A Critical Guide to the Life and Literature of Mark Twain

Tim Horton
Neha Anand

A Critical Guide to the Life and Literature of Mark Twain

Tim Horton
Neha Anand

A Critical Guide to the Life and Literature of Mark Twain

Tim Horton
Neha Anand

Dominant
Publishers & Distributors Pvt Ltd
New Delhi, INDIA

Knowledge is Our Business

A CRITICAL GUIDE TO THE LIFE AND LITERATURE OF MARK TWAIN
By Tim Horton, Neha Anand

This edition published by Dominant Publishers And Distributors (P) Ltd
4378/4-B, Murarilal Street, Ansari Road, Daryaganj,
New Delhi-110002.

ISBN: 978-81-78885-86-5

Edition: 2022 (Revised)

Dominant
Publishers & Distributors Pvt Ltd

Registered Office: 4378/4-B, Murari Lal Street, Ansari Road,
Daryaganj, New Delhi - 110002.
Ph. +91-11-23281685, 41043100, Fax: +91-11-23270680

Production Office: "Dominant House", G - 316, Sector - 63, Noida,
National Capital Region - 201301.
Ph. 0120-4270027, 4273334

e-mail: dominantbooks@gmail.com
info@dominantbooks.com

w w w . d o m i n a n t b o o k s . c o m

CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

UNVEILING THE POWER OF CRITICAL THINKING: A JOURNEY INTO LOGIC AND SOUND DECISION-MAKING

Neha Anand, Assistant Professor
College of Engineering, TeerthankerMahaveer University, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id- nehaanand002@gmail.com

ABSTRACT:
In a world where information is continuously changing, people are frequently deterred from looking for the answers to their queries out of fear of coming out as ignorant. This lack of curiosity prevents one from learning new things and developing personally. This book explores the field of critical thinking, breaking down its numerous facets and illuminating its crucial function in our daily lives. Analytical, creative, and strategic thought are just a few of the many cognitive processes that fall under the umbrella of critical thinking. Analytical thinking is dissecting complicated ideas into their component elements and understanding how they interact. It is a foundational concept in several industries, including academics and crime scene investigation. On the other side, creative thinking promotes releasing mental restrictions in order to create original answers. Strategic thinking is useful in everyday activities like job hunting and event planning since it centers on setting and attaining goals. Critical thinking is fundamentally the thorough testing of concepts both ones that are self-generated and those that are acquired from others against predetermined criteria. It demands careful evaluation and self-evaluation during the decision-making process. This book tries to debunk popular misconceptions regarding the difficulty and innateness of logic and critical thinking. Logic is a process for arriving at justifiable conclusions, not an abstract idea. Better judgements result from conclusions that are supported by appropriate evidence and are justified. This book clarifies the value of logic as a tool for rational decision-making, enabling readers to develop their critical thinking abilities and enrich their lives.

KEYWORDS:

Critical Thinking, Decision-Making, Logic, Strategic.

INTRODUCTION

Critical thinkers exercise a healthy dose of skepticism, thoroughly research their information sources, and base their choices on logic. When faced with important life decisions, the necessity of critical thinking becomes clear. People can distinguish between decisions that are based in reason and those that are influenced by emotion by exercising critical thought. It entails posing precise queries, separating pertinent information from unnecessary data, and identifying reliable sources from dishonest ones. While important, emotions can impair judgement and cause a person to make bad decisions. Clarity and trust in judgement are provided through critical thinking that is based on logical reasoning. It gives people the skills they need to stand up for what they believe in, deal with ambiguity, and guard against deception. Contrary to popular belief, the ability to think logically is a skill that can be learned.

Realizing the importance of reason and accepting intellectual humility are key components of developing a critical and logical outlook. It's a trip that results in a more contented existence, more self-assurance, and the capacity for wise decision-making. Logic is the study of reasoning that leads to justifiable conclusions, according to this definition. In a manner similar to how a properly executed search warrant distinguishes between legal and illegal

behaviours, it offers a mechanism for differentiating well-founded judgements from unfounded assumptions. People can improve their capacity to make decisions that are in line with logic and facts by studying the fundamentals of sound thinking, which will ultimately result in a more certain and satisfying existence. It is impossible to stress the importance of critical thinking in a world where there are innumerable options and difficulties. It makes it easier for us to make sense of difficult situations, separate out opposing counsel, and confidently choose our own routes [1], [2].

Sometimes individuals are reluctant to inquire because they fear doing so will make them appear uninformed to others. But the only way to learn new things and better grasp what other people are trying to teach you is to admit when you don't know something. Different people have different ideas of what critical thinking is. Most of the time, individuals take bits and pieces of these viewpoints and continue with their vague and perhaps contradictory assumptions of what critical thinking might be. The essential significance of pursuing the truth is one of the concepts we shall cover in this book, though. In order to better comprehend what is meant by the word critical thinking, let's break it down.First off, there are many different cognitive processes that can be referred to as thinking, and there are undoubtedly numerous ways to think. We are capable of critical, creative, and strategic thought. When we think analytically, we look at the full thing we are looking atit could be a phrase, a circumstance, or a scientific phenomenon and try to figure out what makes it up. The next stage is to look at each component in turn and comprehend how it interacts with the others. For instance, in order to better comprehend what the term critical thinking means as a whole, we are currently looking at the definitions of each word in the phrase.

The majority of academic, scientific, and legal fields including crime scene investigation use analytical thinking. However, you use analytical thinking more frequently than you may realises in daily life. Consider a situation when you were perplexed by someone else's comment. You might have made an effort to recall the initial circumstance before analysing the language used, the context, the speaker's attitude, and the topic of the comment. Analytical thinking involves identifying the various components and considering how they relate to one another and how they work together to form the total.Unlike when we think analytically, when we think creatively, we are not as concerned with the connections between the parts and their wholes. Instead, we strive to free our thoughts from all restrictions, including laws and customs. Instead, our tools are creativity and originality. Consider a scenario where you are cooking but lack some of the items listed in the recipe. If you start using your imagination, you'll start looking for items in your cupboard and refrigerator that can fill in for the missing ingredients. But to achieve this, you must abandon the expected result of the recipe and think in a different way.

When we think strategically, our priority is to first create a master plan of action, which is then divided into more manageable objectives that are arranged to support our outcomes. For instance, doing a job search requires careful planning. You must determine application deadlines, ask for letters of recommendation, and create your resume and cover letter, among other things. Going grocery shopping or wedding planning are both potential examples of activities in your life where you might apply strategic thinking[3], [4]Instead, it refers to the practise of rigorously scrutinising the ideas and views we receive from others as well as those we develop on our own, and only adopting those that adhere to certain standards. While there are many ways to define critical thinking, we will define it as the practise of meticulous assessment and self-assessment in the process of making judgements. Therefore, when we think critically, we turn into the watchful defenders of the calibre of our thinking.

DISCUSSION

The critical in the term critical thinking simply denotes a healthy amount of scepticism. This means that even when the information comes from close friends or is supported by facts that seem plausible, critical thinkers may not automatically accept what they read or hear from others. Critical thinkers investigate the sources of their information instead. They conduct their own independent research if none are provided if the sources are suspect. Most significantly, critical thinkers rely on logic to make decisions. Always ask yourself what is unclear, not understood, or unknowable as a critical thinker. Since you cannot make sound judgements about things you do not comprehend or know, this is the first step in critical thinking.

The Value of Critical Thought

Why does critical thinking matter to you? What does it have to offer you? Imagine you have to decide on anything crucial, such as your future career, the person you might want to spend the rest of your life with, your financial investments, or another essential issue. What things might you think about? You could question whether you even need to consider it or whether you should simply follow your heart, as the proverb goes. By doing this, you are already making it clear if your choice was made solely on the basis of logic, emotion, or a combination of the two. By following this procedure, you are already using critical thought. You started out by posing queries. After looking over the responses, you would determine whether this knowledge is sufficient and possibly move on to further research from dependable sources. Note that you are drawing distinctions in each of these steps: You would separate relevant questions from irrelevant ones, and among the relevant questions, you would pick out the ones that are clear and exact from the rest. Additionally, you would separate the useful answers from the unhelpful ones. Finally, you would filter the reliable sources from the faulty and biassed ones for your research.

Making distinctions affects how your exam will proceed as well, and here is where critical thinking and logic are related. If you choose to consider the strongest arguments for each of the available possibilities, your decision will lead you in the direction of logic. The evaluation of the evidence is a component of logical reasoning. You must decide which aspects you deem favourable and which you consider unfavorable before making a significant decision. Think about the situation that follows. You have one year left to earn your business degree. But you can't help but sense that you're not made out for business. According to your research, a business major is useful and can open up a lot of doors for well-paying employment. The use or analysis of quantitative methods, however, which appears to be essential to the majority of employment in the corporate world, is not something you find enjoyable. Many might ask for guidance from close friends or family members who they can trust and who know them well enough to supposedly be able to recommend the best course of action. But even those closest to us can offer contradicting counsel. A wise parent could warn out that changing majors with only one year left would be unnecessary and possibly dangerous. A friend with hindsight would observe that the years spent studying business could be seen as an investment in one's own self-discovery, one that prevented years of unhappiness after graduation. Critical thinking and logical reasoning can assist you in these instances in order to separate conflicting factors and prevent rash decisions [5], [6].

Every one of us encounters a crossroads at some point in our life, and the decision we make will affect the course of the rest of our lives. Some people use their feelings to guide their decisions. Of course, it's difficult to discount the influence of feelings. A favourite toy, a first love, or a difficult loss are examples of events or items in our life that we remember more

clearly. Many people consider gut instincts to be revelations of what they should do. Thus, it is simple to believe that feelings can guide us to the truth. Emotions can indeed shed light on occurrences that might otherwise be hidden. For instance, empathy enables us to acknowledge or share the emotions of others. The issue is that emotions are unreliable sources of knowledge on their own. Emotions can only point you in the direction of what seems right or wrong; they cannot, however, prove that what feels right or wrong is indeed the correct or wrong thing to do. For instance, selfish behaviour, theft, and lying are all behaviours that might make us feel good because they serve our selfish objectives. Forgiving someone or asking for their forgiveness, on the other hand, can feel improper because these actions can generate feelings of humiliation, vulnerability, and embarrassment. Emotions may serve to undermine our best judgement. For instance, we frequently fall for the emotional allure of a politician's speech and are duped by fake demonstrations of friendliness and even devotion.The ideal option is the path indicated by logical reasoning, which is the main method for cultivating critical thinking. This book's goal is to teach you how to use this useful tool. What's in it for me? may be a question on your mind. The peace of mind that comes from knowing that your choices are supported by reason rather than just whim or emotion is the first benefit that you may expect to experience. Despite how powerful your own emotional barometer is, you could always be unsure of your decision and may not realise it until it is too late. Additionally, going down the emotional path won't help you gain confidence in your own judgements when faced with ambiguity. In contrast, if you have the ability to reason logically, you may live the life you choose rather than the life that just occurs to you. This ability alone has the ability to separate a happy existence from an unhappy one. Gains in practical abilities such as the capacity to defend your opinions without feeling frightened or inadequate and the capacity to defend yourself against manipulation and deception come from mastering critical thinking. You will benefit from this, and this is just the beginning.It should be obvious by this point that the ability to think critically is a crucial life skill that will significantly affect our daily lives. To be a critical thinker, one need not be lucky or have a certain disposition. Anyone can become proficient in critical thinking. So how does one develop critical thinking skills? Logical reasoning was referred to earlier in the chapter as the primary instrument for critical thinking. Recognising the significance of reason as the filter for your views and behaviours is therefore the first and most important step in developing critical thinking skills. After completing this, you will be in the proper state of mind to begin learning about logic and recognising the logic-related tools at your disposal.

It's also crucial to remember that intellectual modesty is a requirement for developing critical thinking skills. Because we consider the pursuit of truth as a much higher and more rewarding good than the pursuit of being right, we might understand intellectual modesty as the readiness to restrain our egos. Critical thinkers are not concerned with winning favour by attempting to prove their accuracy. They do not believe that dissent indicates a deficiency in knowledge or understanding. Knowing that we can make mistakes and still have a lot to learn is part of intellectual humility. We can be truly free to experience life as richly and satisfactorily as a human being can if we are aware that we are bound to make mistakes and that we will benefit when we recognise them; willing to break old habits and embrace change; and, perhaps most importantly, genuinely willing to know what others think. Given how crucial logic is to critical thinking, it makes sense that we should look at what logic is. Before we begin, we must bust several myths that people have about this assignment because it is not as simple as it may seem [7], [8].

The first falsehood is that humans do not typically demonstrate a command of logic. They are known as the eggheads, geeks, or nerds in American slang because they are intelligent yet struggle to connect with others. These people frequently lack empathy, social charisma, or

emotional expressiveness. They lack the complex combination of traits that people truly possess and are merely logical. Vulcans, for example, are beings who suppress all emotions in favour of reasoning because they believe that emotions are hazardous, and they are logically endowed characters on the Star Trek series. Some viewers may find logic rather revolting because to the Vulcans' actions, which seem callous and uncaring. Another example is the android Data from the Star Trek: The Next Generation series. Data's positronic brain only analyses information using a logical calculus because it lacks the ability to feel anything. Thus, logic is seen as a source of estrangement since Data longs for the depth of affect that his human coworkers enjoy, such as humour and love. Because all humans are endowed with both logical and emotional faculties, not just one or the other, such depictions of logic as the polar opposite of emotion are false dichotomies. Or, to put it another way, we are more capable than we give ourselves credit for. Therefore, if you believe that you are primarily emotional, you simply haven't yet come to terms with your rational side.

However, other people think that human beings are fundamentally marked by their emotions. Emotion has most certainly been crucial to our species' existence as a whole. For instance, according to neuroscientists, our emotions have a quicker route to the brain's action centres than our reasoning skills, which take a methodical approach to decision-making LeDoux, 1986, 1992). For instance, it is advantageous to ignore the possibility of running if we believe a predator is after us. Nowadays, however, avoiding predators is not a primary necessity in the majority of human societies. In fact, in the majority of cases nowadays, methodical reasoning is more advantageous. Logical thought improves decision-making, supports learning at all levels, and leads to improved outcomes in the labour market in seeking employment, receiving promotions, and securing raises. We are more likely to be content and have less regrets if we thoroughly consider our most important life decisions, as was mentioned in the preceding section. Indeed, logical thinking can show to be a more effective method than any other option, such as chance selection, an emotional inclination, waiting and watching, and so on, for achieving a person's search for personal fulfilment.

A second fallacy is the idea that logic is innate and cannot be taught. After all, the ability to reason and engage in abstract cognition sets humans apart from other species. To the best of our understanding, abstract cognition appears to be the distinguishing feature of humankind's special brand of reason, despite the fact that many nonhuman creatures possess quite high intelligence levels. Today, logical reasoning is used in a wide variety of situations. We can fly and observe rockets in space, which is amazing. Additionally, we have access to things like automobiles, skyscrapers, computers, cell phones, air conditioning, house insulation, and even smart homes that let owners control light, temperature, and other features remotely via smartphones and other gadgets. Our lives have become more comfortable as a result of how much better a picture of reality logic has given us.

However, why should anyone have to learn logical reasoning if it is a natural human trait? Since we can feel emotions naturally without training, why should it be any different with our cognitive abilities? Think about the distinction between our inherent abilitiesthose that are automatic or nonvoluntaryand those that require our will. Emotions, as well as breathing, digesting, and swallowing, are all naturally occurring nonvoluntary processes. Usually, we don't force ourselves to feel joyful, furious, or thrilled. Instead, we frequently only experience emotions like happiness, rage, or excitement.Now compare these to voluntary natural abilities like sitting, walking, and running. Most of the time, we have to will these actions into existence. Unlike swallowing, breathing, or experiencing emotions such as excitement or rage, we do not simply find ourselves running without choosing to do so. The universe probably would not seem the same if logic were like breathing. Just as we must learn to walk,

sit, and run, logic must also be intentionally practised. It's true that practically everyone develops their running skills to some extent as they mature. Similar to this, when people grow from being infants to adults, they almost all acquire some level of logical reasoning. However, you must study and hone particular skills if you want to be a successful runner. Similar to how everyone has some capacity for reasoning, developing strong critical thinking skills necessitates studying and applying a variety of logical techniques.

The last myth is that logic is too challenging or challenging to learn. You might be wondering why you should learn reasoning now if you have managed to survive all these years without doing so. It is accurate to say that mastering logic can be difficult and that it requires time and effort before it comes naturally. But take into account that we have the same difficulty anytime we learn something new, whether it be baking, car maintenance, or astrophysics. You cannot expect to be knowledgeable about how to make a soufflé, repair a leaky valve cap, or explain black holes without making an effort to understand the relevant language and methodologies.We must plan to think logically in order to do it, just as we must mean to run in order to do it. We don't have to put as much work or attention into running once we get good at it. Physical duties can be accomplished more readily by a fit body than by an unfit one. The mind works the same way. Activities of the intellect will be simpler for a mind that is used to logical reasoning than for one that is not fit. The best aspect is that all you have to do to develop logical fitness is study and use the appropriate tools.

It will undoubtedly be difficult to understand reasoning. But keep in mind that beginning a programme for logical fitness is quite similar to beginning a programme for physical fitness: There will initially be some discomfort. Muscles that are out of shape pain when they are trained. You might discover that some classes or concepts are a little difficult for you. When this occurs, keep trying! In a physical exercise programme, we are aware that perseverance will eventually cause the pain to subside movement becomes enjoyable when the muscles tone up. Similarly, if you continue to put forth effort in learning and honing your innate logical abilities, you will find that you comprehend new concepts more readily, reading comes more easily to you, and logical reasoning is truly enjoyable and fulfilling. You will eventually develop the ability to see logical connections that you had not previously noticed, make decisions that you are less likely to regret, and get the self-assurance necessary to defend your positions in a less strenuous manner [9], [10].Now that some prevalent myths have been addressed, we can focus on the fundamental query for this book: Who defines logic? One way to begin defining logic is to say that it is the study of the principles and practises of sound thinking. According to this concept, sound reasoning is governed by a set of rules, and several techniques have been created to promote it. It is critical to stress that these ideas and procedures are factual and objective. They hold true whether you live in your hometown or in the tiniest village on the opposite side of the globe. Additionally, they are still appropriate now just as they were 200 or 2,000 years ago.

This definition is a fine starting point, but it doesn't address the issues of what exactly constitutes good reasoning or what distinguishes some arguments from others. Definitions should aim to be more explicit, despite the fact that it is unavoidably difficult to fit answers to all potential queries into a concise statement. In this book, we'll use the definition that follows: Logic is the study of reasoning that are used to form justifiable conclusions. It's important to note that this definition explains how reasoning can benefit you right away, throughout your daily activities, and regardless of your line of work. Let's examine this term a little more closely to see how this is the case.That there are principles at work in sound thinking or that these principles are not always informed by experience is not explained by this definition of logic: The definition of argument in logic serves its purpose. Logic's

definition of an argument is quite technical, therefore is fully devoted to defining argumentswhat they are, what they are not, what they are made of, and what makes them strong. Later on in this chapter, we'll look at the word argument's definitions in contexts other than logic.

A Method for Reaching Warranted Conclusions

For our purposes, judgement merely refers to an educated assessment. You look at the facts to make sure that, even if it isn't true, it is at least likely or theoretically plausible. You decide whether something is true or false, good or terrible, right or wrong, beautiful or ugly, real or fake, delicious or revolting, enjoyable or boring, etc. when you make a judgement. We construct our universe of beliefs by our use of judgements. We can be more certain about what brings us happiness the more diverse our world of beliefs is. Since judgements are crucial, we must ensure that they are reliable.The word warrant comes to mind. Why are justified decisions better than unjustified ones? A warrant: what is it? You might be aware that a warrant is a legally binding document that allows for the search and seizure of potential evidence or the arrest of someone suspected of committing a crime if you are familiar with the criminal justice system or television crime dramas. Such searches and seizures without a warrant, as well as forcing someone to submit to questioning or detention, are violations of the protections and rights that people in free society have. The warrant certifies that a person's search or arrest is lawful, that there is good cause for the search or arrest, and that the person's rights are not being violated excessively. In a broader sense, we say that a course of action is justified if it is supported by sufficient facts or evidence.

Our decisions are therefore justified when there is sufficient justification or supporting evidence. Contrarily, when we refer to anything as being unjustified, we mean that it is not supported by sufficient justification or proof. Unjustified anxieties, for instance, are fears we experience that are unfounded. Unfounded worries of monsters under beds may exist in children. Although they lack concrete proof that the monsters are present, they are scared of them anyway. When there is little evidence to support our conclusions, similar to a young child's belief in lurking monsters under the bed, our judgements are unjustified.The transition from suspicion to arrest in the criminal justice system must be justified. Similar- ly, in logic, the transition from evidence to conclusion must be supported for an example, see A Closer Look: Warrants for the Belief in God). As opposed to a young child's dread of monsters, we want our judgements to be more like a properly performed search warrant. Blind decisions put our lives in danger if we don't think about the reasons behind them; correct beliefs are no more likely to result from our judgements than wrong ones. Thus, it is crucial to become proficient with the instruments for making justifiable decisions. It's critical to understand the pressing need for achieving such competence. It is not just another enjoyable item to cross off our bucket list, something we'll accomplish after our trek through the Himalayas. Instead, understanding argumentationthe key strategy for reaching. Making sound judgmentsjust like learning to read and writeis crucial. Compared to all you've learned thus far, understanding logic is a pretty small piece of knowledge, but it has the power to improve your life.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the ability to think critically is a crucial life skill that enables people to make reasoned judgements. To arrive at justified conclusions, it entails the careful analysis of concepts and the use of reasoning. This book emphasizes the significance of honing logical reasoning abilities, despite the fact that some people may have misconceptions about critical thinking, such as seeing it as the antithesis of emotional reasoning or thinking it is too difficult to learn. Anyone may master critical thinking if they adopt intellectual humility,

acknowledge the value of reason, and commit to logical fitness. By doing this, people provide themselves a strong weapon for directing their lives and maximizing their prospects.

REFERENCES:

[1] D. M. Raymaker, Intersections of Critical Systems Thinking and Community Based Participatory Research: A Learning Organization Example with the Autistic Community, *Syst. Pract. Action Res.*, 2016.

[2] M. Jalbout and S. Farah, Will the Technology Disruption Widen or Close the Skills Gap in the Middle East and North Africa, *... , DC: Global Economy and Development at ...*. 2016.

[3] S. Mirzaee and P. Maftoon, An examination of Vygotsky's socio-cultural theory in second language acquisition: the role of higher order thinking enhancing techniques and the EFL learners' use of private speech in the construction of reasoning, *Asian-Pacific J. Second Foreign Lang. Educ.*, 2016.

[4] C. N. Terranova, Learning from embryology: Locating critical thinking in bioart via complexism, *Technoetic Arts*, 2016.

[5] S. W. Yulianto, Critical Pedagogy Principles in Teaching EFL Reading, *English Rev. J. English Educ.*, 2016.

[6] F. K. T. Mok and T. W. W. Yuen, A critical evaluation of the understanding of critical thinking by school teachers: The case of Hong Kong, *Citizenship, Soc. Econ. Educ.*, 2016.

[7] M. Rogers, Problematising participatory video with youth in Canada: the intersection of therapeutic, deficit and individualising discourses, *Area*, 2016.

[8] B. Mendoza, Coloniality of Gender and Power, *Oxford Handb. Fem. Theory*, 2016.

[9] C. Volk, Towards a critical theory of the political: Hannah Arendt on power and critique, *Philos. Soc. Crit.*, 2016.

[10] R. Arghandeh, A. Von Meier, L. Mehrmanesh, and L. Mili, On the definition of cyber-physical resilience in power systems, *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*. 2016.

CHAPTER 2

FOSTERING CRITICAL THINKING IN EVERYDAY LIFE: THE ROLE OF LOGIC

Jyoti Puri, Associate Prefessor
College of Education, TeerthankerMahaveer University, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id- puri20.j@gmail.com

ABSTRACT:

Logic is a broad subject that is essential to developing and using critical thinking abilities in daily life. This debate focuses on informal logic, highlighting how important it is to how we reason on a daily basis. Although formal logic is briefly discussed, the main goal is to create a strong framework for solid thinking that can be used right away to practical circumstances. The word argument has a different connotation in the context of logic than it does in everyday language. A logical argument is an organised presentation of reasoning to support a point, often made by a single person, as opposed to ordinary arguments, which can involve emotional conflicts between persons. No emotional background is required, and there are no interpersonal issues. This talk also makes a distinction between logical and rhetorical arguments. While logical arguments seek to support a position with reasoned reasoning and evidence, with persuasion as a secondary goal, rhetorical arguments try to persuade and may employ emotional appeals. The careful use of language is emphasised throughout this discussion to emphasize how misunderstandings and word misuse can prevent clear thinking. Our major means of expression and communication, language has a big impact on how we think, feel, and go about our daily lives. In addition to language, logic is a key component of philosophy because it helps to clarify ideas and search for truth. We naturally possess the ability to engage in philosophical inquiry as a continuous process as youngsters, but as adults we frequently lose this ability. This change may cause us to make judgements and take actions that are influenced by our feelings or previous experiences. This conversation highlights the value of logic in eschewing emotionally motivated choices and embracing critical thinking in our everyday activities. We can better manage the intricacies of life by improving our comprehension of logic and its real-world applications.

KEYWORDS:

Argument, Critical Thinking, Formal, Logic, Language.

INTRODUCTION

Logic is a broad and intricate subject. Here, we'll concentrate on how logic aids in the growth and practice of critical thinking in daily life. The ideas we'll talk about mostly correspond to informal logic rules. Examining our justifications for commonplace and everyday claims is the main goal of informal logic. Formal logic, in comparison, is far more abstract and frequently uses symbols and mathematics to evaluate arguments. Although this text will briefly explore certain formal logic topics in its talks of deduction, the goal is to establish a good reasoning process that is immediately applicable to everyday life. There are many different interpretations of what an argument is, therefore you could find that one of the definitions in this section matches your own. It will be easier for you to comprehend what is intended in a specific situation if you are aware that this word can have multiple meanings depending on the context or application.

The term argument is frequently used to describe a discussion of opposing viewpoints, occasionally in a tense, hostile, or furious environment. Say Lola, one of your friends, comes

to you and says, I had an argument with a colleague at work. You might be right to interpret Lola's definition of an argument as being comparable to a verbal argument in a typical situation. But in logic, a conflict or a struggle is not what is meant by an argument. Furthermore, a logical argument does not always have an emotional background and does not include a conversation between two persons [1], [2].

Despite the fact that an argument in everyday English necessitates the participation of two or more persons, this is not the case in logic. Only one individual, acting on their own behalf or on behalf of a group, usually makes a logical argument. No trade is necessary. There need not be a genuine exchange of opposing ideas as a consequence of an argument, even though it may be framed as a challenge to another person's viewpoint. We now have a debate if two people coordinate a presentation of their defences of what may be distinguished as competing points of view. A debate may involve numerous arguments, but it is not a debate in and of itself. Therefore, the only exchanges of opposing viewpoints are debates.

A logical argument's emotional context is not what drives it, even if it is well-supported and sincere. Instead, any sentiment that might be inextricably linked to the defence of the argument's main claim is secondary to the arguments put forward. But let's provide some additional context for the discussion of arguments. Presented are the arguments for both sides of the argument. Consequently, the discussion may reveal angles that each participant has not previously explored. Therefore, discussions can be highly instructive because it is very difficult for the experience to be bad every time our own perspective is widened with concepts we hadn't previously considered and that are convincingly argued. Instead, regardless of how strongly one may feel about the position one is defending, engaging in a good discussion is a stimulating intellectual experience.

Even discussions don't have to be conducted in a hostile or enraged manner, or as a way to express dissatisfaction or other feelings towards the opposing side. Giving way to one's emotions during a discussion can result in one losing track of the opposition's points and being able to muster only feeble refutations. Argument is a word that is used in rhetoric almost as frequently as it is in logic. In English, communication, composition, or argumentation classes, you can come across this usage. An argument, from the perspective of rhetoric, is an effort to persuadeto alter someone's mind or conduct. Good arguments are those that are convincing since persuasion is the aim of a rhetorical argument. In this sense, anyone who tries to convince you to do something can be considered to be advancing an argument.Consider a time when you were a child and you had to convince a sibling to do something for you. You might have tried to influence him or her by making an offer of money, using guilt-inducing techniques, making an appeal to their sense of duty or pride, or simply by trying to reason with them. All of these factors may be used in a rhetorical approach to arguments and all of them have the potential to be inspiring. While it is true that you can induce someone to act in a certain way out of pride, pity, shame, or greed, this does not imply that your stance has been adequately justified.

Demosthenes, Cicero, and Winston Churchill are three of history's most notable orators. Although they were presumably born with a natural ability for rhetoric, they honed it by becoming well-educated and studying the speeches of other great orators. In addition to language proficiency and a comprehensive knowledge base, effective use of phrases, metaphors, pauses, crescendos, humour, and other tactics is essential for effective rhetoric. However, someone with a gift for rhetoric can readily use it to manipulate others. Exactly this property sets rhetorical arguments apart from logic-based arguments [3], [4].Logical arguments seek to illustrate, whereas rhetorical arguments seek to persuade sometimes with the intent to influence. It's important to understand the difference between persuading and

proving. A powerful emotional appeal may be used to disguise the impression of a strong stance in order to persuade. But to demonstrate, a perspective must be presented in a way that even its opponents could understand. The argument must be well-informed, supported by facts, and free of logical errors in order to do this. Of course, in addition to being intellectually sound, an argument can also be compelling. It's crucial to keep in mind that the main goal of logical arguments is not to persuade, but rather to use sound reasoning to establish truths.

DISCUSSION

Consider a scenario in which you and your friend are watching a political discussion and she comments that she thinks one of the candidates made a compelling case for taxes. You reply that you didn't agree with the candidate's position. Have you ever argued with one another? You might have believed that you had, but you might simply be speaking over one another and interpreting the word argument in different ways. Your buddy might be saying that she found the argument convincing, while you are saying that it did not prove the candidate's stance to be correct. It might turn out that you two concur on these ideas. Perhaps the candidate made a passionate plea for tax reform but did not spend much time outlining the specifics of his stance or how it would operate to address any issues. In this situation, the candidate may have presented a strong argument from a rhetorical standpoint but a weak one from a logical standpoint.

Unlike rhetorical and conventional arguments, logical arguments do not include any form of transaction, and they are not motivated by emotions like conventional and rhetorical arguments are. In contrast to rhetorical arguments, logical arguments are not primarily attempts to persuade because there is no attempt to appeal to emotions. In logical arguments, only the reasons given in support of the conclusion constitute the force of the argument. Instead, logical arguments make simply an effort to support their claims with facts. Of course, strong logical arguments might be persuading, but that is not the main objective. The purpose of a logical argument is to show that a claim is likely to be true. So, make sure you and your friend are using the word the same manner before continuing to argue. Then you might consider which kind of argument is most important to the issue at hand. The distinction between the aforementioned uses and meanings of the word argument highlights how crucial precise language use is. Misused words or a lack of comprehension of the differences in words' meanings not only cause misunderstandings, but they also prevent us from formulating clear stances on issues pertaining to our own personal aims and pleasure. The way we think, what we experience, how we experience it, and the kind of lives we lead are all influenced by language.

Our most effective tool for expressing what is on our minds is language. It is not the only way that people communicate, though. We also express ourselves through gestures, emotions, and facial expressions. However, these nonverbal indicators frequently require further explanation, especially from persons we don't know well, in order for us to fully understand what someone else is expressing or feeling. For instance, if we witness a stranger sobbing, we might not immediately be able to tell if they are crying out of joy or grief. Without knowing the language, we might not be able to tell if a man shouting loudly and waving erratically is arguing or is simply being overly passionate.This implies that words have a significant impact because they are the common method for communicating with others. We all use language to communicate, and generally speaking, we seem to be able to do so satisfactorily, so this may seem like common sense. One outcome might be that many people stop ignoring what we say. Another possibility is that as our vocabulary grows, we will no longer be constrained by the words we can use to communicate with others or by the knowledge we can

draw from our experiences. Imagine, for instance, that you are invited to a meal where, unknowingly to you, a spice you have never tried is served. You might taste something new while you savour the meal on your plate, but it might be too subtle for you to detect among the dish's other familiar flavours. As a result of your inability to recognise this new flavour by name and as a new flavour category in your experience, you can really be cognitively unconscious of its characteristics [5], [6].

Many of us do not have a sensitive enough palate, according to philosopher David Hume, to truly recognise new or unexpected flavours in familiar taste sensations. For those who do, it would appear that delicate flavorsrather than overpowering onesare what really put a person's palate to the test. Recent neurological studies, however, indicate that higher levels of language processing may be more important for human responses to taste than sensory acuity. In other words, if you can't express it, it's conceivable that you won't be able to taste it. As a result, our capacity to use language effectively enhances our experience.

Language is taken very seriously by logicians and philosophers in general since it is the finest way to explain our views, be understood by others, and clarify concepts that need clarification. But linguistic communication is more complicated than we realise. Speaking a language means engaging in a rule-governed kind of behaviour, as noted by eminent philosopher John Searle. This implies that everytime we speak or write, we are following predetermined rules. Punctuation markings like commas and periods are used to indicate speech pauses. If we don't stop, the same group of words can have entirely different meanings at different times. The same rule also holds true when writing. But even though we are more aware of using them when speaking, we can forget how crucial they are when writing.

In fact, even a seemingly inconsequential comma can significantly alter a sentence's meaning. We must be aware of pertinent punctuation, accurate grammar, and good spelling if we want to ensure that others can understand what we have written. The message of the author will be lost if something is difficult to read due to poor grammar, missing punctuation, or misspelt words. You may have noticed by now that the terms logic and philosophy are frequently used in the same sentence. This is for a good purpose. Not only is logic a subfield of philosophy, but it is also its mainstay. It is crucial to comprehend the relationship between these two disciplines because doing research in philosophy will help you better understand the importance of logic in daily life.

The problem that everyone is avoiding, though. Some individuals are unaware of what philosophers do. Others assert that philosophers merely occupy themselves with ideas that are rarely useful in real life. For instance, a bearded guy pondering this question is the stereotypical representation of a philosopher: If a tree falls in the forest and no one else is around to hear it, is there sound? This may prompt you to ask, Why should anyone care? In actuality, a lot of people do, and not only beardy philosophers: In addition to scientists who study the nature of sound, such as physicists, researchers in medicine and treatment, and those working in the field of sound technology, such a question is crucial for individuals who operate at the intersection of philosophy and science.The fact that the outcomes concern us all is the best part. A tree in the forest analysis is where many modern technologies have their roots [7], [8].

After demonstrating the practical aspect of philosophical inquiry, we can now go on to a more thorough examination of what philosophy actually is. According to one theory, philosophy is the process of making concepts clear. Because philosophy is fundamentally an action rather than a body of knowledge like history or biology, for example, it qualifies as an activity. In the pursuit of truth, philosophical activity aims to make concepts clear. Using

language, it appears that the youngster is trying to grasp the world by learning what things are named. Although some adults may find this bothersome, the child's intention is evident if we view this action as philosophical: The philosophical mechanism for learning is mainly the association of names with meanings and the act of making distinctions and comparing similarity.

Once something has a name, we can tell it apart from another thing that seems similar because names help us tell things apart. A toy car and a toy truck may look similar to a two-year-old because both are vehicles and have four tyres, but their distinct names indicate that they are not identical. A 2-year-old will therefore likely continue to ask questions like, Why is a car not the same as a truck? until she fully understands the key distinctions between these two objects. This is the philosophy's pursuit of reality.By the time we enter elementary school, we have a few years of philosophical thinking under our belts since children naturally develop a philosophical mindset. Sadly, the philosophical outlook is not often maintained after this. Over time, we stop clarifying concepts because we might stop asking, or we might simply grow weary or complacent. Then, we start to believe everything that we are told or shown by people in our immediate environment, including what we see on television and what we learn through social media. When we cease questioning what we accept, like we did when we were very young children, we open ourselves up to manipulation and deception.

We start to solely rely on emotions or prior experience as the foundation for our decisions and judgements when we stop using questions to rationally distinguish between alternatives or to make judgements regarding contested social situations. Although emotions have value and merit, they can also be untrustworthy or cause us to make snap judgements. If we are simply making an impulsive purchase in the mall, this might not matter all that much. However, when we make decisions solely out of fear or rage, the results are significantly worse and may even lead us to treat others unfairly or with prejudice.Additionally, the past might be deceiving. Take Jay, a college student who has performed admirably in his first four classes. He believes that all university courses are straightforward because he has found them to be quite simple and not very challenging. He is then taken aback when he learns that Introduction to Physics is a difficult course, despite the fact that he should have reasonably understood that pursuing a university education is a difficult effort. Jay might be able to manage his expectations by asking himself questions about the previous classes' topic matter, lecturer, and other factors.

Over two of the key topics we've covered thus far again. First, philosophy is the process of elucidating concepts. The pursuit of truth regarding all phenomena in our experience is philosophy's second aim. We are given a powerful tool by logic to carry out the mission of philosophy and find truths. Thus, this viewpoint has continued to be widely held in Western thought. Logic gives us the means to break the habit of solely basing our decisions on our emotions, feelings, or past experiences when we think philosophically about our everyday practical goals. With this book serving as your guide, your journey will include coming to this realisation on your own in your own case.Throughout our investigation, the use of precise language has come to light as a crucial component, underscoring the significance of clear communication for effectively communicating our thoughts and ideas. Our major means of communication is language, and becoming fluent in it improves our capacity to have meaningful conversations and make wise decisions. We have also discussed the philosophical side of logic, acknowledging that philosophy is the search for conceptual clarity and truth. Philosophy fosters critical thinking from an early age by encouraging us to keep raising questions and questioning presumptions. In sum, logic gives us the tools we need to think critically, tell emotional appeals from rational ones, and have meaningful conversations with

others. By applying the rules of logic to our daily lives, we empower ourselves to make wise decisions, get a deeper comprehension of complicated topics, and ultimately help to create a society that is more logical and reasoned. Logic is not just a theoretical academic field; it is also a useful instrument that improves our lives and our ability to move through the world with purpose and clarity [9], [10].

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the investigation of logic and its function in daily life has demonstrated the enormous influence that sound reasoning and clear thinking may have on our ability to make decisions, communicate with people, and comprehend our surroundings. We have distinguished between informal and formal logic throughout this talk, realising that informal logic gives us useful tools for evaluating claims and arguments we encounter on a daily basis while formal logic is more abstract and mathematical in character. We have also examined the definition of the term argument, highlighting the fact that, in logic, an argument is not always a contentious debate but rather a well-organized presentation of arguments and supporting data. We have also examined the differences between logical and rhetorical arguments, emphasising that although rhetoric strives to convince and influence through the use of emotions and various persuasive strategies, logic seeks to show and establish truths through solid reasoning. For good discussion and debate navigation, it is essential to recognize this distinction.

REFERENCES:

[1] D. Ruge, M. K. Nielsen, B. E. Mikkelsen, and B. Bruun-Jensen, Examining participation in relation to students' development of health-related action competence in a school food setting: LOMA case study, *Health Educ.*, 2016.

[2] L. B., Effects of a positive training program on young adolescents in Hong Kong, *Aust. N. Z. J. Psychiatry*, 2016.

[3] K. Abisheva and L. Assylbekova, Risk Management and Ethical Issues in Social Work, 2016.

[4] TUC &&childer ENgland, An introduction to child protection legislation in the UK, 2016.

[5] E. Veiga, H. G. da Costa, E. Cardoso, and A. Jácomo, A critical thinking development project in high education: The students' perspective, *Rev. Lusofona Educ.*, 2016.

[6] R. E. Nisbett, Tools for Smarter Thinking, *Educ. Leadersh.*, 2016.

[7] S. Bursa and A. F. Ersoy, Social studies teachers' perceptions and experiences of social justice, *Eurasian J. Educ. Res.*, 2016.

[8] A. E. Elliot and S. Barsness, What's in Your Bundle? Building a Communication Map of Relational Coordination Practices to Engage Staff in Individualizing Care, *Seniors Hous. Care J.*, 2016.

[9] E. Billo and A. Mountz, For institutional ethnography, *Prog. Hum. Geogr.*, 2016.

[10] R. M. M. Huerta, R. H. Colás, and C. M. Valentí, An evaluation framework for environmental education through sustainability activities | Una propuesta evaluativa para actividades de educación ambiental para la sostenibilidad, *Educ. XX1*, 2016.

CHAPTER 3

HUCK'S UNCONSCIOUS REALISM: IRONY AND IGNORANCE IN HUCKLEBERRY FINN

Sonia Jayant, Assistant Professor
Department of Computing Sciences and I.T, TeerthankerMahaveer University, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh India,
Email Id- soniaj.jayant@gmail.com

ABSTRACT:

This essay examines how reality, irony, and the protagonist's ignorance subtly interact in Mark Twain's The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn to reveal the intriguing narrative complexity of the work. We analyse a key passage from the book, one that is frequently cited for its powerful depiction of racial prejudice and its dry irony. In this paragraph, we see Huck's acute awareness of his immediate audience within the narrative but his ignorance of the larger public outside the realm of the book. We show how Huck's narrative perspective questions accepted ideas of literary realism and the common understanding of the world through in-depth analysis. Although Huck is skilled at adapting to the situations he runs into, his lack of formal education prevents him from understanding the fundamental reasoning behind them. We examined the complex narrative dynamics of Twain's classic, Huckleberry Finn, in our article, Huck's Unconscious Realism: Irony and Ignorance. A fascinating study in paradoxes, Huck Finn is revealed to be a bright, adaptable young man who is fundamentally illiterate about the world he lives in. The novel's social commentary gains depth and complexity through the contrast between wisdom and naivety.

KEYWORDS:

Huckleberry Finn, Huck's Unconscious, Ignorance, Irony, Social.

INTRODUCTION

The second of these passages, which is too well-known to need much analysis, is commonly used as a theatrical portrayal of a lot of Huckleberry Finn's outstanding qualities: the questions of racial prejudice being central to the book's theme; the obvious irony revealed in Aunt Sally's worried inquiry and her sincere relief that no people were hurt; and the cunning of Huck himself, who, despite being perplexed by this unexpected relative who calls him Tom, knows enough about human nature to create yet another fictional experience and take on yet another persona at the drop of a hat, but who is completely unaware of the satire, irony, In the book, Huck is aware of his audience; he frequently assesses his position in a hostile adult world and appeals to the many hopes, anxieties, and prejudices of people who challenge or interrogate him. Huck frequently ignores or is unaware of how his actions affect readers like us who are not the book's intended audience.

Huckleberry Finn's realism differs strangely from previous realist works if realism is based on a shared understanding of the world that is, a comprehension of what Henry James claimed we cannot, in any case, not known. Twain's adherence to the declared standards of literary realism, as demonstrated by Michael Davitt Bell, is at best shaky1, and what is true for Twain is even more true for his youthful narrator. Because Huck is not only utterly unfit to represent this common knowledge in his tale but also does not knowingly participate in it. Huck repeatedly demonstrates his ability to pick up on the plays of the game, but no one has ever explained its reasoning to him. He is still unsure of the origins of feuds, how pirates and robbers act, how the Granger ford mansion is decorated, and what the royal prerogatives are, but he immediately assesses the situation and plays his part as best he can [1], [2].

The first quotation is from a well-known novel. However, as far as I'm aware, neither this exchange nor Huckleberry Finn's strangely parallel expression have received much attention. There could be a number of reasons for this. One of them, and arguably the most interesting, is the contrast between Moby-Dick's romanticism and Huckleberry Finn's reality. The divide between quest and escape between the pursuit and the scrape could be all that is necessary to define this difference. Huck satisfies whims and court favour with an eye on the quickest departure while Ahab bends the crew's will to his will and forgoes friendly observances and courtesies. The bachelor captain of the Bachelor, like the most of Melville's bachelors, is an example of moral laziness and extravagant good tumour. He is in charge of a loaded ship and is headed home. Aunt Sally fits the mould; she combines Christian goodness, blind bigotry, and adoring affection in equal measure. She is happy to welcome the boy whom she believes to be her nephew. Moby-Dick is distinguished by its symbolism, metaphysical questions, lyrical spontaneity, and Shakespearean quick probings at the very axis of reality, as Melville put it in Hawthorne and His Mosses.

Huckleberry Finn, however, succeeds through a different strategy: it undermines the same high drama that markets its episodes. It enjoys itself to the fullest extent during quiet moments under the benevolent aegis of folklore, superstition, and admirable credulity. Ishmael's reverie in the crow's nest is shattered by the worry that he is hovering over Descartesian vortices, but Huck and Jim debate the origins of stars the moon must have set them after all), and nobody is wounded. Huckleberry Finn exhibits much less of Melville's concern in a community of misfortune, as Mark Twain would later refer to the friendship between Huck and Jim, than he does in the solidarity of two. Melville's phrase in the aforementioned sections is an aside, but Twain's is the definition of vernacular realism.Like Moby-Dick, Huckleberry Finn is a storyteller's tale. Both authors compete for our attention as they convey their stories. Although it is rare that we as readers believe that these adventures are even remotely his, Ishmael, the yarn-spinner, is determined to pursue the meanings of his experiences to their ends. Huck is a receiver of perceptions, too, but they are mediated through a consciousness that is distinctly adolescent in naturequick to detect, slow to understand.

However, Mark Twain and Huck Finn are the two authors of Huckleberry Finn, and they each created a separate fictional world. Twain gives us a world to evaluate, whereas Huck gives us a world to live in. However, even if both authors are realists, their realism is of varying degrees of experience. As Mark Twain famously observed, emotions are among the toughest things in the world to manufacture out of whole cloth; it is easier to manufacture seven facts than one emotion. Huckleberry Finn's story is essentially a record of feeling, not cognition.2 Huck's story satirises the quality of felt life that Henry James thought was essential to the realist aesthetic; Twain's control over that same narrative is largely responsible for the lethal satirical thrusts of a guy somewhat upset by life.

Comparable passages from Life on the Mississippi and Huckleberry Finn show the difference between Mark Twain's realism and Huck Finn's: One can never have enough July sunrises across the Mississippi, so I had myself called at four in the mornings. They are magical. First, there is the beauty of quiet because there is a palpable stillness all around. The eerie feeling of alone, distance, and loneliness from the stress and commotion of the outside world is the next. The water is glass-smooth and emits spectral little wreaths of white mist; there is not the slightest breath of wind or movement of leaves; the tranquilly is profound and infinitely satisfying. The dawn creeps in covertly; the solid walls of the black forest soften to grey; and vast stretches of the river open up and reveal themselves. Once a bird starts to sing, others soon join in, and the piping’s soon turn into a happy riot of melody. One of the loveliest

and softest images imaginable results when the light is a little stronger. This entire stretch of river is a mirror, and you can see the shadowy reflections of the leafage, the curving shoreline, and the receding capes in it. You have the brilliant green of the massed and crowded foliage nearby; you see it paling shade by shade in front of you. All of it is indeed lovely; soft, rich, and lovely; and when the sun rises fully, scattering a pink flush here, a gold dust there, and a purple haze where it will produce the best impression, you admit that you have witnessed something worthwhile [3], [4].

It was completely silent around and seemed as though everyone was asleep, with the possible exception of the bullfrogs sometimes a-cluttering. The first thing to see, looking away over the water, was a kind of dull line that was the woods on tootherside you couldn't make nothing else out; then a pale place in the sky; then more paleness, spreading around; then the river softened up, away off, and warn't black any more, but gray; you could see little dark spots drifting along, ever so far away trading scows, and such things; and long black streaks rafts; sometimes you could hear a sweep streaking; or jumbled up voices, it was so still, and sounds come so far; and by and by you could see a streak on the water which you know by the look of the streak that there's a snag there in a swift current which breaks on it and makes that streak look that way; and you see the mist curl up off of the water, and the east reddens up, and the river, and you make out a log cabin in the edge of the woods, away on the bank on other side of the river, being a wood-yard, likely, and piled by them cheats so you can throw a dog through it anywheres; then the nice breeze springs up, and comes fanning you from over there, so cool and fresh, and sweet to smell, on account of the woods and the flowers; but sometimes not that way, because they've left dead fish laying around, gars, and such, and they do get pretty rank; and next you've got the full day, and everything smiling in the sun, and the song-birds just going it.

DISCUSSION

The obvious distinctions between a polite and a vernacular narrator or, more accurately, between an adult and a child are revealed here. Twain's piece is purposefully written; it is motivated by rhetoric, rationally organised in a single time and location, diversified in diction, constant in tone, and compliant with its stated objectives. Detailed description supports the predetermined mood; the scene's enchantment is enhanced, even validated, by the hushed silence, creeping mists, massed colour, and softening light.Huck's narration is punctuated with statements and clarifications. He claims that there is not a sound most of the time and that sometimes a dead gar is lying around despite the air being sweet to smell. In Huck's text, the term streak is used three times in one clause, which displays an unabashed monotony of language. Huck also skips the justification comment. When Huck states and the east reddens up, and the river, there is no authorial evidence that the river reflects the red of the sky since Twain's universe does not conform to the rules of optics. Instead, his world is a mirror in which the reflections of wood and shore might be found. His perspective of the phenomenon is limited, thus he would not consider the scene to be a effect.

The little dark spots, we are told via an appositive, are trading scows; the dull line, the forests; the long black streaks, rafts; Huck's river at dawn is shifting impressions first and only indirectly a universe of objects. Although there are things in his universe, they do not give him permission to experience them. And he skips over the mental adjustments required to create such a reality.Twain describes the scenario as a composition, a self-aware act of language that is so well-crafted that we can agree that it is worth remembering. Whether or not his description is memorable, it still serves as a tribute to a natural occurrence whose gorgeous presence is unrelated to his portrayal. Despite the fact that Huck's scene is only being remembered, one gets the impression that the world might end if he weren't there to

keep everything together. Despite this, Huck's environment is more forgiving; it accepts the coexistence of dishonesty and the stink of rotting fish with the sound of birds. Huck is constantly on the lookout for trickery and traps, but without passing judgement, he presents an unaltered natural landscape and revels in a special occasion. In contrast, Twain seeks to evoke an emotion that is universal and a tonic solace from the worry and bustle of the world [5], [6].

Huckleberry Finn is infused with Twain's presence, but with rare exceptions, he stays true to the book's guidelines and prefers Huck's unfiltered emotional world to his own, frequently irate conviction.4 That is to say, regardless of how strongly Twain felt, he frequently understood that his first artistic duty was to capture the truth of Huck's juvenile sensibility in his writing. Huckleberry Finn's realism is revealed in two ways: first, by the story itself; second, by the thread of Huck's consciousness, which is still developing and is still unaware of how deeply engaged it is in events. Although they are inexorably linked and frequently confused, it is best to discuss the narrator and the tale separately.One thing to note about Huckleberry Finn's realism is that Huck's voice functions very much like Whitman's multivalent I in Song of Myselfhe is the author of his book and the narrator of his chronicle; he is the main witness to events and, at least emotionally, the main victim of them; he is ruled and to some extent protected by the laws of the republic and the customs of place, but only accidentally a citizen of and

The majority of the time, Huck avoids representational description in his roles as author and storyteller. His interest in revealing Aunt Sally's personality is much less important to him than managing the situation because he has seen the Aunt Sallys of the world before. Huck is equipped for his exploits thanks to his enormous worldly experience, which is both astonishing and regrettable in a fourteen-year-old boy. In this way, the narrative itself assumes the realism of the passage that was just quoted and countless of others like it.5 Unlike Ahab, Huck accepts the world on its terms rather than his own, and through experience he has learned how to best avoid its pitfalls and take pleasure in its wonders.In Huckleberry Finn, Huck's cautious canniness is frequently the cause of the kind of narrative distance that is frequently associated with realism writing. It is also the source of a unique sadness. Huck is unable to become indifferent to the king and the duke's suffering after seeing them tarred and feathered because they didn't look like anything in the world that was human. Human beings can be awful cruel to one another, Huck finally states. This well-known scenario is poignant not because it successfully dramatizes Twain's views on the cursed human race, nor is it morally condescending.

Additionally, I don't think it represents Huck's moral growth or, in Leo Marx's words, a mature blending of his instinctive suspicion of human motives with his capacity for pity.Instead, what gives the moment weight is the unexpected and unsettling revelation, which is fairly unexpected coming from a lad as experienced with the world as Huck.The killing of Buck Granger ford, which still disturbs Huck's sleep, Boggs's gasping out his last breath under the weight of a family Bible, not to mention the theft and calculated deceptions of the king and the duke themselves, are all examples of earlier, far greater, and more upsetting cruelty than this. He hasn't before acknowledged the universal human condition of cruelty, and he still doesn't fully acknowledge it even as he delivers his terrible conclusion. Additionally, he hasn't yet acquired the civilised, or righteous, outrage that would act as a check on his own irrational inclinations.Huck and Tom are unable to assist these scam artists, so they leave and return home. Even though Huck is aware that he had nothing to do with the catastrophe he had just observed, he is now feeling kind of ornery and humble, as opposed to being as arrogant as before.

Only two chapters prior, Huck's sympathies had won out over his training when he famously decided to rip up the letter to Miss Watson, to go to hell, and to aid Jim. When describing a similar internal conflict in chapter 16, Twain famously remarked that it is in this chapter where a sound heart and a deformed conscience come into collision and conscience suffers defeat. However, Harold H. Kolb, Jr. has noted that Huck's same moral choice in chapter 31 is just a momentary victory because Huck never defeats his deformed conscienceit is we who do that, he simply ignores it in relation to Jim. But when he sees the imprisoned king and duke, Huck realises that having a consciencedeformed or nothas little bearing on whether you act morally or not. Conscience suddenly closes in on him at that very moment: If I had a yaller dog that knew nothing more than a person's conscience, I would poison him. It occupies more space than the rest of a person's internal organs, yet it isn't any better.

Huck may never be more exposed than he is right now. Ahab's self-destructive recognition, which is swiftly followed by a hungry conscience, has its reverse counterpart in Moby-Dick when he realises he must continue on despite his self-destructive quest and sheds a tear into the water. Huck draws a conclusion about the human state in his response to the enraged mob of townspeople seeking retribution on these rapscallions and the image of the duo who don't look human. While Huck is dragged into this inhuman, human world just by virtue of being alive and growing up, Ahab is propelled by inward drives that snuff out all natural longings and lovings[7], [8].This is a fatherly piece of advice that has come late, and because boys are boys, it probably won't be taken at all. However, Twain dramatises the early stages of his conflicted understanding; his conclusion is an unstudied comment that is neither a conviction nor a perception. For Huck, corruption has no centre but instead stretches out evenly in front of him, just as he left it behind after fleeing; it presents nothing more than the universal state of humanity, not a problem to be conquered or outlived. Huck is also not yet smart; his knowledge quickly gives way to nebulous, unjustified sentiments of shame. He is a youngster who is more driven by emotion than by reason, and this is another aspect of the book's realism.

Some people have called Huckleberry Finn a picaresque book without the picaro. This might be a true statement if we consider the variations on the genre that Cervantes achieved in Don Quixote, a book that Twain read more than once, Tom Sawyer at least once, and Huck never. Huck isn't quite a rogue or an idealist, though. His youthful mischief is characteristic of boys his age, yet it's paired with a unique, occasionally absurd sensitivity.Huck's numerous roles as author, character, narrator, and comedy device are skillfully combined in this comparatively short episode. He tries, in his capacity as novelist, to bring the circus scene to life for us, but he falls short. His description of the performance stands out for its lack of descriptive depth. Although the chapters contain a few common metaphors, Huck's vocabulary is ambiguous and unclear in contrast to his horrific account of his Pap in chapter 5. He claims that the women are perfectly beautiful, and that the guys are clad in drawers and undershirts. The men also have lovely complexions. However, what stands out is his slurred pronunciation and his slightly gasped eagerness. He fumbles for adjectives while acting as the narrator and defaults to abstractions and cliches. The spectacle, which is both Huck's experience and his subject matter, has mastered him.

It was the splendidness sight that ever was, the women looked like real sure-enough queens, it was a powerful fine sight, I never see anything so lovely, and they done the most astonishing things, but as a boy, he is true to childlike enthusiasm and typically replaces descriptive detail with hyperbolic affidavits of his rapt attention. He eventually assumes the role of the straight guy in his own joke. He is so delighted by the sight that he tells the circus that they may have his business whenever they like, apparently without understanding the

irony of the statement that his custom has not in any way hurt his wallet.This episode dramatizes how wise Huck is in the world yet never cynical, although the value of his jokes is determined less by his youthful intent than by the rules of the journey. Narrative context has the power to fundamentally change the charm of what Neil Schmitz refers to as his Huck speech . When Huck performs a practical joke on Jim after they become separated in the fog, there is prankishness involved, but he gets a tongue-lashing that scars him so deeply that he humbles himself to a nigger. While Huck's fabrication of his own murder to get away from his Pap's potentially fatal abuse is horrific, it is also immensely dramatic, and Huck regrets that Tom wasn't around to add the fancy touches. When he and Jim decide to save Jim Turner from imminent death in chapter 12, he laments Tom's absence in a scene that combines a romantic adventure and existential dread. The same may be said of his efforts to prevent the monarch and duke from taking the fortune of the Wilks girls.

The obvious distinctions between a polite and a vernacular narrator or, more accurately, between an adult and a child are revealed here. Twain's piece is purposefully written; it is motivated by rhetoric, rationally organised in a single time and location, diversified in diction, constant in tone, and compliant with its stated objectives. Detailed description supports the predetermined mood; the scene's enchantment is enhanced, even validated, by the hushed silence, creeping mists, massed colour, and softening light.Huck's narration is punctuated with statements and clarifications. He claims that there is not a sound most of the time and that sometimes a dead gar is lying around despite the air being sweet to smell. In Huck's text, the term streak is used three times in one clause, which displays an unabashed monotony of language. Huck also skips the justification comment. When Huck states and the east reddens up, and the river, there is no authorial evidence that the river reflects the red of the sky since Twain's universe does not conform to the rules of optics. Instead, his world is a mirror in which the reflections of wood and shore might be found. His perspective of the phenomenon is limited, thus he would not consider the scene to be a effect. The little dark spots, we are told via an appositive, are trading scows; the dull line, the forests; the long black streaks, rafts; Huck's river at dawn is shifting impressions first and only indirectly a universe of objects. Although there are things in his universe, they do not give him permission to experience them. And he skips over the mental adjustments required to create such a reality.

Twain describes the scenario as a composition, a self-aware act of language that is so well-crafted that we can agree that it is worth remembering. Whether or not his description is memorable, it still serves as a tribute to a natural occurrence whose gorgeous presence is unrelated to his portrayal. Despite the fact that Huck's scene is only being remembered, one gets the impression that the world might end if he weren't there to keep everything together. Despite this, Huck's environment is more forgiving; it accepts the coexistence of dishonesty and the stink of rotting fish with the sound of birds. Huck is constantly on the lookout for trickery and traps, but without passing judgement, he presents an unaltered natural landscape and revels in a special occasion. In contrast, Twain seeks to evoke an emotion that is universal and a tonic solace from the worry and bustle of the world.

Huckleberry Finn is infused with Twain's presence, but with rare exceptions, he stays true to the book's guidelines and prefers Huck's unfiltered emotional world to his own, frequently irate conviction.4 That is to say, regardless of how strongly Twain felt, he frequently understood that his first artistic duty was to capture the truth of Huck's juvenile sensibility in his writing. Huckleberry Finn's realism is revealed in two ways: first, by the story itself; second, by the thread of Huck's consciousness, which is still developing and is still unaware of how deeply engaged it is in events. Although they are inexorably linked and frequently

confused, it is best to discuss the narrator and the tale separately [9], [10].One thing to note about Huckleberry Finn's realism is that Huck's voice functions very much like Whitman's multivalent I in Song of Myselfhe is the author of his book and the narrator of his chronicle; he is the main witness to events and, at least emotionally, the main victim of them; he is ruled and to some extent protected by the laws of the republic and the customs of place, but only accidentally a citizen of and In Huckleberry Finn, Huck's cautious canniness is frequently the cause of the kind of narrative distance that is frequently associated with realism writing. It is also the source of a unique sadness. Huck is unable to become indifferent to the king and the duke's suffering after seeing them tarred and feathered because they didn't look like anything in the world that was human. Human beings can be awful cruel to one another, Huck finally states. This well-known scenario is poignant not because it successfully dramatises Twain's views on the cursed human race, nor is it morally condescending. Additionally, I don't think it represents Huck's moral growth or, in Leo Marx's words, a mature blending of his instinctive suspicion of human motives with his capacity for pity.6 Instead, what gives the moment weight is the unexpected and unsettling revelation, which is fairly unexpected coming from a lad as experienced with the world as Huck.The killing of Buck Grangerford, which still disturbs Huck's sleep, Boggs's gasping out his last breath under the weight of a family Bible, not to mention the theft and calculated deceptions of the king and the duke themselves, are all examples of earlier, far greater, and more upsetting cruelty than this. He hasn't before acknowledged the universal human condition of cruelty, and he still doesn't fully acknowledge it even as he delivers his terrible conclusion. Additionally, he hasn't yet acquired the civilised, or righteous, outrage that would act as a check on his own irrational inclinations.

Huck and Tom are unable to assist these scam artists, so they leave and return home. Even though Huck is aware that he had nothing to do with the catastrophe he had just observed, he is now feeling kind of ornery and humble, as opposed to being as arrogant as before. Only two chapters prior, Huck's sympathies had won out over his training when he famously decided to rip up the letter to Miss Watson, to go to hell, and to aid Jim. When describing a similar internal conflict in chapter 16, Twain famously remarked that it is in this chapter where a sound heart and a deformed conscience come into collision and conscience suffers defeat. However, Harold H. Kolb, Jr. has noted that Huck's same moral choice in chapter 31 is just a momentary victory because Huck never defeats his deformed conscienceit is we who do that, he simply ignores it in relation to Jim.7 But when he sees the imprisoned king and duke, Huck realises that having a consciencedeformed or nothas little bearing on whether you act morally or not. Conscience suddenly closes in on him at that very moment: If I had a yaller dog that knew nothing more than a person's conscience, I would poison him. It occupies more space than the rest of a person's internal organs, yet it isn't any better.

Huck may never be more exposed than he is right now. Ahab's self-destructive recognition, which is swiftly followed by a hungry conscience, has its reverse counterpart in Moby-Dick when he realises he must continue on despite his self-destructive quest and sheds a tear into the water. Huck draws a conclusion about the human state in his response to the enraged mob of townspeople seeking retribution on these rapscallions and the image of the duo who don't look human. While Huck is dragged into this inhuman, human world just by virtue of being alive and growing up, Ahab is propelled by inward drives that snuff out all natural longings and lovings. This is a fatherly piece of advice that has come late, and because boys are boys, it probably won't be taken at all. However, Twain dramatises the early stages of his conflicted understanding; his conclusion is an unstudied comment that is neither a conviction nor a perception. For Huck, corruption has no centre but instead stretches out evenly in front of him, just as he left it behind after fleeing; it presents nothing more than the universal state of

humanity, not a problem to be conquered or outlived. Huck is also not yet smart; his knowledge quickly gives way to nebulous, unjustified sentiments of shame. He is a youngster who is more driven by emotion than by reason, and this is another aspect of the book's realism.Some people have called Huckleberry Finn a picaresque book without the picaro. This might be a true statement if we consider the variations on the genre that Cervantes achieved in Don Quixote, a book that Twain read more than once, Tom Sawyer at least once, and Huck never. Huck isn't quite a rogue or an idealist, though. His youthful mischief is characteristic of boys his age, yet it's paired with a unique, occasionally absurd sensitivity.

CONCLUSION

Twain deftly depicts the widespread racial biases of his era through the eyes of Huck and the ironic turns of fate that Huck navigates with unassuming elegance. We have seen how Huck plays on the hopes, anxieties, and prejudices of people around him, exhibiting his natural awareness of his target audience. However, his inability to understand the larger context, which includes the satirical components woven into the story, highlights both his low education and his narrow worldview. Essentially, Huck's Unconscious Realism challenges readers to reflect on the complexities of Twain's narrative style. The book questions accepted notions of literary realism and invites us to consider how Huck's perspective, coloured by innocence and ignorance, deepens our comprehension of the social and moral problems that permeate the story. Although humorous and naive at times, Huck's story eventually acts as a provocative lens through which we may examine the complicated concerns of race, society, and human nature that still strike a chord with readers today.

REFERENCES:

[1] V. Kwok, Faithfulness in translation of children's literature The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn in Chinese, *Babel*, 2016.

[2] P. Stoneley, Children, futurity, and value: Adventures of Huckleberry Finn, *Textual Practice*. 2016.

[3] J. S. Ismail Nafi', The Role of Superstition in Twain's The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn and Shakespeare's Macbeth: A Comparative Study, *English Lang. Lit. Stud.*, 2016.

[4] J. Bird, 'And Then Think of Me□!': Huckleberry Finn and Cognitive Dissonance , *Mark Twain Annu.*, 2016.

[5] Liu Xi and Zhang Li-li, On the Initiation Theme in The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn, *US-China Educ. Rev. B*, 2016.

[6] P. Sliwa, Moral Worth and Moral Knowledge, *Philos. Phenomenol. Res.*, 2016.

[7] J. Jesson, Orson welles's deconstruction of media celebrity: From radio dramatizations to citizen Kane, *Adaptation*. 2016.

[8] Social Criticism in Mark Twain's the Adventures of Huckleberry Finn, *Int. J. Stud. English Lang. Lit.*, 2016.

[9] Adventures of Huckleberry Finn, in *Mark Twain and Youth : Studies in His Life and Writings*, 2016.

[10] H. K. Bush, *Continuing bonds with the dead: Parental grief and nineteenth-century American authors*. 2016.

CHAPTER 4

ARTFUL BALANCING ACT: TWAIN'S NARRATIVE SHIFTS IN HUCKLEBERRY FINN

Sandeep Verma, Associate Professor
Department of Computing Sciences and I.T, TeerthankerMahaveer University, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh India,
Email Id- dr.sandeepverma2003@gmail.com

ABSTRACT:

This essay explores the masterful narrative craft of Mark Twain's The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn, highlighting the book's purposeful changes in narrative tone and style. We look at how the first chapters, which are evocative and dreamlike, change into the more sardonic and parodic tone of the final chapters. This analysis reveals how Twain deftly balances these narrative alterations to produce a rich and thought-provoking literary work, shedding light on the author's intention and the thematic growth within the novel. The beginning of the book is characterised by a depth of feeling and a sense of moral uncertainty, as Huck flees from his abusive father and embarks on an adventure with Jim down the Mississippi. The King and the Duke's appearance and Tom Sawyer's reappearance, however, herald a turn towards satire and farce as the story goes on. This change of tone does not signify Twain's failure, but rather a conscious decision to explore the complexity of Southern society, human nature, and morals. Twain's mastery of storytelling is evident in his ability to handle these narrative changes while keeping the reader interested. Despite diverging from the emotional impact of the opening, the novel's end serves as a commentary on the absurdity of cultural conventions and expectations. It forces us to reconsider the fundamental nature of happy endings in both fiction and real life.

KEYWORDS:

Huckleberry Finn, Life, Narrative, Story.

INTRODUCTION

Huck's numerous roles as author, character, narrator, and comedy device are skillfully combined in this comparatively short episode. He tries, in his capacity as novelist, to bring the circus scene to life for us, but he falls short. His description of the performance stands out for its lack of descriptive depth. Although the chapters contain a few common metaphors, Huck's vocabulary is ambiguous and unclear in contrast to his horrific account of his Pap in chapter 5. He claims that the women are perfectly beautiful, and that the guys are clad in drawers and undershirts. The men also have lovely complexions. However, what stands out is his slurred pronunciation and his slightly gasped eagerness. He fumbles for adjectives while acting as the narrator and defaults to abstractions and cliches. The spectacle, which is both Huck's experience and his subject matter, has mastered him. It was the splendidness sight that ever was, the women looked like real sure-enough queens, it was a powerful fine sight, I never see anything so lovely, and they done the most astonishing things, but as a boy, he is true to childlike enthusiasm and typically replaces descriptive detail with hyperbolic affidavits of his rapt attention. He eventually assumes the role of the straight guy in his own joke. He is so delighted by the sight that he tells the circus that they may have his business whenever they like, apparently without understanding the irony of the statement that his custom has not in any way hurt his wallet.

This episode dramatizes how wise Huck is in the world yet never cynical, although the value of his jokes is determined less by his youthful intent than by the rules of the journey.

Narrative context has the power to fundamentally change the charm of what Neil Schmitz refers to as his Huckspeech 8. When Huck performs a practical joke on Jim after they become separated in the fog, there is prankishness involved, but he gets a tongue-lashing that scars him so deeply that he humbles himself to a nigger. While Huck's fabrication of his own murder to get away from his Pap's potentially fatal abuse is horrific, it is also immensely dramatic, and Huck regrets that Tom wasn't around to add the fancy touches. When he and Jim decide to save Jim Turner from imminent death, he laments Tom's absence in a scene that combines a romantic adventure and existential dread. The same may be said of his efforts to prevent the monarch and duke from taking the fortune of the Wilks girls [1], [2].

Huck fails miserably as a humorist, fails miserably as a hero, and fails miserably as a narrator because he never quite gets the accent right. He is inherently incapable of extrapolating the ultimate circumstances or the deeper importance of his travels from his alleged experience. Huck never questions the reality of the bad place and the good place, and he actually thinks that's all Miss Watson has ever told him. He can see the torment of playing the harp and singing endlessly, but he has a difficult time understanding eternity and shows little interest in it. The famous phrase All right, then, I'll go to hell does not contain an exclamation point. Given that Huck is a literal-minded boy, the comment is matter-of-fact and should be interpreted literally. He will give up trying to get to the other area because his disposition makes him fit for the undesirable place. His choice, however, is also a resignation of self-acceptance, a confession, in other words, of the acceptance of the world's judgement of him, and not, as is occasionally asserted, a commitment to submit to some higher moral authority. This unique trait is what lends the scenario its unique pathos. Huck is not physically fit, and it is hardly debatable that he lacks moral character.

Huck is torn between harsh correction and pressured societal acceptance. But he continues to be the same kid that the community let sleep in a hogshead, skip school, and fend for himself. Although Huck is caught in a predicament, there is a strong undercurrent of self-affirmation. When Jim is bitten by a rattlesnake, he calls himself a fool for forgetting that the mate was likely to join the dead one he had placed in Jim's blanket; he is sorry for the result and his stupidity but not the impulse. Because he shares the Granger ford family's belief that Emmeline was a saint, Huck fervently attempts to enjoy her poetic tributes and paintings. When he starts to become too sour on her, he even sneaks up into her room and peruses her scrapbook. Although Tom Sawyer would have added some flair to his plans, Huck frequently laments his absence. He also struggles to accept the world's criticisms and rejections of him. Additionally, Mark Twain turns this same genuine portrayal of a little boy's self-consciousness into a vehicle for satire.

Twain frequently used a satirical technique in Huck that he dramatized in A Tramp Abroad and appears to have noticed in himself. The narrator of that book berates himself for not understanding the wisdom of received tradition rather than condemning the brutal foreign traditions. The same is true of numerous instances in Huckleberry Finn where Twain's intent, as opposed to Huck's, is to expose sham, preteens, and outright silliness: Huck is perplexed that the widow makes him grumble over the victuals despite the fact that there is nothing wrong with them; he takes it on faith that Emmeline Granger Ford's pictures are nice, but they always give him the fan-to Huck is referred to by Tom Sawyer as a lunkhead, an idiot, or a saphead for not understanding the customs expected of pirates, thieves, or royalty. Tom is full of principle;therefore Huck never questions his inherent superiority or his own cultural or moral illiteracy.

Huckleberry Finn, unlike Tom Sawyer, is a book for people who used to be boys, as Twain astutely observed. Given how closely he identified with his fictional creation at the time of

writing the book, it is not entirely clear whether Twain was aware of this distinction. Nevertheless, his instinctive choice to have an unwashed fourteen-year-old outcast tell a tale that was ultimately intended for readers whose own innocence had passed proved to be a helpful one. Huck is the epitome of narrative possibility as a character his future is laid out in front of him, lush in wandering adventures and antics, freedom, and ease. But he is also doomed because every adult reader is aware that Huck's delightful caginess and shenanigans depend less on moral purpose than on youthful energy; ultimately, his escapes and accommodations will turn into evasions and compromises. Huck is unaware of this, and he hasn't even given it much thought, but we, as his grown-up readers, are, and every repugnant example of humanity surveyed in this rich cross section of America confirms it. In his attempt to tell a tale, Huckleberry Finn did his best. Mark Twain gradually realised that the boy was composing a novel[3], [4].

DISCUSSION

Perhaps the word novel is too limited. The yarn Huck relates is all slapdash and Oh, by the way, as messed up in its way as the king's recitation of Hamlet's soliloquy; the book Twain authored is another matter. Twain chose to define his work as a narrative in his Notice, and evidently after some consideration. Since Huckleberry Finn is a highly episodic book, the order in which the incidents are presented does not follow any clear narrative logic. The feud chapters come before the Boggs shooting rather than after, not for obvious creative reasons, but rather because we are supposed to believe that is how Huck experienced them. The book's episodic density decreases significantly as the story goes on, with the lost heirs event and the evasion chapters making up the majority of the second half. However, this is not because these events are more significant than previous ones; rather, over the book's several-year gestation period, Twain himself developed the ability to make the most of limited resources. Although this ability can occasionally deteriorate into artifice and burlesque, as in the plan to steal one of Aunt Sally's spoons, it also reveals the author's carefully considered attitude towards his subject matter. Additionally, Twain was driven to finish the book for both practical and creative reasons. Undoubtedly, during the final burst of writing in 1883, he thought of his story as a product that had been in production for too long. Additionally, he had his own freshly established publishing house prepared to print and advertise it.

Examining how the novel evolved and gained shape during the seven years of its intermittent composition can help one more confidently approach the question of why some episodes come after others. It is too complicated to go into detail here, but suffice it to say that Huck Finn, both as a person and as a voice, served as a metaphor for Twain's own mind. By empathizing with the boy, he was able to indulge in happy memories and vagrant thoughts, and, particularly in the early stages of writing, he was able to satisfy his own need to escape the worries of a world that was too much with him. And when he was in a more combative mood, Twain could deal scathingly with his many hatreds and irritations racial bigotry, mob violence, self-righteousness, aristocratic pretense, venality and duplicity, along with several lesser evils through the satirical latitude Huck's perspective on events permitted him. His gripes about these and other issues made an appearance in Huck's story.

W. D. Howells often wistfully lamented that he wished Mark Twain could more effectively control his fancy, and Twain, for his part, contributed to the public perception of Howells as a jackleg author. However, no critic has been able to praise Twain's unconventional creativity at the expense of his literary craft since the works of Gladys Bellamy, Sydney Krause, William Gibson, Walter Blair, Victor Doyno, or Henry Nash Smith, to mention a few. By the end of the first paragraph, even that modest claim seems too much, but we cannot dismiss out of hand Mark Twain's claim that he merely served as the amanuensis to his creative

imagination; in fact, on the first page of the manuscript of the novel, he gave his book the working title Huckleberry Finn/Reported by Mark Twain.

According to the text, Twain originally started his story with You will not know about me... before completely accepting Huck's grammatical inaccuracy and all the consequences that followed. It is obvious that Mark Twain cannot serve even as the reporter of Huck's narrative and that he cannot be trusted because, according to Huck, he told some stretchers in retelling Tom's story. Huck says that without having read The Adventures of Tom Sawyer, you wouldn't know anything about me. Huck has already omitted Mr. from the first three phrases in a polite manner. Mark Twain and identified himself as an orphan in several different ways.There may not be a more bold beginning to a lengthy work of fiction than the first few words of Song of Myself, if not even those. Strangely, we are amused by Huck rather than because we are in the enticing presence of someone walking around with his vision, thus we consent to assume what Huck assumes. We want to be with him and hear what he has to say because he makes us laugh and then cry. In a similar manner, we never question how a novel like this could have been written by a boy and never demand of it even the most basic components of fictional likelihood.

We can easily picture Huck in the act of writing itself, squinting one eye, squeezing his tongue between his teeth, and firmly grasping his pencil as he starts to record his exploits, even without Kemble's artwork of Huck penning a letter to Mary Jane Wilks in chapter 28. However, it is a little more challenging to picture when or why Huck delivers his tale. We are aware that he completes it before setting out for the Territory, and we can assume that he wrote it in around the same amount of time as it took for Tom's gunshot wound to heal. More puzzling is the fact that Tom Sawyer was published in 1876, but the novel takes place in the 1830s or 1840s, and it never occurs to Huck that he ought to explain this curious discrepancy. Mark Twain had published a forgivably exaggerated account of Tom and him in The Adventures of Tom Sawyer. It is also inconceivable that Huck would have left the Indian Territory for New York to look for a publisher for the finished work. The biggest stretcher of all may be the very parameters of the fiction contained in his book [5], [6].

It is not accidental that Twain added the elaborate introductory apparatus to his novel the heliotype image of him as a frontispiece, sternly presiding over his book; his parenthetical identification of Huck as Tom Sawyer's Comrade; his setting of the scene and the time of the novel; his Notice and his Explanatory. These were no doubt, in part, attempts to reassert his own authorial presence in the After all, Twain provides the where and when of this story the Mississippi Valley, forty to fifty years ago while Huck never does. Twain's Notice rather protectively and very authoritatively cautions us against even noticing their absence in the narrative, suggesting that perhaps Huck did not realise that his story ought to demonstrate any interest in motivation, plot, or moral. Twain also highlights one of the book's key strengths in his Explanatory, namely the careful consideration and accurate representation of dialect. Although we can picture Huck struggling to form complete sentences, we doubt that he went to the same lengths that Twain did to craft his characters' speech.

It's not necessary to be a meta fictionist to grasp the difficulty with this, but Huck discreetly notes the name down since somebody might want me to spell it, next. As the narrator, Huck has consistently spelt George Jackson as well as a variety of other, more challenging names Harney Shepherdson, Emmeline Granger ford, Lafe Buckner, Silas Phelps, Henry the Eight, Colonel Sherburn correctly. Are we to assume that Huck has had some orthographically redeeming experience in the few months since this conversation with Buck? It's not my intention to pick out every little detail, but rather to draw attention to the fact that reading

doesn't typically raise these kinds of queries. Huck's narrative presence creates an ambience of mind that is too enchanting and seductive to allow for skepticism.

Even though the boy's story is impromptu and lacks structure, it somehow holds together practically against all odds. The plot often deepens just to collapse into another overlapping experience. Colonel Sherburn is not lynched as we had anticipated. Huck won't reveal what actually happened to Buck Grangerford. We get intrigued by Miss Sophia and Harney Shepherdson's romance, but all we know about their star-crossed relationship is that they made it over the river without incident. We feel sorry for Boggs's sixteen-year-old daughter and beg for vengeance, but instead of getting a potential hero in Buck Harkness, we get a coward who also happens to be tolerably cheap in appearance. We hope that the king and duke receive their right rewards, but when they do, we are forced to feel bad for them. We want to see the Wilks girls reunited with their money and their relatives, but in the episode's climactic scene, the crowd rushes to the coffin. Huck seizes the opportunity to flee during the chaos, and we, his readers, are willingly drawn after him despite our desire to stay. The experience of the Wilks girls ends abruptly, and Huck is now alive again.

The two main story points are revealed to be false starts, HitchcockianMaGuffins: Huck is running away from Pap, but we finally discover that Pap was the man who died in the floating house thirty-four chapters and a few hundred miles before. Jim is fleeing from Miss Watson's terrible order to sell him down the river, but we later learn that he was set free in her will two months previously. The action that captures our attention is frequently abandoned, detoured, or foiled. Through a number of revelations made by a number of characters, Twain wraps up the plot in Chapter the Last as quickly and effectively as a calf-roper with the rope clenched between his teeth: Jim owns himself, fulfilling an early prophecy that he will become wealthy; Pap is dead, allowing Huck to use his $6,000 to finance a trip west; Tom is healed from his gunshot wound, and we now know why he hadDespite the lack of a clear storyline, the novel's repeated and varied mythic, structural, and satirical patterns of flight and absorption, prophecy and fulfilment, retreat and return, death and rebirth, initiation and emergence, and repetition and variation are all clearly visible.

Additionally, there are many other themes and concerns, such as the absurd and comical results of Christian piety and sentimentality, the obnoxious aristocratic privilege and backwater vulgarity, marginalization and co-optation, intuitive sympathy and utilitarian behaviour, rigid racism and the dignified expansions of open friendship. Then there is the book itself, which serves as an example of a definite advancement over and immeasurable contribution to the tradition of American humor. To the extent that criticism and interpretation can make them so, these patterns, themes, and accomplishments are undoubtedly there in the book, although Huck and perhaps even Twain himself would not see them. Henry Nash Smith's wise observation that Twain's technical accomplishment was of course inseparable from the process of discovering new meanings in his material may help us understand all of them may help us understand them all. His growth as a writer was the result of a dialectic interaction in which the scope of his imagination constantly put a strain on his technical capabilities, and advancements in technique in turn unlocked new vistas for his imagination [7], [8].

However, the four sets of draughts for the novel that Twain made between 1879 and 1883 show that his imaginative reach was occasionally blind groping. Twain considered including in his story, among other things, a Negro sermon, the story of a Missouri earthquake, a house-raising, a village fire, a hazing, elocution lessons, an encounter with alligators, a quilting bee, a candy-pulling, a temperance lecture, a duel, a lynching, an accident killing with a unloaded gun, an auction, a dog messenger, and an elephant Many believe that he irreparably damaged

Huck's integrity and credibility in the final evasion episode by giving in to his love of burlesque, subjecting Jim to a series of needless insults, subverting the terms of their friendship that he had so patiently cultivated, and ultimately betraying his reader's trust.

Individual readers will decide on that matter, but the working notes show at least the variety of options Huck's exploits made available to the authora variety so wide as to be arbitrary. The only prerequisites for his then-forming tale, it seems, were that Huck should have witnessed the events, or heard someone else recite them, and that Huck should have told the story. This is just to argue that Twain relied more on the literary realism than the subject matter realism. Naturally, any and all of the events listed in his working notes could have occurred along the Mississippi, but they don't suggest a clear narrative arc. And many of the instances he did dramatise are just as incidental as those he considered. He did, after all, decide to include things like witch pies, rope ladders, secret tattoos, buried treasure, sideshows, feuds, romances, ghost stories, and fights. As real as the river is in the book, it is still unbelievable that a runaway slave would attempt to go up it in order to reach Canada.

Even if Twain didn't always succeed in controlling his whims, he does appear to have made an effort to organise the various outcomes of it. The Boggs shooting and the inebriated bareback rider at the circus are juxtaposed in a telling way, providing the clearest illustration of this type of aesthetic management. In the first episode, the villagers push one another aside to get a good look at a dying man, which contrasts with the real physical pain Boggs is experiencing and the emotional pain his daughter is experiencing. Huck worries sincerely about the alleged drunk at the circus, but it's all just for show. The rattlesnake that bites Jim in real life on Jackson's Island and the garter snakes with buttons tied to their tails in the shed at the Phelps farm are other examples of paired episodes or details. Similarly, Huck's captivity in his Pap's cabin and the ridiculous remnants of Tom's romantic prescriptions, as well as Jim's captivity in the shed on the Phelps farm and the deaf and dumb hoax of the duke are Each of these correspondences, as well as others, effectively distinguish between genuine urgency and manufactured fraud. They also demonstrate how deftly Twain combined the two.

Many of the characters and incidents in Huckleberry Finn can be attributed to creative narrative turns that advance the plot, expand the scope of Huck and Jim's adventures, and let the author engage in any improvised creative improvisation that came to mind. The king and duke's introduction in chapter 19 and Tom Sawyer's reappearance in chapter 33 are the two most significant of these. Twain broke the raft's and the river's sacredness when he permitted the monarch and duke to commandeer it. However, it was also a helpful step since now that his characters could roam during the day, the author could observe the manners and language of life along the river in a more unrestricted way. Since Huck and Jim now have significantly less control over the course of events, the manoeuvre also helped explain away the challenge of bringing an escaped slave into the Deep South. Huck's experiences and dedication were transformed into depressingly imaginative hoaxes by the spectacular reintroduction of Tom Sawyer, who ostensibly assumes the position of superintendent of affairs and softens the fatally serious repercussions of his decision to assist Jim in chapter 31. But at least it offered a plan, however unlikely, for wrapping up a novel that might have dragged on indefinitely.

Henry James' well-known essay The Art of Fiction was also published in England in 1884, the same year as Huckleberry Finn was. Most of James' criteria for what constitutes a good novelinterestingness, lifelike representation, providing the atmosphere of mind in contact with experience, and catch[ing] the colour, the relief, the expression, the surface, and the substance of the human spectacleare met by Twain's book. It also happens to meet the criteria set down by certain critics and the expectations of many readers that James holds up to sceptic scrutinynamely, that it have a happy ending, be packed with action and excitement,

and have a clear moral purpose. Coincidentally, James contrasts two books he was reading at the timeTreasure Island by Robert Louis Stevenson and Chérie by Edmond de Goncourtin the same essay. The second aims to follow the development of the moral consciousness of a child, while the first treats of murders, mysteries, islands of dreadful renown, hairbreadth escapes, miraculous coincidences, and buried doubloons. James likes Stevenson's book because it succeeds in what it sets out to do, unlike De Goncourt's, in his opinion. Even when he made the analogy, James probably did not think that any writer, much less an American writer, could successfully combine the two efforts into a single work, but he would have undoubtedly supported the effort [9], [10]. Not that Twain would have cared a fig if James had given his blessing. W. D. Howells was Twain's esteemed colleague in these subjects, just as Hawthorne was Melville's. Even so, Twain wrote Howells with a certain petulant self-confidence that he, at least, was pleased with the outcome after finishing his manuscript and making revisions: And I shall like it, whether anybody else does or not. To attempt one last parallel, Melville's concluding remark to Hawthorne regarding Moby-Dick's success is similarly defiant: I have written a wicked book, and feel spotless as a lamb. While Huckleberry Finn's wickedness is obviously not Moby-Dick's, it is yet consistent with what one might anticipate from Huck Finn and perhaps Mark Twain. Because Huck had grown up with it, and because Twain's description of it was accurate.

CONCLUSION

The novel Huckleberry Finn by Mark Twain has substantial and purposeful alterations in narrative tone and style, which have been examined in The Artful Balancing Act: Twain's Narrative Shifts in Huckleberry Finn. We have seen how Twain expertly leads the reader through a narrative trip that develops thematically, from the dreamy and emotionally impactful introductory chapters to the satirical and parodic final ones. Finally, The Artful Balancing Act encourages readers to appreciate the thoughtful and deft narrative decisions Mark Twain made when writing Huckleberry Finn. These changes in tone and style serve to improve our knowledge of the novel's ideas, characters, and the society it critiques; they are not a weakness but rather an asset. The careful balancing act Twain does in Huckleberry Finn between scathing humour and emotional depth makes it a classic and thought-provoking piece of American literature.

REFERENCES:

[1] M. M. Murray, D. J. Lewkowicz, A. Amedi, and M. T. Wallace, Multisensory Processes: A Balancing Act across the Lifespan, *Trends in Neurosciences*. 2016.

[2] D. Elliott, A balancing act for renewables, *Nature Energy*. 2016.

[3] S. M. Cerritelli and R. J. Crouch, The Balancing Act of Ribonucleotides in DNA, *Trends in Biochemical Sciences*. 2016.

[4] P. Kovarik, V. Castiglia, M. Ivin, and F. Ebner, Type I interferons in bacterial infections: A balancing act, *Frontiers in Immunology*. 2016.

[5] L. Goodrich, B. Panning, and K. N. Leung, Activators and repressors: A balancing act for X-inactivation, *Seminars in Cell and Developmental Biology*. 2016.

[6] M. Vankemmelbeke and L. Durrant, Third-generation antibody drug conjugates for cancer therapy - A balancing act, *Therapeutic Delivery*. 2016.

[7] S. J. Matkovich, A balancing act in cardiac hypertrophy, *Cardiovascular Research*. 2016.

[8] F. Rashid-Doubell, S. Mohamed, K. Elmusharaf, and C. S. O'Neill, A balancing act: A phenomenological exploration of medical students' experiences of using mobile devices in the clinical setting, *BMJ Open*, 2016.

[9] V. Agol, J. Cello, K. Chumakov, E. Ehrenfeld, and E. Wimmer, Eradicating polio: A balancing act, *Science*. 2016.

[10] S. Jänicke, Valuable {Research} for {Visualization} and {Digital} {Humanities}: {A} {Balancing} {Act}, *Work. {Visualization} {Digital} {Humanities}, {VisWeek}*, 2016.

CHAPTER 5

THE PATERNAL INFLUENCE IN THE OPENING CHAPTERS OF HUCKLEBERRY FINN

Indu Tripathi, Assistant Professor
Department of Engineering, TeerthankerMahaveer University, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id- indu_tripathi@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT:

This study examines how important the father character is in the first few chapters of Mark Twain's The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn. A fuller comprehension of the novel's themes and character dynamics is revealed by examining the nuanced interactions between Huck and his father, Pap, as well as Jim's growing fatherly role. In order to give light on how these relationships shape the story and prepare the reader for the profound concepts that emerge throughout the work, the paternal influences on Huck's trip are addressed. Pap is a narcissistic, abusive character that personifies the worst facets of society and represents the evil side of paternalism. When compared to Jim, who acts as Huck's surrogate father during their trip down the Mississippi River, his presence stands in stark contrast to the loving and protective traits he demonstrates. Pap's destructive influence stands in stark contrast to Jim's devotion to Huck, wisdom, and moral leadership. Twain establishes the framework for the novel's main themes the examination of social conventions, racial discrimination, and the quest for personal identity through these paternal ties. A recurrent theme in Huck's story that highlights the nuance of his persona is his battle to establish his own moral compass in the absence of appropriate parent figures.

KEYWORDS:

Adventure, Book, Psychological, Unconfuses.

INTRODUCTION

For many decades, critics have debated whether Huckleberry Finn's finale was successful. Ernest Hemingway declared the antics at Silas Phelps' farm to be cheating to start the discussion. This was quickly followed by exchanges of rhetoric between Eliot, Trilling, Marx, and others whose works collectively make up a mini-canon of their own.1 Although the conclusion has received a variety of formal, political, aesthetic, and moral defences, the mere existence of a debate that has lasted more than 60 years is evidence of the problem with those concluding chapters. The protagonists seem to act in ways that reject or undo their earlier, more maturing experiences, which is perhaps the most straightforward criticism of the finale that is ultimately unanswerable. After seeing the Granger fords fight, it appears incomprehensible that Huck would agree to Tom's Count of Monte Cristo antics with so ease. Similarly, Jim's infantile acceptance of the escape plot cannot be reconciled with the wisdom and dignity he had earlier displayed in his role as Huck's surrogate parent. Supporters are left in the more awkward position of arguing that the failure of the ending constitutes an ironic success because no reading can give the characters in the closing chapters the psychological qualities, they so obviously lack, despite the ingenuity of even the most brilliant supporters.

This essay is not meant to be a last-minute contribution to the ongoing discussion. What follows is an explanation of why it occurs, not a defence or criticism of the novel's constrained conventionality. I'll start by saying that an otherwise serious novel is not suddenly followed by the superficiality of its conclusion. Huckleberry Finn opens with a number of evocative, dreamy chapters that begin to give way to Twain's more traditional

caricatures of Southern culture even before Huck is mistaken for Tom by Aunt Polly. Critics have been so preoccupied with the unsatisfying ending that they have neglected to point this out. This change begins with the passing of the Granger fords and the entry of the King and the Duke; from then, the story slowly loses its emotional resonance before reaching its climax in the final chapters' flat, parodic tone. However, the opening scenes of the book, where Huck waits for his father to arrive, eludes him, and flees in a blaze of ambivalence with his substitute father, Jim, are some of the book's most moving passages. According to my theory, the difficulties of the novel's finale can be interpreted as a response to the profundity of its beginning [1], [2].

The novel's introduction juxtaposes a character and the novelist, fiction and reality, and finally a father and son to raise a wide range of formal and psychological questions. When taken as a whole, Huck's rivalry with Mark Twain, his reaction to seeing his father's corpse, and his run to Judge Thatcher and Jim after spotting his tracks, can be seen as a son's difficult struggle against intimacy with a controlling father. I'll make the case that Twain's writing of those first chapters, which was sometimes hampered by writing blockages, exposed to him, knowingly or unconsciously, his troubling concerns with parenthood and selfhood, which made the eventual emptying of the closing chapters inevitable. As the opening chapters focus on conflicts with the father, they also serve as a self-aware commentary on how those conflicts are depicted in the story. Furthermore, this relationship between Twain and the writing of his text is a subject of the images and tropes of Huck's early adventures.

A psychodynamic model of the creative process, which holds that as authors freely associate characters and endings, they catch fleeting glimpses of the unconscious issues reflected in their fiction, is implicit in such an explanation of the novel's structure. Since writers are constantly readers of the text they are creating, they must constantly decide whether to explore the unconscious emotions and memories that their characters' experiences and actions arouse or move onto safer narrative terrain by avoiding the emotionally charged material. Huckleberry Finn initially confuses the readers' perception of who he is when he first addresses them in his alluring and provocative opening paragraph. Finn makes the implication that there is a fictional Huck who shouldn't be confused with the real one by stating that he has read The Adventures of Tom Sawyer and has an opinion about its value. In fact, he makes a strong implication that the real Huck is unnecessary.There are two possible readings for the first sentence. It implies that it makes no difference if we first learned about Huck via Tom Sawyer or, if interpreted literally, that Tom Sawyer is irrelevant. Whatever the case, Finn's opinion of the other book is crystal clear: The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn can be read without having read The Adventures of Tom Sawyer first.

For a long time, commentators have been intrigued by the emergence of Huck Finn the narrator. Huck is trapped by his author's urge to utilise him as a comedic figure, according to Alan Trachtenberg and Henry Nash Smith, respectively. Henry Nash Smith claimed that Twain accidentally created a tragic character as a result of using the first person singular in the vernacular.Trachtenberg contends that the novel's indictment on society demanded that Huck stay underdeveloped and equates Jim's quest for political freedom with Huck's servitude to Twain's satirical goals. Huck’s creator's need to use him as a tool has a negative impact on his personality. Ironic devices that educate the reader about society and human nature and liberate him do the opposite by employing Huck to oppress him. Contrary to what Trachtenberg and Smith claim, Huck does deepen as a tragic character at the novel's introduction and does in fact become a technical device before the book's conclusion. This ironically creates a continuum of discontinuity. I contend that Huck's contradictory narration, which can be both mechanical and forced at times and deeply autonomous at others, is a

result of his position as Mark Twain's literary heir. Twain unintentionally reproduced the conflict between father and son that permeates the motifs and language of the novel's introduction by making the fictional Huck into a fictionally real person who has read Tom Sawyer and wishes to improve on its excellence [3], [4]. The comma that separates he told the truth and mainly in the first sentence is very effective since it creates the impression that Twain is lying. Finn may not publicly criticize the well-known author, but his disdain is always present. In spite of the fact that he pardons Twain by adding, I never seen anybody but lied, one time or another, he makes it very plain that Twain frequently lied in his account by stating, twice, that there were things which he stretched. It was mostly a true book. with some stretchers. Tom Sawyer's opening is in sharp contrast to this one. That book started with a beneficent narrator painting a beautiful picture of the Missouri town; Finn starts his work by criticizing a known author.

DISCUSSION

An unspoken rivalry between father and son is present in this friendly competition between Finn and Twain, and it is also present in Huck's attempt to create a sequel. Due to the demands placed on its structure, the sequel is one of the trickiest artistic tasks and a paradox. A sequel must extend the original work without going against its principles, share some of the traits of the original work without repeating them, and be as good as or better. In this approach, the sequel intensifies the standard fight for rhetorical identity since, unlike first texts, which develop from preexisting genres while preserving some of their characteristics, sequels have a specific antecedent for which they must be both self and other. This is evident in Huckleberry Finn's initial posture. A character from the first piece now introduces the second and claims that the first work is irrelevant. The rhetorical conundrum is obvious from the first two paragraphs' terminology alone. Twain mainly stated the truth, according to Finn, with a few stretchers. Which text is the main one, and how can an author stretch it into a sequel, are the questions.Writing a sequel has an even deeper relationship to oedipal phase anxiety than Harold Bloom believes. Bloom sees every creative act as a conflict between ambitious son-poets and canonical father-texts.According to Bloom, a strong poet will read past poems incorrectly in order to create difference; an author writing a sequel must create both differences and similarity.

Here, psychoanalytic descriptions of adolescent growth might be helpful. The children that manage oedipal period anxiety the best doesn’t come out as opposites of their same-sex parents or duplicates of them; instead, they take pleasure in sharing some traits with the parent while taking pride in the traits that are uniquely theirs. The concept of success as it pertains to this Erewhonian healthy oedipal child, which is generally found in textbooks, is the broadest. Such a child internalizes more than just her parents' skills and ideals; while her achievement may resemble that of her family, it will also be the result of her own accumulation of knowledge and experience. The contradictory definitions of success mirror this paradox of originality, which holds that something is original if it approaches acquired material in a novel way. Success technically means something that succeeds something else, which is derived from the Latin sequor, to follow, although our modern definition of success suggests if not an original event, at least one that is self-sufficient and enduring. These opposing meanings are where the core of the oedipal struggle resides because a successful child is always a successor. The term sequel refers to a form in which the dialectical meanings of success are equally immanent because it is derived from the word sequor. Success is the act of following, and writing a sequel is the act of continuing a successful work [5], [6].

The sequel is usually about the oedipal struggle since it expresses both definitions of success. Or, to put it another way, a sequel's main goal is to be another sequel. For instance, Antony and Cleopatra, a sequel to Julius Caesar, has as one of its main themes Antony's status as Cleopatra's lover, which he inherits from his father Caesar. In the second installment of Don Quixote, Cervantes' knight has earned an antiquated grandeur and, at times, paternal wisdom, and is no longer the naive son trying to reenter the long-gone world of his chivalric fathers.The Odyssey starts out with Telemachus in a difficult situation, needing to defend his mother from potential suitors who represent projections of his own ambitions. The New Testament, which is an appendix to the Old Testament, reveals Christ's oedipal relationship with God. Jesus, as both Son and Father, embodies the Hebrew laws while irreparably changing them. This is possibly the most dramatic example. Therefore, Finn's initial attack on Mark Twain should not come as a surprise; it is a brilliant hint that a sequel has started.

Huck's charge that Mark Twain is a liar demonstrates the conflict between the original text and sequel, Huck Finn and Mark Twain. He makes the implication that his book will be true while the last one was false by doing this, but his readers quickly discover that Huckleberry Finn is possibly the best liar in American fiction. This contradictory statement is potent. The charge implies that this book will prove Tom Sawyer wrong and expose those characters for who they really are. However, the ironic narrator's relationship with the reader is complicated by his admission of lying while maintaining that he is telling the truth. Similar to Iago, who deceives the audience in his asides, Finn's work is vulnerable to post-structuralist questions like, Are there fictional truths? Exist any true fictions? Finally, the propensity for lying that Huck and Twain both possess brings us back to the nature of the sequel since in this instance, the son purposefully downplays his striking likeness to his father.

Even just by virtue of being the successor to an earlier declaration, a sequel is ultimately a response and not an initial assertion. A second novel set in the same landscape is likely to undermine those defences in the service of difference if the first novel is defensively optimistic and happy, a place where mothers adopt stray boys and ideal fathers make them their proteges. It might even present a world without kind mothers where ideal fathers are helpless. Although this paradigm must be reduced, it offers a window into Huckleberry Finn. The St. Petersburg in Huck's book is different from the one in The Adventures of Tom Sawyer, which is a good place to start when looking for differences. The earlier novel's ultimately kindhearted community, which was depicted through literary similes, has been replaced by a less united and protective one. Despite sharing the same names, its population and their society are distinct. The Widow Douglas, who served as Huckleberry's rescuer mother in the first novel, is now a careless person who complains while eating and leaves Huckleberry in the care of her callous sister, Miss Watson. These alterations disprove the implication in the ending of Tom Sawyer that society would save Huck; Tom Sawyer, who had only glimpsed of hubris in the earlier text, now openly mocks Huck's ignorance and brands him a numskull. This St. Petersburg is a dangerous place where violence and isolation are constant, not the sentimental picture of the peaceful antebellum South that might save the kid in its readers.

This often-quoted phrase perfectly conveys Huck's bizarre solitude and functions as the novel's opening chapters in miniature. The youngster receives hazy signals of death but is unable to respond, like in some unpleasant dreams. Huck is a witness to loss both here and throughout, and his description of the night's events makes his readers into fellow witnesses. For the same reason that Huck is unable to respond to the ghost who can't make itself understood, we are unable to respond to Huck because we are confined to our own interpretation of the text.This sequel's tone and setting differ from the first text's, but it also

includes a new psychological angle. In Tom Sawyer, Huckleberry Finn accompanies Tom through nocturnal landscapes where father corpses are interred and dug up, and where excavating beneath the surface briefly reveals subliminal hopes and dreads. Those outings were a byproduct of Tom's success; as he gained strength, he had to occasionally face his impulse to beat his father and his concern about parental retaliation. The nocturnal landscape and the conflict with dads are the main events in this piece; they overpower and rule the daylight world. The psychoformal demands on The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn, Tom Sawyer's Comrade are thus revealed when the character of the sequel is understood. This book must address oedipal conflict because it is a sequel to Tom Sawyer, which moved away from unconscious themes. More particularly, Huck must confront the father in the cemetery whom Tom Sawyer fled to, the idealised figure of Judge Thatcher. Even though these reversals have far-reaching effects, their overall result is that as Huck Finn restrained the unconscious world in Tom Sawyer, its sequel will also reside there.

When Huck first acknowledges his biological father, the novel's unconscious is most obvious. However, Pap's influence on his son and the text is so strong that even a false claim about him amplifies the atmosphere and structure of the early chapters. Ironically, this initial report of Pap is an overblown account of his death [7], [8].An examination of this paragraph illustrates the profound influence of pap, for Huck's justification raises more problems than it does. Why didn't anyone remark that the floating corpse was a lady if it was? Why does Huck explain his argument so collectedly without questioning why a lady would dress in men's clothes? But the reason Huck's theory is so compelling is that it predicts his return to St. Petersburg clothed as a girl in a dress, which he and Jim discover next to pap's dead body. A parent who might be a woman, an unrecognizably unrecognisable face, and the wheeling of the future into the present all conjure up the dream state, in which some events and qualities are overlaid with echoes of other, distinct occurrences and qualities. When reviewers refer to Tom Sawyer as a dream of boyhood, they are referring to a romanticisedidealised world that is nostalgic in nature. The setting of Huckleberry Finn is dreamlike in a different sense, evoking psychological nightmares where identity, impulse, and action are neither fixed nor separate, which is true to the nature of the sequel, which must be both comparable to and different from its initial text.

There aren't many passages that are affected by dream logic, but the false report of Papa's death is one of them. This book's dreamscape is a shaky element that is undoubtedly challenging to maintain. Even the dreamscape of the novel's introduction ebbs and flows like an unconscious tide, drawn, to fulfil the simile, by the waxing and waning of Huck's father. The end chapters of Huckleberry Finn fail because of the complete lack of unconscious depth so prevalent in the earlier chapters. The simplest way to comprehend this hesitant yet percussive interaction between the novel's psychological problems and its representation of reality is to look at what happens after Pap's first symptoms of returning.One inch of snow covered the ground, and I could see someone's footprints. They had ascended from the quarry, spent some time around the stile, and then continued around the yard fence. After waiting so long, it was amusing that they still hadn't entered.

Huck's description builds suspense by delaying telling the reader what the cross in the left boot heel signified until several scenes later namely, that the footprints belong to his father. Aside from piquing the reader's attention, leaving out the stalker's name also obscures his identity and lets his footprints suggest a variety of scenarios. Take the second phrase for example: They had come up from the quarry. Huck's continued usage of the third person plural merely serves to highlight the pronoun's various referents. In a story where Huck adopts a number of men to father him, his use of the pronoun they suggest that there are other

fathers who could be surrounding his home. This chapter recalls the honey pap's death news in addition to predicting dramatic events. The phrase they have come up from the quarry makes it sound as though they have emerged from the ground or the grave, but the crossing of the fence alludes to a journey back from the afterlife. Therefore, the passage combines the longing for his father to die away with the yearning for him to come back. Huck rushes to Judge Thatcher, the perfect father for Tom Sawyer, for assistance as soon as he sees his father's tracks. One critic criticised the exchange for treating Thatcher ambiguously and demanded that Huckries hand over the cash.

A detailed examination of this scenario reveals that Huck has not approached the Judge for assistance.

Contrarily, Huck refuses to tell him what happened and demands Thatcher take his gold instead of speaking out. Huck never explains to the reader why he does this, but one logical theory is that he wants to keep the money and figures his father will have a harder difficulty taking it away from an adult than from a youngster. If so, the boy has conned the judge just as skillfully as any seasoned con man by using him as a barrier. And if his attempt to trap Thatcher may have seemed unjustified, the Judge's response seemed to support Huck's assumptions about him. Like other successful scams, this one focuses on the victim's greed. There is no indication in the current passage that Thatcher plans to refund Huck's money, even if he does so at the book's conclusion. Huck records that He studied for a time, adding, Oho-o... You want to give me all of your possessions. The King or the Duke would have been deserving of a moment's worth of ‘studying' before coming up with a distinction as sophisticated as that between giving cash away and selling it for a dollar. Thatcher seems like a con guy, too, from a man revered as a god by the villagers in Tom Sawyer to a lawyer considering robbing a child in Huckleberry Finn. Perfect fathers are no longer perfect in this sequel.

The Judge is not the only paternal figure Huck encounters; in the very next scene, he goes in search of a third, more hospitable father. He goes to Jim in the hopes that Jim's hairball, which was taken from the fourth stomach of an ox, would contain information about pap. Jim says that the hairball sometimes wouldn't talk without money after attempting to get it to roll on the floor.In terms of organisation, this scenario resembles Huck's conversation with Judge Thatcher, but with a number of significant variations. Both times, the child sought assistance from an older guy, who then demanded payment for his efforts. However, the man and the youngster have more reliable companions in the second rendition. Jim graciously lowers his price and accepts the fake quarter as payment since Huck evidently feels secure enough to tell him about the warning indications of his father's impending arrival.

Huck and Jim's scene functions as a reading of the earlier meeting as a new version of the Thatcher encounter. The counterfeit transaction with the Judge may be represented by the phrase old counterfeit quarter that wasn’t no good's centre image. As the better father, Jim's solution for the brass quarter is both magical and ominous: the raw Irish potato will be split open, and the quarter will be placed between the two halves and kept there all night. This procedure, a sort of Missouri alchemy, strongly suggests that father relationships, so rife with fear and loathing, can be transformed into something of value. That is to say, something counterfeit and violent might be transformed into something real by a more tranquil closeness, like paddling down the Mississippi on a raft. For such a metamorphosis to occur, either a magic spell must be cast or, in the case of the metaphor, a literary structure that can generate and contain a succession of fathers who are all gradually redemptive must be used.

But simply switching from pap to Thatcher to Jim won't solve the issue of the terrible father. When the cure for the quarter is looked at more closely, it appears to create more issues than it does. The potato is divided in half and then put back together, suggesting a prehistoric conception of identity in which the self and other are interdependent parts of the same whole that is continually being broken in half and put back together again. The closer one gets to a decent father, it would seem, the more horrifying it is because, among other strong memories and desires, it reminds one of the previous, violent symbiosis. This explains why inexplicable story twists and Mark Twain's protracted writing blocks keep upsetting the passionate bond between Huck and Jim, which is forever stressed by Huck's social guilt. Because the remedy is ultimately cosmetic, even the magic spell itself exposes the likelihood of a genuine reconciliation with the father. The quarter will still be bad money after a night in between the potato chunks; it will just appear genuine.These events can also be interpreted as a criticism on Huck's relationship with Mark Twain because the discovery of the footprints, the encounter with Thatcher, and the discussion with Jim are all about the psychological repercussions of the father's attitude. After all, Finn challenges Twain at the beginning of his story, and the sequel's oedipal structure offers a strong case for thinking of Twain as a part of pap.

The topology of this section acts as a generalized representation of Twain. It resembles a flowchart of the creative process, with an idea or inspiration coming up from the imagination before being moulded by stile and narrative constraints, symbolized by the garden boundaries. Let's assume that it is Twain himself who has emerged from the quarry, who has seen Huck's stile, and who has circled the house without going inside in order to bring the author directly into this metaphor of his creative process. Huck wonders why they hadn't entered, but the reason might not be as mysterious as he believes. Huckleberry Finn's narrator, Huck, would not have remained such if Twain had entered the home. Instead, the unoccupied mansion stands in for the otherness of the story, and its locked doors highlight how far the author's fiction has come from reality. The long eight years it will take Twain to complete this unsettling storywhich he frequently attempted to pigeonhole and once threatened to burn are foreshadowed by the tracks in the snow, which indicated that the man stood around for a considerable amount of time. The tracks depict him circling his fictional home and seeing within strange figurations that appeared to have somehow sprouted from the shadowy crevices of his quarry.

This Twain-inspired circling of Huck, which stands in for the inherent difficulty of penning a sequel, is also reflected in Jim's alchemical handling of Huck's fake quarter. This bad money is the shady second text that wouldn't pass nohow because it was so slick it felt greasy and so that it would tell on it every time and that somehow manages to pass for the authentic first text. The author is forced to create a new text in the likeness of the earlier one because the earlier text, which was created in an irretrievable fusion of imagination and recall and may now feel foreign to him despite its vaguely familiar strength, compromises him. Cutting the potato in half represents Twain's solution: there will be a second narrator, a new cast of father figures to take the place of Judge Thatcher, and a new narrative that, at least in its first few chapters, will explore the depths of unconscious emotions that were only allusively discussed in Tom Sawyer's gloomy underground scenes. Keep that quarter there all night, perhaps after a night of dreaming, and anybody in town would take it in a minute [9], [10].

The psychological cost of introducing an alter ego narrator who asserts that the narrative ground repressed in your first novel serves as textual material is the rich but unsettled disarray of weakly defended emotions so vividly portrayed by the floating female body of pap and his subsequent resurrection. As the historical controversy surrounding the Phelps

Farm escape sequence suggests, the unconscious depth claimed by the new author, Huck Finn, is only sustained until the old author hastens to restore to his novel the parodies, satires, and other literary devices which served him so well as a journalist and which ultimately take from Huckleberry Finn the temporary majesty of its opening chart. The claustrophobic nature and emotional emptiness of the Phelps Farm escape sequence suggest Twain succeeded in making his own escape; the finale represents a frantic attempt to return to The Adventures of Tom Sawyer in order to escape feelings evoked by the writing of its sequel.

Huck returns home after Jim's visit with the hairball only to see his father waiting in his bedroom. It is not long after that Huck is taken away to a secluded cottage where his father regularly beats him, gets custody of him, and sues Thatcher for the money. Because it is the final and longest interaction between son and father, the account of life in that cabin is arguably the most moving and surreal moment in the book. However, as we've seen, before it occurs, the narrative's tropes, imagery, and happenings appear preoccupied with it; it's as if the proleptic experience in the cabin left a mark on the narrative prior to it. The upcoming relationship with Papa has this effect because Huckleberry Finn cannot function without his father; both Huck and his story are shaped by the race from and inescapable draw to the paternal. The cross that was set in Pap's left boot-heel, which was intended to keep off the devil, demonstrates that even the father of the tale is escaping from a father. This collision of form and psychological intensity is so overwhelming in the novel that its effects threaten to destroy the fundamental structure of the text.

CONCLUSION

Role of the Paternal in the Opening Chapters of Huckleberry Finn sheds light on the complex interactions that parenthood entails and how they affect the young protagonist, Huck. We see the divergent effects of two father figures, Pap and Jim, on Huck's growth in the novel's opening chapters. In sum, the paternal character in Huckleberry Finn's beginning chapters serves as a thematic and narrative cornerstone that directs the story's overall social criticism as well as the course of Huck's experiences. A riveting examination of the complications of fatherhood, identity, and morality in the American South during the 19th century, the work is illuminated by the contrasting influences of Pap and Jim.

REFERENCES:

[1] P. Stoneley, Children, futurity, and value: Adventures of Huckleberry Finn, *Textual Practice*. 2016.

[2] V. Kwok, Faithfulness in translation of children’s literature The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn in Chinese, *Babel*, 2016.

[3] J. Bird, ‘And Then Think of Me□!’: Huckleberry Finn and Cognitive Dissonance , *Mark Twain Annu.*, 2016.

[4] J. S. Ismail Nafi’, The Role of Superstition in Twain’s The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn and Shakespeare’s Macbeth: A Comparative Study, *English Lang. Lit. Stud.*, 2016.

[5] P. Sliwa, Moral Worth and Moral Knowledge, *Philos. Phenomenol. Res.*, 2016.

[6] Liu Xi and Zhang Li-li, On the Initiation Theme in The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn, *US-China Educ. Rev. B*, 2016.

[7] J. Elmore and C. D. Girardi, Reversing the curse: Slavery, child abuse, and Huckleberry finn, *American Literary Realism*. 2016.

[8] V. Kwok, Faithfulness in translation of children's literature, *Babel. Rev. Int. la Trad. / Int. J. Transl.*, 2016.

[9] J. H. McKay, 4. Adventures of Huckleberry Finn: Sophisticated Naïveté, in *Narration and Discourse in American Realistic Fiction*, 2016.

[10] Adventures of Huckleberry Finn, in *Mark Twain and Youth : Studies in His Life and Writings*, 2016.

CHAPTER 6

RECONSIDERING THE RIVER: TWAIN'S CHANGING NARRATIVE COURSE IN HUCKLEBERRY FINN

Zareen Usmani Farooq, Associate Professor
Department of Engineering, TeerthankerMahaveer University, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id- farooqzf@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT:

In this study, the majestic Mississippi River is examined in depth in relation to Mark Twain's Adventures of Huckleberry Finn. Even while the river's significance has been extensively studied by scholars, this research highlights a frequently-overlooked aspect: the fact that Huck and Jim didn't initially aim to travel south along the river. The paper analyses the development of Twain's narrative designs and wonders whether he originally meant for his characters to follow this path. We learn more about Twain's writing process and the river's evolving function in the story by looking at the novel's early draughts and suggested alternate plotlines. The hypothesis put forth by Franklin R. Rogers that Twain's original plan for the book was different from the final southward cruise down the river has been investigated in this essay. According to Rogers, the book may have originally been a burlesque detective story with Jim's trial for killing Huck serving as a major plot point, among other departures from the standard storyline. According to Rogers, the resurrection of the raft and the change in the narrative's course highlight how Twain's storytelling approach is dynamic and ever-evolving. It casts doubt on the idea of a predetermined and rigid plot and demonstrates how flexible and adaptable Twain's creative process was.

KEYWORDS:

Adventures, Huckleberry Finn, Plan, River.

INTRODUCTION

The gorgeous Mississippi River plays a crucial role in Mark Twain's novel The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn, and over the decades since the book's publication, an incredible amount of scholarly work has been put forth to assess its function. While many insightful observations and theories have been advanced to explain various aspects of the qualities that the river displays and embodies, relatively little attention has been paid to the fact that neither Huck nor Jim wish, or originally intend, to board a raft and float down the river with the current. This is because neither character would choose to live on a raft that is drifting south. Twain may not have intended this for his characters, either. DeVoto assumes that Twain planned from the start to take Huck and Jim on a journey downstream to the Phelps's farm, but if such had been Twain's original intent, he would not have destroyed the raft in the first place, says Franklin R. Rogers. Only if one considers that Twain had altered his plans for the novel is the resurrection of the raft understandable.1 Rogers further asserts that Huckleberry Finn was originally intended to be a burlesque detective story. Evidently, the book's climax would have Jim being tried for the murder of Huck, which he had not committed. Pap's murder and the pretend murder would also be related to the enmity between Granger ford and Shepherdson in a plot-complex akin to Simon Wheeler.

Twain, however, felt that the structural plan of his second work session was unsuitable for some reason, perhaps because it was not easily extendable, as Note A-10, encouraging the resurrection of the raft, shows. When forced to continue a story he had reportedly felt was nearly complete, he looked for a way to expand on what he had already written. The strategy

he chose, as the raft's resurrection shows, is to forgo the resolution that would have coincided with the conflict and let Huck and two tramp printers continue their trek downstream [1], [2].

We can thus gain a deeper comprehension of Twain's book by realizing that neither Jim and Huck nor their creator originally intended for them to take a raft down the Mississippi. Huck decides to flee in a canoe he has discovered after narrowly avoiding his father's murder during one of the old man's drunken outbursts. He tells us, I judged I'd hide her good, and then, stead of taking to the woods when I run off, I'd go down the river about fifty mile and camp in one place for good, and not have such a rough time tramping on foot, as he paddles away. The phrase for good implies that Huck will quit, and not just temporarily, and that he won't keep trying to distance himself from his father. We also discover that Huck's first move after escaping the captivity put upon him by Papa was to hide in his canoe, eat a snack, and then smoke a pipe and lay out a plan. This information is revealed a short while later.

It is clear that Huck will use Jackson's Island as a base and rely on the community for supplies. He has no plans to embark on a river expedition, at all. Another person who does not envision jeopardising his future on the river is Jim. In accordance with his strategy, he will move by land rather than by water. For Jim, the river is merely a challenge that must be overcome without betraying him. I'd made up my mind about what I'm Gwynne to do, he says as he tells Huck. You see, if I continued to try to flee on foot, the dogs would find me; if I stole a skift to cross, they would miss the skift, you see, and they would be aware of what I would have been carrying on the other side and where to look for my trail. I therefore declare that a raff is what I'm arter; it doesn't make no track. Jim now decides to swim out to the middle of the river in order to sneakily board a passing raft, and when he finally succeeds in doing so, he reck'n'd 'at by fo' in de mawnin' I'd be twenty-five mile down de river, en den I'd slip in, jis' b'fo' daylight, en swim asho' en take to the woods on de Illinoi side.3 Jim's plan to fully abandon the river, however, fails when one of the raftsmen comes across carrying a lantern. He feels compelled to jump into the Mississippi and swim to Jackson's Island, where he will try to survive for the time being while being engulfed by the waves.

Due to this strange turn of events, Jim and Huck end up thrust together on a refuge island in a way that strongly resembles Robinson Crusoe by Daniel Defoe.4 However, the island itself is portrayed as being much more than a haven from the storms of life or the natural storm from which Jim's understanding of bird behaviour rescues Huck. We are prompted to think of the island as resembling both Paradise and Noah's Ark from Huck's depiction of it during the spring river rise. In the canoe, we explored the entire island over the day. Even though the sun was scorching outside, the dense woods were very cool and shaded. We wound our way through the trees, but occasionally the vines were so overgrown that we had to turn around and find another route. Well, you could see rabbits, snakes, and other creatures on every old, decaying tree. After the island had flooded for a day or two, they became so tame from hunger that you could paddle right up to them and put your hand on them if you wanted to. However, turtles and snakes would slide off in the water. They were everywhere on the ridge that our cavern was in. If we had wanted pets, we could have had enough of them. Even the catfish Jim and Huck capture while residing on the island are an almost magical fisherman's dream.

However, Huck also tells us that there are wild snakes in this Paradise, and the boy's joke with the dead snake, whose mate bites Jim and puts his life in risk, foreshadows the end of the two friends' idyllic existence. In the end, Huck's quest for knowledge is what causes him to leave Paradise. Huck chooses to slip over the river and find out what's going on while posing as a girl [3], [4]. When we consider the many biblical elements in Twain's story, it is not surprise that a woman, in this case Mrs. Judith Loftus, is the one who first informs Jim of

her husband's looming threat to Jim's freedom. It makes sense that Mrs. Loftus' information is what forces Huck and Jim to leave Paradise.

DISCUSSION

The plan of abandoning the raft and the Mississippi at Cairo with the intention of boarding a steamboat in order to go against the flow of the Ohio and towards freedom is only adopted as a new tactic after this point in the novel, where Huck and Jim are forced to start continuously using the flow of the river to avoid capture. The crucial option to leave Jackson's Island and float down the Mississippi is made reluctantly, is at best viewed as a transient situation, and in no way can it be perceived as a wise move. The two runaways' method of escape must also be viewed as less than ideal because the raft they use to make their getaway has the major drawback of being distressingly slow as a vehicle of transportation. When we finally descended below the island, according to Huck, it must have been close to one o'clock, and the raft did seem to go mighty slowly. The king and the duke in a skiff are able to catch up with Jim and Huck just a little time after the raft has taken off later in the story because of its sluggish pace. The lack of speed at that point proves significant as well as aggravating, as Huck is already relishing in the fact that it did seem so good to be free again and all by ourselves on the big river and nobody to bother us and believes he and Jim have finally gotten away of the two frauds. Huck, however, is devastated when the king and the duke succeed in getting to the raft: So I wilted right down onto the planks, then, and give up; and it was all I could do to keep from crying.

Although the narrative has a number of exquisite sequences involving life on a raft, we eventually come to understand that the raft is a hazardously sluggish, awkward contraption. And to make matters worse, it is vulnerable to being ripped from its moorings in crucial situations, as the perilous adventure aboard the sinking Walter Scott or the terrifying experience with the fog. As if the drawbacks already mentioned weren't enough, Huck and Jim are also fully aware that it is nearly impossible to take the raft up the stream of course, especially after having watched the rafts and steamboats spin down the Missouri shore, and up-bound steamboats fight the big river in the middle and after accidentally missing Cairo in the fog. Despite its appealing characteristics, a raft is an ineffective mode of transportation that is constantly at the whim of the weather and the current and, on top of that, is constantly in danger of being sunk by a steamboat. The secure, contented happiness that Jim and Huck experienced in their lost Paradise never fully compares to life on the floating and unpredictable collection of logs, despite Huck's assertion that there warn't no home like a raft, after all. A raft can only travel with the current since it lacks an energy source that would allow it to swim against the current.

Additionally, the river itself is not necessarily the friendliest of settings. Twain fills the river with unfortunate victims at regular intervals, starting with the corpse that was incorrectly thought to be pap. The bodies of Huck's stand-in pig and Pap himself were both discovered in the floating house. And when Buck Granger ford and his cousin Joe seek safety in the nonpartisan river, they too quickly turn into lifeless corpses. By slowing rather than hastening their flight, the Mississippi contributes to their easy targets for their pursuers. Once in the water, they instantly become sitting ducks for the men on shore. When Mary Jane Wilks says that the king and the duke should receive the same treatment as scoundrels in her town, she is referring to having them tarred and feathered, and flung in the river. The three criminals aboard the Walter Scott represent additional sacrifices to the river's unrelenting flow.

Unless we take into account the significance of the various myths to which he refers, myths that serve as a commentary on the ways in which humans strive to relate to the river and its

bodies, it may occasionally seem like Twain overemphasizes the relationship the river has with death. For instance, Huck knows that the body that was mistakenly recognised as being that of Pap after being discovered floating face up in the river had been misidentified. The myth, in which Huck fully believes, states that women's bodies always float with their faces above and men's with their faces downward.6 There's also the notion that quicksilver-laced bread will, in Huck's words, always go right to the drowned carcass and stop there. It has also been demonstrated that one way to get a body to rise to the surface is to fire a cannon in the general vicinity of where it is thought to be. Despite the fact that none of these beliefs are supported by science, Twain's inclusion of them demonstrates the need that people had for them. This need must have been based on a sufficiently frequent occurrence of death by or associated with the river [5], [6].

However, there are multiple points of view about rivers in the book. Rivers served as important thoroughfares in the years before the development of railroads and paved highways, as Mark Twain well knew. Because rivers move, they typically remain navigable even in winter, whereas dirt roads can become impassable during certain seasons or types of weather. Because of this, towns were frequently built along rivers, which highlights the significance of the river as a means of connecting locations and experiences during the time period covered by Twain's novel. The shape of the book is based on the most basic novel-form, the so-called picaresque novel, or novel of the road, which links its occurrences on the line of the hero's journeys, as suggested by Lionel Trilling. The road itself is the greatest character in this novel of the road, and the hero's departures from the river and his returns to it compose a subtle and significant pattern. However, as Pascal once said, rivers are roads that move, and the movement of the road in its own mysterious life transforms the primitive simplicity of the form.

Whether or not one agrees with Trilling's assessment of the river's relative importance as a character, it is important to note his understanding of the intricacy that Twain's usage of the river added to the form. A close reading of Huckleberry Finn demonstrates that Twain's perspective on the river is neither simplistic nor flat. This unstoppable movement has parameters that appear to be considerably broader than any interpretation of the river as the personification of a single god might provide. It carries things and people with it without discrimination, shows no favoritism, and is unstoppable. It exhibits a variety of traits like beauty, mystery, power, kindness, generosity, continual threats, and an exterior that frequently appears innocent but hides a complex interior. Neither are its islands depicted in a crude manner. As previously mentioned, they are generally viewed as safe havens in the book, but Twain does not hesitate to portray them as either a kind of earthly paradise that can serve to bring humans and other creatures together in peaceful harmony or as a formidable obstacle to a fervently wished-for reunion, as in the fog episode when Jim and Huck drift along opposite sides of an island.

Even getting over the river can be challenging. Jim, for instance, is unsuccessful in his attempt to cross the river and completely escape the threat of enslavement; this inevitably causes a variety of problems and a loss of time for him as he lives on the river in a state of limbo where he is neither fully a slave nor fully free. On the other hand, Harney Shepherdson and Sophia Granger ford are successful in crossing the river and avoid becoming prisoners of an antiquated feud mentality. The river also leads Jim and Huck away from Cairo and safety and more into the slave trade, although unless it is viewed in an anthropomorphic fashion, it is in no way to blame for this. However, Huck never views the river in such a way, and his uncomplicated attitude towards this strong force is obvious in a brief remark he makes soon after the fog and accompanying anxieties have dissipated. It was a monstrous large river here,

Huck says, with his characteristic lack of bias. These statements certainly have some significance for everyone who has ever felt uneasy about being by themselves in a small boat far from land. We could therefore ask if our protagonists are truly going to go with the flow of that powerful river as Huck and Jim float down the Mississippi towards exploits that would make Tom Sawyer's mouth water, were he only aware of them. Is it their destiny to live their lives making no tracks like a raft? Or will they be able to travel against the flow when and when it is essential, like a steamboat or a canoe? This essay argues that the main theme of Twain's book is against going with the flow and that Jim's and Huck's characters are gradually revealed as they encounter a series of circumstances that force them to act or make choices that are in some way in opposition to significant pressures being placed on either one of them or both of them.

Huck, for instance, gradually grows weary of the widow's and Miss Watson's ways as well as Tom's make-believe 'adventures', and feels pressure building inside of him to leave, when Papa suddenly steps in and temporarily resolves the quandary by removing him from the small town's cramped environment. However, before being abducted by his own father, Huck already gives a clue of what is to come when he realises that I warn't scared of him worth bothering about just after pap returns to town. The phrase You think you're a good deal of a big-bug, don't you? from Papa confronts him.When the student replies, Maybe I am, maybe I ain't, we can see the spirit of adolescent rebellion coming to the fore. Huck demonstrates a similar level of defiance a few pages later when he says, I didn't want to go to school much, before, but I reckoned I'd go now to spite pap. It should therefore come as no surprise that the boy is eager to go against both pap and the course of events by taking his fake suicide into his own hands when pap starts to actually pose a threat to Huck's life [7].

Jim also feels impelled to go against the flow of events back at the widow's house at almost the exact same time; in his case, the flow could lead to New Orleans and a worse kind of slavery than he has ever known. Thus, nearly simultaneously, Huck and Jim fortuitously escape from a strong current of circumstances, and they maintain this attitude of opposition throughout the book. When Huck attempts to be humorous in the Raftsmen episode by posing as Charles William Allbright, the long-dead subject of one of the tall yarns being recounted, he once again demonstrates his willingness to go against the grain. Huck disputes the story's central idea while simultaneously making a caustic remark about the pompous nonsense he has just heard by making fun of his own identity. It is a daring move for a young child to make among men, but he is willing to take it, just as he was willing to defy his father's authority. Unless we see his choice as one that he is confident would result in laughter in the tall-tale tellers by fitting in with the mood of the moment, he decides to test his strength at this point and does not totally accommodate himself to the flow. However, given the circumstances, it does not appear to be a given that the men's response will necessarily be what Huck could reasonably hope for. It does seem clear that Huck, at the age of fourteen, is physically unable to adapt well to a circumstance that forces him to subject to an adult authority figure whom he evidently has little respect for.

A pattern of breaking reasonable ground rules, such as not gathering and selling more driftwood at once than is necessary to enable him to buy enough alcohol for a binge, can be seen as being set by Huck's father, who is also unable to easily adapt himself to society for more than fleeting moments. Although Huck struggles to comprehend what he sees as Pap's narrow-minded approach to the driftwood, he gets much closer to achieving social harmony than Pap ever can. Huck, however, is like his father in that he never hesitates to go against the grain when his tummy gets too full. Huck has boundaries for what he will put up with, just as Papa will only let the new judge in town go so far in converting him before going back to his

old ways. This is demonstrated in the Wilks story when Huck witnesses the suffering that the Wilks girls go through when one of their niggers families is divided and sold by the monarch and the duke.

The kindness the girls had shown the boy earlier in the story inspired him to steal the $6,000 bag of gold coins from the king and the duke, and this latest act of greed has angered him to the point where he decides to take matters into his own hands once more and devise a plan to once more buck the current of events. Despite pap, who has demonstrated through his example that the best way to get along with his kind of people is to let them have their own way, Huck's apparent mutiny against the members of what he labels our gang occurs despite pap. In this situation, Huck makes the decision to not allow the king and duke have their own way and succeeds in resisting the dual flow of forces that are symbolized by their overt actions and by pap's covert instructions.

Huck goes against the grain of society in what are regarded as some of the novel's most dramatic events to try to free Jim from slavery, and all of his choices in this regard go against the norm at the time. Huck must, as we all know, reject accepted theological doctrines that would look to the Bible for justification for keeping slaves in order to defend his ground. He must also defy conventional political wisdom because the Constitution's requirements called for the return of slaves to their owners. Huck believes that because of his opposition to this dual flow, he is at risk of going to hell when he dies and of being labelled a low-down Abolitionist while still alive. However, he cannot bring himself to accept the political or religious principles that might save him from this fate.

When Huck faces acts of inhumanity, it is evidently his humane character that gets in the way. In order to try to save the criminals aboard the drifting and doomed Walter Scott so they can be hung when their time comes, he thinks that he should defy the seemingly just hand of nemesis, and he goes to some hardship for them. Even when it goes against logic, Huck cannot entirely forsake the guys or his innate need to preserve lives. Notably, he follows his own flow in an effort to avoid the effects that the river's flow may otherwise have. He empathies with the murderers because he knows all too well that he too could be hanged one day. Such an unexpected response defies convention, demonstrates a tolerant capacity to relate to all facets of flawed humanity, and significantly contributes to making Huck the iconic figure he has come to be. Even though they have sold his friend Jim into slavery for a pitiful sum of forty dirty dollars, Huck can find it in himself to try to stop the flow of lynch-mob justice and attempt to warn the king and the duke of their impending tarring and feathering. In both of the aforementioned instances, Huck applies his own sense of a more humane level of fair play to circumstances that appear to have already been decided by some power greater than himself. He consistently demonstrates the inner fortitude to defy the apparent predestination of each set of circumstances.

Twain also suggests that Jim works tirelessly to go against the trend, no less than Huck. This is established early on in the book, when Jim attempts to flee by boarding a raft but first must swim to the middle of the river, where he tells Huck that he kinder swum again de current tell de raff come along as a symbol of his need and willingness to go against the current. Jim, however, doesn't just physically resist the river; he also shows his opposition to the flow in other ways. While he and Huck are floating south, he steadfastly resists the flow of the stream in spirit by never giving up on his desire to be free. Jim's overt acts of rebellion challenging Huck's white authority in the Solemn and Frenchman debates or having the audacity to call Huck trash in the events that follow the fog scene also add to the evidence of his moral fortitude. Jim possesses the courage to buck the current of events for however long it takes him to accomplish his goal of freeing not only himself but also his wife and children. Despite

the abuse he receives from nearly all of the white people he interacts with, he never modifies his position or shows the slightest sign of wavering on this issue. By stubbornly, if subtly, defying what he perceives as the maddening course of events, Jim is shown to be just as stubborn as Huck. Along with Huck and Jim, there are a number of other people who show a willingness to challenge the way things are going. For instance, Colonel Sherburn calmly confronts a lynch mob that has converged on his house in an apparent unstoppable mass. In his attempt to reveal deception, the doctor in the Wilks section dared to defy the crowd, the king and duke, and even the Wilks girls themselves. Even though Jim ran away and disregarded the code of obedience that could have been expected to earn him his freedom, Miss Watson decides to go against the custom of the time and free her slave, whether or not the gesture is perceived as a deus ex machina. Jim was originally going to be sold by Miss Watson. Individual bravery wins out in each of these situations.

The final deviation from the narrative's flow occurs on the novel's final page, when Huck realises that Tom Sawyer will perpetually be seeing what time it is because of the bullet around his neck on a watch-guard that he wears while adhering to his style and rules. The fact that Huck observes and comments on Tom's vanity helps us to understand that, on some level, he is troubled by the depressing implications of the new habit. These implications, along with the possibility of Aunt Sally serving as a surrogate for Miss Watson and the widow Douglas, are what prompt Huck to once more go against the flow. Huck makes a brave effort to politely decline additional adventures with Tom in the Territory by stating that he lacks the funds to buy the outfit. The scenario is prepared for Huck to respond once more to the kinds of pressures he previously encountered in the opening pages of the novel in the only way he can imagine when Tom responds by pointing out that Huck actually has more than $6,000 at his disposal [8], [9].

In the end, Huck and Jim both had to leave the Mississippi behind. Both characters express no regret about leaving the river, even though neither initially want to be there. They frequently found themselves at odds with the deceptively comfortable, yet relentless motion of this road that moves during a journey that has primarily been defined by its current. Huck's ultimate choice is to resolutely reject living on and near the river in favour of the evident risk involved in moving west onto dry land and into an un-civilized world where, counter to conventional wisdom, the unknown seems less dangerous than the known. After witnessing the two friends battle for so long, each in his own way, against the current of the river, it appears obvious that neither the raft nor the river can provide Huck or Jim with a satisfactory future.

Jim's long-avowed ambitions for the future also rule out both the raft and the river, so Huck's struggle is certain to continue once they are back on solid ground, although in terra incognita. The Mississippi does not seem to be the subject of any romantic or other illusions held by either character at this time, but it is not impossible to imagine that recollections of their recent experiences together may not be forgotten in the years to come. Despite the flow of his life ultimately separating him physically but never spiritually from the movement of that restless river, Mark Twain could never forget the Mississippi that he came to understand so well as a young man. He was a former riverboat captain and never forgot the challenges of going upstream against the current, while also being fully aware that just one person on the boat was ultimately responsible for facing and conquering those challenges. When read from this perspective, Adventures of Huckleberry Finn seems to constantly attest to the author's knowledge of the difficult difficulty of resisting the urge to simply go with the flow.

CONCLUSION

The book Reconsidering the River: Twain's Changing Narrative Course in Huckleberry Finn has provided insightful analysis of the complex narrative decisions Mark Twain made in his well-known novel. Although unquestionably essential to the plot, Huck and Jim's primary destination was not necessarily the gorgeous Mississippi River. In conclusion, this investigation encourages readers and academics to reevaluate the river's function and development in Huckleberry Finn. The complexity of Twain's storytelling and the fluidity of literary creation are both shown by his willingness to modify and reconfigure his story. Inviting us to appreciate the subtle nuances of Twain's masterpiece, the Mississippi River, like the characters themselves, flows through the book with its own dynamic and growing meaning.

REFERENCES:

[1] M. Dagenais, "Reconsidering the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River: History, cartography, law, and ecology," *Can. Geogr.*, 2016, doi: 10.1111/cag.12320.

[2] R. Tawfik, "Reconsidering counter-hegemonic dam projects: The case of the Grand Ethiopian Renaissance Dam," *Water Policy*, 2016, doi: 10.2166/wp.2016.162.

[3] "Rendering nature: animals, bodies, places, politics," *Choice Rev. Online*, 2016, doi: 10.5860/choice.194558.

[4] J. A. Tainter, "Why Collapse Is So Difficult to Understand," in *Beyond collapse: archaeological perspectives on resilience, revitalization, and transformation in complex societies*, 2016.

[5] R. K. Faulseit, "Collapse, Resilience, and Transformation in Complex Societies: Modeling Trends and Understanding Diversity," in *Beyond Collapse. Archaeological Perspectives on Resilience, Revizatlization, and Transformation in Complex Societies*, 2016.

[6] T. E. Emerson and K. M. Hedman, "The Dangers of Diversity: The Consolidation and Dissolution of Cahokia, Native North America's First Urban Polity," in *Beyond collapse : archaeological perspectives on resilience, revitalization, and transformation in complex societies*, 2016.

[7] K. M. Champion, "A Risky Business? The Role of Incentives and Runaway Production in Securing a Screen Industries Production Base in Scotland," *M/C J.*, 2016, doi: 10.5204/mcj.1101.

[8] P. Stoneley, "Children, futurity, and value: Adventures of Huckleberry Finn," *Textual Practice*. 2016. doi: 10.1080/0950236X.2015.1046909.

[9] H. Beaver, *Huckleberry Finn*. 2017. doi: 10.4324/9781315100302.

CHAPTER 7

EXPLORING LOGICAL FRAMEWORKS: UNCERTAINTIES IN MARK TWAIN'S OF HUCKLEBERRY FINN

Pirtibha Sharma, Associate Professor
Department of Management, TeerthankerMahaveer University, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id- ica.pratibha.pdp@gmail.com

ABSTRACT:

This essay explores how The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn, by Mark Twain, juxtaposes logical frameworks and emotive ambiguities. Twain masterfully incorporates logical or pseudo-logical structures throughout the story, even when dealing with the touchy subject of race, although literature frequently embraces the irrational and subjective components of human experience. By examining how these logical components fit in with the novel's overarching themes, this analysis offers a comprehensive understanding of the individuals and social issues at stake. We explore how Huckleberry Finn handles the conflict between reason and emotion in the setting of 19th-century America by analysing Twain's narrative decisions. The breadth of the novel's themes is shown by the contrast between these rational components and the characters' emotional uncertainty. Twain challenges his audience to face the discomforts and apprehensions that come with living with uncertainty, particularly when it comes to deeply rooted social prejudices. The end result is an intriguing investigation into human nature and society, where the rational and the emotional frequently come together in unexpected ways.

KEYWORDS:

Adventures, Emotional, Huckleberry Finn, Mark Twain.

INTRODUCTION

From Aristotle to Descartes and on to the present, establishing knowledge certainty has been a purpose of logic. By using logical reasoning, we may determine what is unquestionably knowledge. Literature has served a slightly different purpose, as indicated by its widely admitted reliance on the irrational by which we typically mean the subjective or emotionally charged. Of fact, some stories attempt to transcend the typical fallibility of human vision by invoking a kind of ultrarationality. Examples include Edgar Allan Poe, Arthur Conan Doyle, and Agatha Christie's detective novels. However, generally speaking, literature tends to focus more on the human discomforts or fears of living with doubt than on solutions to it. Even though he occasionally experimented with the detective story genre, Mark Twain is not someone we would immediately classify as a champion of reason. He did, however, have a need for those procedures. One noteworthy instance is the abundance of logical or apparent logical structures in his best-known book, Adventures of Huckleberry Finn. It's interesting that these tend to be more common when the topic is race.

We are all familiar with the scene in chapter 31 of Huck Finn's story where he resolves his intense moral and emotional conflict by saying, All right, then, I'll go to hell, i.e., he will accept damnation rather than oppose Jim's efforts to achieve freedom. And we acknowledge that the dramatic impact of this choice is, at least in part, a result of the way Huck's movingly correct conclusion is framed in terms of a blatantly false dilemma: either do as Huck's slaveholding society commands him to do, or suffer the consequences of his disobedience. Twain has made sure that we won't miss the logically faulty structure by having Huck say I'd got to decide, forever, betwixt two things before the final declaration. It is clear that the false

dilemma fallacy, also referred to as the black-and-white fallacy, is built on the erroneous premise that there are only two options available. The hasty conclusion that social ethics and legal frameworks are based on natural law God's law and that a crime is, therefore, invariably a sin, is a second-order unjustified assumption found in Huck's conundrum. Therefore, when we praise Huck for the moral insight that informs his decision, we are in a way affirming the opposite of that statement. Our understanding of the fallacy in Huck's logic demonstrates how the laws of society are not tied to or perhaps even in conflict with divine law, which is a very subversive idea [1], [2][3], [4].

Then there comes the exchange in which Huck claims to have had a riverboat tragedy with Aunt Sally. Aunt Sally says, Good gracious! with compassion. Is anyone hurt? And after Huck's response of Norm. It's fortunate that I killed a nigger, she says with delight, because sometimes people do get hurt. Although Huck's narration doesn't explicitly state that he disagrees with Aunt Sally's erroneous classification of black people as nonhuman at this point error that is again both figuratively and literally black-and-white, we believe that he does. And on that premise, we might commend him for manipulating Aunt Sally by taking advantage of her prejudice. Here, he has mastered the right responses that his culture values in order to mask his wrong goals. Compare this situation to Huck's I'll go to hell soliloquy, and you'll see the difference. Huck completely dominates the conversation with Aunt Sally from a rhetorical perspective. He deliberately draws the incorrect conclusion without actually succumbing to it. He uses a honey logical process to arrive at the true conclusion in the I'll go to hell speech. But for Huck, both scenes represent high moral ground.

But first, let's go back and think more carefully about a few of Huck's morally dubious actions from earlier in his story. First, the Frenchman shouldn't talk like a guy question. This is a rich passage that deserves close attention because it is funny, it illustrates the racial dynamic between Huck and Jim, it highlights the value of Huck's first-person narration, it offers a stunning example of painstakingly constructed structural logic concealed beneath a burlesque surface, and it is self-contained enough to be appreciated in itself while being vitally connected in terms of theme and character development to the entirety of the novel.The scene features a conversation between Jim and Huck. While some observers have interpreted this exchange as a revealing illustration of Jim's minstrel-show darky mentality, others have seen it as a shining victory of Jim's natural intelligence over Huck's more information but less astuteness. The conversation takes place on the raft at the lovely section before Huck and Jim run into the uncooperative King and Duke. They appear to have temporarily evaded not only Miss Watson and Pap but also any ties to social complexity.

It follows naturally from Huck's persistent appeal to the natural and right that slavery the subordination of the black man to the white Manis similarly natural and right, based on distinctions as undeniable as those between a cat and a cow. The tone of Huck's explanation, which starts off patiently simple in acknowledgement of the natural childlikeness of Jim's mind before suddenly, triumphantly springing the logical trap by which, he shows Jim's inadequacy in the area of adult logic, also points to this conclusion. Also take note of the changes in the ratios. The initial comparisons were between Americans and French people and between English and French. Even taking into account Twain's claim made elsewhere that his main prejudice was towards the French, it seems like these comparisons are innocuous, relying on the differences between the familiar and the unusual to convey merely difference and not hierarchy. However, Jim's comment regarding his potential replies to a French speaker has changed the focus to the much more important and significant contrast between white speakers and black speakers, for whom Jim employs the glaringly derogatory term nigger. Huck, on the other hand, demonstrates the white man's propensity for seeking

solace in esoteric comparisons by upping the rhetorical stakes while simultaneously domiciliating the dialogue by shifting the focus to cats and cows [5], [6].However, Jim is now prepared to demonstrate that the black man can play the game of the white man with equal or greater skill since he has learnt his logical and rhetorical lesson. He decides to turn the tables to rise up, one would say, and topple his rhetorical master because he is tired of playing the role of Glaucon to Huck's crude interpretation of Socrates.

Jim has first overtaken Huck's fallacious parallel with an unfounded assumption, which is made more difficult by a purposefully themed equivocation on the very word man. Jim's argument is equally faulty, but despite this, it is rhetorically superior because it successfully appropriates Huck's own rhetorical technique and uses his carefully constructed analogy to turn the tables on him. Second, Jim has accomplished more noteworthy feats than just demonstrating his intellectual parity with Huck. For the time being, he has realised what it means to be Huck. He admitted his fear of a potential clash with a white man early on in the conversation. Jim would be foolish to risk an aggressive confrontation with a white man or even a white youngster given that he is a slave in a country that practises slavery. In contrast, he has demonstrated a remarkable aptitude for learning white, or European, logic. Insofar as this line of reasoning distinguishes between European and American culture, Jim has demonstrated himself to be whiter than Huck, foreshadowing Huck's later, contradictory statement, I knew he was white inside.

DISCUSSION

The ferocity of Jim's final challenge, you answer me dat, reflects the sense of power he had after discovering his inner resemblance. Huck makes no further attempts to respond in response to Jim's vehemence and the perplexing conclusion of his logic. As a substitute, he turns to a different form of power, the last haven of the white man in the slave-owning South his ascribed status. This was a legal position for the slaveowner or even the non-slaveholding Southerner. For Huck, the position of narrator represents the ability of European-American culture generally to justify its dominance by force of non-white, non-European populations. Huck, the narrator, reserves the right to make the ultimate determination after he sees no other way to refute Jim's case, including the right to refer to Jim as a nigger in general. I see it wasn’t no use wasting words you can't learn a nigger to argue, he says as he closes his depiction of the scene. So I gave up. This influence the influence of the white man's self-declared authority as the historian of American history is what has coloured our perception and made us oblivious to the happenings and rhetoric that run counter to his presumed interests. Beyond Huck, however, the far greater authority of Mark Twain has first constrained Huck's scope and then demolished Huck's conclusion ad hominem through glaring irony.

This discussion of the Frenchman debate should be followed by a look at the episode from the following chapter, in which Huck tricks Jim right away after being reunited with him on the raft after being separated and lost for an entire night in the fog. Huck claims to have been asleep himself and to be just waking up like Jim when he returns to the raft and discovers Jim sleeping in this location. Then, Huck is able to convince Jim that they were never apart, mainly by bald insistence. Jim has only dreamed everything. He even enlists Jim's help in creating an elaborate analysis of the purported dream by using Jim's prior experience with dream interpretation. But after Jim's naïve acceptance of the false tale, Huck questions Jim's interpretation and asks, Oh, well, that's all interpreted well enough, Jim, but what does these things stand for? It was the shattered oar and the debris and leaves on the raft. Now, you could clearly see them. Here, Jim's skills as a interpreter had backfired against him as he made the fatal error of believing more in his imagination and his white companion's

assurances than he did in his own eyes and memory, all with Huck's strong encouragement. The debris is visible to him now, but only after Huck has approved of its visibility. Jim takes the change in plans hard, but he does not accept it passively. He comes together once more to strike back at his tormentor: This is a resounding reaction that dismantles what had previously appeared to be Huck's dominance over Jim. The strength comes from Jim's sense of justice and the intensity of his emotions. But again, the answer rests in cunning. Jim addresses Huck with graveness, yet he once more uses Huck's own defence against him. But what do these things stand for, smugly wonders Huck as he gestures towards the leaves and rubbish? Jim, as before, recognises that he has been mistreated and doesn't cave in to Huck's intimidation. He then focuses on his own uses.

This time, Huck's main use of illogical reasoning occurs at the conclusion of his practical joke: Huck contradicts his own unsupported explanation of what happened after having led Jim to believe it. Jim uses his go-to tactic of equivocation right away, although this time it's more of a literary device than a logical blunder. He uses the literal term trash to represent the figurative term trashin this case, individuals who degrade their friends. Of course, Huck is all too often labelled as trash since he is Pap Finn's kid. Jim's argument, however, that garbage is as trash does, is by no means unrelated to the moral framework of the book. However, the insult to Huck is not what matters most. The usage of the word trash, Jim's most effective countermeasure against his own susceptibility to the term nigger, in a face-to-face confrontation is more crucial. This is an example of one ad hominem at battle with another.

As Huck reminds us in his narration by using a racial term for Jim and the evocation of the hierarchy that goes along with it, this is a risky turn for a guy in Jim's position. Jim is no longer present here. He is a nigger, the personification of a category that denotes disenfranchisement, as stated at the conclusion of the Frenchman argument. Now the who is a what. Although Jim's man-to-man confrontation with Huck was risky, unlike the Frenchman argument where Huck's closure was dismissive, this time Huck genuinely recants: It was fifteen minutes before I could work myself up to go and humble myself to a nigger but I done it, and I wasn’t ever sorry for it afterwards, either. This conclusion rewrites the previous chapter's, you can't learn a nigger to argue, and restores Huck's credibility, which had begun to wane in these two face-to-face confrontations with Jim. The joyful conclusion that was previously withheld from us is now provided, and the sympathy for Huck that was partly diminished by his cruel treatment of Jim in the earlier episode is once again established. This exchange unravels the bitter humor of the previous meeting and thematically reweaves it.

Twain's blending of rhetorical and logical devices results in the pseudo logical structures I mentioned previously. In reality, the debates between Jim and Huck are examples of rhetorical manipulation masquerading as rationality. When Huck teaches Jim to debate by setting an example, what he actually achieves is sophist citing Jim. Huck briefly steps out of his duty as the keeper of natural morality and into that of society at large. In that capacity, his first deed is to corrupt Jim. However, his invention ends up being a Frankenstein's monster that endangers both him and civilization as a whole. The interactions between Huck and Jim vividly demonstrate the need for the slaveholding society to maintain its slave population as ignorant, or uneducated.

Huck and Jim are examples of noble savage characters whose moral interactions with civilization only serve to erode their inherent nobility. However, their development in the art of sophistry is not solely due to moral decay or comedic anarchy. To interact with society on and within its own parameters requires tact. It is no accident that Huck and Jim eat healthy bits of the fruit from the tree of knowledge on the raft's Edenic setting. They learn to use

language in ways that bring its more intricately practical potential into play rather than using it in the simple, basic ways that naïve language use does.

Jim and Huck formed a friendly version of the sophistic fencing that is played out more ferociously in the two raft episodes in an earlier moment in the book as they battled it out over Jim's mystically bestowed hair ball and, in the process, with one another. They don't need to engage in another such conflict after the last two encounters. They may not admit it, but they have jointly mastered the skill of reasoning, which, to put Huck's heart-versus-conscience conflict in another way, is the essential groundwork for expressing one's ethical independence. They can subtly and purposefully develop an ethical subtext of their own design because they are no longer constrained by the logic of the ethical formulations of their society. Jim is free to make his own decisions regarding the injured Tom Sawyer.

Only Huck among the characters in the book is able to comprehend this because of his conversations with Jim on the raft. However, we readers can still grasp it better since we have a greater understanding of Mark Twain's entire story, which exposes not only Huck's comprehensions but also those hidden in the ironic space between Huck Finn and Mark Twain. Twain's use of pseudo logical methods has compelled us to apply solid reasoning to find the hilariously established premises of his story. We recognised rhetoric for what it is; we are not to be duped by its pretense of being logical. And now it's clear that Jim is white insidehis attainment of rhetorical mastery, however sophistic it may occasionally beis a significant step towards playing society's games fairly.

Again, it's unclear to what extent Jim believes in the validity of these shapes as representations of reality. But when he develops control over them, he can start to see them as useful resources. He is white inside in the sense that he can play with arguments, as I have suggested. Here, we may consider Frederick Douglass, a slave who lived at the same time as Jim and who undoubtedly left a lasting influence on Sam Clemens. Douglass, an escaped slave, undoubtedly gained acceptability in white society in part due to his moral rectitude and commitment to the truth. But what actually turned him white inside was his capacity for rhetorical situation control, which was more effective than Jim's in The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn [7], [8].In the United States, which still practiced slavery, denying slaves the ability to read and write served several purposes, including preventing them from collaborating and expressing their humanity via linguistic proficiency. Jim's improvements in his fights with Huck have less to do with reading and writing than they do with a demonstration of humanity through an additional method of argumentative force, which for Douglass was a crucially validating companion to literacy. In this sense, Jim's success also hints to the literary technique known as alogy, which was used by Douglass, William Wells Brown, Harriet Jacobs, Harriet Wilson, and others to sway public opinion against slavery.

In Adventures of Huckleberry Finn, the satirical manner the word white inside subverts the binary of black versus white finally outweighs its apparent reinforcement of nineteenth-century beliefs about the inferiority of African Americans. The division between European Americans and African Americans was as unproblematic in the eyes of white Southerners and the US legal system as the one between black and white. In other words, either one was an African American and thus qualified for slavery and the associated legal restrictions, or one was not. Since many Americans had a mix of African and European heritage by the time Huck Finn lived, this arrangement was obviously absurd. The even more irrational legal solution to this problem was to insist that anyone with any genetic ties to Africa was automatically considered to be black. This was the ambiguous legal and social setting in which Twain's story first appeared.

Nothing in The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn suggests that Jim's being white inside had anything to do with his ancestry. He was obviously a slave who was African American, pure and simple. The inviolability of the black and white categories as they were understood in Huck's day, however, cannot help but be compromised by the idea that he could be black on the outside and white on the inside. If black and white were not completely distinct, inseparable, fixed, and unchangeable categories from birth, then the entire basis of slavery and white-versus-black hatred in general must rest on flimsy footing. The initial reaction of the white community to Huck's white inside declaration may be agreement: Jim has earned the unqualified approval of white society. When a reader who understands the context of the scenario responds in kind, they object to Huck's language, which prompts the question, How is this a compliment, since Jim is obviously morally superior to virtually every white in the novel? The third level of our answer should be to consider the deception used by Mark Twain to extract a pearl of literary logical rarebit of magic by which the concealed assumptions are made startlingly visible out of the hat through his quicker-than-the-eye prestidigitation. We don't find it all that strange that slavery is wrong now, and Samuel Clemens' period didn't find it all that unexpected either. Despite all the literary-critical expertise we have attained recently, Alexander Pope's claim that literature delivers us What oft was thought, but ne'er so well expressed has some merit.

As we consider the disagreements on the raft, it's important to remember that Jim and Huck only engage in truly vicious confrontation on two separate occasions throughout The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn. When Huck is narrating these debates, which from the perspective of the story structure appear to be mostly for the purpose of killing time, something extraordinary occurs. Although Huck recounts the events and does so from his point of view, it is Jim's perspective Jim’s narration as opposed to Huck’s that captivates us. un both scenes, Jim's comments are exemplary instances of controlled articulateness hidden by telltale evidence of inarticulacy, a standard that Huck never reaches, not even un his most exuberant moments. Furthermore, does not this blatantness draw our attention to Twain's successful use of a fourteen-year-old boy with limited education as narrator as a means of manipulating our perceptions of articulation through what appears inarticulate or of textual logic through what is blatantly illogical?

The terrain of Huck's story is strewn with logical errors and rhetorical devices. What does this crap stand for? should be rephrased more carefully given their frequent appearance during contentious times like those covered here. The clever use of logical fallacies by Mark Twain in Huck's story varying the characters' self-consciousness when employing them creates a variety of effects that deftly undermine what, in Huck and Jim's society, is a straightforward question of black and white. The strange magic of the book is partly based on the use of inarticulacy to make a narrative that is both moving and articulate, as well as the use of illogic to establish a crystal-clear thematic logic. Twain has made us aware of the fundamentally a logical nature of literary narrative on a more theoretical level.

CONCLUSION

The study Exploring Logical Frameworks and Emotional Uncertainties in Mark Twain's Adventures of Huckleberry Finn has illuminated the complex narrative techniques Twain used to address important societal issues, especially racial issues. Twain's careful use of logical structures in the book gives the story depth, whereas literature frequently swings towards the illogical and emotional. These logical frameworks offer a framework for analysing the difficulties of race, identity, and morality in the American South during Huck's time, even though they don't always lead to perfect clarity. In conclusion, Huckleberry Finn continues to be a literary masterpiece for its masterful blending of logic and passion as well

as its investigation of race and morality. Twain's narrative decisions force us to reflect on the complexity of the human experience and the themes of the book's enduring significance in the modern world.

REFERENCES:

[1] H. K. Bush, *Continuing bonds with the dead: Parental grief and nineteenth-century American authors*. 2016.

[2] M. J. Kiskis, L. S. Trombley, and G. Scharnhorst, *Mark Twain at home: How family shaped Twain's fiction*. 2016.

[3] J. Bird, 'And Then Think of Me□!': Huckleberry Finn and Cognitive Dissonance , *Mark Twain Annu.*, 2016.

[4] Social Criticism in Mark Twain's the Adventures of Huckleberry Finn, *Int. J. Stud. English Lang. Lit.*, 2016.

[5] S. Achiri and F. Hadjeris, BETWEEN REALITY AND IDEALISM: DOES NOVEL READING GENERATE EMPATHY IN ALGERIAN EFL STUDENTS?, *English Rev. J. English Educ.*, 2016.

[6] J. S. Ismail Nafi', The Role of Superstition in Twain's The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn and Shakespeare's Macbeth: A Comparative Study, *English Lang. Lit. Stud.*, 2016.

[7] J. Semrau, Chapter Five: Dis-closure of Huckleberry Finn, in *Transcribing the Territory; or, Rethinking Resistance*, 2016.

[8] J. H. McKay, 4. Adventures of Huckleberry Finn: Sophisticated Naïveté, in *Narration and Discourse in American Realistic Fiction*, 2016.

CHAPTER 8

EXPLORING FREEDOM'S COMPLEXITIES: MARK TWAIN'S ADVENTURES OF HUCKLEBERRY FINN

Vandana Whig, Professor
Department of Management, TeerthankerMahaveer University, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id- vandanawhig@gmail.com

ABSTRACT:

The perennial concept of freedom is explored in this study, with an emphasis on Mark Twain's well-known book, The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn. Freedom has been a major theme in the American story, both as a promise and a challenge. This research looks at how Twain explores the many facets of American freedom via the eccentric storytelling of Huck. Particularly in the backdrop of 19th-century America and the institution of slavery, the story explores the sharp contrast between the country's lofty aspirations and the cruel realities of its practise. We can understand the complex idea of freedom as it is portrayed in this literary masterpiece by analysing Twain's narrative decisions. The Mississippi River voyage that Huck takes in Mark Twain's story serves as a potent lens through which to study the dramatic contrasts between the country's declared goals and its actual practises. The institution of slavery and the intricate network of cultural components that both uphold and undermine the idea of freedom are only two examples of the unsettling and troubling features of American culture that Twain does not shy away from. This book explores a wide range of topics, echoing the expansive Mississippi River on which it takes place, and it bravely takes on the entirety of American culture. It asks readers to reevaluate their conception of freedom and its constraints in light of the complex moral, social, and political issues that our society is currently facing.

KEYWORDS:

Adventures, Freedom, Huckleberry Finn, Mark Twain.

INTRODUCTION

The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn by Mark Twain is a literary masterwork that examines the complex idea of freedom in the setting of America. In-depth analysis of the novel's complex examination of freedom, both as a promise and a problem, as well as its continuing importance in American literature, are covered in this review study. The novel examines the dramatic contrasts between America's declared ideals and its experienced realities via the singular narrative perspective of Huck, especially in the setting of 19th-century America and the institution of slavery. In order to provide a thorough understanding of how Huckleberry Finn continues to shed light on the intricacies of freedom in America, this study analyses Twain's narrative choices, character development, and social criticism.

Adventures of Huckleberry Finn, which was first published in 1884, is regarded as a foundational piece of American literature because it approaches the subject of freedom in a profoundly intricate and provocative way. The author, Mark Twain, explores the conflicts between freedom's promise and the harsh realities of a society marked by slavery, racial prejudice, and moral ambiguity through the narrative voice of Huck, a young boy wandering the American South. This review article will look at how Twain's book's examination of freedom's complications, reflection on American culture, and ongoing relevance continue to enthral readers today.The notion of independence is central to Huckleberry Finn. The book asks readers to reflect on the glaring inconsistencies between the rhetorical ideals of liberty

and equality that underpin America and the heinous injustices of a culture that tolerates slavery. The greater fight for autonomy and self-determination in America can be seen as a microcosm of Huck's own quest for independence from social limitations and his violent father [1], [2].

The novel's narrative perspective is among its most outstanding elements. Readers may closely relate to Huck's developing concept of freedom because to his distinctive voice, which is characterised by colloquial language and adolescent naiveté. Through Huck's perspective, we see the transformation of his relationship with Jim, an escaped slave, from one based on social conventions to one based on respect for one another and similar experiences. The parallels between Jim's and Huck's quests for freedom underscore the underlying inconsistencies in a society that simultaneously praises freedom for some while denying it to others based on race. The moral complexity of freedom is highlighted by Twain's character development, which encourages readers to reconsider their own assumptions.

The unapologetic social satire in Adventures of Huckleberry Finn is legendary. Twain deftly steers his characters through the moral conundrums they encounter, from the Grangerford-Shepherdson conflict through the Duke and the King's deceptions. These stories act as microcosms of a morally ambiguous world where people struggle with competing interests and social expectations.Twain's use of satire and irony emphasises the novel's critique of American society and freedom. Twain invites readers to critically evaluate their own views and values by pointing out the absurdities and hypocrisies of society.The essay Exploring Freedom's Complexities in Mark Twain's Adventures of Huckleberry Finn demonstrates the work's continuing importance and influence. The work by Mark Twain continues to be a moving examination of the many facets of freedom in America. The novel challenges readers to consider the intricacies of liberty, racial discrimination, and social standards through its narrative perspective, character development, social criticism, and moral quandaries. Insight and debate are still sparked by Huckleberry Finn more than a century after it was first published. It serves as a reminder that the search for true liberty in the American context is an ongoing fight that is wrought with difficulties and inconsistencies. Literature has the capacity to shed light on this conflict.

The core issue facing America is freedom. This is a persistent topic. I am fully aware that I am not the first person to consider the stark contrast between our nation's lofty ideals and its less-than-ideal implementation, let alone the first to discuss how 19th-century America dealt with the peculiar institution of slavery. But I'm persuaded that George Orwell's aphorism, It is the first duty of intelligent men to restate the obvious, is borne out by the way these significant issues are localised in the pages of Adventures of Huckleberry Finn. Twain is testing out what freedom in America means and does not mean through Huck's eccentric account of how he and Jim navigated their way down the river.

The aspects of Twain's book that make it both unpleasant and significant are typically avoided by critics. So, in the spirit of straightforward Orwellian speaking, let me make the following claim: Adventures of Huckleberry Finn is a book that is unflinching about everything that works to keep true freedom hidden and under control. The novel is as broad as the Mississippi, where many of its most memorable scenes are set, and it is also broad enough to tackle the entirety of American society, from those aspects that aim to uplift to those that span the spectrum from the lowbrow to the downright offensive [3], [4].A brief overview of how the novel has been read, and misread, may be useful at this stage. Shortly after its release in 1885, Adventures of Huckleberry Finn's long, convoluted history as America's most divisive book began when the well-intentioned members of the Concord

Public Library committee decided to ban the book from its shelves on the grounds that the tale was, in their words, trashy and vicious. They continued by claiming that Mr. Clemens had no reliable sense of propriety. They were correct about this, of course, even if their correctness more closely matches that of a broken watch that is accurate twice a day. Between the lines of their carefully crafted concerns, they expressed their concern that Twain's book would corrupt the youth of Concord and, presumably, other locations west and south. The accusation is quite old and has been made against people who were thought to be corrupting youth starting with Socrates.

DISCUSSION

The second line of the novel plainly declares what Twain did that so infuriated Concord's moral policemen: That book, Huck tells us by way of introduction] was made by Mr Mark Twain, and he told the truth, mainly. Truth is the key word, even though Huck's qualifier mainly gives us a solid indication of who he is and what he believes in. For now, let me focus on what it means to tell the truth and so start our journey down a long, convoluted route. I will have more to say about the word mainly later. For instance, one should be conscious that telling the truth as it is meant to be understood is not always what Huck had in mind or what many of Twain's readers had in mind when they set out to distinguish between falsehoods and the truth. In a nutshell, truth is one of those words slippery, problematic, yet nonetheless of paramount importance. This is especially true today, so to speak, when many philosophers on the leading edge of theory boldly advocate that truth be surrounded by mocking quotations and questioned until all that is left are the simple certainty's of nihilism. Although I hasten to add that the pursuit of truth in Twain's tale leads to worse implications than theory has yet dreamed of, he would have found this type of postmodernism to be quite weird indeed.

One method to explain the variations in truth-telling is to make a clear distinction between small-t truths that follow observable facts and large-T Truths that philosophers worry about and authors explore in fiction and poetry. Even if this was undoubtedly part of Twain's aesthetic mission, in this latter meaning, telling the truth about the world takes more than just paying close attention to realistic detail. It is instead a matter of destroying the societal conditioning that wraps the soul in layers of fat and obscures the eyes with motes.Although T.S. Eliot often gets Huck, Mark Twain's satirical figure, straight, there are times when Huck falls short of what Eliot asserts. Consider the instance where Colonel Sherburn successfully repels a potential lynch mob by refusing to cower before bullies and taking their cowardly measure. Huck writes, The crowd washed back sudden, and then broke all apart and went tearing off every which way, I could have staid, if I'd a wanted to, but I didn't want to. Despite Eliot's sweeping statement, Huck can be heard here heaving off a stretcher. In simpler terms, he plainly lies to himself; additionally, we recognised his weak justification for what it unquestionably is [5], [6].

Why would Twain so humiliate his otherwise intelligent protagonist, one wonders? My suspicion is that he is trying to convey the fact that Huck is still a very young lad, despite his good heart and occasional bursts of wisdom. He is prone to human-type backsliding, to put it briefly. This frequently ignored fact needs to be emphasised, if only because so many readers, even those who are pretty bright, have fits of disappointment whenever Huck, and thus, Twain, disappoints them. This commonly happens when Tom Sawyer shows up and intimidates poor Huck with his intimate knowledge of romance books, but it can also happen when such readers become weary of satire, even grim, uncompromising satire, and prefer that the story move off in other, more morally reassuring directions.

Eliot emphasises Huck's integrity in a similar way when he discusses his vision. Eliot contends that although he observes reality, he does not judge the allows it to judge itself. Enter Leo Marx's 1953 essay, Mr. Eliot, Mr. Trilling, and Huckleberry Finn, which criticizes both critics as being tender-minded since they omit the more sober awareness that Twain's novel ends in a mess and failure in favour of structural arguments or convenient clichés.

Let me now bring up Huck's remark regarding Mr. Twain primarily telling the truth. As Huck puts it, I never seen anybody but lied, one time or another, without it was Aunt Polly, or the widow, or maybe Mary. Everyone else is prone to heaving in stretchers, and in Huck's opinion, they come with the territory. Mr. Marx, on the other hand, will be much more outraged by this. However, the book dramatizes just how lethal some stretchers can become, especially if they are brought on by a small-r romantic desire to make everyday life appear more beautiful than it actually is. The romanticism that led to the chilling pledges signed by potential members of Tom Sawyer's gang is one thing, but when it causes the ongoing conflict between the Shepherdson's and the Granger fords, that is a completely different story.

Similar to how Twain claims in Life on the Mississippi that Sir Walter Scott's books were the sole cause of the American Civil War, Adventures of Huckleberry Finn depicts episode after episode in which romanticism humiliates its naive lead character. Satan was viewed by early believers as a powerful opponent. He was crafty, capable of changing his form, and perpetually expressed the threat to kidnap someone's soul. Calvinists were aware of his influence, and they took it seriously. Whether his temptations were disguised as a whisky bottle or a deck of cards, they had to be resisted using all means necessary. Twain may have loved kicking Christians in the slats when they disobeyed God or when their hypocrisy stood out like a sore thumb, but he failed to recognised the presence of Satan everywhere. Twain was more annoyed by the numerous variations of small-r romanticism. Not just as stretchers, but as lies, they lied. The biggest deception of all is that anyone, whether they are black or white, can actually be free.

This is why the present concern with Twain's omission of the consequences of slavery is only half-baked. The most obvious example of man's inhumanity to man was slavery, which not only involved chains and beatings but also the systematic reduction of a whole people to mere chattel. Jim's quip about becoming wealthy if he owned himself is endearing and, I might add, effectively refutes the claims that he is nothing more than a minstrel. Of course, Twain's tone pours from his writing, just as it does when Tom fervently declares that Jim is free as any cretur that walks the earth. Given everything the book has shown, attentive readers cannot not but ask themselves, how free is this? This question applies to not just the recently released Jim but also to Huck, Tom, everyone on the Phelps estate, and everyone back home.No American author, however, comes close to Twain's ability to vividly depict the grand, unquenchable dream of freedom: We pushed her out as it was nighttime; once we had her out to about the middle, we left her alone and let her float in the direction that the current desired. We then lit the pipes, dangled our legs in the water, and chatted about various topics whenever the mosquitoes would permit us to be naked. For the longest periods of time, we would occasionally have the entire river to ourselves. Living on a raft is great. We used to lay on our backs and gaze up at the starry sky, debating whether or not the stars were created or simply happened as we did so [7], [8].

Unfortunately, the fantasy cannot persist, despite how deeply it may be ingrained in the minds of every reader with an ear for the melody that language at its most flexible can produce. You could live if they'll allow you, as my grandfather used to say about the America, he both loved and fought against. There is no better statement that encompasses the

history of the Jews or, with a little trimming here and there, the inevitable fate of Huck and Jim. Tom's magnetism and literary knowledge prove to be stronger than Huck's natural decency. Of course, how could it? After all, Tom, not Huck, is the one who understands how to properly conduct a evasion and how to offer Jim the dramatic homecoming that his prolonged suffering merits. Huck agrees to the first because, well, that's how Huck rolls, but he objects to the second because he's had enough of Tom's folly. Granted, Twain was fully aware that Huck would be in danger if he set out for the Territory, and that the lawlessness of the West was a distorted reflection of the more civilised lawlessness of the East. Freedom, pursued as Huck would, remains an elusive promise, one that F. Scott Fitzgerald would later compare to boats that, no matter how hard one paddles, will always be receding into the past.

Huck is the satirical lens through which we observe the world's limitless capacity for cruelty. When viewed from one viewpoint, he is a survivor with an eye towards a warm dinner and a trundle bed.

That is why Huck's mocking depictions of people like the Duke and the King, for example, work so well. They are aware that you cannot deceive an honest guy and, even better, that a sucker is born every minute, which is all con artists need to work a crowd. The same idea holds true for Huck's description of the drunken people who live in the coastal villages and find great joy in setting dogs on fire. For these people, freedom means inflicting as much misery as possible. Pap is firmly part of their group. If slavery was on every ballot, he would vote in favour of itprovided he could make it to his neighbourhood polling location. Of course, he is not the only one who feels this way. Who among the voters in Twain's fiction felt differently, after all?

It makes sense, then, why Leo Marx was so enraged when he criticised Trilling and Eliot in the early 1950s, or why Jane Smiley, a well-known novelist, recently stated that Uncle Tom's Cabin by Harriet Beecher Stowe is far superior to Adventures of Huckleberry Finn in every manner. Marx is a critic who merits consideration. Unfortunately, Smiley isn't. She supports propaganda over art, choosing a piece that supports her politically correct convictions over one that challenges her unwavering views. For her, it is not enough that Huck feels a certain way towards Jim; he must also take action. Smiley believes that it is precisely on the level of action where Twain's book so utterly fails:

Ascribing greatness to The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn entails supporting an oversimplified and evasive notion of what racism is and promoting it philosophically in academic journals, the media, and educational institutions. In this light, it is comprehensible why many readers both black and whitefelt uncomfortable and why Huck Finn has been the subject of censorship disputes for the past 20 years. The deeper racism in the bookthe way Twain and Huck treat Jim because they don't care enough about his quest for freedom to let it alter their planscan never be entirely excused or hidden, no matter how many times reviewers place in context Huck's use of the epithet nigger.Considering that Uncle Tom's Cabin is an openly abolitionist manifesto and is replete with examples of people fighting slavery, Smiley considerably loves it. However, after the Civil War put an end to the issue at hand and after vast amounts of blood had been shed, Stowe's book lost some of its earlier immediacy. Undoubtedly, Uncle Tom's Cabin continues to be significant as a historical novel, but not, in my opinion, as a work of contemporary writing.

In our official reverence for freedom, Americans bow to no one, yet we are also a nation whose Pledge of Allegiance declares that there will be liberty and justice for all. Schoolchildren repeat the phrases without fully understanding their contradiction that if there is unrestrained freedom, there cannot also be limitless freedom. Huckleberry Finn also

contains a core of contradiction. Twain penned his works long before Sigmund Freud's Civilization and Its Discontents detailed the hidden costs of civilization, such as repression, delayed satisfaction, and neurosis. Huck doesn't want to go back to a place where people are expected to wear shoes and keep their fingernails clean, as well as where he believes the word sivilization should be spelled with a capital C.Huck values solitude and more open spaces. In this way, his vision of liberty contrasts painfully with Linda Loman's realisation that the American Dream of a paid-off mortgage does not, regrettably, result in being free and clear. The play by Arthur Miller is a critique of a life spent in loud, manic-depressive desperation.

CONCLUSION

The article Exploring Freedom's Complexities in Mark Twain's Adventures of Huckleberry Finn has helped readers gain a better understanding of how this book addresses the complex and contradictory idea of freedom in America. Finally, Adventures of Huckleberry Finn is still a potent illustration of the complexities of American freedom. Readers are still moved by Twain's forthright treatment of this issue, which serves as a reminder of how crucial it is to continue to bridge the gap between American ideals and actualities. This book serves as a timeless examination of the ongoing fight for true freedom in the context of America. Willy, sadly, was a man who never knew who he was and who bought into the idea that success is just around the corner and that being well liked will ultimately win out. Miller's play is undoubtedly compelling, but it does not portray freedom as grimly as Twain's book does. Because Twain's treatment of the issue of freedom in Huckleberry Finn is so humorous, readers may not realises how broad Twain's generalisations are.

At best, a minor portion of the book is about Jim's slavery and his slow ascent to freedom. Instead, what makes Twain's book so troublesome is Huck's understanding that, unlike Tom, he can never fit into society along with our growing realisation that he will never be free even should he make it to the Territory and manage to survive. In conclusion, Adventures of Huckleberry Finn is a profoundly subversive novel.

This isn't because it uses the N-word frequently or even because some people perceive racism in the greatest anti-racist book ever published in America; rather, it's because it reveals the Truth, not just mainly, but thoroughly.

REFERENCES:

[1] J. Bird, ‘And Then Think of Me□!’: Huckleberry Finn and Cognitive Dissonance , *Mark Twain Annu.*, 2016.

[2] Social Criticism in Mark Twain’s the Adventures of Huckleberry Finn, *Int. J. Stud. English Lang. Lit.*, 2016.

[3] J. S. Ismail Nafi’, The Role of Superstition in Twain’s The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn and Shakespeare’s Macbeth: A Comparative Study, *English Lang. Lit. Stud.*, 2016.

[4] S. Achiri and F. Hadjeris, BETWEEN REALITY AND IDEALISM: DOES NOVEL READING GENERATE EMPATHY IN ALGERIAN EFL STUDENTS?, *English Rev. J. English Educ.*, 2016.

[5] M. J. Kiskis, L. S. Trombley, and G. Scharnhorst, *Mark Twain at home: How family shaped Twain’s fiction*. 2016.

[6] H. K. Bush, *Continuing bonds with the dead: Parental grief and nineteenth-century American authors*. 2016.

[7] P. Stoneley, Children, futurity, and value: Adventures of Huckleberry Finn, *Textual Practice*. 2016.

[8] V. Kwok, Faithfulness in translation of children's literature The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn in Chinese, *Babel*, 2016.

CHAPTER 9

MARK TWAIN'S: DISTINCTIVELY AMERICAN HUMOR IN ADVENTURES OF HUCKLEBERRY FINN

Kanchan Gupta, Assistant Professor
Department of Paramedical Sciences, TeerthankerMahaveer University, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India Email Id- kanchanricha63@gmail.com

ABSTRACT:

This explores the distinctive and particularly American humour present throughout The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn, Mark Twain's literary classic. Twain developed a distinct sense of humour throughout the course of his career, which he sharpened in this well-known piece. This essay focuses on Twain's distinctive approach to humour within the historical and cultural setting of late nineteenth-century America rather than discussing humour in a general theoretical sense. The study looks into how nubs or snappers are used in the story and considers how Twain's humour relates to the larger topics and complexity of his book, offering light on a kind of humour that is still distinctly American and consistently current. The mention of nubs or snappers in Twain's story demonstrates his mastery of fusing humour with profound social insight. Twain's humour is a potent tool for analysing the complexity of American society, including problems with racism, morality, and the state of the human race. It enables him to delicately approach weighty and frequently upsetting subjects in a way that engages readers and tests their assumptions. Additionally, Twain's unique brand of humour has made a lasting impression on American literature. Twain is a pillar of this rich literary history since his work has impacted generations of writers who have tried to encapsulate the spirit of American humour. It becomes clear that Twain's humour is still relevant now just as it was in the late nineteenth century as we consider the book's ongoing popularity. Readers are still captivated by his humor-infused exploration of the inconsistencies of a nation wrestling with its identity as well as his ability to utilize humour to traverse the complexity of American life.

KEYWORDS:

Adventures, American humour, Huckleberry Finn, Society.

INTRODUCTION

Everyone agrees that Mark Twain's The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn is amusing. Among all the disagreements concerning its interpretation, that is one of the few areas where there is agreement. The teller of the comic story informs you beforehand that it is one of the funniest things he has ever heard, then tells it with an eager delight, and is the first person to laugh when he gets through. The teller of the humorous story tells it gravely; the teller does his best to conceal the fact that he even dimly suspects that there is anything funny about it. A nub, point, snapper, or whatever else you want to name it, is a very common way for a comedic story to end. The listener then needs to pay close attention since the teller frequently drops the nub with care and indifference while pretending, he is unaware that it is a nub in order to deflect attention from it.In my essay, I talk about the nubs or snappers in Huckleberry Finn as well as a particular and wholly American style of humour. That is to say, I'm not concentrating on theories of humour ranging from Aristotle to Northrop Frye; rather, I'm concentrating on a specific type of humour that Twain cultivated throughout his career and honed in his most famous work. I have historical and important questions about how the humorous story was actually practised in late nineteenth-century America, according to Mark

Twain [1], [2]. Accordingly, Twain's idea of humour focuses mostly on what we now know to as deadpan, a orig US slang term2 that relates to a variety of American legends, such as the Yankee Peddler, riverboat Confidence-Man, and the Western tall tale. Deadpan, the con game, and the tall tale are all distinct forms of humour, yet they are all fundamentally tied to the American humour heritage I just mentioned. The fundamental formula stays constant throughout. The story is recounted gravely, as Twain puts it, and the narrator is straight-faced. He describes in great detail, for example, how Davy Crockett killed the largest bear in Arkansas when he was eight years old or how you may buy the Brooklyn Bridge for little to nothing. The amusing part is the believer in the story.The tall tale is the happiest of the three because it exaggerates the ideals of the social group to express and enjoy it. The con game is fairly serious and occasionally hazardous because it appeals to common values in order to take advantage of the social group. However, the game's rules here also represent a common community. The con game assumes that certain principles are normative and universal, just like in parody.

Of these, deadpan is the loosest and most adaptable. It refuses to suggest how the listener is expected to interpret the story since it rejects any claims made by the normative. No winks or smiles are exchanged, as in the tall tale, and no changes in demeanor, bearing, or expression are made, as in Melville's Confidence-Man, either. In deadpan, all hints are suppressed and cleverly masked by the humour. As a result, rather than focusing on the story's topic, the author chose to focus on the hearing or reading audience. Or, to put it more precisely, we are the gulls in the story; the reader or listeners of the bigger text are represented as the suckers. The flexibility of deadpan allows it to go one important step farther than the tall tale or con game when our interpretation is regarded as the topic of the story. The exaggeration and ridicule of the humorist may result in a vicious mockery of believing itself, a type of nihilism whose nubs push the boundaries of laughing at society conventions and standards.

Of the three types of indigenous humour I've discussed, deadpan was the last to receive an official label. Although we are aware that it was in use as slang for a very long time, its first recorded use is in the November 1927 issue of Vanity Fair, where it is defined by comparison to a card-shark who is holding four aces and you wouldn't suspect it, and even as late as March 1957, the English Sunday Times felt the need to clarify that what is known as 'dead pan' humour facial expression gives no warning of the thrust to come.3 It is a remarkable coincidence that, in the canon of mainstream American literature, the term deadpan first appears in Nathanael West's Miss Lonely-hearts in the chapter titled Miss Lonely-hearts and the Dead Pan, where, as we shall see, the pun pan as face and as the joking, death-threatening Greek god is entirely appropriate to the approach of Huckleberry Finn.

The term deadpan in Mark Twain is therefore defined in retrospect. I still draw attention to it because it offers a unique viewpoint on historical forms. I would refer to it as historicist hindsight, a perfect example of how the modern perspective, far from being out of date, was and still is an integral element of the subject perhaps even more so than the terminology that was popular at the time. Such expressions are typically descriptive; the perspective from retrospect is analytical. It assists in shedding light on what are now acknowledged as significant cultural continuities. Thus, what I mean when I use the term deadpan is an analytical category that is not abstract, universalist, or comprehensive but rather is conditioned by culture, rooted in society, and focused on aesthetics. It is revealed through the genre or style it represents history as being fundamental to the development and emergence of that genre or form [3], [4]. It provides a temporal, non-transcendent vantage point from which to examine the creative forms in question, in this case, the fluid, ephemeral characteristics of a particular type of humour that was prevalent in Twain's time and that, in

fact, bridged all regions of nineteenth-century America, East and West, North and South, rural and urban, and all periods, from the Federalist and Jacksonian through the Gilded Age, from Timothy Dwight to Arte

DISCUSSION

In all three instances, the humour that Twain acquired reflects the unique circumstances of the southwestern frontier. Tall tale, con game, and deadpan. These are well-known, but practicing them will help you understand the unique links between the tall narrative and the con game in the deadpan mode. First, consider Henry Wenham's account of the tumultuous setting of the legendary tale. Tall humour expresses incongruities that are intrinsic to the American experience, not because it is incongruous per sealhumour is incongruous. The distance that separated the ideal from the real, the language of culture from the language of sweat, the democratic dream from the social and economic reality of the early American republic, could not help but be appreciated by a nation that had been founded, settled, and closely observed by men and women with extraordinary expectations, both exalted and depraved.

Therefore, the social group that the tall tale represents and celebrates is unstable, as shown by its tremendous swings between exaltation and despondence. It is a con artist's heaven due to its blatant contradictions and stark differences between the truth and the ideal. Hilton Obenzinger has expanded on Wonham's definition in a way that strengthens this connection between con guy and tall tale and explains how both relate to the deadpan mode. In line with Wenham, he makes the observation that the gap between culture and sweat found in frontier experiences which typically included Indian wars, slave-dealing, herrenvolk white racial solidarity, endemic violence, economic instability, fluidity, and speculative fantasy cultivated a vernacular humour of extremes, along with pleasure in horror and depravity.As settler-colonial expansion approached, tall humour served as a means of initiation and survival in the face of extreme physical and social unpredictability. This humour flourished at the intersection of migration, displacement, and violence, taking great pleasure in upending the gentility of the densely settled Eastern core while also reproducing the radical discrepancies and incongruities at the core of all American experience.

These are the social and psychological uncertainties of an emerging capitalist society. One style of being hilarious readily transitions into another in a world of physical turmoil and shifting identities. The three primary meanings of the word can be used to see the various types of fun involved in this process: Funny in the sense of just plain fun the silly humour we refer to as kidding around, humour comparable to the classic tall story, designed to amuse. Funny in the archaic sense of befool, as in tricky or deceitful satirical style of humour that subverts social conventions and is hence strongly related to the confidence game. When we remark there's something funny about that con man, we mean funny in the terrifying sense of strangely or suspiciously odd, curious, as in: he might be a murderer. This ominous humour, which is present in all deadpan forms and distinguishes one particular deadpan style, tends towards horror and depravity. We enjoy morbid humour and the absurdity of our post-frontier society.

Typically, humorists focus on one or more types of humor let's call them upbeat, sarcastic, and ominous. However, as we've seen, these styles may easily blend together. American deadpan reaches its pinnacle, the best example of its high and delicate art, when the joke echoes with all three facets of humour, from that's funny to that's funny. Huckleberry Finn is Mark Twain's funniest book in all three senses of the word. His deadpan humour is at its peak in this work. The reason I use the terms tall story, con man, and deadpan interchangeably and

smoothly in the sentences that follow is because Twain's deadpan, which is the third, sinister, odd or curious sense of hilarious, combines the other two types of humour. His approach incorporates a sharp change in deadpan effect [5], [6].

Twain genuinely used unconventional methods to use the tall tale and con game in the service of deadpan humour. That is to say, the novel challenges the very deadpan tradition upon which it is based. That custom typically belongs to the narrator. Huck is renowned for his deadpan delivery, yet he is not a comedian, not even when he is putting someone on. He actually doesn't have fun very often; he's typically in a sweat6; and when he does try to make jokes, the humour frequently backfires and makes him look foolish. Pseudo-deadpan is a good way to describe Huck's voice; although it sounds funny, it's truly concerned and genuine. The genuine master of the deadpan is, of course, Mark Twain, and what is amazing what creates the inversion I just described is that this con artist is not grimacing but rather grinning. The author is donning the Mask of Comedy to highlight Twain's distinction between the English comic story and the American hilarious story. We may say that he conceals his humour under a comedic persona. The audience is the target of the humour, which serves as a disguise. The story itself, however, is consistently enjoyable, frequently humorous, and occasionally hilarious; it's clear that the narrator is having a great time because he or she is laughing the entire time.

The strange or intriguing premise of Huckleberry Finn is as follows: The comic mask-wearing deadpan artist is Mark Twain, who famously succeeds in hiding the fact that he thinks his tale might contain something dangerous or even grave. If we are vigilant, we might then notice something we missed as we laugh or after we have laughed. The humour in the fact that we considered it amusing has not yet been revealed. This con artist duped us. He has drawn our attention away from the essential issue, and we must review his narrative in order to understand its essence.It is possible to show the basics of what recognition in this sense entails. Consider a society that was both racist and egalitarian, like the Southwest in the late nineteenth century. That contradiction gave rise to the genre known as the minstrel show. So picture a sardonic minstrel show that goes something like this. The audience laughs along when a humorous anecdote about a stereotypical darkie is told. The real problem, of course, is that they are being made fun of; they have been duped and made the punchline. If they do, they will then realise what is actually humorous about the narrative, and they will then be able to laugh at themselves for initially laughing. This independence could be comparable to getting your funny bone shocked. Similar to the strange tingling vibration you experience when you are struck on the funny bone, it is a complicated sensation that engages all three definitions of humour. A gentle touch could just be some healthy fun, like the wake-up call of a tall tale. A jab at the system as a whole with a harsh touch could be unsettling.

A sharp, violent cut would hurt and feel violent, in the ominous sense of the word funny.To reiterate, Twain's humour encompasses all three types. The epitome of American deadpan, Huckleberry Finn is a wonderfully orchestrated blend of all three layers of humour, with a focus on the dark. It is important to note that the novel is distinctive in this way. Twain only accomplished this feat once. Even when they are brimming with violence, such in Roughing It or, for that matter, Tom Sawyer, his earlier works are rarely menacing. Even when they are jam-packed with jokes, like Muttonhead Wilson or the tales of terror gathered posthumously as The Great Dark, his latter works are rarely humorous. The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn is Twain's masterful synthesis of his career as America's Humorist, incorporating every phase of his writing from The Celebrated Jumping Frog of Calaveras County to The Man Who Corrupted Hadley burg to the David Lynch-like setting of The Man Who Corrupted Hadley burg. The dialectic underlying Twain's spectacular synthesis in Huckleberry Finn is a

marked effect reversal: the deadpan artist with the Comic Mask. And the succession of nubs or snappers he dish out is among the most brutal shocks to the American funny bone in our literature [7], [8].

The novel's lack of humour is the first surprise. Huckleberry Finn describes a slave hunt that is literally undertaken by a society that is itself enslaved culture in bondage to all the Seven Deadly Sins, and as a result, is characterised by violence, meanness, ignorance, and deceit. The slave hunt serves as both a metaphor and a metonymy for the world it depicts. A good example is Pikesville, a shanty town near the river. All the streets and alleys were made of nothing but mud, which was nearly as black as tar and as deep as a foot in some spots and two to three inches deep everywhere else. The hogs lazed and grumbled all over the place. She would stretch out, close her eyes, and wave her ears while the piglets were milking her, and she would look as content as if she were being paid. You would see a muddy sow and her litter of pigs come lazily along the street and whollop themselves right down in the road, where people had to walk past her. And soon you would hear a loafer calling out, Hello! so boy! Tige, sicken him! Then you would see all the loafers rise up and watch the thing out of sight, and laugh at the fun and appear grateful for the commotion. The sow would then leave, screeching most horribly, with a dog or two clinging to each ear, and three or four dozen more coming. When there was a dogfight, they would then settle back down. Anything other than a dogfight could make people joyful and awaken them all, unless it involved dousing a stray dog in turpentine and setting him ablaze or attaching a tin pan to his tail and watching him burn to death.

The Shakespearean soliloquy performed at Pikesville by the Duke and the King is what readers of the book remember it for instead of that piece of fun: That's what we laugh at, as we should. But think about that picture of a sow rushing away, squealing most horrible, or of a dog running himself to death. And now consider the hidden meaning of the Shakespearean parody: the villagers and the Duke and King are debased, and in both instances, debasement is a metaphor for the slave trade. The stray dog is either Jim on the run or Huck being pursued by society. The animal kingdom is displayed to us as though it were in a cynical Eden, with pigs, dogs, and people happily mixing in the mud. The joke is on us because of the tragedy we humans create out of so long life.

This serves as a kind of brief introduction to the story's primary characters. The deadpan connective, G. introduces the reader to the text and links Mark Twain with Huck Finn, who has written this story. All of the aforementioned are connected by G., the person who orders the Notice, and the Notice itself is an instruction on interpretation. Clearly, it is a direction against interpretation, but it is a deadpan directive, thus interpretation is necessary. The Notice is plainly a joke, a tall tale of sorts, but it also has a sarcastic edge to it, a con man's chuckle levelled at haughty authority. A Chief of Ordnance in this instance is a military officer who is prepared to blow you to pieces. Think of the penalties for trespassing, and the deadly pun that reinforces them: ordnance is not just a colloquial misspelling; technically, it means cannon or artillery. And to do so, it should be noted, for the least offensive of interpretive offences: not to locate a plot or a moral or a motivation.

All of this results in a situation that is exceptionally comical. Although we're not allowed to interpret, the tale Huck tells begs for it constantly and unceasingly. Without understanding the plot and motive, we won't be able to understand any of its gags, and we won't be able to accomplish that without adopting a moral stance. Consider even the most straightforward joke, such as the tale Huck tells Jim about Solomon and the contentious child. No attentive reader can help but notice that the episode makes satirical references to several important issues in the book, including the cultural connections between paternity, the Bible, education,

and government. No reader has failed to chuckle merrily at the occurrence. So, it makes complete sense that Huck would slide from Solomon to rulers in general. I use my second example, the book's final joke, to further examine the query. I'm referring to what is undoubtedly Huck's most well-known quotehis choice to go off for the frontier. The prevailing interpretation of it for a long time has been that Huck goes because he wants to be free. And while there's no doubt that he does, the text itself reveals something else: After continuing to talk, Tom suggested that the three of them leave the house one of these nights, get dressed, and embark on a few weeks or months of wild adventures among the Injuns in the Territory. I said, all right, that sounds like it would be fun.

Huck decides to leave ahead of the rest as a result, but the truth is that he's joking around. He intends to put on a outfit and travel for a while, which we understand as a quest for freedom. If we follow critical tradition, we then go on to allegorize this as the freedom of the spirit. Huck Finn, the outlaw hero of the open road, has become a cultural figure during the past century thanks to this metaphor. It's an astonishing leap in logic. Just consider the ironic parallel between Native Americans and African Americans in this instance: Jim suited up for howling adventures amongst the Injuns! The Duke and King's joke about dressing up Jim as a Sick Arabbut harmless when not out of his head is similar to this one. They reportedly wore King Lear's outfit for the event, and because Jim-in-disguise is a recurring subject, it might not be too difficult to draw a connection [9], [10].

Any ease, Twain's deadpan play in the novel's final scene should alert us to the sophisticated narrative pattern he has constructed, somewhere between Shakespeare's outcast king howling on the heath and Jim howling amongst the Injuns. When Huck prepares to leave the Phelps's for the Territory, two fundamental aspects of both his and our cultures come together in a transitional moment. The settlements, as the N-word forcefully defines them, are connected to the Territory, as the I-word expressly defines it: Injun territory. Then there is the dimension of time; the word Injun is a hint to the cultural ties that the twofold time frame of the novel implies. The antebellum South, the time of slavery, is the fictional setting for Huck's experiences. The book's authorial period, or the decade in which Twain wrote it, was when Indians were being killed often. What joins both time frames is nothing less than the most sinister line of continuity in American history, from slavery to genocide in the pre-Civil War period, the country's economic growth through slavery; after the Civil War, the country's territorial growth through Indian Removal, mainly in the deadly sense of the word removal skinned alive, as Twain punned in a satirical tribute to Plymouth Rock and the Pilgrims, speaking in the guise of a solitary survivor.

Huck's escape to freedom is a shady tall tale told by a con artist that illustrates how much may be left out during interpretation. Additionally, it implies what this form of exclusion allows for. I'm referring to the cultural cliche that derives its power from a potent set of national self-definitions: the idea that the territory in the United States refers to freedom rather than other people's property; the common understanding that open land refers to promise, opportunity, and hope rather than expropriation. This stoic nub has such a grand act of mockery hidden in it! I mentioned before how a minstrel performance crowd was made fun of for participating in racial stereotypes. We are made fun of in Huckleberry Finn for adhering to the American way of thinking.To put it bluntly, the novel's final revelation is that cultural interpretation may be a trap. I now mean interpretation in a unique sense one that is both unique and essential. Most of the time, when we think about interpretation, we picture it as a more or less autonomous act, an assertion of what something or someone means to me, sometimes going against the grain of popular opinion. I acknowledge that interpretation might operate in this manner that it can engender doubt, modification, or disruption and I

certainly have high hopes for this piece. However, it is also true and this is considerably more typical that interpretation is a cultural institution.

Additionally, on this institutional level, interpretation serves as a tool for acculturation rather than skepticism, revision, or disruption. From our very first Dick and Jane reader to our most recent America Is Multicultural guidebook, society has carefully nurtured this process. Through this cultural process, we learn to internally and privately affirm the beliefs that our society has instilled in each of us. And we carefully consider what we do. We acquire social aprioris, and as a result, acquiesce to the constraints imposed by the culture we live in, meticulously, deliberately, step by analytical stupor impatiently, avariciously, and sensuously, like Pecola Breedlove in Toni Morrison's The Bluest Eye.Our fundamental and enduring search for meaning is directed towards socialisation through this process of interpretation. It transforms our environment into a system in our imaginations, arranges our fantasies in a way that allows us to deal with reality, and creates the fundamental connections between subjectivity and society. And in the USA, it often does it in an individualistic way, similar to the American do-it-yourself kit. We all work independently to arrive at what ends up being roughly the same interpretation.

One may even go so far as to claim that interpretation, in this sense, is culture, but that would be stretching the meaning of the term beyond what I intended and beyond its rightful bounds. Rituals, thought patterns, and networks of meaning define the limits of our conscious deliberations and endure as community a priory in culture. It also consists of various customs, practises, and beliefs that are incompatible with one another. What I just referred to as networks of meaning, whose centre and backbone is society's official institution of interpretation, mediates that is, defuses, deflects, or resolves those tensions.The institution of literary interpretation has excelled in this regard throughout the previous two centuries. Perhaps most amazingly, it has played a crucial role in the development and coherence of national identities, first in Europe and subsequently in America. In the words of Robert Spiller and his coeditors, who edited the first significant collaborative History of American Literature, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred astonishing transformation of immigrants into citizens the transformation of the native born into Americans. Never has nature been changed by human activity in such a short period of time so quickly and extensively. Our writing has been profoundly influenced by the ideals and practises developed in democratic living. Never has conquest resulted in a more vigorous development of initiative, individualism, self-reliance, and the demands for freedom. Hence the Americanness of our major authors. It has been keenly aware of the necessities of the average person as well as the aspirations of the individual.

It has been made virulent by criticism of the actual in comparison to the ideal and humanitarian.Huckleberry Finn is a fantastic illustration of this socialisationendeavour, if not the best example. Think about these developments in the novel during the past three decades. The radically revisionist Heath Anthology of American Literature gave the novel more attention in 1990 and even printed the complete thing. After 1970, the very controversy over Twain's racism served as a platform for agreement, and during the 1990s, Huckleberry Finn was taught more than any other novel, more than any other long work, and more than any other work in American literature. With ritual repetition, academic authorities defended the book as an example of integration, saying that even though his society was racist, Twain was not, and so 'we' are not. The significance of this cultural work overrode the offence the book generated among many of its newly authorized, but also newly obligated African-American readers. African Americans must confront this viewpoint in order to undermine the quintessentially American America he represents.

CONCLUSION

The analysis of Mark Twain's uniquely American humour in Adventures of Huckleberry Finn demonstrates the author's unmatched storytelling skills as well as the profound insights he contributes to the American literary tradition. The sly wit, sarcasm, and frequently understated delivery of Twain's humour provide a singular perspective from which to examine the cultural, social, and historical environment of late nineteenth-century America. We have discovered Mark Twain's humorous genius as well as the profound depth of his social critique through this examination of his uniquely American humour. In many ways, Mark Twain's humour is amirror reflecting the ever-changing American experience. These facts strike us as a sharp punch to the funny bone if we pay great attention to the novel's last scene. They show how the institution of literary interpretation served this nation during one of its most turbulent eras to hide the most repugnant feature of our past: the discrepancy between national reality and national beliefs. Technically, the title of Huckleberry Finn, Tom Sawyer's Comrade, refers to the character from whom we frantically wish to distance ourselves.

REFERENCES:

[1] P. Corcoran and C. Costache, Smartphones, Biometrics, and a Brave New World, *IEEE Technol. Soc. Mag.*, 2016.

[2] H. B. Wonham, Mark Twain: The Gift of Humor, *Am. Lit. Realis.*, 2016.

[3] J. Bird, Mark Twain, *American Literary Scholarship*. 2016.

[4] F. Krobb, Imaginary Conquest and Epistemology in Nineteenth-Century Adventure Literature: Africa in Jules Verne, Burmann, May, and Twain, *Child. Lit.*, 2016.

[5] T. R. Smith, Missing Ralph Keeler: Bohemians, Brahmins and Literary Friendships in the Gilded Age, *Comp. Am. Stud.*, 2016.

[6] Intertextuality and pastiche Technoques of Mark Twain Select Novels, *Am. J. Educ. Res. Rev.*, 2016.

[7] D. L. Kennedy and B. D. Hirsch, Prime Suspect: William Cowper Prime in the Holy Land and the Identity of ‘An American’ In Harper’s New Monthly Magazine, 1858, *Palest. Explor. Q.*, 2016.

[8] Fischer, Remarks at the Mark Twain Circle Banquet, *Mark Twain Annu.*, 2016.

[9] K. E. Bishop, Projecting Mark Twain From Bohemia to Xinjiang, *Am. Stud.*, 2016.

[10] L. A. Simmons and S. H. Anderson, Effects of logging activities on selected soil physical and hydraulic properties for a claypan landscape, *Geoderma*, 2016.

CHAPTER 10

HUMOR, INTERPRETATION, AND CULTURAL REFLECTION: MARK TWAIN'S AMERICA

Anuradha Pawar, Assistant Professor
Department of Pharmacy, TeerthankerMahaveer University, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id- anumayak@yahoo.co.in

ABSTRACT:

This essay explores the nuances of cultural narratives and interpretation in relation to Mark Twain's Adventures of Huckleberry Finn. In order to question current cultural norms and beliefs, it investigates how the narrative devices of the tall tale, the confidence game, and deadpan humour interact. A key component of public perception is the urban legend, and Twain's use of the confidence game takes use of shared ideals and the need for believing. The study also looks at how deadpan blends both techniques, making interpretation the main topic of the narrative. The thesis of the essay is that Twain's writing, especially Huckleberry Finn, serves as a subversive critique of racial oppression. It emphasises the role of the artist as a Eternal Disruptor who breaks free from traditional norms by using strategies including reversal, miming, riffing, and inversion. In addition, the essay emphasises how influential interpretation has been as a social control mechanism throughout history and throughout cultures, finally calling into doubt the veracity of dominant interpretations. Twain's wry remark serves as a warning that, while interpretation is a useful tool, it should always be examined and challenged to unearth the more profound truths that lie under the surface.

KEYWORDS:

Humor, Interpretation, and Cultural Reflection, Mark Twain.

INTRODUCTION

Interpretation might be a cultural trap; at this point, it might be helpful to think back on the distinctions and similarities between the tall tale, the confidence game, and deadpan. The urban legend defines the parameters of popular perception. These shared values are exploited by the confidence game, which also exploits the demand for believe. Deadpan effectively combines both styles, turning interpretation the basic foundation of credulity into the story's central theme. With its relentless pursuit of subversion, Twain's final snap is particularly noteworthy in the context of the current critical landscape. According to this viewpoint, the artist takes on the role of an Eternal Disruptor, creating a network of ways to escape cultural oppression using techniques like reversal, miming, riffing, and inversion. Of course, that stereotype implicitly includes the subversively astute art critic.This gives out a pleasant and comfortable image of interpretational abilities. On the other hand, Twain's jest about Huck's escape to freedom is as unsettling anddeflating as it is unexpected. We should be reminded of Twain's initial caution: Beware of Interpretation once again because of the discrepancy it displays between the literal meaning of the material before us and the spiritual meaning we give to it.

I've been suggesting that the primary function of our official institutions of interpretation, especially literary interpretation, is that they act as hubs for social control. And I dare say that assertion can be applied universally across cultures. The status quo has historically used interpretation to defend itself precisely at its points of contention, or potential weak points, throughout time and space. One simply needs to consider the powerfully integrating power of the four-fold approach of mediaeval exegesis, which had layers of meaning that rose from

earth to heaven like rungs on a Jacob's ladder, from the literal and political to the moral and mystical. It would not be an exaggeration to say that the doctrine of the divine right of kings strengthened every aspect of society in the Christian West for a millennium, protecting the status quo precisely where it could be vulnerable: at the intersections of gender, class, and religion; the spiritual imperative and civil law; and public and private life [1], [2].Of fact, the method of official interpretation differs in America. The literate elite established mediaeval exegesis in a hierarchical manner. Exegesis in our culture is based on democratic consensus. They are founded on ideas such as pluralism, individualism, contract, and the separation of religion and state. These are the ideologic bounds of our government, as well as the priorities of our social and personal lives. And to the extent that previous forms of Christian hermeneutics continue today despite these doctrinal restrictions, as they do, these Protestant forms are essentially individualist and based on the individual's conscience rather than a papal bull.

The outcomes, however, are just as systemic and binding. When Chairman Mao said that power emanates from a gun's barrel, he was off the point. Even less effective than other governmental power tools are guns. They only compel us to comply; interpretation wins our approval. Additionally, in America, association and socialisation are both predicated on consent free, self-affirming assent. Culture is facilitated by the movement of appealing artefacts and stories, while society is facilitated by civic and economic institutions. These serve as the body politics' moral lifeblood, with interpretation at its core. What is most personal our capacity for autonomous judgement and our power of consent becomes a source of social renewal as a result of a sound cultural heart in a healthy body politic. The fact that long before 1900, the culture had developed a distinctive network of literal-political-moral-spiritual meanings and a complex set of interpretative techniques appropriate to a modern, free enterprise, open market way of life is largely responsible for society's success in the fragmented, decentralised body of the United States.

Our recognition of this fundamental, conservative strength is compelled by Twain's deadpan. In part due to emotional stress and personal loss, he himself eventually came to understand it. His biographers claim that the crucial years are between 1876 and 1885, when his grievances piled so rapidly upon previous griefs that they surfaced visibly, undeniably. A short list of these grievances and griefs includes a fatal break with Bret Hart, fatal troubles with his publisher, Bliss. Financial difficulties, exorbitantly costly involvements with the Paige typesetter and other patents, a bitterly disappointing return to the Mississippi River, Hannibal, and boyhood scenes, and the beginnings of chronic illness for the four female members of his family all this precisely at the height of his creative powers, throughout the decade of the stop-and-start making of Huckleberry Finn. In 1883, Twain wrote an essay titled the human machine gets all its inspirations from the outside and is not capable of originating an idea of any kind in its own head; two years later, in an essay titled The Character of Man, he added a certain agency to his definition of the human machine and by the time the book was published in 1885, he had developed a series of deterministic principles that explained all values and beliefs as the result of cultural training.

The greatest American humorous story boils down to this: Man's fate is acculturation, a vicious predisposition, and the exit into darkness. The deadpan point of Huck's adventures is that we're caught up not only in the joints of the social body, but in the movement of history: trapped, that is, within the very cultural transitions from slavery to Reconstruction, from civilization to the Territory through which we had hoped to escape. Hank Morgan in A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court laments about mediaeval England, saying, we have no thoughts of our own, no opinions of our own; they are transmitted to us, trained into

us. By training, he is unable to see that he is the main victim of that process, as Twain put it four years later, Training is everything; training is all there is to a person. In fact, the crimes of Camelot have a similar con-man effect to the crimes of slavery in Huckleberry Finn in that they attempt to distract us from the true nature of the present-day crimes by appearing to be the sins of a bygone era. Hank Morgan, the narrator of A Connecticut Yankee, is the target of a sardonic joke debunking the notion of progress. We are made fun of in Huckleberry Finn, and the joke is aimed at our belief in both progress and interpretation. The funny bone gets a really unsettling shock from it, but we can't stop there. We have an obligation to explain our laughing both to ourselves and to Mark Twain's work [3], [4].

I now proceed to my third and key example to illustrate this. When Huck arrives at the Phelps Plantation, he runs into Sally Phelps, who thinks he's her nephew Tom Sawyer. This is where the sentence appears. Huck instinctively accepts his new persona, but he stumbles while explaining why he arrived so late: Tom had been anticipated by the riverboat for some time. Once more, the narrative's structural core is at hand. All three of the novel's sections are connected by the arrival of the Phelps Plantation, as are the three different levels of Trickster fun. It also illustrates Twain's hermeneutic imperative, which states that we must interpret this event, while serving as an excellent illustration of what is amusing about our interpretational habits. I believe the punchline to be the famous one-liner,Norm. slain a nigger. It's actually a one-liner with two parts: Norm. slain a nigger.

Then Aunt Sally's tale of the Lally Rook takes us away from the main point. Remember Twain's warning: The listener must be alert, for... the teller will divert attention from the nub by dropping it in a carefully casual or indifferent way, with the pretense that he does not know it is a nub. The Babtist is a ruse that permits the narrative to flow naturally. In fact, Twain continues Aunt Sally's musings to keep the humour flowing in case the reader doesn't laugh out loud right away: Yes, I recall now, he did die. They were forced to amputate him after he became mortified. But he wasn't saved by it. Yes, that's what it was humiliation. He went completely blue before passing away with the expectation of a blissful afterlife. They said he was beautiful to see. It's a pretty amusing picture, but Huck's two-part throwaway phrase, Norm. slain a nigger. By highlighting eight aspects of Huck's reaction to which we should pay attention, if we're brave enough to want to catch the joke, I hope to decode Twain's deadpan in what follows.

DISCUSSION

First off, the episode is a perfect example of how Twain uses the evil quality of deadpan to mix the tall tale and con game. Huck's reaction is a comic book exaggeration that defines a particular social group's beliefs and then works as a successful con to establish Huck as Tom. As a result, it ranks as one of the cruelest jokes in all of prejudice literature. Nearly every one of the book's good characters is undermined by Huck's No'm, even the sweet frontierswoman Judith Loftus, who interrupts Huck's visit to join the nigger hunt. As the search for Jim comes to a close and the no one joke is fully realises, it also serves as a fitting prelude to the lengthy Phelps episode, where Aunt Sally and Uncle Silas are depicted as warm, hospitable characters, the salt of the earth. Most dramatically, perhaps, is when a group of men decide to lynch Jim for all the trouble, he has causeda raft of trouble, as Twain humorously has one of them phrase it

Second, Huck's usage of the word nigger is blatantly offensive. We cannot claim that it is simply slang, a crude boy's way of pronouncing African American. What Huck is referring to is much worse than what a bigot would mean by wop or wasp. Huck is defining a nigger as a nonhuman or no one. In this regard, it's interesting to note that Barrett Wendell, the first

professor of American literature at Harvard, emphasised on this paragraph in his published Literary History of America in 1900. He claims that Huck's No'm. Killed a nigger is a serious declaration of comparative merit that is both accurate and foresighted in terms of what right-minded people believe: not only is it an admirably compact expression of temper of the antebellum South, but it is also more consonant with New-England temper to-day than it was seventy years ago. Between Stone Age humans and those that evolved into the nineteenth-century civilization, modern ethnology appears to acknowledge a rather clear distinction. Although Wendell's example is extreme he was an outspoken white supremacist he was nonetheless academically endorsing beliefs that were widespread in Twain's America, both in the North and the South. His interpretation hints at the entire significance of Huck's joke when he answers the straight man's question, anybody hurt?

Third, Huck's response is superfluous and gratuitous. The forced pause in the middle of the queue has a joke about it. Huck might as well have ended his sentence with No'm. Also be aware that Huck frequently makes remarks with such needless racist overtones. His lexicon is largely comprised of the informal N-word. The word nigger appears on almost every page of the book, as critics have noted for the previous three decades, and it should be emphasised that it took three generations of readers before they took offence. Huckleberry Finn first generated discussions about class, not race. The issues revolved around Huck's misbehavior, bad habits, and poor grammar. Up until the 1960s, the N-word was widely ignored, and I think that this neglect was a key component of Twain's deadpan. The fact that the word, which was both a cruel epithet and a pervasive, unstudied byword ubiquitous because it was unstudied and unstudied because it was ubiquitous was woven into the very fabric of Twain's self-declared democratic society is part of the joke. Again, Huck's response is completely suitable for both him and his audience. Additionally, it fits with the novel's narrative [5], [6].

Once we understand his methodology, the message becomes clear. Nearly every scene and episode in the book features some form of violence or death. Huckleberry Finn's world is mirrored in the blood link that Tom creates. It foreshadows the death hoax that Huck concocts when he heads for the river, as well as the horrifying scene earlier where his blind-drunk father pursues him around the shack with a clasp knife while screaming that Huck is the Angel of Death and that he will now murder him for good. The exploits of Huck involve these kinds of facts and fancies. In the murder of Boggs, in scenes of lynching and tar and feathering, in the massacre of the Granger ford-Shepherdson clan, and even in the wreck of the Walter Scott when Huck steals the robbers' skiff by acting as he imagines Tom Sawyer would have presumably leaving the robbers to drown they come to life. Huckleberry Finn contains corpses, according to Twain historians, but that number does not include the two robbers who likely drowned or the horrifying corpse described in the passage Twain left out, which is undoubtedly one of the most graphic and macabre pieces of writing he ever produced. Early reviews complained that Huck's experiences were just one bloodcurdling event after another.

and it's not overstating things to argue that the anatomical linkages of his tale are dead bodies, both real and imagined. It's fitting that G.G., the wry link between Huck and Twain, the reader, and the story, is a Chief of Artillery. It's also fitting that his Notice warns that anyone looking for a plot will be shot. The novel's plot revolves around the idea of dying. The sixth criticism of Huck's joke is on the manner of his passing. Explosions frequently occur on the river he travels. This is supported by Aunt Sally in the case of the unfortunate Baptist, and there are numerous additional instances throughout the book. The fact is that this river is ominous. T. S. Eliot dubbed it the river God that gives to Man his dignity; critics have a tendency to romanticize it, although its wry author clearly invites such thoughts. Twain,

however, makes it very clear that this great brown god is a cunning con artist if we pay close attention. In Letters from the Earth, Satan claims that nature is murder all along the line and that Huckleberry Finn may serve as his proof. The river is danger some to those who are on it and those who live nearby because it is the origin of storms, water snakes, and the fog that prevents Huck and Jim from reaching Cairo. One of many examples: the houses were protruding over the bank, bowed and bent, and on the verge of falling in. People continued to live there, but it was dangerous because occasionally a section of land as wide as a house would cave in all at once. A quarter-mile-deep band of land may occasionally begin to cave before eventually doing so all at once in one summer as the river continues to eat at it. Critics often reference Huck's depiction of life on the raft: what you want is for everybody to be satisfied, and feel right and kind towards the others to highlight the beautiful times that this river gives Huck and Jim. However, they have neglected to include Huck's on the raft depression, which is far more typical of him, and his overwhelming sense of loneliness: there wouldn't be nothing to hear nor nothing to see, he remarks about the river, just solid lonesomeness.

They neglected to mention that Huck's quest to appease everybody once more labels Jim as a nobody; this is how Huck justifies letting the King and Duke get their way. The fact that the rapscallions, as Huck charitably refers to them, govern and guide life aboard the raft throughout the most of the river ride is possibly the most significant criticism that I am aware of. The blissful idyll of Huck and Jim on the fiver is covered in roughly three pages, the majority of which are at the beginning of chapter. Although these three pages on the basis of which critics have repeatedly claimed that life on the raft is idyllic, and Huckleberry Finn is a pastoral fiction that looks back nostalgically to an earlier and simpler America occupy less than one percent of the standard edition, Albert Bigelow Paine correctly observed long ago that his is the Huck we want, and this is the Huck we usually have, and... been thankful for these three pages are the ones that have drawn the most criticism.They also come before the Duke and King's invasion of the raft, which could be seen as a deadpan joke by Twain. Although Huck and Jim are currently flying over the Mississippi, the Duke and King naturally live there, and mud slides are also naturally caused by the Mississippi. The universe of Hobbes, not Emerson, is where this river belongs; it is categorically not an emblem of Nature's Nation [7], [8]. Nothing about Huck is more organic, nothing more plainly demonstrates how familiar and close to the river he is than his spontaneous creation of the exploding cylinder that Killed a nigger.

Huck never stops thinking about death and catastrophe;therefore, he doesn't need the river to inspire him to come up with something. The sixth thing about his casual reaction is that. It informs us that he is a young lad who is tormented by death. I'm talking about his thoughts and fantasies right now rather than his experiences. The stories Huck tells and the pictures he imagines when he is by himself give us a glimpse into Huck's inner world; in other words, the reality that Huck creates for both himself and others. It is the grotesque's actuality in both instances. Huck speaks more gravely than gravely, though. He creates a series of horror tales for strangers, stories about families that are either dead, dying, or ill. He also has a grim outlook on life, yet in his solitary reflections, the dead come back to life as ghosts. Take his arrival at the Phelpses' property as an example:When I arrived, the area was deserted, Sunday-like, hot, and sunny. The hands had gone to the fields, and the air was filled with the kind of faint buzzing of insects that give the impression that everyone is dead and gone. If a breeze blows through the area and causes the leaves to tremble, it gives you a melancholy feeling because you believe it to be the whispers of long-dead spirits who are always talking to you. Generally speaking, it makes a body wish he was already dead and finished with everything.

However, he is obviously not acting alone when he creates the cylinder explosion; rather, he is making a concerted effort to win over someone else. Aunt Sally is provoking him about the grounding, leading him on. He is aware of what she wants to hear and anticipates that she will believe a nigger to be no one, just as he is aware that she wants him to be Tom. Naturally, he agrees. The seventh thing about his reaction is that. Huck aspires to fit in. He is a conformist who fails, to put it more precisely. Huck wants to win over everyone, even Miss Watson. He does his best to satisfy the Duke and King; he tells us he'd be happy to join the Granger fords; and he'd love to be Tom Sawyer but he can't. He'd even like to live with Pap, if Pap would let him live. Huck Finn is a deadpan artist's Zellwood Allen's Zelig in reverse. Zelig may not want to be a Nazi or a Chinese cook, but he can't help but imitate those around him. Huck's predicament is the exact opposite: he can't help being unique. We understand and respect his diversity, yet the core still exists. Huck's struggle to fit in emphasises his desire to do so. This is a result of his fervent belief in society. He adheres to Sunday school religion, Southern aristocracy, bigotry, and class distinctions. Why else would he have been so disappointed in Tom's scheme to steal Jim near the conclusion of his adventures? He tries to convince Tom to the contrary, well, one thing was dead sure, he continues, crestfallen. One thing was dead sure, and that was that Tom Sawyer was in earnest, and was actually going to help steal that nigger out of slavery. That was the one thing that I found to be excessive.

Here was a boy who was well-mannered and respectable; who had character to lose; whose family members also had character; who was smart and not a stick-in-the-mud; knowledgeable but not ignorant; kind but not mean; and yet here he was, without any more pride, rightness, or feeling, than to stoop to this business, and make himself and his family look bad in front of everyone. I had absolutely no idea what it meant. This sentence may be cynically viewed as a helpful bit of societal satire if it were a children's book called Tom Sawyer. The respected gang leader is simultaneously being criticised and looked up to by the white trash boy. The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn, however, are a very other story. It's a smart, intricate story about a black-white romance. It's a piece of high and delicate art only an artist can tell it, to paraphrase Mark Twain, when an African American assumes incredible human energy. The noblest person in Huck's life, Jim is revealed to be; if we could see past the minstrel show humour Jim himself is subjected to; the parent we believe Huck deserves and never had; and by any standard, the most sympathetic adult character in the book. After his lengthy encounter with Jim on the river, is it amusing that Huck had this thought process? Can Huck believe that Tom would be leather headed to stoop to this business after everything he has seen of Jim after acknowledging, albeit reluctantly, Jim's goodness, intelligence, and caringafter feeling so ashamed of his behaviour towards Jim, on one unique occasion, that he actually apologizes for itafter all this?

We must go over the context of this nub before we can explain it. The final narrative part, which makes up almost a third of the book, is frequently criticised. Scholars of Mark Twain have argued over its merits ever before Hemingway recommended readers to completely ignore it. Evidently, the Reconstructionist audience of the period enjoyed Tom's pranks at the Phelps's' because in the years that followed: A chain wrapped round and round his neck while Jim was imprisoned in a wood-shack, rolled a grindstone uphill, wrote messages with his blood, and bit into a maize pone that had a candlestick concealed inside. Then, with a straight face, Huck adds: Jim he couldn't make no sense it but he allowed we was white folks and knower better; so, he was satisfied. Huck recounts that it most mashed all his teeth out. Tom gets his higher knowledge from Alexander Dumas' tales; he calls his plan the Great Evasion; and it turns out that Jim has already been let free. If we follow the joke's logic to its ludicrous conclusion, we may conclude that Jim is fortunate that he avoided travelling to Cairo and the North since he would not have known that he was a free man had he done so

[9], [10]. To their credit, critics have vigorously refuted the hoax and everything it implies over the past fifty years. We may now confidently assert that Twain was intentionally mocking Tom Sawyer. Irony has historically been used to express criticism. However, in the ironic scenario as it is traditionally characterised, the readers are the author's accomplice because they gradually come to know what is actually happening. They are the author's victims in the ironic circumstance. In the Great Evasion, that is precisely the situation. We are distracted from the snapping by the comedy of the Good Bad Boy, whose mischief-by-the-book we can see through and mock. It seems as though our need to see Tom as a reader precludes our ability to see ourselves as viewers of Huck's complicity. Tom's deception is particularly humorous when our Bad Boy, Huck, participates. Fundamentally, he is still the same racist, death-haunted, wannabe conformist that he was prior to beginning his travels. That's why, despite everything he knows about Jim, he can still respond to Aunt Sally in the manner that he does. Or, more accurately, because of what he hasn't learnt, since Huck never grows. The third and last section of the book is perfectly in line with Twain's vision, as opposed to what some reviewers have criticised as being a moral and artistic collapse, though not for the same reasons. As far as he is concerned, Huck's last experiences are fundamentally the same as all the rest, just as his attitude towards Tom Sawyer has remained consistent throughout, and just as his subservience to Tom here is similar to his subservience to the Duke and King on the raft. At the Phelps's', Huck behaves in much the same way as he does at Miss Watson's or the Granger fords'.

The triptych's three panels are variants on a nub, and its three panelist Sawyer's gang, a risky raft on a treacherous river, and a wood-shack prison at the Phelps plantation make up the main middle section of the book, the so-called voyage to freedom.There is a technical explanation for this, though: Huckleberry Finn's own retrospective, Adventures of Huckleberry Finn, aims to correct the record. He claims that he wants to take the real tale out of Mr. Mark Twain's stretchers. He would have written a very different novel if he had realises what we'd like him to have realises. Not only would he have felt differently about Jim at that time, but also about Tom, everyone else, even himself. The boy who might have come out of his adventures chastened and humbled, as critics have claimed, would never have said, even early on in his river journey, that you can't learn a nigger to argue, or later, after one of his particularly horrifying experiences, well, if I ever struck anything like it, I'm a nigger. He would have felt obligated to explain why he left Jim to live with the Granger fords. That is to say, Twain the deadpan artist could not fool us into believing that Huck Finn has morally matured if he had in fact done so. There wouldn't be a tale snapper. His story would not be humorously American.This eighth component of the snapper serves as a reminder that Huck's integrity is ultimately what we believe in.

Huck doesn't change in a way that would lead us to assume he has changed. From beginning to end, his poignant purity is the same. He is always the sweet youngster with the sound heart, and from the beginning, his inherent goodness is contrasted with the deformed conscience of society. It is precisely this attractive quality of him, the promise we see in Huck's naivety, that compels us to interpret his story in order to draw out this con. The con game has at its core that much-discussed, much-celebrated genuine American naivety that connects American popular culture, high culture, and international politics. Huck is most definitely not oblivious to the world around him. On the contrary, as seen by his response to Aunt Sally, he has been well socialized into it. He is not completely innocent of the abolitionist cause, for instance, which he vehemently rejects. His spellbound love for the pretentious, phony-aristocratic, meretricious life of the Granger fords also shows that he is not ignorant of the values of the Southern class system. Of course, he is not immune to the opinions of people he respects. If word gets out that Huck Finn helped a nigger escape to

freedom, what would the people of Hannibal think of me the trembling man wonders. If I were to see anybody from that town again, I'd be ready to get down and lick his boots for shame. However, if innocence is defined as ineducability, then Huck is innocent. Huck is unaware of any alternatives to the status quo. As a result, he doesn't grow, so we do it for him. He knows himself less well than we do. In fact, we know him better than he can imagine because we value his innocence and his untapped potential more than anything else.

CONCLUSION

This essay has extensively explored the areas of humour, interpretation, and cultural reflection by examining the subtleties of Mark Twain's narrative technique in The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn. Readers are urged to reconsider their presumptions on cultural norms and beliefs as a result of Twain's deadpan delivery, which combines aspects of the tall tale and the confidence game. The essay emphasises the notion that interpretation can frequently act as a cultural trap, supporting current power systems and upholding the status quo. Twain's writing contests these perceptions and challenges readers to adopt a new perspective. The essay has offered a new perspective on the lasting relevance of Huckleberry Finn as a subversive critique of societal standards and a tribute to the power of humour in defying the established order by studying the numerous layers of cultural meaning and interpretation.

REFERENCES:

[1] R. Olson, J. Bidewell, T. Dune, and N. Lessey, Developing cultural competence through self-reflection in interprofessional education: Findings from an Australian university, *J. Interprof. Care*, 2016.

[2] A. Meule, Cultural Reflections on Restrained Eating, *Frontiers in Psychology*. 2016.

[3] H. I. Cinarbas and R. Hos, Cultural responsiveness in EFL teaching: reflections from native instructors, *J. Lang. Cult. Educ.*, 2016.

[4] A. B. Garneau, Critical reflection in cultural competence development: A framework for undergraduate nursing education, *J. Nurs. Educ.*, 2016.

[5] S. K. Bowen, Early intervention: A multicultural perspective on d/Deaf and hard of hearing multilingual learners, *Am. Ann. Deaf*, 2016.

[6] M. P. Castañeda Salgado, Feminicide in Mexico: An approach through academic, activist and artistic work, *Curr. Sociol.*, 2016.

[7] E. Carnegie *et al.*, Cultural reflections on the Scottish HPV vaccination programme, *Eur. J. Public Health*, 2016.

[8] S. N. A. Kumar, Indian Dalit Literature A Reflection of Cultural Marginality, *Int. J. Lang. Lit. Linguist.*, 2016.

[9] S. Paroz, A. Daele, F. Viret, S. Vadot, R. Bonvin, and P. Bodenmann, Cultural competence and simulated patients, *Clin. Teach.*, 2016.

[10] M. Knudsen, Media for reflection: A comparison of renaissance mirrors for princes and contemporary management education, *Manag. Learn.*, 2016.

CHAPTER 11

TWAIN'S DECEPTIVE DEADPAN: THE DUALITY OF INTERPRETATION IN HUCKLEBERRY FINN

Neha Anand, Assistant Professor
College of Engineering, TeerthankerMahaveer University, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id- nehaanand002@gmail.com

ABSTRACT:

A subtle interaction between deceit and interpretation occurs in Mark Twain's The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn, enabling readers to swing between feeling superior to the protagonist, Huck, and feeling identified with him. In order to maintain the humour of the story, Twain uses a deadpan storytelling style that discreetly steers readers towards a particular mode of interpretation. This technique encourages readers to ignore important nuances. This essay explores the subtle workings of Twain's deadpan, highlighting its contribution to persuading readers to accept interpretations that, although they may initially look subjective and sincere, were painstakingly planned by the author. When Huck decides to give Jim back to Miss Watson, his previous owner, a key moment in his moral development is explored. Twain skillfully uses contradictions and inversions in Huck's vocabulary to highlight the fallibility of interpretation and force readers to rethink their assumptions. In the end, this essay explores the ambivalent nature of interpretation in Huckleberry Finn, illuminating how Twain's dry narrative simultaneously hides and discloses the text's many levels of meaning.

KEYWORDS:

Huckleberry Finn, Humour, Interpretation, River.

INTRODUCTION

This con game assumes that we will react in two opposite ways: first, by thinking of ourselves as superior to Huck, and second, by coming to identify with him. Twain's instruction for interpretation serves as the ironic connecting thread in this conflict. As I already stated, the deadpan Notice prods us to look for a story, purpose, and moral. In order to keep the humour softly simmering around, I would now add that the snapper is then intended to lead us into a particular style of interpretation one that causes us to miss the crux. The scene that critics have deemed the epicenter of Huck's moral development serves as a good illustration of how this all works. Along with the river section at the beginning of, it is probably the passage in the book that is most often mentioned, and it is usually interpreted in the same encouraging way. When Huck finds out that the Duke and King have revealed Jim's location, he determines that rather than letting Jim be sold to strangers, he should give him back to Miss Watson, his true and proper owner. Because we must interpret in order to understand the joke, we are confident that our interpretation is voluntary. This is a classic example of the interpretation-by-consent scheme used by American con artists. The message we discover appears to be wholly subjective, coming straight from the heart, yet it's actually quite foreseeable thanks to Twain's deadpan direction. Due to the fact that we are guided to interpret inversions in a manner that is both perfectly and suspiciously consistent. Huck laments that he was brought up wrong and we are glad that he has clung to his virtues; he tells us he shivered with fear and we think he's brave and independent; he says, trembling, I'll go to hell and we think he's saved!

Huck Finn is a fantastic writer; his errors in language and spelling only serve to highlight how exquisitely simple, spontaneous, and vivid his communication is. However, we always need to shield him from his own text. We must decipher his words, reframe the feelings he records, and turn around the conclusions he draws. Huck is a master of the literal statement, writes with unfailing clarity and directness, and is the epitome of the American plain style, according to Hemingway. However, we have to shield Huck from his own obvious intentions at every stage. When Huck adds, It made me shiver, we have little choice but to change the negative connotation of the term into something nice, dismiss the significance of Huck's decision to chose hell, and white out his repeated N-words. After doing all of that, we may join Huck in his laughter because that is the child within us who has not been corrupted and who does not believe and would never truly believe that a nigger is a no one. We are intelligent people, therefore we are able to smile peacefully and be satisfied, to quote Jim [1], [2].

However, at this stage in the process, we should be feeling really uneasy. Where does our act of appropriation end? With the kid within us. We get the impression that Huck's conscience is the target of Twain's exposé as he relates the tale. Huck's conscience is what turns him into a racist and puts him on the wrong path, and we correctly understand this as a criticism of the pre-Civil War values of the Southwest. However, there was no reason to criticised the slave society in 1885. Twain's deadpan style is primarily geared at his audience, both then and now specifically, at the conscience-driven kinds of liberal interpretation. His project here somewhat echoes the frontier sources of tall tale humour that I mentioned at the beginning of this essay, namely the storyteller's pleasure in dethroning the condescension of gentility at the thickly settled Eastern core, while at the same time reproducing the radical discrepancies and incongruities at the root of all American experience, Eastern-intellectual as well as roughneck-Southwest. And it is in this sense specifically that a distinctly liberal theme infuses the discussion of the book, a critical primary current that permeates almost all sides of the debate. Huck, according to a century's worth of Twain scholars, is self-reliant, an Adamic innocent, exemplifying thestrong and wholesome springs from the great common stock, as well as the heroics of the private man, the highest form of freedom, and each man's and each woman's consciousness of what is right, and thus, in its absolute liberation, ultimately transcending even anarchy as confinement.

Furthermore, the image of Huck and Jim on the raft has come to represent the ideal society. In contrast to settlements, they stand for the spiritual values of individualism compatible with community not only serving as evidence of Mark Twain's dedication to the fight of black civil rights, but also as his general call to the cause of freedom Together, Huck and Jim create a utopian pattern of all human relationships, a redeeming hope for the future health of society, and the pinnacle of human community. These great redemptive facts about the book have repeatedly been praised by critics in a manner that can only be described as reflexive devotion. Jonathan Arac notes that it is as if 'we' uttered in self-congratulation: 'Americans have spiritually solved any problems involved in blacks and whites living together as free human beings and we had already done so by the 1880s'. Beyond smugness, I would add that this attests to the process of interpretation as self-acculturation. It is a striking example of what I called the literary enterprise of socialisation, in compliance with the mandate placed on teachers of American literature to instill the values of enterprise, individualism, self-reliance, and the demand for freedom.

Even more intriguing, this process of interpretation demonstrates how socialisation functions. Although the abstractions I just recited are undoubtedly American ideals, they are applied as though Huck stood in for not just what America should be, but also for all of humanity. Thus,

a certain cultural vision individualism, initiative, business, and most importantly, personal freedom becomes a broad moral requirement. Then, as a moral requirement, it is resurrected, bringing a utopian alternative world back to the real world and serving as a definition of what it means to be an American [3], [4]. Conservative publication Commentary editor Norman Podhoretz once stated: Sooner or later, all discussions of Huckleberry Finn turn into discussions of America. Or, to quote the late Irving Howe, Huck is not only the most American boy in our own literature, he is also the character with whom most American readers have most deeply identified. Alternatively, Eric Sundquist, a centrist Americanist historian, claims that Huckleberry Finn is an autobiographical journey into the past that recounts the grand story of a nation. Harold Bloom correctly sums up the tone of his collection of best critical essays on the book when he argues that the book tells a story which most Americans need to believe is a true representation of the way things were, are, and yet might be.

DISCUSSION

Huckleberry Finn's American humour is based on this need to believe, which is its central theme. It may be true that the work serves as America's literary declaration of independence a model of how one breaks free from the colonizers culture because of its exquisite colloquialism. However, as a mocking proclamation, the model it offers is the pretense of independence. It illustrates our confinement within what Lewis Hyde refers to as the joints of culture in his expansive analysis of the Trickster figure. This idea involves a heroic view of the range of possible interpretations, according to Hyde. He depicts the Trickster's cultural work as an attack on the social body's weak points, most obviously its flexible or movable joints, where several realms of society converge.He claims that Tricksters manifest most vividly in these anatomical weak areas, upsetting the status quo, crossing lines, and disclosing conflicts and contradictions, which, he argues, liberates us from social restraints as sympathetic interpreters of their subversion. If this is the case, Mark Twain is a sort of hilarious anti-trickster. He's not simply making fun of the book's tricksters, like Tom, the Duke and King, and Huck himself. He is making fun of our hypothetical capacities for Trickster criticism. It's funny how our interpretation of the book both of the story and of its autobiographical hero leads us cheerfully and voluntarily into the institutions of our colonizing society. This is true for both the narrative and for the novel's autobiographical hero.

Therefore, it was almost inevitable that Huck would be revealed to be multicultural in our multiracial age. This is not the place to talk about Huck's race, or even the idea that he is an ethnic Irish-American, but it is important to remember Twain's caution that cultural interpretation can be a trap. In his later writings, he makes numerous references to the trap's nature. For instance, he chastises his friends in letters for assuming that there is still dignity in man when, in reality, Man isan April-fool joke played by a malicious Creator with nothing better to waste his time upon. He also claims in essays that he has no race, colour, or creed prejudices. I can stand any society. In journals explaining how history, in all climes, all ages, and all circumstances, furnishes oceans and continents of proof that of all creatures that were made he is the most detestablebelow the rats, the grubs, the trichinae, it is stated that all that I need to know is that a man is a human being; that is enough for me; he can't be any worse. There are some sweet-smelling, sugar-coated lies out there right now. One of them is that there is heroism in human life, that man is not primarily comprised of hatred and deceit, that he is occasionally not a coward, and that there is something about him that deserves to be preserved. Twain reveals the crux lays bare the workings of the trap of hope in his posthumously released book The Mysterious Stranger. Here, his droll stand-in, Satan,

befriends a young, poor-white child who shares many traits with Huck and conjures up for him a series of seductive spectacles and promises before revealing the ridiculousness of each one at the conclusion [5], [6].

If we pay close attention, that is Huckleberry Finn's funny point. The overarching theme and motivation of the book, as well as its sardonic storyline, is that this heroic escape to freedom black and white coexisting, the person being restored by nature was all a dream. Though not a horrifying dream, it is nonetheless dumb because it is a dream that deceives. Remember the representation of the book that critical tradition has left us with. Our rendition of the narrative's raft-promising interpretation is a river story with humour flowing throughout. Now, think about the data. The raft turns out to be a shelter for con artists, and we are left with two fictitious symbolic beings on this raft of trouble, on this river that betrays and murders. The river keeps bringing us back to the villages again and over again. One is an Angel of Death and the other is Huck Finn, a bond-slave to society who is frequently terrified to death and speaks a language we don't trust. The other is Jim, a black fugitive who never needed to leave and who drags Huck into what Jim calls the Black Angel's hell's covenant early on in the book. The key is that the Angel of Death and the Black Angel are drifting into slave country on a bleak raft to freedom.

A viciously humorous obituary of the American dream results from it.However, before we address the full implications of that pointless humour, we should take into consideration a persistent paradox in our reaction to Huckleberry Finn. I'm thinking about the strange, intriguing reality that even after we discover Twain's devastating nub after we've broken through the comedic façade and seen the stern leer beneath it even then, reading the novel is an exhilarating experience. From this vantage point, what's funny is that the story leaves us laughing, as if the happy and satiric layers of funny that the deadpan had attempted to bury were somehow making an uncanny comeback. Despite our abilities to recognised it, the story somehow defies that evil culmination specifically, it defies its own cynical moral, motive, and plot.Let me try to put that opposition in a more comprehensive literary context. Huckleberry Finn's melancholy is hardly a singular case in the annals of American humour. The Confidence-Man by Melville, an absurdist-apocalyptic parody of a world where truth comes in with darkness as the waning light expired, is followed by the Depression-era books of Nathanael West, the self-described laughing undertaker of America's consumerist dream dump, and the postmodern books of Thomas Pynchon, all of whom are preoccupied with the legacy America and lament that the only way t His method and vision are comparable to those of Melville, West, and Pynchon, but his humour is of a higher caliber. That distinction can be found in what I referred to as his inversion approach at the outset.

While performing his deadpan while donning the Mask of Comedy, Twain succeeds, and as a result, the Mask virtually comes to life. His book is actually hilarious. While we laugh, the other humorists in this tradition make us cringe, wince, or squirm. With an almost childlike delight, Twain makes us laugh aloud. While Pierre and The Confidence-Man, Miss Lonely-hearts and The Day of the Locust, The Crying of Lot 49, and Gravity's Rainbow clearly do not, the novel does manage to cheer us up in the style of the tall yarn, and it even occasionally succeeds in reinforcing normative ideas in the manner of con-game parody.The affective sense, as opposed to the analytical, may be the greatest method to convey that contradiction of exhilaration. I'm referring to the flimsy, brittle connection between textual intentionality and authorial intention. Consider the contrast between what Twain intended to accomplish and what he actually accomplished between the awful tale he tells and the brilliance of Huck's monologue and then think back to D. The classic proverb by H. Lawrence, never trust the artist. The anti-deadpan tenet of interpretation, Trust the tale, may

be objected to as being inappropriate in this instance because it is antagonistic to Twain's work. However, we may remember the criticisms of Twain's inadequate control over his materials and his crude plot manipulations.

Even if we simply ignore these criticisms, as I believe we should, we still need to consider the complexity of Twain's strategy, which necessitates that we pay attention to both his tricks and the dynamics of humour that Huck unleashes. We therefore have a crucial responsibility to follow Lawrence's injunction up to a degree. Twain and his contemporaries made a significant distinction that may help make that commitment clearer. Twain's humour is extreme, in the style of Southwestern humour; however, the extremes in other tall tales and con games highlight inconsistencies within the culture: they expand upon the divide in frontier experience between the language of sweat and the language of civilised language. Huckleberry Finn speaks from both inside and outside the culture: inside because it centres on Huck's vernacular and our civilised interpretation; outside because the deadpan nihilism. The American dream-works are being sold to us lock, stock, and barrel in a very daring con game, on the one hand. On the other hand, we are being encouraged to fall in love with Huck, which is a comparably risky tall lie. And each game is reliant on the others. To maintain our love for Huck, we must buy into the dream-works. However, in order for Twain's plan to succeed, we must also maintain our love for Huck [7], [8].

The end outcome is a simultaneity of opposing influences, which leads to persistent perspective volatility. The Lawrencian snapper, if I may use that term, is that since deadpan is essentially systemic, volatility undercuts the mode. It depends on an all-encompassing, fundamental meaning the epiphany, the epiphany that clarifies everything that has gone before. In other words, deadpan humour indicates a hierarchy of layers of meaning that leads to an ultimate meaning, not unlike the mediaeval four-fold method or Renaissance Protestant allegory, encompassing both the tall tale and the con game. Dante's Jerusalem is ultimately anagogical, while Bunyan's Pilgrim finally stands in for the Redeemed Christian. The phrase I have used throughout, layers of meaning, on the other hand, refers to meanings that are mutable, change shape, or kaleidoscopic in nature. Depending on the direction you turn them, they are always open to another turn or set of turns.Both approaches are combined in Twain's painting. As I've been saying, his humour simultaneously relies on volatile layers of meaning and hierarchical levels. Thus, it creates a split-off language that, despite its brilliance, functions incongruously. The degrees of meaning in Twain's book depend on cause and effect: first, there is the joke we laugh at, then comes the startling realisation.

The design of Twain, however, also calls for us to bumble along as we move from sick joke to fantastic yarn, from the fictitious nigger to the Baptist on the Lally Rook. As a result, a pattern of affective inversions is present in the levels of meaning inside what I have called the analytical process. Our reaction keeps veering from happy to satirical to sinister, sinister to satirical to cheerful, back and forth, and up and down, down and up, as we read and reread, aware of the hilarious nubs yet flowing pleasantly with the currents of comedy. Therefore, despite the plot's deterministically downward trajectory down in hope on an emotive level and down the river in terms of geography, the strategy underlying it calls for an anti-deterministic flow of aesthetic give and take. For the trick to succeed, the stakes in the love-game must be upped correspondingly to those in the narrative snappers. In other words, Huck is kept alive and healthy within his own universe by the precise technique by which Twain the deadpan artist controls both sarcasm and exaggeration, con game and tall yarn equally.

The issue with both of these options is that they require a comedic resolution, and any such resolution, no matter how we choose to frame it, lessens Twain's fantastic achievement: the high and delicate art by which he draws us in and through which he gives us the chance to

laugh heartily at ourselves, good enough to do what he believed all laughter should do, which is to blow to rags and atoms at a blast. More importantly: to indulge in those dreams of transcend It also won't do to attempt a political conclusion in that act of exposé, similar to the neo-Marxist forms of intellectual critique put forth by Raymond Williams, Antonio Gramsci, and Louis Althusser. In this light, the fact that Twain's snappers set us apart from Huck attests to the interpretation's radical potential. Although humans are unable to transcend ideology, there are important tools inside popular culture that enable us to oppose and even push us towards subcultures that are counter to the mainstream one. Perhaps a happy possibility once more, but Huckleberry Finn is intended to disabuse us of precisely such idealistic aspirations. Our ability to laugh in the face of clear-sighted despair, or to laugh at realism's grim reality rather than the illusions of progress, is what Twain finds to be positive.He notes that the comedic typically works to remove us from the distressing effects of humor the kind of humour that does damage and causes pain to the extent that we are completely cut off from the distressing circumstance. The fundamental difference between Twain and those who would find ways out of the position he portrays is that the victim of the injury might obtain humorous pleasure, while the unconcerned person laughs from comic pleasure, he writes. Disengaging from the injury would be a slight to Twain's art's form and content. Huckleberry Finn takes advantage of the pleasure principle to cruelly jolt us into self-recognition.

In essence, Twain's reversal of the conventional deadpan is an outright rejection of comic modes. The most pertinent of them is to the current fascination with the skaz, a Russian dialect monologue where humour is partially found in the dialect itself, like in Huckleberry Finn. The skaz is characterised by irony, satire, and parody, all of which, in Mikhail Bakhtin's opinion, either advance social standards or provide spiritual or intellectual alternatives prospect that, in any case, is specifically the subject of Twain's derision. This mockery also applies to the liberating magic that Walter Benjamin ascribes to Nikolai Leskov's folktales: tales told in a vernacular that calls to mind the earliest arrangements that mankind made to shake off the nightmare of which the myth had placed on its chest.26 Twain, on the other hand, exposes liberation as con-game magic or as one of those mirage-like points of light that flicker briefly from time to time in the ever-darken Twain's sardonic tone highlights the unassailable weight of history, the horror into which we are inevitably sucked by conditioning and innate human nature.The Jewish humor's technique of laughter amid misery is perhaps more revealing. I am particularly reminded of Holocaust humour and its variations in the Yiddish skaz, especially in Sholem Aleichem's monologues about the besieged shtetl. Huckleberry Finn, for starters, steadfastly rejects what David Roskies claims for pogrom jokes: to fortify us against the trauma of history by laughing off, thus providing a sort of enclosed communal garden against the apocalypse. Roskies contends that Sholem Aleichem's monologue technique gives us the laughter that results from the clash between languages and life.

The funnier it is, the more fortifying it is, and the greater the discrepancy, the funnier it isa tactic that Twain's snappers are aiming for. Second, Twain's deadpan turns our laughter into hostilityat society, at ideals, and at ourselves for wanting to embrace either one or the other contradicting the idea that humour can embrace in order to diffuse hostility, as Terrence Des Pres says of Holocaust laughter. His snappers destroy rather than save. The effect of what Henri Bergson refers to as the dissociated contexts of comedy is finally reversed by Twain's deadpan delivery. Arthur Koestler speaks in this manner directly about gulag and concentration camp jokes, and Peter Berger applies that notion to the wider tragedy of man, saying that, by highlighting differences in context, humour relativizes the tragic, and so provides yet another signal of transcendence. He contends that the subversive writer contrives

situations capable of being interpreted in two entirely different meanings at the same time in order to mock authority. The dissociated settings of humorous meaning are also manipulated by Twain, but he does so in a way that ignores transcendental signals and makes us the target of ridicule [9], [10].

Sidra Ezrahi defends Holocaust humour as an aesthetics of deferral formed by Jews over the course of their lengthy dispersion, one that balances recurrent catastrophes against scriptural promises of millennial redemption, in an important recent article that draws on most of these Holocaust interpreters. Twain's situation is somewhat different. According to reports, he used the river idyll as an anticipation of the Messianic time ofinvoking the American redeeming hope. Peace and harmony but this millennium are gloomy. The nub that this implies also hints to one of Twain's harshest humour elements. I'm referring to the American promise's hazardous open-endedness, perpetual provisionally, and the anticipation of its antithesis, apocalypse. American dark humorists have historically seized upon that potentiality. The theodicy of the Jews... In the Bible, the happy end is certain, unambiguous, and written from all eternity.28 For the late Mark Twain, the idea of a paradise in the New World is the biggest and final of history's con games. The American millennium, to use the first definition of deadpan, is the game being trumped by this card-shark, whose poker face is lit up in a broad and cheery smile as he unleashes one surprising snap after another.

Thus, Holocaust laughter is Twain's opposite. Given that laughter indicates continuity and that continuity, even within the confines of culture, attests to human agency and will, it's possible that all laughter, including Satanic laughter, is a sign of hope. But the Jewish context and Huckleberry Finn's context are very different from one another. A Holocaust Huck would actually be a stray, good-hearted German boy let’s call him Heinz Inurning away from home and unintentionally teaming up with a grown Jew who had just escaped from a concentration campa sympathetic, loving, incredibly capable, and incredibly appreciative man who was desperate to one day reunite with his family. Heinz occasionally treats the escapee as an equal in spite of himself, although he feels bad about it. And he feels ashamed because, at his core, he thinks of Jews as what his Nazi upbringing has taught him to be. Imagine reading a genuinely funny book of this kind and coming to the conclusion that this boy is not just forgivable, but a moral hero, the very model of what boyhood should be. As a result, he repeatedly refers to Jew-vermin or, in his most generous gesture, immediately after the escapee has saved his best friend's life, at the risk of his own, I knewed he was Aryan inside.

That would be the author's deadpan attitude. Additionally, in order to continue Twain's legacy, the book would need to be written for a German audience that was still largely anti-Semitic, just as Twain's Reconstructionist audience was still largely racist. Imagine, then, if some of those readers were laughing at themselves for falling for the deadpan, but the author claims they had no choice no way to escape the acculturation that had led them to respect the youngster in the first place.Can Americans conceive what they would take themselves to be if...? Perry Miller asked rhetorically some 40 years ago. Those who have thus far avoided it indicate a certain desperation. Huckleberry Finn was removed from popular culture? Even those of us who had never seen the Mississippi River wouldn't be able to identify ourselves without that book. How else, if not by overcoming the obstacle of Twain's brutal American humour? Wordsworth, for instance, remembered his utter loss of hope itself/And things to hope for with the tranquility of faith restored. Other writers too found a path out of despair. Twain never really healed; on the contrary, he turned his disdain for optimism into his creative outlet. Miller's question implies a humorous interpretation of Huckleberry Finn.

He maintained to the very end that an optimist was simply a Day dreamer more elegantly spelt and that there were no thoughts or opinions other than those that were transmitted to us.

However, the comic manner at the very least demands a happy reunion at the conclusion, even if just in fiction to satisfy viewer interest. Huckleberry Finn's planned reunion, in contrast, is a snappy rebuttal against the custom of happy endings, and the laughter it elicits is meant to transform desire into anguish. Twain attempts to show through our laughing the process of our victimization by transforming our protecting comic pleasure into a self-ridiculing humorous pleasure, to use Freud's terminology.

The victim's laughter is an even more hopeless scenario. It's as if, prior to the author's cosmic resolution, Job was to imagine himself smiling at his misfortunes. Maybe even that gloomy analogy is insufficient. In the deadpan version, we would be asked to chuckle at Job's faith not only in God's concern but in his own integrity: Though He slay me, says Job in his darkest hour, yet I will maintain my integrity. There is no consolation here, but there are always plenty of secular and religious, nationalist and universalist, left and right, consolation sources available. We must take care of Twain's unsettling nubs and snappers for the sake of his art. Could we not, after all, find something enabling in them? Enabling rather than edifying: a method for surviving in a world devoid of amusing solutions. We need not agree with this viewpoint in order to recognised its wisdom or even its heroic quality. This trait entails having the courage to laugh at the traps that befall us without running to our laughter for solace. As a result, Huckleberry Finn's most endearing quality the one component of the book that may be said to encourage interpretation rather than mock it lies in its rejection of humorous relief.

CONCLUSION

We looked at the intricate interplay between deceit and interpretation in Mark Twain's classic book, Huckleberry Finn, in Twain's Deceptive Deadpan: The Duality of Interpretation. We have seen how readers are made to alternately feel superior to Huck and identify with him while viewing the story's events and characters via the prism of Twain's deadpan narrative style. In order to build a story that encourages readers to adopt interpretations that on the surface seem subjective and genuine but are, in fact, discreetly staged, the author expertly uses inversions and contradictions in Huck's words. The key turning point in Huck's moral development his choice to give Jim back to Miss Watsons a perfect illustration of how Twain's wry story forces readers to reconsider their assumptions. We have seen the misleading nature of interpretation through this prism, where moral principles and motivations are deftly twisted, compelling readers to explore the text's subtle nuances further. Finally, Twain's Deceptive Deadpan serves as a reminder that great literature frequently works on several levels. Twain presents a narrative that is both humorous and thought-provoking, inviting readers to traverse the duality of interpretation. He deftly conceals and discloses layers of significance through his deadpan storytelling, giving us with a lasting appreciation for the richness and depth of The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn. A timeless reminder of the intricacies presents in both narrative and the human experience is provided by Twain's examination of the human capacity for interpretation, even in the face of dishonesty.

REFERENCES:

[1] P. Stoneley, Children, futurity, and value: Adventures of Huckleberry Finn, *Textual Practice*. 2016.

[2] V. Kwok, Faithfulness in translation of children’s literature The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn in Chinese, *Babel*, 2016.

[3] J. Bird, ‘And Then Think of Me□!’: Huckleberry Finn and Cognitive Dissonance , *Mark Twain Annu.*, 2016.

[4] J. S. Ismail Nafi', The Role of Superstition in Twain's The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn and Shakespeare's Macbeth: A Comparative Study, *English Lang. Lit. Stud.*, 2016.

[5] P. Sliwa, Moral Worth and Moral Knowledge, *Philos. Phenomenol. Res.*, 2016.

[6] Liu Xi and Zhang Li-li, On the Initiation Theme in The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn, *US-China Educ. Rev. B*, 2016.

[7] J. Jesson, Orson welles's deconstruction of media celebrity: From radio dramatizations to citizen Kane, *Adaptation*. 2016.

[8] Social Criticism in Mark Twain's the Adventures of Huckleberry Finn, *Int. J. Stud. English Lang. Lit.*, 2016.

[9] D. LANDSBERG GELENDER COELHO and P. FERNANDO HENRIQUES BRITTO, AS TRADUÇÕES DE HUCKLEBERRY FINN À LUZ DAS NORMAS DE TOURY, *TRADUÇÃO EM Rev.*, 2016.

[10] J. Elmore and C. D. Girardi, Reversing the curse: Slavery, child abuse, and Huckleberry finn, *American Literary Realism*. 2016.

CHAPTER 12

BULLET THAT KILLS TOM SAWYER: TWAIN'S MARKSMANSHIP IN HUCKLEBERRY FINN

Jyoti Puri, Associate Prefessor
College of Education, TeerthankerMahaveer University, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id- puri20.j@gmail.com

ABSTRACT:

In the universe of Mark Twain's Adventures of Huckleberry Finn, the bullets that fly throughout the story show evidence of deliberate authorial meddling, much as the one that ultimately claims Tom Sawyer's life. Twain, who is definitely a realist, shows his mastery of storytelling by organising these bullets as essential components of the developing drama. This essay explores the complex function of these bullets, looking at how they influence the plot and the characters. The narrative explores the concept of self-inflicted literary wounds by highlighting the numerous suspects who could be pulling the metaphorical trigger, from Tom Sawyer to the actual shooter in the Arkansas farm. In order to understand Twain's motivations for Tom Sawyer's deeds and the bullet he receives, the author dives into the complicated relationship between Twain and his persona Tom Sawyer. This investigation tries to illuminate the complex layers of authorship and reader interpretation in Huckleberry Finn through a critical perspective. Essentially, Twain uses the gunshot as a literary device to elicit readers' views of the people and things in Huckleberry Finn. It serves as a constant reminder that the author is guiding the story in subtle yet deliberate ways. The bullets that pierce this classic work are a testament to the author's skill as well as to the literature's enduring ability to spark debate and inspire new interpretations across generations.

KEYWORDS:

Adventure, Huckleberry, Jim, Tom, Twain.

INTRODUCTION

It was Mark Twain. The bullet that kills Tom Sawyer bears evidence of intentional authorial interference as indelible as does the one that kills Huck and Jim when they are forced to find their way to the Arkansas farm of Sally and Silas Phelps, who also happen to be Tom's aunt and uncle, earlier in the Adventures of Huckleberry Finn. Of course, in the end, he was responsible for all of the bullets that flew throughout the story. Though he was undoubtedly a realist, Mark Twain was not above giving a youngster or a bullet a lucky break when a story required a boost. After all, the aforementioned bullet might have behaved similarly to the numerous other bullets nearby and merely added to the overall sensation of urgency and danger during the final crisis of Tom's complex evasion plot. Or it might have hit Huck or Jim, which would have produced a different tale in each instance. Or Tom might have perished, adding still another. Despite his early experience with a wasteful Allen revolver in Roughing It, Mark Twain was not a man to waste ammunition.

He had used them particularly sparingly in Huck Finn, resulting in the tragic deaths of Boggs and Buck Granger ford as well as the eradication of Pap Finn. He said that James Fenimore Cooper's Natty Bumppo, who might have used a rifle to hunt flies, was comparable to him in terms of gun skills.Mark Twain killed Tom Sawyer, but he had helpers the story's real trigger-man, undoubtedly, and possibly a few eager readers and a good reason for doing so. Even some peaceful detractors have argued that Tom deserved a successful shot. The purpose of the following meditation is to demonstrate how our reaction to the shooting provides vital

information about how we have read the book Huck Finn and the kid Tom Sawyer. The meditation brings together this mixture of suspects and discusses each one in turn [1], [2].

We can start by recalling the events in the story that lead to the bullet that kills Tom Sawyer: Tom, too, has arrived at the Phelps property and has astounded Huck by promising to assist in rescuing Jim from captivity. The demands of Tom's hyper-romantic imagination have caused him to stir up what Huck calls a thundering hornet's nest of agitation among the Phelpses and their neighbours, many of whom are on guard at the farm, with their rifles, on the night of the escape.1 In doing so, he devises and executes the elaborate escape sequence with which the novel ends and with which critics have been contending for generations. The three do manage to escape capture, only to find that Tom was wounded in the calf during the commotion.One of the hornets is the actual shooter, literally the shooter. That is, in the fictional world of the book, one of the Phelpses' neighbours in Arkansas shoots Tom Sawyer because they think he is either the slave who is trying to flee or one of the slave's collaborators. It's possible that the gunman is Silas Phelps, the good uncle.

However, in the universe of the novel, it makes no difference who fires the shot which is, after all, the result of a rather random barrage from a group of riflemen who are completely indistinguishable from one another as long as Tom is wounded. The attacker who attacked Tom receives zero attention in the book. However, Tom's injury is used to pique our curiosity and has a significant impact on how the plot develops.Tom himself may be a suspect given that no one could be happier with this outcome than Tom himself. With a little creativity, we could claim his injury to be self-inflicted. Did Tom Sawyer actually shoot himself? Take into account the facts: We knower we learn that Tom's unnecessary scheme to set a man free who is already free led to the entire evasive event. We know that in his pursuit of romantic glory, Tom has spared no effort to make this unnecessary process more difficult.3 We know that in support of this overwrought romanticism, he insists not only on stealing Jim away from the Phelps's, but also on warning them that he is about to do so. He sends out what Huck refers to as anonymous letters informing the neighbourhood of a desperate gang of cutthroats and even detailing the time of their attack. Then, by pulling off the evasion at the predetermined time, he puts himself, along with Huck and Jim, in the middle of the target he has drawn.

This one serves as a fairly accurate gauge of the difference between Tom's imagination and Huck's experience: Huck, who has, for example, witnessed the shooting and death of Buck Granger ford, is horrified by the fifteen-armed farmers in the Phelps parlor who may soon be aiming their weapons at him. Tom, whose writings have persuaded him to believe that gun barrels spew not death but grandeur, wishes only that those fifteen could be two hundred. He claims that he was most powerful sick at their sight. Even better would be a thousand, and Tom would gladly shoot himself if he could do it with honour. He is able to take the next best action thanks to the evasion.To suggest Tom Sawyer is suicidal would be inaccurate. As far from suicidal as an obese mortal can be, he is. If Tom takes a bullet and I think the phrase is well chosen it will serve not to slay but to ornament him. He can't imagine his own death other than in terms of the silly, melancholy narcissism he practises in his own book, a book in which, additionally, he is permitted to enact his immortality by surviving to prevail at his own funeral. And in this mindset or conviction, he is W's soul mate rather than Becky Thatcher's. Editha Balcom, a character by D. Howells, is horribly inconvenienced when her overly amorous fiancé is killed in a conflict she had hoped would elevate them both [3], [4].

The general frustration of this essay in dealing with Tom suggests another possibility, even if Tom's Byronic morality won't quite allow him to kill himself: I could have shot him. My fraternal love for the Arkansas farmer who actually does cripple Tom places me, without a doubt, at the dangerous extreme of reader-response reviewers. But after the rats, spiders, and

snakes; after the millstone; after the rope-ladder pie, the journal written in blood, the coat of arms; after the anonymous letters and the bloody graffiti he scrawls on the Phelps's' doors; after forcing Jim to wear a dress after all that, I'm not sure I could resist the temptation to hurt Tom if I had the means and the chance. I'm not the only one that has these ugly feelings. Over the years since the publication of Huck Finn, irate critics have gathered, like the thundering hornets in the Phelps' parlor, to lament the day that Tom stepped foot on Phelps property and, at the very least, to take their best shot at him. I suspect that the ranks of the disenchanted have gotten larger recently, as controversy over Jim's treatment in the book has made readers more aware of Tom's role in causing him to suffer.

This brings us full round to Mark Twain, who did have a shot at Tom Sawyer and was, for whatever reason, far more attentively guiding the bullet that found Tom than the Arkansas farmer who fired into the night after the fugitives. According to various reports, modern Huck Finn readers get frustrated with Tom's actions much more quickly than their forebears did. Given their specific attention to Twain's social consciousness, they are more inclined to assume that he understands their grievances and that murdering Tom Sawyer is consequently a sort of authorial retribution or hard justice. That is to say, we suppose that he, too, becomes so tired of Tom's self-centered, conceited, emotional, humiliating blasted folly that he longs to make up for some of the suffering Tom has caused Huck and, particularly, Jim. It is apparent from the record that Samuel Clemens anticipated this kind of separation. Tom would just be like all the one-horse men in literature & the reader would conceive a hearty contempt for him, if I went on, now, and took him into manhood', he wrote of Tom to Howells just as he was finishing Tom's own book. Many critics have noted that Tom may already have crossed the line into one-horse manhood by the time that book ends: the Bad Boy has become a respected, even a revered The judge envisions him attending a military academy before attending law school. If Twain had given Tom a position in Congress, he hardly could have cursed him more harshly.

There is evidence to suggest that Mark Twain had had enough of Tom Sawyer by the time he finished writing Tom's book and felt that continuing to write about him would be a mistake9. Nevertheless, Tom reappears at the beginning and, more importantly, the conclusion of Huck's book, offering himself up for our hearty contempt. Tom appears to be becoming a target for Twain, who has him in his sights. Take into account Tom's first interaction with Huck following their reunion at the Phelps property. Jim has been sold out by the king and duke for forty filthy dollars, and Huck is there to attempt and free him. The duke comes close to telling Huck where Jim is before deciding against it and lying. The duke says, 'I'll tell you where to find him.Tom is adjusting his views, much like the duke. He begins by speaking the truth, much like the Duke: 'What! Why Jim is as liberated as any creature that exists now!' He pauses, studies, and lies like the duke; nine chapters will pass before he finishes this phrase truthfully. Tom appears to be a scam artist who is used to advancing his own agenda at the expense of others, much like the duke.

Mark Twain is probably driving the bullet that hits Tom, and he's probably intending for it to hurt, to the extent that he regards and treats Tom as an object of contempt as he undoubtedly does the duke, and as he looks prepared to do in this scenario. However, it is clear from the way the evasive chapters generally treat Tom that this is untrue. Despite this early instance connecting Tom's actions to those of the duke, our disapproval of Tom's treatment of Huck and, in particular, of Jim during the evasion is more a reflection of our modern sensibilities than a reaction to Twain's authorial signals. The willingness with which we have recently overread the broad humanity and decency for which Mark Twain spoke in his day has led us to recast him in the context of the societal norms that have been established in our time. I've

previously acknowledged my outrage and hatred at the tortures and insults Tom inflicts on Jim. Are cruel enough to make me wish to join those farmers from Arkansas at the shooting gallery. However, as I read Huckleberry Finn's epilogue, Mark Twain comes across as wholly tolerant evenappreciative of Tom's outrageousness.I'm really thankful for it, in fact. Making it go, or finding a way to propel it along, was Twain's primary preoccupation in this book as it was in everything he wrote [5], [6].

The writer must have found, or invented, the idea that Tom could be used in the novel's last action, Jim's escape, with no less incandescence than it does to Huck. Tom's amorous excess is a strong andfamiliar engine in this conflict. Something akin to foreshadowing occurs when Tom appalls and pleases Huck by pledging to assist in robbing Jim from the Phelps farm: In the latter parts of Huck Finn, Twain continues to satirize Tom's book-fueled imagination, just as it did in Tom's book. However, from the perspective of the author, it is also, once again, a rich source of humour and movement in the book. Tom causes events to occur, which Twain finds amusing even though they are signs of a very severe case of the Sir Walter Disease. When it comes to Tom's annoying intentions, Huck is much more conflicted than Twain appears to be. Very little of the book's ironic energy is focused on Tom, who is treated like a boy by all the story's adults, including the author. Aunt Sally tells Huck that the little rapscallions need a good paddling for the crimes that he and Tom have committed in liberating Jim, including the small thefts, domestic disturbances, and frightening warnings. And Aunt Polly is not at all surprised to see such a scamp as my Tom in trouble when she shows up on the scene.

Tom is actually resurrected as a boy when he makes a second appearance in Huck's book, having almost achieved adulthood by the end of his own. Tom returns to a peaceful, summery world where he is free to act just outside the line of sight of dull, uncaring grownups, away from St Petersburg and the fame he has gained there. While critics have emphasised Huck's remark that it was like being born again when the Phelps's mistook him for Tom, it is actually Tom who is reborn in Huckleberry Finn, or at the very least revitalized. Tom may certainly be on the path to a disgraceful, one-horse manhood, but by the conclusion of Huck's book, he is further away from it than at the conclusion of his own.Mark Twain typically expresses tolerant amusement at a boy's excesses, including amorous excesses; he saves his vitriol and gunplay for targets who are older and more responsible. I believe it is better to understand the gunshot that kills Tom Sawyer as a sign of the author's admiration rather than his animosity. Tom receives a lead badge of courage, not what, in the eyes of modern sensibilities, he deserves. Tom demands that Jim and Huck break for the fence and the fields beyond him before he does so after packing the Phelps's' yard with riflemen.

By catching Tom's seat of pants on a splinter as he is clearing the fence, either Tom or Twain manages to make Tom an even more likely target. Tom doesn't tell that he's been hit until the three have moved to what appears to be safety, of course triumphantly. Tom was the happiest of all since he had a gunshot in his calf of his leg, according to Huck, who recounts their narrow escape.That bullet does Mark Twain well, just as Tom does for him. The bullet forces Huck to find a doctor to cure Tom, which gives Twain the opportunity to restore Jim's humanity by making him give up his freedom for Tom's sake. Before Tom regains consciousness and tells him the amazing news that Jim is and has been free, the fever the bullet wound causes in him only lasts long enough to reinstall and even strengthen the terms of Jim's service. The bullet wraps around Tom's neck in the final sentence of the novel, making the modern reader desperately want to wring his own neck. not Mark Twain, though. Tom is just allowed to continue talking while he blocks out the story in favour of the howling

adventures among the Indians, over in the Territory. The perfect setting for someone else to, hopefully, take a crack at Tom Sawyer.

DISCUSSION

Huckleberry Finn's Adventures All of the main characters in Huckleberry Finn's Adventures are storytellers. Huck is a master storyteller who wears a variety of disguises as he travels with Jim, an escaped slave, down the Mississippi. Twain's portrayal of Huck as the author and narrator of The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn is crucial. Huck then recounts his own story-telling in this manner. However, Huck learns from Tom Sawyer, who serves as his role model. Huck repeatedly says, I did wish Tom Sawyer were there, since Tom would have added the fancy finishing touches and the gaudy embellishments. According to Twain expert Robert Hill, Tom is not only the undisputed intellectual authority on the books the lads adore, but also a practitioner of the imaginative prank. As the village's leading artist, Tom is also responsible for the rescue of Jim at the book's conclusion, which critics find to be problematic because they feel that it denigrates Jim, loses sight of the moral of the story, and transforms satire into burlesque. And since Jim has already been set free by Miss Watson's will as a result of her conscience-wrenching struggles, Twain is charged with a moral blind spot and a failure of nerve for giving up on his critique of respectable society, which is what gives the book its significance.

Because he notices Aunt Sally's and the neighbors' responses, Twain is obviously well aware of how absurd the rescue of Jim appears. It's possible that Twain's goal is to explore how democratic societies can fall victim to imaginative hoaxes, whether they take the form of Tom's absurd pranks or the even more harmful schemes of the duke and the king, the novels' two conmen who travel with Huck and Jim. Twain may also be interested in exploring the effects of storytelling. But for a storyteller to write a story that critiques storytelling, it would seem paradoxical. Does The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn itself avoid being criticised for the negative impact that literature and, more broadly, the imagination have on people's lives?In discussing these topics, I'll focus on the various storytelling techniques found in Twain's work, particularly the distinctions between Tom and the books he reads and his friend Huck and the book he writes. Despite Huck's affinity to Tom, I will contend that the contrasts between the two boys are essential to comprehending the story. Huck is a truly democratic figure who stands out for his appreciation of nature's simple pleasures, his compassion, as well as his common sense and practicality, making him a better role model for democracy than Tom. However, Twain demonstrates that these traits in Huck need to be improved or learned.

He needs to broaden his perception of nature's goodness to include perceptions of human goodness. Huck's inherent sympathy or compassion for others must be restrained by admiration for excellent human traits and the people who exhibit them. Finally, Huck's common sense must overcome Tom's romanticism and advance from experience to comprehension. In other words, Huck's innocent goodness must give way to introspection. In the course of his adventures on the river, Twain chronicles Huck's growth or education, including both Huck's experiences and his opinions on them. The most crucial though not the only factor in Huck's development is his friendship with Jim. After discussing Huck's education in the first section of this essay, I will argue in the second section that Huck is more qualified than Tom to narrate his Adventures because of his capacity for reflection and self-knowledge.6 Through his depiction of Huck's growth, Twain suggests an education fit for a democratic man, one more consistent with responsible citizenship than the frivolous and selfish romanticism of Tom. Twain thus demonstrates the necessity of a literary form that

raises democracy's noble tendencies and warns against idealistic ambitions to go beyond the bounds of democratic existence.

I acknowledge that by advocating such a reading of this book, I appear to defy Mark Twain's authority, who warns readers at the book's opening that any attempts to glean a motivation or lesson from it will result in legal action. But as Huck notes on the first page of his book, Mr. Twain, like most people he knows, occasionally tells a few stretchers. And if we just blindly followed the experts in literature, we might end up sounding just as foolish as Tom Sawyer.Lying in the bottom of his boat, Huck takes pleasure in the twilight because the sky looks ever so deep when you lay down on your back in the moonshine, as he escapes from Pap's imprisonment. It's great to live on a raft, Huck discovers later when Jim joins him as they float down the Mississippi, with the sky up there, all speckled with stars. Huck seeks simple pleasures that everyone may enjoy if they take the time to light their corncob pipe or look up at the stars at night, in contrast to Tom, whose enjoyment comes mostly from elaborate imitations of the novels he has read [7], [8].

In some ways, Twain is making fun of Huck's encounters with nature's beauty because the youngster seems to have forgotten the river's floods and potentially fatal storms. Furthermore, Jim's diligence and care in maintaining the raft and making it seaworthy make living on a raft is lovely. However, there is more to this than mere ridicule, and there is more to Huck's straightforward sense of nature than first meets the eye. He hears the voices of people talking at the ferry-landing, as well as their laughter, as he relaxes with his pipe and the moonlight from his canoe. Later, when describing stargazing with Jim, he says, we used to while Huck initially assumes the latter because it would have taken too long to make so many, he later comes to endorse Jim's theory that the moon may have lain them because he had observed frogs laying almost as many eggs. Huck makes use of nature to comprehend nature, including the amazing aspects of nature, yet his enjoyments of nature are shared and spark conversation. Huck's encounters with nature are human experiences in all of these ways.

The most significant aspect of Huck's encounters with goodness in nature, however, is that they are a flawed expression of another encounter with goodness, initially just a natural compassion for hurting people, and then an appreciation for human brilliance. Twain demonstrates how Huck's compassion for others' pain may serve as a brake on his own impulses and a force that keeps him from harming others. In a same way, Huck's compassion for Jim's anguish makes him understand Jim's humanity. Huck has to accept that Jim cared just as much for his people as white folks does for therian since he was often moaning and mourning that way nights, when he judged I was asleep. When the duke and the king split up the families of the slaves owned by the Wilks to sell them down the river, Huck's experience of Jim's suffering at being separated from his family undoubtedly helps him prepare for his own reaction to the sight of them poor miserable girls and niggers hanging around each other's necks and crying. Huck says, I can't ever get out of my memory when describing his adventures to the reader even later. Huck's inherent compassion serves as a greater moral compass than his conscience, which draws inspiration from societal norms and their acceptance of slavery.

Despite this, Twain implies that compassion is insufficient because it causes Huck to feel sorry for the murderers and even jeopardize Jim's freedom to save them, thinking how dreadful it was, even for murderers to be in such a fix When Huck says that the sweet Widow Douglas, who had attempted to educate him to help others when he was under her care, would be happy of him since rapscallions and dead-beats is the kind that the widow and good people takes the most interest in, his sympathy for the killers turns comical. After all, it was the excellent judge's sympathy for Pap that motivated him to return Huck to his father and

work to change Pap's life. But it was a sympathy he would soon come to regret.So, even while Huck feels bad for the duke and the king's victims, he also feels bad for the two con artists who are caught and punished. He acknowledges, It was a terrible thing to behold. People may be really harsh to one another. Natural compassion is unbiased, emphasising suffering rather than debating whether the suffering is justified. Huck isn't inspired to action until after he gets to know Mary Jane and recognises her brilliance, notably her charity and her insistence that her sisters reciprocate.

Similar changes take place in Huck's friendship with Jim. As we've seen, Huck feels sympathy for Jim's suffering, but he also feels for Jim's owner, poor Miss Watson, who would suffer if her slave escaped. Huck only understands the responsibility of deep human interactions when he realises that he himself is to blame for Jim's suffering. Both times, Huck makes an attempt to tease Jim, thinking there'd be some fun at Jim's expense, much how Tom wanted to tie Jim to the tree just for fun. But Huck's fun has unanticipated and negative effects. Jim is laid up for days from the rattlesnake's bite after Huck unintentionally attracts one to his bed by leaving its dead companion there. Despite this, Huck continues to make Jim laugh by tricking him into thinking that the violent storm that kept them apart last night was just a dream. Before Huck draws attention to the debris and leaves on the raft as well as the broken oar, Jim interprets his dream and paints it up considerably.

His heart mos' broke bekaze you wuzlos' and his joy in seeing him alive again. Clearly, the incident was a turning moment in his schooling. Jim's suffering and his assertions about friendship and Huck's violation of it also move Huck. Huck warn't ever sorry for it afterward, either, and he does no more mean tricks, just as he wouldn't done that one if I'd 'a' known it would make him feel that way. Despite the fact that Huck makes no attempt to argue against slavery, he finds it impossible to sell Jim back into it and even makes the decision to free Jim when the duke and the king do. He actually doesn't doubt the decency of the institution of slavery, which is why his resolve to all right, then, I'll go to hell is so admirable. His choice is not made solely or even primarily out of sympathy for Jim's suffering, but rather because he has come to value and even love Jim's positive traits while they have been travelling down the river: I couldn't seem to find no places to harden me against him, but only the other kind as he recalls Jim's concern for him and the enjoyable times they have had together [9], [10].When Jim is imprisoned on the Phelps farm, does Huck's agreement to Tom's plan to release him not constitute a betrayal of Jim and the same kind of mean trick Huck vows never to pull again? As I've already mentioned, the critics contend that Tom's antics for Jim's escape divest Jim, as well as Huck, of much of his dignity and individuality, and diminish importance and uniqueness of Huck's victory. Leo Marx, for instance, asks, if cannot accept Tom's harmless fantasies about the A-rabs, how are we to believe that a year later Huck is capable of awe-struck submission to the far

Marx, however, does not properly acknowledge Huck. First of all, Huck is unaware that the rescue is a mock rescue, unlike Tom, who is aware of Huck well enough to refrain from telling him that Miss Watson had liberated Jim in her will. In other words, Tom sees a distinction between himself and Huck that Marx does not because Tom knows he can't rely on Huck for a pretend rescue if Jim is already a free man. Tom is saving Jim just out of amusement. Huck adds that Tom was in high spirits and that he said it was the best fun he ever had in his life, and the most intellectural; and said if he only could see his way to it we would keep it up for the rest of our lives and leave Jim to our children to get out. Tom wants the rescue to be so spectacular that it will be celebrated, so it must be executed in style and in accordance with the best authorities. The fastest way to the desired result is all that Huck cares about, though:Huck resists Tom's attempts to use every trick in the book to save Jim;

instead, he continuously makes attempts to control his companion, sometimes with success. Throughout, he constantly questions Tom's intentions and offers speedier and more efficient solutions to the issues at hand. Even as he describes Tom's plans, Huck displays some sarcasm.16 In fact, the appearance of Tom Sawyer in the novel's final fifth demonstrates that Huck has not lost moral integrity by deferring to Tom, but rather that his adventures with Jim on the river have highlighted the differences between the two boys.

This is especially evident when Tom has been shot while making their getaway with Jim and his wound has already begun to swell by the time they get to the island where the raft is concealed. Despite Tom's considerable row that they ignore the wound and continue on, Huck and Jim decide that Huck would seek medical attention. Me and Jim stuck to it and wouldn't budge. Huck does not submit to Tom's authority when it comes to matters involving Tom's life. Additionally, he shows no excitement for Tom's suggestions to blindfold the doctor, vow him to quiet, offer him a gold bag, or lead him roundaboutly in the canoe and into back alleyways. Huck merely nods in agreement and does nothing.

Thus, Huck does not succumb to Tom's romanticism at the conclusion of the story any more than he does at the beginning, when he challenges Tom's knowledge from books about the ability of ancient tin lamps to generate genies by locating one and giving it a try. Tom's version of reality is rejected by Huck, who relies on his senses instead. A Sunday school picnic is not a group of magician-transformed Arabs and Spaniards holding diamonds for the taking by Tom Sawyer's Gang, and the farm shed where Jim is being imprisoned is not a castle with a moat surrounding it. Huck, like Tom and the other boys in St. Petersburg, worries about bad luck from knocking over the salt shaker, but he also puts Jim's mind at ease about the voices they hear on the river because he knows that spirits wouldn't say, 'dern the dern fog'. Tom's imaginative interpretation of events is just as credible as the idea that these sounds are those of ghosts. Huck like the Americans Tocqueville encountered who blindly follow Descartes' ideals by rejecting authority of all kinds and depending on himself.

However, Twain does offer one manner in which Huck's common sense understanding of things may be enhanced beyond the empirical world, but not to an incomprehensible one. We have witnessed Jim's attempt to interpret what he believed to be warnings from his dreams, as well as Huck's refutation of Jim by citing the storm's physical remnants on the raft. What do the leaves, trash, and broken oar stand for, he enquired of Jim. The storm's aftereffects provide unmistakable evidence that the storm indeed happened. However, Jim's alternative interpretation of what day stan' for the scum who abuse their friends which goes beyond the just empirical to the realities that define human relationships and that Huck's own feelings immediately confirm points Huck beyond the simply empirical to the truths. Jim's interpretation of the events is challenged, and if no genies appear as a result, Huck does apologies to Jim and swears never to pull cruel pranks on him again.

Huck is overjoyed to learn that he is actually Tom Sawyer when he comes at the Phelps' farm in quest of Jim and is mistaken for someone else: for it was like being born again, I was so glad to find out who I was. However, Twain does not demonstrate that Huck's ultimate cover in the book is actually not a disguise at all. Rather, Twain himself speaks through Aunt Polly's eventual admission that Huck is not Tom. That is, it is finally and unmistakably established that Huck is not Tom Sawyer. Tom represents democracy's effort to be something it is not, even to view itself in terms of a more exciting and colorful past than it actually has. Tom represents democracy's attempt to break out from the ordinary and acquire notoriety in the process. Tom looks for a beauty and excitement in romances that are difficult to discover in an era of equality. The camp meeting attendees also readily accept the king's claim that he is a former pirate and contribute their resources to his mission. Huck provides Twain with

more engaging democratic material than Tom does. We don't need Tom's more bizarre and even cruel experiences or the entertainment the con men offer if Huck's adventures are plausible. Even though Twain implies in the book's subtitle that Huck would always be Tom's comrade, Tom ends up being more of a challenge than a role model.

One of the most striking contrasts between Huck and Tom is rarely discussed19, yet Twain draws our attention to it right away. The Adventures of Tom Sawyer, a novel made by Mr. Mark Twain, may have been where Huck first introduced himself. The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn will pick up where the earlier book left off, with Huck living with the Widow Douglas and Tom having discovered robbers' money in a cave. Huck Finn will pick up where Mark Twain leaves off, in other words. Although by the time he gets to the end he is rotten glad that there is nothing more to write about given how much trouble it was to make a book, Huck is not only the narrator but also the author of The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn. The Adventures of Tom Sawyer is neither narrated by Tom Sawyer nor written by him.However, it appears at first that Tom Sawyer, a voracious reader, is a more plausible storyteller than Huck. He is not only better read, but he also enjoys recounting and embellishing his adventures. For instance, Tom, not Huck, desires that Jim be rescued in a way that will bring him fame. Tom informs Huck that while his idea will work, it is too blame simple. It wouldn't be worth talking about any more than breaking into a soap factory. Writing a book about his exploits, though, would bring greater notoriety, and who could do it better than the well-read Tom Sawyer?

Additionally, Tom appears like a likely author, whereas Huck looks unlikely. In actuality, Huck's opening chapters contain an underlying critique of books. The widow states that she got out her book and taught me about Moses and the Bulrushes in the opening chapter. After learning that Moses had been dead a considerable long time, Huck loses interest in him and is bewildered by the widow's a-bothering about Moses, which was no kin to her, and no use to anybody being gone. Tom Sawyer joins forces with his companions to establish Tom Sawyer's Gang in chapter 2, sneaking into a cave at night. Tom follows the highwaymen's authorities and their customs, even though he doesn't always understand what they entail, like ransoms. When they attack hog-drivers and ladies carrying goods to markets, Tom labels the hogs ingots and the turnips Juley, but the group doesn't rob or kill anyone, according to Huck, only just pretended. Huck says that Tom believes in A-ribs and the elephants, but as for me I think different. And with regards to the group of Arabs and Spaniards and their elephants that Tom alleges were transformed into a Sunday school picnic by magicians. It was clearly a Sunday school in every way. Twain demonstrates that some novels, at the very least, misrepresent reality, provide us with bad role models for behaviour, and make us care about things that are unrelated to ourselves.

CONCLUSION

We have revealed the significant ramifications of the bullets that punctuate Mark Twain's Adventures of Huckleberry Finn through this reflective tour through the book. These bullets, like the literary implements used by a good artisan, depict the complex interrelationship between author, character, and reader in addition to serving to increase tension and urgency. Tom Sawyer's fatal gunshot serves as a metaphor for Twain's authorial hand, which led the story to its end. Despite at times looking harsh, Twain's handling of Tom shows a keen appreciation of the character's significance to the plot. While Tom's antics may annoy modern readers, it's important to remember Twain's point of view and his desire to entertain and subvert social conventions of the time. Twain uses Tom to highlight the striking difference between romanticism and reality. Twain illustrates the ridiculousness and destructive repercussions of blindly following to idealized ideals via Tom's fantastic, but sometimes

impracticable, concepts of adventure and chivalry. Tom's injuries at the novel's finale serves as a tangible embodiment of the repercussions of his idealized thinking. Twain sends a strong message about the value of practicality and the risks of sticking to unrealistic ambitions by finishing with Tom's injuries. Tom's idealized ideas die, signalling a move toward a more realistic and adult knowledge of the world, in line with Huck's maturing character. This ending emphasizes Twain's main topic of the struggle between society's idealized aspirations and life's harsh reality, leaving readers with a sad reminder of the value of critical thinking and flexibility in the face of a complicated and frequently tough world.

REFERENCES:

[1] J. Semrau, Chapter Five: Dis-closure of Huckleberry Finn, in *Transcribing the Territory; or, Rethinking Resistance*, 2016.

[2] J. H. McKay, 4. Adventures of Huckleberry Finn: Sophisticated Naïveté, in *Narration and Discourse in American Realistic Fiction*, 2016.

[3] Adventures of Huckleberry Finn, in *Mark Twain and Youth : Studies in His Life and Writings*, 2016.

[4] H. K. Bush, *Continuing bonds with the dead: Parental grief and nineteenth-century American authors*. 2016.

[5] W. G. Müller, A journey through the realms of good and evil: Ethics in philosophy and literature, *Forum for World Literature Studies*. 2016.

[6] S. D. White, 'The peace in the feud' revisited: Feuds in the peace in medieval European feuds, in *Making Early Medieval Societies: Conflict and Belonging in the Latin West, 300-1200*, 2016.

[7] R. Weber, The Midwestern Novel: Literary Populism from Huckleberry Finn to the Present by Nancy L. Bunge, *Middle West Rev.*, 2016.

[8] P. H. Pfatteicher, Walking Home Together: John Bunyan and the Pilgrim Church, *Pro Eccles. A J. Cathol. Evang. Theol.*, 2016.

[9] J. S. Ismail Nafi', The Role of Superstition in Twain's The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn and Shakespeare's Macbeth: A Comparative Study, *English Lang. Lit. Stud.*, 2016.

[10] P. Sliwa, Moral Worth and Moral Knowledge, *Philos. Phenomenol. Res.*, 2016.