Chapter-III

MARK TWAIN ACROSS CULTURES

Translation does not involve the mere transfer of meaning from one language into another. It also makes possible the transfer of culture. The language is a medium for an individual's society to express his feelings and passion. Each separate community would represent a separate reality. A look at the following words show how much literature is related to culture: "No language can exist unless it is steeped in the context of culture, and no culture can exist which does not have at its center, the structure of natural language." 1

In effect it is clear that language is the heart within the body of culture. So any one of these can never stand on its own. So a translator can never see a piece of work without having taken into notice the culture dealt within.

Translation of Mark Twain's books is a typical example of transfer of cultures. There are many

similarities of cultures in the characters of Mark Twain between America and India, particularly Kerala. In fact his characters live among us even today after more than a century. The attitude against monarchy and democracy is same all over the world. Nobody likes dictatorship. Freedom is something which everybody desires to have in his life. Mark Twain wants to show that real freedom is yet to be attained by negroes even after the abolition of slavery. He portrays good people like Judge Thatcher in his novel. Spirit of adventure is everywhere in the world. Superstition is present in India, almost everywhere, even among the educated class. Witchcraft is still in use in India. Mark Twain finds, fault with the system of education where the children are not educated properly. The interest, aptitude, tastes, instincts, IQ etc are not taken into consideration in the field of education. They are penalised unnecessarily and so children try to escape from schools. This is the case in India especially in Kerala. So Mark Twain's reference to Huck's and Tom's escape from the school is quite relevant. Illiteracy is one reason for many of the cruelties in India. Like Pap Fin, there are many parents in India who illtreat their children.
Piety and providence can be seen everywhere in the world. Evangelism is a Christian theme. Whenever there are Christians, it is prevalent.

Feuds can be seen in India as well. Conflicts may not be in the name of family always but in the name of religion, politics, caste, creed, class, inequalities etc. Even petty groupism in a particular political party leads to violence, murder and what not. Patriotism is something which everybody upholds throughout the world. When we read the novel A H F, we find all these tendencies. When the book is translated the American culture seemed to have crossed over the seas to Kerala. Here Pramod Talgin's words are pertinent.

"Every national literature gives its own interpretation of social communication corresponding to its cultural ethos. While doing so it reflects a normative identity of its culture, in which it is rooted"¹.

Let us see how Mark Twain's autobiographical elements have influenced the cultures across the countries throughout the world.

Clemens' youth furnished the material for his best books. Tom Sawyer remains a child's book, filled with fantasy, and practical jokes and budding romance between Tom Sawyer and some maidens. Its power lies in Tom's relationship with two people, his aunt Polly and his friend Huckleberry Finn. Aunt Polly, by Mark Twain's own admission in his autobiography published after his death is modelled closely on his own mother.

Huckleberry Finn was a real boy. Twain had known in Habbibal. His name was actually Tom Blankenship and he was drawn exactly as he was. He was ignorant, unwashed, insufficiently fed, but he had a good heart as ever any boy had. He was the only really independent person, boy or man in the community, and by consequence he was continuously happy and was envied by all rest.

Tom is beaten savagely and regularly at home and in school for small crimes that he has done and has not done. He suffers interminable sabbaths and Sunday schools. He sees grave robbers and a murder and he hears of a threatened mutilation of a lonely widow. So Tom became cruel and sadist. Towards the end of
In *Huckleberry Finn* we find Tom imposing a lot of penalties for setting Jim free. It becomes actually a punishment for Jim as well as the Phelps family. This is a defect in the character formation of children. It happens everywhere including our country.

Tom Sawyer wholly conforms to the ethics of his home town, just as Mark Twain did as a boy.

As far as Huck is concerned, the Duke and the king are just the same as the real articles, tricksters and swaggerers, out for a loot.

As the bed of a Mississippi contains the flow of the river, so an allegory of freedom contains the flow of *Huckleberry Finn*. *Huckleberry Finn* was as paradoxical as the state of the first man in Eden, and the fall of man was the fall into the trap of civilization. Huck refers to his primitive father as being like Adam because he is all covered with river mud.

Twain took his style of humour from the storytellers of the Back woods and the dialect humourists
and lectures like Artemus Ward.

Between the writing of *Tom Sawyer* and *Huckleberry Finn* Mark Twain had become a disillusioned man. Although Mark Twain meant the book *Huckleberry Finn* to be about conscience against heart, society against liberty, white against black, the shore against the river, the house against the raft, he never forgot that it was meant to be a work for children and their parents.

*Huckleberry Finn* is a work of genius for people of all ages that *Tom Sawyer* never claims to be. The writing of the book was even more spread over time than its predecessor. Mark Twain began the work in 1876, then broke it off for 2 years, started again to add the middle of the book, broke it off again for some more years and finished the last part in 1883. *Huckleberry Finn* falls into three parts.

1. Huck's escape from the Window Douglas and his father down the river with the runaway slave Jim, towards liberty.
2. Huck's relationship with the Duke and the King. Their exploration of towns along the Mississippi.

3. Colonel Sherburn's violent denunciation of the mob, civilization of the small town and Jim's second imprisonment and Tom Sawyer's fantastic scheming for his rescue.

At the first reading the last section of Huckleberry Finn seems a reversion to childish pranks of Tom Sawyer. But in fact the romantic compulsion of Tom Sawyer, which makes him risk death to free a slave already freed for satisfaction is on approved method of historical fiction. Huck agrees to help a slave runaway. The original editions of Huckleberry Finn were generally badly received by the critics.

The author writes these two books taking his own experiences of life. Just like Wordsworth, he too writes the remembered experiences of the past in tranquillity. He kept and carried the experiences of his life as a treasure and gave vent to his thoughts in these books. But unlike Wordsworth or Kamaladas, Mark Twain added his imaginary decorations to his past
experiences and wrote his masterpieces *Huckleberry Finn* and *Tom Sawyer*.

The following statement of Mark Twain sheds light to the above statement.

Most of the adventures recorded in this book really occurred, one or two were experiences of my own, the rest those of boys who were schoolmates of mine. *Huckleberry Finn* is drawn from life; *Tom Sawyer* also, but not from an individual; he is a combination of the characteristics of three boys whom I knew, and therefore belongs to the composit order of architecture.

The old superstitions touched upon were all prevalent among children and slaves in the west at the period of this story, that is to say, thirty or forty years ago.

Although my book is intended for the entertainment of boys and girls, I hope it will not be shunned by men and women on any account for part of my life has been to try pleasantly to remind adults what they once were themselves, and of how they felt and thought and talked, and what queer enterprises they sometimes engaged in.

Hartford 1876

The Author

There are at least two major kinds of objectives in cross-cultural comparison: these are the establishment of universals, and the explanation of differences. Like all dichotomies, this is of course rather too simplistic, but it has a large measure of truth. Early speculators about man have supposed that there might exist tribes without any kind of beliefs in the supernatural, who could only communicate with the most rudimentary sounds and gesticulations, or in which there was no marriage, but only coupling like beasts, or in which there that the primitive life was a war of all against all, in which the human passions raged unchecked. The subsequent researches of ethnographers over the whole range of human societies as they exist today at all levels of technological development, have established beyond doubt that there is no people without a sophisticated and well-developed language, in which the social roles of the sexes are reversed or interchangeable, in which age status is unimportant, where the disposal of the dead is ignored, which lacks rites of passage, without some means of controlling aggression or settling disputes, in which the parents of a child are ignored in the child's nurturance and upbringing, without incest taboos, and
many other such findings could be added. It should be stressed, however, that findings of this sort require explanations which will originate as much in ethology, biology, psychology, and communication theory as in social anthropology.

For it can be fairly argued that the cross-culturalists have no coherent theory of society. To be sure, they believe there are certain basic similarities in all societies, but upon examination these turn out to be so general as to be explanatorily impotent. Murdock in his article "The cross cultural survey" states that these uniformities are (1) that culture is learned, 'and must obey the laws of learning which psychologists have now worked out in some detail', (2) that culture is social, and therefore all cultures should reveal certain similarities because they have all had to provide for social survival, (3) that culture is ideational (conceptual) and will therefore reveal similarities derived from 'the universal laws governing the symbolic mental processes', (4) that culture always satisfies basic biological needs and
of nature and fellow men', (5) culture is also adaptive to the environment, and the biological and psychological demands of the human organism, and integrative. But while it is undoubtedly true that culture is learned, bound by society, governed by certain general characteristics of the human mind, and adaptive to the environment, these platitudes scarcely amount to a theory of society. It will also be noted that they are phrased entirely in terms of 'culture' and not 'society', and indeed this is one of the greatest differences between current cross-cultural ideology and that of the British school, or, as Kobben phrases it, between the hologetic and the Gestalt. Murdock believes that:

The special province of anthropology in relation to its sister disciplines is the study of culture... Having chosen to investigate culture, most anthropologists find themselves committed to studying the processes by which it grows (culture change), is transmitted from one generation to another (education and socialization) and is spread geographically (diffusion or culture borrowing) and are thus driven irresistibly to an interest in History, Psychology, and Geography.

With this conception of the aims of anthropology, which seems to be widely accepted, it is not surprising therefore that cross-cultural research, especially that done in America, is heavily oriented towards studies of individual behaviour, and personality structure, with a corresponding tendency to draw upon psychology for explanatory concepts. Studies of divorce rates, sex taboos, crime, alcoholism, child-training, food-sharing, artistic style, suicide, and romantic love are typical of many of the published studies. As Murdock realizes, the British anthropologists in particular are sociologists, and not anthropologists in his definition of the term, in so far as they are interested primarily in social groups and their relationships. This being established, it is nevertheless relevant to ask how it is possible to study the workings of culture without basing such an analysis on an understanding of the nature of the societies with which it is intimately bound up. Correlations of traits can never be added together to produce higher-order generalizations, and consequently a basic understanding of human society, yet paradoxically cross-cultural research is also oriented towards understanding society, and not just culture.
The basic objections to cross-cultural research of the statistical type are therefore not so much that the data are vast, uneven in quality, difficult to codify without making arbitrary distinctions, that similar phenomena may be produced by different factors, or by diffusion, and that it is very difficult to obtain genuinely random samples, but rather, that social reality is not susceptible to being meaningfully broken down into correlations between two variables. Not only is there an important difference between statistical significance and substantive significance, but even more fundamentally, societies are processes and rule systems in which interactions of a very complex type involving large numbers of variables, and this type of entity has to be analysed by more sophisticated methods, by equations or simulations if we are dealing with types of social phenomena, or more usually by intensive studies of particular cases by trained observers. In this connection C.R. Hallpike says:

A boy of knowledge which claims to be explanatory as well as descriptive must be basically oriented to understanding the fundamental processes of the phenomena it is studying, and this cannot come from assembling large numbers of individual correlations; science is not a pastiche of
elementary propositions, but a way of looking at things and in social anthropology our chief inspiration has always been the study of the total society, and comparison of the structural characteristics of particular institutions and belief.

An international trend that can be observed increasingly is the one which frequently comes across literary works depicting the reality of alien cultures. The question arises as to why such an urge emanates in the writer at all to project alien cultural values through his work. This question exposes the function of literature from a different perspective. Accordingly, the literature becomes one of the effective projection media of the reality of a particular cultural region. In that the literature represents this reality, a sense of a collective identity of the concerned cultural region finds its expression in this literary representative. Culture, in this context, is to be understood as a process of total objectivisation of man's activities in a particular linguistic community with a view to forming a meaningful social coherence of human life.

The culture in the modern times has a political significance. Again, the term "Political" has to be

conceived in a somewhat different perspective. It refers to the social processes of decision-making and transformation, which form and adjust public opinion and social attitudes and accordingly contribute towards changing the social thinking and therefore, the social reality.

How is this process of assimilation of alien cultural values and norms articulated in literature? Firstly, it should be remarked that this process at least in the beginning can take place only as a literary imagery, as a theoretical possibility. It is not an uncriticised appropriation of alien values nor is it an imitation of mere external forms. It is an intellectual process of the activisation of the consciousness, which is in search of a new emancipatory orientation. An underlying urge in the writer, conscious and critical, namely to produce general human, but concrete situational communication-structures with a definite claim on unbiased possibilities of value and norm formation in one's own cultural surrounding.

In connection with the topic of this chapter, let us examine how Mark Twain' across cultures, can be
seen from Mark Twain's *What is Man*. The study of Mark Twain across cultures will be incomplete unless a brief view of *What is Man* is made. Dr. Ramaswamy in his essay "Mark Twain's *What is Man?* An Indian view"\(^1\) gives a perceptive and clear criticism of the work, in *Mark Twain and Nineteenth Century American Literature*.

Though Mark Twain is justly famous as a "born humorist, he is also a reformer, a moralist, a character-painter, a travelling determinist and pessimist. Indeed, he is no less critical of "the damned human race" than Jonathan Swift. Gladys Carmen Bellamy, writing about Mark Twain's mind, says - "he evolved, a determinism that explained, for him a great deal about the damned human race.' He wrote it down in what he called his Gospel - that is, 'What is Man?'

---


Mark Twain's concept of man strikes an Indian when it is viewed from the Vedantic vantage point. The viewing of What Is Man? from the Indian Philosophical angle is prompted by the somewhat special place it occupies among Mark Twain's voluminous writings.

Mark Twain's What Is Man? which is written in the form of a 'Dialogue' between an Old Man and a Young Man is in six sections. The first section deals with Man the Machine and Personal Merit.

"Yes. Man the machine - man, the impersonal engine. Whosoever a man is, is due to his make, and to the influences brought to bear upon if by his heredities, his habitat, his associations. I am sorry, but you see yourself, that your mind is merely a machine, nothing more".

Twain's idea of "Man the Machine" is that there is a certain mechanical quality about his body and his


Further references are cited in text.
mind. His heredity is as important as his habitat. This is in keeping with the view that the 'swabhava' of a man is due to his 'vasanas' and his 'samskara' with which he is born. This is the reason why Twain talks about goldmen, and tin men, and copper men and leaden men and steel men, and so on - and each has the limitations of his nature, his heredities. The limitations of each person's nature is according to 'gunas', in Indian terminology Sattva, rajas and tamas are the three gunas which determine whether a man is a gold man or steel man or a tin man. If there is a predominance of sweetness and light he is a sattvika, if a predisposition for emotion and action, he is a rajasik person and if he is ignorant and lethargic he is a tamasik by nature.

The second idea is of what Twain calls "Personal Merit" - Personal Merit? No. A brave man does not create his bravery. He is entitled to no personal credit for possessing it. It is born to him ... There was a seed. No seed, no plant. Did he make that seed himself, or was it born in him? It was no merit of his that the seed was there." (Baender Paul 131-132)
The second section deals with what Twain feels is Man's Sole Impulse - the Securing of His Own Approval. He examines the concept of 'Self-approval,' the necessary of securing one's self-approval. He shows how a man cannot be comfortable without his own approval. He gives various instances and even tells what he calls "A Little Story" to prove the central point.

"Yes. This is the Law. Keep it in your mind. From his cradle to his grave a man never does a single thing which has any First and Foremost object but one - to secure peace of mind, spiritual comfort, for HIMSELF" (Baaedr Paul 136).

The authoritative tone of "Yes, this is the law keep it in your mind" is reminiscent of the Sanskrit ya yesha adeshaha. Twain is making pronouncements throughout the work because he is himself convinced about their authenticity and truthfulness. The emphasis, of course, is one "spiritual comfort for HIMSELF."

This idea that "all is dear" only for the sake of the Self is taken up in the Third Section of Twain's work where he continues with what he calls "the Gospel
of Self Approval. "He points out that the so called "Self sacrifice" and "duty for duty's sake" are all in the ultimate analysis only for the Self-

In Section Four entitled "Training" Mark Twain returns to the idea of innate propensity or 'swabhava' which is congenital but nevertheless points out the importance of "Training" which can be talked about as equivalent of Sadhana.

You remember you said that I said training was everything, I corrected you, and said "training and another thing." That other thing is temperament - that is, the disposition you were born with. You can't eradicate your disposition nor any rag of it - you can only put a pressure on it and keep it down and quiet... You will never get rid of it, but by watching it you can keep it down nearly all the time. Its presence is your limit. Your reform will never quite reach perfection... you have made valuable progress and can make more. There is use in training. (Baender Paul 168)

What Twain describes here is the process of a Sadhana - a man of tamasik disposition or temperament.
In Section Five, Twain returns to the idea of "The Man-Machine again" and concentrates on the "mind" of man. He makes the statement "the mind is independent of the man". This creates no problems for the Indian because of the meaning of the Self as "I" has to do with dissociating and dissociating both the "body" and the "mind" from the "I" sense. The mind is the seat of the ego sense -ahamkara-and unless this false identification -Adhyasa-is got rid of there is no way of finding the real "I".

The Sixth and final section of What Is Man? is sub-titled "Instinct and Thought". The congenital characteristic or swabhava which was discussed earlier comes back into the picture in the final section when Twain asserts deterministically - "If man is born with an unhappy temperament, nothing can make him happy, if he is born with a happy temperament, nothing can make him happy" which ties up with his assertion - "Temperament is born, not made". (Baender Paul 201)

To sum up the Indian response to Mark Twain's thought in his What Is Man? to the extent to which he stresses the spiritual foundation adhishana of all
things and to the extent to which asserts that everything is for the sake of Self in the ultimate analysis. Twain's thought runs parallel to Indian philosophical thinking. He asserts categorically.

Any so-called material thing that you want is merely a symbol; you want it not for itself, but because it will content your spirit of the moment. It is so with all things, little or big, majestic or trivial - there are no exceptions. Crowns, sceptres, pennies, paste jewels, village notoriety, world-wide fame - they are all the same, they have no material value: while they content the spirit they are precious, when this fails they are worthless". (Baender Paul 202-203).

Mark Twain's choice of the "Dialogue Form" to present his thoughts is specially appealing to the Indian mind as this is the form through which-through the Dialogue of the Guru and Sishya - the Indian concepts are explored.

From the Indian Point of view it seems as though the self-enquiry has been abandoned inconclusively. Though terms like "God" and "Soul" are differently defined concepts, in the Indian thought from the way they have been used by Mark Twain and there is a lot...
of misunderstanding about the use of the word "Self", it can be clearly seen that in most of the things that Twain is taking about, there is a corresponding line of thought in Indian Philosophical thinking. He is right in coming to the conclusion that

There is no help for it" and "We cannot do it" if we remain at the level of intellectuality and operate at the level of the mind. The true nature of the "I" can only be directly experienced as it is the very nature of Man—"Swatah siddha" and ever present. That it cannot be described in words and penetrated by thought is clearly stated in Sanskrit as "Yato vaco nivarthante aprapya manasasah".

Mark Twain's concept of man has taken into account the body-mind complex which is the "illusory self" according to Vedantic thought. Among the notions of Selfhood which constitute the Indian concept of Man, include the secondary self, called gana where a person relates himself to his son, wife etc., as an extension of himself and 'the illusory selfmithya' which Mark Twain has discussed under the body-mind context—both "machines". However, the principal self is the "Supreme Self" (mukhya), the witness of all experience. To quote from "The Insights of Advaita":

The meaning of the "I" which seems impenetrable to Twain is simply explained by the statement "Thou art That" - Tattvamasi - which when understood and experienced by the student takes the form of "I am That" i.e. I am the Self, which is a synonym for Brahman. Thus "I" "Self", "Brahman" - all become experienced as the non-dual Reality.

Thus Mark Twain's *What Is Man?* is such an unusual and controversial work that one is tempted to offer what can be termed an "Indian response". This is essential to know some of the cultures prevalent at the time of Mark Twain. Mark Twain, a Southerner, who had during his Hannibal days harboured certain Southern attitudes and beliefs, particularly concerning slavery and racism, had to bury them in the debris of the past when he came to North and became associated with Northern liberals. But the past could not be eclipsed completely and some of its traces were carried over to the present through his symbols and icons. Therefore throughout his life he remained a divided person, haunted by his own doppelganger. Mark Twain's was not a unique case, however. In mid-nineteenth century, America was a divided nation. While reinforcing the
democratic value of freedom, it indirectly justified aggression through its Twain principles of "manifest destiny" and Social Darwinism. Mark Twain employed this ambivalence and paradox in his writings.

Mark Twain's varied experience in life and his first-hand vision as a novelist, a vision which got sharper as he grew older and maturer in sensibility helped him in his field of work. His perception of reality prevalent in mid-nineteenth century America was essentially ironic, the kind we find in Melville, Conrad, and Faulkner. He is closer in vision to Conrad than any of the American writers. In his treatment of the psychological journey of his protagonist into the heart of American darkness, a darkness caused by the prevailing mood of uncertainly and chaos of contending ideologies, _Huckleberry Finn_ is similar to Conrad's _Heart of Darkness_. Like Conrad's Marlow, Huck Finn moves from an apparently visible universe to a relatively invisible or a partially visible one, from childish larkiness and adventure to philosophical reflection and to ultimate scepticism, from luminosity to opacity. This is more or less the pattern of the structure of the journey of his major protagonists.
During the course of their journey they discover that beneath the comic facade of life there is hidden darkness. Mark Twain also felt in the same way about life. During his growth as a writer he came to understand that humour was tinged with pathos and comic situation was only an enticement for plunging deeper into darker aspects of life. Mark Twain's primary concern as a writer was to unmask the prevailing myths about America and to create fresh conditions for their reappraisal. He examined some of the stereotyped, American myths and found them inauthentic in the context of his times. One was the myth of the frontier popularized by Cooper. Cooper's frontier myth was not produced, by the actuality of the American Frontier experience but by the effect of obsolete romanticism of England. Cooper in America and Walter Scott in England were responsible in disseminating such myths. Although the landscape of the American West which Cooper described was barren, rugged and hostile to the explorer, Cooper made it look 'picturesque', an expression which was recurrent in his writings. The American Indians were also idealized in his work.
Mark Twain in fact straggled between the two worlds, one derived from the aristocracy of the South, the other from the liberal humanism of the North, and between the two was the dark shadow of Puritanism with its emphasis on determinism and innate depravity of man. Caught up in these diverse and often contradictory forces, he developed a mixed response to life,

Mark Twain remained comfortably at home with a large number of such inherent contradictions and paradoxes sustaining the vitality of American culture. He not only dealt with various value systems which obtained in his immediate context in their ludicrous coexistence, but also tried to transcend his milieu by philosophically joining contradictions — through playful juxtaposition. Both The Adventures of Tom Sawyer and Huckleberry Finn are as such a celebration of the American ideal of pastoralism as a critique of that ideal. While Mark Twain observed American culture from the perspectives of children and found it joyful, he also discovered its seamy side. Apparently comical and playful, these two novels transcend their comic
exterior and address issues which have profound psychological significance even for children. Tom Sawyer is created out of nostalgic evocation of his St. Petersburg childhood. In his attempt to re-live the world which was lost forever, Mark Twain suggests that even for a child certain past incidents are tremendously significant for their tragic overtones. The novel is as complex as *Huckleberry Finn* in its symbolism. McDougal's Cave, where Injun Joe had hidden his money and where he finally died of starvation, is invested with rich metaphoricity. The Cave is almost Gothic with elements of horror. Tom's entry into the Cave is described as his entry into a labyrinth: "McDougal's Cave was but a vast labyrinth of crooked aisles that ran into each other and out again and led nowhere. It was said that one might wander days and nights together through its intricate tangle of rifts and chasms, and never find the end of the cave, that he might go down and down, and still down, into the earth and it was just the same-labyrinth under the labyrinth, and no end to any of them." ( *AHF* 161) Tom's journey into the Cave can be taken as Mark Twain's entry into the heart of America, into the very core of American
reality, which is labyrinthine. That's why, whether he was making fun of European culture or decadent romanticism in frontier consciousness, he was only trying to probe deeper into the American cultural psyche.

Mark Twain attempted to probe the mystery of the journey into the heart of the American reality at the close of the nineteenth century when values were fast changing and earlier myths were being exploded. Huckleberry Finn is about the frontier, both geographical and psychological, about exploration and also about metaphysical quest. As Huck and Jim move on their raft from North to South, the river closes in on them and they appear to be drifting slowly into the labyrinth from which they cannot easily extricate themselves. Using the complex symbolism of the fog, mark Twain evaded an important issue and escaped from any commitment to it. This evasion was not an escape from responsibility, but a philosophical position from which success and failure, attachment and detachment were difficult to ascertain. Jim and Huck face disaster after disaster during their journey and as they near Cairo in thick fog, Jim's prospect for freedom gets
murkier and murkier. Finally, Mark Twain implied in Jim's freedom that it was not worth trying for. In fact, his freedom becomes a travesty of freedom. Since the novel is about freedom, Huck's freedom from civilization and Jim's hope for freedom from slavery, Mark Twain plays on the concept of freedom in a philosophical way. First of all, he is undecided about whether freedom is centripetal or centrifugal. Since Huck is running away from civilization, which for Jim is where freedom is located, freedom has different connotations for each. Jim wants to be reintegrated to his family and there to enjoy the fruits of freedom, but Huck wants to flee the security of home to the wilderness of the outside world. To the former, freedom is centripetal, to latter it is centrifugal. And both are justified in their pursuits.

Huck's so-called escape from civilization takes him into the heart of nature, into the heart of American psyche, into the heart of darkness, or primeval terror. As the novel comes to close it is very difficult to distinguish the land from the river. The river replicates the evil on the land. Toward the
end of their journey Huck suffers a moral crisis, the first major one during his association with Jim. The crisis involves his dilemma concerning Jim's freedom. Although he was sincere in his help to free Jim he feels guilty for helping a fugitive Nigger who is someone's property. He is troubled in conscience between what he considered humanity and public morality. Finally, he resolved his dilemma in choosing the first, i.e. humanity, and eschewing his social morality. But the way Mark Twain closes the novel by bringing Tom to action and pushing Huck into the margin implies that he does not commit himself totally to the idea of the freedom of the Black. By using playful caricature of the idea of freedom he clouds the issue and keeps it unresolved. Perhaps Mark Twain felt at that time that the idea of a slave's freedom was too premature and complex to be tackled in a narrowly simplistic way. Freedom was a big idea and required a more careful examination. And since the basis of the American democratic experiment is this idea, it has political overtones. Through Huck's perception of the unreality of American freedom and its murky political context Mark Twain leaves the question unresolved.
Huck's evasion of responsibility is characteristic of the American ambivalence, which is a positive aspect of the American response to reality, a response which is context-sensitive. As the context changes, the response also changes correspondingly. Concepts like liberty, equality, freedom, guilt and responsibility go through constant mutations in the American context which distorts the conceptual clarity of each of these notions and obfuscates their distinctions by blurring their differences. That is, perhaps why Mark Twain chose a child-protagonist for his purpose, a protagonist who has no fixed attitudes to reality, who grows as he encounters events and finally leaves them as they were without showing any sense of commitment. Huckleberry Finn proves that lucidity of perception and conceptual clarity are ideal constructions and have no relevance to the American context. In his later novels like Connecticut Yankee at King Arthur's Court and The Mysterious Stranger as well as in his prose works like What Is Man and Letters From the Earth Mark Twain addressed these difficulties of definition and questioned values like "morality" and "good sense" for their innate depravity and finally accepted determinism. At last by turning to
determinism he freed himself from the shackles of the need to define his ideas in clear and lucid terms.

Dr. Sreepathi Sreedevi in "Innathe America" says:

Here we understand that the American civilization is a mixture of the cultures of various countries, mainly English Culture. European culture is the part and parcel of Mark Twain's characters in _Huckleberry Finn._

In Kerala we do not have slavery or monarchy. In America also there is neither slavery nor monarchy. Though class differences are clearly seen in America even in educational institutions, public places etc. we in India do not have such discriminations. Mark Twain's travel all over the world helped him to get first hand information and direct experiences of various culture. Though his autobiographical elements have played an important role in his characterisation, his characters like Huck and Tom with their revolutionary and adventurous nature still live in the minds of the readers of *Huckleberry Finn*. Many of the cultures found in *Huckleberry Finn* are still relevant in Kerala.

Lack of sincere friendship can be seen in the Novels of Mark Twain, especially in *Huckleberry Finn*.

Huck's ignorance about friendship is not surprising, for this novel is aware of how rare, true friendship is. The novel is obsessed with isolation and disguise because these are to be expected in a world where there is little friendship and where every
meeting opens the possibility for new violence. What one learns in such a world is how to protect one's humanity by hiding it, but this hiding then condemns the self to solitude. The first chapter ends with lonesome sounds. Even before the beatings drive Huck to seek an escape from Pap, his lonesomeness causes him to act: "Once he(Pap)locked me in and was gone three days. It was dreadful lonesome. I judged he had got drowned and I wasn't evergoing to get out any more. I was scared. I made up my mind I would fix up some way to leave there." (A H F 220) Huck does not have a destination rather, he is running from a world in which there is no friendship but only the inadequate and crushing human relationships that are exemplified in the brutality of Pap and the sentimentality of the widow.

Only on Jackson's Island does Huck begin to see the consequences of living without others. Once alone, Huck begins to confront the limits of such a life:

"When it was dark I sat by my camp fire smoking, and feeling pretty satisfied: but by-and-by it got
sort of lonesome, and so I went and sat on the bank and listened to the currents washing along, and counted the stars and drift-logs and rafts that come down, and then went to bed, there ain't no better way to put in time when you are lonesome: you can't stay so, you soon get over it. (A H F 233)

Still, such a resolution can only be temporary, for Huck is not that self-sufficient. Although he certainly has the skills to survive in nature, Huck needs people. The nightmarish quality of his later separation from Jim in the fog shows how terrifying a world of genuine isolation is.

But when Huck meets Jim on Jackson's Island, Jim is not the friend that he will become later on. Despite Jim's being only an acquaintance, Huck eagerly throws in his lot with him. There is little, indeed in Jim's past to suggest the stature he will achieve. Upto this point in the novel, Jim is a limit, comic character-almost a burlesque figure in his superstition and incredulity. When Huck agrees not to turn Jim in, he is not acting out of any prior commitment to
Jim. The friendship follows upon rather than prompts Huck's decision to run with him. Huck simply needs to be with somebody for he is not against community, just civilization.

In their budding friendship Huck and Jim enact in a modified form of the mythic drama of Rousseau's theory of the social contract and leave their condition of being separate and unrelated individuals in the state of nature. Jim's telling his secret and Huck's keeping it are mutual acts of trust that form the community by binding the two members together in a common identity. The telling and promising produce a set of duties, as Huck and Jim enter into a community that marks them off from other people and unites them in an effort of self-protection.

We can also find how an evil society give shape to cruel human beings.

This is a vicious world, and its action, tone, and mood are produced by the coalescence of the valley world with Tom's. The Tom of the robber band has been growing with the valley world. The same cruelty,
indifference to suffering, deception, and murderous brinkmanship now epitomize Tom. The King, Duke, Shepherdsons, Grangerfords and Sherburns flow into him. Tom has grown in their model. Huck readily notices this "new bulliness" in Tom and realizes that it could "get us all killed". Tom's response to the environment has become completely dehumanized. The indifference with which he could pile labours on Jim is matched only by his Negroesque demand for Jim to play music to the rats: "They don't care what kind of music'tis. A Jews-harp's plenty good enough for a rat. All animals like ... painful music ... It always interests them ... play The Last Link is Broken ... and ... the rats and the snakes, and the spiders, and things just fairly swarm over you, and have a noble good time"

Jim's appeal falls on unfeeling ears: "Yes, dey will, I reck'n, Mars Tom, but what kine er time is Jim havin'? (A H F 422) Tom is untouched, he goes on to think of further tasks. Ironically, however, the speech is disrupted by references to human suffering - Jews, painful music, and The Last Link is Broken - which his word create but to which his heart is dead; the last human link is broken. Tom is so enclosed
within himself and his conceptions that he has not developed the ability to look outward. That is why he is not selfconscious and is incapable of self-assessment. But more important than that, he is completely bereft of the ability to think and feel for others. He cannot look at himself from outside and he cannot feel into others.

Let us examine the Christian culture in Mark Twain's work Huckleberry Finn.

Huck's affection for Jim has not dwindled and his happiness on finding him free is genuine. Yet Jim can no longer accompany Huck. This must be so because Huck cannot accept the values Jim has come to represent, the clear Christian values of innocence, goodness, love, and sacrifice which he has watched closely enough and learnt from. In a way Jim's symbolic burden involves capitulation to institutionalism; Jim is received into the white society and with a vengeance has become the epitome of its religious values like the institutionalized human models he is but upon, an Uncle Tommor Uncle Daniel.' Bellamy's perception - "Both Tom and Jim are in bondage to
institutionalism"¹ - is right, although Jim's bondage is seen here differently, in terms of the values of Christianity and not in terms of Africanism which to me is a minor content. Browne is perhaps no closer to the truth in this matter when he observes that Jim is inescapably tied to St.Petersburg psychology and therefore can no longer be Huck's comapnion. This is true only to the extent that Jim would perhaps accept St.petersburg now that he is free. But he is more likely to move a free state, for he has already started. In inner content also he is as far removed from the Mississippi valley world as imaginable. But he is institutionalized in terms of Christianity in the sense that he has been made a symbol of its values and has adopted them into his nature.

"Only Huck is free from institutions" His rejection of Jim is a rejection of both institutionalism with its epitome, Jim, are received, but the soft, femine, self-sacrificing spirit of Christianity is rejected. Yates is right when he observes that Huck

lacks concern for the love of God or for salvation through Christ. The older spirit, the pagan spirit of rugged individualism and adventure, the Ulyssenan spirit of chasing the horizon is tempered, perhaps, with a certain other sense. One cannot imagine Huck going down to have a "roaring adventure". He is one beset with a conscience which has a perpetual feeling of guilt as it has had throughout the novel. Although overcome, it will go with himma as an achieved content of personality and meaning, into the Territory. There is something Hebraic added to the Hellenic in this quest, a sense of guilt and a search for a new home wedded to the Ulyssenan. But, of course, he would go alone, unlike Moses leading the Hebrews out of bondage; like Moses going into the desert alone, to discover himself. Huck's ultimate freedom is in attaining this complex sense of individuality, th is release from society, from religion, from morals, the sense of freedom to create one's own responses from within alone, and the abrogation to himself of the ability to move on.

Thus we find the culture existed in the society of Mark Twain having been conveyed to the language into
which his works are translated. We see in *Huckleberry Finninte Vikramangal*, *Huckleberry Finn Enna Sahasikan* and *Huckleberry Finn* how Azheecode, Thayat and Vijayan respectively succeeded to convey the cultures of Mark Twain's characters and episodes. The social elements in *Huckleberry Finn* will be portrayed in the next chapter with a comparative study of the translations made in Malayalam.