

Spring 2021

Creation's Face in *Moby-Dick*

Richard Jackson Guignard Wells

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd>



Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Wells, R. J.(2021). *Creation's Face in Moby-Dick*. (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd/6226>

This Open Access Thesis is brought to you by Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact dillarda@mailbox.sc.edu.

CREATION'S FACE IN *MOBY-DICK*

by

Richard Jackson Guignard Wells

Bachelor of Arts,
University of South Carolina, 2019

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of Master of Arts in

English

College of Arts and Sciences

University of South Carolina

2021

Accepted by:

David Greven, Director of Thesis

Jie Guo, Reader

Tracey L. Weldon, Interim Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

© Copyright by Richard Jackson Guignard Wells, 2021
All Rights Reserved.

DEDICATION

To Dr. David Greven & Dr. Jie Guo

ABSTRACT

In 1973, Gerhard T. Alexis published “Two Footnotes on a Faceless Whale” (AN&Q, vol. 11, pp. 99-100) to point out how Melville was alluding to an exchange between Yahweh and Moses in Exodus 33 during a commentary by Ishmael in Chapter 86 “The Tail” of *Moby-Dick* (1851). By using Ishmael’s allusion to the facelessness of Yahweh in relation to his hand in Exodus 33 as a window, I meditate on the relationship between the hand and face images more properly to propose how they are functioning in Melville’s epic in regard to the phenomenon of veiling. The corporeal body in both the Old Testament of the King James Bible and *Moby-Dick* (i.e. the face, hand, arm, leg, etc.) are powerful drivers for plot, expression, and aestheticization and, thus, are images that can be honed in on for performing meaningful readings. I build on this framework by arguing that the outwardly masculine plot in *Moby-Dick* can be read as a narrative grappling with the Old Testament’s representation of the archetypal Son’s creation in Genesis as distinctly Motherless under the trinitarian schema of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. I argue that Melville’s controversial character, Ahab, is a direct descendant of Adam still grappling with his origin story, and I use Melville’s comparisons of them to make my case. Lastly, I connect Michelangelo’s painting, the *Creation of Adam*, with Ahab’s speech to his “fiery father” in Chapter 119 “The Candles” to apply my meditation on the hand and face images in the context of the trinity to argue that Adam and Ahab are

both reaching past their Father through the Ghost of their creation for the face of their captured Mother.

Keywords: hand, face, trinity, Creation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Dedication.....	iii
Abstract.....	iv
Chapter 1: Creation's Face in <i>Moby-Dick</i>	1
Bibliography.....	37

CHAPTER 1

CREATION'S FACE IN *MOBY-DICK*

This paper approaches *Moby-Dick* (1851) from the viewpoint of comparative mythology. It understands Herman Melville's (b. 1819-1891) prose-epic to be an effort to create an American mythos following in the Western tradition of mythopoeia (Greek μυθοποιία), or mythmaking. It sees the narrative of a problematic son with devastating origins becoming the king of a great nation as the germ of both the narrative of the Egyptian-born Ishmael in the Book of Genesis and the American-born Ishmael in *Moby-Dick*.¹ A dialectic between Melville developing an American mythos and his reading of the Old Testament of the King James Bible plays out not only in the Ishmael narrative, but in the wisdom literature of Job and the story of Jonah too. However, my intertextual focus in this paper is the Second Book of Moses: the Book of Exodus, a book that has received less attention as an intertextual well for Melville's epic, but one I hope to make a compelling case for future study.

I will begin by giving special attention to an allusion Melville makes at the end of Chapter 86 "The Tail" to a passage from the Book of Exodus. I will be most interested in weighing this passage's portrayal of the hand and face images in regard to the phenomenon of veiling. From here, I will transition into discussing Melville's ontotheology and its manifestation in the sculpting of *Moby-Dick*. I will make the case

that Melville has a compulsion for dissatisfactory trinitarian thinking stemming from his deep reading of the King James Bible and that it undergirds *Moby-Dick* as a metaphysical skeleton—structuring relationships on both a literal and an abstract level in the text. To streamline my case, Michelangelo’s the *Creation of Adam* (c. 1508-1512) will be invoked to illustrate how the novel is grappling with Genesis’ representation of trinitarian Creation—Father, Son, and Holy Ghost—as, uniquely, an outwardly Motherless act. At this point, my meditation on the hand and face images will become critically important because of the structural gravity hands and faces pose in Michelangelo’s representation of the inception of the archetypal Son. I argue, contrary to popular belief, that Adam is not reaching out his hand to touch the finger of God the Father but, instead, to unveil the hidden face of his Mother through the Ghost of his Father’s falsely constructed reality; and I believe Melville’s seafaring epic can be distilled into a similar dramatic action.

But, instead of Adam, Melville births a new archetypal Son—Ahab—who I argue is a direct descendent of Adam descendentially cursed with reaching out *his* hand for the hidden face of his Mother beyond his Father’s falsely constructed reality. To make this point, I will focus on Ahab’s speech in Chapter 119 “The Candles” to the burning theophany whom he identifies as his “fiery father”² and interpret it as a lamentation on his cursed state of *reaching*. For my reading, the question driving Ahab’s monomania and, by extension, his ship of disillusioned sons is, Why is the Mother’s face in Michelangelo’s flying cloud of Creation hidden from Her Son, Adam, reaching his hand out for Her, by God the Father? When Melville writes of Ahab that, “He piled upon the whale’s white hump the sum of all the general rage and hate felt by his whole race from

Adam down,”³ he is referring to, for my reading, Adam and Ahab’s existential despair at being archetypal Sons of Genesis living with the burden of staring into the face of a Motherless Creation. The keywords for my paper are: hand, face, trinity, and Creation.

To begin, though, I must properly meditate on the image of the *face* and how Melville is re-reading the face-image from the Old Testament of the King James Bible into his prose epic. To do so, I will be giving my focus to its use in the Book of Exodus. This will be critical for my reading of the theme of mothering being the dominant force propelling Melville’s outwardly masculine narrative forward. Unpacking the face-image is paramount because it is simultaneously an image of fear and creation, and my reading of *Moby-Dick* is, ultimately, a reading of Creation. The mutually inclusive phenomena of fear and creation are vital to understanding Melville’s prose-epic following a narrative arc of *coming into being*. Ishmael begins his journey walking in the valley of the shadow of death and ends it spinning in a magnificent vortex in the middle of the ocean after the Pequod has drowned, falling headlong like Milton’s Satan, into the Abyss.⁴ Thus, the narrative arc is less like the traditional rainbow of beginning-middle-end and, instead, much more like the motion of the novel’s concluding vortex-image: an endlessly spinning life-cycle of death and re-birth. Sabina Spielrein’s essay “Destruction as the Cause of Coming Into Being” (1912) is the title of a seminal, and wonderful, psychoanalytic essay, but I want to propose it as a borrowed thesis for my reading of *Moby-Dick*. The Old Testament analog for all of this, and one that Melville deftly weaves into his masterpiece, is what Job pronounces after he has lost everything, and like everything Job says, there is

timeless wisdom in it: “Naked came I out of my mother's womb, and naked shall I return thither” (1:21).⁵

I will start by addressing an oft quoted passage from *Moby-Dick* regarding the theme of a faceless face that overshadows the hunt for the White Whale. It is delivered by Ishmael, the odyssey’s quasi-narrator, and, although I have focused on equating Ahab with Adam and archetypal Son-hood in setting up my argument, it is important to note that what I say of Ahab in regard to his undergoing the birth-pangs of mothering can also be said of Ishmael, whose status as an orphan can likewise be translated to his being another type of archetypal Son without a named Mother. “Call me Ishmael” is an opening line that rings in history, but it is, uniquely, a line that is an act of self-naming—a line that suggests the son’s origin—i.e. his mother’s identity—is confused and missing.⁶ With that said, let us look at what Ishmael says regarding a faceless face at the end of Chapter 86 “The Tail”:

But if I know not even the tail of this whale, how understand his head?
much more, how comprehend his face, when face he has none? Thou shalt
see my back parts, my tail, he seems to say, but my face shall not be seen.
But I cannot completely make out his back parts; and hint what he will
about his face, I say again he has no face.⁷

This chapter, and the cetology sections more broadly speaking, deal with the twofold problem that the Eastern parable of the Blind Men and an Elephant deals with: the

problem of beholding *and* understanding the nature of an entity towering over human proportions. In the Eastern parable, the blind men can each feel a part of the elephant, i.e. the trunk, the leg, the ear, and so forth, but never the whole, and thus, each man is left incorrectly guessing as to its totality.⁸ The enormity of the sperm whale and the sailors' metaphorically blindfolded quest to behold and understand *its* totality is so dauntingly gigantic that analyzing its individual parts emerges as an ever-present interest of Melville's cetology chapters, with Chapter 86 "The Tail" being one such component.

In regard to the poetic diction of Ishmael's pointed and provocative question concerning the opposing ends of the whale's face and tail, Gerhard T. Alexis has made the connection in "Two Footnotes on a Faceless Whale" (1973) that Melville is re-reading part of an exchange from Exodus 33 between Yahweh and Moses concerning Moses *seeing* Yahweh's face and back parts; and I want to elaborate beyond just footnotes, so let us begin. Here are the principal verses of Exodus 33 regarding Yahweh's face and back parts:

20 And he said, Thou canst not see my face: for there shall no man see me, and live.

21 And the LORD said, Behold, there is a place by me, and thou shalt stand upon a rock:

22 And it shall come to pass, while my glory passeth by, that I will put thee in a clift of the rock, and will cover thee with my hand while I pass by:

23 And I will take away mine hand, and thou shalt see my back parts: but my face shall not be seen.⁹

The language of the “back parts” in Ishmael’s answer to his own question at the end of Chapter 86 and the “back parts” of Verse 23 here in Exodus certainly cements a connection and, most interestingly, identifies the White Whale with the Yahweh of the Old Testament. But there is a consequential difference between what the two have to say about the face of god: unlike the Yahweh of Exodus, who says, “Thou canst not see my face: for there shall no man see me, and live,” Ishmael directly responds by declaring, “hint what he will about his face, I say again he has no face.” Ishmael’s boldness in saying with such conviction that Yahweh’s masked face is a masquerade is of a vindictive soul who has lost all faith in religious speculation. The face is Truth, and if Yahweh has no face, there is no Truth; meaning, the Holy Tongue has been lying to its people for millennia—a crime that Melville, himself a devoted reader of the Holy Tongue, would not have taken lightly.

Ishmael’s vindictive response to Yahweh’s instruction to Moses is one of the many powerful signs of the agon playing out between Melville and his epic’s most significant precursor text in the Old Testament of the King James Bible. And it makes perfect sense that the White Whale’s remarkable personality as a literary character can only find parallel in the Yahweh of the Old Testament. They are both equally magnificent in stature: both murderous, irrational, intelligent, humorous, and characterized anthropomorphically *and* godly—Ishmael’s questioning over the whale’s face being one

such example. The White Whale's reaping away of Ahab's leg "as a mower a blade of grass in the field"¹⁰ is the casual murderousness of only someone as grand as Yahweh who can send an Angel of Death over Egypt on the Passover to slaughter every firstborn son and not feel a grain of guilt. Incidentally enough, Melville happens to include this character when Ishmael sees a "black Angel of Doom" after tumbling into a church at the outset of his journey.¹¹

All this is to say that Melville is battling the Old Testament's Yahweh through his White Whale and that Ishmael's undermining of Yahweh's direction to Moses by saying his face is nothing more than a clever charade—firmly declaring twice that "he has no face"—is the assassin taking their decided shot at the king. It is an attempt to one-up the primary source text; to speak face-to-face with it as if Melville and Yahweh are standing eye-to-eye on equal ground and Melville has opened his eyes and discovered Yahweh's hand to be nothing more than a paper-tiger. It is a response with nihilistic overtones that appropriately consorts with the novel's philosophical strain of blankness. Melville's faith in Yahweh's face is lacking; the hint of his face being there is a religious mystification to cover the facelessness of existence's actuality—a void without meaning. The face is the image of emotion, visceral knowledge, and recognition. If the face disappeared, humans would be spiritually anarchic and, thus, living lives of Chaos—the antithesis to Genesis and Creation. If the hint of Yahweh's face is a lie, the mask of Western Christendom's faith would dissipate and Melville's fruitless hunt for the White Whale would be vindicated.

Yet, another interesting feature of these verses from Exodus, and one that finds its way into Melville's re-reading, i.e. re-expression, of the King James Bible's aesthetics of the human body, which are sublime and profound to the highest degree, is the coordinated presence of the face and the hand. This is an essential thread to draw and to weigh for my connecting the hand with Creation because *touch*—done with the hand—is synonymous with the act of Creation. This is no better represented than in Michelangelo's *Creation of Adam* where the impending touch of Adam and the Father's reaching hands is, compositionally, the fount of Creation; and I will dig into this on the final stretch of my essay. In Yahweh's address to Moses in Exodus 33 that we just looked at, he tells him that his hand *is* itself the veil for his face: "I will put thee in a clift of the rock, and will cover thee with my hand while I pass by: And I will take away mine hand, and thou shalt see my back parts: but my face shall not be seen" (22-23). Discussing exactly what is going on here regarding the face and hand—my most immediate interest—will be assisted by another instance of veiling from Exodus, namely the Shining Face of Moses sequence from Chapter 34, Verses 29-35. This is an incredibly powerful moment of literature and worth reading in full:

29 Now it was so, when Moses came down from mount Sinai with the two tables of testimony in Moses' hand, when he came down from the mount, that Moses wist not that the skin of his face shone while he talked with him.

30 So when Aaron and all the children of Israel saw Moses, behold, the skin of his face shone, and they were afraid to come nigh him.

31 And Moses called unto them; and Aaron and all the rulers of the congregation returned unto him: and Moses talked with them.

32 And afterward all the children of Israel came nigh: and he gave them in commandment all that the LORD had spoken with him in mount Sinai.

33 And *till* Moses had done speaking with them, he put a vail on his face.

34 But when Moses went in before the LORD to speak with him, he took the vail off, until he came out. And he came out, and spake unto the children of Israel *that* which he was commanded.

35 And the children of Israel saw the face of Moses, that the skin of Moses' face shone: and Moses would put the vail on his face again, until he went in to speak with him.¹²

Moses going in and out to speak with Yahweh and the children of Israel underscores the meeting of god and his foremost prophet as a meeting of two faces, or a face-to-face meeting. The importance of this cannot be underestimated; after Moses' death, it is said, "And there arose not a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses, whom the LORD knew face to face."¹³ Moses needing to veil his own face when descending from Mount Sinai to speak to the children of Israel is a profound moment of Yahweh's residual light from atop the mountaintop bathing Moses in the most high's coruscating aura—a light too bright for the lowlanders' sight. The White Whale's blinding whiteness upon its own mountaintop

of a hill—“one grand hooded phantom, like a snow hill in the air”—is surely an analog for this.¹⁴ Melville’s view from his house at Arrowhead in Pittsfield Massachusetts where he wrote *Moby-Dick* is famously known to have had a view of, not a Mount Sinai, but a Mount Greylock—the highest mountain in Massachusetts at 3,491 feet. One can only imagine that when Melville was either in deep reading of Exodus or intensive composition of *Moby-Dick* that he would look out and *see* both the White Whale’s signature hump *and* Moses’ ascension of Mount Sinai to reach the face of god all in one sublime image. This is a mountaintop, too, that Melville would dedicate his very next kraken of a novel to in the year following *Moby-Dick*’s publication—namely, *Pierre* (1852)—, writing in its opening leaves, “To Greylock’s Most Excellent Majesty.” He would go even further in deifying it by characterizing it as, “my own more immediate sovereign lord and king.”¹⁵

What I want to focus on, though, more specifically regarding this sequence is the dramatic production that Moses’ hand and Moses’ face perform in this scene. The former is carrying the two tables of testimony, and the latter is being covered and uncovered while serving as emissary and translator between the two parties of Divine and base-human. When compared to the previous passage of Exodus 33, where Yahweh’s hand was *itself* the veil—“will cover thee with my hand while I pass by”—, in these verses from Exodus 34, the veil Moses uses to cover his face is not his own hand, literally speaking, but, instead, a piece of cloth independent from his body. But, for the poetic artist like Melville, always writing with visions, internalizing dramas with perceptive precision, it is essential to imagine and recognize that the veilings of Exodus 33 and 34 do have a

commonality: they are both performed by the instrument of the *hand*. I follow Michelangelo's *Moses* (c. 1513-1515) guarding the Tomb of Pope Julius II to say that if Moses' right hand is the carrier for the two tables of testimony, then his left is free to veil and unveil his face. This may come off as a trivial observation for some, but for the aesthetic reader, this is a key point for understanding why the face and hand find poetic association in his dramatic prose: because they function alongside one another whilst performing the rotating acts of veiling *and* un-veiling, acts of which *Moby-Dick* is absolutely obsessed. Melville, commenting on the Christian veil in in Chapter 41 "The Whiteness of the Whale," writes, "[whiteness] is at once the most meaning symbol of spiritual things, nay, the very veil of the Christian's Deity; and yet should be as it is, the intensifying agent in things the most appalling to mankind."¹⁶

Thinking about this in relation to the passages of Exodus just read: we can imagine the White Whale to be the appalling veil of Yahweh and Ahab to be Moses-in-rebellion trying to tear it down as if he had disobeyed and opened his eyes after being told by Yahweh that his all-powerful hand would cover them in order to shield his death-inducingly bright face. Ahab does say, "If man will strike, strike through the mask! How can the prisoner reach outside except by thrusting through the wall? To me, the white whale is that wall, shoved near to me."¹⁷ If Yahweh's hand is the mask, then Melville's corresponding drama is crystal clear: it is having a ship of men throwing lances and harpoons from the grips of their hands—meaning that the battle between god and man is a battle between two hands. Can the Pequod, under the influence of Ahab's desperate mission, tear down Yahweh's hand and see, not his "back parts," but, instead, "his face"

before he passes by? Ishmael says twice that “he has no face”; but is *it* true? That *is* the question. Melville says of the sailors that, “face to face they not only eye its greatest marvels, but, hand to jaw, give battle to them.”¹⁸ The “hand to jaw” in a “face to face” battle is the sailors’ effort to unveil the face before them with their hand. Again, I stress this because the association between the *face* and the *hand* cannot be stressed enough for the aesthetic reader’s interpretation of the underlying acts of Destruction and Creation beating at the heart of *Moby-Dick*. They stage the dramatic analog for the back-and-forth of Veiling and Unveiling—reciprocating actions of which the face and hand are utmost concerned.

Building on Gerhard T. Alexis’ connection between Ishmael’s question and answer in Chapter 86 and Exodus 33, I want to go one step further. But the specific needle I am going to be threading is being able to use what I bring up to transition into my final discussion of Michelangelo’s *Creation of Adam*—the culmination of my argument. I will, first, need to discuss Melville’s ontotheology of which I identify to be distinctly trinitarian. And although the New Testament is more pronounced about the doctrine with the coming of Christ, I contend that Adam’s creation is its earliest incarnation and that this matters for the comparisons Melville makes between the archetypal Son of the Old Testament and his descendant in Ahab. When I turn to Michelangelo’s fresco, I will expand on this by underscoring how the painting’s principal figures are placed in such a way so as to reflect a trinitarian pattern. What I am going to pair this final discussion with is the burning theophany from Chapter 119 “The Candles,” and my reading will prioritize Part 2 of the two-part speech Ahab delivers to the

apparition whom he identifies as his “fiery father.” I identify the topic of his speech to be on the Knowledge of Creation, and this is the landing ground for my dénouement of Mothering because the Knowledge of Creation, under the creative schema of Father-Son-Ghost, is, ultimately, a question over Mothering, or the lack there-of. This is where my third and final intertextual contribution from the Book of Exodus will be featured—specifically, the famous Burning Bush theophany from Exodus 3—and it will be my last mentioning of Moses’ face, but it will be, nonetheless, a crucial final mentioning.

Following this, I will dig my heels into Part 2 of Ahab’s speech and propose it to be a resounding oration that, indirectly, but quite beautifully, reads as a piece of art-criticism for the *Creation of Adam*. The two works are strikingly similar in that each are Father-Son meetings suspended in the act of reaching. I will use my trinitarian framework to argue that Adam and Ahab are both extending *past* their Father for their Mother *through* the Ghost of their Creation. My meditation on the face and hand images will find their greatest use here since the hand and face are the predominant forces for conveying meaning in the act of transcendent reaching—an action which entails unveiling and seeing. As my analysis will show, this is the very reason Melville choreographs Ahab’s eyes and hands so methodically. To tie it all together, I will connect Ahab’s speech to Adam’s pose in Michelangelo’s painting by arguing that Ahab is expressing a devolution of Adam’s state of mind in the moment of his inception that has descended through the generations of man down to Ahab himself. I identify Adam’s original condition to be one of melancholia whilst being a lifeless mold of clay in the face of a Motherless creation and Ahab’s to be this melancholia rotted over the arc of time and into his signature

foaming monomania in Melville's epic. To quote Chapter 132 "The Symphony," Ahab says, "I feel deadly faint, bowed, and humped, as though I were Adam, staggering beneath the piled centuries since Paradise."¹⁹ Thus, for my reading, the millennia of a Motherless Creation have been stacked on the archetypal Son's cracked back for far too long, and it has culminated in a pitiable Son named Ahab, tired and desperate, tearing down the reality taunting him all around to try and find her once and for all.

Let me begin with introducing my perception that Melville is susceptible to trinitarian thinking. The first and most obvious grounds to make this argument are the repeated references to the number three in *Moby-Dick*. In fact, it would be almost impossible to go over every one because of the piling multitude; but to name a few, there is the three-day's chase at the journey's end, the journey being set to take three years' time, the three mast heads aboard the ship, Ahab laying "lay like dead for three days and nights" (likely alluding to Matthew 12:40: "For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth."²⁰), and, finally, "the tri-pointed trinity of flames,"²¹ which I will address momentarily. These overt references to three-ness in Melville's epic are secondary to what I will be discussing now, which is how the formula structures character relations under the creative schema of Father-Son-Ghost. I will be focusing on, first, the relationship between Ahab and his crew and, second, the relationship between Ahab and his father.

To address this properly, I must lay the groundwork of citing the trinity as I see it first occurring in the Old Testament. This is the creation of man as it occurs in Genesis

2:7: “And the LORD God formed man *of* the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.”²² Here, Adam’s creation involves two persons and one spirit. The two persons are Father and Son, and the Ghost is “the breath of life.” The Ghost is unlike Father and Son in that it is non-anthropomorphic and takes the place of who we would assume to be the Mother; and I want to briefly meditate on why this might be the case. Carl Jung in his study *A Psychological Approach to the Dogma of the Trinity* has this to say about what can be inferred from trinitarian styled creation:

The third element, however, the connecting link between “Father” and Son,” is spirit and not a human figure. The masculine father-son relationship is thus lifted out of the natural order (which includes mothers and daughters) and translated to a sphere from which the feminine element is excluded.²³

While I am thankful for this insight, my contention with it is a quibble over Jung’s diction. I do not believe that the feminine is “excluded” in the act of Adam’s creation; I do firmly stand by my belief that Adam does, indeed, have a Mother. Instead, I see the feminine as being veiled *by* spirit. This is an important distinction to make because whereas absence follows from exclusion, veiling implies *presence*, and I am of the opinion that the feminine has powerful presence in both the *Creation of Adam* and *Moby-Dick*; and I think Michelangelo and Melville agree with me.

This aspect of the feminine being veiled in trinitarian creation becomes more relevant when examining a pivotal moment of creativity in Melville's story and breaking it down into its appropriate trinitarian parts. The scene is from Chapter 36 "The Quarter-Deck," and the moment comes shortly after the Pequod has set sail and Ahab has brought the crew together for an oath-swearing ceremony. I call it a creative moment primarily because it effectively re-creates whatever past lives the crew might have had into that of Ahab's singular and unvarying fixation. It comes, too, just after Ahab has said in an aside, "Something shot from my dilated nostrils, he has inhaled it in his lungs. Starbuck now is mine; cannot oppose me now, without rebellion"—disclosing his method of re-enactment being Adam's creation.²⁴ Here is the finalé of Ahab's inauspicious toast and the sailors consuming the "fiery waters" that Ahab has poured into their chalices:

"Now, three to three, ye stand. Commend the murderous chalices! Bestow them, ye who are now made parties to this indissoluble league. Ha! Starbuck! but the deed is done! Yon ratifying sun now waits to sit upon it. Drink, ye harpooners! drink and swear, ye men that man the deathful whaleboat's bow—Death to Moby Dick! God hunt us all, if we do not hunt Moby Dick to his death!" The long, barbed steel goblets were lifted; and to cries and maledictions against the white whale, the spirits were simultaneously quaffed down with a hiss.²⁵

After giving one of those familiar references to three-ness—“Now, three to three, ye stand”—Ahab has the crewmen partake in a trinitarian oath. Instead of “the breath of life” that Yahweh breathes into Adam, the breath of “fiery waters” is breathed by Ahab into his crew. It is a ceremonial baptism in that it adopts the crew into a Father-Son relationship and replaces Father, Son, and Holy Ghost in man’s genesis with Ahab, the crew, and fiery waters for the Pequod’s beginning. Melville caps off the ceremony with a tantalizing line—“the spirits were simultaneously quaffed down with a hiss”—and the seal of the collective’s new beginning takes permanent shape.

Regarding the dynamic that the oath swearing ceremony creates—which is their separateness being transmuted into that of one godhead with Ahab at the helm—, Melville, in Chapter 134 “The Chase—Second Day,” gives an illuminating narration of its influence operating in real-time:

They were one man, not thirty. For as the one ship that held them all; though it was put together of all contrasting things—oak, and maple, and pine wood; iron, and pitch, and hemp—yet all these ran into each other in the one concrete hull, which shot on its way, both balanced and directed by the long central keel; even so, all the individualities of the crew, this man’s valor, that man’s fear; guilt and guiltiness, all varieties were welded into oneness, and were all directed to that fatal goal which Ahab their one lord and keel did point to.²⁶

The conceptual magic that the trinity professes is consubstantiality. It describes how different aspects can be unified through a shared substance.²⁷ This is what elapses in the passage above when, “all varieties were welded into oneness.” However, the version Melville creates is disturbed by a franticness—felt in Ahab's “fatal goal”—that fails to create the harmony that the formula aspires to. My view of this is that this brokenness stems from Melville’s interpretation of the trinity’s motherlessness as an appalling feature of biblical creativity. He is vexed by the trinity's lacking the creativity of mothering, and his ship getting stuck in a vortex of un-creativity by endlessly chasing whales is a neurosis of their trinitarian constitution. Thus, Ahab’s hunt can be understood as Melville desperately trying to re-amend the Old Testament’s creative-schema to reveal the identity of Adam’s premier Mother. But, as the story goes *for* Ahab, the task is too large, and she cannot be reached, and he is forced to plunge into the Abyss in order to reach her. Right before falling to his doom, he yells, “Sink all coffins and all hearses to one common pool!”²⁸ Ahab’s trinitarian oneness leading to self-annihilation is a damning indictment of its spiritual health. Yet, it does fulfill the ship’s un-creative constitution, and in this way, the journey *is* a success. But, if we are moved by the tragedy, a part of us has to continue asking why Ahab’s life cannot be lived. My paper’s answer is motherlessness, and it recalls the Jewish mystical saying, “in the mother’s body man knows the universe, in birth he forgets it.”²⁹ Through this lens, Ahab’s character can be seen as quite beautiful in the sense that he has the visceral knowledge of a Son’s origin, but the trinitarian web of reality he lives in of Father-Son-Ghost has cursed him into forgotten-ness. All he wants is

to remember and *see* and *touch* his creative beginning (i.e. Creation's Face), and his plunge into the Abyss is his breaking past the mask and finding her in nothingness.

I need to go further, though, in elaborating on just why it is "fiery waters," in particular, that Melville has concocted to be the Pequod's spiritual agent. It will help make better sense of the ship's trinitarian constitution and Ahab's condition, and it is an important question for me to answer since fire is the substance of the theophany from Chapter 119 "The Candles." My investigation requires rewinding back to Ahab's eponymous profiling in Chapter 28, "Ahab." Here, the before unseen captain steps out onto the deck of the Pequod for the very first time, and he is romantically limned. He is said, first, to look "like a man cut away from the stake, when the fire has overrunningly wasted all the limbs without consuming them."³⁰ The reason for his folkloric appearance is expressed through his most salient feature: a "slender rod-like mark, lividly whitish"³¹ that runs down his face and disappears into his clothing. It is the scar from a lightning strike, and it is peculiarly identified as a birthmark. Garnering much gossip, it is said that, "Whether that mark was born with him, or whether it was the scar left by some desperate wound, no one could certainly say," and, "if ever Captain Ahab should be tranquilly laid out . . . then, whoever should do that last office for the dead, would find a birth-mark on him from crown to sole."³² This is a kind of second birth that overshadows Ahab's first. The latter is divulged by Peleg in Chapter 16 "The Ship"—giving further evidence for Ahab's hunt being rooted in a cry for his lost mother: "Captain Ahab did not name himself. 'Twas a foolish, ignorant whim of his crazy, widowed mother, who died when he was only a twelvemonth old."³³

For why Melville, an utmost scholar of Western mythology, decided to brand Ahab with a lightning strike is because the father of the Roman sky is Jupiter, and his weapon of choice is the thunderbolt. For my trinitarian framework, this means that the act of Ahab's having been struck by plasmic fire is analogous to Yahweh's breathing life into Adam in that both are a Father monologically creating a Son with a spiritual agent. Therefore, Ahab re-creates his own beginning when passing around the "fiery waters" to adopt his crew into a Father-Son relationship of a similar substance. Both instances effectively circumvent the natural-bearing womb, and the Old Testament is quite explicit about its womb-phobia when Eve is expelled from the Garden of Eden. When handing down her judgment, Yahweh, cursing motherhood, tells her, "I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children."³⁴ These lurid details come to a head in Chapter 133 "The Chase—First Day," when the White Whale makes his climactic entrance, and Jupiter—Ahab's Father-figure—is seated in the comparison. I find it to be a revelatory moment for Fatherhood and how it sheds a drastically different light onto Ahab's origin story:

Not the white bull Jupiter swimming away with ravished Europa clinging to his graceful horns; his lovely, leering eyes sideways intent upon the maid; with smooth bewitching fleetness, rippling straight for the nuptial bower in Crete; not Jove, not that great majesty Supreme! did surpass the glorified White Whale as he so divinely swam.³⁵

This description is unique in that it features the feminine when introducing the most masculine force in the novel; and an alarm should go off whenever the feminine is mentioned in *Moby-Dick*. The White Whale's grand entrance importantly identifies the white-haired creature with the same Jupiter of white-fire that made the birthmark that Ahab wears on his body. It solidifies the Father-Son relation between Ahab and the White Whale and helps explain his disregard for its fleece's hot, blinding whiteness since it triggers the trauma of his lightning strike. However, the novel's view of Fatherhood is indicted on a terrible charge in this ghastly scene by having "ravished Europa" being raped by the story's overshadowing paternal figure. And it causes Ahab's origin-story to take on quite a different image than the one in Chapter 28. If the White Whale's entrance is any hint toward the truth of Ahab's trinitarian beginning, it points to a much more violent crime than a simple strike from a sky-father's bolt. For my argument of the trinity veiling the feminine with spirit, it follows that Ahab's birthmark is a cover for a much more gruesome and sadder story; and the same can be said of Adam's "breath of life." As I will show when looking at Chapter 119 "The Candles" and the *Creation of Adam*, trinitarian creation necessitates the feminine's creative power being exploited by the father, and the evidence here is that Ahab and Adam are more akin to sons of rape than being created by a father monologically; though the latter is a much more palatable story to swallow for the believers of a moral faith.

Knowing that Melville is working within a trinitarian framework and that Jupiter's fire created Ahab, we can now look at the burning theophany that Ahab

addresses as his “fiery father” in Chapter 119 “The Candles” with the proper context and understanding. To introduce it, I will briefly consider the Old Testament’s own Burning Bush theophany in Exodus 3 to consider why the face of god finds expression in this elemental medium, and I will articulate the contrast between the movements of Moses’ and Ahab’s faces when met by their respective phantom of flames. Following this, I will introduce Ahab’s speech and zoom in on Part 2 of it—focusing on its interwoven poetry and choreography. Finally, I will draw a few comparisons between Ahab’s speech and Michelangelo’s the *Creation of Adam*—emphasizing both their trinitarian compositions and the role that hands and faces play in their dramatic actions—and then, we will be done.

Let me first start with the moment in question from Exodus 3, Verses 2-6. It is after Moses has led his father-in-law’s flock into the desert and reached as far as Mount Horeb:

2 And the angel of the LORD appeared unto him in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush: and he looked, and, behold, the bush burned with fire, and the bush *was* not consumed.

3 And Moses said, I will now turn aside, and see this great sight, why the bush is not burnt.

4 And when the LORD saw that he turned aside to see, God called unto him out of the midst of the bush, and said, Moses, Moses. And he said, Here *am* I.

5 And he said, Draw not nigh hither: put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground.

6 Moreover he said, I *am* the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. And Moses hid his face; for he was afraid to look upon God.³⁶

Having already established that the movements of Moses' face are of supreme literary value and meaning, both for Melville and students of literature, then asking why Moses covers his face is profitable. When recognizing it is Yahweh who has appeared unto him in the form of a preternatural flame, Moses' gut reaction to hide his face reveals that he is "afraid to look upon God." This is the litmus test for a pious prophet because hiding one's face signals faith in a god-fearing man. And this is what Yahweh wants more than anything else; he tells us as such when giving Moses the Ten Commandments: "For thou shalt worship no other god: for the LORD, whose name *is* Jealous, *is* a jealous God."³⁷ This is consistent with what Yahweh has already said regarding his being *seen* in Exodus 33:20: "Thou canst not see my face: for there shall no man see me, and live." Thus, for the reader of the Book of Exodus in the King James Bible, the thin-skinnedness of Yahweh's power as a personality crystallizes foremost in his jealous face-image, and the human eyes—the two diamonds of the face-image—are the avenue for undermining him. A burning bush is an apparition that delivers this challenge to human eyes through fire's visual expression as a bright and burning energy. It is an appropriate medium for a jealous god who expresses themselves foremost in visual language. The strategy of both

Yahweh and the White Whale is to inspire fear through their appearance, and the flamey medium is the most qualified candidate from the elemental priesthood for this performance.

By reading the Old Testament's most famous burning theophany, the mind begins to become attuned to fire's distinctness for arresting the sense of sight. This is a helpful gateway for beginning to read Melville's own burning theophany in Chapter 119 "The Candles" and being able to pick up on a similar visual emphasis. At the point in the story where it occurs, the Pequod is nearing its tragic end, and it is floating off the Japanese Coast where the specter of the mighty Typhoon haunts. It is an astounding chapter of world literature with its apocalyptic storm vision, and it is of a magnitude that finds small company with the likes of the whirlwind theophany in the Book of Job and the tempest on the heath in *King Lear*.³⁸ And just before the drama gets into full swing, Melville supplies a very clever explanation for the theophany's appearance: because the ship has been harvesting spermaceti oil from sperm whales, it has inevitably spilled in the process, and as a result, the oil has been absorbed into the ship's wood, and the mastheads have sucked it up like sap in a great tree. So, when the typhoon hits and an electric field is charged, the mastheads combust like a three-headed candelabra burning titan-sized flames. Once this has happened, the intuition written in Ahab's body by the scar he bears senses the nature of the event, and he steps forward to confront it:

"Aye, aye, men!" cried Ahab. "Look up at it; mark it well; the white flame but lights the way to the White Whale! Hand me those

mainmast links there; I would fain feel this pulse, and let mine beat against it; blood against fire! So.”

Then turning—the last link held fast in his left hand, he put his foot upon the Parsee; and with fixed upward eye, and high-flung right arm, he stood erect before the lofty tri-pointed trinity of flames.³⁹

Following in the same spirit of Ishmael’s insurgent response to Yahweh’s hint about his face by saying that “he has no face,” Ahab responds to Moses’ pious act of hiding his face before the burning theophany by inversely throwing his right up to it—“with fixed upward eye”—and commanding his child soldiers to do the same—“Look up at it.” This is a significant divergence that we have already touched on but, because it so important for my interpretation of Melville’s re-reading of Exodus, I want to hammer it in. It is an inversion that gets at the heart of Melville’s religiously subversive text, and it is no better represented than by Ahab’s face-image being thrown up to the face of god. The action’s intensity is augmented by Ahab’s face being printed with the most ungodly iconography. This fact is expressed in one of the loveliest treasure-pieces of descriptive literature—with Melville writing, “And not only that, but moody stricken Ahab stood before them with a crucifixion in his face; in all the nameless regal overbearing dignity of some mighty woe.”⁴⁰ Knowing Ahab walks through the world with the death of god beaming from his visage makes throwing it up to his fiery father stand in such diametric opposition to Moses hiding his.

After taking his dramatic pose for his oration, Ahab begins Part 1 of his two-part speech. However, since my focus is on Part 2, I will have to just briefly underscore a few

points regarding it. It begins with Ahab acknowledging that the fiery apparition before him is the one who gave him the scar that runs down his frame. He says, “till in the sacramental act so burned by thee, that to this hour I bear the scar.”⁴¹ And he bookends Part 1 by reaffirming their relation, saying, “Oh, thou clear spirit, of thy fire thou madest me, and like a true child of fire, I breathe it back to thee”⁴²; if there was any lingering doubt as to who Ahab’s father was, this should alleviate it. In between these bookends, Ahab gestures to the feminine by saying, “yet while I earthly live, the queenly personality lives in me, and feels her royal rights.”⁴³ His identification with the feminine in the face of his fiery father anticipates the cry he will subsequently make for his mother in Part 2 of his speech. But there is an important stage-direction beforehand:

*[Sudden, repeated flashes of lightning; the nine flames leap lengthwise to thrice their previous height; Ahab, with the rest, closes his eyes, his right hand pressed hard upon them.]*⁴⁴

After beginning the speech with “high flung right arm” and “fixed upward eye,” Ahab retracts his right arm in order to shield his vision from the leaping flames with his right hand. It is yet another inversion of what Yahweh tells Moses in Exodus 33: “And it shall come to pass, while my glory passeth by, that I will put thee in a clift of the rock, and will cover thee with my hand while I pass by.” Because Ahab is one to disobey, his *own* hand has to be forced upon him to stop him from looking. There is a certain irony to this; the fiery father is intent on covering that terrible crucifix beaming from him. However, there is a catch. Although Ahab has his right limb and mortal eyes neutered, he manages to

continue *reaching* and *seeing*. The cause lies in the choreographic details. When Ahab was preparing to speak, he asked for the mainmast link. He said, “Hand me those mainmast links there; I would fain feel this pulse, and let mine beat against it; blood against fire! So. . . . Then turning—the last link held fast in his left hand.”⁴⁵ His holding the mainmast link in his left hand connects him to where the corposants burn above, which allows him to continue reaching even after having to retract his right limb. These details are far from random, and Melville is exhibiting his skill for being quite the orchestrator.

With this said, I am going to include Part 2 of Ahab’s speech in-full which comes immediately after the stage-direction has been given. I am going to be paying close attention to Ahab *seeing* while being physically blinded, the movement of his left hand *reaching* after withdrawing the other limb, and the accusation he makes against his father for hiding his mother:

“I own thy speechless, placeless power; said I not so? Nor was it wrung from me; nor do I now drop these links. Thou canst blind; but I can then grope. Thou canst consume; but I can then be ashes. Take the homage of these poor eyes, and shutter-hands. I would not take it. The lightning flashes through my skull; mine eye-balls ache and ache; my whole beaten brain seems as beheaded, and rolling on some stunning ground. Oh, oh! Yet blindfold, yet will I talk to thee. Light though thou be, thou leapest out of darkness; but I am darkness leaping out of light, leaping out of thee! The javelins cease; open eyes; see, or not? There burn the flames! Oh, thou

magnanimous! now I do glory in my genealogy. But thou art but my fiery father; my sweet mother, I know not. Oh, cruel! what hast thou done with her? There lies my puzzle; but thine is greater. Thou knowest not how came ye, hence callest thyself unbegotten; certainly knowest not thy beginning, hence callest thyself unbegun. I know that of me, which thou knowest not of thyself, oh, thou omnipotent. There is some unsuffusing thing beyond thee, thou clear spirit, to whom all thy eternity is but time, all thy creativeness mechanical. Through thee, thy flaming self, my scorched eyes do dimly see it. Oh, thou foundling fire, thou hermit immemorial, thou too hast thy incommunicable riddle, thy unparticipated grief. Here again with haughty agony, I read my sire. Leap! leap up, and lick the sky! I leap with thee; I burn with thee; would fain be welded with thee; defyingly I worship thee!”⁴⁶

This is where all the parts of my paper fall into place like a slow-building puzzle. As it relates to my meditation on the hand and face images, Ahab’s moment of truth is dramatically staged as a moment of reaching into his cryptic beginning. Although forced to blind himself with his right hand by the leaping flames in the stage-direction, Ahab is able to continue *reaching* and *seeing*; he says, “nor do I now drop these links,” and, “Yet blindfold, yet will I talk to thee.” My meditation on the hand and face images signals that Ahab is in the act of unveiling—he says, “The javelins cease; open eyes; see, or not?”—and my meditation on the trinity says that he is unveiling his spirit-figure, which is fire, for his mother—he says, “But thou art but my fiery father; my sweet mother, I know not.

Oh, cruel! what hast thou done with her? . . . Through thee, thy flaming self, my scorched eyes do dimly see it.” It is an act of the hand trying to *touch* and the eyes trying to *see* the face of his lineage. With the mainmast link in his left hand, he is reaching into the electrically charged theophany atop the mastheads as if the lightning strike that struck him has frozen in time and he has grasped it, lifted it, and is interrogating what is underneath. He looks, and what he sees is the wellspring of Creativity: “There is some unsuffusing thing beyond thee, thou clear spirit, to whom all thy eternity is but time, all thy creativeness mechanical.” It is this mechanical creativity that is the germ of Mothering, and it is this mechanical creativity that was covered by the sheet of lightning in his origin story. He is caught repeating it to himself during the three day-chase as if it is the cause for his soul’s thirst. At first day’s end, Stubb laughs at Ahab’s shattered boat, and he quickly retorts, “Man, man! did I not know thee brave as fearless fire (and as mechanical)”; and, at second day’s end, Ahab asks his men if they feel brave: ““As fearless fire,” cried Stubb. “And as mechanical,” muttered Ahab.”⁴⁷ Mechanical creativity is what the barren trinity of father-son-spirit lacks. But the centuries of its veneration in Christendom is stacked to such a height in history that it crushes a lone man’s effort to topple it.

To finish this reading, I have to note that Ahab’s moment of truth is so uncannily similar to a passage from Jewish theologian Martin Buber’s famous *I and Thou* (1923) that I must provide it here. I include it not for analysis but to appreciate it for what it is:

Only he who knows relation and knows about the presence of the Thou is capable of decision. He who decides is free, for he has approached the Face.

The fiery stuff of all my ability to will seethes tremendously, all that I might do circles around me, still without actuality in the world, flung together and seemingly inseparable, alluring glimpses of power flicker from all the uttermost bounds: the universe is my temptation, and I achieve being in an instant, with both hands plunged deep in the fire, where the single deed is hidden, the deed which aims at me—now is the moment.⁴⁸

The backbone of my argument thus far has been that Ahab is a direct descendant of Adam and that he possesses Adam's unique trait of being the Old Testament's archetypal Son whose birth is defined by its Motherlessness. I have demonstrated that this Motherless Creation is a result of the doctrine of the trinity and that this doctrine's falseness is the source of Ahab's despair. I have identified that the spirit of Ahab's creation, as it is known to him, is a lightning strike that veiled his mother during his cryptic origin story. Next, I showed that he reaches past a curtain of fire in Chapter 119 "The Candles" in order to try and lift the spirit of his creation to try and reach her; and I gave special attention to the movement of his hand and face images to articulate the struggle through a framework of spiritual reaching and seeing. Now I will close my paper by proposing that this same dramatic monologue of Ahab's has been recorded in a single

frame. It is Michelangelo's *Creation of Adam* which I believe Ahab has just beautifully described; and it is Michelangelo's *Creation of Adam* which I believe so exquisitely visualizes Ahab's poetry.

To briefly situate the masterpiece, the *Creation of Adam* is one of the scenes painted in concert across the Sistine Chapel's ceiling by Michelangelo between 1508-1512 in Vatican City. As the scene goes, Adam is lying on the ground at the edge of a cliff, and his posture is defined by its moroseness due to his being only a mold of lifeless clay yet to be given "the breath of life" and made into a living soul. God the Father is flying across from him at an upward angle on a flying cloud of Creation supported by a host of angels. The Father's right arm and hand are outstretched toward Adam, the Son, whose left arm and hand are reaching back toward the cloud floating across from him. What distinguishes the two appendages is that, whereas the Father's is firm and erect, Adam's is limp and languid. The Father and Son's extended limbs meet with an Air-of-separation suspended between their not-yet-touching fingers. The painting's trinitarian composition of Father-Son-Ghost expresses its oneness of consubstantiality at this point of convergence.

However, as my discussion of the trinity revealed, this Air-of-separation is the devious "breath of life" that veils the feminine during Creation. It is what distracts the viewer from the exploited creative-source of the painting, which is the Woman at the Father's left hand. This is whom Adam is truly reaching out for like a babe out of the womb flailing. Adam's act of reaching with his left hand identifies him with the Woman at the Father's left hand, and the feminine's association with the left hand is due to the Son always being seated at the right hand of the Father as a place of prestige in the Holy Bible

—the hand that is reaching out to Adam in this painting. Therefore, the left hand is a place for shadows and unrecognized forces, and this fits the feminine’s lack of recognition in the trinity. Milton agrees, and he goes as far to specify that Eve is born from Adam’s left rib—“Who stooping op’nd my left side, and took / From thence a Rib” —and that Satan’s daughter, Sin, sprung from the left side of his head—“Threw forth, till on the left side opening wide.”⁴⁹ This gives new meaning to why Ahab holds onto the mainmast link with his left hand and lowers his right to shield his eyes. Ahab’s lowering of his “high flung right arm” when intimidated by his fiery-father is the suppression of his dominant, erect, and masculine side and his continued reaching with his left hand by holding the mainmast link is a kind of shadow-reaching that permits him to reach into the beyond.

The most astounding feature of Michelangelo’s painting may be the Mother’s face, and this paper’s title is indebted to her expression. Unlike the Father and Adam who are half-faced and lone-eyed, the Mother is afforded a full face and her two eyes are wide open and directed at Adam in his act of reaching as if she wants to hold him too. When Ahab wails, “Through thee, thy flaming self, my scorched eyes do dimly see it,” one can only guess that Ahab’s mother is staring back at him like this. In addition to staring, the Mother is naked like Adam is, yet unlike the Father who is clothed in a flowing dress of a rosy-pink hue. Ahab’s accusations against his father’s dishonesty crystallize in this feature. The Father’s being clothed suggests that *he* is the one who has just been expelled from Eden, and the sentiment is generally correct; he *is* ashamed, and he *is* hiding something; and Ahab has identified it: “But thou art but my fiery father; my sweet mother, I know not. Oh, cruel! what hast thou done with her?” What the Father is hiding

is his exploitation of the feminine during the creative process. The Father has appeared unto Adam in such a way that, from Adam's point of view, all he can see is the Father reaching out to him. His curse growing up will be thinking that a Father's erect and outstretched arm was the only thing responsible for his birth; and this is the correlative for Ahab and his lightning strike. But as Ahab has noted, this cannot be right, and the painting holds the truth. For the Father to extend and reach out his arm to Adam from the cloud he flies on, he needs to anchor his other arm onto something in the cloud. He does, and he wraps it around the Woman at his left hand so that if she truly was not there, or if she vanished, the Father would *fall* and Adam would finally see the hidden face that neither he nor Ahab have been able to reach.

NOTES

-
- ¹ Genesis 16-21 (King James Version).
- ² Herman Melville, *Moby-Dick; or The Whale*, ed. Harrison Hayford and Hershel Parker (New York & London: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1967), Chapter 119 “The Candles,” p. 417.
- ³ *Ibid.*, Chapter 41 “Moby Dick,” p. 160.
- ⁴ John Milton, *Paradise Lost*, (New York: The Crowell-Collier Publishing Company, fifth printing, 1967), 1:44-49, p. 17; and Herman Melville, *Moby-Dick; or The Whale*, Chapter 135 “The Chase—Third Day,” p. 469.
- ⁵ Job 1:21 (King James Version).
- ⁶ Herman Melville, *Moby-Dick; or The Whale*, Chapter 1 “Loomings,” p. 12.
- ⁷ *Ibid.*, Chapter 86 “The Tail,” p. 318.
- ⁸ *Udāna: Exclamations*, Translated by Ṭhānissaro Bhikkhu, 6:4 Sectarians (1) (Tittha Sutta), pp. 95-97.
- ⁹ Exodus 33:20-23 (King James Version).
- ¹⁰ Herman Melville, *Moby-Dick; or The Whale*, Chapter 41 “Moby Dick,” p. 160.
- ¹¹ Exodus 12 (King James Version); and Herman Melville, *Moby-Dick; or The Whale*, Chapter 2 “The Carpet-Bag,” p. 18.
- ¹² Exodus 34: 29-35 (King James Version).
- ¹³ Deuteronomy 34:10 (King James Version).
- ¹⁴ Herman Melville, *Moby-Dick; or The Whale*, Chapter 1 “Loomings,” p. 16.
- ¹⁵ Herman Melville, Dedication to *Pierre: or, The Ambiguities*, ed. Henry A. Murray (New York: Hendricks House, Inc., 1962).
- ¹⁶ Herman Melville, *Moby-Dick; or The Whale*, Chapter 41 “The Whiteness of the Whale,” p. 169.
- ¹⁷ *Ibid.*, Chapter 36 “The Quarter-Deck,” p. 144.
- ¹⁸ *Ibid.*, Chapter 42 “Moby Dick,” p. 156.

-
- ¹⁹ Ibid., Chapter 132 “The Symphony,” p. 444.
- ²⁰ Ibid., Chapter 19 “The Prophet,” p. 87; Matthew 12:40 (King James Version).
- ²¹ Herman Melville, *Moby-Dick; or The Whale*, Chapter 119 “The Candles,” p. 416.
- ²² Genesis 2:7 (King James Version).
- ²³ Carl Jung, *A Psychological Approach to the Dogma of the Trinity*, ed. Gerhard Adler and R.F.C. (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1969), “Father, Son, and Spirit,” p. 132.
- ²⁴ Ibid., Chapter 36 “The Quarter-Deck,” p. 144.
- ²⁵ Ibid., Chapter 36 “The Quarter-Deck,” p. 146.
- ²⁶ Ibid., Chapter 134 “The Chase—Second Day,” pp. 454-455.
- ²⁷ Hans Hauben, “On the Invocation of the ‘Holy and Consubstantial Trinity’ in Byzantine Oath and Dating Formulas,” *Zeitschrift Für Papyrologie Und Epigraphik*, vol. 139 (2002): pp. 158–160, *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/20191434.
- ²⁸ Herman Melville, *Moby-Dick; or The Whale*, Chapter 36 “The Chase—Third Day,” p. 468.
- ²⁹ Martin Buber, *I And Thou*, 2nd ed. (New York: Scribner, 1958), p. 25.
- ³⁰ Herman Melville, *Moby-Dick; or The Whale*, Chapter 28 “Ahab,” pp. 109-110.
- ³¹ Ibid., p. 110.
- ³² Ibid.
- ³³ Ibid., Chapter 16 “The Ship,” pp. 77.
- ³⁴ Genesis 3:16 (King James Version).
- ³⁵ Herman Melville, *Moby-Dick; or The Whale*, Chapter 133 “The Chase—First Day,” p. 447.
- ³⁶ Exodus 3:2-6 (King James Version).
- ³⁷ Exodus 34:14 (King James Version).
- ³⁸ Job 38-41 (King James Version); and William Shakespeare, *King Lear*, ed. R.A. Foakes (London: Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, 1997), 3.2, pp. 263-269 & 3.4, pp. 271-279.
- ³⁹ Herman Melville, *Moby-Dick; or The Whale*, Chapter 119 “The Candles,” p. 416.
- ⁴⁰ Ibid., Chapter 28 “Ahab,” p. 111.
- ⁴¹ Ibid., Chapter 119 “The Candles,” p. 416.
- ⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ Ibid., p. 417.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 416.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Ibid., Chapter 133 “The Chase—First Day,” p. 452; and Ibid., Chapter 134 “The Chase—Second Day,” p. 459.

⁴⁸ Martin Buber, *I And Thou*, 2nd ed. (New York: Scribner, 1958), pp. 51-52.

⁴⁹ John Milton, *Paradise Lost*, 8:465-66, p. 165; Ibid., 2:755-758, p. 51.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alexis, Gerhard T. "Two Footnotes on a Faceless Whale." *American Notes & Queries*, vol. 11 (1973): 98-100.
- Buber, Martin. *I And Thou*. 2nd ed. New York: Scribner, 1958.
- Buonarroti, Michelangelo. *Creation of Adam*. c. 1508-1512. Fresco. The Sistine Chapel, Vatican City. *Web Gallery of Art*. created by Emil Krén and Daniel Marx. https://www.wga.hu/frames-e.html?/html/m/michelan/3sistina/1genesis/6adam/06_3ce6.html.
- Buonarroti, Michelangelo. *Moses*. c. 1513-1515. Marble. San Pietro in Vincoli, Rome, Italy. *Web Gallery of Art*. created by Emil Krén and Daniel Marx. https://www.wga.hu/frames-e.html?/html/m/michelan/1sculptu/giulio_2/moses.html.
- Hauben, Hans. "On the Invocation of the 'Holy and Consubstantial Trinity' in Byzantine Oath and Dating Formulas." *Zeitschrift Für Papyrologie Und Epigraphik*, vol. 139 (2002): 158–160. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/20191434.
- Jung, Carl. *A Psychological Approach to the Dogma of the Trinity. Collected Works of C.G. Jung, Volume 11: Psychology and Religion: West and East*. Edited by Gerhard Adler and R.F.C. Hull. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1969. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt5hhr4b.10.
- Melville, Herman. *Moby-Dick; or The Whale*. Edited by Harrison Hayford and Hershel Parker. New York & London: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1967.
- Melville, Herman. *Pierre: or, The Ambiguities*. Edited by Henry A. Murray. New York: Hendricks House, Inc., 1962.
- Milton, John. *Paradise Lost, Paradise Regained, Samson Agonistes*. New York: The Crowell-Collier Publishing Company, fifth printing, 1967.
- Shakespeare, William. *King Lear*. Edited by R.A. Foakes. London: Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, 1997.

Spielrein, Sabina. "Destruction as the Cause of Coming Into Being." *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, vol. 39 (1994): 155-186. Wiley Online Library. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1465-5922.1994.00155.x>.

The Holy Bible: King James Version. Gordonsville, TN: Dugan Publishers, Inc., 1987.

Udāna: Exclamations. Translated by Ṭhānissaro Bhikkhu. Access to Insight: Readings in Theravāda Buddhism, 2012. <https://accesstoinsight.org/lib/authors/thanissaro/udana.pdf>.