THE FUNCTIONS OF ISHMAEL AND QUEEQUEG IN *MOBY-DICK*

Kenji Ueda

ISHMAEL AND QUEEQUEG

As one of the most important aspects of the total structure of *Moby-Dick*, it is often pointed out that Melville projected one phase of himself into the narrator Ishmael, and then another phase into Ahab. This is true as such. By "as such" I mean that it depends upon each reader's viewpoint what phase of the writer Ishmael and Ahab represent respectively. I would like to discuss what Ishmael and Queequeg mean in the novel with special emphasis on the co-relationship between the two characters.

Before entering the main discussion, I would like to say that this voluminous novel can be devided into three major parts in terms of its plot and its general theme. The first parts begins with "Call me Ishmael," the very first sentence of *Moby-Dick*, and ends with Chapter 25 ("Postscript"). The second part consists of the next 110 chapters, beginning with the introduction of the Pequod's "knights and squires" and ends with the end of Captain Ahab's life. And the third part is the"Epilogue" or the very last page of the novel. The epilogue has some special meanings to me, and I cannot help but consider it 'a part'.

(The reasons for this I am going to explain later.) What I want to emphasize concerning those three parts is that each of the three is equally important and has its own meaning as to the general theme of the work.

Comparing the first part with the other parts, we can easily notice that the first part is so deeply concerned with Ishmael and Queequeg and their relationship that it is impossible to discuss the general theme without taking a close look at this part.

One of the best ways to consider "Ishmael and Queequeg" in the first part, I believe, is to analyze their relationship from the following two angles: (1) Ishmael expresses his view of Western civilization and religion as his response to Queequeg. (2) Ishmael and Queequeg's "bosom friendship".

(1) In the "Spouter Inn" Ishmael had no other choice but to share a bed with a harpooner because of the bitter cold and his lack of money. To his great surprise, the harpooner was a cannibal. This accidental encounter of the white youth called Ishmael and the cannibal pagan harpooner called Queequeg is the beginning of the story. In this sense, Moby-Dick resembles Typee, Melville's very first work. As the result of his escape from the Dolly, Tom, the hero of the novel, was destined to live with a cannibal tribe named "Typee". Comparing the Ishmael case with that of Tom, we can easily notice one great difference

between the two.

Unlike the young deserter from a whaler, Ishmael not only accepts the hospitality of the cannibal but tries hard to say to both himself and the other civilized men that Queequeg is a "human being just as I (: Ishmael) am." It is very interesting to see the fact that this tendency of Ishmael is so strong throughout the first part concerned. Here let us have a closer look at those words ventured by Ishmael which expresses his view of Queequeg.

At the end of the "Spouter Inn" chapter, he said to himself, reflecting how he behaved to the cannibal roommate:

> What's all this fuss I have been making about, ... the man's a human being just as I am: he has just as much reason to fear me, as I have to be afraid of him. Better sleep with a sober cannibal than a drunken Christian.1)

These words were meant seriously. 'How seriously' the reader can understand by listening to Ishmael, the narrator, tell us in the very last part of the chapter: "I turned in, and never slept better in my life."[2)]

Moved deeply by Queequeg's treatment of him with "so much civility and consideration" in spite of his "great rudeness," Ishmael paid a particular compliment to his cannibal roommate: "Queequeg, under the circumstances, this is a very civilized overture," adding with a sense of generalization: "these savages have an innate sense of delicacy, say what you will: it

is marvelous how essentially polite they are." [3]

The narrator's description of what Queequeg is and what the cannibal means to him continues after his return from the sermon. He saw in the cannibal's unearthly tattoos "a simple honest heart" and in his eyes "a spirit that would dare a thousand devils." As for his head, it reminded Ishmael of that of General Washington, making him conclude that Queequeg was "George Washington cannibalistically developed." With strange feelings in him of which he began to be sensible, he found that "his splintered heart and maddened hand were no more turned against the wolfish world." It was Queequeg, the "soothing savage," that had redeemed it. To Ishmael, the indifferent way in which Queequeg sat meant "a nature in which there lurked no civilized hypocrisies and bland deceits." Before trying to talk with Queequeg poring over a book Ishmael thought, "I'll try a pagan friend, since Christian Kindness has proved but hullow courtesy." [4]

In those words I quoted from Ishmael we can see his notable view of Western civilization and Christianity as well as the good feelings and impressions that he got from Queequeg. And this view of Ishmael as of civilization and religion is most remarkably and most explicitly explained by Ishmael himself, when he describes why he united with Queequeg in his peculiar idolatrous form of worship:

> I was a good Christian; born and bred in the bosom of the infallible Presbyterian Church. How then could I unite with this wild idolator in worshipping his piece of wood? But what is worship? ... But what is worship?--to do the will of God? that is worship. And what is the will of God?--to do to my fellow man what I would have my fellow man to do to me--that is the will of God.[5)]

This is such an 'easy-to-understand' explanation that it is not necessary at all for me to explain what Ishmael really meant. However, I would like to point out the fact that it is to the contemporary reading public deeply committed to Christianity that the narrator's explanation was made. It is because of the doctrine of Christianity itself that the explanation must have sounded very acceptable, convincing and even excellent to those contemporary readers.

Is Ishmael a pure Christian? The answer is yes and no. By "yes" I mean that Ishmael is a "good Christian" on one hand. And by "no" I mean that he is a believer of another religion in which Christianity is included on the other hand. What is that religion? The religion itself existed in Ishmael's mind, but the name for it did not exist until he answered Captain Bildad's question: "Art thou(Queequeg) at present in communion with any Christian Church? " "Why," Ishmael answered, "he's a member of the first Congregational Church." It was not really the First Congregational Church that existed at that time, but:

> the same ancient Catholic Church to which you(Bildad) and I(Ishmael) and Captain Peleg there, and Queequeg here, and all of us, and every mother's son and soul of us belong; the great and everlasting First Congre-

gation of this whole worshipping world.[6)]

According to Ishmael, "we all belong to that church, and only some of us cherish some crotchets noways touching the grand belief; in that we all join hands."[7)]

It is evident that Ishmael called people like Captain Bildad "some of us" in his explanation of the First Congregational Church. To the "pious," God-fearing captain, Queequeg was a "son of darkness" who "clingest to his Pagan ways."

In the two above-quoted 'declarations of Ishmael', his view of civilization and religion, or his view of the world in a broad sense is quite explicitly mentioned. At the same time, I believe that in the way in which the narrator expresses his peculiar view of civilization and religion we cannot but see 'Melville himself'. In this sense, too, it is of great significance to compare *Moby-Dick* with *Typee*.

While he enjoys his wonderful life among the so-called cannibals in the paradise-like Polynesian island, Tom, the narrator-hero of the novel never forgets that, in a word, no matter how good they are, cannibals are cannibals after all. On one hand, Tom believes in the way of life of the savage in comparison with Western civilization. On the other hand, however, he intentionally tries to believe that he is not safe in this cannibal island for some reasons or other. Just as Ishmael, who criticizes civilization in general in many ways (as we have seen

and we will see), Tom often compares the civilized with the savage in favor of the latter. The following is a good example:

> The term "Savage" is, I conceive, often misapplied, and indeed when I consider the vices, cruelties, and enormities of every kind that spring up in the tainted atmosphere of a feverish civilization, I am inclined to think that so far as the relative wickedness of the parties is concerned, four or five Marquesan Islanders sent to the United States as Missionaries might be quite as useful as an equal number of Americans despatched to the Islands in a similar capacity.[8)]

What is most contradictory about Tom, however, is that he himself misapplies the term "Savage" in his real life; that is, no matter how much in favor he may conceive, speak, or state concerning the "savage" in its 'not-misapplied' sense, he must live with the "savage" in what he calls "misapplied" sense in order to be understood by or to please the contemporary reading public more or less committed to so-called 'civilization'. It is necessary by all means for Tom to escape at the end. And the contradiction between the two aspects of this hero of the novel is so much evidently seen throughout the story as to irritate some of the modern readers. In case of Ishmael, as we have seen, Melville hesitated much less to express himself frankly than in case of Tom.

(2) As the conclusion of my analysis of Ishmael from the first angle, I mentioned that in the narrator's characteristic way of expressing his view of civilization in its broad sense

we cannot but see Melville himself who is not hesitated (or, at least much less hesitated than in case of *Typee*) in expressing himself frankly. This intention of the author is more clearly seen in the narrator-hero's friendship with his cannibal friend, Queequeg.

Ishmael's friendship with Queequeg was quite casually built up in the "Spouter Inn" when he shared the bed and never slept better in his life, and promoted in their bed. This relation between the Ishmael-Queequeg friendship and a bed is not only interesting but very important. Any careful reader would easily notice the important fact that, as far as this beginning part is concerned, most of the chapters are concerned with their friendship and with this 'bed image'. In addition to this frequency of a bed image as related to the friendship between the two persons, we should pay our attention to how this bed image functions in relation to the narrator's view of the world.

After that noteworthy explanation of why he joined the pagan's idolatrous worship, Ishmael continues his narration as the following:

> ... and that done, we undressed and went to bed, at peace with our own consciences and all the world. ... Thus, then, in our heart's honeymoon, lay I and Queequeg--a cozy, loving pair. 9)

Here we have a kind of double function of a bed image: (1)

the function as something which spiritually 'marries' the two men; (2) the function as something which 'marries' the two aspects of Ishmael's attitude toward what is meant by such words as "pagan," "savage," "cannibal": the mental aspect and the physical aspect.

The same characteristic can be seen in Chapter 12 ("Biographical"). In this chapter, narrating Queequeg's past life, Ishmael criticizes civilization obliquely but harshly. His best friend is introduced as the son of a savage king who escaped his island with a "wild desire to visit Christendom" to make his people still happier and better than they were; who was convinced that "even Christians could be both miserable and wicked; infinitely more so, than all his father's heathens"; who had decided with a sad disillusionment to "die a pagan".

After the story of Queequeg which was later told by the narrator-hero to his audience (: the reader) in such ways as seen above, the Christian hero was "embraced" by the son of a savage king and went into a sound sleep.

As the former two examples adequately show, the tension of the narrator-hero's characteristic view of Christianity or civilization is united with the cozy and loving atmosphere of the newlyweds by the interesting double function of the bed image. At the same time, it might well be said that such union of 'tension' and 'love' is too assorted and made clear an inter-

esting fact for any careful audience of the narrator-hero. That is, the narrator and the hero are not always the same person, or to put it in other words, we cannot but see a circle of the beautiful union pushing up a smaller circle with the same center of the narrator, that is none but Melville. This bigger circle of the narrator-hero, or Ishmael is sometimes superimposed by the smaller circle of another narrator, or Melville. This is true not only in the first and beginning part but in the second part of the novel, as I will explain in the next chapter.

As the conclusion of my analysis of the relationship of Ishmael and Queequeg from those two angles, I would like to point out some other facts that have consequently been made clear: (1) As far as the first part of *Moby-Dick* is concerned, Queequeg functions as a 'mirror' which reflects Ishmael's characteristic views of Western civilization and Christianity. (2) In this sense, Queequeg is much like the "Doubloon" in Chapter 99. Although Ishmael doesn't stand before the Spanish coin as Ahab and some other characters do, he stands before the 'Doubloon of Queequeg' much longer and sees far more things than any of the men who appear in the chapter. (3) And the reader sometimes sees the 'mirror' reflect Melville's face as well as Ishmael's. (4) The nearer Ishmael approaches the 'mirror' of Queequeg, the clearer the superimposed face of

Melville becomes to the reader. (5) The friendship between Ishmael and Queequeg is so close and so striking that the reader cannot help thinking that the 'oneness' named 'bosom-friendship' exists between the two men.

"ISHMAEL-QUEEQUEG" AND "AHAB-MOBY DICK"

So far I have considered what the "Ishmael-Queequeg" relationship means in the first part of the novel where no less pages are devoted to the description and explanation of "Ishmael-Queequeg" than to those of Ahab in the second part. However, we haven't finished considering the question. We are going to face the necessity of considering the same question as one of the crucial aspects of the novel in the next and second part, which begins with the introduction of the Pequod's crew and ends with the death of her captain, Ahab. As I will demonstrate from now on in this section, I am very interested in the possibility of approaching the general theme presented by Melville to us in his work of *Moby-Dick* by shedding much brighter light on the relationship between "Ishmael-Queequeg" and "Ahab-Moby Dick".

With the "Cetology" chapter as the best example, not a few readers of Moby-Dick, I believe, say that this novel is consider-

ably verbose in terms of its style and structure. As far as the style is concerned, I agree to those readers' view. Jacques-Fernand Cahen, for example, says in his book, La *Littérature Americane* that, although he admits some good aspects of Melville's style in *Moby-Dick* such as its marvelous breathing and its long-drawn tones of grandeur and greatness, his style is too complicated, too twisted and too noble. Melville tends to say something like 'grasp one's last' instead of 'die'; 'less shallow' instead of 'deep'; 'scarlet' instead of 'red'.

As for the structure of *Moby-Dick*, however, I cannot agree with the French scholar entirely. He says in the same book that the novel involves too many things and they are not in good order; and that those chapters on natural history, geography and zoology easily discourage the reader from enjoying the further readering. I believe that he is partly true, because, if the reader reads *Moby-Dick* as a 'story of adventure', he necessarily finds too many chapters in the story that are never necessary for him. To put it in other words, such readers like to read the novel as a novel written by Herman Melville as a 'novelist'. There is no harm or wrong in reading the work in such a way. But there are some more aspects of *Moby-Dick*. In addition to the aspects chiefly concerned with 'Melville as a novelist', we can find the aspects which have a great deal to do with 'Melville

as an ex-sailor', an ex-whaler; a cetologist, a natural historian, a geographer; a man who is deeply versed in the Bible and so on. These aspects of Melville other than 'Melville as a novelist' are carefully and skilfully woven into each other to create such a big book.

One of the most important and most easily overlooked aspects of Melville in *Moby-Dick*, however, is that of 'Melville who had lived among the cannibals as the young man and consequently was very conscious of the contrast between civilization and savagery as the former's antithesis. How profoundly he was conscious of that contrast can be easily known by the fact that there have been and are few novels, if at all, in which we can see the words as 'cannibal', 'savage', 'pagan', 'Christian', 'civilized' so often as in *Moby-Dick* and other works by Melville. This aspect of Melville is largely concerned with the relationship between "Ishmael and Queequeg" in the first part of the novel. What about in the second part of the novel?

Before answering the question, let me repeat once more the two aspects of the "Ishmael-Queequeg" relationship which I made clear in the former section: (1) Ishmael expresses his view of civilization in general in the form of responding Queequeg, his cannibal friend in many ways; (2) Ishmael and Queequeg are such good friends that we cannot imagine the image of Ishmael without that of Queequeg and vice versa.

Let us begin with the second aspect.

Surprising enough to those readers to whom this (second) part is merely that of Ahab's monomaniac quest, we can see as much image of "Ishmael and Queequeg" as bosom friends in this part as in the first part of the novel. In the "Mat-Maker" chapter, first of all, we know how Ishmael and Queequeg are 'together' aboard the Pequod:

> I (Ishmael) was the attendant or page of Queequeg, while busy at the mat. As I kept passing and repassing the filling or woof of marline between the long yarns of the warp using my own hand for the shuttle, and as Queequeg, standing sideways, ever and anon slid his heavy oaken sword between the threads, and idly looking off upon the water, carelessly and unthinkingly drove home every yarn;... 10)

While making the mat, they were making "the mat of their friendship"; one as the "warp" and the other as the "woof".

In the very next chapter, Ishmael narrates how he and Queequeg went through hardships 'together' on the sea at the time of their "First Lowing". As a result, this terrible incident made Ishmael need Queequeg more not only in terms of whaling but in legal terms. Having resigned himself to the possibility of death while chasing a whale, Ishmael asked Queequeg to be his lawyer, executer, and legattee. This means that Ishmael "resolved to ship aboard the same vessel, get into the same watch, the same boat, the same mess" with Queequeg even after his death. For Queequeg, who, in the "Bosom Friend"

chapter, said that "henceforth we (Ishmael and Queequeg) were married, ... , he would gladly die for me(Ishmael) ,"[11] it was not necessary to ask Ishmael to be those legal persons. His life had already been Ishmael's and Ishmael's life his in all respects. Legal procedure meant nothing for the savage. They were two men, and 'one' at the same time.

This 'oneness' seen in Ishmael and Queequeg takes a definite shape in the "Monkey-Rope" chapter:

> ... the monkey-rope was fast at both ends; fast to Queequeg's broad canvas belt, and fast to my narrow leather one. So that for better or for worse, we two, for the time, were wedded; and should poor Queequeg sink to rise no more, then both usage and honor demanded, that instead of cutting the cord, it should drag me down in his wake. So, then, an elongated Siamese ligature united us. Queequeg was my own inseparable twin brother; nor could I any way get rid of the dangerous liabilities which the hempen bond entailed.[12]

And when we read the footnote for the monkey-rope, we cannot help seeing that the image of the author himself,too, is taking a definite shape:

> The monkey-rope is found in all whalers; but it was only in the Pequod that the monkey and his holder were ever tied together. This improvement upon the original usage was introduced by no less a man than Stubb, in order to afford to the imperilled harpooner the strongest possible guarantee for the faithfulness and vigilance of his monkey-rope holder.[13]

Now, the careful reader easily notices that this improvement of Stubb "was introduced by no less a man than" Melville, "in order to afford to" the reader "the strongest possible

guarantee for" the reasonableness of his paying close attention to the 'oneness' between Ishmael and Queequeg as the relationship not less important than that between Ahab and Fedallah.

Now that we have made clear, or more accurate to say, have been made clear by Melville, that the "twin" brother relationship between Ishmael and Queequeg has important meanings to make the author himself introduce an improvement upon the original usage of the "monkey-rope" in order to crystallize his view of "Ishmael-Queequeg", I think that we can "account it high time to" compare the "Ishmael-Queequeg" with the other 'oneness' relationship seen in this novel--"Ahab and Fedallah"--for the purpose of making clearer the question in hand.

Just as the monkey-rope symbolizes the 'oneness' between Ishmael and Queequeg, so the shadow of Ahab symbolizes the 'oneness' between "Ahab and Fedallah". Take the very last paragraph of Chapter 73 for example.

> Meantime, Fedallah was calmly eyeing the right whales's head, and ever and anon glancing from the deep wrinkles there to the lines in his own hand. And Ahab chanced so to stand, that the Parsee occupied his shadow; while if the Parsee's shadow was there at all it seemed only to blend with and lengthen Ahab's ... [14]

This emphasizes the fact that the two, Ahab and Fedallah, are 'one', although we are, at the same time, forced to speculate on the question of whether the shadow of Fedallah really exists.

Ishmael and Queequeg are 'one', and Ahab and Fedallah are

also 'one' However, we are soon aware of an essential difference between the two 'onenesses'. While the 'oneness' between Ahab-Fedallah is always connected with 'something dark' throughout the novel, that of Ishmael-Queequeg sounds 'bright'. And this 'bright' impression of Ishmael-Queequeg is, I believe, largely attributable to what Queequeg does and what Ishmael says in the novel.

What did Queequeg do? Queequeg was a harpooner, and the job of a harpooner was to kill whales. Like the other harpooners of the Pequod, he did his best to kill as many whales as possible. At the same time, however, we should not forget that he saved a life. Throughout the novel, he saved three lives. Two were other persons'. First, on his way to Nantucket he saved a man who was swept overboard, the same man who despised him on the ship. "From that hour" Ishmael "clove to Queequeg like a barnacle till Queequeg took his last long dive." Secondly, in the "Cistern and Buckets" chapter, "the deliverance, or rather, delivery of Tashtego, was successfully accomplished," "through the courage and great skill in obstetrics of Queequeg." And thirdly, he saved his own life. He was almost died of sickness. At the last moment, however, he rallied because he said "he had just recalled a little duty ashore, which he was leaving undone; and therefore had changed his mind about dying." According to Queequeg, "mere sickness could not kill a man, if he made up his mind to live."

This 'intentional' recovery of Queequeg deeply impresses on the reader the immunity against 'death' which he has as a savage. Thus, Queequeg, the only man on the Pequod who saves a life three times, cannot but make us regard him as a character with a distinctive 'image of life'.

What did Ishmael say? He said so many things in so many chapters of the book that we cannot summarize all his words in a sentence or two. As far as his concept of 'how human beings should be' is concerned, however, we can summarize his point of view in a word:

> Oh! my dear fellow beings, why should we longer cherish any social acerbities, or know the slightest ill-humor or envy! Come; let us squeeze hands all round; nay, let us all squeeze ourselves into each other; let us squeeze ourselves universally into the very milk and sperm of kindness.[15]

This statement of Ishmael cannot but remind us of the other two statements of his which I quoted in the previous section of this paper: one is the statement in which he explained why he united with Queequeg in his peculiar idolatrous form of worship; and the other is that of "THE FIRST CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH". All these statements, I am confidnet to say, crystallize Ishmael's and Melville's general view of the world--all human beings in this world should "squeeze" themselves "into each other." And, as we have seen, the 'oneness' of Ishmael-Queequeg is nothing but the incarnation of Melville's idea of

'love', 'harmony' and 'peace'

So far I have considered how the second aspect of the "Ishmael-Queequeg" relationship is seen in the second part of Moby-Dick and what it means. It has been made clear that the "bosom-friend" relationship established between Ishmael and Queequeg in the first and preparatory (in terms of the Pequod's adventurous voyage) part of the novel is not only maintained but also strengthened aboard the Pequod; that the "monkey-rope" which ties Ishmael and Queequeg together symbolizes not only the close friendship between the two but also Melville's idea that we should "squeeze ourselves into each other" and "merge our own individuality into a joint stock company of all human beings." As we have seen, the image of Melville as a man who believes in universal 'love' takes a more definite shape in proportion to the promotion of the 'oneness' between Ishmael and Queequeg. Next, let us explore how the first aspect of the "Ishmael-Queequeg" relationship is seen in the relevant part of *Moby-Dick*.

It is often said or suggested that Ishmael as a narrator talks much less about Queequeg after the Pequod has left Nantucket. This is true. Just as the narrator describes many aspects of Queequeg in the first part, so he describes many aspects of a whale and whaling in general in the second part of *Moby-Dick*. It is also true that far more pages and

chapters are devoted to the 'lectures' on a whale and whaling by Cetologist Herman Melville in the second part than to the description of Queequeg in the first part. We can see without difficulty how many chapters of *Moby-Dick* are more or less concerned with those lectures by Melville simply by reading the table of contents. There are so many chapters entitled cetologically that the book looks as if a sort of 'encyclopaedia' on cetology or the whaling industry.

There is no harm or wrong in skipping those chapters to understand 'what is going on aboard the Pequod.' However, there is much harm in skipping such apparently cetological chapters as "Of Whales in Paint in Teeth; in Wood; in Sheet Iron; in Stone; in Mountains; in Stars", "The Whale as a Dish", "The Fountain", "Fast-Fish and Loose-Fish", if we want to really appreciate *Moby-Dick*. Because we can understand Melville much better by reading those chapters which have 'apparently' no connections with the story of the Pequod. Understanding the author better naturally leads the reader to a better understanding of his work. What aspect of Melville can we apprehend more by reading those chapters?

The answer is: we can see in those chapters the same aspect of Melville that has been made clear by considering the relationship between Ishmael and Queequeg, especially the first aspect of their relationship. That is the aspect of Melville as a man

who had lived among the savages and consequently was very conscious of the contrast between civilization and savagery.

Ishmael frankly expresses his views of civilization in general as his response to Queequeg in many ways. In this sense, as I mentioned, Queequeg functions as a 'mirror' or "the Doubloon". The mirror of Queequeg reflects Ishmael's (and Melville's) points of view concerning 'human beings', and 'human world'. In the second part which we are going to examine, Ishmael (and more often Melville himself) expresses his views or opinions of man and man's world more frankly and much more often than in the previous part. Queequeg does not function as a 'mirror' in this part (at least so often as in the previous part). What is interesting, however, is that we might well say that 'a whale' takes the place of Queequeg in the sense that Melville's harsh criticism on civilization and the world dominated by civilization is offered when he describes various aspects of a whale or whaling. In this sense, it can be safely said that the first aspect of "Ishmael-Queequeg" relationship which we dissected in the previous section of this paper continues to exist in the second part of *Moby-Dick*, although it is modified to a large extent in the part concerned.

Now that it has been said that the fisrt aspect of "Ishmael-Queequeg" relationship still exists in the second part of the novel in its modified form, let me explain in detail how the

author himself expresses his views or opinions of 'man' and 'man's world' from his anti-civilizational point of view. However, the aim of this paper is not to list all the statements that Melville made in *Moby-Dick* in this respect. Therefore, I will show some of the best examples in order to make myself clearer.

Chapter 57 is "Of Whales in Paint; in Teeth; in Wood; in Sheet-Iron; in Stone; in Mountains; in Stars." It is very interesting to find the fact that this chapter is also of Melville's definition of 'savagery', one of the key words for the real understanding of *Moby-Dick*:

> Long exile from Christendom and civilization inevitably restores a man to that condition in which God placed him, i.e. what is called savagery. Your true whaler-hunter is as much a savage as an Iroquois. I myself am a savage, owing no allegiance but to the king of the cannibals; and ready at any moment to rebel against him.16)

We remember that Melville mentioned in Typee that the term "savage" was often misapplied. Now we can see what the term "savage" really means when it is not misapplied. Later in the chapter his definition of "savage" is given as the following:

> As with the Hawaiian savage, so with the white sailor savage. With the same marvellous patience, and with the same single shark's tooth, of his one poor jack-knife, he will carve you a bit of bone sculpture, not quite as workmanlike, but as close packed in its magaziness of design, as the Greek savage, Achilles's shield; and full of barbaric spirit and suggestiveness,

as the prints of that fine Dutch savage, Albert Durer.[17]

Another key word which appears very frequently as the antithesis of 'civilized' is 'cannibal'. Who is really 'cannibal'? The answer to this question is given in Chapter 65 ("The Whale As a Dish"):

> Go to the meat-market of a Saturday night and see the crowds of live bepeds staring up at the long rows of dead quadrupeds. Does not that sight take a tooth out of the cannibal's jaw ? Cannibals? who is not a cannibal? I tell you it will be more tolerate for the Fejee that salted down a lean missionary in his cellar against a comming famine; it will be more tolerable for that provident Fejee. I say, in the day of judgment, than for thee, civilized and enlightened gourmand, who nailest geese to the ground and feastest on their bloated livers in thy paté-de-foie-gras.[18]

These "Et tu Brute" aspects of 'man' are symbolically emphasized in the process of "cutting whales" in the Pequod, which have now "turned into what seemed a shamble" with every sailor as a "butcher". These sailor butchers, especially the harpooners like Queequeg are to work on the whale in the smell of its blood. It is a "bloody" job. However, it is not those "butchers" but the sharks and the sea-vultures around and above the dead whale that are depicted as the symbol of the "bloody" aspects of man and his world. It might be safely said that these "shark" and "sea-vulture" images function as the symbol of "horrible vultureism of earth" throughout *Moby-Dick*. When Queequeg cries as the following in "The

Shark Massacre" chapter, the reader cannot help seeing more universal meanings in the words:

> Queequeg no care what god made him shark, wedder Fejee god or Nantucket god; but de god wat made shark must be one dam Ingin.[19]

Emphasizing the "bloodiness" of sharks in many parts of his description of such an anatomical work on the Pequod, Melville cannot help entering his peculiar discussion about the civilized part of the world. Chapter 89 begins, as its title indicates, with the explanation of "Fast-Fish" and "Loose-Fish". As he goes on with the explanation, however, Melville begins to mean something far more universal by the two whaling terms. This pattern of expressing his opinions of the various aspects of man's life and world in parallel with the explanation of the various aspects of a whale or the whaling industry is too often and too intentionally repeated throughout the second part of the novel, especially before Chapter 99 ("The Doubloon"). In this sense, I think, Melville cannot be called a very good writer. However, we can also say that we can know him better all the more because the pattern is too often and too intentionally repeated.

After generalizing that "these two laws touching Fast-Fish and Loose-Fish will on reflection be found the fundamentals of all human jurisprudance," Melville expresses his views of civilization in the following way:

> What to that redoubted harpooneer, John Bull, is poor Ireland, but a Fast-Fish? What to that apostoric lancer, Brother Jonathan, is Texas but a Fast-Fish? ... What was America in 1492 but a Loose-Fish, in which Columbus struck the Spanish standard by way of waifing it for his royal master and mistress? What was Poland to the Czar? What Greece to the Turk? What India to England? What at last will Mexico be to the United States? All Loose Fish.[20]

What on earth does Melville want to say? It seems to me that all these critical views of Melville against the "bloody" aspects of civilization in general have indirectly and symbolically summarized in the following four capitalized letters in the very first chapter of *Moby-Dick* by Melville: "BLOODY BATTLE IN AFFGHANISTAN" [21]

"ISHMAEL-QUEEQUEG" AND THE "EPILOGUE"

"The drama's done." This is the first sentence of the first paragraph of the "EPILOGUE". However, the novel isn't done yet. Ishmael "ONLY [IS] ESCAPED ALONE TO TELL" us. Tell us what? That is the question.

When I read *Moby-Dick* more than several times, I could not help feeling a sense of discovery and excitement in opening up the unknown as to the epilogue. Until then I had been one of those readers to whom this epilogue sounded very mysterious as well as epilogue-like. Just as the manner of Ishmael's escape

with Queequeg's coffin is striking, so the manner of Melville's finishing the novel is surprising to me. How clearly and cunningly the two facts that Ishmael tells in this eplilogue correspond to the two aspects that the "Ishmael-Queequeg" relationship has!

At first glance, this twenty-eight-line epilogue of *Moby-Dick* may seem to be a mere device for explaining how it happened that Ishmael survived to tell the story and nothing more. The more I read, however, the more I was interested in the possibility of the co-relation between the eplilogue and the rest of the book. And, when I found new meanings in the following sentence, I felt as if I had grasped the "ungraspable phantom":

> The unharming sharks, they glided by as if with padlocks on their mouths; the savage sea-hawks sailed with sheathed beaks. [22]

The more I read, the more I became familiar with the startling contrast between the "shark" and "sea-bird" images in the previous parts of *Moby-Dick* and those in this epilogue. As we have seen in the second section of this paper, "sharks" and "sea-birds" very characteristically symbolize the "bloodiness" of the world in many parts of the book. Especially in the "Chase" chapters "sharks" accompany Ahab engaging in the "bloody" war with Moby Dick:

> And still as Ahab glided over the waves the unpitying sharks accompanied him; and so pertinaciously stuck to the boat; and so continually bit at the plying

Ishmael was "tossed out of" Ahab's boat together with Ahab. But Ishmael "did survive the wreck." When he was near "that vital centre, the black bubble upward burst; and now, liberated by reason of its cunning spring, and owing to its great buoyancy, rising with great force, the coffin life-buoy shot lengthwise from the sea, fell over, and floated by" his side. What we see here is nothing but the ultimate 'goal' of the "oneness" between Ishmael and Queequeg.

Queequeg saved Ishmael from 'death' by his coffin. As Ahab himself said, Queequeg's coffin turned out to be an "immortality-preserver"!

Now, Ishmael is on Queequeg's coffin in a new world of 'peace', 'love' and 'harmony'.

> oars, that the blades became jagged and crunched, and left small splinters in the sea, at almost every dip. 23)

This is only one of the good examples. We can see such "shark" images throughout the novel.

Comparing those "bloody" sharks and sea-birds with "the unharming sharks with padlocks" and "the savage sea-hawks with sheathed beaks," we can see a complete contrast between the two kinds of images. Just as the "bloody" sharks in the previous chapters symbolize the "bloody" sea and the "bloody" world, so the "sharks with padlocks" and the "sea-hawks with sheathed beaks" in this epilogue symbolize the 'peaceful' sea and the 'peaceful' world--the world formed in love and harmony.

After the Pequod sank to the dark bottom of the sea with all its crew except Ishmael, "great shroud of the sea rolled on as it rolled five thousand years ago." The sea never changes, no matter what man does on it. The sea which floats Ishmael and Queequeg's coffin, however, was changed with "the unharming sharks" and "the sea-hawks" sailing "with sheathed beaks." This is a different world. It was a new world with no battles, no wars, nothing militant. It was a new world formed in 'love' and 'harmony' with people who "squeeze themselves into each other." It was a new world which welcomes the men like Ishmael.

NOTES

1 Herman Melville, *Moby-Dick*, Laurel, New york, p. 51
2 Ibid., p.51
3 Ibid., p.54
4 Ibid., p.78
5 Ibid., pp.79-80
6 Ibid., p.117
7 Ibid., p.117
8 Herman Melville, *Typee*, Northwestern University, Evanston, 1968, pp.125-126
9 *Moby-Dick*, p.80
10 Ibid., p.245
11 Ibid., p.79
12 Ibid., p.354
13 Ibid., pp. 354-355
14 Ibid., p.363
15 Ibid., p.453
16 Ibid., p.305
17 Ibid., pp.305-306
18 Ibid., p.335
19 Ibid., p.337
20 Ibid., p.434
21 Ibid., p.31
22 Ibid., p.608
23 Ibid., p.603