UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

SENTIMENTAL BOUNDARIES IN MARK TWAIN'S NOVELS

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

KUMI IKOMA
Norman, Oklahoma
2018

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/316775

SENTIMENTAL BOUNDARIES IN MARK TWAIN'S NOVELS

A DISSERTATION APPROVED FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

BY

Dr. Rita Keresztesi, Chair

Dr. Francesca Sawaya, Co-Chair

Dr. William Henry McDonald

Dr. James Zeigler

Dr. Benjamin Alpers

© Copyright by KUMI IKOMA 2018
All Rights Reserved.

This dissertation is dedicated to the memory of my late father Minoru Ikoma whose love of poetry and novels inspired me to pursue my studies in American literature.

Acknowledgments

It is my pleasure to express my gratitude toward those who helped and supported me in various ways in completing this project. First of all, I would like to thank my advisor Dr. Francesca Sawaya. She continually supported and guided me over my graduate years while I was at OU and after I started teaching at a Japanese university in 2013. My work sometimes made it difficult for me to find enough time for writing and revising my chapters, but she always encouraged me by saying "Kumi, step by step!" I cannot express my deepest gratitude toward her for having patiently and enthusiastically read every single word of the drafts of my dissertation. She has offered insightful comments and suggestions, while at the same time challenging me with tough questions and constructive criticisms. The sparkle of her intelligence, humor, and wit has guided me toward completion of my doctoral thesis. When I was writing the epilogue, it brought home to me how much I was influenced by her work, *The Difficult Art of Giving.* My dissertation is deeply indebted to Dr. Sawaya.

I would also like to express my sincere gratitude toward the other members of my committee—Dr. Rita Keresztesi, Dr. Henry McDonald, Dr. Jim Zeigler, and Dr. Ben Alpers—for showing me warm supports and encouragements. I feel enormously grateful to Dr. Rita Keresztesi for serving as a co-chair for the sake of me. Indeed, without her help, support, and enveloping warmth, I could not have successfully completed my project. I felt like being protected by her encouraging questions and comments during my oral defense.

I deeply thank Dr. Henry McDonald for providing me with precious guidance about the nineteenth-century American literature, as well as Emmanuel Levinas. When I

visited him in his office hour, I felt like being at home, talking with him about how Levinas was received in Japan. I am grateful to Dr. Jim Zeigler for reading my dissertation meticulously and offering me a lot of challenging and inspiring questions and comments. I was deeply moved when I read his notes, “Congratulations! Great work!” on my dissertation with many stick notes, comments, and suggestions. I really appreciate Dr. Ben Alpers for having agreed to serve on my dissertation committee on a short notice, as well as reading my work closely and carefully and offering incisive questions and comments. Our exchange during the defense gave me a great opportunity to take a fresh look at my project.

My first year at OU was funded by Fulbright, and I thank the Institute of International Education for opening the gate of my academic pursuit in the United States. I was also fortunate to be selected for Dr. Edward Clark Memorial Scholarship Award from the Department of English at OU in 2011. I would also like to thank the faculty of the Departments of English at Tokyo Metropolitan University and at University of Tokyo, with special acknowledgement to Professors Kiyohiko Murayama, Masashi Orishima, and Koichi Suwabe. They helped me deepen my understanding of the nineteenth-century American literature. I am also grateful to Professor Kazuhiko Goto and the members of Mark Twain Society in Japan for their warm supports for my project. I also owe much to Professor Tomoyuki Zettsu, whose influence led to my interests in the issue of sentimentality in Mark Twain. I am also thankful to the cordial atmosphere of my colleagues at Daito Bunka University. Without their understanding and encouragement, I could not have achieved my goal.

I am also blessed with good friends, who have helped me navigate my life at OU. Words cannot express my deep gratitude toward Jen Elsner and Jen Tucker, who have always encouraged me over the past nine years. I never forgot the day when they celebrated my successful defense at Full Moon Sushi. I believe our friendship will continue even after I graduate from OU. Special thanks goes to Brian Hudson, who posted Carter Reward's essay on Injun Joe in *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer* and gave me his poetry Brian edited. He gave me a clue to understand Native American art and culture. I am also grateful to my classmates—Amanda Klinger, Steven Saxon, Elizabeth Smith, Jarrod McCartney, Nancy El Gendy, and Heidi Olson-Silcox, who invited me to a Dissertation Reading/Writing Group, Halloweens, a Baby Shower, Thanksgiving parties, and other activities.

As for friendship in Japan, I deeply appreciate Maki Shiozawa, a close friend of mine from a junior high school. I never forget my gratitude toward her when she sent me a box filled with foods, clothes, and other items, along with her heartwarming letter. Friendship with her gave me full energy and courage. Plus, my thanks goes to Atsushi Sugimura, whose research on Mark Twain has always inspired me over the years. I deeply appreciate his proofreading and comments on my draft on *Tom Sawyer*. I also express my gratitude toward Kenji Gonda, Tomohiro Hori, Mayumi Watanabe, Ai Hanada, Hiroyo Sugimoto, and Kaname Yoshida, because our study group on the issue of poor whites helped me write my chapter on *Huckleberry* Finn. I also extend my appreciation toward the late Keiko Ogata as I have been influenced by her energetic attitudes toward American literature and literary theory.

Last but not least, my thanks goes to my family, who has supported me in many ways. My beloved husband Takeshi Kimoto has proofread all my drafts over many years. I deeply appreciate his ongoing supports and encouragement. My mother Yoko Ikoma has always been concerned about my dissertation. Although it has taken years, I am glad that she is relieved at last. Although my father has passed away in 2003, his influence on my project is beyond description. In retrospect, it can be said that my concern with the theme of sentimentality originally derived from my memories of him. Even as he maintained his masculinity, he was gentle, sensitive, and sentimental at the same time. Although he always believed that men should not cry in public, he secretly shed tears when he watched a very sentimental film. I can never forget his tears. Therefore, I dedicate my dissertation to my father.

Table of Contents

Introduction: Mark Twain and Sentimentality
The Birth of Mark Twain from the Culture of Sentimentality……..……1
Genealogy of Sentimentality in British and American Culture……..…7
Literary and Cultural Studies on Sentimentality in the Twentieth-Century America…….....16
Criticism of Twain's Sentimentality…….....20
Outline of Chapters……..23

Chapter One: "Real Sentiment is a Very Rare & Godlike Thing": Sentimentality and the Question of Gender and Race in *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer*
Critical Responses to *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer*.....28
Twain's Letter to His Childhood Friend…….……..……...32
"An Awful, Unaccountable Fascination" with Injun Joe…….34
Tom's Gendered Sympathy for Becky…….....37
Injun Joe's Revenge…….....41
The Narrator's "Real Sentiment"....…….....46
Conclusion……...……...…….....48

Chapter Two: Father and Son: The Boundary of Race and the Question of Class in *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*
Introduction…….....54
Pap Finn's Whiteness……..59
Pap Finn as a Poor White……..…….60
Economic and Cultural Conditions of Poor Whites in the Old South.....62
Pap Finn's Racism and Insecurity as a Poor White……..……...64
Huck Finn as a Poor White and Boundaries of Race...…….....71
Did Huck Move Upward Class?.....72
Boundaries Between White and Black……...…….....77
Blurred Boundaries…….....79
Between Huck and Jim…….....82
Huck's Decision and Two Boundaries…….,…….....82
Huck and Pap: the "Line" of Poor Whiteness……86
Between Huck and Tom…….....90
Conclusion: the Intersection between Class and Race…….…….....94

Chapter Three: "I Wish We Could Hear of a Country That's Out of Kings": Social Hierarchy and Sympathy in *The Prince and The Pauper* and *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*
Introduction…….96
The Power of Sympathy in *The Prince and The Pauper*……...…….....100
Critical Response to *The Prince and The Pauper*……..100
How to Make a King…….....103

Sympathy and Class Differences…….....106
Aristocracy of America in *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*…….....110
The King and Duke as Poor Whites……..112
False Sympathy in *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*…….....115
Huck on Kings…….....119
Jim's Commitment to American Ideals…….....123
Conclusion……..…….....127

Chapter Four: Roxana Between Sentimental Novel and Slave Narrative: Race, Gender, and Genre in *Pudd'nhead Wilson*
Introduction……..…….....130
Motherhood in American Sentimental Literature……..131
Slave Mother Cassy in Uncle Tom's Cabin……...134
Roxana and "Motherhood"……136
Mother and Changeling……136
Roxana as "Imitation White"……..……..…....139
Ambivalent Motherhood……..….....141
Parody of Sacred Tears……..146
Roxana and the Slave Narrative…….....149
The Slave Narratives in Nineteenth Century America……..150
Roxana in the Mode of a Slave Narrative…….....152
Roxana's Sexuality…….....154
The Double Genre and the Issue of Race……..157
Conclusion ……159

Epilogue……..165

Bibliography……...177

Abstract

In this dissertation, I have discussed Mark Twain's four major novels in terms of sentimentality and boundary-making. Recent studies have characteristically revised the established image of Twain's anti-sentimentalism to show that he was actually a sentimentalist. By contrast, my dissertation focuses on how his (anti-)sentimentalism works in his stories: the protagonists and major characters of his novels feel sympathy for others across social divides of race, gender, and class thereby drawing, redrawing, crossing, or erasing the boundaries between themselves and these others.

Chapter 1 "'Real Sentiment is a Very Rare & Godlike Thing': Sentimentality and the Question of Gender and Race in *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer*" has examined how the white boy's sympathy for the racial and sexual others functions in *Tom Sawyer*. While Tom and the narrator show their male sympathy toward the Native American antagonist Injun Joe who is condemned to death in the cave, the narrator caricatures the townswomen collecting pardon petitions for Joe, and curiously remains silent about their motive. By analyzing his rhetoric of eloquence and reticence as a symptom, however, I not only showed that the women's sympathy might represent an affective mode of reason, but also that his own text ironically undermines the gendered binary of sentimentality.

In Chapter 2 "Father and Son: The Boundary of Race and the Question of Class in *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn,*" I have focused on how Huck coming from a poor white family draws boundaries in relation to Jim and Miss Watson. Asking whether or not he should help Jim in bondage in Chapter 31, he refers to his poor white background and accepts its stigma. This act of self-identification makes it possible for him to

envision a form of solidarity with Jim, even if for a brief moment. In the final chapters of the novel, however, Twain depicts that this possible cross-racial solidarity turns out to be fragile as Tom and Huck join together to "rescue" Jim. At the same time, I have also argued that Tom's scheme to set Jim free also applies to Clemens himself to a certain degree, because he narrates the antebellum story in the postbellum era—just as Tom sets up a heroic rescue scheme, knowing that Jim was already freed.

In Chapter 3 "'I Wish We Could Hear of a Country That's Out of Kings': Social Hierarchy and Sympathy in *The Prince and The Pauper* and *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*," I have compared *The Prince and The Pauper* with *Huck Finn* in terms of sympathy and class positionality. By comparing Edward's sympathy in *The Prince and The Pauper* with the confidence men in *Huck Finn*, I have indicated that the king and duke, who try to fabricate a prestigious pedigree, represents a negative of *The Prince and The Pauper*. I have then shown that Huck and Jim express very different opinions on monarchy and aristocracy, which indicates optimistic and pessimistic views on the United States as a republic and as a class society respectively. In so doing, I have argued that these polyphonic voices in *Huck Finn* can be taken as Twain's self-commentary on *The Prince and the Pauper*.

In Chapter 4 "Roxana Between Sentimental Novel and Slave Narrative: Race, Gender, and Genre in *Pudd'nhead Wilson"* I have shown how closely Roxana's dual roles in the novel are connected with character types in sentimental novels and slave narratives. First, I have explored how her maternal status is modeled after the mothers in nineteenth-century American sentimental novels. I have then examined how the elements of slave narratives are involved in her characterization as well. However,

Twain closes the novel not as a sentimental one or a slave narrative, but as a detective story. By focusing on the sympathetic relation between Wilson expressive of the new North and Judge Driscoll of the old South, I have pointed out that they cooperatively reinforce the racism in the postbellum America.

Introduction: Mark Twain and Sentimentality

The Birth of Mark Twain from the Culture of Sentimentality

Samuel Clemens was recurrently interested in the discourse of sentimentality, whether rejecting or embracing it. On February 19, 1863, Clemens published sketches entitled "Ye Sentimental Law Student," using a comic format to make fun of the sentimental language found in popular fictions. Clemens cites a fictive letter as if he had accidently found the love letter on the summit of Sugar Loaf Peak, written by someone named Solon Lycurgus, a law student and Notary Public in and for the said County of Storey, and Territory of Nevada. Clemens viewed him as an exemplar of a dim-witted person, because he was mixing love notes with legal jargon. This young journalist sent it to a newspaper to get it published. According to James Edward Caron, "the clash of inappropriate rhetoric—sentimental and legal—found in 'Ye Sentimental Law Student' expands the earlier version of this comic device when a wedding vow tangles with jargon from the stock market" (113). The founding editor of *Territorial Enterprise*, Joseph T. Goodman remembered "Ye Sentimental Law Student" as a special article for *Enterprise* signed with the pseudonym "Mark Twain" for the first time. More strictly speaking, Clemens had first signed the penname on February 3 to his weekly satirical piece in the Virginia City Territorial Enterprise. Just after adopting this pseudonym, Clemens wrote a fake love letter by himself in order to caricature its sentimental aspect. Clemens obviously saw profit in promoting "Mark Twain" through a critique of sentimentalism, while allowing himself to indulge in his sentimentalism and humor.

What is interesting in the fake love letter is that Twain mixes sentimental content with legal jargon. Twain here evokes laughter from his reader by pointing out that the

law student mixes “the beautiful language of love” with “the infernal phraseology of the law” (25). That is to say, Twain himself constructed the binary opposition between law and sentimentality. It follows from the fake letter that he assumes that the sentimental language should be differentiated from the legal jargon. Given the fact that the author writes the hoax letter himself, it is clear that sentimental and anti-sentimental emotions are both located within himself. To put it another way, he made his reader laugh by burlesquing sentimentality within himself from the anti-sentimental viewpoint.

Despite his burlesque of sentimental tropes, however, Samuel Clemens had not always been immune to the sentimentality he parodied in his article and major works such as *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer* (1876) and its sequel *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* (1885). As a teenager in Keokuk, Iowa, Samuel Clemens wrote poetry such as “To Jennie” (1853) and “To Mollie” (1854). For example, “To Jennie” is depicted as follows:

> Good –bye! A kind good-bye,
> I bid you now, my friend,
> And though ‘tis sad to speak the word,
> To destiny I bend.
>
> And though it be decreed by Fate,
> That we ne’er meet again,
> Your image, graven on my heart,
> Forever shall remain.
> Aye, in my heart thoult have a place,
> Among the friends held dear, --
> Nor shall the hand of Time efface
> The memories written there.
> Good bye,
> S.L.C.
> (quoted in Norton version of *Huck Finn* 306)

Jennie was Ann Virginia Ruffner, with whom Clemens socialized briefly in 1853 before she left town. He apparently expressed his grief and sorrow of his separation from

Jennie. Yet, we should not miss that Clemens makes a clear contrast between "Fate" and his personal memory of Jennie. He admitted that he was defeated by "Fate" or "destiny," which seem to go beyond time and man's will. At the same time, Clemens tries to resist "destiny," by showing strong attachment to his own memory. As Thomas Cooley who edits the Norton version of *Huck Finn* points out, there is not a hint of irony, burlesque, and satire at all, in this poetry written by Mark Twain (206n). The poem indicates Clemens' predilection for his own personal past and nostalgia. He has a romantic fantasy that his affection for her is so infinite that it can transcend "the Fate" and continues forever.

Here we can recognize what Justin Kaplan calls "the doubleness of Samuel L. Clemens and Mark Twain" (101). On the one hand, Clemens privately shows his preferences for sentimental poetries and novels. In fact, he covertly wrote *The Prince and The Pauper* (1882) to his daughters, and anonymously wrote *Personal Recollections of Joan of Arc* (1896), both of which are reminiscent of sentimental novels, in terms of their style and contents.[1] Interestingly enough, his daughter Susy

[1] In other stories, too, Twain dramatizes sentimental topics like death of or separation from family members in his short stories. For example, "A True Story, Repeated Word for Word as I heard It" (1874) begins in the first-person from the point of view of "Misto C" suggestive of Clemens himself. Yet, when he asks Aunt Rachel, a servant aged about sixty, about how she could have lived so long with no trouble, she tells a story of losing her family members due to slavery. Arthur G. Pettit calls "A True Story" "a heavy dose of Victorian sentiment" (53). Moreover, Twain's another short story "Which It Heaven? or Hell?" (1902) is about the moral dilemma that elderly sisters are confronted with when tending their dying niece and the latter's dying daughter. (Though they firmly believe any kind of lie to be a sin, they hide from them each one's critical condition and tell a lie about them respectively.) R. Kent Rasmussen evaluates this piece as "a sentimental story" (206). These tales, especially "Which It Heaven? or Hell?," draw relatively less attention from critics and scholars than Twain's other works such as *The Prince and The Pauper* and *Personal Recollections of Joan of Arc*. These stories suggest that Twain repetitively shows his preference for sentimental topics.

claimed that "'His Prince and Pauper' is his most original, and best production" (*Autobiography Vol.2* 332). Twain responded on September 21, 1906: "[s]he has said it well and correctly. Humor is a subject which has never had much interest for me" (*Autobiography Vol.2* 332). His tendency for sentimentalism is obvious from his private life as well. From 1874, Clemens, his wife Olivia, and their daughters moved to Hartford, Connecticut, and became close neighbors of Harriet Beecher Stowe. Stowe was their family friend, and they owned a variety of her books. Indeed, Clemens was interested in *Uncle Tom's Cabin* (1852) not only for its contents, but also for its popularity, noting its many dramatic performances and comparing the book to his own works (Harris "Harriet Beecher Stowe" 717). The autobiographical studies about Samuel Clemens make it clear that he read sentimental novels with appreciation, including Stowe's magnum opus.

Nevertheless, Mark Twain publicly burlesqued and downplayed sentimental novels and their conventions, establishing his position as a humor writer. For instance, in *Life on the Mississippi* (1883), Twain vehemently criticized the Southern partiality for romantic and sentimental novels of Sir Walter Scott, arguing that they helped cause the huge catastrophe of the Civil War:

> There [in our South], the genuine and wholesome civilization of the nineteenth century is curiously confused and commingled with the Walter Scott Middle-Age sham civilization; and so you have practical, common-sense, progressive ideas, and progressive works, mixed up with the duel, the inflated speech, and the jejune romanticism of an absurd past that is dead, and out of charity ought to be buried. But for the Sir Walter disease, the character of the Southerner--or Southron, according to Sir Walter's starchier way of phrasing it--would be wholly modern, in place of modern and mediaeval mixed, and the South would be fully a generation further advanced than it is. (332)

Twain elsewhere describes the South's attachment to the past as what he calls "Sir Walter Scott disease." In his view, the worst traits of southern character and manners stem from Scott's romanticism, and it functions to prevent the Southerners from facing southern backwardness. In the quote above, Twain makes a stark contrast between "practical, common-sense, progressive ideas, and progressive works" and "the duel, the inflated speech, and the jejune romanticism of an absurd past." In other words, the South is characterized as retrogressive in contradistinction to progress, which is implicitly represented by the North. In this way, Twain vehemently criticizes the southern backwardness in terms of sentimentalism. His critique of sentimentality depends upon such a dichotomy he himself makes between civilization and anti-civilization.

Likewise, he also has his protagonist Huck feel uncomfortable with the sentimental pictures and poetries left by Emmeline Grangerford, a dead fifteen-year-old girl in *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*:

> There was one where a young lady was at a window looking up at the moon, and tears running down her cheeks; and she had an open letter in one hand with black sealing wax showing on one edge of it, and she was mashing a locket with a chain to it against her mouth, and underneath the picture it said "And Art Thou Gone Yes Thou Art Gone Alas." These was all nice pictures, I reckon, but I didn't somehow seem to take to them, because if ever I was down a little they always give me the fantods. (121)

Emmeline's works display a sentimental obsession with death and sorrow that gives Huck "the fantods." Like Twain's indictment of Sir Walter Scott, the protagonist's reaction to her indicates his irritation: her pictures and poetry obscure the underlying culture in which a homicidal feud is destroying her family as well as the brutal injustice of a society founded on slavery. Furthermore, Twain tries to differentiate the sentimental

culture Emmeline embodies from Huck and Jim's world in terms of gender. As shown below, sentimental culture tends to be associated with women and feminine culture. By making his protagonist feel uncomfortable about Emmeline's works, the author makes a stark binary between masculine and feminine culture.

Ironically enough, the portrait of a young lady on a crayon drawing recalls the girls in young Clemens' poetry. The girl in Emmeline's drawing expresses sorrow of separation, just like the young Clemens. Whereas he sincerely expressed his sorrow about the separation from the girl he loved, Twain burlesques the same type of girl Emmeline draws. Leland Krauth makes a point concerning this contradiction:

> The sentimental was, in short, very much with Mark Twain. It was also *in* him. Twain's burlesque of the cult in *Huckleberry Finn*, is in part, I believe, a check against his own susceptibility, and in part a diversion calculated to deflect our attention away from Huck's own overabundance emotion. ("The Victorian Southwestern Humor" 230)

Indeed, while caricaturing Emmeline's works, Twain dramatizes Huck's sentimental and sympathetic feeling for Jim. Twain's contradictory attitudes toward sentimentality lead us to exploring why he privately shows an inclination and preference for it even as he publicly problematizes and criticizes sentimentality at the same time. In fact, Twain's attack on the Southern partiality for Sir Walter Scott's novel and Huck's reaction toward Emmeline's works suggest that he believed that sentimental culture and works were linked with insincere, narcissistic, or false feelings. In his view, sentimentality functions as a screen deflecting attention away from the harsh realities of racial and familial conflict in the United States.

In short, Twain tended to make the stark contrast between sentimentality and progress. While associating progressiveness mainly with masculinity, the North, and

modern civilization, Twain viewed sentimentality as feminine, Southern, nostalgic for the past, and anti-civilization. His dichotomies lead us to asking why Twain had to make up such stark binary oppositions even though he himself showed signs of involvement in sentimental culture. In other words, one might wonder why Twain, despite his implicit sentimentalism needed to denounce sentimental culture in public. Furthermore, it is also important to ask what Twain sought to do by making such dichotomies between feminized sentimentality and masculinized progressiveness. As I will develop in my chapters, the notion of boundary will play a key role in investigating what Twain is doing by making such dichotomies.

In order to answer these questions, however, we might first need to trace the history of sentimental culture. The transformation of the meaning of sentimentality over time helps us understand why Twain suffered inner conflicts over the issue of sentimentality, and why Twain, in spite of his criticism, dramatized his protagonist's sympathetic feeling toward his friend in his works. To this end, I will first explain the etymology and cultural backgrounds of the term.

Genealogy of Sentimentality in British and American Culture

First of all, we need to grasp the basic meaning of the word "sentimentality." The etymology reveals us how the meaning has changed over time. According to *The Oxford English Dictionary Online* and Fred Kaplan (17), the word *sentiment*, originally from medieval Latin *sentimentum* through Old French *sentement*, came into English as early as the fourteenth century and meant "personal experience" and "one's own feelings" at first. Later it came to mean, in chronological sequence, "physical feeling," "mental

attitude (of approval or disapproval)," "an emotion," "a thought of reflection coloured by or proceeding from emotion," "an emotional thought expressed in literature or art," and "a striking or agreeable thought or wish." The words "sentimental" and "sentimentality" were coined in the middle to late eighteenth century, and through much of the nineteenth, neither word had pejorative implications, except in special cases. With slowly gathering force, "sentimentalism" came to denote late in the nineteenth century the misuse of sentiment, "the disposition to attribute undue importance to sentimental considerations, to be governed by sentiment in opposition to reason; the tendency to excessive indulgence in or insincere display of sentiment." In short, although the word "sentimental" first came into being in eighteenth-century England and America as a term of approval, in the course of the nineteenth century, the notion of sentimentality as insincerity, false feeling, or hypocrisy became prevalent.

In addition to its etymology, we might also need to explore its cultural backgrounds to better understand the term. The transformation of its meaning did not only happen over time, but also across nations. Discussions of sentimentality were originally elaborated by the Common Sense philosophy in eighteenth-century Britain, and later transferred to America to evolve into sentimentalism of the nineteenth-century American culture. There was a major difference between England and the United States in terms of its evaluation. According to Fred Kaplan, many Victorian writers, especially Charles Dickens, William Makepeace Thackeray, George Eliot, and Thomas Carlyle, influenced by the eighteenth century moral philosophy, believed that "the human community was one of shared moral feelings, and that sentimentality was a desirable way of feeling and of expressing ourselves morally" (3). In the United States, however,

although the founders of the nation earnestly studied moral philosophy, sentimentality came to be feminized and hence degraded.

In the eighteenth-century Scottish Common Sense philosophy, the word sentimentality was closely connected with other feeling-related terms, most notably "sympathy," which was upheld as a moral sentiment. Therefore, the genealogy of sentimentality can be traced within the interplay between social ideology and literary movements in this historical context. As Jay Fligelman, Kristin Boudreau, and Fred Kaplan put it (Fligelman:10-35, Boudreau: 1-18, Kaplan:11-20), Scottish philosophers, including Francis Hutcheson, David Hume, and Adam Smith derived morality from sympathetic emotion. They affirmed that human beings had moral instincts that were as natural as their selfish instincts; by relying on sympathy, they all attempted to bridge the gap between the self and the other. For example, accepting John Locke's pedagogy,[2] Hutcheson held moral sentiment in high regard as a new sixth sense, which integrated with other senses, i.e., sight, hearing, tasting, touch, and smell. For him, sympathy served as an automatic moral sense that urged people to help whenever they catch a sight of another person's suffering. Hutcheson's follower, Adam Smith expanded the meaning of sympathy to designate fundamental social ties among individuals. He explained to the reader the dynamics of sympathy in *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (1759):

[2] According to Jay Fligelman, Locke concluded in his *Some Thoughts Concerning Education* (1693) that "the education must rest not on the teaching of 'precept,' but on the force of 'example,' specifically parental example, for it registers the earliest impressions on human mind" (13). Fligelman's study chronicles the eighteenth-century American efforts to domesticate an older patriarchal family authority through representation of parent-child relations as more affectionate and equalitarian.

> As we have no immediate experience of what other men feel, we can form no idea of the matter in which they are affected, but by conceiving what we ourselves should feel in the like situation. Though our brother is upon the rack, as long as we ourselves are our ease, our sense will never inform us of what he suffers. They never did, never can, carry us beyond our own person, and it is by the imagination only that we can form any conception of what are his sensation….By imagination we place ourselves in his situation, we conceive ourselves enduring all the same torments, we enter as it were into his body and become in some measure the same person with him, and thence from some idea of his sensations, and even feel something which, though weaker in degree, is not altogether unlike him. (3-4)

Smith claims that sympathy is made possible by imagination. While other people's sentiments are fundamentally inaccessible to us, we imagine their passions and sentiments by placing ourselves in their situation. That is to say, the self constructs the other self by projecting one's own sentiments onto him or her. Thus, Smith describes sympathy as a "fellow-feeling" that mediates between us. While the words "pity" and "passion" primarily signify "our fellow-feeling with the sorrow of others," sympathy, he suggests, can be used to denote "our fellow-feeling with any passion whatever." Therefore, sympathy in Smith not only connects a sympathizer and a sufferer, but also provides an important principle for social relationship in general. He envisages that human behavior can be regulated by what he calls "an internal monitor" activated by sympathy, which eases the tension between individuals' self-interest and social stability.

Then, how did these philosophers detect sympathetic exchanges between the sufferer and his or her observer? They consider scenes and expressions of the human body to be a central place for the operation of sympathy. For instance, Hume explores, "[w]hen any affection is infu'sed by sympathy, it is at first known only by its effects, and by those external signs in the countenance and conversation, which conveys an idea of it" (quoted in Boudreau, 11). Likewise, Smith's explanation of sympathy is

predicated upon the notion of sense impressions; "When we see a stroke aimed and just ready to fall upon the leg or arm of another person, we naturally shrink and draw back our own leg or our own arm; when it does fall, we feel it in some measure, and are hurt by it as well as the sufferer" (4). Hume and Smith hold that our capacity to sympathize with the other's sentiments is crucial. According to them, sensory impressions function as external signs that are crucial for the exchange of sympathy.

Sympathy was vital as a sociable and cultural ideal not only in Europe, but also on the other side of the Atlantic. The founding fathers of the United States of America, such as Thomas Paine, Thomas Jefferson, and Benjamin Rush, eagerly studied the idea of sympathy. They supposed that nothing but sympathy enabled them to construct American identity and hold the young nation together in the Revolutionary War. However, there were contradictory aspects to this notion; while sympathy tended to unite people, it could also upset the stability of the self by intruding into the private realm of individual identity. In other words, while sympathy was believed to encourage people to participate in democracy, the reliance on this emotion, they argued, resulted in the blurring of boundaries between the self and the other. Confronted with the horror of the French Revolution, some American politicians suspected that the contagious effect of sympathy might implicate the young republican nation in the madness of a social disorder. Therefore, rationalists maintained that sympathy was a dangerous doctrine; from their perspective, sympathetic identification with others incurred the loss of the self's autonomy.

The seduction novel, for example, alarmed readers about the perverse and mocking aspects of affective exchange. For instance, the first American novel, *The*

Power of the Sympathy, or the Triumph of Nature (1789), reflected the eighteenth-century's preoccupation with the danger of sympathy. Harrington, a wealthy young seducer, falls in love with the apparently orphaned Harriet. Though he finally decides to marry her, they find out the secret of their birth—the hidden fact that they are half-brother and sister. As a result, the sister's reluctance to overcome her affection toward her brother hastens her depression and death, while the brother also commits suicide, claiming "Let the tears of sorrow blot out, my guilt from the book of thy wrath" (101). In spite of Harrington's crying out for pity and his need for sympathy, their deaths suggest the danger of sympathetic identification.[3] Likewise, Hannah Webster Foster's *The Coquette, or The History of Eliza Wharton* (1799) also demonstrates the tragedy of the young heroine Eliza Wharton. Foster depicts how the heroine, after being easily attracted and seduced by a libertine, gives birth to an illegitimate child and dies soon after at a roadside tavern. Thus, these novels played a central role of conveying the danger of sympathy.[4]

While the popularity of the seduction novel gradually declined in the early nineteenth century, the sentimental novel (also called domestic fiction) remained prevalent in the United States. While the seduction novel associated a young woman's virginal body with virtue, the nineteenth–century domestic fiction presented to the

[3] Focusing on the final words of the novel ("May we never love as these have lov'd") Cathy N. Davidson also insists that these words express "the darker power of sympathy" (184).

[4] Leonard Tennehouse points out that American readers at that time were drawn to seduction novels: "[w]hether British or American in origin, this fiction invariably featured the same array of cruel libertines, foolish coquettes, ruined women, stillborn babies, and destinies misshapen by desire. Judging by the sheer number of variations on this stock of plots and characters, there was virtually no end to the demand for this type of fiction" (1).

reader a young girl's struggle over physical hardship, so as to maintain morality and triumph by gaining a new family. For example, Susan Warner's *Wide Wide World* (1850) depicts the young heroine's, Ellen Montgomery, struggle to endure her mother's death, as well as the brutality and contempt of those she encounters on her life voyage. Likewise, Maria Susanna Cummins' *The Lamplighter* (1854) narrates the story of Gertrude, an orphan girl rescued at the age of eight by a kind old lamplighter. She is lovingly raised and taught virtues and religious faith by him. As a result, she is finally rewarded with marriage to a childhood friend and reunion with her father. Thus, the transition from the seduction novel to sentimental fiction represented a shift of concern from the female body to the female spirit.

It is noteworthy that in spite of some differences between them, both domestic fiction writers and seduction novelists focused on sympathy. As I will discuss in Chapter 4, one of the most influential sentimental writers, Harriet Beecher Stowe in her *Uncle Tom's Cabin* (1852) urged the reader to "feel right" and show sympathy to others. Stowe continues: "[a]n atmosphere of sympathetic influence encircles every human being; and the man or woman who feels strongly, healthily and justly, on the great interests of humanity, is a constant benefactor to the human race" (385). Gregg Camfield argues that, in order to challenge the doctrine of Calvinism her father instilled in his sons and daughters, Stowe is self-consciously involved herself in the effort to spread Common Sense in her writing (25). Stowe's acclaim for sympathy reminds the reader of the Common Sense philosophy's presumption that sympathy serves as the sociable instinct bringing together separate individuals.

How did sentimentalists like Stowe represent the occurrence of sympathy? Sentimental fictions tried to evoke from the reader the tears, which registers the physical nature of sentimental discourse. According to Jane Tompkins, their heart is indicative of a state of grace and such grace can be detected by the sound of our voice, the touch of our hand, and especially tears (60). Indeed, when Little Eva, a virtuous girl typical of sentimental novel's heroine, is dying, Stowe demonstrates that "it is impossible to describe the scene [the dying scene of Little Eva], as with tears and sobs, they [black slaves] gathered round the creature [Little Eva], and took from her hands what seemed to them a last mark of her love" (251). Behaviors such as sobbing and the grasping of hands designate sympathetic exchanges between the dying girl and the black slaves.

By the same token, *The Lamplighter* elucidated the importance of behavior such as "shedding tears" and "embracing." When Gertrude has a reunion with her father, who has been searching for her for years, the description of the sensation the heroine feels is described as follows:

> So noiseless is her light step, that before he is conscious of her presence, she has thrown herself upon his bosom and, her whole frame trembling with the vehemence of long-suppressed agitation, burst into a torrent of passionate tears, interrupted only by frequent sobs, so deep and so exhausting that her father, with his arms folded around her, and clasping her so closely to his heart that she feels its irregular beating, endeavours to still the tempest of her grief, whispering softly, as to an infant, "Hush! hush, my child! you frighten me!" (392)

The sobbing, tears, and embraces of the two represent an affective exchange between the father and the daughter after years of separation. Thus, the sentimentalists' approval of sympathy results in the repeated description of tears as an external sign of compassionate emotion in their novel.

As is widely known, however, these female writers of sentimental novels drew jealous attention from male writers. In January 1855, for example, according to F.O. Matthiessen, Nathaniel Hawthorne wrote a letter to one of his publishers describing the overwhelming success of the female writers at the time:

> America is now wholly given over to a damned mob of scribbling women, and I should have no chance of success while the public taste is occupied with their trash-and should be ashamed of myself if I did succeed. What is the mystery of these innumerable editions of the 'Lamplighter,' and other books neither better nor worse?-worse they could not be, and better they need not be, when they sell by the 100,000. (44)

The increasing public influence of women endangered the male writers like Hawthorne. His evaluation describes and anticipates the later antipathy and derision against sentimental novels and their writers. Just as the influence of the Common Sense Philosophy gradually declined after the mid-nineteenth-century, so the popularity of the sentimental novel diminished and it became the object of criticism. June Howard explains:

> We should recognize as well that, in postbellum America, the literary was often defined against sentimentality and the domestic culture of letters. Prestigious writing gradually and unevenly became less openly emotional and more ambitiously intellectual, less directly didactic and more conspicuously masculine. Antisentimentalism is an important part of that story, especially for literary studies. (74)

Thus, one of the favorite themes of sentimental fiction, the sympathetic and affectionate tie, especially between a child and his or her mother, is burlesqued, caricatured, or even criticized by male writers like Mark Twain in the late nineteenth-century. Consequently, as Suzanne Clark puts it, "Narration in the twentieth century would become a struggle over how emotion is to be regulated and distributed, where feeling can be allowed" (31). Thus, emotion like sympathy and sentimentality tends to be denied and repressed

by both realist and modernist writers.

Literary and Cultural Studies on Sentimentality in the Twentieth-Century America

Until the mid-twentieth century, literary scholars, as if to correspond to the literary movements, also associated sentimentality with women and criticized it vehemently. For example, R.W. B. Lewis in *The American Adam* (1959) depicted what he calls American Adam as "a new kind of hero, the heroic embodiment of a new set of ideal human attributes" (5). Leo Marx in *The Machine in the Garden* (1964) also noted the contrast between "popular and sentimental" pastoralism whose harmonious accommodation with nature is embodied by women and the family and "the other imaginative complex" pastoralism whose struggle with sentimentalism is mainly expressed by canonical male writers. Likewise, Leslie Fiedler in *Love and Death in the American Novel* (1960) points out that the great tradition of American literature, from Charles Brockden Brown to William Faulkner, represents the escape from a domestic, female-dominated American culture. These critics tend to take for granted the equivalency between sentimentality and femininity and devalued them both.

However, sentimental literature has undergone extensive critical reassessment, especially since the late 1970s. For example, the famous controversy between Ann Douglas and Jane Tompkins over the valorization of sentimentality ended up affirming that the genre should be associated with women writers and was expressive of women's issues. Ann Douglas's *The Feminization of American Culture* (1977) denigrated sentimental women writers for their "debased religiosity, [and] their sentimental

peddling of Christian belief for its nostalgic value." According to her, "the sentimentalization of theological and secular culture was an inevitable part of the self-evasion of a society both committed to laissez-faire industrial expansion and disturbed by its consequences" (12). Disputing Douglas's underestimation of sentimentalism, Jane Tompkins, in *Sensational Designs; The Cultural Work of American Fiction, 1790-1860* (1986), described one of the most famous sentimental novels, *Uncle Tom's Cabin,* as "the *summa theologica* of nineteenth-century America's religion of domesticity, a brilliant redaction of the culture's favorite story about itself—the story of salvation through motherly love" (125). Regardless of their argument for or against the power of sentimental literature, both Douglas and Tompkins presuppose the tendency that sentimentality can be associated with women.

In responding to Douglas and Tompkins's debates on American Sentimentalism, various feminist critics have made contributions to further reevaluate nineteenth-century sentimental fiction. For instance, following Tompkins's attempt to highlight the value of sentimental fiction, Joanna Dobson, in "Reclaiming Sentimental Literature," (1997) investigates the literary qualities of sentimental fiction by focusing on female poets and novelists. By citing mainly female writers, Cindy Weinstein, in *Sympathy in Nineteenth-Century American Literature* (2004), also places stress on the cultural value of sentimentality; she argues that "the cultural work of sentimental fictions is nothing less than an interrogation and reconfiguration of what constitutes a family" (9). Significant as their arguments are, they tend to perpetuate the gendered notions of sentimentality and sympathy.

Likewise, two other important critics Laura Wexler and Amy Kaplan, while calling attention to the sentimental culture's secret alliance with US imperialism, follow the assumption that sentimentalism embodies a feminine system of values.[5] Wexler in "Tender Violence: Literary Eavesdropping, Domestic Fiction, and Educational Reform" (1992) interprets sentimentalism as "the expansive and imperial project of sentimentalism." According to her, "'sentimentalization was a form of externalized aggression that was sadistic, not masochistic, in flavor. The energies it developed were intended as a tool for the control of others, not merely as aid in the conquest of the self" (15). Likewise, posing the question of "how the ideology of separate spheres in antebellum America contributed to creating an American empire by imaging the nation as a home" (583), Kaplan's "Manifest Domesticity" (1998) offers an indictment of sentimentalism by demonstrating the close link between sentimental discourse and colonialism.

Moreover, some critics have revisited the origin of sentimentalism in the seduction novels of the early Republic. Julia A. Sterns, in *The Plight of Feeling* (1997), demonstrates that the excessive sentimentality of the early Republican novels registers "a collective mourning over the violence of the Revolution and the preemption of liberty in the wake of the post-Revolutionary settlement" (2). According to her, heroines at that time "reorchestrate the voices and restore the visibility of those Americans [women, the poor, Native American, African American, as aliens] silenced and

[5] Recent critics tend to resist positions "for" or "against" sentimentality. For instance, Lora Romeo's argument about early nineteenth-century domesticity demonstrates that "the politics of culture reside in local formulations—and historical locations of those formulations—rather than in some essential and ineluctable political tendency inhering within them" (6-7). I agree with her remark, because we need to grasp complicated mechanisms of what is called sentimentalism rather than purify its meanings.

submerged by the promise of Founding" (29). In contrast, Elizabeth Barnes's *States of Sympathy* (1997) rebuts "the idea that female bonding offers a new and liberating alternative to the seductive practices of male-dominated culture" (17). Barnes insists that the early Republican novel and its successor, the domestic novel, do not challenge, but reinforce, the patriarchal family model by placing stress on sympathetic identification, subordinating differences to sameness.

Thus, in spite of their different valorization of sentimentality, both Stern and Barnes take into reconsideration the function of sentimentality irrespective of femininity.[6] Against this backdrop, the editors of the anthology *Sentimental Men* (1999), Mary Chapman and Glenn Hendler, affirm that "men did in fact participate in sentimental discourse." They elucidate "the hidden hearts of sentimental men: crying over their drunken depravities, emotionally begging for financial support, grieving the deaths of their children" (9). This anthology is quite noteworthy for throwing light on male sentimentality.

However, the male writers' harsh critique of American sentimentalism suggests that there is not only contiguity, which the above anthology highlights, but also disjunction between male and female sentimentality, at least after the late nineteenth-century. Twain's novels are a case in point. As shown in Chapter 1 on *Tom Sawyer*, Twain comes to focus on male sentimentality, faced with a variety of challenges to traditional ways of building male identities. Gail Bederman clearly illustrates a crisis of male-identity in the 1880s through the 1910s that took place partly because "economic

[6] Leonard Tennenhouse asserts that "a new generation of scholar critics [i.e. Shirley Samuels, Julia A. Stern, and Elizabeth Barnes] has taken up the project moving American literary criticism beyond the masculine-feminine opposition that structures any theory of feminization, good or bad" (4).

changes had rendered earlier ideologies of middle-class manhood less plausible" (12). Other scholars like E. Anthony Rotundo and Michael S. Kimmel also argue that middle-class men experienced the crisis of manhood in the late nineteenth century, with developments of modernization including rapid industrialization, technological transformation, capital concentration, urbanization, immigrants entering the workplace, and so forth (Rotundo 174, Kimmel 58). Thus, many men tried to revitalize manhood "by celebrating all things male" and "by opposing excessive femininity" (Bederman 16). [7]

Criticism of Twain's Sentimentality

Significantly, the pros and cons of sentimental literature correspond to the existing studies of Mark Twain in terms of sentimentality. Over the last one hundred years since Twain's death, a number of critics and scholars have debated whether Twain is really a sentimentalist or not, as well as how Twain evaluates sentimental novels and culture. For example, there was a controversy over evaluation of Twain's works between Van Wyck Brooks and Bernard De Voto from 1920 to 1930. On the one hand, Brooks claimed that Twain curtailed his genius by repressing his natural artistic bent for the sake of American sentimentalism embodied by his wife Olivia (25). On the other hand, De Voto maintained that although he was negatively influenced by the feminized

[7] Basil Ransom in *Bostonian* (1885) expresses that anger and resentment which, according to Kimmel, "many men had come to feel at the turn of the century (80): "the whole generation is womanized; the masculine tone is passing out of the world; it's a feminine, a nervous, hysterical, chattering, canning age, an age of hollow phrases and false delicacy and exaggerated solitudes and coddled sensibilities….The masculine character, the ability to dare and endure, to know and yet not fear is what I want to preserve, or rather recover" (322).

Victorian culture in the East, Twain, based on his own experience in the West, could achieve and express his masculine thoughts and values (210-216). Thus, the critics took opposite positions with respect to evaluation of Twain on sentimentality. Nevertheless, we can detect the same assumption shared by them; while associating sentimentality and femininity and devaluing both, they view anti-sentimentalism as the authentic standpoint for literature.[8] Even in the 1950s, other scholars continued to follow this devaluation of sentimentality. For example, Henry Nash Smith asserted that Twain in his use of vernacular language struggled to indicate how shallow and inappropriate American Victorianism was (113-37). Likewise, James M. Cox in *Mark Twain: The Fate of Humor* made a stark contrast between Twain as a humorist and Stowe as a sentimentalist, praising the former over the latter.[9]

As mentioned before, however, the debate between Douglas and Tompkins has led to a reconsideration of Twain's reaction to sentimental culture and gender. Laura Skandera Trombley has modified the male critics and scholars' evaluation of Twain, by demonstrating that Twain was greatly influenced by his mother, wife, daughters, and contemporary female writers to become an authoritative writer (1-11). Envisioning the concept of feminization as an ideological process that involved both men and women, Peter Stoneley has shown how Twain, who had been associated with the adventurous, picaresque, and male world, was struggling to deal with femininity and feminine

---

[8] Francesca Sawaya, discussing the place of women in the history of modern professionalism, challenges the tacit gendered assumption that "[m]odernity is thereby implicitly linked to masculinity and whiteness and premodernity to femininity and racial or ethnic otherness" (2). My treatment of sentimentality in Mark Twain is informed by her argument.

[9] Leland Krauth in *Mark Twain & Company* argues that "Stowe has her own kind of humor," whereas "Twain himself is often a sentimentalist" (93).

aesthetics (8). Furthermore, Gregg Camfield has shed a new light on Mark Twain studies, clarifying the philosophical context of nineteenth-century American sentimental literature. Showing that the sentimental discourse at that time stemmed from Scottish Common Sense philosophy, Camfield has examined how Twain's life and thought were affected by sentimentalism, especially in terms of its philosophical context. According to Camfield, the term "realism" means the mimesis of a psychological reality or how we perceive it, rather than a simple physical reality. By the same token, he argues that sentimentalism is not contradictory to, but complementary with, realism. Camfield also points out that because Twain suffered from epistemological difficulties in sorting out objectivity and subjectivity, he gradually became interested in sentimentalism as a philosophy, despite his rejection of it in the beginning of his life as a novelist (12).

Likewise, Leland Krauth contradicts the conventional view of Twain as a rebel against American sentimental culture and examines how the real Twain is committed to Victorian ideals of conventionality, respectability, and propriety (*Proper* 9-11). For example, Krauth, drawing on Peter Brooks' *The Melodramatic Imagination,* maintains that Twain "creates a final scene of the power of the heart" (*Proper* 187) in his masterpiece *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. Mary Louis Kete defines the poetics of the nineteenth-century American sentimental literature as celebrating "the domestic, the familial, and the possibility of consent" (3). She argues that *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer* is indicative of the promise of sentimentality (159-65), while the sequel *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* is of its limitation (166-79).

In terms of gender or moral philosophy, Twain scholars tend to explore whether Twain is truly a sentimentalist or not, and how Twain deals with conflicts over

sentimentality through writing his novels. Important as their studies are, they do not seem to fully investigate how sentimentality works in his novels. Twain makes a series of dichotomies deriving from sentimentality, such as masculinity and femininity, progress and backwardness, the North and the South, and so forth. In so doing, Twain differentiates himself or his protagonists from others and constructs his and their subjectivity. Indeed, his novels often dramatize, relativize, and parodize the emotional relationship between his protagonists and other characters. Whereas the latter often includes others in terms of race, gender, and class, the former primarily represents white middle-class boys or men. To put it in another way, the white male protagonists construct their subjectivity by drawing, redrawing, and overcoming sentimental boundaries between themselves and others. Thus, sentimentality plays a pivotal role in constructing the male subjectivity through building up the affective relationship between the protagonist and others. Therefore, it is productive to consider how sentimentality or sympathy functions in his works, not just asking whether or not Twain was sentimentalist.

Outline of Chapters

This dissertation aims to explore the protagonists' sympathy toward others in Twain's major novels from the viewpoint of sentimental boundaries in gender, race, and class. Twain recurrently dramatizes his protagonists' sympathetic or compassionate feeling for others. Focusing on these scenes, scholars and critics have examined whether or not Twain was really a sentimentalist and how he overcame repression of his own sentimentality. But they have not delved into how the boundary between oneself and the

others is drawn and redrawn, erased and crossed, by the protagonists who feel compassionate toward others. In contrast, this dissertation will look at boundary-(re)making through the protagonists' sentimentality or sympathy. By doing so, I will clarify how the subject formation of the protagonist or major characters takes place in the process of social or ideological boundary-making through sympathy.

Rather than trying to distinguish and classify the semantics of sentimental terms, I will use the words, including (but not limited to) "sentimentality" and "sympathy," somewhat interchangeably. In this respect, I will follow the lead of Julia Ellison: "I have used words like 'emotion,' 'feeling,' 'affect,' 'sensibility,' 'sympathy,' and 'sentiment' in an impressionistic fashion… to emphasize that what these terms have in common is much more important than what differentiates them from one another" (4) Although I have sketched a genealogy of sentimentality so as to emphasize the continuity between "sympathy" and sentimentalism in America, I do not intend to provide either positive or negative evaluation of sentimental beliefs and ideology. This is because I am more concerned with how sentimental or sympathetic feelings function in Twain's works. Here I agree with Eve Sedgwick's argument. Sedgwick suggests that we focus on a "structure of relation," rather than "a thematic or a particular subject matter" (143). Interpreting sentimentality or sympathy "as a structure of relation" is more meaningful and fruitful than defining or classifying these words rigidly. In my view, the boundary-making between the self/inside and the other/outside is at work in the feeling of sentimentality or sympathy. That is the reason why sentimentality plays a central role in investigating the "structure of relation" among the protagonists and characters in Twain's works.

In Chapter 1, I will address sympathy in connection with gender and race in *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer*, focusing on the relationship between the white male sympathizers (Tom and Twain) and the sympathized women and people of color (Becky and Joe). I will first clarify how Twain valorizes Tom Sawyer's sympathy as rational, individual, and genuine in contrast to that of women, including Becky, as tearful, collective, and inauthentic. I will then examine how "Injun Joe," a Native American antagonist who is condemned to death in the cave, receives Tom's and the narrator's male sympathy. While the townswomen collect pardon petitions for Joe, the narrator caricatures them and curiously remains silent about their motive. By analyzing his rhetoric of eloquence and reticence as a symptom, I will not merely insist that the women's sympathy might represent an affective mode of reason, but also that his own text ironically undermines the gendered binary of sentimentality.

In Chapter 2, I will discuss how sympathy works at the boundaries of class and of race in *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. Specifically, I will argue that looking at Huck's lower-class status as a poor white will help explain his relationship with the runaway slave Jim. I will first clarify the notion of poor whites from historical and sociological perspectives, and then examine how Huck, while befriending Jim, draws and redraws boundaries of class and race in Chapter 31 in particular. By reading the chapter from the point of view of class, I will indicate how Huck's position as both poor and white plays a significant role in making his decision to help Jim. As is well known, however, the author ultimately burlesques Huck's decision after Chapter 31 by reintroducing Tom Sawyer into the story. Therefore, I will conclude by showing that the class boundary between Huck and Tom is closely related to the sarcastic ending of the

novel.

Chapter 3 will discuss sympathy and social status, including commoners and nobility in Twain's two works, *The Prince and The Pauper* and *Huckleberry Finn*, looking at both similarities and differences between them. I will first discuss *The Prince and The Pauper*, showing how switching Prince Edward, son of King Henry VIII, and the pauper boy Tom Canty, constructs and deconstructs the status of a king. I will also show how the Prince sympathizes with the oppressed commoners. I will then discuss the episode of the fake king and duke in *Huck Finn*. In contrast to *The Prince*, the frauds in *Huck Finn* falsify themselves as a king and a duke, preying on the sympathy of credulous people. I will describe their class position as poor whites, contrasting them with the Southern aristocrats like Colonel Grangerford. As I will show, Huck and Jim adopt remarkably different attitudes to the king and the duke. Through a reading of Chapter 14 in which Jim and Huck have a dialogue on "King Sollermun," I will indicate that they express very different opinions on monarchy and aristocracy, which indicates optimistic and pessimistic views on the United States as a republic and as a class society respectively. In so doing, I will argue that these polyphonic voices in *Huck Finn* can be taken as Twain's self-commentary on *The Prince and the Pauper*.

In the final chapter of my dissertation, I will discuss sentimentality in relation to gender, race, and literary genres in *Pudd'nhead Wilson*. Specifically, I will show how closely Roxana's dual roles in the novel are related with character types in sentimental novels and slave narratives. First, I will explore how her maternal status is modeled after the mothers in the nineteenth-century American sentimental novels. I will discuss how Twain, while parodying the genre, treats the mixed race woman's dilemma as a

slave mother. I will therefore also examine how the elements of slave narratives are involved in her characterization. Specifically, the issues of disguise and sexuality play a significant role in Roxana's slave narrative. As is widely known, however, Twain closes the novel not as a sentimental novel or a slave narrative, but in the mode of a detective story. Therefore, I will discuss what the ending implies in terms of race, gender, and genre.

Throughout these chapters, I will trace how sentimental and sympathetic feelings in Twain's major novels function to form, maintain, and change the relationships between the sympathizers and the sympathized. His works often depict the major characters' emotional ties with others in terms of gender, race, and class, showing how sentimental boundaries change between them. Despite his earlier preference for the white male points of view, Twain comes to deal with other perspectives when he show how the protagonists change and exchange their positions with others in race, gender, and class, crossing the boundaries between themselves. I suggest this demonstrates his deepening insight into sentimentality and sympathy. By focusing on his protagonists' emotional boundary-making and border-crossing, I will shed light on how feelings of sentimentality and sympathy work in Twain's major novels.

Chapter One

"*Real* Sentiment is a Very Rare & Godlike Thing": Sentimentality and the Question of Gender and Race in *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer*

Critical Response to *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer*

Mark Twain's *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer* (1876) has drawn critical attention from scholars, critics, and readers beyond its reception as an American masterpiece of children's literature. Especially since the re-evaluation of the novel's gender and race politics in the 1970s, some scholars have come to focus on the relationship between the protagonist Tom and sentimental or feminine culture, while others have elucidated the role that the antagonist Injun Joe plays in the novel. In terms of gender, several scholars have challenged the received masculine image of Tom and shown how the author and the novel are involved in feminine culture of the late nineteenth century. Mary Louis Kete has discussed Twain's use of sentimental culture in *Tom Sawyer.*[10] Focusing on Tom's self-sacrifice and public punishment for the sake of Becky, Gregg Camfield has demonstrated Twain's interest in sympathy as a moral feeling, and Michael Kiskis has

[10] Kete argues that *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer* expresses promising potentials of sentimentality. For her support she mentions the funeral scene in Chapter 17 in which Tom, Joe Harper, and Huck suddenly attend their own funeral held by townspeople including Aunt Polly who believe they are dead. Whereas they are moved by Tom's and Joe's resurrection, they never pay attention to Huck's return. When Huck feeling uncomfortable "started to slink away," Tom asks Aunt Polly to "be glad to see Huck," and then she replies that "I'm glad to see him, poor motherless thing." Focusing on this scene, Kete insists that "the funeral for Huck, Tom, and Joe in *Tom Sawyer* begins the important symbolic transformation of Huck from outsider to insider" (164). However, I would disagree with her reading, given the fact that Huck feels "more uncomfortable than he was before" (*Tom Sawyer* 131).

explored Twain's strong concern with domesticity and sentimentality. Glenn Hendler has returned to the theme of masculinity, linking it to Tom's preference for theatricality. In short, there is little doubt that the notion of gender as such has become an indispensable perspective for interpreting *Tom Sawyer*.

Not only gender but also race issue is crucial for understanding this novel. While the African American character Jim plays a minor role in the story, the Native American antagonist "Injun Joe" has been a main focus for critical commentary. Cynthia Griffin Wolff and Leland Krauth refer to the relationship between Tom and Joe as "doubling" (*Proper*145) or Tom's "shadow self" (Wolff 647-48). Likewise, Forrest G. Robinson fully examines Tom's encounter with Joe as a typical story of initiation through which Tom, who initially tries to evade the villain, confronts the object of his real terror and then becomes a heroic new leader (*Bad Faith* 99-108). Recently, however, some scholars and critics have examined the racist implications of Injun Joe's depictions. Although Krauth, Wolff, and Robinson contributed to clarifying Tom's relationship with Joe, the figure of the Native American cannot be reduced to the status of a "shadow self," insofar as he is a racial other to Tom and Twain. The Native American scholar Carter Revard critically examines racial prejudices in Joe's representations as a savage, "half-breed," and vengeful murderer. Louis Owens also maintains that "Twain's pathological Injun Joe in *Tom Sawyer*" is typical of the representation of Native half-breed's lives in Euro-American fiction as "nasty, brutish and short" (25). Although these critics make an important point with respect to Twain's racial bias in the representation of this Native American, they tend to only focus on the aspect of Injun Joe's victimization. By contrast, I maintain that there is a crucial ambivalence on the issue of

race in the motif of Joe's revenge against the white community.

Although these two analytical frames of gender and race are valuable in themselves, the existing studies make little or no connection between them. I claim that to understand *Tom Sawyer*, it is crucial to combine the gender issue with the question of race. In fact, Tom's spiritual growth as a white man is achieved through his differentiation from his sexual and racial others, that is, Becky and Joe, in the climax of the story. In this sense, I will insist that gender and race share a similar structure of exclusion in Twain's novelistic world.

In my view, "sentimentality" and "sympathy" plays a key role in Tom's relations with both Becky and Injun Joe. Tom, whose male sentiment is differentiated from women's, sympathizes with Becky. Likewise, Injun Joe, while being excluded from the white community, is the object of Tom's sympathy. These aspects of the story demonstrate that the protagonist establishes his white male subjectivity by overcoming the racialized or feminine other through his sympathy for them. Moreover, as I will show, the issue of sentimentality is a recurrent theme for the author Mark Twain as well. Twain desperately attempts to differentiate his own version of male sentimentality from American Victorian sentimental novels, which Twain associates with femininity. Twain, while showing strong interest in the bestselling sentimental novels by women like Harriet Beecher Stowe, tries to differentiate his novel from theirs. For these reasons, Tom's sympathy for Becky and Joe plays a significant role in the novel, as well for the author himself.

In this chapter, I will analyze the relationship between the male sympathizers (Tom and Twain) and the subjects of male sympathy (Becky and Joe). I will first clarify

how Twain valorizes what he calls "*real* sentiment" in his letter to Will Bowen. I will argue that while Twain does not subscribe to the dichotomy between reason and emotion, he reinstates another binary opposition between male and female sentimentality. In so doing, Twain genders sentiment, presenting Tom Sawyer's sympathy as rational, individual, and genuine in contrast to women's as tearful, collective, and inauthentic. Specifically, while tracing the course of Tom's fascination with Injun Joe, I will discuss Tom's experience in McDougal's cave, through which his male subjectivity is established in distinction from his sweetheart Becky Thatcher. Here we will see how his sentimentality is gendered as male, as opposed to female. I will then look at the racial other who receives Tom's and Twain's male sympathy, that is, "Injun Joe," a Native American antagonist who is condemned to death in the cave. While addressing the racial implications of his depictions, I will emphasize that Twain depicts Injun Joe as voluntarily choosing his identity as an "Indian," rather than being a mere victim of racism. Also, I will reveal how Twain's contrast between the time of nature ("water drip") and that of history ("empires") in his narration of Joe's end works to repress the race problem. Finally, I will discuss how and why Twain caricatures the townswomen's pardon petition for Joe but curiously remains silent about its motive, something which can be interpreted as addressing the racial discrimination against this indigenous antagonist. By analyzing the novel's rhetoric of eloquence and reticence as a symptom of repressed guilt, I will suggest not only that the women's sympathy might represent an affective mode of reason, but that his own text ironically undermines the gendered binary of sentimentality.

Twain's Letter to His Childhood Friend

Dated August 31, 1876, Mark Twain's letter to his childhood friend Will Bowen was sent just before the publication of *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer* and clearly exemplifies his view of sentimentality:

> Damnation, (if you will allow the expression,) get up & take a turn around the block & let the sentiment blow off you. Sentiment is for girls—I mean the maudlin article, of course. *Real* sentiment is a very rare & godlike thing.—You do not know anybody that has it; neither do I. ("SLC to William Bowen")

By ascribing the "maudlin article" to girls, Twain associates sentimentality with femininity in a negative manner.[11] Although he insists that "[s]entiment is for girls," not all men are free from sentimentality. Twain scolds his old male friend in a relentless manner that is typical of him: "I can see by your manner of speech, that for more than twenty years you have stood dead still in midst of the dreaminess, the melancholy, the romance, the heroics, of sweet but sappy sixteen." He then asserts: "Will, you must forgive me, but I have not the slightest sympathy with what the world calls Sentiment—not the slightest." Twain's letter expresses his negative view on "what the world calls Sentiment," whether it is embraced by women or feminized men.

Here, we need to make sense of "what the world calls Sentiment." Twain's attribution of sentimentality to women is evident in his caricatured description of girl students' compositions in *Tom Sawyer* and Emmeline Grangerford's poetry and drawing

[11] Twain's ironic attribution of sentimentality to women is evident in his description of girl students' compositions in *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer*: "A prevalent feature in these composition was a nursed and petted melancholy; another was a wasteful and opulent gush of 'fine language'; another was a tendency to lug in by the ears particularly prized words and phrases until they were worn entirely out." These compositions are finally summed up as "glaring insincerity" (156). For him, female sentimentality is nothing but insincerity and narcissism.

in *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. Such a sentimental mode of writing is associated with sentimental culture and novels that prevailed in America in the middle of the nineteenth century. As clearly shown *Uncle Tom's Cabin* and *The Wide, Wide World*, sentimental novelists such as Harriet Beecher Stowe and Susan Warner exalted the notion of sympathy, particularly the sympathetic tie between mother and daughter. In fact, Hendler asserts that "within the evolving 'culture of sentiment' that reached its American apotheosis in Stowe's novel, the most highly valorized emotional form was compassion, or what eighteenth- and nineteenth-century writers called 'sympathy'" (3). What kind of literary techniques do the sentimentalists like Stowe employ to represent actual sympathy? Jane Tompkins maintains that "not words, but the emotions of their heart bespeak a state of grace, and these are known by the sound of a voice, the touch of a hand, but chiefly, in moments of greatest importance, by tears" (131). As she indicates, the tears that sentimental fiction seeks to evoke register the physical nature of the sentimental discourse. Twain deems such tears to be insincere and narcissistic.

Despite his censure on sentimentality in his letter, it does not necessarily mean that he dismisses sentimentality per se. Twain, in criticizing sentimental culture, does not follow the binary opposition between reason and emotion, but rather seeks to associate "*real* sentiment" with reason and rationality.[12] In so doing, he re-genders the notion of sentimentality, splitting it into male and female versions, "*real*" and "maudlin" kinds. In other words, what Twain valorizes as "*real* sentiment," I claim, is none other than *male* sentimentality. Although Twain may seem to suggest the impossibility of

[12] For more on Twain's relation with sentimental novels, as well as an intellectual historical account of the notion of "sentimentality," see my "From Suffering Women to Suffering Men: A Genealogy of Sentimentality" in *Metropolitan*, vol. 52 (March 2008), 51-71.

sympathy when he describes it as "a very rare & godlike thing," this phrase can and should be interpreted literally, rather than rhetorically. As Krauth also notes, Twain here admires genuine sentimentality, instead of insisting on its impossibility (*Proper* 138). Indeed, Twain is concerned with male sympathy toward other men in many of his major works: Tom Sawyer's compassion for the miserable death of the mixed-blood antagonist Injun Joe in *Tom Sawyer*; Prince Edward's sympathetic exchange with the pauper Tom Canty in *The Prince and the Pauper* (1882); Huck's struggle with the moral dilemma between social conscience and his compassion for the runaway slave Jim in *Huck Finn*; the social reformer Hank Morgan's sympathetic tie with his fifty –two boys in *A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court* (1889); and Wilson's pity for the doting father Judge Driscoll in *Pudd'nhead Wilson* (1894). The episodes in these novels demonstrate the author's particular concern for male sympathy toward male others. If this is the case, his critical comments on sentimentality can be taken as his desperate attempts to differentiate male sentimentality from the feminized American Victorian version. In order to demonstrate this, I now turn to elucidate how Tom comes to feel sympathy toward his antagonist Injun Joe, and examine the stark contrast Twain makes between Tom's and "sappy" women's reactions to Joe starving in the cave.

"An Awful, Unaccountable Fascination" with Injun Joe

In this section, I will elucidate Tom's fascination with, and fear of, Injun Joe by tracing the course of the encounters between Joe and Tom. His first encounter with Joe is very sensational. Tom and Huck accidentally come across Injun Joe who is engaged in grave robbing. As they watch this outlaw and his cohorts from their hiding place,

they overhear Injun Joe confessing his motive of revenge to a young physician who is paying Joe for the disinterred body. Tom, who tends to romanticize himself as a hapless victim of unwarranted punishment, feels fascinated with the man, who really suffers racial discrimination and expresses his suffering with his act of revenge. It is important to note Tom's developing relationship with Injun Joe. Even though he is frightened by Joe after the murder of Dr. Robinson, Tom cannot help lingering around the graveyard where the murder took place, "not because he would not a thousand times rather go anywhere else, but because an awful, unaccountable fascination drew him on" (86-87). Furthermore, later on when Tom notices that the "half-breed" is making a false charge against Muff Potter, Joe becomes "the most balefully interesting object" (89). Tom's terror of Joe is inseparable from his fascination with him. Bernard DeVote aptly observes of Tom's fascination with this antagonist that, "when Injun Joe addresses Doctor Robinson across the blanketed corpse…, his language comes close to thrillers of the itinerant stage but his emotions are genuine. Nor, to boys…was there anything unreasonable in the powers exerted in graveyards by ghosts or witches" (306).

Tom's intense interest in Injun Joe is closely aligned with his unconscious desire to behave like him. When Tom runs away with his comrades from home to Jackson Island, he calls himself "the Black Avenger of the Spanish Main" (100). The word "avenger" reminds us of Injun Joe, who always intends to take revenge upon the upper-class whites of St. Petersburg. Moreover, the word "Spanish" also implies Injun Joe, because Joe pretends to be "the old and dumb Spaniard" (187) in order to evade criminal investigation and prosecution on the charge of murder. Here we should not miss the fact that running away from home to Jackson Island, the boys grow homesick

and return to St. Petersburg where Tom stops calling himself "the Black Avenger of the Spanish Main." It is only on the island that Tom, perhaps unconsciously, can act as or identify himself with Injun Joe. Thus, we can extract from the Jackson Island episode Tom's unconscious identification with Joe.

At the same time, Tom suffers from a bad conscience because he tries to keep to himself the secret about Joe's murder of Dr. Robinson, as well as his false accusation against Muff Potter. However, at the murder trial, Tom finally admits the truth about the homicide. The moment when Tom indicts Injun Joe, the "half-breed" breaks the window of the courthouse and runs away. On account of his testimony against the criminal, Tom is hailed as a hero in the village in the daytime. After dark, however, he suffers from nightmares: "Tom's days were days of splendor and exultation to him, but his nights were seasons of horror. Injun Joe infested all his dreams, and always with doom in his eye" (174). Injun Joe is now the object of the boy's fear, as well as fascination. According to the *OED*, the word "infest" has the meaning of "being annoyed or harassed by disease." Likewise, Tom's secret about Joe is described with an image of disease: "a very cancer for permanency and pain" (163). By breaking out of the window, symbolic of the threshold of Tom's consciousness, Joe becomes a disease-like presence that eludes Tom's conscious censorship and move in and out of his mind freely. Thus, Tom's indictment leads to the collapse of the boundary between the inside and outside of consciousness, and Injun Joe exists everywhere for Tom.

After the trial, indeed, it seems as if Tom unconsciously seeks to have an encounter with Joe. In spite of his fear that Injun Joe may take revenge on him, Tom suddenly decides to go to the haunted house, which reminds us of the graveyard where

he witnessed Joe murdering the young physician. There, he actually discovers that Joe is searching for treasure. Tom feels the urge to spy on Joe. Then, when Tom catches the word "revenge" being uttered by Joe he sees that "a wicked light flamed in his [Joe's] eyes" in the dark (190), which triggers an awful thought: "[r]evenge? What if he means *us*, Huck!" (192). As the novel progresses, it turns out that it is not Tom and Huck, but Widow Douglas upon whom Injun Joe plans to make an assault. The memory of unfair punishment in public drives Injun Joe's anger; Tom and Huck are only mentioned as "those infernal boys" by Joe (187). Therefore, Tom is not an object of interest for this avenger; nevertheless Tom attempts, both consciously and unconsciously, to seek out a certain closeness in their relationship. In other words, as already mentioned by Wolff and Krauth, Injun Joe clearly exemplifies the dark side of Tom's self, as opposed to its light side: "Tom's melancholy, his morbid, excessive feeling of slight and neglect, are matched by Joe's bitter outbursts against mistreatment at the hands of Doc Robinson and the husband of the Widow Douglas" (*Proper* 145), write Krauth. In short, Joe functions as the "double" for Tom, to the extent that Injun Joe (outsider) is opposite but at the same time supplementary to Tom (insider).

Tom's Gendered Sympathy with Becky

Like Tom's "unaccountable" fascination with Joe, his sweetheart Becky Thatcher becomes another object of sympathetic identification, as he witnesses her tearing Mr. Dobbin's book by mistake. When he watches her being frightened at the thought of the punishment she might receive and imagines what she is feeling, Tom feels more and more uneasy and starts "trembling from head to foot" (151). His shivers can be

interpreted as a bodily symptom of his sympathetic identification with Becky. The reason why he takes the blame for tearing the book is to relieve the pain for both of them. In the end, Tom happily receives her admiration and succeeds in regaining both her affection and confidence along with a renewed sense of respect: "Tom, how *could* you be so noble!" (152), Becky says. Though Tom learns to imagine how Becky feels, his empathy with her reaches an apex when he encounters Injun Joe in the cave.

Here it is important to examine the stark contrast between Tom and Becky that is made to establish his male sentimentality. When they get lost in McDougal's cave during the school excursion, "Becky would watch his face for an encouraging sign," and therefore Tom "would say cheerfully—'Oh, it's all right. That ain't the one, but we'll come to it right away.'" In spite of his apparent encouragement, the boy secretly feels "less and less hopeful with each failure" (225). From the beginning, Becky considers Tom as her responsible guardian, and Becky's passive and dependent attitude force Tom to behave like an active and independent supporter for her. Despite Tom's desperate efforts, however, he fails to find the exit, and they gradually feel so powerless, vulnerable, and helpless that they cannot take any action. Whereas Becky becomes "very weak" and has "sunk into a dreary apathy and would not be roused" (231), his sudden encounter with Injun Joe enables Tom to transform himself into the guardian who "felt willing to risk Injun Joe and all other terrors" for her. As Hendler points out, Becky here reminds us of the iconic dying heroine of sentimental novels, Little Eva in *Uncle Tom's Cabin* (205). In contrast, Tom never gives up escaping from the cave, tying the kite to a projection in the cave and taking it in his hand so as not to lose his way. Unlike Becky, who is too emotional and weak, Tom overcomes fear and acts bravely for

both Becky and himself, inventing an effective means to escape from the cave. In the foregoing scene where Tom perceived Becky's acute anxiety for possible punishment, he involuntarily identified himself with her; now, as he sees her weakening, he tries to protect Becky without losing his mind. In other words, the boy learns how to sympathize with her, while acting bravely, reasonably, and responsibly for her.[13] The confinement in the cave, as well as the successful escape from it, implies his initiation into what Wolff calls "manhood" (644) and through this experience, Tom establishes his male subjectivity that is active, independent, and yet sympathetic.

Undoubtedly, Tom's sympathy for others exemplifies what Twain calls "*real* sentiment" in a letter written just around the publication of the novel. It is all too clear that such male sympathy is differentiated from female, emotional, and even hysterical identification with others, especially women. It is precisely Twain's narrative, however, that contrasts, distinguishes, and genders sympathy into male and female types. Put differently, his textual practice performatively constructs these gendered modes of sentimentality.

It is when he eventually learns that Injun Joe has died in the cave that Tom shows his sympathy for Joe. In face of the tragic death of Injun Joe, who was locked up in the

[13]Not only Becky but also Aunt Polly leads Tom to feeling compassionate for others. In the beginning of the novel, Aunt Polly cannot understands Tom's melancholic feeling and tries to give him a "Pain-killer" (94), which burns him out (96). Likewise, Tom is so egoistical that he cannot pay attention to her emotion. However, the boy comes to feel sympathetic toward her as well as Becky. For example, the Jackson Island episode shows Tom's spiritual growth. When Tom steals quietly away from sleeping comrades on the Island and goes back to St. Petersburg at night, he eavesdrops Aunt Polly's grief; he is "touched by his aunt's grief"(116) and writes a memo delivering his and his friends' safety to her. Although he changes his mind and decides not to leave it, the memo later functions as a proof of his sympathy for her. When she finds it in his pocket, she sheds tears saying: "I could forgive the boy [Tom], now, if he's committed a million sins." (146).

cave and dies there, Tom sympathizes with him. In this scene, Tom embodies "*real* sentiment." While feeling pity for him, he feels himself relieved at the same time:

> Tom was touched, for he knew by his own experience how this wretch had suffered. His pity was moved, but nevertheless he felt an abounding sense of relief and security, now, which revealed to him in a degree which he had not fully appreciated before, how vast a weight of dread had been lying upon him since the day he lifted his voice against this bloody-minded outcast. (238)

Tom, who had the experience of being lost in the same cave, is the only one who can realistically imagine the suffering of Injun Joe. Therefore, Tom's sympathy is predicated upon the experience he shared with this "bloody-minded outcast." In contrast, women's pity for Joe is founded upon mere emotion and imagination, which, as I will discuss later, drive them to start a pardon petition movement for Joe. The women's sympathy is depicted as fantastical, unrealistic, and insincere. Moreover, Tom is able to hold back his tears whereas the women are described as "sappy." Here Twain parodies the sentimental novel's convention that tears are the noblest manifestations of sentiment. In this way, the author presents "*real* sentiment" as men's rational sympathy based on experience, not on tears. This valorization is made possible by differentiating Tom's male sentiment from female emotions.

Just after depicting Tom's pity for Joe, Twain describes Joe's miserable death in detail, as if attempting to praise Tom's sentimentality:

> When the cave door was unlocked, a sorrowful sight presented itself in the dim twilight of the place. Injun Joe lay stretched upon the ground, dead, with his face close to the crack of the door, as if his longing eyes had been fixed, to the latest moment, upon the light and the cheer of the free world outside. (238)

Twain's additional description of the suffering of Injun Joe evokes compassionate feelings from the reader: "unable to scratch his way out of the cave, the villain, after

eating waxed candle and even a few bats living in the cave and desperately lapping water drops from stalagmites, finally dies of starvation" (238). Twain's rendering of Joe's end, as well as Tom's rational sentimental response to it, can be read as the author's attempt to create his own version of sentimentality—one that is closer to something "rare & godlike" and far removed from the prevailing Victorian model he so despised.

Injun Joe's Revenge

Thus far, I have shown that Tom's male sentimentality is differentiated from female sympathy. This distinction concerns the gendered modes of a sympathizing subject. As seen in the depictions of Injun Joe's end, his sympathy is also depicted as *white* male sympathy that is directed toward a non-white, racial other. In this section, I will analyze the racialized depictions of Injun Joe, who is the object of fear, fascination, and sympathy. I will not only address the racism inherent in the representations, but also show how Joe's vengeful will implicitly registers his agency even beyond the author's intention.

Tom and Huck accidentally come across Injun Joe as he engages in grave robbing. As they watch him and his gang from the hiding place, they hear this outlaw confessing to the young physician for whom he has disinterred the body.

> "Five years ago you drove me away from your father's kitchen one night, when I come to ask for something to eat, and you said I warn't there for any good; and when I swore I'd get even with you if it took a hundred years, your father had me jailed for a vagrant. Did you think I'd forget? The Injun blood ain't in me for nothing. And now I've *got* you, and you got to *settle*, you know!" (74-75)

Although Joe calls himself "Injun," a Southern dialect for "Indian," the word has a derogatory meaning for Native Americans. Moreover, we should not miss the fact that Injun Joe is actually described as "half-breed" (74). While the language of "breed" derives from biological racism, "half-breed" implies something more. Carter Revard critically points out that representative Twain scholars, such as Robinson and Wolff, do not fully address the racist implications of such characterization. "We may also recall here," Revard says, "what 'half-breed' would have implied, in that time and place: not only the bastard son of white father and Indian woman, but likely of an Indian woman used as prostitute." In short, "half-breed" connotes "children of criminal sex between drunks and whores" (655). Therefore, it is all too obvious that Twain's representation of Injun Joe not only as a murderer, but also as "half-breed" is racially biased and discriminatory, which undoubtedly shows his well documented and deep-rooted hatred of Native Americans.[14]

Nevertheless, reading the above passage carefully, we can see how Joe speaks in his own voice and reveals a self-identification beyond racial stigma. "The Injun blood," Joe asserts, "ain't in me for nothing." Or, "by the great Sachem, no!" (190), he exclaims. Here he intentionally identifies himself as an Indian, rather than loathing it. Moreover, Joe refuses to forget the many hardships he has suffered, and this deep resentment motivates him to take vengeance on the racist community. Through these

[14] Mark Twain's hatred of Indians is well known. In his unfinished novel written in the early 1880s, "Huck Finn and Tom Sawyer Among the Indians," for example, Twain tells a story of Indians' massacre of a white family and the likely rape of the daughter. Tom and Huck eventually meet with a man who is her sweetheart. Tom says to Huck, wondering whether or not to confess to him that she was abducted and might be raped: "if you could and did [tell the truth], you'd be lower and hard-hearteder [sic] than the devils, you'd be an Indian" (79). This is but one of many examples of Twain's deep-rooted prejudice against Native Americans.

acts of identification, memory, and revenge, he exercises his subjective agency, instead of being a mere object of discrimination.

Furthermore, it is important to look closer at the motive and reason for his action. When Joe seeks to attack Widow Douglas, he reveals that he holds a grudge against her late husband for treating him unfairly:

> …her husband was rough on me—many times he was rough on me—and mainly he was the justice of the peace that jugged me for a vagrant. And that ain't all. It ain't the millionth part of it! He had me *horsewhipped*!—horsewhipped in front of the jail, like a nigger!—with all the town looking on! HORSEWHIPPED!—do you understand? He took advantage of me and died. But I'll take it out of *her*. (207-8)

Commenting on this passage, Harry J. Brown asserts that "[s]adism, not misguided justice, drives his revenge, and his hellish fantasies cause only his own tortuous and well-deserved demise" (14).[15] Although this reading intends to address the stereotypical image of Injun Joe as "mixed-blood," it does not fully explain his motive. Here it is important to pay more attention to the historical context of the racialized legal apparatus, such as the vagrancy laws, which were operative in the United States at the time, especially in the South. Hsuan L. Hsu argues that "Vagrancy, like race, was a crime of status rather than act: it criminalized and degraded persons for what they were, not for illegal actions performed and intended" (701). If this is the case, it is fully justified to assume that a racial bias was involved when the late Judge Douglas treated Joe as a vagrant. Therefore, it is difficult to interpret Joe's vengeance merely as

[15] Harry Brown, focusing on the image of "mixed-blood" that Injun Joe embodies, discusses the historical process in which the image of mixed-blood Indians, something once depicted as a disturbing threat in late eighteenth- and nineteenth-century American literature, has been transfigured into the symbol of cultural hero in contemporary Native writing. His study greatly contributes to the reevaluation of the Indian mixed-blood figure, yet Brown, whose main concern is the transition of the image of Indian-white hybrid, does not throw much light on Injun Joe's active vengeance.

"sadism." In spite of his greed, Joe's revenge is not motivated by any financial reason either. Rather, he was driven by his wrath against racial injustice.

In this context, I should mention a curious biographical fact about the author: his father John Marshall Clemens actually served as the justice of the peace in Hannibal, Missouri. Moreover, Twain recalls his father "whipping" his black slave. According to Arthur G. Pettit, "When a young slave woman named Jenny snatched a whip from Jane Clemens, who was about to beat her, Judge Clemens rushed home, tied the black woman's wrists together and flogged her with a cowhide whip" (17). Pettit also notes that Mark Twain even refers to Jenny in his last notebook, kept between 1905 and 1908 (192). Thus, Joe's depiction can be interpreted as based on Twain's own family history and memory, which suggests that a certain sense of sympathy and guilt on Twain's part—however repressed—is involved in this passage.

Nevertheless, it is still necessary to ask: how do we know who Joe's 'enemy' was? Obviously, it is the late justice of the peace and his widow Douglas upon whom Injun Joe desires to take revenge. One might wonder whether the target of Joe's revenge is these particular individuals or the "white" community as a whole. When Joe disguised himself as a "Spaniard," Huck tells the truth to a "Welchman" (*sic*, 208), who then says: "[w]hen you talked about notching ears and slitting noses, I judged that that was your own embellishment, because white men don't take that sort of revenge. But an Injun! That's a different matter, altogether" (214). In this rare use of the term "white men" in *Tom Sawyer*, it is defined in contradistinction to the word "Injun." Moreover, Indians are said to stand in an antagonistic relationship to "white men," but not the other way around. In this way, the text describes these two racial groups, not individuals, as

essentially different, and holds Indians alone accountable for the antagonism. It is precisely in this race relation that Injun Joe finds himself.

However, the race issue in Twain's text is not reducible to this dichotomy. While Joe's self-esteem as an Indian was made impossible by physical punishments like horsewhipping, his sense of degradation also derives from a more symbolic aspect, that is, the downgrading of him to the same status as African Americans, probably slaves (the story is staged before Emancipation). Joe even utters the discriminatory word for slaves. It is, therefore, premature to interpret Injun Joe as just an innocent victim of racism. Joe himself might also be involved in the complex racial configurations of the South at the time.[16]

In a sense, precisely because Twain foregrounds the racial otherness of Joe, he goes beyond his own intention to treat Joe as an atrocious murderer. Joe as the avenger not only frightens and fascinates Tom, but discloses certain realities of race relations at the time. Twain's text inscribes Joe's motivation of revenge for racial discrimination, as well as his implication in the racial hierarchy. This fact of inscription, I would also suggest, might answer the question of why the white protagonist, as well as the narrator, has to sympathize with the non-white other who is also the novel's antagonist. Here

[16] Some tribes, such as Cherokees and Seminoles among the Five Civilized Nations, owned African Americans as chattel slaves in the antebellum era and expropriated them as labor power in the cotton field. See James F. Brooks, Patrick Minges, and Celia E. Naylor. However, we also need to acknowledge that the large majority of Native Americans was dispossessed of their land by white colonizers and did not choose to be part of the racial hierarchy of the South. While some Native Americans surely imbibed American racism, others collaborated with African American slaves and resisted American racial hierarchies, as shown by William Loren Katz's *Black Indians: A Hidden Heritage*. In short, Twain has an investment in one kind of depiction of Joe. We should not miss the fact that the representation of Joe is one choice of many different ones that Twain could have made to depict the racial hierarchy.

again we can detect the existence of a guilty conscience on Twain's part, which he barely addresses. Of course, whether he feels guilty or not, Twain surely offers a very problematic representation of the Native American. Yet, it can be said that such nuances seem to be lost in the existing studies on *Tom Sawyer*, which either simply takes Injun Joe as the villain in children's literature or rejects his image as the problematic racial representation of Native Americans.

The Narrator's "*Real* Sentiment"

Twain describes the confinement and death of Joe in the cave towards the end of the story, and Tom, as well as the narrator, expresses their sympathy for Joe. This, as we have seen, is what Twain calls "*real* sentiment." Here I will analyze at length the rhetoric of this sympathy in order to address what kind of white male subjectivity is constructed through this sentimentality vis-à-vis the racial other. When narrating Joe's end, Twain dedicates a long passage to a sublime parable of "water drip":

> The poor unfortunate had starved to death. In one place near at hand, a stalagmite had been slowly growing up from the ground for ages, builded by the water-drip from a stalactite overhead. The captive had broken off the stalagmite, and upon the stump had placed a stone wherein he had scooped a shallow hollow to catch the precious drop that fell once in every three minutes with the dreary regularity of a clock-tick—a dessert spoonful once in four and twenty hours. That drop was falling when the Pyramids were new; when Troy fell; when the foundations of Rome were laid; when Christ was crucified; when the Conqueror created the British empire; when Columbus sailed; when the massacre at Lexington was "news." It is falling now; it will still be falling when all these things shall have sunk down the afternoon of history, and the twilight of tradition, and been swallowed up in the thick night of oblivion. (239-40)

Here the narrator makes a stark contrast between the never-ending "water-drips" and the rise and fall of "empires." The infinitely repeated "water-drip" indicates the temporality

of nature, which lasts permanently and transcends man-made phenomena. In contrast, the crucifixion of Jesus and the outbreak of the American Revolutionary War are one-time, historical events. Likewise, entire empires: Egyptian, Roman, and British, were built up and disappeared while the water kept dripping. Even historic empires cannot evade their rise and fall, because they are finite in comparison with the incessant drop of waters. The narrator thus distinguishes the temporality of nature and that of history, suggesting that the social formations created by acts of free humans are essentially finite.

The reader wonders why Twain narrates such a philosophical story to depict Injun Joe's death.[17] In my reading, the imagery of "empire" here serves as an analogy of Injun Joe's will to revenge. Joe, who commits revenge as an act of his own free will, is confined to the cave and defeated by "nature." The novel suggests that Joe's vengeful will, just like ephemeral empires, is only finite and transient, and therefore doomed to insignificance in comparison to the infinite time of nature. Indeed, when describing Injun Joe's death in the cave, the author feels deep sympathy for his fate as a human being doomed by nature and casts light on the sufferings of Injun Joe who resists his destiny.

This "empire" analogy, however, is quite problematic in many respects. Obviously, the narrator does not bring up the trope of "empires" in order to implicitly comment on imperialism or colonialism in any sense. Instead, making an analogy

[17] Henry Nash Smith once strongly criticized this long passage as superfluous: "such a burst of eloquence is quite out of keeping with the tone of the book. It serves no purpose except to demonstrate that the narrator can produce the kind of associations held in esteem by the dominant culture" (84). Important as it is, his argument does not delve into the rhetorical and perfromative aspects of Twain's narration.

between empires and Native Americans has the effect of blurring the distinction between the oppressor and the oppressed. Even as he sympathizes with Injun Joe's end as a universal human destiny, the narrator depicts his defeat as a natural necessity, as if to suggest that any resistance to racism were a futile undertaking. Indeed, the novel is written mainly from a white man's point of view and leaves little or no room for self-reflection or self-criticism in terms of racism.

The narrator's sympathy for Joe's fate is primarily concerned with his thirst, starvation, and ultimately his death as instances of human powerlessness in the face of nature. However, this exclusive focus on his *physical* pain allows Twain to avoid confronting his *social* suffering from the racial discrimination in the white community. In other words, by emphasizing Joe's defeat as a universal human destiny and also as a natural, rather than social, process, the white male narrator exempts himself from addressing his own relationship with this particular racial other. As a consequence, his sympathy allows him to repress his guilty feelings stemming from their racial relations. This is the kind of white male subjectivity that is constructed through the feeling of sympathy in *Tom Sawyer*. Thus, Twain's "*real* sentiment," which he describes as universal, sublime, and probably "godlike," works to conceal the race problem that is the central motive for Joe's revenge, by seeking to universalize the futility of all human life.

Conclusion

In this way, Twain's "*real* sentiment" establishes white male subjectivity by subsuming Injun Joe's claim for ethnic identity and justice under universal human destiny.

Immediately after his narration of this natural necessity, Twain reinforces the gendered notion of sentimentality again. The narrator mentions the movement of a pardon petition for Injun Joe.

> This [Joe's] funeral stopped the further growth of one thing—the petition to the Governor for Injun Joe's pardon. The petition had been largely signed; many tearful and eloquent meetings had been held, and a committee of sappy women been appointed to go in deep mourning and wail around the governor and implore him to be a merciful ass and trample his duty under foot. Injun Joe was believed to have killed five citizens of the village, but what of that? If he had been Satan himself there would have been plenty of weaklings ready to scribble their names to a pardon-petition and drip a tear on it from their permanently impaired and leaky water-works. (240-41)

Interestingly enough, *water-works* here in the form of tears are charged with totally different signification from that of the "water drip" in the cave. Although scholars like Tompkins argue that the function of tears in sentimental novel lies in "a state of grace" (131), Twain describes tears shed by women for Joe as something far removed from it. He insists that these "sappy" women would almost automatically feel pity for anyone, whatever crime he or she had committed. Although they think they are relieving the poor Injun Joe through their petition, these women are, he claims, merely intoxicated by hysterical and narcissistic identification with him. Here again, we can see clearly how Twain genders their sympathy as essentially female, emotional, and irrational, as opposed to male sentiment that is based on reason and moral judgment.

Curiously enough, however, whereas he is quite eloquent about Joe's death in the cave, Twain remains silent on specific details of the pardon-petition movement. He suggests that it has become widespread. Since this petition has a great many signatures, it is more natural to assume that these were signed by both men and women. In spite of that, he only mentions "sappy" women for the organizers. Moreover, Twain does not

explain the reasons why they held the meetings for Injun Joe in the first place. Nor does he specify when they started the movement. Also, one has to wonder why Twain first mentions the petition at this point in the story line. In this way, there are significant gaps in the text, which indicates a symptom in Twain's suppressed guilt.

The passage may induce us to believe that the petition started after Joe's tragic death. This is not the case, however, because if they had requested the governor to pardon a dead person, the funeral would not have stopped the movement. Since the movement was already widespread by that time, it is natural to suppose that they started the movement right after Joe was convicted of murder. Therefore, the women came to sympathize with him, even though they already knew he had committed the crime.

How can we make sense of possible motives for the women's petition movement? Here, we might take a brief look at the women's history of mid-nineteenth century America. In fact, there are records of white women who felt sympathy for Native peoples and tried to draw attention to their plight. According to Tiffany K. Wayne, "[s]ome Native women as well as white women spoke out publicly against U.S. Indian and Western policy, detailing the effects of westward expansion on Native culture and life" (153).[18] When you put the petition in this perspective, it is legitimate to assume that the "sappy women" sympathize with Injun Joe because he was a Native American. Otherwise, it would be difficult to think of any textual or circumstantial reasons for their activism. The narrator depicts the women as merely emotional, unreasonable, and morally misguided, because they sympathize with the murderer. Yet,

[18] Wayne also notes: "Although many white pioneers feared encountering Native Americans, many white women diarists and letter writers often discussed their role as guides and providers of food to near-starving travelers" (156). Through their writing, many white women contributed to lessening prejudice against Native American peoples.

he seems to be too hasty in negating them without explaining the cause of the movement.

Despite Twain's caricature of women activists, one can also imagine that there may be reasonable aspects to the women's case. Their movement derives from a certain sense of social justice, albeit unarticulated (in the novel). Specifically, it aims to achieve the "pardon" by imploring the governor through a legitimate procedure, i.e., "petitions." To this end, it seeks to mobilize the public through "eloquent" speech, an essential marker of reason. As a result, many "scribble[d] their names" in their own responsibility as petitioners. With specific motives, goals, and means, therefore, the petition seems to fully qualify as a "rational" social movement. If this is the case, it is all too unfair to downgrade its significance by saying it's just emotional. Ironically enough, Twain's passage itself seems to undermine the simplistic opposition between rational male sentimentality and emotional female sympathy.

I do not mean, however, to present a rosy picture of their activism. The women as Twain describes them are so emotional and hysterical that they tend to deem Injun Joe solely as a mere object of sympathy, rather than, for example, as a Native American who has been dispossessed of his rights and land in the US racial hierarchy. This representation, however biased by the author's gender politics, might indicate certain risks and limitations in their movement. Lauren Berlant, though commenting on female sentimental culture in the twentieth century, argues that white women's "paternalism" towards non-white others often represented "a kind of soft supremacy rooted in compassion and coercive identification" (6). Sympathizing with a racial minority does not necessarily mean politically addressing racism per se, much less one's own

involvement in it. (This is a problem shared by Twain himself.) Nevertheless, it is important to recognize that the women's movement in the novel implies a certain normative or even utopian dimension for a compassionate community, which Berlant calls the "unfinished business of sentimentality" (44).

To conclude, it turns out that what Twain omits in the above extended quotation is precisely the issue of race. This also explains why he mentions this petition episode at this point in the story. He could have done so much earlier, for instance, right after the scene of the murder trial. However, he has to wait until Injun Joe dies: Twain first needs to narrate his "*real* sentiment" in order to erase the issue of race relation and sublimate it to the universal human fate. Therefore, by mentioning the movement at this point, as well as obscuring its cause, he can present the women's sympathy in negative terms, while further effacing the race problem. This persistent disavowal of the racism in the novel indicates a symptom of the author's unconscious that refuses to confront his own guilt feeling for racial others, such as Native people. Hence, we can see how his anxiety as a white drives the narrator to deny the women's sentimentality that is affected by Injun Joe.

Therefore, it is crucial to carefully trace the way in which the question of race closely, if not explicitly, interacts with the gender formation of the era. In *Tom Sawyer* Twain seeks to construct white male subjectivity by gendering sentimentality and repressing the question of race. Here "*real* sentiment" plays a pivotal role in this rhetorical strategy. Insofar as his text betrays voices of the abjected others, however, the repressed guilt will continually return and keep haunting the author, like "water drips,"

permanently falling in the cave. My next chapter continues to examine Twain's struggle with this problem in his later work.

Chapter Two

Father and Son:

The Boundary of Race and the Question of Class

in *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*

Introduction

Adventures of Huckleberry Finn (1885) still continues to raise questions about race in American society. In *Playing in the Dark* (1993), Toni Morrison called for an examination of the African American presence in canonical American literature, most notably *Huck Finn*. In dialogue with Morrison, Shelly Fisher Fishkin opened up a new perspective on the race issue in Twain's novel in *Was Huck Black?* (1993), maintaining that "African-American voices plays a major role" in this canonical novel and "Mark Twain helped open American literature to the multicultural polyphony that is its birthright and special strength" (5).

In response to Fishkin's argument, some scholars addressed the issue of ethnicity. For instance, Hugh J. Dawson, pointing out that Huck's surname connotes Irish ethnicity, argues that the Finns' behavior and traits are depicted differently from the establishment of St. Petersburg (9). In so doing, he claims that "Twain exploits the currency of the nativist stereotype" (9) of the Irish. From a slightly different perspective, the historian Noel Ignatiev focuses on the similarities between Irish immigrants and black slaves in terms of their living conditions in the beginning and mid-nineteenth

century to conclude that "the national character [of Huck]…is part Irish as well as part Negro" (58).[19]

In this way, inspired by Fishkin's argument, Dawson and Ignatiev have come to focus on Huck's ethnicity as Irish. Precisely speaking, while Fishkin addresses the ambiguity of the boundary between black and white in terms of race, critics after the 1990s argue that the designation "white" should never be viewed monolithically. It is important to note that at the time Irish immigrants were sometimes called "Irish slaves," "nigger turned inside out," or "smoked Irish" (Ignatiev 41). As David R. Roediger and others show, the Irish were associated with blacks (as a racial grouping), and not regarded as 'white' until the late nineteenth century.[20] They "became white" in the course of the nineteenth century. The notion of "ethnicity" itself can be taken as a product of that historical process. In other words, ethnicity was "invented" so as to facilitate the movement of Irish from one racial category to another and then maintain

[19] Dawson and Ignatiev refer to a letter written on May 7, 1884 in which Clemens rejects the first sketch for a cover portrait of the novel that the original edition's illustrator Edward Windsor Kemble submitted. Clemens wrote "I returned the book-back [the cover design for *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*]. All right and good, and will answer, although the boy's mouth is a trifle more Irishy than necessary" (Ignatiev 174). Since Irish immigrants were mocked for stereotypical physical feature, i.e., "a conspicuous prognathian jaw" (Dawson 8), Clemens's claim for Kemble suggests the fact that Clemens implicitly associates Huck with the Irish. These episodes, Dawson argues, provide the evidence for Clemens' nativist view of the Finns as Irish immigrants.

[20] The tragedy of the great Potato Famine in 1845-1855 brought Irish immigrants to America who were more impoverished than those who had come earlier. The Irish youth were called "'Irish slaves,' and more frequently 'bound boys,'" during that time period through the Civil War. David R. Roediger argues "Irish-American workers also suffered an association with servile labor by virtue of their…practiced use as substitutes for slaves within the South," as Irish immigrants worked "ditching, draining plantations, building levees and sometimes cleaning land because of the danger of death to valuable slave property (and, as one account put it, to mules) in such pursuits" (*Working* 146). Thus, Irish immigrants tended to be associated with black slaves.

certain peoples there (Roediger, *Working* 21). For that matter, the notion of "whiteness" was equally a historical construct, a malleable social category in the process of constant change. Therefore, we should be careful not to project today's views about race or ethnicity onto the past. Rather than identify Huck as Irish or any other ethnicity, we might need to explore the logic involved in determining the boundaries of race and/or ethnicity. The Irish origin became important, because it referred to a lesser, disadvantaged position within the white community in the mid-nineteenth century. In fact, Huck Finn in the novel is located at the margins of white society.

Therefore, I will insist that class positions constitute a pivotal issue in this novel. Specifically, I argue that the notion of "poor white" helps understand Huck's peculiar positionality within the novel as well as his relationship with other characters, most notably, the runaway slave Jim. "Poor whites" refers to lower-class white people in the antebellum South. Landless and non-slaveowning, they occupied a marginal position within the white community under slavery. However, poor whites, also known as "white trash," not merely indicated economic conditions, but also described cultural dimensions, often serving as a label, stereotype, and stigma for this group of people. As the social theorist Matt Wray explains, "white trash" is a liminal category that works as an intersection between race and class. Being white, he argues, is not a substantive racial category, but a "social and symbolic boundary" which is constructed cognitively and materially and that are also conditioned by other dimensions, including one's class positions.[21]

[21] "Whiteness," Wray argues, indicates "a flexible set of social and symbolic boundaries that give shape, meaning, and power to the social category *white*" (6). Furthermore, Wray proposes to understand major social categories—race, class, gender, and

From this analytical perspective, I will seek to demonstrate that the white characters in the novel, such as Huck, Tom, Pap Finn, Miss Watson, Widow Douglas, and so on, are clearly differentiated through their class positions. Interestingly enough, Huck's class position does not remain the same, but moves upward since he started to live with Widow Douglas. Nevertheless, Huck cannot fully identity with this new way of life. Nor is he able to return to his old lifestyle with Pap. This changing and ambiguous class positionality, I will argue, is crucial to understand Huck's journey. In the process, he learns how to draw and redraw the boundaries between himself and other characters across the color line.

Needless to say, *Huck Finn* is a novel, and it is therefore important to recognize that fiction and history, or sociology for that matter, are two different things. I do not mean to conflate these two dimensions. Yet, as his pet motifs of cross-dressing and changeling suggest, Twain in his works often describes how his characters draw and redraw symbolic borders of gender, race, and class, sometimes even crossing them. In so doing, Twain manages to question and relativize fixed and essential identities through his textual practices. Likewise, Twain's *Huck Finn* seeks to destabilize the boundaries of race through changing class positions.

Nevertheless, when discussing the race issues in the novel, many Twain scholars still tend to interpret it as a monolithic category.[22] For instance, Forrest G.

---

sexuality—as "four deeply related subprocesses of a single, larger process of social differentiation" (5) that are constructed both symbolically and materially.

[22] Insisting that literary theory has to address the issue of poverty, Gavin Jones argues that "[w]riting about the poor always has the potential for a troubling power dynamic in which states of structural inferiority and social barriers that threaten literacy are brought, ironically, into the literary sphere" (19). Although he explores Herman Melville, Theodore Dreiser, Edith Wharton, James Agee, and Richard Wright, all of

Robinson's *Author-Cat* certainly succeeds in demonstrating Clemens' as well as Huck's guilt as a white person; however, although the critic mentions the class difference between Clemens and Huck at the beginning of his argument, he tacitly evades discussing the issue of class in the novel.[23] To put it another way, Robinson effaces the different positionalities between the author and his character by building up the image of the white boy who feels sympathy toward his black friend. By the same token, Robinson, while focusing on the protagonist's guilt about Jim, makes little mention of Huck's reaction to other poor white figures like Pap Finn, the King and the Duke. As a result, Robinson fails to recognize the class differences among the white characters, displacing them as interracial relationships marked by the guilt arising therein.

In this way, racial hierarchies have been central to the analysis of *Huck Finn*.[24] In contrast, this chapter will focus on how class intersects with race. In his novel, Twain imagines or fantasizes, even for a moment, the possibility of change through the notion that if poor whites recognize their structural similarity to black slaves

---

whom he insists deal with poverty, he could have added Twain's *Huckleberry Finn* to his discussion.

[23] Forrest G. Robinson's *Author-Cat* addresses how in his writing Clemens was torn between the desire to reveal his guilt over his involvement with slavery, and the simultaneous impulse to conceal it. According to Robinson, whereas the author could easily identify himself with Tom Sawyer, Clemens could not directly identify with Huck Finn because of their class differences. Consequently, his conscience "was much less vigilant than he would have been had he been speaking more nearly in *propria persona*." "[T]he novel indirectly betrays," he continues, "much that Clemens would have refrained from articulating in his own voice" (135-36).

[24] For other discussions about the race issues in the novel, see the following: Ralph Ellison, "Change the Joke and Slips the Yoke"; James S. Leonard, Thomas Tenney, and Thadious M. Davis, *Satire or Evasion?: Black Perspectives on* Huckleberry Finn; Eric Lott, "Mr. Clemens and Jim Crow: Twain, Race, and Blackface"; Jocelyn Chadwick-Joshua, *Jim's Dilemma: Reading Race in Huckleberry Finn*; Forrest G. Robinson, "The Characterization of Jim in Huckleberry Finn"; and Shelly Fisher Fishkin, *Lighting Out for the Territory: Reflections on Mark Twain and American Culture*.

and their mutual oppression, radical change can happen in the U.S. In the ending of the novel, however, Twain has to break with this optimistic scenario. I will discuss how and why this takes place from the point of view of boundary making.

In this chapter, I will argue that looking at Huck's lower-class status as a poor white will help explain his relationship with the runaway slave Jim in *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. I will first show how his father Pap Finn represents a stereotypical poor white in the Old South. I will also clarify the term "poor whites" from historical and sociological perspectives. Pap Finn is important for our reading, because Huck's relationship with Jim is markedly different from his father's attitude towards blacks. We might need to ask where this difference comes from. To this end, I will explore how Huck himself draws and redraws boundaries of class and race in getting involved with Jim (in Chapter 31 in particular). As I will show later, scholars and critics have tended to focus on the disconnect between Huck and Jim, rather than Huck's lower class status.[25] In contrast, by reading the chapter from the point of view of changing class positionality, I will show how Huck's position as both poor and white plays a major role in making his decision to help Jim. As is well known, however, the author ultimately relativizes Huck's decision after Chapter 31 by reintroducing Tom Sawyer into the story. Therefore, I will conclude by showing that the class difference between Huck and Tom is closely related to the ending of the novel.

Pap Finn's Whiteness

[25] According to Gavin Jones, critics tend to emphasize the cultural categories of race and gender, rather than that of class, even when tackling with the socioeconomic dynamics of class marginalization. See Jones, 14-15.

Pap Finn as a Poor White

Adventures of Huckleberry Finn is a story of a poor white boy Huck Finn. As he says in his *Autobiography,* Samuel Clemens modeled the protagonist on his childhood friend, Tom Blankenship. According to the author, "[h]e was ignorant, unwashed, insufficiently fed." Although he was a lower-class boy, Clemens recollects that "he had as good a heart as ever any boy had" (*Autobiography* 191). Significantly, Tom had an elder brother named Benson who helped a runaway slave by secretly taking food to him on an island across the river in Hannibal. Moreover, the Blankenship brothers had a father who was always drunk, which reminds us of Huck's father.[26] In this way, Tom and Benson Blankenship provided one major source of inspiration for Clemens in creating *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*.

In the story, Pap Finn represents a stereotypical poor white. Huck refers to Pap Finn's clothes as "just rags" (31), indicating his needy condition.[27] Huck describes his physical appearance in detail. "He was most fifty, and he looked it. His hair was long and tangled and greasy, and hung down, and you could see his eyes shining through like he was behind vines. It was all black, no gray; so was his long, mixed-up whiskers" (31). Here his hair looks untrimmed, unkempt, and unwashed. Contrasted with his black hair is the extraordinary whiteness of his skin. "There warn't no color in

[26] Dawson argues that the model of Pap Finn is not Tom and Benson's father, but a drunkard named Jimmy Finn, whom Clemens met in his childhood. Clemens says: "Jimmy Finn, the town drunkard, reformed, and that broke up the only saloon in the village. But the temperance people liked it; they were willing enough to sacrifice public prosperity to public morality. And so they made much of Jimmy Finn—dressed him up in new clothes, and showed him off as great living curiosity—a shining example of the power of temperance doctrines when earnestly and eloquently set forth….Jimmy Finn couldn't stand it. He got remorseful about the loss of his liberty; and after that, he got drunk. He got awfully drunk." (Clemens, letter of April 16, 1876). See Dawson 5-6.
[27] Thereafter, I will refer to the Norton edition of *Huck Finn*.

his face," Huck continues, "where his face showed; it was white; not like another man's white, but a white to make a body sick, a white to make a body's flesh crawl—a tree-toad white, a fish-belly white" (31). His dirty appearance makes his skin look even more conspicuous. The color of his skin is unusual, and even uncanny, in that it has "no color." In a sense, Pap Finn represents whiteness as its most extreme case, as shown by the fact that Huck repetitively describes his father with the word "white." Like a tree-toad or fish, it has a wet feel. Even as Huck emphasizes Pap's whiteness, he depicts it not as something pure, clean, and beautiful, but ugly, sickly, and even uncanny, giving a sense of horror to the reader.

Although Pap Finn's skin is completely "white," his lifestyle is fundamentally different from that of the white people around him. Pap Finn is the town's drunkard with the ghostlike white skin and tattered clothes. He "used to lay drunk with the hogs in the tanyard" (21) and still consumes a "four-gallon jug of whisky" (38). Not only that, he has no fixed residence, roaming about inside and outside of the town. The reader wonders, then, how he earns money to buy drink. According to Huck, Pap "traded fish and game for whisky and fetched it home and got drunk and had a good time, and licked me" (36).

In addition to being a drunkard with no steady job, he is an abusive father. "I used to be scared of him all the time," Huck remembers. "[H]e tanned me so much" (31). Trying to dominate his son as his possession, Pap puts physical punishment on him on a regular basis. "By and by pap got too handy with hick'ry, and I couldn't stand it." "I was all over welts" (37), Huck says. On one occasion, the drunken Pap hallucinates, even trying to kill his son with a clasp knife. On another occasion, when he

learns that his son has acquired a large sum of money, Pap Finn comes to see him to take it away from his son. When he finds that he cannot do it, Pap Finn kidnaps and beats Huck. Clearly, his father's abuse leads to Huck's extremely low spirits, which is expressed when he repeats "I most wished I was dead" (16, 110). These incidents also demonstrate that poor whites represent the horror at the bottom of whiteness. Pap's violent outbursts are such that ultimately they force his son to run away. As these episodes suggest, his relationship with this abusive father is crucial to make sense of Huck's personality and behavior in the novel, which I will address later in this chapter.

Economic and Cultural Conditions of Poor Whites in the Old South

Exaggerated and stereotypical as it may be, such a characterization of Pap Finn represents the image of an impoverished class in the antebellum South, that is, the "poor white" sections of society. Living in the periphery of white plantation society, these people were called "lubber" or "cracker" in the eighteenth century, as well as "poor white trash" in the nineteenth century. According to *OED*, the first printed use of the word "white trash" appeared in 1821 in the newspaper *Illinois Gazette*. The term described "poor white people of low social status, esp. when regarded as uneducated or uncultured; (also) people who are perceived as having the values or attitudes associated with such a group. In earlier use, frequently in the language of African Americans of the southern United States" (*OED*). In the antebellum era, the poor white population was the object of social reform for both antislavery abolitionists and secessionists: while the former claimed that this demographic were victims of the system of slavery that caused their dishonorable behavior, the latter concerned itself with the poor white's putative

laziness. The historian Charles Bolton defines "poor whites" in economic terms, primarily as landless, non-slave owners within the structure of plantation society in the antebellum South. His definition includes not only tenant farmers borrowing a small piece of land from planters, but more broadly the impoverished, common white folks. They tended to live in "distinct, isolated settlements in the mountains, hills, pine barrens, and sandhills," on one hand, and be "extremely mobile," on the other (*Poor White* 7). Referring to the autobiography of Edward Isham, a poor white who worked as ditcher, gold miner, tenant farmer, rail splitter, railroad worker, and fireman, and was later executed for murder in North Carolina in 1860, Bolton also notes other types of peripheral jobs in which poor whites were engaged, including "independent miners, loggers, hunters, or herders" ("Edward Isham" 25-26).

At the same time, the terms such as "poor white" and "poor white trash" not only indicated an economic, but a moral and cultural condition. As Bolton shows, they were viewed as "illiterate, superstitious, and, above all, lazy and perpetually drunk" (*Poor White* 4). By the same token, the sociologist Matt Wray points out that poor whites, Indians and blacks were described in similar ways as "immoral, lazy, and dirty" (23). In this sense, poor whites were a nuisance for white middle-class society because the conditions of poor whites were contrary to the premise of white supremacy in which whites were supposed to be superior to people of color in most, if not all, respects. In fact, the black slaves often used the term "po' white trash" or "poor white trash," because "the slaves themselves entertained the very highest contempt for white servants" (Wray 41). The slaves' contempt for poor whites seemed dangerous for slaveholders, and so the other (non-poor) classes of whites tried to distinguish

themselves from poor whites.[28] The phrase "poor white trash" signified a stigma, as they were despised by black slaves, as well as middle-class and elite whites. Thus, the poor whites were a scandalous figure, because, in spite of whiteness, their life conditions were so low that they could barely be viewed as "white."

Pap Finn's Racism and Insecurity as a Poor White

Thus, Twain's characterization of Pap Finn can be said to represent a typical, or rather stereotypical, poor white Southerner: he not only has no money, but also is negatively described as 'immoral,' 'lazy,' and 'dirty.' Pap also conforms to another characterization of poor whites, that is, their racial prejudices towards African Americans. Of course, it is important to make a distinction between fiction and historical reality. Obviously, Pap Finn is a product of Twain's imagination, an exaggerated stereotype of the marginal white folks in the Old South. Yet, the way Twain describes Pap allows us to look into their attitude to race relations, as well as their peculiar position within the white community. However exaggerated, Twain magnifies their behavioral and psychological dimensions through Pap's image. As I will show later, Pap is also a key to understand Huck's own story, because major contrasts, as well as family resemblances, between the father and son provide important motives for his journey.

---

[28] This situation indicates a division within the whites in the antebellum South. Indeed, there was a discourse that addressed that the poor whites were economically disadvantaged in the system. For instance, North Carolinian Hinton Rowan Helper published one of the most influential books in the antebellum period entitled *The Impending Crisis of the South* in 1857 in which he called for abolition. His argument was shared by the Free Soil Party and its successor Republic Party. According to Nancy Isenberg, "Free Soil rhetoric fed the belief that freemen could not coexist with slaves—just as Anglo-Saxons could not live side by side with Indians. Slavery was a dangerous contagion spreading death and decay, and feeding a class/demographic war by 'depopulating' the nation of its white inhabitants" (146).

In Chapter 6, Pap expresses his hate against a 'mulatto' professor from Ohio whom he came across. In this emotional outburst, Pap also directs his anger at the state government of Ohio for allowing the professor to vote. Pap's reaction not only illustrates his racial discrimination against blacks, but also reveals his deep-held insecurity within the white community.

> "Oh, yes, this is a wonderful govment, wonderful. Why, looky here. There was a free nigger there from Ohio—a mulatter, most as white as a white man. He had the whitest shirt on you ever see, too, and the shiniest hat; and there ain't a man in that town that's got as fine clothes as what he had; and he had a gold watch and chain, and a silver-headed cane—the awfulest old gray-headed nabob in the State. And what do you think? They said he was a p'fessor in a college, and could talk all kinds of languages, and knowed everything. And that ain't the wust. They said he could *vote* when he was at home. Well, that let me out. Thinks I, what is the country a-coming to? It was 'lection day, and I was just about to go and vote myself if I warn't too drunk to get there; but when they told me there was a State in this country where they'd let that nigger vote, I drawed out. I says I'll never vote agin." (39)

Interestingly, Pap Finn, whose whiteness is emphasized in the novel, highlights the white skin color of the professor from Ohio. Although Pap takes for granted that his white skin differentiates himself from blacks, the appearance of the professor deeply frustrates his racial assumption. Obviously, the existence of mixed race blurs the dichotomy between whites and blacks. (As exemplified by Roxana in *Pudd'nhead Wilson*, a mixed blood figure is a pet motif for Mark Twain. I will discuss the novel in the final chapter.) Furthermore, the professor's social standing complicates Pap Finn's attempts to distinguish himself and his own status on the basis of skin color. The "p'fessor" from the North is depicted as wealthier and more educated than Pap Finn. In sociological terms, this means that the poor white man is inferior to the person in both economic and cultural capital. Of course, it is necessary to add that the professor does

not represent a general lifestyle of blacks, but a very exceptional case either in the South or the North. But there is no doubt, I argue, that the author intentionally contrasts them in this quite unusual and even counterintuitive way. Specifically, Twain is emphasizing Pap Finn's psychological vulnerability. In fact, perceiving that the professor has not merely a "white" skin, but also more education and intelligence than himself, Pap Finn cannot maintain his sense of superiority to the person of color. This is part of why Pap expresses his emotional outburst.

What infuriates Pap the most is the fact that the mixed race professor can vote. He vehemently criticizes the Ohio government for giving him the suffrage. He shouts curses: "And to see the cool way of that nigger—why, he wouldn't a give me the road if I hadn't shoved him out o' the way" (40). Pap cannot show his superiority without shoving off the professor, which, however, does not take the political rights away from him. Looking at the Ohio and Missouri laws in the antebellum period, Sharon D. McCoy shows that the professor from Ohio could be considered as "nearer white than a mulatto" and be justified to vote. According to her, in *Gray v. Ohio* (1831), the Ohio Supreme Court, citing a definition of "a mulatto" as the "child of one white and one black parent," ruled that "any Ohio resident with more white antecedents than blacks was averred white in the eye of the law." Furthermore, McCoy argues that Pap Finn was probably ineligible to vote because of his temporal residency in Illinois for a few months.[29] Ironically, while the professor in this episode may be entitled to vote, Pap Finn cannot legally exercise any racial privilege.

[29] According to McCoy, "[w]hile Missouri's constitution imposed no property or tax requirements for suffrage, it did have a residency requirement: to be eligible, a voter must have resided in the state for one year and in the county for three months preceding

To be sure, the professor's voting can only occur in the North, whereas Pap can vote in the North or the South as soon as he establishes residence. More generally, we cannot negate the fact that whereas very few blacks could vote, most whites were entitled to—if we put aside the existence of unequal voting rights among them.[30] However, McCoy makes an important point that Twain describes the confrontation between the poor white Southerner and the free black from the North in this inverted manner. I agree with her interpretation supporting my reading of Pap Finn and other poor white characters in the novel. Yet it is not my intention either to say that some blacks historically enjoyed a better position than the poor white as a whole. There is no denying that poor whites were free and had legal rights, whereas slaves were unfree and didn't have any legal rights. In this respect, poor whites and slaves were fundamentally different. I do not mean to conflate fiction and history.

Yet, we might need to ask why Twain sets up this seeming anomaly. Or, one might also wonder why Pap Finn is hostile to the Northern government, not just the free black man. In the above quote, Pap turns his resentment to the government in the North, i.e., the state of Ohio. Pap Finn's aversion to and indignation at Ohio state government surely indicates the opposition between the North and the South. In this context, Pap's hostility to the mixed-race professor is closely connected to the opposition between the North and the South in terms of slavery in the antebellum period. Therefore, it is obvious that his outburst of anger is regionally, as well as racially, motivated.

---

the election."

[30] David Brown points out that citizenship or voting rights were not equal even among the whites (840). For this reason he criticizes the concept of "Herrenvolk democracy," a theory that in the Jacksonian period voting rights were expanded to a large portion of the white populations, but not to the non-white groups.

At the same time, however, we might need to recognize that Pap is not merely frustrated with the black professor and the Northern government. Here it is important to pay a close attention to what he says: "when they told me there was a State in this country where they'd let that nigger vote, I drawed out. I says I'll never vote agin." (39) This means that his rage is directed against the whole country, including his own Southern state of Missouri. He says he'll never vote again, because he cannot feel he is represented in the election process. Here he expresses his sense of total distrust and even rejection of the government, as well as the election system.

In the novel, however, although he dares to reject the whole country, he is virtually rejected by his own community. Indeed, Pap Finn lies at the bottom of the white community. Pap is a despised figure, because not only his lifestyle but also his moral value is degraded; the judge who tries but fails to reform him "reckoned a body could reform the old man with a shot-gun" (35). As a result, Pap Finn cannot really feel a sense of belonging to the community. His alienation from his own community implies that there are hierarchies and divisions among the whites in the South. (Perhaps, the irony of Pap's rejection to participate in the election is that it would amount to perpetuating the status quo of the Southern aristocracy's rule and, therefore, his subaltern position.)

Thus, Pap's speech exhibits complex emotional dynamics, including hate, rage, a sense of alienation, distrust, insecurity, resentment, rejection, and so forth. All this implies his own repressed anxiety as a poor white and discontent as a member of the Southern white community.

He so vehemently reacts to the seemingly more privileged black professor, desperately drawing a boundary between whites and blacks and excluding the racial other from his community. He thus sticks to his white Southern community to gain a sense of belonging. However, it does not necessarily mean that those on the inside, distinguished from the outside, constitute a homogeneous and monolithic group. Precisely because Pap is at the margin of the white community, he has to draw the boundary between whites and blacks. In other words, his insecurity as a poor white leads him to reinforcing his racial discrimination against blacks. If this is the case, Pap's rage can be interpreted as a symptom of hidden tensions and divisions within the white community. Drawing the boundary is a way to turn the internal conflicts within the community into a putative unity of whiteness, as opposed to peoples of color. By doing so, he can believe in the pernicious myth of white supremacy and evade facing his own insecurity.

Finally, Pap's hate speech reveals what kind of entitlements he believes he has about his racial status. Pap Finn calls the mixed-race man "a prowling, thieving, infernal, white-shirted free nigger" (40). In fact, however, the professor does not steal anything from the poor white. It is only in Pap Finn's paranoid belief that white privilege is stolen by the mulatto professor.[31] Yet, Pap's unfounded accusation clearly demonstrates a fantasy of racism. The presence of the mixed-race man intimidates Huck's father, because, in Pap's view, he deprives the whites of their "privileges," such as fine clothing, education, and social status. Furthermore, this professor is described as if he were omniscient, as talking all kinds of languages and knowing everything. Ironically,

[31] See Žižek 203. According to Žižek, one type of racist fantasy is the apprehension that the ethnic "other" desires and steals "our" enjoyment.

his own fantasy for the professor serves as a threat to Pap Finn.[32]

In this way, Twain emphasizes Pap's psychological insecurity about his status as a white. To be sure, there is no denying that Pap has legal rights, including the suffrage, which certainly constitutes part of "white privileges"; many of them were denied to most black and enslaved populations in the Old South. But white privileges were not equally distributed among the white people, because they were divided into different class positions—most notably, the slaveowning planters and the landless poor whites in the historical context. When compared with other white folks, Pap does not enjoy any "privilege." Wealth and education, for instance, are not accessible to him. The only privilege he has derives from his being white. In other words, he cannot maintain his privilege without discriminating against other peoples of color. Indeed, he tries to demonstrate his white supremacy by shoving the professor off the sidewalk. His violence against the free black man is even legally sanctified.[33] Nevertheless, this privilege does not seem to change his miserable life condition. Therefore, he desperately fantasizes that the black man deprives him of his racial entitlements. This fantasy enables him to imagine that he possesses those privileges he has never had in reality. Thus, Pap Finn in his emotional outburst might incarnate the outrageous racial

[32] Interestingly enough, Pap Finn's indignation against the professor is parallel to the one against Huck. Just as he hates the professor whose dress and education are far superior to his, so does he show his frustration with his son, who now exhibits similar class trappings indicative of his higher social position. Pap is angry at them, as if his own privileges were stolen by them. In this sense, this novel can be read as a story of complicated relations not merely between the black and the white, but also between the whites.

[33] Pap Finn's racism is not exceptional, but shared with the Southern community, as Pettit suggests: "There are…a host of other Southerners who are not too far above him, especially when it comes to the one trait that unites a good many Southerners in *Huckleberry Finn*: violence" (84).

fantasy of white supremacy.

Huck Finn as a Poor White and the Boundaries of Race

Significantly enough, Huck Finn's path makes a striking contrast to his father. Samuel Clemens wrote his masterpiece dramatizing Huck's resolve to free the runaway slave Jim. As noted above, Clemens was inspired by the historical episode of Benson Blankenship who helped a runaway slave in the summer of 1847. Benson definitely provided an inspiration for Clemens in creating the protagonist Huck Finn. In the context of looking back at Blankenship's actions in 1895, Clemens mentions moral and legal implications of helping a runaway slave in the Old South:

> [T]he whole community was agreed as to one thing—the awful sacredness of slave property. To help steal a horse or a cow was a low crime, but to help steal a hunted slave, or free him or shelter him, or hide him, or comfort him, in his trouble, his terrors, his despair, or hesitate to promptly betray him to the slave-catcher when opportunity offered was a much baser crime, & carried with it a stain, a moral smirch which nothing could wipe away (quoted in Robinson, *Author-Cat* 132).

In this reminiscence in the last years of his life, Clemens emphasizes that violation of property rights for slaves was one of the most terrible crimes in the antebellum South.[34]

---

[34] As the historian Jeff Forret shows, the relation between poor whites and blacks in the antebellum South was full of ambivalences, irreducible to discrimination and mutual hostility. To be sure, poor whites came in close contact with slaves under the power structure of slavery. Many of them played a central role in maintaining the slave system as overseers, slave traders, and slave hunters; in turn, slaves regarded them as the objects of their hatred (Forret 117-22). At the same time, however, everyday contacts and even friendships existed between them, alongside mutual contempt and hatred. As Edward Isham confessed, poor whites spent their time with black slaves or freedmen, by drinking, gambling, working with them, and even having sexual relationships ("Autobiography" 1-18). Some poor whites aided fugitives by giving them food and shelter, running away with them, and stealing them, which constituted a grave crime and could lead to harsh punishments, including death penalty. In some rare cases, poor whites even sided with and encouraged slave uprisings (Forret 147-56). The

Clemens remembers at this point of his career, or perhaps fantasizes, that there were some courageous whites who helped slaves, and apparently used that memory to weave his tale of Huck and Jim.

Did Huck Move Upward in Class?

The Finns represent two different types of poor whites: while Pap discriminates against blacks, his son resolves to rescue the runaway slave, trying to seek solidarity with him, even if in a transient manner. Here one has to wonder why Twain depicts Huck as different from his father. In other words, one has to examine how Twain is imagining the father/son relationship. Existing studies have emphasized Pap Finn's negative legacies for his son. For instance, Dawson points out that Huck inherits from his father laziness, unruliness, a propensity for tobacco, disobedience, and so on. Likewise, Robinson, while mentioning that Huck is considerably free from discriminatory feelings, asserts Huck's inheritance of certain antipathies toward blacks from Pap Finn.[35] However, we need to investigate how the protagonist gains distance from his father since their actions are significantly different.

---

slaveholding planters were most afraid of their potential cooperation and alliance to rebel against slavery. While some poor whites had strong antipathies towards slaveowners, some others felt deprived of their economic opportunities because of slavery. Therefore, we cannot ignore instances of cooperation and sympathy, as well mutual hostility, between poor whites and blacks in the Old South.

[35] Some scholars shed light on the father-son relationship from a different point of view from Dawson and Robinson. For example, Yasuhiro Takeuchi claims that "Huck's Oedipal guilt over the naked body of his father" results from Twain's repressed guilt from witnessing his father's autopsy in his childhood (270). Interesting as his argument may be, Takeuchi never takes into consideration Huck's father-son relationship in terms of the class position.

Huck Finn is first introduced in *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer*: "Shortly Tom came upon the juvenile pariah of the village, Huckleberry Finn, son of the town drunkard. Huckleberry was cordially hated and dreaded by all the mothers of the town, because he was idle and lawless and vulgar and bad" (47). Although he is pejoratively described as a stereotypical poor white, Huck, unlike his father, gets along with black slaves. Huck confesses his friendship with Uncle Jake to Tom:

> That's a mighty good nigger, Tom. He likes me, becuz I don't ever act as if I was above him. Sometime I've set right down and eat *with* him. But you needn't tell that. A body's got to do things when he's awful hungry he wouldn't want to do as a steady thing. (*Tom Sawyer* 200-201)

Having a meal with the black slave is closely connected with the impoverished way of life lived by poor whites. While carefully asking Tom not to tell of his association with Uncle Jake, Huck secretly praises him. This implies that Huck, in reality, enjoys his company with the slaves.

At the end of the *Tom Sawyer,* however, Tom and Huck win a large sum of money, and Huck is taken charge of and educated by Widow Douglas. At that point, Huck starts a course of upward mobility. Perhaps strangely enough, Pap Finn gets so angry at his son that he swears at Huck: "Your mother couldn't read, and she couldn't write, nuther, before she died. None of the family couldn't before *they* died. *I* can't; and here you're a-swelling yourself up like this. I ain't the man to stand it -- you hear?" (32). He cowhides his son heavily.[36] Pap's anger is targeted at Huck's departure from illiteracy. He clearly does not want his son to get educated and rise above his lower class conditions.

[36] As I mentioned in Chapter 1, Clemens remembers his father flogging a black woman with a cowhide whip in his childhood (see also Pettit 17). Likewise, Pap Finn whipped his son with a hickory, which suggests that Huck grew up in similar conditions to black slaves.

Interestingly, just as Hank Morgan in *The Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court* adheres to being called "boss," Pap Finn also clings to his position as Huck's boss: "[Pap Finn] said he was boss of his son, and he'd make it warm for *him*" (33). Pap also says, "he would show who was Huck Finn's boss" (36). According to David R. Roediger, the word "boss" emerges as a replacement for "master" (*Wages* 53). [37] By forcing his son to call him "boss," Pap Finn makes sure that he dominates his son and that Huck cannot help submitting to his father (54).

The historian David Brown argues that the lower class whites in the antebellum South experienced differing degrees of economic opportunities and social mobility. This means that it is possible to distinguish between two types of poor whites. One set is "vagabonds" who "fought, gambled, stole, and freely associated with slaves and free blacks" (807). Just like other historians such as Jeff Forret, Brown clearly intends to challenge the conventional view of poor whites as racial bigots. In contrast to the vagabonds, the other poor white grouping here consists of "aspirational poor whites" who were "yeomen in the making, seeking their own independent paths as best they could with the resources available to them" (813).

Unlike the vagabonds who lacked any notion of a work ethic and remained poor throughout their lives, the aspirational poor whites endeavored to escape from poverty through their hard work. This vagabond notion seems to largely apply to the Finn family, except for Pap's explicit racial bias against the blacks. Yet, his son appears to depart from his original class background once he starts living with Widow Douglas

[37] Indeed, according to *OED*, "boss" means "American equivalent of master in the sense of employer of labor; applied also to a business manager, or any one who has a right to give orders."

and Miss Watson. Therefore, we need to ask whether Huck can be categorized as an aspirational poor white.

While Pap Finn is presented in the text as stereotypical white trash, Huck's identity is deeply ambivalent in many ways. Unlike his father, Huck gained a fortune of six thousand dollars at the end of *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer* and received an education—reading, writing, and arithmetic with Miss Watson, at a school where he is often physically punished. Despite coming from a lower-class background, Huck is no longer impoverished or illiterate like his father. More significant is that Huck gets a religious and moral education from women. He is also taken to church, which embodies the social order in the antebellum South. Thus, it is through education at home and school that the vagabond son starts internalizing the white middle-class discipline. At first, however, Huck cannot adjust to this strict education:

> Miss Watson she kept pecking at me, and it got tiresome and lonesome. By and by they fetched the niggers in and had prayers, and then everybody was off to bed. I went up to my room with a piece of candle, and put it on the table. Then I set down in a chair by the window and tried to think of something cheerful, but it warn't no use. I felt so lonesome I most wished I was dead. (16)

Huck feels alienated and depressed because he cannot assimilate into his new environment; he keenly senses a strict boundary between himself and middle-class life. Yet Huck gradually comes to adapt himself to his new lifestyle and mutters to himself: "I liked the old ways best, but I was getting so I liked the new ones, too, a little bit" (41). He becomes acclimatized to his new school life, as well as to home study with Widow Douglas and Miss Watson. In fact, he is no longer illiterate. Once he starts acquiring the requisite knowledge and discipline, Huck unwittingly moves upward from the bottom of his society.

This move away from his family background greatly frustrates his father, as noted above. Pap Finn is then further angered when the judge denies him access to his son's money. His outrage drives him to go so far as taking back his son from Widow Douglas, who, as a woman, was not allowed to establish guardianship (McCoy). Huck now turns back to his previous easy-going lifestyle and says: "I didn't see how I'd ever got to like it so well at the widow's" (37). His quick reversion implies that the protagonist fails to fully acquire the cultural habits of the middle class and returns to his former lifestyle of a poor white. Therefore, Huck cannot neatly be classified as what Brown calls an "aspirational poor white."

At the same time, Huck is no longer a "vagabond," because he has already lived with and received education from Widow Douglas and Miss Watson. That is to say, he cannot strictly be categorized either as a poor white or a middle-class boy. His social position is located between a vagabond and an aspirational poor white, if you will. Huck always finds himself in an ambivalent position vis-à-vis other people in society. In this regard, Huck's situation is quite different from that of Pap Finn, who seems tied to his lower-class status. That is why Huck does not feel at home in either class position, whether it is Pap's or Widow Douglas's. Dawson argues that the protagonist's detachment from middle-class lifestyle stems from his Irish ethnicity (11), but what he misses is that Huck is no longer a vagabond to be viewed as idle and violent like his father. To put it differently, the scholar overlooks the fact that Huck has already been "civilized" to some extent. Huck not only cannot have a sense of belonging to the middle-class whites, embodied by Miss Watson, but also cannot identify himself with the poor whites represented by Pap Finn. His uncomfortable feeling makes the

protagonist escape from both worlds. Thus, Huck's running away is facilitated, in Twain's depiction of it, by his sense of alienation due to his peculiar class position.

Boundaries Between White and Black

When Huck runs away from both Pap Finn and Widow Douglas, he accidentally meets Jim, a fugitive slave, and travels with him by rafting down the Mississippi river. Jim is desperately trying to escape from slavery, making his scheme much more dangerous and urgent than that of Huck's. Yet, we cannot miss some important similarities between Jim and Huck: Jim is Miss Watson's property, while Huck is treated as his father's possession; alienated from the community, both escape from their father or owner. Robinson in *The Author-Cat* concisely points out that Huck and Jim "find themselves…bound together in mutual desperation" (143).

Despite the similarities, however, Huck, when running into Jim, draws a line of demarcation between them in terms of race. In exploring the Jackson Island, Huck says: "I was boss of it [the Island]; it all belonged to me, so to say, and I wanted to know all about it" (51). What he says expresses his desire to conquer and possess the Island. Moreover, we should not miss that Huck is called "boss" by Jim: "Well, looky here, boss, dey's sumf'n wrong, dey is" and "Now ain't dat so, boss" (94). One can see an ironic parallel between the father and the son: just like Pap, Huck, if not forcefully, gets Jim to call him "boss." If Huck wishes to be addressed as such, it would indicate his desire to show his superiority to Jim. His tendency to play with Jim implies such feelings toward the slave, as we shall see shortly.

In one instance, in Chapter 16, Huck's complex sense of superiority to Jim becomes apparent when Huck becomes reluctant to help Jim, who is now overjoyed because of a mistaken belief that he has finally arrived at Cairo, his destination. Huck now retrospectively begins to feel compassion for Jim's owner Miss Watson, someone toward whom he has only felt a measure of antipathy up to this point:

> Conscience says to me, "What had poor Miss Watson done to you that you could see her nigger go off right under your eyes and never say one single word? What did that poor old woman do to you that you could treat her so mean? Why, she tried to learn you your book, she tried to learn you your manners, she tried to be good to you every way she knowed how. *That's* what she done." (110)

At the beginning of the novel, Huck cannot endure Miss Watson's discipline and schooling to the extent that he even sighs to himself, "I most wished I was dead" (16). Moreover, Huck in the next chapter mentions her as a potential hostage in order to participate in Tom Sawyer's gang: "I was most ready to cry; but all at once I thought of a way, and so I offered them Miss Watson—they could kill her" (21). Thus, although having felt no affection for the scolding Miss Watson, Huck remembers the education he received and laments, "I got to feeling so mean and so miserable I most wished I was dead" (110). In this way, Huck feels depressed every time he remembers Miss Watson.

At a certain moment in the text, Huck draws a boundary between himself and Miss Watson in terms of class, but on another occasion, he retrospectively feels sympathy for her, redrawing a different line between himself and Jim in terms of race. Specifically, when Huck confronts Jim's plan to save his money so that he can buy his wife and children from the farms in her neighborhood, he quotes an old saying with a strong sense of aversion to Jim: "give a nigger an inch and he'll take an ell" (110). Here Huck comes very close to his father's racism. Just like his father's fantasy of stolen

privilege, Huck feels as if the blacks would take away everything from the whites. As Arthur G. Pettit points out, such discrimination and prejudice were not unique to poor whites, but shared by the Southern white community as a whole (84-85). Although the protagonist does not mind living with the runaway slave, he is undoubtedly affected by the racist discourse of the antebellum South.

Blurred Boundaries

Critics have pointed out that Jim wears what is called "the mask of the gullible, passive, grateful slave" (Robinson, *Bad Faith* 149) in order to lower Huck's vigilance and increase his own chances of survival. However, Jim sometimes takes off the mask, revealing his real emotions. As Huck and Jim attempt to navigate along the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers to the free states of Indiana and Illinois, they experience tensions with each other. Precisely through getting over their conflict, they experience reconciliation thereby making their racial boundaries blur. In Chapter 15, for example, when his raft was separated from Huck's canoe by the strong current, Jim calls in vain for Huck but in the thick fog, he cannot make his way back. Exhausted in his search for the boy, he falls asleep. The next day, when the fog has lifted and they get reunited, Jim bursts into tears. But Huck makes Jim believe that he has been there asleep the whole night and has just dreamed it all. Taking Huck's trick as an insult, Jim shows righteous anger; "Dat truck dah is *trash;* en trash is what people is dat puts dirt on de head er dey fren's en makes 'em ashamed" (95). Jim's insistence on friendship is consistent with his emphasis on human equality in Chapter 14. Interestingly enough, Jim repetitively mentions "trash," which reminds us of "white trash." As Wray and others point out,

black slaves looked down on poor whites as white trash.[38] Of course, Jim calls him trash due to Huck's meanness, without directly mentioning his poor white background. Nevertheless, it is clear that calling him trash is a way of showing Jim's contempt for him, which makes Huck regret having done such a thing. As a result, he apologizes to him, and feels like "I didn't do him no more mean tricks, and I wouldn't done that one if I'd knowed it would make him feel that way" (95). Here Huck feels respect for Jim's dignity for the first time in their journey, and comes to recognize Jim not as Miss Watson's slave, but as a human being. Indeed, Jim stops calling the boy "boss" after Huck plays this trick on Jim. The boundary between a black and white begins to blur.[39]

This effacing of binary distinctions is visible elsewhere when Huck witnesses Jim's suffering caused by separation from his family, and Huck sympathizes with him: "I do believe he cared just as much for his people as white folks does for their'n. It don't seem natural, but I reckon it's so" (170). Ironically enough, as we have seen, Huck's own father has never cared for his son the way Huck says here. It is by stretching his imagination, however, that he exercises his sympathy, realizing that there is no difference between blacks and whites in their sincere feelings about their family. Nevertheless, Huck behaves as if he does not notice Jim's suffering: "[w]hen I waked up just at daybreak he was sitting there with his head down betwixt his knees, moaning

---

[38] According to Wray, "Harriet Beecher Stowe arguably does more to popularize, nationalize, and internationalize the phrase poor white trash than anyone in Antebellum South" (57).

[39] Just as Huck's cognitive boundary between black and white starts to blur, his epistemic boundary between inside and outside seems to disappear. When Huck, after escaping from the feud between the Grangerfords and the Shepherdsons, gazes absent-mindedly at the world outside the raft: "The first thing to see, looking away over the water, was a kind of dull line—that was the woods on t'other side; you couldn't make nothing else out" (135).

and mourning to himself. I didn't take notice nor let on" (120). As Robinson in *In Bad Faith* puts it, "[h]is refusal to hear [his friend's appeal] is one sure sign of his acculturation to the side of Jim's oppressors" (171). Huck recognizes Jim's appeal to deal with the trouble on board the raft. But he is willing to ignore it, because his recognition leads him to confronting his self-deception: although he is traveling with the runaway slave, he implicitly evades helping Jim escape from his owner, Miss Watson at the same time, knowing that helping Jim flee is breaking the law. In short, Huck tries to suppress his emotion for his friend's distress at separation from the family.

Significantly enough, it's no coincidence that Huck's silence about Jim's suffering is followed by Huck's sympathy for Mary Jane's tears for the sudden separation of her black slave family. In Chapter 27, Huck emotionally responds to Mary Jane and her sisters' sorrow, when their black slave family was about to be sold out separately by her false uncle: "The girls said they hadn't ever dreamed of seeing the family separated or sold away from the town. I can't ever get it out of my memory, the sight of them poor miserable girls and niggers hanging around each other's necks and crying; and I reckon I couldn't a stood it all" (195). His emotional response is noteworthy, when we take into consideration the fact that the boy never shows compassion for Mary Jane shedding tears for her dead uncle. Huck's strong reaction to Mary Jane and her sisters appear to reflect his repressed guilt for Jim's suffering. Thus, although Huck first tried to behave like a boss of the runaway slave, Jim, his emotional reaction to the separation of the black slave family makes the demarcation between whites and blacks increasingly irrelevant. Racial boundaries are neither clear nor static

whenever Huck runs into the problem of potential separation of a black slave family.[40] Huck's affective reaction to the separation of black family is foreshadowing Huck's ultimate acceptance of his poor-white father.

Between Huck and Jim

Huck' Decision and Two Boundaries

In Chapter 31, when the self-claimed king and duke, who are con artists, capture Jim and sell him for forty dollars, Huck famously debates over whether or not to "steal" Jim. Indeed, in his decision-making, the racial boundary between them fades. (In my Chapter 3, I will discuss the king and duke as another example of poor whites in Twain's texts.)

Here I will pay attention to how Huck's position as a poor white is involved in his resolve. When the moral dilemma of Huck reaches its climax in the Chapter 31, Huck has to confront the dominant culture of the white South and becomes overwhelmed by it. He thinks to himself:

> And at last, when it hit me all of a sudden that here was the plain hand of Providence slapping me in the face and letting me know my wickedness was being watched all the time from up there in heaven, whilst I was stealing a poor old woman's nigger that hadn't ever done me no harm[.] (222)

Although he escaped from Miss Watson's mission to "sivilize" him, Huck retrospectively regrets having once "stolen" Jim from "a poor old woman." Huck's

[40] See Twain's *Autobiography* 6-7. Twain recounts the incident of a little slave boy separated from his family. As a result, Twain repetitively presents the narrative of a black family separation and reunion in his major works: Aunt Rachel's separation and reunion with her son in "A True Story" and Roxy's emotional reaction to the prospect of being separated from her son and their ironic reunion in *Pudd'nhead Wilson*.

betrayal of Miss Watson represents a blasphemy because she embodies the societal, cultural, and religious norm of the white South based on the Church's authority.[41] The notion that "stealing" Jim is nothing but a sin comes from Sunday school lessons, which Huck never really attended. He says to himself, "people that acts as I'd been acting about that nigger goes to everlasting fire" (222). Churches in the South at that time justified slavery as part of the private property system. Huck has unwittingly internalized its norms, i.e., "conscience," more than he thought. Thus Huck says, "I most dropped in my track I was so scared" and "It made me shiver" (222).

Nevertheless, we have to wonder why Huck can side with Jim. His decision is never founded upon abolitionist ideology. We need to ask about the process by which he came to try to rescue a slave (even without being an ardent subscriber to abolitionism), and what motivated his actions. First, looking back at his experience with Jim, Huck comes to realize that he has a sense of camaraderie with Jim that is quite different from any relationship he had ever had with anybody else; Jim "said I was the best friend old Jim ever had in the world, and the *only* one he's got now" (223). Precisely because of his position as a poor white, Huck always lets others in a superior position to him "have their own way" (142) and pretends to be naïve so that he can draw sympathy from people surrounding him. That is how Huck survives on his journey. Severely abused by his father and still as a child, Huck is accustomed to obeying the people surrounding him without expressing his feelings.[42] Yet he cannot escape his own solitude to the

[41] Here we can detect Twain's misogyny. Just as he vehemently criticizes "sappy women" who petition for Injun Joe in *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer*, he makes Miss Watson embody the social, cultural, and religious norms justifying slavery.

[42] While the class issue directly represents a social problem, the parent-child relationship is often viewed as a private issue. Nevertheless, Pap Finn's abuse of his son

extent that he disguises himself.

To be sure, Tom Sawyer is his friend, but even when Tom's way of doing things does not make sense to him, Huck never confronts or quarrels with him. Huck maintains his silence in front of him, and Tom does not show him due respect. In short, the relationship with Tom is never an equal one with Huck, for it exhibits an asymmetry that can be said to derive from their different class and family backgrounds.[43] This should be contrasted with Huck's reminiscences in Chapter 31 where he remembers Jim calling him "the best friend" and "the only one" (223), which means that Jim treated him with respect. Huck's experience of being treated as a friend for the first time offers at least one important reason for Huck's decision to side with Jim.

As discussed above, the novel dramatizes the racial tensions between Huck and Jim. Yet, what is at issue is how the protagonist can overcome those. I do not mean to present a rosy picture of Huck's resolve to free Jim. James M. Cox argues that "the deep wish which *Huck Finn* embodies" is "the wish for freedom from any conscience" (180). Indeed, Huck's decision to "go to hell" is nothing but a moment of defeat, rather than victory. Likewise, Robinson also says, "his [Huck's] resolve, though noble, is inadequate as a stay against the craving for relief from the confusion that his journey with Jim has entailed" (*Author-Cat* 154). To be sure, these two critics make important points. But we still need to clarify at least *how* Huck reaches his decision to help Jim in

---

is closely related with his impoverished conditions. Thus, Huck's relation with his father is profoundly related to the class issue. Here too, the slogan, "the personal is political," matters.

[43] Indeed, their relationship is suggested in the following: "Tom was off at once. He did not care to have Huck's company in public places" (*Tom Sawyer* 195). Tom evades meeting with Huck in public because he is likely aware that Huck belongs to the marginal positionality in his community.

the novel.

Huck's friendship with Jim does not fully explain his motives. What is crucial here is not only who Jim is for Huck, but also how Huck understands himself. In other words, his decision also depends on his awareness of his own identity. When he debates over whether or not he will help Jim, he returns to his own background: "Well, I tried the best I could to kinder soften it up somehow for myself by saying I was brung up wicked, and so I warn't so much to blame" (222). When he says he was "brung up wicked," he not just says he is "wicked," but says to himself that he was "brung up" that way.[44] Put differently, while accepting that he is morally wrong, he reconfirms that he was brought up that way for which he was not responsible. Since he already knew stealing a slave would be a "wicked" thing violating "conscience," his emphasis here lies on his upbringing. If this is the case, he highlights his family background in which

[44] The word "wicked" and its cognates appear six times in the novel and are used in connection with other adjectives, including "low-down" and "ornery." For instance, right before he makes up his mind, he says: "The more I studied about this the more my conscience went to grinding me, and the more *wicked* and *low-down* and *ornery* I got to feeling" (222; italic mine). Here the word wicked is used to mean "morally wrong," in opposition to "conscience." Significantly enough, the word "low-down," too, is used several times to describe stealing a runaway slave. When Tom Sawyer reappears and offers to help steal Jim in Chapter 33, Huck describes it as a "low-down business" (235) that is not appropriate for a good boy like Tom. Moreover, Huck applies the adjective to the very term "abolitionist" in Chapter 8, when he first encountered runaway Jim: "Well, I b'lieve you, Huck. I—*I run off*." "Jim!" "But mind, you said you wouldn' tell—you know you said you wouldn' tell, Huck." "Well, I did. I said I wouldn't, and I'll stick to it. Honest *injun* I will. People would call me a low down Ablitionist (*sic*) and despise me for keeping mum—but that don't make no difference." (55) It is important to note that the word "abolitionist" appears very rarely, just twice, in the novel and here it is used in association with "low down." Huck uses the word "abolitionist" pejoratively to mean just stealing a slave. Obviously, he does not show any understanding of the cause of abolitionism here. At any rate, the words "wicked" and "low-down" have textual association with slave stealing and abolitionism.

he lived with and was raised by the poor white father.[45] Recalling his humble, marginal origin, he expresses his sense of belonging to the lower-class family. In so doing, Huck makes a stark contrast between his lowly descent and the social and cultural norms of the middle class. Rather than expressing his race as a white, he severs himself from those who belong to a higher class such as Miss Watson and Widow Douglas.

His self-understanding in Chapter 31 amounts to rebelling against the religious order of the South that justified slavery. While feeling a shiver down his back, Huck makes his momentous decision and refers to his descent again: "I would take up wickedness again, which was in my line, being brung up to it, and the other warn't." (223). He repeatedly emphasizes his wicked upbringing and family "line." Therefore, Huck never intends to do something "good." He tries to rescue the runaway slave, not because it is a right thing to do, but because in his view he was brought up wicked, and thus cannot do otherwise than to commit a crime, that is, to "steal" Miss Watson's "property."

Huck and Pap: the "Line" of Poor Whiteness

Huck's resolve to rescue the runaway slave brings him back to his origin and upbringing and this indicates his family relationship with Pap Finn. Interestingly, the expression "in

[45] Faced with a decision about whether he will rescue Jim or not, Huck refers to his family background not only in Chapter 31, but also Chapter 16. When he comes across two men in a boat who want to search his raft for escaped slaves, Huck tells a lie and manages to save Jim. Nevertheless, Huck feels bad: "a body that don't get *started* right when he's little ain't got no show—when the pinch comes there ain't nothing to back him up and keep him to his work, and so he gets be" (113). His reference to his breeding in Chapter 16 leads the boy not to resolve to side with Jim, but to justify his decision-making. In other words, although referring to his origin as an excuse for his action, Huck still cannot accept it in that moment.

my [Huck's] line" recalls the description of his father: "Every time he got money he got drunk; and every time he got drunk he raised Cain around town; and every time he raised Cain he got jailed. He was just suited—this kind of thing was right in his line" (36). The same word "line" here implies the poor whiteness of his father, which Huck inherits. In other words, the "line" of poor whiteness connects the father and his son.

Furthermore, the word "stealing" suggests another connection between them. Huck is involved in a number of thefts and on one occasion he remembers what his father had said: "Pap always said it warn't no harm to borrow things if you was meaning to pay them back some time" (75). Pap insists that "stealing" is not "stealing," but "borrowing." Huck follows this lesson throughout his journey. In fact, in Chapter 35, Huck debates with Tom: "I called it borrowing, because that was what pap always called it; but Tom said it warn't borrowing, it was stealing" (250). Huck shares with his father the same feeling that "stealing" is just "borrowing," a belief that deviates significantly from Tom's middle-class values.[46] Pap Finn's lesson has not only helped Huck to travel with Jim, but lies behind his resolve to rescue him. At the very least, one could say it was an enabling condition for this action. Furthermore, perhaps, one might be tempted to say that Pap's notion serves to relativize the very idea of private property on which chattel slavery is based. To be sure, Pap Finn himself is far from radical: as noted above, he is a committed racist. Pap was clearly driven by his racial fantasy that

[46] With a focus on Huck's inter-class and interracial relationships with Tom and Jim, McCoy avers the difference in the meaning of "borrowing" as understood by Huck and Tom. While allowing Huck to call theft "borrowing," Tom forces him to pay for a watermelon that he stole from a slave's private garden. According to McCoy, "Tom's security in his status as a white boy and relative of the owners of the farm—and the slaves—enables him to recognize some aspects of noblesse oblige and paternalist class responsibility" (60).

blacks “steal” his white privileges. In this respect, Pap does not seem to reject, but presuppose the ownership on which the chattel slavery is based. Yet, Pap’s euphemism of “borrowing” indeed disrespects and undermines the lawful order of private property. Recalling Pap’s potentially disruptive way of thinking, Huck even goes further than his father in that he uses the word for stealing a chattel slave. Unlike Pap, Huck seems to be free from the racial prejudice here. Whereas Pap Finn sticks to racial boundaries, Huck detaches himself from the white community and aligns himself with the runaway slave. Paradoxically enough, the protagonist takes a distance from his father’s racism, precisely by acceding to his class position.

Of course, I’m not suggesting that Huck escapes racial boundaries once and for all. His decision-making remains quite uneven, sometimes crossing the boundary and sometimes not. As I will mention shortly, his resolve becomes shaky once Tom Sawyer reappears in the story. But his decision shows that racial division is far from absolute and more porous than usually thought, and that his ambiguous class position was involved in redrawing the racial boundary.

Here we have to wonder why Twain depicts Huck as not inheriting Pap’s racism. Where do their differences originate? While Pap Finn is presented in the text as stereotypical “white trash,” Huck’s class identification is deeply ambiguous. As a result, he feels ambivalent about his identity. Unlike his father, Huck gained a fortune of six thousand dollars at the end of *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer*, and received an education from Miss Watson and Widow Douglas. Despite coming from a lower-class background, Huck is no longer impoverished or illiterate like his father. As a result, it seems he has benefited from immense upward social mobility, and certain amounts of

capital, both economic and cultural, are now available to him. Nevertheless, his fortune and education were not acquired through his own efforts, but came to him by chance. He feels uncomfortable with his position in Widow Douglas's household and by extension in the middle-class society. However, neither does he maintain his original family background. Nor can he assimilate into the middle-class position to which he has risen. He always feels out of place and has no real sense of belonging. As Cox once pointed out, "Huck's central mode of being is that of escape and evasion" (173). Yet despite escaping from his abusive father, Huck still remembers his teachings. Although he cannot feel at home with Miss Watson, he feels sorry for her when Jim is about to be set free. While suffering from a bad conscience, Huck irresistibly sympathizes with Jim, who is also escaping. In this way, Huck's evasion derives from the deep-rooted ambivalence about his class position. He did not completely inherit his father's racism, because Huck cannot identify himself with the white community.

In Chapter 31, then, Huck is faced with two choices. One option is to remain within the white community by drawing a color line between himself and Jim. The other is to ally with Jim by differentiating his class positionality from Miss Watson. Therefore, what is at issue are two ways of drawing the boundaries, either in terms of race or class. At the same time, it is important to recognize that drawing a line is also a matter of choosing his own identity. In fact, Huck has chosen the second alternative of siding with Jim by identifying himself as poor and wicked. Although his attitude towards others has been ambivalent, Huck puts himself on the side of Jim. Remembering Pap's lessons, Huck returns to his poor white origins and accepts its stigma. Of course, Huck has not chosen to be "wicked" in the way Pap is. For example,

Huck does not choose to be a white supremacist. However, one cannot overlook the fact that in his decision making Huck remembers Pap, deriving his wickedness from his family and class background. If this is the case, this act of selective self-identification makes it possible for him to side with Jim and envision a form of friendship with him, even if for a brief moment.

In this way, Huck in Chapter 31 identifies himself as a poor white. He finally accepts his own legacy and the stigma he inherited from Pap Finn. It means that Huck is re-drawing the boundary now in terms of class, not race. Huck is able to side with Jim precisely by doing so. That is to say, his class identification overrides the racial distinction between himself and Jim. Therefore, his return to his roots as a son of the poor white father makes possible the slave rescue even without his believing in abolitionism.[47]

Between Huck and Tom

As is well known, however, Huck's decision to overcome the racial boundary becomes ambivalent again after Chapter 32. As he seeks for solidarity with Jim, the protagonist ironically returns to solitude as in Chapter 1: "I knowed for certain I wished I was dead—for that *is* the lonesomest sound in the whole world" (229). Therefore, when Huck was mistaken for Tom in the Phelps farm of Chapter 32, he feels relieved: "Being Tom Sawyer was easy and comfortable" (233). Moreover, when Tom reappears to visit his uncle and aunt Phelps in Chapter 33, Huck, while complaining about the authoritarian way Tom rescues Jim, follows his directions. The apparent transformation

[47] As for "abolitionism" in the novel, see the footnote above.

of Huck has aroused a lot of debates among Twain readers and scholars. For instance, Toni Morrison argues: "[t]he change from underground activist to vocal one marks Huck's other important relationship –that between himself and Tom Sawyer, to whom Huck has always been subservient" ("Introduction" XL). Robinson also mentions Huck's transformation in Chapter 32 with a focus on the author's and his protagonist's feelings of guilt about slavery: "at a suppressed level of consciousness both young Sam Clemens and Huck do in fact recognize that there *is* something morally wrong with slavery." "For his part," he continues, "Huck retreats from the psychologically intolerable weight of this knowledge when he embraces the identity of Tom Sawyer" (*Author-Cat* 138).

Although Robinson's argument is significant from the perspective of Clemens' and Huck's repression of guilt, it does not fully account for Huck's transformation. In order to investigate why Huck cannot help following him, we might need to examine their class difference as a key factor. When Huck is reunited with Tom, he confesses his plan to steal Jim: "[y]ou'll say it's dirty, low-down business; but what if it is? I'm low down; and I'm a-going to steal him, and I want you keep mum and not let on" (235). Here Huck associates "low-down business" of stealing Jim with his "low-down" origin. When Tom insists that he will rescue Jim together, however, Huck shows embarrassment: "Only I couldn't believe it. Tom Sawyer a *nigger stealer*!" (235). Tom's notorious plan to free Jim has been called a 'slapstick comedy,' because he conceals from Huck the fact that Jim has already been emancipated by his owner Miss Watson. Yet, what matters more is Huck's reaction toward Tom:

> Here was a boy that was respectable and well brung up; and had a character to lose; and folks at home that had characters; and he was bright

> and not leather-headed; and knowing and not ignorant; and not mean, but kind; and yet here he was, without any more pride, or rightness, or feeling, than to stoop to this business, and make himself a shame, and his family a shame, before everybody. I *couldn't* understand it no way at all. (242)

Huck here draws a line between himself and Tom in terms of different breeding. Huck deeply internalizes the class hierarchy: Tom belonging to the middle-class is deemed superior to Huck who comes from the poor whites. Inferiority to Tom causes Huck not only to follow, but also idealize Tom. Therefore, the reason why Huck feels delighted to act as Tom is that he acquires a new identify as an insider and a welcome member of the white community. Hence, Huck comes to follow Tom, although he complains about Tom's ridiculous plan to free Jim.

In Chapter 31, by separating himself from white middle-class society, Huck was able to establish solidarity with Jim. However, in Chapter 32, Huck differentiates himself and Tom so as to strengthen the class hierarchy among the whites. Thus, drawing the boundary between himself and white middle-class society has different functions depending on the context, as well as relationality with other characters. This derives from Huck's vulnerability and ambiguity as a poor white. Thus, we need to comprehend Huck's ambivalent positionality as a whole.

In the final chapters of the novel, Tom forces Jim to work as hard as any slave in order to accomplish his ludicrous plan. It includes, for instance, turning spoons into pens and then carving several mottoes with these pens into a grindstone, which Jim has had to roll to the cabin. To put it differently, this scenario emphasizes the absurdity of Tom's agenda, which might correspond to the point of view of the former slaveholders,

rather than the poor whites.[48] In a sense, Tom's scheme to set Jim free can be read as a caricature of the postbellum Southern whites who could not accept the results of the Civil War. Their psychological denial of the historical facts is transformed into a fantasy suggesting they had generously emancipated slaves, rather than being defeated and deprived of them.

This denial also applies to Clemens himself to a certain degree, because he narrates the antebellum story of a poor white protagonist and a runaway slave in the postbellum era—just as Tom sets up a heroic rescue scheme, knowing that Jim was already freed. Insofar as the author presents it as a form of caricature, however, the novel can be read as an unwitting self-commentary of Clemens himself. To be sure, there are differences between them; while Tom's scheme is planned in the antebellum South, Clemens wrote the novel in Elmira, New York after the war. Nevertheless, Tom chooses, and Clemens chose, an attempt to free the slave in a *safe* way. Like Tom knowing that his rescue plan to free Jim is not dangerous at all, Clemens's novel about freeing the runaway slave in the antebellum South would have been easily endorsed by Northern readers in the postbellum era. If this is the case, I argue that Tom's scheme can and should be interpreted as a kind of allegory of Clemens himself. Whether or not he was aware of this irony, Tom's hypocrisy points to the author himself.[49]

---

[48] Forrest G. Robinson maintains that "[m]ost significantly and most ironically of all, Tom is blind to the fact that in freeing the already free black man he must first re-enslave him" (*Bad Faith* 179). Tom's apathy for Jim's suffering reminds us of Tom Driscoll feeling for Roxana's pain, as shown in my final chapter.

[49] There are ample evidences from his personal history that show that Clemens himself felt deeply guilty about his origin in the South. His father John Marshall Clemens owned black slaves, before and after Sam Clemens was born. According to Arthur G. Pettit, "Clemens's own father had long and complicated business dealings with Beebe [a slave trader], and Mark Twain vividly recalled as a boy seeing gangs of slaves chained

Conclusion: the Intersection between Class and Race

Adventures of Huckleberry Finn depicts the ways in which solidarity could occur between a slave and a poor white boy. While numerous critics have focused on the white/black binary to discuss this solidarity, a closer examination of the novel revealed how Mark Twain seeks imaginatively to show the possibility of the alliance along class lines. When asking whether or not he should help Jim in Chapter 31, Huck refers to his origin as a poor. Huck here refers to his poor white background and accepts its stigma. This act of self-identification makes it possible for him to envision a form of solidarity with Jim, even if for a brief moment.

At the same time, however, Twain depicts that this possible cross-racial solidarity turns out to be quite fragile as Tom and Huck join together to "rescue" Jim in the final chapters of the novel: Huck ends up giving priority to his whiteness as opposed to his class position, rather than pursuing cross-racial alliance. The novel implies that when the race boundary comes to the surface, the class distinction seems to disappear

---

together on Hannibal's cobblestone wharf, waiting to be shipped down the river" (14). After the Civil War broke out, Sam Clemens ended his career as a river pilot and joined the Marion Rangers, a new Confederate militia unit in Hannibal, Missouri, as shown in "My Military History" in 1877. Thus, Clemens, the son of a slaveholder, was sympathetic toward the South at the time of the Civil War. Nonetheless, after his marriage to Olivia, the daughter of wealthy coal merchant and ardent abolitionist Jervis Langdon, Clemens had to repress his origin as a Southerner. According to Atsushi Sugimura, "[i]t is highly plausible that during his courtship, Clemens should have suffered from an inarticulate sense of insecurity, guilt, and victimization as the son of slaveholders." "Clemens's troubled feelings about his past life," he continues, "must have functioned as the primal, if not sole, impetus for his radical transformation into Mark Twain, preceding the Langdons' enlightening influence" (56). Therefore, while he created the friendship between Huck and Jim as if to support the Union's cause, Clemens might have felt guilty about his hidden or disguised past. If this is the case, the grotesque ending can be taken as casting doubt on himself. As he felt guilty about his hidden past as a slaveholder's son and as a militia of the Confederates, albeit for two weeks, Clemens could not endure his hypocritical narrative of the slave rescue. In this sense, the ending can be taken as unintended self-commentary on Sam Clemens himself.

from our sight. As I have shown, however, this apparent invisibility also derives from Huck's very ambiguous position as a poor white. In this way, the novel indicates that the issue of class in *Huck Finn* plays a pivotal role in the development of the entire story: the characterizations of, and the dynamics between, the protagonists, the motive for Huck's escape, his decision to rescue Jim, and his subjugation to Tom in the ending, as well as drawing and redrawing of the racial boundary between the whites and the blacks.

In this way, the problem of race in the novel is so closely intertwined with class that it is necessary to analyze the intersection of both, instead of focusing on either race or class. Indeed, the class issue plays crucial roles in Twain's other novels, too. In the next chapter, therefore, I will discuss how class works in *The Prince and The Pauper* in comparison with the con artists named "the King" and "the Duke" in *Huck Finn*.

Chapter Three

"I Wish We Could Hear of a Country That's Out of Kings": Social Hierarchy and Sympathy in *The Prince and the Pauper* and *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*

Introduction

Recent findings about Twain's writing process of *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* urge us to reconsider the relation between this novel and his other works from the same period, such as *The Prince and the Pauper.* In 1990, the long lost original manuscript of the first 600 plus pages of *Huckleberry Finn* was discovered after more than a hundred years, providing a crucial clue to the mystery of its composition process. Twain scholars, such as Walter Blair, have traditionally estimated that Clemens had probably completed chapters 1 through 16 (except for chapters 12-14) by the end of 1876, and resumed the draft in 1880, creating the Grangerford-Shepherdson feud, chapters 17-18 (Doyno 23). However, the editors of the 2003 authoritative version of the text, Victor Fischer and Lin Salamo correct the previous consensus: the first 446 pages of the newly discovered manuscript (MS1a) show that he suspended the writing in the middle of chapter 18, where Huck asks what a feud is (682).[50] He then took a three-year break from the draft until March 1880 and started to write other works, most notably *The Prince and the Pauper*. Twain then returned to *Huckleberry Finn*, writing the second

[50] In this discussion of the draft, I will refer to the 2003 edition of *Huck Finn*, edited by Fischer and Salamo. But later in the body of this chapter, I will use the Norton edition of the text.

half of the manuscript (MS1b), a portion that corresponds to what would become chapters 19 through 21. That is to say, it was not the Grangerford episode that was newly introduced in the second stint; rather, it was the figures of the fraudulent king and duke. Fischer and Salamo explain the contents of MS1b:

> In the 217 pages Clemens completed in the spring of 1880 he brought the Grangerford-Shepherdson feud to its bloody conclusion and reunited Huck and Jim, sending them on down the river where they encounter two fugitive confidence men, the king and the duke (chapters 18 and 19). The introduction of these characters provided the motivation for Huck and Jim's continued travel south on the Mississippi: the king and the duke commandeer the raft by implicitly threatening to turn Jim in. (684-685)

Twain continued to write up to chapters 20 and 21. "At that point," the editors say, "the last page of MS1b (663)—just about the mid-point of the book—the purple-ink inscription ends" (685). He would return to *Huck Finn* in June-September 1883, completing the remaining portion of the novel (MS2), from chapter 22 to the end, as well as chapters 12-14, including the conversation between Huck and Jim on King Sollermun and the French language.

A supporting evidence for the importance of the King and Duke episode is a prospectus that the publisher Webster used for sales promotion of *Huck Finn*.

> the adventures of Huckleberry Finn, Tom Sawyer and a negro named Jim, who in their travels fall in with two tramps engaged in *taking in* the different country towns through which they pass, by means of the missionary dodge, the temperance crusade, or under any pretext that offers to *easily* raise a dishonest dollar. The writer follows these characters through their various adventures, until finally, we find the tramps properly and warmly clothed,—*with a coat of tar and feathers*,—and the boys and Jim escape their persecution and return safely to their friends. (quoted in Arac 143)

The prospectus shows that the publisher sought to promote the novel focusing on the King and Duke. According to Jonathan Arac, "the editors [of collected works of Mark

Twain, Walter Blair and Victor Fischer] are certain that all advertising material had 'at least the author's tacit approval'" (144). In other words, the publisher and the author put stress on the King and Duke episode as what Arac calls a "local narrative of southwestern humor" (143), although the dominant interpretation of what the text is about is Huck's moral dilemma and the runaway slave Jim.[51]

What is equally significant is the fact that around the time of the second stint of writing *Huck Finn*, Twain was working alternately on *The Prince and the Pauper* and *Huck Finn*. In other words, he had been writing *Prince*, switched to the *Huck Finn* manuscript (MS1b) in March-June 1880, and then returned to *Prince*, completing and publishing it the following year. His alternation from one manuscript to another indicates a strong mutual influence between the two novels. In fact, according to the biographer Ron Powers, Twain was planning to publish them in one volume:

> The two manuscripts were linked in a more explicit way: revealingly, Clemens made a "verbal agreement' with James Osgood in 1880 in which both novels would be published under the same cover. Livy quashed this idea, insisting that *Prince and the Pauper* be issued free from contamination by its rough-edged cousin. (473)

That is to say, in the mind of the author, the works next to each other were twins of a sort. As is well known, *The Prince and the Pauper* is a story in which a pauper boy Tom Canty is mistaken as Prince Edward. This plot of mistaken identity appears in *Huck Finn* as the episode of con artists pretending to be royalty.

Scholars have not yet paid enough attention to this remarkable parallel between these two stories.[52] In my view, there are three substantial commonalities

---

[51] Jonathan Arac examines the process by which *Huck Finn* achieved its unique status, what he calls "hypercanonization" (133).

[52] Instead, scholars tend to focus on the linkage between *The Prince and the Pauper* and

between them: 1) kings and aristocrats, on the one hand, and the poor on the other, which indicates Twain's concern with the issue of status and class in a broad sense; 2) identity switching between the characters from these opposite class backgrounds, or the impostures of royalty in the case of *Huck Finn*[53]; 3) emphasis on, or the disguising of, an emotional relationship between these two classes of people in the form of sympathy. At the same time, however, one cannot overlook a difference between them: whereas *The Prince and the Pauper* presents a rather optimistic view on the sympathy between the king and the commoners, the pseudo-aristocratic episode in *Huck Finn* seems to provide an alternative view, relativizing or critically commenting on the other work. Comparing these two novels, therefore, helps illuminate each.

In this chapter, I will discuss both similarities and differences between *The Prince and The Pauper* and *Huckleberry Finn*, especially in terms of social status and class. In the first section, I will focus on *The Prince and The Pauper*. I will first show how in the role switching of Prince Edward, son of King Henry VIII, and the pauper boy Tom Canty, the status of a king is constructed and deconstructed. I will also discuss how Prince Edward sympathizes with the oppressed people. Sympathy is one of the key words for this novel. In fact, Twain quotes as an epigraph "the quality of mercy" from William Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice*. In the second section of this chapter, I will discuss the episode of the fake king and duke in *Huckleberry Finn*. In contrast to

---

A Connecticut Yankee in terms of the genre, that is, historical romance. See Howe 119 and Knoper 155.

[53] Susan Gilman in *Dark Twins* maintains that "by 1890 Twain is replacing the more legitimately confused, switched, or mistaken identities, which spill over in his fiction of seventies and eighties, with the impostor, a figure of potentially illegitimate, indeterminate identity"(5). In my view, however, *Huck Finn* demonstrates Twain's strong concern for not merely mistaken identity but also imposture.

The Prince, the frauds in *Huck Finn* falsify themselves as a king and a duke, preying on the sympathy of credulous people. I will analyze their class position as poor whites by contrasting them with the Southern aristocrats like Colonel Grangerford. I will also discuss how and why Huck and Jim adopt remarkably different attitudes to the king and the duke. Furthermore, through an examination of Chapter 14 in which Jim and Huck have a dialogue on "King Sollermun," I will show that they express their very different opinions on monarchy and aristocracy, which indicates optimistic and pessimistic views on America as a republic and as a class society respectively. In so doing, I will argue that these divergent voices in *Huck Finn* can be taken as Twain's self-commentary on *The Prince and the Pauper*.

The Power of Sympathy in *The Prince and the Pauper*

Critical Response to *The Prince and The Pauper*

The Prince and the Pauper draws relatively little literary attention from scholars. As Lawrence Howe points out, "this text is perhaps the most neglected of Twain's major works" (122). According to Shelly Fisher Fishkin's overview, authors like Justin Kaplan "maintained that Twain's willingness to acquiesce to the effete, refined taste of his daughter Suzy helps explain his production of and enthusiasm for such inferior, openly sentimental books as *Joan of Arc* and *The Prince and the Pauper*" ("Mark Twain and Women" 53). In other words, this view regards the novel as a sort of private narrative for his family members, especially children, associating it with the mode of sentimentality. However, this novel was much more than a minor piece in his works. Samuel Clemens himself told his correspondent Mary Manson Fairbanks about his

preference for *The Prince and the Pauper*: "I like this tale better than *Tom Sawyer*—because I haven't put any fun in it. I think that is why I like it better. You know a body always enjoy seeing himself attempting something out of his line" (quoted in *P&P* 1 n.2). What is in his line in *The Prince and the Pauper* is, for one thing, the theme of sentimentality and sympathy. As Leland Krause argues, this novel "reflects Twain's continuing interest in the efficacy of tender human feeling" (157). As I have discussed in Chapter One, Mark Twain shows an ambivalent attitude towards sentimentality and sentimentalism in *Tom Sawyer*, denigrating the "maudlin" feminine version and lauding the "*real*" masculine version. In *The Prince and the Pauper*, however, he seems to put the feeling of sympathy in a more positive light and in a broader social context. Specifically, Twain frames the story in terms of a lesson of "mercy" for the young prince. Thus, Twain explores an emotional tie between people in totally different social and class positions. In this sense, sympathy becomes a political sentiment and creates important relationships within a nation.

It goes without saying that *The Prince and the Pauper* is a historical novel based on sixteenth-century Tudor England. As Lawrence Howe puts it, critics have debated the ideological implications of this novel, between its "democratic" and its "nostalgia" thesis (120). The critics like Justin Kaplan advocating for the latter claim that Twain was intrigued by the "genteel tradition" that romanticized the culture and history of monarchical England (239).[54] In contrast, James M. Cox comments that *The Prince and the Pauper* "is in certain ways an interesting democratic fable, turning on a plot device

[54] J.D. Stahl argues that "[t]he debate surrounding *The Prince and the Pauper* has tended to equate this work with genteel tradition whose tone was primarily defined by women and to denigrate the novel as an expression of Twain's literary domestication" (67).

which elevates a commoner to a king and reduces a king to a commoner" (152). The fictive plot of identity switch has certainly "democratic" implication. Obviously, however, the switch does not do away with the hierarchy of the king and the commoners. After all, Cox comes to the conclusion: "'Mark Twain,' the genius of Samuel Clemens' humor, is betrayed in the name of piety and 'noble' sentiment" (153). While blaming sentimentality for its failure, he seems to agree with the nostalgia thesis in the end.

While these debates revolve around the straightforwardly ideological implication of the novel, recent critics tend to focus on textual practices of the narrative. Scholars like Randall Knoper analyze how Twain's rhetorical devices contribute to constructing and deconstructing authority. For instance, he points out that *The Prince and the Pauper* reveals kingship as effects of verbal and physical performances, including costume and protocol ceremony. In fact, Twain was driven by his "overt concern with questions of public symbolism" (Knoper 151). Moreover, referring to Twain's interests in the emerging discourse on pauperism and crime in the 1870s and 80s, Laurence Howe reads the novel as a form of allegory that reflects contemporary American society. In other words, the novel implies "Twain's indirect mode of representing contemporary social condition in the mirror of sixteenth-century English society" (125). As I show, the novel not only demonstrates how the authority and identity of a king is constructed, but also sheds much light on the living conditions of the lower class people in Tudor England, allegorizing the poor whites in the American South. In addition, locating *The Prince and the Pauper* within Twain's literary attempts at dealing with history and historiography throughout his career, Howe argues that

Twain discovers the novelistic potential to overcome the weight of history. He asserts that this discovery bears fruit in *A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court* in which Twain utilizes the writer's liberty to the fullest (118-147).

As I mentioned earlier, however, *The Prince and the Pauper* was written alternately with *Huck Finn* and can be seen as its twin. In addition, there are substantial parallels between them, i.e., monarchy, class hierarchy, and sympathy. Nevertheless, few critics have paid due attention to this fact. Therefore, it is important to take into account both works in order to fully understand Mark Twain's view on these issues. In the next sections, I turn first to discuss *The Prince and the Pauper*.

How to Make a King

Set in 1547, *The Prince and the Pauper* tells a story of two young boys, Tom Canty, a pauper boy, and Prince Edward, son of King Henry VIII, who resemble each other and switch their identities. Interestingly enough, in spite of claiming his identity as a pauper, Tom is gradually trained to become a king, reminding us that "training is everything" (162), Twain's oft-repeated phrase in *A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court*. Indeed, the way Tom gets accustomed to the new environment reveals how the structure of power is constructed. To put it in another way, Twain shows how social status is not innate but retrospectively constructed, thereby radically betraying performative aspects of social status and identity.

First, the mechanism at work in creating the authority and identity of a king is his appearance, costume, and the spectacle of rituals. These visual aspects are instrumental to the royal institution. The prince and the pauper cannot be told apart

when Tom is clothed in "the gaudy plumage of royalty" (18). As a result, his uncle the lord Hertford tells himself: "Tush, he *must* be the prince! Will any he in all the land maintain there can be two, not of one blood and birth, so marvelously twinned?["] (50). The novel further depicts Tom's costume: "He was 'magnificently habited in a doublet of white satin, with a front-piece of purple cloth-of-tissue, powdered with diamonds, and edged with ermine." (64) This gorgeous costume enables Tom to act as the prince. In this way, the visual effects are essential to the exchange of identities between the prince and the pauper. Furthermore, on the day of his coronation, ritualistic displays of authority, such as "a bewildering succession of spectacular and symbolical tableaux, each of which typified and exalted some virtue, or talent, or merit, of the little King's" (257), also function to cover Tom's true identity. In this way, royal power is being dramatized through visual and symbolic rituals. In other words, these visual performances, including the royal pageant, constitute a mechanism that produces the little king's authority and identity, which helps the pauper boy act as the prince. Thus, Knoper maintains:

> Edward's conviction that he is "the very source of power in this broad realm" (281) is simply wrong; the structure of power carries on without concern for existence or presence of its supposed origin. The Recognition Procession, the formal acknowledgment of the sovereign by his subjects, is a performance of *mis*recognition, unimpededly conferring the kingly identity to Tom, not Edward. (151)

If this is the case, the very procedure that establishes the monarch's authority is also open for its failure that is misrecognition of his identity.

Second, certain possession of cultural capital also helps Tom behave as the one who he appears to be. He happens to have knowledge of Latin. When Tom is led to a reception room in order to meet with Henry VIII, he tries to reveal the fact of his

illegitimacy to his alleged father. In order to judge whether or not Tom is his biological son, Henry VIII asks Tom a question in Latin. Tom's accidental knowledge of Latin is proof for him that he is indeed Edward, Prince of Wales, although Tom cannot answer the king's question in French. In this sense, as Howe puts it, "[t]his official dismissal of Tom's disclaimer ironically underscores the fact that it is the court's reason, not Tom's, that has become dislodged by blind devotion to the principle of legitimacy" (129). Furthermore, Tom's discovery of a book of etiquette in the royal palace enables him to alleviate his inexpertness in the court: "When the nuts were all gone, he stumbled upon some inviting books in a closet, among them one about the etiquette of the English court. This was a prize. He lay down upon a sumptuous divan, and proceeded to instruct himself with honest zeal" (56). Thus, Tom's English literacy as well as knowledge of Latin enables him to maintain his unintentional imposture.

Third, in addition to visual performances and cultural capital, insider information about the prince and those around him are important for Tom to continue pretending to be the prince. Tom tries to get necessary information out of talking with his whipping boy, although the boy knows nothing of the real reason why Tom does so. Consequently, Tom "lost his fears; his misgivings faded out and died; his embarrassments departed, and gave place to an easy and confident bearing. He worked the whipping-boy mine to ever-increasing profit" (249). Moreover, his uncle the Earl of Hertford whispers in Tom's ear, whenever he is in trouble: "Observing that Tom did not seem to know how to proceed, Hertford whispered him to make a sign with his hand, and not trouble himself to speak unless he chose" (40). Thus, the information about how

the prince is supposed to behave, along with the gorgeous costume and knowledge, helps Tom act as the prince.

In spite of Tom's royal performance, however, it is the Great Seal that clarifies and modifies the misidentification of Tom with Edward. When Edward tries to reestablish the social order through correction of the misidentification, his memory about where he put the Great Seal works as the authenticator of his true identity. Although Edward rightly answers many questions about "the court, the late king, the prince, the princesses" (268) asked by the Lord Protector, he cannot recover his position as a king. His answers do not function as a proof. However, Edward's memory and testimony about the Great Seal is taken as the proof of his true identity. There is certain ambiguity in this episode. As Knoper points out, "Edward's body fails to express his identity; authentication has to come from an external sign" (152). That is to say, it is not quite his personal memory per se, but the information about something external and material that proves his identity. If Tom had known the information, he could have continued acting as the prince. In this way, Twain not only shows how the king's identity is constructed, but that it can be imitated, replicated, and stolen.

Sympathy and Class Differences

As is well known, the identity switch is one of Twain's favorite plot devices. What deserves equal attention, however, is the fact that he focuses the novel on the vast class differences and hierarchies. The trade of identity between the prince and the pauper does not dissolve the very existence of different classes, but rather presupposes it. Nevertheless, in depicting the relationship between the nobility and the poor, Twain

chooses to tell a harmonious story in which two classes can overcome their conflicts. This is where the issue of sympathy comes in. By focusing on the exchange of feelings, as well as identities, between Tom and Edward, Twain imagines or fantasizes a utopian vision of the emotional communion between the upper class and the lower class. Behind this is Twain's view of community. "Twain's ideal society," Robert E. Weir argues, "synthesized the best traits of those above and below him." He continues, "[t]o paraphrase one of his novels, it was a world in which there was neither 'prince nor pauper.'" (199). This is why Twain ultimately narrates a story in which the social order is recuperated. Therefore, many critics have described the novel's ideological implication as conservative, rather than democratic.

When Tom eventually learns about Henry VIII's death and acts as a new king, he wishes to establish a reign of mercy and justice. Issuing his first decree that "the Duke of Norfolk shall not die," he declares: "Then shall the king's law be law of mercy, from this day, and never more be law of blood! Up from thy knees and away! To the Tower, and say the King decrees the Duke of Norfolk shall not die!" (83). In this way, Tom the king not only emphasizes the significance of "mercy," but also seeks to reform the monarchy in which the common people have been oppressed by tyrannical power. Tom's unintentional usurpation of the kingdom, however, is far from getting rid of the hereditary class system of the king, the aristocrats, the commoners, and the paupers. In other words, the fact that Tom can take over Edward's position does not change the institution of monarchy. Instead, showing mercy and compassion for his people would morally reinforce its legitimacy.

On Edward's side, too, the crux of his experience is sympathy. The story itself started with his curiosity about his doppelganger who lives in straitened circumstances, leading the two to exchange their clothes. Banished from the court as a pauper boy, Edward at first harbors animosity and easily concludes that "the pauper lad, Tom Canty, had deliberately taken advantage of his stupendous opportunity and become a usurper" (75). He even considers that "Tom should be allowed a reasonable time for spiritual preparation, and then be hanged, drawn and quartered, according to the law and usage of the day in cases of high treason" (75). As he experiences hardships, however, Edward gradually develops sympathy for the impoverished lower classes and comes to learn about his father's tyranny. He even offers a critique of the regime. For example, when he has an opportunity to hear an old lawyer talking about his cruel treatment in prison, Edward claims: "within the compass of a month thou shalt be free; and more, the laws that have dishonoured thee, and shamed the English name, shall be swept from the statute books. The world is made wrong; kings should go to school to their own laws, at times, and so learn mercy" (238). Because of this experience, Edward, once regaining the kingly position, aims to become a worthy ruler—lenient with his people and doing his best to mend repressive laws: "whilst his life was spared he should continue to tell the story, and thus keep its sorrowful spectacles fresh in his memory and the springs of pity replenished in his heart" (288). Here Edward epitomizes a merciful, sympathetic, and enlightened king, a product of the nation's fantasy.

The receiving end of the kingly mercy is the pauper. Twain depicts a stark contrast between the royals and aristocrats in the palace, on the one hand, and the paupers of "Offal Court," on the other. This district in London is a place full of drunken

brawls, riots, poverty, and irrationality. (As I will show, these people in sixteenth-century Britain remind us of the "poor whites" in the antebellum South in *Huck Finn*, which Mark Twain was writing alternately with *The Prince and the Pauper* in the early 1880s.) The paupers in this novel have been oppressed by the English law, which justifies various tortures and abuses, such as burning witches and heretics, flogging vagrants, cutting off their ears, and selling them as slaves, and the branding of skin. In spite of this, the people of the Offal as Twain represents them never rebel against the king's rule. On the contrary, they express pious support for the monarchy. In fact, when Edward steps forward as a king in front of the people of the Offal, the burly Ruffler tells: "we be bad men in some few trifling ways, but none among us is so base as to be traitor to his King; we be loving and loyal hearts, in that regard" (152). Thus, in Twain's narrative, even if the people of the Offal explicitly violate the law, they still believe they obey the social order and show a strong sense of loyalty to their king. Although the people of the Offal have been aggrieved and trampled down by the king, there is a complementary relationship between the monarchy controlling them and the poor of the Offal supporting it.

As I have already mentioned, a number of scholars point out the conservative aspects of the novel. For instance, Lawrence Howe argues, "The growing attention to Edward's adventures thematically recuperates the legitimacy principle, which resonates more harmoniously with Twain's own quest for legitimation than did the satire of legitimacy in the episodes of Tom's accession" (130-131).[55] Knoper also insists, "Not an exposure of the impostures of power, not truly an attack on the status quo, not really

[55] Not only Howe, but also other critics also extract conservative aspects from this novel. See Krauth, *Proper* 163; Knoper 152-154.

a licensed rebellion for the purpose of blowing off steam, their [the people of Offal Court's] carnival finally has a conservative force" (154). There is much merit in this argument.

However, since Twain dedicates the book to "those good mannered and agreeable children, Susie and Clara Clemens" at the opening of the novel, he obviously wanted to tell them a sort of fairy tale of the righteous and esteemed king, as well as his sympathy for his people's suffering and difficulties. Therefore, it does not follow that the conservative fantasy of monarchy in *The Prince and the Pauper* represents Twain's own political ideology concerning this matter. In fact, in those chapters of *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* that he was drafting alternately with Tom Canty and Prince Edward's story, Twain presents a burlesque episode of the con artists who pretend to be royalty; Huck and Jim make rather critical but contrasting commentaries on kings and aristocrats, as well as these men, who represent anything but sympathy and compassion towards others. Therefore, these chapters can be read as Twain's parodic self-commentary on *The Prince and the Pauper*. In the next section, I will show how *Huck Finn* provides quite different views on the issues of kings, aristocrats, and social hierarchy than the relatively conservative and fantastical *The Prince and the Pauper*.

Aristocracy in America in *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*

The episode of the king and duke in *Huckleberry Finn* can be read as a critique of *The Prince and the Pauper*. There are at least three parallels. First, in both of them, there are characters from different social and class backgrounds; in *Huck Finn*, the fraudulent king and the duke are contrasted with the Southern aristocrats, i.e., the Grangerfords and

the Shepherdsons. Second, the poor con artists pretend to be nobility, which corresponds to the identity switch between Tom and Edward. Third, these con men prey on people's sympathy, an inversion of the compassionate exchange between the prince and the pauper. To be sure, the historical settings are far apart: sixteenth-century England and nineteenth-century America. Therefore, it does not come as a surprise that both works present rather different attitudes towards monarchy and aristocracy. Indeed, Twain makes Huck critically mention the tyranny of Henry VIII. Nevertheless, there are almost obsessive references to kings and aristocrats in *Huck Finn*, which is all the more curious given the fact that the United States at that time was not a kingdom, but a republic. Why is that?

Of course, it is obvious that *Huck Finn* does not insist on the conservative ideology affirming the legitimacy of king and class hierarchy as in *The Prince and the Pauper*. But the references to kings and aristocrats in *Huck Finn* do not indicate a mere parody or inversion of the historical novel, but represent different views and attitudes towards the issue of king and class hierarchy. Specifically, Huck and Jim respond to the fake king and duke in a very different way: while the poor white Huck somehow tolerates their imposture, the runaway slave Jim will not accept them; Jim elsewhere insists on the ideal image of American republic as antithesis to monarchy. These two responses not only imply a contrast between Europe's ancient regimes and the American republic, but derive from their different attitudes toward class structure in antebellum (and also postbellum) America. Far from monolithic, *Huck Finn* involves polyphonic perspectives on kings, aristocrats, and class hierarchy in America.

The King and the Duke as Poor Whites

In Chapter 19 of *Huckleberry Finn*, two con artists suddenly board the raft and force Huck and Jim to call them "the king" and "the duke." As J.R. LeMaster and David Haines point out, "they [the confidence men] represent that vile class that feeds on honest people" (235). Their episode represents yet another tale of stereotypical poor whites in *Huck Finn*, just like Pap Finn. The chapter follows the feuds between the Grangerfords and the Shepherdsons, who represent major "aristocratic" families in the antebellum South. Taken together, these episodes depict the existence of both the hierarchical class structure and different class cultures in the U.S. at that time.

The self-proclaimed king's outward appearance looks far from that of a king: "He had an old battered-up slouch hat on, and a greasy blue woollen shirt, and ragged old blue jeans britches stuffed into his boot-tops, and home-knit galluses—no, he only had one" (136). His clothes are dirty, ragged, and worn out, clearly indicating his impoverished conditions, which makes his claim to be a king seem quite dubious. The king's appearance is very similar to Huck's in *Tom Sawyer*: "one suspender supported his trousers; the seat of the trousers bagged low and contained nothing, the fringed legs dragged in the dirt when not rolled up" (48). Their outfits definitely show proximity or resemblance to Huck's own living conditions. In fact, Huck calls the king and the duke "family" (142). Obviously, the king and the duke are the same sort of people as Pap Finn. Interestingly, their clothing is sharply contrasted with that of Colonel Grangerford: "every day of his life he put on a clean shirt and a full suit from head to foot made out of linen so white it hurt your eyes to look at it" (125). Unlike the king's and Huck's filthy clothes, his costume impresses the narrator as clean and white. His

whiteness is certainly different from Pap Finn's uncanny whiteness. Thus, like the function of clothes in *The Prince and the Pauper*, clothing signifies different class statuses within the white population, making people suspect that the king and the duke are dubious con artists originating from the lower class.

The king and the duke can never stay in one town or job for very long. This is partly due to their criminal behavior, but not only for this reason. When asked "what's your line—mainly?" (138), the duke enumerates his many jobs: "Jour printer by trade; do a little in patent medicines; theater-actor—tragedy, you know; take a turn to mesmerism and phrenology….; teach singing-geography school…; sling a lecture." Likewise, the king has engaged in various jobs, including reading fortunes and performing faith healings. "Preaching's my line, too," he says (139). Doing all sorts of marginal jobs was a typical way of living for lower class whites in the antebellum South. For example, the actual poor white named Edward Isham, worked many jobs, alongside his drinking and gambling, until he was hanged for the murder of his employer. As historian Charles Bolton argues, "In a mature, settled slave society like most of the antebellum South during the 1850s, the market for poor white labor would always be varied, fleeting, and unstable" ("Edward Isham" 31). As a result, this group of landless and impoverished people suffered through the vicissitudes of economic life.

Lamenting his fate of being "degraded down into such company" (139) as that of the old con man, the young one says:

> "Yes, it is good enough for me; it's as good as I deserve; for who fetched me so low, when I was so high? I did myself….Let the cold world do its worst; one thing I know—there's a grave somewhere for me. The world may go on just as it's always done, and take everything from me—loved ones, property, everything—but it can't take that." (139)

He has now fallen from grace and is dispossessed. In this quotation, he seems to take personal responsibility for the downturns in his various careers, as well as his family life. But it is at this point in his narrative of self-pity that he suddenly starts talking about the "secret of [his] birth." He exclaims: "By rights I am a duke!" (139) "I am the rightful Duke of Bridgewater; and here am I, forlorn, torn from my high estate, hunted of men, despised by the cold world, ragged, worn, heart-broken, and degraded to the companionship of felons on a raft!" (139-40). When Huck and Jim heard this talk, their eyes "bugged out."

Competing with this self-proclamation of the duke, the old con man makes an even more incredible confession of his lineage: "I'm the late Dauphin." "Yes, my friend, it is too true—your eyes is lookin' at this very moment on the pore disappeared Dauphin, Looy the Seventeen, son of Looy the Sixteen and Marry Antonette" (141). These con men, having experienced a series of professional and personal failures, resort to something that appears to be immune to such competitions and fluctuations in the labor market: the aristocratic lineage, which represents entitlements that do not derive from one's own merit and hard work, but from the privilege based on one's "birth." Interestingly, the duke confuses "birth" with "rights": whereas the former implies hereditary entitlements as a premise for aristocracy and monarchy, the latter was considered to be inherent to every individual and provided a major theoretical ground for the revolutions of this era. When the king "said it often made him feel easier and better for a while," Huck tells us, "if people treated him according to his rights" (141-2). Here the king means by "rights" mere entitlements to enjoy a high, unearned status, something which might represent a caricature of American society.

False Sympathy in *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*

As in *The Prince and the Pauper*, sentimentality plays an important role for the king and duke: the con men are not only driven by self-pity, but seek to attract public sympathy; unlike Tom and Edward, however, they prey on others. At one time, the old con man was running a "temperance revival," which made him the "pet of the women-folks, big and little" (138). At another time, Huck and the king go to a religious revival camp-meeting in the woods. A preacher and his congregants are singing a hymn, and the preacher soon begins to preach. The king joins the preacher on the platform and proclaims to the congregants that he is a reformed pirate who, if given enough money, will return to the Indian Ocean to convert other pirates to Christianity. The speech the king makes is noteworthy:

> "Don't you thank me, don't you give me no credit; it all belongs to them dear people in Pokeville camp-meeting, natural brothers and benefactors of the race, and that dear preacher there, the truest friend a pirate ever had!" And then he busted into tears, and so did everybody. Then somebody sings out, "Take up a collection for him, take up a collection!" (148-149)

In order to dupe the audience, the king seizes their attention by telling a fake story, which so easily moves them that they are not only willing to donate, but also to hug and even kiss him. As I mentioned in Chapter 1, sentimental writers viewed the sound of a voice, the touch of a hand, and, above all, tears as the manifestation of sincere emotion; Twain mocked the sentimental discourse, associating it with the middle-class women at that time. In *The Prince and the Pauper*, too, tears are certainly expressive of genuine emotion for Tom Canty acting as Prince Edward. But the king, the duke, and Pap Finn

regard tears as a tool to dupe their audience for their own purposes.[56] Here we can see Twain's implicit commentary on *The Prince and the Pauper*. Alluding to the sentimental discourse, the king sheds crocodile tears in order to defraud their credulous audience of money. The fraud exploits their emotional desire to rescue the distressed people like a heathen pirate. As shown in Emmeline Grangerford's picture and poetry, Twain often associates women in particular with the narcissistic aspects of sentimentality.[57] In this way, he tends to show an ugly picture of how sentimentalism works for middle-class people.

Likewise, when hearing the news that a Peter Wilks has died, leaving his whole estate to his brothers, the fraudulent king decides to pretend to be the brother from Sheffield, England in order to seize his inheritance. Like Tom Canty collecting information from his whipping boy, the king is involved in a sort of intelligence activity, gathering every detail from a young man.[58] Also, what the king does to pretend to be the Wilks' brother is to practice British pronunciation: "he tried to talk like an Englishman; and he done it pretty well, too, for a slouch" (175). Moreover, the king changes his clothes from the ragged to the refined one:

> The king's duds was all black, and he did look real swell and starchy. I never knowed how clothes could change a body before. Why, before, he looked like the orneriest old rip that ever was; but now, when he'd take off his new white beaver and make a bow and do a smile, he looked that grand and good and pious that you'd say he had walked right out of the ark, and maybe was old Leviticus himself. (172)

---

[56] See *Huck Finn* 34. Pap Finn also preys on the new judge's sympathy in order to get goods from him.

[57] Mary Louis Kete argues that Emmeline's artifacts exemplify "[t]he inability to mourn in the proper way, to complete an aesthetically unified symbolic replacement for the dead person" (176).

[58] Ironically enough, the king's English error of "orgies" makes the doctor say "You talk like an Englishman—don't you? It's the worst imitation I ever heard" (183).

Just as Tom Canty who exchanges his clothes with Edward's to metamorphose into Prince, the fake king, when cleaning himself up, looks like a fine British gentleman at least in the eyes of Huck. The con man fully understands how clothing conveys social identities through the conventions of a dress code.

In spite of the similarities between the fake prince and the fraudulent king, it is important to take into account the overall contexts of the king and the duke episode and *The Prince and the Pauper*. Twain draws a subtle but clear distinction between them from the viewpoint of sentimentality. For instance, the king pretending to be Wilks' brother makes a speech for his dead brother, Peter Wilks. Huck reports:

> Well, by and by the king he gets up and comes forward a little, and works himself up and slobbers out a speech, all full of tears and flapdoodle about its being a sore trial for him and his poor brother to lose the diseased, and to miss seeing diseased alive, after the long journey of four thousand mile, but it's a trial that's sweetened and sanctified to us by this dear sympathy and these holy tears [.] (178)

As Huck juxtaposes "all full of tears" with "flapdoodle," tears are far from "a state of grace." The king intentionally delivers a tearful speech so as to blind his audience from recognizing his true identity. This maudlin speech the king delivers certainly recalls John Canty's apprentice Hugo's lecture on begging:

> "Now will I fall down in a fit. When the stranger runs to me, set you up a wail, and fall upon your knees, seeming to weep; then cry out as all the devils of misery were in your belly, and say, 'Oh, sir, it is my poor afflicted brother, and we be friendless; o' God's name cast through your merciful eyes one pitiful look upon a sick, forsaken, and most miserable wretch; bestow one little penny out of thy riches upon one smitten of God and ready to perish!'—and mind you, keep you *on* wailing, and abate not till we bilk him of his penny, else shall you rue it." (160)

These two quotes seem to indicate the same thing: the con men and Hugo both cheat others for money by telling a fake sorry story and attracting mercy from them. Very

similar as the passages may seem, it is important to put them in contexts. In *The Prince and the Pauper*, Hugo does make up a false story, but he does not disguise his identity; being needy, he has to deceive people for his own survival. Moreover, one of the messages of the whole narrative is that the new king needs to learn and show mercy for his people because Henry VIII's tyranny was responsible for their impoverished conditions. In other words, Twain does not depict the misery of the paupers to say they are bad people. In contrast, the fake king and duke pretend to be the Wilkes's brothers, trying to cheat the inheritance from the bereaved family, who are young nieces and now orphans. That is to say, the con men are preying on the innocent, helpless victims, not the rich or the privileged. There seems to be little justification for exploiting sympathy from such people. While they come from a lower class background similar to the paupers in the Offal Court, they are the vile confidence men who mercilessly scam innocent people. In this way, the two similar passages I have quoted above need to be read in their own contexts, which suggests why the king and duke episode represents a negative image of *The Prince and the Pauper*.

Significantly enough, even Huck cannot tolerate the king and duke any longer because he learns they are now cheating the innocent orphan sisters. Huck clearly sympathizes with the sisters, especially Mary Jane, trying to rescue them by revealing the truth. Indeed, this Mary Jane episode foreshadows the famous Huck's decision in chapter 31, which I discussed in the previous chapter. Therefore, it is important to notice that *Huck Finn* does not necessarily dismiss feelings of sympathy and compassion out of hand. Indeed, Huck has felt a certain sense of closeness to the con men up to this episode. However, Huck is deeply ambivalent about them, which differs

from Jim's critical attitude toward them, but in either case, they both present a far more critical relation to the possibility of class rapprochement than is evident anywhere in *The Prince and the Pauper*.

Huck on Kings

Although it is obvious that the king and duke are nothing but con artists, Huck does not stay away from them up until later on in the narrative. Huck and the runaway slave Jim show a stark contrast in their attitudes to these con men. What underlies the difference is their divergent views on kings and aristocrats. Significantly enough, Huck and Jim have conversations about "kings" at several different points in their journey, and Chapters 14 and 22 in particular, both of which Twain added in 1883 in the final part of the composition process, are particularly important. Together with the con men episode, these conversations can be taken as nuanced commentaries on Twain's thinking on monarchs and class.

Unlike Jim, Huck treats the king and the duke as what they claim to be. And indeed it makes them feel better. When they embark on the raft and exploit Huck and Jim, the protagonist utters: "If I never learnt nothing else out of pap, I learnt that the best way to get along with his kind of people is to let them have their own way" (142). Based on this lesson, he decides to behave toward them just as he did to Pap Finn. This represents a rule of life for Huck, because it's precisely the way he survived his childhood with his abusive father. However, Huck not only "lets them have their own way." He even seems to tolerate their lies and take part in them in order to please these confidence men: "So Jim and me set to majestying him, and doing this and that and

t'other for him, and standing up till he told us we might set down. This done him heaps of good, and so he got cheerful and comfortable" (142). Needless to say, Huck already recognizes that the king and the duke are "just low-down humbugs and frauds" (142). Nevertheless, he pretends to believe in what they insist. Precisely because Huck treats them as such, the con artists can behave like a king and a duke. Here we can derive an insight into how power works: the authority of the king and the duke is nothing but the effect of Huck's performance of voluntary subjugation. In other words, their status is performatively constructed by those who subject themselves to power. If this is the case, it does not matter whether or not the king and the duke are authentic. What Huck is getting at, it seems, is this mechanism of power.

By contrast, Jim won't let them have their own way. When he sees the con artists earn four hundred sixty-five dollars through their ridiculous performance, he calls them "reglar rapscallions" (168). As Forrest G. Robinson points out, Jim "comes as close as he can to saying what he must feel—that the newcomers are not royalty at all, but fraudulent, degraded human specimens who represent a very serious threat to his quest for freedom" (*Bad Faith* 168). Nevertheless, Huck replies to him in a rather unexpected way:

> "we got to remember what they are, and make allowances. Sometimes I wish we could hear of a country that's out of kings." What was the use to tell Jim these warn't real kings and dukes? It wouldn't a done no good; and, besides, it was just as I said: you couldn't tell them from the real kind. (170)

For all the evidence that the king and the duke are con artists, Huck insists that there is no difference between them and real ones. Furthermore, Huck demonstrates that there is no country without kings. How should we make sense of these statements? One possible

interpretation is that it is pointless to distinguish a real king and a fake one because monarchy is a bad thing that is essentially unjust, corrupt, and oppressive. Indeed, Huck talks about horrible kings in history, such as Henry VIII (168-9). (Obviously Twain had in mind *The Prince and the Pauper* when he wrote this passage; this self-reference would imply that Twain made clear that he had no intention to endorse monarchical institutions per se.) Yet, this does not offer a convincing reason for why Huck makes allowances for people who pretend to be royalty. Moreover, Huck is saying he "wish[es] we could hear of a country that's out of kings," which of course means that there is no country without a king.

Needless to say, the United States of America was, and is, a republic built upon the fundamental proposition that "all men are created equal." America has imagined itself as opposed to any hereditary order, monarchical or otherwise since its founding. Is Huck saying that America is not a "country that's out of kings" either? How does he look at American society?

In order to examine Huck's view of "kings" in America, we need to explore the episode concerning the Southern aristocratic family the Grangerfords. Just before encountering the con artists, Huck confronts the feud between the Grangerfords and the Shepherdsons in Chapters 17 and 18. Huck's adoptive family, the Grangerfords, is a proud family of plantation aristocracy who own hundreds of slaves. The term "aristocracy" here is founded on slavery and categorizes the Grangerfords as white. Yet, the episode is clearly used to contrast different class positions within the white community. Huck designates Colonel Grangerford as a "gentleman" (125), differentiating a poor white like himself from the Colonel:

> He [Col. Grangerfold] was well born, as the saying is, and that's worth as much in a man as it is in a horse, so the Widow Douglas said, and nobody ever denied that she was of the first aristocracy in our town; and pap he always said it, too, though he warn't no more quality than a mud-cat, himself. (125)

The existence of the aristocrats, as well as poor whites, demonstrates a hierarchy within the whites. Obviously, such social ranks and status are based upon class difference. Huck's remark on kings, taken together with the aristocratic episode, indicates the fact that a class system exists in the United States. What is more, this system did not go away even after race-based slavery was abolished. Therefore, the Grangerfords episode should not be read exclusively as a historical reference to the Southern aristocracy before the Civil War and the Emancipation Proclamation, but needs to be interpreted as meaningful even in the postbellum period. Huck, being a poor white's son, can see through the American myth of equality. His pessimism must come from this recognition.

In short, when he says he wishes "we could hear of a country that's out of kings," he is not just talking about monarchy in its literal sense, but about the persistence of class hierarchy before and after the Civil War. Put differently, the story Huck tells about the king and the duke, coupled with the episode of the Grangerfords, can be read as an allegory of America's class system even after Emancipation.

Thus, from Huck's point of view, it is not surprising that people like the king and the duke attempt to falsify their identity and fabricate their privilege, as long as there is hierarchy and inequality based on what family you are born into. If Pap Finn lives the fantasy that his privilege was stolen by blacks, as I mentioned in the previous chapter, the king and the duke simply fabricate a prestigious pedigree. In short, Huck is suggesting that both his father and the frauds are obsessed with authority and

entitlement, precisely because of a lack thereof. In so doing, Huck also hints at an insight that class hierarchy is established and consolidated by the dispossessed.[59]

Jim's Commitment to American Ideals

What is equally important is that Jim takes a wholly different view from Huck. As I mentioned, Jim won't let the con artists have their own way. He calls them "reglar rapscallions." Jim is critical of them, not only because they are con men, but also because Jim does not seem to support the idea of kings and dukes in general. We can derive his views about this issue from their conversations in Chapter 14. Since this chapter was added in the final months of his composition of *Huck Finn* in 1883, we can take for granted that Jim's view on kings represents a commentary on the king and duke, and *The Prince and the Pauper* by extension.

With Huck alone on a river island, and free from the yoke of slavery, Jim expresses his critical views about the society. Here they discuss the biblical "King Sollermun," and Jim vehemently accuses Solomon.

> "Well, but he was the wisest man, anyway; because the widow she told me so, her own self." "I doan k'yer what de widder say, he warn't no wise man nuther. He had some er de dad-fetchedes' ways I ever see. Does you know 'bout dat chile dat he 'uz gwyne to chop in two?" (87)

Huck insists that "you don't get the point," but Jim disagrees. "En mine you, de real pint is down furder—it's down deeper. It lays in de way Sollermun was raised" (88). Jim

[59] In this context, we might mention Twain's negative view of the cowardice of mobs, too. For example, Huck watches the town's leading citizen, Colonel Sherburn shoot the farmer Boggs. Although the citizen who laughed at and enjoyed watching Boggs die try to lynch Colonel Sherburn, they, after listening to his speech on the cowardice of his audience, ultimately recoil from lynching him (162). As Forrest G. Robinson puts it, Colonel Sherburn enjoys "the social preeminence and legal exemption that comes with his exalted status" (*Bad Faith* 149), and his privilege is reinforced by the mob.

argues that the king did not understand the meaning of family, because Solomon had plenty of wives at the "harem" and had them bear plenty of children. If you have only one or two children, he argues, you would know how valuable they are. But if you have "'bout five million chillen runnin' roun' de house," like Solomon, you would not. "He as soon chop a chile in two as a cat. Dey's plenty mo,'" Jim says. He is critical of King Solomon from the point of view of being a father. In saying this, Jim undoubtedly thinks of his own family members who are still caught up in slavery. As for Huck, he is impressed by Jim's sustained argument. "I never see such a nigger. If he got a notion in his head once, there warn't no getting it out again. He was the most down on Solomon of any nigger I ever see" (89). [60]

They continue to discuss other kings, which further reveals Jim's view about monarchy. Huck tells him about the Dauphin, the son of the executed King Louis XVI of France, who was rumored to have migrated to America. Jim's response is remarkable: "Dat's good! But he'll be pooty lonesome—dey ain' no kings here, is dey, Huck?" (89). This passage is significant because it foreshadows the episode of the king, who claims to be the Dauphin. What is more important, Jim contends that there are no kings in America. This remark is not just a factual statement, but a value judgment on the country: Jim is clearly proud of America as a republic. One has to wonder why he can have such a trust in the nation, in spite of the fact that it treats him as a slave. This

[60] One of a few critics who have examined the debate over King Solomon between Huck and Jim is Forrest Robinson. However, when he points out that "Jim's childish simplicity has great humanity as its implied correlatives" (*Bad Faith* 137), he does not seem to fully evaluate Jim's intelligence and thoughtfulness. (Instead, his another essay entitled "Characterization of Jim" carefully examines Jim's thoughtfulness.)

may be a bit too optimistic an attitude to say the least, and makes a stark contrast with Huck's pessimism about the reality of America as a class society.

Needless to say, however, the United States of America in the mid-nineteenth century was divided between North and South in terms of slavery, which led to the Civil War. In fact, Jim starts his adventure in order to escape to the free states. In this respect, it can be said that his runaway trip is premised upon America's unfinished promise of universal equality, which has enabled the nation's narrative of overcoming conflicts and divisions to form a "more perfect union," as the Preamble to the U.S. Constitution puts it. If this is the case, there seems to be a reason for Jim's optimism.

The next debate they have over whether or not the French speak the same language as them further attests to Jim's commitment to the ideal of equality. What seems to be a funny, nonsensical dialogue contains a rather sophisticated rhetorical strategy on the part of Jim.

First of all, Jim is totally unfamiliar with the notion that there are different languages in the world. He will not accept it. "Why, Huck, doan' de French people talk de same way we does?" (89). Huck tries to explain this idea by way of an analogy. "Looky here, Jim; does a cat talk like we do?" "And ain't it natural and right," he continues, "for a cat and a cow to talk different from us?" Jim of course agrees. Huck then concludes: "Well, then, why ain't it natural and right for a Frenchman to talk different from us? You answer me that." This seems to be quite an effective analogy, and Jim accepts it. However, he then starts his counterargument: "Is a cat a man, Huck?," asks Jim. "Well, den, dey ain't no sense in a cat talkin' like a man. Is a cow a man?—er is a cow a cat?" (90) Jim basically repeats the premise of Huck's inference here. He

then continues: “Well, den, she ain’t got no business to talk like either one er the yuther of ‘em. Is a Frenchman a man?” Huck of course says yes. Then Jim’s final objection: “*Well*, den! Dad blame it, why doan’ he *talk* like a man? You answer me *dat*!” (90)

In this debate, Jim employs an excellent rhetorical strategy: he uses Huck’s own argument against him to show that humans speak more differently than animals. From the same premise, Jim draws a different conclusion. Needless to say, Jim has not managed to prove that the French speak the same language as Americans. He has just demonstrated that the French speak a human language. What is remarkable here, however, is that Jim establishes the identity of humans by drawing a line between humans and animals. Humans are the same in contradistinction to animals. Obviously, this rhetoric serves to highlight the equality of human beings across nations and cultures. In this way, Jim expands the boundary of humanity to invalidate the distinctions among them, such as blacks and whites, kings and commoners, the French and Americans, and so on. Therefore, Jim can be said to represent a universal humanism.

At the same time, however, Jim’s rhetoric can be read as saying that the French must speak as Americans do. In other words, there is a hint of American nationalism in his rhetoric. This is also compatible with his previous argument about the U.S. as a country without kings. Thus, his argument allows for two interpretations. On the one hand, he says that humans are the same and equal everywhere. On the other, he seems to say that the United States represents universal humanity. Whereas Huck is pessimistic since America is a profoundly hierarchical society, Jim seems to take an optimistic view of the United States as a hope for universal equality. In this sense, Jim

in Chapter 14 represents the paradox of a runaway slave committing himself to American ideals.

Although Twain scholars have amply explored Jim's intelligence and shrewdness, as well as his sorrow and despair, laying stress on his suffering as a slave, they tend to miss the aspect of Jim asserting the universal equality of humanity as American ideals.[61] Here one might be tempted to detect the author's deep-seated desire for having African Americans affirm and pursue the cause of the United States. In a sense, we can state that Twain is using for Jim a strategy that African Americans, like Frederick Douglass, used at the time to argue that African Americans and runaway slaves in general were the true Americans in their desire for freedom and equality and that white America had betrayed American ideals.

Conclusion:

In the above sections I have argued that *The Prince and the Pauper* and the episode of the king and duke in *Huckleberry Finn* show a number of differences and similarities. Whereas *The Prince and the Pauper* dramatizes the compassionate exchange and reconciliation between Tom and Edward, the con artists never feel sympathy toward the marginalized characters, such as Jim, Huck, and the orphan girls like Mary Jane and her sisters. Although he depicts a harmonious kingdom in *The Prince*, Twain, as if to write a critical commentary on his own novel, depicts in some ways a pessimistic, if not merciless, world in *Huckleberry Finn*.

[61] See Ellison 45-59; Cox 318-322; Robinson, "Characterization of Jim" 361-391.

For instance, toward the end of the latter, Twain indicates an antagonistic relationship between the black slave and the white confidence men. Huck in Chapter 33 is surprised to know that the king and duke are tarred and feathered by their audience, because Jim revealed the frauds that the king and duke have committed. When one of Uncle Silas' children asks him to go to the show, he claims: "I reckon there ain't going to be any; and you couldn't go if there was; because the runaway nigger told Burton and me all about that scandalous show, and Burton said he would tell the people; so I reckon they've drove the owdacious loafers out of town before this time" (239). "The runaway nigger" refers to Jim, and from what Uncle Silas says, Huck judges that Jim exacts revenge on the rogues, who mercilessly sold out Jim. In fact, when Huck asks the duke where Jim is located in Chapter 31, he replies: "[d]o you reckon that nigger would blow on us? We'd skin him if he done that!" (225). The duke's hysterical response implies that he is cautious about Jim's potential for vengeance on them. Since the con artists remorselessly sold Jim for money, Jim wreaks vengeance on them by revealing "the scandalous show" (239) and leading their audience to them. Thus, from the viewpoint of Jim, the novel seems to say there is no reconciliation and sympathy between races or classes.

Here one might wonder how Huck reacts to the racial division between the confidence men and Jim. On the one hand, Huck feels nauseated or disgusted at the con men's deceptions whenever he encounters their unconscionable acts toward innocent and marginalized people such as Jim and the orphan girls. For example, when Huck knows that the con artists have sold Jim, he murmurs: "After all this long journey, and after all we'd done for them scoundrels, here it was all come to nothing, everything all

busted up and ruined, because they could have the heart to serve Jim such a trick as that, and make him a slave again all his life, and amongst strangers, too, for forty dirty dollars" (221). Huck finally understands their real nature; they are lazy, greedy, and heartless. On the other hand, when Huck witnesses them being tarred and feathered by "a raging rush of people," he observes: "[w]ell, it made me sick to see it; and I was sorry for them poor pitiful rascals, it seemed like I couldn't ever feel any hardness against them any more in the world. It was a dreadful thing to see. Human beings can be awful cruel to one another" (239). Thus, Huck is deeply ambivalent toward the con artists. Even as he feels contempt for them, he still cannot bring himself to endorse revenge and violence toward them. He still somehow sympathizes with them. As I have mentioned, Huck sometimes "wish[es] we could hear of a country that's out of kings" (170). In other words, he feels that the con men wanted to be the king and duke, because vast social inequality exists. Huck seems to suggest that if the social structure is to blame, there should be a room for sympathy for the worst specimens of poor white men.

Unlike *The Prince and the Pauper*, the order is not restored in either of these reactions to the end of the king and duke. By depicting polyphonic responses to the racial and class hierarchies in *Huck Finn*, Mark Twain makes a critical commentary on the pre-established harmony of his romance.

Chapter Four

Roxana Between Sentimental Novel and Slave Narrative: Race, Gender, and Genre in *Pudd'nhead Wilson*

Introduction

Roxana in *Pudd'nhead Wilson* is depicted as a mixed race mother who sacrifices herself for her biological son Chambers, which reminds us of the American women's sentimental novels. Some critics have detected in the novel's resemblance to, or commentary on, the sentimental discourse. James M. Cox attributes the failure of the novel to sentimentality because it dissociates her character from the plot. "It is also why Roxana, though she functions as the queen in the novel, ultimately fails to transcend the sentimentality she evokes" (244). In fact, Roxana exhibits an overwhelming sense of sentimentality in *Pudd'nhead Wilson*. Cox does not seem to take into account, however, that Twain is making yet another commentary on sentimentality. In contrast, Myra Jehlen maintains that "[a] black woman exercising the authority of motherhood in a white society may call in question the domestic ideology of white womanhood." "In *Pudd'nhead Wilson*," she continues, "this domestic ideology means the genteel sentimentalism of aunts and widows" (112). Jehlen even suggests that Roxana takes the place of the white women, such as Widow Douglass and Aunt Polly and Aunt Sally in *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer* and its sequel, *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. As I argued in Chapter 1, Twain had in mind a gendered notion of sentimentalism, making a critical commentary on female figures, including "sappy women" in *Tom Sawyer*. In *Pudd'nhead Wilson*, he adds a racial twist to his take on sentimentalism, which, as I will

show, is expressed in the mode of a slave narrative. At any rate, although Jehlen and Cox address Roxana's sentimentality in different ways, these scholars have one thing in common: they do not necessarily discuss sentimentality as a question of the genre in the novel.[62]

Other critics have recently shed more light on Roxana's sentimentality in the novel. Lawrence Howe, for instance, argues that "Roxana's attempt to combat slavery is informed by nineteenth-century sentimentalism, which prescribed in popular literature like *Uncle Tom's Cabin* the ideal of maternal love as the cure for such social ills as slavery" (195). Likewise, Linda A. Morris, pointing out the similarities between Roxana and the slave woman Cassy in *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, critically argues that "Twain always fell short of crediting Stowe as an influence upon him" (71). In this way, both Howe and Morris refer to *Uncle Tom's Cabin* as a frame of reference in *Pudd'nhead Wilson*. To be sure, this sentimental novel's influence on Roxana's characterization is a significant point. But they ignore the fact that Twain does not simply adopt, but rather burlesques the mode of the sentimental novel in *Pudd'nhead Wilson*. And the way he does so is far from simple, because the author is both influenced by and commenting on Harriet Beecher Stowe's black sentimental characters' motherhood. In order to clarify Roxana's complicated character, we first need to take a look at what characterizes the sentimental novel in the nineteenth-century American literature and culture.

Motherhood in the American Sentimental Literature

[62] While some critics view Roxana as similar to a typical mother character in the sentimental novel, the contemporary critic like Susan Gillman take the novel as the sensational and the melodramatic. See Gilman, "The Mulatto, Tragic or Triumphant" 88.

American women's sentimental novels, such as *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, *The Wide, Wide World*, and Catherine Maria Sedgwick's *A New England Tale* (1822) can be described as a narrative in which a heroine, usually a white female protagonist, overcomes various hardships that often come with the death of her family members, having a happy marriage and becoming an ideal mother of the republic. [63] Mary Louis Ketes characterizes American sentimental novels this way: "a protagonist who is generally weak, vulnerable, and female (or equivalent) devotes herself to attaining heart, hearth, and home through the exercise of self-sacrifice and moral devotion" (14-15). It is often a motherly figure who embodies such spirit. Eliza in Harriet Beecher Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin* is a representative one. She is depicted as a self-sacrificial slave mother, especially when she crosses the treacherous, icy Ohio river to reach the North and save her son from her master. Likewise, *The Wide, Wide World* expresses a story of "Ellen Montgomery's achievement of a Christianized feminine self....through the female virtues of self-sacrifice and submission rather than revolution" (Amy Kaplan 45).

Specifically, sentimental writers tend to represent the mother as a moral leader for her children. For example, Stowe favorably depicts the Quaker mother named Rachel Halliday:

> ….the children all avowed that they wouldn't miss of hearing mother's chair for anything in the world. For why? For twenty years or more, nothing but loving words, and gentle moralities, and motherly loving kindness, had come from that chair;--headaches and heartaches innumerable had been cured there, --difficulties spiritual and temporal solved there, --all by one good, loving woman, God bless her! (117)

Jane Tompkins has made an influential point that Rachel represents "God in human form" in the novel (142). Chapter XIII of the novel, entitled "The Quaker Settlement,"

[63] As for the sentimental novels' conventions, see Baym 6; Dobson 268; and Kete 3.

Tompkins argues, provides a utopian vision of women's ability to reform the nation through the power of matriarchy, from the kitchen. Thus, Stowe in *Uncle Tom's Cabin* definitely praises the spirit of mother's love and self-sacrifice for her children. In her essay "Heroines in *Uncle Tom's Cabin*," Elizabeth Ammons neatly summarizes the qualities of Stowe's ideal womanhood as follows: "unshakable allegiance to the Christian virtues of faith, hope, charity, mercy, and self-sacrifice; purity in body and mind; ethical dependence more on emotion than on reason; submission to mundane authority except when it violates higher laws; and protection of the home as a sacred and inviolable institution" (164). Obviously, it is mothers who embody these ethical traits in *Uncle Tom's Cabin*.

How then do sentimentalists like Stowe describe expressions of motherly love? As Marianne Noble explains, the tears, which sentimental fictions try to evoke in the reader, register the physical nature of sentimental discourse.[64] As discussed in Chapter 1, behaviors such as shedding tears and shaking hands describe sympathetic exchanges between black slaves and a dying girl. By the same token, *The Wide, Wide World* elucidates the importance of behaviors of shedding tears and embracing. When Ellen's mother is about to separate from her daughter in order for the former to embark on an oversea trip for her health, the sorrowful separation between Ellen and her mother is described thusly:

> The breakfast-table was still standing and her father gone, when Ellen went down-stairs. Mrs. Montgomery welcomed her with usual quiet smile, and held out her hand. Ellen tried to smile in answer, but she was glad to hide her face in her mother's bosom; and the long, close embrace was too

[64] Concerning Stowe's attempt to implant a strong sense of subjective identity in the reader, Marianne Noble says that "sentimental authors like Stowe tend to see the emotional self as an embodied self" (131).

> close and too long; it told of sorrow as well as love; and tears fell from the eyes of each that the other did not see. (17)

As the mother imagines what her daughter feels—"sorrow as well as love"—, embracing and sobbing represent an affective exchange between them in the face of separation. Thus, as I mentioned in Chapter 1, the sentimentalists' approval of sympathetic exchanges results in the repeated description of tears and embracing as external signs of compassionate emotion.

Slave Mother Cassy in *Uncle Tom's Cabin*

It is important to note, however, that the motherhood depicted in the sentimental novels is not always limited to white mothers, but also includes black women. *Uncle Tom's Cabin* is exemplary in this regard, too. And indeed, this is another important source of influence of Stowe's work on Mark Twain, especially in his characterization of Roxana in *Pudd'hnhead Wilson*.

In *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, Stowe depicts several slave mothers, such as Eliza and Cassy. Twain's Roxana reminds us of Cassy in particular. A slave master's mistress on the Louisiana plantation, Cassy committed infanticide when she gave birth to a baby, because she did not want to let her child lead a miserable life as a slave. She tells Uncle Tom about her own experience of killing her third child after her first two children were sold away from her:

> I would never again let a child live to grow up! I took the little fellow in my arms, when he was two weeks old, and kissed him, and cried over him; and then I gave him laudanum, and held him close to my bosom, while he slept to death. How I mourned and cried over it! and who ever dreamed that it was anything but a mistake, that had made me give it the laudanum? (318)

Cassy's murder of her child is an apparent betrayal of the kind of motherhood that the novel has established. Given Ammon's description I mentioned above, it seems as if Cassy defied Stowe's principle: despite her will, and due to her harsh circumstances, Cassy was sexually abused, lost her faith, and now rebels against her master. Nevertheless, as shown by Uncle Tom looking "pitifully" into her face (319), Cassy is never regarded as aberration from Stowe's feminine aesthetics. Moreover, Cassy never regrets her action of infanticide: "it's one of the few things that I'm glad of, now. I am not sorry, to this day; he [her son], at least, is out of pain. What better than death could I give him, poor child!" (318). Cassy views her action of taking her own child's life as justified and even beneficial to him. Uncle Tom quietly listens to her story, without becoming judgmental to her shocking act. Thus, Stowe suggests that the act of infanticide on the part of a slave woman should be understood as a manifestation of motherhood. In this sense, Stowe tries to illustrate another discourse of motherhood for slave mothers that is different from the one for white mothers.

Very sadly, Cassy's infanticide is not just a fictional episode. It also reflects real historical conditions surrounding slave mothers in the antebellum South. Margaret Garner's incident, which occurred some years after the publication of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, is a case in point. As is well known, Toni Morrison's *Beloved* is based on this actual incident. According to Venetria Patton, "On January 26, 1856, after a failed escape attempt, Garner slit the throat of her three-year-old girl and wounded her other three children to prevent their master from remanding them to slavery." (13) One of the basic backgrounds for this tragedy, Patton argues, is the fact that slaves were not allowed to maintain a family. That is to say, slave parents and children always faced the

fate of separation from each other. Indeed, "female as well as male slaves had no parental rights; they were breeders, not parents." Regardless, slave parents, especially mothers, developed their sense of motherhood.[65] In describing slave mothers, such as Eliza and Cassy, Stowe addresses slaveholders' cruel treatment of black women, as well as denial of their maternity, trying to make motherhood the site of a common ground for women across races.

Twain's Roxana certainly reminds us of Cassy as a black slave mother, although Roxana can be taken as his commentary on sentimental motherhood. It is also highly likely that Mark Twain was aware of the tragedy of Margaret Garner in writing Roxana's story. In the next, I will investigate how Twain responds to white and black sentimental motherhoods.

Roxana and "Motherhood"

Mother and Changeling

Roxana's plot begins with her panic as mother of slave baby. Although her motherhood will be put into question later in the story, Roxana is deeply involved in the themes of the sentimental novels dramatizing motherly love and affection. When Roxana is confronted with the fact that her master sells his slaves as a punishment for stealing his money, she recognizes that her and her son's fate depends on the master's will. Hearing

[65] Patton explains: "According to slave society, female slaves were numb to any maternal feelings, but slave accounts contradict this assumption. They were clearly aware of the cult of true womanhood and the glorification of motherhood, and in all probability maintained some remembrance of African traditions, including the high regard for motherhood. All of this allowed them to feel what they referred to as maternal instincts. However the slave mother's feelings and her anguish went unrecognized by slaveholders" (37).

him threatening her peers, “I will sell you DOWN THE RIVER” (12), Roxana reels in her tracks and her color vanishes out of her face. “Down the river” points towards plantations in the Deep South, which is equivalent to “the novel’s version of hell” (Porter 126). This is why Roxana’s fellow slaves express deep gratitude when they find out they won’t be sold down the river. At any rate, Roxana recognizes that her son might be sold down river at the whim of his master as long as he remains a slave. Because of the grim prospects, she cannot sleep at all while her master sleeps well. As Carolyn Porter puts it, Roxana “understands her very life, and that of her son, is permanently conditional—a commuted death sentence that can always be revoked at the master’s will” (126). Later in the story, when Tom betrays Roxana and sells her to a cotton planter in Arkansas, she confirms that the place is as miserable as its reputation; “Sell a pusson down de river—down the river!—for de bes’! I wouldn’t treat a dog so!” (85). Ironically enough, at the end of the novel, Tom is “restored” to his status as a chattel and sold down the river in the ending of the novel.

In order to save her son from being sold downriver, Roxana makes an ultimate, tragic decision: She paused awhile, thinking; then she burst into wild sobbing again, and turned away, saying, “Oh, I got to kill my chile, dey ain’t no yuther way,—killin’ him wouldn’t save de chile fum goin’ down de river. Oh, I got to do it, yo’ po’ mammy’s got to kill you to save you, honey” (13). In a state of panic, Roxana makes a resolve to kill her child and herself to save him from the life of suffering as a slave. Here the idea of committing double suicide is described as motivated by her motherly instinct. As mentioned before, the protagonists in the sentimental novels tend to valorize the affectionate tie between mother and child. More specifically, Roxana’s episode clearly

recalls the story of Cassy committing infanticide in *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. Stowe describes that the black mother kills her child to protect him from the harsh reality, which works to draw sympathy and compassion from the white middle-class readers. Like Cassy, Roxana decides to take her son's life out of deep affection and concern as a mother. Whether or not child murder is ethically justifiable, it is her motherly love that motivates Roxana's decision. If this is the case, Roxana repeats, albeit in a very different format, the central theme of the sentimental novel, that is, mother's love and self-sacrifice for her child.

Obviously Roxana is repeating the motif of motherhood as described in the sentimental novels. When she dresses herself and her son in their finest clothes, she discovers that her child and her master's child are indistinguishable without clothing. She then switches the children's clothes so that her child, Valet de Chambers takes the place of her master's son, Tom Driscoll. As I analyzed in Chapter 3, exchanging clothes is one of Twain's pet motifs, which appeared in *The Prince and the Pauper* and *Huckleberry Finn* and is now repeated in *Pudd'nhead Wilson*. Whereas the clothes in the former two novels signified their class status, those in the latter serve as a metaphor of race. As I will mention later in this chapter, *Pudd'nhead Wilson* also involves gender crossing through clothing. In this context, Roxana is crossing the racial boundary between white and black through exchanging the babies' clothes. Interestingly, Roxana justifies her action by recalling a tale she heard from a black preacher, about a young white prince who was taken from the palace and exchanged with another baby by an impostor and put him in "de nigger-quarter" (15). She says to herself, "'Tain't no sin—white folks has done it! It ain't no sin, glory to goodness it ain't no sin! Dey's done

it'"(15). Here she does not express hatred or resentment; instead, she simply claims it is not a sin because "white folks has done it!" (15) This means that she is neither questioning nor complaining about what white masters have done to her race; she is instead justifying her action by referring to what white masters have done. In other words, Roxana imitates the white (English) people in her action.

Roxana as "Imitation White"

Roxana can imitate mother figures in sentimental narratives, because she is characterized by racial ambiguity as a 'mulatto.' Although being regarded as a black by "a fiction of law and custom," Roxana is "as white as anybody" (8) and sometimes identifies herself with whites, which creates a major source of confusion. At one point, she has a conversation with Chambers, who is biologically her master's son, but grows up as her son. When she calls Chambers "you misable imitation nigger," he retorts: "If I's imitation, what is you? Bofe of us is imitation white—dat's what we is—en pow'ful good imitation, too" (35). He rebukes Roxana for her derision by labeling her and himself as "imitation whites" in terms of complexion. Here John Bird's argument about "cognitive dissonance" in *Huckleberry Finn* is suggestive. According to Bird, this psychological concept is "a state of tension that occurs whenever a person holds two cognitions that are psychologically inconsistent." The "cognitive dissonance" is applicable to Roxana as well, who internalizes her white master's values and visions in spite of her racial status. For instance, when she confronts the fact that her biological son Tom refuses Luigi's challenge to a duel, she expresses anger over her son: "Pah! it make me sick! It's de nigger in you, dat's what it is. Thirty-one parts o' you is white, en

on'y one part nigger, en dat po' little one part is yo' soul" (70). Roxana is indignant at her son' s evasion of the challenge, because he is multiply descended from many different Southern "gentlemen." This also recalls Judge Driscoll's exasperation at Tom: "A coward in my family! A Driscoll a coward! Oh, what have I done to deserve this infamy!" or "you base son of a most noble father" (60). Both Roxana's and Judge Driscoll's anger shows that they place much value on the white bloodline. Yet, there is a slight difference between Driscoll and Roxana in terms of how they understand the lineage. Roxana maintains that she and her son are descended from Captain John Smith and Pocahontas:

> My great-great-great-gran'father en yo' great-great-great-great-gran'father was Ole Cap'n John Smith, de highest blood dat Ole Virginny ever turned out, en his great-great-gran'mother or somers along back dah, was Pocahontas de Injun queen, en her husbun' was a nigger king outen Africa[.] (70)

In contrast with Judge Driscoll emphasizing white supremacy, Roxana's bloodline is deeply hybrid and both borrows from and questions his simplistic notion of the white race. Roxana unwittingly reveals the secret of the FFV or the First Families of Virginia, i.e., their involvement in miscegenation with Native Americans, as well as black Africans. Nevertheless, she shares the same values of pedigree and racial hierarchy with Driscoll, which attests to her profound cognitive dissonance. Consequently, she blames her son for his inability to duel with Luigi: "Yes, it's de nigger in you!" (70). As Christopher Gair points out, "Unlike Jim in *Huckleberry Finn*, Roxy shows little inclination to dispute the racist orthodoxies propagated by the FFV." "Instead," he continues, "throughout the book, she shows pride in white genealogy" (201).

It is precisely because Roxana identifies herself with the whites that she can exert maternal power not only by switching the babies, but also naming their racial identities. Carolyn Porter makes this point: "Roxana's opening gambit needs to be understood not only as a reiteration of the white patriarchy's structural inequality, but also as a specific imitation of the white master's power to enforce that inequality in the form of social death"(127). Interesting as her argument is, we might need to rethink it, because Roxana is committing a subversive act of reversing who is slave and who is master. Certainly, Roxana is represented as having internalized the racial logic of the Southern aristocrats. Nevertheless, we should not miss that she has also challenged the very logic of slavery that takes for granted innate and essential differences between blacks and whites. In short, her action is a powerful one for a black slave to enact, because it virtually demonstrates that there are no such identifiable markers as "race."

Ambivalent Motherhood

It is noteworthy, however, that Roxana, while trying to imitate mother figures in the sentimental novel, deviates from them at the same time. For example, Roxana becomes concerned about her status as mother, because her son Tom grows up as her master and treats her as a slave:

> She saw herself sink from the sublime height of motherhood to the somber depths of unmodified slavery. The abyss of separation between her and her boy was complete. She was merely his chattel, now, his convenience, his dog, his cringing and helpless slave, the humble and unresisting victim of his capricious temper and vicious nature. (21)

Unlike mother figures in the sentimental novel, who never question their status, Roxana experiences extreme anxiety about her position as mother. Cindy Weinstein makes an

important point that slaves' existential conditions are fundamentally different from those of white sentimental heroines: whereas the latter do not need to actively pursue freedom, slaves must constantly pursue freedom, which "is never fully achieved" ("The Slave Narrative" 129). By the same token, as long as she remains a slave, Roxana never feels secure about her position as mother.

In this regard, Roxana's act of renaming her son is as subversive as that of switching the children. When her grown-up son never knows she is his biological mother and treats her as a slave—not a mother—, she displays anger towards him by recalling the terrible names Tom calls her:

> "You call me names, en as good as spit on me when I comes here po'en ornery en 'umble, to praise you for bein' growed up so fine en handsome, en tell you how I used to nuss you en tend you en watch you when you 'uz sick en hadn't no mother but me in de whole worl', en beg you to give de po' ole nigger a dollah for to git her som'n' to eat, en you call me names—names, dad blame you!" (39).

As Tom grew up, it was comforting for her to know that he did not have to experience the fear of being sold down the river as a slave. Quite ironically, however, she is now horrified to learn that Tom has become such a tyrant that he treats her terribly. After being called names by her own son, she decides to expose him as her son and erase the name of the father. Unlike mothers in the sentimental novels who attempt to lead their children to become good Christians, Roxana tries to control her son, because while loving him, she also regards him as a tool of "securely avenging their [the whites'] crimes against her race" (39). Roxana's utterance indicates her profound ambivalence: although identifying with the whites, she simultaneously expresses antipathy toward them. For Roxana, internalizing white supremacy is not inconsistent with her abhorrence of whites, because in spite of her sense of privilege, she has been treated and

degraded as a slave. Whereas white mother figures in the sentimental novels raise their children to become good members of the republic, Roxana treats her child as an instrument of vengeance upon the white masters.

Such racial ambiguity, however, prevents Roxana not only from completely identifying with the white race, but with the maternal role as defined by the sentimental novel. In fact, it is important to notice that she has never openly behaved as Tom's mother: she has related to him in her capacity as "mammy" (nanny) over ten years; after being set free by her master, she has served as a chambermaid on a Cincinnati boat in New Orleans until she has rheumatism in her arms. Significantly, during all these years, she has never referred to Tom as her own son even in her mind. It is not until there is a financial crash at her bank that she retrospectively remembers her son. That is to say, there is a lapse of more than twenty years before she reveals herself as his mother. If this is the case, her identity as Tom's mother is not an essential one to her, but can and should be regarded as one of her potential attributes that she can choose when it is necessary. Carolyn Porter makes an important point:

> "Mother" is to be understood here not as a 'natural' but as a social identity defined in Roxana's case by a set of particular legal, social, and cultural codes that makes the slave mother at once antebellum America's most tragic victim and potentially one of its most powerful subversive agents. (123)[66]

[66] At the same time, Porter also insists that what makes Roxana's plot truly subversive is not her sexuality in adultery, but "childbirth" (125), which seems to presuppose the priority of being a mother. Moreover, Porter says: "What is surprising is that twenty-three years later she is able to enforce the threat implicit in her deed" (127). Here again, she takes for granted continuity of Roxana's motherhood twenty-three years after the baby switch—despite the fact that she has never served or named herself as mother since then. If this is the case, Porter seems to slightly compromise her own point on the social construction of Roxana's motherhood.

In fact, Roxana appears in front of Tom as his mother and names him her son only when she is in financial trouble; she has been out of town for eight years with no intention to return to the village or meet him. By naming him her son, then, she becomes so powerful that she can control her son. In this respect, Roxana is depicted as a female figure who relativizes the sentimental novel in which the identity of a mother is never put into question.

Ironically, in spite of her intelligence and boldness, Roxana is completely deceived by her son exploiting her "motherly love." After boldly confronting him and blackmailing him, she later finds him in despair and misery due to financial predicaments. At this point in the novel, she feels that "her motherhood rose up strong in her. He was ruined past hope, now; his destruction would be immediate and sure, and he would be an outcast and friendless. That was reason enough for a mother to love a child; so she loved him, and told him so" (80). Although what she said makes Tom feel disgusted secretly, she does not notice his emotion and offers him a plan to sell her for six hundred dollars to pay off his debt. Then she explains: "Ain't you my chile? En does you know anything dat a mother won't do for her chile? Day ain't nothin' a white mother won't do for her chile" (80). She allows her child to sell her down the river for him, which is equivalent to hell in the novel. And when Tom calls Roxana "mammy," she is carried away by overwhelming emotion so that she cries out: "Say it ag'in! En keep on sayin' it! It's all de pay a body kin want in dis worl', en it's mo' den enough." (81) Thus, she embodies the theme of maternal love and mother's sacrifice expressed in the sentimental novels. Such an act of self-sacrifice that would be impossible without true love of someone might indicate what Mark Twain calls "*real* sentiment." As I

discussed in Chapter 1, Twain downplays sentimentalism of white female characters, like Emmeline Grangerford, differentiating it from a rare instance of "*real*" and "Godlike" sentiment. Given her extreme dedication to her child, Roxy here, it seems, fits better into Twain's notion of "*real* sentiment" than into his usual critique of female maudlin-ness.

At the same time, however, when she said "In de inside, mothers is all de same" (80), Roxana forgets "a fiction of law and custom" declaring her to be black, no matter how white she looks. In fact, she seems so deeply compassionate with her son in trouble that she never pays attention to her son's character. She thus ends up getting deceived by him:

> she was not dreaming that her own son could be guilty of treason to a mother who, in voluntarily going into slavery—slavery of any kind, mild or severe, or of any duration, brief or long—was making a sacrifice for him compared with which death would have been a poor and commonplace one. (81)

She does not even imagine that Tom can deceive her when she sacrifices herself in order for her son to repay the debt. Tom suffers from his bad feeling for a while, but "after that he began to get comfortable again, and was presently able to sleep like any other miscreant" (82). One issue that is raised here is how a "white" son can betray his "black" mother. It is how his subjectivity is constructed as a "white master" that makes it apparently impossible to understand what slavery is and what being sold down the river means. In contrast with Roxana's "*real* sentiment," her son has become a "white slave owner" who has little or no compassionate feeling or understanding for his slave. Consequently, Roxana's compassion for her son is completely mistreated by her son. In this sense, the author problematizes emotional apathy for blacks on white master's part.

Parody of Sacred Tears

Consequently, the meaning of tears in *Pudd'nhead Wilson* is largely divergent from the one in the sentimental novel. In fact, Twain reveals the irony of salvation by motherly love. As I have already noted, the shedding of tears is approved by the sentimental writers as a sign of a "state of grace." According to Jane Tompkins, "the emotions of the heart bespeak a state of grace, and these are known by the sound of a voice, the touch of a hand, but chiefly, in moments of greatest importance, by tears" (131). In the case of Roxana, however, when shedding tears for her son, she cannot detect her son's lies and villainous behaviors. For instance, separated from Tom, Roxana "lavished tears and loving caresses upon him privately, and then went away with her owner—went away broken-hearted, and yet proud of what she was doing, and glad it was in her power to do it" (81). Although Roxana alone was able to penetrate into Wilson's intelligence that the villagers in Dawson's Landing misunderstood and underestimated, the shedding of tears hinders her from recognizing the cruel fact that her biological son has attempted to sell her down the river for the sake of his financial gain.[67] In this respect, Roxana's tears and her embracing with Tom cannot be said to represent "a state of grace" as in the sentimental writes.

Obviously, Twain does not celebrate her behavior as a sentimental mother. Just after she was tearfully separated from her son, Roxana confronts the harsh fact that he

[67] In "The Medicine of Sympathy," Ken Parille examines the affective nature of mother-daughter and mother-son bonds in the nineteenth century sentimental novels, pointing out the depicted difficulties that training of boys posed for women. "With girls, sympathy comes naturally, but with boys," Parille insists, "it must be calculated" by their mothers (37). If this is the case, it follows from his argument that Roxana represents a mother who, unlike conventional sentimental mothers, cannot calculate affection toward her son.

has sold her down the river, knowing of his racial identity and biological connection with her. Even as she imitates sentimental discourse, she has a bitter experience. Whenever she acts like and identifies herself with mothers in sentimental novels, she forgets the fact that she is treated as a slave by "the fiction of law and custom." In this view, motherly love is caricatured in *Pudd'nhead Wilson* in such a way that it is easily abused and distorted by white slave owners like Tom. For example, when he confronts Roxana returning from the plantation, he mutters: "I never believed that story; I couldn't believe she would be so dead to all motherly instincts as to come here, knowing the risk she would run of getting me into irremediable trouble"(88). Whereas sentimental heroines recognizing mother's love and self-sacrifice for her children tend to achieve spiritual growth, Tom never feels a sense of guilt or remorse and thinks nothing but utilizing Roxana's "motherly instinct." Tom's reaction toward Roxana's motherly love is also proof that Twain burlesques the sentimental novel.

In this regard, Twain most probably has in mind Harriet Beecher Stowe acclaiming the significance of motherhood. On the part of Stowe, motherhood offers a new and liberating alternative to the practices of patriarchy. In her concluding remarks, she tells the reader;

> There is one thing that every individual can do,—they can see to it that they feel right. An atmosphere of sympathetic influence encircles every human being; and the man or woman who feels strongly, healthily and justly, on the great interests of humanity, is a constant benefactor to the human race. (385)

Tom's response to Roxana in *Pudd'nhead Wilson* indicates that Stowe's commitment of "feeling right" does not apply to slave holders. In other words, her sentimental novel does not address white slave owner's apathy toward enslaved black people and runs the

risk of making it invisible to the reader. Thus Twain implies, it seems, that sympathetic identification Stowe stresses can function to obscure the basic racial difference among women, subordinating it to their motherhood in common. If this is the case, Twain seems to claim that even though the sentimental novels, most notably *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, involve some slave mothers, they were, after all, written of, by, and for the white middle-class women.

As a result, tears as celebrated by the sentimental writers have a quite different meaning for a black female slave. Whereas white mothers in tears might move their hearts or conscience, tears shed by black slaves have little or no effect on the part of slave owners. Here we can see Twain's tacit commentary on the gap of the meaning of "tears" between the mainstream white women and the enslaved black women.

Thus, Twain parodies and burlesques the central themes and literary conventions of the sentimental novels by depicting excessive identification with a maternal role by a mixed race woman. Whereas in the sentimental novels, being a mother was idealized as an essential identity of women, Roxana shows how her maternal role is one of her optional attributes she recovers after twenty-three years. Moreover, her self-sacrifice as mother is not very rewarding for her. Betrayed by her own son, she throws away the mask of an ideal mother; she demands that Tom go to Judge Driscoll and borrow enough money to pay the planter for her freedom. As a result, Tom commits a crime of killing his uncle. Here we can see how Twain relativizes the ideology of ideal motherhood from the point of view of a black woman.

As I have discussed in Chapter 1, Twain in his early work *Tom Sawyer* puts into question the discourse of sentimentalism by setting up the gendered dichotomies

between reason and emotion, men and women. However, Twain in *Pudd'nhead Wilson* burlesques the association between sentimentality and femininity by introducing different racial positions among women. In fact, Roxana challenge gender norms as well as racial ones, by assuming masculine attitudes. When her son pitifully betrayed her, Roxana "went away broken-hearted, and yet proud of what she was doing and glad that it was in her power to do it." (82) Twain emphasizes her pride as a self-sacrificial mother representing a motherly sentiment. Here it is important to recognize how the author genders Roxana in almost masculine languages—as "bold," "proud," and "noble," which recalls that Becky cries out "Tom, how could you be so noble" (152) when he screens her from their teacher's blame. In this way, Twain's depiction of Roxana as a colored woman might be said to represent his commentary on the cultural discourse of sentimentality in the mid-nineteenth century America. If this is the case, *Pudd'nhead Wilson* develops and complicates his early critique of sentimentalism.

Nevertheless, Twain ultimately reintroduces gender binary with David Wilson resolving the murder case in the ending of the novel. I will comment on the implications of Wilson's plot from the perspective of gender and race in my conclusion. Before going on to this issue, I will further discuss the racial dimensions of Roxana's plot in the next section.

Roxana and the Slave Narratives

Although Roxana tries to adjust herself to the ideal image of a mother in the sentimental novel, she confronts racial barriers and cannot fully identify herself with sentimental motherhood. It is precisely here that Roxana's plot becomes that of a slave narrative. In

Chapter 18 when Roxana escapes from the plantation and disguises herself as a black man to show up for a meeting with Tom, the story shifts from a sentimental to a slave narrative. While these two genres are based on distinct racial experiences in nineteenth-century America, there are some similarities, as well as differences, between them. I will first explain basic characteristics of the slave narrative.

The Slave Narratives in Nineteenth-Century America

Slave narratives can be defined as an account of a life narrated by a fugitive or former slave endeavoring to achieve his or her freedom in the antebellum United States. Major slave narratives include Frederick Douglass's *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass, an American Slave* (1845), Solomon Northrup's *Twelve Years a Slave* (1853), Harriet Wilson's *Our Nig* (1859), and Harriet Jacobs's *Incidents in the Life of a Slave Girl* (1861). These stories express how African American slaves escaped from the Southern plantations in search of liberty in the North, Canada, or even Europe, making a way out of no way, resisting and fighting back against the slaveholders. In addition to the plot of escaping from slavery, Venetria K. Patton enumerates common characteristics of the slave narratives: "birth at an undetermined time with an unknown father, early separation from the mother, descriptions of physical and sexual abuse of female slaves, the threat of being sold down South, the denial of education or religious instruction, and the lack of legalized marriage between slaves" (41).

While the slaves narrate their experiences of these hardships, there are significant differences between male and female versions. At a time when the black male writers and masculine perspectives dominated the genre of the slave narrative, "a

number of black women writers respond to and remodel the maternal argument Stowe offers in *Uncle Tom's Cabin*" (Patton 39). In order to draw sympathy from the reader, some female black writers actively utilized the trope and rhetoric of the American women's sentimental novels. Philip Gould maintains that "Lydia Maria Child…includes a letter from Amy Post in the first edition of Harriet Jacobs's *Incidents in the Life of Slave Girl* (1861) that praised the protagonist as a 'naturally virtuous and refined' slave woman with 'a natural craving for human sympathy'" (25). Jacobs, like a sentimental writer, uses her rhetoric to draw sympathy from readers and affect their attitudes toward blacks.

Thus, it comes as no surprise that there are some overlaps between the sentimental novels and the slave narratives. One of the major themes in both genres is the issue of family. According to Cindy Weinstein, the protagonists of both stories "experience the hardships that come with the absence of family ties, the slave because of the institutional assault on the biological family, and the sentimental heroine because parental loss is the novel's point of departure." ("The Slave Narrative" 116) Another common aspect is the importance of the affective experience for the protagonists. The two genres highlight feeling and sympathy, "whether for the brutal treatment of the slave or the suffering of the heroine" ("The Slave Narrative"116-117).

At the same time, Weinstein points out major differences between the two genres: the father's identity is almost always a mystery remaining unsolved in the slave narrative; the father is often found or revealed in the sentimental novel ("The Slave Narrative," 123). In this sense, the basic access to knowledge concerning one's identity in the sentimental novels remains out of reach in the slave narratives. Moreover, while

sentimental heroines are often rescued by their prospective husbands, slave women must always pursue liberty at their own risk. Another important difference is how the issue of disguise plays out. Unlike the slave narrative in which their disguises are revealed only after they have attained their freedom, "sentimental protagonists….often pretends to be that which they are not, but the revelation of their true identity is the necessary prelude to their ultimate reward, which is marriage" ("The Slave Narrative" 121). Whereas marriage represents the ultimate goal in the sentimental novel, the slave narrative reveals that the opportunity for marriage is not available for slave women and that there is nobody who would rescue them. For instance, Linda in *Incidents* has her sexual partner named Mr. Sands make a promise that he does not keep that he will not only buy their children from Mr. Flint but free them.

Roxana in the Mode of a Slave Narrative

In *Pudd'hnhead Wilson*, Roxana's story shifts from a sentimental mode into that of a slave narrative. Therefore, exploring contrasts between them helps us locate Roxana's changing subject positions in the novel. Some scholars have noticed Twain's use of slave narratives in Roxana's plot. Linda A. Morris, while referring to some aspects of the sentimental conventions in the novel, argues: "[t]he influence of slave narratives upon *Pudd'nhead Wilson*, and especially upon Roxana, is felt most forcefully in the long account she gives her son of her escape from slavery" (69). Likewise, Lawrence Howe asserts that "Linda Brent, in Harriet Jacob's autobiographical *Incidents in the Life of a Slave Girl*, emphatically anticipates Roxana's maternal power" (193). In Brent's narrative, she values her family tie over breaking free from the bondage, which reminds

us of Roxana's selling herself to save her son. In fact, episodes from Brent's text, such as escaping from the Southern plantation, disguising, and caring for her children, are quite similar to Roxana's situation.

One of the significant parallels between *Pudd'nhead Wilson* and *Incidents* is the heroines' racial and gender disguise. Indeed, just as Linda wears her "sailor's clothes" and has "blackened" her face with charcoal (91), so does Roxana disguise herself as a black man when she escapes from the Southern plantation to meet Tom: "[t]he man [Roxana] turned around, a wreck of shabby old clothes, sodden with rain and all a-drip, and showed a black face under an old slouch hat" (84). Furthermore, when Roxana demands that Tom walk her back to where she's staying at a deserted wharf, she threatens him with a knife. Again, Roxana is depicted as bold and masculine.

In this way, Roxana embodies the subversive power of gender and racial disguise. Linda Morris interprets it from a poststructuralist point of view, claiming that "*Pudd'nhead Wilson* ultimately insists that race and gender are interconnected performances that are multivocal and highly unstable." She continues, "[t]hrough racial and gender crossings, all meaningful social categories collapse" (87). As Morris puts it, Twain definitely plays with the instability of race and gender. When you look at the slave narratives, transvestism is not an especially rare or exceptional thing at all, but a quite common event. For instance, Linda disguises herself as a sailor in order to escape from Dr. Flint because the performance of disguise is instrumental for runaway slaves. Hence, we can understand Roxana's transvestism not merely from a poststructuralist point of view, but also in terms of the slave narratives' influence on her

characterization.[68]

Roxana's Sexuality

Moreover, there is another major overlap between Roxana and Linda, i.e., the issue of sexuality. In a sense, this is more noteworthy than the parallel of disguise, because it explicitly discloses the intersection between race and gender. For example, after escaping from the plantation, Roxana states as below:

> I'll tell you what you's got to do. Dat man dat bought me ain't a bad man; he's good enough, as planters goes; en if he could 'a' had his way I'd 'a' be'n a house servant in his fambly en be'n comfortable: but his wife she was a Yank, en not right down good lookin', en she riz up agin me straight off; so den dey sent me out to de quarter' mongst de common fiel' han's. Dat woman warn't satisfied even wid dat, but she worked up de overseer ag'in' me, she 'uz dat jealous en hateful[.] (85)

Here Roxana never blames her master for his action as a slaveholder; on the contrary, she evaluates him as "good enough." Furthermore, she even confesses that if the master could have had his own way, she could have become a house servant in his family. Yet, why does Roxana direct her hatred toward her master's wife? As John Slimkin puts it, domestic slaves "often had uncomfortable relation with their white owners" and "faced all the potential aggravations of close proximity, from sexual threats through to white women's dissatisfaction and anger" (4882). In this respect, it is helpful to take a look at the master's wife's attitude toward Linda in *Incidents in the Life of a Slave Girl*:

> I had entered my sixteenth year, and every day it became more apparent that my presence was intolerable to Mrs. Flint. Angry words frequently passed between her and her husband. He had never punished me himself, and he would not allow any body else to punish me. In that respect, she was never satisfied; but, in her angry moods, no terms were too vile for her to bestow upon me. (29)

[68] Some sentimental novels also involve protagonists in disguise. However, while their disguise often leads to marriage, Roxana must disguise herself because she is a slave.

Obviously, Mrs. Flint is jealous of her husband's special treatment of, and implicit lust for, Linda. [69] In fact, Linda faces her master's sexual advance, which she has to avoid by choosing another white man instead. In this way, the slave women were exposed to sexual threats from their white masters on a daily basis in the plantations—one of the major aspects in *Pudd'nhead Wilson* that cannot be fully explained by an analogy to the theme of "motherly love" in the sentimental novels. This is why Roxana's characterization involving her sexuality inevitably comes close to the mode of the slave narrative.

Unlike Linda, however, Roxana does not seem to have a bad feeling about her master. In this respect, Roxana's behavior prevents us from associating her slave narrative exclusively with a threat to female sexuality as an issue of victimization. When Tom asks her, "would you mind telling me who was my father?", Roxy draws herself up, "with a proud toss of her head" (43). Furthermore, telling him that his father is Colonel Cecil Burleigh Essex, one of the highest ranking men in the whole town, she looks proud and confident: "Under the inspiration of her soaring complacency the departed graces of her earlier days returned to her, and her bearing took to itself a dignity and state that might have passed for queenly if her surroundings had been a little more in keeping with it" (43). This reminiscence of her past glory appears to imply that she was not a victim of the white master's lust; instead, she seems to show no sign of regret for her actions or resentment towards white masters. One might wonder, however,

[69] Solomon Northup's autobiography, *Twelve Years a Slave* gives another example of a slave owner's sexual abuse and his wife's jealousy of a slave girl named Patsey. He confesses "It has been seen that the jealousy and hatred of Mistress Epps makes the daily life of her young and agile slave completely miserable….I was the means of averting punishment from the inoffensive girl. In Epps' absence the mistress often ordered me to whip her without the remotest provocation" (143).

if Roxana was really sexually active in the interracial relationships under slavery. Linda Morris purses this kind of reading for her agency: "Having Chamber's father be an equally powerful, but unrelated, white man suggests instead the possibility of consensual sex across the color line, and powerfully suggests that Roxana had agency in the affair" (66-67).[70]

It is highly questionable, however, to describe the physical relationship between a slave and her slave master as a "consensual" sex. Needless to say, if Harriet Jacobs talks about "choosing" to have a relation with one white neighbor and slave owner, Mr. Sands, it is largely because she wants to outwit her master, Mr. Flint, who has harassed her from her childhood onwards. Thus, it is never the case that she has a "consensual" sex with the white slave owner. In fact, Jacobs has to give up the black free man who she actually loves. She chooses within a framework of no choice. African American theorist Saidiya V. Hartman makes a suggestive argument in terms of whether or not Roxana has sexual agency. Hartman puts into question the talk of sexual agency of black women, pointing to their fundamental life conditions under chattel slavery. "As the enslaved is legally unable to give consent or offer resistance, she [a slave woman] is presumed to be always willing" (81). In other words, as long as the black women were treated as the private property of slave owners, they were denied the choice of either consent or disobedience. Therefore, she claims that "the purportedly binding passions of master-slave relations were predicated upon the inability of the enslaved to exercise her

[70] Her argument stands in stark contrast to James M. Cox. What explains Roxana's power is, Cox argues, the "submerged lust" of the white male, whose "passion" is transferred "from white wives to the slave mistresses" (395). Whereas Morris emphasizes Roxana's subversive power in terms of her sexuality, Cox interprets her as the repository of "the guilt of their repressed desires," highlighting her humiliation (231).

will in any ways other than serving the master, and in this respect, she existed only as an extension or embodiment of the owner's rights of property." (82) Undoubtedly, Hartman is making a strong historical and legal case about the lack of agency, sexual or otherwise, on the part of black slave women.

If this is the case, Morris's claim for Roxana's agency becomes rather dubious because it tends to minimize the effects of slavery on her life. Roxana may appear to have some agency, which Twain seems to emphasize. But it is important to notice that he is also deeply ironic about the notion of freedom and agency on the part of a (former) slave woman. Even though Roxana indulges in "queenly" reminiscences, her freedom meant nothing more than accepting her owner's desire or will to control. As I will show in my conclusion, Roxana's plot finally leads to a tragic ending where her act of the baby swap, as well as her son Tom's murder, are exposed by David Wilson in the courtroom. Here Tom is regarded as not even capable of committing a crime, because his true identity is a chattel slave, lacking legal agency and responsibility. This is largely true of Roxana herself as well. Roxana, who is no longer a slave, has completely lost any sense of agency when she exclaims in the end: "De Lord have mercy on me, po' misable sinner dat I is!" (113) To be sure, Roxana here is "reduced to the rags of racial stereotype," as Carolyn Porter says (136), but it is important to notice that Twain puts into question the false sense of Roxana's agency.

The Double Genre and the Issue of Race

In this way, Roxana follows the mode of slave narratives through the racial disguise and the issue of sexuality. In other words, the mode of the sentimental novel seems to be

replaced by that of the slave narrative. Even as she mimics the role of an ideal mother, her racial position as a slave prevents her from fully achieving the ideal image of maternal affection and self-sacrifice as the central theme of the sentimental novel. In this respect, she comes closer to black mothers in the slave narratives. She is involved in those actions that are largely absent in the sentimental fictions but found in the slave narratives, such as disguise and sexual affairs.

This double genre corresponds to Roxana's ambivalence as a mixed race woman. In other words, the different modes of narration derive from the incoherence of racism, racial construction, and slavery of which her racial hybridity originating from miscegenation is only one symptom. This is also why Roxana herself suffers from cognitive dissonance, a gap between her consciousness and her racial identity determined by the "fiction of law and custom." If this is the case, it is not through Twain's merely arbitrary depiction, but because of racism bringing about her racial hybridity, that Roxana's narration shifts between two genres. In this way, the author creates Roxana as a very complex character.

Moreover, Roxana represents an exceptional female figure in his novels, because Mark Twain is known for his ineptness in describing women's sexuality. Even though he hardly touched upon white women's sexual life in his works, he was able to depict sensuality in regard to Roxana. Shelly Fisher Fishkin explains that "Twain's rigid gender stereotypes….applied strictly to white womanhood; by virtue of her race, Roxy escaped the structures Twain normally placed on women" ("Mark Twain and Women" 61). In other words, Roxana's behavior implies that Twain's sexual repression against white women gets loosened vis-à-vis a black woman. This is also closely connected

with the point I have made earlier, i.e., Roxana's relativizing sentimental version of essential motherhood. Perhaps, it may be said that Roxana goes even beyond the control of the author, representing a more affirmative picture of a woman as a subversive race and gender transgression.[71]

Conclusion:

Although the novel seemed to affirm a black woman's transgressions in terms of race and gender, it concludes with making a final judgment on Roxana and Tom Driscoll in the courtroom. Here "Pudd'nhead" Wilson appears as a counsel for Count Luigi, who is accused of murdering Judge Driscoll. Wilson not only uncovers Tom Driscoll as the real culprit, but his true identity as a black man who was switched with Chambers as a baby. As is well known, Wilson solved the case with his science of fingerprints, which not only crushes Roxana's plot, but restores Wilson's reputation as attorney.

The ending clearly follows the format of a mystery fiction, or more precisely, a detective story.[72] That is to say, while Twain first relativized the sentimental mode through the slave narrative, he ultimately subsumes it in the genre of the detective novel. The shift in the genres has both gender and racial implications: the white

---

[71] When it comes to female characters with courage and intelligence, we can not merely mention black female characters, such as Roxana and the former slave Aunt Rachel in "A True Story," but also white female figures like the smart woman to see through his disguise, Mrs. Judith Loftus in *Huck Finn*, Eve in "Eve's Diary" and the tomboy girl Rachel in "Hellfire Hotchkiss."

[72] In addition to *Pudd'nhead Wilson*, Twain writes many detective novels: *Tom Sawyer, Detective* (1896), *Tom Sawyer's Conspiracy* (1897-1900), and his short stories such as "The Stolen White Elephant" (1882) and "A Double-Barreled Detective Story" (1902). Among them, "A Double-Barreled Detective Story" is under the influence of Doyle's *Study of Scarlet* (1887), even though Twain rather aimed to parody and burlesque it. According to Andy J. Moore, "*Pudd'nhead Wilson*....did employ detectives and ingenious courtroom tactics, perhaps inspired by Doyle's very popular fiction" (228).

women's motherhood is relativized by the black slave woman, who is, then, ruined by the white man in the end.[73] Wilson now reestablishes his manliness by defeating Roxana's secret agenda to swap his son and her master's and make her son survive in Dawson's Landing. Moreover, her hybrid and fluid identities, which correspond to the two genres, i.e., the sentimental novel and the slave narrative, are finally pinned down by the sameness of the fingerprints in the mode of the detective story.

In the courtroom, Wilson gives an eloquent speech on fingerprints:

> Every human being carries with him from his cradle to his grave certain physical marks which do not change their character, and by which he can always be identified—and that without shade of doubt or question. These marks are his signature, his physiological autograph, so to speak, and this autograph can not be counterfeited, nor can he disguise it or hide it away, nor can it become illegible by the wear and mutations of time. (108)

The identification by fingerprints serves to ward off the evils of interracial sex and the baby switch Roxana committed. It is also supposed to help reestablish the stable and essential racial distinction between the whites and the blacks on which slavery is based. However, fingerprints can only serve for personal identification, not racial grouping. As Susan Gillman argues, "What they [fingerprints] prove, in fact, is that one can be interchangeably 'white and free' and 'a negro and a slave'" (99).[74] In other words, fingerprints do not teach anything about racial identity. Nor do they prevent races from

---

[73] LeRoy Panek argues that American detective novels in the late nineteenth century often contained misogynistic biases, as well as tendency for manliness. At that time, publishers of detective fictions "reduced their own costs by accepting advertisement, which, in turn, appealed to the same fantasies about self-improvement, eroticism, and manliness exploited by the fiction on the accompanying pages" (148).

[74] Gillman points out that in writing *Pudd'hnhead Wilson*, Twain was strongly influenced by Francis Galton's 1892 work, *Finger Prints* ("Sure Identifiers" 97). In relation to Twain's interest in Galton (cousin of Charles Darwin), Michael Rogin also shows that his research of fingerprints is closely connected with the rise of eugenics in the late nineteenth century. See Rogin 73-85.

mixing with each other.

Nevertheless, Twain's ending shows that Wilson's authority as attorney is regained at the cost of the slave woman. This implies that the white supremacist and male-dominated order of the antebellum South is recovered, excluding the slave woman, who seemed to disrupt the social order. Yet, given the racial hierarchy under slavery, it was not Roxana, but also white male slaveholders, who are responsible for the scandal of miscegenation. In other words, Roxana is unfairly punished for everything, with the responsibility of white men elided.

Although Wilson coming from the New York at first seems like an ally for Roxy, he ultimately helps the Southern aristocrats in Dawson's Landing reinforce the racial order of slavery. Christopher Gair argues that Wilson's changing role implies the alliance between the North and the South against Roxana's subversive tactic. "While, of course, Wilson's faith in (and use of) new science (fingerprint) identifies him with developments of the kind associated with the North, the consequence of his action is the restoration of traditional Southern racial hegemony" (203-204). Paying attention to the historical context of the author in which the white North is colluding with the white South in the post-Reconstruction era, Gair concludes Twain's work provides an indictment of the North and its involvement in enforcing racial hierarchies in the South in his own time. As Gair puts it, the last chapter of *Pudd'nhead Wilson* demonstrates all the satire Twain expends on what constitutes "law" and also what constitutes "science": Tom is recategorized not as a murderer, and Chambers is uncomfortable being "white": "The poor fellow [Chambers] could not endure the terrors of the white man's parlor, and felt at home and at peace but in the kitchen" (114). What is called "the law" and "the

science" in the novel imprisons the black characters into fixed racial identity. As Rogin claims, "Blackness becomes something no longer to be taken on and off, escaped and disguised" (85).

Furthermore, Twain in this novel makes an important shift concerning the issue of sentimentality, which we have addressed throughout the chapters. The ending of the novel clearly foregrounds male sentimentality, instead of female sentimentality. "[A]s the friendship between Judge Driscoll and Wilson seems to signify," Gair points out, "a new alliances between traditional white Southern codes and new legal and scientific Northern ones reimposes old bonds" (205). Indeed, the male bondage between Judge Driscoll and Wilson stands out, given the major differences between them: whereas Judge Driscoll comes from the FFV, Scottish Wilson from the North; while the former has an adopted son, the latter is single with no family; the latter is considerably younger than the former. Despite the seeming lack of connections, Wilson and Judge Driscoll are both "free-thinker[s]" (25).[75] As John Carlos Rowe in "Murder, Money, and Manners" points out, Judge Driscoll behaves as "Wilson's protector and guarantor of his rights in town" (153). Consequently, Wilson understands Judge Driscoll's sufferings as his patron.

For example, the fact that Tom evades dueling with Luigi, one of the Italian twins, instead sues him makes Judge Driscoll so shocked that he faints: "The old man

[75] Rowe makes an important point: "Wilson and Judge Driscoll are both 'free-thinkers,' by which we assume they are mild agnostics, but 'free thinking' in general is mercilessly indicted in *The Gilded Age* as one of the sources for unchecked speculative 'instinct' (as Twain and Warner calls it) in modern industrial America" ("Murder" 150). If this is the case, this not only offers another evidence for the alliance between the North (Wilson) and the South (Judge Driscoll), but shows that Twain is critical of this complicity.

[Judge Driscoll] shrank suddenly together like one who has received a death-stroke. Howard sprang for him as he sank forward in a swoon, and took him in his arms, and bedded him on his back in the boat" (59). The fainting body of Judge Driscoll draws sympathy from his friends like Howard Pembroke and Wilson. Indeed, Wilson gets infuriated at Tom; "Tom, I am ashamed of you! I don't see how you could treat your good old uncle so. I am a better friend of his than you are" (62-63) "Well," Wilson continues, "he has been requiring you to fight the Italian and you have refused. You degenerate remnant of an honorable line! I'm thoroughly ashamed of you, Tom!" (63). Focusing on the antebellum South, Ryan L. Dearinger points out that "To Southern gentlemen, often statesmen, slave holders, lawyers, or professionals, dueling demonstrated uncompromising courage, stability, chivalry, calmness, under stress, and class superiority" (30). Strangely enough, however, Wilson himself is not a Southerner; he originally comes from the state of New York. Nevertheless, Wilson urges Tom to fight a duel with Luigi. His indignation recalls Judge Driscoll's own. At first, Judge Driscoll tries to fight Luigi on behalf of his nephew, but decides not to do so because he believes Tom's feigned talk that Luigi is an assassin. Wilson then stands up for Judge Driscoll: "The old man liked both of you. Tom conceived a hatred for you. That was enough; it turned the old man around at once. The oldest and strongest friendship must go to the ground when one of these late-adopted darlings throws a brick at it" (93). Interestingly, Wilson eloquently speaks for Judge Driscoll, as if he protects his own father. Despite the difference in their origins, Wilson deeply sympathizes and identifies with Judge Driscoll.

Thus, Twain's tacit but central concern in the midst of his critical commentary

on sentimental women is male sympathy toward other men. Indeed, this has been one of the consistent themes in Twain's novels: Tom Sawyer's compassion for the miserable death of the half-blooded villain Injun Joe in *Tom Sawyer*; Edward Tutor's sympathetic exchange with the pauper Tom Canty in *The Prince and the Pauper*; Huck's struggle with the moral dilemma between social conscience and his compassion for runaway slave Jim in *Huck Finn*. By the same token, Twain focuses on Wilson's pity for the doting father Judge Driscoll in this novel, which might recall Tom Sawyer's feeling for Injun Joe.

It is important to recognize, however, that in *Pudd'nhead Wilson* Twain is increasingly more critical of male sympathy than his previous novels. Unlike others, Wilson exemplifies the "new legal and scientific Northern" code, whereas Judge Driscoll does "white traditional white Southern code" (Gair 205). The sympathetic relation between Wilson (the new North) and Judge Driscoll (the old South) cooperatively reinforces the racism in the postbellum America. (Or to put it differently, as Rowe points out, Wilson is "the appropriate heir to the arbitrary authority represented by Judge Driscoll and the F.F.V.s" ("Murder" 153).) In this sense, by depicting Wilson achieving fame and prestige in Dawson's Landing, Twain warns of the rise of new racism in the United States at the turn of the twentieth century.

In this way, the ending of *Pudd'nhead Wilson* foregrounds the male alliance between the North and the South, as well as the triumph of the "fiction of law and custom" racially identifying a mixed race woman as a black person. Regardless, Roxana certainly plays a provocative role as a mixed race woman and serves as a subversive figure disrupting the male bonding and sentimentality.

Epilogue

In this dissertation, I have discussed Mark Twain's four major novels in terms of sentimentality and boundary-making: *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer* (1876), *The Prince and the Pauper* (1882), *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* (1885), and *Pudd'nhead Wilson* (1896). Recent studies have characteristically revised the established image of Twain's anti-sentimentalism to show that he was actually a sentimentalist. By contrast, my dissertation focuses on how his (anti-)sentimentalism works in his stories: the protagonists and major characters of his novels feel sympathy for others across social divides of race, gender, and class thereby drawing, redrawing, crossing, or erasing the boundaries between themselves and these others. In this respect, emotions like sympathy and sentimentality are closely linked with an imagined ability to cross social boundaries. My chapters have demonstrated how the subject formation of the protagonists in his novels occurs in the process of affective and ideological boundary-making or crossing through sympathy and sentimentality.

In my concluding remarks, I will first summarize my reading in each chapter, and then suggest how Twain's view of sentimentality and sympathy has evolved from his early to the late works. To this end, I will also mention *A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court* to clarify how Twain changed in this regard over time.

Chapter 1 "'Real Sentiment is a Very Rare & Godlike Thing': Sentimentality and the Question of Gender and Race in *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer*" has examined how the white boy's sympathy for the racial and sexual others functions in *Tom Sawyer*. While Tom and the narrator show their male sympathy toward the Native American antagonist Injun Joe who is condemned to death in the cave, the narrator caricatures the

townswomen collecting pardon petitions for Joe, and curiously remains silent about their motive. By analyzing his rhetoric of eloquence and reticence as a symptom, however, I not only showed that the women's sympathy might represent an affective mode of reason, but also that his own text ironically undermines the gendered binary of sentimentality.

In Chapter 2 "Father and Son: The Boundary of Race and the Question of Class in *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn,*" I have focused on how Huck coming from a poor white family draws boundaries in relation to Jim and Miss Watson. Asking whether or not he should help Jim in bondage in Chapter 31, he refers to his poor white background and accepts its stigma. This act of self-identification makes it possible for him to envision a form of solidarity with Jim, even if for a brief moment. In the final chapters of the novel, however, Twain depicts that this possible cross-racial solidarity turns out to be fragile as Tom and Huck join together to "rescue" Jim. At the same time, I have also argued that Tom's scheme to set Jim free also applies to Clemens himself to a certain degree, because he narrates the antebellum story in the postbellum era—just as Tom sets up a heroic rescue scheme, knowing that Jim was already freed.

In Chapter 3 "'I Wish We Could Hear of a Country That's Out of Kings': Social Hierarchy and Sympathy in *The Prince and The Pauper* and *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*," I have compared *The Prince and The Pauper* with *Huck Finn* in terms of sympathy and class positionality. By comparing Edward's sympathy in *The Prince and The Pauper* with the confidence men in *Huck Finn*, I have indicated that the king and duke, who try to fabricate a prestigious pedigree, represents a negative of *The Prince and The Pauper*. I have then shown that Huck and Jim express very different opinions

on monarchy and aristocracy, which indicates optimistic and pessimistic views on the United States as a republic and as a class society respectively. In so doing, I have argued that these polyphonic voices in *Huck Finn* can be taken as Twain's self-commentary on *The Prince and the Pauper*.

In Chapter 4 "Roxana Between Sentimental Novel and Slave Narrative: Race, Gender, and Genre in *Pudd'nhead Wilson"* I have shown how closely Roxana's dual roles in the novel are connected with character types in sentimental novels and slave narratives. First, I have explored how her maternal status is modeled after the mothers in nineteenth-century American sentimental novels. I have then examined how the elements of slave narratives are involved in her characterization as well. However, Twain closes the novel not as a sentimental one or a slave narrative, but as a detective story. By focusing on the sympathetic relation between Wilson expressive of the new North and Judge Driscoll of the old South, I have pointed out that they cooperatively reinforce the racism in the postbellum America.

This summary of the chapters suggests that Mark Twain has somehow changed his approach to sentimentality and sympathy over time. In the early days as a writer, Twain described positively the sympathy of the middle-class white male protagonists like Tom Sawyer, while showing antipathy toward the women performing a pardon petition for Injun Joe. However, Twain came to depict sympathy for and by those characters in minority positions, including the poor white boy, the African American man, or the mixed race mother. Furthermore, he showed doubt about sympathetic relations between Wilson and Judge Driscoll as shown in *Pudd'nhead Wilson*.
In this novel, Twain describes how the friendship between the Northern man and the

Southern gentleman functions to perpetuate racism in the postbellum America. Thus, although he once praised male sympathy as "real sentiment," Twain now criticizes the white middle class men's emotional bonding. At the same time, as a writer, he himself has come to show sympathy toward the marginal figures, such as Jim, Huck, and Roxana.

In this regard, Twain's 1889 novel *The Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court* best exemplifies how Twain comes to cast doubt on white man's *rational* sentimentality and sympathy toward others. Specifically, Hank Morgan's pity is associated with his desire to control people in Arthur's Court. In this sense Twain's representation of Hank's compassion is starkly contrasted with his earlier valorization of male sympathy in *Tom Sawyer*. In other words, whereas depicting Tom's sentimental response to Injun Joe's death as a rational and "*real* sentiment," in *Tom Sawyer*, Twain problematizes Hank Morgan's use of rational sentimentality in political affairs.

James M. Cox makes an interesting comparison between Tom and Hank. "The Yankee is in many ways Tom Sawyer grown up," he argues, "but Tom Sawyer grown up is alas, somehow grown down" (220). Hank, like Tom Sawyer, shows off by his use of an eclipse to make his British audience believe that he can blot out the sun. Just as Tom sympathizes with Becky and Injun Joe, Hank feels pity for people suffering from the oppression by the royalty and the Catholic church. In fact, Hank's project of sympathy even goes further than Tom's, because it does not remain as a personal sentiment, but aims at a large-scale social reform of the Arthurian world. As the novel ends up with a mass murder by Hank, however, his social reform based on sympathy turns out to be a dystopia. Twain's critical intent is clear in this regard. That is, Hank is a negative image

of Tom Sawyer.

When Hank Morgan appears in the novel, he takes pride in his practicality and rationality: "So I am a Yankee of the Yankees—and practical; yes, and nearly barren of sentiment, I suppose—or poetry, in other words" (4). Later, finding knight-errantry so absurd that he should abolish it, Hank calls himself "the champion of hard unsentimental common-sense and reason" (384). Thus, clearly opposing sentimentality against common-sense, practicality, and rationality, Hank insists that he is free from any sentimental elements.

As a matter of fact, however, the novel begins with Hank's felt ressentiment caused by the failure of his manhood. As Eve Sedgwick argues, "ressentiment" needs to be understood as a reaction to, and therefore a repression of, sentimentality. If this is the case, Hank's critique of sentimentality can be taken as a form of ressentiment.[76] As the superintendent of a Colt Arms machine shop in the nineteenth century Connecticut, Hank tries to differentiate himself from those men under him. He boasts that "I could make anything a body wanted—anything in the world" (20). His pride and emphasis on his productive power causes the enmity of the "rough men" (4) whom he supervises. He receives a severe blow from the fellow named "Heracles," symbolic of masculinity and warriorship, which sends him backward in time to the sixth-century England. Thus, the very beginning of the story indicates that Hank, failing to behave as the superintendent, falters in his manhood. Nevertheless, or precisely because of this, when the Yankee

[76] Eve Sedgwick makes a significant point on Friedrich Nietzsche: "Although the negative valuation attached to *ressentiment* per se—*ressentiment* under its own name—is one of the most consistent of Nietzsche's ethical judgments, it's nonetheless clear that his acuity as a psychologist of ressentimentality requires that he as well undergo subjection to its process" (169)

emerges into the Arthurian court, he tries to prove his manhood by reforming this world in the name of civilization and industrialism.

Significantly, Hank Morgan is driven by pity for the illiterate and oppressed peasants in the Arthurian world, trying to implement a series of social reform policies to improve the livelihood of the population. Here it is important to note that Twain's interest in the idea of social reform originated from his own personal experience with contemporary American business social circles. As Francesca Sawaya points out, from the 1880s onward, since the failure of his investment in the Paige Compositor, Samuel Clemens sought for patronage and financial supports from the business world. He thus came to develop his friendship with famous figures in this field, most notably Henry H. Rogers and Andrew Carnegie. In the process, Clemens had the opportunity to closely observe how the industrialists promoted the idea of philanthropy and social reform to legitimate corporate capitalism. In particular, Carnegie advocates "scientific philanthropy" in *Triumphant Democracy* (1886). In his memorial to the writer, Carnegie remembers Twain told him that "the idea of 'A Yankee at the Court of King Arthur' came from reading my first literary outburst written at high noon when the sun cast no shadow" (quoted in Sawaya 116). That is to say, *Connecticut Yankee* can be taken as Twain's response to his book. Indeed, as Sawaya argues, the novel "analyzes managerial capitalism's attempt to justify itself as a kind of social reform philanthropy by claiming it creates a meritocratic democracy" (115). In spite of his friendship with and debt to the entrepreneur, or perhaps because of this, Twain ironically dramatizes a catastrophic failure of Hank's philanthropy and social reform.

Hank's social reform based on modern science and technology attempts to

develop the economic system and improve the general welfare of the population. Unlike Carnegie's rather optimistic manifesto for American capitalism, however, *Connecticut Yankee* reveals that benevolent scientific philanthropy turns into a total disaster. In the ending of the novel, Hank's project ends up with a massacre of over twenty five thousand knights. In other words, Twain shows a paradox that Hank's well-meaning attempts at philanthropy and social reform lead to tyranny and atrocity. Indeed, from the beginning of the novel, Hank is torn between contradictory impulses: whereas he tries to emancipate the people from slavery, he, like the king and aristocrats, tries to exercise control over them. In contrast, Carnegie does not have a slightest doubt about his agenda, equating philanthropy and meritocracy with democracy. He firmly believed that managerial capitalism would promote prosperity and democracy. As Sawaya argues, however, Twain "suggests that by claiming to promote democracy through meritocracy, the "scientific philanthropy" of managerial capitalism authorizes its most violently antidemocratic acts" (117). Twain is deeply critical of the corporate capitalist notion of meritocracy, because it involves expert domination that is inherently authoritarian. In short, managerial capitalism tends to be antidemocratic and even aristocratic. By the same token, the author critically depicts Hank's use of modern technology, because it is directly linked with mass destruction, which uncannily anticipates the historic genocides in the twentieth century.[77] When he launches his high-tech mass murder, Hank exclaims: "I shot the current through all the fences and struck the wholes host dead in their tracks! There was a groan you could hear! It voiced the death-pang of eleven

[77] In this respect, Sawaya makes an important point: Twain's novel not only anticipates Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer's *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (1944), but shows that "managerial capitalism justifies and legitimizes such irrationality and violence as a form of social reform, as scientific philanthropy" (121).

thousand men. It swelled out on the night with awful pathos" (440). Here Twain depicts the extreme violence made possible by the use of modern technology, which does not bring about progress and welfare, but destruction and death. In this way, Twain comes to address the issue of knowledge, technology, and power, which is deeply connected with male domination. His critique of Hank's domination through knowledge and technology leads Twain to criticizing Wilson's triumph over Roxana with the science of fingerprints.

The episode of fifty-two boys suggests the failure of Hank's male-oriented sympathy and scientific philanthropy. I argue that these characters clearly show what the collapse of Hank's social reform might imply in terms of gender. The fifty-two boys appear in the context of fighting the aristocratic forces including the knights and the Catholic Church, which announces an interdict to him as long as Hank remains alive. Nevertheless Hank resists the Church by wielding influence over his subordinate Clarence and his fifty-two boys aged from fourteen to seventeen, who have grown up free from the Church's influence. The Yankee makes stronger efforts to train the "brightest young mind[s]" (120) in England. Nevertheless, when Hank tries to attack England, one of the boys begs not to be asked to do so: "Oh, sir, consider!—reflect!—these people are our people, they are bone of our bone, flesh of our flesh, we love them—do not ask us to destroy our nation!" (429). For Hank, who is interdicted, the knights are the enemy and nothing but the object of annihilation. However, from the point of view of the boys, their knights are the object of affection as well as hatred. Hank insists that they will be fighting not the populace but the military: "It is absolutely true that we shall have to fight nobody but these thirty thousand knights. Now speak,

and it shall be as you decide. Shall we avoid the battle, retire from the field?" (429). The boy's response of "NO!!!" sounds "unanimous and hearty" to Hank (430). By drawing the line between the military (knights) and the civilians, Hank persuades the boys to protect and rescue the latter from the former.

Through this episode, Twain addresses the male bonding between Hank and the youth. "The faithfulness of these boys," Sawaya mentions, "reminds us of the loyalty fostered by the intra-class welfare of the men's club of the time" (120). The homosocial camaraderie that accompanies Hank's violent social revolution is also shared by corporate capitalists. Interestingly enough, Hank depicts the boys agreeing with him as ones "[a]s pretty as girls, too" (430). We should not miss that the Yankee here silences and feminizes the boys. This gendered phrase also implies Hank's homoerotic feelings toward them. (Indeed, the male bonding between Hank and his boys reminds us of the Hitler Youth in Nazi Germany.) Thus, Hank's power operates by differentiating the thirty thousand knights from them, preserving homosocial and homoerotic bonds of sympathy among them, and cultivating his manhood by controlling them. In this respect, Hank's rhetoric, which creates a divide of us versus them, enables the boys to voluntarily die in the name of civilization. Hank thus succeeds in mobilizing his boys into the mission of mass destruction, which means the ultimate absurdity of his male-dominated, technological social reform.

Sandy is another case that indicates Hank's male-dominated social reform. On the one hand, his attitude toward Sandy presupposes a rather problematic gender dichotomy between men and women, with her representing nothing but backward irrationality and sentimentality. She becomes the object of his enlightenment and

indoctrination. In this respect, she is a victim of his scientific philanthropy. On the other hand, the ending of the novel dramatizes a complete reversal of this gender relationship between them. In his dream, Hank says he cannot live without Sandy, revealing his weak, effeminate, and sentimental feelings.

In the ending of the novel, however, Twain reexamines the protagonist's relationship with his wife as well as his own domesticity. As a result of being put under a spell by Merlin, Hank Morgan shall sleep for thirteen hundred years. The narrator finds Hank on his deathbed dreaming that Sandy is near him:

> "Yes, I seemed to have flown back out of that age into this of ours, and then forward to it again, and was set down, a stranger and forlorn in that strange England, with an abyss of thirteen centuries yawning between me and you! Between me and my home and my friends! between me and all that is dear to me, all that could make life worth the living! It was awful—awfuler than you can ever imagine, Sandy. Ah, watch by me, Sandy—stay by me every moment—don't let me go out of my mind again; death is nothing, let it come, but not with those dreams, not with the torture of those hideous dreams—I cannot endure that again....Sandy?..." (447).

Hank in his delirium admits that his social reform and massacre in the sixth-century England were nothing but a nightmare. By asking Sandy for her love and sympathy for him, Hank tries to endure the bad dreams. His delirium is very nostalgic and sentimental. For this reason, Cox argues that "*A Connecticut Yankee,* for all its hardheaded irreverence, succumbed to sentimentality" (202-203). On the contrary, Susan K. Harris positively points out:

> Hank's record of his emotional responses to his discoveries [about home] shows how central the image of domesticity was for a man threatened by forces that at any moment could move beyond his control . . . Hank finds his repose only in the figure of wife and child and the tiny community they represent. (*Mark Twain's Escape from Time* 58)

In other words, Hank comes to recognize how significant domesticity is for him.[78] Indeed, Hank's delirium shows his transformation from his obsession with rationality and manhood to his ultimate attachment to his family and feminized sentimentality.

Therefore, Mark Twain has totally changed his view of male sentimentality from *Tom Sawyer* to *Connecticut Yankee*. Whereas he praised his protagonist's rational sentimentality and sympathy as "*real* sentiment" in the former, Twain vehemently criticizes male sentimentality entangled with power, control, and violence in the latter. In other words, Twain comes to problematize men's obsession with rationality, knowledge, and technology, reconsidering male domesticity and sentimentality as shown by Hank. As it turns out, the author now applies the same kind of critique I have leveled against *Tom Sawyer* to Hank Morgan in *Connecticut Yankee*. Just as I have critically analyzed Tom and the narrator's sympathy for others, Twain now satirizes Hank's male-oriented and paternalistic rationalism. That is to say, Twain himself comes to raise fundamental doubts about his earlier point of view of white middle-class men.

In *Tom Sawyer* (1876), Mark Twain draws clear boundaries between white middle-class men and female and mixed-race characters, evaluating the former's sympathy in a positive way and downplaying the significance of women's. In contrast, *Connecticut Yankee* (1889) depicts how Hank's benevolence and philanthropy leads to violence and massacre. The author now comes to put into question the white middle-class men's rationality instrumental in governing and manipulating others in terms of race, gender, and class. In the meantime, *Huckleberry Finn* (1884) depicts the white

[78] Likewise, viewing the Yankee's delirium as sentimental or idealistic, Greg Camfield concludes that "the value Clemens puts in imagination places him firmly in the idealist side of the sentimental camp despite his fervent efforts to prove that sentimental conceptions of the human mind and morality are ultimately wrong" (163).

lower-class protagonist attempt at overcoming the racial boundaries, while *The Prince and the Pauper* (1883) narrates a fantasy about the sympathetic relation between the nobility and the poor. Finally, Twain dramatizes male sentimentality in *Pudd'nhead Wilson* (1894) resulting in new scientific racism, while depicting the "real sentiment" of the mixed race mother. Thus, Mark Twain has explored and deepened his novelistic presentations of the workings of sentimental boundaries throughout his major works.

Bibliography

Ammons, Elizabeth. "Heroines in *Uncle Tom's Cabin*." *American Literature* 49 (1977): 161-179. Web. 10 January 2015.

Arac, Jonathan. *Huckleberry Finn As Idol and Target: The Functions of Criticism in Our Time.* Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1997. Print.

Barnes, Elizabeth. *State of Sympathy: Seduction and Democracy in the American Novel.* New York: Columbia UP, 1997. Print.

Baym, Nina. *American Women Writers and the Work of History,* 1790-1860. New Jersey: Rutgers UP, 1995. Print.

Bederman Gail. *Manliness and Civilization; a Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880-1917*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1995. Print.

Berlant, Laura. *The Female Complaint: the Unfinished Business of Sentimentality in American Literature*. Durham: Duke UP, 2008. Print.

Bird, John. "And Then Think of *Me*!: *Huckleberry Finn* and Cognitive Dissonance." Clemens Conference. The Mark Twain Boyhood Home and Museum, Hannibal MO, 24 July 2015. Address.

Bolton, Charles C. *Poor Whites of the Antebellum South: Tenants and Laborers in Central North Carolina and Northeast Mississippi*. Durham: Duke UP, 1994. Print.

--- "Edward Isham and Poor White Labor in the Old South." *The Confessions of Edward Isham: A Poor White Life of the Old South*. Ed. Charles C Bolton and Scott P. Culclasure. Athens: U of Georgia P, 1998. 19-31. Print.

Boudreau, Kristin. *Sympathy in American Literature: American Sentiments from Jefferson to the Jameses.* Gainesville: UP of Florida, 2002. Print.

Brooks, James F. "Confounding the Color Line: Indian-Black Relations in Historical and Anthropological Perspective." *American Indian Quarterly* 22 (1998): 125-133. Web. 31 March, 2011.

Brooks, Van Wyck. *The Ordeal of Mark Twain*. New York: Dutton, 1920. Print.

Brown, David. "A Vagabond's Tale: Poor Whites, Herrenvolk Democracy, and the Value of Whiteness in the Late Antebellum South." *The Journal of Southern History*. Vol. LXXIX, No.4 (2013): 799-840. Web. 30 April 2014.

Brown, Harry J. *Injun Joe's Ghost: the Indian Mixed-Blood in the American Writing*. Columbia: U of Missouri P, 2004. Print.

Brown, William Hill. *The Power of Sympathy*. 1789. *The Power of Sympathy and the Coquette.* By William Hill Brown and Hannah Webster Foster. New York: Penguin, 1996. Penguin.

Camfield, Gregg. *Sentimental Twain: Samuel Clemens in the Maze of Moral Philosophy*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1994.

Caron, James Edward. *Mark Twain, Unsanctified Newspaper Reporter*. Colombia, U of Missouri P, 2008. Print.

Chadwick-Joshua, Jocelyn. *Jim's Dilemma: Reading Race in* Huckleberry Finn. Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 1998. Print.

Chapman, Mary and Glenn Hendler, eds. *Sentimental Men: Masculinity and the Politics of Affect in American Culture*. Berkley: U of California P, 1999. Print.

Clark, Susan. *Sentimental Modernism: Women Writers and the Revolution of the Word.* Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1991. Print.

Cox, James M. *Mark Twain: The Fate of Humor*. 1966. Missouri: U of Missouri P, 1992. Print.

Cummings, Maria Susanna. *The Lamplighter*. 1854. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1995. Print.

Davidson, Cathy N. *Revolution and the Word: the Rise of he Novel in America*. 1986. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004.

Dawson, Hugh J. "The Ethnicity of Huck Finn—and the Difference It Makes." *American Literary Realism, 1870-1910.* Vol. 30, No 2 (1998): 1-16. Web. 17 February 2015.

Dearinger, Ryan. L. "Masculinity, Image, and Reality on the Antebellum Frontier." Indiana Magazine of History. Vol.100, No1 (2004): 26-55. Web. 2 August, 2018.

DeVoto, Bernard. *Mark Twain's America*. 1932. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1997. Print.

Dobson, Joanne. "Reclaiming Sentimental Literature." *American Literature* 69 (1997): 263-88. Web. April 23, 2004.

Douglas, Ann. *The Feminization of American Culture*. 1977. New York: Noonday, 1998. Print.

Douglass, Frederick. *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass, An American Slave*. 1845. New York. Penguin, 1982. Print.

Doyno, Victor. A. *Writing Huck Finn: Mark Twain's Creative Process*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1991. Print.

Ellison Julie. *Cato's Tears and the Making of Anglo-American Emotion*. Chicago. U of Chicago P, 1999. Print.

Ellison, Ralph. "Change the Joke and Slip the Yoke," *Partisan Review* 25 (Spring 1958):212-22. Rpt. In Ellison, *Shadow and Act*,53-65. New York: Random House, 1995.Print.

Fiedler. Leslie A. *Love and Death in the American Novel*. 1960. Illinois: Dalkey Archive Press, 1997. Print.

Fisch, Audrey A. "Introduction." *The Cambridge Companion to African American Slave Narrative*. Ed. Audrey A. Fisch. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007. 1-7. Print.

Fishkin, Sally Fisher. *Lighting Out for the Territory: Reflections on Mark Twain and American Culture*. New York: Oxford UP, 1998. Print.

---. "Mark Twain and Women." *The Cambridge Companion to Mark Twain*. Ed. Forrest G. Robinson. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995. 52-73. Print.

---. *Was Huck Black? Mark Twain and African American Voices*. New York: Oxford UP, 1993. Print.

Fliegelman, Jay. *Prodigals and Pilgrims: The American Revolution against Patriarchal Authority. 1750-1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1982. Print.

Forret, Jeff. *Race Relations at the Margins: Slaves and Poor Whites in the Antebellum Southern Countryside*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 2006. Print.

Foster, Hannah Webster. *The Coquette, or The History of Eliza Wharton.*1799. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1984. Print.

Gazaille, Brian A. "Making a Mill of a Mouth More Productive: Efficiency and Linguistic Management in twain's *Connecticut Yankee*." *American Literary Realism* 47 (2014): 55-70. Web. June 23 2017.

Gilman, Susan. *Dark Twins: Imposture and Identity in Mark Twain's America*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1989. Print.

---. "The Mulatto, Tragic or Triumphant?: The Nineteenth-Century American Race Melodrama." Ed. Shirley Samuels. *The Culture of Sentiment: Race, Gender, and Sentimentality in 19th Century America.* Oxford: Oxford UP, 1992. 221-243. Print.

Gould, Philip. "The Rise, Development, and Circulation of the Slave Narrative." Ed. Fisch, Audrey. *The Cambridge Companion to the African American Slave Narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007. 11-27. Print.

Hartman, Saidiya V. *Scenes of Subjection: Terror, Slavery, and Self-Making in Nineteenth-Century America*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1997. Print.

Harris, Susan K. "Harriet Beecher Stowe." *The Mark Twain Encyclopedia.* Ed. J. R, LeMaster and James D. Wilson. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1993. 716-718. Print.

---. *Mark Twain's Escape from Time: A Study of Patterns and Images.* Columbia: U of Missouri P, 1982. Print.

Hendler, Glenn. *Public Sentiments: Structures of Feeling in Nineteenth-Century American Literature.* Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 2001. Print.

Howard June. "What is Sentimentality?" *American Literary History* 11 (1999): 63-81. Web. April 23, 2004.

Howe, Lawrence. *Mark Twain and the Novel: The Double-Cross of Authority.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998. Print.

Hsu, Hsuan L. "Vagrancy and Comparative Racialization in *Huckleberry Finn* and 'Three Vagabonds of Trinidad'." *American Literature* 81 (2009): 687-717. Web. 20 March 2011.

Ignatiev, Noel. *How the Irish Became White.* New York: Routledge, 1995. Print.

Ikoma, Kumi. "From Suffering Women to Suffering Men: A Genealogy of Sentimentality." *Metropolitan* 52 (2008): 51-71. Print.

Isenberg, Nancy. *White Trash: The 400-Year Untold History of Class in America*. New York: Viking, 2016.

Isham, Edward. "Autobiography of Edward Isham, Alias 'Hardaway Bone.'" *The Confessions of Edward Isham: A Poor White Life of the Old South*. Ed. Charles C. Bolton and Scott P. Culclasure. Athens: U of Georgia P, 1998. 1-18. Print.

Jacobs, Harriet. *Incidents in the Life of a Slave Girl*. 1861. New York: Dover, 2001. Print.

James, Henry. *The Bostonians*. 1886. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1984. Print.

Jehlen, Myra. "Race and Sex in *Pudd'nhead Wilson.*" *Mark Twain's Pudd'nhead Wilson: Race, Conflict, and Culture*. Ed. Susan Gillman and Forrest G. Robinson. Durham: Duke UP, 1990. 105-20. Print.

Jones, Gavin. *American Hungers: The Problem of Poverty in U.S. Literature, 1840-1945*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2009. Print.

Kaplan, Amy. "Manifest Domesticity. " *American Literature* 70 (1998): 581-606. Web. September 12, 2002.

Kaplan, Fred. *Sacred Tears: Sentimentality in Victorian Literature*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1987. Print.

Kaplan, Justin. *Mr. Clemens and Mark Twain: A Biography*. 1966. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2006. Print.

Katz, William Loren. *Black Indians: A Hidden Heritage*. New York: Atheneum Books, 1986. Print.

Kete, Mary Louise. *Sentimental Collaborations; Mourning and Middle-Class Identity in Nineteenth-Century America*. Durham: Duke UP, 2000. Print.

Kimmel, Michael S. *Manhood in America: A Cultural History*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006. Print.

Kiskis, J Michael. "Mark Twain and the Tradition of Literary Domesticity." *Constructing Mark Twain—New Directions in Scholarship*. Ed. Laura E Skandera Trombley and Michael J. Kiskis. Columbia: U of Missouri P, 2001. Print.

Knoper, Randall. *Acting Naturally: Mark Twain in the Culture of Performance*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1995. Print.

Krauth, Leland. *Mark Twain & Company: Six Literary Relations*. Athens: U of Georgia P, 2003. Print.

---. *Proper Mark Twain*. Athens: U of Georgia P, 1999. Print.

---. "The Victorian of Southwestern Humor." *The Humor of the Old South*. Ed. M. Thomas Inge and Edward J. Piacentino. Lexington: U of Kentucky P, 2001. Print.

LeMaster J. R. and David Haines Jr. "The Duke and the Dauphin." *The Mark Twain Encyclopedia.* Ed. J. R, LeMaster and James D. Wilson. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1993. Print. 234-235.

Leonard, James S., Thomas Tenney, and Thadious M. Davis. *Satire or Evasion?: Black Perspectives on* Huckleberry Finn. Durham: Duke UP, 1991. Print.

Lewis, R.W.B. *American Adam; Innocence, Tragedy and Tradition in the Nineteenth Century*. Chicago: Chicago UP, 1959. Print. 222-235. Print.

Lott, Eric. "Mr. Clemens and Jim Crow: Twain, Race, and Blackface." *The Cambridge Companion of Mark Twain.* Ed. Forrest G. Robinson. New York: Cambridge UP, 1995. Print.

Marx, Leo. *The Machine in the Garden: Technology and the Pastoral Ideal in America*. 1964. New York. Oxford UP, 2000. Print.

Matthiessen, F.O. "Method and Scope." Ed by. Harold Bloom. *The American Renaissance.* New York: Chelsea House, 2004. Print. 41-50.

McCoy, Sharon D. "'Fiction of Law and Custom': Personhood under Law and Social Status in *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* and *The Tragedy of Pudd'nhead Wilson*." Clemens Conference. The Mark Twain Boyhood Home and Museum, Hannibal MO, 24 July 2015. Address.

---. "No Evading the Jokes: *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, Mark Twain, and Male Friendship Across Racial and Class Lines." *The Mark Twain Annual*, Vol.12 (2014): 46-69. Web. 3 August 2015.

Minges, Patrick. "Introduction." *Black Indian Slave Narratives*. Winston-Salem: John F. Blair, 2004. xv-xxiii. Print.

Moore, Andy J. "Arthur Conan Doyle." Eds. J.R. LeMaster and James D. Wilson. *The Mark Twain Encyclopedia*. New York: Garland Publishing, Ing, 1993. Print.

Morris, Linda A. *Gender Play in Mark Twain: Cross-Dressing and Transgression*. Columbia: U of Missouri P, 2007. Print.

Morrison, Toni. *Beloved.* New York: Vintage International, 2004. Print.

---. "Introduction." *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn.* Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996, XXXI-XLI. Print.

---. *Playing in the Dark: Whiteness and the Literary Imagination.* London: Picador, 1993. Print.

Naylor, Celia. E. *African Cherokees in Indian Territory From Chattel to Citizens*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 2008. Print.

Noble, Marianne. *The Masochistic Pleasures of Sentimental Literature*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2000. Print.

Northup, Solomon. *Twelve Years a Slave*. 1853. New York: Norton, 2017. Print.

Owen, Louis. *Mixedblood Messages: Literature, Film, Family, Place.* Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1998. Print.

Oxford English Dictionary Online. June 2018. http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/view/Entry/176056?redirectedFrom=sentiment#eid. Accessed 7 July, 2018.

Panek, Leroy Lao. *An Introduction to the Detective Story*. Bowling Green: Bowling Green State University Popular Press, 1987. Print.

Parille, Ken. "'The Medicine of Sympathy' Mothers, Sons, and Affective Pedagogy in Antebellum America." *Sentimentalism in Nineteenth-Century America*. Ed. Mary G. De Jong. Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2013.29-45. Print.

Patton, Venetria K. *Women in Chains; the Legacy of Slavery in Black Women's Fiction*. Albany: SUNY Press, 2000. Print.

Pettit, Arthur G. *Mark Twain and the South*. Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1974. Print.

Porter, Carolyn. "Roxana's Plot." *Mark Twain's Pudd'nhead Wilson: Race, Conflict, and Culture*. Ed. Susan Gillman and Forrest G. Robinson. Durham: Duke UP, 1990. 105-20. Print.

Powers, Ron. *Mark Twain: A Life.* London: Pocket Books, 2006. Print.

Rasmussen, R. Kent Ed. *Dear Mark Twain: Letters From His Readers.* Berkley: U of California P, 2013. Print.

Revard, Carter. "Why Mark Twain Murdered Injun Joe—and Will Never Be Indicted." *Massachusetts Review* 40.4 (1999/2000): 643-670. Web. 10 April 2006.

Robinson, Forrest G. *In Bad Faith: The Dynamics of Deception in Mark Twain's America*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1992. Print.

---. *The Author-Cat: Clemens's Life in Fiction*. New York: Fordham UP, 2007. Print.

---. "The Characterization of Jim in Huckleberry Finn." *Nineteenth-Century Literature.* 43.3 (1988): 361-391. Web. 9 April 2013.

Roediger. David R. *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class.* New York: Verso, 1991. Print.

---. *Working Toward Whiteness: How America's Immigrants Became White: The Strange Journey from Ellis Island to the Suburbs*. New York: Basic Books, 2006. Print.

Rogin, Michael. "Francis Galton and Mark Twain": The Natal Autograph in *Pudd'nhead Wilson*." *Mark Twain's Pudd'nhead Wilson: Race, Conflict, and Culture*. Ed. Susan Gillman and Forrest G. Robinson. Durham: Duke UP, 1990. 73-85. Print.

Romero, Lora. *Home Fronts: Domesticity and Its Critics in the Antebellum United States.* Durham: Duke UP, 1997.

Rotundo, E. Anthony. *American Manhood: Transformations in Masculinity from the Revolution to the Modern Era*. New York: Basic Books. 1993. Print.

---. "Murder, Money, and Manners in *Pudd'nhead Wilson*." *Mark Twain's Pudd'nhead Wilson: Race, Conflict, and Culture*. Ed. Susan Gillman and Forrest G. Robinson. Durham: Duke UP, 1990. 137-154. Print.

Sawaya, Francesca. *Modern Women, Modern Work: Domesticity, Professionalism, and American Writing, 1890-1950*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2004. Print.

---. *The Difficult Art of Giving: Patronage, Philanthropy, and the American Literary Market*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2014. Print.

Sedgwick, Catharine Maria. *A New England Tale*. 1822. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1995. Print.

Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. *Epistemology of the Closet*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1990. 2001. Print.

Simpson, J.A., and E.S. C. Weiner. *The Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1989. Print.

Skandera-Trombley, Laura E. *Mark Twain in the Company of Women.* Philadelphia: U of Philadelphia P, 1994. Print.

Slimkin, John. "House Slaves." *Slavery in United States*. Spartacus Educational Publishers, 2014. Digital.

Smith, Adam. *The Theory of Moral Sentiments.* 1759. New York: Prometheus Books, Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1997. Print.

Smith, Henry Nash. *Mark Twain: The Development of a Writer*. Cambridge: The Belknap P of Harvard U, 1962. Print.

Stahl, J.D. *Mark Twain, Culture and Gender: Envisioning America Through Europe.* Athens: U of Georgia P, 1994.

Stern, Julia. *The Plight of Feeling: Sympathy and Dissent in the Early American Novel.* Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1997. Print.

Stoneley, Peter. *Mark Twain and the Feminine Aesthetics*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992. Print.

Stowe, Harriet Beecher. *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. 1852. Ed. Elizabeth Ammons. New York: Norton, 1994. Print.

Sugimura, Atsushi. "'Heavenly War-Paint': Mark Twain's Courtship and His Suppressed Identity as a Southerner." *Studies in English Literature* 57 (2016): 41-58. Print.

Takeuchi, Yasuhiro. “Twain’s Trauma and the Unresolved Murder of Huckleberry Finn’s Father.” *Literary Imagination*. Vol. 15 (2013) : 259-274. Web, February 14, 2014.

Tennenhouse, Leonard. “Libertine America.” *Differences*. Vol. 11.3 (1999/2000): 1-28. Web, August 30, 2004.

Tompkins, Jane. *Sensational Designs: The Cultural Work of American Fiction, 1790-1860*. New York: Oxford UP, 1986. Print.

Twain, Mark. *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. 1885. Ed. Thomas Cooley. 3rd ed. New York: Norton, 1998. Print.

---. *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. 1885. Ed. Victor Fisher, Lin Salamo. California: U of California P, 2003. Print.

---. *Autobiography of Mark Twain Volume* 2. Berkeley: U of California P, 2010. Print.

---. *A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur’s Court*. 1889. Ed. Bernard L. Stein. Berkeley: U of California P, 1979. Print.

---. “A Double-Barreled Detective Story.” 1902. *The Complete Short Stories of Mark Twain.* New York: Bantam Books, 1990. 426-471. Print.

---. “A True Story: Repeated Word for Word As I Heard It.” 1874. *The Complete Short Stories of Mark Twain*. New York: Bantam Books, 1990, 94-98. Print.

---. “Eve’s Diary.” 1906. *How Nancy Jackson Married Kate Wilson.* Ed. John Cooley. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 2001. 181-197. Print.

---. “Huck Finn and Tom Sawyer Among the Indians.” 1969. Ed. Dahlia Armon, Walter Blair, et al. *Huck Finn and Tom Sawyer Among the Indians and Other Unfinished Stories.* Berkeley: U of California P, 2011. 33-81. Print.

---. *Life on the Mississippi.* 1883. New York: Penguin, 1984. Print.

---.“SLC to William Bowen, 31 Auf 1876, Elmira N.Y. (UCCL 01360).” *Mark Twain Letters, 1876–80*. Ed. Michael B. Frank and Harriet Elinor Smith. *Mark Twain Project Online*. Berkley: U to California P. 2007. Web, January 27, 2010.

---.*Mark Twain’s Letters to His Publishers 1867-1894*. Ed. Hamlin Hill. Berkeley: U of California P, 1967. Print.

---. “My Military History.” 1877. *Mark Twain: Collected Tales, Sketches, Speeches, & Essays 1852-1890*. New York: The Library of America, 1992, 679-682. Print.

---. *Personal Recollections of Joan of Arc.* 1896. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996. Print.

---. *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer*. 1876. Ed. John C. Gerber. Berkeley: U of California P, 1980. Print.

---. *The Autobiography of Mark Twain.* Ed. Charles Neider. New York: HarperCollins, 1990. Print.

---. *The Prince and the Pauper*. 1882. Ed. Victor Fischer and Lin Salamo. Berkeley: U of California P, 1984. Print.

---. "To Jennie." *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. 1885. Ed. Victor Fisher, Lin Salamo. California: U of California P, 2003. 306. Print.

---. "To Mollie." *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. 1885. Ed. Victor Fisher, Lin Salamo. California: U of California P, 2003. 306. Print.

---. "Tom Sawyer's Conspiracy." 1897-1900. *Huck Finn and Tom Sawyer Among the Indians and Other Unfinished Stories*. Berkley: U of California P, 1989. 134-213. Print.

---. *Tom Sawyer, Detective*. 1896. *Tom Sawyer Abroad/ Tom Sawyer, Detective.* Berkley: U of California P, 1982. 107-177. Print.

---. *The Tragedy of Pudd'nhead Wilson; and Those Extraordinary Twins*. 1894.Ed. Sidney E. Berger. New York: Norton, 1980. Print.

---. "Was It Heaven? Or Hell?" 1902. *The Complete Short Stories of Mark Twain*. New York: Bantam Books, 1990, 474-491. Print.

---. "Ye Sentimental Law Student." *Mark Twain: Collected Takes, Sketches, Speeches, and Essays 1852-1890*. New York: Library of America, 1992. 25-27. Print.

Warner, Susan. *The Wide, Wide World.* 1850. New York: Feminist Press, 1987. Print.

Wayne, Tiffany K. *Woman's Roles in Nineteenth-Century America*. Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 2007. Print.

Weinstein, Cindy. *Family, Kinship, and Sympathy in Nineteenth-Century American Literature.* New York; Cambridge UP, 2004. Print.

---. "The Slave Narrative and Sentimental Literature." Ed. Audrey Fisch. *The Cambridge Companion to the African American Slave Narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007. 115-134. Print.

Weir, Robert E. “Mark Twain and Social Class.” *A Historical Guide to Mark Twain*. Ed. Shelly Fisher Fishkin. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2002. Print.

Wexler, Laura. “Tender Violence: Literary Eavesdropping, Domestic Fiction, and Educational Reform.” *The Culture of Sentiment—Race, Gender, and Sentimentality in 19th America*. Ed. Shirley Samuels. New York: Oxford UP, 1992. 9-38. Print.

Wilson, Harriet E. *Our Nig or, Sketches from the Life of a Free Black.* 1859. New York; Penguin, 2009. Print.

Wolff, Cynthia Griffin. “*The Adventures of Tom Sawyer*: The Nightmare Vision of American Boyhood.” *Massachusetts Review* 21 (1980) 637-52. Web. 10 April 2006.

Wray, Matt. *Not Quite White: White Trash and the Boundaries of Whiteness*. Durham: Duke UP, 2006. Print.

Žižek, Slavoj. *Tarrying with the Negative: Kant, Hegel, and the Critique of Ideology*. Durham: Duke UP, 1993.