imperativeness associated with the fate of these souls: Someone *must* do, or something *must* be done, if their doom is to be prevented. This sort of dynamic speaks to the power-authoritativeness of death over life, as well as to the implied ability on the part of the person being able to prevent instance, in this case, Arthur Gordon Pym. Of course, the authenticity of this implied authority in this case is immediately undercut by the words "neither" and "nor," which limit and define what preventative action Pym is capable of, which is none.

Poe has Pym continue this rhetorical formula later in the narrative:

> <u>For a long time</u> I found it <u>nearly</u> *impossible to connect my ideas*—but <u>by very slow degrees</u>, *my thinking facilities returned*, and *I again called to memory the several incidents of my condition*. (24) [my italics and underlining highlighting imperativeness and delimitation respectively]

The first delimitation, "for a long time," indicates that there existed a period of time which had been extended as regards Pym's inability to "connect . . . [his] . . . ideas." Yet, regardless of its extended time, it was still finite: Such inability had a beginning and an end. The implicit fact that it had parameters is what creates its delimitation; the fact that it was a "long time" indicates it was out of the ordinary as indicated by the modification of the noun "time" by the adjective "long." Furthermore, that this is stated

at all testifies to its significance, a significance reflecting that its genesis must include a power greater than that of Pym. This, of course, is validated by the next delimiter, "nearly," referencing the inability of the narrator to "connect his ideas." What implies imperativeness here is the situation: Generally speaking—and especially when one is possibly suffering from starvation and dehydration—it is absolutely necessary to keep rational; the results of any state of mind to the contrary can spell death.

But again, Pym delimits his decision with "but by very slow degrees," the delimitation being the adjective "slow," as regards the imperatively necessary action he needs to effect should he wish to live through his ordeal. In this case, that action is the return of his "thinking facilities" which will enable him to "call . . . to memory the several incidents of . . . [his] . . . condition," and once realizing them, catalyzing himself by a realization of their gravity, to act against them and save himself from demise.

This pattern of delimitation associated with imperative situations is repeated throughout the novel. Indeed, it is at the heart of the tension which is a vital part of moving the plot along . . . or at least, on the surface, so it would seem. In essence though, when readers come to the end of the narrative and are left with such a cryptic finale as Poe creates, what this dynamic of delimitation/imperativeness really accomplishes is the moving of the *action only*, and *not* the *story line* itself; the authorial message of the novel, once analyzed in its true light as an extended allegory attempting to further the cause of a continuation of European-descended enslavement of displaced Africans and African-descended Americans, can never be authenticated, in spite of Poe's cleverly crafted tale in which he endeavors to do so through the inauthentic authoritative voice of his abolitionist-representative narrator.

Confident language in a literary voice expresses the sense that the speaker of that voice believes what is being said. As such, it implies authoritativeness because strong belief is usually backed up by either power and/or knowledge. Literary authors may use this rhetorical device to develop authoritativeness in the voices of their narrators or characters.

Emphatic language conveys a sense of inarguability. It implies that because the language is inarguable, the speaker is an authority on the subject matter referenced (knowledge), or has the requisite authoritative wherewithal of an elevated social status to effect its desire upon those at which it is directed (power).

Melville often uses confident language to give the voices of his narrator or characters a heightened sense of authoritativeness. In the following quotation the author employs it in Ishmael's narrative to report the confidence of the *Pequod's* third mate Flask and develop that character's image and voice:

> How different the loud little King-Post. 'Sing out and say something, my hearties. Roar and pull, my thunderbolts! Beach me, beach me on their black backs, boys; only do that for me, and I'll sign over to you my Martha's Vineyard plantation, boys; including wife and children; boys. Lay me on—lay me on! O Lord, Lord! but I shall go stark, staring mad: See! see that white water!' And so shouting, he pulled his hat from his head, and stamped up and down on it; then picking it up, flirted it far off upon the sea; and finally fell to rearing and plunging in the boat's stern like a crazed colt from the prairie. (227)

Flask's confident language inspires the crew of his whaling boat to pull harder after the prey. He also implies that he has a greater authoritative standing than the crew he addresses, by virtue of his landholding status. Through this status, Flask gives his

79

oarsmen and harpooners incentive to excel in doing his bidding, by promising them a piece of his wealth. Of course, this is a hyperbolic promise, but the point is—and this is something not lost on either the crew or the audience—that Flask has a power-based authority, both on dry land and especially on the sea. As such, it behooves the crew to follow his orders, not only for the rewards they bring, but also to avoid any of the negative repercussions.

In another example of how conviction builds up a voice's authoritativeness, readers view through Ishmael's narrative how second mate Stubb's confidence mollifies the feelings of the *Pequod's* crew at the appearance of Fedallah and Ahab's select whaleboat crew:

> . . . with . . . Stubb's confident way of accounting for their
> appearance, they were for the time being, freed from
> superstitious surmisings . . . (224)

Stubb is an authority figure; he is third in command of the *Pequod*. This status suggests possession of an authority of power and usually of knowledge as well. As such, Stubb is imbued with a confidence which it is incumbent upon him to relay to the crew. But is Stubb's confidence about the strange party of whalemen authentically authoritative? In this case, only partially. As it turns out, Fedallah's compatriots are not some incarnate demons, fanatically unfazed by any danger, as the crew had originally thought, and as Ishmael has painted them throughout his narrative from their introduction until they went out after Moby Dick himself in Chapter 133. This picture of them has been merely a falsely perceived image that rapidly fades to cowardice—at least for the crew—as they come face to face with the White Whale under their whaleboat (551).

However, in the case of Fedallah who sits calmly by watching the beast swim round and round his fragment of the smashed whaleboat where he "incuriously and mildly eyed him" (552), it would appear that Ishmael's perception of the strange man could possibly be true; Fedallah's demeanor is inordinately reserved for so dire a situation; is it because pure evil fears no other evil?

Melville also uses emphatic language throughout *Moby-Dick* in the narrative to infuse authoritativeness into Ishmael's voice, as in the excerpt at the top of the next page:

> Oh ye whose dead lie buried beneath the green grass, who standing among flowers can say—here, *here* my beloved; ye *know* not the desolation that broods in bosoms like these. What bitter blanks in those black-bordered marble covers with no ashes! What despair in those immovable inscriptions! (38)

He also uses it to give other characters an enhanced authoritative. An example is Father Mapple delivering his sermon:

> 'This, shipmates, this is that other lesson; and woe to that pilot of the living God who slights it. Woe to him whom this world charms from Gospel duty! Woe to him who seeks to pour oil upon the waters when God has brewed them into a gale! Woe to him who seeks to please rather than appall! Woe to him whose good name is more to him than goodness! Woe to him who, in this world, courts not dishonor! Woe to him who would not be true, even though to be false were salvation! Yea, woe to him who, as the great Pilot Paul has it, while preaching to others is himself a castaway!' (50)

But does Ishmael, by associating himself with various confident and emphatic others ever authenticate his own blustering, prime examples of which are Chapter 24, "The Advocate" (111-15), and Chapter 25, "Postscript" (115-16)? In spite of his best efforts to come across as authentically authoritative through confident and emphatic

rhetoric, Ishmael oftentimes fails to substantiate his intention because he uses vacuous and proclamatious claims,[15] as in the excerpt below where he attempts to defend the whaling trade:

> But, if in the face of all this, you still declare that whaling
> has no aesthetically nobel associations connected with it,
> then am I ready to shiver fifty lances with you there, and
> unhorse you with a split helmet every time. (114)

Ultimately then, despite the confident and emphatic rhetorical positions that Ishmael displays throughout *Moby-Dick*, these do not make up for the lack of substance in what he says, and therefore fail to create an authentic authoritative voice.

Arthur Gordon Pym also exhibits confidence and emphaticism via rhetoric in his narrative voice:

> These difficulties, however, so far from abating my desire,
> only added fuel to the flame. I determined to go at all
> hazards; and, having made known my intention to
> Augustus, we set about arranging a plan by which it might
> be accomplished. (16)

And what was this confidently and emphatically expressed plan of action about? Nothing less than stowing away on Augustus' father's ship, the *Grampus*. As it turns out, in spite of the surety sounding in the intent to accomplish his goal of going on a whaling expedition by any means necessary, the methodology he chooses becomes a life threatening nightmare for Pym, as he lies unattended below decks while mutiny rages above.

---

[15] See "Proclamatious Postulation and Proclamatious Declaration," section 3.A.III.iv, page 84.

And what of that situation? Again, Pym relies on his determination to extricate himself from the possible tomb of his close quarters via the trap door to Augustus' room, making this clear in the emphatic and confident rhetoric he uses, embedding this resolve within a litany of obstructions to elevate its value:

> The spoiled meat I could well spare, but my heart sank as I thought of the water. I was feeble in the extreme—so much so that I shook all over, as with an ague, at the slightest movement or exertion. To add to my troubles, the brig was pitching and rolling with great violence, and the oil casks which lay upon my box were in momentatry danger of falling down, to block up the only ingress or egress. I felt, also, terrible suffering from seasickness. These considerations determined me to make my way, at all hazards, to the trap, and obtain immediate relief, before I should be incapacitated from doing so altogether. (26)

Pym's confidence, supplemented by the emphaticism with which he "determine[s]" himself to succeed, speak to a power of authority with which to back up such valiant claims. But to what avail? While he does find the trap door after exhaustive difficulty, once there, Pym discovers it is stuck; no amount of confidence, no matter how insistently expressed, moves the door upward.

And so it goes throughout *Pym*. Time after time, statements are made by the narrator which sound as if he is in control of a situation, or knows what he is talking about, only to be revealed at a later point in the story as being inauthentic in their authority of either power or knowledge.

83

But to reiterate, Poe wishes it this way. For all of the sure and resolute speech concerning their agenda of preserving the Union against the South's insistence of maintaining the status quo of slavery, Yankee sentiments—which Pym represents—are nothing but bluster . . . at least in Poe's mind.

3 A III iv   PROCLAMATIOUS POSTULATION AND PROCLAMATIOUS DECLARATION

Proclamations postulation is a rhetorical device used within either the narrator's or a character's voice, which expresses itself as pondering a "great truth" to arrive at a "profound conclusion" through its persona's intellectual reasoning processes. The authoritativeness of these conclusions may be augmentatively driven home to the novel's readers by stylistic affectation, exclamatory emphasis, and/or confident language. Emphaticism and confidence, when used with proclamations postulation, reinforce the voice's conviction in its conclusion, while simultaneously expressing incredulity at anyone not accepting as fact the belief stated. Stylistic affectation when used in this context serves to elevate the tone of the voice speaking to a sense of heightened emotion denoting significance.

Proclamatious declaration effects the same rhetorical devices as proclamatious postulation, except as statement instead of as speculation. It is effected by either the narrator or a character making a grandly stated claim which purports to be an unmitigated truth.

Once again, Melville uses both proclamatious postulation and declaration in an attempt to give his literary voices more authoritativeness. An example of proclamatious

postulation is seen when Ishmael contemplates the meaning of life and death in the

passage which begins at the top of the next page:

> Yes, there is death in the business of whaling—a speechless
> quick chaotic bundling of a man into Eternity. But what
> then? Methinks we have hugely mistaken this matter of
> Life and Death. Methinks that what they call my shadow
> here on earth is my true substance. Methinks that in
> looking at things spiritual, we are too much like oysters
> observing the sun through the water, and thinking the water
> the thinnest of air. Methinks my body is but the less of my
> better being. In fact take my body who will, take it I say, it
> is not me. And therefore three cheers for Nantucket; and
> come a stove boat and stove body when they will, for stave
> my soul, Jove himself cannot. (39)

By posing the question "But what then," Ishmael sets himself up as someone who has the

authority to answer it. Now many, if not all people ponder their earthly end, so Ishmael

is no different in this regard than the majority of folks; indeed, anyone who addresses this

issue intimates a certain degree of authority to do so. So what readers are left with is the

question of authenticity. It is impossible to determine if what Ishmael is saying is true

since no mortal person has ever died and come back to either validate or refute the

contentions put forth by him. By default, then, since his statement can be neither proven

nor disproven, the voice becomes authoritatively inauthentic owing to the onus being

upon it to prove its claim, rather than upon the audience to disprove.

Proclamatious declaration is also used by Melville. In the following case, Ishmael

as narrator answers the question put forth by Don Sebastian, one of his lounging

companions at the Golden Inn, in Lima, Peru, by relating a proclamatiously grandiose

sub-narrative within the tale of the *Town Ho*:

For in their interflowing aggregate, those grand fresh-water
seas of ours,—Erie, and Ontario, and Huron, and Superior
and Michigan,—possesses an ocean-like expansiveness,
with many of the ocean's noblest traits; with many of its
rimmed varieties of races and climes. They contain round
archipelagoes of romantic isles, even as Polynesian waters
do; in large part, are shored by two contrasting nations, as
the Atlantic is; they furnish long maritime approaches to
our numerous territorial colonies from the East, dotted all
round their banks; here and there are frowned upon by
batteries, and by the goat-like craggy guns of lofty
Mackinaw; they have heard the fleet thunderings of naval
victories; at intervals, they yield their beaches to wild
barbarians, whose red painted faces flash from out their
peltry wigwams; for leagues and leagues are flanked by
ancient and unentered forests, where gaunt pines stand like
serried lines of kings in Gothic genealogies; those same
woods harboring Afric beasts of prey, and silken creatures
whose exported furs give robes to Tartar Emperors; they
mirror the paved streets of Buffalo and Cleveland, as well
as Winnebago villages; they float alike the full-rigged
merchant ship, the armed cruiser of the State, the steamer,
and the birch canoe; they are swept by Borean and
dismasting blasts as direful as any that lash the salted wave;
they know what shipwrecks are, for out of sight of land,
however inland, they have drowned full many a midnight a
ship with all its shrieking crew. (248-250)

Such examples of elevated diction as "interflowing aggregate," "grand,"

"noblest," "archipelagoes," "peltry," "Gothic genealogies, "Afric," "Tartar Emperors,"

and "Winnebago" along with the images they evoke, frame the subject in a more

significant than ordinary light. But does this attempt to infuse nobility into the Great

Lakes work? While the passage is a wonderfully constructed piece of romanticism, the

Great Lakes in this context are being spoken of as a commercial waterway. The degree

to which Melville through Ishmael goes in singing their praises here is thus inappropriate.

This renders the narrator's voice as inauthentically authoritative.

Poe also uses both proclamatious postulation and declaration as a means to infuse a sense of inauthentic authority into Pym's voice, but not in so grandiose a manner as Melville does with Ishmael in *Moby-Dick*. Oftentimes, he will combine them. An example of a somewhat muted proclamatious declaration which results in an even more muted proclamatious postulation in *Pym* is as follows:

> Presently, feeling an almost ravenous appetitie, I bethought myself of the cold mutton, some of which I had eaten just before going to sleep, and found excellent. What was my astonishment at discovering it to be in a state of putrefaction! This circumstance occasioned me great quietude; for connecting it with the disorder of the mind I experienced when awakening, I began to suppose that I must have slept for and inordinately long period of time. (22)

At first, Pym's reaction to discovering that the meat he had previously eaten was spoiled, is one of shock and alarm, as indicated by the proclamatious declaration ending in the exclamation mark. He then mutes this by stating rather affectedly that it "occasion[s]" him to "great quietude." This results in Pym casually postulating whether this might have had something to do with the confused state of mind he experienced when he awoke earlier in the story. He proclamatiously declares his arrived upon conclusion that since he had previously found the mutton "excellent," he must have "slept for an inordinately long time" for it to have been spoiled upon the second eating. Of course, this sort of obvious, common sense deduction does not merit the degree of rhetorical enthusiasm nor focus he gives it.

But is the authoritative voice in which Pym ponders the cause then concludes of his mental state based upon fact? The answer is, no. All of the reasoning is speculative, the result conjecture. Pym's voice, then, is inauthentic in its authority, just as Poe planned it to further the narrator's characterological development as a representative of inept Northern thinking.

Technical writing style and rhetoric are those elements of logos, subject matter, tone, and word choice which on might commonly expect to find in technical writing.

There are, however, times when these technical writing styles and rhetorical devices can be employed within the framework of a literary piece to give it an authoritative voice. This is definitely the case in the two literary works I have chosen to explore, *Moby-Dick: or the White Whale* and *The Narrative of Arthur Gordon Pym of Nantucket*.

The technical writing rhetorical devices and styles which are most amenable to this are detailed in the following sections listed below:

Insofar as authoritative voice is in technical writing is concerned, no particular subject matter lends itself to authenticity; all areas of technical writing should be

equally capable of being translated into authentically authoritative writing through the writer's voice.

Additionally, while all accomplished technical writing should ultimately be authoritatively authentic, this is generally achieved by staying within the rhetorical boundaries of any one of the several devices used to effect the desired end result, as opposed to literary writing where it is usually necessary to enhance the chances of the same outcome by application of a greater number of these elements. This is not to say that employing more of these rhetorical components in technical writing is a bad thing; quite the contrary—in this context, more really is better. Given the narrow focus of much technical writing, generally speaking, the opportunity to utilize more then a few of the mechanisms I have identified in this study is oftentimes not available; succinctness and concision are what is striven for in technical writing, not the poetically enhanced elaboration which might be considered a virtue in literature.

3.13.1.   LINGUISTICS

The American Heritage Dictionary defines "linguistics" as, "The study of the nature and structure of human speech."

Oftentimes, linguistics is considered more germane to technical writing than to literary writing, owing to the more critical issue of audience-focus. However, literary writers also devote focus upon their audience, and many of the same rhetorical techniques as employed in technical writing which concentrate on audience related matters, are also used by authors of literature, including level of diction.

While many other linguistic attributes may exist that enhance authoritative voice in literature, the two reviewed in this study are listed below:

3.B.I.i   LEVEL OF DICTION

Certain word choices fit certain circumstances. Word choices can be evaluated for their effectiveness in portraying degrees of both knowledge- and power-based authoritativeness by examining the level of diction from which the verbiage is drawn. The level of a speaker's diction—that is, the complexity of meaning or sophistication of the word choices—may indicate who the speaker is, either from a sociological, and/or intellectual perspective. As such , then, any deviation from the set of words which are expected from a narrator or character draws attention to itself. This attention can be effected either purposefully on the part of the author, or inadvertently. It can affect how a speaker's voice is viewed as being either authentically or inauthentically authoritative. Additionally, it can affect character development.

In *Moby-Dick*, Ishmael speaks with an other-than-personal normal level of diction, is given below as he states to Mrs. Hussey his concerns regarding the bill of faire for the evening's meal:

---

[16] Insofar as the literary foci of this study are concerned, etymolgy as a technical writing rhetorical linguistic attribute of authoritative voice is exclusively employed in *Moby Dick*.

A clam for suppe? a cold clam; is *that* what you meant Mr. Hussey?" says I; "but that's a rather cold and clammy reception in the winter time, *ain't* it, Mrs. Hussey? (67-8) [second italics mine, highlighting lowered diction]

The use of the word "ain't" is very out of place for Ishmael, at least insofar as the elevated level of diction readers have encountered and come to expect from him in the preceding 66 pages of the book is concerned, examples of which follow:

... (that is, if you never violate the *Pythagorean maxim*). (6)

Where else but in Nantucket did those *aboriginal* whalemen, the Red-Men, first *sally* out in canoes to give

chase to the *Leviathan*? (8) [italics mine, indicating elevated diction]

Now that Lazarus should lie *stranded* there on the *curbstone* before the door of *Dives*, this is more wonderful than that an iceberg should be *moored* to one of the *Moluccas*. Yet *Dives* himself, he too lives like a Czar in an ice palace made of frozen sighs, and being a president of a *temperance* society, he only drinks the *tepid* tears of orphans. (11-12) [italics mine, indicating elevated diction]

Between the marble *cenotaphs* on either hand of the pulpit ... (41) [italics mine, indicating elevated diction]

Whether it was, too, that his head being shaved, his forehead was drawn out in freer and brighter *relief*, and looked more *expansive* than it otherwise would, this I will not *venture* to decide; but certain it was his head was *phrenologically* an excellent one. (52) [italics mine, indicating elevated diction]

... it is therefore *meet*, that in this ... (121) [italics mine, indicating elevated diction]

For him to suddenly and unexpectedly use a crude colloquialism such as "ain't" vis-à-vis such other word choices as "Pythagorean maxim" and "phrenologically," not only affects readers' perception of him as a narrator, but also of Melville as an author.

Both Ishmael's authoritative position, as well as Melville's skill at authentic character development, immediately come into question as a direct result of this.

Though the first cited passage above shows a characterologically developmental faux pas by Melville, this is truly an anomaly; Melville usually employs various levels of diction to various characters in *Moby-Dick* with a deftness of skill which immediately alerts a reader to a character's authoritative position within the context of the novel. However stereotypical and sociologically offensive such language might be to the sensibilities of a latter day, more humanitarianly attuned audience, Fleece's speech pattern as a mid-nineteenth century antebellum African-American servant is authentic as he preaches to the sharks over the side of the *Pequod*:

> 'Fellow-critters: *I'se* ordered here to say *dat* you must stop
> dat dam noise dare. You hear? Stop dat dam smackin' ob
> de lip! Massa Stubb day dat you can fill your dam bellies
> up to de hatchings, but by Gor! you must stop dat dam
> racket!' (303)

Here readers immediately know that Fleece is not a power-based authoritative person by virtue of his level of diction, though his level of diction does not necessarily indicate he is not a knowledge-based character. The level of diction is also commensurate with Fleece's social and cultural status, and Melville through consistency in the word choice he uses for this character keeps him characterologically authentic whenever he appears in the novel.

Conversely, it is through an *elevated* level of diction that Melville attempts to raise the degree of power-based authoritativeness through knowledge-based authoritativeness in Ishmael. Ishmael's level of diction is overwhelmingly above the norm. This is out of place in the larger context of what one would expect for an ordinary

member of a nineteenth century whaling crew. In giving his narrator an above average vocabularic virtuosity, Melville is alerting readers to Ishmael's education, and by inference, his assumed authority of knowledge. But is this really the case?

For all of Ishmael's elevated word choice, there remains a number of factual inaccuracies which he makes throughout the novel (see "Reference And Terminology," section 3.B.III.i, page 118; "Historical Data," section 3.B.III.ii, page 123; and "Authenticity and Inauthenticity In *Moby-Dick* and *Pym*," section 3.C, page 143 for further detail). All of these errors sound as though they are correct, that is, on their surface, with their academic, scientific, and socially accepted as above average linguistic and semantic superiority. However, a closer examination of many of these reveals inauthenticity in their informational veracity. As such, Ishmael's voice's authoritative authenticity becomes seriously compromised.

This is not what Melville intends. He intends for the level of diction used by Ishmael to augment factually correct data and enhance the authoritative knowledgeability of his narrator's voice, thus giving him the authoritative power over readers of the novel which was to have them consider the narrators' utterances as profound in toto. While much of what Ishmael says is true, there is just too much of it which is not.

The final overall analysis, then, is that Melville's narrator's voice is not authoritatively authentic, and is merely using elevated diction to obfuscate this fact; Ishmael's own self-deprecation, vagueness, and qualification of his knowledgeability throughout the story validates this.

In *Pym*, Poe also employs various levels of diction for both his narrator and other characters.

Similarly as Melville characterologically developed Ishmael, Poe also gives Pym an elevated vocabulary:

> In the meantime, Henderson had again put off from the ship, although the wind was now blowing almost a hurricane. He had not been gone many minutes when he fell in with some *fragments* of our boat, and shortly afterward one of the men with him *asserted* that he could *distinguish* a cry for help at *intervals* amid the roaring *tempest*. This *induced* the hardy seamen to *perservere* in their search for more than an hour, although repeated signals were made them by Captain Block, and although every moment on the water in so *frail* a boat was *fraught* to them with the most *imminent* and deadly *peril*. (12) [italics mine, highlighting elevated word choice; my underling indicating affected style][17]

The words "fragments," "asserted'" "intervals'" "amid'" "induced'" "persevere'" "frail'" "fraught'" "imminent'" and "peril" are all words which come from the set of vocabulary normally thought of as elevated. Poe is constructing Pym within the framework of a gentleman. The in toto affected speech patterns, underlined above, further the author's characterological development of his narrator, to this end. As an extension of this end, Poe also wishes to convey that this particular gentleman is of Northern extraction. While Southern gentlemen of that era would also have spoken at similar levels of diction in their normal discursive intercourse, Poe takes pains to have

---

[17] n.b. Affected style both compliments and works in unison with elevated diction to foster authoritativeness.

Pym do so in a constant and ultra-verbose fashion, which creates him as a character/narrator who says much about nothing, and often even , then, incorrectly.

But, as previously stated, this was Poe's intent: to show Pym as representative of all Yankee gentlemen, and as such, also representative of abolitionists in toto as being effete, wanting in their intelligence, and vapid in their speech.

Also as Melville did with Ishmael, Poe makes Pym speak out of character for his station, but as opposed to Melville's mere lapse of characterological developmental skill, Poe has his narrator employ a lower level of diction for a reason within the context of the novel; n.b. how Pym's level of diction changes between his narration and his dialogue:

> . . . after passing Mr. Edmund's well, who should appear, standing right in front of me, and looking me full in the face, but old Mr. Peterson, my grandfather. 'Why bless my soul, Gordon,' said he, after a long pause, 'why, why— *whose* dirty cloak is that you have on?' 'Sir!' I replied, <u>assuming</u>, as well as I could, in the <u>exigency</u> of the moment, an air of <u>offended</u> surprise, and talking in the gruffest of tones—'sir! you are a *sum'mat* mistaken; my name, in the first place, *bee'nt* nothing at all like *Goddin*, and I'd want you for to know better, you blackguard, that to call my new *obbercoat* a *darty* one. (18) [my underlining, indicating elevated diction, my italics indicating lower diction, with the exception of the word "whose" spoken by Pym's grandfather]

All of the words I have highlighted are not only of a lower level of diction than the underlined words, but they have also been enhanced by Poe to assimilate a regional accent through his phonetic and punctuational manipulation of their spelling. This manipulation of Pym's voice via the synthesis of both level of diction and regional phonetic mutation, accomplishes that which Poe intended for Pym's voice in this bit of

dialogue: to change it so that his narrator could evade the recognition of his own grandfather. Of course, in so doing, Poe also gives Pym an elevated sense of authoritative knowledge which brings him the power to deceive. In this case , then, Pym does come across as authentically authoritative, but as a deceiver, a fact Poe hopes is not lost on his audience.

3.B.1.ii.   ETYMOLOGY

Etymology, in and of itself, is usually not something an author goes out of his or her way to use within a literary piece when seeking to substantiate an authoritative voice. However, in the particular case of *Moby-Dick*, Melville uses this artifice precisely to do so.

The strange one page preface "Etymology" (viii) cites, then parenthetically describes, a "pale usher" whose interpretation of a number of different languages' manifestations of the English equivalent for "whale" are listed after an unattributed cryptic treatment concerning some alluded to yet undefined language's word for the same mammal, "*Hackluyt,*" and two different dictionary definitions for "WHALE."

The fact that Melville chooses to initiate the reader to his novel with the presentation of a purported etymological examination of the word "whale," indicates his desire to immediately let it be known that this book is by someone who knows the subject matter at hand. The fact that the "someone" is not identified until the next page, is irrelevant; the mere posturing of the speaker elicits the reader to take notice of the speaker's—and by extension—the author's, intent. Etymology is both a refined science,

and a word whose level of diction is usually not readily appreciated by other than language arts students. All of this in toto, speaks of both expertise and a power through this knowledge above and beyond the average person's scope of understanding or of ability.

Melville continues to infuse the page with authoritativeness, by shrouding it in further mystery regarding the reference to the "pale usher," referring to "mortality," and choosing the classic languages of Western civilization to translate within the etymological treatise: Hebrew; Greek; and Latin.

But for all of this effort, does the author succeed in his goal? Not really. When weighed against the numerous errors one encounters while reading the novel, in retrospect, this initial section is reduced to an attempt to obfuscate Ishmael's woeful lack of knowledge . . . a paradigm which continues throughout the rest of the work.

3 B II.   RHETORICAL DEVICES INVOLVING EXPERT SOURCES

Expert sources reinforce a narrative or characterological voice's authority by adding additional authoritative information outside of the speaker's own immediate realm of knowledge. There are two kinds of expert sources:

- First-Hand Account Expert Sources: People who directly report information to the speaker of the voice.

- Documentary Expert Sources: Written material which the speaker of the voice has read.

Additionally, it is important to note the knowledgeability, veracity, currency of both first-hand and documentary expert sources.

Expert sources can also be evaluated as either authentically or inauthentically authoritative, which has implications as to the authoritativeness of the speaker citing the sources.

This study examines each of these factors individually as to how they are employed in literature and how one might arrive at a conclusion as to the validity of the information they convey in the sections listed below:

3 B II i   FIRST-HAND ACCOUNT EXPERT SOURCES

As mentioned previously in "Rhetorical Devices Involving Expert Sources," section 3.B.II, page 97, first-hand account expert sources are those persons who give information directly to the those whom they inform. Literary authors can effect first-hand expert source informational transfers via either dialogue between two or more characters, or as testimonial monologue or narrative .

In *Moby-Dick* we see several instances of both narrative and characterological dialogic first-hand expert source information being given.

In the narrative passage below, Ishmael speaks in testimonial style regarding his admiration for the expert quality of whalemanship he finds in his companion Queequeg:

> To all this I joyously assented; for besides the affection I
> now felt for Queequeg, he was an experienced harpooner,
> and as such, could not fail to be of great usefulness to one,
> who, like me, was wholly ignorant of the mysteries of
> whaling, though well aquainted with the sea, as known to a
> merchant seaman. (58-59)

It is interesting to note here that while Ishmael gives a testimonial to Queequeg's authority of knowledge regarding whale hunting, he also simultaneously states his own first-hand ignorance of whaling. This section, while attempting to reinforce Ishmael's authoritativeness, actually undermines it. It also serves to diminish his degree of culpability for any inaccuracies from this point forward in the novel as regards the whaling business: He basically has established here that while he is an expert in some areas about which the story of the novel is concerned, being ". . . well aquatinted with the sea . . . " (58-59), he is nonetheless, not so authoritative in others, that is, admitting that he is a man who is ". . . wholly ignorant of the mysteries of whaling . . . " (58-59).

Contrary to what the previous example might lead one to believe, usually first-hand account expert sources are considered somewhat more authoritative than documentary expert sources, as the speaker of the voice is immediately aquatinted with the source, and may be able to glean any inconsistencies more readily, and to address these to the informant. It follows then that the speaker of the voice can make a decision as to the authenticity of the source's authoritativeness before including the information received into the text.

If this was Melville's intent in *Moby-Dick*, it is strange he should include the disclaimer by Ishmael regarding his inability to discern authenticity from inauthenticity regarding whaling. Once again, in presenting Ishmael as being unknowledgeable, Melville dilutes his narrator's authoritativeness.

As seen in the excerpt beginning below and continuing on to the next page (previously used in "Interrogatives," section 3.A.III.i, page 67, to explicate those rhetorical devices), Melville also has Ishmael directly solicit first-hand expert account sources:

> 'Queequeg,' said I, when they had dragged me, the last man to the deck, and I was still shaking myself in my jacket to fling off the water; 'Queequeg, dear friend does this sort of thing often happen?' Without much emotion, though soaked through just like me, he gave me to understand that such things do often happen.
>
> 'Mr. Stubb,' said I, turning to that worthy, who, buttoned up in his oil-jacket, was now calmly smoking his pipe in the rain; 'Mr. Stubb, I think I have heard you say that of all the whalemen you ever met, Mr. Starbuck, is by far the most careful and prudent. I suppose then, that going plump on a flying whale with your sail set in a foggy squall is the height of a whaleman's discretion?'
>
> 'Certain. I've lowered for whales from a leaking ship in a gale off Cape Horn.'
>
> 'Mr. Flask, said I, turning to the little King-Post, who was standing close by; 'you are experienced in these things, and I am not. will you tell me whether it is an unalterable law in this fishery, Mr. Flask, for and oarsman to break his back pulling himself back-foremost into death's jaws?'
>
> 'Can't you twist that smaller?' said Flask. 'Yes, that's the law. I should like to see a boat's crew backing water up to a whale face fore-most. Ha, ha! the whale would give them squint for squint, mind that!'
>
> Here then from three impartial witnesses I had deliberate statement of the entire case. (232)

Ishmael is seeking information from three expert sources: Queequeg, Stubb, and Flask. In getting the resultant input he does, he can make the final statement regarding his deliberation of the entire case with the effect of being now intelligently informed by sources who have expertise wrought from empiricism. Since he has previously laid the groundwork regarding each of these sources as authentic—from his own observation and through

100

Melville's authoritative enhancements regarding the sociological status of Stubb and Flask as first and second mate, as well as the elevated regard in which these two hold Queequeg's authoritative authenticity—Ishmael, by virtue of his newly accrued knowledge from this informative conduit, now increases his own authoritative value.

On the other hand, unlike Melville in *Moby-Dick* where the narrator solicits first-hand expert information from other sources, Poe's use of first-hand expert source information to characterize the authoritative authenticity of Arthur Gordon Pym lays almost entirely within the narrative of Pym himself. In point of fact, the lion's share of the story is nothing but a first-hand account by Pym of his own adventures. Even those sections where he digresses into historical reference of documentary expert sources (Chapters 14 through 18) are related by Pym to the reader. As such, one must accept on faith that the narrator is reliably relaying this information—or not accept it, as the case might be.

This lack of any primary informational source for readers other than the narrator was intentionally written into *The Narrative of Arthur Gordon Pym of Nantucket* by Poe. In constructing his novel this way, Poe ensures that readers remain focused on the speaking voice's point of view. As such, they can better identify separate elements of this voice to scrutinize its authoritative authenticity or lack thereof . . . and with Pym, the more closely one looks, the more incorrect information is revealed. But as previously put forth in this study, this is Poe's intent; it is the main characterological developmental tool he uses to further the his personal pro-slavery agenda.

Documentary expert sources in writing are those informational references cited by

a speaker which are derived from written material: In technical writing, the speaker

within the text is manifested as the voice of the author; In literary writing, the speaker can

be heard through the voice of the narrator, a character, or characters. It is assumed the

speaker citing the source has read the source cited.

Naturally, the written words in the documentation from which the information is

derived are generated by someone. However, the person who is the recipient of the

information may or may not know the provider personally—and in point of fact usually

will not—so there is a degree of separation from the source, rendering documentary

expert data sources as somewhat more suspect regarding the authenticity of their

authority in the minds of readers than first-hand account expert sources. It is incumbent

upon those persons citing the source , then, to have researched their authenticity, either

by reading the source's information and applying their own empirical knowledge against

it, or via testimonial from other proven reliable sources.

Melville gives many instances of documentary expert sources in *Moby-Dick*.

All of the prefatory section "Extracts" (ix-xv) "Supplied by a Sub-Sub-Librarian"

(ix) is nothing more than four full pages of documentary source information.

These sources range from Biblical passages, to ancient Roman philosophers to English

Elizabethan to mid-nineteenth century poets and playwrights, to the lyrics of

folkloric ditties. While on their surface they may seem authoritative, even Melville, via

the cryptically quasi-referenced narrator's voice (is it the Sub-Sub-Librarian speaking of

himself in second person, or Ishmael speaking of the Sub-Sub, or . . . ?) qualifies these

sources' authenticity:

> It will be seen that this mere burrower and grubworm of a
> poor devil of a Sub-Sub appears to have gone through the
> long Vaticans and street-stalls of the earth, picking up
> whatever random allusions to whales he could anyways
> find in andy book whatsoever, sacre or profane. Therefore
> you must not, in every case as least, take the higgledy-
> piggledy whale stateents, however authentic, in these
> extracts, for veritable gospel cetology. (ix)

In his introduction to this novel , then, Melville is alerting the reader to the

inauthenticity of at least its documentary expert sources' authoritativeness. As such,

Melville also creates a sense of well-founded doubt concerning the authoritative

authenticity of all other speakers and all other manner of information spoken of through

their voices from this point forward. As such, Ishmael, the main character/

protagonist/narrator remains interminably open to scrutiny insofar as his credibility is

concerned. It is for this reason that the narrator feels compelled to validate the

authenticity of his authoritative knowledge throughout the rest of the book via reference

to all manner of expert sources and other credible information and data.[18]

A prime example of this attempted self-validation of Ishmael's authoritative

authenticity via citation of knowledge is seen in Chapter 32, "Cetology" (133-148),

where the narrator cites numerous documentary sources:

> . . . the men, small and great, old and new, landsmen and
> seamen, who have at large or in little, written of the whale.

---

[18] Also see "First-Hand Account Expert Sources," section 3.B.II.i, page 98, "Historical Data," section
3.B.III.ii, page 123, and "Locational Data," 3.B.III.iii, page 128.

> Run over a few:—The Authors of the Bible; Aristotle;
> Pliny; Aldrovandi; Sir Thomas Browne; Gesner; Ray;
> Linnaeus; Rondelitius; Willoughby; Green; Artedi;
> Sibbald; Brisson; Marten; Lacépède; Bonnatierre;
> Desmarest; Baron Cuvier; Frederick Cuvier; John Hunter;
> Owen; Scoresby; Beale; Bennet; J. Ross Browne; the
> Author of Miriam Coffin; Olmstead; and the Rev. Hey T.
> Cheever. (134)

Immediately following this listing of documentary expert sources, Ishmael

himself then writes an 11 page "cetological" folio, so "informed" has he now become by

inference due to the research material he has cited.

Chapter 55, "Of the Monstrous Pictures of Whales" (268-272), continues on this

tour de force of referencing documentary expert sources, citing for example, Harris's

collection of voyages, "'A Whaling Voyage to Spitzenberg in the ship Jonas in the

Whale, Peter Petersen of Friesland, master'" (270), or Captain Colnett's "'A Voyage

round Cape Horn into the South Seas, for the purpose of extending the Spermaceti Whale

Fisheries'" (270), or "'Goldsmith's Animated Nature'" (270).

And on and on it goes, but does Ishmael ever truly authenticate his documentary

sources' authority? In citing these sources, Melville makes Ishmael rely upon the mere

calling of their oftentimes authoritative sounding titular names, "Peter Petersen . . .

master" (270), "Captain Colnett" (270), etc., to suffice for validation of the authenticity

of the authoritativeness of their knowledge. However seemingly this may give the

appearance of knowledge-based authoritative authenticity to Ishmael's voice, it is in

reality not enough. Many of the documentary sources cited by the narrator are tenuous at

best, and with the proviso of caution regarding all speakers' authenticity of documentary

expert sources given by Melville in "Extracts," there is little that can be done to make any of them believable by the narrator.

The same sort of lack of credibility also holds true for *Pym*'s documentary expert sources.[19] In the case of Poe's novel, however, this is by design. Poe wants Arthur Gordon Pym to come across as inauthentic in his authoritativeness to further the author's intent of having the narrator represent all Yankees as such, and by extension, the presumed abolitionist stance of all Yankees.

3.B.II.iii.   KNOWLEDGEABILITY OF EXPERT SOURCES

When expert sources are used in a text—be it technical or literary writing— determining their knowledgeability is a key element in evaluating a voice's authoritative authenticity.

From *Moby-Dick*, a look at "Extracts" (ix-xv) proves this point. As previously stated, it is four pages of documentary expert source information concerning all manner of whaling and cetology. However, all of this testimonial follows a very interestingly put preface by a "Sub-Sub-Librarian" (ix). What makes this preface interesting from the point of view of knowledgeability analysis of its sources, is how it is qualified, both outright and in subtle nuance. Just what, for instance, is a "Sub-Sub-Librarian?" The prefix "sub" implies something below, a quality of lesser value than even average.

---

[19] See "Historical Data," section 3.B.III.ii, page 123, "Locational Data," section 3.B.III.iii, page 128.

Moving through the text, we encounter the following disclaimer to the reader:

> Therefore you must not, in every cast at least, take the
> higgledy-piggledy whale statements, however authentic, in
> these extracts, for veritable gospel cetology. (ix)

Once more, Melville is qualifying his narrator's authoritative voice by bringing into question the authenticity of his very own "expert" sources.

Again from *Moby-Dick* in Chapter 55, "Of the Monstrous Pictures of Whales," Melville indicates by Ishmael's citation of the numerous documentary expert sources previously detailed in "Documentary Expert Sources," section 3.B.II.ii, page 105 of this study, that his narrator is well aquatinted with—that is, has actually personally read—these documentary expert sources. But other than their being an "imposing quarto" (referring to the Colnett work, 270), or that the upcoming works are a ". . . glance at those pictures of leviathan purporting to be sober, scientific delineation, by those who know," what actual verification of the authenticity of these sources has the narrator attempted?

The same sort of authentication-evaluative process for authoritativeness as was applied to documentary expert sources needs to be exercised against first-hand account expert sources as well. The passage from *Moby-Dick* beginning after the next paragraph, studied with an eye toward assessing its value as a piece of expert source material,[20] can reveal the importance of ascertaining the knowledgeability of sources in general.

In this piece, Ishmael is asking first Queequeg, then Stubb and finally Flask for their opinions regarding the swamping of the whaleboat and Starbuck's decision regarding its cause:

'Queequeg,' said I, when they had dragged me, the last man to the deck, and I was still shaking myself in my jacket to fling off the water; 'Queequeg, dear friend does this sort of thing often happen?' Without much emotion, though soaked through just like me, he gave me to understand that such things do often happen.

'Mr. Stubb,' said I, turning to that worthy, who, buttoned up in his oil-jacket, was now calmly smoking his pipe in the rain; 'Mr. Stubb, I think I have heard you say that of all the whalemen you ever met, Mr. Starbuck, is by far the most careful and prudent. I suppose then, that going plump on a flying whale with your sail set in a foggy squall is the height of a whaleman's discretion?'

'Certain. I've lowered for whales from a leaking ship in a gale off Cape Horn.'

'Mr. Flask, said I, turning to the little King-Post, who was standing close by; 'you are experienced in these things, and I am not. will you tell me whether it is an unalterable law in this fishery, Mr. Flask, for and oarsman to break his back pulling himself back-foremost into death's jaws?'

'Can't you twist that smaller?' said Flask. 'Yes, that's the law. I should like to see a boat's crew backing water up to a whale face fore-most. Ha, ha! the whale would give them squint for squint, mind that!'

Here then from three impartial witnesses I had deliberate statement of the entire case. (232)

Obviously, Ishmael trusts his sources. Queequeg, Starbuck, Flask, and Stubb are all established expert whalers; Starbuck, Flask, and Stubb have the added advantage of being de facto authoritative figures by virtue of their positions as ship's officers.

---

[20] Previously studied in "Interrogatives," section 3.A.III.i, page 67 of this study.

Ishmael knows them all, and has empirically experienced their expertise. So here, not only are the expert sources giving their own first-hand accounts, but as well, Ishmael has first-hand witness to the authenticity of their authority as regards other directly related matters to that which he is now posing. By virtue of this entire dynamic, then, readers experience an authentication of the authoritativeness of these sources' knowledge. Both the expert sources—as well as Ishmael for being wise enough to have gone to them—enjoy this symbiotically enhanced position as perceived by the audience. Furthermore, this reinforcement of the knowledgeability of expert sources may resonate not only within individual episodes where these expert sources are cited, but also, when compiled with the majority of the other expert sources cited during the course of the narrative also being authentically authoritative, throughout the entire work as well. Of course, the contrary is just as true: a majority of unknowledgeable expert source occurrences may sway an audience towards an inclination to disbelieve the voice.

So overall, are Ishmael's expert sources knowledgeable?

The answer is, "It depends."

It would seem that the first-hand accounts most certainly are; all of the people Ishmael uses are authentically authoritative in their subject matter. It is only when Ishmael starts to believe himself among them, and interpolate their information incorrectly that things fall apart; Chapter 32, "Cetology" (133-148), is a prime example of this.

As far as the documentary expert sources are concerned, Melville himself takes care of calling them to task from the very opening pages of the novel; this pall cast upon them remains throughout the work. This leaves readers confused.

In any work of writing, either technical or literary, if there is a mixture of both knowledgeable and unknowledgeable expert sources, then readers are forced to compute which of these types is in greater proportion to the other to arrive at an informed conclusion about the authenticity of the voice's authoritativeness. In the case of *Moby-Dick*, first-hand account expert sources are knowledgeable, but caution is advised regarding the narrator's propensity for misinterpretation and/or narrative license with the information he receives from these sources, and that all documentary expert sources are suspect; readers need to take these with a grain of salt.

Poe's *Pym* is an entirely different case. Arthur Gordon Pym's expert sources consist chiefly of his own empiricism for first-hand account, and the presumed texts of the men listed in Chapters 15 through 18 for documentary. As explicated in other sections of this paper,[21] the knowledgeability of both of these type of expert sources is questionable, at best.

Pym himself acknowledges his woeful lack of knowledge concerning nautical matters from the very start of the novel; it stands to reason that as such, he is probably

[21] See "First-Hand Account Expert Sources," section 3.B.II.i, page 98, "Documentary Expert Sources," section 3.B.II.ii, page 102, "Credibility of Expert Sources," section 3.B.II.iv, page 110, "Contemporaneousness of Expert Sources," section 3.B.II.v, page 114, "Historical Data," section 3.B.III.ii, page 123," and "Locational Data," section 3.B.III.iii, page 128

incapable of discerning knowledgeability of his documentary sources as well, if these sources even really exist and he is not just fabricating the data outright.[22]

3.B.II.iv   CREDIBILITY OF EXPERT SOURCES

Related to the knowledgeability of expert sources is the issue of their credibility: How believable is a given source?

Several factors can come into play here. First, even though generally speaking they may be authentically authoritative in the larger subject matter under which a particular issue may fall, are they knowledgeable enough in that subject down to the level of specificity required for any finer matter being addressed? For instance, someone who is an expert in general marine mammalogy may or may not have that same degree of expertise in cetology. Even though this expert may be telling the truth about whales and dolphins, there is the chance that the source is overstepping boundaries and making comment on unknown areas, not meaning to lie outright, but through presumptiveness, not telling the truth nonetheless.

Readers need to evaluate if the speaker of the voice citing the source has investigated the scope of the source's expertise. For instance, just how knowledgeable was Scoresby, often cited in *Moby-Dick* by Ishmael as an expert documentary source (133, 134, 184, 270), whose works include his *Journal of a Voyage Around the World for Magnetical Research* and *American Factories and Their Female Operatives*, as well as

---

[22] See "Documentary Expert Sources," section 3.B.II.ii, page 102 for expansion upon this.

An Account of the Arctic Regions with a History and Description of the Northern Whale-Fishery and *Journal of a Voyage to the Northern Whale Fishery*, regarding whaling vis-à-vis the breadth of subject matter he purports himself to be authoritative in, both within the related subject matter of oceanic exploration, i.e., magnetic research, and without it regarding such far flung subjects as evaluating feminist concerns of industrial women in America? Was Scoresby so talented that he could be authentically authoritative in such diverse fields, or was he merely spreading himself too thin? If the former, then the credibility relating to his information remains intact; if the latter, he is obviously unqualified, at least in some, if not all, of the subjects he writes on, and the credibility of his data is suspect . . . who is to say that subject where he is lacking is not whaling, the very subject Ishmael cites him for as an expert documentary source?

How knowledgeable a source is, then, relates directly to how truthful it is: A source is highly unlikely to be authentically authoritative if it does not know what it is talking about.

Qualification of information by an expert source can also bring into question just how authentically authoritative both the source, and by extension, the speaker referencing it, is. An example of this dilution of authoritativeness is seen in the footnote testimony of Owen Chase of the Essex in *Moby-Dick*:

> Again: 'At all events, the whole circumstances taken together, all happening before my own eyes, and producing, at that time, impressions in my mind of decided, calculating mischief, on the part of the whale (*many of which impressions I cannot now recall*), induce me to be

satisfied that I am correct in my opinion.' (210) [my italics,
showing qualification; parentheses Melville's]

The parenthetical immediately begs the question, "Are any of these recollections

critical as to the credibility of the information you are conveying?"

Melville himself knows the importance of credibility as regards establishing

authentic authoritativeness, even in first-hand account expert sources, let alone the

sometimes more questionable documentary sources, as illustrated here in the

interrogative dialogue between Don Sebastion and Ishmael concerning the credibility of

the latter's story concerning the *Town-Ho*:

> Then I entreat you, tell me if to the best of your own
> convictions, this your story is in substance really true? It is
> so passing wonderful! Did you get it from an unquestionable
> source? Bear with me if I seem to press. (267)

Basically, Don Sebastion is evaluating the authenticity of Ishmael's authoritative

voice by questioning the credibility of his story. Ishmael needs to respond in the

affirmative if he is to be believed. Readers need to ask these types of questions of

speakers' too. If the speaker has substantiated the credibility of his expert sources, either

by empirical observation of the matter being spoken about, or by qualification from other

acknowledged authoritative sources, then the source in question can be taken to be telling

the truth. However, if there is no substantiation as to the authenticity of an expert

source's authoritativeness of knowledge, at the very least, it casts doubt upon the sources

credibility; at worst, readers will dismiss the source's information altogether one word.

Since Melville has Ishmael discredit the authenticity of his documentary expert

sources authoritative knowledge from page ix in "Extracts," why should readers believe

any of his other documentary expert sources after that? Even qualifying these sources as he does—stating that some are credible—some not, why and how should readers discern which of these camps a particular source belongs to? As far as his first-hand account expert sources are concerned, their credibility is far more acceptable. In the main, they are characters with an established base of both authentic authority of knowledge and/or power: Ahab, Flask, Stubb, and Starbuck, by virtue of their positions on the ship as officers, and Queequeg owing to his years of experience and demonstrated abilities. Indeed, as the events of the novel unfold, the reader sees validation of the authenticity of the authoritativeness of these expert first-hand sources as time and time again, what they previously have spoken of, is borne out to be true.

In the final analysis, then, Ishmael's first-hand account expert sources have credibility, his documentary expert sources are questionable. The effect this has on readers is one which creates suspicion and confusion regarding what parts of *Moby-Dick* to believe as credible, what parts to discard as untrue. The fact that Melville would have his audience believe all of the sources his narrator references, at least vis-à-vis the rhetorical posturing of Ishmael's authoritative voice, indicates a failure on the part of the author to achieve overall credibility.

Poe, on the other hand, suffers from no such delusions in *Pym* as does Melville in *Moby-Dick* pertaining to establishing the credibility of expert sources. First of all, virtually the only first-hand account expert source Pym uses is Pym, and his credibility is

suspect from the start; this diminishing believability in the narrator only grows as the story progresses.[23]

Insofar as his documentary expert sources are concerned, their lack of credibility owing to their lack of authentic authoritative knowledge is also understood.[24]

What Poe creates through all of this lack of credibility is an incredibility in readers' minds when it comes to both the narrator's own account of things, and also of any documentary source he may use. Thus, the knowledge-based authoritative authenticity of Arthur Gordon Pym's voice erodes to the point that by the end of the novel, readers can hardly believe any premise he puts forth regarding anything.

But this is as Poe wanted it: an authoritative sounding yet ultimately unbelievable narrator, representative of all things which such authoritative sounding yet ultimately unbelievable sources which Pym represented—that is, Yankee abolitionists—were in the end proven to be.

3.B.II.v.   CONTEMPORANEOUSNESS OF EXPERT SOURCES

How contemporaneous expert source information is to the time of the setting in a literary work can also be important in evaluating its authoritativeness: The more recent the information, the more likely it is to be authentically authoritative; the more dated, the more of a chance that the information has become incorrect. A noted exception to this

---

[23] Discussed in "First-Hand Account Expert Sources," section 3.B.II.i, page 98.
[24] Discussed in "Documentary Expert Sources," section 3.B.II.ii, page 102, and "Knowledgeability of Expert Sources," section 3.B.II.iii, page 105.

latter premise, is information which comes from classic sources, such as any of the ancient philosophers (Plato, Aristotle, Socrates, etc.), or scientists (Galileo, da Vinci, Copernicus, etc.), which has consistently proven itself axiomatic over the course of history. But even then, these sources' information can also prove to be incorrect in some cases, as artistic and scientific progress might have caused them to become outdated.

Melville uses expert references which derive from both fairly contemporaneous and classic sources. However, in the case of the former, he is sometimes outdated by as much as 12 to 30 years:

> 'No branch of Zoology is so much involved as that which is entitled Cetology,' Captain Scoresby, A.D. 1820. (133)

> 'It is not my intention, were it in my power, to enter into the inquiry as to the true method of dividing the cetacea into groups and families. . . . Utter confusion exists among the historians of this animal,' (sperm whale) says Surgeon Beale, 1839 A.D. (133)

While science in Melville's time could sometimes stay status quo for centuries, other parts of it were developing rapidly. For example, Charles Darwin's voyage to the Galapagos was from 1831 to 1836; in five years time, Darwin took the creationist sensibilities of the Western world which had existed for more than 6000 years, and challenged them to the extent that it changed the course of history. *Moby-Dick*, published in 1851, would have been from the same era. With such volatile scientific developments, a 30 or even 12 year gap in source material begs scrutiny.

Melville also cites sources from antiquity. Some of these, such as Aristotle (134) do have sustaining authentic authoritative merit, yet others, even by the standards of Melville's contemporaries were questionable:

> In the sixth Christian century lived Procopius, a Christian
> magistrate . . . As many know, he wrote the history of his
> own times, . . . By the best authorities, he has always been
> considered a trustworthy and unexaggerated historian, . . .
> (213)

Melville speaks of Procopius' authoritative authenticity via his reputation for

trustworthiness and restraint, yet San José State University's Rome website says this

about him:

> Procopius is one of those writers that present us with the
> little mysteries of history. He writes several books praising
> the emperor and his accomplishments, then he turns around
> and writes The Secret History, in which he describes the
> reigning emperor Justinian and his empress Theodora as the
> most dishonorable and treacherous people on the face of
> the Earth, always betraying their friends and supporters and
> condemning innocent men and women to exile, death, or
> dungeon.

Consistency of opinion, it would seem, was not Procopius' strong suit.

Educated readers would have known this in Melville's time; as well, certainly Procopius'

works have not changed in the nearly 150 years it has been since publication of

Moby-Dick so that even today, his unreliability as an information source is still a

valid concern. So, if any informed reader of this man's works could have readily seen the

contradiction, it begs the question: "Why did Melville fail to discern this?"

These suspicions, based upon the contemporaneousness of Melville's historical

data serve only to cast doubt upon the authenticity of Ishmael's authoritativeness.

As previously stated, this was not Melville's intent with his narrator, in fact, the opposite

was the desired effect. Couching Ishmael's narrative in such rhetorical attributes as

acknowledged historically authentic data would cause readers to associate the

authoritativeness of the narrator's voice with the substance of the historical data sources. Melville, however, to the enlightened reader, fails in doing this with such outdated expert source references as Precipice and those which go back beyond what currently was accepted knowledge for his era.

Poe also has Pym use expert source data which ranges from contemporaneous to antiquated, going as far back as 1643 (134) and as recent to the narration's setting (*Pym* was published in 1838) as 1832 (137).

As with the other rhetorical elements Poe employs in developing Pym's character, some of these historical data contain fact, some fiction. In *Pym*, however, there appears to be no correlation between authenticity and inauthenticity and the contemporaneousness of the expert source; all of it comes into question . . . but ever so subtly . . . which is exactly Poe's intent.[25]

---

[25] See "First-Hand Account Expert Sources," section 3.B.II.i, page 98, "Documentary Expert Sources," section 3.B.II.ii, page 102, " Knowledgeability of Expert Sources," section 3.B.II.iii, page 105, "Credibility of Expert Sources," section 3.B.II.iv, page 110, "Historical Data," section 3.B.III.ii, page 123, and "Locational Data," section 3.B.III.iii, page 128 for more detail concerning the authoritative inauthenticity of Pym's sources and data.

RHETORICAL DEVICES INVOLVING ACADEMIA AND SCIENCE

Academic and scientific information sets are used to give a written voice a direct connection with scholarly and/or scientific thought, both of which are inherently authoritative.

The following sections list the types of academic and scientific forms of technical writing rhetorical devices used by authors of literature to give their narrative and characterological voices' authoritativeness:

3.B.III.i.   REFERENCE AND TERMINOLOGY

In literature, academic and scientific reference and terminology associate a speaker's voice with the authority which goes along with those areas of studies rhetorically employed in the fictive text: In referring to these areas of elevated knowledge, it is implied that the speaker is qualified to do so.

However, per se, both authors are keenly aware of the value of using technical writing rhetorical devices in literature to attempt to infuse authoritativeness into a voice.[26]

---

[26] See "Historical Data," section 3.B.III.ii, page 123, and "Locational Data," section 3.B.III.iii, page 128.

Melville wastes no time in implanting academic reference and terminology into *Moby-Dick*; the entire prefatory section entitled "Etymology"(viii) is a faux-academic treatise upon the history of the word "whale," not only in the author/narrator's native English, but also in a near pan-global polyglot of explication.[27]

The study of the origin of words is not the only academic and scientific reference and terminology Melville uses in his novel. History is also an academic subject, and *Moby-Dick* has it in plentitude.[28]

In addition to historical data, Melville also has his narrator address the subject of the study of whales using scientific and academic rhetoric in Chapter 32, "Cetology" (133-48). This chapter becomes in a sense, the heart of Ishmael's premise of authoritativeness concerning whaling. It is here that he attempts to establish his narrator's "expertise" on whales, the surface-level subject of *Moby-Dick*. But how well does Melville accomplish this?

As Ishmael attempts to categorize what, in his mind, are all the types of whales and dolphins which exist, it becomes painfully obvious that he is not qualified to do so, as obviated by certain statements he makes regarding this subject:

> First: the uncertain, unsettled condition of this science of
> Cetology is in the very vestibule attested by the fact, that in
> some quarters it still remains moot point whether a whale
> be a fish. In his System of Nature, A.D. 1776, Linnaeus
> declares, 'I hereby separate the whales from the fish.' But

---

[27] A more thorough study of that section in this paper is given in "Etymology," section 3.B.I.ii, page 96.
[28] All of the rhetorical elements of authoritativeness discussed in "Historical Data," section 3.B.III.ii, page 123 and "Documentary Expert Sources," section 3.B.II.ii, page 102, cross over into this section as well.

of my knowledge, I know that down to the year 1850,
sharks and shad, alewives and herring, against Linnaeus's
express edict were still found dividing the possesion of the
same seas as the Leviathan. . . . Be it be know that, waiving
all argument, I take the good old fashioned ground that the
whale is a fish . . . (135-36)

Additionally, he qualifies his attempt to categorize whales as being of both poor

quality and doomed to fail, and states that he will not give much description, which he

later disproves by giving quite a bit of it, if not per individual case, at least in toto:

As no better man advances to take this matter in hand, I
hereupon offer my own poor endeavors. I promise nothing
complete; because any human thing supposed to be
complete, must for that very reason infallibly be faulty. I
shall not pretend to a minute anatomical description of the
various species, or—in this place at least—to much of any
description. (135)

Throughout the rest of the novel, Melville uses attention to mathematical,

maritime, and cetological detail and minutiae in an attempt to showcase the knowledge-

base of his narrator and characters. By doing this, he tries to give them a sense of

authoritative knowledgeability via their alleged command of a special set of facts.

This sort of erudition being the definition of knowledge-based authoritativeness as

illustrated in the excerpts beginning below and continuing on to the next page (all

citations are Ishmael as narrator; italics mine, indicating academic/scientific reference,

terminology or rhetoric; bracketed information is also mine indicating the area of

academia or science from which the italicized word is derived):

. . . (that is, if you never violate the *Pythagorean* maxim).
(6) [mathematical axiom]

What a fine frosty night; how *Orion* glitters. (11)
[astronomy]

120

But being now interrupted, he put up his image; and pretty soon, going to the table, took up a large book there, and placing it on his lap began counting the pages with a deliberate regularity; at every *fiftieth* page—as I fancied—stopping a moment, looking vacantly around him, and giving utterance to a long-drawn gurgling whistle of astonishment. He would then begin again at the next *fifty*; seeming to commence at number one each time, as though he could not count more than *fifty*, and it was only by such a large number of *fifties* being found together, that his astonishment at the multitude of pages excited him. (51) [mathematics]

Furthermore, the footnotes which appear throughout the novel are not unlike those notes given in academic and scientific writing documents, alerting readers to items of special interest or offering additional information to the main subject.

So, in infusing all of this academic scientific reference and terminology into *Moby-Dick*, does Melville accomplish what he is attempting to do? Does he create a narrator's and several character's voices which convey authentic authoritativeness of knowledge through their innate presumed privy to and acumen in, in this case, academic and scientific information and data? The answer is, overall, no.

As previously discussed in numerous other sections of this project,[29] Melville's Ishmael is lacking in authentic authority of knowledge across the board in these areas. The type of information contained in the sections referenced here specify expert source data which are largely either academic or scientific in origin. All of the data from *Moby-*

---

[29] See "First-Hand Account Expert Sources," section 3.B.II.i, page 98, "Documentary Expert Sources," section 3.B.II.ii, page 102, "Knowledgeability of Expert Sources," section 3.B.II.iii, page 105, "Credibility of Expert Sources," section 3.B.II.iv, page 110, and "Contemporaneousness of Expert Sources," section 3.B.II.v, page 114.

Dick referred to in these sections is highly suspect in its credibility. As such, Melville's attempt to associate Ishmael with the authentic authoritativeness of academic and scientific institutions and people via their rhetoric, only renders an inauthentic authoritative voice in the narrator.

While a certain amount of nautical terms throughout, and a small section containing zoological and ornithological terminology in Chapter 14, pages 123 through 126 exist in the novel, the main use of academic and scientific reference and terminology that exists in *Pym* is in the form of cartographic coordinates in Chapters 4, and 14 through 18.[30]

Like Melville in *Moby-Dick*, using academic and scientific references and terminology, Poe attempts to convey the sense that Pym is an educated man of science. This device appears solid at first, but upon washing it down with the water of investigation, it soon is revealed as hollow, quickly crumbling owing to its lack of supporting substance. This lack of truth and accuracy, of course—in this case in academic and scientific areas of study, but also throughout all other areas discussed in previous section of this examination—ultimately renders the voice of Arthur Gordon Pym as being, overall, inauthentically authoritative, that is, sounding like it knows its subject matters, yet truly not ever knowing any of them fully.

---

[30] This is discussed greater detail in "Locational Data," section 3.B.III.iii, page 128

Using historical data as a means to lend authoritative authenticity to a speaker's voice, is another technical writing technique which can be used in a literary work. Historical data, if accurate, non es disputandum, ergo, the speaker using it reinforces his credibility as such as well by association with the historical data's veracity.

Melville uses historical data throughout *Moby-Dick* to strengthen Ishmael's knowledge-based authoritativeness.

Chapter 35, "Masthead" (156-163), exemplifies the use of historical data synthesized with technical data, which attempts to create an authentic authoritative voice. The narrative intimates that Ishmael possesses a great deal of knowledge concerning whaling, by using the example of his expertise on the subject of the masthead to exemplify this; Melville attempts to reinforce this even further with ancient historical allusions:

> . . . we cannot give these Babel builders priority over the
> Egyptians. (157)

Melville also has Ishmael allude to more recent history in the excerpt at the top of the next page, for which all that remains are verisimilar objects (sculptures) to suffice for further expansion upon the subject of comparative architecture:

> There is Napoleon; who, upon the top of the column of
> Vendome, stands with arms folded, . . . (157)

Ishmael then compares and contrasts those historical figures who stand before masts on land, to those at sea, in a vain-glorious attempt to show seafaring authority as the better of the two:

> But neither great Washington, nor Napoleon, nor Nelson,
> will answer a single hail from below, however madly
> invoked to befriend their counsels the distracted decks upon
> which they gaze; however, it may be surmised, that their
> spirits penetrate through the thick haze of the future, and
> descry what shoals and what rocks must be shunned.
>
> It may seem unwarrantable to couple in any respect the
> mast-head standers of the land with those of the sea; but
> that in truth it is not so. (158)

By using all of these historical references, Melville is trying to show that Ishmael

has "done his homework," so to speak, that is, researched the matters of which he speaks

from a historical perspective. By doing so—or so this type of logic goes—he now

possesses a special knowledge, or authority on his subjects based upon historical

precedence which he has explicated. But are these attempts successful in establishing an

authentic authoritative voice in Ishmael?

The mere citation of historical figures is not enough to truly create an authentic

authoritative voice, and that is all that Melville has Ishmael do. In using the ghosts of

these acknowledged authentic authoritative individuals, Ishmael creates only a

phantasmal authoritativeness for himself, one which seems to be there, but truly never is.

Authentic authoritativeness may validly employ previously constructed knowledge from

times gone by, but mere name-dropping of the progenitors of this intelligence in

metaphoric accolade, is not a bona fide way of doing this.

Poe also has Pym use historical data in his narrative to try to infuse an

authoritativeness of knowledge into the narrator's voice. What differentiates Poe's

methodology in *Pym* from Melville's in *Moby-Dick* is that the narrator from Nantucket

also includes data which is quantitatively measurable, in this case, through latitudinal and

longitudinal coordinates, as well as specific dates. This technique is executed in Chapters 15 and 16, much of which same references are also enhanced with locational data.[31]

Aside from one isolated bearing listed on page 44, starting on page 128, the first of these contiguous references speaks of the discovery of the Tristan d' Acunha (sic) island group. Pym has it discovered by the Portuguese (128), but does not give the date; it was 1506. (South Atlantic and Subantarctic Island website) He then goes on to state it was visited by the Dutch in 1716 (128), and by the French in 1767 (128), then that they were frequent visitors to it thereafter (129), all of which statements are correct. (South Atlantic and Subantarctic Island website) Next he details the visit of a Captain Patten in 1790 (129), and "not long after," a Captain Colquhoun (129). An extensive search of the Internet and the Stanford University Socrates library reference online database revealed absolutely no information on either of these alleged explorers. Nor did a search within the same resources render any data on the next three historical references he cites related to this archipelago: Captain Patten (129); Captain Colquhoun (129); Captain Heywood (129); the American sealskin processor Jonathan Lambert (129); Captain Jeffery (130); nor the English "supreme governor" Glass (130).

Pym—even though he sounds *completely* authentic in his authoritative citation of these historical data—is only *partially* correct, as with the omission of the Portuguese discovery date, or the tenuous nature of who he cites: Patten, Colquhoun, Heywood, Lambert, Jeffery, and Glass could be either fabrications of Poe's, to pad Pym's portfolio

---

[31] See "Locational Data," 3.B.III.iii, page 128.

of historical data; or if any of them did exist, they were of no great consequence, an indication of inauthentic authoritativeness, that Pym would hold such bit players in high esteem. This of course, dilutes the authenticity of Pym's authoritative knowledge and as a result, renders his voice authoritatively inauthentic; authentic authoritative voice must both speak credibly and of significant matters throughout.

Immediately following the historical data concerning the Tristan group, references to expeditions in search of the non-existent Aurora Islands[32] are made by Pym: their ostensible discoverer, the ship *Aurora* in 1762 (130); the alleged 1790 journey there Captain Manuel de Oyarvido (130-31); and the supposed 1794 voyage of the Spanish corvette *Atrevida* (131). All of these are, of course, absolutely false; once again, a search of the aforementioned resources offered no information. Pym's authoritative credence is further eroded by even grouping these fantasy islands in with other verifiable Antarctic exploratory data.

After the tenuous Tristan data and Aurora pseudo-information, reference is made to an 1820 expedition by Captain James Weddell of the British Navy (131). Weddell was in fact a bona fide Antarctic explorer, but Pym asserts he was also looking for the Auroras; no direct reference pertaining to Weddell's alleged search for this ephemeral archipelago could be found within the aforementioned resources, nor on the webpage

---

[32] See "Locational Data," section 3.B.III.iii, items 12/1-3 of Table 1: Annotated Latitudinal and Longitudinal Coordinates in *Pym*, page 128 for further details on this.

dedicated to him, though that text did render the following passage about an expedition

by that navigator which would have included the year 1820:

> In 1818 he joined the Merchant Service and was introduced
> to a shipwright named James Strachan who, along with
> several other partners, owned a 160 ton brig. Weddell
> persuaded Strachan to give him command of the ship for a
> sealing expedition to the newly discovered South Shetland
> Islands.   Even though Weddell was new to sealing,
> Strachan went along with the plans due to Weddell's
> Antarctic training while in the Navy. Little is known about
> this voyage other than Weddell actually visited the group as
> well as the South Orkney Islands recently found by Powell
> and Palmer.   Weddell returned in 1821 . . . (Antarctic
> Philately website, Explorers link, James Weddell page)

While it is *possible*, as Pym contends, that Weddell sailed from Staten Island in

New York (given that Strachan's brig's port of departure is not identified), the salient

question remains as to how *likely* would it have been for a British naval officer to have

worked for an American concern in 1818, a scant three years after the completion of the

British-American War of 1812-1815? As well, even if it could be successfully argued

that Staten Island was a port of call on this expedition, it would not have taken two years

to go from England to New York. Once again, Pym offers debatable historical data,

further calling into question his authoritative authenticity.

Pym next references Captain James Cook in Chapter 16, (133-34).

The information he gives here is correct in the general areas, that is, the name of the

ships, the dates Cook would have been in the Antarctic vicinity (Biography of Captain

James Cook website). But how would Pym have known the details of dates and

coordinates he also gives? In stating them, he implies privy to historical documentation

which would have rendered the granularity of detail he gives in the narrative, a data

source most people would not have had access to. This begs the question: "How likely is it that Pym would have had this access?"

Two things , then, are going on in these examples of Pym citing historical data in an attempt to effect an authentic authoritativeness: One is that Poe is making Pym imply he has authentic authoritative knowledge by the specific cartographic and date references he gives throughout these examples; the second is, simultaneously, the author sets up Pym's credibility for doubt. Readers will naturally ponder the probability of this young gentleman from Nantucket's ability to have gotten hold of this type of select data. Poe, of course, designs this suspicion into Pym's narration, because the ultimate intent of the author is to show the narrator as being authoritatively inauthentic, that is, a voice which sounds credible, but which when analyzed, is not.

.: ti !II iii   LOCATIONAL DATA

Locational data is another technical writing information-type which can be used to give a literary text greater authoritative authenticity. In citing particular locations relative to a character or set of characters, authors can imply that certain attributes associated with the locations are also associated with the characters. This can give the speaking voice the overall stance of a knowledgeable authoritativeness, in that it entices readers' into thinking that the person behind the voice must possess a special insight into the makeup of certain individuals, with the locations it is citing.

A further enhancement of locational data is to be able to give exact coordinates of a place; doing so gives the impression that the speaker behind a voice is knowledgeable

about navigation, cartography, or some other authoritatively knowledgeable scientific field which uses these sophisticated types of data.

In *Moby-Dick*, Melville uses locational data rather sparingly, and then without much focus upon specificity or scientific methods. Such romanticized reporting on the towns of New Bedford in "The Carpet Bag," Chapter 2, and Nantucket in "Nantucket," Chapter 14, while intended to instill authoritativeness into Ishmael's voice in other ways —that is, by historical association to other places of great importance—or to lay the necessary background to substantiate his later analysis of Bildad, Peleg, and Ahab, does not use any technical writing skills, per se.

While Melville's reliance on this form of technical writing is minimal, in *Pym* it becomes critical to Poe's construction of his narrator's characterological development.

Chapters 14 through 18 (pages 120 through 146) are obsessed with giving exact latitudinal and longitudinal coordinates to indicate certain bearings germane to Pym's narrative. These coordinates are in reference to not only Arthur Pym's own travels, but to numerous other seafarers' expeditions as well.

The table starting on the next page lists this locational data in the order they appear in the novel: The first column lists on which of the two maps attached to the end of this project the coordinate's bearings can be found (1 or 2); the second column gives the coordinate's bearing numeric identifier on that map; the third column gives the page and chapter of the novel the coordinates appear in; the large single column at the bottom of each entry gives relevant details concerning the bearing including excerpts from the novel in quotation marks, followed in parentheses by any date given in the novel associated with the bearing:

MAP	BEARING'S IDENTIFICATION NUMBER ON MAP	LATITUDINAL AND LONGITUDINAL COORDINATES	PAGE / CHAPTER
1	0	35° 30' N x 61° 20' W	44 / 4

While this first set of coordinates is isolated from the other group contained within the contiguous chapters 14 through 18, and is not particularly germane to much of the other substance regarding the remainder of the bearings, it does, however, likewise indicate the lack of accuracy those coordinates often display, i.e., Pym states that the *Grampus* at that point is "at no very great distance from Bermuda," yet Bermuda's true bearings are 32° 30' N x 64° 40' W, and as such ~213 statute miles away from the coordinates Pym indicates here.[33]

MAP	BEARING'S IDENTIFICATION NUMBER ON MAP	LATITUDINAL AND LONGITUDINAL COORDINATES	PAGE / CHAPTER
1	1	25° 5' 5" N x 20° W	120 /14

Where the *Jane Guy* crossed the Tropic of Cancer; (7/25/1827)

MAP	BEARING'S IDENTIFICATION NUMBER ON MAP	LATITUDINAL AND LONGITUDINAL COORDINATES	PAGE / CHAPTER
1	2	15° N x 25° W	120 / 14

Where the *Jane Guy* reached Sal Island of the Cape Verd Islands; (8/3/1827)

MAP	BEARING'S IDENTIFICATION NUMBER ON MAP	LATITUDINAL AND LONGITUDINAL COORDINATES	PAGE / CHAPTER
1	3	0° N/S x 29° W	120 / 14

Where the *Jane Guy* crossed the Equator; (no date; 1827)

TABLE 1: ANNOTATED LATITUDINAL AND LONGITUDINAL COORDINATES IN PYM (1 OF 10)

---

[33] Cartographic scales are divided as follows: degrees, minuets, and seconds. Each degree (as indicated by the symbol: °) is divided into 60 minutes; each minute (as indicated by the symbol: ') into 60 seconds(asindicated by the symbol: "). These measurements pertain to both longitude and latitude. Longitudinal lines, also known as "meridians," run on the Earth's surface from end points at each Pole; they follow the curvature of the Earth rendering them smaller the closer they get to the Poles: each Pole is measured @ 0° longitude. All meridians are measured @ of between +1" and 180° east or west of Greenwich, England. Latitudinal lines, also know as "parallels," run parallel to the Equator; they do not follow the curvature of the Earth's surface but rather remain parallel to each in distance: the Equator is measured @ 0° latitude. All parallels are measured @ between +1" through 90° north or south of the Equator: each Pole is measured @ 90° north or south of the Equator All measurements of statute miles in this table are approximations, as indicated by the symbol "~," to within the closest highest percentage of a degree as interpolated by the number of additional minutes of the given coordinate (e.g.: a bearing of 60° 28' would be interpolated as 60.5°); it is a given that each degree of latitude is 60 miles, each minute of latitude 1 mile. The numeric values of the distances were calculated using the Pythagorean theorem for a right angle triangle: where said triangle has sides A, B, and C, and where side A is the horizontal side of the 90° angle with a known length, side B is the vertical side of the 90° angle with a known length, and side C is the hypotenuse, the square root of the lengths of $A^2 + B^2 =$ length of side C. In concluding what numeric values to use in calculating the distances of sides A and B. The distances between degrees of meridians at given parallels were calculated from table D.1: "Lengths of Degrees of the Parallel," of Appendix D, page 307, in *Elements of Cartography* which is reproduced in Appendix A of this project.

130

MAP	BEARING'S IDENTIFICATION NUMBER ON MAP	LATITUDINAL AND LONGITUDINAL COORDINATES	PAGE / CHAPTER
1	4	5° 9' S x 31° W	120 / 14
Where the *Jane Guy* picked up the survivors of the *Grampus* off the Cape of St. Roque; (no date; 1827)			
1	$\frac{5}{1}$	48-50° S x 68-70° E	120 / 14
Pym states Capt. Guy indicates the "Kerguelen's Land" might be their first stop; the coordinates are where the narrator states they are; (no date; 1827)			
1	$\frac{5}{2}$	40° 20' S x 70° E	n/a
True location of the Kerguelen Islands; (n/a)			
1	9	48° 40'S x 69° 6' E	123 / 14
Entrance to Christmas Harbor on Kerguelen Island, a.k.a.: Desolation Island; (10/18/1827)			
1	10	46° 52' 34" S x 37° 51' 32" E	128 / 15
True location of Marion Island; Pym claims that it is a part of the Crozet Island Group; not true: Marion Island is actually a part of the Prince Edward Island Group; these bearings show where Marion Island truly is situated; n.b., the Crozets true location: 45° 95' – 46° 50' S x 50° 33' - 52° 50' E (see 8/2 of this table); (11/12/1827)			
1	$\frac{11}{1}$	37° 8' S x 12° 8' W	128 / 15
Where Pym states the "Tristan d'Acunha" (sic) islands are; Pym claims they are 10 miles apart; they are really 25 miles apart; true location of the singular Tristan Da Cunha Island is: 37° 15' S x 12° 15' W;[34] sometimes these three actually are called the Tristan Group, and can include both Inaccessible and Nightingales Islands, but most often referred to separately; (11/27/1827: this date derived from statement by Pym that the *Jane Guy* had "made (these island) in fifteen days," referring to departure from bearing number 10, map 1)			

TABLE 1: ANNOTATED LATITUDINAL AND LONGITUDINAL COORDINATES IN PYM (2 OF 10)

---

[34] Information provided by Brian Baldwin, Administrator of Tristan Da Cunha Island, via email dated 8/27/99.

MAP	BEARING'S IDENTIFICATION NUMBER ON MAP	LATITUDINAL AND LONGITUDINAL COORDINATES	PAGE / CHAPTER
1	$\dfrac{11}{2}$	37° 17' S x 12° 24' W	129 / 15
Where Pym says Inaccessible Island is; true bearings are: 37° 14' S x 12° 47' W[35]			
1	$\dfrac{11}{3}$	37° 26' S x 12° 12' W	129 / 15
Where Pym says Nightingale Island is; true bearings are: 37° 20' S x 12° 30' W[36]			
1	$\dfrac{12}{2}$	53° 2' 40" S x 47° 55' 15" W	131 / 15
Location of Aurora Island 2, according to Pym's reference to the Spanish corvette *Atrevida*			
1	$\dfrac{12}{3}$	53° 15' 22" S x 47° 57' 15" W	131 / 15
Location of Aurora Island 3, according to Pym's reference to the Spanish corvette *Atrevida*			
1	$\dfrac{13}{1}$	53° 15 S x 47° 58' W	131-32 / 15
S/W parameter of the *Jane Guy*'s search for the Aurora Islands; (12/18/1827: derived from Pym's statement that the *Jane Guy* searched for the Auroras "for a period of three weeks")			
1	$\dfrac{13}{2}$	53° S x 50° W	131-32 / 15
N/W parameter of the *Jane Guy*'s search for the Aurora Islands			

TABLE 1: ANNOTATED LATITUDINAL AND LONGITUDINAL COORDINATES IN PYM (3 OF 10)

---

[35] Ibid.
[36] Ibid.

MAP	BEARING'S IDENTIFICATION NUMBER ON MAP	LATITUDINAL AND LONGITUDINAL COORDINATES	PAGE / CHAPTER
1	$\dfrac{13}{3}$	52° S x 38° W	131-32 / 15

E parameter of the *Jane Guy*'s search for the Aurora Islands, "the western coast of Georgia;" (132) one can assume that the N/E and S/E coordinates would be the latitude along the same meridian as the N/W and S/W parameters, that is: 53° S and 52° S

MAP	BEARING	COORD	PAGE
1	$\dfrac{15}{1}$	58° S x 26° 57' E	133 / 16

Begins huge digression that lasts through all of Chapter 16 (133-138) including a voyage of Capt. Cook, commentary by J. N. Reynolds—a promoter of Symmes' theory (Kaplan, xiii-iv)[37] —, the further voyages of Capts. Kreutzenstern and Lisiausky of Russia, Capts. James Weddell and Benjamin Morrell of England, and one "Capt. Briscoe" (sic) of England, before returning to the voyage of the *Jane Guy* (see item 23 of this table below);

Pym citing Capt. Cook's coordinates; ice sheets 8 to 10 inches thick; (Dec., 1772)

MAP	BEARING	COORD	PAGE
1	$\dfrac{15}{2}$	64° S x 38° 14' W	134 / 16

Pym citing Capt. Cook's coordinates; "mild weather;" (Dec., 1772)

MAP	BEARING	COORD	PAGE
1	$\dfrac{15}{3}$	67° 15' S; no longitude cited; can only assume directly south of $\dfrac{15}{2}$. 38° 14' W	134 / 16

Pym citing Capt. Cook's coordinates; huge ice flow stops Cook; (Jan., 1773)

TABLE 1: ANNOTATED LATITUDINAL AND LONGITUDINAL COORDINATES IN PYM (4 OF 10)

---

[37] Kaplan states about Symmes: "When Poe was a boy of nine, an ex-captain of the infantry, one John Cleves Symmes, living in St. Louis, addressed to 'all the World' a printed circular which he sent to learned societies and distinguished persons in America and Europe. 'I declare the earth is hollow and habitable within . . . that it is open at the poles'—so began the manifesto . . . The theory of 'Symmes' Hole'—so Thoreau refers to it in *Walden*—was bandied about in the United States for a quarter of a century; the captain's son, Americus Symmes, tells us that it was 'overwhelmed with ridicule as the production of a distempered imagination, or the result of partial insanity'—a 'fruitful source of jest with the newspapers.'" (xiii)

MAP	BEARING'S IDENTIFICATION NUMBER ON MAP	LATITUDINAL AND LONGITUDINAL COORDINATES	PAGE / CHAPTER
1	16	59° 40' y" S; no longitude cited, no indication of where one might place this	134 / 16
Pym citing Capt. Cook's coordinates; "strong current setting to the southward;" (Nov., 1773)			
2	17 / 1	67° 31' S x 142° 54' W	134 / 16
Pym citing Capt. Cook's coordinates; "the cold was excessive, with heavy gales and fog;" (Dec, 1773)			
2	17 / 2	70° 23' S x 124° W	134 / 16
Pym citing Capt. Cook's coordinates; "some large islands of ice;" (date not given)			
2	17 / 3	71° 10' S x 106° 54' W	134 / 16
Pym citing Capt. Cook's coordinates; "stopped . . . by immense frozen expanse;" (date not given)			
2	17 / 4	64° S x no longitude given; 65° W chosen, as this is central to both the Shetlands and Palmer Land	135 / 16
Pym cites J. N. Reynolds, proselytizing upon why Capt. Cook could not get beyond location of the Shetland Islands at 70° 10' S x 106° 54' W, states that "Palmer's Land lies south of the Shetlands, latitude sixty-four degrees;" (no date)			
1	18	59° 58' S x 70° 15' W	135 / 16
Sent on expedition by Alexander of Russia, Capts. Kreutzenstern's and Lisiausky's, furthest southern travel; encountered strong eastern currents; no ice; (1803)			

TABLE 1: ANNOTATED LATITUDINAL AND LONGITUDINAL COORDINATES IN PYM (5 OF 10)

MAP	BEARING'S IDENTIFICATION NUMBER ON MAP	LATITUDINAL AND LONGITUDINAL COORDINATES	PAGE / CHAPTER
2	$\dfrac{19}{1}$	61° S x 53° 83' W	135 / 16
The Shetlands are the fiduciary for the travels of Capt. James Weddell, listed in $\dfrac{19}{5}$ through $\dfrac{19}{8}$ below; therefore, their boundaries are listed in $\dfrac{19}{1}$ through $\dfrac{19}{4}$; N/E parameter of South Shetland Islands; (n/a)			
2	$\dfrac{19}{3}$	63° 37' S x 53° 83' W	135 / 16
S/E parameter of South Shetland Islands; (n/a)			
2	$\dfrac{19}{4}$	63° 37' S x 62° 83' W	135 / 16
S/W parameter of South Shetland Islands; (n/a)			
2	$\dfrac{19}{5}$	72° S x 53° 83' W	135 / 16
Interpolated N/E parameter of Capt. James Weddell's expedition; longitude derived from same tangents as parameters of South Shetland Islands; (1822)			
2	$\dfrac{19}{6}$	72° S x 62° 83' W	135 / 16
Interpolated N/W parameter of Capt. James Weddell's expedition; longitude derived from same tangents as parameters of South Shetland Islands; this bearing on Palmer Land; (1822)			
2	$\dfrac{19}{7}$	74° S x 53° 83' W	135 / 16
Interpolated S/E parameter of Capt. James Weddell's expedition; longitude derived from same tangents as parameters of South Shetland Islands; (1822)			

TABLE 1: ANNOTATED LATITUDINAL AND LONGITUDINAL COORDINATES IN PYM (6 OF 10)

MAP	BEARING'S IDENTIFICATION NUMBER ON MAP	LATITUDINAL AND LONGITUDINAL COORDINATES	PAGE / CHAPTER
2	$\dfrac{19}{8}$	74° S 62° 83' W	135 / 16
Interpolated S/W parameter of Capt. James Weddell's expedition; longitude derived from same tangents as parameters of South Shetland Islands; this bearing on Palmer Land; (1822)			
1	$\dfrac{20}{2}$	66° 5' S x 69° 15' E	136 / 16
Capt. Benjamin Morrell of American schooner *Wasp*; latitude is the Antarctic Circle; "no *field ice*;" given that this bearing is cited on same day as $\dfrac{20}{1}$ above, Morrell would have had to have traveled more than ~1436[38] statute miles to be at both places on the same day.			
1	$\dfrac{20}{3}$	70° 14' S x 14° 27' E	136 / 16
Capt. Benjamin Morrell of American schooner *Wasp*; speaking of bearings below the Antarctic circle, says he has "uniformly found the temperature, of both air and water, to become more and more mild the farther I advance;" (3/14/1823)			
1	$\dfrac{21}{1}$	66° 30' S x 47° 31' E	137 / 16
Describes the first of a series of two separate bearings of the expedition of one "Capt. Briscoe," (sic) "in the employ of Messieurs Enderby, whaleship owners of London," in the brig *Lively*; "descried land;" (2/28/1831)			

TABLE 1: ANNOTATED LATITUDINAL AND LONGITUDINAL COORDINATES IN PYM (7 OF 10)

---

[38] Ibid. footnote 17.

MAP	BEARING'S IDENTIFICATION NUMBER ON MAP	LATITUDINAL AND LONGITUDINAL COORDINATES	PAGE / CHAPTER
1	$\frac{21}{2}$	67° 15' S x 69° 29'W	137 / 16

Describes the second of a series of two separate bearings of the expedition of one Capt. Briscoe, (sic) "in the employ of Messieurs Enderby, whaleship owners of London," in the brig *Lively*; "found an island near the headland of the country he first discovered ... naming it Adelaide's Island;" lands on the island; (2/21/1832)

MAP	BEARING'S IDENTIFICATION NUMBER ON MAP	LATITUDINAL AND LONGITUDINAL COORDINATES	PAGE / CHAPTER
1	$\frac{22}{1}$	66° S x 47° 30'E	137 / 16

$\frac{22}{1}$ through $\frac{22}{4}$ identifies the parameters of a "'continuous tract of land'"

derived by Royal Geographic Society of London, based upon the report by Capt. Briscoe (sic) of his finding in $\frac{21}{1}$ and $\frac{21}{2}$ above (no date; one can derive post 2/21/1832).

N/E parameter; no land for at least 12° directly W on that latitude (~338.5 statute miles[39]), nor 3° E and 30' S latitude (~89.8 statute miles[40]); and then it is just an island;

MAP	BEARING'S IDENTIFICATION NUMBER ON MAP	LATITUDINAL AND LONGITUDINAL COORDINATES	PAGE / CHAPTER
1	$\frac{22}{2}$	67° S x 47° 30'E	137 / 16

S/E parameter; no land for at least 12° directly W on that latitude (338.5 statute miles[41]), nor 3° E and 1° 30' S latitude, and then it is just an island; (121.29 statute miles[42])

TABLE 1: ANNOTATED LATITUDINAL AND LONGITUDINAL COORDINATES IN PYM (8 OF 10)

---

[39] Ibid.
[40] Ibid.
[41] Ibid.
[42] Ibid.

MAP	BEARING'S IDENTIFICATION NUMBER ON MAP	LATITUDINAL AND LONGITUDINAL COORDINATES	PAGE / CHAPTER
1	$\dfrac{22}{3}$	66° S x 69° 29'W	137 / 16

N/W parameter; no land for 3° to the W at which point the "Biscoe Islands" exist (~84.5 statute miles[43]), nor 150° to the E in between the George V and Adelie Coasts (~4232 statute miles[44]);

| 1 | $\dfrac{22}{4}$ | 67° S x 69° 29'W | 137 / 16 |

S/W parameter; no land for 3° to the W, at which point the "Biscoe Islands" exist (~84.5 statute miles[45]), nor 150° to the E in between the George V and Adelie Coasts (~4232 statute miles[46]);

| 1 | 23 | 63° 23' S x 41° 25' W | 139 / 17 |

Resumes chronicling the voyage of the *Jane Guy*; rain; records air temperature as 35° F; (12/26-27/1827)

| 1 | 24 | 69° 10' S x 42° 20' W | 139 / 17 |

Jane Guy; ". . . completely hemmed in by ice. . . a strong gale blew;" records air temperature as 33° (1/2/1828)

| 2 | 25 | 73° 15' E x 42° 10' W | 140 / 17 |

Jane Guy; the first coordinate indicates an E of Greenwich bearing, and the next one is W; the first of these is probably S, deduced from the context of the narrative; however, it is conjectural as to whether this a typographic error or a construct of Poe's to discredit the authenticity of Pym; "brought to a stand by an immense expanse of firm ice. We saw, nevertheless, much open water to the southward. . . . at length we came to a passage of about a mile in width . . . The sea . . . was thickly covered with ice islands, but had no ice fields . . . ;" (1/5/1828)

TABLE 1: ANNOTATED LATITUDINAL AND LONGITUDINAL COORDINATES IN PYM (9 OF 10)

[43] Ibid
[44] Ibid
[45] Ibid
[46] Ibid

MAP	BEARING'S IDENTIFICATION NUMBER ON MAP	LATITUDINAL AND LONGITUDINAL COORDINATES	PAGE / CHAPTER
2	26	78° 30' S x 40° 15' W	140 / 17

Jane Guy; "The cold was now excessive, and we had hail squalls . . . some driftwood floated by . . . and a great quantity of birds flew over;" even though Pym states they are still in the ocean, the bearing he gives is at the edge of the Antarctic continent; (1/10/1828)

MAP			
2	27	81° 21' S x 42° W	141 / 17

Jane Guy; "the temperature of the air was mild and pleasant . . . being as high as fifty-one. . . . not a particle of ice was discovered . . .;" southerly current at .75 mph; once more, the *Jane Guy* is at a bearing which is well within the boundaries of the Antarctic land mass; (1/16/1828)

MAP			
2	28	82° 50' S x 42° 20' W	143-42 / 17

Jane Guy; "a small floe of ice was seen off the masthead . . . the weather was good and nearly calm . . . the man at the masthead gave the joyful shout of '*land on the starboard bow!*' . . . It proved to be a low rock islet . . . which Capt. Guy gave the name of Bennet's Islet, in honor of his partner in ownership of the schooner;" again, at this bearing, Pym and crew are on the Antarctic continent; a search of the Internet and Stanford University's Socrates library online reference database rendered no reference to either "Bennet's Islet" or "Island;"(1/17/1828)

MAP			
2	29	83° 20' S x 43° 5' W	

Jane Guy; "the sea being extraordinarily dark in color . . . saw land from the masthead . . . found it to be one of a group of very large islands;" this bearing is on Antarctic land (1/17/1828)

TABLE 1: ANNOTATED LATITUDINAL AND LONGITUDINAL COORDINATES IN PYM (10 OF 10)

As is clear from the data presented in the table vis-à-vis an examination of the maps attached to the end of this study, Pym exhibits both correct and incorrect understanding of the locational data he presents in his narrative.

Locational data for Christmas Harbor on Kerguelen Island, Inaccessible Island, Nightingale Island, and Adelaide's Island are all correct within 10 minutes (~5 statute miles). He is also generally correct in citing the locational data relating to the

explorations of Cook, Weddell, Morrell, Kerguelen, and Kreutzenstern and Lisiausky, all authentically authoritatively knowledgeable historical figures. All of this accuracy is employed by Poe to infuse a sense of knowledgeability into the voice of Arthur Gordon Pym. Readers know these facts to be true, so by extension, they have a tendency to believe that Pym knows what he is talking about, because in some cases he does. But a closer examination discovers the whole truth, and this truth is that Poe successfully constructed this groundwork of believability to lull readers into his intended ultimate portrayal of Pym: that of the knowledgeable-sounding fool.

The first indication that Pym is incorrect in citations of some of his bearings is in item 5/1 in which he gives a false location of the Kerguelen Islands; the true location is given in item 5/2. This substantial inaccuracy in location of either landmarks, or for that matter, land at all, is rampant throughout Chapters 16 through 18: Items 8/1; 9; 11/1; 22/2 – 22/4; 26, 27, 28; and 29, all give bearings which coordinates either reflect no land in the near vicinity, give inaccurate bearings as to where the landmark cited lies, or water where there is supposed to be land. It should be noted also that several other bearings are incorrect, but only by under 5 miles, such as his location of Sal Island, item 2 in Table 1.

Some of these inaccuracies, of course, can be attributed to a lack of general knowledge at the time of *Pym*'s publication is 1838; Antarctic exploration and mapping were in their infancy during this time, the first definite conjecture of a land mass from the 65th to the 90th parallels coming from Capt. James Cook, February 21, 1775, as detailed in the excerpt at the top of the next page:

The intention of the voyage has in every respect been fully
Answered, the Southern Hemisphere sufficiently explored
and a final end put to the searching after a Southern
Continent, which has at times engrossed the attention of
some of the Maritime Powers for near two Centuries past
and the Geographers of all ages. That there may be a
Continent of large tract of land near the Poles, I will not
deny, on the contrary I am of the opinion there is . . .
(History of Antarctic Exploration website)

In point of fact, the South Pole was not actually walked upon until December 14,

1911 by Roald Amundsen (History of Antarctic Exploration Web site). As such, some of

the errors concerning Pym's contention that the *Jane Guy* is still at sea when in point of

fact, the bearings cited would indicate the ship would have been upon the Antarctic

continent (items 26-29 in the table), can be forgiven.

But others of these inaccuracies are bona fide errors vis-à-vis contemporaneous

knowledge on the part of Pym which Poe must have deliberately put in: The Kerguelen

Islands had been charted since February 12, 1772 by Chevalier Yves de Kerguelen

(Kerguelen Archipelago website); the Crozets were discovered and mapped by Marc

Mace Marion du Fresne on January 23, 1772 (South Atlantic and Subantarctic Islands

website); Prince Edward and Marion Islands, first on March 4, 1663 by Barent

Barentzoon Lam, then by du Fresne in 1772, and then again by Cook in 1776 (South

Atlantic and Subantarctic Islands website). All of these discoveries predated *Pym*, and

were significant enough that Poe would have been aware of their coordinates.

Furthermore, his using J. N. Reynolds as an authoritative source is obviously done to

dilute Pym's authoritative authenticity: As previously referenced in Table 1, item 15/2,

and detailed in footnote 27, Mr. Reynolds was not highly regarded in his day.

On page 120, Pym states that the survivors of the *Grampus* had "drifted probably, from north to south, *not more than five-and-twenty degrees*;" 25° distance between latitudinal parallels is 1500 statute miles . . . hardly a span which merits the dismissive term "not more than." Furthermore, since they were adrift after their ship as foundered in a severe storm with no navigational instruments, how could Pym have known an initial bearing from which he might deduce the distance they had traveled? Clearly, Poe is trying here to give Pym a voice which reflects a postulation not supported by fact, that is, an inauthentic authoritative voice: Using such purported exactitude ("five-and-twenty degrees") gives it the appearance of knowledgeability; the fact that it simultaneously implies that the distance it is referring to is inconsequential, speaks to the ignorance of the speaker.

Poe also gives several references to non-existent, or elusive islands: The Auroras; (items 12/1-3 in the table) "some small islands;" (item 14 in the table) and Bennet's Islet, (item 28 in the table) which take on the character of "lost islands." Poe even has Pym conduct an extensive search for the Auroras (items 13/1-3). These mysterious archipelagos do even more discrediting damage to Pym's authenticity: People even of Poe's era believed in scientific fact, giving only derision to speculation-based folkloric tales.

Ultimately, that information known to be vague and incorrect that Poe has Pym convey, is authorially intentional to further discredit the Yankee from Nantucket as inauthentically authoritative. In the end, after all, Poe means to show how many times people who sound as if they know what they are speaking about, in actuality, are just covering their ignorance with knowledgeable-sounding rhetoric. This of course, would also speak to the abolitionists which Poe detested and which Pym represented.

Authenticity and Inauthenticity in Moby-Dick and Pym

Throughout the previous sections of this paper, various rhetorical elements available to authors by which authoritative voice can be incorporated into literature have been laid out and examined. Some limited discourse concerning authenticity or inauthenticity within an authoritative voice has also been discussed, that is, the issue of whether—all rhetorical virtuosity notwithstanding—the content of the texts being expressed through the voice are true or not.

Overall, then, how authentically authoritative are the written voices of *Moby-Dick* and *The Narrative of Arthur Gordon Pym* in relative to the previously examined and defined rhetorical evaluative criteria? In particular, owing to their prominence in each of the novels, how authentically authoritative are the voices of the narrators, Ishmael and Arthur Gordon Pym, respectively?

An examination of *Moby-Dick* a mixed conclusion. The reason for this is the fact that the main tenets of Ishmael's ostensible authoritativeness, whaling and an above ordinary insight into human nature, are often brought into question.

Throughout *Moby-Dick*, Ishmael, in his best authoritative voice, expresses cetological and whaling commentary. A number of representative excerpts of Ishmael speaking about his cetological and whaling expertise are offered starting on the next page. These passages' catalyzed some questions (marked: Q) which were posed to Dr. Laurie Gage, DVM, Head Veterinarian, Six Flags Marine World, Vallejo, CA; her

commentary concerning the authenticity or inauthenticity of the passages follows each of these (marked: LG):

> Sometimes Ishmael offers completely accurate cetological data:

>> I have every reason to believe that the food of the spermwhale—squid or cuttle-fish lurks at the bottom of the sea . . . (214)

>> Is this really what sperm whales eat? (Q)

>> Do they really live at the bottom of the sea? (Q)

>> Sperm whales feed primarily on cuttlefish and squid. The large cuttlefish live at lower ocean depths. (LG)

and

>> Also, that in Henry VIIIth's time, a certain cook of the court obtained a handsome reward for inventing an admirable sauce to be eaten with barbequed porpoises, which, you remember, are a species of whale. (307)

>> Are propoises really a 'species of whales?' (Q)

>> Yes, dolphins are a superfamily (Delphinoidea) within the suborder Odotocete or toothed whale. Killer whales are the largest members of the delphinind family. (LG)

Therefore, these statements, when researched, seem to do much to reinforce the authenticity of Ishmael's authoritative voice.

However, further research shows that at other times, the narrator offers only partially correct information:

>> . . . at any rate, there are plenty of whalemen, especially those whaling nations not sailing under the American flag, who have never hostilely encountered the Sperm Whale, but whose sole knowledge of the leviathan is restricted to the ignoble monster primitively pursued in the North; seated on their hatches, these men will hearken with a childish fireside interest and awe, to the wild, strange tales of Southern whaling. (182)

>> What is the global distribution of sperm whales? (Q)

> Sperm whales generally live in temperate waters. Females
> are found only in waters between 40° north latitude and 40°
> south latitude. But males can also be found in polar regions.
> (LG)

and talking about whales in general:

> But he cannot by any degree breathe through his mouth
> . . . his windpipe has no connection with his mouth. (379)

> Is this true? (Q)

> Dolphins and whales have an adaptation whereby certain
> cartilages in their larynx are elongated, connecting their
> trachea with the blowhole. This apparatus can be
> disconnected, even by the animal itself, but never to allow
> the animal to breathe through its mouth. There is, however
> a connection between the blowhole and the mouth, if this
> apparatus is disconnected. Some animals have been know
> to eat certain food items (such as squid), and load them into
> their blowhole apparatus, and blow them out the blowhole.
> (LG)

In the first of the three preceding passages, Ishmael is making the statement by default

that sperm whales inhabit only southern waters, but what does this mean?

The vagueness invites many interpretations and, as a result, begs many questions: Does

the speaker mean southern around the equator, or southern hemispheric? What is meant

by the terms "North" and "Southern?"

Dr. Gage's answer to the question catalyzed by Ishmael's statement regarding

where whales inhabit the ocean is concise. As indicated by her response to the passage,

Ishmael is only partially right in claiming that sperm whales inhabit only the "Southern"

waters; while the South Polar region is indeed in southern waters, it is hardly temperate;

the North Polar region is neither southern nor temperate. The same sort of dynamic of

partial precision/imprecision on the part of Ishmael as indicated by Dr. Gage's answer for the first example, also holds true for the second example.

Finally, to further muddy up the waters regarding the authoritative authenticity of Ishmael's voice, sometimes the narrator's information is not accurate at all:

> In most land animals there are certain valves or flood-gates in many of their veins, whereby when wounded, the blood is in some degree at least instantly shot off in certain directions. Not so with the whale . . . (367)

> Is this 'no-valve' in whales versus 'valved' circulatory system in other animals really true? (Q)

> I'm not sure what he is talking about with a valved circulatory system. The only variant valves in mammals I'm aware of is in the neck of giraffes. Insofar as the way whales bleed, he may be describing the many blood vessels in the flukes of cetaceans that are a part of their themoregulatory system; when they cut themselves, their blood oozes rather than squirts because of the many tiny capillaries present. (LG)

At other times what Ishmael says is given to exaggeration, as exemplified below when he talks about sperm whales:

> Between his ribs and on each side of his spine he is supplied with a remarkable involved Cretan labyrinth of vermicelli-like vessels, which vessels, when he quits the surface, are completely distended with oxygenated blood. So . . . a thousand fathoms in the sea, he carries a surplus stock of viality in him . . . (380)

> Can sperm whales stay under water at 1000 fathoms (6000 ft; 1830 meters) for? (Q)

> The sperm whale is the second most efficient diver of all the whales, and makes dives of 500 to 1000 meters." (LG)

As can be seen by all of these examples, there is both authenticity and inauthenticity to Ishmael's authoritativeness. So where does this leave readers , then, insofar as an overall

evaluation of the voice of *Moby-Dick*, and by extension, other works of fiction of this type?

Because Melville is presenting his narrator as authentically authoritative he begs his readers to scrutinize this stance. As illustrated above, many holes are found in the technical accuracy of Ishmael's statements. This serves to challenge the authenticity of the narrator's authority of knowledge; insofar as his authority of power is concerned, he has very little, per se, other than when this is dependent upon his expertise, which has been diluted by the erroneous factual data he has claimed.

Yet Ishmael's own experiences in whaling would seem to reinforce his authoritativeness, in that it makes it difficult to challenge him without calling him a liar . . . and readers are especially loathe to question Ishmael, the author having couched his narrator in speech in so much authoritative-associative rhetoric previously, that readers have probably already grown to accept Ishmael's authority. Intellectually and emotionally , then, it becomes harder to challenge the narrator's veracity. This device, a concerted effort at establishing a "technically factual truth" in one's narrator, is important in Melville's attempt to establish his story as valid on all fronts, infusing even deeper meaning into its "artistic truth."

At the beginning of the novel (1-58), Melville portrays Ishmael as a man who has learned to be an authoritative whaler. Much is implied by the way the narrator emphatically expresses his points of view regarding the subject:

> . . . though New Bedford has of late been gradually
> monopolizing the business of whaling, and though in this
> matter poor old Nantucket is much behind her, yet

> Nantucket was her original—the Tyre of this Carthage;—
> the place where the first dead American whale
> was stranded. (8)

In point of fact, Melville's own whaling experience was limited to a mere 12 months; he did not have the requisite personal knowledge to give his narrator the authority to speak so knowledgeably, ergo, the many technical inaccuracies. In the quotation above, how can Ishmael know which port is the better between New Bedford and Nantucket, or when and where the "first American whale was stranded"; he himself professes (though noticeably later in the novel) he is "wholly ignorant of the mysteries of whaling" (59). Of course Melville writes this caveat into his story as a way to excuse this knowledge-inadequacy in Ishmael, attributing any whaling knowledge, or lack thereof, to other "expert" sources, thus eluding culpability. So why is it then that previous to Ishmael's admission of inadequacy, Melville is posturing Ishmael as an authoritative whaler, based on an implicit empiricism? The answer is that this would serve as a marvelously reinforcing device for enriching the underlying fabric of the novel, if it were not for the fact that some of what the author puts forth through his narrator is speculative at best or false at worst.

Melville realizes this by page 59, and tries to compensate for it by having Ishmael qualify all of his authoritative rhetoric with his "some-facts-which-I-make-sound-so-factual-just-might-not-be-so" disclaimer regarding his "ignoran[ce] of the mysteries of whaling." It is precisely here that the authenticity of the narrator's rhetorically-effected voice comes into question. While Melville tries to blame any inaccuracies on Ishmael's part on the inaccuracy of his source information, the whole question of accuracy—that is,

148

authenticity—has been raised, and from that point on Melville loses the sort of credence he had previously striven to attain and maintain. Additionally, the same devices Melville uses when Ishmael is actually authentic in his authoritative voice are also employed when he is inauthentic: Emphaticism; delineation; elevated diction; references to authority figures, deity, cosmology; historical precedence; attention to detail; etc., are not sufficient in and of themselves to make the voice authentic. The rhetoric, then, is a ruse and actually creates a pseudo-authenticity, which ultimately renders to the voice being rendered inauthentic. What determines whether the voice is authentic is holding what it says up to the light of technical factuality, that is, *what* it says rather than *how* it says it— this is exactly the crucial criterion used to evaluate authoritative authenticity in technical writing.

There is so much of this amelioration, that it begs the reader to question—to *doubt*—the authenticity of the authoritativeness, that is to paraphrase the famous line from *Hamlet*, the voice " . . . dost protest too much, methinks."

Even Melville knows he is weak in many of his statements, as he makes Ishmael attempt to account for them by stating, "For this is one of those disheartening instances where truth requires full as much bolstering as error" (207), speaking specifically about the dangers inherent to a life of whaling.

Ishmael as narrator at the beginning of Chapter 45, "The Affidavit," refers to the immediately preceding "The Chart," Chapter 44, which he describes as being: ". . . as important a one as will be found in this volume; but the leading matter of it requires to be still further and more familiarly enlarged upon, in order to be adequately

understood, and moreover to take away any incredulity which a profound ignorance of the entire subject may induce in some minds, as to the natural verity of the main points of this affair." (205) This statement indicates Ishmael needs some sort of reinforcement, some validation, some shoring up of the whole picture presented in Chapter 44 (indeed, up to that point in the novel); that is, he needs to *qualify* all of the information that he has put forth as authoritative. This leads to inauthenticity; authenticity needs no amelioration.

Immediately following this call for more qualifying of his authoritativeness, Ishmael volunteers to shed some light—though not in any orderly fashion—then admits that he is unqualified:

> I care not to perform this part of my task methodically; but
> shall be content to produce the desired impression by
> separate citations of items, practically or reliably known to
> me as a whaleman; and from these citations, I take it—the
> conclusion aimed at will naturally follow of itself. (205)

Melville is having Ishmael give conflicting accounts of his credibility as an authoritative voice. On the one hand, Ishmael says he is going to clarify things, not by giving us an orderly accounting, but rather, through a scattershot throwing out of items by which readers should glean a conclusion similar to Ishmael's regarding the validity of the wild tales he has conveyed in the previous chapter(s). This raises the questions, "Why does Ishmael's authoritativeness need to be reiterated to reinforce it at this point? Has this not been previously established?"

The answer is, Melville, knowing his limitations regarding whaling knowledge, assuages his own insecurities regarding his lack of authentic authoritativeness, and

150

through authorial extension, his narrator's as well. He goes on to build a position of experiential validity insofar as whaling expertise is concerned, by enumerating several of his arguments throughout the rest of the chapter (a technique which mimics a similar device used in technical writing of enumerating or bulleting items to clarify their separate identity). For example, he has Ishmael say,

> First: I have personally known three instances where a whale after receiving a harpoon, has effected a complete escape; and, after an interval (in one instance of three years), has been again struck by the same hand . . . (205)

He goes on to build on his first premise:

> Secondly: It is well known in the Sperm Whale Fishery, however ignorant the world ashore may be of it, that there have been several memorable historical instances where a particular whale in the ocean has been at distant times and places popularly cognisable. (206)

Using the same building technique in making another point, Melville has Ishmael construct his case again:

> First: Though most men have some vague flitting ideas of the general perils of the grand fishery, yet they have nothing like a fixed, vivid conception of those perils, and the frequency with which they recur. (208)

And once again, he adds another argument:

> Secondly: People ashore have indeed some indefinite idea that a whale is an enormous creature of enormous power; but I have ever found that when narrating to them some specific example of this two-fold enormousness, they have significantly complimented me upon my facetiousness; when, I declare upon my soul, I had no more idea of being facetious than Moses, when he wrote the history of the plagues of Egypt. (208)

151

Finally, Melville has Ishmael finishes the entire logic chain, once more using the same numerically built paradigm:

> First: In the year 1820, the ship Essex, Captain Pollard, of Nantucket, was cruising in the Pacific Ocean. One day she saw spouts, lowered her boats, and gave chase to a shoal of sperm whales. Ere long, several of the whales were wounded; when suddenly, a very large whale escaping from the boats, issued from the shoal, and bore directly down upon the ship. Dashing his forehead against her hull, he so stove her in, that in less than "ten minutes" she settled and fell over. (209)

> Secondly: The ship Union, also of Nantucket, was in the year 1807 totally lost off the Azores by a similar onset, but the authentic particulars of this catastrophe I have never chanced to encounter . . . (210)

> Thirdly: Some eighteen or twenty years ago Commodore J____ then commanding an American Sloop-of-war of the first class, happened to be dining with a party of whaling captains, on board a Nantucket ship in the harbor of Oahu, Sandwich Islands. . . . He peremptorily denied for example, that any whale could so smite his stout sloop-of-war as to cause her to leak so much as a thimbleful. . . . Some weeks after, . . . he was stopped . . . by a portly sperm whale, that . . . consisted in fetching the Commodore's craft such a thwack, that with all his pumps going he made straight for the nearest port to heave down . . . (210)

Other statements serve outright in the attempt to bolster Ishmael's authoritativeness, such as the footnote which is the testimony of one "Owen Chase of the Essex":

> Again: 'At all events, the whole circumstances taken together, all happening before my own eyes, and producing, at that time, impressions in my mind of decided, calculating mischief, on the part of the whale (many of which impressions I cannot now recall, induce me to be satisfied that I am correct in my opinion' (210).

Melville strives for authentic authoritativeness in developing the narrator/character of Ishmael from page viii, "Etymology," through page 180, so by Chap. 41, "Moby Dick" (180-188), he will have created a strong sense of credibility with his audience when he starts into the fantastical dissertation upon "the unaccompanied, secluded White Whale (who) had haunted those uncivilized seas mostly frequented by the Sperm Whale fishermen" (180). Thus, this authoritativeness lends itself to giving the legend of the particular singular whale in question the mythological status of a sub-species.

To further this end, Melville reasserts his narrator's presence in the novel with the very first words of this chapter, "I Ishmael, was one of that crew . . . " (180), whereas in the previous five chapters, 36-40, Ishmael had moved to the background, replaced by a third person narrator. In point of fact, Chapters 36-40 almost form a separate play within the novel, complete with stage settings and directions parenthetically accompanying the titles of those chapters. It is as if Melville were trying to validate and reinforce Ishmael's authoritativeness by removing him personally as a character from the novel and allowing the reader to see things through the "objective eye" of the "anonymous" narrator who relates these dramatic chapters.

While *Moby-Dick* is a novel, a piece of fiction, up to Chapter 41, Melville through Ishmael, infuses into it a tone of veracity, that is, an authentic authoritativeness, through the many rhetorical devices he uses: scriptural, religious, theological, cosmic, and mythological references, allusions and language; imperatives, delimiters and immediacies; historical references; allusions to timelessness, infinity, and eternity-

symbology; references to acknowledged masters of science/art; proclamatious postulation and proclamations declaration; elevated diction; etymology; attention to mathematical, maritime and cetological detail and minutiae; technical writing per se, and illustrations; academic and scientific terminology, form and reference; expert sources; specifying authority per se, and references to authority figures; faith-based omnipresence and secrecy in word choice and symbology; syntactical variance, stylistic affectation, and superfluousness; sudden shifts in diction or inappropriate diction which detract from the narrator's authoritative voice; foreshadowing; examples of obviously false antithesis used vis-à-vis obviously true thesis; to reinforce the latter's veracity. Of course, the most salient question regarding the authenticity of the authoritative voice in *Moby-Dick* is, in, does Melville accomplish his goal of suspending his audience's natural inclination toward disbelief? Does he authentically employ the authoritative voice, or merely create an illusion, a facsimile which ultimately fall short of his mark of fashioning artistic truth and ultimately is manifest as an inauthentic authoritative voice instead?

Chapter 41 gives countless examples of "wild tales" concerning sperm whales in general, and by association and sometimes by direct reference, concerning Moby Dick as well. Melville has Ishmael keep his distance, so to speak, from these purported "truths"; however, he uses "credible" citation as well, for example, from American and English whaling ships; Ishmael cites an:

> . . . authoritative record years ago by Scoresby, that some
> whales had been captured in the Pacific, in whose bodies
> have been found the barbs of harpoons darted in the
> Greenland seas. Nor is it to be gainsaid that the interval of
> time between the two assaults could not have exceeded

very many days. Hence, by inference, it is believed by some whalemen, that the Nor' West Passage, so long a problem to man, was never a problem to the whale. (184)

Melville is, once again, trying to instill a sense of authoritativeness into his narrator by association with Scoresby. Yet, he also—in nearly the same breath—has Ishmael discount other similar tales. Is Melville hedging his bet, so to speak, alleging some of the wild tales to be true, specifically Scoresby's, attributing them to others so he can later say that he must have been mistaken? After all, perhaps even Scoresby can be as misguided. Or is the author trying to pull his readers' emotions both ways, getting out of them a maximum of emotions—albeit conflicting ones? Perhaps he is effecting Ishmael's duplicitous stance and conveyance of contrary information to soften the blow to come later; that is, perhaps Melville is straining the reasonable truth with the exploits of both man and leviathan, a straining he wishes, however, for his audience to accept as true, given Ishmael's reluctance to embrace the tales he relates in Chapter 41.

Finally, there is the association of Ahab's madness with this chapter. Melville includes this here because it is the finale of the three main elements central to making his tale artistically successful:

- The credibility of Ishmael

- The mythologization of Moby Dick

- The insanity of Ahab in going after such a monster.

Melville gives Ishmael all of the trappings—that is, the rhetoric—of authoritativeness in his voice, to lead his readers through the story believing that maybe—just *maybe*—

Moby Dick's wickedness *is* real, and maybe—just *maybe*—Ahab *is not* insane, but rather *righteous* for pursuing him.

Chapter 41, therefore, is pivotal in the novel insofar as authoritative authenticity is concerned in terms of both artistry and technical accuracy—the former relaying on the latter to support and foster its existence. Melville wants his audience to believe in the authenticity of Ishmael's perspective regarding Ahab . . . the author has the narrator authoritatively tell them so. And just *what* is *most* important for them to acquiesce to as credible in the narrator's tale? Ishmael sums it up in the final sentence of the chapter:

> For one, I gave myself up to the abandonment of the time
> and place; but while yet all a-rush to encounter the whale,
> could see naught in that brute but the deadliest ill. (189)

Canaday agrees that it is critical for Ishmael to assume authentic authoritativeness. And why? It is because he has become, de facto, the word of God:

> Ishmael's task at hand is to narrate the terrible story of
> Captain Ahab, the true telling of which imposes certain
> responsibilities. . . . He must guard against emphasizing
> Ahab's stature and authority and minimizing the wrath of
> God. . . . Furthermore, Ishmael himself must accept the
> authority of God while demonstrating it to others. (52)

Still, there is the question of why Melville puts his narrator in such a menial position within the context of the setting. Canaday ponders upon this too:

> Yet by going on the voyage as a common sailor, which
> deliberately precludes any office of authority and any
> responsibility, and by never intervening to bring his insight
> into Ahab's demonic character to the others—to this extent
> Ishmael fails Father Mapple's test. (53)

Here, Canaday is referring to the spiritual test of Ishmael's salvation, but this study would also put forth that the fact that Melville places him in the novel in an unauthoritative

position, also speaks to each reader's personal test regarding the authenticity of the narrator's authoritativeness; here too, Ishmael fails.

So, apart from all of the rhetorical virtuosity effected by Melville through his narrator, is Ishmael' authority authentic or inauthentic?

The answer is, "both."

There are times when Melville's narrator conveys much accurate information; at other times, he is only partially correct; and there are instances when he is incorrect in the data he conveys. Naturally, an analysis of the authenticity of Ishmael's authority needs to assess these variances in veracity. But given the size and frequency of Ishmael's characterological and narrative voice speaking in the novel, readers will need to analyze his authenticity or inauthenticity based upon the overall impression derived from their reading, rather than take each instance; there are just too many times when this voice conveys information to try to track them all—any attempt to do so would become an exercise in futility.

By this method of overall assessment, then, we can conclude that Ishmael's voice is either authentic or inauthentic. The final analysis of the authenticity of Ishmael's authoritative voice, then, lies with each individual reader, and is a matter of such profound complexity—a complexity which includes each reader's psychological, sociological, and educational background, to name but the most obvious of factors—that a universally conclusive statement as regards the authenticity or inauthenticity of the narrative voice in *Moby-Dick* is impossible; each reader needs to make that decision.

In Poe's *The Narrative of Arthur Gordon Pym of Nantucket*, an entirely different dynamic occurs. Poe's ultimate goal is to show Pym as possessing an astonishingly convincing verisimilitude of authoritativeness, but ultimately, to show that his voice is inauthentically authoritative.

Poe then—in his genius—is using the authoritative voice *inauthentically* throughout his novel, as a means of facilitating the characterological development of the narrator, Arthur Gordon Pym. At first this is subtle. Vagueness or inaccuracy are attributed to drunkenness, others' faults, a lack of empiricism on the part of the narrator, etc. Slowly but surely, however, the truth about Pym's authority is revealed: he has none; he has only his self-delusional grandiosity. As a consequence, the entire novel is ultimately turned on its head.

So *Pym*, contrary to what many critics have said, is neither a misshapen, inept travel adventure, nor a hoax, but rather (at least in part), a keen examination of the dynamic of how convincing the world of self-delusion can be to the sane . . . indeed, how fine the line is between sanity and insanity, or fantasy.

This intent of Poe's seems to have been missed for as long as the novel has existed, save for the observation of Samuel Maio in the *South Dakota Review*. In the Introduction to the edition of *Pym* used for this examination, Sidney Kaplan gives this commentary, written contemporaneously to *Pym*'s publication:

> Alfred Russel Wallace, the evolutionist, wrote to a friend:
> '. . . the Antarctic part completely spoils it, being so
> completely impossible, with its abundant vegetation, mild
> climate, fruits and land animals near the *South Pole!* Also

the fantastic idea of *striped water* so utterly unecessary . . .
it was these absurdities that disgusted me with the story.'
(vii)

It even affronted Pym himself; clearly, so many self-references concerning his own state

of mind by the narrator indicate that his sanity is a central thematic preoccupation. For so

many to have missed the significance of this as a primary focal object of authorial intent

is astonishing; again, only Maio has discerned this. Yet, insanity is not the main theme of

The Narrative of Arthur Gordon Pym of Nantucket; it is merely the vehicle by which Poe

explicates it.

And so, what is this underlying theme Poe wishes to put forth to his readership?

None other than an agenda of pro-slavery through a Southern author's perspective, an

acknowledged man of letters, regarding the well-intentioned but to him ultimate insanity

of abolitionism. And what better way to show this than through an effete yet common-

posturing, educated yet ignorant, convincing-sounding yet vacuous, seemingly controlled

and sane yet out-of-control and insane Nantucket Yankee?

Throughout *Pym*, numerous examples of the contrast of black and white, both

subtly and overtly racial appear. All of these contrasts either symbolize, or directly

address, the conflict between European- and African-descended Americans of the

antebellum United States. The fact that, when speaking about the crew of the *Grampus*,

he needs to mention that ". . . among . . . (them) . . . was the cook, a Negro," the outright

characterization of Dirk Peters' Native American and African-American heritage as

grotesquely animal in nature, takes on a near-zoological rhetorical tone of primate

examination:

'Dirk Peters . . . the son of an Indian squaw of the tribe of Upsarokas . . . was one of the most purely ferocious-looking men I ever beheld. He was short in stature—not more than four feet eight inches high—but his limbs were of the most Herculean mold. His hands, especially, were so enormously thick and broad as hardly to retain human shape. His arms, as well as his legs, were *bowed* in the most singular manner, and appeared to possess no flexibility whatever. His head was equally deformed, being of immense size, with an indentation on the crown (like that on the head of most Negroes) . . . (43) [italics and parentheses Poe's]

Poe also racially stereotypes the people of Too-Wit:

In the four *canoes*, which might have been fifty feet long and five broad, there were a hundred and ten *savages* in all. They were of *ordinary stature of Europeans*, but of a *more muscular* and brawny frame. *Their complexion [was] a jet black, with thick and wolly hair. They were clothed in skins of an unknown black animal*, shaggy and silky, and made to fit the body with *some degree of skill*, the hair being inside, except where turned out about the neck, wrists, and ankles. *Their arms consisted principally of clubs*, of a dark, and apparently very heavy wood. Some *spears*, however, were observed among them, *headed with flint*, and a few *slings*. (146-47) [my italics indicating this; bracket's Poe's]

And in numerous other places in the novel, emphasizes blackness and whiteness:

Their arms consisted principally of clubs, of a *dark*, and apparently very heavy wood . . . (146) [italics mine highlighting balck/white emphasis]

The bottoms of the canoes were full of *black* stones about the size of a large *egg*. (147) [italics mine highlighting balck/white emphasis]

There were, however, some points of their demeanor which we found it impossible to understand: for example, we could not get them to approach several very harmless

objects—such as the schooner's *sails*, an *egg*, and *open book*, or a pan of *flour*.[47] (149) [italics mine highlighting balck/white emphasis]

This black/white focus culminates in the final image from the narrative in which whiteness is presented in the following haunting way:

> And now we rushed into the embraces of the cataract, where a chasm threw itself open to receive us. But there arose in our pathway a shrouded human figure, very far larger in its proportions than any dweller among men. And the hue of the skin of the figure was the perfect whiteness of snow. (195)

All of this points to the racism of Poe as author; for more insight into whiteness per se in Poe and its association to racism.[48]

All creative writing process analysis notwithstanding, it is *authorial intent*, *not* some abstract notion of a free-thinking, autonomous creation sprung forth from the author yet somehow out of his control, which designs the narrator/character of Arthur Gordon Pym. Poe means for Pym to be hypocritical; this furthers the author's racist agenda through an almost subliminal projection of his own mindset into Pym's dialogue.

As such, Poe has created a narrative voice in Arthur Gordon Pym which resonates as inauthentically authoritative on both intentional and unintentional levels. When Pym voices all manner of inaccurate, incomplete, or deranged information in contrast to the more accurate, complete, or rational contrapuntal elements of Pym's rhetoric, we see authorial intention at work. What Poe also creates, however—and this most assuredly

---

[47] n.b.: All of the italicized items he lists in this excerpt are white.
[48] See "Faith-Based Omnipresence And Secrecy Symbology," section 3.A.I.vi, page 41 and "Authority Per Se," section 3.A.II.i, page 54.

unintentionally—is a realization among enlightened readers of the authoritative inauthenticity of his authorial racist agenda: the perpetuated enslavement of African-Americans.

Overall, then, Pym's voice is inauthentically authoritative—but this is just as Poe intended it to be—to ultimately effect an authentic method of character development. The author's error, though, is that he thinks such a depiction of Pym's voice will make Poe's agenda of enslavement based on racism seem erudite. In point of fact, the converse comes to pass: Intelligent readers are not favorably impressed with any premise based upon the racial subjugation of other peoples, regardless of how skillfully the design in which it is put forth.

4.   **Conclusion**

Moby-Dick, or, the White Whale and *The Narrative of Arthur Gordon Pym of Nantucket* are two of the finest examples of literary craft to come out of the United States of America. Both novels are rich in formal craft, and speak to issues which transcend the passage of time—destiny; the power of God; the subjugation of one people by another—but most of all, the quest for an authentic authority.

Their greatness notwithstanding, both can also—indeed *must*—be critiqued; in no other way can we understand such works. And here I have tried to critique the degree of authentic authority in their narrator's voices. As a consequence, the following logic thread develops:

Authoritative voices can exist in literature as the effect of authorial artifice which draws from technical and literary rhetorical devices.

This authoritative voice can manifest itself within a literary work via either narrators, characters, or both.

Additionally, authoritative voices can be evaluated as either authentic or inauthentic.

This authenticity or inauthenticity can be either the unintentional result of poor research or ignorance by an author, or authorially intentional design to further a narrative or characterological development.

Moby-Dick; or, the Whale represents the former paradigm, *The Narrative of Arthur Gordon Pym of Nantucket* the latter.

Bibliography

The following bibliography lists documentation used as research material for this project:

Maps:

Antarctic Area. GNC (Global Navigation and Planning Chart) 26. Edition 7. Riverdale, Md.: National Ocean Service. 1985.

The World. Sheets 5 and 6. Washington, D.C.: Defense Mapping Agency, under the direction of the Department of Defense. 1995.

Cartography:

Robinson, Arthur H. *Elements of Cartography.* New York: John Wiley & Sons. 1963.

Dictionaries:

The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language. Third edition. New York: Houghton Mifflin. 1992.

The Oxford Dictionary of Quotations. Third Edition. Oxford, England: The Oxford P. 1980.

Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language. Second College Edition. David B. Guralink, editor in chief. New York: William Collins + World Publishing Co. 1974.

Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language Unabridged. Philip Babcock Gove, Ph. D. editor in chief. Springfield, MA: G & C Merriam. 1976.

Religious Documentary Sources:

The Book: Wisdom for Living in Modern Day Language. Cambridge, MA: The Learning Company, Inc. CD-ROM. v1.0c. 1999.

The Holy Bible: The Authorized King James Bible. Grand Rapids, MI: The Zondervvan Corporation. 1983.

Internet Informational Sources:

Antarctic Philately website: http://south-pole.com/homepage.html

Antarctic Philately website, Explorers link: http://www.south-pole.com/p0000017.htm

Antarctic Philately website, Explorers link, James Weddell page: http://www.south-pole.com/p0000075.htm

Argentine Islands website: http://www.antarcticida.kiev.ua/english/history.htm

Biography of Captain James Cook website: http://www.pacific coast.net/~regent/cookbio.html

History of Antarctic Exploration website: http://users.erols.com/jackbobo/Exploration.htm)

Kerguelen Archipelago website: http://www.crozet.demon.co.uk/kerg.htm

San José State University Rome website: http://myron.sjsu.edu/ROMEWEB/writers/art18.htm

The Scott Polar Research Institute Summary of Peri-Antarctic Islands website: http://www.spri.cam.ac.uk./bob/periant.htm

South Atlantic Subantarctic Island website: http://www.btinternet.com/~sa_sa/index.html

Literary Source Texts:

The two literary source texts used for quoted excerpts in this paper are as follows:

Melville, Herman. *Moby-Dick; or, the Whale*. London: D. Campbell Publishers, Ltd.; Distributed by Random Century Group Ltd. 1991.

Poe, Edgar Allan. *The Narrative of Arthur Gordon Pym of Nantucket*. Introduction by Sidney Kaplan. New York: Hill and Wang. 1960.

Criticism on Literary Source Texts:

In gaining perspective about the underlying narrative and characterological voices in the novels listed above, the following critical works were researched:

Moby Dick:

Badaracco, Claire. *American Culture and the Marketplace: R.R. Donnelley's Four American Books Campaign, 1926-1930*. Washington: Library of Congress. 1992.

Borton, John. *Herman Melville: The Philosophical Implications of Literary Technique in Moby-Dick*. Amherst, MA: Amherst College P. 1961.

Cameron, Sharon. *The Corporeal Self: Allegories of the Body in Melville and Hawthorne*. Baltimore: John Hopkins U P. 1981.

Canaday, Nicholas, Jr. *Melville and Authority*. Gainsville, FL: U of Florida P. 1968.

Davis, Clark. *After the Whale: Melville in the Wake of Moby-Dick*. Tuscaloosa: U of Alabama P. 1995.

Gilmore, Michael T., Ed. *Twentieth Century Interpretations of Moby-Dick: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall. 1977.

Hall, Joan Joffe. "Some Problems if Structure in Melville's Novels." (Ph.D. diss., Stanford University, 1961).

Hayes, Kevin J., Ed. *The Critical Response to Herman Melville's Moby-Dick*. Westport, CT: Greenwood P. 1994.

Herbert, Thomas Walter. *Moby-Dick and Calvinism: A World Dismantled*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers U P. 1977.

Higgins, Brian and Parker, Hershel, Eds. *Critical Essays on Herman Melville's Moby-Dick*. New York: G.K. Hall. 1992.

Hoffman, Leanoard Raymond. "Problems In Melville: The Style From the Beginnings through *Moby-Dick*." (Ph.D. diss., Stanford University, 1954).

Markels, Julian. *Melville and the Politics of Identity*. Urbana: U of Illinois P. 1993.

Nechas, James William. *Synonomy, Repetition, and Restatement in the Vocabulary of Herman Melville's Moby-Dick*. Norwood, PA: Norwood Editions. 1978.

Spanos, William V. *The Errant Art of Moby-Dick: The Canon, the Cold War, and the Struggle for American Studies*. Durham, NC: Duke U P. 1995.

Ujhazy, Maria. *Herman Melville's World of Whaling*. Budapest: Akad Emiai Kiad O. 1982.

Van Zuylen, Marina. *Difficulty as an Aesthetic Principle: Realism and Unreadability in Stifter, Melville, and Flaubert*. Tubingen: G. Narr. 1994.

Arthur Gordon Pym

Bloom, Harold. Editor. *The Tales of Poe*. New York; New Haven; Philadelphia: Chelsea House. 1987.

Harvey, Ronald, C. *The Critical History of Edgar Allan Poe's The Narrative of Arthur Gordon Pym: "A Dialogue with Unreason."* New York: Garland P. 1998.

Kennedy, J. Gerald. *The Narrative of Arthur Gordon Pym and the Abyss of Interpretation*. New York: Twayne Publishers. 1994.

Kopley, Richard. Editor. *Poe's Pym: Critical Explorations*. Durham: Duke U P. 1992.

Maio, Samuel. "The Word Lunacy Was Never Employed: A Defense of the Structure of Poe's Narrative of *Arthur Gordon Pym*." *South Dakota Review*. 35. 1 (1997): 54-67.

Pollin, Burton R. Editor. *The Imaginary Voyages: The Narrative of Arthur Gordon Pym; The Unparalleled Adventure of one Hans Pfaal; The Journal of Julius Rodman*." Boston: Twain Publishers. 1981.

Sutherland, Judith L. *The Problematic Fictions of Poe, James, and Hawthorne*. Columbia: U of Missouri P. 1984.

Watkins, G. K. *God and Circumstances: A Lineal Study of Intent in Edgar Allan Poe's The Narrative of Arthur Gordon Pym and Mark Twain's The Great Dark*. New York: P. Lang. 1982.

Voice in Technical Writing:

Additionally, the books listed below were used to research elements of craft, including an especially sharp focus upon voice, within technical writing:

Alley, Michael. *The Craft of Scientific Writing*. Third edition. New York: Springer. 1996.

Bly, Robert W. and Gary Blake. *Technical Writing: Structure, Standards, and Style*. New York: McGraw-Hill. 1982.

—. *The Elements of Technical Writing*. New York: Macmillan Publishing ; Toronto: Maxwell Macmillan Canada; New York: Maxwell Macmillan International. 1993.

Dear, Peter Robert, Ed. *The Literary Structure of Scientific Argument: Historical Studies*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P. 1991.

Ehrlich, Eugene and Murphy, Daniel. *The Art of Technical Writing: A Manual for Scientists, Engineers, and Students*. New York: Crowell. 1964.

Reep, Diana C. *Principles, Strategies, and Readings*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon. 1994.

Rubens, Philip. *Science and Technical Writing: A Manual of Style*. New York: H. Holt. 1992.

Sides, Charles H. *How to Write & Present Technical Information*. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx P. 1999.

Spilka, Rachel, Ed. *Writing in the Workplace: New Research Perspectives*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois U P. 1993.

Young, Matt. *The Technical Writer's Handbook: Writing with Style and Clarity*. Mill Valley, CA: University Science Books. 1989.

Voice in Literary Writing:

For information concerning writing and voice in literary writing, the following texts were consulted:

Alvarez, Joseph A. *The Elements of Technical Writing*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich. 1980.

Elbow, Peter, Ed. *Landmark Essays on Voice and Writing*. Davis, CA: Hermagoras P. 1994.

Hays, Robert William. *Principles of Technical Writing*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley. 1965.

Jordan, Stello, Ed., Assoc. Eds. Joseph M. Kleinman and Lee Shimberg. *Handbook of Technical Writing Practices*. New York: Wiley-Interscience. 1971.

Maio, Samuel. *Creating Another Self*. Kirksville, MO: Thomas Jefferson University P, 1995

Neel, Jasper P. *Rhetoric, Theory, and Writing in America*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University P. 1994.

Moffett, James. *Active Voice: A Writing Program Across the Curriculum*, 2nd Ed.. Upper Montclaire, NJ: Boyton/Cook Publishers. 1992.

Authoritative Voice:

Research concerning the authoritative voice was conducted using the following texts:

Anthes, Roberta Jean. "Nathaniel Hawthorne's Narrative Authority." *Dissertation Abstracts International (DAI)*. Ann Arbor, MI. 43, 10 (1983, Apr) 3317A, Pt. A, 0419-4209; Pt. B, 0419-4217; Pt. C, 1042-7279.

Denver, Carl. "The Voice of Authority." *Denver Quarterly.* Denver, CO. 23, 3-4, (1989), Winter-Spring): 137-56.

Elrod, Eileen Razzari. "'Mouth Put in the Dust': Personal Authority and Biblical Resonance in Anne Bradstreet's Poems." *Studies in Puritan American Spirituality.* 5 (1995): 35-62.

Fabricant, Carole. "History, Narrative, and Swift's Project to 'Mend the World.'" *Jonathan Swift's Gulliver's Travels: Complete, Authoritative Text with Bibliographical and Historical Contexts, Critical History and Essays from Five Contemporary Critical Perspectives,* Christopher Fox and Ross C. Murfin, Eds.. Bedford, Boston. x (1995): 348-65.

Fisher, Leona Mae Weaver. "The Authoritative Voice: Carlyle and Newman." *Dissertation Abstracts International (DAI).* Ann Arbor, MI. 36, (1976) 5314A-15A, Pt. A, 0419-4209; Pt. B, 0419-4217.

Gilmore, Susan. "'Poses of Sophistry': Impersonation and Authority in Millay's 'Conversation at Midnight.'" *Millay at 100: A Critical Reappraisal.* Diane P. Feedman, Ed. Carbondale: Southern Illinois U P. xviii, (1995): 182-97.

Lane, Jeremy. "His Master's Voice? The Questioning of Authority in Literature." *The Modern English Novel: the Reader, the Write, and the Work.* New York: Josipovici, Gabriel, Barnes & Noble. 1976: 113-29.

Maganaro, Marc. *Myth, Rhetoric, and the Voice of Authority: A Critique of Frazer, Eliot, Frye, and Campbell.* New Haven: Yale University P. 1992.

Montgomery, Maxine Lavon. "Authority, Multivocality, and the New World Order in Gloria Naylor Bailey's Cafe." *African American Review.* Terra Haute, IN. 29, 1 (1995): 27-33.

Neal, Honora Maureen. "Academic Register: The Voice of Authority." *Dissertation Abstracts International (DAI).* Ann Arbor, MI. 55, 10 (1995, Apr) 3174A, Pt. A, 0419-4209; Pt. B, 0419-4217.

171

Nowak, William Joseph. "Disillusioning Authority: Mateo Aleman's Representations of the Writer (Volumes I and II)." *Dissertation Abstracts International (DAI)*. Ann Arbor, MI. 54, 5 (1993, Nov) 1823A, Pt. A, 0419-4209; Pt. B, 0419-4217; Pt. C 1042-7279.

Ramanan, Mohan G. 'The Voice of Authority': A Theme in Contemporary English Poetry." *Critical Survey*. Oxford, England. 5, 1, (1993): 34-44.

Rhetoric:

Finally, the following texts were used to help in this examination's' author's understanding of the subject of rhetoric:

Bender, John and Wellberry, David E, Eds. *The Ends of Rhetoric: History, Theory, Practice*. Stanford, CA: Stanford U P. 1990.

Benson, Thomas W., Ed. *American Rhetoric: Context and Criticism*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University P. 1989.

—. *Rhetoric and Political Culture in Nineteenth-Century America*. East Lansing: Michigan State U P. 1997.

Brody, Miriam. *Manly Writing: Gender, Rhetoric, and the Rise of Composition*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University P. 1993.

Cain, William E. Ed. *Reconceptualizing American Literary/Cultural Studies: Rhetoric, History, and Politics in the Humanities*. New York: Garland Publishers. 1996.

Hill, Knox C. *Interpreting Literature; History, Drama and Fiction, Philosophy, Rhetoric*. Chicago: U of Chicago P. 1966.

Johnson, Nan. *Nineteenth Century Rhetoric in North America*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois U P. 1991.

Jost, Walter and Hyde, Michael J. *Rhetoric and Hermeneutics in Our Time: A Reader.* New Haven, CT: Yale U P. 1997.

Kennedy, George Alexander. *A New History of Classical Rhetoric.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton U P. 1994.

Murphy, James Jerome, Ed.. *A Synoptic History of Classical Rhetoric.* New York: Random House. 1972.

Poulakos, Takos. *Rethinking the History of Rhetoric: Multidisciplinary Essays on the Rhetorical Tradition.* Boulder, CO: Westview P. 1993.

Weber, Donald. *Rhetoric and History in Revolutionary New England.* New York: Oxford U P. 1988.

Appendix A

The following table is from the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey, as given in

Elements of Cartography by Arthur H. Robinson:

Lat.	Meters	Statute miles	Lat.	Meters	Statute miles	Lat.	Meters	Statute miles
° ′			° ′			° ′		
0 00	111 321	69.172	30 00	96 488	59.956	60 00	55 802	34.674
1 00	111 304	69.162	31 00	95 506	59.345	61 00	54 110	33.623
2 00	111 253	69.130	32 00	94 495	58.716	62 00	52 400	32.560
3 00	111 169	69.078	33 00	93 455	58.071	63 00	50 675	31.488
4 00	111 051	69.005	34 00	92 387	57.407	64 00	48 934	30.406
5 00	110 900	68.911	35 00	91 290	56.725	65 00	47 177	29.315
6 00	110 715	68.795	36 00	90 166	56.027	66 00	45 407	28.215
7 00	110 497	68.660	37 00	89 014	55.311	67 00	43 622	27.106
8 00	110 245	68.504	38 00	87 835	54.579	68 00	41 823	25.988
9 00	109 959	68.326	39 00	86 629	53.829	69 00	40 012	24.862
10 00	109 641	68.129	40 00	85 396	53.063	70 00	38 188	23.729
11 00	109 289	67.910	41 00	84 137	52.281	71 00	36 353	22.589
12 00	108 904	67.670	42 00	82 853	51.483	72 00	34 506	21.441
13 00	108 486	67.410	43 00	81 543	50.669	73 00	32 648	20.287
14 00	108 036	67.131	44 00	80 208	49.840	74 00	30 781	19.127
15 00	107 553	66.830	45 00	78 849	48.995	75 00	28 903	17.960
16 00	107 036	66.510	46 00	77 466	48.136	76 00	27 017	16.788
17 00	106 487	66.169	47 00	76 058	47.261	77 00	25 123	15.611
18 00	105 906	65.808	48 00	74 628	46.372	78 00	23 220	14.428
19 00	105 294	65.427	49 00	73 174	45.469	79 00	21 311	13.242
20 00	104 649	65.026	50 00	71 698	44.552	80 00	19 394	12.051
21 00	103 972	64.606	51 00	70 200	43.621	81 00	17 472	10.857
22 00	103 264	64.166	52 00	68 680	42.676	82 00	15 545	9.059
23 00	102 524	63.706	53 00	67 140	41.719	83 00	13 612	8.458
24 00	101 754	63.228	54 00	65 578	40.749	84 00	11 675	7.255
25 00	100 952	62.729	55 00	63 996	39.766	85 00	9 735	6.049
26 00	100 119	62.212	56 00	62 395	38.771	86 00	7 792	4.842
27 00	99 257	61.676	57 00	60 774	37.764	87 00	5 846	3.632
28 00	98 364	61.122	58 00	59 135	36.745	88 00	3 898	2.422
29 00	97 441	60.548	59 00	57 478	35.716	89 00	1 949	1.211
						90 00	0	0

TABLE 2: LENGTHS OF DEGREES OF THE PARALLEL

Each of the distances indicated is for each meridian degree of latitude, either north or south of the equator, within the indicated longitudinal parallel. The differences are due to the meridians following the surface curvature of the Earth's surface. For example, one degree of longitude at the equator is 69.172 statute miles compared to 2.051 statue miles at the eighty-ninth parallel (one degree from the polar ninety degrees).