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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to identify Emerson’s Conflict of the Soul in the context of 19th century American spiritual quest as the country was searching for its own identity. As background, this thesis explores basic differences between American and European Romantic discourse (s). The first two chapters prepare the theoretical framework, outlining two main aspects of European Romanticism: first, the new attitudes toward nature; the dichotomy between consciousness and unconsciousness; the discrepancy between reality and appearance to transcend outer and inner phenomenon; art and history; and different meanings and origin of the word “romantic;” second, the intellectual climate (Emerson’s heterogeneous influences) or intellectual love and scientific vision to affirm the Principium of Individualism, to celebrate the conflict between microcosm and macrocosm, the taste of foreign and domestic artistic, the polarities and fragmentations of the Romantic self to sing his own song of allegiance and introduce a distinctive literary language and forms to express Transcendental ideas. Chapter One explores his Transcendentalism and Romantic spirit. The vision of the new organic theory of evolution is explored in Chapter Two. Chapter Three describes the two-fold geometrical approaches (Reasoning and Understanding: Vectors of Romantic Dilemma) to unveil the secret enigmas of Emerson’s discourse. Finally, Chapter Four examines the roots of Emerson’s Quest for Romantic Truth; it explores his rational and irrational impulses to define Romanticism as the problematic issue between inner and outer worlds. Romantic attitude, then, becomes the work of art, the culmination and result of creative product: the vehicle through which Emerson’s Conflict of the Soul: A Romantic Unsolved Issue is connected to romantic themes and symbolic circumstances of his life: Beauty, Love, Suffering, and Immortality emerge, then, as recurrent and interrelated themes from the beginning of Romanticism in 1800s. Emerson is portrayed as the innovator not only of a new philosophy called Transcendentalism, but also as an American democratic poet, who secures moral perfectibility for his society.
O objectivo deste estudo é o de identificar o tema *Emerson’s Conflict of the Soul* no contexto do Séc. XIX, durante o qual a América procurava definir a sua própria identidade através duma procura espiritual. Tendo em conta o passado, esta tese, explora as diferenças básicas entre os discursos românticos Europeu e Americano. Os primeiros dois capítulos preparam um quadro teórico, delineando dois principais aspectos do Romantismo Europeu: as novas atitudes perante a natureza; a dicotomia entre o consciente e o inconsciente; a discrepância entre a realidade e a aparência para transcender o fenómeno externo e interno; arte e história; e diferentes significados e origem da palavra “romântico;” em segundo lugar, o clima intelectual (Influências heterogéneas de Emerson), ou o amor intelectual e visão científica para afirmar o *Principium of individualism*; para celebrar o conflito entre o microcosmo e o macrocosmo; o gosto artístico estrangeiro; as polaridades e fragmentações do eu romântico para cantar a sua própria canção de fidelidade e introduz uma distinta linguagem literária e formas para manifestar ideais transcendentais. A visão da nova teoria orgânica da evolução é desenvolvida no segundo capítulo. O terceiro capítulo descreve duas abordagens geométricas (Razão e Compreensão: Vectores do Dilema Romântico) com o objectivo de desvendar os enigmas secretos do discurso de Emerson. Finalmente, o quarto capítulo examina as raízes de *Emerson’s Quest of Romantic Truth*; os seus impulsos racionais e irracionais; o conflito entre mundo interior e exterior. Conclui-se que a atitude romântica se torna objecto do discurso artístico, culminar e resultado do produto criativo, e veículo através do qual *Emerson’s Conflict of Soul: A Romantic Unsolved Issue* surge associado aos temas românticos e a circunstâncias simbólicas da sua vida: *Beauty, Love, Suffering, and Immortality*, emergem, então, como temas recorrentes e inter-relacionados a partir do começo do Romantismo em 1800. Emerson é, deste modo, retratado como pioneiro, não só no ambito da nova filosofia designada Trancendentalista, mas também como poeta da democracia americana que assegura a perfectibilidade moral da sua sociedade.
Introduction

It is the purpose of this study to examine Ralph Waldo Emerson’s oeuvre in a context of spiritual quest and self-fulfillment. We will focus on the author’s longing for a spiritual journey as a personal process built upon the ground of ordinary reality where God’s discourse may be unveiled, in a wider context of Romantic discourse(s).

Since our project deals with Emerson’s oeuvre as a whole we will ponder on his essays, letters, journals, and poems in order to confirm his self-fulfillment as an attempt to dislodge the relation of the soul to nature as well as the relation of the self to culture as ambiguous entities within nineteenth-century American literature. Hopefully we will understand whether Emerson actually builds a new intellectual discourse, or a mere pastiche of former ones; whether his project provides an original American approach, or a mere outdated Romantic view.

In order to meet these intellectual challenges, some questions must be raised: Is Romanticism the source of an irrational realm and of powerful emotions that dictate Emerson’s self conduct? How can we determine whether or not Emerson was a Romantic? If he were, how should we distinguish him from other authors? And how are his works associated with the spirit of American Romantic literature? If he were not, how should we define him? How can we relate him to American Individualism? Is he at the center or is he a
step, a moment of an ongoing process? What is the relationship between his spiritual quest and biographical experience?

These questions obviously enhance others, namely: What are the main American intellectual vectors in early and mid-nineteenth century? How is Romanticism linked with American experience? How can we define Romanticism in its relationship between the inner and outer world? What are the philological roots of this concept? Where does it come from? What distinguishes American from European Romanticism? What is the relationship between Romanticism and Transcendentalism? What are the risks in defining Romanticism within the limits of ego or self-reliance? Is the dualism between subject and object part of the Romantic vision? How does the Romantic poet or painter represent what he/she sees? To what extent is Romanticism an impossible or possible instrument to solve human nature’s conflict? If Emerson is considered the father of American Transcendentalism and Walt Whitman the poet of democracy who was intended to signalize the rupture with American tradition, are we in a position to ask if his poetry echoes Emerson’s organic theory of poetry?

In order to ponder and eventually answer to these questions, we must focus upon Emerson’s oeuvre as a whole: his poetry, essays, journals and letters. We must read carefully his work as a whole in order to ponder on his Romantic filiations and on his hopeful revision of an idealist philosophical
tradition. The concepts of Soul, Self Man, Nature, and God must be scrutinized in order to unfold Emerson’s singular approach.

This perspective seems to stress the fact that there exists a correspondence between the human soul and nature. Thus it must reopen a polemical issue concerning the connection between the material world and the spiritual world in which the human mind, the soul, and the self at their most intrinsic levels, may seem to be associated with a certain Romantic spontaneity. In dealing with these two operative components, we question if they are part of Romanticism.

This question reflects a problematic and difficult issue, the traditional tendency to confront the world of external facts and the inner world of thought and imagination. This may be the crucial problem within the biographical topic that underlines Emerson’s works. Its exact relation to this American writer ought be explored.

In dealing with this problem, we have to analyze Transcendentalism not only as a philosophical movement that explores the existence of spiritual capacities, but also as a source of religion in which the gist of human life can only be revealed through one’s own consciousness. Furthermore, we must study Romanticism as a historical and intellectual movement in which the biographical topic along with its sensibility, imagination, fantasy and reason lead to the notion of nature as a divine construct and as a founding element in the structure of the universe. Through these claims, we must explore cultural
and ideological genealogy within the Romantic and Transcendentalist movements as they may deal with the impact on the indefinable and unknown spheres.

In constituting this purpose, we have conceived a methodological process structured upon seven chapters. Our reflection on *An Internal Conflict of the Soul: A Romantic Unsolved Issue* starts with Chapter One. In this Chapter we will concentrate on some critical and theoretical approaches to Romanticism in order to ponder on the several trends involved in the building of this concept. Chapter Two will approach Emerson’s heterogeneous influences. We will explore the cultural background that led him to write the book of *Nature*. Hopefully we will examine factual thoughts linked to his doctrine of self-reliance which was based upon a whole different kind of experience, as he writes in the lecture of “Ethics”: “Self-Trust, that is, not a faith in a man’s whim or conceit as if he were quite severed from all beings and acted on his own private account, but a perception that the mind common to the Universe is disclosed to the individual through his own nature” (Emerson 159). Chapter Three - *The Ambiguity of the Self...A Homage to the Past, Nature, History, Language, Religion and Culture* - will discuss how the poetic self longs to relate to a tradition that attempts to reconcile civic duty and national identity with historical narrative. This Chapter must help us to understand how the development of science in the nineteenth-century enhanced a skeptical questioning in Emerson’s work in the sense that the idea
of God seems to be tied to a process of contemplation and adoration, as well as to a moral imitation and conformity to divine will.

This line of thought leads us to the issue that we will discuss in Chapter Four. We will see how Emerson’s self may find a new way of coping with his own spiritual and metaphysical turbulences, while reconciling his self and the other “me,” in connection with Reasoning and Understanding. We must summon Walt Whitman since his notion of the poet as a genius of the modern somehow echoes Emerson’s work. Besides he conceives of poetry as related to science, a new mode of knowledge, as he observes in *Leaves of Grass* that “Hurrah for positive science! Hurrah for exact demonstration!” (Miller ed. 41).

Chapters Five and Six will ponder on Emerson’s attempt to respond, not only to Reasoning and Understanding as a flowing solitude that seems to provide a perfect scientific representation of the inward and outward worlds as a possible remedy, but also to the questioning of dualism of Metaphysical and Divine worlds: How can the human being harmonize the world, which may seem to impress his own image? And how far may he go while attempting to bridge imagination and thought? In these two chapters we will see how Emerson explores the drift of scientific system—an visionary excursion and an intellectual flight from real to unreal worlds—or toward moral conduct in which the footsteps from matter to life, from science to ethics, from observation to admiration fail and remain beyond the imaginative power of any poet.
Within a Pythagorean tradition we will conceive also some detailed geometrical figures which attempt to respond, not only to these intriguing questions, but also to understand the complexity of *An Internal Conflict of the Soul* as it may be linked to mental structure subjacent to the thought of Emerson’s works. These geometrical figures refer to a framing device within Romantic complexity, which may seem to produce two realms: the *ab extra* and *ab intra* labels within these spatial metaphors: heaven and earth, love and mind, matter and immortality, reasoning and understanding, finite and infinite, empiricism and sensationism, feelings and affections, and the natural and supernatural.

These viewpoints hopefully constitute the objective and the problematic aspect we may encounter in Emerson’s work in which the self – and the *Principium of Individualism* (personal spiritual fulfillment within a democratic ethos)- may emerge as a conflicting entity, disintegrated in all kinds of ways: divided, subdivided, and still further subdivided in all directions and producing a myriad of combinations and dissociations, representing a double synthesis within this *Principium of Individualism*. This double will be referred to as *An Internal Conflict of the Soul*: the *agon* enacting struggle between the individualism (Me) and his double (Not Me)—infinite/finite, or an effort to perceive and minimize nature into the self itself — the historical entity which may seem to provide the reader a variety of misapprehensions within an idealist (Romantic?) agenda.
The process that will be forged in these chapters will allow us to unveil Emerson’s relationship with Romantic tradition(s) and his notion of the self as a dynamic entity built by discourse. Besides it will allow us to realize Emerson’s contribution to the American revision of the spiritual autobiographical tradition.
Chapter One: Part One

An Internal Conflict of the Soul: A Romantic Unsolved

Issue: Some Critical and Theoretical Approaches

Ma vie entière n’a guère été qu’une longue rêverie
divisée en chapitres par mes promenades de tous les jours.

Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Les Rêveries

Ich mubte überall die Flucht ergreifen. Bin alles gewesen. . . . Lebte
auf den Alpen, weidete die Ziegen, lag Tag und Nacht unter dem
enendlichen Gewölb des Himmels, von den Winden gekühlt und von
innern Fruer gebrannt.

Goethe, "Sturm Und Drang"

We choose these quotes from Rousseau and Goethe since they illuminate the philosophical backdrop that lies at the core of Romanticism. These quotes reflect not only the dawn of a new century but also the announcement of a modern age, since this movement born in the late eighteenth century enhanced radical reactions in literature, society, the individual, philosophy, art, music, ethics, religion, and politics. Besides they signal our understanding of Romanticism as an intellectual movement associated with the history of ideas – Illuminism and Liberalism that cut itself from the umbilical cord of the tradition of the immediate past in its attempt to bring the Individual to the center of discourse.

As will become clear, this analysis does not aim to be a summary of the Romantic problem. Hopefully it will provide the background that may
illuminate Emerson’s spiritual quest and personal fulfillment. Early Romantic writers actually help the contemporary reader to unveil Emerson’s literary identity.

Rousseau and Goethe may be considered representative Romantic figures that achieve creative maturity in the late eighteenth century. They are inspired by new idealism that echoes freedom, individualism, happiness, equality, and fraternity. In their works one may recognize the dramatic conflict of a *Principium of Individualism*: a focus both on the individual with his subjective and imagination power, and on his psychological background in the flow of his own stream of consciousness, perceptions, thoughts, spiritual feelings in the awaking soul and mind in accordance with social, religious, and political principles.

This notion refers to the individual inner world of spirit, spiritual self as he/she employs a sort of an integration of his/her own way of knowing and thinking. David M. Robinson puts forward a relevant topic when he claims that Emerson’s philosophy is “founded on his belief in a kinship with other individuals and with the things and events around us that suggest the common origins and shared constitution of all reality” (Robinson 2).

The tension that underlines this dialogue between the self and community may echo the tradition previously identified with Goethe and Rousseau. In *European Romanticism: Literary Cross-Currents, Modes, and Models*, Lilian R. Furst had in mind Goethe’s *Die Leiden des jugen Werthers*
and Rousseau’s *Les Rêveries du promeneur Solitaire* when she states “The autonomy of the individual, his right to self-determination, to freedom from social constraints and even from cognitive limitations, was to become one of the tenets of romanticism” (146). Furst goes on claiming: “The stance of Werther and of the solitary walker [may seem to] represent an important prefiguration of this, which was soon to become widespread” (Idem).

The tension between loneliness and community, between personal and collective quest will be approached later in more detail. Nevertheless at this stage we must focus on this new idealism which tends to challenge rather than champion the social and moral values of his time. The Romantic somehow saw himself/herself as champion of cult of his/her own personality. He/she conjectures to embrace all means of heightening imaginative experience. And, as will see ahead, this experience, this tension between personal experience and social agenda were channeled into Romantic art.

Bearing this in mind, the Romantic writer may seek for reconciliation between the inner and outer experiences; he/she appears to be searching for a perception that allows him/her to reactivate the outer world, to provide it with meaning, while re-discovering himself/herself, while building a new social and political discourse. In this process the Romantic writer prizes the powers of his/her own intuition and conceives of nature in a deeply subjective sense that had been lost in the preceding period. The Romantic seemed to be looking forward for an art in which reason would be replaced by emotion, imagination
and intuition; he/she seemed to be looking for art in which the mind would succumb before the heart; the rigid forms regulated by rule would, perhaps, give way to wild freedom of expression. The main cultural background changed, and the humanism of ancient Greece and Rome was replaced by the Gothic mysticism of the North.

In this light, Romanticism may be viewed as a dynamic movement against the rationalism and empiricism of the eighteenth century; a cluster of history of ideas, aesthetic style, and an attitude or spirit of revolt. In *Masterpieces of American Romantic Literature*, Melissa McFarland Pennell rightly reminds that “the various ideas that emerged as Romanticism took shape in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries are sometimes referred to as constituting the Romantic rebellion or revolution, a rejection of the objectivity and empiricism that had defined intellectual understanding during the Age of Reason” (Pennell 1).

It is this dynamic aspect that appears to lead the poets to the discovering of Nature as a living power, standing in an organic relation to the individual, and of the imagination itself as a shaping, creative force. This aspect must be traced to a touchstone of Romantic theorization, Samuel Taylor Coleridge. Coleridge ponders on the dynamic links between human mind and Nature, and gives special emphasis on the dialogue between the poetic act – the Imagination, the perceiving mind, and the physical phenomenon: reflections regarding viewpoints that link human mind in
correlation with Nature in the sense that within this gulf there seems to exist a
dialogue between the poetic act and the relationship of the perceiving mind
and the physical phenomenon. Or as Avelar claims in O Nascimento de uma
Nação (Nas origens da literatura Americana) that “imagination” appears to be
at the center of Emerson’s oeuvre (231).

Besides the nostalgia for ancient culture, a remote, shadowy,
picturesque past, and the persistent thirst for subjects taken from humble life,
the exaltation of nationalism, and the incessant relocation of the individual self
fed Romanticism with new ideological paths. Heterogeneity actually seems to
be at the core of Romanticism. In order to understand its dynamic, one must
place it within a broader context of history of ideas, or in conjunction with
other national and international literatures.

In Atlantic Poets: Fernando Pessoa’s Turn in Anglo-American Modernism,
Maria Irene Ramalho de Sousa Santos, while focusing on viewpoints linked to
Romanticism and cross-cultural exchange, rightly claims: “national literatures
[may seem to] continue to be thought of, by and large, as self-contained,
ahotellic entities. . . . the assumption that the heteroreferentiality of national
[or international] literatures and cultures constitutes their original proper
mode, regardless of ‘influences’” (4-5). In this vein, we may contend that
there seem not only to exist many kinds of Romanticisms, but also, and
probably, different kinds of Romantic poetic strategies that, although in
different styles, manners and moods, appear to share certain features. These
features must be brought to mind while discussing *An Internal Conflict of the Soul: A Romantic Unsolved Issue?* The personal experience, the personal aesthetic, the *Principium of Individualism* seems to reside at the heart of the Romantic agenda(s).

The individual viewpoint, the tension between private and social, between personal and political keep on emerging at the center of Romantic aesthetics. In *American Romanticism: Literary Movements and Genres*, Jennifer A. Hurley suggests that “the Romantic movement [may not only seem to be] influenced by the rise of democracy thought,” but also and perhaps it conjectures to reveal “a feeling of triumphant individualism and self-love” (Hurley 16-17). It was perhaps within democracy, and within this movement which historically we call Romanticism, that the individual appears to pledge his own song of allegiance.

In this regard, the heteroreferentiality [borrowing Santos’s word] or confusion surrounding the term Romanticism may seem to be largely deepened by further attempts of definition. Its complexity thus requires further reflection. Before moving forward we must go back to Rousseau and Goethe.

We must start with Rousseau’s *Les Rêveries du promeneur Solitaire*, as cited at the beginning of this chapter, “Confessions,” and *Nouvelle Heloise*, since in these books he intends to penetrate into the individual, as a Free Man, natural man, whose life appears to have many phases, whose life seems to be
divided into many chapters. This division conjectures to be part of Romantic inflection in the sense that his ego, as it walks through nature, seems to be imbued, psychologically, with an intensive feeling and desire to imitate nature, and to escape from reality into a world of dreams. In it there seems to exist a double vision of man: the *Me and Not Me*, as Emerson would state later. Rousseau attempts to distinguish and harmonize both nature and art, in a certain sense, because, “Poesie,” as Friedrich Schlegel had written in *Der Poesiebegriff der deutschen Romantic* “ist der ursprungliche Zustand des Menschen und auch der letzte” (Schlegel 87). Schlegel attempted to envisage poetry as a bolder expression of human life. Poetry may seem to reflect to “des Menschen,” and in particular to the human poet, a relevant task: a possible truly organic account of the universe by demonstrating the relationship between God and humanity. These ideas would also be reflected in Novalis’ works where *Die romantische Poesie* may seem to be progressive and that *Die Welt* along with *Der Man* “muss romantisirt werden” (144).

In his important essay *Romanticism Reconsidered*, Northrop Frye turns upon viewpoints pertaining to the study of Romanticism, and claims that “[t]he individual becomes the ego, and the ego turns to a kind of perversion of Puritanism, seeking the principle of its own being in a pure detachment which rebuffs everything that it might come to depend on or be indebted to, especially pleasure” (Frye vii). This aspect echoes on the literary and philosophical theories that conceive of the individual at the center of existence.
Besides it places the individual at the core of art, by making literature valuable as a medium of communication through which the poet expresses his/her feelings and particular attitudes. The total characteristics that appear to pertain to Romantic program cannot stabilize the confronting problem between finite-infinite.

Having this in mind, it is crucial to elaborate further on the traditional approaches to Romanticism in Germany before approaching the English specificity.

In Goethe’s famous essay “Sturm Und Drang,” the dualism between Vollendung (completion) and Unendelichkeit (infinity), inclines to infuse aspects of subjectivity and objectivity, or even incompleteness that were discussed by the Jena Romantics. Goethe may seem not to stand at the period known as Zeit der Klassic: a period that took place between 1786 and 1805, but also we must hold him as a fundamental figure within the context of European Romantic Movement. In The Western Canon, Harold Bloom claims

Goethe is in himself an entire culture, the culture of literary humanism in the long tradition that goes from Dante to Faust, Part Two, the canonical achievement of Vico’s Aristocratic Age. In the memory of Goethe, the classics of the Theological Age—Homer, the Athenian tragedies, the Bible—are crossed by Dante, Shakespeare, Calderon, and Milton, and what issues from this crossing is a culture that, in Goethe’s era and nation, belonged to Goethe alone. (Bloom 201)

These viewpoints deal with the conceptual genealogies that coincide with the significance of the broader social and historical context of Romanticism. It
reflects not only our reading of Bloom’s observations on the roots of the concept (Romantic), but also our understanding that Romanticism in Germany may seem to derive from both Gothic Middle Ages—gothic and sentimental novels focused on human emotion, in a certain sense, because, in them, there seemed to exist a desire to preserve certain qualities of medieval life, along with national identity and a growing respect for the Roman Catholic unity of pre-Reformation Europe.

Closely linked with this revival appears to be the cult of the emotions by romantic writers. Their exaltation of the imagination over reason can be found in the works of Schlegel and Novalis in which they place intuition at the core of individual insight. While reflecting on viewpoints associated with *Poesie und Prosa*, Schlegel wrote that Romantic poetry embraces “Eins und Alles,” [Emerson appears to come with his “Each and All” poem] in the sense that: “Der Poet steht eingentlich in der Mitte der Mythologie und der Volkskieder” (in Polheim 109). In France Madame De Staël would emphasize that Romanticism as “a new career would [perhaps] open to authors who have the talent to paint all emotions of the human heart, and are able to use their intimate knowledge of it to involve us” (David H. Richter 289).

These aspects reflect not only on the exaltation of Principium of Individualism in order to build a new and highly inner world within this Internal Conflict of the Soul, but also it may seem to elevate the dignity of the poet as he/she intends to create the world in the act of perceiving it: the
inward versus outward; the unconscious versus (self-) conscious; the poet
myth-making versus the perplexities of reflective thought. These viewpoints
bring to mind Novalis’ definition of Romantik Poesie as “die grosse Kunst der
Construction der transcendentalen Gesundheit. Der Poet ist also der
transcendentale Artz” (Idem 142). As we will see ahead in Chapter Four, “The
Nature and Function of the Poet,” this line of thought echoes in Emerson’s
famous proclamation “the poet is the Namer or Language-maker” (“The Poet”
21).

This network path brings us closer to Robert M. Wernaer’s arguments
while reflecting on the differences between the historical explication of
Romanticism as it occurred in both England and Germany. In his book
Romanticism and the Romantic School in Germany, Wernaer points out some
“romanticists’ forerunners”: “Rousseau, Hamann, Lavater, the Stormers and
Stressers, Bürger, Herder, Heine, the young Goethe and Schiller” (22). While
continuing to focus on the argument that reflects the implicit literary history
which tends to obscure Goethe’s role in the development and history of
Romanticism, Wernaer states:

In those revolutionary days . . . our writers were born, [Madame de Staël in
1766], August Wilhelm Schlegel in 1767 . . . Freidrich Schlegel and Novalis in
1772 . . . It is [also] to be noticed that these dates precede by a few years the
corresponding dates of our English romanticists,— Wordsworth was born 1770,
Scott in 1771, Coleridge in 1772, Byron in 1788, Shelley in 1792, Keats in
1795. (23)
The scene-spectrum on the genesis of Romanticism in England may seem to fall into different viewpoint. Most neo-pragmatic scholars, such as A. O. Lovejoy’s essay ["On the Discrimination of Romanticism" (1920)], and M. H. Abrams [The Mirror and the Lamp (1953)], and Natural Supernaturalism: Tradition and Revolution in Romantic Literature (1971), and Harold Bloom, [The Western Canon (1994)], agree that the Romantic Movement can be traced back to the works of William Blake (1757-1827), continuing through the end of the eighteenth and the early nineteenth centuries with William Wordsworth, Samuel Taylor Coleridge, Percy Bysshe Shelley, and John Keats, before reaching the second flowering in the United States, chiefly in the works of Ralph Waldo Emerson and his fellow countrymen, Henry David Thoreau, Margaret Fuller, Walt Whitman and Emily Dickinson.

At this stage we must summon three thorough-going viewpoints surrounding the term Romanticism in the Anglo-American tradition, mostly to the neo-pragmatic reception in figures such as the above mentioned M. H. Abrams, A. O. Lovejoy and Harold Bloom because they are the most comprehensive historical, critical explicators of the term Romanticism as it occurred in both Germany and England before its importance into American soil.

Abrams’ understanding of Romanticism as associated with an older "History of Ideas" approach and modern secularization from ancient religious views provides us a large contextualization upon the theory of double vision
which seems to suggest itself as being opposite with Goethe’s position of the vastly often differing elucidations of Romanticism found in Anglo-American literature. In fact, if we peruse the Jena Romantic writers like Goethe, Schlegel, De Staël, and Novalis, through Abrams’ lens of definition of Romanticism, out of which the term may seem to encompass and “naturalize the supernatural and the divine” (Natural Supernaturalism 68), it seems quite clear that they were chiefly concerned with spiritual issues. Thus the Romantic writer may seem to interconnect the relationship between God, nature, and the soul. In his attempt to define Romanticism, Abrams writes that:

It is a historical commonplace that the course of Western thought since the Renaissance has been one of progressive secularization, but it is easy to mistake the way in which that process took place. Secular thinkers have no more been able to work free of the centuries-old Judaeo-Christian culture than Christian authors were able to work free of their inheritance of classical and pagan thought. The process — outside the exact sciences at any rate — has not been the deletion and replacement of religious ideas but rather the assimilation and reinterpretation of religious ideas, as constitutive elements in a word view founded on secular premises. Much of what distinguishes writers I call “Romantic” derives from the fact that they understood, whatever their religious creed or lack of creed, to save traditional concepts, schemes, and values which had been based on the relation of the Creator to his creature and creation, but to reformulate them within the prevailing two-system of subject and object, ego and non-ego, the human mind consciousness and its transactions with nature. (Supernaturalism 13)

We quote this passage in its entirety because it provides both a comprehensive historical aspect of how the Romantic writer tended to regard himself/herself as the most (interesting and) reliable topic of literary creation, and also how he/she was inclined to respond strongly to the impact of new
forces within the context of European Enlightenment. It seems to be clear that either consciously or unconsciously the Romantic writer intended to assimilate “the prevailing two-system of subject and object” through which the Romanticist tends to be a creator, a dreamer in order “to save traditional concepts,” but also to merge himself/herself into the moonlight of sensory perception and religious experience so that he/she is, perhaps, able to differentiate the ego and not-ego: the confusion which seems to be clear in defining the term Romanticism as it derives from different viewpoints.

This aspect brings us to A. O. Lovejoy’s view of the definition of the Romantic sensibility. In his essay “On the Discrimination of Romanticism,” Lovejoy raises the many difficulties and possibilities in defining the term Romanticism:

For one of the few things certain about Romanticism is that the name of it offers one of the most complicated, fascinating, and instructive of all problems in semantics. It is, in short, a part of the task of the historian of ideas, when he applies himself to study of the thing or things called Romanticism, to render it, if possible, psychologically intelligible how such manifold and discrepant phenomena have all come to receive one name. Such an analysis would, I am convinced, show us a large mass of purely verbal confusions operative as actual factors in the movement of thought in the past century and a quarter; and it would, by making these confusions explicit, make it easier to avoid them. (8)

This passage both ponders on the concept of Romanticism, and points out an analogy for the chain of objects and social problems that link various readings of this concept.
While approaching Romanticism as a rather complex concept, we must bring to mind the great chain of objects that the Romantic poet used to rely on. This is not a conclusion but rather it is a pathway of our investigation, an understanding of Romanticism as a fossil word that echoes the dualism infinite/finite. As Fritz Strich has pointed out in *Deutsche Klassik und Romantic, oder, Vollendung und Unendlichkeit* that ‘Die Sehnsucht der Romantik aber hat, wenn man hier noch von Ziel sprechen darf, ein unendliches Ziel: es liegt nicht nur in der Undendlichkeit, sondern es ist liegt sie selbst’ (70). Strich goes on to claim that ‘Die Seele der Romantik war die Sehnsucht ohne Ziel und Grenze und Gegenstand’ (107). These viewpoints actually emphasize the above mentioned *Principium of Individualism*: human consciousness and unconsciousness—the possibilities of human nature to be awakened by his/her own experience and sensibility in his/her attempt to transfer the perception of an object into an idea (“Grenze und Gegenstand”).

The poet’s attempt to transfer the perception of an object into an idea is relevant for the concerns of this work. We must remind the reader the fundamental cultural and historical figures within the Anglo-Saxon literature of the early nineteenth-century, Blake, Wordsworth, Coleridge and Shelley as they are a new generation of writers that helped to define Romanticism long before the term reached America.
In “The Ecchoing Green” William Blake associates Romanticism with the enchantments of nature. The poet’s soul may seem to be in conflict with dream-world in which the poem moves:

The Sun does arise,
And makes happy the skies.
The merry bells ring
To welcome the Spring.
The sky-lark and thrush,
The birds of the bush,
Sing louder around,
To the bells chearful sound
While our sports shall be seen
On the Ecchoing Green. (*Longman Anthology* 1394)

This poem reflects on a nuclear drama of the Romantic agenda when it reveals a sort of spiritual journey: the soul appears to perceive many sensations through myriad things. It reflects, to a certain sense, a kind of religious depth, because, as soon as the poet’s soul tends to move through different spatial signs, she sees the rising sun, listens not only to the bells, but also she becomes sensitized by the songs of birds: the beauty and the illusion in which the (synthesis between the) poet’s soul and mind appear to be moving in order to constitute poetic growth.

Wordsworth provides another aspect of Romanticism as he acknowledges the dependence of the individual upon the circumstances of time, space, and existence. In the “Prelude” he writes:

In Nature’s presence stood, as I stand now,
A sensitive and creative Soul.
This idea emerges in a letter to his sister Dorothy Wordsworth written on September 12th, 1790: “I am a perfect Enthusiast in my admiration of Nature in all her various forms” (Letters, New Selection, 2).

Here the sign (Romanticism) is associated with the theme of mutability. It functions as a path to achieve a noble inspiration and to explain not only his own state of mind, but also the soul’s unevenness and existence. Besides this sign somehow reveals a moral strain of this Internal Conflict of the Soul and her relationship to the natural world, but its Romantic essence, and perhaps, its intentness redeems the poem into an uncanny dualism between finite and infinite. This split summons the problematic conflict between conscious and unconscious: the human mind as it appears to “fly and land the universe,” or before “Nature’s presence” it is to be able to produce, duplicate and reduplicate itself into many chapters: the progressive doctrine of human perfectibility that would perhaps create new life style within this Principium of Individualism.

This duplication may not only seem to suggest that poetry reflects moral consciousness, but also it suggests that, as Wordsworth has stated, the poet finds inspiration both in the natural world and in the past. The poet realizes that nature is a sign of divine, and the imagination becomes the method of unveiling its divinity. This is the reason why in The Rhetoric of Romanticism Paul de Man points out: “the theme of imagination ... [is] linked
closely to the theme of nature . . . [may seem to be one of] the fundamental ambiguity that characterizes the poetics of romanticism” (de Man 2). This viewpoint reflects on the continuity of nature in order to reconstitute an original discourse within the *Internal Conflict of the Soul*: the ambiguous locus in a certain sense simultaneously stimulates different streams of thoughts within the self.

The claims of poetic imagination must also be linked to Coleridge’s poem “Kubla Khan.” In this poem the poet explores and reconciles both the pleasure and sacredness of the external world:

> In Xanadu did Kubla Khan  
> A stately pleasure-dome decree:  
> Where Alph, the sacred river, ran  
> Through caverns measureless to man  
> Down to a sunless sea. (*Longman Anthology* 1656)

And also

> The shadow of the dome of pleasure  
> Floated midway on the waves;  
> Where was heard the mingled measure  
> From the fountain and caves. (1657)

These two passages provide relevant examples of poetic creation within Romantic agenda since the different signs - “pleasure-dome, sacred river, caverns, a sunless sea, the shadow of the dome,” “caves,” may enhance a clarification of the concept – Romanticism. These signs reflect the notion that everything in the universe may be accessed through a hermeneutic process where the intuition plays a key role. The individual, the reader, the beholder
remains at the center of the whole process of discovery. Lilian R. Furst reminds in *The Contours of European Romanticism*,

> [it] continues to signify the primacy of the individual consciousness, an emphasis on emotion rather than reason, the espousal of irrationalism rather than rationalism, the reliance on vision rather than the orientation to reality, the trust in subjective reactions rather than objective standards. (Furst 12)

Personal insight may unveil a meaning in the silent discourse of the cosmos. When this is achieved the human being’s relationship with the cosmos definitely changes, and the self gains a new, renewed identity.

The poet’s visionary power comes forward in his/her attempt to understand the relation between self – the microcosm – and the larger realities of the social and political world – the macrocosm – and hopefully of the spirit. To a certain degree, these two instances, the outer and inner, conjecture to function as stimulus for the poet who engages himself/herself in the most relevant human activity: thinking. Thus the importance of personal insight in the whole process that leads to the revelation of an original Beauty, of an original cosmic discourse.

The second generation British Romantic poet Shelley follows this line of thought in his poem “Mont Blanc”:

> The everlasting universe of things
> Flows through the mind, and rolls its rapid waves,
> Now dark—now glittering—now reflecting gloom—
> Now lending splendor, where from secret springs
> The source of human thought its tribute brings
> Of waters,—with a sound but half its own. (*Longman Anthology* 1704)
This stanza summons relevant signs of the Romantic agenda. The range “of things” that “Flow through the mind” of human thought appear perpetually juxtaposed into new and sudden combinations in order to stabilize and destabilize poetic imagination. Poetic creativity may not only seem to be part of Romantic paradox for solution, but also it inclines to reveal the contradiction and the range of meaning and analogies within this “everlasting universe of things.” The juxtaposition of adverbs and adjectives “now glittering” and “now reflecting” intend to lead the poet’s soul into an unknown space: dark and gloom. This aspect emphasizes the problematic tension between infinite/finite shared both by Romantic and Transcendentalist writers.

Both the English Romantics and the Transcendentalists believe in a deep spiritual connection between the human being – self – and nature. They rely on subjective experience, including human emotions and imagination. Nature functions as a reservoir and stimulus for intuition that grants him/her higher truths. This process is enhanced by ordinary experience and by social interaction.

As we will see later, European Romanticism has seminal influence on American literature. In early nineteenth century its influence was already felt in the works of Washington Irving and Charles Brockden Brown. Both writers brought forward, however, a new topic, the wilderness. Along with this topic the frontier emerged as relevant American *topos*. The signs of American
identity helped in the revision of the line consciousness/unconsciousness pertaining to the Romantic agenda.

These authors and these topoi define the flowering of Romanticism in America. They will be part of the soil where Transcendentalism will find its roots. The American perception of European Romanticism tends to put the literature of the New World in connection with the heteroreferentiality of cross-cultural and international literatures. At the center of New England Transcendentalism stands a belief in the existence of universal truths that linger beyond ordinary perception and material existence.

Besides German idealism and English Romanticism, Transcendentalism owes its emergence to the growth of the Unitarian spirit in New England. As a movement, it relied on intuition and conscience. Although they seem to be summoned at all times, self-trust and self-reliance acquire a new dimension since self appears to trust the voice of a God Who speaks intrinsically.

In the 1830’s Ralph Waldo Emerson along with literary friends from Boston founded The Dial, a relevant vehicle for their new emerging ideas. At the core of these ideas stood the democratic notion that each person was able to apprehend truths directly from the external world. As Emerson writes in the “Over-Soul”:

The soul looketh steadily forwards, creating a world before her, leaving worlds behind her. She has no dates, nor rites, nor persons, nor specialties nor men. The soul knows only the soul; the web of events is the flowing robe in which she is clothed. (274)
Emerson stresses the opportunity of starting anew, of beginning the world again. In a New World, a new self, a new Adam emerges. The self appears to look before and after “the web of events” in order to create not only a visible world of her own, but also an intellectual independent invisible world. This philosophical attitude somehow provides the basis for a new religious awakening, for new hope, and for a “flowing” of national literature. This comes along with the political expectations for democracy in the 1830s—a seeming demand to put an end to America’s cultural apprenticeship from Europe, in a certain sense, because Emerson observes in 1837 that:

We will walk on our own feet; we will work with our own hands; we will speak our own minds. . . . A nation of men will for the first time exist, because each believes himself inspired by the Divine Soul which also inspired all men. (“The American Scholar” 115)

Emerson is aware of the philosophical background enmeshed in European Enlightenment, or Age of Reason, and in European Romanticism. This quote reflects Emerson’s pledging his own song of allegiance of self-reliance, but also it illustrates the offspring of a transcendentalism “inspired by Divine Soul which also inspired all men.” It also reflects on a revision of national pride, of faith in social and political democracy. The Principium of Individualism is built within this specific American democracy experience: within an American democratic ethos. As Lawrence Buell has pointed out in Emerson “Self-Reliance,” [is] “Emerson’s theory of the bedrock equivalence of individual constitutions” (Buell 74).
As the quote from “Over-Soul” made clear, Emerson welcomes the intuitive, mystical and idealistic philosophy of the East. His work promised to create new forms that would eventually convey and foster intellectual thought, mental attitudes, new relations, incorporating experience, science, history and art: a philosophy of the human being as a conscious being. These aspects reflect a dynamic conception of the relationship between the human being and nature in which “the soul looketh . . . forwards.” Besides, it seems to draw upon Romantic thought in the formulation of an organic aesthetic.

Language and art are both expressions and translations of nature. The human being and the universal meaning appear to be found within "the web of events."

Emerson invokes a whole set of evaluative remarks through which human self, standing at the center of the Romantic aesthetic, promotes subjective experience and emotional responses over reason while looking to nature in order to find inspiration, to find a guide to moral life. Self and soul become part of a single unified identity. The flowing discourse represents not only individual expression, but also a revision of discourse, the translations of nature; human and universal meaning can be found in the forms of nature. Personal – microcosm – identity merges deep in collective – macrocosm – identity.

A whole process of revelation stands at the center of personal experience. Growing means the unveiling of an original discourse shared by
microcosm and macrocosm: the unveiling of Beauty and Truth. Ernest Bernbaum claims: “the Universe willed to reveal its essential nature and its eternal purposes to Man” (xxvi). Bernbaum also states that Romanticism “spoke to individual men through Nature, and through other men endowed with the gift of conveying truth and beauty” (idem). If one bears in mind the ongoing importance of Nature in American experience, in American History, one can easily identify how much the legacy of Romanticism owes to this sign. Its political impact would also become clear in years to come.

In George Ripley: Transcendentalist and Utopian Socialist, Charles Crowe investigates Ripley’s ideas. In the critic’s view these are closely allied to the Jacksonian agrarian period. Democratic experience dives deep then in a Western Christian tradition: “The nineteenth century [seems to be sensitized by] a sincere desire to follow Christ [and] to work for the end of slavery, war, poverty, and economic oppression” (Crowe 129). Furthermore, Crowe adds that the human being was urged “to work for a democratic culture appropriate to the institutions of the future” (29). This reading reopens relevant speculations within American cultural History – Calvinist legacy – about human (Manifest) destiny.

In the nineteenth-century “to dream daringly of a new world” in which “the general status quo” appears to raise “anxieties in an age of astonishing population growth, immigration, commercial expansion, changing customs, and decline in the effectiveness of old religious and social institutions” (124).
This complex series of factors would lead American writers to move from the early 17th century to modern times, and to foster new sense of self, which we will analyze in the following study.

American experience actually is instrumental in the revision of European Romanticism that will take place during the nineteenth century. While discussing Romanticism as a literary movement Roy Porter and Mikulas Teich suggest that the term is associated “with the ‘truth of the imagination and the holiness of the heart’s intentions,’ with a love of nature in the wild, and with the spiritual discovery of the self” (Porter and Teich1). The two critics go on to argue that “Wordsworth, Coleridge, and their contemporaries rejected and repudiated this idea; they turned back on the philistine world, wondering lonely in search for eternal, the ideal, pure truth and beauty to what Coleridge called ‘inner goings-on’” (1). These insights direct us to Bloom’s view on European theoretical influence in Emerson’s thought. In Agon: Towards a Theory of Revisionism, Harold Bloom puts forward a relevant philosophical topic, Gnosticism. He claims that man’s Gnostic vision in the process of knowing himself is associated with the cosmic creation, and suggests a dialectical interplay of presence and absence (54-159). Bloom’s observations somehow bring to mind Alexis De Tocqueville’s predictions: “America is the embodiment of a providentially sponsored evolution of the democratic spirit as it replaces, in some cases for better and others for worse, the aristocratic ideals that had flourished for centuries in England and France” (Kammick, In
his Introduction to Alexis De Tocqueville’s masterpiece). Kammick claims: “America embodied the spirit of the age, the world-historic transformative process whereby hierarchical, deferential, and communal values were inexorably being supplanted by new ideals of individualism and equality” (xxv). America seems to be a place where the self is in permanent conflict between a distant providential God and hidden God that although hidden can be revealed; between a Calvinist tradition and a Transcendentalist tradition.

These topics, the tension between self and Nature, between concealment and revelation, between experience and insight, point out crucial denominators for the development of the present study. Although they may seem to be in confrontation among themselves, they are central pillars in our attempt to analyze Romantic art within specific social, political, economic and historical contexts. Besides, they call attention to the importance of examining the individual’s role in the nineteenth-century in America.

As we have pointed out above, this chapter aims at drawing a map of the constellation of viewpoints that may stand at the center of the *Principium of Individualism* along with intuition, and self-reliance. This *Principium* also refers to the shifts of thoughts within the human mind’s imagination. These may be figured out only by approaching the theme of illusion. Since nature is supposed to have a positive influence on man, it may function as a key connection between the individual soul and the World/Over-soul.
The dialogue between the individual soul and the World-soul refers to the psychological principles that appear to guide the individual in order to grasp two kinds of perceptions: \textit{knowledge by acquaintance and knowledge about}. The different but complementary perceptions denounce a conflicting paradigm, a paradigm structured upon a dichotomy between inner and outer worlds. This dichotomy echoes another one, the dichotomy between scientific knowledge and aesthetic sensibility.

The Romantic paradigm may surpass this dichotomy, since the individual seems to emerge as the source and route of knowledge. In the wake of the Liberal shift of paradigm the individual started to believe that the knowledge of the natural world was available through subjective intuition. Consequently, all truths could be perceived through one’s experience of the natural world. This subjective truth would emphasize and encourage the individual to develop his/her own best self by motivating him/her to do the work for which each one was best suited within a Romantic agenda.

To some extent, with the outcry of the American Revolution and with nostalgia for the past, in Irving’s and Brown’s works, Romanticism had already expanded the horizon of human history. It appealed for the individual to look back at the glory of the fathers as the dawn of civilization, which was a firm standard for moral and spiritual life. Although Romanticism became an historical movement through which human nature attempted to decipher itself,
it also became an intellectual *topos* in which the *Principium of Individualism* could be understood in an inclusive perspective. A new synthesis was required.

In *Doubles: Studies in Literary History*, Karl Miller conjectures that

America is an orphan of a kind. The ethos of the first European settlements spoke both of ostracism and of escape, of hardship and danger and of a new life. Then, at later time, like some romantic person of that time, the country declared its independence, and the New World began in earnest. The New World began when romance began again in literature, and it entered upon a divided relationship with the Old, rejecting the past which it was nevertheless to resume and perpetuate. It became a haven for outcasts, but also their pursuer, a strange place of chases and journeys . . . For such place, the imagination of an Ishmael and of a plural self, of rebellion, hostility, and distress, of secrecy and mystery, adventure and escape, could not fail to make sense. (349)

In line with Miller’s view we contend that in mid nineteenth-century any separation from the past, either at the individual or collective level, was a generator of instability, of conflict, of ambiguity and fragmentation.

The philosophical rupture enhanced by the Transcendentalists directed the human being down new paths through which he/she could reconstruct his/her own relationship with the surrounding world. In search for lost uniqueness or identity, the self attempts to postulate the molded rebirth in beauty, in ideals, in unity, purity and kindness. In short, a new emerging self projects a rehabilitative process of being that would eventually lead to the knowledge of the soul. This shift of relationship has obvious implications in the way the relationship between microcosm and macrocosm is structured; and this implies a shift in a rhetorical approach to the real.
In *The Symbol of the Soul from Hölderlin to Yeats: A Study in Metonymy*, Suzanne Nalbantian argues that “the imagery relating to the soul in the course of a century, [appears to] find a mutation of metaphor that gradually destroys that dichotomy and in so doing is suggestive of a basic change in sensibility, ultimately leading to a [probable] state of spiritual shipwreck” (Nalbantian 6). Although “the early Romantic poets accept the metaphor of man’s dual existence . . . the signifier, soul, and the evolution of its significance, [demonstrate] a striking phenomenon in the poetics of the nineteenth century” (7). This analysis helps us to understand that what the romantic poet expresses in his/her work depends not only on personal experience and feeling, but also on the literary tradition and convention. Balbantian’s viewpoint reflects the gist of human condition. But this fact must be viewed with caution, because the individual conjectures to be at the center of an invisible and visible world.

In the same line of Nalbantian’s analysis Marcel Brion’s *Art of the Romantic Era: Romanticism. Classicism. Realism* illuminates several questions previously raised. In his view, all discourse formulations appear to be variable paths of conceptualizing the relationship between Emerson’s and the outer world. They show the difficulties of a late Romantic experience towards an organic unity which seems to provide a given organic form through process of images, symbol, eventually structure. The poet’s own intuition and the cosmic creation are thus conjectured:
The clearest and most colorful traits of the romanticist are his loving and longing looks into the past and into the future, his delight in rosy recollections and fervid hopes, his easy and fanciful dreams of distant place and distant clime, and his preoccupation with the curious, the strange, and the mysterious. His revolutionary spirit prefers to act on faith, to trust the inner experiences of life, to follow the sentimental longings of his heart. (2)

This passage reflects not only on the outward forms or representations of sensible objects, but it also emphasizes the importance of the poet’s personal experience. At the ideological level, this prima truth may seem to reinforce individualism and self-reliance in a solitary communion with tradition, epitomizing a dramatization of the difficulty of maintaining a proper equilibrium between self-trust and moral conscience.

This moral conscience is linked with the values of freedom and democracy. Besides, they rely on Protestant traditions that marked the industrial revolution phase; but these schemes of values only remain an increasingly inadequate source of our critical perspective.

In the same move, Sacvan Bercovitch projects in The American Jeremiad a vivid picture of the emergence of social and cultural preoccupations with the inner experience of the past: to find a new way of living and a new way of thinking. The concept of jeremiad stands at the core of Bercovitch’s analysis:

The ritual of the jeremiad bespeaks an ideological consensus- in moral, religious, economic, social, and intellectual matters- unmatched in any other modern culture. And the power of consensus is nowhere more evident than in the symbolic meaning that the jeremiad infused into the term America. . . . Of all symbols of identity, only America has united nationality and universality, a civic and spiritual selfhood, secular and redemptive history, the country’s past and paradise to be, in a single synthetic ideal. (Bercovitch 176)
Personal experience finds a stimulating intellectual, religious and emotional background in the biblical tradition. An ethos framed by a specific approach to this tradition – the Unitarian – informs the idealist experience in America. The Romantic attitude somehow dissolves itself in a new sensibility; for the Transcendentalists thought also means action. Political discourse and a wide web of (religious, philosophical) ideas merge thus building a specific ethos.

In *Philosophy for a Time of Crisis: An Interpretation with Key Writings by Fifteen Great Modern Thinkers* Adrienne Koch somehow approaches this shift in sensibility

> Historians, looking backward over the course of Western civilization, readily recognize periods of crisis in the career of man, indicated by upheavals in economic, social, and political organization that threatened long-established values and challenged the usual modes of control. (Koch 17)

This rapture with traditional artistic models, (prevalent during the 18th Century in the United States of America, imported from European models) reveals a rather relevant wave of creativity in those times. Culture turns to imagination since it didn’t supply any metaphysical or spiritual explanations for the members of the community who stand confusedly in search for comprehension about the meaning of this world and life beyond. A passage in “The American Scholar” opens a breach toward this antebellum period:

> We do not meet for games of strength of skills, for the recitation of histories, tragedies, and odes, like the ancient Greeks; . . . nor for the advancement of science, like our contemporaries in the British and European capitals. . . .
Perhaps the time is already come when it ought to be, and will be, something else. (81)

This passage manifests itself in a wide range of fields: from economy to agriculture, from science to culture, among others. Here literature plays a relevant role. In fact, until mid 19th century, American Literature seems to imitate and follow the European style, models, and aesthetics. With the 19th Century a new era was born. A New Man (Adam?) emerged through his way of thinking about himself and his world, the New World or in Alex De Tocqueville’s words “the new idea” (28). This new creativity is urged in America with new lands, new human beings, new thoughts, but on what grounds? In *Main Currents of American Thoughts: An Interpretation of American Literature from the Beginnings to 1920*, Vernon Louis Parrington, by discussing the circumstances leading up to the origins of the American socio-cultural and historical life, anticipates “with a certain feeling of temerity” (i), the intellectual backgrounds, and especially with those diverse systems of European thought that from generation to generation have domesticated themselves in America, and through cross-fertilization with native aspirations and indigenous growths, have resulted in a body of ideals that we reckon definitively American. (iii)

Within the same light, in *American Romanticism and the Marketplace*, Michael T. Gilmore problematizes the Romantic vision, which was argued by Leon Chai. Gilmore writes that:
The revolution began perhaps a decade and a half earlier, and required the Civil War to complete, but it proceeded as its most rapid pace during the very years when the classic works of American literature were produced. Literature itself became an article of commerce at this time, as improvements in manufacture, distribution, and promotion helped to create a national audience for letters. . . . the commercialization of society and culture, profoundly affected the American romantics and had a shaping influence on the themes and form of their art. (Gilmore 1)

This passage emphasizes the social and moral conditions of a new era in which New England thought and American literature were about to grow. It appears to incline on a full flowering of an ideology based on the imagination as unifying mental powers. The imagination enables the poet to envision eternal truths, or as Santos had pointed out “a knowledge and vision that is of the highest quality . . . . from the tradition conflation in the culture of poetry and origin” (Santos 23) on American soil in which the individual may seem to be uprooted, isolated, anxious, and confronted by a world of turmoil. It also reflects on the civic responsibility as an attempt to establish a widespread effort to improve education in America: a shared American idealism of individualism or a sort of romantic current, an emergence of feeling and freedom beyond the limits set by rationalism and rules during the 18th century. This passage is both connected with the intellectual renascence which was germinating in New England, and with the Romantic tide which, as a reflux of rationalism and neo-classicism, was now surging throughout European life and hence into American thought by a myriad of discontinuous channels.
Leon Chai in *The Romantic Foundations of the American Renaissance*, conjectures that: “Despite obvious discontinuities, it seems possible in at least some respects to regard the American Renaissance as the final phase of a movement that begins with European Romanticism” (xii). Chai provides a relevant analysis of American literary history, which not only depicts concerns about the rise of a new mentality but also demonstrates how the new emerging (Adamic?) civilization promotes the triumph of the self.

While cutting his cultural and intellectual connections with the Past, Ralph Waldo, the Transcendentalist main reference, seems to adopt, from his European counterparts, a new path, a new system in which reform, technology and utopia become the most recurrent themes and styles of the Age. Joel Myerson reminds: “The resulting loss of economic individuality or selfhood came about at the same time as the industrial revolution,” [and that] . . . in New England, the Transcendentalists” seem to have “found themselves responding to this loss by posing a solution to the anomie of their contemporaries” (xxxii). While discussing the importance of this intellectual movement in American thought, Perry Miller suggests the Transcendentalists were “caught up in a crisis of the spirit and of the nation, a crisis that carries immense implications for the American predicament not only in their time but also in ours” (Miller 7). These viewpoints may propound the fundamental difference between Romanticism and Transcendentalism: the relationship between self and nature, subject and object.
In a touchstone on Transcendentalism, *American Renaissance: Art and Expression in the Age of Emerson and Whitman*, F. O. Matthiessen considers that the artist

felt that it was incumbent upon [his] generation to give fulfillment to the potentialities freed by the Revolution, to provide a culture commensurate with America’s political opportunity . . . . but what [seems to] emerge from the total pattern of [his] achievement . . . is [a] literature for our democracy. (Matthiessen xv)

It is through this despairing pattern that the individual may unveil in Transcendentalism a response to a cultural crisis that was anchored on topics such as spontaneity, nationalism, and liberalism. The self emerges then as a problematic entity enhanced by the Romantic inflection.

Nevertheless, would this new literary culture be genuinely American, or would it represent only the re-creation of the legacy of the past? Was this new way of thinking based on original values, principles, and rules, or were they a reformulation of existing concepts? On the other hand, was that process of rebirth, filled with contradictions and internal conflicts, capable of neutralizing the influence of the individual and collective past? If contradiction seems to be a main literary characteristic of the romantic period that emerges in the 19th Century, how can they reconcile them with a transcendental concept of the human being.

In order to move forward, we must question the revisionists of American Romanticism, as well as the structural view of German and English
Romanticisms, out of which Emerson’s doctrine of self-reliance would emerge. We must also ponder on certain fundamental aspects of Romanticism as a new theory in which the final link between mind and nature creates an organic relationship between matter and spirit. This intellectual approach to the universe, though it may seem to be pantheistic, reveals one of the fundamental aspects of Romanticism as a new way to re-examine the mind introspectively.

If we are to understand these views, we must trace back our question to the relationship between subject and object as it appears in Kant’s *The Critique of Pure Reason*.

While noting that man seems to be possessed of a synthetic *a priori* knowledge, Kant advances that “The world must have a beginning in time.’ The cause of this is as follows. In our reason, subjectivity considered as a faculty of human cognition, there exist fundamental rules and maxims of its exercise, which have completely the appearance of objective principles” (Kant 109). Here we are obliged to raise a question: Is this the line of thought to which Emerson attempted to adhere? This line of thought actually seems to reveal that Emerson was influenced by Kant’s views. The dualism between subjective and objective appearances can be associated with the *Principium of Individualism* in the sense that the faculty of human cognition is at the center of the whole hermeneutic process. If the poet exiles himself/herself, his/her
we exile contemplating being, from this earth, then, he/she runs the risk not to apprehend the subliminal discourse of the universe.

This viewpoint maps the route and the foundation of human thoughts for finding aesthetic forms and building aesthetic impressions as he/she attempts to overcome the duality between Reason and Understanding. The evidence of our own being and the evidence of the world’s phenomena begin and “proceeds,” as Kant had already observed “thence to understanding, and ends with reason, beyond which nothing higher can be discovered in the human mind for elaborating the matter of intuition and subjecting it to the highest unity of thought” (Pure Reason 109). Or, as Emerson would put it while reflecting on new phenomenon of human faculty: “The mind, penetrated with its sentiment or its thoughts, projects it outward on whatever it beholds” (“Poetry and Imagination” 11).

These two passages envision the human mind as a legislator of the outer world. They stress the individual innate faculties as distinct from subjective modes of experience. Actually, it is all that was alive and vitally active in Europe at the end of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth century which we call Romanticism.

Considering this aspect, we must recall Matthiessen’s contributions to the controversy between Reason and Understanding; the conflict between Natural and human nature, or the unbridgeable gap that seems to dominate at the beginning of Emerson’s book of Nature when the self is confronted with
the sublime view of the landscape. Matthiessen argues in *American Renaissance Art and Expression in the Age of Emerson and Whitman* that: “Kant’s distinction between the Reason and the Understanding . . . [seemed to influence Emerson’s self to] secure in the realm of [his own] higher laws” (Matthiessen 3). The American critic goes on to state that: “Today he [Emerson] has been overtaken by the paradox that ‘The Over-Soul’ proves generally unreadable; on the level of the Understanding, which he regarded as mere appearance, his tenacious perception left us the best intellectual history that we have of his age” (Idem). These observations can be traced back to Emerson’s approach to language symbolic nature: “A happy symbol is a sort of evidence that your thought is just. I had rather have a good symbol of my thought, or a good analogy, than the suffrage of Kant” ("Poetry and Imagination" 13). It is from this analogy that Emerson values human nature along with the cosmos; all which would have to appear in his inventory regarding issues linked to the Romantic pursuits: Organicism and environment, individual, history, religion, and cultural climate which may seem to be in a ceaseless interplay. This dialogue conjectures a return to primitive, original conditions of life in which the human being was advancing into a new frontier line: a problematic and continuous expansion that propounds to reveal the dominating features pertaining to American character as we will discuss ahead in Chapter Four.
Richard Moody’s reflection on the external and internal worlds, or between imagination and reality is helpful at this level. In America Takes the Stage: Romanticism in American Drama and Theatre, Moody suggests that:

The aesthetic phenomenon we call Romanticism is not easily placed in a particular period or a particular place, for it is a condition of the human consciousness which manifests itself, often simultaneously, in the infinitely varied domains of art, philosophy, music and poetry. . . . From all sides and in all directions are fused those unique features of unrest, of a notion of Becoming, of feelings -- feeling for nature, for the infinite and for distant pastures, for solitude, for the tragedy of Being and the inaccessible ideal--which constitute the principal elements of Romantic art. (13)

This passage reflects on the problem of anchoring Romanticism in a diachronic timeline; in History as narrative. Moody reminds that the term “Romantic” embodies a heterogeneous playing field of quite often different perceptions. In a common ground literature and art were waging a war on the classical standards in the name of a new relationship between the human being and nature. Also in a common ground the romantic writer/artist attempted to approach and apprehend the living world through his/her senses and imagination rather than reason. There is a new fresh infusion of ideas in turning attention from life to nature; the human being may think that he/she is here to observe the growth of a universal in which he/she attempts to find a direct spiritual inspiration from God through a personal unification with nature.

In this light, we must ask: Then what is American Romanticism? What place did God, man and nature occupy in American Romanticism?
Charles Brockden Brown’s and Washington Irving’s observations on the essence of American Romanticism are relevant to our study. While discussing the contrasting views linked to American Romanticism, Brown predicted that America’s “presentiments, dreams, vivid reminiscences, and sympathetic phenomena, of which introspective natures are conscious, indicate to the calmest reflection that we are linked to the domain of moral experience and of destiny by more than tangible relations” (63). Brown seems to ponder on language with the pleas for political, commercial, and literary independence in order to explore the meaning of his own country in the bosom of its wilderness.

In his Preface to *Edgar Huntley* written in 1799, his character carries a double (mental) existence. Writing and wilderness exploration symbolize the frontier between consciousness and unconsciousness. Although the word frontier is not exclusively applied here to the dualism of human mind, it represents an on-going return to the primitive conditions of the eighteenth-century as current waves of settlers concerning the presence of land and economic as well as the poetic imagination which might be traced back to the Old World. In this light, the writer’s mind is divided into two halves—the Old and New.

Emerson appears to be listening to Brown’s views regarding American culture, language, manners, chimeras, and wilderness. As early as in “The American Scholar” Emerson seems to be conceiving an idea of culture as a
revolutionary power that would awaken his fellows them to “quit the false and leap to true,” for “[w]e have listened too long to the courtly muses of Europe” (114-15). Or, as he would observe in *The Journals and Miscellaneous Notes* (1826):

> Every cultivated man observes in his past years intervals of mentality . . . & is accustomed to consider the present state of mind especially till the old age of man, depends on aliment procured from without. But this aliment for which we search the bosoms of other men, or their books or the face of external nature will be got in larger or less amounts according to circumstances quite as often without as within our control. (Vol.III.24)

Emerson’s observations regarding the polemical problem of his own country seem to be inspired by the divine power, out of which natural science might have been taking a new path. Brown actually opened the path for Emerson’s intellectual rupture:

> One merit the writer may at least claim—that of calling forth the passions and the engaging the sympathy of the reader by means hitherto unemployed by preceding authors. Puerile superstitions and exploded manners, Gothic castles and chimeras, are the materials usually employed for this end. The incidents of Indian hostility and the perils of the Western Wilderness are far more suitable; and for a native of America to overlook these would admit of no apology (*Preface* to Edgar Huntley, 1799). (Bank 17)

Later on in the same preface Brown goes on to argue that:

> America has opened new views to the naturalist and politician, but has seldom furnished themes to the moral painter. That new springs of actions and new motives to curiosity should operate,— that the field of investigation, opened to us by our country, should differ essentially from those which exist in Europe,—
may be readily conceived. The sources of amusement to the fancy and
instruction to the heart, that are peculiar to ourselves, are equally numerous
and inexhaustible. It is the purpose of this work to profit by some of those
sources; to exhibit a series of adventures, growing out of the condition of our
country, and connected with one of the most common and most wonderful
diseases or affections of the human frame. (17-18)

Brown’s argument may be amplified if we bring into our analysis his major
contemporary fellow writer, Washington Irving. We must start by remembering
Irving’s 1882 comment on the problems of his country.

Having been born and brought up in a new country, yet educated from infancy
in the literature of an old one, my mind was early filled with historical and
poetical associations, connected with place, and manners, and customs of
Europe: but which could rarely be applied to those of my own country. To a
mind this peculiar prepared, the most ordinary objects and scenes, on arriving
in Europe, are full of strange matter and interesting novelty. England is . . .
classic ground to an American. (Idem 67)

This passage provides a scene of moods and tones where we recognize the
topoi that signal Irving’s importance as introducer of the Romantic short story
in America. In a certain sense both Brown and Irving envision a literature full
of shadowy past in which the human mind seemed to be “filled with historical
and poetical associations.” Brown’s and Irving’s writing may seem to be a sort
of purgation by rejecting “the most ordinary objects and scenes” coming from
Europe for a distinctively and typically American art in which the artist,
painter, and philosopher, as Emerson would write in Nature, could express
his/her own ideal within this Principium of Individualism. Brown’s and Irving’s
observations somehow echo in Ralph Waldo Emerson’s first book of Nature as
he asks, “Of what use is nature?” Emerson begins at the most crucial point: that nature is a commodity.

Emerson’s position regarding the outer summons the importance of mood in personal perception. Then he moves toward a more abstract concept nature in which beauty, language, discipline, idealism, and spirit carry on the various meanings of activities of human life. He goes on to prefigure that human intuition hopes to lead him steadily away from the impermanent and perishable toward the absolute. And that his relationship to nature becomes ever more spiritual, its evil disappears, displaced by goodness and virtue (“Nature,” First Series 12).

In Emerson’s Theories of Literary Expression, Emerson Grant Sutcliffe, while reflecting on viewpoints linked to the natural world, claims: “External nature [may seem to be for Emerson] the source of all that is holy” (128). These reflect the Transcendentalist vision in which natural facts are symbols of particular spiritual facts. On the other hand, they articulate the different levels of unending flow of sensations, memories, thoughts, reflections, and feelings. This flow forms part of mental-emotional aspect of human life, but its gist remains between unified/disjointed views: a shifting sequence of thought and feeling to understand art as an expression of the artist within a Romantic agenda.

Matthiessen considers that the contrasting types of features of the Age derive from the notion of “transcendentalism as ‘romanticism in the Puritan
setting”” (104). This critic goes on to state that: “Emerson broke through the barriers of rationalism, [and] could not escape to the Middle Ages, as could Keats and even Coleridge, for the long distrust of Catholic ritual was deeply engrained in his background” (Idem). These viewpoints must be traced to Emerson’s work as vehicle to acknowledge his intrinsic and extrinsic belief in the unity of life, which has to be explained not in terms of history but in terms of individual experience. It envisions that self-reliance cannot be avoided; and that human life along with his/her moral conduct may seem to be a perpetual conflict between the universal ideal and the selfish desires of the individual.

American cultural history seems to reveal the natural clarities, polarities, and fragmentations of the voice of the Romantic self, of the Romantic poet who writes his/her own song of allegiance, Or in Emerson’s insight “[I] “see no reason why I should not have the same thought, the same power of expression, to-morrow. What I write, whilst I write it, seems the most natural thing in the world” (“Circles” 306). This antithetical aspect somehow preserves the artist’s poetical imagination through self-trust and a possible way to affirm him/herself before the diversity of the universe. This poetic affirmation between the empirical “I” and the outer noumenal remains, however, unachieved in the American Romantic imagination. It would wait for Emerson to be fulfilled.

This dualistic configuration through which the self appears to be in interplay with the universe motivates Emerson to urge the reader to “believe
your own thought, to believe that what is true for you in your private heart is true for all men,-that is genius. . . . A man should learn to detect and watch that gleam of light which flashes across his mind from within” ("Self-Reliance” 45). According to Emerson, Man attempts to move from the intractable to the tractable conceptual difficulties of his lifetime.

In “The Divinity School Address,” written three years before “Self-Reliance,” Emerson warns the reader to “dare to love God without mediator or veil” (145), not in conformity with the forms of the church, because “Historical Christianity has fallen into the error that corrupts all attempts to communicate religion . . . historical Christianity destroys the power of preaching, by withdrawing it from the exploration of the moral nature of man” (130). This approach to Christian ethos suggests that this tradition doesn’t provide a whole discourse upon which the American Principium of Individualism should be built. Emerson regarded personal experience as an intellectual action anchored on an going hermeneutic process. The ordinary citizen coincided with the writer in his/her power as reader; a reader of signs that stood latent in Nature, society, politics. The writer coincided with the ordinary citizen due to the importance of daily experience for his/her verbal exercises, for his/her poems. Inner and outer experiences become only different expressions of the same sign.

This dilemma will echo later in other relevant moments of American intellectual discourse. In “The Divided Self, and the Process of its Unification,”
(Writing 1902-1910) William James reopens a new polemical breach when he argues that

. . . the inner heterogeneity [may seem to be the] only trait that leads . . . a man of sensibility in many directions, who finds more difficulty than is common in keeping his spiritual house in order and running his furrow straight, because his feelings and impulses are too keen and too discrepant mutually. (158)

The concept of self-reliance as a means of sanctifying one’s own character may be linked to myriad of everlasting universe of things: “heterogeneity”—the consisting dissimilar elements within the human mind that inclines to propound not only the divorce of rational and irrational impulses, but also the tendency of Transcendentalists to overcome the frontier between the self and nature as one of the undoubtedly and difficult aspects to define the relationship between the individual and God, or Divine Spirit or Absolute. But this viewpoint would not only suggest that both the growth of the self and the organic form seem to hold innumerable perceptions, but also each of them functioning in separation. This perspective dialogues with the concept of natural law which in a certain sense lies behind the heterogeneity of nature: a spiritual law pervades throughout nature uniting all signs as part of an orderly cosmos. On the other hand, it also tends to reveal a Romantic ideology oscillating into dreams and longings, into unconscious and conscious, into light and darkness: an unbalanced flight of the poet’s mind from restraint and rules, suggesting that the individualism is both marked by an ethos of coeval revolutionary political ideas, and by many current beliefs and attitudes based on the legacy of the agrarian period [to look at
nature as source of life] may seem not only to be marked by an encouragement of revolutionary political ideas of the time, but also by many current beliefs and attitudes based on the legacy of the agrarian period [to look at nature as source of life]. Thus it may become clear that Romanticism was a dynamic movement; a movement that integrated the whole; a movement of Becoming rather than of Being. But this process of defining Romanticism makes our task difficult in our attempt to find its characteristics and themes when we deal with the America experience.

Francis E. Skipp speculates that “American literary Romanticism [may seem] to derive mainly from the English Romantic poets, particularly Coleridge and Wordsworth, and from German Romantic philosophy. Jonathan Edwards, in ‘A Divine and Supernatural Light,’ and ‘Images and Shadows of Divine Things’ [seem to be] native sources” (23). Skipp goes on to determine that “There are five principal Romantic themes in American literature” (idem) as follows:

1. intuition (“the truth of heart”) is more trustworthy than reason;

2. the expression of deeply felt experience is more valuable than the elaboration of universal principles;

3. the individual is at the center of life and God is at the center of the individual;

4. nature is an array of physical symbols from which knowledge of the supernatural can be intuited;

5. one should aspire to the Ideal, to changing what is to what ought to be. (23)

From this outline of main features, Skipp speculates that “Emerson is the most comprehensive and influential spokesman for the five principles”. This critic goes on to state that: “Nature and “Self-Reliance,” he adds, “are the most
important expression of his Romanticism. His powerful influence on Walt Whitman is clearly seen in Song of Myself, the key to understanding Leaves of Grass” (23), reflecting Emerson’s organic theory of evolution: a metaphor for the creative and daring human spirit to master somehow forms of experience.

Inevitably, in trying to pursue what the American Renaissance is, we urge to venture that the nature of the human being may be explained as a problematic condition of the continuity of Nature itself, but its essence remains unfolded. This notion suggests a projection of the mind to join and disjoin a transcendental process -- a redemptive journey of the self in which matter is the opposing side of spirituality. Thus, at a conceptual level, Transcendentalism would emerge as a unitary model, the origin and evaluative process of the being or as Emerson wrote in 1822 that: “the Mind shall reap all fruits of the toiling of the body . . . And every man who gives his unbiased thought to this view will deem it worthy of sedulous attention and profound pursuit” (JMN, Vol.I.105). These viewpoints of internal and external worlds in which body and mind are in confrontation, may be associated to the Romantic heterogeneity which explains human conduct in the course of life: the problematic issue between Imagination and Reason in which the everlasting events of things appear to solve this Internal Conflict of the Soul, but this drift conjectures to create some anxiety in the attempt to define romanticism.

In British Romantic Poets: Recent Revaluations, Shiv K. Kumar infers that “the word ‘romanticism’ refers to any number of things, it has two
primary referents: [First, it refers to] a general and permanent characteristic of mind, art, and personality, found in all periods and in all cultures; [secondly, to] a specific historical movement in art and ideas which occurred in Europe and America in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries” (1). Furthermore, Kumar adds that:

in this historical sense ‘romanticism’ as a revolution in art and ideas is often considered to be only an expression of a general redirection of European life which included also political revolution, an industrial revolution, and perhaps several others. There may be a connection between the revolution in ideas and the arts and the more or less contemporary revolutions in other fields of human activities. (1)

Following Kumar we argue that American writer, in mid 19th Century, lived in the throes of crisis: he/she was not able to escape from European influences. This passage reveals, as we have already discussed, not only a philosophical background, the Age of Reason: the birth and development of an evolutionary theory that would lead human nature into a new historical consciousness of human existence. Besides they help understand how they helped to create an independent American Romanticism in which the new political discourses enmeshed with the industrial revolution along with the idea of modern progress and consequent emerging topoi: imagination, organicism, sensibility, subjectivism, objectivism, rationalism, science, and pragmatism. Hopefully they all help building the Principium of Individualism in American grounds.

In his attempt to define Romanticism, Hans Eichner associates it with the spirit of the age while reminding of the importance of German thought,
namely within “the typological and historical concept of ‘romantic’ as defined by A. W. Schlegel . . . throughout Europe in the second decade of the nineteenth century” (12). “It was in A. W. Schlegel’s historical and typological sense that the concept of ‘romantic poetry’ spread across Europe; but in every country it reached, the term subsequently had a history of its own, with its own shades of meanings and its own peculiar twists and turns,” Eichner infers (8). Eichner also emphasizes the importance of national origins and traditions in the whole process of building a new discourse. In other words, each period of time has its own genius and worth within individuality. These viewpoints incline to emphasize that the Romantic writers turned with curiosity to their own national origins and traditions. In other words, each period of time has its own genius and worth within individuality.

The impact of German thought in American was also analyzed by Réné Wellek. The critic “[S]tudies . . . the intellectual and literary relations between Germany, England, and the United States during the nineteenth century,” which seems to show that “in Germany philosophy,” there existed “an abortive plan to give an address on ‘the influence of German thought on the contemporary literature of England and America,’ in 1837” (158). “An issue of the Philadelphia Monthly Magazine for 1798 includes a note on Kant based on a German source, which speaks of the Criterion [sic] of Pure Reason; and the Boston Register of 1801 [seems to] contain quotations from Fichte refuting the charges of atheism”(158), Wellek also infers.
This persistence in the attempt to unravel the term Romantic not only in Schlegel, but also, in the case of Emerson’s works, within Romantic agenda, is the subject of Sylvia E. Bowman. Bowman argues that in 1796, Schlegel may have read Chamfort’s *Pensées, maximes, anecdotes, dialogues*. Bowman speculates that Schlegel was “enthralled by the informal mode of communication employed in them. He [Schlegel] promptly appears to adopt Chamfort’s method,” and in “his own collections of aphorisms” we may find “aphoristic genre with long statements, occasionally extending to well over a page of print” (46). Bowman goes on to claim that “[h]e [Schlegel] was influenced by Leibniz’ doctrine of the unconscious activities of the monads and, by the doctrines of enthusiasm of the Platonic and Platonic tradition,” which was crucial Emerson’s discourse. In *Representative Men* (1850), Emerson venerates the genius of Western thought. To him, “Plato is philosophy, and philosophy is Plato” (40). This aspect is pre-eminent, since Emerson appears to join, as he observes, “The unity of Asia and the detail of Europe; the infinitude of the Asiatic soul and the defining, result-loving, machine-making, surface-seeking, opera-going Europe” (53-54). These insights somehow justify Robert D. Richardson’s anchorage of Emerson’s place in American intellectual tradition. In *Emerson: the Mind on Fire*, Richardson actually points out that Emerson’s “*Nature* [may seem to be] a modern version of Plato, [or] an American version of Kant” (233).
At this stage we must raise a question: Was American Romanticism already constructed, and then reconstructed in the nineteenth-century? American Romanticism, as an historical and revolutionary term, is associated with plasticity, spontaneity and liberty of human imagination; it is enmeshed from human temperament in order to “inquire,” as Emerson wrote in “The American Scholar”: “what light new days and events have thrown on his [the American Scholar] character and his hopes” (82). These aspects appear to reflect on the difficulty to define and understand Romanticism as a critical interpretative mode, out of which a map of features pertaining to Romanticism tradition could be perhaps identified.

In “American Romanticism,” Literary Movements, Donna M. Campbell projects and lists some features which we consider most relevant for our line of thought. These characteristics are:

1. Belief in natural goodness of man, that man in a state of nature would behave well but is hindered by civilization. The figure of the “Noble Savage” is an outgrowth of this idea.
2. Sincerity, spontaneity, and faith in emotion as markers of truth. (Doctrine of sensibility)
3. Belief that what is special in man is to be valued over what is representative; delight in self-analysis.
4. Nature as a source of instruction, delight, and nourishment for the soul; return to nature as a source of inspiration and wisdom; celebration of man’s connection with nature; life in nature often contrasted with the unnatural constraints of society.
5. Affirmation of values of democracy and the freedom of the individual. (Jacksonian Democracy)
6. High value placed on finding connection with fresh, spontaneous in nature and self.
7. Aspiration after the sublime and the wonderful, that which transcends mundane limits.
8. In art, the sublime, the grotesque, the picturesque, and the beautiful with a touch of strangeness all were valued above the Neoclassical principles of order, proportion, and decorum. (Hudson River School of painters)
9. Interest in the ‘antique’; medieval tales and forms, ballads, Norse and Celtic mythology; the Gothic.
10. Belief in perfectibility of man; spiritual force immanent not only in nature but also in the mind of man.
11. Belief in organicism rather than Neoclassical rules; development of a unique form in each work. (<http://www.gonzaga.edu/faculty/campbell/enl311/romanticism.htm>)

These vectors stress the multitude of trends underlying the term Romanticism. They appear to function as spatial metaphors: perhaps, the most frequent words that the Romantic poet loved to think with. They suggest the mysterious realm to which everything within this everlasting universe corresponds to an idea, in a certain sense, because the Romantic writer, as Leon Chai has pointed out, seeks for “a theoretical apprehension” (8), or approach in order to distinguish and understand the dichotomies between knowledge about and knowledge by acquaintance. This dualism evokes Romantic many-sided moods: a psychological urge that tended to lead, intuitively, human nature to look for far-distant places, to the past; for the exotic and strange; for freedom of expression; for the gist for which expression appears to be emotional and sentimental. It seems clear that these insistences conjecture to draw a line of thought according to which there seems not only to exist one Romanticism, but many Romanticisms and many Romantic poets. In 'The Concept of Romanticism in Literary History,’ René Wellek approaches the term Romanticism into three categories: “imagination for the view of poetry, nature for the view of the world, and symbol and myth for poetic style” (161).
In *The Oxford Companion to American Literature*, James D. Hart defines Romanticism

. . . [as a] term that is associated with imagination and boundlessness, and in critical usage is contrasted with classicism, which is commonly associated with reason and restriction. A romantic attitude may be detected in literature of any period, but as an historical movement it arose in the 18th and 19th centuries, in reaction to more rational literary, philosophic, artistic, religious, and economic standards . . . The most profound and comprehensive ideal of romanticism is the vision of a greater personal freedom for the individual. Its origins may be traced to the economic rise of the middle class, struggling to free itself from feudal and monarchial restrictions; to the individualism of the Renaissance; to the Reformation, which was based on the belief in an immediate relationship between man and God. (650-51)

Drawing on these features we conclude that the Romantic poet’s appeal resides within the growth of his/her own mind. This anchorage on the self reflects the dynamic aspect of “Romantic attitude.” The individual, upon drawing on his/her own resources, attempts to establish a connection between the absolute inwardsness of the self and the absolute outwardsness sphere; in this intersection resides the relation between the *Me* and *Not Me* (Emerson, *Nature* 1836); a path (a bridge) where subjectivism is deeply felt in terms of Sentimentalism, primitivism and the cult of the noble savage; political liberalism; the celebration of natural beauty and the simple life; introspection; the idealization of the common man, uncorrupted by civilization; interest in the picturesque past; interest in remote places; antiquarianism; individualism; morbid melancholy; and historical romance. (Hart 651)

This passage exhibits the importance of a synthesis of inner and outer phenomena; a blending of the human being and nature, art and nature, and visible and invisible actions. These aspects also reflect the scope of the
Romantic vigor between consciousness and unconsciousness. Besides they also summon the notion of Adamic natural goodness, which appears throughout American writing in the nineteenth century. The individual strives for a moral perfectibility, integrated self, an integrated vision of line within two antithetical worlds: the internal and external impressions.

Without anticipating our analysis of Emerson’s discourse one must remember at this stage “The Divinity School Address” since he glorifies here the power of imagination through which he brings at the center of discussion the common man and the cult of noble savage, the beauty of nature as anew paradigm for the individual:

... the uses of nature admit of being summed in one, which yields the activity of man an infinite scope. Through all its kingdom, to the suburbs and outskirts of things, it is faithful to the cause whence it had its origin. It always speaks of Spirit. It suggests the absolute. It is a perpetual effect. It is a great shadow pointing always to the sun behind us. (“Nature,” First Series 61)

It is through “an infinite scope” that Emerson seems to look at the individual, the begetter of a myriad of things, as active and noble man in a struggle between a providential God and an hidden one, or even between heart (self) and land. Emerson’s agenda builds a path (a bridge) between these two poles, between microcosm and macrocosm, between the individual and the collective, between self and nature, and he wants us, his readers, to be part of his intellectual journey towards revelation and freedom; he wants us to build our own intellectual journey towards higher stage. As Van Wyck Brooks observes in
Emerson and Others, “would take” the reader and us “into [his] studio . . . [so that he can perhaps] shape [our] mind” (12).

Despite its American dimension this intellectual process towards a higher stage also finds relevant backgrounds in Romantic European traditions. Johann Gottlieb Fichte (The Vocation of Man), while reflecting on views regarding on the existence of something which lies within the individual that does not lies outside of himself, claims that:

Nature, becomes in . . . [an individual] conscious of herself as a whole, but only by beginning with . . . [her] own individual consciousness, and proceeding from thence to the consciousness of the universal being by inference [which appears to be] founded on the principle of causality;— that is, she is conscious of the conditions under which alone such a form, such a motion, such a thought as that which my personality consists, is possible. (21)

These viewpoints may seem to be part of Zeitgeist idealism in the sense that the diversity and heterogeneousness of the universe not only resonate within human intellectual activity, but it also appears to be connected with emotional and imaginative richness which we speculate are the source of struggles and conflicts within the Principium of Individualism.

Stephen Whicher’s (Freedom and Fate) approaches the impact of Emerson’s expression “modern philosophy” within Romanticism scope, and studies his basic equation of Not-Me [Nature], and the Me [Individual]. In a rather familiar way Whicher suggests that Emerson’s whole intellectual process could be defined as follows:
Take a quantity of Kant; . . . stir in, as Emerson did, as a generous amount of Swedenborg; strain through Mme de Stäel, Sampson Reed, Oegger, Coleridge, Carlyle, Wordsworth, . . . spill half and season with Plato – and you have something resembling the indescribable brew called modern philosophy whose aroma Emerson began to detect in his corner of the world in the 1820s. (17)

In the same vein, Peter A. Obuchowshi observes in *Emerson & Science: Goethe, Monism, and the Search for Unity* that:

Kant, of course, did nourish Emerson’s thought in other ways. His transcendental epistemology, explained and interpreted by Carlyle and, particularly, by Coleridge, was a dominant influence in the growth of Emerson’s thought. (70)

These readings reflect the nuclear importance of sensory perception as an act of understanding and intuiting the mystery of the organic world through which the self conjectures to give access to his/her own knowledge beyond the senses. These passages also reflect the grounds and originality of Emersonian Transcendentalism along with his so-called scientific spirit; the spirit that he intends to instill in *Nature, Representative Man, “The American Scholar,” “The Divinity School Address,” “Self-Reliance,” “Experience” and The Conduct of Life*. This scientific spirit functions as an autobiographic device in order to recover an Adamic self: a new self which is one’s own creation. This emerging deals not only with the problem of the organic world, but also with the cultural matrix.

Emerson’s perception of the cosmos conceives of this notion in two basic worlds, the intellectual and the physical. The bridge connecting these
two instances had yet to be built and was a basic dimension of American Principium of Individualism. Emerson’s essays may be understood as stages, as chapters of an ongoing textual process which hopefully would lead to this bridge, and to the overcoming of a dichotomy. In them the writer appears not only to interfuse his own moral conscience by awakening his fellow-men, but also to infuse the moral integrity demanded by the two dominant value-systems of early nineteenth-century: Jeffersonian individualism, with its premise of self-restraint, and Protestantism, with its emphasis on the scrutiny of all actions for ethical implications. This premise of self-restraint implies however not only the burden of the Past, but also the dichotomy self/infinite as we will discuss ahead Chapter Three. In following a lead which was vigorously discussed in *Ekphrasis: O Poeta no atelier do artista*, Mário Avelar has claimed that “A Emerson se deverá, entre outras coisas, a criação de uma cosmovisão centrada no individuo e que será particularmente influente em gerações posteriores” (119).

These viewpoints are relevant in the sense that Emerson was beginning to assess the impact of social transformation in the mid nineteenth century in which both past and skepticism were not debilitating human conduct, but they intended to be means of education. Thus they should be morally creative; leading to a new social adjustment, new demands for considering the past (History, narratives, biographies of *representative men*) as part of human
biography in order to build a psychological stable identity in a fragmented world.

Concentrating particularly on the feeling of the past in which the artist seems to be restricted and inhibited from his poetic/literary freedom, in *The Lost World of Thomas Jefferson*, Daniel J. Boorstin notes that “Our [American] past must serve us not as an anthology from which to cull apt phrases for current needs, but as a stage for observing in all their tantalizing complexity the actual ways in which men in America have faced the ancient problems of the human race” (ix). Boorstin goes on stating:

> Puritanism, Jeffersonianism, Transcendentalism, and Pragmatism have all testified to man’s inability to turn his back on philosophy. Yet, each in its different fashion, these American movements have ended in a refusal to follow philosophy when it might paralyze the hand of the artisan or the conqueror. Each has found another way of assuaging man’s scruples without obstructing the exploitation of the continent; each has found a means to hallow the building of a New World while implying that such building was somehow its own justification. (4)

This passage of Boorstin’s *The Lost World of Thomas Jefferson*, sheds some light on some contradictions and obscurities that plagued Emerson’s work as part of Romantic effusiveness in which the individual projects to look upon “Puritanism, Jeffersonianism, Transcendentalism, and Pragmatism” not only as spiritual sources, but also as ways to exploit and build a “New World” a new (individual and collective) reality. Emerson actually was confronted by a series of antagonisms from *within* and from *without*. His work is full of tantalizing contradictions in which the individual appears to be engaged largely with
religious, scientific, agricultural, pragmatic, and industrial worlds in mid-nineteenth-century America, out of which particular moods, political views, emotional, rational, cultural ideologies, and new sensibility may seem to generate. Emerson, as a possible remedy, in search for his own Past, wonders:

What is matter? and Whereto? many truths arise to us out of the recesses of consciousness. We learn that the highest is present to the soul of man; that the dread universal essence, which is not wisdom, or love, or beauty, or power, but all in one, and each entirely, is that for which all things exist, and that by which they are; that spirit creates; that behind nature, throughout nature, spirit is present; one and not compound it does not act upon us from without, that is, in space and time, but spiritually, or through ourselves: therefore, that is, the Supreme Being, does not build up nature around us, but puts it forth through us, as the life of the tree puts forth new branches and leaves through the pores of the old. (“Nature,” First Series 63-64)

This passage may essentially seem to reflect on multiplicity and division of matter: the leitmotif of struggles and conflicts within the Principium of Individualism. It suggests that “matter” is inherent to (modern) progress in which the self supersedes the divine, earth overtops heaven; the individual may seem to set the measure for all things, and dictates to the universe laws drawn entirely from his own relative and fallible reason as he attempts to romanticize the universe. These aspects may seem to be in harmony with New England Transcendentalism, but the inference “of the old” New Puritanism played a relevant role in Emerson’s life and temperament. Emerson’s self is in relation to the Cosmos around him so that “the dread universal essence, which
is not wisdom, or love” but a compound to explain why “all things exist.” The above passage is also crucial, both for its meaning and promises in the sense that it helps to speculate on Emerson’s discourse through a framework of the traditional mystical experience, or to foreshadow a romantic sensibility pointed out by William James in *Varieties of Religious Experience*. Emerson’s work, chronologically speaking may seem to be part of the Romantic agenda: the century-long evolution through which Coleridge somehow triumphs since he not only relied firmly on the traditional Protestant emphasis of the freedom of the individual, but also on organic form: his worship of nature, of American Adamic wilderness as the source of enchantment and revelation.

Extending this logic, Emerson’s self-reliance or his doctrine of Over-Soul seems to be associated with Romantic views because they echo the line of the Transcendental philosophy which must be traced back within Kant’s, Fichte’s, Schelling’s, Wordsworth’s, Shelley’s and Coleridge’s continuing dialectical problem regarding the nature of the poetic art and the interaction of the perceiving mind with the physical world within this *Internal Conflict of the Soul*.

In *The Life of the Mind in America*, Perry Miller stated: “Transcendentalists, on the contrary, saw no such danger in the wild country because they believed in man’s basic goodness. . . . they argued that one’s chances of attaining moral perfection and knowing God were maximized by entering wilderness” (86).
This attitude toward wilderness seems to mirror an indication of a Romantic spectrum in Emerson’s works. It reflects on the key precepts of organic unity, polarity, fragmentation, beauty, and art to mediate between God, man, and nature. In his essays *Nature* Emerson argues that: "In the wilderness, I [he] find[s] something more dear and connate than in the streets or villages . . . in the woods we return to reason and faith" (*First Series* 10). In this essayistic realm, “wilderness” may seem to become integral part of décor of daily existence in the sense that in “wilderness” there is a relationship of cause and effect: in the wood the poetic “I” detaches from itself and creates another “I”: a spiritual “I” who will, probably, connect man with Divine power and the universe. Emerson, in different ways, seems to propel a philosophical theory of American Romanticism in which the corporeal world is observed by an intuitive imagination, and, then, furnishes a manifestation about the incorporeal world whose truths stand eternally behind the physical facts perceived by our senses.

In taking the same point, in *Wilderness and American Mind*, Roderick Nash analyzes the relationship of God, man, and wild nature in which he attempts to show how the real identity of man, the inner beauty and of being truth are principal themes of Romanticism. Nash argues:

> The deists, however, based their entire faith in the existence of God on the appreciation of reason to nature . . . they accorded wilderness, as pure nature, special importance as clearest medium through which God showed His power and excellency. Spiritual truths emerged most forcefully from the
This passage leads to a questioning of the concepts of God, nature, man or the self both in Emerson and in other contemporaries writers. This hermeneutic process, Emerson observes, propagates itself “through the sacred fermentations, by that law of nature whereby everything climbs to higher platforms and bodily vigor becomes mental and moral vigor” (Conduct of Life, “Wealth” 126). In An American Idol: Emerson and the Jewish Idea Robert J. Loewenberg writes that: “Emerson’s paradoxical views, of which his vision of the self as neither an I nor a thou [seems to be] the centerpiece [of a] self-conscious doctrine” (50). This viewpoint is, perhaps, one of the most interesting Romantic paradoxes in Emerson’s work in the sense that the self, the entity of practicality conjectures to seek out for (textual) advise (in the signs that emerge throughout Nature), thus overcoming the binary opposition and conflict involving matter and spirit, and Man and God.

Larzer Ziff has argued that

What men commonly call the real, then, is only the apparent. The real, rather, is what they term the ideal—the Idea or Soul of which appearance is but a visible, imperfect termination— and it unites the elements in the natural world to one another and to ourselves. For real, meaning matter, versus ideal, meaning thought, substitute the truer distinction between the real as the idea behind all appearances and the apparent as the mere show of a word apart from us. (17)

From this disjunction of the worlds of reality and imagination, which appears all to be a Romantic anxiety of the soul, the individual engages in a risky
journey to transmute his self into universality in order to acknowledge and exploit the flowing of his poetry between “matter and ideal.” But as the poet is deeply filled with an ulterior intellectual perception, he/she may seem to discover the genius to exhibit and to unite “the elements in the natural world to one another and to ourselves.” While discussing Emerson’s ego within the agons of literature Joel Porte observes that “self-realization . . . was on the way to being considered a richly evasive and enigmatic figure whose interest would more and more turn on that ‘personal element’” (37). These biographical and textual dimensions are obvious vectors of Emerson’s Transcendentalism since they reflect on the need to include an intuitive cognizance of moral and truths that transcend the dichotomy between spirit and matter, between Reason and Understanding. They incline to stress the validity of a mode of knowledge which conjectures to derive in feeling and intuition in which both humanity and the cosmos (a textual entity waiting to be deciphered) participate. They tend not only to reflect on ethic of individualism – stressing self-trust, self-reliance, and self-sufficiency-, but also a turning path from modern society to cluster scenes and objects (textual signs) of the natural

As we are approaching at the end of this preliminary reflection, we believe that we are in such a position to affirm that Emerson was looking for a distinctive past and History, which would reflect the emerging reality of American individualism. He was looking for a Romantic spectrum based on
morality, justice, democracy, faith, values, freedom and perfectibility of human endeavor. In expressing this idealism, Emerson builds a world of his own, which opens the reader’s eyes to a landscape painted in his/her mind. Emerson takes risks and asks fundamental questions about his culture, society and environment; fundamental questions for the unveiling of American identity. Ziff argues that:

Emerson’s ideas of the relation of nature to the self delivered Americans into the custody of America. Instead of regarding their identity as historically determined consciousness that must impose itself upon the mindless matter of the wild, they were encouraged to see that their land was another expression of the soul centered in themselves, that it beckoned to them to realize their true relation with it. American history could be the history of nature’s reassuming alienated man to itself rather than the history of man’s warfare with it. (19)

Emerson’s anchorage and revision of American cultural, religious and historical legacies allowed him to take the Romantic tradition (s) into a new stage; a new stage where Nature, the wilderness, this sign of a primeval Adamic reality, would challenge the individual to dive deep in his/her own personal experience. Since this is a relationship based on conflict and on the need to overcome (interpret) the Other (the signs), action becomes a key-concept in Emerson’s thought. It is this emphasis on action, on its instrumental importance that brings the Romantic experience into a new dimension; a dimension where the individual stands at the center but in a radical dialogue with the cosmos (both nature and society). Charles E. Mitchell in *Individualism and Its Discontents: Appropriations of Emerson, 1880-1950* reminds us and
the reader while reflecting on viewpoints linked to individualism in American life that “Emerson [may seem to be] the most articulate and representative expounder of American individualism, it is because his own work so clearly [appears to] reflect the contradictions and paradoxes inherent in democratic individuality” (3). Although these paradoxes may seem to be associated with Romantic inflection, it begins to be clear that the fundamental structure of human nature consciousness reflects the same fundamental structure of the outer world through which the interpenetration of man and nature, the physical and intellectual spheres explain the creation and nature of this Principium of Individualism.

These aspects, as we will observe throughout this work, fueled the release of written material that would progressively change the way a person looked at the world, discussing topics in ways that were taboo at the time. Is the individual the center of the universe, or do the power and love of God even exist?

Emerson appears to be moved by a vision of the future of human nature possibilities, rather than of the past and of what man had become or had been. Nevertheless his assumptions regarding God, man and nature also reflect the Transcendentalism Spirit of New England as the ultimate reality of this world (macrocosm) and of the world beyond (cosmos).

This aspect may seem to prospect a philosophical theory of American post-Romanticism in which, as Emerson has written in “The American Scholar”
that “the visible, audible, tangible world. . . .” [and] “the mysterious bond that allies moral evil to the foul material forms” (“The American Scholar” 113). These aspects appear to be observed by an intuitive imagination, which furnishes a manifestation about the incorporeal world whose truths seem to stand eternally behind physical facts perceived by our senses. These ideas dramatize Emerson’s dichotomy between subject and object, a point we will discuss later on during this work. Although this rapture informs Emerson’s reason and will in conflict, it also reflects that the self may seem in search for its own totality of experience, past, history, language, culture, and religion, in order to ascend from human finitude to divinely infinite. It seems that the self strives to enjoy the concrete fullness of totality of its own personal experience in its attempt to encompass the natural phenomena. These aspects reflect however a Romantic view: Emerson’s self, while in conflict with divine nature and cosmic force, is in search for his own apocalypse of idealism within the Principium of Individualism. They must be traced to the beauty of the Romantic sensibility, the truth of human mind between physical and eternal realms where the discrepancy between reality and appearance as part of the Romantic agenda, becomes also part of the poet’s intuition. They function together to express the universal beauty and truth that transcend the beauty and truth of the outer and inner phenomenon. They are associated with the transcendental and romantic lyricisms in which the soul is in connection with her own perception and world by taking the reader and us back to the German
Zeitgeist philosophy derived from Kant, which Emerson had read. This aspect traces back the relation between human nature, art and religion, so that it takes the reader and us in contact with his/her fellow: a mode to celebrate human culture, an intellectual love and scientific vision to fulfill the requisiteness and affirmations of self-reliance, because human nature is the result of the human and divine values through which he/she becomes an absolute set of seminal influences for moral conduct; because the Individual (microcosm) is the world (macrocosm), as we will discuss in the ensuing chapters.
Chapter Two:

Emerson’s Heterogeneous Influences

I am beginning my professional studies. In a month I shall be legally a man. And I deliberately dedicate my time, my talents, and my hopes to the Church. Man is an animal that looks before and after; and I should be loth to reflect at a remote period that I took so solemn a step in my existence without some careful examination of my past and present life. \( \textit{JMN}, \text{April 18, 1824, Vol. II. 237} \)

On Looking over the diary of my journey . . . I have copied the few notes I made of visits to persons, and of visits to places. \( \textit{English Traits 5} \) I like my book about nature . . . & wish I knew where & how to live. God will show me. \( \textit{JMN, Vol. IV. 237} \)

To this partiality the history of nations corresponded. The country of unity, of immovable institutions, the seat of a philosophy delighting in abstractions, of men faithful in doctrine and in practice to the idea of a deaf, unimplorable, immense fate, is Asia; and it realizes this faith in the social institution of caste. On the other side, the genius of Europe is active and creative: it resists caste by culture; its philosophy was a discipline; it is a land of arts, inventions, trade, freedom. If the East loved infinity, the West delighted in boundaries. \( \textit{Representative Men 52} \)

In this chapter we will pursue two main aims: the analysis of Emerson’s literary influence in the mid 19\textsuperscript{th} century, and the identification of the leading topics of his intellectual discourse.
Before we start to ponder on these issues, we must inform the reader that we follow Harold Bloom’s theory of “anxiety of influence,” namely his focus on the influence of New England Calvinism and Puritanism, and of the romantic discourses via Kant in the writings of Wordsworth, Coleridge, and Schelling, in Emerson’s text and hopefully in the American mind. We agree with Bloom when he stresses the way these topics echo in American nationalism, freedom, patriotism, and politics; in American emphasis in a society where the Individual stands at the center.

2.1. Bloom’s analysis delineates a rather idiosyncratic perspective of Emerson’s work and echoes in many other critics. Among these stands Salle Fox Engstrom. In *The Infinitude of the Private Man: Emerson’s Presence in Western New York, 1851-1861* this critic writes that: “Emerson’s body of beliefs centers on the principle of individualism, which encompasses intuition, self-reliance, and anti-traditionalism” (7; italics added). She further adds that: “Individualism is at the heart of Nature and other essays . . . journals and notebooks” (Idem). Individualism emerges then as an ongoing struggle within the self; a struggle in order to emphasize a personal identity against the pressure of the past; an idea that lies at the center of Bloom’s *The Anxiety of Influence*:

Poetic influence is a gift of the spirit that comes to us through what could be called, dispassionately, the perversity of the spirit . . . [and] [t]he history of fruitful poetic influence . . . is a history of anxiety and self-saving caricature, of distortion, of perverse, willful revisionism without which modern poetry as such could not exist. (30)
Although "poetic influence is a gift" it also reflects an internal textual conflict, since the poet engages himself in examining and redefining intertextuality as a way of writing, reading and analyzing a radical cultural interaction: the relation of present culture to the past within a series of historical discourses involving culture, society, literature, politics et al. This conflict has an ethical dimension because eventually it means freedom; both individual and social freedom.

Emerson insisted on a radical dialogue between personal independence and the *Principium of Individualism*; as he concedes in his Journal: “In all my lectures, I have taught one doctrine, namely, the infinitude of the private man” (*JMN*, Vol.VII.342). His focus on self-reliance is a logical corollary of this dialogue. This is, however, a dialogue that takes place within the Self, between two poles of thought - Reasoning and Understanding. At the heart of this dialogue stands the romantic tradition. Kenneth S. Sacks claims in *Understanding Emerson: “The American Scholar” and His Struggle for Self-Reliance* that “By evoking the dualism of Reason and Understanding, Emerson anchored his self-portrait of the artist in Coleridge’s interpretation of Kantian epistemology” (86).

Simultaneously another dialogue, between the self and the world, between microcosm and macrocosm, between *Me* and *Not Me*, between the individual and Nature, takes place. This textual interaction unveils Emerson’s
organic theory doctrine; a doctrine with deep roots within Romantic tradition(s). In *Emerson’s Sublime Science*, Eric Wilson points out this common ground: “the Romantics like Goethe, Coleridge, and Emerson [were] thrilled in harvesting disparity into unity, the many into one” (6). This tension, we contend, forms part of Emerson’s Romantic *science*: the organic theory of life linked to History and biography, ancestral culture(s) and personal reading and influences.

Clearly, this line of reasoning touches that of Emerson’s words as he speaks of *Ancients*, the *Antique*; I see all that is excellent under that name somewhat near to me. It is the genius of European family. The discovery & the planting of America & the American revolution & mechanic arts are Greek, Attic, Antique, in this sense, as much as the Parthenon or the ‘Prometheus Chained.’ I can easily see in our periodical Literature for example a diffused & weakened Athens. (*JMN*, Vol.VII.390)

This is one of the likely vehicles that would lead him to reflect both on artistic and philosophical observations while focusing and celebrating the place of the poetic vision in tradition. Poetic vision widens the perception of the world, since it incorporates influences, inheritances and indebtedness from a societal and cultural perspectives rather than solely a scientific one. The significance of the individual gravitates not only within himself, but also with the *topos* [place], or as Bloom observes in *The Anxiety of Influence*, while discussing views associated with the romantic poet’s progress “in a dialectical relationship (transference, repetition, error, communication) with another poet or poets”
These viewpoints suggest, as we wish to show further, that American literary influence is an intertwined network, *the Old* and *the New* prevail in a permanent intellectual tension. Intertextuality emerges then as a link both among poets and between the poet and Nature.

Literary influences (and intertextuality) is the object of Ralph H. Orth’s systematic reading of Emerson’s Journals, *The Journals and Miscellaneous Notebooks of Ralph Waldo Emerson*. While discussing Emerson’s influences, Orth concludes that: “The thousands of individual entries demonstrate clearly Emerson’s interest in those authors who have always been regarded as major influences on his style and thought” (*Foreword to Volume VI*. xi). Orth goes on to point out some of these major influences: “Montaigne, Plutarch, Bacon, Coleridge, Carlyle, Goethe. They also reveal his knowledge of such obscure and forgotten figures as Robert Browning, James Flavel, Robert Plumer Ward, Francis Osborne, William de Britaine, and a great many others” (xi).

Emerson’s reference can be traced back to his *English Traits* where he unearths the sources of his literary influences. Aesthetic aspects apart, they allow the reader to frame him within a romantic agenda, namely when he looks before and after as he seeks and renders tribute for scientific facts and truths that would guide him to see unity in diversity and diversity in unity. These individuals, Emerson had observed, are “The taste and science of thirty peaceful generations . . . the taste of foreign and domestic artists” ("Aristocracy” 163), or as he puts it in another passage “the love [intellectual
love] and labor of many generations on the building, planting and decoration of their homesteads” (English Traits, “Aristocracy” 177). They stress human perfectibility “to secure the comfort and independence” (idem) of the country and to “cement & comfort of the social being” (JMN, Vol. XV.187).

In Representative Men Emerson insisted on the values of European culture, and he catalogued the heroes and great minds that embodied the field of vision that allowed him to evaluate his own life: Plato (The Philosopher); Swedenborg (The Mystic); Montaigne (The Skeptic); Shakespeare (The Poet); Napoleon (The Man of the World); Goethe (The Writer). The subtitles underscore the singularity of a perception. When we gather these singularities we reach a global meaning, a macrocosm of essential and topoi, which he regarded as the best sources of knowledge of moral achievement. Besides, they represent Emerson’s fundamental idea in defining transcendentalism, the material world and the realm of ideas. They represent not only “The old mythology . . . [and] the Genius of Humanity” (JMN, Vol. XI. 92), but also the problematic issues of nature, man, God, art, history, literature, culture, religion, past and the source for a further speculative research within the law of the nature. To emulate them must be the aim of the poet, hopefully of every single individual. This emulation may be seen as Emerson’s ideal project. In Bloom’s words: “he [Emerson] apprehends the appalling energy of his own precursor as being at once the Wholly Other yet also a possessing force” (Anxiety 101).
Emerson’s dialogue with the other wasn’t confined, however, to a textual solitary experience (the solitude of the act of reading). His (textual) trips also are inextricably involved in a social matrix and circumscribed by a variety of social and political obligations. We must not forget that Emerson went to England and met personally, as he indicates in *JMN*, Vol.XI.


Despite the catalogue, this passage subliminally points to a moral recovery and a cultural revival. The catalogue is clearly bound up within the conventions of Romantic sensibility of the poet’s eye or “I” in which the self communicates with the universe, with itself along with its own past, nature, God, society, religion, culture, and invention in order to unify two views: infinite and finite. Or as Bloom has pointed out that “The profundities of poetic influence cannot be reduced to source-study, to the history of ideas, to the patterning of images. . . . Poetic influence . . . is necessarily the study of the life-cycle of the poet-as-poet” (*Anxiety* 7), reflecting “a metaphor . . . that implicates a matrix of relationships—imagistic, temporal, spiritual, psychological—all of them ultimately defensive in their nature” (xxiii). This life-cycle, along with poetic imagistic, is not only part of poetic interruption, but also part of the dualism between eyes and “I’s.” It constitutes an integral part
of Emerson’s heterogeneous influences, and identifies the juxtaposition of the poet’s physical eye, [body], the spiritual eye, the perpetual eye, the looking glass eye, the romantic eye.

Emerson is aware of the importance of his own (poetic) identity, of his own ongoing struggle with the constraints of the past and with the new challenges of a world that lives in a permanent state of renewal. Emerson’s awareness lies however beyond the mere individual sphere; it points out to a macrocosmic identity, to American identity. In The Genteel Tradition, George Santayana sharply claims: “The American is accordingly the most adventurous, or the descendant of the most adventurous, of Europeans. . . . To be American is of itself almost a moral condition, an education, and a career” (120). In the last word, career Santayana subliminally emphasizes the notion of process that lies at the core of American intellectual experience. As Emerson had already observed, a way to connect the agon law of dots of “. . . the whole circle of persons and things, of actions and events, of country and religion, not as painfully accumulated, atom after atom, act after act, in an aged creeping Past, but as one vast picture which God paints on the instant eternity for the contemplation of the soul” (“Nature,” First Series 60).

The perception of the full extent of Emerson’s intellectual experience can also be outlined through an analysis of his notes on influential magazines such as The Edinburgh Review, The Quarterly Review, The North American Review, and New Jerusalem Magazine. In his study Orth concludes that “he sought to
emulate the pithiness of the quotations he copied from his wide reading” (Orth xi). As we noted above this intellectual experience must be amplified with the impact of his European tour. In *Emerson on Race and History: An Examination of English Traits*, Philip L. Nicoloff reminds us that his trip to Europe was associated with a deeper inner search. Emerson had to restore energies because “[h]e had the year before lost his first wife,” and that in that same year “he had given up his pastoral influence at the Second Church in exchange for his conscience” (14). In his edition of the *Journal and Miscellaneous Notebooks of Volume V*, Merton M. Sealts emphasizes that “his ensuing European trip” was conceived to “restore his severely impaired health and troubled spirit” (ix). It was at this time that “he had apparently conceived the idea of a book” (ix); while returning home, writes: “I like my book about nature,” “& wish I knew where & how I ought to live. God will show me” (*JMN*, Vol.IV.237). We can conclude with Nicoloff when he states that

Emerson’s first voyage abroad provides us simultaneously, with a revelation of the manner in which he regarded his debt to contemporary Englishmen, an illustration of doubts he felt as to his own adequacy for independent thought, and a demonstration of a sort of recovery of self-esteem which was possible for him when faced with the necessity of establishing his intellectual commitment. (13)

This quote illustrates how relevant European sources were to Emerson. Besides it stresses the fact that he was familiar with the most relevant intellectual and philosophical debates that were taking place at the time.
These debates incorporated a wide range of philosophical views that dwelled in his *Internal Conflict of the Soul*.

The main relevant voices were few as he would concede later: “I look back over all my reading, & think how few authors have given me *things*: Plato has, and Shakespeare, & Plutarch, & Montaigne, & Swedenborg. . . . Goethe abounds in things, Chaucer & Donne & Herbert & Bacon had much to communicate” (*JMN*, Vol.XI.273). Though he felt that the most important readings of the world could be restricted to a rather small group of thinkers Emerson kept on searching “. . . in the mass of reading that occupies or impends over me. . . . What arrangement in priority of subjects? When shall I read Greek, when Roman, when Austrian, when Ecclesiastical, when American history? Whilst we deliberate, time escapes. . . . [Then, he decided to read] All history [because it] is ecclesiastical and all reasonings go back to Greece” (*JMN*, Vol.II.300). Although this passage relies upon European intellectual life in which the influence of the Greek and Rome was fundamental, Emerson was an original observer who knew how to cultivate his thoughts in an original lexicon while reading the culture of the Old World. Nicoloff observes that

indeed, his encounter with the leading writers of England . . . provides us with one of the most delightful and revelatory moments in his biography. It provides us, as well, with an excellent standard by which to measure the alteration in his attitude toward England by the time of the second trip in 1847. (14)
Bloom offers a rather provoking reading on this issue when he claims that European writers influence became for Emerson a sort of *Influenza*—an astral disease (*Anxiety* 95). David A. Hollinger and Charles Capper provide a more engaging analysis since they connect Emerson’s philosophical viewpoints with his ethical posture. They argue that “in order to be a self-reliant” it is necessary “to be nonconforming” (289). His posture can be seen then as a logical corollary of the permanent change that characterized contemporary American society:

> his social vision was neither anarchic nor hermetic. What he desired – and what tied him to the bustling democratic society for which he would soon become a national spokesman - was a society so fluid that all of its parts would be capable of constantly moving and changing and therefore feeling their ‘power.’ . . . [and finally, they add that] No one in nineteenth-century Western thought, not even Nietzsche (who admired Emerson greatly), offered a more exhilaratingly-or chillingly-transvalued vision of emerging modern culture. (289)

This quote also lays emphasis on the way Emerson was viewed and admired by other philosophers both as a man of letters, and as an inevitable reference and record of American life. Emerson himself was aware of this and enhanced this response:

> Yet can he [the scholar] explain Life? Can he unfold the theory of this particular Monday? Can he uncover the living ligaments, concealed from all but poets, which attach the dull men & things we converse with, to the splendor of the First Cause? . . . Then, shall he ascend from a menial & eleemosynary existence into riches & stability, into repose; then he dignifies the present hour & the place where he is; Beauty is at home: this mendicant America, this curious peering travelling itinerant imitative Greece & Rome America, studious of Greece and Rome, studious of England, will take off its dusty shoes, will
Emerson speaks with an extraordinary admiration for the liveliest spirit of the Greeks and Rome. Greece and Rome, which he had visited with enthusiasm, actually became inseparable universe in writing his book of *Nature*. Although this passage seems to demonstrate an interfusion between Greek and Roman elements, it reveals a dualism between these two Romantic unities: object and subject. This polarity also echoes Hegel’s comments on the differences between these two civilizations. On the one hand: “The course of Roman History involves the expansion of undeveloped subjectivity—inward conviction of existence—to the visibility of the real world” (281). But, on the other hand, still in Hegel’s view, it involves “[t]he development . . . not the same kind as that in Greece—the unfolding and expanding of its own substance on the part of the principle; but it is the transition to its opposite” (281). Human existence is formulated in this tension between inward and outward expansions. In his attempt to figure out himself within the *Principium of Individualism*, the individual must unfold the *outer half character of himself*.

This issue raises a question: Are these two unfolding and folding concepts part of Emerson’s Self? The answers to this question may be disarmingly simple when we connect Emerson’s Self in the wider context of a textual unity, the context of a cosmic unity, of an ongoing dialogue between signs, between microcosm and macrocosm. In the line with previous romantic
writers, Emerson sought to unify and articulate with deep joy and affection all manifestations of the external world within him, since all these were symbols of God. The reading of these symbols will eventually lead to an ultimate soil, to an ultimate stability. In Emerson’s *epistemology: the Argument of the Essays* David Van Leer observes that “man’s need to experience the world as stable, consciousness as one, and sensations as ... his own” (105).

Emerson sought to join the ideal of the past as an ignition that could direct him in writing his work, and hopefully, as he would write in *Natural History of Intellect*, unveil that “Beauty [which is] in the largest sense, beauty inward and outward, comprehending grandeur as a part, and reaching to goodness as its soul, — this to receive and this to impart, was his genius” (216). This passage speaks of beauty as part of (human) ethics; it reflects not only on the self’s dynamic relationship between nature and God, but also on the self’s genius as it discovers the place of beauty in the scheme of things. Beauty is thus an aspect of divine design along with social and scientific developments.

When he conceives of Beauty as a trace of any sign in a cosmic order, Emerson is implicitly include the signs of the modern, signs of industry; the signs that Whitman will celebrate in *Leaves of Grass*; the signs that Charles Sheeler will represent in his paintings of modern America. The New World is thus conceived as a place of integration. In this sense Emerson is building his own distance towards Europe. This point of view actually echoes the need he
felt in June 10, 1834, when he wrote in his Journal: “We all lean on England, scarce a verse, a page, a newspaper but is writ in imitation of English forms, our very manners & conversation are traditional & sometimes the life seems dying out of all literature & this enormous paper currency of Words is accepted instead” (JMN, Vol. IV. 297). His (pantheistic) vision of correspondence with the external world had been previously recorded in a rather different context. In April 7, 1833 he visited Rome and attended a mass at St. Peter’s Church, Emerson wrote:

At twelve o clock the benediction was given. A canopy was hung over the great window that is above the principal door of St Peter’s & there sat the Pope. The troops were all under arms & uniform in the piazza below, & all Rome & much of England & Germany & France & America was gathered there also... I love St. Peter’s Church. It grieves me that after a few days I shall see it no more. It has a peculiar smell from the quantity of incense burned in it. (JMN, Vol.IV.156-57)

This passage reveals an obvious empathy towards the magic of the place and its rituals. As he recorded elsewhere in “learning the revelation of all nature and all thought to his heart; this, namely; that the Highest dwells with him; that the sources of nature are in his own mind, if the sentiment of duty is there” (“The Over-Soul” 294). This spiritual experience reveals a new self; a self no longer divided; a self that became a whole. In The Emerson Museum: Practical Romanticism and the Pursuit of the Whole, Lee Rust Brown discusses Emerson’s aim to reconcile the outer and the inner worlds, and states that: “Emerson’s work, toward whole representation and toward fragmentary
production . . . offered him a new initiation as a reader as well as a writer” (108).

As his Romantic fascination and spiritual kinship with the natural world grows a new approach to the real, a new sensibility emerges. This aspect is obvious in his Journal entry in July, 1833, on a visit to Paris: “It is a pleasant thing to walk along the Boulevards & see how men live in Paris. I carried my ticket from Mr. Warden to the Cabinet of Natural History in the Garden of Plants. How much finer things are in composition than alone” (*JMN*, Vol.IV.197). This passage stresses both his metaphysical and scientific thoughts; as he notes again in *Natural History of Intellect* he

share[s] the belief that the natural direction of the intellectual powers is from within outward, and that just in proportion to the activity of thoughts on the study of outward objects, as architecture, or farming, or natural history, ships, animal, chemistry, — in that proportion the faculties of the mind had a healthy growth. (12)

Emerson believes that the True Poet, Scholar or Philosopher is a naturalist, who searches for new value within his own *Internal Conflict of the Soul*. The soul possesses certain powers that are the seeds of modern philosophy and from which man explains his own existence in the universe as a new creation proceeding from God. In order to unveil this dimension the individual is driven by an ongoing inner search. Every aspect of his life, every single experience thus becomes a segment of a whole text; a text that waits to be deciphered. Sealts points out how relevant a whole new textual dimension was for him in
the Preface of *JMN*: “Emerson’s book was looking to the future while bringing into sharp focus what he had been learning to see and say all through the early 1830’s in his experience, in his journals, and in his apprentice lecturing on popular science, travel, biography, and literature (Vol. V. x). The book, the text, derives from an ongoing inner search. The self and the text coincide. Sealts expands this reading when he focus on the (textual) influence of those around him: Sealts

The continuity of Emerson’s development is evident not only in the gradual emergence of his guiding ideas but also in the reappearance, in the first journals of the Concord years, of names associated with antecedent periods of his life: Dr. Gamaliel Bradford, Abel Adams, George Ripley, Frederic Henry, and George Partridge Bradford. Among his various relatives, the most prominent figures are ‘the wise aunt,’ Mary Moody Emerson; the venerable stepgrandfather, Dr. Ezra Ripley; and the brilliant younger brother Charles. (x)

Emerson was directly and indirectly influenced by prominent figures. These became part of a new experience of the whole, of the macrocosm; in them he finds a moral lesson. There is a radical empathy towards the outer which allows him to conceive a new experience of the self:

I am seeking to put myself on a footing of old acquaintance with Nature, as a poet should,— but the fair divinity is somewhat shy on my advances, & I confess I cannot find myself quite as perfectly at home on the rock & in the wood, as my ancient, & I may say, infant aspirations led me to expect. My aunt, (of whom I think you have heard before & who is alone among women,) has spent a great part of her life in the country, is an idolater of Nature, & counts but a small number who merit the privilege of dwelling among the mountains. . . . she was anxious that her nephew might hold high & reverential notions regarding it (as) the temple where God & the Mind are to be studied & adored & where the fiery soul can begin a premature
communication with other worlds. (The Letters of Ralph Waldo Emerson, Vol. I.133)

This passage illustrates how Emerson relied on ordinary experience, namely on personal acquaintance, in order to move forward. Besides, it demonstrates the moral and intellectual impact that Aunt Mary Moody had on him and on his dialogue with nature. Sacvan Bercovitch and Cyrus R. K. Patell us remind that his aunt was a major force behind Emerson’s career:

Perhaps more important than any of these other influences was the mentorship of Mary Moody Emerson, William Emerson’s sister, who lived with the family at various times during Waldo’s youth and who kept up a vigorous correspondence with Waldo throughout her long life. Mary (1774-1863) was old enough to remember the earlier generations of family ministers, all of them believers in the doctrines advanced by Jonathan Edwards, convinced of the necessity of conversions and submission to the will of God. While . . . living with the Emerson family she supervised the education of the boys and wrote the family long prayers, which long after her death still echoed in Waldo’s memory ‘with their prophetic and apocalyptic ejaculations.’ She was a voracious reader not only of theologians and philosophers (Plato, Plotinus, Spinoza, Cudworth, Butler, Clarke, Jonathan Edwards) but also of poets and prose writers (Akenside, Young, Byron, Wordsworth, de Stael). (365-66)

Emerson actually glorified his aunt in Lectures and Biographical Sketches when he writes that “the fruit of Calvinism and New England . . . [who] marks the precise time when the power of the old creed yielded to the influence of modern science and humanity. . . . [She is the] heroine, premising a sketch of her time and place” (399). Like him, she had read “Milton, Young, Akenside, Samuel Clarke, Jonathan Edwards, and always the Bible. Later Plato, Plotinus,
Marcus Antonius, Stewart, Coleridge, Cousin, Herder, Locke, Madame De Stäel, Channing, Mackintosh, Byron” (Biographical Sketches 402). Like the character standing in the wide theater of Nature portrayed by Thomas Cole, Emerson and is Aunt were kindred spirits.

Emerson thus stands in a bridge between American reality and European memory. Frederick Coplestone provides a sharp insight on this relationship with European thought: “Ralph Waldo Emerson was the man who found inspiration in Coleridge and Carlyle, who laid emphasis on moral self-development and tended to divest religion of its historical associations, who was more concerned with giving expression to his personal vision of the world than with transmitting a traditional message” (262). These viewpoints can be traced back to Emerson’s indebtedness to influences as he states that: “I have been twice in England. . . . Like most young men at that time, I was much indebted to the men of Edinburgh and of the Edinburgh Review,- Jeffrey, Mackintosh, Hallam, and to Scott, Plyafair and DeQuincey; and my narrow and desultory reading had inspired the wish to see the faces of three or four writers,- Coleridge, Wordsworth, Landor, DeQuincey . . . Carlyle.” (English Traits 10). Here is the neat evidence of his indebtedness to some major literary figures; an indebtedness that isn’t confined to the sphere of the literary. Wordsworth, for instance, “He had much to say of America, the more that it gave occasion for his favorite topic,- that society is being enlightened
by a superficial tuition, out of all proportion to its being retrained by moral culture” (*English Traits* 19).

William Peterfield Trent, John Erskine, Stuart P. Sherman’s and Carl Van Doren remind another relevant influence of European thought, the influence of German culture:

The impetus toward things German had come, about 1819, with the return to America from Gottingen of George Ticknor, George Bancroft, and Edward Everett, young men, all of them, of brilliant parts. The interest thus aroused was fostered by the coming to Harvard a few years later, as instructor in German, of Charles T. Follen, a political exile. From about this time, some direct knowledge of Kant, Fichte, and Schelling, of Schleiermacher. Of Goethe and Schiller-of Goethe probably more than of any other German writer-gradually began to make its way into New England, while the indirect German influence was even greater, coming in part through France in the works of Madame de Stael, Cousin, and Jouffroy, but much more significantly through England, in subtle form in the poetry of Wordsworth, more openly in the writings of Coleridge, and, a little later, in the essays of Carlyle. (332)

The wide range of discourses that merge into the text of Emerson’s life become a central part of his intellectual growth and of his own *Internal Conflict of the Soul*; an internal conflict that mirrors an ongoing search. As he reveals in his Journals, the “soul is connected to the womb of its mother by a cord from the navel, so . . . is man connected to God . . . it is like the hydrostatic paradox . . . the Ocean against a hair line of water, God against a human soul” (*JMN*, Vol.III.139). Emerson’s Journals – the meditations, confessions, insights, and testimonies he reveals there- provide a detailed knowledge of his inner search. Sealts is one of the several scholars that
searched in his Journals in order to unveil the diversity of voices that helped to structure his self; for instance, “among the entries of 1835 and 1836 there are ... extracts of some length from the English theologian John Norris; ... Swedenborg ... which Emerson read in a manuscript translation, yielded phrasing for Nature; and from the saying of Confucius as translated by Joshua Marshman. Emerson also mentions with approval Elizabeth Peabody’s Record of a School, dealing with Alcott’s work in Boston and Alcott’s own Conversations with Children on the Gospel (xiii). A few years earlier, May 24, 1831, Emerson writes: “I have been reading 7 and 8 lectures of Cousin- in the first of three vols. Of his Philosophy” (Letters of Ralph Waldo Emerson, Rusk 322). Several years later, in 1842, another Journal entry reveals that Swedenborg remained for him a relevant intellectual presence: “In town I also talked with Sampson Reed, of Swedenborg & the rest. ... All my concern is with the subjective truth of Jesus’s or Swedenborg’s or Homer’s remark, not at all with the object” (Gilman 92).

These are some of the voices whose influences (or influenza in the above mentioned Bloom’s insight) helped him to build his own journey within this Principium of Individualism. They helped him in trusting his own consciousness within the agon law of poetic-language – an intertextuale dialogue with the external world.
Furthermore, Emerson’s influences go beyond European sources. Other passages of his Journals, for instance, his dependence on Indian cultural backgrounds: “We sigh for the thousand heads & thousand bodies of the Indian gods, that we might celebrate its immense beauty in many ways & places, & absorb all its good” (JMN, Vol.IX.312). Eventually these references will echo in his dynamic notion of fluidity, of metamorphosis: “Metamorphosis is the law of the Universe. All forms are fluent and as the bird alights on the bough & pauses for rest, then plunges into the air again on its way, so the thoughts of God pause but for a moment in any form, but pass into a new form, as if by touching the earth again in burial, to acquire new energy” (JMN, Vol.IX.301).

Between 1820-1822, Emerson shows that he had at least some indirect knowledge of the laws of Menu-Books Inquirenda (Letters of Ralph Waldo Emerson, Rusk ix). He also read in the Christian Register about Rommohun Roy, the ‘Hindoo convert’ (Rusk ix). In June of 1845: Emerson wrote to Elizabeth Hoar about this new enthusiasm, the real Bhagavad-Gita, which he had never before in his hand (Rusk ix). Although this aspect not only confirms his knowledge regarding Indian philosophy, in which the problem of metempsychosis reflects ascetic realization or self-trust, it also illustrates the search for his own identity. These alien discourses helped him to find his own path both as a man and as American. Then he would feel free from the cultural bonds that linked him to the past, to the Old World: “Glad I bid adieu
to England, the old, rich, the strong nation, full of arts & men & memories; nor can I feel any regret in the presence of the best of its sons that I was not born here. I am thankful that I am an American as I am thankful that I am a man” (JMN, Vol.IV.81). This passage also unveils how this Principium of Individualism was built; the emphasis on the union between the intellect and imagination. Besides it reflects not only Emerson’s self-trust, but also his self-skepticism: an internal conflict which still remains within American literature.

It is within this dualism between intellect and imagination that we not only realize Emerson’s debt to the Bhagavad-Gita, out of which he embraced the tenets of Indian philosophy that allowed him to see new paths of devotional service, action, and knowledge associated with ethical and religious experience, but also how it helped him to identify himself as a Transcendentalist who sought to clothe and trust in his own faculty of reason and spontaneous ideas which were aroused from his own mind and self-reliance: an American man. The intellectual search is thus radically connected with the above-mentioned cultural encounter with a civilization that he was committed to know and surpass. While discussing Emerson’s pilgrimage abroad, in Emerson on Race and History, Nicoloff states that “Emerson soon resolved that he was not going among foreign things to be challenged, but rather to be himself the challenger” (16). In this light, we are in a position to state that when he was sailing for home in September, after nine months
abroad, he felt sure that he now knew how to value eminent men justly, understanding both their largeness and their limitations as follows:

In 1833, on my return from a short tour in Sicily, Italy and France, I crossed from Boulogne and landed in London at the Tower stairs. . . . For the first time for many months we were forced to check the saucy habit of travellers’ criticism, as we could no longer speak aloud in the streets without being understood. . . . Like most young men at that time, I was much indebted to the men of Edinburgh and of the Edinburgh Review . . . Coleridge, Wordsworth, Landor, DeQuincey [and] Carlyle; and I suppose if I had sifted the reasons that led me to Europe, when I was ill and advised to travel, it was mainly the attraction of these persons. (English Traits 3-4)

Again, as he heartily misses his country, he utters proudly,

Ah my country! In thee is the reasonable hope of mankind not fulfilled. It should be that when all feudal strap & bandages were taken off an unfolding of the Titans had followed & they had laughed & leaped young giants along the continent & ran up the mountains of the West with the errand of Genius & of love. But the utmost thou hast yet produced, is a puny love of beauty in Allston; in Greenough; in Bryant; in Everett; in Channing; in Irving; an imitative love of grace. . . . Ah me! The cause is one; the difference of Ages in the Soul has crept over thee too, America. No man here believeth in the soul of Man but only in some name or person old & departed. . . . (JMN, Vol.VII. 24)

These quotations actually reveal Emerson’s Self-Reliance. He urges man to instill in his heart the sentiment of virtue; to speak with conviction and to believe that what is true for him is true for all men (“Self-Reliance” 45). They reveal poetic transmigrations in the sense that they demonstrate mysterious influences of poetic creation he found while in Europe and in ancient Greece and Rome. They point out, as John T. Reid has shown in his Indian Influences
in American Literature and Thought, that: “the so-called Transcendentalist group,..., was an American manifestation of that great revolution in Western thought and literature called Romanticism; ... they shared with their European confreres a reaction against the dry rationalism of the preceding century, and in their restless search for fresh, exotic themes and lines of speculation they discovered ... the strangeness of Asia and its scriptures of the olden days” (2).

These ideas reflect a romantic pretension to awaken man’s “ego-Self axis, or Individuation [as] the raison d’être of the Self” (Freud & Jung: A Dual Introduction, Stevens 45), or as Tocqueville observes in Democracy in America and Two Essays on America for “living in a democratic country [in which Emerson] compares himself individually with all those around him, [and] sees with pride that he is equal to each of them; but when he happens to contemplate the huge gathering of his fellow men and take his place beside this great body, he is straightway overwhelmed by his own insignificance and weakness” (501). Or as he writes farther ahead: “every man [must] seek out the truth by himself” (506). Emerson actually listens and advises to

Trust thyself: every heart vibrates to that iron string. Accept the place the divine providence has found for you, the society of your contemporaries, and the connection of events. Great men have always done so, and confided themselves childlike to the genius of their age, betraying their perception that the absolutely trustworthy was seated at their heart, working through their hands, predominating in all their being. (“Self-Reliance” 47)

This passage demonstrates the “fundamental principle of the necessary unity of apperception . . . [to reveal] the necessity for a synthesis of the manifold
given in an intuition, without which the identity of self-consciousness would be incogitable” (Kant, *Pure Reason* 50). Besides it informs us of a “Self in its working sense ... [in connection with] *qua* that consciousness ... [suggesting] all the way we are consciousness of self” (John Miller, *Metaphysics* 87). Ultimately, it reveals, as James observes in *Principles of Psychology*, that Romantic “[s]ensibility, which *per se* is chaotic, and the unity is due to the synthetic handling which this Manifold receives from the higher faculties of Intuition, Apprehension, Imagination, Understanding, and Apperception” (232), thus suggesting the most comprehensive and abstract manifestation within romantic paradox.

The self, although in conflict, still helps the poet to establish a link between Nature and God (Gusdorf 309). This connection, this link must be traced back to Emerson’s organic theory of the soul in the sense that it seeks to transform itself into an ideal of itself; the one who, as Emerson writes in “The Divinity School Address,” shall “look for the new Teacher that shall follow so far those shining laws that shall see them come full circle; shall see their rounding complete grace; shall see the world to be the mirror of the soul” (95). This aspect comprises the problematic and the *Ambiguity of the Soul* in Emerson’s journals, letters, essays and poems. It reveals not only the significance of the individual and the duty of the soul to value Nature, but also it draws the dramatic path in Romanticism and Transcendentalism to explore the discrepancy bridge between Reasoning and Understanding, the
problematic of the self/not-self, and soul/heart. “The Soul,” as Jonathan Bishop observes in *Emerson on the Soul*, “is the central drama of all Emerson’s work ... Every sentence, every paragraph, every essay, poem, lecture, or journal note attracts our best attention to the degree that it manifests and promulgates the victory of the Soul” (19). Hopefully, as Emerson observes “... that Unity, that Over-Soul, within which every man’s particular being is contained and made one with all other; that common heart of which all sincere conversation is the worship, to which all right action is submission ... within man is the soul of the whole; the wise silence; the universal beauty, to which every part and particle is equally related; the eternal One” (“The Over-Soul” 268-69). In the permanent dialogue between microcosm and macrocosm the duality may be surpassed.

This quotation reveals a Romantic insight, since what is at stake here is a search for search “that Unity ... within man” (“Over-Soul” 268-69). This unity forms part of romantic discourse on man’s search for an original identity, for a new relationship between the visible and invisible experiences. As George Dusdorf observes in *Fondements du Savoir Romantique* within man’s soul there is a “voie romantique, [et une] attitude d’adhésion fervente à une réalité qui appelle l’âme humaine, du dehors et du dedans, et l’absorbe dans son unite” (87). Hence the nostalgic atmosphere that emerges in relevant texts of the romantic tradition, such as Wordsworth’s Intimations of Immortality from Recollections of Childhood. The lost time and world of
infancy, the lost unity can be recaptured by the Imagination. In his critical approach to poetry, Wordsworth actually speaks of the « Soul, [as the gist of] the Imagination of the Whole,” and “sense of God . . . to hold communion with the invisible world” (The Prelude, 1604-05). There is an obvious affinity with Coleridge when he claims that man’s “GOOD SENSE” of “LIFE, and IMAGINATION [of] the SOUL . . . is everywhere, and in each; and forms all into one graceful and intelligent whole” (Biographia Literaria, 1669). This concept was crucial for Emerson in the sense that, he, as a Romantic/Transcendentalist writer, through the use of his own imagination, purports to establish a link with the world of abstract ideas, with true reality. This means the achievement of a correspondence to the ideal order of things. Then, while freeing from the constraints of previous voices, the self can achieve a new identity as a whole, and eventually pay homage to Past, Nature, History, Language, Religion, Culture, and even Invention, since they stand at the core of man’s existence. They just have to be discovered through the eyes of the whole.

2.2. We have so far attempted to ponder on Emerson’s concept of the self as an identity inscribed within Romantic tradition. His Internal Conflict of the Soul has emerged as a crucial element of his intellectual journey; a journey that hopefully would lead to a new stage, since “[h]e who puts off impurity, thereby puts on purity. If a man is at heart just, then in so far is he
God; the safety of God, the immortality of God, the majesty of God do enter into that man with justice” (“The Divinity School Address” 122). This statement subliminally echoes the recurrent textual dialogue between microcosm and macrocosm: “the currents of the Universal Being ... circulate through” him because he is “a parcel of God” design. Bercovitch and Patell stress the ultimate implication of this dialogue when they unfold a crucial presence, the presence of logos, of Reason:

If the Reason is God, then God is interior to the self, and the self has a principle of illumination no empiricism can menace. All the searches after ‘evidences,’ . . . are fruitless attempts to use the mechanics of the Understanding to discover a truth perceptible to the Reason; they are rendered superfluous by the discovery that the divine is present here and now, in individual human beings, and that it requires of individuals only that they not deny those truths they inwardly perceive. Indeed, submission to the kind of external authority that founds theological schools represents the only apostasy Emerson dreaded – the denial of what one believes to be true in the face of pressure to acquiesce in the beliefs of others. (367)

Bercovitch’s and Patell’s insight helps us to distinguish the crucial antithesis between objectivity and subjectivity, a dualism associated with Emerson’s Ambiguity of the Self. The purposiveness of imagination and of reason exhibit that which is intrinsic, and that which is exterior: a complex power of the romantic sensibility implying moral principles and explaining man’s existence, man’s unity, man’s spontaneous and original genius in contemplating the flux or the following view of the Universe, in which he is the centre. Although this passage seems to offer some deceptive illusion of man’s belief in the existence of a world that is relatively permanent, it contributes to
demonstrate that the scientific chain of things can only be well understood when we distinguish the opposing mechanic evidences between two truths: Understanding and Reasoning. These two poles are part of Emerson’s concept of modern philosophy. They reflect and infer concepts associated with all rational beings, as well as with God. This notion establishes a direct link with the principle of morality in which all our cognition begins from the senses and ends with reason.

In *The Ferment of Reform 1830-1860*, Arthur S. Link has pointed out that “Ralph Waldo Emerson was . . . a transcendentalist [who] urged Americans toward new ways of knowing truth; toward spirituality instead of materialism; toward new ways of dwelling with nature, man, and God” (6). In the same line of thought, Joel Porte stresses that: Emerson ..., in literary terms at least, really put America on the map; [he] created for himself the practically nonexistent role of man of letters, and for about a half century—from the age of Jackson to the gilded age of Grant - criticized, cajoled, sometimes confused, but mainly inspired audiences in America and abroad (1). Emerson actually was the father of the transcendental movement, and the poet who addressed the organic theory of correspondences between the dualistic ethos of *Unity and Variety, the One and the Many*, in the ethos of Romanticism as we will discuss ahead.

In line with romantic tradition he moved into a myriad of directions, and privileged spontaneity and insight. He constituted the zenith and the best
source of knowledge for American civilization. He became the voice of modern philosophy in America. Mirroring the country’s dynamics, he was permanently on the alert, listening to the promptings of his own Thought and Will, sensibility, and imagination. His texts (essays, notebooks, Journals, and poems) reveal the fluidity of microcosm and of the macrocosm, of human mind and of an *ethos*, of personality. He was a moralist with a powerful keen observation of man’s nature in placing and distinguishing his place on earth among other beings, among other signs, among other emblems.
2.3. Ralph Waldo Emerson: The Ambiguity of the Self...Homage to the Past, Nature, History, Language, Religion and Culture

The rounded world is fair to see,
Nine times folded in mystery:
Though baffled seers cannot impart
The secret of its laboring heart.

Emerson, Nature, Second Series

There is nothing but is related to us, nothing that does not interest us
– kingdom, college, tree, horse, or iron shoe – the roots of all things
are in man. Emerson, “History”

. . . . .

These fragments synthesize Emerson’s transcendentalist philosophy of the cosmos of creation. They emphasize the structural relevance of the correspondences as a textual link between the visible and invisible worlds; they unfold the importance of a systematic decoding of emblems that surround the individual. They reveal “the interdependency of fact and mind” (Richardson 563), and how importance is “to experience both sides of every polarity, and never to become rigid or static, never to become confined . . . but always to be in pursuit of the infinite” (Lavine 204).
These passages also illustrate the problem we meet in defining the concept of Romanticism. Roy Porter and Mikulas Teich, in their attempt to define it, propound that: “the Romantics naturally looked within their own nations, seeking to put down new roots in history, in folklore and folksong, in pure, indigenous traditions of language, speech, and expression, in bards and ballads” (5). These two critics go on to remind the reader that this sign is associated with “universal progress and rationality, [and that the] Romantics aimed to uncover a national character and even ‘racial’ continuities through which the past, embodied in living memory” (Idem).

The dialogue with the past may contradict the ongoing sense of renewal that stands at the center of the American ethos and of the Emersonian Text. Besides it may introduce a determinist agenda which links both Emerson and this ethos with Calvinist tradition. Stephen E. Whicher emphasizes this paradoxical dimension: “There is an Emersonian tragedy and an Emersonian sense of tragedy, and we begin to know him when we feel their presence underlying his impressive confidence” (39).

Emerson, as a transcendentalist, believed that human nature should seek direct spiritual inspiration from God through a personal unification with the universe. This means the dignity of human life as the predominance of Eternal Truth in which the soul searches for natural simplicity and spiritual renewal. This search must, however, be supported by a radical personnel commitment, by self-reliance. Susan L. Roberson claims that: “self-reliance is
located both in the external, progressive spatiality of mobility and the open road, and in the inner, private domain of the self, making the self both pilgrim on a journey to self-reliance and the stabilizing center from which self-reliance emerges” (277).

As we have already discussed above, it is through this Romantic paradox that the self develops a longing for a spiritual poetic journey, within An Internal Conflict of the Soul. The individual believes that the outer phenomenon is not only composed of matter, but also it is crowded with life and hence filled with the spirit of God. Emerson’s quest for transcendental truth is thus highly focused both on insight and on the analytical strategies. And therefore prophetic.

Here we must raise a question: Which actually was Emerson’s point of view on insight and tradition? In “Over-Soul” he notes that

> We distinguish the announcements of the soul, its manifestations of its own nature, by the term Revelation. These are always attended by the emotion of the sublime. For this communication is an influx of the Divine mind into our mind. It is an ebb of the individual rivulet before the flowing surges of the sea of life. . . . Every moment when the individual feels himself invaded by it is memorable. By the necessity of our constitution a certain enthusiasm attends the individual’s consciousness of that divine presence. The character and the duration of this enthusiasm vary with the state of the individual, from an ecstasy and trance and prophetic inspiration. (“Over-Soul” 280-81)

This passage is linked to one of the central topics of our thesis, Emerson’s Ambiguity of the Self, meaning the Romantic truth of his own identity in which “the announcements of the Soul” along with “its manifestations” illustrate
several characteristics pertaining to the greater poetic eruption of the nineteenth-century in America. Hence by breaking free from all banalities within “this communication” between “an influx of the Divine mind” and this “ebb of the individual” mind. It is within this aspect that Emerson’s Soul renders tribute to his own “consciousness”: a new field, suggesting the feeling of the Romantic characteristic for the infinite and absolute truth through which the human soul finds a new world of perceptions—an interfusion of intellectual perception with the intuiting self.

Perception magnifies the poetic “prophetic inspiration” along with the inner intellectual structure of the universe in order to stress the eternal and occult conflict between materialism/idealism within this Principium of Individualism. As Anthony Stevens reminds us:

Individualism is the raison d’être of the Self. Though it has evident biological goals, the Self also seeks fulfillment in the spiritual achievements of art and religion and in the inner life of the soul. Hence we can experience it as a profound mystery, a secret resource, or a manifestation of the God within. For this reason, it has been identified with the notion of deity in numerous cultures and finds symbolic expression in such universal configurations as the mandala. As a consequence, the Self came in Jung’s view to provide the means of personal adjustment not only to the social environment but also to God, the cosmos, and the life of the spirit. (45)

This passage helps us to understand Emerson’s self as a Romantic entity that creates a consciousness of God, a spiritual force as he informs the reader in “The Divinity School Address,” the “Over-Soul,” or the Ideal. They reveal a self-fulfillment of the human intellectual revolution, a creative power of the
intellect that allows him to transcend the negative aspects of his own life. They also reflect on the central problem of ethics, on moral energy between man and nature, or as Foucault has observed in *The Order of Things* the “reflexive form of knowledge . . . [which is] in accordance with a conscious/unconscious dimension” (363). These notions echo in Robert D. Richardson when he writes that in Emerson’s *Nature* there is an intensive “insistence on grounding thought, actions, ethics, religion, and art in individual experience” (234). Hence they demonstrate how aspects of cosmic endeavor are associated with the *Principium of Individualism*.

The cosmic endeavor is also relevant because it brings us back to Emerson’s doctrine of the self in “connection between nature and the affections of the soul” (“The American Scholar” 113), as well as with “the procession of facts ... as flowing perpetually outward from an invisible, unsounded centre in himself . . . to that aforesaid Unknown Centre of him” (“Transcendentalist” 334). It suggests the duality of the human spirit in flux in contrast with the solidity of physical nature. Besides it displays the very connection of Emerson’s full range of an allegorical part-whole interaction within his own *Internal Conflict of the Soul*. Hopefully it reflects the metaphorical combination between cause and effect within the Romantic agenda in the sense that, as Cousin had observed “Tout ce qui commence à paraître a nécessairement une cause. Les autres principes ont cette même

Following the same lead, in *The Claims of Reason*, Stanley Cavell discusses Emerson’s vision of the world as an allegorical sphere in which words remark and reveal the hidden depth to conceptualize the romantic longing enactment of “one’s self at the central point of view of a poet.” Cavell further states that:

The words are forced upon us when we feel we must enforce the connection between something inner and an outer something. But those very words – or rather the insistence with which they are withheld – exactly serve to break this natural connection. . . . They [words] make the fact that an expression and what it expresses go together seem more or less accidental, or perhaps like a primitive natural law, as for example that when water boils in a pot steam comes forth from the pot; and, by the way, a much weaker law, because quite often when pain boils in a human being pain-behavior does not come forth. (338)

Romanticism stresses the power of thoughts in their radical dialogue with words. Through this dialogue the poet may reach a new meaning and a deeper knowledge of the cosmos. Then he is apt to unveil a new expression in every natural fact. The power expression connects intimately the poet with universe, awakening in him a new sense of, a new sense of natural and moral beauty.

The poetic expression emerges thus as the main instrument of perceiving truth. In *The Creative Imagination: Enlightenment to Romanticism*, James Engell points out this power of poetry:
The range and power of poetry come from a pattern of words. Figures of speech and phrases become identified with a pattern of feelings and ideas. ‘Words are a measure of truth. They ascertain intuitively the degrees, inflections, and powers of things in a wonderful manner.’ They are the atoms of a second universe in which the psyche [emphasis mine- the self] has touched, sympathized, and associated itself with part of the natural creation. Words become objects and feelings themselves. A figure of speech requires no proof: ‘It gives carte blanche to the imagination’ and encourages us to think of the connections between facts and feelings, the journey of the mind as it considers nature in relation to its own experience. (207)

Emerson actually notes that: “When the mind is braced by labor and invention, the page of whatever book we read becomes luminous with manifold allusion. Every sentence is doubly significant, and the sense of our author is broad as the world” (“The American Scholar” 93). This revelatory dimension of reading is tied up with romantic sensibility since the human mind becomes not only part of the relationship between “labor and invention,” or between “manifold allusion” [physical world], but also is both a creator a vehicle of poetic language. Thus the poet’s intimate sphere, in this case with our analysis of the Principium of Individualism, is an inner constellation of “a private site of speculation and self-fashioning” (Emersonian Circles 10), pertaining to achieve poetic interruption.

This also may be a way of celebrating both spiritual perfection and earthly beauty within the realms of religion, poetry, and art through which the “manifold allusion” of thoughts, ideas, and words become, essentially, an intellectual, emotional and imaginative utterance of human consciousness and unconsciousness within the romantic agenda. In Ralph Waldo Emerson: The
Making of a Democratic Intellectual, Peter S. Field reminds the reader that Emerson “became the critical intellectual figure of his time whose significance extends far beyond his Concord study and Transcendentalist Romanticism” (4). In our view Emerson somehow moves beyond a mere romantic agenda when he indicates that American Romanticism has its roots not only in social philosophy, but also is linked to democracy because Emerson, as a seer and prophet, believed in all ranges of society. Although Emerson speaks of society as a stock of conspiracy, he was the idealistic man of letters who, transcendentalistically, urged to unite the common man along with community in the sense that, as Stanley Cavell observes In Quest of the Ordinary: Lines of Skepticism and Romanticism, the interfusion of Emerson’s self along with its society should not only “be taken as empirically,” but also it should “be taken as claiming a transcendental relation among the concepts of community and the individual” (105) himself in which he finds new awareness of the ambiguities of his own self as he thinks/rethinks of the relationship between its own self and the community in which he lives.

Returning back to viewpoints linked to the manifold allusion, along with words and thoughts raise particularly interesting observations about the power of human mind not only to define but also to reduce the outer world into a myth of his own vision. It is within this aspect that motivates us to bring into our discussion Bloom’s ideas when he states that the poet, or the self as he writes or reads something, is always in struggle and under four principles of
illusion. In his *Kabbalah and Criticism* he presents “the four largest illusions that we tend to have about the nature of a poem” (121), which we connect with Emerson’s work as follows:

1. There is the *religious* illusion, that a poem possesses or creates a real presence.
2. There is the *organic* illusion, that a poem possesses or creates a kind of unity.
3. There is the *rhetorical* illusion, that a poem possesses or creates a definite form.
4. There is the *metaphysical* illusion, that a poem possesses or creates meaning. (122)

Bloom’s ideas must to be traced to Emerson’s works as he searches for an inner constellation: a Gnostic vision between materialism and idealism or a way to look, overlook or even to speak of that wonderful congruity or incongruity that subsists between human nature, the outer world, and spiritual vigor to reflect Emerson’s organic theory of the world. In this case, Emerson, as a poet, an endless seeker, and a philosopher searches for a poetic creativity which can only be understood within the realms of intertextuality [his influences], life experience, perceptions, feelings, imagination, social, intellectual love, religious, and historical contexts in the mid nineteenth-century. In *The Critical Reception of Emerson: Unsettling Things*, Sarah Ann Wider while focusing not only on Emerson’s influences, but also on the major themes of Romanticism and her attempt to contest our poet in the nineteenth-century, reminds the reader that: “Emerson relentlessly explored the illusions by which human beings effectively lived. . . . Emerson accepted it as a
necessary element in human behavior” (56), in order to assert not only that something is true, but also it may be instead one of many other possible way of representing realities, utterances, and interactions within human beings. The above instance demonstrates how Emerson’s work is associated with the “religious illusion” in a certain sense, because it stresses Emerson’s belief, and religious aspects for moral conduct: on one hand, the basic belief in the perfectibility of this Principium of Individualism with emphasis on intuition and self trust; on the other hand, it reflects on reasons that led him to withdraw from the Church as he confessed in 1832 before his congregation that he could not accept the Communion service. These aspects are relevant in discussing and understanding the nature of Emerson’s Ambiguity of the self along with his own sense of optimism, pessimism, fall, faith, justice and progress for personal enrichment, in a certain sense, because “Religion,” as he explained, “in the mind is not credulity, and in the practice is not form. It is life. It is the order and soundness of man. It is not something else to be got, to be added, but is a new life of those faculties you have” (JMN. Vol.IV:27). Here Romanticism is not only associated with a religious view, as an illusion, but also with history of ideas, hope, progress, and revolution since Emerson is in defiance with old creeds and had rediscovered the romantic progressive and idealistic of self-reliance that range widely through the works of his precursors like Rousseau, Goethe, Schiller, Novalis, Carlyle, Wordsworth, Coleridge and others as we have already discussed in the Introduction. These aspects would
lead Sigmund Freud in *Civilization and Its Discontents* to observe while placing faith and religious views in science that “religion [is] an illusion . . . is a feeling . . . a sensation of eternity . . . something [intrinsically] oceanic” (10-11). These aspects, in terms of intertextuality, must also be traced not only to the Calvinistic and Puritan traditions, but also to his sympathetic idea of rebirth and the Hindu teaching that the supreme good can be attained through knowledge in the sense that both “feeling and sensation” are not only words that help us to define Romanticism, or even metaphysic science, but also they are linked to human mind along with his own *Principium of Individualism*. These aspects echo Emerson’s essay “Illusions” from *The Conduct of Life* in which he informs the reader that “In this kingdom of illusions we grope eagerly for stays and foundations. There is none but a strict and faithful dealing at home and a severe barring out of all duplicity or illusion there” (322). Or as he puts it in another passage, as he attempts to discriminate, or “setting aside,” the dilemma between visible and invisible that: “qualities, & affections or emotions and persons, & actions, as Maias or illusions, & thus arriving at the contemplation of the one eternal Life & Cause, & a perpetual approach & assimilation to Him, thus escaping new births and transmigration” (*JMN, Vol. 16*:36). These passages reflect not only on psychological analysis of an interior conflict in which the self deals with “all duplicity,” “deceptions,” “qualities and affections,” and comes to understand itself, in the light of its own reason, but also as it projects itself upon a mental stage; it seeks to carry
a chain of ideas that lie beyond the bounds of sense and forms of intuition because as Adam Gopnik observes in *Americans in Paris: A Literary Anthology* that Emerson possessed “a mystical vision of a natural universe . . . a vision of occult correspondence between mind and nature” (53). “Organic illusion,” deals with the problematic issue between idealism-materialism: a mechanized universe and scientific materialism through which nature is subjected to the principles of forms and matter, end and means, cause and effect, as it is documented in this passage that: “there is no hint to explain the relation between things and thoughts; no ray upon the *metaphysics* of conchology, of botany, of the arts, to show the relation of forms of flowers, shells, animals, architecture, to the mind, and build science upon ideas” (*Nature, First Series*, “Prospects” 67). This passage presents a chain of Romantic antithesis between the forms and limits of sensibility, physical reality and spirit: as two predominant unities that intensify internal experiences. Or a deep insight will differentiate some metaphysical beliefs concerning the self, nature, and God, or as Kant had already written in *The Critique of Pure Reason* while reflecting on the problematic aspects between Reason and Understanding that

metaphysics cannot form the foundation of religion, it must always be one of its most important bulwarks, and human reason, which naturally pursues a dialectical course, cannot do without this science, which checks its tendencies towards dialectic and, by elevating reason to a scientific and clear self-knowledge. (248)
This passage reflects not only on the dynamical antinomies of Kant’s solution within the laws of nature, underlying the whole series of natural causes and effects, which Emerson was aware of, but also it is associated with Emerson’s views concerning his poetic-language-intertextuality: an homage to the rise of Romanticism in America because the problematic issue between self and nature, suggesting “the transcendentalizing of the domestic” gulf between “internalization, or subjectivizing,” as Stanley Cavell observes in *Emerson’s Transcendental Etudes*, “is something that causes romanticism, causes at any rate . . . experiments with romantic texts” (59). “Rhetorical illusion,” encompasses not only Emerson’s mannerism to compose and recompose, invent, reinvent and presenting ideas emotionally and imaginatively, but also it deals with words, syntax within his own poet’s eye [transparent eyeball and genius], in proceeding to discover within this same eye new rhetorical ways that best fit into his poetic thought—the poetic power in which beauty is taken for awakening and communicating aesthetic ideas to explain religious experiences. It reflects the heterogeneity and outpouring of human mind, intellect, and spirituality towards God. This outpouring cry is, intrinsically, associated with originality, styles, feeling of unity or disunity [“Each and All”]; it is in connection with Emerson’s search for the equilibrium between good/evil [“Compensation”]; or even in [“Self-Reliance”] where he celebrates human destiny or fate; and finally, in [“Over-Soul”] Emerson reflects that nature is linked to both God’s mind and human soul: his contribution to the modern
subconscious as a new or “Another element of the modern poetry akin to this subjective tendency,” (Papers From the Dial 316), reflecting, as David M. Robinson observes in Emerson: Bicentennial Essays that “the formulation of a new vocabulary for the shifting vision of ethical experience” (394) in defining the inconsistencies of the term Romanticism; “metaphysics illusion” presents the self as part of metaphysical or empiricist science, confronting with the problem of polarity as it converses with the universe and natural objects in order to find its own: “1. Identity, whence comes the fact that metaphysical faculties & facts are the transcendency of the physical. 2. Flowing, or transition, or shooting the gulf, the perpetual striving to ascend to higher platform, the same thing in new & higher forms” (JMN, Vol. 14:191-92). This passage stresses the poet’s way to unite the poet’s self with the world for moral perfection and instruction, in a certain sense, because the human being is made of moral sentiment and the world in which he lives is also made by the same morality, or as Emerson had already observed that in each man there is always time for education. These aspects reflect the sources of the continuous romantic antithetical reality through which the poet’s intuitive genius provides the reader with an intimate vision to picture the gist of poetry within the law of agon and literature. These notions would be reflected on Preminger’s observations while discussing viewpoints linked to Romanticism in which, as he has pointed out that the “semantic principles [of] poetry, [are linked to] a bipolar distribution of all discourse . . . by defining the ‘emotive,’
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and ‘paradoxal’ language of poetry [to the] systematic opposition of the attributes of the ‘referential,’ ‘cognitive,’ and unambiguously ‘rational’ language of science” (*Encyclopedia* 644). This line of thought reflects the dynamic and static movements through which the self, along with its poetry, engages in an internal and intellectual flight throughout the universe, and the universe engages itself throughout the intellectual flight in order to demonstrate that poetry is a representation of life and through it the human being is apt to achieve the general truth of events.

In this light, in *Freedom and Fate: An Inner Life of Ralph Waldo Emerson*, Stephen Whicher claims that

This transfer of the world into the consciousness is the secret key that unlocked [The American Thinking Man’s] energies. The revelation of what it meant to be a Man, of the unlimited resources of spiritual energy inherent in his separate and independent self, is the vision that charges his three challenges of the 1830s—*Nature*, ‘The American Scholar,’ and ‘The Divinity School Address’—with their immense store of force. (52)

It is within this interior force that Emerson attempted to distinguish the dualism between the real as the idea that lies behind all the appearances in order to harmonize or romanticize the inner and the outer spheres in which the soul explores every possibility within the unbroken chain of phenomena. This chain is part of *Emerson’s Ambiguity of the Self* in the sense that it searches to apprehend the whole value of existence as a way to conform to the premonitions of Reason and Understanding of the human being’s conscience, between the “I” and the “Eye” there is a psychological dualism of
consciousness and unconsciousness through which the Romantic poet, like Emerson, will build up new varieties of creative experience and kinds of knowledge with himself in order to perpetuate the openness of human mind to new influx of light of poetic endeavor, in a certain sense, because as M. H. Abrams in *The Mirror and the Lamp: Romantic Theory and the Critical Tradition*, reminds the reader while focusing not only on the multiple meanings that the term Romanticism carries, but also on the paradox of any romantic poetic art that this influx “results from an interpenetration of spontaneity and voluntarism” (123) within the gulf of a physical self and inner self from which the poet release his own inner creativity.

In “The American Scholar” Emerson writes that “the only thing in the world, of value, is the active soul. This every man is entitled to; this every man contains within him . . . The soul active sees absolute truth and utters truth, or creates” (90). He goes on to say that:

> The world,—this shadow of the soul, or other me,—lies wide around. Its attractions are the keys which unlock my thoughts and make me acquainted with myself. I grasp the hands of those next me, and take my place in the ring to suffer and to work, taught by an instinct that so shall the dumb abyss be vocal with speech. (95)

It is also within this interior vocal speech that Emerson’s Soul finds its own consciousness, something deeply intuitive: the maxim of value within the law of *agon* associated with *Principium of Individualism*: the Romantic groundwork of his Self-Reliance. This voice leads the self to acquire knowledge about and
knowledge by acquaintance in order to delve into a mysterious “abyss.” It leads the individual to create not only his own place in order to find joy, but also his own suffering: the continuum paradox within romantic agenda through which the individual asserts not only his own sense of humanism with his fellow-men, by urging them to create and not to imitate, but also he affirms his own self-love, self-trust, and self-reliance in accordance with the natural world in the sense that the “individual virtue and happiness,” as David Bowers observes in *American Romanticism* in the chapter entitled “American Romanticism Is Humanistic,”

> depend upon self-realization, and that self-realization, in turn, depends upon the harmonious reconciliation of two universal psychological tendencies: . . . [on one hand, the desire] to embrace the whole world and become one with that world; [on the other hand] . . . his desire to withdraw, to remain unique and separate, (48-49)

from society, by affirming his own *Principium of Individualism*: the tension of sensibility that may seem to prevail within Romantic yearning because the self as it strives to attain his own self-fulfillment he realizes it as he searches for his own past, history, culture, religion, and experience—a twofold division “to embrace the whole world and become one with that world,” scientifically, in the sense that Emerson, as a Romantic writer, stressed not only on emotion and imagination of the individual, but also on subjectivity approach.
Within the same light, in which the body and the soul are involved with the external and internal worlds, John Michael has pointed out in *Emerson and Skepticism: the Cipher of the World* that:

In this flexed antithesis between seeing and being seen, an antithesis that is always in danger of doubling back upon the seer, Emerson reduces the other to an apparition while he elevates the self to essentialized being. He dreams of freeing himself from relation to the apparition. But the “tragedy” of his situation . . . is that his very denial of links to the world around him is an acknowledgment of his relationship to it. (62)

We wish to offer a very different approach to Emerson’s work. We see the book of *Nature* as the first of Emerson’s pragmatic mandate on the theory of self, or “the upbuilding of a man” to reflect “The main enterprise of the world for splendor” (“The American Scholar” 107) along with its *Past, Nature, Language, History, Religion and Culture* or even *Invention*, on the one hand. But it also moves into a panegyric presage on the myth of fall and recovery of man, on the other hand. Although it presents Emerson’s style and his strong prophetic strains and fissures intrinsically, as naively optimistic, neo-platonic idealist, and affirmative action, it suggests a naively pessimistic, conservative or confused failed project, as we are informed in his essay “Experience,” *Second Series* that:

It is very unhappy, but too late to be helped, the discovery we have made that we exist. That discovery is called the Fall of Man. Ever afterwards we suspect our instruments. We have learned that we do not see directly, but mediately, and that we have no means of correcting these colored and distorting lenses which we are, or of computing the amount of their errors [The Lords of life]. (75)
This project, an origin myth of man’s ascending or descending, is not an attempt to tax the self to its own limits, but rather a provisional and synthetic statement for writing Nature—a pseudo-scientific contrivance that anticipates Emerson’s *First Series Essays* as Orphic poet to “Insist on yourself: never imitate” (“Self-reliance” 83). Within the same vein, in his *A History of Western Philosophy: 7 Continental Philosophy since 1750. The Rise and Fall of the Self*, Robert C. Solomon offers a relevant point when he discusses that:

> What Rousseau found in the woods . . . of France was a self so rich and substantial, so filled with good feelings and half-articulated good thoughts, so expansive, natural, and at peace with the universe, that he recognized it immediately as something much more than *his* singular self. (1)

Furthermore, Solomon informs us that when he was “Looking deeply into himself, Rousseau discovered the self that he shared with all men and women the world over, and declared that it was good-intrinsically good, despite all of the artifices and superficialities of the social whirl” (Idem), awakening a stimulus for the poet to engage in the most important characteristics of human activities: those of Reasoning and Understanding as we will discuss ahead (Chapter Five). These ideas should be associated with Emerson’s descriptions of the self as he writes that man’s intercourse with heaven and earth becomes part of his [man’s] daily food. In the presence of nature a wild delight runs through the man, in spite of real sorrows. Nature says, - he is my creature, and maugre all his impertinent griefs, he shall be glad with me. Not the sun or the summer alone, but every hour and season yields its tribute of delight; for every hour and change corresponds to and authorizes a different state of mind, from breathless noon to grimmest midnight. (“Nature,” *First Series* 9)
This interaction between heaven and earth in which the "wild delight, sorrows, and griefs" not only attracted Emerson’s mind in experiencing mental images, emotional states, the different sensations of “light and night,” and the stream of consciousness thought, but also it attracted Emerson’s consciousness to explore, within the Romantic agenda, the perception of the outer world in terms of “sun, and change of season.” Light and night are words linked to spirit and matter, religion and thought, past and present in order to inform that both the visible and invisible spheres had an important implication for modern philosophy as Emerson wished it. It is within these ideas that Emerson had related every single aspect of this *Principium of Individualism* with its counterpart in the universe: the hiatus between the inner self and outer phenomena in which the self looks for other ways to inveigle his own past, history, language, religion, nature, and invention.

In the same vein, in *Les Sciences Humaines et la Conscience Occidentale*, Georges Gusdorf, while centering on some views associated with Romanticism between the inner and outer spheres, discusses the problem of the self as an entity through which the *moi* is the inalienable principle of an existence which belongs to itself, from birth to death; and this existence affects each of the events of my life with an irreducible sign. The self is not a hypothesis, an object of probability or of possibility, as Hume affirmed; it imposes as reality of fact and of right, source and resource of a first-person discourse. (78)
Gusdorf’s observations are essentially important because they serve as path for visualizing personal development in search for “le principe inalienable d’une existence” of the self after and beyond its “naissance” and “mort.” The self is not an object of “hypothese [et] probabilite,” but it is an entity of the first person “I,” reflecting, as Wellek has pointed out in Confrontations an “‘interior consciousness,’” of the self itself along with its own “free intuition and ratio cognoscenti” (159). These viewpoints reflect the turbulent conception of human mind through which he/she attempts to reconcile matter and spirit: an issue that forms part of Romantic agenda. They also demonstrate how the faculty of human mind is associated with his/her own physical and spiritual aspects which constitute the principal object within the Romantic effusiveness in which the Principium of Individualism envisioned to create a new body and soul inspired by Eternal Unity.

Here we are confronted with a question. How are Gusdorf’s and Wellek’s observations on the self linked with Emerson’s self? Is there any conflict? We maintain that Emerson’s self presents two fundamental aspects: a naively optimistic and neo-platonic idealist on one hand, and a naively pessimistic and failed entity, on the other hand, as we have already discussed. This view is extremely crucial in the sense that Emerson’s self, as a human being, has a keen and shrewd ability to observe the problems of its own self along with the problems of its own country in which he rejected automatic progress and believed in the goodness, holiness and perfection of mankind as he writes,
In this our talking America we are ruined by our good nature and listening on all sides. This compliance takes away the power of being greatly useful. A man should not be able to look other than directly and forthright. A preoccupied attention is the only answer to the importunate frivolity of other people; an attention, and to an aim which makes their wants frivolous. ("Experience,” Second Series 82)

Related to this passage is the idea that the human being should seek his own “power of being.” It exposes the foundation of action to illustrate two major tendencies: one to explore the instability of a self who experiences the problematic coexistence of the world in which he lives, and the other to become immersed in the world of “compliance” and “importunate frivolity” without “aim.” In discussing this view, we stress that Romanticism arises here in terms of “ruined, compliance, and frivolity” since a “preoccupied” man should not be a static entity, but a dynamic being who keeps searching for new psychological principles that would guide and awaken him to what life was, is or would be because “life” itself, as Emerson writes in JMN is “within life” (Vol.VII.271), or as he puts in “Circles”, “The life of man is a self-evolving circle, which from a ring imperceptibly small, rushes on all sides outwards to new and larger circles, and that without end” (304).

It is not coincidental that, in The Puritan Origins of the American Self, Sacvan Bercovitch, in the chapter entitled “Language” cites as an example of Emerson’s conservative American desire to fix man to a stable nature and step out of history (165-86). This line of thought must be traced to what
Emerson had already written regarding the human destiny. In an audacious passage from “Spiritual Laws” Emerson warns the reader to draw a lesson from nature, which always works by short ways. When the fruit is ripe, it falls. When the fruit is dispatched, the leaf falls. The circuit of the waters is mere falling. The walking of man and all animals is a falling forward. All our manual labor and works of strength, as prying, splitting, digging, rowing and so forth, are done by dint of continual falling, and the globe, earth, moon, comet, sun, star, fall for ever and ever. (First Series 137)

Although this passage refers to the law of gravity, it also demonstrates and dramatizes man’s destiny, man’s life in downward or in “circuit of the waters,” as a “continual falling,” which is part of our condition, part of the law of nature and predestination through original sin; it reflects on the human destiny and arbitrary sense of life within the Principium of Individualism in order to anchor or submit himself under the universal current of spiritual and intellectual life, in a certain sense, because “the sublimest flights of the soul” (“The Divinity School Address” 125), awakening “a sentiment which we call the religious sentiment,” reflect man’s “highest happiness” (“The Divinity School Address” 124). These viewpoints are part of Emerson’s “Self-Reliance” in which he encourages human nature to find his own beliefs and his own relationships with other men and with the forces of nature. This line of thought is connected with Bercovitch’s arguments on Emerson’s self as a social entity to demonstrate that “The Emersonian triad is American nature, the American self, and American destiny, a triple tautology designed to obviate the anxieties both of consciousness and of the recalcitrant world” (22) of the Puritan
fathers. In just this way, in *The American Metamorphosis*, Daniel B. Shea proclaims that

Emerson is the crucial figure in a tradition that has helped identify American literature, the celebration and testing of the proposition that ‘men are convertible’- an institutionalized article of faith to the Puritans . . . challenged the American writer to deliver up of his experience a transformed language and imaginative structure more nearly organic with an American conception of man as endlessly capable of regeneration. Such a challenge . . . interacting with a society, comes to rest in increased self-understanding. The kind of becoming suggested in the symbol of the transparent eyeball is metamorphic, not simple a change of status but a change of state; the attainment of a newly-given self. (31)

In this passage, Emerson’s self is described as a component associated with tradition, past and history, in which the human facts derive from a mysterious and inviolable “institutionalized article of faith to the Puritans,” suggesting the triumphs of man’s will and genius by interacting with society and cosmic forces for the sake of human spiritual perceptions. These aspects reflect the birth of patriotism of *Principium of Individualism* in order to “identify” natural goodness of man or “an American conception of man” as an endless seeker to attain “a newly-given self,” out of which human being will affirm his own values in terms of sincerity, spontaneity, and faith in emotion.

In the same vein, in *A Historical Guide to Ralph Waldo Emerson*, Joel Myerson has pointed out that “Emerson was America’s great philosopher-psychologist-poet of the Self as well as a keen observer of the characteristics of the times” (61). Emerson’s “true gift to his contemporaries, and to later generations, was his ability to ignite in others an empowering sense of self-
reliance,” Myerson observes (idem). He was “regarded as a national treasure, an oracle approached to reassure a sometimes troubled America that its self-image was true, its mission on track. Today, [Myerson adds] on the verge of the twenty-first century, invoked as often as Shakespeare or the Bible by politicians and social commentators . . . Emerson remains, an American icon” (62). This gift comes not only from within, God, and from his self-reliance, but also it derives from Emerson’s natural reason to encourage his fellow-men to seek both moral conduct and knowledge for social reform.

Myerson’s ideas function as a key-stone in responding to some of the questions we set up at the beginning of our work: whether Emerson were a Romantic writer or not. They suggest a comprehensive grounding in discussing the romantic sensibility in Emerson’s work: for he speaks of the self as a national and true entity linked with the breadth of vision of American Transcendentalism, in creating a link that is so potential within the individual’s responsibility to social law, and divine forces. They come to reinforce that intuition was the source of the Emersonian self in reconciling the individual and the universe, in a certain sense, because, as H. B. Van Wesep observes in Seven Sages: The Story of American Philosophy, that when Emerson used the term intuition, he used it “as an essential ingredient in scientific thinking” (103) in order to assert and distinguish his belief in a higher agency outside of human nature consciousness and inside of human nature unconsciousness: suggesting Emerson’s Internal Conflict of the Soul. They demonstrate
Emerson’s views on the externalization of the self as he observes in “The American Scholar” that

The mind now thinks; now acts; and each fit reproduces the other. When the artist has exhausted his materials, when the fancy no longer paints, when thoughts are no longer apprehended, and books are weariness,—he has always the recourse to live. Character is higher than intellect. Thinking is the function. Living is the functionary. (99)

Also this in “The Divinity School Address” that

He who puts off impurity, thereby puts on purity. If a man is at heart just, then in so far is he God; the safety of God; the immortality of God, the majesty of God do enter into that man with justice. (122)

There is an ambiguity or a striking parallel in the above passage between Emerson’s thought and the Upanishads: on the grounds that he speaks of Mayas and illusion as we have already discussed. In *The Spiritual Heritage of India*, Swami Prabhavananda discusses the immortal, unchanging nature of cosmic self as follows:

This self has no absolute reality, and can therefore have no absolute or permanent existence. When moksa is achieved, it altogether disappears. Furthermore, the immortality of the Upanishads, in contrast with a common Western conception, cannot properly be regarded as in any sense a continuance in time. (*The Spiritual Heritage of India: Upanishads* 62)

Or this,

The conception of immortality to be found in the Upanishads runs counter, it must be admitted, to a common human desire. Most of us cling fondly to what we call our individuality, or personality, and long to retain it through what we think of as an infinite extension of earthly time. Against this prepossession there lies implicit in the Upanishads the following argument. This so-vaunted individuality of our—what is it, after all? Born as it is of the false identification of
the Self with the non-Self, it is but the illusory product of a radical misunderstanding. It has no genuinely real, no ultimate, existence. And, further, if only we will but observe and reflect, we shall realize that everything which pertains to this particularized self, whether of body or mind, is in a state of incessant change. (*The Spiritual Heritage of India: Upanishads* 63)

Although this passage seems to demonstrate that the human being is in ruin or death, it demonstrates “the sentiment of virtue on the heart, [which] gives and is the assurance that Law is sovereign over all natures; and the worlds, time, space, eternity, do seem to break out into joy,” (“The Divinity School Address” 125); it informs “the basis of the soul [,] truth, justice, love, & the idea of eternity” (*JMN*, Vol.V.306) through which man’s vision searches for “God without can only be known by God within” (*JMN*, Vol.V.236).

The famous opening lines of *Nature*’s introduction demonstrate the self as an affront to original Past or action, but usually overlooked is the fact that the opening paragraph offers its own remedy, as Emerson warns that:

> Our age is retrospective. It builds the sepulchres of fathers. It writes biographies, histories, and criticism. The foregoing generations beheld God and nature face to face; we, through their eyes. Why should not we also enjoy an original relation to the universe? Why should not we have a poetry and philosophy of insight and not of tradition, and a religion by revelation to us, and not the history of theirs? Embosomed for a season in nature, whose floods of life stream around and through us, and invite by the powers they supply. To action proportioned to nature, why should we grasp among the dry bones of the past, or put the living generation into masquerade out of its faded wardrobe? The sun shines today also. There is more wool and flax in the fields. There are new lands, new men, new thoughts. Let us demand our own works and laws and worship. (“Nature,” *First Series* 3)
This passage immediately demonstrates Emerson’s difficulties advocating “our words and laws and worship.” Although it reveals concerns about culture and history as a threat to development of self, it awakens and urges us to have “an original relation to the universe” or Emerson’s insistence on self-reliance and nonconformity, terms he virtually discovered; it also suggests nothing but man’s power to “action proportioned to nature.” This view is romantic in the sense that Emerson’s self reveals a keen interest in the picturesque past. Emerson not only transferred the locus of power in religion from external to internal worlds, a sort of pilgrimage or dance from Calvinism, through Unitarianism to Transcendentalism, but also he shifted his idealism from traditional language of religion to a new language of moral philosophy as he puts it “why should not we have a poetry and philosophy of insight and not of tradition, and a religion by revelation to us, and not the history of theirs?” In the same vein, in *Endless Experiments: Essays on the Heroic Experience in American Romanticism*, Todd M. Lieber, while discussing the writing of Irving, Cooper, Bryant, and Longfellow, within a Romantic sensibility context, which permeated the triumvirate of the self, nature, and God, offers a relevant view when he states that

the Transcendentalists were primarily concerned with rephrasing the ancient religious preoccupations of New England, [and that] its outlook was predominantly Romantic, characterized by a new emphasis on individual freedom and aspiration, making literature most valuable as an expression of personal feeling and attitudes, and placing its supreme confidence in nature and in the transcendent power of the human imagination. (9-10)
This instance soars with eloquence not only on the problematic role to link both Transcendentalism and Romanticism into “religious” concerns at the beginning of nineteenth century in New England life, but also it reflects on the celebration and primacy of the individual along with his “imagination” so that he can affirm his own ability, improve himself through his own poetic genius, as he uses his “freedom, aspiration, and personal feeling.” These words pertain to the glory and triumph of Romanticism since the term is linked to the great variety of cultural, social, and historical events in the sense that, as Jerome J. McGann reminds us in The Romantic Ideology: A Critical Investigation that the ‘Isms’ of Romanticism” or any “Romantic works engage the world, [and] seek to engage with the world, at the level of ideology” (70).

In continuing to discuss viewpoints associated with ancient religious preoccupations in America, [between 1829-1832-Emerson served as first assistant, and later as pastor of the Second Church of Boston-Unitarian], in Revista Portuguesa de Filosofia, Joseph Eugene Mullin has pointed out that “Emerson stands at some crossroads in the mental life of America.” “Emerson,” Mullin adds,

summarized and epitomized what preceded him. [ He] embodied the slide away from the faith of the Puritan of fathers beyond Congregational and Unitarianism, responding to a private call and no more to an institutional dispensation, symbolizing resigning the ministry for a life of letters, and found a voice to express a Romanticism still touched with Puritan vigor. (567-68)
These aspects stress a kind of theoretical and historical dilemma through which the human self would create interference between inner and outer spheres. They reflect Emerson’s search for a connection with any specific organic process and spiritual vigor in order to record and explore personal confrontation which might be only found, as Perry Miller observes in *The Transcendentalists: An Anthology*, “within the soul that testifies for God, and gives us the grounds of a living faith in his being and providence, in his love and mercy” (246). This aspect is associated with the Romantic approach, in a certain sense, because it echoes that Emerson was aware of the impact and threat of cultural difference in the mid nineteenth century through which Transcendentalism and Romanticism would draw freely under the fantasies of the human genius, or as Emerson had already written that “whole conception of spiritual doctrine” is “in the perpetual openness of the human mind to new influx of light and power” (“The Transcendentalist” 335).

Extending this logic, Emerson’s interest is not so much in nature, but in both human action and invention as tropes for “new lands, new men, new thoughts,” or as he puts it in another passage “No man fears age or misfortune or death in their serene company, for he is transported out of the district of change” (“Nature,” *First Series* 3) of “Moral Nature, that Law of laws whose revelations introduce greatness –yea, God himself – into the open soul, [which] is not explored as the fountain of the established teaching in society” (“The Divinity School Address” 134).
This contrast is prominent for both attitudes towards history and action. We argue, however, this rehabilitation of past, history and action, from Protestantism to Transcendentalism is finally and essentially incomplete. It must remain so if Transcendentalism is to survive. Rather than effecting a de-allegorization of Protestantism, Transcendentalism would just be anticipating the creation of another self, or allegorically, of a self in a longing spiritual journey in which - the self that is never the self and who regards his own life in this world as an extended metaphor and hidden entity of true life in the next.

In this light, in *Transcendentalism: A Reader*, Joel Myerson, while discussing relevant aspects concerning the dualistic between matter/spirit in Romanticism/Transcendentalism and analogies between the human mind and the outer phenomenon, informs us that “the Transcendentalists not only were theologically radical but also challenged the need for a formally credentialed ministerial class” (xxix). Myerson goes on to state that: “They also set the stage for advocating the doctrine of self-reliance (or to enhance the divinity within one’s self) and distressing the importance of observing nature (if nature is divine, then studying nature is a way to examine the expressions and workings of the divine mind)” (xxix). These viewpoints are essentially part of Romanticism/Transcendentalism in the sense that they stress the concepts of self-reliance, individual experience of life, God, and nature. Through this experience, human nature is apt to purify his own life, select his own society,
and discern the dilemma between good/evil, delight in new thoughts [as the romantic and transcendentalist poet loves to think], so that he is also able to put himself in a place for self-renewal.

In this vein, we must cite Perry Miller. In *The Life of the Mind in America: from the Revolution to the Civil War*, Miller has pointed out that

> Transcendentalists had a definite conception of man’s place in a universe divided between object and essence. His physical existence rooted him to the material portion, like all natural objects, but his soul gave him the potential to transcend this condition. Using intuition or imagination (as distinct from rational understanding), man might penetrate to spiritual truths. (85)

Under these ideas, in the nineteenth-century the Unitarian-Reform movement, out of which Transcendentalism arose, began to challenge those aspects of Puritanism that kept man from nature. The Transcendentalists went on to challenge much more than the Unitarians, but Transcendentalism took the idea of the divine in nature as a basic premise to “a belief that the nature not self, suffused with the divine power of God, offered an equivalent response to the expanding and expressive self” (*Endless Experiments* 12). These ideas can be traced to a much earlier period as David A. Hollinger and Charles Capper have shown in their discussion about Thomas Jefferson’s views on American society and culture. In *Selection From Notes on the State of Virginia*, these two American critics claim that

> Jefferson’s political sociology, or his pioneering effort at integrating his enlightened views of society and culture with his democratic politics and ethics. . . . He [Jefferson] maintained that the spring of social and political virtue was economic independence, which, in turn, was nurtured by a commercial yet
This passage helps the reader and us to understand Jefferson’s social life, political, economical, and intellectual activities at the beginning of the nineteenth century. As a member of the Enlightenment, he shared his faith and optimism in human reason and science for social progress in which the happiness and morality of his country would depend upon the recognition of *natura naturata* as the bedrock of the interrelationship between the human being and God. This notion reflects a sort of revolution in which the moral duty of the human being consisted in rescuing viewpoints associated with political and religious approaches within *the Principium of Individualism* in which, as Emerson would observe the “Systems of Education [such as] Literature, Politics, Morals, & Physics, are engaged in loud civil contention” (*JMN*, Vol.I.219). This passage reflects on American social development life. It exhibits not only the evolution of institutions, in the fields of education, moral, and scientific progress, but also in the fields of democracy and freedom: as a way to advance, fortify and distinguish new aspects between savagery and “civil contention” within the American frontier.

In *The Lost World of Thomas Jefferson*, Daniel J. Boorstin takes a similar approach when he states that: “This struggle with nature in which American civilization was born had surely shaped the Jeffersonian mind; through the Jeffersonian tradition and in many other ways it was to affect the whole future
character of American thought.” Boorstin adds that “the Jeffersonian tradition has played and should continue to play a vital and valuable role in American history: it has provided our principal check on the demands of irresponsible power,” and that “Our willingness to begin with the probings of an Emerson is explained by our confidence that we will end with the affirmations of a Whitman” (3, xi, 4). From this perspective, we argue that Emerson’s *Nature* meets the crux of vision of Romantic agenda in the sense that nature becomes part of the divine power and the emblem of God. It symbolizes not only the product of will and thought, but also a product of moral sentiment, a product of birth and rebirth to reflect a Romantic approach or revolution of eternal verities as we discuss ahead (Chapter Four). It symbolizes the perfume of mind, spirit, and body, the school of education in which human being soul is vacillating between two worlds: Understanding and Reason. Or as Joel Porte observes in *Consciousness and Culture: Emerson and Thoreau*, that: “Man’s self-consciousness, at once his glory and his anguish, keeps him from accepting wholeheartedly his animal body and the spontaneous life of nature. . . . [or] even becoming an innocent part of nature was possibly one way of attempting to solve the problem of the double consciousness”(4): the gulf between Reason and Understanding. This aspect is also discussed later (in Chapter Five).

In *Images or Shadows of Divine Things by Jonathan Edwards*, Miller informs us that Jefferson’s *Notes on Virginia* was an important scientific work,
but it also significantly contained a real appreciation of nature’s aesthetic qualities such as only Jonathan Edwards had shown. Miller goes on to show that

Edwards in his own way was anticipating the distinction which would be made by post Kantian philosophers, by Coleridge and Emerson, between the ‘imagination’ and the ‘fancy,’ wherein they would promote the imagination to the status of what Edwards meant by the naked idea and leave the fancy substantially what he called imagination. With him as with them, the aim was to establish an activity of mind in which the idea and the object could be so consolidated that the one became expressible in terms of the other. (21)

The combination of Jeffersonian, Unitarian and European (including neo-platonic) ideas helped to make Emerson’s “Nature,” written in 1836 a unique Romantic work because there

is the belief in the presence of a thought element within Nature itself, so that the content is really asserted to exist within the forms of matter as such rather than merely representing post facto human or rationalistic constructions. In the process, thought comes to be viewed as an activity (like that of pre Darwinian evolution) of the material substance itself rather that of the rational intelligence seeking to establish relations between things. (Chai 154)

In the same vein, in American Criticism: A Study in Literary Theory from Poe to the Present, Norman Foerster propounds the case by saying that: “The discovery of America provided the setting, or theatre, for European culture: the New World had everything to receive, nothing to give, in respect to the higher interests of humanity. . . . Inevitably, therefore, our culture and our criticism have been mainly derivative” (xiv). This idea is very arbitrary; it is a very Euro-centric paradigm in the sense that this land was not empty. We
maintain that this aspect came into intellectual climate that reflected America’s unique historical, political and geographical situation. According to Parrington all “those germinal contributions were the bequests successively of English Independency, of French romantic theory, of the industrial revolution and 
laissez faire, of nineteenth-century science, and of Continental theories of 
collectivism” (iii). Furthermore, Parrington stresses that these truths were “Transplanted to American soil . . . and flourished in such spots as proved congenial, stimulating American thought, suggesting programs for fresh Utopian ventures, providing an intellectual sanction for new experiments in government” (iii). Within the same thought, in Selected Writings of Washington Irving, Saxe Commins, in discussing Irving’s works, informs us that

We [Americans] have groped our way among the European cultures, borrowing their philosophy, accepting their science, proclaiming their literature, memorizing their music and imitating their art, only to come back a little less provincial after each journey from home and always a little more acutely hopeful of regaining some portion of our heritage. (vii)

This process reflected a double one: American society received the ideas, but then they “reprint them and adapt them to their own uses,” as Tocqueville had pointed out in 1840 (Democracy in America and Two Essays on America 543): he re-interpreted them in the light of their particular intellectual climate.

At the first formal expression of American Romanticism, Nature was an important setting in Emerson’s and other writings of that time. Emerson’s
early writings not only reveal a Romantic outlook through which the soul, imaginatively, could land and take off, as it searches both for an effective artistic unity and knowledge in order to adjust itself in the society. The central idea of the essay is that the mind of man is one with the laws of nature. “Sensible objects,” Emerson said, “conform to the premonitions of Reason and reflect the conscience” (“Nature,” First Series 40).

Here we must raise a question: How should we distinguish Romanticism and Transcendentalism? This question is relevant since Emerson was caught in literary cross-currents of the mid 19th century. He was also considered the Father of Transcendentalism and within Nature Emerson seeks not only to examine and legitimize social, political, economic and historical facts through which Romanticism and Transcendentalism would emerge in America, but also he entails a sort of dialogic interrelationship between Europe and other countries. In view of this fact, in Encyclopedia of Transcendentalism, edited by Wesley T. Mott, Transcendentalism is associated with “theological innovation and literary experiment arising within New England Unitarianism” (224). In 1966, in Transcendentalists: An Anthology, Perry Miller, while discussing the issue, stresses that Transcendentalism is “an expression of a religious radicalism in revolt against a rational conservatism” (8). Then, what is Romanticism? Is Romanticism part of Transcendentalism? We argue that Transcendentalism is within Romanticism in the sense that it focuses on man’s personalism or experience to deeply feel and believe in the existence of both
worlds, mystical and sensuous. Romanticism reflects on the human being tensions, internal conflict, stream of consciousness and unconsciousness in reconciling the inner and outer cosmic forces, in which the self flows with the flowing of nature. While here Romanticism is associated with the spirit of reanimating the nature and relocating the poet into a realistic view of the world: as a return to nature [source of instruction], past [as nobler time-Our age is retrospective], glorified the individual and his actions [There are new men, new thoughts], admired and cherished traditional ballads, and stories [The foregoing generations beheld God and nature face to face], valued the common man [Every man’s condition is a solution], and promoted change in democracy [self-reliance], Transcendentalism can be defined here as an extended religious metaphor through which Romanticism can be understood: Here we forward an hypothesis: If natural fact is linked to moral truth, then, it is possible that, as Emerson reminds the reader, “the whole of nature is a metaphor of the human mind.” that: If natural fact is linked to moral truth, then, it was a religious and theological doctrine to explain, spiritually, the consequences of relationship lived among the individual, God, society, and nature [The rays that come from those heavenly worlds will separate between him and what he touches], in a certain sense, because as Joel Myerson observes in Transcendentalism: A Reader that Transcendentalists, like Emerson, “set the stage for advocating the doctrine of self-reliance (or to enhance the divinity within one’s self) and stressing the importance of
observing nature (if nature is divine, then studying nature is a way to examine the expressions and workings of the divine mind” (xxix) for mankind moral conduct.

Following this view, in *Varieties of Religious Experience*, William James argues that “All our attitudes, moral, practical, or emotional, as well as religious, are due to the ‘objects’ of our consciousness, the things which we believe to exist, whether really or ideally, along with ourselves” (55). James’s position seems to find its stimulus of sensibility or creative fecundity of imagination [mind] from Emerson’s phrase of “Sensible objects.” According to Emerson, “All things are moral; and in their boundless changes have an increasing reference to spiritual nature” (“Nature,” *First Series* 40). “Such objects,” James explains, on the other hand, “may be present to our senses . . . due to things of thought as due to sensible presences” (55). These aspects would reflect on Todd M. Lieber’s arguments, while discussing Emerson’s views regarding the inner and outer worlds. In his *Endless Experiments: Essays on the Heroic Experience in American Romanticism* he has pointed out that “For Emerson the dualism of the cosmos was represented by spirit and matter, and the psychological internalization of this dualism was expressed by the Soul and Understanding” (35), from which Emerson stresses that within human mind

There is an elevation of thought from which things venerable become less, because we are in the presence of their Source. When we catch one clear glimpse of the moral harmonies which accomplish themselves throughout the Everlasting Now & throughout the omnipresent Here how impertinent seem the controversies of the theologians. God is before us & they are wrangling about dead
gods. . . . [and then] if we have access inwardly to the Almighty & all wise One, Inspirer of all Prophecy, Container of all Truth & Sole Cause of Causes? . . . I look for & await [s] [Whitman-the son who] shall enunciate with more precision & universality, with piercing poetic insight those beautiful yet severe compensations that give to moral nature an aspect of mathematical science. He will not occupy himself in laboriously reanimating a historical religion but in bringing men to God by showing them that he IS, not was, & speaks not spoke. (JMN, Vol. V. 6)

These lines reflect an important attempt to internalize and externalize, romantically speaking, the image of Eternity. They outline the laws of nature of progression, the actions of outward and inward, and the paradigms of evolution in man’s soul in order to experience, as Bishop observes in Angle of Vision “the cipher of change . . . the living experience . . . the chain of being . . . the dialectic as natural unfolding of thought- the science of ideas . . . the pulses of insight . . . the world in motion . . . [and] the fluidity of the universe” (112-13). The above passage, morally and ethically, reveals reminiscences of thought of the Transcendentalist vision, which was enmeshed with Plato’s and Kant’s ideas about the universe, and the chiliastic division of subject and object. It depicts, as Parrington has pointed out in Main Currents “the inherited asceticism, and a transcendental revulsion from common pessimism [that] had turned into a serene optimist . . . as bleak and austerely introspective” (Vol. II, 381) of a prescience which can only be understood through human being intuition. These viewpoints demonstrate the depth of Emerson’s soul in search for higher laws, poetic imagination or cosmogony relationship in order to find its own utmost freedom of expression, a response
to his own inspiration and enthusiasm which thrills him, so that he is apt to express fully and freely his own ideas. They reflect on the human mind as an extending metaphor of the universe to externalize and interiorize natural facts as symbols of spirituality. Here Romanticism is defined as the container of all truths, cause and effect, out of which the self, as a nonconformity entity is not only concerned with the laws and morality of nature, but also with the intuitive sense of religious and moral truth pertaining to the Transcendental movement.

In this light, in *Essays in the Romantic Poets*, Solomon Francis Gingerich has also pointed out that:

> The principle of Transcendentalism is closely allied to the principle of Free - Will. Strictly speaking, 'transcendentalism is a theory, not of intuition, but of knowledge. It lays bare the method, or mode, by which the intellect grows. It reverses the conception that all knowledge is derived from the senses, and asserts that the sense impressions that stream into mind from the outer world were meaningless, a mere blotch on the canvas, had not the mind an original, active, organizing principle within itself by which it turns them into knowledge.’ (9)

This passage reflects on philosophical and social matters. It illustrates an embodiment to achieve an effect of double vision between inner and outer phenomenon within the *Principium of Individualism*, suggesting what the past was, and what it can be to the reader when contemplating it from the present, in which manifoldness, as an eternally and a continuum problem inherent in the One, implies a comprehensive and empirical way for contemplating the divine presence through two methods: *knowledge by acquaintance and knowledge about* from which, as Avelar observes in *Historia da Literatura (s) Americana*
while discussing views associated with inner and outer sides that “o psicológico prevalece sobre o ontológico” (169). This aspect goes back to what Jean-Francois Guillow had observed, while reflecting on issues linked to Romanticism, in which the double vision becomes the embodiment of the divine science. Although these observations seem to be in conflict with themselves whether Emerson’s self proceeds from the One through the process of emanation, they display and invigorate the Romantic integrity, sensibility of the soul to enjoy the wilderness and the delight of natural objects. This line of thought is in direct connection with Guillou’s views associated with the Romantic approach, in a certain sense, because:

at the dawn of the 19th century, Romantic[ism], not as a movement but as a new sensibility, saw art as essentially a search for an ideal, an inspiration to transcendence. Despite the silence of God, art was a revelation of his presence . . . the charm of the picturesque, the landscape has become the empty site where a manifestation of God is awaited. For God is not present in the silence of the ruins in the classical, pantheistic sense preached by Spinoza or Voltaire. Nature is not God, nor is God the sum of all that exists. But the material world in its appearance of disorder is the visible token of his invisible presence. (124)

Within such a context, Emerson informs that: “The intellect searches out the absolute order of things as they stand in the mind of God,” and that: “The production of a work of art throws a light upon the mystery of humanity” ("Nature,” First Series 22-23). This means all things the human being deals with illustrate a high moral standing of perfect knowledge. The beauty of nature suggests to the human being’s intellect a law which reflects a unity
behind the variety of physical forms. Since the unity of nature is complete, every universal truth implies every other truth. This beauty, Emerson writes, is “a reverence and delight in the presence of certain laws,” ("The Divinity School Address" 121) in which the self or the soul, the laws of society, good and evil demonstrates the human intuitive nature and moral sentiment. The beauty or the self as a “refulgent summer,” “draw[s] the breath of life” ("The Divinity School Address" 119), “The intuition, of the moral sentiment,” and suggests “an insight of the perfection of the laws of the soul.” And

These laws execute themselves. They are out of time, out of space, and not subject to circumstance. Thus in the soul of man there is a justice whose retributions are instant and entire. . . . If a man is at heart just, then in so far is he God; the safety of God, the immortality of God, the majesty of God do enter into that man with justice. ("The Divinity School Address" 122)

From this province of relationship between God and man, it is important in discussing Emerson’s views to bring into light the concept of “theogony.” This concept refers to, as we read in The American College Dictionary “An account of the gods’ origin and genealogy” because of the American belief that God dwells in each individual, as Emerson observes: “Everything real is self-existent. Everything divine shares the self-existence of Deity. All that you call the world is the shadow of that substance which you are, the perpetual creation of the powers of thought, of those that are dependent and of those that are independent of your will” ("Transcendentalist" 334). “In this view of him, as Man Thinking, the theory of his office is contained. Him Nature solicits
with all her placid, all her monitory pictures; him the past instructs; him the future invites,” . . . because “There is never a beginning, there is never an end, to the inexplicable continuity of this web of God, but always circular power returning into itself,” as Emerson writes in “The American Scholar” (84-85). These ideas reflect that the human being is an organic continuum element situated between the beyond and this world. He is alive. He is outside and inside himself in search for finite and infinite in order to communicate his own perception in terms of delight between visible and invisible worlds.

Analogies exist between physical objects and spiritual meanings, and analogies also exist among thoughts. According to Emerson, “Nature is the vehicle of thought, and in a simple, double, and three-fold degree. 1. Words are signs of natural facts. 2. Particular natural facts are symbols of particular spiritual facts. 3. Nature is the symbol of spirit (“Nature,” First Series 25). “The laws of moral nature answer to those of matter as face to face in a glass. ‘The visible world and the relation of its parts, is the dial plate of the invisible.’ The axioms of physics translate [into] the laws of ethics. Thus, ‘the whole is greater than its part;’ ‘reaction is equal to action;’ ‘the smallest weight may be made to lift the greatest, the difference of weight being compensated by time,’ Emerson proclaims in “Nature,” First Series (32-33). The Transcendentalists, in Emerson’s words, born with knives in their minds, admitted that mind would be the object of inquiry independent of the external world. It is from this ability of inquiry, as an assumption that leads Emerson to write:
In the woods, too, a man casts off his years, as the snake his slough, and at what period soever of life is always a child . . . There I feel that nothing can befall me in life,- no disgrace, no calamity (leaving me my eyes), which nature cannot repair. Standing on the bare ground, - my head bathed by the blithe air and uplifted into infinite space,-all mean egotism vanishes. I become a transparent eyeball; I am nothing; I see all; the currents of the Universal Being circulate through me; I am part or parcel of God. ("Nature," First Series 9-10)

Although this little set piece demonstrates Emerson’s technique to urge the young writers of his country to become aware of their role and existence, it also presents Emerson’s difficulties to devote himself to depicting the infinite variety of natural appearances. By stating he is part of God, Emerson confounds the visible and the invisible phenomena, the Over-Soul or the higher self. The dichotomy between this world of physics and the spiritual one is contingent; Emerson does not reconcile, by using his mind as a sensory object of inquiry, the heterogeneousness of nature and the unity of the Soul or self. “Every appearance in nature corresponds to some state of the mind, and that state of the mind can only be described by presenting that nature appearance as its picture.” This picture propagates “the beautiful type of all influence” because “Man is conscious of a universal soul within or behind his individual life,” Emerson writes in “Nature,” First Series (27).

For Emerson the goal is not ultimate liberation, but freedom within nature: it teaches and gives morals, it glorifies the mortification of self by seeking transformation and connectedness to things. When he seeks to move
beyond the confines of ego, he tries to shed the will as a snake sheds its skin, in order to become pure or “transparent eyeball,” unbounded consciousness, a transparent lens is able to “see all” through a channel of the “vital force supplied by Eternal” (“Experience,” Second Series 69).

Furthermore, as a result of this rehabilitation with the absolute, he finds himself awakened and restored to his full stature as a conduit through which “the currents of the Universal Being” circulate through his corpus and soul becoming a child again. We deduce that this attitude demonstrates Emerson was aware of classic theory of the self as backward step to a forward step as an alternative to resist the demands of his optative moods. Although Emerson knew that his art came from the insights of inner world, he was driven away from this world by fear or skepticism: if he moved too far into his own mind, he risked isolation and even insanity; but if he moved too far into the factual world, he could not tap the sources of his art, in a certain sense, because, as Avelar explains, that the art of writing, thinking or even of painting look for a dialogue through theoretical approach to find Romanticism. That is, the human nature as he/she writes, his/her art centers in a dramatic philosophical idealism which is associated with the most heartfelt emotional needs in search for spiritual meaning.

In dealing with this hypothetical approach to the human being’s ability to improve himself and his world through poetic creativity, in The Triumph of Romanticism: Collected Essays, Morse Peckham discusses man’s life and the
universe as new organic thought associated with the Zeitgeist idealism as a “continual recurrence” (12) image of the nineteenth-century not only applied to the poetic art, but also to the concepts of self-reliance, self-trust, and individualism. Peckham informs us that the relationship between man’s life and the universe grows organically. [And that this relationship] is alive. It is not something made, a perfect machine; it grows. Therefore change becomes a positive value, not a negative value; change is not man’s punishment, it is his opportunity. . . . Since the universe is changing and growing, there is consequently a positive and radical intrusion of novelty into the world. (10)

This aspect informs us of Emerson’s Over-Soul, an heterogeneous romantic entity, which, partially or provisionally, in her realization, transcends her uniqueness and engages in a mutual relation with a larger self or Over-Soul. This perspective is, of course, part of the romantic inflection in the sense that there is a dialogue of the body and of the soul, in which the human being struggles with the problems of his relevance to the world and the meaning of his own Self, Nature, History, Past, Language, Culture, Religion and Invention to suggest a static, or as Peckham stresses a
dynamic organism [that] results in the idea that the history of the universe is the history of God creating himself. . . . God being imperfect to begin with-is the history of God, whether transcendent or immanent, ridding himself, by the evolutionary process. (11)

Again, here we are concerned with the self pertaining to the history of ideas of God, to both a vision of creation, and a vision of immanence through which human nature is guided by eternal truths. The self is part of an “evolutionary
process,” part of existence, or even rhetoric. This allows it to support and sustain another existing self. The self forms part of social movements, part of social change: a continuum struggle for social identity in the ethos of Romanticism: the dualistic dilemma between finite/infinite.

In *Critical Writings, 1953-1978*, Paul de Man has demonstrated that “Man in the center of space . . . is in the midst of his own struggle: and that [in] his history with this physical entity . . . he searches [for] a perfect approximation of his action to his being” (31). This view is important because it deals with the doctrine of permanence of the soul, in which the nature of the soul is in “the eternal conflict in which consciousness is founded, the conflict the experience of which, according to Hegel, is the movement of the dialectic,” (31). These aspects are relevant in the sense that they stress subjective experience which sharply discriminated the romantic mood from empiricism. They reflect that the romantic poet’s mind is able to apprehend and discriminate the essence of things in order to envision a Romantic approach to study humans in their natural and social environments. Within the same vein, in *Freud & Jung*, Stevens offers an interesting notion when he discusses Jungian views about the law of compensation “for his social isolation by constructing an imaginary relationship with a stone” [emphasizing mine-particle of nature] (124), which seems to have an organic link to our study. This critic goes on to emphasize that within this approach there is a dialogue, which informs “the principles of duality, opposition, and enantiodromia, the
animating power of the imagination which, through projection, quickens the world with life and meaning, the inner dialectic of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis central to psychic balance and growth” (124). In *Towards a Literature of Knowledge*, Jerome J. McGann claims that this dualistic viewpoint reveals a romantic position of sincerity and knowledge, in which “Romantic truth is inner vision, and Romantic knowledge is the unfolding of the truths of that inner vision” (38). From all these speculations, as it were a response, Emerson observes that:

> Through the transparent darkness the stars pour their almost spiritual rays. Man under them seems a young child, and his huge globe a toy. The cool night bathes the world as with a river, and prepares his eyes again for the crimson dawn. The mystery of nature was never displayed more happily. The corn and the wine have been freely dealt to all creatures, and the never-broken silence with which the old bounty goes forward has not yielded yet one word of explanation. One is constrained to respect the perfection of this world in which our senses converse. (“The Divinity School Address” 119)

The perfection or the beauty of nature seems to be associated with man’s intellectual laws which delight in a unity behind the variety of physical forms. Although this beauty is spiritually enlarged by man’s senses, suggesting human will and sentiment of virtue, as “the action of light, motion, gravity, muscular force” within “the game of human life,” which makes “love, fear, justice, appetite, man and God, interact” (“The Divinity School Address 121). It reveals an inner tragedy through which the human being engages or approaches himself in several ways in order to achieve *Larger Truth* within his own soul. It demonstrates “the fountain of all good to be in himself, and that
he, equally with every man, is an inlet into the deeps of Reason” (“The Divinity School Address” 125).

Here we must introduce some of Emerson’s aphorisms of the self which we find to be in connection with his self-reliance: “By trusting your own heart, you shall gain more confidence in other men,” because “The eye of youth is not lighted by the hope of other worlds”; “I would study, I would know, I would admire forever. These works of thought have been the entertainments of the human spirit in all ages”; and the “beauty appears to man when his heart and mind open to the sentiment of virtue” (“The Divinity School Address” 146, 143, 120).

From these passages, Emerson warns of the ambiguities of historical Christianity, of the schism and failure applied to the soul. What is then the remedy? “He [Man] is religious. Man is the wonderworker,” who must be “a newborn bard of the Holy Ghost, cast behind you[him] all conformity, and acquaint men at the first hand with Deity” (“The Divinity School Address” 144-46). This change goes back to traditional Biblical and Puritanical past, (a transition from Puritanism to physical attributes of mankind); but Emerson, with emphasis on reason and a scientific view, converts the notion of a wrathful God into a creation of new poetic language which is essentially American. In touching this subject, we are in such a position to bring into our discussion Emerson’s warning about the old creed. Although he informs us that “The Puritans in England and America found in the Christ of the Catholic
Church and in the dogmas inherited from Rome, scope for austere piety and their longings for civil freedom,“(Address 142), he warns the reader of their inactivity, blasphemy and credibility. Emerson goes on to explain that they [dogmas] are losing sight, passing away, losing the affection of the good; their sights are bitterness of heart; people are withdrawing from the religious meetings; he himself has found a reason for resigning from the ministry (Address, 142-43).

In The American Notebooks of Nathaniel Hawthorne, Randall Stewart argues that “The absence of such ‘idealistic,’ [poetic genius] by which Hawthorne, [in Emerson’s case] means a stylized rather than a literal representation of an object, is equivalent to artistic failure” (148). This aspect is extremely important in the sense that it goes back to Emerson’s theory of the self as a naively optimistic, idealist, or naively pessimistic, conservative project to insist on the Principium of the Individualism. It reflects on the Romantic self to create a world view of its self, along with its own past, history, culture, religion, and the world of metaphysic: the conflict of the self which concerns itself within Romanticism. Emerson, as a poet, privileged and paid especial attention to the problem of the human mind and of outer world, and sought to create new things with a philosophy stressing the presence of ongoing evolution.

Related to this historical perspective, in “Circles,” Emerson informs us of some interminable unfolding suggestions of what man should pursue. “Our life
is an apprenticeship to truth that around every circle another can be drawn; that there is no end in nature, but every end is a beginning; that there is always another dawn risen on mid-noon, and under every deep a lower deep opens.” [And that] “There are no fixtures in nature. The universe is fluid and volatile. Permanence is but a word of degrees. Our globe seen by God is a transparent law, not a mass of facts.” [And moreover that] “The new continents are built out of the ruins of an old planet; the new races fed out of the decomposition of the foregoing. New arts destroy the old” (“Circles,” First Series 301-02).

These ideas motivate us to raise a question. How does Emerson’s self portray the true reality of nature and comprehend his own self? Although Emerson’s self is in conflict with its own consciousness, his self sustains an hidden mirror of his own self and nature. It means that the self talks to the self itself. The self, intuitively, reveals to itself the great mysteries of his own existence, creating and re-creating new ways of poetic genius, awakening a religious sentiment that he inherited from the natural law.

This is the hypothesis of Emerson’s self about the past to what in História (s) da Literatura Americana, Avelar claims that

A perspicácia e a lucidez de Emerson expostas nesta revelação do real, sustentam, não só, a função central por ele desempenhado no seu tempo, como, também, aquilo que de radical ele soube desvendar no Novo Mundo, e que constitui ainda hoje a sua essência; lucidez, ao compreender a identidade do instante. (121)
The identity and reality are associated with man’s conscience of himself, civilization, myth, and the *Principium of Individualism* discussed earlier. It is within this “perspicácia” and “lucidez” that Romanticism furnishes the dignity to the artist the role to interpret nature as an entity that connects physically, spiritually, emotionally and intellectually Emerson’s poetic genius with his own nature, past, history, language, religion and culture in the sense that as Len Gougeon puts it, recently, in *Emerson & Eros: The Making of a Cultural Hero*, that Emerson’s intellectual life: the source of transcendence that made him Romantic poet, claims that

Emerson[’s] emotional, affective, mystical, and intuitional insights. . . . are all directly related to the divine. They are integral to our understanding of ourselves and our world. He [Emerson] recognized the necessary relationship between thought and passion in human experience and understanding. (13)

These viewpoints manifest themselves not only to human consciousness as influxes of inspired insights, but also they are the source of the most profound self-consciousness awareness and poetic myth-making truths and necessary condition of all moral and spiritual development within Romanticism and Transcendentalism movements. In this light, in *Mythe et Metaphysique: Introduction à la Philosophie*, Georges Gusdorf provides a relevant point by stating that the problem of myth is a fundamental structure in the universe and in man’s consciousness. This French critic observes that “La conscience humaine [doit] . . . s’affirme[r] en affirmant une dimension nouvelle du réel,
un nouvel ordre manifeste par l’émergence de la conscience” (213). These ideas demonstrate the truth and the triumph of “l’avènement de la conscience réfléchie jusqu’a l’établissement de sa domination plénière. La norme, principe du jugement, ouvrière de lucidité, [qui] dessine à la fois les structures maîtresses de l’âme humaine et les configurations du monde” (Mythe, Gusdorf 158).

In *Representative Man: Ralph Waldo Emerson*, Joel Porte also offers a suggestive axis of vision by informing us that Nature’s tropes reveal images of total revelation, suggesting a process of self-recovery, or a way of reanimating and reorienting the self, which he [Emerson] hoped he might make perpetual (64-68). We contend that Emerson’s self insistently portrays an array of cultural and historical *manifestos* which criss-cross his works. This is just an hypothesis. If history is an inherited culture that inhabits new forms and new demands to build the sepulchers of fathers, then history also relates historical change; if history is a vehicle of change that makes change our selves in constructing and reconstructing new visions of life, then it offers us a new intuitive imagination, which historically we call Romanticism.

In this vein, we must bring into our discussion Cavell’s observations about Romanticism. This neo-pragmatic critic poses a polemic vision when he states

that romanticism can be thought of as the discovery, or one rediscovery, of the subjective; the subjective as the exceptional; or the discovery of freedom as a state in which each subject claims its rights to recognition, or
Here we must raise some questions: What is behind these speculations? Is Cavell trying to awaken and reawaken our sense of humanness? Is there any call? We maintain that this is a call that has not gone unheeded, but it is a call that informs the reader and us of the patterns of Emerson’s Ambiguity of the Self as a homage of his own Past, Nature, History, Language, Religion, Culture and Invention: this notion seems to be true for us all at various levels of our society, but we need to experience new and different cultural paradigms for us all. Emerson’s seemingly constructing tropes, in fact, expresses a continuum process: the same sun that dries the “bones of the past” fades the fathers’ wardrobes. Conversely, Emerson, unable to free himself from complete dependence upon a single definition of reality, seriously asks, “why should not we enjoy an original relation to the universe?” This question possibly suggests a range of possibilities for “Greatness and Future,” but Emerson recommends holding all old creeds in abeyance as America became the sacred environment, the most conducive to the future evolution of the human race. Emerson could ask the universal question, but every generation by necessity has an original relation to the universe. Moreover, Emerson’s attitude toward the past is not one of denial, but inclusion in which cultural beliefs are “unexplained but inexplicable” (“Nature,” First Series 4), at their roots to bring new definitions of human consciousness. “Every man is an inlet to the same and to all of the
same,” Emerson observes in “History” (First Series 3). History “be-comes subjective,” (“History,” First Series 10) or is “intrinsic” because man’s self or mind as an “encyclopedia of facts,” comes up with “emphatic facts” (“History,” First Series 3) of history, to portray the limits and losses of our physical world as the necessary condition of the creative change and freedom that make life vital and meaningful. This focus on limitation in Emerson’s later works is not a retreat from his early emphasis on the power of logos in human actions, but a continuation and development of it. Then, our poet observes that “The reference of all production at last to an aboriginal Power explains the traits common to all works of the highest art-that they are universally intelligible; that they restore to us the simplest states of mind, and are religious” (“Art” First Series 358).

In extending this fact of view, in Emerson’s Romantic Style, Julie Ellison argues that

> When this new configuration emerges, however, Emerson does not abandon his old attitudes. He does not renounce or forget his daydreams of glory, his paralysis before excessive knowledge, his sense that he lives in an impoverished age. Instead, he now locates these despairing moods in a sequence of emotions that dramatizes both crisis and resolution. Readers of his journals know that statements of anxiety and self-enjoyment doubt and pride alternate with each other for decades. (10)

This perspective can be viewed in his repeated, but effective, use of the word “also,” as a transition from past to original action, an analogy of emptying out the old, and the creation of a new intuitive self empowered by its own rhetoric,
trope, history and language to emphasize self-control rather than difference. “Language is a city to the building of which every human being brought a stone: yet he is no more to be credited with the grand result than the acelaph which adds a cell to the coral reef which is the basis of the continent,” Emerson observes in “Nature” (199).

In História(s) da Literatura Americana, Avelar offers another excellent and suggestive point when he asserts that language “associa-se à espontaneidade mítica ao universo nativo” (95). It demonstrates an “intimate tie” between “the being of the world and man, in whatever form it is experienced, [and that] appears then as a constant characteristic of the human consciousness of values,” Gusdorf observes in Speaking (La Parole, 15). This line of thought has its source in what Emerson had shown that: “We unite all things by perceiving the law which pervades them; by perceiving the superficial differences and the profound resemblances.” “But,” the Sage of Concord adds, “every mental act,- this very perception of identity or oneness, recognizes the difference of things.” And, finally, “It is impossible to speak or to think without embracing both” (Representative Men 48), he concludes.

In A World Elsewhere: The Place of Style in American Literature, and in The Politics of the Self-Parody, Poirier has pointed out that “The most interesting American books are an image of the creation of American itself, of the effort, in the words of Emerson’s Orphic poet, to ‘Build therefore your own world’ . . . Literature is itself an act of history, so this argument runs . . .
can give us while we read a consciousness of life just as ‘real’ as any accredited to daily living” (3, 28). Here we must raise a question: To what extent is language part of the self-parody, part of history of ideas, and part of the ethos of Romanticism? Arguably, we maintain that language reflects a spectrum of a kind, through which the objective and subjective universes converse in order to reveal the sublime truth of the human meaning in the universe. It serves as a mirror of the self and the outer world; it illuminates the significance of the universe and human being relationship to it, in a certain sense, because the self or the poet is not only primarily concerned with the world of the spirit and imagination, but also it is “coupled,” as Robert E. Belknap observes in *The List: The Uses and Pleasures of Cataloguing*, “with the vast store of words available to language, that ultimately sets the Transcendentalist catalogue apart from other literary catalogues” (49).

This perspective leads us to bring into our discussion Emerson’s attitude on books. Language becomes the symbol of the perennial problem of his own homage to the *Past, Nature, History, Language, Religion, Culture and Invention*. Then, Emerson writes that: “Every book is a quotation; and every house is a quotation out of all forest and mines and stone-quarries; and every man is a quotation from all his ancestors” (“Nature,” *Second Series* 176). Although these aspects reflect an implicit aperture in their own meaning, they are associated with George Santayana’s comments on the history of American tradition.
In this light, in *The Genteel Tradition: Nine Essays*, in the chapter entitled “American Philosophy,” Santayana claims that:

> the transcendental method, in its way, was also sympathetic to the American mind. It embodied, in a radical form, the spirit of Protestantism as distinguished from its inherited doctrines . . . it felt that Will was deeper than Intellect; it focused everything here and now, and asked all things to show their credentials at the bar of the young self, and to prove their value for this latest born moment. (47)

Emerson is not rejecting the past, but he is affirming the human power to assert the long foreground of the self as homage to the past. He romanticizes and immortalizes the past in constructing, or reconstructing paradoxes in order to dignify that line of thought that “lasts a century pleases us in comparison with what lasts an hour” (“Immortality” 335). This idea reflects, as Georges Duby and Robert Mandrou have pointed out in *A History of French Civilization* “an attitude of mind, a reaction against rationalism in the name of sensibility and religious faith – its continuations, one might say, its rebounds, into the twentieth century,” (453). In this light, Emerson notes that

> The human voice is sublime when it clothes wisdom, passion, poetry, in words. It moves in the soul thoughts that pass its gift to describe. . . . It surrenders in common life its high office of being the imparter of intellectual greatness & the instructor of mind to grumble in brutal discontent before God & Man; to grumble in cynic discontent before God & man. (*JMN*, Vol.VI.119)

A strong deterministic strain is demonstrated in Emerson’s rhetorical question, “How shall a man escape from his ancestors, or draw off from his veins the black drop which he drew from his father’s or his mother’s life?” (*Conduct of
Life, “Fate” 9-11). It is an inescapable truth, Emerson sustains that individuals are products of their upbringing. Emerson insists that “the whole circle of persons and things and events, of country and religion not as painfully accumulated, atom after atom, act after act, in an aged creeping Past, but as one vast picture which God paints on the instant eternity for the contemplation of the soul” (“Nature,” First Series 60). This perspective is relevant because it reflects Emerson’s insistence by awakening the reason and understanding of his fellows on the problems of his country in order to preserve for many generations the perpetual presence and sentiment of virtue of the ancestors. This line of thought directs us to bring into discussion Santayana’s comments on the past.

In The Genteel Tradition: Nine Essays, Santayana proclaims that:

America is not simply, a young country, with an old mentality: it is a country with two mentalities, one a survival of the beliefs and standards of the fathers, the other an expression of the instincts, practice, and discoveries of the young generations. In all the higher things of the mind—in religion, in literature, in the moral emotions—it is the hereditary spirit that still prevails. (11)

Furthermore, in Reconstructing American Literary History, Bercovitch has claimed that “The immediate offspring of the writer Waldo is to be this essay called ‘Experience,’ this effort to discover the energy needed to pass beyond the temptation merely to monumentalize the past, and to move on to a ‘new creation’” (48).
Here we must raise two questions: How does it happen that Emerson explicitly or implicitly writes about the self with its allegory, so widely hailed not just as literary figure, but as artifact of the American culture? How does Emerson re-create the action of an old self and make it new?

We argue that a number of critics or neo-pragmatic scholars such as Cavell, Poirier and others operate through Emerson with double meanings or to what Santayana called the “genteel tradition,” of which Emerson was unequivocally aware. This line of thought presents and conceals a rippling series of contradictions, a thorough decentering of language, voice, and philosophical assumptions beneath the nation’s public discourse. There exists a gulf between his language and the demotic traditions. This rupture, probably, reflects his Not Me, a confusing self, unbalanced self, a polysemous self in search for homage to the past and to affirm: “Nothing is at last sacred but the integrity of your own mind. Absolve you to yourself, and you shall have the suffrage of the world” (“Self-Reliance” 50). It reveals that “A man is to carry himself in the presence of all opposition as if every thing were titular and ephemeral but he. I am ashamed to think how easily we capitulate to badges and names, to large societies and dead institutions” (“Self-Reliance” 51), because man’s “Life only avails, not the having lived. Power ceases in the instant of repose; it resides in the moment of transition from past to a new state,” as Emerson warns the reader of “the law of consciousness,” of the “two confessionals, in one or the other of which [man] we must be shriven” (“Self-
Reliance” 69-74). That is a symptom of his own tragedy, may be true, but it asserts an uncertainty of his natural principles - thought of his own mind. Although Emerson’s mind is in connection with a series of extremes of facts, it stresses ,phenomenalistically, an awareness of the continuity of an experience that “inverts the vulgar views of human nature, and brings the mind to call that apparent which it uses [culture] to call real, and that real which it uses to call visionary,” (“Nature,” First Series 59). In this light, in The Renewal of Literature: Emersonian Reflections, Poirier propounds that

Man is still revealing himself to himself, continuously coming into being, continuously recreating in the present a past which the historic past itself cannot have known. That most Emersonian of movies, 2001, takes all this impressively for granted, visually collapsing differences among past, present, and future by allowing the same motifs to recur in each projected period. . . . History, Tradition . . . Society. All of these tend to be characterized in works of Literature, though with varying degrees of intensity, as constraints on Freedom, Imagination, Aspiration, Desire, Originality. . . The desire to originate began with the origination of ourselves, and even this was only a revision or transformation of whatever Else was there. (136, 137)

This passage confirms that within the Principium of Individualism the human being is the epicenter of the past, nature, history, language, religion and culture. It reflects on the human conversion, individual experience along with his social development in order to find himself not only before the invisible world but also before forms of revelation such as “History, Tradition, Society” in which “freedom, imagination, aspiration, desire and originality” help the reader understand and us about the range of experience associated with the Romantic subjective feelings. It is through this subjectivism that the human being creates
his own invisible and visible worlds, suggesting the grandeur and evolution of the earth and of life within “the existence of the Universe as a new Creation,” (Rusk 174), in which, as Emerson would write “The walls are taken away,” and “the attributes of God,” such as “Justice, Love, Freedom, Power” (“Over-Soul” 272) are features of the “Peculiarities of the present Age. . . . of the first person singular” (JMN, Vol.III.70). These ideas come to strengthen the human being perfectibility, man’s belief in conceiving his own plans and his own universe in selecting his own society. Although man’s plan is associated with his own freedom and faith in search for his own dreams, self-trust, self-realization, self-confident, it also a network of this triumph of Principium of Individualism: the growth of the human being within himself. This plan is also a symptom of a conflict, a conflict which can never be solved, since it is the gist of the Romantic phenomena dilemma in experiencing the relationship between man himself and cosmic forces, in a certain sense, because as Len Gougeon reminds the reader in Virtue’s Hero: Emerson, Antislavery, and Reform that within human being’s life “There is a spirit that animates man and his world, a spirit that both creates and destroys” (83) this same spirit. This aspect emphasizes the dialectics of object and subject upon the existence of an aesthetic self or hero to harmonize many elements into a unity: the emphasis not only on the self as the knower of the true nature of the universe, but also on poetic eye, imagination and sensibility, suggesting the resemblance of the self’s art to divine creation.
In his insistence on reflecting on self-trust, in an 1840 entry he affirms that his idealism of the private man would not only be linked to the “essence of heroism,” “the best of the artist” (“Nature,” *First Series* 14), but also to “the integrity of impression made by manifold natural objects,” “the light of the universe,” “the eye of the man,” “the eye and the heart of the child,” as the poet “cross [es] a bare common, and stand [s] on the bare ground, becoming a transparent eyeball” (*First Series* 7-8). But Emerson warns us that “The eye was placed where one ray should fall, that it might testify of that particular ray” (“Self-Reliance” 46). Each individual represents a different “divine idea” for perfect correspondence because

> Beauty is the mark God sets upon virtue. Every natural action is graceful. Every heroic act is also decent, and causes the place and the bystanders to shine. We are taught by great actions that the universe is the property of every individual in it. Every rational creature has all nature for his dowry and estate. It is his, if he will. He may divest himself of it. (“Nature,” *First Series* 19-20)

This is a moment of joy into which the “the soul becomes” progressive, reflecting the paradigm of the Romantic elusiveness. Here we raise some questions: Is Emerson’s self part of the Romantic vision to assert his own originality and authenticity? How does Emerson’s “transparent eyeball,” represent a “perfect correspondence” of an experience of universal truth? In Chapter Four we will attempt to respond to these questions, since they are associated with the theory of evolution of man in search for the internal and external solving problems of the soul in dynamic and static position.
From all these observations, we conclude that Emerson’s self reveals an effective embodiment to apply its Transcendentalist and Romantic vision within the conflicting aspects of nature, art, history, religion, culture, language and invention, which he inherited from his ancestral voices. This voice becomes the perpetual struggle that leads him to discover that between man and nature there is an hidden truth, a divine unity, which constitutes man’s supreme condition in distinguishing the manifold of representations given by the outer cosmological perception, or empirical world, and by the inner cosmological perception, transcendental and absolute world. It is reasonable to conclude that these two contrasting wishes reflect Emerson’s self contributions to the skeptic development of science of the 19th Century, through which he welcomes the intuitive mode as a mean to explain man’s dual existence, man’s anxieties, man’s dialectical and purified experience within this Internal Conflict of the Soul. It is within this necessary and immediate condition that we are in a position to stress that man’s self, however limited and determined by metaphysical conditions, is a non-conformist entity. It is a dialectical, social, political, and Romantic entity apt to stand in reconciling all incompatible concepts of its own conflict in order to generate new waves for possible solution between the dualistic consciousness and unconsciousness in the ethos of Romanticism. This view reveals that the self in Emerson’s work is an heterogeneous, creative and powerful entity. It is an entity that traverses the whole scale of the universe; as she walks, softly
and playfully, within it, she creates and generates an intelligible bridge through which, with the help of its higher cognitive faculties, but subjected to a heteronomy of empirical laws, she magnifies and dignifies the will and the freedom of the poetic imagination. This line of thought stresses that the soul celebrates its own moments of exhilaration, moments of moral judgment, moments of belief or disbelief, moments of romantic sensibility, reflecting a heart-rejoicing festival of human empirical self-consciousness, self-satisfaction, self-trust, self-necessary, self-evolving circle of his own apocalypse of an idealism in building the inevitable cord that will create a broader belief in the potential perfectibility of man. This idea is closely linked to the cosmological sense of optimism and faith in progress. It reflects a close renewing interest in individual moral integrity and freedom within every man’s intuitive sensations, from which, by means of affections, the soul searches, mentally and physically, for an universal conjoined law. It is within this law that she finds something in relation as cause and effect to transcend and exhibit the function of poetic imagination: a speculative philosophy to demonstrate that man, while contemplating the splendor of the universal truth, stands, insatiably, in need of new expression that is a release from the old in which he grew to a new form of poetic genius as we discuss in the next chapter.
2.4. “The Poet: The Nature and Functions of the Poet within Romantic Doctrine: ‘The other half is his expression’”.

The breadth of the problem is great, for the poet is representative. He stands among partial men for the complete man, and apprises us not of his wealth, but of the common wealth. The young man reveres men of genius, because, to speak truly, they are more himself than he is. They receive of the soul as he also receives, but they more. Nature enhances her beauty, to the eye of loving men, from their belief that the poet is beholding her shows at the same time.

In love, in art, in avarice, in politics, in labor, in games, we study to utter our painful secret. The man is only half himself, the other half is his expression. (“Poet,” Second Series 5)

A MOODY child and wildly wise
Pursued the game with joyful eyes,
Which chose, like meteors, their way,
And rived the dark with private ray:
They overleap the horizon’s edge,
Searched with Apollo’s privilege;
Through man, and woman, and sea, and star
Saw the dance of nature forward far;
Through worlds, and races, and terms, and times
Saw musical order, and pairing rhymes. (“The Poet,” Second Series 2)

... .

These textual meditations demonstrate Emerson’s attitude in his search for individuality, an aspect of his evolving self that reflects a mystical experience, in which physical reality, the Me apprehends the Not Me in terms of enjoyment.
These fragments also outline human anxieties and necessities in order to express immaterialities by senses and perceptions drawn from circumstance. They reveal, as Emerson observes in *Natural History of Intellect*, an attitude of transition in which “[t]he habit of saliency, of not pausing but proceeding, is a sort of importation and domestication of the divine effort into a man” (59).

In our attempt to move into a new stage in our argument, we must bring into our discussion Sigmund Freud’s comments on individual cultural development. In *Civilization and Its Discontents*, Freud asks the reader to “imagine a cultural community consisting of double individuals like this, who, libidinally satisfied in themselves, are connected with one another through bonds of common work and interests” (65). Freud’s argument somehow reminds us of Percy Bysshe Shelley’s views on the poetical nature, namely its faculty to create the fruit and seed of scientific delight and invention within a poetic context. In *A Defence of Poetry*, Shelley writes that: “The functions of the poetical faculty are twofold: by one it creates new materials of knowledge and power and pleasure; by the other it engenders in the mind a desire to reproduce and arrange them to a certain rhythm and order which may be called the beautiful and the good” (*Longman Anthology* 1730). In this light, in *Message Poétique du Symbolisme*, Guy Michaud offers a relevant point when he shows that the poet is

Engagé dans un combat où il est responsable, mais qui en même temps le dépasse. Derrière lui, derrière ses conflits et ses lutes, se profile l’ombre d’une lutte infiniment plus vaste: celle des forces du Bien contre les forces du Mal;
These ideas reflect poetical, political and social reforms that affirm a renaissance voice that incorporate oneness in all things and beings. These views reveal and explore artistic freedom and political responsibility by invoking credentials of the poet; thus emerges, as Emerson had already observed: “a new thought . . . a whole experience to unfold” (“Poet”, Second Series 10), “the birth of a poet” (Poet,” Second Series 11), “in which the inward eye opens to the Unity in things, to the omnipresence of law:- [and] sees that what is must be and ought to be, or is to be” (Conduct of Life 25).

Ganesh Vasudeo Tagare helps clarifying the role of the self (and of the poet) when he writes that he “should merge his mind along with its desires and objects in the Moon-god, the intelligence and the objects to be grasped by it in the highest god Brahma” (972).

Other relevant insights on this topic are provided by Henri de Lubac and Perkins Gilman. In Teilhard de Chardin: The Man and His Meaning, de Lubac ponders on the genesis of the poet in the light of Darwin’s theory on the origin of human species. This critic argues that “this birth of man [the poet] in the midst of general life has been one of the finest achievements of man’s persistence and tenacity in the course of the last years” (176). De Lubac goes on to state that “the birth of man from pre-human forms would already be
certain from what we have learnt about the universal derivation of all living beings from other living beings” (177). In the chapter entitled “The Man-Made Family” of *The Yellow Wallpaper and Other Writings*, Perkins Gilman, approaches the topic of human consciousness, and points that “our greatest poets are those who most deeply and widely experience and reveal the feelings of the human heart; and the power of fiction is that it can reach and express this great field of human life with no limits but those of the author” (218).

These comments echo Emerson’s views regarding the poet. They intensify his poetic vision of art associated with a myriad of personal experiences; with a sense of expansion in venturing out into the universe in search for an interfusion of what is spiritual and material. This aspect reminds us how optimistic and constructive the romantic poet may be, since he believes in the future as a way of refining and developing romantic science. Besides it stresses Emerson’s organic theory of evolution.

Romanticism entails the belief in a relationship with individuals and with things; it encompasses, on one hand, the rejection of the objectivity and empiricism inherited by the Enlightenment ethos with its emphasis on the individual as a sign of uniformity of reason and language; it entails, on the other hand, on the spirit of biological kinship which stresses the poet’s inspiration and imagination in order to realize that the human heart must be open to experience, through feelings and sensation, the several vicissitude of the universe; or as David Bowers puts it in *American Romanticism Is*
**Humanistic** that “[T]he belief that individual virtue and happiness depend upon self-realization, and that self-realization, in turn, depends upon the harmonious reconciliation of two universal psychological tendencies: first, the expansive or self-transcending impulse of the self . . . second, the contrasting or self-asserting impulse of the individual” (48).

These speculations somehow seem to be heirs of Foucaudian theories of cosmology in “the history of science and thought for emergence of truth and pure reason” (*Order of Things* xi). They reveal the romantic inflection since they dignify and explain “the impulse that compels it [the birth] to create an allegory of itself . . . the allure of that self knowledge [that] shuns and attempts to obscure” (Chai 36). It is also a romantic approach in the sense that this birth duplicates self-consciousness, or as Lavine observes “human historical development - the ideal toward which the historical progress of the consciousness of freedom is moving” (249).

In *Approaches to Teaching Homer’s: Iliad and Odyssey*, John E. Rexine puts forward a relevant notion for our argument. In the chapter entitled “The Concept of the Hero” he approaches human progress as a narrative that “symbolize[s] the resurgence of humanity, our basic indestructibility, our immortality as a species” (72). Rexine goes on to state that the “linking [of] human growth with the appearance of spring” suggests “an eternal constant” link of “humankind” (Idem) existence. Then he adds:
the forces with which we are always in conflict, particularly those created by
nature, may succeed in scattering a few leaves from the tree but that the live
timber, our minds and souls, will remain forever to regenerate new leaves and
branches, or, again interpreting symbolically, new civilizations will arise as well
as new, fresh societies from the old. (Idem)

This passage reminds us how central is the poet’s self conflict with cosmic
forces. Although there are forces that sabotage the poet’s self or the poet’s
mystical experience, his endeavor in order to identify he with he-himself, we
argue that it is within this conflict that he is able to translate and transcend
into a new self as part of the eternal life process. This line of thought connects
with Joel Porte’s arguments on Emerson’s evolving self. In Representative Man:
Ralph Waldo Emerson in His Time, Porte shows that:

The new power that engages Emerson is the power of his own mind to create
the world of illusion in which he lives. It is the power, effectively and
paradoxically, to make nothing out of something-to absorb the world and turn
it into uncertainties. Accordingly, self-consciousness-brings Emerson to call
into question not only the existence of that very world in which alone our own
existence can have any meaning but our being itself. (196)

This passage echoes a romantic approach when it stresses both stresses both
an internal impression and an impression of reflection within the primacy (and
the validity) of the power to engage into the spheres of imagination and
intuition. Then our “own existence” emphasizes the Principium of Individualism,
thus solving the romantic ambiguity of the soul. As Jay Grossman observes in
Reconstituting the American Renaissance, “our canonical understanding of
these two figures [Emerson and Whitman] have been rooted in a presumed
clarity of post-Romantic assumptions” (74); the poet’s own sentiment of virtue and the intellect’s response to complex existences that reflect Emerson’s organic theory of the universe; the connection with any specific organic process and spiritual vigor in order to record and explore personal confrontation which might be only found, as Perry Miller reminds the reader in *The Transcendentalists: an Anthology*, “within the soul that testifies for God, and gives us the grounds of a living faith in his being and his providence, in his love and his mercy” (246).

In *Literary Transcendentalism: Style and Vision in the American Renaissance*, Lawrence Buell also offers a relevant contribution when he argues that “[t]hough Emerson deprecates subjective experience as such in favor of the universal truth it contains, he [Emerson] gives general approval to the ‘subjectiveness’ of modern literature as a hopeful sign” (270). Buell goes on to write “[T]he leading Transcendentalists, despite their distrust of egoism, relied heavily on first-person approaches and thereby helped to prepare the way for culmination of romantic egoism in America” (Idem). This view, we agree, is romantic in the sense that it reveals Emerson’s transcendental self in a mystical and privileged moment of his own axis of vision. This axis is part of an empirical verification of the worldview between the individual intellect and the universe. It reflects Emerson’s romantic concept poetic-language within this *Principium of Individualism*. Intertextuality allows him to assimilate and stress the fluidity and foregrounds signs of the Puritan Past in which the
American identity was grounded: an aggressive legacy within cultural transvaluation and nationalism in the mid 19th by creating new spaces of mobility and difference, because “[t]he cultural transvaluation of individuality,” as Max Cavitch observes in *American Elegy: The Poetry of Mourning from the Puritans to Whitman* “becomes increasingly a means for the transmission not of a particular social structure but of the value of self-production” (47). This aspect is associated with the problematic of personal utterance which was relevant during the nineteenth century. It presents the worth of this *Principium of Individualism* experience as opposed to the Past. Besides it reinforces the aspect that Romanticism as an intellectual movement allows the human being to know himself as he lives in a particular society. These ideas are thus part of moral conduct.

Within the same perspective, in *Emerson’s Romantic Style*, Ellison observes that

> the real importance of understanding the psychological dynamic of Emerson’s ‘intellectual Voice’ is that, in them, [in generic and historical contexts] we discover patterns common to most Romantic philosophers-poets.’ . . . The intensity of his fantasies of identification with great authors of the past [his ancestors] is directly proportionate to his contempt for himself as their critic. His gloomy meditations on history and historical awareness express the Romantic sense that self-consciousness is a belated, sentimental condition. His judgments about history, religion, and literature are manifestations of his first vocational crisis, precipitated by conflict between the dream of an inaccessible eloquence and the habit of criticism. (4)

In this passage Ellison portrays some interesting views on Emerson’s life. She provides the reader with a myriad of crosscurrent facts that helped solidify
Emerson’s poetic background. This passage demonstrates that Emerson was a prolific author with a great deal of psychological awareness of the romantic idealism that reached its zenith before the Civil War. It also reminds us that he was aware of the growth of science, History, religion, and he responded, in one way or another, to the idea of progress and evolution. Actually it reveals, as Emerson stresses in *Natural History of Intellect* “a fulcrum of the spirit. [and] the terminus of a past . . . to new sallies of the imagination and new progress of wisdom” (59). This passage reflects on the romantic science through which the poet self explores the depths of his own “new sallies”: the pantheistic theory of evolution linked to Romanticism and Transcendentalism in which all living things derive their being from the same universal source and shared the unity of humanity, nature, and God.

These viewpoints also unveil Emerson’s intellectual mode, his emotional and optative moods. As Eric Wilson indicates in *Romantic Turbulance: Chaos, Ecology, and American Space*, there is “a vision of a spiritual whole . . . [that] challenges the mind to represent unpresentable physical forces: evanescent currents, fluxional patterns, polarized strife” (29), stressing the constitution in human being capacity of knowing truth intuitively.

It is so coincidental that in *Atlantic Poets*, Irene Ramalho Santos offers a relevant aspect while comparing Portuguese literature and the Anglo-American literary tradition (2). In her reflections on the issue on the theory and poetic practice she claims that
On the one hand [the] conception of poetry [is] as a unifying, comprehensive, center-holding, meaning-giving totality, a totality disengaged from the world and only grounded in or symbolized by the ‘lyric I’ or ‘the poet,’ ‘imagination,’ ‘form,’ the ‘poem’ or, simply and tautologically, ‘poetry.’ On the other is a conception of poetry as worldly, fragmentary, disruptive, center-exploding, and meaning-shattering rupture, hence essentially ungrounded (16).

Santos goes on to state that

The main argument of *Atlantic Poets* is that an understanding of Portuguese modernist poet Fernando Pessoa’s poetry and poetics is relevant for a deeper understanding of Anglo-American modernism. Although there is today much talk about border crossing and cross-cultural exchange, the truth is that national literatures continue to be thought of, by and large, as self-contained, autotelic entities. (4)

We cite these two passages because they are crucial and relevant to our understanding of Emerson’s evolving self, and of his position on the function of the poet. They are also important in the sense that they can be traced back to his viewpoints on modern philosophy, namely his understanding of human nature that stands at center of his works.

Emerson’s works reflect a deeper fascination with both History and in the thoughts and feelings of the individual. He focused not only on the ideas of freedom, but also on the rights of the individual. His is an idealistic notion of history that stresses two aspects: on one hand, “a myth out of himself,” as stated by F. O. Matthiessen, and on the other hand, “a ‘stock personality’ as a means of elevating and harmonizing the conception of an American” (73), suggesting as Bloom would put it in *Kabbalah and Criticism* “A de-idealized vision of Romanticism” (102).
In keeping with this cross-cultural and historical orientation, Santos’s approach is both strongly committed to a canonical reading of Emerson and highly analytic. It is committed to a canonical reading because in her comments on Emerson’s self and poetic authority, she stresses that his work is entrenched in the historical past. In this light, Santos “envisioned in him [a poet with a] liberating power of a god, a power that, because ‘poetry was written before time was,’ the poet was to receive not from the ‘world,’ but from ‘the muse’ (23). These ideas are associated with romantic inflection, “with the transcendent vision of a comprehensive and unifying imagination ... [with] nature and humankind, the world and society [in order to ] express [a] vision that is of the highest quality and compelling force, whether aesthetically, ethically or even politically,” (Santos 23), thus reflecting the validity of a mode of knowledge that is enmeshed from romantic intuition in order to stress self-sufficiency: a turn away from modern society to the scenes and objects of the outer world to viewpoints of the human spirit. In discussing this notion, Rexine observes that “[t]he hero [who] represents humankind in its supreme form, a combination of physical strength, intellectual ability, and the will to survive all obstacles, all odds. . . . [It] is ultimately a tribute to the survivability of humankind through the astute use of intelligence” (75). Like many romantics, Emerson not only admired the self-centered hero, as an individual creator, but he also stressed the unity of human being with nature, past and myth.
In this light, Emerson, as Father of the Transcendentalist philosophy, who sought to open imagination to nature, had observed that the poet:

> he who can articulate [the world] stands one step nearer to things, and sees the flowing or metamorphosis; perceives that thought is multiform; that within the form of every creature is [or lies] a force impelling it to ascend into a higher form; and following with his eyes the life, uses the forms which express that life, and so his speech flows with the flowing of nature . . . and admits us to a new scene. (“The Poet,” Second Series 20-21-33)

This above passage reflects on the language of science: the necessity for understanding the romantic outcry in order to “articulate” the world with human being first expression: the interfusion between human being “speech” that “flows with the flowing of nature,” out of which the individual is apt to give response to the unknowable; and the self as the poet expresses his own romantic ability to communicate by means of signs or gestures, reflecting, as William Wordsworth had already written in Preface to *Lyrical Ballads* “the spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings” (*Longman Anthology* 1534), or as Emerson would write “the essence of genius . . . which we call Spontaneity or Instinct” (“Self-Reliance” 64).

While approaching this issue, in his *Mark Strand and the Unraveling of Romanticism*, Jeffrey Scott Childs states that “[a] transition from Emerson to Whitman can be regarded as a shift from the prophet to the poet of prospective life, though the distinction between these is necessarily hazy, a question of the method of utterance rather than anything that could be put forth as a substantial difference” (151). This difference reflects the romantic
attitude of the self in order to achieve divine power. It stresses not only the inherent and systematic analogies between the human mind and the outer world, but also the gulf of the material and spiritual worlds associated with Emerson’s belief in organicism. Nature emerges then as a source of education, inspiration, and nourishment of the soul within Romanticism and Transcendentalism.

Here we must raise some questions: How should we distinguish Romanticism from Transcendentalism in the specific light of their importance in Emerson’s life? Are both the same thing? Before we move forward, we must bring into our work Emory Elliott’s, Wesley T. Mott’s and Duane E. Smith’s arguments in discussing this issue. Our study would be incomplete without their help. In *Columbia Literary History of the United States*, Emory Elliott, while discussing the problem of Transcendentalism, connects it with religious views in the sense that he considers it to be a variant form of the Second of Awakening (369). This critic goes on to stress that “the transcendentalists held up a model of human nature as inherently divine, and a model of divinity as accessible to and immanent within human nature itself” (368). In pursuing this issue, Elliott claims that it was Emerson who “best encapsulated [it while] deliver [ing] to the graduating class of the Harvard Divinity School in 1838 and in *A Discourse of the Transient and Permanent in Christianity* (1841)” (368). These aspects of Transcendentalism deal not only with focus on of the individual, but also with metaphysics, out of which it is
impossible to explain, in terms of reasoning, the existence of God and the limits of human knowledge. It deals with self-reliance, self-trust in order to find God within himself rather than through a ritualistic church as Emerson urged the individual in 1826 “Ne te quaesiveris extra” (JMN: Vol. VI: 19).

Here we must raise some questions: Which are the Transcendentalist key themes? Who sponsored this philosophical movement in America? When did it reach America? Is this Philosophical Romanticism tied up with this Principium of Individualism?

Drawing on these questions, we contend that the Transcendentalists stressed and believed not only on the Principium of Individualism, self-confidence, self-consciousness, but also in human faculty that we call intuition. Intuition allows that each individual build a harmonious relationship with nature in line with Coleridge’s organic theory. They also believed in the Eternal Truth following Kant’s dictum. They stressed the crucial role of ethics in human social behavior, thus echoing Puritanism. They were concerned not only with the world of the spirit, but also with science [Darwin’s influence] through which the individual could create and unfold his artistic and poetic genius. They insisted on the affirmation of values of democracy and the freedom of individual [Jacksonian’s influence]. In the blending of these heterogeneous discourses thus emerges a new conception of human being, of his place in the world, and of his relationship with Divine. These aspects are all documented and celebrated with great enthusiasm in “The American Scholar,”
The literature of the poor, the feelings of the child, the philosophy of the street, the meaning of household life, are the topics of the time. It is a great stride. . . . I embrace the common, I explore and sit at the feet of the familiar, the low. Give me insight into to-day, and you may have the antique and future worlds. What would we really know the meaning of? The meal in the firkin; the milk in the pan; the ballad in the street; the news of the boat; the glance of the eye; the form and the gait of the body;- show me the ultimate reason of these matters; show me the sublime presence of the highest spiritual cause lurking, as always it does lurk, in these suburbs and extremities of nature; let me see every trifle bristling with the polarity that ranges it instantly on an eternal law; and the shop, the plough, and the ledger referred to the like cause by which light undulates and poets sing;- and the world lies no longer a dull miscellany and lumber-room, but has form and order; there is no trifle, there is no puzzle, but one design unites and animates the farthest pinnacle and the lowest trench. (111-12)

We cite this passage in its full length since it illustrates how representative of both Romanticism and Transcendentalism movements in America Emerson was. The passage reflects on a wide range of ideas and attitudes by emphasizing inner feelings, emotions, and embracing the common man into unknown places; it focuses on the mystery and “meaning of household life,” the supernatural actions, which provides the individual some “insight” to re-see and re-idealize the past (antique) and “to-day” so that the common people would promote, change, and create “future worlds”: the meaning of democracy as a new unfolding mode of the human being spirit during the nineteenth century called The Age of Reason.

In extending this logic, in Encyclopedia of Transcendentalism, Wesley T. Mott reminds us that “Transcendentalism [was] a movement of theological innovation and literary experiment arising within New England in 1830s and
1840s, [that] has had a significant impact on later developments in American religious, educational, literary, and political culture, [whose] leading figures [were] R. W. Emerson, M. Fuller, T. Parker, and H. D. Thoreau” (224). In this vein, Duane E. Smith stresses the importance of Romanticism and of Transcendentalism, since, as we have already argued that these two movements are tied up with Emerson’s doctrine of immanence. Immanence allows him to assert his own conviction of the immediacy of religious experience, and this had an important effect on his whole notion of the conduct of human nature. Smith reminds that “[t]he period from 1830 through 1860’s saw the growth of one of the most exotic intellectual movements ever to take root in American soil. Led by Ralph Waldo Emerson, the New England transcendentalists mounted an attack on the social, intellectual, religious and political beliefs which their fathers . . . had blandly held to represent the ultimate of human wisdom” (483).

Smith goes on to state that “[t]he Transcendentalists were ... part of that larger movement of nineteenth-century thought which we know as romanticism. It was, however, a curiously American manifestation of the Romantic Movement” (384). Furthermore, Smith observes that “Romanticism, like liberalism, is fundamentally individualistic, but romantic individualism is very different from liberal individualism. The romantics were preoccupied, indeed obsessed, with the cultivation of the individual ego, the development of the inner life” (486), in which the dazzling of romantic expression retains
an aura of magic and renewal vigor. From these ideas, with which we agree, we argue that Transcendentalism, on one hand, stresses a belief that the outside world, which is exterior or the visible world, is perceived by an intuitive power; on the other hand, the inner or the invisible world, which is interior, finds its truths through the senses. Although it is linked to English, European, and Oriental philosophy, the essence of Transcendentalism is to be connected with Quakerism, with inner light.

Transcendentalism stresses the scientific view, in which every single object could be explained as a miniature of this universe. This point can be traced to Emerson’s gospel of Transcendentalism, as he observes in *Nature* that “Each particle is a microcosm, and faithfully renders the likeness of the world” (“Discipline” 43). From “Commodity” we retain that “man is fed, not that he may be fed, but that he may work” (14). Thus “Language” tying “[t]he visible world [with] its parts, is the dial plate of the invisible” (33). This idea reflects, on one hand, man’s dual existence, man’s conflict in his attempt to solve the dualism between object-subject. And on the other hand, it reflect a transitional concept of man’s soul that fills the universe with “that glimpse of inextinguishable light by which men are guided,” as Emerson observes in *Natural History of Intellect* (34): the need for vigorous and organic interfusion between human mind and physical world, the unity of spiritual meaning/physical phenomenon.
In this line of thought, Robert D. Richardson considers that Emerson’s essay “The Poet,” “focuses on the human need for expression and happiness itself, not on property but on expression” (357), since “[o]ur poets are men of talents who sing,” and employ “The vocabulary of an omniscient man” in their discourse (“Poet,” Second Series 9, 17). Farther evidences on the role of the poet are to be found in such passages as: “He is the true and only doctor; he knows and tells; he is the only teller of news, for he was present and privy to the appearance which he describes. He is a beholder of ideas an utterer of necessary and causal” (“Poet”, Second Series, 8). Finally, Emerson depicts the poet as the one who “reveres men of genius, because, to speak truly, they are more himself than he is” (“Poet,” Second Series 5), or “The poet accounts all productions and changes of Nature as the nouns of language, uses them representatively, too well pleased with their ulterior to value much their primary meaning” (“Poetry and Imagination” 15).

Emerson brags about and praises the role of the poet, insisting that the true poet must “[s]tand there, balked and dumb, stuttering and stammering, hissed and hooted, stand and strive, until at last rage draw out of thee that dream-power which every night shows thee is thine own” (“The Poet,” Second Series 40). He also considers that the poet is the “Knower, the Doer and the Sayer,” who comes to distinguish his position between the world of physics and the world of the spirit. In his role, he creates the great poetry of his nation, he discloses the underlying unity in the universe between God, man,
and nature and “handles that which others dream of, traverses the whole scale of experience, and is representative of man, in virtue of being the largest power to receive and to impart” (“Poet,” *Second Series* 6). “He” [the poet] Emerson observes, “is the healthy, the wise, the fundamental, the manly man, seer of the secret; against all the appearance he sees and reports the truth, namely that the soul generates matter” (“Poetry and Imagination” 26-27). In his essay “The American Scholar,” Emerson continues to praise the poet when he builds a subliminal analogy with the Scholar. Emerson maintains that he is the “oracle” who “sees absolute truth and utters truth” (9); who “grudges every opportunity of action past” (95). The Scholar (or the poet) is thus representative “of all men” (100); “he is who raises himself from private considerations and breathes and lives on the public and illustrious thoughts” (101); in his lifetime, he is motivated “to cheer, to raise, and to guide men by showing them facts amidst appearances” (100).

These ideas follow Shelley’s, Wordsworth’s, Coleridge’s and Blake’s concepts of Man, poetry and language. Harold Bloom reminds us of Emerson’s definition of poetry shares Shelley’s paradigm because “it exalts the beauty of that which is most beautiful, and it adds beauty to that which is most deformed; it marries exultation and horror, grief and pleasure, eternity and change; it subdued to union under its light yoke all irreconcilable things” (*Longman Anthology* 1732). On language, Shelley states that “colour, form, and religious and civil habits of action are all the instruments and materials of
poetry.” Thus he suggests “that imperial faculty whose throne is curtained within the invisible nature of man” (*Longman Anthology* 1728). In just this way, Emerson writes that “[p]oetry is the perpetual endeavor to express the spirit of the thing, to pass the brute body and search the life and reason which causes it to exist:- to see that the object is always flowing away, whilst the spirit or necessity which causes it subsists” (“Poetry and Imagination” 17). On language, Emerson implies that “[l]anguage is fossil poetry” (“The Poet,” *Second Series* 22), which reflects “. . . the quality of the imagination . . . [of a] new thought. [Language] . . . nails a symbol to one sense, which was a true sense for a moment, but soon becomes old and false. For all symbols are fluxional; all language is vehicular and transitive, and is good, as ferries and horses are, for conveyance, not as farms and horses are, for homestead” (“Poet,” *Second Series* 34).

These views on language help the reader to understand that language becomes the medium of the poetic utterance within the romantic agenda. It becomes the mental materialism through which the poet’s individual genius flourishes and becomes part of the nature of the *Principium of Individualism*. Language becomes the burden thrill within Romanticism through which the poet seeks to respond, instinctively, to the many turmoils and sequels of human life. Language informs not only the dualistic romantic *ethos*, but it also shows how the principle of correspondence between subject/object is part of this World and Creation.
From the same point of view, Wordsworth had already claimed that within poetry “our continued influxes of feeling are modified and directed by our thoughts, which are indeed the representatives of all our past feelings” (*Longman Anthology* 1534). On Language, the British writer observes that it is a poetic diction used by writers (*Longman Anthology* 1536). Later Emerson would imply that poetry is “[a] deep insight [that] will always, like Nature, ultimate its thought in a thing” (“Poetry and Imagination” 17). Emerson also notes that it is “man’s power to connect his thought with its proper symbol, and so to utter it depends on the simplicity of his character, that is upon his love of truth and his desire to communicate it without loss” (“Nature,” *First Series* 29). It reflects the “symbols of particular spiritual facts,” through which “[e]very appearance in nature corresponds to some state of the mind, and that state of the mind can only be described by presenting that natural appearance as its picture” (“Nature,” *First Series* 24).

From this perceptive, we contend that language becomes an extended metaphor of nature and of the divine reality; it becomes both a means of nature and of poetic genius that is unveiled, read by intuition. Eventually these insights unfold signs of transcendence and immanence of Emerson’s *Internal Conflict of the Soul* in which the poet’s mind is an open receptor gathering information from outer phenomenon.

Coleridge already had explained that poetic faith was linked with an “ideal perfection, [which] brings the whole soul of man into activity, with the
subordination of its faculties to each other, according to their relative worth and dignity” (*Longman Anthology* 1669). Hence language “is derived from reflection on the acts of the mind itself. It is formed by a voluntary appropriation of fixed symbols to internal acts, to processes and results of imagination” (1672). In the same line of thought, Emerson maintains that poetry is a “pure delight . . . a flute . . . a delicious secret . . . of a true poet” (“Poetry and Imagination” 18-19) through which he “resigns himself to his mood” (“The Poet,” *Second Series* 24).

On the specific topic of language, our poet says that it is the “expression” of the new “organic, or [of] the new type” (“The Poet,” *Second Series* 24) of “expression for knowledge and ignorance” (“Nature,” *First Series* 26) associated with “infinite masses of shells of animalcules, images or tropes” (“The Poet,” *Second Series* 24) in order “to remind us of their poetic origin” (“The Poet,” *Second Series* idem). Romanticism becomes the product of intellectual revolution in which the poet’s soul is engaged in a sort of struggle in order to apprehend the whole of existence as a way to conform to the premonitions of Reason and Understanding.

Blake already had established an association between poetry and language, and “Eternal Delight” (*Longman Anthology* 1410). “[T]he enjoyments of Genius,” thus reflected “an immense world of delight” (1411). with “finite organical perception” in order to discover “the infinite in every thing” (1414). In line with this argument Emerson evinces that poetry is a
“mystic string” from which we “are drawn quite through from matter to spirit” in order to “require the miracle” ("Poetry and Imagination” 16). On language, the father of Transcendentalism envisions that it is “[t]he spirit of the world” ("The Poet,” Second Series 28) associated with “the great calm presence of the Creator... [with] the sublime vision” (“The Poet,” Second Series 28) of the soul.

This is, of course, a romantic approach in the sense that it reflects a sort of incantation of the soul: the poet receives answers about the ultimate truth from natural signs - beings or spirits-who operate on the higher ethereal planes, and who would thus have access to that information of what the poet can express, of life, of experience. Hopefully a new concept of poetry emerges: “... it is not metres, but a metre-making argument that makes a poem,- a thought so passionate and alive that like the spirit of a plant or animal it has an architecture of its own, and adorns nature with a new thing,” Emerson proclaims (“The Poet,” Second Series 9-10 ).

Here we are obliged to bring into our study Jones Very’s reflections on American Transcendentalism, since he, like Emerson was a worshipper of Nature. Emerson listed him between two classes as reads: “The great distinction between teachers sacred or literary; between poets like Herbert and poets like Warton; between philosophers like Coleridge and philosophers like Mackintosh; between talkers like Reed and Very and talkers like Walder and Ripley, is, that one class speak ab intra, and the other class, ab extra. It is
of no use to preach to me *ab extra.*” (*JMN*, Vol.V.143). In keeping praising him, Emerson stresses that Very was a sort of “a fervent mystic, prophesying half-insane under the infinitude of his thought” (“Over-Soul” 278). Very actually stresses this aspect clearly in a poem entitled “Inward Direction”:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{With outward impulse, running to and fro,} \\
\text{How many men with restless minds we meet,} \\
(\text{Who but an outward impulse only know}) \\
\text{In the swift cars, or in the busy street!} \\
\text{By man they’re sent, and man’s behests fulfill,} \\
\text{They hear no other voice within their souls;} \\
\text{Nor have they learned to obey a higher will,} \\
\text{Which earthly hopes, and earthly fears controls. (Poem 840. 380)}
\end{align*}
\]

The last line suggests the hidden world of human mental and spiritual life. It reveals the scope between inner and outer phenomenon. Earthly hopes and earthly fears emerge then as paradigms of a broader 19th century view in which the *Principium of Individualism* not only identified the self, but also created new waves in relation to others. This was Emerson’s social decorum: to suggest his Romantic endeavor, sensation, affectivity and poetic expression. In this vein, we argue, Jones Very became Emerson’s self-reliance prophet. However Emerson detached from him because he considered that his religious ideas insulated him from the world; as he observes: “Here is Simeon the Stylite, or John of Patmos in the shape of Jones Very, religion for religion’s sake, religion divorced, detached from man, from the world, from science and art; grim, unmarried, insulated” (*JMN*, Vol.VII.120). Or as Emerson stresses in
“Nature”: The world is mind precipitated, and the volatile essence is forever escaping again into the state of free thought. Hence the virtue and pungency of the influence on the mind of natural objects, whether inorganic or organized. Man imprisoned, man crystallized, man vegetative, speaks to man impersonated (Second Series 196).

These ideas reflect the confluence of interrelated issues in the mid 19th century that dignified and magnified the intellectual growth in mediating the differences of classes between ab extra and ab intra. This point is inscribed in romantic ideology because it stresses the tension of metaphysical idealism in considering that the world is composed of nothing but ideas, or as the Sage of Concord had already informed the reader: to condense here is to empty there. It reveals a romantic inflection, because it explains, as Bernaum observes, that:

what men really were and could become, what their inmost thoughts were, and what the relationships, political, economic, social, and personal, between them ought to be. Only he who had become capable of imagining himself outside of his own ego, no longer self-centered, could begin to see the world of Reality, his environment and his fellowmen, as they truly were, in themselves and in their relation to one another. (xxvii)

Or as Anthony Stevens puts it in Freud & Jung: A Dual Introduction that

Being passionately on the side of individuation, the Self seeks growth and development in our lives. Affirmation of the Self liberates its creative energies and brings certain knowledge that the best life is the life lived sub specie aeternitatis: This, the ultimate question for mankind, has given rise to all the myths and religions ever created, each one being a brave attempt on the part
of some human group to relate to the infinite, the eternal. The quest for the
universe, the experience of the Sacred and Holy, is a fundamental
requirement of the Self. (127)

In his optimistic view Emerson is consistent with personal growth. In “Circles,”
he claims that the soul or the self does not regress once it has attained a new
circle or orbit of consciousness. While, on one hand, the individual self seems
to be losing his consciousness, on the other hand, unconsciousness equalizes.
Such confusion is due to the individual’s being clouded by the challenge of new
consciousness surging forth through and into the soul and expanding outward.
This aspect is outlined by Whicher’s comments on Emerson’s status as a 19th
man of letters. This critic observes that Emerson has “at last openly cut the
cords that bound him to society,” and “launched out from the slavish shore
into the open seas of the mind, a single man against the universe,” (52). But
in his search for poetical genius, he warns us the “I” is an expectant seer,
waiting to gain weight, and form; the self or the Not Me, the other me is an
half-born being in the process and “the other half is his expression” (“The
Poet,” Second Series 5). This idea, Gusdorf notes, reveals Emerson’s “personal
reality within the person who is himself speaking . . . [It demonstrates that]
“man ex-presses himself,” [or man] “actualizes himself,” by creating “his own
substance, like a fruit [that] one squeezes in order to get juice from it”
Speaking (La Parole 69). This position reflects “[t]he concept of the modern
poet-prophet” and “the elevation of the poet as the prophet of the age” as “the
truth teller, the gospel maker, the primary witness for his time and place” (Richardson 12). In this vein, Emerson states that the poet

is the world’s eye. He is the world’s heart. He is to resist the vulgar prosperity that retrogrades ever to barbarism, by preserving and communicating heroic sentiments, noble biographies, melodious verse, and the conclusions of history . . . He and he only knows the world . . . He then learns that in going down into the secrets of his own mind he has descended into the secrets of all minds . . . [and] the deeper he dives into his privatest, secretest presentiment, to his wonder he finds this is the most acceptable, most public, and universally true. (“The American Scholar” 101-03)

In continuing praising the poet as “the sayer, the namer,” who “represents beauty,” (“Poet”, Second Series 7), Emerson writes that “poetry was all written before time was” (“Poet,” Second Series 8) and that all “men of more delicate ear write down these cadences more faithfully” (“The Poet” 8) in order to watch “for the arrival of a brother who can hold him steady to a truth until he has made it his own” (“The Poet,” Second Series 11). Eventually he puts forward that Americans need an “interpreter” (“The Poet,” Second Series 11). The poet must play his role, he must be the interpreter and the “artist that ... could report in conversation what had befallen him” (Poet,” Second Series 6). He must detach “from him [self] to a new self, that the kind may be safe from accidents to which the individual is exposed” (“The Poet,” Second Series 23). “The poet,” Emerson observes, “counsels his own son as if he were a merchant. The poet with poets betrays no amiable weakness. They [poets] all chime in, and are as inexorable as bankers on the subject of real life” (“The Scholar” 264-65). This position points out that “[t]o the poet the world is
virgin soil; all is practicable; the men are ready for virtue; it is always time to do right. He is a true re-commencer, or Adam in the garden again” (“Poetry and Imagination,” 31).

Here we must raise some questions: Is Whitman the Son or the male prophetic teacher? What is behind this cycle? Is Emerson reflecting on the theory of the human species? How should we distinguish Emerson’s writing from Whitman’s? What are the essays, fragments of journals or poems associated with these speculations?

Of all Emerson’s works we start by selecting a passage from his Journals that in our view illustrates the topics above mentioned:

Who is he that shall control me? Why may not I act & speak & write with entire freedom? What am I to the Universe, or, the Universe, what is it to me? . . . I am solitary in the vast society of beings; I consort with no species; I indulge no sympathies. I see the world, human, brute & inanimate nature; I am in the midst of them, but not of them; I hear the song of the storm, - The Winds & warring Elements sweep by me – but they mix not with my being. I see <its> cities & nations & witness passions, - the roar of their laughter, - but I partake it not; - the yell of their grief, - it touches no chord in me; their fellowship & fashions, lusts & virtues, the words & deeds they call glory & shame, - I disclaim them all. I say to the Universe, Mighty one! (JMN, Vol II, 189-90).

And from Whitman’s Leaves of Grass we select these lines from a rather relevant poem, “The Sleepers”:

I go from bedside to beside; I sleep close with the other sleepers each in turn,
I dream in my dream all the dreams of the other dreamers,
And I become the other dreamers.
I am a dance-play up there! the fit is whirling me fast!
I am the ever-laughing- it is new moon and twilight,
I see the hiding of douceurs, I see nimble ghosts whichever way I
look,
Cache and cache again deep in the ground and sea, and where it is
neither ground nor sea. ("Sleepers" 298)

We argue that Emerson represents not only the bridge, the precursor of
Whitman within the context of theory of influence or influenza, but also is
within the paradigm of intertextuality. These passages are filled with similar
phrases, structures, punctuations, ideas, suggesting textual genealogy. As
Emerson observes in Representative Men: “Other men are lenses through
which we read our own minds. Each man seeks those of different quality from
his own, and such as are good of their kind; that is, he seeks other men, and
the otherest” (5).

In just this way, in The Powers of Poetry, while discussing the
differences between the two poets, Gilbert Highet offers a crucial point when
he states that although “they [Emerson and Whitman] wrote two different
kinds of poetry ... [they] were certainly thinking and feeling in utterly different
spiritual worlds. They were Americans, contemporaries, allies in politics,
spiritual friends in many things” (100). Highet goes on to explain that “[b]oth
of them were passionate patriots, and democratic idealists, and opponents of
slavery” (103). Furthermore, this English critic adds that “[o]ne is the cool,
calm, orderly, inventive spirit which inspired New England for many
generations: one of its voices was Emerson. The other is the warm, excitable,
disorderly, enthusiastic spirit which explored the West, and climbed the
Rockies, and pioneered first over half a continent and then, now, over half the world. Of that spirit, Whitman was an early voice” (103).

Following this perspective, we are inclined to argue that however those passages instance a close striking parallel between the “dangerous passivity of aesthetic seeing” and “the vital activity of seeing” (Bishop 36), they dignify a dynamic act of the imagination that reflects Emerson’s organic theory. This aspect may be inscribed in both romantic and transcendentalist agendas because it is part of human being intellectual light, and part of the Divine Truth out of which all things derive: “[T]he inner intellectual structure of the universe,” as Cassirer observes in The Philosophy of the Enlightenment, “which cannot be known in terms of concepts alone or grasped inductively by means of accumulation of individual experiences ... can only be immediately experienced and intuitively understood” (314) by the individual if there is an influx or revelation of the Eternal Truth into the mind of human nature. This line of thought leads us to Emerson’s letter to Whitman after the publication of Leaves of Grass:

I am not blind to the worth of the wonderful gift of Leaves of Grass. I find it the most extraordinary piece of wit and wisdom that American has yet contributed. I am very much happy in reading it, as great power makes us happy. It meets the demands I am always making of what seemed the sterile and stingy Nature, as if too much handwork or too much lymph in the temperament were making our western wits fat and mean. I give you joy of your free and brave thought. I have great joy in it. I find incomparable things said incomparable well, as they must be. I find the courage of treatment which so delight us, and which large perception only can inspire. I greet you at the beginning of a great career. . . . (“Introduction” xxv)
Emerson’s letter stresses his recognition of Whitman’s response to the thrilling prophecy of the foregoing generations, suggesting, as we have already argued, literary genealogy, or as Emerson observes, romantically speaking, that “[t]he man is only half himself, the other half is his expression” (“The Poet” 5).

While commenting on William Wordsworth’s famous line: “The Child is the Father of Man,” D. Bruce Lockerbie argues that Whitman’s self-deification and art does not spring from some vacuum or void; conversely, it springs from a long foreground somewhere. Ironically, Lockerbie adds that “[i]n a burst of self-promotion, the poet sent a copy of his book to his hero, the quiet and refined Emerson, who replied with a letter that sent Whitman soaring: ‘I am [was] not blind to the worth of the wonderful gift of Leaves of Grass’” (51, 59). Despite Whitman’s self-promotion attitude, we claim that Emerson lies behind this link. As it were a remedy, he observes that “Strong men believe in cause and effect. The man was born to do it, and his father was born to be the father of him and of his deed. ... The curve of the flight of the moth is preordained, and all things go by number, rule and weight” (Conduct of Life 220).

Authors such as Emerson and Whitman “with an intuitive sense of its wider implications, chose to refer to it as ‘artistic’ irony” (Furst 238). According to Furst this is a way to reveal “the essential dynamic force in a progressive process in which the work of art was to be de-constructed and re-constructed into a closer approximation of the Ideal” (Furst idem), as Emerson wished it.
These ideas actually reflect Emerson’s transcendental self, intuitively, inspired by his own insights, in assuming new forms, new dimensions, new revelations, as moments of its own existence and exhilaration by distinguishing the soul manifestations within its own nature. It evidences, as Du Lubac observes, “the search for the organic link, for the element of continuity, the ‘phylum,’ [that] has therefore dominated all researches in anthropology, as it has also dominated all the other biological sciences” (179). Or as Bank had already prompted “the relationship of the artist with his society, with himself, and with what he saw as a land without the long, honorable traditions in art which gave his European counterpart a different role in society and in his own eyes,” (7).

It is also relevant to remember that Bloom makes similar points. In The Western Canon, the American critic claims that “Walt is indeed Emerson’s new Adam, American and Nietzschean, who can live as if it were morning, but though he is as Biblical and Miltonic Adam” (131), or as the Orphic poet had pointed out “[t]he umbilical cord [that] has not yet been cut” (“Nature,” Second Series 188).

This idea suggests Emerson’s oddly negative phrasing, his romantic position of consciousness and unconsciousness, which seems to be associated with his inability to concentrate on reading as he ages: a Romantic paradox of the unseen truth. Although this notion reveals an optimistic action of a continuum of man’s deterministic position on earth, it also suggests a
transmutation from Puritanism to physical attributes of mankind or from the Father (Emerson) to the Son.

Here we must raise two questions and forward a hypothesis: How should we characterize Emerson’s concept of self? If the nature of the new self is an illusion, and the law that governs it is permanent, what is the reality that imposes to distinguish the alternating dualism of subject-object? In our attempt to forward our understanding, we argue that Emerson’s self can be traced to many ancestral voices.

In this line of thought, in *Encyclopedia of Transcendentalism*, Wesley T. Mott, while discussing the problem of landscape aesthetics, and different ways that the Transcendentalists deal with nature, observes that “[w]hat unites them [Transcendentalists] is the belief that landscape must be shown as balanced and organic wholes that reveal the unity of all things, both outer and inner” (97). Mott’s argument raises the topic of Emerson’s approach to nature.

We have argued above that Emerson as Transcendentalist perceived the world divided into two poles of thought, that of the Understanding and that of the Reason. He believed that there is a sphere of the senses and a sphere of spirit. This polarity, these two views of outer and inner things are instrumental: on one hand, the materialistic facts; and on the other hand, the idealistic ideas. From these aspects, we are in such a position to proclaim that Emerson was aware of the facts of consciousness and unconsciousness. These two poles of thought reflect Emerson’s attitude towards things as: apparent -
real, finite - infinite. In this line of thought we must quote Emerson’s significant passage from *Representative Men*: “Montaigne,” in which he highlights the dualism of facts: “Every fact is related on one side to sensation, and on the other to morals. The game of thought is, on the appearance of one of these two sides, to find the other: given the upper, to find the under side. Nothing so thin but has these two faces, and when the observer has seen the observe, he turns it over to see the reverse” (150). Although these ideas seem to fall in a vacuum, they reflect cosmic principles in the sense that the problematic issue between object-matter and subject-matter, pertaining to Psychology, and the aspect of transcendental Soul, or Over-Soul, linked to *Psychologia rationalis*, in borrowing Kant’s words, are all associated with theology.

From these ideas we argue that in Emerson’s book of *Nature* there is a self that is linked with art. There lies a self with dualistic principles, cosmologic morals, and with contradictory attitudes, reflecting antagonist pressures of rationalism and romanticism. This conflict is associated with Emerson’s soul’s dilemma to duplicate the depiction of nature and of the poet, suggesting as he observes in *Nature* that “I am a transparent eyeball; I am nothing; I see all; the currents of the Universal Being circulate through me; I am part and parcel of God” (16), or as he puts it in another passage that “[t]here is a conflict between a man’s private dexterity or talent and his access to the free air and light which wisdom is” *Natural History of Intellect* (57).
This view of fact of nature and self, Mott stresses, had been already observed in "Edmund Burke’s 1757 invention of ‘the Sublime’ as a quality of landscape painting—wild or desolate vistas that excited the imagination by arousing fear. . . . [Furthermore] by 1800, thanks to Burke and to Rousseau’s cult of the ‘state of nature,’ the natural vista (genuine or artificial) had acquired primitivist, historical, and pantheistic associations” (97). Mott goes on to stress that it was “[b]y this time [that] Kant and Fichte had articulated the idea that, as Coleridge put it, ‘our awareness [of nature] was in fact an act of creation.’ For the German Romantics, looking at nature led to intuition of correspondences that existed between the interior self and the exterior world as God’s creation” (97). From this vein, Mott goes on claiming that R.W. Emerson’s Nature (1836), which asserted the unity of self and nature (the ‘NOT ME’), introduced this landscape aesthetic to America. Nature oscillates between several implied definitions for ‘nature,’ from the common landscape to the universal Not-Me. It shares the confusion of terms common in the 1830s between (as Barbara Novak puts it) ‘God’s nature’ and ‘God in Nature.’ Like the European Romantics, Emerson redefined the Sublime as a religious attitude that apprehended God through direct, unmediated sense contact with God’s creation. (97-98)

We cite fully Mott’s observations because they are of crucial importance to our thought. They meet the crux of vision on Emerson’s attitude on the interconnection of Nature, Man, and God. They illustrate Emerson’s fundamental insistence on the dilemma between his idealism and his belief in the freedom, justice and integrity of the individual. As he observes “A deep man believes in miracles, waits for them, believes in magic, believes that the
orator will decompose his adversary; believes that the evil eye can wither, that the heart’s blessing can heal; that love can exalt talent; can overcome all odds” (*Conduct of Life*, “Beauty” 283). It is this extreme expression of cosmology conceptions of the self in relation with the inner and outer worlds that anticipate Carl Jung’s arguments on the *anima*.

Jung defines the self as the motivator and builder of man’s existence. This notion brings back a dilemma, an *eternal one*, in defining and redefining formalities and expressions of the new mode of human being, in which the new self and the new poetry would emerge. According to Jung, “[t]he self is both architect and builder of the dynamic structure which supports our psychic existence throughout life. ... Its goal is wholeness, the complete realization of the blueprint for human existence within the context of the life of the individual” (45). Here we are again obliged to raise a question: *Is man alive?* Then, if it is so, Whitman’s self suggests Emerson’s half expression of the self who will

articulate and faithfully express in literary or poetic form, and uncompromisingly, [to reveal] my [his] own physical, emotions, moral, intellectual, and aesthetic Personality, in the midst of, and tallying, the momentous spirit and facts of its immediate days, and of current America- and to exploit that Personality, identified with place and date, in a far more candid and comprehensive sense than any hitherto poem or book. (“Selected Prose” 444)

This passage reflects the romantic inflection of the relationship between Man and God, Nature and Soul, internal and external worlds. It suggests, as
Emerson observes the "Resources of Man,- the inventory of the world, the role of arts and sciences; the whole of memory, the whole of invention; the power of passion, the majesty of virtue and the omnipotence of will"
("Resources" 153) of man, or as Whitman observes in "Democratic Vistas" :

America demands a poetry that is bold, modern, and all-surrounding and kosmical, as she is herself. It must in no respect ignore science or the modern, but inspire itself with science and the modern. It must bend its vision toward the future, more than the past. Like America, it must extriccate itself from even the greatest models of the past, and, while courteous to them, must have entire faith in itself, and the products of its own democratic spirit only. Like her, it must place in the van, and hold up at all hazards, the banner of the divine pride of man in himself (the radical foundation of the new religion). Long enough have the People been listening to poems in which common humanity, deferential, bends low, humiliated, acknowledging superiors. But America listens to no such poems. Erect, inflated, and fully self-esteeming be the chant; and then America will listen with pleased ears. ("Democratic Vistas" 491)

This passage explores, celebrates and stresses the self's stream of consciousness on the findings of contemporary science as materialistic opposed to the spiritual realm. It demonstrates the function of poetic genius by breaking away from the tradition of history to urge man to direct himself in order to achieve new possibilities of life by dealing with the world beyond phenomena, which can only be understood through senses, faith and intuition.

Here we must raise a question: Does this passage deal with emphasis of the evolving self? Our conviction is that the above passage is linked with Emerson’s theory of evolution of human beings, as he observes that: “It is soul, - one in all bodies, pervading, uniform, perfect, preeminent over nature,
This passage glosses on the subjective persona in his effort to interpret the world; it reflects on the poet’s own synecdoche of his own personality: the concerning dilemma between the material world and the spiritual world in which the mind, the soul, as they entail the many and the one, are linked to the romantic spontaneity. The anthology of words like “birth, growth, decay, independent, unconnected, unrealities, past, present and come” must be, in our views, included in the lexicon of any romantic study because they highlight the development of science in the 19th century: the views of the poet genius, of the modern philosophy that signalizes the rupture with American tradition, or even with the Enlightenment ethos of human uniformity as the word “uniform” indicates.

In taking this thought, we must bring into this reasoning a coeval argument: Charles Darwin’s notion of evolution. J. and M. Gribbin, remind us that Darwin did not invent the theory of evolution, “which had grown steadily from the sixteenth century onwards as scientific learning developed in Europe” (7). His work is an expression of 19th century expansion of the existing paradigms, from which, Emerson notes “A correspondent revolution in things will attend the influx of the spirit” (Nature, “Prospects,” First Series, 76). In “The Culture of Hope,” Frederick Turner claims that Emerson, in one of his
most striking prophecies, has anticipated the theory of evolution by natural selection as it would be developed by Charles Darwin in *The Origins of Species* (*May 2003, Smithsonian* 107). This line of thought goes back to what we had already argued that Emerson’s book of “Nature” involves a mastery over man, over his own self, over his own fate, over his fellow man, and over nature. This view announces Emerson’s transcendental hope on the search for a new religious awakening, suggesting a widespread faith in progress, or Emerson’s soul in conflict between science and religion to utter that creation had not been yet completed and therefore the world was still, as he observes, “plastic and fluid in he hands of God, so it is ever to so much of his attributes as we bring to it” (“The American Scholar” 105).

While discussing this topic, we must bring into our study Bloom’s reflections on science and religion. In *Agon: Towards a Theory of Revisionism*, this critic stresses that “Emerson’s . . . truest achievements was to invent the American religion . . . [and that] the mind of Emerson is the mind of America, for worse and for glory, and the central concern of that mind was the American religion . . . which most memorably was named ‘self-reliance’”(145). Bloom goes on to stress that in Emerson’s *Nature*, “his soul proclaim[s] a world so metamorphic and beyond natural metamorphosis that its status is radically prior to that of the existent universe” (150).

Here we must raise a question: Was Emerson interested in science? Whether he was or not interested in science, we maintain that Emerson, as a
romantic writer, he attempted to demonstrate that he was deeply involved in a series of botanical aphorisms, celebrating the *Naturphilosophie* approach that he inherited from European counterparts, like Wordsworth, Coleridge, Shelley and Keats. This notion, we argue, was a fundamental romantic idea that led Emerson to observe that:

> Sensible objects conform to the premonitions of Reason and reflect the conscience. All things are moral; and in their boundless changes have an increasing reference to spiritual nature. Therefore is nature glorious with form, color, and motion; that every globe in the remotest heaven, every chemical change from the rudest crystal up to the laws of life, every change of vegetation from the first principle of growth in the eye of a leaf, to the tropical forest and antediluvian coal-mine, every animal function from the sponge up to Hercules, shall hint or thunder to man the laws of right and wrong, and echo the Ten Commandments” (*Nature*, "Discipline 40-41).

Although this passage reflects not only a series of observations concerning Emerson’s interest in science, it also reveals a source of his arguments which are relevant in asserting that he had a special keen in science as a justification of seeing things in relation to other things. This line of thought indicates that Emerson believed in harmony, and in relationship between the inner and the outer worlds of man. This thought demonstrates that his reflection on science is linked to the assertion of proportions, meanings, affirmations, because it is always in contact with his own intellect and will; as he observes: “In proportion to the energy of his thought and will, he [man] takes up the world into himself” (“Nature,” *First Series* 20), or as he puts it in another passage that “The world is emblematic. . . . [and ] The laws of moral nature answer to those
of matter as face to face in a glass. ‘The visible world and the relation of its parts, is the dial plate of the invisible”’ ("Nature," *First Series* 32-33).

Similarly, in *American Renaissance*, F. O. Matthiessen argues that

in that way only could he [Emerson] come finally to share in the active element, to escape the limitations of his private self and feel that he was swept by a force beyond his will, that he obeyed ‘that redundancy or excess of life which in conscious beings we call ecstasy.’ Such ecstasy in its flood-tide of abandonment was . . . Emerson’s conception of genius. His process of entering into possession of its power has been regarded by many as an incomplete pseudo-mysticism, and the conception itself may be judged a especially innocent kind of romantic spontaneity. (58)

In the “Commodity” chapter, Emerson suggests that the roads with iron bars reveal that history supplies us not only with symbolic forms for new creation, but also it furnishes a continuum stimulus between past and present histories. We contend that the act of creating in art and science reflects the romantic spirit of originality and authenticity, in which intuition is not merely a subconscious sense perception, but rather the knowing of the soul, which is the a priori essence in the poet’s imagination. It is romantic in the sense that within the poet’s own imagination there is, as Bloom observes in *Romanticism and Consciousness: Essays in Criticism*, an “internalization of quest-romance made of the poet-hero [in being] a seeker not after nature but after his own mature powers, and so the Romantic poet turned away, not from society to nature, but from nature to what was more integral than nature, within himself” (15). In pursing this discussion, we argue that within the poet’s own imagination there is not only the mystical vision of rationality, when he
explores the existence of spiritual capacities, but also it reflects as source of religion faith in which the gist of human life can only revealed through the poet’s own consciousness, or as Mott observes that there is “an extraordinary spiritual and cultural status of the individual consciousness and [his] own intuition” (82), in exploring cultural and ideological genealogy pertaining to Romanticism and Transcendentalism. This line of thought becomes clear when we read in “The Transcendentalist”:

It is well known to most of my audience that the Idealism of the present day acquired the name of Transcendental from the use of that term by Immanuel Kant, of Königsberg, who replied to the skeptical philosophy of Locke, which insisted that there was nothing in the intellect which was not previously in the experience of the senses, by showing that there was a very important class of ideas or imperative forms, which did not come by experience, but through which experience was acquired; that these were intuitions of the mind itself; and he denominated them Transcendental forms. The extraordinary profoundness and precision of that man’s thinking have given vogue to his nomenclature, in Europe and America, to the extent that whatever belongs to the class of intuitive thought is popularly called at the present day Transcendental. (340)

This passage reflects on Transcendentalism as a reliance on human nature’s intuition and conscience: an assertion of intuitive Idealism that opposed “the skeptical philosophy of Locke.” It implies Emerson’s homage to Transcendentalism in order to stress not only his own religious experiences, but also how these “ideas or imperatives forms” are so connected to the broader belief of “man’s thinking,” man’s faith, perfectibility, optimism, moral, evolution, and progress in early nineteenth century: “the extraordinary
profoundness . . . of intuitive thought,” grounded in feeling and intuition, in ethics of individualism to stress both self-reliance and natural world—the source of the profoundest truths and the necessity condition of all moral and spiritual development. This aspect, in which both human being and the outer phenomenon participate, constitutes, as Emerson wrote in “Circles” “the force or truth of the individual soul” (304).

In “The Poet,” Emerson writes “this hidden truth, that the fountains whence all this river of Time, and its creatures, floweth, are intrinsically ideal and beautiful,” from which “draws us to the consideration of the nature and functions of the Poet, or the man of Beauty” (*Second Series* 4). This hidden truth suggests the unseen power to connect human thought with the world. This power circulates within nature thus making it a dynamic living organism rather than a static or dead one. This aspect emphasizes that human creative activity reflects the medium of expression within the nature and functions of the poet in which the self searches for other self in order to communicate rational and irrational impulses.

These notions can be traced to what Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel had observed while reflecting on views associated with rational conceptions. In *The Philosophy of History*, Hegel had pointed out that “[t]he only Thought which Philosophy brings with it to contemplation of history is the simple conception of *Reason*; that Reason is the Sovereign of the World; that the history of the world, therefore, presents us a rational process” (9). Hegel’s approach to
History will meet an echo in Emerson’s manipulation of tropes and in the dialogue they engage in the past, as a continuity of action, to appropriate their energy— an energy for new invention, for building our own world: "by aggregate of these aids, how is the face of the world changed, from era of Noah to that of Napoleon!" History may be anything but a burden: inherited culture is thus a collection of tools for re-troping, for recreation. Invention or creation thus considered is a kind of synonym for genius as Poirier has shown:

the creation of America out of a continental vastness is to some degree synonymous in the imagination with the creation of freedom, of an open space made free, once savagery has been dislodged, for some unexampled expansion of human consciousness. The repetition and persistence of this myth has been especially evident in American literature for the obvious reason that for the only time in history men could, with the prospects of a new continent, actually believe in their power at last to create an environment congenial to an ideal self. (4, 17)

Fulfillment centers on the problem of coeval morality and freedom that Emerson depicts as our “hits,” glancing blows: the mark and the result of man’s self and the restoration of unity. In considering History as struggle between Fate and Freedom, Emerson tries “to lift this mountain of Fate, to reconcile this despotism of race with liberty” (Conduct of Life, “Fate” 12). He sees this despotism as a mortification of Freedom or determinism, which is revealed in both nature and the self. As he concedes: “the history of the individual is always an account of his condition, and he knows himself to be a party to his present estate” (Conduct of Life, “Fate” 13). In the same perspective, in Nature in the chapter entitled “History,” Emerson provides the
historical aperture to comprehend the infinitude of his moments of perfect exhilaration to overcome the power of the past, the inertia of an old self, as a dynamic agent that “Time dissipates to shining ether the solid singularity of facts,” (153) and look, placidly for a “Babylon, Troy, Tyre, Palestine, and even early Rome[that] are passing already into fiction,” thus also he lets the old self go (153). Emerson draws on History as a hypothesis for generating a test tube for a sturdier self and the world. What then is Emerson’s self? Is it a dynamic, static or ecstatic agent?

In *The Romance of Individualism in Emerson and Nietzsche*, David Mikics has shown that “the Emerson self is both Dionysian (or musical) and Apollonian (or architectonic).” For Emerson, Mikics adds, “the self at once lives out an ecstatic illumination and survives the exposure of this ecstatic to a sometimes brutal skepticism” (33). Mikics goes on to write “Emerson criticizes his flights of visionary egoism, even as he indulges in them. Instead of simply promoting an expansive American selfhood in order to escape from thinking about America society, Emerson stays acutely aware that his dreams of prophetic grandeur remain subject to the bards, the deflating gestures, of his fellow citizens” (33).

Consistent with this view, in *The Emerson Museum: Practical Romanticism and the Pursuit of the Whole*, Lee Rust Brown notes that

> Emersonian transparency [that is, the self or the eyeball] occurs in the shift of intellectual focus, in the gesture of negation that enables the eye to pass from the previously visible sign to the previously hidden meaning of the sign. As
such, transparency should not be pictured as an ideal ontological condition, 
nor as a “place” upon which the eye might dwell. It appears (or disappears) 
only in the context of the shifting relations created by the intellect in its transit 
from old to new objects of focus. (46)

Although this argument seems to be linked to the Puritan’s dilemma between 
material and spiritual dimensions, it nevertheless opens the seals of shadow 
and obscurity of the poet’s past which shroud this visible world in order to 
achieve self-knowledge and identity of the underlying unity in the universe 
between God, Man, and Nature. These come along with its History, language, 
culture, religion and experience, or rather a drama than something else more 
signified. Our point of view is supported by critics such as Bercovitch. In 
*Emerson the Prophet*, Bercovitch claims that

> The Puritan’s dilemma was that the way from the self necessarily led through 
> the self; history was part of the dialectic through which he had to overcome 
> history. Sometimes the struggle became so severe that he could resolve it 
> only by abandoning hope, or else by leaping, self and all, directly to Christ. 
> For the Romantic, the way to the self led through the precursor poet. Only the 
> strongest did not abandon either poetry or the self. (7)

It seems that Emerson’s self is paralyzed as long as it is interested in the 
magnificence of the external world. As he dreams of an ulterior perception, he 
loses his capacities, and his vision turns the world outside in, brings 
everything and strives for a self within the self itself. Then, as it gains mobility 
he absorbs his wholly personal identity, he internalizes the outside world as it 
becomes a comprehensible and an intellectual object of the poetic and 
Romantic endeavor. Thus, the more energetically the self searches for its own
grounding self or collective identities, the more the self finds itself in an idiosyncratic hermeneutic universe. Within such a context of the conception of an allegorical self, Emerson writes that “[t]hose who are esteemed umpires of taste . . . seem to have lost the perception of the instant dependence of form upon the soul” (“The Poet,” Second Series 3). This is both man’s failure and assumption that there is no

essential dependence of the material world on thought and volition. . . . But the highest minds of the world have never ceased to explore the double meaning, or shall I say the quadruple or the centuple of much more manifold meaning, of every sensuous fact . . . For we are . . . [all] children of the fire, made of it, and only the same divinity transmuted . . . [and that there is an] hidden truth, [which, if seen, would intrinsically delight] the nature and the functions of the Poet, or the man of Beauty; to the means and materials he uses, and to the general aspect of art in the present time. (“Poet,” Second Series 4)

This passage reveals an organic occurrence, a connection between the physical and the invisible worlds, the metaphysic fact and the poet’s own existence. This perspective depends on two formulations, on understanding and on rational paradigms, through which we distinguish the inner and outer sides. This worldview, this dislocation or detachment from life, the twofold approach demonstrates the poet’s ideal situation as distinct from the partial poet’s, and human moral situation, fallen and potentially regenerate. And for “better perception he [the poet] stands one step nearer to things, and sees the flowing or metamorphosis; perceives that thought is multiform; that within the form of every creature is a force impelling it to ascend into a higher form; and
following with his eyes the life, uses the forms which express that life, and so his speech flows with the flowing of nature” (“Poet,” *Second Series* 20-21).

This artistic sensitiveness is the soul itself that admonishes the gleams of the romantic approach from which the poet’s mind oscillates between the inward and outer heralds. There the soul converses with the laws that traverse the universe and make things what they are within the *Principium of Individualism*. It is for this reason that we must bring into our study Leon Chai’s arguments while reflecting on issues associated with inner and outer aspects. In *The Romantic Foundations of the American Renaissance*, Chai has pointed out that

> to an inner movement or tendency . . . all things aspire to a higher more spiritual level. . . . Nature is thus not static but progressive. . . . It is this striving that creates the ‘correspondences’ between mind and matter, nature and spirit. . . . Such correspondences represent not merely the result of a preestablished harmony but the incarnation of thought in matter, an immanence of the spiritual within the material, which seeks to turn all into its own likeness as thought. (69)

These notions can be traced to what Emerson had already written in 1842. For Emerson there is no beauty without mystery: nature, the *natura naturata* or the self exists to the soul in order to satisfy the desire of the beauty. This view reflects the romantic *Zeitgeist* because, in its largest and profoundest sense, it demonstrates the individualistic human being creativity of the poetic authority. It creates a work of art into which the self finds some comfort or discomfort while retreating to inwardness or enlarging to outwardness, where aggressive
impulses may be transformed through the formation of another self. That is, the self seems to destroy the self by the very energy that defines its being; it seems to preserve the negative energy of its own energy. This position, whether we agree or not, demonstrates an irony that delights the poet’s soul or self. A work of art is considered romantic, Moody argues, because it is “a *total work of art*, that is to say one which addresses itself simultaneously to all the senses, to the sensibility, to the emotions, and to the intelligence” (14). It also reflects, according to Buell, “[t]he Transcendentalist paradox of self-preoccupation versus self-transcendence [that] has its origin in the three traditions of democratic, romantic, and (especially) Protestant thought” (271). As if Emerson provides a possible solution for this ambiguity, in “Circles” he warns the reader:

> . . . let me remind the reader that I am only an experimenter . . . I unsettle all things. No facts are to me sacred; none are profane; I simply experiment, an endless seeker, with no Past at my back. Yet this incessant movement and progression, which all things partake, could never become sensible to us, but by contrast to some principle of fixture or stability in the soul. Whilst the eternal generation of circles proceeds, the eternal generator abides. That central life is somewhat superior to creation, superior to knowledge and thought, and contains all its circles. Forever it labors to create a life and a thought as large and excellent as itself, suggesting to our thought a certain development, as if that which is made, instructs how to make a better. (318)

Though the passage illustrates a contrast between “this incessant movement and progression” and “principle of fixture,” it reveals the poet’s experience of a mystical vision of inconformity with the inner and outer worlds. It seems to suggests Emerson’s abstractness and disembodied ideals that elude ordinary,
less philosophical activities of life to what he had termed in Nature “man’s power to connect his thought with its proper symbol, and to utter it,” (“Nature,” First Series 29). This thought anticipates the emotions of joy and surprise of self-recognition, the raison d’être of the Self, the allegory of souls and the antithesis between seeing and being seen of a self in pilgrimage, to seek fulfillment in the spiritual achievement of art and religion, as we have shown above.

In the chapter entitled “The Foundations of Science,” Chai makes similar claims. He propounds that “[f]or Emerson, the externalization of mind, its outward projection into Nature, springs not only from an inner necessity but from the lure of the world itself” (149). This notion becomes clear when we read the complete quotation in “Over-Soul” as follows:

> Ineffable is the union of man and God in every act of the soul. The simplest person who in his integrity worships God, becomes God; yet for ever and ever the influx of this better and universal self is new and unsearchable. It inspires awe and astonishment. How dear, how soothing to man, arises the idea of God, people the lonely place, effacing the scars of our mistakes and disappointments! When we have broken our god of tradition and ceased from our god of rhetoric, then may God fire the heart with his presence. It is the doubling of the heart itself, nay, the infinite enlargement of the heart with a power of growth to a new infinity on every side. It inspires in man an infallible trust. (292-93)

Emerson informs the reader here of his lucidity not only in matter or nature, but also in man. It demonstrates how he could understand life as fully as possible within consciousness and unconsciousness, so as to go beyond nature, past, history, culture and religious lights. It reveals that “[a]ll things
proceed out of the same spirit,” and that “the world is not the product of manifold power, but of one will, of one mind; and that one mind is everywhere active ... Good is positive. Evil is merely privative, not absolute” (“The Divinity School Address” 123-24). It further informs Emerson’s self speaking scientifically “through a pantomimic scene,” transferring “the world into the consciousness” as the “flowing perpetually outward from an invisible, unsounded centre in himself, centre alike of him and of them, and necessitating him to regard all things as having a subjective or relative existence, relative to that aforesaid Unknown Centre of him” (“Transcendentalist” 333-34).

In extending this logic we must bring into our discussion a passage from The Bhagavad-Gita, which we believe that Emerson, always wise and attentive to other discourses, may have read:

. . . the true glory of the Self is perceived only when the mind remains free from all the tendencies created by its good as well as its evil actions. This condition of mind is produced when a man acts according to his dharma in a spirit of utter detachment. The organs may then be active, but the mind does not retain the slightest impression of the action. This is the meaning of Sri Krishna’s advice to Arjuna to work and surrender the results to the Lord. It is the only way to exhaust the past tendencies and at the same time prevent the formation of the new ones. By freeing the mind of attachment and delusion a man ultimately realizes that his supreme dharma is to worship God, and God alone. ‘Abandon all dharmas and come to Me alone for shelter. I will deliver you from all sins; do not grieve.’ Thus, through our worldly dharma, we acquire fitness to perform the supreme duty of human evolution, which is the attainment of Self-knowledge. (Swami Nikhilananda 13)
This passage demonstrates “the Self” capacity for apprehending transcendental forms, which can only be understood by examining and treating it in connection with the theme of illusion which Emerson treats too. The same lines reveal *The Ambiguity of the Self* in a blend of reasoning and understanding, between materialism and idealism in order to express instinct and intuition of his own poetic power, and suggesting “the supreme duty of human evolution”: the organic theory of human mind that reflects “the glory of the Self,” the fruit and seed of its own scientific delight and invention, while exploring the dilemma between appearances and mere representations of the universe in which Emerson examines views linked to Reason and Understanding, matter and spirit — the vision that Emerson held, as transcendentalist, that God is everywhere present, and that the physical world reflected the mask of the inner world of spiritual values. As Mott observes, Emerson was in search for an “exaltation of man - the merging of man’s personality in that of the Divinity, as well as by what was perceived as the pantheistic destruction of moral distinctions between good and evil” (157).

These viewpoints had already been discussed in “The Divinity School Address” as Emerson informs the reader that: “the visions of the moral sentiment. . . . affect us more than all other compositions. [Because] This thought [moral sentiment] dwelled always deepest in the minds of men in the devout and contemplative East; not alone in Palestine, where it reached its purest expression, but in Egypt, in Persia, in India, in China (*Address* 126).
In this way, we may argue that Emerson does not mistake the image in his mind for an objective object in natural world. At most, his scientific and poetic vision allow for a correspondence between the mental image and the concrete object. As a result and possible answer from the above excerpt he writes:

“To the senses and the unrenewed understanding, belongs a sort of instinctive belief in the absolute existence of nature. In their view man and nature are indissolubly joined. Things are ultimates, and they never look beyond their sphere. . . . When the eye of Reason opens, to outline and surface are at once added grace and expression. These proceed from imagination and affection, and abate somewhat of the angular distinctness of objects. If the Reason be stimulated to more earnest vision, outlines and surfaces become transparent, and are no longer seen; causes and spirits are seen through them. The best moments of life are these delicious awakening of the higher powers, and the reverential withdrawing of nature before its God. (“Nature,” First Series 49-50)

This passage seems to suggest that Emerson’s self is inspired by an acute perception of the grotesque and voluptuous moment of annihilation. Self-consciousness emerges then as a generative agent for poetic genius, it demonstrating his faculty for finding enjoyment in pleasures “of the higher powers.” In his search for a fulfilled self he observes that

“This determination of Genius in each is so strong that, if it were not guarded with powerful checks, it would have made society impossible. As it is, men are the best and most by themselves: and always work in society with great loss of power. They are not timed each to the other: they cannot keep step, and life requires too much compromise. Men go through the world each musing on a great fable dramatically pictured and rehearsed before him. If you speak to the man, he turns his eyes from his own scene, and, slower or faster, endeavors to comprehend what you say. When you have done speaking, he
returns to his private music. (Natural History of Intellect, “Instinct and Inspiration” 84)

It is by this trait of the soul and of the self that Emerson deliberately dedicates his own time, his own talents, and his own hopes on the determination of Genius as a delicate romantic sensible object in order to analyze the power of the inner and outer worlds, in connection with all scientific events that impress man’s soul. This strategy connects him with the romantic school. In touching this subject, in The Romantic Foundations of the American Renaissance, Chai has shown that “Romantic nature symbolism affords a glimpse of higher, transcendental realities that are external or objective; a more radical form of allegory could reveal the internal or subjective reality of the self” (7). Chai goes on to explain

What Emerson refers to is the experience of pure seeing, devoid of all phenomenal content received through external impressions. In such experience, the mind necessarily confronts the process of its own consciousness, or the reality of consciousness itself. This sublime moment Emerson also characterizes as an apprehension of the divine essence. At such moments, all trace of individual of self disappears. What remains is the overwhelming experience of divine consciousness. (8)

This dualism between object and subject, which reflects a product of the self and the text, a struggle to transcend the lyric dilemma of the soul, is an attempt to work out a voice of self-expression which lies on the intuition as an ultimate horizon to reconstruct and celebrate a larger self. In his attempt to define the aboriginal Self Emerson (de)ciphers it as “[t]he magnetism [in] which all original action exerts ... when we inquire the reason of self-trust.” It
is “the essence of genius, of virtue, and of life, which we call Spontaneity or Instinct.” In there [within self] “[w]e denote this primary wisdom as Intuition, [as] the last fact behind which analysis cannot go, all things find their common origin” (“Self-Reliance” 63-64). This voice is adjusted to the self’s intimate geometry, thus creating and retaining the grandeur of an epic self in continuity and discontinuity in the midst of romantic motion. It suggests a sort of tragedy, a dance from Protestantism to Transcendentalism, or a pendulum between Reason and Understanding from which Emerson’s ideas derive and flow.

The poet’s voice is part of the romantic spirit because it encompasses man’s belief, man’s sincerity and spontaneity, and faith emotions; it reflects man’s delight in self-analysis; it asserts man’s affirmation of the values of democracy and freedom; it affirms man’s sublime, grotesque, picturesque, and the beautiful touch of strangeness in art; finally, it stresses man’s perfectibility, spiritual force immanent not only in nature but in the mind of man. As if it were a remedy for all enchantments, our poet writes:

In looking back they [men] may find that several things were not the charm have more reality to this groping memory than the charm itself which embalmed them. But be our experience in particulars what it may, no man ever forgot the visitations of that power to his heart and brain, which created all things anew; which was the dawn in him of music, poetry and art; which made the face of nature radiant with purple light, the morning and the night varied enchantments. (Conduct of Life, "Love" 196)
Concerning this passage in its application to the poet spiritual journey, we must bring into our discussion Emerson’s relevant letter to his brother Edward in which he asks:

Do you draw the distinction of Milton, Coleridge, and the Germans between Reason and Understanding? . . . Reason is the highest faculty of the soul, what we mean often by the soul itself: it never reasons, never proves; it simply perceives, it is vision. The Understanding toils all the time, compares, contrives, adds, argues; near-sighted but strong-sighted, dwelling in the present, expedient, the customary. (Cabot, Memoir I, 218)

This passage reveals that Emerson was interested in science, progress and evolution. It also reflects 19th century nationalist and patriotic attitudes since Emerson believed that the historical progress of America’s social, political and scientific developments actually were realms of spiritual progress. This passage still reveals the inseparability of political and the Reason within a romantic paradigm in which the individual mind and the power of the creative imagination oscillate between two fundamental and different worlds: Idealism and Materialism. It is precisely from these traits that Emerson’s Ambiguity of the Self reveals a significant contribution to the romantic impetus: the problem of how to conceptualize and how to distinguish the relationship between a sensible object, by employing the faculty of reason, and an intelligible object, by employing the world of understanding.

This notion, we conclude, demonstrates our position in responding some of the questions we set up in elaborating this work. This notion provides a possible answer to the argument of the subjective phenomenal world as an
illusion to the materialism; and on the other hand, it is part of the argument of the objective phenomenal world, in which the world of idealism is contrary and runs against materialism. Besides it is part of the argument of the objective phenomenal world, in which the world of idealism is contrary and runs against materialism. It reflects that in every creative work of art, be it Classic or Romantic, there is a productive and divided self, in which the duality is a synthesis of the human being rational and irrational impulses. It is extremely important to remember that in a work of art the power of the poetic imagination proceeds, mentally and organically, from the human soul and is responsible, romantically speaking, for its own odds, by establishing and intensifying its own inevitable intensified sensibilities of its Internal Conflict: within two Romantic and scientific vectors: Reasoning and Understanding as we discuss in next chapter.
Chapter Three
Reasoning and Understanding: Vectors of Romantic Dilemma

The act of imagination is ever attended by pure delight. It infuses a certain volatility and intoxication into all Nature. It has a flute which sets the atoms of our frame in a dance. Our indeterminate size is a delicious secret which it reveals to us. The mountains begin to dislimn, and float in the air. In the presence and conversation of a true poet, teeming with images to express his enlarging thought, his person, his form, grows larger to our fascinated eyes. (“Imagination” 19)

This quotation can be understood, as we will observe in the next pages, in a schematic/geometric way, in a pendulum in which the soul travels the entire universe between Reasoning and Understanding in search for Larger Truth; as Emerson observes that:

Though we travel the world over to find the beautiful, we must carry it with us, or we find it not. The best of beauty is a finer charm that skill in surfaces, in outlines, or rules of art can ever teach, namely a radiation from the work of art, of human character - a wonderful expression through stone, or canvas, or musical sound, of the deepest and simplest attributes of our nature, and therefore most intelligible at last to those souls which have these attributes. (“Art” 293)

In our attempt to give concrete form to one aspect of Emerson’s “transparent eye ball,” “the Me,” and “the Not Me,” we must bring into our discussion
Foucault’s claims on “the power of imagination,” and his views on “the negative one of the disorder in nature and in our impressions,” and “the other the positive one of the power to reconstitute order out of those impressions” (*The Order of Things* 70), in order to reveal the romantic approach and the forces that awaken man’s consciousness and unconsciousness.

**3.1. A geometrical approach to Emerson’s discourse**

Figure 1 demonstrates the interfusion between Matter and Mind as sublime representations of Emerson’s vigor to reflect both visions of metaphysical and divine madness. It reflects a view of the whole natural universe in order to render an explicit or implicit definite link between human nature and eternal Truth. Besides, this Figure also illustrates a theoretical romantic approach of the variable demands within *knowledge about and knowledge by acquaintance* for moral education. As Christopher J. Windolph observes while focusing on viewpoints linked to geometric structure: “Geometric thinking underpins all of Emerson’s theories about nature. . . . geometric [*thinking-emphazing mine*] in this context must be [well] understood as giving reference to metaphysical concerns” (2) between Reasoning and Understanding. This is a two-folded consideration that helps us to an understanding Emerson’s continuum interest in dealing not only with Eternal Truth, as “a pure abstraction of the human mind,” but also with astrology and mathematical figures as an occult vision of
correspondence to mirror that: “[t]he astronomer discovers that geometry.” Thus emerges a romantic approach to “measure of planetary motion” (“The American Scholar” 86). Emerson’s organic theory of the correspondence actually encompassed All and Each, or Each and All — as not only a new science engendered by a spirit of objective inquiry in literature, but also in visual arts such as geometry, astrology, architecture, and geology.

Here we must raise a question: What is the relationship between finite and infinite within man’s consciousness and unconscious apprehensions? In our attempt to answer this question we take Chai’s position on Emerson’s viewpoints regarding the polemical issue between mind and soul. In his capacity to explain the differences between one thing and another, Chai argues that the

. . . Mind is identified with Soul on account of its spiritualizing function, by which it penetrates the opaque denseness of nature to reveal those luminous higher laws governing its operation. In these laws, Mind perceives a reflection of itself. Soul, like Mind, is but another name for the infinite. If all things receive their being from the element of Mind, it cannot suffice merely to perceive these things themselves: . . . According to Emerson, then, it becomes necessary to see in the finite a manifestation of the Infinite. (190)

Thus, we contend that, in this line of thought, our geometric diagram illustrates the following romantic features, which are associated with Emerson’s works.

Our geometric figure, as a semiotic text, deals with the highly abstract subject matter of the internal differences between the unknown and known
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universes, or the difference between the inner self and physical body in which the human mind is apt to demonstrate and stress the relationship between abstract cosmogony and the pragmatics of this visible world in order to reveal, as Emerson wrote in 1824, “the secret enigmas of science by whose successive development the history of nature is to be explained” (JMN, Vol. II:203). This enigma is part of the poet’s mind, of imagination and of intellectual love that unite both the visible and invisible worlds. It is not only linked to the poet’s admiration, magnificence and delight for the external universe in order to enlarge or even reduce his own poetic interruption, but also it is associated with his own moral judgments to look at the outer world and attempt to penetrate its interior through his own imagination. In this vein, our geometric figure draws on:

Fig. 1

Although this scheme presents a confrontation or a kind of juxtaposition of Man/Self/Heart/Soul pertaining to romantic discrimination, or to a myriad of things that the poet love to think, it also informs the reader of Emerson’s ambivalence of the self in search for a philosophical distinction which would offer to establish forms on various levels of life. It reflects the view of opposing elements that seeks to stress the conflict between interior and exterior sensations in the sense that Emerson’s soul is driven by an interior romantic thrill. On one hand, “Mind and Understanding,” and “Matter and Reasoning,” on the other hand, pertaining not only to the organic theory of “World/Nature,” but also to the Principium of Individualism of the self.

Here lies the mental motive that leads human nature to search for the coexistence of a physical cause in the sense that, as Jeffrey Steele observes in The Representation of the Self in the American Renaissance while focusing on the mind’s self in 19th century in America: “Emerson interprets the individual as the function of an inner essence that exfoliates itself in an organic process” (2). This function is part of the romantic agenda since it reflects the human imagination as it moves from the intractable to the tractable conceptual difficulties of a static or dynamic position. These notions can be traced back to what Emerson had already written: “A man should learn to detect and watch that gleam of light which flashes across his mind from within” (“Self-Reliance” 45); a man should “love God without mediator (145). This is an assertively
intrinsic way to find God among “Mind and Understanding” and “Matter and Reason.” In this light, we contend that our geometric structure reveals Nature’s lesson [Nature as source of instruction, delight, and nourishment for the soul], which educate[s] both the Understanding and the Reason. Every property of matter is a school for understanding, - its solidity or resistance, its inertia, its extension, its figure, its divisibility. The understanding adds, divides, combines, measures, and finds nutriment and room for its activity in this worthy scene. Meantime, Reason transfers all these lessons into its own world of thought, by perceiving the analogy that marries Matter and Mind. (“Discipline” 36)

Within such a context, we can also argue that although Figure 1 demonstrates a rapture between the vision of words and the vision of the soul, a diametrical geometric cleavage between “this transition from the taxonomic to the synthetic notion of life which is indicated, in the chronology of ideas and science, by the recrudescence, in the early nineteenth century, of vitalist themes. From the archaeological point of view, what is being established at this particular moment is the condition of possibility of a biology,” as Foucault observes (269). In this light, we are in a position to bring into our discussion G. R. Elliot’s views on human life and its relationship with God. In Humanism and Imagination, Elliot considers that “God and Nature are both essential for human versatility, if for nothing higher” (49). This critic goes on to state: “They [God and Nature] provide the fundamental variety of Man. If either of
these two grand factors is omitted or submerged, our life begins to flatten out” (49).

At this stage we must put forward a hypothesis. If these speculations are the hallmark in reproducing our work, then we maintain that our diagram unveils the illusion of both visible and invisible worlds, and human morality, a constant interplay between Understanding and Reasoning, between Mind and Matter, reflecting the ambiguities of the romantic approach. As Stanley Cavell stresses in Cities of Works: “The distinction between Understanding and Reason is greatly important in the formation of Romanticism, of which Kant is a principal source” (131). It is within this aspect that the dualism of spiritual and metaphysical scheme function as a way for understanding the human destiny. As Elliot reminds us: “... the Christian conception of the dual will of man, the Sin and Grace so heavily accented by the Puritans, as merely one form of perennial human experience that is central, not only in religion, but in literature; that constitutes, in fact, the most vital source of the human imagination” (53). This viewpoint inspires the human being to a new prophetic art of creation from which the unseen power accomplishes concepts with powerful meaning for man’s higher self. It reflects Emerson’s self position as dualistic, aesthetic and poetic vision of “[a]ll are needed by each one” rather “than a monistic artifact of his art” (Donald McQuade, Selected Writings of Emerson 847).
Our diagram further reveals “[t]he virtue of art [that] lies in detachment, in sequestering one object from the embarrassing variety” (“Art” 291), or Emerson’s soul in a sublime conflict with the internal and external worlds. This view also stresses “the beauty of the world [as it] may be viewed, namely, as it becomes an object of the intellect,” (“Nature,” First Series, 22), or as Emerson writes in another passage “the absolute order of things as they stand in the mind of God” (“Nature,” First Series, 22). Within this light, Thomas Weiskel while discussing human feeling associated with the visible and invisible worlds has pointed out that:

The essential claim of the sublime is that man can, in feeling and in speech, transcend the human. . . . [The sublime] lies beyond the human-God or the gods, the daemon or Nature. . . . the human was the domain of art or techne; the sublime, just that which eluded the art in our experience of art, the soul of the rhetorical body. The sublime must be referred to nature (physis), for ‘it is by nature that man is being gifted with speech.’ (3)

This sublime is part of the poetic transcendent genius in the sense that it reflects romantic writing capabilities in order to comprehend the boundlessness or seeming infinity between “techne/physis” of natural magnitudes. It also stresses the importance of human mind: the dynamic sublime in order to surpass the dichotomy object and subject, and achieve the Whole. Emerson actually wrote in “Poetry and Imagination” that “the poet listens to conversation [between the soul/universe] and beholds all objects in Nature, to give back ... a new and transcendent whole” (17). As Jeffrey Scott Childs observes in Mark Strand and the Unraveling of Romanticism, while
reflecting on Emerson works: “The dual task of Emerson throughout his writings is to maintain a permanent flux between self and world, which means keeping either term from settling into something definitive, and, as a corollary of this, to empower the self to create enough space for its own imaginative resources” (141). This dualism suggests an oxymoronic epiphany of creation, an exhortation of perceptual possibilities associated with romantic inflection. It also reveals an attempt to build a new dogmatic vision for (visual and) mental celebration of things and of the relations among them within two poles of thought: Reasoning and Understanding.

In *The Reason, the Understanding and Time*, Arthur O. Lovejoy concurs with our position. He states that “the Understanding’ and ‘the Reason’ . . . enable us to discover universal laws to which it can be known in advance that all sensibly experienced phenomena will conform” (2). In another passage, while discussing the concepts of Reason and Understanding as two opponent forces, Lovejoy says that “The reasoning characteristic of ordinary thought and natural science depends upon the setting up of sharp contrasts between things, upon propounding dilemmas and formulating irreconcilable oppositions” (137). Here we must raise two questions: Are these viewpoints associated with Puritanism?

In *Endless Experiments: Essays on the Heroic Experience in American Romanticism*, Todd M. Lieber points out a relevant notion. In order “... to understand the Romantic tradition in America, it is necessary to consider the
Puritan background from which it grew” (6). This American critic goes on to emphasize that “[t]he Puritans posited that a simple and comprehensible divine order permeated the world . . . [and that] there was, in other words, no difference between the laws of things, but rather a set of immutable essences that existed both within the mind and within the natural order” (6). In Emerson’s words: “In the absence of man, we turn to nature, which stands next. . . . we can turn as a convenient standard, and the meter of our rise and fall. It has this advantage as a witness, it cannot be debauched” (“The Method of Nature” 196-97). For Emerson, Man is alive since

We are natural believers. Truth, or connection between cause and effect, alone interests us. We are persuaded that a thread runs through all things: all worlds are strong on it, as beads; and men, and events, and life, come to us only because of that thread: they pass and repass only that we may know the direction and continuity of that line . . . Seen or unseen, we believe the tie exists. Talent makes counterfeit ties; genius finds the real ones. (“Montaigne Or, the Skeptic” 170)

In another passage, Emerson stresses that “[e]very verse or sentence possessing this virtue will take care of its own immortality. The religions of the world are the ejaculations of a few imaginative men,” and “Men have really got a new sense, and found within their world another world, or nest of worlds (“The Poet,” Second Series 34, 30). Man is alive because he still proclaims his intellectual freedom, his permanent curiosity enhanced by the text of Nature. As Emerson observes: “Human curiosity is forever engaged in seeking out ways & means of making a connection between the mind & the world of
matter without or the world of mind that has subsisted here or an uniting bridge which shall join to future ages our own memory & deeds” (*JMN*, V. II. 87).

These passages from Emerson’s essay, “the Poet,” and from his Journals reveal that his self lives under a continual reflection both of himself and others. Emerson’s self believes firmly in the natural process, which leads man to triumph from triumph from “all inside / outside dichotomies” (Bloom, *Kabbalah and Criticism* 123), or as Michael observes from “endless series of confrontations” (*The Cipher of the World* 138). These ideas demonstrate the relevance of the enduring facts of human nature and of the universe. In this light Andrew J. Reck shows that:

> The individual, so far as he suffers from his wrongness and criticizes it, is to that extent consciously beyond it, and in at least possible touch with something higher, if anything higher exists. Along with the wrong part there is thus a better part oh him, even though it may be but a most helpless germ. With which part he should identify his real being is by no means obvious at the stage; but when stage 2 (the stage of solution or salvation) arrives, the man identifies his real with the germinal higher part of himself; and does so in the following way. He becomes conscious that the higher part is conterminous and continuous with a more of the same quality, which is operative in the universe outside of him, and which he can keep in working touch with, and in fashion get on board of and save himself when all his lower being has gone to pieces in the wreck. (149)

In connection with this perspective, Whicher claims that “Emerson’s mind, the truth of the present insight, must be dynamic rather than systematic, a statement of controlling opposites between which, by some organic law of
undulation, his mental life swung” (57). The American critic goes on to argue that in Emerson’s mind

The north and the south poles, the major axis, are the conceptual poles of the One and the Many, the Universal and the Individual, faith and the rest of experience, Reason and Understanding, between which Emerson saw man suspended. And across this lies a minor axis, whose poles, shifting and blending into each other, are harder to define, the temperamental west and east poles of pride and humility, egoism and pantheism, activity and passivity, Power and Law, between which, again, Emerson’s nature was divided. (57)

This thought actually reflects Emerson’s conflict of the soul, as our poet observes in “The Transcendentalist”:

The worst feature of this double consciousness is, that of the two lives, of the understanding and of the soul, which we lead, really show very little relation to each other; never meet and measure each other: one prevails now, all buzz and din; and the other prevails then, all infinitude and paradise; and, with the progress of life, the two discover no greater disposition to reconcile themselves. (353-54)

Although this passage seems to be controversial because of the ambiguity between consciousness and unconsciousness, between Reason and Understanding, it represents the two great vectors that have prevailed in 19th century American literature: the need of science and the need of the ideal. This was the spirit of the man who directed the course of minds, which taken together demonstrate the organic set of relationships in Emerson’s thought.

In this light, in The Principles of Psychology, William James points out that:

the soul balances between two sorts of knowledge: knowledge by acquaintance, which is associated with our own experience: relationships with
people and things; and knowledge about, which is associated with the inner nature of [these] facts or what makes them what they are. . . . It is connected with All the elementary natures of the world, its highest genera, the simple qualities of matter and mind, together with the kinds of relation that subsist between them. (144)

This passage emphasizes the structural relevance of a dualism between mental and physical aspects that at the core of romantic agenda, namely in the process of perception and representation: knowledge by acquaintance and knowledge about. A concept of knowledge as a Whole, integrating Ethics and Aesthetics, thus prevails.

Weiskel observes that “[t]he aesthetic of the beautiful ... [is] a humanizing influence ... in idealist thought, [as] it came to subvert the very dualisms-of eye and object, spirit and sense-that the sublime presupposed and reinforced. . . . [as] the odd literalism of the visionary tradition, a persistent atavism which found in Blake a major representative” (8-9). These ideas can be traced to what Emerson pointed out at the beginning of his career. In “Nature” he states that: “The difference between the actual and the ideal force of man is happily figured by the schoolmen, in saying, that the knowledge of man is an evening knowledge, vespertina cognitio, but that of God is a morning knowledge, matutina cognitio” (Nature, “Idealism”, First Series 73).

The desire to know seems to be the uppermost kernel to have faith in science, even admitting to the existence of other things than science. But if we desire comfort for the visible reality, yet we also desire fuller knowledge of reality,
and ultimate arrival at the domination of reality. “It is very certain that it is the effect of conversation with the beauty of the soul, to beget a desire and need to impart to others the same knowledge and love. If utterance is denied, the thought lies like a burden on the man. Always the seer is a sayer,” Emerson proclaims in “The Divinity School Address” (134). The insistence upon science and upon the beauty of the soul, the pregnancy of the matter, brings to it nothing of his own but an ability to illuminate man’s “Ne te quaesiveris extra” (JMN, Vol.VI.19), as he proclaims in “Self-Reliance”:

Man is his own star; and the soul that can
Render an honest and a perfect man,
Commands all light, all influence, all fate;
Nothing to him falls early or too late.
Our acts our angels are, or good or ill,
Our fatal shadows that walk by us still.
*Epilogue to Beaumont and Fletcher’s Honest Man’s Fortune.* ("Self-Reliance" 43)

Along this thought in “The Culture of Hope,” Frederick Turner argues that:

Emerson is a renaissance voice. Living in the afterglow of New England Puritan age of faith, and in the dawn of American’s political, artistic and exploring power, Emerson combined a boisterous energy with rational and judicious piety. Too intellectually adventurous to remain a Unitarian minister (he became fascinated by Hindu theology), he did not abandon his religious tradition altogether. At the center of his insights was a vision of nature’s intimate relationship with the human and the divine. (107)

This issue actually leads us back to Figure 1. There we contend that, although the two elements [Reason and Understanding] appear to be in conflict [a sort of tragedy], they create a soil *on* and *within* which they develop the triumph of
the soul and of the mind. In this light, we stress that nature becomes a sublime airport, or a sublime and an intellectual mushroom, a romantic setting, a romantic flight, on which the soul lands and departs from and searches; as Kant had already observed in *Philosophies of Art and Beauty*, for “a constitutive principle of the possibility of experience, or whether a yet higher principle of reason” (304), or for a “new material poetica,” as Packer would write in *Emerson’s Fall* within “the complexities of the human mind” (104).

Kant’s “higher principles” echoes in the relationship between the inner and outer realms. Emerson’s views on the objective organic world must be thus understood in line with Kantian tradition. Finally, it demonstrates that “this Unity, that, it is easily seen, ... lie[s] under the undermost garment of Nature, and betrays its source in Universal Spirit,” as Emerson would observe in (“Nature,” *First Series* 44). This search, of course, was “suspect,” but man, as Bank points out, “responded by searching for a rationale for his art: his search took the shape of a literary form in which he could express his conviction that the imagination was an important faculty, even in a century in which commerce was becoming king” (7). This brings to light, “The American Scholar,” where Emerson writes that

> the world was plastic and fluid in the hands of God, so it is ever to so much of his attributes as we bring to it. . . . For this self-trust, the reason is deeper than can be fathomed,-darker than can be enlightened. I might not carry with me the feeling of my audience in stating my own belief. . . . I believe man has
been wronged; he has wronged himself, [then it is time that] All the rest behold in the hero or the poet their own green and crude being. (105-06)

This passage illustrates the impact of the romantic fluxes and influxes within Emerson’s Text. It puts forward an insight of human nature and a spiritual enlightenment that would guide the human being to a harmonious mix of spirituality, psychology, and practical guidance. Thus personal improvement would be achieved. Emerson actually believes that “Man owns the dignity of the life which throbs around him, in chemistry, and tree, and animal, and in the involuntary functions of his body; ... Yet genius and virtue predict in man the same absence of private ends and of condescension to circumstances, united with every trait and talent of beauty and power” (“The Transcendentalist” 339). Besides man’s faculty “[i]n its fruitful soils; in its navigable sea; in its mountains of metal and stone; in its forests of all woods; in its animals; in its chemical ingredients; in its powers and path of light, heat, attraction and life, it is well worth the pith and heart of great men to subdue and enjoy it” (“The Divinity School Address” 119-20).

In demanding intellectual and scientific vision in order to fulfill the requisiteness and affirmations of “Self-Reliance,” Emerson warns that:

There is a time in every man’s education when he arrives at the conviction that envy is ignorance; that imitation is suicide; that he must take himself for better, for worse, as his portion; that though the wide universe is full of good, no kernel of nourishing corn can come to him but through his toil bestowed on that plot of ground which is given to him to till. (46)
From this kernel of perceptual possibilities, James offers a relevant argument, which we believe is in connection with Emerson’s conflict of soul, of the self. James observes that:

The centre works in one way while the margins work in another, and presently overpower the centre and are central themselves. What we conceptually identify ourselves with and say we are thinking of at any time is the centre; but our full self is the whole field, with all those indefinitely radiating subconscious possibilities of increase that we can only feel without conceiving, and can hardly begin to analyze. The collective and distributive ways of being coexist here, for each part functions distinctly, makes connection with its own peculiar region in the still wider rest of experience and tends to draw us into that line, and yet the whole is somehow felt as one pulse of our life,- not conceived so, but felt so. (289)

In “Experience” Emerson may have already answered this issue, as he writes that

We live amid surfaces, and the true art of life is to skate well on them. Under the oldest mouldiest conventions a man of native force prospers just as well as in the newest world, and that by skill of handling and treatment. He can take hold anywhere. Life itself is a mixture of power and form, and will not bear the least excess of either. (Second Series 59-60)

Here our poet reveals the importance of “art” as an inseparable tribute to the progress of human life. He begins with a simple assertion that the human being lives under “conventions” of two views: the old and new, through which he is apt to create his own poetic genius in order to sustain the “power and form” of “the true art of life” attached to this Principium of Individualism. Emerson, as an artist, wished that a work be part of knowledge about and knowledge by acquaintance. This is the basis for all conception of art on which
rests the grandeur and beauty of human life, and provides the knowledge of
the means through which human being expresses his own emotion: “Well,
souls never touch their objects. An innavigable sea washes with silent waves
between us and the things we aim at and converse with. Grief too will make
us idealists” (“Experience,” Second Series 48).

It is this point of view that led Emerson to ponder on the theory of the
fall and recovery of man in response to the death of both his wife Ellen and
son Waldo. “The advantage of the ideal theory over the popular faith is this,
that it presents the world in precisely that view which is most desirable to the
mind. It is, in fact, the view of Reason, both speculative and practical, that is,
philosophy and virtue, take,” Emerson writes in “Nature,” First Series (59-60).
Or as he adds in another passage: “Man is fallen; nature erects, and serves as
a differential thermometer, detecting the presence or absence of the divine
sentiment in man. By fault of our dullness and selfishness we are looking up to
nature, but when we are convalescent, nature will look up to us” (“Nature,”
Second Series 178). Furthermore Emerson observes that “[t]he perception of
real affinities between events (that is to say, of ideal affinities, for those only
are real), enables the poet [the self or higher self] to make free with the most
imposing forms and phenomena of the world, and to assert the predominance
of the soul. ... Its beauty is infinite” (“Nature,” First Series 54-55). While
Nietzsche would recognize in the Greek mind an attitude which he calls the
union of the Apollonian and Dionysian spirit, Emerson’s pessimist conception
of Principium Individualism of self leads him to a dream of beauty; as he writes in Nature: “Indeed, it is [within] the magical lights . . . [of] the Notch Mountains [that the boy] restores to him[self] the Dorian mythology, Apollo, Diana, and all divine hunters and huntresses. [Then] Can a musical note be so lofty, so haughtily beautiful!” (Second Series, 174-75).

In Philosophies of Art & Beauty: Selected Readings in Aesthetics from Plato to Heidegger, Albert Hofstadter and Richard Kuhns read Plotinus’ doctrine of multiplicity as “[t]he beautiful appearance of the dream-worlds, in creating which every man is a perfect artist, is the prerequisite of all plastic art ... [and] In our dreams we delight in the immediate apprehension of form; all forms speak to us; none are unimportant, none are superfluous” (499). The two critics go on to state that

... the Athenian poets of the fifth and fourth century B.C. were able to develop an art form which combined the Apollonian dream and the Dionysiac intoxication. Thus in the tragic drama the chorus of dancing satyrs discharges itself upon the stages in a series of dreamlike images of the God Dionysus. The conflict between the formal individuation of dream life and the blind merging of self into oneness of intoxication is resolved for a moment in the achievement of Attic tragedy. But the solution must be momentary; it breaks up into the simple blindness of music on the one hand, and the Doric rigidity of formal plastic art on the other. Apollo is in danger of becoming empty; Dionysus of becoming blind. But tragedy in its integration remains one of the greatest achievements of man. (497)

This passage clarifies a whole philosophical tradition that finds in Emerson an American seminal voice. Emerson’s self actually is an entity, a voice anchored on the primacy of the Classics. It demonstrates how classical mythos may be
alive in America. Besides it reminds that Emerson looked back to the classical world in search for moral and sentimental virtue, which he believed was missing in the country. Eventually he pointed out the impact of Greek civilization: “European civility is the triumph of talent, the extension of system, the sharpened understanding, adaptive skill, delight in forms, delight in manifestation, in comprehensible results. Pericles, Athens, Greece, had been working in this element with joy of genius not yet chilled by any foresight of the detriment of an excess” *(Representative Men 52)*.

Emerson’s Text offers a sensitive view of the romantic inflection in which “the artist succors his flagging spirits by opium or wine” (“Worship” 223), and under the dominion of divine intoxication, the poet’s self feels his identity with the entire universe. Hopefully in the joy he feels at such a discovery, he envisions that “[t]he divine bards are the friends of my [his] virtue, of my [his] intellect, of my [his] strength. They admonish me that the gleams which flash across my mind are not mine, but God’s; that they had the like, and were not disobedient to the heavenly vision” (“The Divinity School Address” 132). The self understands that art is the great consoler, and while decrying life for its cruelty, at the same time celebrates it for its beauty, since “[w]e learn that the highest [thought] is present to the soul of man; that the dread universal essence, which is not wisdom, or love, or beauty, or power, but all in one, and each entirely, is that for which all exist, and that by which they are; that spirit creates; that behind nature, spirit is present” (“Nature,” *First Series* 63-64).
This line of thought is enlightened in *Emerson: The Mind on Fire*, by Richardson, who offers an important exegesis when he states that “Emerson’s life and his reading while he worked on *Nature* show the book to be rooted in family life, formal logic Greek tragedy, and Asian classics. Most of all, *Nature* is a modern Stoic handbook, Marcus Aurelius in New England. It is also a modern version of Plato, an American version of Kant” (233). In this pattern of accord of spirits, in *Spires of Form: A Study of Emerson’s Aesthetic Theory*, Vivian C. Hopkins puts forward a sharp explanation of the relationship between creative experience and receptive experience of the poetic genius as a new reflection of the progressive development of consciousness’ self. Hopkins claims:

For Emerson, the culmination of the aesthetic, as of the creative experience, consists in the fusion of the observer’s soul with that of the Divine. As with the creative artist, ecstasy comes to the observer through subordination of the will; it is characterized by brief moments of vivid illumination; and it comes to the intuition, or to the emotions, rather than to the ratiocinative intellect. Emerson’s account of aesthetic enjoyment differs from that of the creative process, in giving a fuller analysis of psychological conditions; but he shows clearly that the receptive experience, in its culmination, shares the mystical quality of creation. (198)

Hopkins argument enhances an observation: If we seek to visualize this mystical creation in its totality, we must resort to some kind of schematic or geometric diagram, one that is more an attempt to reflection than a literal prescription. Our own diagram would consist of an obscure rectangular shape of symbolism in which Emerson’s theory of *each and all* is revealed. The world of imagination is not a mere mental form of the world in which we have our
daily experience, such as in the woods, though it resembles it in different ways and derives from it through a poetic transparent eyeball. It is the world of prescience or ontological splendor in which, as William James observes in *Principles of Psychology* lies “the empirical Self or Me” and man’s “widest possible sense, however, a man’s Self is the sum total of all that he CAN call his, not only his body and his psychic powers, but his clothes and his house, his wife and children, his ancestors and friends, his reputation and works, his lands and horses, and yacht and bank-account” (188). In this inclusive concept of life lies Emerson’s approach to Literature:

> Literature, poetry, science are the homage of man to this unfathomed secret, concerning which no sane man can affect an indifference or incuriosity. Nature is loved by what is best in us. It is loved as the city of God, although, or rather because there is no citizen. . . . And the beauty of nature must always seem unreal and mocking, until the landscape has human figures that are as good as itself. (*Nature, Second Series* 177-78)

Despite its romantic background Emerson’s approach ought to be understood also within a specific American intellectual tradition. In *The American Intellectual Tradition*, Hollinger and Capper have pointed out Jonathan Edwards’ position on the matter of religious affections which Emerson had read:

> There are some exercises of pleasedness or displeasedness, inclination or disinclination, wherein the soul is carried but a little beyond a state of perfect indifference. And there are other degrees above this, wherein the approbation or dislike, pleasedness or aversion, are stronger; wherein we may rise higher and higher, till the soul comes to act vigorously and sensibly, and the actings of the soul are with that strength that (through the laws of the union which the Creator has fixed between soul and body) the motion of the blood and
animal spirits begins to be sensibly altered; whence oftentimes arises some bodily sensation, especially about the heart and vitals, that are the fountain of the fluids of the body: from whence it comes to pass, that the mind, with regard to the exercises of this faculty, perhaps in all nations and ages, is called the heart. (71)

It is within this ability of prescience, ontological splendor, and spiritual potency of “animal spirits,” inciting new contemplation of souls that we attempt to ascertain what lies within a single work of art. At its core stands an internal conflict that leads to the necessity of distinguishing the representation of the world in a kind of visionary form. Our diagram unveils this contemplation of an apocalyptic vision by the active soul. There we may recognize Thomas Carlyle when he claims:

Of our Modern Metaphysics, accordingly, may not this already be said, that if they have produced no Affirmation, they have destroyed much Negation? It is a disease expelling a disease: the fire of Doubt, as above hinted, consuming away the Doubtful; that so the Certain come to light, and again lie visible on the surface. . . . Yet in that wide-spreading, deep-whirling vortex of Kantism, so soon metamorphosed into Fichteism, Schellingism, and then as Hegelism, and Cousinism, perhaps finally evaporated, is not this issue visible enough, that Pyrrhonism and Materialism, themselves necessary phenomena in European culture, have disappeared; and a Faith in Religion has again become possible and inevitable for the scientific mind. (Carlyle, Essays 40-41)

Carlyle demonstrates that man’s dilemma is a sort of undercurrent of his own freedom, of his own moral and intellectual turpitude in reconciling the phenomena which he observes with any possible hypothesis of the unseen phenomena. These arguments reveal the zeal and the sole of the romantic vigor through which the human being attempts to establish a perfect reasoning
and understanding of his design within two moral principles: Metaphysical and Divine Worlds. Man’s design, on one hand, vacillates between his own rationalistic, intellectualistic and idealistic traits. This design, on the other hand, it is linked to empiricist and materialistic facts. It is through these traits that man is apt to reconcile his conscientious feelings, affections and sentiments of virtue with the universe.

This universe provides manifest evidence that Emerson’s ideas are operative modes of things that bear an architectonic connection between subjective factor and objective factor. These, in turn, set forth the concept of transcendental philosophy in distinguishing these two majestic edifices of moral science: Metaphysical and Divine worlds. There lies the gist of human nature and the highest sense of the Principium of Individualism that gives place to the romantic spontaneous sentiment that elevates the soul’s full enthusiasm thus determining consciousness and unconsciousness activities.

This point affirms the existence of a hidden deep fact in the soul, which permeates her to oscillate between sentient imaginative material and sentient imaginative spiritual ideologies as we discuss in the ensuing chapter. This line of thought, we maintain, reflects the particularity of the age: the ground for attesting and revealing the distinction between the sensuous and super sensuous worlds. This ground reveals Emerson’s rationalistic and empiricist inferences in demonstrating a romantic tendency and his interest in both scientific and religious views. It is from this vein of thought that he naturally
looks for guidance in distinguishing the contrast between the intrinsic truth of nature and the apparent truth of culture: the existing differences between the eternal heart of things and the collective world of phenomena as we will discuss in the sub point, 3.2. The Metaphysical and Divine Worlds: Romantic-Scientific Ideologies.
3.2. The Metaphysical and Divine Worlds: Romantic-Scientific Ideologies

A work that aspires, however humbly, to the condition of art should carry its justification in every line. And art itself may be defined as a single-minded attempt to render the highest kind of justice to the visible universe, by bringing to light the truth, manifold and one, underlying its every aspects of matter, and in the facts of life what of each is fundamental, what is enduring and essential-their one illuminating thinker or the scientific, seeks the truth and makes his appeal. Impressed by the aspect of the world the thinker plunges into ideas, the scientist into facts-whence, presently, emerging they make their appeal to those qualities of our being that fit us best for the hazardous enterprise of living. (Joseph Conrad, Preface to 'Nigger of the Narcissus,' 2190)

The sciences, which are largely based on observations by the senses, are constantly changing, revising themselves, contradicting themselves, producing more and more numbers, charts, and computer printouts, and more and more experimentation with electrons and rats. (Lavine, From Socrates to Sartre: the Philosophic Quest, 2)

Here again we are impressed and even daunted by the immense Universe to be explored 'What we know is a ponit to what we do not know.' Open any recent journal of science, and weigh the problems suggested concerning Light, Heat, Electricity, Magnetism, Physiology, Geology, and judge whether the interest of natural science is likely to be exhausted. (Emerson, Nature, First Series, 39)

Although the two initial quotations refer to Conrad they show how relevant a certain Western philosophical tradition is: a philosophical tradition that finds in Emerson its most imaginative touchstone, in Arnold’s words. As we have been
showing, this tradition is built upon a specific cosmology that deals with sensible objects in a static or progressive arrangement in order to ascend from a particular to general viewpoints of this manifold world. They parallel Emerson’s Transcendentalist agenda to awaken all Americans to grow a nation which should depend on its genius, delicacy of sentiment, sense of honor and taste. They reflect the problem of the Naturphilosophie in which moral sentiment, or the romantic endeavor, brings, animates and illustrates the vital refinements of moral and intellectual steps in order to achieve the higher realm of natural laws during the 19th century.

These passages can be traced back to scientific theories of evolution of the manifold world along with the tendency to romanticize “the immense Universe” as an organic expression. It is in this line of thought that we have to inscribe and understand the debates on science and literature that, in Mott’s words, portray the “theological innovation and literary experiment arising within New England Unitarianism.” These had

a significant impact on later development in American religious, educational, literary, and political culture . . . [demonstrate the] assertions about the grounds of knowledge and the apprehension of truth—that is, to how we know reality. [How Transcendentalism reflects] a widespread belief in the dignity and potential of human nature, a desire for institutional reform to sweep away impediments to self-culture, and a call for freedom of creative expression.

(224)

In The Rites of Assent, Sacvan Bercovitch offers a rather relevant point when he states that the progress of the nation is linked with “the revivalist doctrine
of postmillennialism” (37). Thus emerges a dialogue with the Puritan colonial intellectual background. This critic goes on to inform us that already Edwards and his followers had an idea better suited to the Enlightenment and the New Science. [And that] they envisioned a continual increase of moral, spiritual, and material goods in this world-an age of sacred-secular wonders within history. They [Edwards and his followers] inherited the hope of supernatural things to come, and they altered this to mean an indefinite course of human progress. (37)

This instance illustrates Emerson’s metaphysical category of spontaneity and contingency of influences that reveal the impact of science, which is relatively given as an abstract expressionism of the artist for emotional interpretation. Emerson as poet and artist sought to search for an appropriate way to use the scientific language of the experienced: invisible and visible worlds as a new means of dealing with truth, or a way of seeing, thinking and to adopt a certain convention in order to portray the essence of the, Its Idea, or the world as it is. A few decades later Wallace Stevens, in line with Emerson, would approach the same issue with the famous line, “things as they are.”

This line of thought stresses Frederick J. E. Woodbridge’s observations, while discussing points of interesting views associated with this study. He warns the reader that the “form of connection or continuum which we call consciousness is thus distinguished by the fact that it makes knowledge possible, and this knowledge, so far as its content is concerned, and that is so far as it is knowledge of anything, is determined not by consciousness, but by something else” (311). Actually in 1824 Emerson had already noted that
“[m]etaphysicians are mortified to find how entirely the whole materials of understanding are derived from sense.” In his reflections on the problems of science, matter and mind, he had indicated that “[n]o man is understood who speculates on mind or character until he borrows the / emphatic / specific / imagery of Sense” (JMN, Vol. II. 224). This idea approached by Vernon Louis Parrington’s observations on Emerson’s concerns about the future of Man. In his Main Currents in American Thought, he notes that in order “to apply the test of spiritual values to material forces and mechanical philosophies of the times” (379), Emerson’s soul ought to search for “the systematic contemplation of nature which left so considerable a deposit in his mind” (Parrington 381).

This notion reflects the romantic ideology, since it confirms Emerson’s authenticity on the issue of man’s mind: as Emerson observed, within the “activity of mind” (JMN, Vol. II.194), there is “the strength & the wisdom, the power and majesty of all ages’ [in] [th] is Truth” (JMN, Vol. II. 194). Here we must bring Chai’s insights while discussing Emerson’s views between inner and outer facts: “The disparity between the different elements of thought that occurs when philosophy comes to an end results from an inability to apprehend the inner nature of such elements, to perceive the inner tendencies of development within these elements themselves” (Chai 288). This view not only forms part of romantic inflection, but also it is linked to Emerson’s deep interest in science as a means of inquiring into the “visions [of man and nature] … [in] which the heart embraces with rapture & the understanding commends … [of]
Material beauty ... Moral beauty” (*JMN*, Vol. II.220), and the “tenderness & beauty of association.” There lies the American zeitgeist, “the spontaneous offspring of the human nature under every sky [of] ... A Romantic Age” (*JMN*, Vol.II.194).

Emerson’s unveiling of the American mid-19th century Zeitgeist demonstrates his romantic relation to nature, and how moral his own vision of American is. Morals and politics, freedom and self-reliance thus merge in a single approach to the cosmos, this cosmos, the American cosmos:

> Who is he that shall control me? Why may not I act & speak & write & think with entire freedom? What am I to the Universe, or, the Universe, what is it to me? Who hath forged the chains of Wrong & Right, of Opinion & Custom? . . . Is Society my anointed King? Or is there any mightier community or any man or more than man, whose slave I am? ... I am solitary in the vast society of beings; I consort with species; I indulge no sympathies. I see the world, human, brute & inanimate nature; I am in the midst of them, but not of them; I hear the song of the storm, - the Winds & warring Elements sweep by me – but they mix not with my being. I see cities & nations & witness passions, - the roar of their laughter, - but I partake it not . . . I say to the Universe, Mighty one! ... Star by Star, world by world, system by system shall be crushed, - but I shall live. (*JMN*, Vol. II. 189-190)

These instances, we argue, offer not only a sharper appreciation of natural forms, but they also provide the basis of Emerson’s tendency to treat natural objects and human life as reflections of an ideal, of... Plato’s Idea. On the one hand, this notion demonstrates that Emerson was embarking on the crux of romantic nature communion that he inherited from Wordsworth and Shelley who, according to Bloom’s or Santayana’s observations, strongly influenced
him. On the other hand, they reflect Emerson’s theory of art and religion in a Platonic way in the sense that his soul takes a voyage into the universe and seeks, as Plato had already written, “the true beauty simple and divine,” or “that communion only, beholding beauty with the eye of the mind” (Symposium 167) that reside, as Emerson would write, in that “influx of the Divine mind into our mind,” which contemplates human soul “enthusiasm, ecstasy, trance, and inspiration” (Over-Soul 392-93).

Emerson’s affinities with Classic Western philosophy actually emerge in single instant of his Text, namely when he approaches the topic of the Ideal essence of the cosmos; an Ideal that would emerge in the American topics of the New Paradise, of the New (American) Adam. Emerson urges the reader to find this truth within him and outside him: “the universe becomes transparent, and the light of higher laws than its own shines through it. It is the standing problem which has exercised the wonder and the study of every fine genius since the world began; from the era of Egyptians and the Brahmins to that of Pythagoras, of Plato, of Bacon, of Leibnitz, of Swedenborg” (Nature, “Language” 34). This myriad of apparently conflicting notions of the soul, mind, art, nature and poetry acquaint us with Emerson’s notion of outer and inner worlds: an issue he introduces in Nature in his attempt to depict the self, or the individual as the fundamental entity of American culture, as he observes that “The sensual man confronts thoughts to things; the poet conforms things to his thoughts” (Nature, First Series, “Idealism” 52), or as he writes in another
passage: “I—this thought which is called I—is the mold into which the world is poured like melted wax” (“Transcendentalist” 335).

What most prompts us here is Emerson’s duplication of man’s relationship with visible and invisible worlds. Here lies Emerson’s own notion of self-reliance, an intellectual and emotional threshold that would provide the initial step for personal growth; a personal growth that would eventually solve the conflict between external nature and internal sphere. Emerson actually attempted to reconcile scientific understanding with man’s faith; in other words the dichotomy between Reason and Understanding.

In approaching this aspect, through another geometric figure, we wish to provide Emerson’s concern in the acts of reason and understanding, or the relationship between Metaphysical and Divine Ideologies. This geometry provides a visual representation (a picture) of higher moral standard in explaining the growth of scientific knowledge in the mid 19th century. Emerson obviously was aware of this issue. In the early 1830’s while reflecting on viewpoints linked to moral reasoning, mathematics, and the polarization of geometric science in the universe, Emerson wrote the following meditation in his Journal: “The Idea according to which the Universe is made is wholly wanting to us; is it not? Yet it may or will be found to be constructed on as harmonious & perfect a thought, self explaining, as a problem in geometry” (JMN, Vol. IV: 287-88).
In this passage lies the key to our methodological insight. This geometry speaks of Emerson’s state of mind in order to achieve moral and personal significance, or an intense conflicting of inwardness, which deals simultaneously with the external world. In this geometry, there is an immense reflection, intense meditation moments, between animate or inanimate elements, static versus dynamic facts, which altogether stress a new morality, a new perception of (American) nature. There lies the conflicting paradoxes that stand at the center of his thought: continuity and discontinuity, an inward and outward preoccupation in order to balance the organic theory of subject and object which is grounded in divine creativity.

Within this geometry there is an intimate agenda, an interior monologue which the subject (I) and the object (thing) seem to claim for their own existence. As Emerson had observed, within “Science & Art the one, All things brought into the mind; the other, the mind going into things” (JMN, Vol.V. 360), and “the true religion is God himself to the believer & maketh him a perfect lover of the whole world” (JMN, Vol.IV.364). Then, our geometric figure, as it unveils Emerson’s view of the world, indicates the following: Heaven infers the existence of God; Man contemplates the wonderful work of God’s hands, the creation of the universe.

The human being is thus placed between Metaphysical and Divine Worlds, in which the full history of moral science evidences two romantic properties as it is illustrated in our geometric figure: Reasoning and Understanding, or Divine
and Material facts. These viewpoints, which reflect the division between Nature and Art, are relevant because they became the bipolarities (and contrarieties in bridging the gap) between idealism and materialism. The Figure further provides an extended organic metaphor of our investigation allowing us to view (and review) pertinent aspects to an understanding of how metaphysical and divine thoughts became a problem in the mid 19th century in order to reconcile Christian revelation with intuitive sense of divine truth. Or as Laura Dassow Walls puts it in *Emerson’s Life in Science: The Culture of Truth* that:

> All objects in nature are part of a plan [geometric-figure- emphasizing ours], which the advancement of knowledge realizes. Mind, as it advances, expands and unites things long severed, restoring order to chaos. The name of this process is science, and the goal of science is to discover the purpose of nature. (71)

Thus, we claim that our plan or geometric figure presents an elaborative symbolic aspect of human existence, in which moral principle and the human mind simultaneously are the end and the aim of all the Divine and Material operations. This aspect stresses the result of two contrasting historical phenomenon to suggest *An Internal Conflict of the Soul*: on one hand, it refers to objectiveness, rationalism, materialism, and external morality; on the other hand, it is linked to the mystery of human life such as subjectivity, imagination, and sensibility of a deeply felt personal experience. All these signs enhance Romantic and Transcendentalist vigor that circulate through the universe and through the human being’s daily, ordinary life.
Franklin L. Baumer’s *Modern European Thought: Continuity and Change in Ideas, 1600-1950* provides a relevant example associated with aspects linked to the romantic geometric. This critic claims that: “The romantics, of whatever country, had a penchant for the mysterious and put a premium on individual feeling and expression” (269). Baumer further states: “The romantics thought that. . . . The geometric spirit, though metaphysical bold, tried to subject all life to reason, and thus to mechanize and demean it” (270-71). These aspects are relevant because they reveal the alternative romantic approach to use words. Language emerges as a memory and insight, a locus of historical practice (s) (hence the notion of *fossil mean of communication*) and an instrument of a personal choice. The geometric perception stands at the center of the whole process of choice; there lies the moral judgment and romantic discursive revolution. William Wordsworth [*geometry excursions linked to French Revolution*] in *The Prelude or Growth of a Poet’s Mind* already had observed that:

Diagrams drawn on paper are copies of ideas in the mind, and not liable to the uncertainty that words carry in their signification. An angle, circle, or square, drawn in lines, lies open to the view, and cannot be mistaken: it remains unchangeable, and may at leisure be considered and examined, and the demonstration be revised, and all the parts of it may be gone over more that once, without any danger of the least change in the ideas. (318-19)

Or in a poetic perception:

My heart to rural objects, day by day
How Nature, intervenient till this time
And secondary, now at length was sought
These passages highlight a line of thought, an idealistic and romantic perception emerging in England with and eventually culminating in the American bard. Both Wordsworth and Emerson looked at geometry as a romantic textual perception of reality that allowed them to experience new “ideas in the mind” of human being: human “heart” due to “geometric rules” becomes sensible “to rural objects.” Here it becomes clear that both writers lived a synthesis of reason and understanding. This means a sort of experience through which natural and spiritual objects, as Emerson would write in *The Journals and Miscellaneous Notebooks* that “are striking out a new path for their progress towards perfection” (Vol, XVI: 347).

Emerson’s strategy discourse can be unveiled in the following diagram:

![Fig. 2](image-url)
This diagram shows a geometrical spiritual and intellectual path; it illustrates how Emerson’s soul travels the universe of Intuition and Imagination of Metaphysical and Divine Worlds, and finally that of Classic and Romantic-scientific rational spirits of the 19th century. Hopefully it illustrates man’s place in the universe, man’s comprehensive philosophic vision as he keeps searching for eventual solutions within this Internal Conflict of the Soul. It reflects Emerson’s act of the mind, an illusion to the romantic spontaneity that should stand at the center of the dialogue between subject and object.

Death & Pain & Ruin may deal his bolts even within the circle of their own sympathies . . . [and that] All this passes in their minds, but they will not forsake for a day or an hour the dull unsatisfactory world to which their customs & feelings cling & which passes before them daily [24 hours] in an uniform & joyless reverie. (JMN, Vol. II.160)

Furthermore, “Historically,” Emerson informs us that “there is thought to be difference in the ideas which predominate over successive epochs, and there are data for making the genius of the Classic, of the Romantic, and now of the Reflective or Philosophical age” ("The American Scholar" 109).

By looking closely at our geometric figure, we conclude that it reflects what Emerson had already written in 1849 on man’s wisdom and life experience: “man [although he is vacillating between two scientific aspects: infinite/finite] has made great progress, & has come, as he fancies, to heights hitherto unscaled, the common words [that] still fit his thought … ‘Macrocosm,’ Reason, Conscience, Substance … Nature, Relation … Fate, Genius, Element,
Person” (JMN, Vol.XI.92). This geometric figure still evidences a dynamic existence of events, an ongoing struggle for existence, an ongoing growth of reasoning within the evolution of human thought. Emerson himself, while deepening on man’s mental function, related to the cognitive life of the human being, had informed us that “man’s fiery imagination [in the invention of art was] bearing any proportion as a picture of delight to the promises granted to Obedience,” (JMN, Vol.II.142), thus suggesting “this unity of thought in which every heart beats with nobler sense of power and duty, and things and acts with unusual solemnity” (“The Over-Soul” 277).

This solemnity not only becomes part of the radiance of the universe by creating a geometric bridge between art and science, but also it forms the highest expression of the “Element” that satisfies the universal grace, since it corresponds to the state of the human mind. “Person” stands in the will of God and waits to be known by all other men. For Emerson the concept of “Person” is tied up between the inner and outer events. “Genius” is the quality that distinguishes one human being from every other. “Relation” is linked to the sublime correspondence between visible and invisible things or human thought through Man is apt to connect his own thoughts with the outer world. “Fate” is associated with transcendental aspect through which human nature involves in satisfying and meliorating his own values, in a certain sense, because “Nature,” Emerson observes “is intricate, overlapped, interweaved and endless” (“Fate” 36). “Conscience” is associated with human mind, as a way
to identify itself in the natural and physical worlds as it explores new waves of thinking between matter and spirit. “Substance” is synonymous to progress and human nature fantasy: this is the occult truth that will unlock a new faculty of the human mind in order to explain the mystery of the universe. Through “Reason” the human being is apt to feel that everything can befall him in life: human nature finds itself between knowledge by acquaintance and knowledge about as a way to confront sensible acquaintance experience (intuition), on the one hand, and perceptions of changes associated with spiritual nature, on the other hand. These are the most significant features linked to the Romantic and Transcendentalist movements because “Everything,” in the universe, as Eric G. Wilson observes “is a geometrical form of infinite [and finite] motion [s]” (23).

In 1800, Hegel, already had put forward this aspect while elaborating on religious and social issues. According to the German philosopher, man “will not stop but will work into finer particulars, and from finer to finest” directions in order to acquire and understand “the blending of the Natural with the Spiritual” (The Philosophy of History 246). This topic would echo on Emerson’s observations on the sensibility of man’s heart, as he observes that: “The human soul, the world, the universe are labouring on to their magnificent consummation. ... The straining conceptions of man, the moments of his reason & the whole furniture of his faculties,” (JMN, Vol.II.46) [because] ... “human intellect [once] purified & sublimed shall mount from perfection to
perfection” the “knowledge & glory” (46) “for the rational philanthropist,” revealing “social feelings” (JMN, Vol.II.106). It is through this rational and social feeling that the notitia intuitiva of the Soul, in contrast with the body’s stimuli upon mental images, extends its own qualities into eternity in order to apprehend and experience the difference between visible and invisible worlds: the stream conscious and unconscious of human thought within Romanticism and Transcendentalism.

It is through this aspect that the Principium of Individualism along with natural science is intellectualized into laws of thought and intuition. The problematic issue between objective and subjective factor is thus translated into a new process of style and theory within human intellect through which the individual is able to explain his existence. In Emerson’s Theories of Literary Expression, Emerson Grant Sutcliffe, while reflecting on words used in our geometric figure reminds that “[s]uch words are philosophical or sacred in import; they are expressions of the common sense of making regarding its knowledge of the Over-Soul” (38) existence. Sutcliffe’s ideas concerning individual relationship with the universe help us understand Emerson’s view of human existence within this Principium of Individualism. In this light, we consider Emerson as a romantic poet who used those terms successfully with complexities inherent to mid-19th century.

From these perspectives, and in line with Emerson thought, we claim that higher knowledge generates eternal truths. Truths however are linked to
an intuition. Intuition teaches us ethical judgments for every expression of human culture, as a crucial fact of universal symbolism. Here we argue that the essential revolution in the expression of human culture and scientific thought can be traced back to the epistemological rupture that took place in Modern Age. However great the impact or change might have been in our time, the ancient philosophical heritage still constitutes the tenets of the general mental moods that echo in Emerson’s Text. In this line of thought we claim that Emerson’s idealism reflects blending of ordinary daily signs and divine forces. It is through this notion that we claim that Emerson’s philosophy of science is connected with Plato’s Idealism. The Sage of Concord actually protests against the contemporary detachment of the physical from the spiritual: “It appears that motion, poetry, physical and intellectual science, and religion, all tend to affect our convictions of the reality of the external world” (Nature, “Idealism” 59). This notion actually reflects a tribute to Plato; as he observes in another instant of his Text, his book Representative Men: that “He [Plato] is a great average of man; one who, to the best thinking, adds a proportion and equality in his faculties, so that men see in him their own dreams and glimpses made availed and made to pass for what they are” (Representative Men 61). Or as he further states in another instant of his Text, his Journal: “He [Plato] represents the privilege of the human mind, the power of ascending to new platforms with every subject, & so giving to every subject an expansion” (JMN, Vol.XI.148).
Although these ideas stress that Emerson’s textual diversity, and Plato’s echoes in his Transcendentalism, we argue that there are other relevant other influences on our poet, namely, as mentioned above his Aunt’s Mary Moody Emerson. These voices helped him to surpass what he thought to be America’s main concern at the time: and from very serious thinkers before him and from his own time: how to build a bridge between God and Man. Here also lay the fundamental antagonism between science and religion, in other words, the hiatus between the Divine Faith and the Discovery of Science. This thought might be of interest to us as we bring into our study Michel Foucault’s views on scientific discourse because he discusses the problem between power and knowledge as signs of universal endeavor.

Foucault’s Mathesis and ‘Taxinomia’ theory of representing a general concept of signs in different arrangements constitutes an innovative vector for this work. As he observes in *The Order of Things*: ”Nature and human nature within the general configuration of the episteme, permit the reconciliation of resemblance and imagination that provides a foundation for, and makes possible, all the empirical sciences of order” (71). This viewpoint, we argue, contributes to the analysis of the human mind as a fundamental component in discussing the antithetical forces of Materialism and Spirituality. Foucault’s views of facts are also connected with Woodbridge’s discussions on the differences between conscious/unconscious perceptions. Woodbridge states that
ideas which represent things, or phenomena which represent noumena, or things in the body which represent things outside, or states of consciousness which represent an external world. It is each other that they represent, as bread represents nourishment. Because of such representation, all our knowledge is built up; . . . [and therefore] all science deals solely with the systematization of this representative value of the things with which it is concerned. (310)

Woodbridge focuses on the intricate interaction between outer and inner apprehensions revealing the human dialogue with the universe, between microcosm and cosmos, within the scope of spontaneous and voluntary meanings. The phenomenon that represents noumena is an issue that has been discussed from Renaissance to modern times as we have already shown. It is through this division between God and Art, or between Thought and Being as well as between Heaven and Earth, as expressions of Man’s life experience that the Soul attempts to harmonize and encompass the tensions, the contrarieties and the paradoxes of the human Internal Conflict of the Soul in order to achieve the necessary stillness and calmness: possibly, as it were the triumph of Romanticism. But this notion had been already verbalized in 1816, in Coleridge’s “Kubla Khan”:

Through wood and dale the sacred river ran,
Then reached the caverns measureless to man,
And sank in tumult to a lifeless ocean:
And ’mid this tumult Kubla heard from far
Ancestral voices prophesying war!
The shadow of the dome of pleasure
Floated midway on the waves:
Where was heard the mingled measure
This complex mode of presenting the dichotomy between the psyche and the outer elements is typically romantic. It reflects a moral and personal expression of an intense inwardness of language through which a meditative observation between Thought and Will demonstrates an unsettling conceptual issue: the link between the active mind and ancestral voices. Coleridge ponders on the divine life as an essential part of an expression of the great unity. This instance is a sort of museum in which the human psyche is essentially linked to romantic cosmological speculations of “wood, river, ocean, voices, waves and caves.” These signs introduce values into a poetic construction since they ascribe moral significance, pertaining to the author’s moral intention.

Here we must bring into our study Harold Bloom’s observations while arguing Wordsworth’s and Shelley’s controversies on poetry, which Emerson had read. In The Best Poems of the English Language: from Chaucer through Frost, Bloom points out that nature for Wordsworth is a realm linked to imagination; nature outshines imagination; nature offers her cup of communion. In Shelley’s poetry there are three mythic inventive and provocative realms of light as reads: poetry (the stars), nature (the sun), life (the chariot’s glare) (439). This romantic perspective, we argue, plays an interesting point in discussing Figure 2.
If we look at our geometric figure, we observe that it also displays natural elements: *Element, Person, Genius, Relation, Fate, Conscience, Substance, Macrososm and Reason* (objects) and Senses are products of natural resources, products of the triumph of life. They are linked, in certain sense, to Transcendentalism because they are part of the evolution of the human value in the search for the divine and in History. They are strongly tied up with human consciousness, with material and spirituality agendas because in the mind of human nature there lies the *Internal Conflict of the Soul* through which one attempts to explore the relationship between physical and abstract notions.

While discussing romantic morality we must bear in mind that it reflects the tension and conflict between object and subject: the only discursive path that we can understand how the *Principium of Individualism* operates on the realm of the Imagination. Emerson meditated on this issue in his Journal. For him it meant: “a discourse upon Revelation as standing in comparison with Nature . . . conveying with the utmost distinctness, [of meanings in order] to teach men the great doctrines . . . of infinite extent & complicate relations [of things] to be measured by the eye & understanding of man” (*JMN*, Vol.II.161). Emerson’s meditation actually echoes Hegel’s views on oddities of subjectivism and objectivism related with moral precept. This precept advocates ethical skepticism in the sense that it explores the romantic
absurdity of the soul that “lies between reason as self-conscious mind and reason as an actual world before our eyes,” (Philosophy of Right 7).

In their study on modern art, Modern Art: Painting, Sculpture, Architecture, Sam Hunter and John Jacobus show that within nature there are “a series of discoveries in science [that] revolutionized the conception of the structure of the universe ... [in which] ‘All things become flimsy, with no strength or certainty.’ [Suggesting] allowances for romantic exaggeration . . . on artistic sensibilities (10) in that the poet looks at the universe as an object of delight, grandeur, beauty, and unity of his own imagination.

In adopting this view, we are in a position to proclaim that our geometric figure might also be traced back to the writers and philosophers of the German Romantic Movement - Kant, Schelling, and Goethe, due to their influence on Emerson

who were all agreed that art must be autonomous. [Emphasis mine-points of view of Principium of Individualism: Self-Reliance]. Kant stressed the ‘pure’ and disinterested existence of the work of art . . . Goethe, the work of art as an independent organism; and Schelling, the work of art as a unique revelation of the universal in the particular. In England, these ideas, at least in part, were diffused by Coleridge and Carlyle; in America [obviously] by Emerson and Poe; in France, by such enthusiasts for German culture as Mme de Stael, Victor Cousin, and his disciple Theophile Jouffroy. (6)

This comment highlights the influences that shaped Emerson’s skepticism on Metaphysical speculations via Europe, essentially of Kant, Schelling and Fichte, of Coleridge and Carlyle as well as of Victor Cousin and Mme de Stäel. If, as Emerson in his Journal, “in a vague sense, history may be said to
comprise also all the store of Natural knowledge” (*JMN*, Vol.II.242-43) certain voices definitely contributed to the shaping of his own voice; as writes in *Representative Men* that “Other men are lenses through which we read our minds. Each man seeks those of different quality from his own, and such as are good of their kind” (5). In his Transcendentalist attitude Emerson sought to search for teleological explanations about man, nature and God. He stepped forward in search for truth, while drawing an observation on Science and Religion as reads that:

> The mixture of the body & soul [which] is [connected with] the great wonder in the world, and our familiarity with this, puts at ease with all that is unaccountable in our condition. Providence, no doubt, scrupulously observes the proportions of this mixture, and requires for the soundness of both, a fixed equilibrium. . . . [the proportions of this mixture reflect] Those passages & conduits of thought, of divine construction, through which, God intended, that the streams of intellect should flow in various directions . . . of the Universe & the inheritor of glory has become the caterer & the pander of Sense. (*JMN*, Vol II. 97)

This meditation shows how relevant was for him the mystical pantheism of religious experience in which the soul and the body are interconnected. This fusion creates an enthusiasm that is caused by God’s transcendence. It identifies with the hylomorphic fashion in affirming that matter (body) senses the imposition of an extrinsic activity; and, conversely, the soul senses a feeling that involves it along with an original relation to the universe. In following this perspective, we argue, Emerson had anticipated new principles of natural evolution in which human beings would not just function as entities
linked to Science, but also as entities that distance themselves from the domains of materialism.

This tension between the extrinsic and intrinsic envisions a scenario that would echo in Carl Jung’s theoretical approach to the visible and invisible worlds. The Swiss philosopher, while discussing the processes of “thinking and feeling, sensation and intuition” as traits of “rational” and “irrational functions” of man’s Principium of Individualism states that within the human being there lie two selves: one linked to everyday life, and the other which is associated with divine power. In this light, he observes that man is “a profound mystery, a secret resource, or a manifestation of the God within” (45). Jung’s notion goes back to Emerson’s fundamental romantic dilemma between reality and illusion that he envisioned within the law of compensation: “[in] Nature & Literature [there is a] prove [of] subjective phenomena. . . . There is an optical illusion about every person we see. In reality they are all creatures of given temperament which will appear in a given character whose boundaries they will never pass” (JMN, Vol.VII.464). Or as he had written some time before: “I am an aggregate of infinitesimal parts & that every minutest streamlet that has flowed to me is represented in that man which I am, so that if every one should claim his part in me I should be instantaneously diffused through the creation & individually decease, then I say if am but an alms of All” (JMN, Vol.IV.351).
These passages demonstrate an emotive cognition of the romantic dilemma between consciousness and unconsciousness. While discussing “the fusion of Classicism and Romanticism into a new progressive literature” (15) Behler and Struck frame this dilemma within “the dynamism of the Ego … [the] metamorphosis of the Idealistic movement, the pantheistic doctrine of self-creating,” (Behler and Struck 7). We must trace this reading back to Jung’s arguments on the “balance between opposing propensities, while at the same time, seeking its own growth and development,” (Stevens 54).

We must remind the reader how central in Emerson’s Text the primacy of the spiritual endeavor was. We must not forget that for him metaphysics is a methodological tool that helps the self in dealing with the outer world, with the macrocosm, and, hopefully, with the cosmos. This idea stresses the notion that human personality cannot be separated from this dualism: Infinite and Finite. That is, the human being is a lens formed by the shadow of God. Although divine power and human creativity are both separate, they are, somehow, altogether. This observation links us back to Matthiessen’s arguments which arose while discussing Coleridge’s organic principle, whose moral principle is associated with Emerson’s work. In American Renaissance: Art and Expression in the Age of Emerson and Whitman, this critic has pointed out that

[Emerson] maintained that since the universal mind is the sole creator of both the useful and the beautiful, the only way for the individual to partake in the creative act is by submitting himself entirely to this primal source beyond the
understanding. . . [Is] losing himself in his vaguely luminous doctrine of divine inspiration . . . [and that] the broad hints that material nature has given to the receptive mind and eye of the artist . . . springs from man’s response to forms in nature. (135)

This assertion shows how the growth of genius takes place within Emerson’s soul. It reveals that Emerson knew how to voice skepticism, implying the great motives of science as the language that should touch the eye of the artist. Besides, it reflects the New England Puritan mind whose radical relationship between mind and body, the dualism of immaterial soul and material body, helps building the specificity of the American Romantic approach; a complex issue linked to mid 19th century ethos. It forms part of the Romantic approach: a complex issue linked to the mid nineteenth century. Emerson believed that the soul was an animated force of his own being, and therefore he insisted upon a direct and immediate apprehension of spiritual force; as he observes in Nature that “The stars awaken a certain reverence, because though always present, they are inaccessible; but all natural objects make a kindred impression, when the mind is open to their influence” (First Series 7). In this light, we must bring into our study Harold Bloom’s arguments on nature as linked to antithetical subliminal concepts.

In Kabbalah and Criticism, Bloom writes that “Nature, to Romanticism, is a vast trope, and is by synecdoche a part that the so-called Imagination must complete” (102). The American critic goes on to state: “Over representation demanded hyperbole and transumption, and hyperbolical and
transumptive thinking [like that of Emerson’s that] moves us into areas beyond the traditional Western balancing of microcosm and macrocosm” (Idem). This idiosyncratic aspect offers a metaphysical apprehension on nature which merges with the absolute Truth. Then the human being is essentially in everyone or everywhere. This idea is a Romantic Scientific mode in which the soul takes, we repeat, a voyage through the universe in order to access and transcend human sentiment of virtue within the dualism of Metaphysical and Divine Worlds.

It is in this vein of thought that we bring Emerson’s observations on transmigrations. In “Compensation,” Emerson informed that: “the soul strives a man to live and work through all things. It would be the only fact. All things shall be added into I - power, pleasure, knowledge, beauty” (105). Although in this passage there is a deepest romantic appeal and an association of natural and transcendental approaches, its content is rather controversial since it shows how the Romantic writers could survive within bounds of obscurity and of fantastic passion. This notion reflects the legitimate function of the poet, according to which, the soul, while expounding through the universe, apprehends the vast splendor of continuity and discontinuity among objects.

In supporting this controversial statement we summon Chai’s views on Romanticism. While discussing Romantic disparities linked to Emerson’s Transcendentalism, Chai observes that “Romanticism ... should seek to
internalize the principle of its opposite within itself ... [and that] within the Romantic mode of thought, this opposite [which] can then act as a force that produces its own opposite (that is, the properly Romantic attitude or concept)” (376).

Pertaining to geometric Figure 3, we draw a sharp dichotomy between Past and Present since the former retraces and retraces back Emerson’s teleological views for his admiration and awareness to the Puritan Past. Then faith was to survive in this world. The latter relies on views of modern philosophy, according to which the human being searches for a new progressive path in order to invent and construct a new aesthetic sublime within his Internal Conflict of the Soul; as Emerson observes, “the plea of poetic and human conservatism ... [as] the truest love for everything old ... and a genuine respect for the basis of truth in those whom he exposes” (Natural History of Intellect 385). In this vein, we argue that although Emerson and Jung lived in different moments of our historical modernity, they nevertheless share affinities on the issue of the self and in its relationship with the universe.

Here we must raise a question: Was Romanticism opening and reopening new avenues in order to solve the dualism between outer and inner worlds? Jung’s theoretical concept on Reason, echoing Emerson’s dualistic vision of the world, is a point of reflection on Chai’s observations on the bipolarity of Emerson’s “act of seeing and the thing seen, the subject and
object become[ing] one in the moment of apprehension, the coming-intoexistence of external things through consciousness belongs in part to our consciousness as well” (189). This emphasis on the consciousness and unconsciousness of ordinary experience reflects a conventional wisdom since it asserts a relevant emphasis in decision-making. It is a decisive attribute either of success or of failure endeavors in the *Internal Conflict of the Soul*: by raising better judgments for the most immediate impulses and awareness between the principles of consciousness and unconsciousness. This was the task of modern philosophy as Emerson had observed. It looks to discover the unity of art and science in order to create a new world in which the human being mind would romanticize the universe as follows:
This spectrum is a hypothesis of mapping out the cosmogonic dilemma between reasoning and understanding in which Emerson’s Ambiguity of self appears to be associated with scientific limits and impossibilities. It reveals the whole outlook of Emerson’s doubting faith, belief and disbelief; his troubled convictions; and his fluctuating commitments in search for a romantic organic principle in which correlations among consciousness and unconsciousness, sensation and feeling, shadow and intuition, as social and scientific forces could be a promising hypothesis. Here relies the dualism that divides the Metaphysical and Divine Worlds.

In geometric Figure 3 the intellectual mind is sharply reflected in the relationship between extroversion and introversion. In these grounds, this geometric figure expands a scope or a dialogue between “Introversion and Extraversion” in which the tensions that arose from this dynamic and static relationship stress a new interplay of rational and irrational impulses between individual psychology and social patterns.

We contend that Emerson’s views on the issues of the outer and inner worlds would be reflected in Carl Jung’s arguments within two functions: “An extraverted thinking-sensation” and “an introverted-intuitive shadow” (Stevens 70). This notion reflects a spectrum of romantic vigor according to which the human being acts in time and space with his own belief, with the Eternal Unity as a hidden unity of his own deeds; or, as Emerson had already observed: “the use of the outer creation ... give[s] us language for the beings
and changes of the inward creation” (Nature, First Series, 25). This is the reason why Furst felt compelled to discuss paradoxes linked to Emerson’s romantic fluxes and refluxes about the world. This critic reminds the “continuing tension between the maintenance of the work’s fictionality and the breaking of the illusion” 135), which constitutes the literary mainstream, and which deals with the most enigmatic problem of the universe.

While pondering on this intellectual process, we must summon fragments of Emerson’s Text that illustrates how he emphasizes the relation between Thought and Action. We start by quoting from “Intellect” where he describes the first stages of this process, a celebration of inwardness: “Our thinking is a pious reception” from which we are “introverted [to our] self-tormentor’s life” (“Intellect” 328). In “The Transcendentalist,” while discussing the contrast between Materialists and Idealists, he adds a very important element, thinking as a way of elevation: “These two modes of thinking are both natural, but the idealist contends that his way of thinking is in higher nature” (“The Transcendentalist” 329-30). While pondering on occult and morals principles of the soul, he informs the reader that: “The idealist takes his departure from his consciousness, and reckons the world an appearance” (“The Transcendentalist” 332-33) in the sense that “[t]hinking is the function” (“The American Scholar” 99) of the divine self, eg, thinking follows the Kantian notion of action, thus ascribing the Philosopher a special status in the society.
In *The Emerson Effect: Individualism and Submission in America*, Christopher Newfield pays attention to the problem of thought and will. He claims that the “individuality lives in thought and will, properly appreciated only by the transcendentalist who puts individual Reason before all other things” (18). This aspect sustains Emerson’s view on *Principium of Individualism* to believe in man’s potential in search for his own maximum: that necessary wholeness that springs from his own knowledge by acquaintance and knowledge about — the realization of unity and harmony in the self or disunity and disharmony in the self.

It is at this point in the evolution of his ideas on consciousness that Emerson discusses *Intuition*, or the power of creative process. “The extraordinary profoundness and precision of that man’s thinking have given vogue to his nomenclature, in Europe and America, to that extent that whatever belongs to the class of intuitive thought is popularly called at the present day *Transcendental*” (“The Transcendentalist” 340). In his essay “Over-Soul,” while reasoning on the distinction between teachers and poets, philosophers and talkers, Emerson proclaims that in “the infinitude of his thought, [there] is that one class [that] speak[s] from within, or from experience ... and the other class from without” (287). This distinction allows him to reflect on the bipolarity of introversion and extroversion of the human soul; “Man Thinking,” he informs in “The American Scholar,” is “the parrot of other men’s thinking” (84). Finally, on *Sensation*, as Emerson’s soul catches
sight in contemplating the outer world, he stresses “the senses and the unrenewed understanding, belong [to] a sort of instinctive belief in the absolute existence of nature” (Nature, “Idealism” 49). So then, he speaks of shadow as something associated with “Sensible objects” (Nature, First Series 40) in order to link man to “a subtile spiritual connection” (Nature, “Idealism” 52) with the external world.

Here we must raise a question: what is the difference between Feeling and Sensation? We maintain that there is a parallel ambiguity between these two terms. Feeling and sensation are revealed within man’s own sensibility or experience along with his own relationship with the visible and invisible phenomenon. Feeling and Sensation are signs linked to poetic genius since they function within this same poetic genius as corollary of intuitive expressions to obscure emotions.

Having reached this stage we suggest an argument that hopefully will lead us to a new moment in our work: If these two operative modes of Romantic sensibility do share some affinities within poetic genius, then, it is within these same affinities that all aesthetic production of poetic genius do contradict themselves. Thus, as these modes are part of the Romantic intellectual intuition in order to distinguish the dichotomy between infinite and finite, there is aroused a considerable hostility in establishing a network between Metaphysical and Divine Worlds.
Closer notions to these standpoints are Haskell E. Bernstein’s and Isaiah Berlin’s observations while discussing the issues of feeling and sensation. In his *Being Human: the Art of Feeling Alive*, Bernstein illustrates, with great sensibility, how the notions of sensation and feeling are part of the human being’s life experience. In his arguments he points out “that sensation comes from outside and that feelings come from within. We all experience a multitude of body sensations, subjective experiences of body parts and functions that arise wholly within the body and that do not, thereby, become classified as feelings” (32). In *The Age of Enlightenment: the Eighteenth Century Philosopher*, Berlin has claimed that the problem of feelings and sensations are components associated with knowledge in the sense that: “The world consists of thought, feelings, sensations-‘ideas’ in the minds of agents, of God, and his creatures, men” (22). Feeling and sensation, Berlin observes, as one unity reveals “a consistent empiricism with regard to the material world with belief in the reality of spiritual substances-eternal souls or spirits-active beings” (Idem). All of these aspects convey not only flux and influx between the relationship extroversion and intraversion, or the gulf between physiology and the science of mind, but also they project moving images and feelings that are conceptualized within human’s consciousness. Sensation and feeling emerge then as fossil language crucial to romantic poetics.

In 1836, Emerson had already proclaimed that feeling and sensation were radically linked “the heart to express emotion, the head to denote
thought.” Thus “[t]he poet, the painter, the sculptor, the musician, the architect, seek each to concentrate this radiance of the world on one point, and each in his several work to satisfy the love of beauty which stimulates him to produce” (“Nature,” First Series, 24) internal and external facts within this Internal Conflict of the Soul. Weiskel revisited this aspect while pondering on the romantic sublime:

The metaphorical moment of the [romantic] sublime would be understood as an internalization or sublimation of the imagination’s relation to the object . . . [it] would be duplicated as an inner structure, so that in the sublime moment the mind would discover or posit an indefinable (ungraspable) domain within. (23)

In this light, we maintain that traits of irrationality [we use the term in a good sense-belief in instinct or other nonrational forces rather than reason] and Romanticism are apparent in this picture as well as in Emerson’s work; we are informed of many Romantic associative mechanisms, sensational paragraphs, giving, pantheistically, free rein to the soul as she crosses a bare common in order to achieve a perfect exhilaration, in a certain sense, because in man’s heart there is “a secret greatness inheres in his soul” (JMN, Vol.II.284); there exists “the harmony of the centrifugal and centripetal forces,” (“Nature,” Second Series 184), or as he observes in a different passage that there is the “reflection and echo of the triumph that has passed by and is now at its glancing splendor and heyday, perchance in the neighboring fields, or, if you stand in the field, then in the adjacent woods” (“Nature,” Second Series 192).
These are relevant details associated with the triumph of the Romantic sublime in the sense that they are forces within human being and with his relationship with Nature and God. Within these details there is an intuition-expression communication among the forces of reality and forces of spirituality in which the soul, while contemplating the mystery and the creation of the world, elaborates her own art within her intuition-expression in order to create other creations such as: passions, feelings, sensations, hedonism, aesthetic values or morals as part of the design of universal truth. But within this creation there is a vacuum, a space between art and nature, or a poetic continuity and discontinuity, which sharply demarcates the effervescent Emerson of Nature and self-reliance from romantic imagination to metaphysical imagination. This is, of course, a Romantic approach in the sense that between immaterial and material worlds there is an “exoticism” (Eichner 50), which interacts dynamically and reciprocally with the worlds of reality and illusion. These notions describe the conscious and the unconscious modes of the Romantic approach, in a certain sense, because, as positive and negative paradigms, they operate within our geometry in tracing the problematic issue of discovery in conjunction with religious aspects from ancient times to the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries and the beginnings of the nineteenth century. This point of view reflects an interplay act that leads us to reflect on Emerson’s Transcendentalism: a philosophy that relies on the natural world and its relationship to humanity, in which all forms of being —
God, nature, and man — are spiritually connected through a shared universal Over-Soul, as Emerson observes, paradoxically, that: “If . . . the world is not a dualism, is not a bipolar Unity, but is two, is Me and It, then is there the Alien, the Unknown, and all we have believed & chanted out of our deep instinctive hope is a pretty dream” (JMN, Vol.VII.200).

Perhaps and for the same reason, in his *Varieties of Religious Experience*, William James had reflected on the problem of human life, or on the issue between subject-object as a way to demonstrate how the secret bond which connects the human spirit is in relation to human experience. James had observed that “The sentiment of reality . . . so strongly to our object of belief [suggests] that our whole life is polarized through and through . . . by its sense of the existence of the thing believed in . . . for the purpose of definite description . . . to our mind at all” (57). This notion is essentially linked to our diagram, in a certain sense, because it relates to Emerson’s soul in conflict in searches, as Kant had already pointed out in 1764, for “the sublimity and majesty of creation” (*Philosophies of Art and Beauty* 319) of “an aesthetical idea . . . [of an] Imagination . . . in creating another nature, as it were, out of the material that actual nature gives it. . . . [in which] . . . The poet ventures to realize to sense, rational ideas of invisible beings . . . [by seeking] fully adequate internal intuitions” (*Philosophies of Art and Beauty* 318). It demonstrates “la vérité universelle toute prise sur l’individu” and “la source du scepticisme moderne, de l’indifférence en matière de religion”
(Moreau 123). This is, of course, a Romantic inflection in the sense that it reflects a scientific vision, or as Cavell observes in *The Claim of Reason*, of “The progressive dissociation of spirit and nature (hence the possible disappearing of both) . . . [the] process of the progressive internalization and externalization of human interests. The guiding thought [to inform] some progressing bilateralization of human, entailing some further fearful symmetries,” (472). Our geometry (Fig.3) is linked to the Romantic approach in the sense that it demonstrates a scientific activity of the poetic struggle of a self-sustaining, self-generating activity in a reciprocal activity between “Introversion and Extraversion” in which the human soul is nourished by the splendor and mystery of the universe and returns to nature, which is a source of inspiration and wisdom in freeing the artist from the constraints and rules of society. In this view, the artist’s soul seeks to find the Eternal Absolute, the Ideal in the fields of the Metaphysical and Divine Worlds.

In this search, the individual sees himself at the center of the universe, at the center of all forces of nature, at the center of his own art in order to make his own art [see our Figure] a valuable instrument in expressing his own feelings, sensations, belief, disbelief, death, love, suffering, intuition and beauty as vital elements of human design in portraying his own religious experiences. This, Bercovich stresses in *Rights*, reflects the “tendency of the age toward what we have come to term individualism in Eighteenth-century America [that] offered brave new ideas for private enterprise, provided higher
incentives for self-assertion, and fortified self-interest with a new theological and philosophical rational for self-love” (35-36). This line of thought finds its most extension in *The Cipher of the World*, in which John Michael’s claims while discussing romantic *optative moods* linked to *Emerson’s Ambiguity of the Self*, that “an optimistic [and pessimistic] affirmation of the moral law within him [Emerson] [is] but a continuation of skeptical doubts that called into question the status of that law and of his identity” (57). It suggests, as Cassirer has pointed out in *The Philosophy of Enlightenment*, the Romantic motive “assures us of the presence of the infinite and teaches us to place it within measure and bound, not in order to limit its realm but in order to know it in its all-comprehensive and all-pervasive law” (38). Finally, it describes as Braun has indicated in *La Crise de L’Humanisme*, the “valeurs spirituelles auxquelles l’humanité aspire, [et au dedans des ces valeurs] il y a la grande lutte du bien et du mal dans laquelle elle [l’humanité] prend parti, et, au terme de l’évolution, on entrevoit un Dieu juste et bon” (36).

It may be said that these perspectives are to be found in Emerson’s descriptions of Transcendentalism-Romanticism aspects: as two philosophical viewpoints in which the value of the individual, the value of the romantic view of nature as a source of knowledge is deeply associated with the implications of Metaphysical and Spiritual aspects within this *Internal Conflict of the Soul* from which the Sage of Concord had already informed the reader that the romantic
Fear [that] damps the warmth of passions and affections, of fancy & pride; how it [Religion] quells in a moment the strength of habits which were rooted with life, and, in fine, how that fear marches on with portentous rapidity, as if to anticipate the speed of Death. (*JMN*, Vol. II: 12)

Or this, to reveal that

God has peopled it [the Universe] with images of himself, and kindred within them the light of his own understanding- a portion of that ray which illuminates as it formed the Creation. He has communicated to them an intelligence by which they [men] are able to see . . . all those communications which in past or future time he is pleased to make; . . . There are about and amidst them [communications] a thousand beautiful forms with a thousand different properties; there are hills and waters, trees and flowers, the living forms of nature and the stars of the firmament; . . . [there is] that living spirit which opens the eyes of man and without which the Universe is as if it were not, and the glory of Deity is darkness. . . . In fine, it is an intelligence which reveals to man another condition of existence and a nearer approach to the Supreme Being. This Intelligence is *Reason*. (*JMN*, Vol. II. 14)

These quotations demonstrate Emerson’s soul in search for a Romantic vigor in dealing with the working of the world-soul through individual man. This notion illustrates man’s mental activity to contemplate poetic imagination as an ultimate fulfillment of the spiritual need of the soul. This idea demonstrates a contemplative activity of the functions of feeling and intuitive representations of the soul in search for an interpretation why things exist as Emerson wished. Thus, the key to unlock the symmetry between Reason-Understanding was Emerson’s convictions and considerations of religious issues to satisfy the great demands of spiritual desire. These demands suggest the Transcendental or Romantic motives of his writings and his insistence upon man’s spirituality, divinity and the idea of God in his attempt in defining *Beauty, Suffering, Love,*
as we have already discussed. These features are among the most crucial themes of Romanticism, reflecting the enduring legacy of natural and internal boundaries of the age. These elements, we maintain, are in accordance with the manifestations of divinity and natural laws in the sense that they interfere within man’s moral sentiment of virtue: the highest law in the spiritual world. Again, these components are the claims which are associated with romantic discourse through which the human being flings himself on the natural and permanent function of things. The human being, as an organic agent, or a beholder of the real depth of his own reverence, is apt to deal with the material world and the world of appearance, in which the whole of the world and even God are ultimate realities. These facts are parts or sources of the crisis of the romantic period in the sense that they assert and demonstrate an antithesis between two fundamental concepts of arts: the classical against romanticism or romanticism against classical. This duality leads us to consider that art is not only an expression of earthly life, but it is also part of transcendence of life by revealing the contemplation of infinite and universal truths. This is part of the romantic endeavor because the task in constructing and reconstructing poetic creation presupposes and advocates an aesthetic creation of this *Internal Conflict of the Soul*. This notion is a leading dualism to reflect either transcendence or agnosticism in order to demonstrate a romantic and philosophical unsolved problem of the inner and outer matters in which the soul as the only body finds its artistic expressions within these
inextricable romantic features: *Beauty, Love, Suffering, and Immortality* as we discuss in the ensuing chapter.
Chapter Four

Emerson’s Quest for Romantic Truth: Beauty, Love, Suffering and Immortality.

There is not in the whole wide Universe of God (my relations to Himself I do not understand) one being to whom I am attached with warm & entire devotion,- not a being to whom I have joined fate for weal or wo, not one whose interests I have nearly & dearly at heart:- and this I say at most susceptible age of man. (JMN, Vol.I.39, 134)

God gave man Senses which he might pervert, passions that he might indulge to excess-these actings, not to balance the just influence of Eternal Happiness but to lead him astray from making the Comparison. The Revelation is full [,] the knowledge is obtruded upon his notice from without, & by the importunate whisper of Conscience within; and if he persists in barring out from his thoughts the light & beauty of Heaven, I know not how he can deem himself hardly dealt by. (JMN, Vol. II.142)

Dieu Principe des principes
Quatre hypothèses: La vérité absolue peut résider ou dans notre esprit, ou dans les êtres particuliers, ou en elle-même, ou en Dieu. 1. Notre esprit aperçoit la vérité absolue, il ne la constitue pas. 2. Les êtres particuliers participent de la volonté absolue, mais ils ne l’expliquent pas; réfutation d’Aristote. 3. La vérité n’existe pas en elle-même. 4. La vérité réside en Dieu.
– La vérité médiatrice entre Dieu et l’homme.
Victor Cousin, Du Bien.

At this stage we must ponder on some of the most pervasive Romantic components which are linked to Emerson’s work, and particularly on the way
these features were associated not only with bonds of passion of this *Principium of Individualism*, along with its aspirations and sensibilities in order to reflect the truth of an emotional state of the soul to express a deeply felt experience; as Abrams observes in *The Mirror and the Lamp*: “a work of art is essentially the internal made external, resulting from a creative process operating under the impulse of feeling, and embodying the combined product of the poet’s perceptions, thoughts, and feelings” (22).

In this light, *Beauty, Love, Suffering, and Immortality* are recurrent topics in this chapter reflecting Emerson’s rational and irrational impulses in defining Romanticism as the problematic issue between inwardness and outwardness. This Romantic attitude is associated with the poet’s own tendency towards a deeply felt respect for nature as a vehicle for expressing his feelings; his emphasis and enthusiasm in the past, and his veneration of human feeling; his preoccupation with human frailty, good and evil, life and death; his effusively emotional, sentimental, and romantic attitude in musing, lamenting, mourning, longing, visiting tombs, and immortalizing the lost ones.

All of these aspects, along with the topics mentioned above, operate as recurrent and universal symbols of some (symbolic) circumstances of Emerson’s life: his marriage and the death of his first wife, Ellen; his second marriage and the birth of his first daughter named Ellen; the death of friends, and especially that of his little son Waldo. All these emerge as interrelated romantic themes. Besides, they were also among the topics discussed from
the beginning of Romanticism in 1800s. Indeed, in many ways, they reinforce the gist of romantic (in) flux of mental and physical aspects concerned with Emerson’s attitude in praising the imagination as a vehicle that links him into the realm of spiritual truth and transcendent experience: the romantic position towards the universe in order to inform the reader of the interactions between the forces of spirit and matter in the sense that “Immanence and transcendence,” as Bloom observes in *Romanticism: Vistas, Instances, Continuities* “are both spatial concepts; the Divine is either in the world or above and over the world, but the Emersonian transparency gives us the Divine as being found through the world” (171).

These [romantic] topics help the reader to understand the components mentioned above as fundamental tools in examining the mystery of life and the growth of poetic imagination within the human soul. Here lie the dynamic tendencies (centripetal and centrifugal) within this *Internal Conflict of the Soul*: the opposing realms between consciousness and unconsciousness, the poet own relationship with “God,” and with “the whole universe.” This entails Emerson’s transparent eyeball, and his *optative moods* that awaken the *Principium of Individualism*.

This *principium* thus guides the poet, through the medium of his own sensibility, allowing him to achieve eternal truths. Then the individual may find, as Cousin observes, “*La vérité absolute*” (*our italics*) that resides between Romanticism/Transcendentalism.
The above instances share two relevant aspects: one that stresses the necessity for any romantic work to represent change, so that the poet searches to balance his own “thoughts of light” through his own “Conscience,” which must be done through a deeply felt “passion” seeded in this *Principium of Individualism*; second, through the beauty of universe, as opposed to the “beauty of Heaven,” the poet searches the “Eternal Happiness” – this search which must be built upon through the evolutionary progress that oscillates between the Enlightenment (*the era of homogeneity*) and the romantic the ethos (*the era of heterogeneity*). Robert D. Richardson synthesizes this balance when he claims that Emerson’s “nature furnishes us with our ideas and standards of beauty, whether of physical beauty, moral beauty (virtue), or intellectual beauty (truth)” (230).

From these aspects, we contend that Emerson, as a romantic writer, was profoundly sensitized by these qualities. While conceiving them as part of the history of ideas and individual life complexity, he used and (scientifically) combined them in his essays, journals, letters, and poetry. Thus he was able to designate the influence of his inner spiritual life, of his stream of thought and will as the basis for his own study eventually encompassing knowledge about, and knowledge by acquaintance in an evolutionary process. While dealing with God, life, art, and the universe, the poet should give birth to new ways of creating (for his own self) a romantic truth and a personal quest. As Marlon B. Ross has pointed out in *Romantic Quest and Conquest: Troping*
Masculine Power in the Crisis of Poetry Identity “the Romantic poet[s] are driven to a quest for self-creation ... self-comprehension, [and] self-positioning that is unprecedented in literature” (26).

This viewpoint can be considered as the network upon which Emerson’s work elaborates the above cited themes: **Beauty, Love, Suffering, and Immortality**. We repeat, all these textual and spiritual topics are interrelated abstract topics within the romantic ethos. They help the reader to understand the enormous complexity of the concept Romanticism since this sign, as we have already discussed, encompasses many meanings from many different poets, writers, philosophers, and from Emerson himself.

These features are not only congenial to Emerson’s spiritual quest. They also are in connection with his life, with his thoughts, feelings, sensations, anxieties, melancholy, memories, (reasoning and understanding) that actively awaken his romantic self to a new attitude towards the mystery of the human soul and of the universe. As he observes “I find myself often idle ... I yet wish to be romantic” (*JMN*, Vol.I.39; italics mine) in order to absorb and “balance the just influence of Eternal Happiness” for “the knowledge by the importunate whisper of Conscience within” (*JMN*, Vol.II.142).

These elements operate as channels of an obscure camera through which human impressions, in combination with the external and internal experiences, are received, stored and restored in the individual mind so that he is apt to animate, reanimate, and reinterpret the manifold discrepancy
between *that which*, which is revealed within human mind, and *that which*, which is exterior to human soul: the romantic light and shadow pertaining to the dualistic of Reasoning and Understanding in distinguishing, as Emerson writes “Material beauty [that] perishes or пalls. [And] Intellectual beauty [which] limits admiration to seasons & ages” (*JMN*, Vol.II:220). “Reason,” as Sampson Reed reminds the reader in *Observations on the Growth of the Mind*, “is partly a natural and partly an acquired power. The understanding is the eye, with simply the power of discerning the light . . . [And] the relation they [*Beauty, Love, Suffering, and Immortality*] bear to each other” (75).

These aspects emphasize the link of Emerson’s organic theory between the mind and the world outside, between the self and cosmos. While the poet contemplates the universe, his mind creates a blend of plurality into oneness. Through this oneness the individual self-consciousness, the vision of that interior aurora or light which belongs to his own creative sphere attains a subsequent knowledge of things and of himself: each word is felt not only as a word but as a dynamic and connotative sign that infer many meanings. As David Perkins observes in *Romanticism and Animals Rights* “The divine is moving into the landscape, and, in the process, is endowing it with the immense appeal and significance that it retained throughout the Romantic age” (39).

This appeal stresses both the sense of meaning of the individual self close to Reason, and the feelings and moods that tend to build up the sense of
the poet’s identity through his own affections: the master-symbols of his own experience and the interfusion of sensation and imagination that linger in the history of Romanticism.

Here we must raise a question: Does this dilemma between inner and outer world aggrandize, minimize and establish the meaning of Romanticism? The answer for this question is shifted between “the whole wide Universe of God” and human “Conscience” of himself along with semantic meaning of the term romantic. Besides it is linked to the traits of American transcendental thought: the ultimate reality is the spirit that lies beyond man’s realm of the mind. As Sampson Reed observes in Observations of the Growth of the Mind, in this world “[t]here is” not only “a more extensive intercourse of thought,” but also “a more powerful action of mind upon mind” (1).

This interfusion suggests the dynamic way of approaching Emerson’s Ambiguity of the self, the unfolding of a stream of consciousness while contemplating the universe. This development occurs throughout most of binary oppositions in the dualistic ethos of Romanticism, between influx and flux, motion and transition, and change and action. In this context the poet’s eye is apt to embrace the manifold phenomena of the external world: the antithesis found in the Classical ideal of unity and the Romantic ideal of self-transcendence.

These viewpoints stress the theme of plurality, with a new interest in the powers of imagination, a new awareness of the relationship between
human being and nature along with the feeling for beauty and exquisiteness of the animate world for the artist and poet. This beauty fostered the individual with new sensibility, an enthusiasm, and an enjoyment in nature, and led him to discover deep new meanings in ordinary things. Walt Whitman recovers this notion in the following lines: “Nor an inch, nor a particle of an inch is vile.” It is through *Beauty, Love, Suffering, and Immortality*, as components linked to the Romantic Movement (s), that we are concerned here. They bear not only some corollaries among themselves, but also they are the most relevant complex and contradictory signs in romantic ethos.

Emerson as a romantic poet used them in order to complexify visions of inner and outer phenomena in the sense that Lavine observes in *From Socrates to Sartre: the Philosophic Quest*: “The Romantic ideal is to experience both sides of every polarity, and never to become rigid or static, never to become confined, the prisoner of any one mode of thought or way of life, but always to be in pursuit of the infinite” (204). Here the term romanticism is applied to diversity; it is linked to the polarity of ideas concerning not only this *Principium of Individualism* in which the self is in connection with other souls, culture and religious systems, but also, and essentially, with tragic circumstances in his Emerson’s family. These tragic circumstances enhanced a revision of his perception of nature shrouded in sublime mystery of life. As John T. Lysaker reminds in *Emerson and Self-Culture* “death” was “a central concern” that Emerson “had” already “to
confront” during his life time. “Born in 1803,” he had “lost a brother in 1807, his father in 1811, a sister in 1814, his first wife in 1831, another brother in 1834, and his son Waldo in 1842” (90).

Here we must pose an hypothesis: If human being is a creative entity, and his art coexists with his own self, then the essence of its significance would derive not only from its objectivity, but from the poet’s personal (confessional?) interference. Romanticism thus forms a complete set of ideas in which every single word is interrelated to others; for instance: Beauty, Love, Suffering, and Immortality.

For our purpose, we must start with Beauty. This sign imaginatively exhibits the truth of intellectual principle and the concept of Zeitgeist due to the fact that Emerson’s concept of Soul is inscribed in natura naturans: the permanent sight flux/reflux interaction with the forces of the universe along with certain combinations of words, music, art, melodies, charm of color, symmetries of parts towards the whole, allegorically, constituting the beauty of the poet eye and the antithesis of Romantic ideology. As Emerson had already observed “In the world, we are perpetually reminded of natural connections & adaptations of parts to parts, & systems to systems. In material, & in human nature, this design is alike evident” (JMN, Vol.II: 146).

These aspects reflect on the allurements of the 19th century linked to the spirit of revolution of the Age, as opposed to the Enlightenment. This antithesis derives from the Romantic emphasis on experimentation and from a
persistent struggle against the neo-classicist conception of a mechanized universe, of its preference for static and rational discipline. Romanticism rejected these aspects and put forward instead expansive and dynamic emotion and freedom of action. As Isaiah Berlin claims in *The Roots of Romanticism*: “The importance of romanticism is that it is. . . . the greatest single shift in the consciousness of the West that has occurred, and all the other shifts which have occurred in the course of nineteenth and twentieth centuries” (1-2). This passage links Romanticism with historical events - the French and the American Revolutions, and reminds how important the focuses on the individual self in order to explain and uncover contradictions and generalities, as we have already discussed at the beginning of this study.

Here we must forward another hypothesis: If the Enlightenment emphasized reason, empiricism and materialism, Romanticism stood for intuition and spirit aspects, and favored for the individual faith and ability to have contact with the divine. Thus the poet searches for his own religious experience in what he unveils in nature and eventually fuses with (his own) spirit.

This interrelatedness is important not only to Emerson’s *Internal Conflict of the Soul*, but also to his creativity because he is in direct contact with the mystery of the universe and receives from it the knowledge that will allow him to interact with God, nature, and himself. As David J. Gordon observes in *Imagining the End of Life in Post-Enlightenment Poetry: Voices*
against the Void, while reflecting on co-existing themes of Romanticism: “The Romantic sometimes saw God in nature, and Emerson conceived of poetic language as a way of revealing a transcendental beyond, a higher symbolic knowledge” (61).

These aspects stress the range of connotative values as we reflect on the topics mentioned above. These topics are subjective signs involving not only views of human emotion and of inner life, but also as they are part of the direct experience of the outer phenomenon. This sensibility forms part of romantic agenda in the sense that it reflects and praises human ability to transcend two realms: the earthly and the beyond through which the individual tries to find his own truth and identity - a way to achieve his own sublime spirituality since the human heart is open to the discourse of the universe.

This new tendency to cosmological dilemma is an issue that Todd M. Lieber discusses in *Endless Experiments: Essays on the Heroic Experience in American Romanticism*. Lieber. While reflecting on the problematic aspect between subject and object, Lieber points out that:

Somehow a new resolution had to be found that joined the self to the larger whole at all levels of experience without denying the importance of the individual, and this was the central Transcendentalist problem. The tensions involved between self and not self, and within the self between spirit and sense, reach a peak in the writings of Ralph Waldo Emerson. (10)
This resolution is part of Emerson’s Transcendentalist dilemma to reflect not only on the poet’s own experience, perception of freedom of art in which the self would join with the forces of universe, but also in his own sentiments and spiritual insights. Thus is able to intensify the romantic dialectical monologue of poetic genius, and to illustrate the romantic epiphany endeavor in this *Internal Conflict of the Soul*. The romantic poet actually believes that the sense of beauty reawakens and reopens his mind in order to discover, explore, enjoy, and to express every kind of human experience. These aspects must be traced back to Emerson’s desire to reconstruct a more balanced universe:

> The universe is pervaded with myriads of secret analogies that tie together its remotest parts as the atmosphere of a summer morning is filled with innumerable gossamer threads running in every direction but unseen except revealed by the brilliancy beams of the rising sun. So when the soul which in its activity is light begins to throw out its rays, it finds it has been living amidst beauty. (*JMN*, Vol.III.256)

Emerson’s meditation unveils his inner-going in dealing with “beauty” from several angles. His search reflects the beauty of the universe along with its secrets and analogies and delight, and it becomes an object of the human mind. While, on one hand, the beauty of nature is associated with the artist’s creativity, involving both his own perception and Understanding, on the other hand, it is in connection with Reason since it deals with human moral reality. As Emerson writes: “The Cause & end of this distinction we gain from Reason & experience. We see how hateful vice makes human nature, how it alters it from a beautiful harmony of excellent qualities to vile incongruous
wretchedness” (JMN, Vol.II:157). It is through these myriad of analogies and heterogeneities that we must link *Beauty* to Emerson’s Quest for Romantic Truth; it works as a poem, and it contains the poet’s life, solitude, joy, happiness, relationships, love, and inquietudes. It is the basic and source of Emerson’s own optimistic and fatal property of imagination in serious and reflective persons he loved heartily.

This deeply felt sentiment or experience springs from the poet’s own intellect while observing the natural beauty. The interruption and abrupt changes of mood are intended to stress an introspective awareness of *Love, Beauty, Suffering, and Immortality*. The individual generalizes and confines them to his own romantic gift in moments of intensely heightened poetic endeavor. He is heightened before “summer morning” along with the “brilliancy beams of the rising sun,” (JMN, Vol.III:256) or even before “a beautiful harmony of excellent qualities . . . [of human nature] relations to God & [his] our fellows” which lies in “connection & symmetry of all parts of the moral world,” out of which “goodness & beauty are one” (JMN, Vol. II: 157).

These viewpoints inform the reader of the series of internal sensations and tensions in which *Emerson’s Principium of Individualism* is involved. They provide the plurality of metaphors through which the poet’s self and mind stress the relationship between (facts of) nature and life: a way to restate the
human incompatibility of spiritual consciousness to apprehend the invisible world.

These viewpoints also emphasize the romantic flux as it prized human life, morality and spirituality as moving and beautiful; besides it reflects on the flow of sensations: the deeply felt experience and the kinship between subject and object, through which the self merges its own identity within the life of the universe. Thus emerges a new romantic scenery that eventually would revolutionize the poet’s imagination. Emerson reminds the reader that, as a romantic poet, he also “had a strong imagination & consequently a keen relish for the beauties of poetry” (JMN, Vol.II:238). This quote unveils an individual romantic feeling of pleasure that emerges when the poet admires the natural beauty through the lens of his own imagination and fantasy. As Melissa McFarland Pennell observes in Masterpieces of American Romantic Literature, there is a “continual” conflict or “process of inner development, which allowed an individual to reach her or his full potential and, in the view of some, recognize the divinity within” (2). This process is associated with the most profound and comprehensive vision of romanticism in which the poet has a great personal freedom, and an intimacy with the surrounding environment: her lies the basic belief in an immediate kinship between human nature and God.

These aspects haunt Emerson’s organic theory, seeded in Coleridge’s dualistic ethos between the “I” and “eye”: [The poet] “holds him with his
glittering eye- / The wedding-guest stood still, / And listens like a three years’ child: / The Mariner hath his will” (Longman Anthology 1641). Although this passage reflects not only on the problematic aspect of the psyche - the mind and the soul, it also illustrates the poet’s romantic quest for a vision of both light and shadow which will lead to the unveiling of beauty in ordinary things. Hopefully it reflects in the act of (vision-) seeing an act of imagination. The act of beauty, love and fantasy project the human mind as an active force into the body of the universe, as Emerson writes in Conduct of Life, in the chapter entitled “Beauty,” “all beauty must be organic,” and “that outside embellishment is deformity” (290).

It is through this organic metaphor that Emerson’s Romantic Truth Quest resides as it searches not only for the highest revelation of beauty throughout the universe, but also for the romantic highest manifestation of this same beauty in connection with Eros, or Amor as it is documented in these lines: “Nature is loved by what is best in us,” but also how “It is loved as the city of God” (Nature, Second Series, 178).

The concept of Eros lies at the center of Emerson’s own spiritual and earthly experiences; on one hand, while his mind travels the universe, it discovers and rediscovers, exquisitely, the mysterious and vivid passages of the natural world pertaining to the beauty of the mind; on the other hand, he accepts the images of things he loved as symbols of his own spiritual and romantic quest in the sense that as Bloom has pointed out: “Emerson traces in
every sphere the same spiritual laws of experience [of] the self-expression of the Soul in the forms of Nature and of society, until she finally recognizes herself in her own work and sees its beneficence and beauty” (146), by enlarging and reconstituting the sense of romantic heterogeneity and the meaning of love in its universal application: the word that in early times embraced also the love of animals, and the love which was thought to be the cause of productiveness throughout the universe.

It is through this dilemma that we must argue that in the romantic era the sign “love” was in connection with earthly light, strong passion and birthright; it exalted the most deeply felt human experience and sentiments leading to a radical unity; it reflected on the culmination of the Principium of Individualism’s life that moves from one love experience to another; as Emerson observes: “All that life demands of us through the greater part of the day, is composure, an equilibrium, a readiness, open eyes & years, free hands, a Sympathy. Society asks this & Truth & Love & the Genius of our Life. There is a fire in many men which demands an outlet in some vigorous action” (JMN, Vol.VII: 64). The “Troubadours,” Emerson says, “& old ballads are bowers of joy that . . . catch us up into heavens, & drown all remembrance. . . . [They] soar into the heaven of invention & coin fancies of our own, weave a web of dreams” (JMN, Vol.VII:137).

These viewpoints stress that Emerson’s work was a result of a myriad of ideas that were sweeping the world. Although he was a product of New
England Puritanism, he also was an admirer of the Greek/Roman philosophies and the poets of seventeenth and eighteenth-centuries England in the sense that these writers were guided by the new light of the time: The Age of Reason and Genius in which as Emerson observes in *The Conduct of Life* (1859) “the sharpest-sighted hunter in the universe is Love, for finding what he seeks. . . . [And] In the true mythology Love is an immortal child, and Beauty leads him as a guide: nor can we express a deeper sense than when we say, Beauty is the pilot of the young soul” (289).

Here we wish to forward an hypothesis and argue four aspects: If Love is an ineffable and mysterious force that leads and awakens the human soul in search for the true beauty and highest good, then we must state that it is also associated with these four Romantic ideologies as reads: 1) on daily love of human relationship through which the human being searches and strives for an equilibrium and sympathy; 2) on individual love to another in which we encounter with a set of beliefs that transforms earthly things into the enchantment of human life; 3) on intellectual love linking the poet not only to the thirst of nationalism and heroics of this *Principium of Individualism*, and to international interactions in which the poet shares his own convictions on reforms - political, social, economic, poetical, and religious; 4) on the Eternal love, which implies the relationship of the human being with God: an hidden truth that illuminates the individual’s soul throughout the universe; the second passage reflects on Emerson’s axis of vision of the term love within the
principle of knowledge by acquaintance: love by influence—that interior aurora or perception he assimilates with pride while reading other romantic writers, or when he decided to travel throughout Europe and met personally some of the genius poets as we have already discussed above.

In *Romantic and Its Cognates: the European History of a Word*, Hans Eichner points out that “romantic love...or Romances were still read and enjoyed, and that the word could also be used in a way that reflected that enjoyment” (5). This joy is a reflective process that insists on a concrete view as the individual attempts not only to abandon the outward phenomena, but also he is able to think of himself as thinker or poet. The romantic recognizes, in an intellectual way, that there is a direct sensible acquaintance between him and the universe and that within the human mind there is an organic love, kinship or dialogue between the visible and invisible worlds. In *Light from Heaven: Love in British Romantic Literature* Frederick L. Beaty observes that “the Romantics were, without denying the validity of a spiritual quest, were interested in the light of love chiefly as a way of coping with problems in earthly existence” (xvi). Beaty further states: “These converse orientations are strikingly revealed by the sun imagery of each period” (Idem).

This light illustrates how love is associated with a transcendental dimension, suggesting, as Emerson had already written “an aurora of light which surrounds in our hearts” (*JMN*, Vol.VIII:106). This aurora is a kind of interior romantic thrill, in Bloom’s words, *interior oratory* [our italics], or fire
that helps the poet to romanticize the universe through eight organic principles: 1) a movement forward from reason to an emphasis upon understanding and diversity: “We wake and find ourselves on a stair; there are stairs below us, which we seem to have ascended; there are stairs above us, many a one, which go upward and out of sight” (“Experience” 45); 2) from a mechanized world to philosophical idealism: “The human heart concerns us more than the pouring into microscopes, and is larger than can be measured by pompous figures of the astronomer” (Conduct of Life, “Beauty” 282); 3) from uniformity to the diversity: “the lover comes to a warmer love of these nobilities, and a quicker apprehension of them” (“Love” 182); 4) from a civilized world to the rustic life: “Turn the eyes upside down, by looking at the landscape through your legs, and how agreeable is the picture, though you have seen it any time these twenty years” (Nature, First Series “Idealism” 51); 5) from urban life to a love of country life, natural scenery, and solitudes: “Then in solitude & darkness, I walk over again my sunny walks; in streets behold again the shadows of my grey birches . . . & vibrate anew to the tenderness & dainty music of the early poetry I fed upon in boyhood” (JMN, Vol.VII:148); 6) from a preoccupation with human nature to a love preoccupation with aesthetic and spiritual values of external world: “One might think the atmosphere was made transparent with this design, to give man, in the heavenly bodies, the perpetual presence of the sublime” (“Nature,” First Series 7); 7) from a concern with the species to a loved
concerned with the individual: “I love my wife, my mother, my child, better than strangers, because I can see nearer & know the talents, graces, virtues that are in them” (JMN, Vol.II:73); 8) from a poetry of prose to a loved poetry of imagination, sentimentalism, fantasy, and symbols: “Between these extremes [science/sensation] is the equator of life, of thought, of spirit, of poetry” (“Experience” 62), or this “Poetry is the gay science. The trait and test of the poet is that he builds, adds and affirms” (“Poetry and Imagination” 37).

All of these qualities reflect Emerson’s pathos in celebrating the beauty of the mind, of the soul and souls, of the poetic creative as the most intimate subjects within human consciousness, as the self adventures and transforms itself into a romantic wonderer. We attend a kind of return not only to Christian and nationalistic themes, but also to both this Principium of Individualism and to artistic freedom. This web weaved out of an going dialogue in order to stress the influence of the senses and impressions of the various levels of correspondences and analogies in which the poet’s heart and mind attempt to unify the beauty and greatness of appearances of the universe. This internalization of things, a mental activity of the poet’s mind, is a conflicting problem between Reason and Understanding and emphasizes the historical dilemma between subjectivity and objectivity: the indissoluble union between the intellectual and the material world which leads the individual to abandon or to confront, as Michel Foucault observes in The Order of Things: An Archaeology of Human Science, “the origin of knowledge [that] was [not
only] sought within this pure sequence of representations,” but also within “The retreat and return of the Origin” (328-29), where the poet’s mind, because of the abundant accumulation of beauty, love and splendor in nature, finds an exquisite sensitiveness for his own moral conduct.

From the viewpoint of Romanticism, these dialogues involving beauty and love can be traced back to the romantic poets of the 19th century and their followers. Rousseau’s *Les reveries du promeneur solitaire* - “Il est vrai que’au milieu des outrages sans nombre et des indignités sans mesure don’t je me sentais accablé de toutes parts, des intervalles d’inquiétude et de doutes venaient de temps à autre ébranler mon espérance et troubler ma tranquillité” (63), in which the poet loved to go for longs walks through the woods, and the poet’s soul is divided into many chapters; Goethe’s *The Sorrows of Werther: Elective Affinities* - the poet’s “heart beats when by accident I [he] touch[es] her finger, or my [his] feet meet hers under the table! I draw back as if from a furnace; but a secret force impels me forward again, and my senses become disordered” (35); Schlegel’s conception of *Romantische Poesie* as an expression of human life; Novalis’ viewpoints concerning the relationship between the human being and the world which must be romanticized; Wordsworth’s *Lyrical Ballads* in which all good poetry reflects the spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings; Coleridge’s organic theory of the world as an animate organism in which love as an act of imagination and redemption exalts: “O Lady! we receive but what we give, / And in our life alone does
nature live: /Ours is her wedding garment, ours her shroud" (Longman Anthology, “Dejection: An Ode,” II.47-49), reflecting the most happiest inner and noble manifestation that unites humankind in a common way of life. As Emerson would later write “All mankind love a lover” (First Series, “Love,” 172).

Here we must remind the reader of one aspect: If romanticism is associated with many topics and signs, and the word love is an organic element within romanticism, then this word also carries many different meanings and many splendid things; it brings not only happiness, joy, pleasure, comfort, and stability, but it also encompasses suffering, disillusionment, and abandonment; or, as Emerson depicts “it seduces to Pleasure and leads on to Death and the shadow of Eternity settle over its termination” (JMN, Vol.I:140).

It is from these [romantic] signs that we are motivated to stress that Emerson, as romantic poet, was led by his own poetic conviction of self-reliance, wit, desire, and feelings: he possessed a fervid and lovely thirst for reading, listening, conversing and writing so that he could frame his own ideas - be aware of someone else’s concerns, socialize and share his poetic creativities with his fellow-men, within a new American approach to romantic tradition(s). His romantic thirst “unites him,” as he observes in the chapter entitled “Love,”
to his race, pledges him to the domestic and civic relations, carries him with
new sympathy into nature, enhances the powers of the senses, opens the
imagination, adds to his character heroic and sacred attributes, establishes
marriage and gives permanence to human society. (First Series 169)

This brilliantly revealing passage reflects on the dynamic sequence of the term
love as it is associated with the spirit of the masses to encompasses not only
“domestic and civic relations,” but also with the poet’s sensibility, love, and
imagination which impel him to rediscover “sacred attributes,” out of which the
individual is apt to transform his own life and the world in which he lives. Here
love becomes the leading romantic sign of “one beautiful soul” through which
“all true and pure souls” (“Love” 182) will intimately link the individual into the
burdens of society and culture.

While reflecting on the problem of human morality and human love,
Vyacheslav P. Shestakov observes that: “Love is a universal subject of
romantic novels and poetry. ... [The] Romantics energetically pursued the
study of love as a philosophical phenomenon” (71). The “study of love”
belongs to a search not only for the highest form of Eros as the ultimate
reality of the human being life, but also for a transcendent quest that
embraces and embodies every ideality through the highest aspect of this
Principium of Individualism itself.

This spectrum reflects the unsullied romantic symptom of decadence
that precedes Emerson’s fatality. As he observes: of his own optimistic and
pessimistic wishes of a Farmer’s Almanac of the Mental Moods, as he
observes: “From within or from behind, a light shines through us upon things and makes us aware that we are nothing, but the light is all” (“The Over-Soul” 270). Here love conveys and illustrates not only the poet’s own faith in the fundamental unity of the relationship between the individual and the universe, but also it reflects on the problem of how this beauty of love awakes us up to the inner world; how the poet learns to live with this light or fire; and how he learns to live and gaze outward again toward some unexpected circumstances of life: Ellen’s death; his child’s birth; his brother’s, father’s, friends’ and son’s deaths.

Allegorically, these qualities symbolize the three stages of human life. Here we may recognize the continuum and paradox process within a romantic frame of mind and the belief in the reality of life-after-death. As Emerson observes: “That stage of the existence to which our actual knowledge is confined is the first period or the passage of the young candidates for Eternity from birth of /their/his/ being to the Change which is to introduce /them/him/ to the world of spirits” (JMN, Vol. II:150).

This passage reflects and shows Emerson’s mental flight of scientific imagination and the drama of the vices between soul and body in order to seek equilibrium between spirit and physical realities. It illustrates not only on his own observations concerning the growth of human life, but also that he was aware of a pathetic (romantic) dialogue between subjectivism and objectivism which actually was enmeshed in Western tradition. One of these
observations reminds Coleridge’s reflections on human evolution: “... there is humanity common to all periods of life, which each period from childhood has its own way of representing. Hence, in whatever laid firm hold of us in early life, there lurks an interest & a charm for our maturest years” (JMN, Vol.VI:329).

Under these same circumstances, we are in a position to claim that the love of the individual is, at the same time, a divine and humanistic love that gives meaning to the entire human existence. This spiritual and ideal love is the ultimate meaning for the poet’s self before the revelation.

This viewpoint pushes us back to Emerson’s concept of love. This concept is very powerful and intricate in essays such as “Circles,” “Experience,” Conduct of Life, in several poems and especially in The Journals and Miscellaneous Notebooks. There we see reflected a Neo-platonic sense of ultimate generative ideal form, a sensual and dynamic component associated with the perpetual metaphor of a spiritual journey. In his Journals we are informed of Emerson’s identity search, of his own sense of individualism, of his own (romantic) isolation, pain, sorrow, grief, trauma, loss, mourning, melancholia, silence, beauty, and illusion. Then he is able to understand how things transform themselves from solidity into motion; from birth into death, in a certain sense, because as Len Gougeon claims in Emerson & Eros: The Making of a Cultural Hero that Emerson’s “journal entries show that his expression is becoming more metaphorical, imaginative, and cosmic, as the
light of moral science becomes” the aurora of his own “inner enlightenment” (83). Or as Irene Ramalho Santos reminds in *Atlantic Poets: Fernando Pessoa’s Turn in Anglo - American Modernism* there is an “intricate relation between life and death, love and deceit, sex and friendship, power and dependency, necessity and freedom, language and immortality, sensuality and sense, eroticism and the responsibility of generation, male and female” (235). Santos thus suggests two points: the cosmogony and theogony of the earthly and spiritual life are fundamental unities that reside at the heart of all romanticism.

Here we must forward another hypothesis: If Santos’s passage also involves a romantic perception of the world, and then these features are testaments of the poet’s flow and will since the individual is able to perceive the universe through the equation of *love-perception*. Then we must associate love both with God’s and the artist’s creation because the beauty of the individual intellect, and the poet’s sensibility to delight in art, music, poetry, physical, spiritual, friendship, family, and intellectual are all in congenial harmony with personal suffering, grief, separation, fear, death, and immortality.

This understanding of love, in line with Wordsworth’s, a kind of emotion recollected in tranquility, with its all connotations, intimations of revelation, inspiration, feelings, imagination, and possession, is a chief element within the context of romanticism that allows the poet to describe loved people with
extraordinary gifts as Emerson indicates in the following passages while mystifying his wife Ellen as

But spirit that dwelt in mine
The spirit wherein mine dwelt
The soul of Ellen the thought divine
From God, that came—for all that felt

The hope & action of my sovereign soul
In miserable ruin. Not a hope
Should ever make a holiday for me
I would not be the fool of accident
I would not have a project seek an end
That needed aught
Beyond the hand of my present means
The sun of Duty drop from his firmament. (JMN, Vol.III:228-29)

These lines reflect the organic unity that stands at the core of Emerson’s view of poetry as a seminal product of (his own) imagination. They illustrate how a death object that dwells in the poet’s soul brings a new light to happiness and effectiveness. The dialogue between (romantic) love and (personal) memories unveils a deeply felt experience life, sentiments, integrity, and perceptions of biological growth within a new real: “divine thought.” This flowers forth of Emerson’s desire to achieve the equilibrium between discordant qualities: the ideal and image; the individual and the representative; the poet’s ego and the lover.

Love becomes the natural aurora that takes the poet beyond himself toward eternity; it is dynamic, becoming, moving beyond (itself) in order to
find “That needed aught” of “The sun,” which will direct the soul beyond the firmament. Eventually, it reflects and pushes back the term love along with romanticism to the picturesque past of “ruin.” As Beaty observes in *Light from Heaven* the “Romantic felt that ... true light would be possible only in the life beyond. ... [And] the light of love, like the imagination, did actually emanate from an external, objective heaven or whether it was merely a projection of the inner eye” (xviii) of the poet finite wish-fulfillment in keeping loving himself or the other, because God is the Other, or as Emerson had already urged his fellow-men to “Love thy neighbour, as *thyself*” (*JMN*, Vol.I:261).

Extending this logic, the word love operates in terms of metamorphosis; it becomes part of human suffering and sorrow; it transforms into an higher level of human life consciousness. This higher level of the poet’s mindfulness helps us to understand Emerson’s concept of love as a dynamic continuum of transformation linked to human relationship in which suffering and death means being present and being with the loved one; as Emerson reminds “All life a progress toward death” (*JMN*, Vol.III:220).

Having this in mind, we affirm that this Romantic sign is in total connection with Emerson’s desire of union in love. Hence the biographical and confessional mood, since his soul is still filled with the passion of love for Ellen. She became his “hope & action” in order to balance his grief and suffering: the romantic and transcendent life seeded upon the foundation of faith. It is by virtue of this beautiful spiritual life that Emerson stresses and recognizes Ellen
as “the Vision beautiful too beautiful,” (JMN, Vol.III: 230), who shall keep restoring him “that serene & Spiritual beauty” (Idem, 232), and being his beloved “holy wife” (Idem, 234) who will be praying and “Teaching that faith & love” (Idem, 235).

In view of this textual and spiritual description of love within a romantic context, Emerson intellectualizes his grief and his personal engagement; thus he is apt to extend his self into the lost object:

> After a fortnight’s wandering . . . yet finding you dear Ellen nowhere & yet everywhere, I come again to my own place, & would willingly transfer some of the pictures that the eyes saw, in living language to my page; yea translate the fair & magnificent symbols into their own sentiments. But this were to antedate knowledge. It grows into us, say rather, we grow wise & not take wisdom; and only in God’s own order & by my concurrent effort can I get the abstract sense of which mountains, sunshine, thunder, night, birds, & flowers are the sublime alphabet. (JMN, Vol. III: 257-58)

This is a way to idolatry and keeps alive the promises of Romanticism in which marriage was a means of consolidating family. Throughout the above Journal, Emerson thrusts signs such as “mountains,” “thunder,” “night,” “birds,” and “flowers”: physical terms that link his conflict and (the term) romanticism with the universe. Human nature and its complexities unveil a strong connection with polarities such as finite/infinite, faith/reason, anima/animus. They are features of microorganism, science, reason, and understanding. Besides they weave threads from Puritanism to Romanticism: the period in which Love, Beauty, Suffering, and Immortality reflected the inextricably interwoven tendency to understand the internal and external selves.
This aspect reflects the pervasive metaphor in which each sign tended to create tension in a dualistic ethos between subject and object. The rendering of natural world itself began to assume as the most mysterious components in Romantic agenda. Nature becomes the confidante of the soul and Emerson invites the reader to be part of his love-suffering moment.

Emerson believed not only in the real profundity of love - the mystical union with God along with the union mediated by his beloved Ellen, but also in the purity of love. It is by virtue of this uniqueness that Emerson’s soul is in motion, in tranquility with Ellen, the other half of his own self-reliance in the sense that as Plato had already put it in Symposium that “Each of us when separated, having one side only, like a flat fish, is but the indenture of a man, and he is always looking for his half” (158). In this light, Ellen, intuitively and morally, keeps not only magnetizing Emerson’s feelings, imagination, spontaneity, fluidity, intellect, and wit, but she also enhances Emerson’s Romantic flight: the poet’s soul is in a direct communication with the beauties and mysteries of finite/infinite loving relationship. As Stanley Cavell stresses in The Human Embrace: The Love of Philosophy and the Philosophy of Love, while reflecting on Emerson’s ‘silent melancholy’: “The romantic protest is that things are alive, that we are alive, that we can have (restore) an intimacy with things, with the world. ... We can recover our (lost) intimacy with the world, with things, with others, with ourselves” (110).
This passage must be traced back to Emerson’s journal entry written in 1831 in which he descriptively reminds moments of love, suffering, and death: the moments of clear self-evaluation on Ellen’s death:

Five days are wasted since Ellen went to heaven to see, to know, to worship, to love, to intercede. God be merciful to me a sinner & repair this miserable deblility in which her death has left my soul. Two nights since, I have again heard her breathing, seen her dying. O willingly, my wife, I would lie down in your tomb. But I have no desert like yours, no such purity, or singles of heart. Pray for me Ellen & raise the friend you so truly loved, to be what you thought him. When your friends or mine cross me, I confess myself by saying; you should not have done so. Dear Ellen (for that is your name in heaven) shall we not be united even more & more, as I more steadfastly persist in the love of truth & virtue which you loved? (JMN, Vol. III: 226)

This passage in its entirety must be traced back not only to the cluster of history of ideas which Emerson was aware of, but also to the myriad of personal feelings, memories and mood in the sense that its language and content derive from the activities of the individual consciousness which affect the romantic sympathy and nostalgia for the sense of personal lost and on the lamentation of the absence of the beloved companion. Emerson’s descriptions of natural scenery stress human suffering and pain experience which can only be released by her spiritual and physical presence. Its primary concern is linked to Emerson’s romantic quest to transcend and transform, through the medium of poetic art, the essence of things into terms of human ideas. While he reproduces abstract aspects of his own wisdom into visible images, Emerson transforms human frailty and anxiety into the highest levels of arts, at the moment of “dying,” so that he is able not only to understand and
reflect on the emotional and spiritual aspects, but also on the complexity of the real meaning of death. Bloom observes in *Where Shall Wisdom Be Found?*, that when "Emerson abandoned his post because he knew only the God within, which he defined as the best and oldest part of his self. He became a wisdom writer, practicing what could be called interior oratory" (192). Thus the emphasis on the individual love and romantic delight.

Back to the above journal, we argue that it must also be traced to Dante’s definition of love. In Dante’s *Inferno* love was associated with eternal place, pain, suffering and death. From the context of viewpoint of romanticism, Beatrice descended from Heaven to Limbo with a special mission: to save Dante because she feels that he needed help and that her motive was love: “Love moved me and makes me speak. When I am before my Lord I will often praise you to Him” (Canto II 2). This aspect became a seminal romantic sign in Emerson’s discourse. He was aware of a classic mythology surrounding love when in 1843 he spoke of “Dante’s Nuova Vita” (*JMN*, Vol.VIII:369) and of “Dante’s *Inferno*” (“Poetry and Imagination” 12) as imaginative works in which the individual was not only in love and in journey, but also in conflict with forces of nature.. He was aware of this wide sense of the word love which in early times embraced also the love of Nature, and the love which was thought to be the cause of productiveness throughout nature. Like Dante who asks Beatrice to pray for him, Emerson also asks Ellen to pray for him because he was part of human frailty.
Dante strongly echoes in Emerson’s concept of love. In Dante’s *Inferno* this sign is associated with moral and theological aspects of “downward” and “upward” (*Western World*, Canto V 6) in fusing two objects: the beloved (Beatrice) with the poet’s psyche (Dante’s) as it searches for new-consciousness and new life. In Emerson’s case this sign is an inner component pertaining not only to all forms of life along with this *Principium of Individualism*, but also it is linked to “currents of natural laws” (“Poetry and Imagination” 68) and mystical events:

> For flowing is the secret of things & no wonder the children love masks, & to trick themselves in endless costumes, & be a horse, a soldier, a parson, or a bear; and, older, delight in theatricals; as, in nature, the egg is passing to a grub, the grub to a fly, and the vegetable eye to a bud, the bud to a leaf, a stem, a flower, a fruit; the children have only the instinct of their race, the instinct of the Universe, in which, Becoming something is the whole game of nature, & death the penalty of standing still. (*JMN*, Vol. XIII: 408)

Here love is associated with two sacramental aspects: the power in nature and in human sensibility pertaining to the poet’s personal life as he intends to bind together the “Flowing” of “secret of things” and the “delight” that derives from that flowing in order to explain the creation of the world. In this light, this passage reflects on the problematic issue of immanence or correspondence seeded in Emerson’s theory of nature: the organic principle out of which each particle is subordinated to itself in that in unfolds and folds itself, it (un)folds like: “the egg is passing to a grub, the grub to a fly, and the vegetable eye to a bud.”
This passage is unquestionably central for our understanding of Emerson’s Romantic quest and of his concept of Romanticism as a word that proceeds from all things; thus it is suited to the broader belief of faith, moral, sentiment, of the poet’s attitude to confront the world, progress, and science in 19th century America. Besides Emerson believed that the world also was a product of the human mind could not only be explained in rational terms alone, since it should reflect the poet’s self in the artist’s own way of loving the universe. As Richard P. Mullin observes in *The Soul of Classical American Philosophy* “the world soul is filtered through each human organism creating a sense of individuality” (53).

Back again to the above passage on Ellen’s death, we argue that it reflects Emerson’s lyricism, eulogistic and subjectiveness, in seeing and saying facts, not as they are, but how these aspects affect not only the poet’s own feelings in terms of “know,” “be merciful,” “debility,” “breathing,” “death,” “dying,” “willingly,” and the very act of seeing and to “lie down in your [her] tomb.”

Emerson absorbs and crystallized the romantic sentiments of death, grief, and mystery. It is by virtue of these levels of consciousness that his soul approximates impetuously to the great stretches of beyond in the sense that to die or lie down together was part of the pietistic melancholy of the Puritans funeral elegies.
Emerson invites the reader to sympathize with his sorrow, and to join him in this tragic and lonely journey while musing on the loss of his beloved object; as Shestakov observes in *The Philosophy of Eros and European Art* that the “Romantic” poets “united love with death” (71). This union approaches romanticism not only as an expression associated with the range of feelings of belonging, but also with the strong power to attach the beloved and the poet from love to death. This viewpoint is, perhaps, due to the spread of the belief that death is a transition from life to eternity.

These aspects motivate us to argue that Emerson is a kind of Christian poet who believed that the individual life unfolds itself into an allegorical longing journey resulting in an higher insight of human soul(-life), as he explains in his journal written in 1838:

> Our journey, the journey of the Soul, is through different regions of thought, and to each its own vocabulary. As soon as we hear a new vocabulary from our own, at once exaggerate the alarming differences . . . we find he was loving & hating, doing & thinking the same things as we, under his own vocabulary. (*JMN*, Vol.VII: 117)

Emerson’s silent confession reinforces and illustrate the romantic tension of the individual’s self regarding the relationship between the material and the imaginary: the central epistemological dilemma of the poet’s mind versus the material world in which the “different regions of thought,” or the shifts of visible and invisible aspects emphasize the thematic issue on the world of the mind, the self and consciousness rather than on the world of outer
phenomenon. It reflects on the romantic journey of the soul, on moments of human experience that search to “find” “a new vocabulary” in defining romantic love as something like “loving & hating, doing & thinking” (our italics), out of which the representations of “the same things” correspond themselves to the formative act of pure intuition: the immediate human intuition to balance and create new “journey of the soul” within this Internal Conflict of the Soul, which also is associated with this An Unsolved Romantic Issue.

Yet, this passage stresses not only on the profound union of the thought and feeling, but it also reflects the poet’s concern while dealing with death which eventually emerges as an ending flow/reflow of sensations, vivid reminiscences, thoughts, reflections feelings, oscillating from dreams and longings, from consciousness into consciousness, from dark into light, moral experience and human destiny. In Emerson & Eros: The Making of a Cultural Hero Len Gougoen states: “Emerson’s Transcendental arguments for human dignity and self-worth ... derive from a divine source that dwells within all, provided a powerful stimulus for reform of all types” (178). Or, as Emerson observes: “The Soul circumscribes all things” and all “These natures . . . tower over us, and most in the moment when our interests tempt us to wound them” (“Over-Soul” 272).
Here we must raise two questions: Is it possible to testify the birth of a new concept of art in Emerson’s theory of the self? And does this new conception reveal human inventiveness?

In fact, the conception of human inventiveness is associated with the dialectical of coincidentia oppositorum in which the individual is in conflict with his own life since he duplicates/reduplicates his Me/Not Me, by reassessing and retrieving his own sense of self-reliance. The individual dreams, daringly, for a new life by prizing the powers of his own intuition, insight, and sentiment; he longs not only for a new world which is different from the harsh one, but also he awakens and reinforces his own longing for the spiritual journey in exhibiting many characteristics to knead the term romanticism into many directions in a romantic quest to “Give All to Love” (Poems 90), or as he writes in “Circles” “This old age ought not to creep on human mind. In nature every moment is new; the past is always swallowed and forgotten; the coming only is sacred. Nothing is secure but life, transition, the energizing spirit” (319-20). Yet, as he writes in his Journals passage in May of 1834: “I am born tranquil, and not a stern economist of Time but never a keen sufferer” (JMN, Vol. IV: 292).

Emerson attempts to compensate the outer and inner proportions by reconstituting a new relationship with Eternal and natural orders. Although he speaks of past as something remote that he had already forgotten, it is clear that Emerson invokes both the past and sorrow in the image of Ellen; she is
not only at the center of his own obscure emotion and imagination, but she also is the center of his aspirations to bear solace and consolation. She continues to enlarge *that interior aurora* and delight of his soul; after the birth of his first daughter, from his second marriage with Lidian, whom he describes as his “Lydian Queen,” and “dear lover of harmonies ... specially of the correspondences” (*Letters of Ralph Waldo Emerson* Vol.I: 434-35) of his Not Me/Me or “sibyl” (Idem 438). Ellen hopefully was incarnated into another Ellen, as Emerson writes in a journal entry on February 25th that:

Yesterday morning, 24 Feb. at 8 o’clock a daughter was born to me, a soft, quiete, swarthy little creature, apparently perfect & healthy. My second child. Blessing on thy head, little winter bud! & comest thou to try thy luck in this world & know if the things of God are things for thee? Well assured & very soft & still, the little maiden expresses great contentment with all she finds, & her delicate but fixed determination to stay where she is, & grow. So be it, my fair child! Lidian, who magnanimously makes my gods her gods, calls the babe Ellen. I can hardly ask more for thee, my babe, than that name implies. Be that vision & remain with us, & after us. (*JMN*, Vol.VII:170).

Finding himself in the act of grieving and suffering, Emerson’s soul is bound up into an higher significance of happiness in the sense that the birth of new “babe” incarnates and reincarnates not only “that vision” and “Blessing. ... things of God,” but also it reflects that “great contentment” and happiness of Romanticism in dealing with the poet’s new life or with his “gods” and Ellen’s “gods” to balance three aspects: 1) life/death; 2) death/life; 3) and the poet’s intellect, emotional, and religious faith recollected in tranquility.
This cycle illustrates and helps us to understand how Emerson’s vision—seeing between visible and invisible things is associated with the evolutionary process of human life through which death becomes the transfiguration of life; his daughter became the continual filling in for Ellen’s absence in which the self is also between knowledge about and knowledge by acquaintance: it is morally and spiritually uplifted; it is aware of the real facts of life and is able to move on in order to create new things, new relationships, and new capacities in him such as new sensations, sensitivities, experiences, and thoughts in the sense that as Lee Rust Brown observes in *The Emerson Museum: Practical Romanticism and the Pursuit of the Whole* that this “New accomplishment in writing and new attachments to others were always twined together in Emerson’s recuperations from devastating loss” (251).

These lines reflect not only on the romantic empathy in dealing with the death/life cycle, but also with the revolutionary cluster of ideas that help the poet to enhance his cosmological and spiritual dimensions concerning not only with Each/All, or All/Each, but also as he confronts himself with the very meaning of the word Immortality. Or as he writes with “the feeling of my [his] immortality (*JMN*, Vol.III:261), because the fusion of secular love with religious worship in mid-nineteenth-century as Philip F. Gura claims in *American Transcendentalism: A History* “was at the heart of his [Emerson] Transcendentalism” (211): the mode of knowledge that is grounded in feeling and intuition to stress self-trust and self-reliance, in which the aspects of
microcosm and macrocosm – the dual entities of the unity, where the spiritual unity is the result of cosmic forces in a certain sense, because as John Michael observes in *Emerson’s Skepticism: The Cipher of the World* Emerson’s self is a product of social conflict and finds its solace not only in paradoxes, but also when it “wanders in the labyrinth of his problem, exploring the mazes of his own identity” (146).

This state of unconsciousness reflects an aesthetic ability of the poet to create his own myth enabling him to wander through views of Beauty, Love, Suffering, and Immortality world-weary in which the dualism aspects of spiritual and material seem to revive the poet’s sadness and the essence of his own grief as reads that: “The days pass over me / And I am still the same / The Aroma of my life is gone / Like the flower with which it came” (*JMN*, Vol. III.260). In a similar move, the death of his son Waldo at the age of five in 1842 was another burden, which is concomitant with his essay “Experience,” written in 1844 in which he laments and mourns: “The only thing grief has taught me is to know how shallow it is” (48).

This aspect leaves him again in an ambiguous state of mind. The death of his son symbolizes that his other side is lost and death too. All his expectations, anxieties, dreams, and hopes are also lost. Death and human nature robbed his own identity and he feels that he is left with the very sense of fall/failure. Sigmund Freud approaches these topics while focusing on viewpoints linked to the tragic of this *Principium of Individualism*. In
“Mourning and Melancholia” Freud speaks of the actions, reactions, and consequences of the lost loved person. While, on one hand, “Mourning” refers to “the reaction to the loss of a loved person,” (153), melancholia, on the other hand, stresses and “establish[es] an identification of the ego with the abandoned object. ... the loss of the object became transformed into a loss in the ego, and the conflict between the ego and the loved person transformed into a cleavage between the criticizing faculty of the ego and the ego as altered by the identification” (159).

This conflict or turning viewpoint from inner side to outer side is interrelated because it reflects an ongoing process (in a romantic context). Both the past and the poet’s life experience are thus still alive. This aspect echoes Coleridge’s “Dejection: An Ode,” and “Constancy to an Ideal Object” where the poet expresses not only “[a] grief without a pang, void, dark, and drear,” but also his melancholia for the lost of loved person: “I mourn to thee and say—Ah! Loveliest friend!” (Longman Anthology 1660-63).

These viewpoints remind the reader that Romanticism deals with states of mourning and melancholia which the poetic double consciousness attempts to reflect: love associated with emotion, passion, sadness, and suffering, and in connection with the lost object, since the poet loves the other as part of himself. While the romantic poet mourns, despair, and suffers, he is under a kind of obscure emotion moods; he becomes blind and limited to discern and reveal the significance of death.
Although this ethos intensifies the individual’s desire for transcendence, for what lies beyond, it also leaves the individual with the sense that he has lost something. With nothing left he must search for another object. This desire and this sense of loss must be traced back to Emerson’s essay “Experience,” in which he deals with the loss of his own sense of self-trust and with his incapacity to react and bring himself to grieve; as he writes “Nothing is left us now but death” (“Experience” 49), or this passage as he has put it earlier:

In the death of my son, now more than two years ago, I seem to have lost a beautiful estate,−no more. I cannot get it nearer to me. If to-morrow I should be informed of the bankruptcy of my principal debtors, the loss of my property would be a great inconvenience to me, perhaps, for many years; but it would leave me as it found me,−neither better nor worse. (“Experience,” Second Series 48-49)

What gives this passage its magic, its more than magic, its deep sense of life, is that in it the human soul reveals itself. The soul travels a journey of self-discovery: a soul in bereavement, in torment, and unsatisfied with the natural order of things: the death of his romantic and lovely “son, property, and beautiful-estate.” A soul that searches for answers to the passing of his own expression; it reflects on Emerson’s mourning, melancholia, and grief to conclude “neither better nor worse” from what heights the self and the soul must have fallen in the sense that “the child,” as he observes in his Journal “is a realization of a remembrance, & our [Lidia and him] love of the child is an acknowledgment of the beauty of human nature” (JMN, Vol. VII: 148). Or as

These aspects demonstrate that Emerson was apt to learn, as he observes to “[t]hink of living” (*JMN*, Vol.IV.40). However his soul remained in conflict with the abyss, chaos and absurdity, he was able to leap across the artificial abyss that separates him from materialists and idealists. This means that the ideal is synonymous with the apocalypse of the mind, which Emerson called Over-Soul.

Thus, for Emerson the soul is the source of all knowledge. The soul is not an object, but an organ; an organ that, within a romantic context, makes the other organs move upward and downward. It expounds the dialectics of subject and object within conscious and unconscious aesthetics, because in human life, Emerson observes, there is “[no] love without sympathy. Minds must be alike. All love a seeking in another what is like self. Difference of opinion separates, common thought ties us. If we find a person esteems excellence that we have loved we love him . . . the higher is the principle on which we symphonized the deeper more the more the love” (*JMN*, Vol.III.260). For this reason, as he searches not only for the responsive answer and source of his suffering, but also as he is confronted with doubt, pain, separation, rejection, and for nostalgic for remote, Emerson, as a romantic poet “visited Ellen’s tomb & opened the coffin” (*JMN*, Vol.IV.7),
because “[i]t encourages, exhilarates, inspires me. I feel that the affections of the soul are sublimer than the faculties of the intellect. I feel immortal. And the evidence of immortality comes better from consciousness than from reason” (JMN, Vol.III.25), and from “[t]he fragility of man into the Eternity of God” JMN, Vol.IV.22).

Having reached this stage where art functions as mediator between man, God and Nature, we must raise some questions: Was Emerson aware of the power of his suffering? What led him to open Ellen’s coffin? What did Emerson see? How did he feel when he opens the coffin? What he was searching for? Must the function of art be defined within or without the order of abyss and suffering?

The actions underlying seeing and feeling unveil the most crucial and most difficult subject to deal in a Romantic agenda, while approaching the problem of both art and soul for art and the soul’s sake. It is at this level that we must associate Beauty, Love, Suffering, and Immortality with Emerson’s Soul or with this Internal Conflict of the Soul: An Unsolved Romantic Issue, because they are congenial themselves not only with the Age, but they also are deeply in connection with his own life, with the reader and his/her own life, out of which the tension of romantic family-love, friendship, sensations, memories, imaginations, feelings, energy, sentiment, grieving, intellectual, and genius must be found.
While reflecting on both Coleridge’s and Emerson’s topics - “aesthetic, intuitive, idealize, intellectualize, organic, organization, and self-conscious,” Mattiessen reminds the reader that along with *Beauty, Love, Suffering, and Immortality* they encompass Emerson’s “whole range of experience” (7). This evidence reflects not only on the assembled mental moods which give rise to Romantic melancholy - in terms of grieving, introspection, mourning, and melancholia, but they also are in complete connection with Emerson’s love, tenderness, intellectual flight, memories, and romantic vulgarity and pretentiousness in order to reconcile and expound, as he draws a moral lesson, the relationship of all the particular sign to the whole, since he affirms the harmony and the heterogeneity of the world come from spiritual law. This notion unifies all things as part of the process of Universal Being through which the viewpoints of *Beauty, Love, Suffering, and Immortality* or even the ugliness of the cosmos are seen as the bewilderment and disenchantment of *Emerson’s Internal Conflict*.

All these have been the sensibility’s characteristic of some critical approaches on Romanticism in which human genius reflects and demonstrates the voice of truth within transcendental idealism, and the intimate connection and contradiction between the realm of physical and mental appearances. These passages, we contend, reflect upon metaphysical and transcendental expositions because they provide show that the visible and invisible worlds are contentions of a formal and a *prior* condition of aspects of the whole. They
symbolize the twofold wishes of Reason and Understanding enmeshed under the influences of the soul, of the cosmos, of God, of the poet’s optative moods amidst 19th century America.

In extending this logic, we must discuss Emerson’s string of beads which are linked to his Romantic Quest because the poet’s soul [encom]passes through different moods: Illusion, Temperament, Succession, and Surface. All these are romantic signs that function as lenses of Emerson’s subjective and objective moods to accept the inscrutability of his own life and destiny:

> It is unhappy, but too late to be helped, the discovery we have made that we exist. That discovery is called the Fall of Man. Ever afterwards we suspect our instruments. We have learned that we do not see directly, but mediately, and that we have no means of correcting these colored and distorting lenses which we are, or of computing the amount of their errors. . . . [And] The great and crescive self, rooted in absolute nature, supplant all relative existence and ruins the kingdom of mortal friendship and love. (“Experience” 82-83)

This passage demonstrates the spectrum of subjectiveness and the realm of paradoxical experiences that stand at the center of An Internal Conflict of the Soul: as A Romantic Unsolved Issue in which the growing of the individuation reflects the struggle of an unsolved thought between consciousness and unconsciousness. These viewpoints stress the opposition between materialism and spiritualism: an issue concerning the dilemma of Romantic Naturphilosophie in reconciling matter and mind. This line of thought goes back to Emerson’s reflections on immortality:

> Wilt thou not open thy heart to know
What rainbows teach, and sunsets show?
Verdict which accumulates
From lengthening scroll of human fates,
Voice of earth to earth returned,
Prayers of saints that only burned,-
Saying, What is excellent,
As God lives, is permanent;
Hearts are dust, hearts’ loves remain;
Heart’s love will meet thee again. ("Immortality" 321)

This experience of immortality brings man into union with the cosmos, with God and unveils an entire reintegration within cosmic creation. Emerson’s Transcendentalism brings man to get actively involved in higher powers. The true artist, the Sage of Concord informs us “expresses himself in terms of abundantly, not dwarfishly.” Man “stands among partial men for the complete man, and apprises not of his wealth, but of the common wealth.” Therefore, “God … is in me and must go forth of me.” These ideas lead to the fulfillment of the spiritual need of the Soul. Thus, the key to unlock the symmetry between Reason and Understanding was Emerson’s conviction on the power of religious’ sensibility in order to satisfy the great demands of spiritual desire. This is, of course, a reflection of Romantic vision of science, faith, modes of rational and irrationality, Reasoning and Understanding, democracy, freedom, virtue and moral, suggesting all transparent forces that drive into man’s soul.

These forces find their solace and gratification in the revelations that the poet is apt to universalize within An Internal Conflict of the Soul. Emerson’s soul intends to

This was Emerson’s tentative emergence in changing direction in modern philosophical thinking. He attempts to awaken man’s conscience and interest in the spiritual dimension. This passage reveals Emerson’s skepticism to [re] consider man’s relation to Spirit and Nature as an issue of his own personal experience, as part of an *Internal Conflict of the Soul*, as a triumph or failure in reconciling the discrepancy between his optimistic and pessimistic views at the time he was writing the book of *Nature* in 1836.

All these reflections are intended to bring into our conclusion that the sense of *Beauty, Love, Suffering, and Immortality* reflect features of romantic ideology in which the self attempts to preserve a balance amid human affections. They demonstrate that permutation and combination are possible in human activity. The sentiment of virtue and the whole conduct of morality ought to act towards every single person as Emerson wished it. In this line of thought, we maintain and conclude that his aesthetic relies on an ongoing process (and chain) of *discoveries, applications, inventions and enlargements* within his own *Internal Conflict of the Soul*.

In sum, through Nature the individual unveils a cleavage and what seems to be an impossible reconciliation between the outer and the inner worlds. The self to search for an expression that proceeds from the dualism, from the union
of physical and mental activities. Within these activities the human being proposes to seek in nature an intellectual and moral affinity, an intimate relation between himself/herself and nature in order to illustrate the dreams of his/her own imagination as standards of his/her own faith: an analogy under which human wisdom sees the imperfection of a single object, and attempts to labor out the perfection of the whole range of things which fall under his/her own judgments upon the opposition between the Divine Power and natural power.

These notions reflect Emerson’s reminiscences and contributions in his incessant role, as an American democratic poet, to secure moral perfectibility for his society. He asserted and reasserted the retreat and the return of the *Principium of Individualism* within the metaphysical and spiritual worlds, through which the human being was able to surrender in order to search for his own creed within inner-life along with its dilemmas and satisfactions.
Notes Towards a Conclusion

In this study we have attempted to contribute a clearer understanding of nineteenth-century American literature, specifically in the works of Ralph Waldo Emerson, the Sage of Concord, or the Father of Transcendentalist philosophy. It focuses, however, on Emerson’s oeuvre of spiritual quest: the subject of many critical controversies for at least a century and a half; it raises the problem of Emerson’s deep insight into the Internal Conflict of the Soul of human existence, experience, conflict, crisis, nationalism, rational and irrational modes, science, history, biographical sign, and art. Or as John T. Lysaker declares in Emerson’s & Self-Culture that “Emerson’s commitment to self-trust is so intense that among its prospects one finds an assertion of the right to determine, through receptions of involuntary perceptions, what distinguishes the sacred from the profane, a right that renders one god-like, a source of the sacred” (113). These viewpoints are embodied in a view of literary history to suggest a philosophy of the human as conscious being, resulting in a spiritual endeavor to awaken his ego-Self under the Principium of Individualism in which the soul becomes a supreme being: a likeness to God and Nature; this inflection is based on a multiplicity of concepts and polymorphism of divine representation of the Zeitgeist idealism of the world in associating Romanticism as a movement of merging of Puritan, Unitarian and
Transcendental visions in search for the homage to the *Soul, Beauty, Nature, History, Religion, Justice, Love, Death, Immortality, Freedom, Democracy, Reason and Understanding, Metaphysical and Divine Worlds* in America by revealing the dynamic and static positions of this Western Romantic movement. We examine socio-political, philosophical, and religious aspects which demonstrate the sublime and romantic pathos that Emerson was seeking in order to attain the “currents of the Universal Being” that “circulate through” through his Internal Conflict of the Soul. This aspect clarifies Emerson’s relation to the Romantic tradition to suggest a total response to the perennial questions about what sort of man he was. Emerson was inspired by ideas or by a Self that was searching for Thoughts and Will, or moments of romantic sublime exhilaration. These ideas show how Emerson’s internal and external dramatization of the Soul reveal a romantic authority, in which his soul travels the universe of “Intuition and Imagination” of “Metaphysical and Divine Worlds,” embracing the “unity of thought in which every heart beats with nobler sense of power and duty, and things and acts with unusual solemnity” (“Over-Soul” 277).

This thesis has been an effort to illuminate the works of Emerson in reassessing the Romantic mode in the usage of the word *soul* as synonymous with *energy, sensibility, creativity, courage, love, sentiment, confidence, conscience, essence, authenticity, integrity, intellectual, and genius*. These signs are configurations of the romantic inflection mandala, in which the self or
the soul is associated with cosmos and with the zelem or divine forces to stress his own “inner enlightenment” (Gougeon 83). As we look back to the questions we raised in the introduction of this study: whether Emerson were romantic, we maintain, he was strongly engaged within Romantic Movement in the sense that in his works we have found features of Romantic agenda, which were used by Romantic writers such as Locke, Carlyle, Rousseau, Victor Hugo, Montaigne, Coleridge, Goethe, Wordsworth, Keats, Shelley, Kant, Schelling, Madame de Stael, Cousin and Jouffroy. These features are: the emotional candor of the self in nature along with social feelings; the attitude of common sense of things on what we see, hear, know and sense, suggesting a Kantianian dualism between subject and object, or between the observer and the observed; the interest of the poet in remote and distant places to reveal the human being deeply felt sense experience; the tendencies to attract him/herself to exotic, dangerous, terrifying, dark and gothic places exciting his own romantic fascination; the juxtaposition of facts of the human being mind as the only object of inquiry, mixing the frightening invention of human vision with one’s own psychological bag on his shoulders.

These ideas link Emerson and help to identify him as Romantic writer by creating and recreating a literature full of shadowy past, imaginative dreams, and apparitions to reflect the ambivalence of the dynamic and static mechanisms that stand for life change. Or as Stephen E. Whicher stresses in Freedom and Fate that in those days there had been a strong tendency of a
changing (285-92). The human being as a living organism is, romantically speaking, a force for change, an entity of oneness, an entity of moral principles, an entity of soul’s anxiety, an entity of deep meditation, of flux, an entity of intelligence that permeates in the world we live in a new conception of life. This position of vacillating now toward one extreme and now toward the other is part of the Romantic approach in the sense that human perception, in Emerson’s works, moves into different poles of thoughts: toward eternity, a vision of existentialist life, and toward a tangible vision of empirical vigor; this notion is important because it informs the crux of an Internal Conflict of the Soul [as] A Romantic Unsolved Issue and Truth to value the romantic vision of man as an Individualism. This is quite in correspondence with what Perry Miller declared that Emerson as a Transcendentalist was “caught up in a crisis of the spirit and of the nation, a crisis that carries immense implications for the American predicament not only in ... [his] time but also in ours” (The Transcendentalists 7). Although this aspect, we conclude, is against the established order of Classicism, it attracted Emerson and most of the Romantic writers of the 19th century in the sense that the world was and is exotic; this realm fosters the cult of freedom among Romantics to write with intuition and enthusiasm in which all emotions stem from this very fountain of heart-truth to reveal a call or an echo of the transcendentalist vision that rippled across the intellectual environment of America. In the vein of A Romantic Unsolved Issue, Emerson as an artist responded with great romantic sensibility by
searching for a place, for a rational spirit for their art, which took form in literary terms and which impacted American Literature.

To conclude with our study, let us be grateful to Emerson who brought forward new models of writing, new combinations of thoughts, new sorts of incantation and invocation, new paths of elaborating enthusiasm of the emotion of the self or soul, new candles of Romantic spontaneous sentiment, new poetic pre-Darwinian evolution of species, new esse is percepi to sensible objects, new beacons of Transcendentalist Spirit between Man and God whether in the sense of belief or disbelief within his Internal Conflict of the Soul. This living organicism can only be grasped within Romantic principles in the sense that it produces and heightens not only human sensibilities, but also heightens an increasing awareness of representation of the human being mind, self, soul, nature, religion, past, history and culture within the principium of Individualism and the raison d’être: the camara obscura that better photographs the miracle of delight of the human being eye within this Internal Conflict of the Soul: A Romantic Unsolved Issue. Although this notion may consolidate the crux of vision of the Romantic approach in order to help understand the problem of the human being life along with his desires, sentiment of virtue, feelings and anxieties, it fails, in its entirety, to provide the basic ground of value through which the relationship of the human being to his life, his God, his fellows and his environment remains an unsolved conflict within the Romantic agenda. It fails because a work of art, as Bloom
declared is comparable to a set of funhouse of mirrors: the conflict between the visible and invisible worlds – the permanent discrepancy between the Individual (microcosm) and the world (macrocosm) in the sense that, as Emerson writes: “God offers to every mind its choice between truth and repose. Take which you please, - you can never have both. Between these, as a pendulum, man oscillates” (“Intellect” 341): the *coincidentia oppositorum* of the Romantic agenda.
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