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Hemingway claims in Green Hills of Africa that "all modern American literature comes from one book by Mark Twain called Huckleberry Finn." If this basic idea is applied to his own work, elements of Adventures of Huckleberry Finn appear in some of Hemingway's Nick Adams stories and his novel The Old Man and the Sea. All major characters and several minor characters in these works share the quality of natural innocence, composed of their primitivism, sensibility, and active morality. Hemingway's Nick, Santiago, and Manolin, and Twain's Huck Finn and Jim reflect their authors' similar backgrounds and experiences and themselves come from similar environments. These environments are directly related to their continued possession and expression of their natural innocence.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

When Hemingway asserts in *Green Hills of Africa* that "all modern American literature comes from one book by Mark Twain called *Huckleberry Finn*" (Green Hills 22), his comment is typical of his generous praise for Twain (Green Hills 22; By-Line 218), but he unfortunately does not go on to explain or defend his assertion. Also, the broad scope of his comment makes difficult its use as a tool for the comparison of modern literature with *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. If Hemingway's comment is applied more narrowly to his own work, however, elements of *Huckleberry Finn* can be seen quite clearly in at least one of his novels and several short stories. These works are Hemingway's stories about the boy Nick Adams and his novel about an elderly fisherman and his young companion, *The Old Man and the Sea*. Specifically, the characters Nick, Santiago, Manolin, and Twain's Huck Finn and Jim arise out of their authors' similar backgrounds and experiences; these five characters come from similar environments, which stand in a complex relationship with their most important shared quality, their natural innocence.¹
The natural innocence of these characters is composed of several distinguishing elements, one being the distinctively Romantic characteristic of sensibility (Holman 408). These characters demonstrate a "reliance upon the feelings as guides to truth and conduct as opposed to reason and law"; their decisions are based on "emotionalism as opposed to rationalism" (Holman 408).

These characters' natural innocence is also composed of characteristics that are similar to some of the elements of Romantic primitivism. C. Hugh Holman defines this "eighteenth-century" idea as "the doctrine that primitive peoples, because they had remained closer to nature and had been less subject to the influences of society, were nobler and more nearly perfect than civilized peoples" (349). An earlier, more specific definition of primitivism also quoted by Holman adds that "primitive peoples," who are close to "perfect" nature in which God is "revealed," are "close to God," and they are "therefore essentially moral" (350). Furthermore, "human beings are by nature prone to do good: their evil comes from self-imposed limitations of their freedom" (350). Consistent with these definitions, the characters considered in this thesis are essentially and actively moral; their deeds are the expression of their morality. These characters' sensibility is the impulse they act upon as they express their morality through their
actions. Also consistent with the above definitions, their active morality connects them with the natural world, the world of the woods, river, or ocean. In the case of these characters, however, they are not actively moral because they are primitive and close to nature; in these works by Twain and Hemingway, the causality is reversed. Instead, because these characters are actively moral, they deliberately seek and are comfortable in conditions in which they have the freedom to express their morality; limitations on their freedom come from without rather than from within. For this reason, these characters generally prefer and are often found in isolated settings, apart from other men who hold and enforce different moral standards that would limit their freedom.  

The definition of the natural innocence of these characters may be further clarified through a statement of what it is not, a clarification made necessary by the several connotations of the word "innocence." For example, their innocence is not the result of outside influences but is an innate quality of the characters' personalities; this innocence is not learned. This innocence is imperfect in that it is not entirely consistent and is not without flaws; not all of the demonstrated elements of this quality are present in the thoughts and behavior of each character at all times. Theirs is also an imperfect innocence in that
they occasionally commit legal or moral crimes, at least in the eyes of the societies which judge them ("Innocent"). This innocence should not be confused with absolute ignorance or complete gullibility, although in some instances these five characters demonstrate a degree of one or both of these qualities as well, especially Huck, Jim, and Nick.

In spite of the approximately sixty-five-year difference in the periods of their childhoods, both Twain and Hemingway grew up in similar environments that later figured prominently in their fiction. Both Albert B. Paine's and Dixon Wecter's descriptions of Twain's early life show clearly the major influences on the future writer: these were his considerable freedom and his substantial exposure to a rural and near-wilderness environment.

Twain spent part of his early childhood in Florida, Missouri, a settlement of "only twenty-one houses," far from the "metropolis" of St. Louis (Paine 10). Before "Little Sam's" birth, his father had found too often that Tennessee could provide only a meager living and had moved his family to Missouri with hopes of a better future (Paine 7-9, 11, 14). Although Florida was far better than any of the Clemens family's previous residences in Tennessee, it was a town of "iridescent promise and negligible future" that never had the economic development that John Clemens
expected (Paine 10-11). The family found primitive conditions in Florida,
its houses all frame or log chinked with clay,
with puncheon floors; its log church with slab benches; its two streets lying ankle-deep in dust
or mud, depending on the season, and its lanes mere straggling lines of rail fence with
cornfields on either side (Wecter 41).

For Sam, however, Florida held influences and experiences that, amplified and reinforced by similar, subsequent experiences in Hannibal, were to figure prominently in his later look back at childhood memories through a writer's eyes. For one thing, Sam had the companionship not only of his parents, his two brothers, and two sisters, but also of the family's two slaves (Paine 14-15). Jennie, who worked in the household, and Uncle Ned, "a man of all work," were emotionally close to Sam and his siblings and looked after them more than did their busy parents (Paine 14-15). These two also probably gave young Sam his first acquaintance with the stories and superstitions of their own heritage, "fanciful semi-African conditions and strange primal possibilities" (Paine 14-16). Wecter sees such stories as "stirring the souls of their young listeners with a delicious and unforgettable terror," and writes that "to analyze the part that terror ... plays
in a book like *Huckleberry Finn* ... is to glimpse the effect of this early education upon the mind of a child" (46). These and later stories no doubt influenced Twain's inclusion of the many superstitions that appear in *Huckleberry Finn*, although Jim's prescient "hair-ball" is alone among the book's superstitions in being "of incontestably African origin" (Hoffman 52). Along with his physical environment, these superstitions helped create "a curious childhood, full of weird, fantastic impressions and contradictory influences, stimulating alike to the imagination and that embryo philosophy of life which begins almost with infancy" (Paine 14).

In an effort to improve her son's fragile health, Jane Clemens took Sam to his Uncle John Quarles' nearby farm for the summers, both during and after the family's residence in Florida (Paine 18, 30, 31). In his later years, Twain wrote that "I was his guest for two or three months every year, from the fourth year after we removed to Hannibal till I was eleven or twelve years old" (Twain, *Autobiography* 4). He recalled that "it was a heavenly place for a boy, that farm of my uncle John's" (Twain, *Autobiography* 4). These visits apparently had their intended effect and helped Sam survive his precarious early childhood (Paine 32). The farm and its residents, both black and white, may have been just "ordinary" and "average" for the time and place, but for Sam
this was "never apparent" (Paine 18). Instead, the farm presented "one long idyllic dream of summer-time and freedom" (Paine 31).

From these experiences on Quarles' farm also came several elements of Huckleberry Finn. One of these is that John Quarles' farm "generally resembles" the Grangerford farm (Blair 398). Also, "Huck's description of various omens, magical rituals, and methods of prophecy" came from the "informal instruction he [Sam] received" from his uncle's slaves (Blair 371). In particular, the slave on the Phelps' farm who ties his hair into bunches with thread as a protection against witches is derived from Sam's observations on the Quarles' farm (Twain, Autobiography 6; Notebooks & Journals 160). The superstitions Sam learned both at home and on his uncle's farm not only appear as subject matter in Huckleberry Finn but also, because they were "prevalent among children and slaves" (Blair 371), are part of the common bond that Huck and Jim share.

Once referring to the source of literary characters, Twain said, "I don't believe an author, good, bad or indifferent, ever lived, who created a character. It was always drawn from his recollection of someone he had known." More emphatically, he continued: "even when he is making no attempt to draw his character from life, ... he is yet unconsciously drawing from memory" (Pease 10).
Bearing out his own words, Twain found more than just lessons in superstition on Quarles' farm; he found the slave who would later become the model for Jim, "Uncle Dan'l" (Paine 33). Twain described him as "a middle-aged slave whose head was the best one in the Negro quarter, whose sympathies were wide and warm and whose heart was honest and simple and knew no guile," an accurate description of Jim, as well (Twain, Autobiography 6).

After the federal government refused to develop a series of "locks and dams" that would have made Florida's Salt River "navigable," John Clemens saw that the town would remain economically stagnant and decided to move his family again (Paine 20, 21, 24). His choice for this move was far better than Florida, for Hannibal was a "steamboat town" with a commercial life of its own, right on the Mississippi (Paine 24), a "funnel [to the river] for the landlocked counties" (Wecter 49).

Sam's first years in Hannibal, like his brief stay in Florida, gave him a great deal of freedom; he was only four when his family moved, still too young to attend school (Paine 25, 35). After a summer on his uncle's farm, when Sam was "about five years old," however, his mother decided that "she was willing to pay somebody to take him off her hands for a part of each day and try to teach him manners"; she would send him to school (Paine 35). His attitude
toward school emphasizes the importance of freedom to Twain, an attitude he carried even from childhood:

Each morning he went with reluctance and remained with loathing—the loathing which he always had for anything resembling bondage and tyranny or even the smallest curtailment of liberty (Paine 38).

Hannibal's surroundings, while more settled than those of Florida, had important topographical features that Florida lacked. Most importantly, it had the Mississippi: "A Sam Clemens growing up in landlocked Florida or elsewhere in the interior of Missouri would have lacked a vital dimension of experience, given him by this greatest of American rivers that swept past his doorway" (Wecter 167). The river fascinated Sam even at an early age, for Paine notes that in his quest for freedom from the restraints of the household, this "queer, fanciful, uncommunicative child that detested indoors . . . would run away if not watched—always in the direction of the river" (28).

As described by Wecter, the particular situations of time and place which began in Florida influenced Sam even more as he grew up in Hannibal:

In Hannibal young Sam Clemens had reached his predestined great good place. Here during most of each year, and back on the Quarles's farm during
certain summer weeks, he grew stronger in body and more aware of the world about him. These streets and the people that walked in them, each carrying with him some unforgettable mannerism of speech or dress, some vestige of comedy or pathos, the waters, the woods, the hills, the birds and animals, left the boy with a mortal nostalgia all his life (61-62).

Beyond the general awareness Twain gained in Hannibal, here he found the model for Huck Finn, just as he found the model for Jim on Quarles' farm:

Back to back with the old Clemens property but facing upon the less prosperous thoroughfare of North Street stood the big barnlike structure where Tom Blankenship, the original of Huck Finn, lived with his drunken father and slatternly kin, in tempting proximity to young Sam Clemens (Wecter 59).

Wecter's description of Tom, when compared to Huck Finn, lends additional credibility to Twain's claim that his characters are "drawn from life":

Tom was ill-fed, an outrageous wreck of rags, dirty, ignorant, cheerful, carefree, and altogether enviable, being "the only really independent person--boy or man--in the community."
The woods and the waters around Hannibal were his education. Living by his wits, suspicious of every attempt to civilize him . . . he had none of the unimportant virtues and all the essential ones. The school of hard knocks had given him a tenacious grasp on reality, despite his faith in dreams, omens, and superstitions. But it had not toughened him into cynicism or crime . . . (Wecter 149).

Another member of the Blankenship family, Tom's older brother Bence, provided Twain with the source of Huck's most distinctive characteristic:

In the summer of 1847 Bence befriended secretly a runaway Negro whom he found hiding among the swampy thickets of Sny Island, a part of Illinois's Pike County that hugged the opposite bank of the river from Hannibal. Ignoring the reward posted for the black man, Bence carried food to him week after week and kept mum about his hiding place--thus inspiring that rare tribute to loyalty in Huckleberry Finn . . . (Wecter 148).

In Hannibal, Sam chose to associate closely with the slaves, viewing them positively even if he did not take Bence's direct action to help them. Fifty years later, he humorously commented on his favorable view of them:
I was playmate to all the niggers, preferring their society to that of the elect, I being a person of low-down tastes from the start, notwithstanding my high birth, and ever ready to forsake the communion of high souls if I could strike anything nearer my grade (Wecter 75).

One diversion of Sam's adolescence in Hannibal was his exploration of nearby Glasscock's Island (Paine 56-57), better known, through Huck, as Jackson's Island. This island was "three miles long and three miles downstream from Hannibal in a mile-wide stretch of the Mississippi" (Blair 384). Written many years later, Twain's words in a letter to a friend demonstrate that the environment of the river remained for him a symbol of freedom. He writes "about his 'longing to go back to the seclusion of Jackson's island & give up the futilities of life. I suppose we all have a Jackson's island somewhere, & dream of it when we are tired'" (Hearn 98). On another occasion he asked himself, "What is human life? The first third a good time; the rest remembering about it" (Twain qtd. in Gerber, 1). In another letter, written fifty years after his boyhood, Twain elaborates on this thought and emphasizes his preference for the portion of his life spent in Hannibal: "I should greatly like to re-live my youth, and then get drowned. I should like to call back Will Bowen and John Garth and the
others, and live the life, and be as we were, and make holiday until 15, then all drown together" (Wecter 168).

Paine gives a concise summary of the overall effect that this childhood, shaped by his homes in Florida and Hannibal, his uncle's farm, and his considerable freedom would have on Twain the writer:

One is tempted to dwell on this period, to quote prodigally from these vivid memories—the thousand minute impressions which the child's sensitive mind acquired in that long-ago time and would reveal everywhere in his work in the years to come. For him it was education of a more valuable and lasting sort than any he would ever acquire from books (34).

Just as Twain's and Hemingway's naturally innocent characters choose environments that offer them freedom to express this innate quality, both authors made similar choices in their own lives that supported their own innate qualities; the most important elements of their educations came from environments that they chose to pursue. Twain's available choices included the household, school, and books, as opposed to the river, Glasscock's Island, and the strange, orally-transmitted stories of the slaves. In support of his own strong desire for freedom and his persistent primitivism, Twain educated himself as much as
possible through the latter elements of his boyhood environment. As will be demonstrated below, Hemingway also shared these same innate qualities and chose environments for his own education that supported them. For Hemingway, northern Michigan and the Ojibway Indians were equivalent to Twain's Mississippi and John Quarles' slaves. The end result for both authors is that these innate qualities, their strong desire for freedom and their primitivism, supported by these chosen educations, later appear in their fiction.

Twain's Florida, Missouri, was a true rural village (Paine 10), and the larger community of Hannibal was but a small town (Paine 24), but the intentionally-constructed "Village" of Oak Park, Illinois, was a reasonably good approximation of them both, at least in spirit (Reynolds 1). Oak Park was almost as isolated as Hannibal, in spite of both communities' fairly close location to large cities. Oak Park's isolation was created as much by its pervasive moral and political conservatism as by time and distance, making it an "island on the Illinois prairie" (Reynolds 1, 8). The residents' intent in the creation of Oak Park, at least in the beginning, was fulfilled; "Village life . . . revolved slowly about church and family" (Reynolds 3). The community provided safety from the crime and immorality it perceived in the surrounding areas, at least until the
commuter trains opened it to Chicago in 1904 (Reynolds 3-4, 8).

In Oak Park, Hemingway acquired much of his education from life, as did Twain in Missouri (Vonnegut xi, xiii). Michael Reynolds' brief sketch of the Village of Hemingway's early childhood could almost have been written about Twain's nineteenth-century Hannibal:

Cows grazed in vacant lots that now have disappeared, and dogs ran freely in dusty summer streets where there were more horses than dogs. At the Fourth of July picnic, young and old ran foot-races, cheered at the baseball game and applauded the band. There were prizes then for the fattest lady and the oldest man (1-2).

In addition to the livestock in this "suburban" community, Oak Park offered "whole blocks of vacant lots . . . the North Prairie and the Des Plaines river" for Hemingway's education and exploration (Reynolds 3). Oak Park was much more settled and civilized than Florida or Hannibal (Reynolds 3), but the nearness of a rural environment and the freedom to explore it did give Hemingway a basic approximation to Twain's early life.

Hemingway's education from life was also derived from his own boyhood equivalent of John Quarles' farm, his family's summer retreat at Bear Lake [later renamed
Walloon Lake, in Michigan (Baker 1). Constance Cappel describes this area as being quite different from suburban Oak Park: "Northern Michigan, a land of low, rolling hills heavily forested with pines, maples, and birches, dotted with clear lakes and ponds, is bordered to the west by the inland sea which is Lake Michigan" (11). During Hemingway's childhood, this area of the state included "lumbering camps, steamboats and working schooners, horse-drawn farm wagons, a pioneer life that Hemingway saw and partially shared as a boy . . ." (11).

Carlos Baker notes that Hemingway's parents introduced him to the "northern woods" at the age of seven weeks, when they took him there for the first time, "as soon as it was safe for the boy to travel" (1). Baker describes the lakeside property and its surroundings as "an environment ideally suited to manly endeavors," and points out that here young Ernest "played, ate, and slept with a kind of passionate enjoyment" (3). The family's cottage and its accommodations would have been familiar enough to young Sam Clemens:

There were two small bedrooms, a narrow dining room, and a kitchen with a wood-burning range and an iron pump for the well water. Lighting was by oil lamp. In a clump of evergreens up the slope stood the small outhouse. The lake itself was the
Cappel notes that here "Ernest spent all of his summers from his first to his twenty-first year, except for the summer of 1918, when he was in Italy" (13).

Ernest was not isolated during the summer months, however. Nearby was a small town, reminiscent in some ways, perhaps, of Hannibal or Florida, Missouri: "Horton Bay was only a cluster of houses, with a general store and post office and a small Methodist church. But in the years of Ernest's childhood, it was almost as familiar to him as Windemere and Walloon Lake" (Baker 6).

The northern Michigan area not only afforded Hemingway with a "pioneer" environment and even more freedom than granted him in Oak Park, where he did have to attend school, but its importance to Hemingway was just as great as Twain's early surroundings were to him. In 1942, Hemingway told his son, Gregory, "about how he had fished and hunted in the Michigan north woods and about how he wished he could have stayed my age [ten] and lived there forever . . . ." (Hemingway, G. 61, 63). Baker also notes that, for Hemingway, "the child was father to the man," including his attitude toward the outdoors: "The love of nature, of hunting and fishing, of the freedom to be found in the woods or on the water, stayed solidly with him to the end of his life" (16-17).
In these north woods, Hemingway was exposed to a culture more primitive than his own, with a different metaphysical view, just as Twain had been exposed to the slaves and their superstitions in Missouri: "As a boy, Ernest Hemingway spent his summers near the Indian camp, and he came to know its inhabitants. . . . Hemingway played, hunted, and fished with the Indian children and also grew to know their parents" (Cappel 56). The Ojibways appear in Hemingway's writing as early as the February, 1916, issue of the Oak Park High School *Tabula*, in a story titled "Judgment of Manitou" (Cappel 43): "Since much of the conflict between the trapper and his associate was framed in the mysticism of Indian folklore, the information Hemingway was writing about or elaborating on must have been gathered from his Indian friends" (Cappel 46). Baker also observes the influence of these people, who were quite different from those in conservative, Christian Oak Park:

Although Ernest worshipped no heroes among the Indians who lived in the woods near Bacon's farm, he was constantly aware of their presence, like atavistic shadows moving along the edges of his consciousness, coming and going without a sound (13).

Of the two environments of his boyhood, critics generally agree that the influence of northern Michigan is
stronger in Hemingway's work than that of Oak Park. Reynolds even argues that Oak Park "was a world about which Hemingway never wrote a single story" (5). Supporting the same argument from a different perspective, Philip Young observes that

the parts of the childhood which stuck were the summertimes up in Michigan. The Hemingways had a house on Walloon Lake, in a region which was populated chiefly by the Ojibway Indians. Here the boy, like Nick, did his real growing up, and learned to hunt, fish, drink, and know girls. Here too he went on professional errands with the doctor (136).

Referring to Young's remarks, Cappel extends the argument and places even more emphasis on the influence of Michigan:

The "summertimes" and even the other times of the year spent in Michigan did stick with Hemingway, and he used Michigan as the setting for ten published stories, sections of two other stories, one high school story . . . and a short novel (14-15).

The Nick considered later in this thesis is too young to drink or have a serious interest in girls, but the accuracy of Young's and Cappel's comments remains. Both of
the short stories examined in Chapter 3, in which Nick demonstrates all the elements of natural innocence, have settings that are recognizably those of Michigan. Baker finds specific parallels between these stories and Hemingway's actual Michigan experiences:

The story ["Indian Camp"] used the Walloon Lake locale and an Indian camp not unlike the settlement near Bacon's farm. The doctor, his brother, and his son were clearly modeled on Dr. Hemingway, his brother George, and Ernest (125).

Concerning "The Doctor and the Doctor's Wife," Baker writes that Hemingway drew from "the episode in the summer of 1911 when Nick Boulton and Billy Tabeshaw had come to cut up the beech log on the shore at Windemere Cottage" (132). Noting the "autobiographical" elements of this latter story (Cappel 12), Hemingway wrote his father in 1925:

Thanks for your fine letter enclosing the K.C. Star review. I'm so glad you liked the Doctor story. I put in Dick Boulton and Billy Tabeshaw as real people with their real names because it was pretty sure they would never read the Transatlantic Review. I've written a number of stories about the Michigan country--the country is always true--what happens in the stories is fiction (Letters 153).
Comparable autobiographical elements, such as those of the two short stories mentioned above, are present in each of the works to be examined: *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, selected Nick Adams stories, and *The Old Man and the Sea*. Hemingway's Nick, Santiago, and Manolin, and Twain's Huck Finn and Jim reflect their authors' synthesis of their boyhood experiences and environments into these characters who come from similar environments that are closely related to their natural innocence. This innocence is itself composed of Twain's and Hemingway's idealized perceptions of childhood innocence: their characters' sensibility, active morality, and primitivism.

As demonstrated by their later works, neither Twain nor Hemingway maintained this Romantic view of the world through very much of their careers. This synthesis, however, yields a precise, yet comprehensive, world view that bridges the distance of time and place between these two authors and is reflected in the shared natural innocence of these characters. In writing about Huck, Jim, Nick, Santiago, and Manolin, both authors attempt and achieve the synthesis that Hemingway mentions in a letter: "I am trying to make, before I get through, a picture of the whole world—or as much of it as I have seen. Boiling it down always, rather than spreading it out thin" (Letters 397). This thesis does not attempt to demonstrate that part of Hemingway's work
actually "comes from one book by Mark Twain called
Huckleberry Finn," but, as subsequent chapters will
demonstrate, the works of both authors here considered
contain an unmistakable similarity in the shared natural
innocence of some of their characters.
NOTES

1 For convenience, I here refer to Nick as if he were one completely consistent character. As a later chapter will show, however, I do take exception to the extreme position of Philip Young and Joseph Defalco that Nick is necessarily a single consistent character throughout the stories. "Nick Adams" may be viewed as a generic name for most of Hemingway's young male protagonists. Philip Young also refers to Nick as "generic" but uses the term to explain his position that different characters with other names are actually Nick, such as Mr. Frazer in "The Gambler, the Nun, and the Radio": "Clearly, this is our old friend Nick" (Ernest Hemingway 66-67).

2 For the purposes of this discussion, this element of these characters' natural innocence is referred to as "active morality."

3 As used herein, "primitivism" refers to these characters' preference for such settings.

4 Windemere is the name Ernest's mother gave to the family property containing the cottage in 1900. Bear Lake's name was changed to Walloon at about the same time (Baker 3, 5).

5 This argument is especially accurate for the "Nick
Adams' short stories that are examined in this thesis. The rationale for the selection of these particular stories is explained in the introduction to Chapter 3.

Certainly the Michigan themes predominate in the short stories, but Young is mistaken about the complete exclusion of Oak Park from these. As Peter Griffin points out, a section of "Now I Lay Me" describes the burning of items in the back yard before Nick's family moves into a new house. This move and "general clearance" actually occurred (11-12). Also, the story "Soldier's Home," presents strong and unmistakable autobiographical elements, although the name Adams is changed to Krebs and the setting is moved to Oklahoma.

This particular argument is well-addressed by Philip Young in *Ernest Hemingway: A Reconsideration*. 
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CHAPTER II

"A BODY THAT DON'T GET STARTED RIGHT"

That Huck's innocence is innate and not due to environmental influences can be demonstrated through a comparison of Huck and his human environment. If Huck's innocence is the result of environmental influences, there should be a clear link between his innocence and its source, some effect from his family or others who have the opportunity to influence him. This link is not expressed in Adventures of Huckleberry Finn, however; an examination of the novel reveals varying degrees and kinds of external influences but discloses no evidence of any influence that accounts for Huck's lingering innocence.

John C. Gerber supports the idea that Huck has both innate and learned values, and he traces their source in Twain's writing:

Mark Twain, following the theory of William Lecky, provides Huck with a set of innate values as well as the set he acquires from his environment. Thus his judgments are not all environmentally determined, for many proceed from his "sound heart" (109).
A History of European Morals, Lecky's book to which Gerber refers, was a part of the Quarry Farm library "as far back as 1874 . . ., a volume that made a deep impression upon Mark Twain and exerted no small influence upon his intellectual life" (Paine ix). In this work, Lecky "distinguished two opposing schools of morality" (Blair 396):

One of them is generally described as the stoical, the intuitive, the independent or the sentimental; the other as the epicurean, the inductive, the utilitarian, or the selfish. The moralists of the former school . . . believe that we have a natural power of perceiving that some qualities, such as benevolence, chastity, or veracity, are better than others. . . . The moralist of the opposite school denies that we have any such natural perception. He maintains that we have by nature absolutely no knowledge of merit and demerit . . ." (Lecky qtd. in Blair 396).

Clemens wrote in his copy of Lecky's History that "all moral perceptions are acquired by the influences around us; these influences begin in infancy; we never get a chance to find out whether we have any that are innate or not" (Blair 396-397). This statement conforms to Huck's own view that
"a body that don't get started right when he's little, ain't got no show" (Blair 396). In spite of Twain's apparent belief that "environment determines morality" however, through Huck's "instinctual desire to help Jim" Twain illustrates and supports the opposite position, that morality is innate (Blair 396).

Aside from his family, those who have the opportunity to influence Huck in a substantial way are the few residents of St. Petersburg, "a world seemingly without extended families" (Beaver 48), with whom he has frequent, close contact: Tom Sawyer, Miss Watson, and the Widow Douglas. Each of these characters shares with Huck at least one of the elements of his natural innocence, but in Huck's personality these elements are more clearly defined and stronger than in the other characters. Additionally, no one else possesses all three of these elements; these facts preclude the possibility that any one of these characters, alone, could serve as a single influence that accounts for Huck's innocence.

Tom, for instance, possesses the quality of sensibility, for he generally looks to his feelings more often than his mental abilities to guide his actions. Tom's bias toward following his feelings does not mean, however, that he cannot reason; he demonstrates both "shrewdness and self-pitying romanticism" (Hoffman 328-329).
Tom is indeed capable of arguing from facts, as he does in a learned "detective fashion" about Jim's being held in the shack on Silas Phelps' farm:

"Looky-here, Huck, what fools we are, to not think of it before! I bet I know where Jim is."

"No! Where?"

"In that hut down by the ash-hopper. Why looky-here. When we was at dinner, didn't you see a nigger man go in there with some vittles?"

"Yes."

"What did you think the vittles was for?"

"For a dog."

"So'd I. Well, it warn't for a dog."

"Why?"

"Because part of it was watermelon" (291).

From further evidence Tom concludes that the watermelon is for a prisoner and that the prisoner is Jim: "Watermelon shows man, lock shows prisoner; and it ain't likely there's two prisoners on such a little plantation, and where the people's all so kind and good. Jim's the prisoner" (291).

As the above example shows, Tom can think in simple terms, but he does not often rely on his mental capacity to guide his actions. For this, Tom looks to his emotions, and his predominant emotion is a craving for adventure. Tom fulfills this desire and demonstrates his sensibility
through following his "literary models" (Beaver 55), which, at least in his own mind, provide him with all sorts of fantastic adventures. Tom's insistence upon the "proper" form these models provide, contained in a reply to a member of his "gang," illustrates the strength of his underlying sensibility:

"Why can't a body take a club and ransom them [the gang's hostages] as soon as they get here?"

"Because it ain't in the books so--that's why. Now Ben Rogers, do you want to do things regular, or don't you?--that's the idea. Don't you reckon that the people that made the books knows what's the correct thing to do? Do you reckon you can learn 'em anything? Not by a good deal. No, sir, we'll just go on and ransom them in the regular way" (11).

Tom's sensibility again appears when he leads his gang in an attack upon a "Sunday-school picnic" that he insists is a caravan of wealthy Spaniards and Arabs (15) and when he later acts out the final chapters' "evasion."

Along with sensibility, Tom also shares Huck's primitivism; he is drawn to the natural world because it provides a haven from the limitations imposed by conventional society. The limitations that Tom feels, however, are different from those that Huck feels. While
Huck seeks a place to express freely his active morality and sensibility, Tom is drawn to the natural world because it provides a setting for his imaginatively games, the "ephebic rites" that his society tolerates (Lynn 399); the freedom he finds is secondary to his fantasies. Tom does not seek the broader, perhaps permanent, freedom that Huck seeks and is always eventually willing to return to the limitations he has temporarily left behind.

While Tom does possess Huck's sensibility and primitivism, he lacks his friend's active morality. Tom's need for adventure does not consistently lead him toward clearly positive or negative actions, but because he lacks Huck's compassion the outcome of his actions is often negative for someone. Additionally, in spite of appearances, Tom never strays too far from the morality acceptable to respectable citizens, even when he violates some elements of their standards to indulge his taste for literary fantasies. Even then, Tom believes that he operates within the moral bounds of a still larger and more authoritative community, that formed by his literary models. Tom's confusion between written models and community morality emerges when he finally agrees with Huck that digging Jim out with pocket knives is impractical:

"Well, then, what are we going to do, Tom?"

"I'll tell you. It ain't right, and it ain't
moral, and I wouldn't like it to get out--but there ain't only just the one way: we got to dig him out with the picks, and let on it's case-knives" (307).

In spite of their apparent unity of purpose in freeing Jim, Huck understands that he and Tom do not share the same morality. Huck makes an implicit and accurate assessment of Tom's morality in his surprised thoughts when Tom offers to help free Jim. In Huck's estimation, Tom's morality is basically conventional, a morality marked most of all by its support of slavery:

Well, I let go all holts, then, like I was shot. It was the most astonishing speech I ever heard--and I'm bound to say Tom Sawyer fell, considerable, in my estimation. Only I couldn't believe it. Tom Sawyer a nigger stealer! (284).

Of course, as Huck learns much later, Jim is already free, so Tom commits no serious crime. Tom's only offense is in frightening the Phelps' household and their neighbors through his "nonnamous letters" (332). His standing as a member of the community is still secure, if unique.

Tom's morality is also clarified by his treatment of Jim while he is confined to the shed on the Phelps farm. Tom once again plays out his literary fantasies, and Jim is held prisoner by these almost as he is held prisoner by
Silas Phelps. Tom could free Jim relatively quickly by informing the Phelps family of the contents of Miss Watson's will, which they could verify by letter; the Phelps farm is not isolated from mail delivery (351). Instead, he chooses to keep silent about Jim's freedom so that he may plan and act out the escape (284). As part of this elaborate plan, Tom makes sure that Jim is amply supplied with snakes, rats, and spiders for companionship (330-331), and subjects Jim to other ridiculous elements of a long and arduous "rescue."

Tom also summarizes his attitude toward Jim in his own words to Huck that the Phelps' farm is a place "where the people's all so kind and good" (291).

Tom's consistent disregard for Jim's well-being indicates that he actually shares the sentiment Huck expresses to Aunt Sally, as expected by the conventional society she represents, when Huck replies to her question about a fictitious steamboat accident "by telling an immediately acceptable lie" (Gibson 111):

"It warn't the grounding--that didn't keep us back but a little. We blowed out a cylinder-head."

"Good gracious! anybody hurt?"

"No'm. Killed a nigger."

"Well, it's lucky; because sometimes people do get hurt" (279).
Harold L. Beaver describes in detail Huck's exposure of Aunt Sally's morality:

Huck had never before met Aunt Sally. He was spinning out a yarn. It was off the cuff—a reflex. But he is whip-smart. It was his instinctive idea of her idea of the conventions. He glibly exploited those conventions; and her reply promptly confirmed his assumptions (42).

Huck, of course, can also be faulted for his generally compliant role in Tom's abuse of Jim, but he can also be at least partially excused. Huck's ultimate goals in the "evasion," which he usually keeps in mind, are Jim's well-being and freedom; Tom's goals are to act with style and to have adventures, "aesthetic fun to indulge Tom's boyish sense of the proprieties" (Beaver 89). Additionally, Tom has what Neil Schmitz refers to as "blindness, his simple inability to see Jim [as a person]" (65).

Huck allows his goals to be obscured or delayed by Tom's elaborate schemes because he believes that Tom is his moral and intellectual superior. "Huck is made," writes Schmitz, "a reluctant actor in a scenario that provides Jim with a spurious escape and an authentic mob of lynchers" (65). Huck chooses this role through following his own feelings toward Tom and himself. These attitudes are implicit in Huck's amazement that his friend "was actu
going to help steal that nigger out of slavery" (292):

Here was a boy [Tom] that was respectable, and well brung up; and had a character to lose; and folks at home that had characters; and he was bright and not leatherheaded; and knowing, and not ignorant; and not mean, but kind; and yet here he was, without any more pride, or rightness, or feeling, than to stoop to this business [stealing Jim], and make himself a shame, and his family a shame, before everybody (292).

Given this attitude, Huck quite naturally follows Tom's lead, but his acquiescence to most of Tom's schemes is tempered by an underlying concern for Jim's safety when Tom tries to add elements to the escape that are truly dangerous:

"No, it wouldn't do--there ain't necessity enough for it."

"For what?" I [Huck] says.

"Why, to saw Jim's leg off," he says.

"Good land!" I says, "Why, there ain't no necessity for it" (299-300).

Huck also spends a good deal of time with Miss Watson and the Widow Douglas, described by Gerber as "the middle class":

At their best Huck finds these people gentle and
even affectionate; at their worst they are intolerant and demanding. They insist on cleanliness, good manners, and "proper" behavior generally. With equal fervor they oppose tobacco, liquor, profanity, and indolence. They insist on obedience to one's conscience, which they believe is the voice of Providence—though there is some division of opinion over the nature of Providence, since the Widow sees it as kindly and Miss Watson as dictatorial (Gerber 110).

Miss Watson has only a limited amount of Huck's primitivism. Most of her time is apparently spent indoors, except when she and the widow go to a "camp-meet'n" (53), an obvious attempt to get back to natural innocence on a group basis. Miss Watson fully shares Huck's sensibility. She relies primarily on emotion to guide her actions; she shows no clear evidence of even Tom's level of rational thinking. While Huck is guided by his compassion, however, Miss Watson is guided by her selfishness and self-righteousness. Gerber notes one expression of these feelings in the basic hypocrisy of her religious beliefs: "While they [the middle class] prate about Christian love, they own slaves—even Miss Watson, the most pious of them all" (111). These emotions, as well as their negative consequences, are also well-illustrated by her treatment of
both Huck and Jim.

Huck's experience with Miss Watson is wholly unpleasant. Her selfishness and self-righteousness emerge even in Huck's first account of their relationship, as she attempts to impose her own standards of behavior on him:

Miss Watson . . . took a set at me now, with a spelling-book. She worked me middling hard for about an hour, and then the widow made her ease up. . . . Then for an hour it was deadly dull, and I was fidgety. . . . Then she told me all about the bad place, and I said I wished I was there. She got mad, then, but I didn't mean no harm. All I wanted was to go somewheres; all I wanted was a change, I warn't particular (3-4).

For Huck, the aftermath of this evening with Miss Watson is the fact that "I felt so lonesome I most wished I was dead" (4).

Along with her efforts to constrict Huck's behavior to suit herself, Miss Watson also continues her efforts to indoctrinate him with her own theology. Her methods and her theology itself reflect the emotions underlying her sensibility. After one of Huck's transgressions, he says, Miss Watson she took me in the closet and prayed, but nothing come of it. She told me to pray every day, and whatever I asked for I would get
it. But it warn't so. I tried it. Once I got a fish-line, but no hooks. It warn't any good to me without hooks. I tried for the hooks three or four times, but somehow I couldn't make it work. By and by, one day, I asked Miss Watson to try for me, but she said I was a fool. She never told me why, and I couldn't make it out no way (13).

After more thought about Miss Watson's religious beliefs, especially her ideas about a God who is as strict and unforgiving as she, Huck decides that "if Miss Watson's [Providence] got him [a poor chap] there warn't no help for him any more" (14).

Because Miss Watson is guided by the negative emotions of selfishness and self-righteousness, the outcome of her actions is also negative. While Huck's active morality yields positive results, Miss Watson's morality is essentially conventional and is amply illustrated by her broken promise to Jim and her plans to sell him.

The Widow Douglas shows more promise than her sister as a possible source of Huck's innocence, although she also shows no evidence of primitivism (Jim only mentions her leaving her house once, 53). Importantly for this comparison to Huck, however, she consistently demonstrates sensibility. The widow shows no clear example of reasoning
ability to match Tom's, but she does show evidence that she is guided primarily by her emotions.

The predominant emotion that guides the Widow Douglas is compassion, and her religious beliefs reflect these feelings. Like her sister, the widow also attempts to give Huck a theological indoctrination, but he quickly sees that the widow's version is preferable to Miss Watson's:

Sometimes the widow would take me one side and talk about Providence in a way to make a body's mouth water; but maybe next day Miss Watson would take hold and knock it all down again. I judged I could see that there was two Providences, and a poor chap would stand considerable show with the widow's Providence. . . . I thought it all out, and reckoned I would belong to the widow's, if he wanted me . . . (14).

The widow also tells Huck that through prayer he will gain "spiritual gifts": "I must help other people, and do everything I could for other people, and look out for them all the time, and never think about myself" (13).

Because the Widow Douglas acts upon the guidance of the compassion reflected in her theology, she displays a capacity for active morality. One area in which she is actively moral is in her role as Huck's unofficial guardian.

The widow not only gives Huck a home, but, in his own
words, "she took me for her son" (1). Being the widow's son means that Huck must endure a great loss of freedom, which leads to his escape to the comfort of his "old rags and . . . sugar-hogshead again" (1). His return to the widow is notable for her lack of anger and continued kindness: "The widow she cried over me, and called me a poor lost lamb, and she called me a lot of other names, too, but she never meant no harm by it" (2).

Although the widow makes only a fairly brief appearance in Huck's story, her active morality also appears in other instances; she actually tries to follow the "spiritual gifts" advice she gives Huck. When Miss Watson presses Huck too hard in his spelling lesson, "the widow made her ease up" (3). The widow also defends him against her sister when Miss Watson scolds Huck at the dinner table for spilling the salt: "The widow put in a good word for me . . ." (18-19). The Widow Douglas also does what she can to defend Huck from Pap (26, 31), trying twice to become his legal guardian, and also telling Pap to stay away from her home (29).

In spite of the several instances that demonstrate the widow's active morality, she falls short of the standard set by Huck. Huck's most powerful expression of his active morality occurs when he makes a conscious decision to assist Jim's quest for freedom: "All right, then, I'll go to hell . . ." (271). The widow's own defense of Jim is weak and
limited by comparison: "De widder she try to git her [Miss Watson] to say she wouldn' do it [sell Jim] . . ." (53). In her effort to defend Jim, the widow expresses her compassion, but, unlike Huck, she is unwilling to violate the conventional moral code which endorses slavery.

In addition to Tom, Miss Watson, and the Widow Douglas, Huck once had a family that theoretically could have also influenced him. One of its members, Pap Finn, still survives and does influence Huck in several minor ways, but his influence is not the source of Huck's innocence. Henry Nash Smith observes that Pap's "function in the plot" is that he "helps to characterize Huck by making vivid the conditions of Huck's childhood" (125).

The members of Huck's family, other than Pap, influence him only superficially, if at all. When Pap berates Huck for his "considerble many frills," especially his schooling, he also provides the only information in the novel about the rest of the family: they are all dead, and they were all illiterate. Pap tells Huck that "none of the family couldn't [read], before they died," and he goes on to say that he cannot read either (24). Huck's mother is mentioned only in the same context: "Your mother couldn't read, and she couldn't write, nuther, before she died" (24). Huck never mentions the rest of the family at all, perhaps because he "don't take no stock in dead people" (2).
Regardless of the cause, Huck's complete lack of interest in them indicates that the other family members have not influenced him in any substantial way.

By the time Huck stages his own murder and escapes from Pap, "the father who is no father" (Gibson 103), Twain presents a good deal of information about Pap and his relationship with Huck, enough for the reader to determine that, although Huck's remaining family member influences him in comparatively insignificant ways, he is not the source of Huck's innocence. Pap was once a resident of St. Petersburg, well-known if not well-respected by its citizens (Twain, Adventures 10), having held the position of "Town Drunkard, an exceedingly well-defined and unofficial office of those days" (Twain, Autobiography 73). As a member of "Tom Sawyer's Gang" says, however, "he [Huck] hain't got no family," because while Huck has a father, "you can't never find him, these days. He used to lay drunk with the hogs in the tanyard, but he hain't been seen in these parts for a year or more" (10). Pap's direct influence on his son in the recent past has been, therefore, limited.

Several of Huck's comments about Pap, however, indicate that he and Pap have spent quite a bit of time together in the more distant past; Huck knows Pap well. When Pap suddenly reappears, Huck says that he "used to be scared of him" because of the frequent beatings he received (23).
Huck knows that the best way to deal with Pap is to let him do as he wants: "If I never learnt nothing else out of pap, I learnt that the best way to get along with his kind of people is to let them have their own way" (165). This statement implies that Huck also learned other lessons from Pap. Huck also knows that "whenever his liquor begun to work, he [Pap] most always went for the govment" (33).

Having spent enough time with Pap to fear him, learn how to deal with him effectively, and predict the content of his drunken monologues, Huck of course shows some additional evidence of Pap's influence. Beaver notes some of these relatively trivial similarities:

But they have much in common. Pap may cuss and get roaring drink; Huck just smokes. . . . He smokes cheap chewing tobacco--even cigars when he can lay hands on them--but never touches liquor. His superstitions, too, seem largely to derive from Pap. His belief in ghosts and the significance of 'signs' all sound like Pap. . . . He spots the sign of the cross, made with nails in Pap's left boot-heel, to ward off the devil (Beaver 80).

Another example of Pap's influence is the informal instruction he gives Huck in the skills of lying and stealing. These are both "natural" activities that children
engage in readily. After a few years of discouragement and punishment, however, most persons make at least a pretense of following society's restrictions on these activities, regardless of the pleasures or material gains they may bring. Huck has not learned this restraint. Instead, from Pap he has learned that lying and stealing are valid survival skills, skills worthy of improvement and cultivation, and Huck's implementation of these skills bears the mark of Pap's instruction.

Pap's lessons about theft have been quite specific. He has taught Huck both what to steal and how to rationalize the thefts:

Pap always said, take a chicken when you get a chance, because if you don't want him yourself you can easy find somebody that does, and a good deed ain't ever forgot. I never see pap when he didn't want the chicken himself, but that is what he used to say, anyway (79).

Regarding other stolen items, Pap has told Huck that "it warn't no harm to borrow things, if you was meaning to pay them back, sometime ..." (80).

Huck feels some stirrings of conscience over his "borrowing," but Pap's lessons prove their durability:

The widow said it [borrowing] warn't anything but a soft name for stealing, and no decent body would
do it. Jim said he reckoned the widow was partly right and pap was partly right; so the best way would be for us to pick out two or three things from the list and say we wouldn't borrow them any more--then he reckoned it wouldn't be no harm to borrow the others. . . . We got it all settled satisfactory, and concluded to drop crabapples and p'simmons. We warn't feeling just right, before that, but it was all comfortable now. I was glad the way it come out, too, because crabapples ain't ever good, and the p'simmons wouldn't be ripe for two or three months yet (80).

Another "natural" skill that Huck has improved through Pap's influence, probably through observation rather than direct instruction, is lying. Huck knows in detail, for instance, Pap's rather involved lie presented for the benefit of St. Petersburg's new judge, Pap's short-lived performance "of a man that's started in on a new life . . ." (26-27). This lie is initially quite successful, but Pap's project lasts less than a day, only until he gets "thirsty" (27).

This lie to the judge is somewhat unusual behavior for Pap, for he is usually quite straightforward in both his words and actions. For example, Pap takes direct action when he initially tries to claim Huck's money: "Next day he
[Pap] was drunk, and he went to Judge Thatcher's and bullyragged him and tried to make him give up the money, but he couldn't, and then he swore he'd make the law force him" (26). The short episode in the new judge's home contains the novel's only clear example of one of Pap's lies, but his basically convincing skill shows that he is both experienced and resourceful, just as Huck proves to be during his journey down the river.

Huck surpasses his tutor, however, for he lies more often and with generally more success than Pap. He sees this skill as practical and quite valuable: "I reckon a body that ups and tells the truth when he is in a tight place, is taking considerable many resks; though I ain't had no experience, and can't say for certain ..." (239). When Huck is forced to lie in defense of the Duke and the Dauphin as they attempt to steal the estate of Harvey Wilks, about a subject with which he is unfamiliar, Dr. Robinson tells him that "you ain't used to lying, it don't seem to come handy; what you want is practice. You do it pretty awkward" (253). Huck's unspoken reply again expresses his attitude toward lying: "I didn't care nothing for the compliment ..." (253).

Pap is not the only person available who can teach Huck the skills of stealing and lying before he begins his escape downriver. In both these areas, however, Huck's actions
bear closer similarities to Pap's actions than to anyone else's. Huck believes that most people lie, except those he recognizes as his moral superiors: "I never seen anybody but lied, one time or another, without it was aunt Polly, or the widow, or maybe Mary" (1). Even though he is almost certainly wrong about these women, the remaining group gives Huck a large number of potential teachers, in addition to Pap, before he starts downriver. The most prominent member of this group is his friend Tom, whose lies Huck consistently and often skeptically reports. Pap's lies, however, resemble Huck's much more closely than Tom's do and therefore point to Pap as Huck's primary model or teacher in this subject. Tom's lies are most often simply the verbal expression of his private literary fantasies. Huck's evaluation of Tom's stories about genies, lamps, iron rings, Arabs, and elephants illustrates the usual nature of Tom's lies (17).

Pap's and Huck's lies, contrasted with Tom's, are directed toward pragmatic, practical ends. Pap's lie to St. Petersburg's judge about his suddenly-discovered urge for sobriety, for example, is intended to help Pap obtain Huck's money. Pap believes this wealth would yield benefits in both his social and physical environments:

I says, look at my hat--if you call it a hat--but the lid raises up and the rest of it goes down
till it's below my chin, and then it ain't rightly a hat at all, but more like my head was shoved up through a jint o' stove-pipe. Look at it, says I--such a hat for me to wear--one of the wealthiest men in this town, if I could git my rights (33).

Similarly, Huck constructs his own lies with practical results in mind, such as when he constructs a convincing trail of physical clues that leads Pap, the widow, and the rest of St. Petersburg to believe that he is dead. This lie gives Huck anonymity and freedom from his past until his chance meeting with Tom weeks later. As he escapes from the cabin, Huck thinks about Tom's talents for deception: "I did wish Tom Sawyer was there, I knowed he would take an interest in this kind of business, and throw in the fancy touches" (41). On his own, Huck draws only on his own practical knowledge of life in the woods and follows no external influence resembling Tom's literary models. The relative directness of Huck's lie and its practical end, his freedom, illustrate the close kinship Huck's lies share with Pap's and sets Huck's fabrications apart from those of Tom.

Huck also uses a similar lie to protect both his and Jim's freedom when he misdirects two slave-hunters and allows them to reach their own conclusions about the contents of the raft:
"I will [tell the truth], sir, I will, honest--but don't leave us, please. It's the--the--gentlemen, if you'll only pull ahead, and let me heave you the head-line, you won't have to come a-near the raft--please do."

"Set her back, John, set her back!" says one. They backed water. "Keep away, boy--keep to looard. Confound it, I just expect the wind has blewed it to us. Your pap's got the small-pox, and you know it precious well. Why didn't you come out and say so? Do you want to spread it all over?" (126-127).

Huck witnesses less theft than lying, at least before he leaves St. Peters burg, so the available number of potential teachers is correspondingly less for this behavior than for lying. Tom and Pap are again the individuals whose actions are most likely to influence Huck, but Huck's actions bear far more resemblance to Pap's than to Tom's.

Tom's thievery is basically inconsequential in any practical sense. If he really steals at all, the act produces only props for his fantasies. Huck's disgusted comment about the demise of Tom's gang describes the usual results of Tom's sort of theft:

We hadn't robbed nobody, we hadn't killed any people, but only just pretended. We used to hop
out of the woods and go charging down on hog-drovers and women in carts taking garden stuff to market, but we never hived any of them. Tom Sawyer called the hogs "ingots," and he called the turnips and stuff "julery" and we would go to the cave and pow-wow over what we had done and how many people we had killed and marked. But I couldn't see no profit in it (14).

In contrast, Huck's reports about Pap's thievery are inconclusive and sometimes speculative, such as when he says that Pap's rifle is probably stolen (30), and that Pap would "borrow" a canoe if he needed one (130). Through his other comments about his father, however, Huck proves that his observations are both astute and accurate; they indicate that Pap is a habitual thief and that he steals items that have practical value. Huck learns Pap's lessons well and uses these skills often during his trip down the river: "sometimes I lifted a chicken that warn't roosting comfortable, and took him along." Huck also says that "mornings, before daylight, I slipped into corn fields and borrowed a watermelon, or a mushmelon, or a punkin, or some new corn, or things of that kind" (79-80).

Huck and Pap share little else beyond these skills in lying and stealing. A more detailed comparison of their behaviors and personalities yields many more differences
than similarities. Beaver develops a similar argument around some of their more obvious differences:

Each is a kind of mirror image of the other. Each, throughout *Huckleberry Finn*, will seem a reverse image of the other. Whereas Old Finn will be officially alive (though actually dead), Young Finn will be officially dead (though actually alive). . . . Whereas Old Finn (the confirmed bigot) rants at Blacks, Young Finn (the sentimental bigot) will accompany and shelter a Black on the run (Beaver 80).

One useful comparison that helps clarify these differences is that between Huck's and Pap's own evaluations of their qualitative kinship. Whether Pap himself takes a conscious inventory of his and his son's similarities and differences is unclear, but he demonstrates his assumption that they are basically alike when he verbally abuses Huck for being "a good deal of a big-bug" (23):

*Ain't* you a sweet-scented dandy, though? A bed; and bedclothes; and a look'n-glass; and a piece of carpet on the floor—and your own father got to sleep with the hogs in the tanyard. I never see such a son. I bet I'll take some o' these frills out o' you before I'm done with you. Why there ain't no end to your airs . . . (24-25).
To Pap, all of the changes he sees in Huck simply overlay the basic similarities that he assumes exist:

- You've put on considerable many frills since I been away. . . . You're educated, too, they say; can read and write. You think you're better than your father, now, don't you, because he can't? (24).

Pap continues on this subject: "I'll learn people to bring up a boy to put on airs over his own father and let on to be better'n what he is" (24).

Pap's words to describe the changes he sees in Huck, repeated throughout the above passages, clearly display his belief that he and Huck are basically similar: "put on considerable many frills," "think you're better'n your father," "put on airs," and "let on" (24). These "airs" are, in fact, superficial and temporary additions to Huck's life, but Pap does not or cannot see this.

Unlike Pap, Huck recognizes their differences, although his recognition is intuitive, not conscious. This recognition is complicated by Huck's rather poor opinion of himself, expressed when he says,

I thought it all out, and I reckoned I would belong to the widow's [Providence], if he wanted me, though I couldn't make out how he was going to be any better off then than what he was before,
seeing I was so ignorant and so kind of low-down and ornery (14).

Later in the novel, when Huck experiences his first major trial of conscience as Jim strains for a sight of Cairo and freedom, Huck believes that he has behaved wrongly, turned away the slave hunters, because of his background:

I knowed very well I had done wrong, and I see it warn't no use for me to try to learn to do right; a body that don't get started right when he's little, ain't got no show--when the pinch comes there ain't nothing to back him up and keep him to his work, and so he gets beat (127).

In spite of his poor self-image and lack of a clear grasp of his own identity, Huck refers to "his [Pap's] kind of people" when he realizes that the Duke and the Dauphin are only poor imitations of royalty, and clearly does not include himself within this group of "low-down humbugs and frauds" (165). Huck expresses this recognition when he sets out to rescue Jim:

I reckoned I better start in on my plan straight off, without fooling around, because I wanted to stop Jim's mouth till these fellows could get away. I didn't want no trouble with their kind. I'd seen all I wanted to of them, and wanted to
get entirely shut of them (274-275).

The mutual emotional distance between Huck and Pap also emphasizes their differences. For Huck, this feeling shows that his recognition of separateness from Pap is both unconscious as well as conscious; there is no bond between them. When Pap appears in Huck's bedroom after a year's absence, Huck has little emotional reaction; Huck even discovers that he is no longer afraid of Pap:

I used to be scared of him all the time, he tanned me so much. I reckoned I was scared now, too; but in a minute I see I was mistaken. That is, after the first jolt, as you may say, when my breath sort of hitched—he being so unexpected; but right away after, I see I warn't scared of him worth bothering about (23).

Pap also shows a decided lack of familial warmth during this encounter with Huck; Pap's emotions demonstrate that he does at least unconsciously recognize the many substantial differences between him and his son. Pap first threatens to beat Huck several times because he continues to "meddle with such hifalut'n foolishness" as education (24). His anger is genuine, not just an excuse for mistreatment of Huck: "Pap listens for half a minute; then swipes the revolutionary and patriotic text out of Huck's hand. Pap is not drunk. . . . Old Finn bears a grudge, a deep grudge. He is a disposed..."
White in an embattled stance against the whole bookish establishment" (Beaver 82).

Pap soon, however, gets to the real point of his visit, Huck's money: "I've been in town two days, and I hain't heard nothing but about you bein' rich. I heard about it away down the river, too. That's why I come. You git me that money to-morrow--I want it" (25). Pap shows no sign that he accepts the explanation that Huck himself believes, "I hain't got no money" (25), and threatens to beat Huck again, until he is "black and blue," if he does not "raise some money for him" (26). Affection for Huck has no part in Pap's motivations.

Huck's and Pap's contrasting personalities are also illuminated in Kenneth S. Lynn's article "You Can't Go Home Again." Lynn develops his claim that "the day after Pap tries to kill Huck with a claspknife, Huck manages to escape from the cabin by committing symbolic suicide and murder":

So that his Pap will not pursue him, Huck simulates his own death by killing a wild pig and distributing its blood around the cabin; but this act has a double meaning, which emerges only when we recall Pap Finn's notorious habit of lying drunk amongst the hogs in the tanyard, as well as the drunkard's slobberingly self-pitying identification of himself with his sleeping
companions: "There's the hand that was the hand of a hog." Huck's slaughter of the pig not only symbolizes his desire to end his own miserable life, but to slay his father and the sordid animality of his ways (400).

While Lynn's assessment of Huck's motivations is detailed, it is, however, incorrect; Huck shows no desire for murder or suicide, symbolic or otherwise. A comparison of Lynn's view with Huck's demonstrated motivations, and lack of them, serves not only to illustrate Huck's personality but also points out further differences between Huck and Pap.

Lynn's claim that Huck's killing of the pig demonstrates his desire for suicide also does not fit the available evidence. Of course, Huck does refer to suicide several times, but his thoughts usually seem to be merely metaphorical, as if he tries to describe a feeling for which he lacks more precise words (Beaver 160), or which he attempts to describe through common expressions that he has overheard. For Huck, the effect is similar to that he describes when he attempts to convey his impressions of drifting down the moonlit Mississippi: "Everything was dead quiet, and it looked late, and smelt late. You know what I mean--I don't know the words to put it in" (42).

In Chapter 1, for example, Huck sits alone in his room
after a long and boring evening with the widow and Miss Watson: "Then I set down in a chair by the window and tried to think of something cheerful, but it warn't no use. I felt so lonesome I most wished I was dead" (4). When he arrives at the Phelps' farm, the sounds he encounters evoke the same ideas and feelings:

When I got there it was all still and Sunday-like, and hot and sunshiny . . . and there was them kind of faint dronings of bugs and flies in the air that makes it seem so lonesome and like everybody's dead and gone. . . . As a general thing, it makes a body wish he was dead, too, and done with it all (276).

The sound of a spinning wheel then encourages Huck's imagination still further, and he again attempts to describe his feelings:

When I got a little ways, I heard the dim hum of a spinning wheel wailing along up and sinking along down again: and then I knowed for certain I wished I was dead--for that is the lonesomest sound in the whole world (277).

In spite of his words, Huck's references to suicide do not have their roots in his own feelings; they are not accompanied by self-disgust, and he demonstrates none of his father's own self-destructive tendencies. For Huck, the
above references are only a means of expressing his own temporary melancholy.

At least once Huck uses a reference to death, similar to his references to suicide, only for dramatic effect, separate from his own feelings. When he lies to convince the ferryboat operator to go to the wrecked steamboat, Huck says, "all of us was saved but Bill Whipple—and oh, he was the best cretur!—I most wish it had been me, I do" (90). Later, when Huck finds that the robbers have drowned, his mood is somber, but he is not depressed:

I pulled all around her [the wreck], and hollered a little, but there wasn't any answer; all dead still. I felt a little bit heavy-hearted about the gang, but not much, for I reckoned if they could stand it, I could (91).

Also, concerning Lynn's reference to Huck's "own miserable life," Huck generally expresses quite different emotions than those Lynn assumes. In the first part of the novel, before Huck escapes from Pap at the cabin and the section which Lynn addresses in this part of his argument, Huck is satisfied with much of his life. In Chapter 1, upon his return to his "old rags" and "sugar-hogshead," he is "free and satisfied" (1). Even when Huck is again subject to the widow's foreign ways, restrictions, and discipline, he is ambivalent but not miserable: "I liked the old ways
best, but I was getting so I liked the new ones, too, a little bit" (18). At this time Huck also enjoys his membership in "Tom Sawyer's Gang" (9), a diversion that lasts "about a month," until the discrepancies between Tom's fantasies and reality cause all the gang's members to quit, not just Huck (14). Until Pap reappears and Huck "gives" his money to Judge Thatcher (19-20), Huck even implies that he enjoys his wealth in some fashion:

Tom and me found the money that the robbers hid in the cave, and it made us rich. We got six thousand dollars apiece—all gold. It was an awful sight of money when it was piled up. . . . It fetched us a dollar a day apiece, all the year round—more than a body could tell what to do with (1). 

Even at the cabin, when Pap becomes too abusive, Huck may indeed be miserable, but he takes a pragmatic approach to his predicament:

By and by pap got too handy with his hick'ry, and I couldn't stand it. I was all over welts. He got to going away so much, too, and locking me in. Once he locked me in and was gone three days. . . . I made up my mind I would fix up some way to leave there (30-31).

Suicide, as a possible way to end this unpleasant situation,
does not enter Huck's thoughts.

More proof to support the claim that Huck harbors no suicidal desires appears in Chapter 8, and also gives direct evidence of Huck's thoughts and motivations. When Huck thinks himself alone on Jackson's Island and feels "lonesome," he takes deliberate action to relieve his loneliness, and does not proceed from that emotion to depression. Huck remedies this condition simply by sitting by the water, watching and listening to his surroundings (48).

The second part of Lynn's interpretation, that Huck commits symbolic murder, requires that Huck share at least some of Pap's capacity for anger and violence. In contrast, Leslie Fiedler refers to Huck as "the most non-violent of American fictional children... He runs, hides, equivocates, dodges, and, when he can do nothing else, suffers" (426-427). Lynn's argument falters because nowhere in the novel does Huck behave violently, and he also shows an unusual lack of anger, even in provocative circumstances. As Beaver points out, "Young Huck had survived at least nine attempts on his life. Within less than six months it had been threatened..." (119).

Huck shows no anger, for example, when Pap tries to kill him, and he holds a gun on Pap only as a defense against Pap's knife (35-37). Huck's plans for escape from
the cabin also provide insight into his character, for Huck shows no anger toward Pap and plans no revenge:

I reckoned I would walk off with the gun and some lines, and take to the woods when I run away. I guessed I wouldn't stay in one place, but just tramp right across the country, mostly night times, and hunt and fish to keep alive, and so get so far away that the old man nor the widow couldn't ever find me any more (32).

When Huck lies to Jim about being lost in the fog in Chapter 15, Jim tells him that he is "trash . . . what people is dat puts dirt on de head er dey fren's en makes 'em ashamed" (105). The reaction of most whites to Jim's indignant outburst would undoubtedly be anger, but Huck only feels ashamed: "It made me feel so mean I could almost kissed his foot to get him to take it back" (105).

Just as the above comparisons between Huck and Pap yield both similarities and differences, an examination of Pap in the light of Huck's innocence shows that Pap has some of its qualities and lacks others. For example, Pap has the quality of sensibility; like Huck, he generally looks to his feelings rather than his reason to guide his actions.

Even though Pap follows his sensibility more often than his reason, especially when drunk, he is also capable of deliberate thought and action. Pap demonstrates this
ability as he attempts to take Huck's money. Huck tells Pap that he has no money to give him: "I hain't got no money. ... You ask Judge Thatcher; he'll tell you the same" (25). Pap does not believe this explanation, and, in response, he immediately devises a plan to verify Huck's story and take possession of Huck's money: "All right. I'll ask him; and I'll make him pungle, too, or I'll know the reason why" (25). Even though Pap's method is rather ill-considered, he follows through on his idea and plans a logical next step when he fails:

Next day he was drunk, and he went to Judge Thatcher's and bullyragged him and tried to make him give up the money, but he couldn't, and then he swore he'd make the law force him (26).

Later, in spite of all his careful work directed toward pleasing the new judge and the possibility that this route might lead him to Huck's money, Pap betrays himself as his more powerful sensibility asserts itself over his rationality:

Then they tucked the old man into a beautiful room, which was the spare room, and in the night some time he got powerful thirsty and clumb out onto the porch-roof and slid down a stanchion and traded his new coat for a jug of forty-rod, and clumb back again and had a good old time. ...
And when they come to look at that spare room, they had to take soundings before they could navigate it (27).

In addition to the sensibility they share, Pap and Huck also have in common another element of Huck's innocence, his primitivism. Like Huck, Pap is an outcast within the conventional world of St. Petersburg. Pap is unwelcome here for several reasons, including his frequent drunkenness and abuse of Huck and others. Pap's general behavior is also marked by an active, if implicit, disregard for the "respectable" standards of St. Petersburg; Pap makes and has made deliberate choices that have led to his outcast state. For instance, based on his ability to climb in and out of second-story windows, Pap demonstrates that he is able-bodied enough to work for a living if he wanted (23, 27). Also, as Huck points out, Pap is well along in life (23). If he wanted to change, Pap could certainly have done so by now.

Marked by his reputation as well as his actions, Pap, like Huck, often chooses life away from most other people, whether this is somewhere on the river or in a dilapidated cabin in the dense woods (25, 29). While Pap does not seem to mind the frequent conflicts that arise when he is in town, and which result in his frequent stays in jail, his more common absence from St. Petersburg indicates an overall
preference for the natural world. Pap does not directly communicate his attitudes toward his wilderness environment, but his year-long absence from St. Petersburg and the environments he chooses during and after this period demonstrate that his primitivism is approximately as strong as Huck's. Both choose the wilderness over civilization for long periods of time. When he reappears, Pap tells Huck that he has been "away down the river" (25), not in another town.

Although Pap and Huck both demonstrate primitivism and sensibility, Pap is not the source of Huck's innocence because he lacks its most distinctive element, active morality. Being guided by the negative emotions of greed and anger, Pap performs actions that are also negative; nowhere does he demonstrate any tendency to perform positive actions. In addition to reporting Pap's actions throughout the novel's first few chapters, including Pap's drunkenness, his abuse of Huck and others, his lying, and his stealing, Huck also includes a short summary of Pap's life in St. Petersburg that accurately reflects the anger and greed of his morality. Soon after Pap reappears, Huck says that

Every now and then I'd borrow two or three dollars off the judge for him, to keep from getting a cowhiding. Every time he got money he got drunk; and every time he got drunk he raised Cain around
town; and every time he raised Cain he got jailed. He was just suited--this kind of thing was right in his line (29).

Although Tom, Miss Watson, the widow, and Pap each have in common with Huck at least one element of his natural innocence, each also lacks at least one of these elements. With the exception of their sensibility, which they possess in amounts roughly equal to Huck's, the elements of natural innocence they do possess are not as strong as his. Their primitivism, for instance, is not as strong as Huck's. The Widow Douglas and Miss Watson demonstrate a weak and infrequent primitivism, and Tom and Pap, who express a comparatively strong primitivism, still do not seek the comfort and security of the natural world as commonly as Huck. These characters also either lack active morality or possess less of this quality than Huck; Tom, Miss Watson, and Pap lack active morality and the widow's is rather weak. For these reasons, none of these individuals can be the single source from which Huck's natural innocence is derived.

Because Huck's environment contains no individual who can serve as the single source of his innocence, an alternative explanation for his possession of this quality is that he synthesizes it from several sources. Huck's comments about two separate subjects, dead people and
mathematics, contain an implied answer to this explanation. Although Huck's comments do not directly address his innocence, which he is unaware of in any case, the emotion behind Huck's words expresses the consistent self-containment of his personality: "I don't take no stock in dead people" (2) and "I don't take no stock in mathematics, anyway" (18). In the same way, Huck usually "takes no stock" in the personal qualities displayed by others.

Miss Watson, the widow, Pap, and Tom each present Huck with different individual qualities that he could emulate. As he is exposed to these qualities, Huck examines and compares them to his own, sometimes consciously, sometimes subconsciously; he usually finds these qualities substantially different from his own and dismisses them quickly. For example, both Miss Watson and Pap display differing versions of conventional morality. A distinguishing measure of this morality is its support of slavery, and both of these characters openly support slavery (34, 53). Huck finds this morality lacking and does not substitute their standards for his own, as shown by his early declaration of support for Jim:

Well, I did [say I wouldn't tell]. I said I wouldn't, and I'll stick to it. Honest injun I will. People would call me a low down Ablitionist
and despise me for keeping mum--but that don't make no difference (52-53).

Even when other characters' qualities are more similar to his own, Huck still rejects them. Also, each element of Huck's innocence is far stronger in his own personality than in any of these other characters, almost as if the other characters unsuccessfully try to emulate him. Tom Sawyer, for instance, displays a primitivism based only on his need for an isolated place to act out literary fantasies. Huck finally rejects both Tom's fantasies and his version of primitivism when Tom tries to convince him of the reality of genies: "So then I judged that all that stuff was only just one of Tom Sawyer's lies" (17). Pap's primitivism, however, is more like Huck's than Tom's; on one level, both Huck and Pap seek escape from a conventional society because they are unwelcome within it. While Pap's primitivism follows from his violation of relatively trivial social rules about behavior, such as his drinking, Huck's results from his need to express a morality based on compassion that conflicts with the demands of slavery. Twain addresses the attitudes surrounding slavery in a notebook entry:

In those old slave-holding days the whole community was agreed as to one thing--the awful sacredness of slave property. To help steal a horse or a cow was a low crime, but to help a
hunted slave, or feed him or shelter him, or hide him, or comfort him, in his troubles, his terrors, his despair, or hesitate to promptly betray him to the slave-catcher when opportunity offered was a much baser crime, & carried with it a stain, a moral smirch which nothing could wipe away (Twain qtd. in Blair xx-xxi).

Because Pap's morality does not conflict with this basic tenet of conventional society, he is somewhat more acceptable than Huck, but Huck does not adopt his father's values to change his own status.

The Widow Douglas also presents Huck with a quality similar to one of his own; she shows a limited degree of active morality. Huck expresses this element of his innocence to a far greater extent and does not limit his morality to match the widow's. While the widow limits her defense of Jim to a discussion with her sister (53), Huck takes action to rescue Jim from slavery, beginning with their escape from Jackson's Island (75). With no single model of natural innocence available to him, and with no examples of individual characteristics available that are acceptable to his own moral self-containment, Huck's innocence can only come from within himself; it is entirely innate.
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CHAPTER III

"SET HER LOOSE, JIM, WE'RE ALL RIGHT, NOW!"

Huck's primitivism, his preference for the freedom of the woods and river, both begins and ends his narrative. In Chapter 1, Huck flees the widow for the safety of the outdoors: "Living in a house, and sleeping in a bed, pulled on me pretty tight, mostly, but before the cold weather I used to slide out and sleep in the woods, sometimes, and so that was a rest to me" (18). He ends his story with the intention to "light out for the Territory ahead of the rest, because aunt Sally she's going to adopt me and sivilize me and I can't stand it" (362). The restrictions Huck flees in these instances arise from essentially a world of the mothers, that is to say, of what Christianity has become among the females who sustain it just behind the advancing frontier. It is a sufficiently simple-minded world in which one does not cuss or steal or smoke but keeps clean, wears shoes, and prays for spiritual gifts" (Fiedler 18).

Between these two events Huck's primitivism repeatedly asserts itself as he flees other, different hazards. Huck
always feels far more at home in the woods or on the raft than he does when he is subject to or part of any community that restricts even slightly the expression of his natural innocence. Huck's primitivism, however, is most obvious when he retreats from restrictions more serious than the discomforts of being civilized and seeks freedom for both himself and Jim.

Huck's next expression of primitivism, after he escapes the "dismal regular and decent" life of the widow (1), appears in his escape from Pap's cabin to Jackson's Island. In this short journey, Huck continues his flight from the widow's well-intentioned efforts at his domestication and begins his escape from Pap's abuse. His goal is to "get so far away that the old man nor the widow couldn't ever find me any more" (32). Huck's escape from the "disreputable prison" of Pap's cabin (Lynn 399), and from Pap's near-murderous assault, also marks a shift from the relative safety and fairly innocuous discomforts of St. Petersburg to the often life-threatening dangers Huck faces later on the river.

Having successfully left both his unwelcome guardians behind in his nocturnal escape, the next morning Huck expresses the satisfaction that he always finds in freedom from the restrictions of others: "The sun was up so high when I waked, that I judged it was after eight o'clock. I
laid there in the grass and the cool shade, thinking about things and feeling rested and ruther comfortable and satisfied" (45).

The importance of an unrestricted environment to Huck and the comfort and satisfaction he finds in it are also displayed when the solitude of the island begins to bother him:

When it was dark I set by my camp fire smoking, and feeling pretty satisfied; but by and by it got sort of lonesome, and so I went and set 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 (48).

Huck and Jim's successful escape from the island marks the beginning of their journey by raft, and, for the first time, Huck is truly at ease. He has at last put the barriers of distance and time between himself and his former captors:

It was kind of solemn, drifting down the big still river, laying on our backs looking up at the stars, and we didn't ever feel like talking loud, and it warn't often that we laughed, only a little
kind of a low chuckle. We had mighty good weather, as a general thing, and nothing ever happened to us at all, that night, nor the next, nor the next (78).

"The fifth night below St. Louis" (80), Huck and Jim make the mistake of boarding the wrecked steamboat Walter Scott and must then escape from the "gang of murderers" (85). This is an escape from a hostile and oppressive morality, but it also involves dangers that Huck and Jim have not faced in earlier escapes. Jake Packard and Bill have, and would likely enforce, their own particular moral code, expressed in their plans for Jim Turner, their fellow looter who lies tied up in a stateroom:

"Now I say it ain't agoin' to be more'n two hours befo' this wrack breaks up and washes off down the river. See? He'll be drownded, and won't have nobody to blame for it but his own self. I reckon that's a considerable sight better'n killin' of him. I'm unfavorable to killin' a man as long as you can git around it; it ain't good sense, it ain't good morals. Ain't I right?"

"Yes--I reck'n you are" (84).

The morality of these criminals and their will to enforce it makes Huck's and Jim's escape more of a matter of survival
rather than only that of an unpleasant return to some form of captivity.

The days immediately following this escape are once again a pleasant time for Huck and Jim: "Two or three days and nights went by; I reckon I might say they swum by, they slid along so quiet and smooth and lovely" (156). The two fugitives' respite is short-lived, however. A few days later Huck rescues the Duke and the Dauphin from angry townspeople (159), and this begins a new period of captivity for Huck and Jim.

The Duke and the Dauphin are not so dangerous as either the Sheperdsons or the looters on the Walter Scott; they are only petty criminals, not murderers. They have in common with the others from whom Huck and Jim have escaped, however, a morality that conflicts with Huck's and threatens his and Jim's freedom. Huck's initial and correct concern about the duke and king is that they might discover and expose his and Jim's true identities and purpose:

They asked us considerable many questions; wanted to know what we covered up the raft that way for, and laid by in the daytime instead of running--was Jim a runaway nigger? (166).

As Huck suspects, and in spite of their many moral differences with conventional society, the duke and king share with this society a support of slavery. They
demonstrate this support when the king, with the duke's subsequent approval, later sells Jim in Chapter 31 (268, 273). Huck himself makes little distinction between his own circumstances and Jim's; he believes that they both risk capture and captivity. As Huck says just before he rescues the king and duke, "I thought I was a goner, for whenever anybody was after anybody I judged it was me--or maybe Jim" (158-159). The two criminals' control over Huck and Jim comes primarily from this threat to their freedom.

With more than enough reason to escape the king and duke, Huck tries at each infrequent opportunity. Huck's first attempt comes when he is accidentally released during the excitement as Peter Wilks is exhumed. When he reaches the raft, Huck's words once more show the intensity of his desire for the freedom of the river:

Out with you Jim, and set her loose! Glory be to goodness, we're shut of them! . . . So, in two seconds, away we went, a sliding down the river, and it did seem so good to be free again and all by ourselves on the big river and nobody to bother us (258-259).

Because the king and duke also evade the crowd at the graveyard and make their way back to the raft, this escape is short-lived. Huck tries once more when the king and duke become preoccupied with each other during an argument in "a
little bit of a shabby village, named Pikesville" (266). He sets out for the raft again, convinced that this time he and Jim are finally free, and he once more shows the happiness that this prospect brings him:

I lit out, and shook the reefs out of my hind legs, and spun down the river road like a deer--for I see our chance; and I made up my mind that it would be a long day before they ever see me and Jim again. I got down there all out of breath but loaded up with joy, and sung out--

"Set her loose, Jim, we're all right, now!"

(266).

Rather than an escape down the river on the raft with Jim, the best "home" Huck has ever known, he instead finds the raft empty; Jim has already been sold to Silas Phelps. In his attempt to rescue Jim, Huck is soon caught up in the "evasion," and his further plans for escape are effectively blunted by Tom's elaborate schemes. Although Huck never loses his desire to flee conventional society for the relative safety of the river, he does not again come as close to freedom as he does in the above passage.

The sensibility and active morality, or lack of it, of several secondary characters, Pap, Tom, the Widow Douglas, and Miss Watson, have been discussed separately, as separate qualities. This organization is used and is effective for
two reasons. First, in comparison to the information Twain gives about Huck, he gives the reader little information about these other characters; their appearances in the novel are relatively brief. This lack of information makes correspondences between these qualities less clear than they are in Huck's personality. Second, these characters' sensibility, even though they share the general quality with Huck, differs substantially from his. Their sensibility is essentially a need to conform, to meet the demands of conventional society. Their basically conventional morality satisfies this sensibility but is at times shifting and ill-defined because of inconsistencies within the demands of society or within themselves.

Huck demonstrates, however, along with Jim, direct correspondence between his sensibility and morality; the two qualities are intertwined. For this reason, they are discussed together, not separately. Just as for these other characters, Huck's morality satisfies his sensibility. The important difference between them is that Huck's sensibility is not based on a need to conform but on compassion. His active morality is composed of his efforts to satisfy his sensibility. This satisfaction is, at times, complicated by the conflicting demands of external, conventional society, but Huck's sensibility itself contains no conflicts and he resolves external conflicts in favor of his own innate
qualities. Additionally, Huck traces his thoughts for the reader during these conflicts, which makes clear the relationship between sensibility and his morality; he is "explicitly conscious of his own thought processes" (Beaver 84).

Huck's sensibility and active morality emerge several times in his story, but the most telling examples appear when he or someone else is faced with death or loss of freedom. The first of these extreme circumstances occurs after Huck and Jim escape Jake and Bill on the wrecked Walter Scott. After their own raft drifts away, Huck and Jim take the looters' boat to save themselves from either drowning or murder: "Shut up on a wreck with such a gang as that! But it warn't no time to be sentimentering. We'd got to find that boat, now--had to have it for ourselves" (86).

As Huck and Jim drift to safety "three or four hundred yards down stream" (87), Huck then realizes that the looters are in danger of drowning. Huck feels compassion for the men, even though he saw them as a threat to his life only moments earlier:

Now was the first time that I begun to worry about the men--I reckon I hadn't had time to, before. I begun to think how dreadful it was, even for murderers, to be in such a fix. I says to myself, there ain't no telling but I might come to be a
murderer myself, yet, and then how would I like it? (87).

Huck's next reaction to the looters' "fix" gives an example of his active morality at its best, without the delay between intention and action that sometimes occurs when Huck wrestles with his conventionally-trained conscience:

The first place we see, we'll land a hundred yards below it or above it, in a place where it's a good hiding place for you and the skiff, and then I'll go and fix up some kind of a yarn, and get somebody to go for that gang and get them out of their scrape, so they can be hung when their time comes (87).

Although Huck recognizes drowning in the river on a stormy night as an unpleasant sort of death, he is not so naive as to dismiss the looters' crimes or their likely punishment upon rescue. Huck follows his plan and is successful in finding a rescuer for the criminals. The men drown anyway; Huck's lack of success in this instance does not change his intentions or his actions.

When Huck happens upon the Duke and the Dauphin, he again feels compassion for men in a dangerous situation and immediately takes action to help them. The Duke and Dauphin, Huck says, "begged me to save their lives--said
they hadn't been doing nothing, and was being chased for it--said there was men and dogs a-coming" (159).

Without hesitation, Huck gives them directions to throw off their pursuers:

I don't hear the dogs and horses yet; you've got time to crowd through the brush and get up the crick a little ways; then you take to the water and wade down to me and get in--that'll throw the dogs off the scent (159).

Huck also demonstrates his sensibility and active morality as he assists Jim in his escape from slavery. Huck does not take action as quickly in these instances as those discussed above; the interference of his socially-trained conscience, defined by Henry Nash Smith as "simply the attitudes he has taken over from his environment" (122), causes his hesitation. Concerning Huck's struggles, James Cox writes that

the conscience, after all is said and done, is the real tyrant in the book. It is the relentless force which pursues Huckleberry Finn; it is the tyrant from which he seeks freedom. And it is not only the social conscience which threatens Huck, but any conscience (Fate 172-173).

Regardless of the interference of his conscience, the final decisions Huck reaches reflect both his own compassion
and his sensibility as he follows this feeling, not the demands of conscience. About Huck's temporary dilemmas concerning Jim, Twain wrote, "In a crucial moral emergency... a sound heart & a deformed conscience come into collision & conscience suffers defeat" (Twain qtd. in Blair xx). As Huck wrestles with his conscience after these collisions, he also demonstrates the underlying consistency and strength of his moral self-containment; in spite of his very real discomfort during these struggles, he always proceeds from sensibility to active morality.

Huck's first major battle with his conscience occurs as he and Jim "look out sharp" for Cairo, Illinois: "He [Jim] said he'd be mighty sure to see it, because he'd be a free man the minute he seen it, but if he missed it he'd be in the slave country again and no more show for freedom" (123).

Huck plans to go ashore in the canoe and verify their location, and his conscience begins to attack as he prepares to do this. Huck first decides that he is to blame for Jim's escape: "I begun to get it through my head that he was most free--and who was to blame for it? Why me" (124). Huck even feels guilty for the damage he has done to Miss Watson, a substantial shift in his feelings toward her from those he displays previously and a gross distortion of the facts. Smith notes that Huck "dramatizes his inner debate by quoting the words in which his conscience
denounces him" (120):

What had poor Miss Watson done to you, that you could see her nigger go off right under your eyes and never say one single word? What did that poor old woman do to you, that you could treat her so mean? Why, she tried to learn you your book, she tried to learn you your manners, she tried to be good to you in every way she knewed how. That's what she done (124).

Under these assaults from his conscience, which play rather well off his poor self-image, Huck temporarily surrenders: "Let up on me--it ain't too late, yet--I'll paddle ashore at the first light, and tell" (125). As Huck paddles off, however, Jim's words remind him both of his own values and his affection for Jim:

I's a free man, en I couldn't ever ben free ef it hadn' ben for Huck; Huck done it. Jim won't ever forgit you, Huck; you's de bes' fren' Jim's ever had; en you's de only fren' ole Jim's got now (125).

Huck says these words "seemed to kind of take the tuck all out of me" but that he has still "got to do it--I can't get out of it" (125).

When Huck then encounters two men hunting "five niggers [that] run off to-night," they ask, "is your man white or
black?" (125). Huck attempts to obey the demands of his conscience only to find that he cannot:

I didn't answer up prompt. I tried to, but the words wouldn't come. I tried, for a second or two, to brace up and out with it [the truth about Jim], but I warn't man enough--hadn't the spunk of a rabbit. I see I was weakening; so I just give up trying, and up and says--

"He's white" (125-126).

Of course, what Huck sees as a weakness is actually the victory of his heart over his conscience. Having won this battle, Huck immediately takes further action to protect Jim. He tells the men that his "family" on the raft has smallpox, and they quickly leave (126-127). In this instance, unlike Huck's first major moral struggle "we are given no details about how his inner conflict was resolved" (Smith 120).

Huck faces a similar internal struggle when he finds that the king has sold Jim to Silas Phelps. He first plans to "rescue" Jim by sending a message to Miss Watson so that Jim can be returned to St. Petersburg: "It would be a thousand times better for Jim to be a slave at home where his family was . . ." (268). Huck begins to examine the problems with this plan, and his conscience attacks him once again for his disregard of "the awful sacredness of slave
Huck forgets his earlier repudiation of conventional morality that he expresses when he initially encounters Jim: "People would call me a low down Abolitionist and despise me for keeping mum--but that don't make no difference" (52). Under the proddings of his conscience, for the first time Huck worries about his social status when he says,

And then think of me! It would get all around, that Huck Finn helped a nigger to get his freedom; and if I was to ever see anybody from that town again, I'd be ready to get down and lick his boots for shame. That's just the way: a person does a low-down thing, and then he don't want to take no consequences of it (268).

In its final attempt to assert itself over the counsel of his heart, Huck's conscience turns Miss Watson's version of Providence against him. Huck "instinctively resorts to her [Miss Watson's] vocabulary. More than resorts, he thinks in it . . ." (Beaver 105):

The more I studied about this [unwillingness to take consequences], the more my conscience went to grinding me, and the more wicked, and low-down and ornery I got to feeling (268).

Unlike the earlier messages of his conscience, "which formerly had employed only secular arguments, [it] now deals
heavily in religious cant" (Smith 121):

It hit me all of a sudden that here was the plain hand of Providence slapping me in the face and letting me know my wickedness was being watched all the time from up there in heaven . . .

(268-269).

The words of Huck's conscience also gain authority through the way he expresses them: "When he paraphrases the admonitions of his conscience they are incorporated into his own discourse. . . . He does not question its moral authority" (Smith 121-122).

With the image of a watchful Providence in his mind, Huck again surrenders temporarily. He decides to pray "and see if I couldn't try to quit being the kind of boy I was, and be better" (269). Huck's heart, his innocence, won't allow this prayer even though Huck still believes that he is wrong and society is right:

I knowed very well why they wouldn't come [the words for his prayer]. It was because my heart warn't right; it was because I warn't square. . . . I was letting on to give up sin, but away inside of me I was holding on to the biggest one of all (269).

Still "full of trouble," Huck decides, "I'll go and write the letter--and then see if I can pray" (269). Huck's
conscience eases at once when he writes the letter, just as it did when he once paddled away from the raft to "tell on Jim": "I felt good and all washed clean of sin for the first time I had ever felt so in my life, and I knowed I could pray, now" (269).

This final battle of Huck's heart and conscience is not over, however; just as before, thoughts of Jim outweigh the demands of conscience. Huck remembers that

[I] got to thinking over our trip down the river; and I see Jim before me, all the time, in the day, and in the night-time, sometimes moonlight, sometimes storms, and we a floating along, talking, and singing, and laughing. But somehow I couldn't seem to strike no places to harden me against him, but only the other kind (269-270).

Huck realizes that he must now make a choice between his heart and his conscience. He decides in favor of his heart, demonstrating with finality the strength of his compassion and his self-containment: "All right, then, I'll go to hell . . ." (271).

Huck knows, this time, that his decision to choose his heart over his conscience is final, yet he still believes he is wrong. Huck says he never thought no more about reforming. I . . . said I would take up wickedness again, which was
in my line, being brung up to it, and the other warn't. And for a starter, I would go to work and steal Jim out of slavery again; and if I could think up anything worse, I would do that, too; because as long as I was in, and in for good, I might as well go the whole hog (271).

Yet only a few days later, Huck finally arrives at the truth about his conscience, an intuitive rather than rational observation:

[I was feeling] kind of ornery, and humble, and to blame, somehow [for Pikesville's tar and feathering of the Duke and Dauphin]—though I hadn't done nothing. But that's always the way: it don't make no difference whether you do right or wrong, a person's conscience ain't got no sense, and just goes for him anyway. . . . It takes up more room than all the rest of a person's insides, and yet ain't no good, nohow (290).

Jim demonstrates the same elements of natural innocence as does Huck; the primary differences between them arise simply because Jim is not the novel's main character. *Huckleberry Finn* contains much less information about Jim than Huck; Jim lacks Huck's comprehensive background, and the reader learns relatively little of him in the present. Without more information about Jim's past, the question of
whether his innocence is learned or innate cannot be
adequately addressed as it is for Huck. Also, without more
information about Jim in the present, the existence of his
innocence cannot be as conclusively proven as that of Huck.
At the same time, however, the existence of Jim's innocence
cannot be disproven, for the elements he demonstrates are
unmistakable.

While Huck's innocence can be traced through the many
observations and opinions expressed in his narrative, as
well as through his actions, "Jim rarely speaks out" (Beaver
174). The reader hears little from Jim in words, but his
actions also give him a voice, and through the combination
of the two Jim exposes and expresses the elements of his
innocence.

Jim's primitivism springs from a somewhat different
source than Huck's. Both seek freedom, but Jim is both in
conflict with and subject to conventional society to a far
greater degree than Huck. Huck lacks the freedom to express
his innocence, but Jim has no freedom at all; he is only
property. Jim's primitivism comes from his deeper desire
for a different degree of freedom than that expressed and
sought by Huck.

Jim first expresses his primitivism when he chooses
life as a fugitive to being sold "down the river" (Blair
385-386). As soon as a this threat becomes clear, he leaves
his owner and swims to uninhabited Jackson's Island, taking only his pipe, tobacco, and matches (54). Jim's escape mirrors Huck's in two important ways: Jim flees the prison of slavery and the likelihood of future abuse as Huck flees Pap's cabin, and he shares Huck's intention to make sure that his pursuers "couldn't ever find" him "any more" (32). The price Jim willingly pays for the freedom he finds on the island demonstrates the strength of his primitivism. Until Huck arrives with Pap's gun and supplies, Jim has almost nothing to eat:

"It's good daylight. Le's get breakfast. Make up your camp fire good."

"What's de use er makin' up de camp fire to cook strawbries en sich truck? But you got a gun, hain't you? Den we kin git sumfn better den strawbries."

"Strawberries and such truck," I says. "Is that what you live on?"

"I couldn' git nuffn else . . ." (51).

For the rest of his time as a fugitive and a "free" man, Jim necessarily follows more or less willingly along with Huck or unwillingly at the command of others. Regardless, his actions still occasionally express his primitivism when he can make his own choices. After a steamboat strikes the raft, Jim weighs the risk of capture
against losing Huck's protective presence; none of his
decisions are easy. Jim tells Huck that he had "swum along
behind me, that night, and heard me yell every time, but
dasn't answer, because he didn't want nobody to pick him up,
and take him into slavery again" (149-150).

Huck comments on his own preference for the woods and
river several times, but Jim breaks his silence about his
own primitivism only once. While Huck stays with the
Grangerfords for two to three weeks after the steamboat
accident (Miller 196), Jim hides on a remote island in the
swamp. When Huck and Jim are reunited after the
Sheperdson-Grangerford feud, Huck says that

I was powerful glad to get away from the feuds,
and so was Jim to get away from the swamp. We
said there warn't no home like a raft, after all.
Other places do seem so cramped up and smothery,
but a raft don't. You feel mighty free and easy
and comfortable on a raft (155; emphasis added).

As indicated by the "we" in this passage, which conveys
Jim's agreement with Huck on the point that there is "no
home like a raft," Jim feels the comfort of the river and
the freedom it has to offer in the same way as Huck.

Jim shares with Huck the other two elements of natural
innocence, and the precise qualities of these match Huck's
in most respects. Like Huck, Jim demonstrates a direct
correspondence between his sensibility and active morality. Jim's sensibility is also based on a need to follow his compassion, and his active morality is similarly composed of his efforts to satisfy his sensibility. Because he chooses to be a runaway slave, Jim shows that he also does not follow conventional morality and that he has no desire to conform to the demands of society. While Huck sometimes hesitates to act on his sensibility because he must sort through the conflicting demands of his conventionally-trained conscience and his heart, Jim avoids this conflict. On the single occasion that Jim can act, without the interference of others, he does so quickly and without hesitation. Jim's conscience, unlike Huck's, does not demand adherence to conventional values; instead, like Jim's morality, his conscience seeks to satisfy his compassion. Because of the unhesitating directness of Jim's morality, Cox describes him as "the conscience of the novel, the spiritual yardstick by which all men are measured . . ." ("Remarks on" 404).

Jim expresses his sensibility and active morality when he decides to risk his freedom to see that Tom, wounded in the "evasion," gets medical attention. Huck says that "me and Jim was consulting--and thinking" (340), and this time, significantly, Jim speaks instead of Huck:

Ef it wuz him [Tom] dat 'uz bein' sot free, en one
er de boys wuz to git shot, would he say, 'Go on en save me, nemmine 'bout a doctor f'r to save dis one?' . . . You bet he wouldn't! Well den--is Jim gwyne to say it? No, sah--I doan' budge a step out'n dis place, 'dout a doctor; not ef it's forty year! (340-341).

_Huckleberry Finn_ contains each of the three elements of natural innocence: sensibility, active morality, and primitivism. Huck demonstrates sensibility because his emotions, not his reason, guide his actions. The emotion that Huck consistently follows is his compassion, which sets him apart from characters who follow negative emotions. In turn, Huck's attempts to satisfy his sensibility, his tendency to perform positive actions, compose his active morality. The satisfaction of his sensibility is at times complicated by the conflicting demands of conventional society, but Huck's final resolution of these conflicts always favors active morality.

As the result of his sensibility and active morality, Huck also demonstrates consistent primitivism, especially in his preference for the woods and river. These place him in conflict with the morality of conventional society that is not based on compassion and a tendency toward positive actions; its basic difference is definitively demonstrated in its support of slavery. For Huck, primitivism provides
an escape from the restrictions that this society imposes upon him and gives him the freedom necessary to express his natural innocence.

Hemingway's claim that "all modern American literature comes from one book by Mark Twain called Huckleberry Finn" contains the implicit statement that elements of this novel, including Huck's natural innocence, are to be found in his own work. The following chapter examines Hemingway's use of natural innocence in some of the early Nick Adams stories.
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CHAPTER IV

"I KNOW WHERE THERE'S BLACK SQUIRRELS, DADDY"

Phillip Young and Joseph DeFalco, among others, see Hemingway's Nick Adams as a single consistent character. To these critics, the Nick Adams stories present Nick in related scenes spanning the years from his early childhood to middle age. Commenting on *In Our Time*, where Nick makes his first appearance, Young writes that the book cannot really be understood at all without the clear perception that the stories are arranged in the chronological order of his boyhood and young manhood, and that the volume is in large part devoted to a scrupulously planned account of his character, and the reasons for it (Hemingway 30).

DeFalco takes a similar position, saying that "half of the stories of *In Our Time* . . . are devoted to the development of Nick Adams. They are arranged chronologically, moving from Nick's boyhood to his young manhood . . ." (13). He sees Nick as "the leading protagonist in the early short stories . . ." (16).

Joseph M. Flora also makes a similar claim, saying that
"Nick is the central character of *In Our Time*" (1), and that "Hemingway . . . had written about his protagonist's life from early boyhood into middle age" (11). He also adds that, compared to Young's rearrangement of the stories in 1972, "the stories can be read in another order, closer to Nick's own biography [than to Hemingway's]. . ." (13).

This criticism recognizes and focuses upon the fact that the protagonists of these stories do all share at least two primary characteristics. The first and most obvious is that they share the same name. These characters also share similar environments. The settings often closely resemble Hemingway's own early surroundings, including elements and combinations of Oak Park, northern Michigan, and World War I Europe. Beyond these two elements, which are consistent throughout the Nick Adams stories, however, these protagonists often differ from each other in ways not recognized by these critics.

While these mainstream Hemingway critics see the Nick Adams stories as episodes in the life of a single individual, they also acknowledge, sometimes indirectly, their difficulty in maintaining this position, at times in conflict with their other opinions about these stories. For example, in contrast with his statement that "the stories are arranged in the chronological order of his boyhood and young manhood," in his 1972 collection of the stories Young
notes that these pieces had long been in print, but that Nick himself was scarcely known at all; people had practically no idea who he was or what he was like, the main reason being the jumbled ages at which one met up with him. . . . The coherence of his adventures was obscured . . . and their overall significance was just about invisible ("Big World" 5).

While discussing the critics' confusion about the possible identity of some of Hemingway's characters, Flora acknowledges a second explanation about Nick's identity:

Moreover, there was sometimes doubt about whether a given story actually was about Nick. Critics had more or less agreed that the young narrator of "The Light of the World" is Nick Adams, but there are other Hemingway stories with an unnamed narrator whom some critics have thought Nick Adams, but other critics have not (11).

As an example of this critical approach, but confined to stories with a protagonist named Nick, Flora paraphrases Barbara Sanders' implicit question: "Couldn't different people in different [Nick Adams] stories share the same last name?" (43-52). Sanders' explanation for the appearance of a character named Nick in all these stories, while not critically popular, does at least directly acknowledge the
stories' inconsistencies and uses this information to help explain Nick's identity.

Whether Nick is one character or several is actually problematical in an examination of his innocence, and neither critical approach gives an entirely satisfactory explanation for Nick's identity. The argument itself, however, introduces a significant point about Nick: the inconsistencies of his character that are usually present from story to story need explanation if he is to be understood. Rather than only dismissing or emphasizing these inconsistencies, Flora also mentions but does not fully develop a more fruitful approach to the problem of Nick's identity. He makes the following comment about the Nick in "The Last Good Country":

[He] does not fit easily into a chronological reading of the stories because he is not sufficiently consistent with the Nick of the other stories. He is too brooding, too victimized (15). Although Flora again mentions Nick's nonsequential presentation, the emphasis here is on Nick's shifting personality. Flora recognizes that at least one of these characters has a different personality than the others. Nick's changing personality can be explained by the amount of innocence that he retains at various ages. A brief return to the ending of Huck's story will shed some
light on the changes in Nick. At the end of *Huckleberry Finn*, Huck says he intends to "light out for the Territory . . . because aunt Sally she's going to adopt me and sivilize me and I can't stand it" (362). If he is successful, Huck will escape the corrupting influence of society that he fights throughout the novel and retain his innocence in the primitive Territory. If Huck is not successful, if he remains under the influence of conventional society, his innocence will likely be at least partially worn away as he gets older. The result would be somewhat like what Twain anticipated for an adult Tom Sawyer: "If I went on . . . & took him into manhood, he would be just like all the one-horse men in literature, & the reader would conceive a hearty contempt for him" ("Letters" 282). In any case, Twain leaves the matter unresolved, and the reader leaves Huck with the hope that he will escape and retain his innocence.

Hemingway, however, does not leave the possibility of Nick's continuing innocence unresolved. Unlike Huck, Nick does not have the option of escape. These stories contain no Territory and no true wilderness, and even their primitives show the influence of the civilized world, if only in their vices. Beyond the northern Michigan woods lies only more civilization. Even while only a child, Nick is already more "sivilized" than Huck ever becomes, and his
innocence erodes as he grows older.

From among the various Nick Adams stories, the only Nick who clearly possesses natural innocence is the child who appears in "Indian Camp" and "The Doctor and the Doctor's Wife"; in these two stories he displays all three of its elements. Nick is younger here than in any of his other appearances, and he seems considerably younger than Huck's "thirteen or fourteen or along there" (Twain, Adventures 134); Nick is perhaps not much more than half Huck's age.

As Flora points out, the way Nick addresses his father and the way his father addresses him indicate his youth:

Nick is very young during the time of 'Indian Camp.' Not only is he the questioner of the story, but he receives answers that make his extreme youth clear. 'There is an Indian lady very sick,' says his father. . . . A teenager or adult would have received more exact information in syntax less formal. But the answer satisfies the doctor's son, who is leaning back 'with his father's arm around him' (23).

"The Doctor and the Doctor's Wife" also presents a young boy. Nick says little in this story, but his words again indicate that he is "still quite young," calling his father "Daddy" (Flora 42).
This very young Nick differs somewhat from Huck in several important ways that must be taken into account in an evaluation of his innocence. For one thing, this naturally innocent Nick makes only a very brief appearance in Hemingway's short stories. Like the secondary characters in Huck's narrative, Nick makes the elements of his personality clear enough, but they are not as well or as frequently developed as Huck's.

Nick's youth has two effects on the expression of his innocence. Because his experiences are limited, he tends to watch and ask questions rather than act. Because of his inability to act independently of his father or other adults, Nick also bears some resemblance to Jim. He usually does as he is told or is expected to do, and he seldom has the opportunity to make choices on his own.

Like Huck and Jim, Nick relies on his feelings more than his mental abilities to guide his actions. Nick does not clearly demonstrate reasoning abilities, and the mental processes he displays as he attempts to understand his surroundings are rudimentary and consistent with his youth; Nick's questioning reflects his sensibility rather than his reason. While compassion is the consistent basis for Huck's sensibility, the basis for Nick's sensibility shifts at times, depending on his emotional state.

In "Indian Camp," Nick's predominant emotional state is
uneasiness caused by the violence of the night's events. Rather than act to express and confirm this feeling, as Huck does with his compassion, Nick displays his sensibility in his attempts to overcome his uneasiness. Most of the questions to his father are Nick's attempts to regain emotional security and are driven by his disquiet.

Three of Nick's questions especially demonstrate his sensibility because they focus on the most disturbing events of the story. Shortly after Nick and Dr. Adams enter the cabin, Nick is confronted by the Indian woman's screams, screams that have long since driven most of the male members of the community "out of range of the noise she made." Nick asks, "Oh, Daddy, can't you give her something to make her stop screaming?" (92). At the end of the story, after witnessing not only a violent birth but also the aftermath of a violent death, Nick says to his father, "Do ladies always have such a hard time having babies?" Nick then asks his father the first of a series of questions about the Indian husband's suicide: "Why did he kill himself, Daddy?" The story's last line demonstrates that Nick's primary uneasiness arises not from concern for the Indian or distress at the difficult birth but from thoughts of his own mortality: "He felt quite sure he would never die" (95).

Nick's appearance in "The Doctor and the Doctor's Wife" is brief, for he does not witness his father's difficulties
with either Dick Boulton or Mrs. Adams, but he again demonstrates sensibility. Nick's uneasiness is now gone, and although his precise emotional state is indistinct, he makes clear his desire to be with his father rather than his mother, and this desire guides his actions:

"Your mother wants you to come and see her," the doctor said.

"I want to go with you," Nick said.

"All right. Come on, then . . ." (103).

Nick shows evidence of his primitivism in both these stories. "Indian Camp" begins with "at the lake shore there was another rowboat drawn up. The two Indians stood waiting" (91). This description, along with Dr. Adams' crude operating instruments, "a cake of soap he had brought from the camp" (93), "a jack-knife" and "nine-foot, tapered gut leaders" (94) indicates that he, Uncle George, and Nick had been fishing and been met at their camp as they returned. The camp itself is not at his family's cabin but elsewhere, deeper in the woods and closer to its more primitive people. Nick's later uneasiness is not caused by the lake, the woods, or the Indian camp itself; its cause is solely the violent events he witnesses.

Nick actively chooses in favor of his primitivism in "The Doctor and the Doctor's Wife." Having already been exposed to the more complicated world of husbands, wives,
and babies, Nick makes plain his own preference for the natural world.² He wants to go with his father into the woods, not back to his mother in her darkened room, isolated from her surroundings. His final comment to his father reflects not only his preference for the woods but also implies an intimate knowledge of his environment: "I know where there's black squirrels, Daddy . . ." (103).

Even though he is primarily an observer in the story, Nick performs an action in "Indian Camp" that demonstrates his active morality in a small way. Nick's father can be verbally forceful with Nick, such as when he abruptly explains about the woman's prolonged labor: "You don't know [about childbirth]. . . . Listen to me" (92). Dr. Adams says nothing like this to Nick as he operates, but the narrator says, "Nick held the basin for his father" (93). The story implies that Nick performs this action by choice, even though he finds the operation disturbing: "Nick did not watch. His curiosity had been gone for a long time" (93).

Although his appearance in "The Doctor and the Doctor's Wife" is much shorter than that in "Indian Camp," Nick again displays active morality, although in a slightly different way. In "Indian Camp" Nick's choices are between action and inaction, whether to assist his father or remain an observer. In "The Doctor and the Doctor's Wife," however,
Nick must choose between two possible actions, one of his own choosing and the other dictated by his mother: "If you see Nick, dear, will you tell him his mother wants to see him?" (102).

As her treatment of Dr. Adams makes clear, Mrs. Adams is negative and manipulative. Without knowing anything about the events at the lakeshore other than that her husband "had a row with Dick Boulton," she offers quick criticism, only slightly blunted: "I hope you didn't lose your temper, Henry" (101). Following his negative reply, Mrs. Adams gives Henry useless and condescending advice: "Remember, that he who ruleth his spirit is greater than he that taketh a city . . ." (101). Because he did lose his temper, Dr. Adams tries to avoid telling his wife any more about the incident, but she persists in an attempt to control him: "Tell me Henry. Please don't try and keep anything from me" (102). Dr. Adams explains that Boulton provoked an argument to avoid payment in work for medical services, and Mrs. Adams tries to weaken him once more: "Dear, I don't think, I really don't think that anyone would really do a thing like that" (102).

Dr. Adams is himself presented rather negatively in this story. He allows himself to be provoked by Dick Boulton and backs down from a fight that he is foolish enough to suggest. He allows his wife to browbeat and
manipulate him. He doesn't read his medical journals, which "irritated him" (101). He is, in short, presented as a weak man not in control of his own life. Compared to Nick's mother, however, Nick's father is by far more positive.

Even though he is a young child, Nick undoubtedly recognizes the differences between his parents, if only subconsciously. His parents' conversation in the cabin has probably been played out in variation before him many times. If Nick chooses to go to his mother for some undefined purpose, as she requests, he supports her manipulative and negative behavior. Instead, Nick expresses his active morality the best way he can in these limiting circumstances, saying to his father: "I want to go with you" (103).

In the later Nick Adams stories, Nick demonstrates that his innocence is being worn away. In "The Killers," in which he appears to be a teenager, Nick demonstrates active morality in his warning to Ole Andreson, but shows no evidence of primitivism. In other stories, his active morality disappears, and he often displays cynicism and anger, qualities that Huck and the naturally innocent Nick lack. These Nicks are found, for example, in stories such as "The End of Something," "The Battler," and "Cross-Country Snow." In "The End of Something," Nick feigns anger at his girlfriend in an unsuccessful effort to cover his emotional
pain, although the reason for his pain is not disclosed. He also expresses cynicism about their relationship: "It isn't fun any more. Not any of it" (110). In "The Battler," Nick expresses anger at "that lousy crut of a brakeman" who strikes him, and cynically states that "they would never suck him in that way again" (129). And in "Cross-Country Snow," Nick shows a more subdued anger when he considers his future role as a father in a conversation with his friend George:

"It's hell, isn't it [becoming a father]?" he said.

"No. Not exactly," Nick said.

"Why not?"

"I don't know," Nick said (187).

Even in these three stories, however, Nick still shows that his innocence is not entirely gone. His active morality has disappeared, but his primitivism is still strong. In "The End of Something," Nick chooses a beach on a familiar lake to end his relationship with Marjorie. In "Cross-Country Snow," he enjoys a last outing in the Swiss mountains with his friend George before his planned return to the United States, where "the mountains aren't much" (187), and where the unwelcome responsibilities of fatherhood await. "The Battler" does not make clear Nick's purpose in his journey through the countryside, but it
strongly suggests that he willingly "rides the rails," even with its hazards.

In the two stories in which Nick demonstrates natural innocence, "Indian Camp" and "The Doctor and the Doctor's Wife," he is quite young, still a child. His youth limits his ability to express and display his innocence, yet he still demonstrates all three of its elements. Nick's sensibility is evident in both stories, and the events of "Indian Camp" introduce the themes of primitivism and active morality that Nick more fully demonstrates in "The Doctor and the Doctor's Wife."

Nick is beyond childhood in the other stories, and his innocence wears away through his continued exposure to conventional society and some actions in the world that Hemingway seems to label as evil. Unlike Huck's environment, Nick's does not offer the possibility of escape from this corrupting influence. His innocence does not entirely disappear, however; Nick's expression of innocence varies from story to story as he grows up, but he consistently demonstrates at least one of its elements.

Hemingway makes further use of natural innocence in The Old Man and the Sea, where he develops this theme in a fashion different from that in both his own Nick Adams stories and Adventures of Huckleberry Finn. Chapter V examines Hemingway's use of natural innocence in this novel.
NOTES

1Critical opinion about Nick's presence in the story is mixed. Philip Young, for instance, says that Nick witnesses his father's difficulties with both Boulton and Mrs. Adams, while DeFalco says that he witnesses neither.

2In the context of his Jungian interpretation of "The Doctor and the Doctor's Wife," Joseph DeFalco also notes Nick's choice between the primitive and the civilized.
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CHAPTER V

"I AM A STRANGE OLD MAN"

In *The Old Man and the Sea* Hemingway continues to develop the theme of natural innocence that he first uses in the early Nick Adams stories.¹ *Old Man* is consistent with these stories and with *Huckleberry Finn* in that its protagonist, Santiago, also demonstrates primitivism, sensibility, and active morality. Santiago's expression of his innocence generally resembles that of Huck and Nick, but his primitivism and active morality differ sufficiently from theirs to make him a different sort of character than these two, who have more in common with his young companion, Manolin.

Unfavorable criticism of *The Old Man and the Sea* often concerns the critics' belief that Santiago himself is neither plausible nor believable. Some of this criticism, like that of Robert P. Weeks, focuses upon the supposed unreality of Santiago's physical abilities. Weeks describes Santiago's recognition of the type of fish at the end of his line as "fakery": "This is not fishing skill; it's clairvoyance" (189).² Critics more often, however, question the plausibility of Santiago's unusual personality. Gerry
Brenner introduces this concern in addition to questioning the novel's physical accuracy:

Of *The Old Man and the Sea* Hemingway said, 'I tried to make a real old man, a real boy, a real sea and a real fish and real sharks.' Try though he did, no critic commends this novella for its realistic writing, subject, or hero... A symbolic character, Santiago embodies only virtues that ask for moral approval of him as an idealized Papa (176).

Leslie Fiedler offers more general criticism that he directs partially at *The Old Man and the Sea* and that also bears upon Santiago's personality:

The contemporary American writer [Hemingway included] can abjure negativism only if he is willing to sacrifice truth and art. For major novelists and minor, the pursuit of the positive means stylistic suicide. Language itself decays, and dialogue becomes travesty; character, stereotype; insight, sentiment (238).

The supposed implausibility of Santiago's personality can be refuted by a close examination of the text. He is a natural innocent, a primitive whose personality reflects both his own innate qualities and the environment that allows him to remain uncorrupted by society. In his
creation of Santiago, Hemingway sacrifices nothing but achieves much. An unmistakably positive and distinctive character, Santiago conveys meaningful insights about the truths of his life. He is a man who demonstrates many of the qualities of the beasts of the sea and yet who also retains enough human qualities to remain clearly human.

The source of Santiago's primitivism lies partially within his relationship to the rest of his society. Katharine Jobes identifies Santiago as "an outsider in some sense from his community" (15). Little more than a subsistence fisherman, Santiago has not caught a fish in eighty-four days and is described by others as "salao . . . the worst form of unlucky" (9). Jobes sees his failure as a violation of "the established values of his community" (15). The young boy, Manolin, who once fished with him and who had fished with him for years has been removed by his father to a "lucky boat" (10), and "many of the fishermen made fun of the old man" for his lack of success (11).

Like Huck, Santiago holds values that sometimes set him apart from other men. Jobes notes, however, that Santiago's "self-definition is not created in active opposition to society, nor is it threatened by society" (15); he is simply true to his own innate qualities and his own values. These values are partially expressed in his view of the ocean itself, although he is likely not the only fisherman of his
village who loves the sea:

He always thought of the sea as la mar which is what people call her in Spanish when they love her. Sometimes those who love her say bad things of her but they are always said as though she were a woman... The old man always thought of her as feminine and as something that gave or withheld great favours, and if she did wild or wicked things it was because she could not help them (29-30).

In contrast to Santiago's love of the ocean, "some of the younger fishermen, those who used buoys as floats for their lines and had motorboats... spoke of her as el mar which is masculine. They spoke of her as a contestant or a place or even an enemy" (29-30).

Santiago's differences with conventional society go further than his attitude toward the ocean. A more fundamental difference between Santiago and the others of his village is that he is not properly a social creature at all. He is instead a true primitive who is most at home on the ocean rather than in his village. Unlike Huck, who is at times a part of conventional society and who then leaves it to express his innocence, Santiago never leaves society because he has never truly been a part of it. He feels little sense of belonging to the community; his primary
interest in it is in the news of "the baseball" that the newspapers bring (17). Philip Young writes that "baseball . . . beside the lions, is all the life he has beyond his calling" (130).³ Santiago says little about his past, but his self-containment and his indifference toward social concerns other than baseball strongly indicate that his innocence is innate, not learned.⁴

Santiago's attitude toward his presumably dead wife and the few things she leaves behind also shows that he is not a part of the village religious life:

On the brown walls of the flattened, overlapping leaves of the sturdy fibered guano there was a picture in color of the Sacred Heart of Jesus and another of the Virgin of Cobre. These were relics of his wife. Once there had been a tinted photograph of his wife on the wall but he had taken it down because it made him too lonely to see it and it was on the shelf in the corner under his clean shirt (15-16).

Other than Manolin, Santiago's sole emotional attachment is to the memory of his wife. He keeps her picture but tucks it away, out of sight, because it causes him pain. He continues to display, however, the religious pictures that once belonged to her. Santiago, who "owns almost nothing" (Young 128), sleeps in a one-room shack that
is sparsely furnished with only "a bed, a table, one chair, and a place on the dirt floor to cook with charcoal" (15). His wife's relics are the only decoration. These are in plain view, yet Santiago does not refer to them or even look at them. These pictures are merely furniture, like the chair and the bed, and they have no emotional meaning for him.

While Santiago exists on the edges of both conventional society and formal religion, he lives on the sea. His social identity is weak, but his primitivism is correspondingly strong. Even in his dreams, his primitivism outweighs all other desires and concerns:

He dreamed of Africa when he was a boy and the long golden beaches and the white beaches, so white they hurt your eyes, and the high capes and the great brown mountains. He lived along that coast now every night. . . . He smelled the smell of Africa that the land breeze brought at morning.

He no longer dreamed of storms, nor of women, nor of great occurrences, nor of great fish, nor fights, nor of contests of strength, nor of his wife. He only dreamed of places now and of the lions on the beach. They played like young cats in the dusk and he loved them as he loved the boy [Manolin] (24-25).
Santiago also demonstrates his primitivism, as well as his isolation from society, during his waking hours through his attitude toward the creatures of the sea and toward inanimate objects associated with it; he has an "intimate at-homeness in nature" (Jobes 16). Isolated from the people of his village, Santiago finds his friends at sea, where "he is not in any real sense alone at all" (Rovit 87): "He was very fond of flying fish as they were his principal friends on the ocean" (29). He feels similarly about the stars: "The first stars were out. He did not know the name of Rigel but he saw it and knew soon they would all be out and he would have all his distant friends" (74-75). He even feels love for some of the turtles he encounters: "He loved green turtles and hawk-bills with their elegance and speed . . ." (36). Santiago feels himself a brother to other creatures of the sea, but it is to the turtles he loves that he compares himself directly: "I have such a heart too and my feet and hands are like theirs" (37). Santiago extends his kinship to the porpoises and sees within them positive human qualities: "They are good. . . . They play and make jokes and love one another. They are our brothers like the flying fish" (48).

Santiago's kinship with the creatures of the sea is perhaps deeper than he realizes, going beyond his affection for them and the common qualities he perceives. A
comparison of Santiago and his marlin shows that they are not very different in their ability to choose what they are and what they do. A marlin, or even a Portuguese man-of-war, acts not by choice but by the necessity of its nature. The marlin can be only what it was born to be. This creature cannot choose to act in ways that are contrary to its nature. It cannot choose to be a shark.

When Santiago wakes Manolin before sunrise, the old man apologizes, knowing how hard it is for the boy to wake at that hour. Manolin replies that "it is what a man must do" (26). It is at least what rural Cuban fishermen must do, and this is no doubt an attitude he has learned from Santiago. In a small way, this early awakening demonstrates that Manolin is true to his role as a fisherman. Santiago later elaborates on this theme while alone in the skiff. On his way back to the village with the shark-chewed marlin, Santiago thinks of himself: "You were born to be a fisherman as the fish was born to be a fish" (105). Just as the marlin acts by the necessity of its nature, Santiago acts by the necessity of his own. In this respect, he and the fish are indeed brothers, yet Santiago retains a human trait that sets him apart. While the marlin cannot choose to violate his true nature, Santiago can, whether he realizes this fact or not: Santiago has a free will. He could choose to be something other than a fisherman, but he
instead chooses to follow his own innate nature.

While Santiago finds his friends among several of the ocean's creatures, his strongest feelings are for the marlin at the end of his fishing line. This fish, he thinks, "is my brother" (59), and he believes that "there are three things that are brothers: the fish and my two hands" (64). Beyond kinship, Santiago also feels admiration and respect for the marlin: "I wish I was the fish . . . with everything he has against only my will and my intelligence" (64). He later contemplates his struggle against the fish and expresses not only his opinion about the fish but about other men as well:

How many people will he feed. . . . But are they worthy to eat him? No, of course not. There is no one worthy of eating him from the manner of his behaviour and his great dignity.

I do not understand these things (75).

Santiago's comment that he does not understand "these things" seems to point to another similarity between himself and the marlin. The fish, presumably, also lacks understanding of the sort of questions that come to Santiago's mind as he fishes:

Imagine if each day a man must try to kill the moon, he thought. The moon runs away. But imagine if a man each day should have to try to
Believing that he lacks understanding, Santiago perhaps thinks that he is only an ignorant old man. He is mistaken about himself, however, for he has the human ability to understand and believe in these matters that the marlin lacks. More than that, he has real, although often unrecognized, insights into truths, lacking only the words to convey them. To his own question about killing the sun, he gives this answer: "We were born lucky, he thought. . . . It is enough to live on the sea and kill our true brothers" (75). In other words, our tasks are not too difficult.

Santiago's answers to these questions set him apart from other men. A man with a conventional social or formal religious background probably has answers for these sorts of questions as well, but his answers are most likely based on dogma, whether secular or religious. Santiago's answers are incomplete, but they are based on his own observations and experiences, not the opinions of others.

Santiago's sensibility is based partially on the emotions of empathy and compassion. He often expresses compassion, and this feeling is usually accompanied by empathy. Santiago's empathy is a deeper, stronger emotion than his compassion; sympathy is relatively easy, but vicarious identification is not. His expression of empathy
and compassion is consistent but is found more often in his attitudes rather than his actions. Santiago shows no malice toward other men, and could no doubt have these feelings for them, but he usually directs these emotions toward his brothers on the sea:

He was sorry for the birds, especially the small delicate dark terns that were always flying and looking and almost never finding, and he thought, the birds have a harder life than we do except for the robber birds and the heavy strong ones. Why did they make birds so delicate and fine as those sea swallows when the ocean can be so cruel? (29).

Santiago also feels empathy and compassion for the marlin that tows him out to sea, the creature he must kill in order to survive himself. This creature's hunger weakens it and provides an advantage to Santiago, yet he thinks, "I wish I could feed the fish" (59). He feels its hunger as his own.

Santiago expresses his empathy and compassion again in his memory of the loyalty of a male marlin for its mate, hooked on his line, and his emotions this time guide his actions:

He was beautiful, the old man remembered, and he had stayed.

That was the saddest thing I ever saw with
them, the old man thought. The boy was sad too
and we begged her pardon and butchered her
promptly (50).

Santiago's empathy sets him apart from both men and
beasts. The marlin, for example, probably feels no empathy
for the other creatures it encounters. Its primary concerns
are to eat and to avoid being eaten. The fish does not
identify with or recognize the feelings of its prey or its
pursuers.

Empathy is a purely human emotion, yet most men do not
feel or express it. This difference between Santiago and
other men is clearly expressed in his attitude toward
fishing. Most fishermen see their conquest of the sea and
its creatures as right and natural; they deny their
humanity. Other creatures are not their brothers but their
victims. Santiago, however, expresses his humanity because
he regrets what he must do. His observations about turtles
reflect his own empathy as well as the lack of it in other
men:

He had no mysticism about turtles although he had
gone in turtle boats for many years. He was sorry
for them all, even the great trunk backs that were
as long as the skiff and weighed a ton. Most
people are heartless about turtles because a
turtle's heart will beat for hours after he has
been cut up and butchered. But the old man thought, I have such a heart too and my feet and hands are like theirs (37).

Santiago is also guided by his hope, and he usually takes action as he follows this emotion. Santiago again differs from Huck in that his active morality is directed toward himself, not others. Because he is uncorrupted by society, however, Santiago can demonstrate self-interest without selfishness.

Delmore Schwartz comments on the importance of hope to Santiago: "He suffers neither from illusion nor from disillusion: he lives, as he says, by hope: 'It is silly not to hope,' he tells himself, and 'besides, it is a sin'" (84). Although Santiago has not caught a fish in almost three months, "his hope and his confidence had never gone" (13). Later, however, Santiago does feel doubt, discouragement, and fatigue during his long struggle with the marlin, and, after that, during his fight with the sharks. Young notes that Santiago recognizes his need for some assistance, writing that "the ex-champion musters his confidence: 'I may not be as strong as I think. . . . But I know many tricks and I have resolution'" (127). Santiago expresses his active morality when he acts upon his hope and encourages himself in an effort to counter these negative emotions and his physical weakness.
Santiago's actions in these instances are mental rather than physical; he uses "imaginative vision" (Jobes 2). He calls up personal "talismans" from his memory that give him the strength and encouragement he needs to continue (Baker 305). Carlos Baker observes that Santiago uses two primary images "to give himself confidence during the ordeal," Manolin and the lions of his dreams (305).

Santiago calls up the image of Manolin as a way of "invoking . . . the strength and courage of his youth" (Baker 305). Santiago uses this image several times, such as when he realizes that a long ordeal lies ahead and when he must work the cramp out of his left hand to fish effectively; each time he finds the physical and mental strength he needs (Baker 305). Santiago dreams of the lions he saw in his youth as he sleeps briefly while being towed by the marlin: "In his old age and the time of his suffering, Santiago is supported by the memory of his youth and the strength of his youth" (Baker 307). Baker also points out that Santiago "gains strength" from the images of the baseball player Joe DiMaggio and his own young self as a handwrestling champion (306).

Santiago also resorts to prayer to help him through his suffering while he struggles with the marlin:

"I am not religious," he said. "But I will say ten Our Fathers and ten Hail Marys that I should
catch this fish. . . ."

He commenced to say his prayers mechanically.

. . . Hail Marys are easier to say than Our Fathers, he thought (64-65).

Unlike his personal talismans, these prayers are relatively ineffectual: "With his prayers said, and feeling much better, but suffering exactly as much, and perhaps a little more, he leaned against the wood of the bow . . ." (65). Santiago feels better in the sense that he believes that prayers will help him, but they do not. His prayers have brought illusory comfort, but they do not summon strength or endurance as do the images of Manolin or the lions. Like the "relics" of his wife, the prayers have no personal meaning for him because Santiago is not part of a formal religious community.  

The nature of Santiago's hope can be accurately compared to that of his nonhuman friends. He thinks of hope in the abstract, human sense, but he can think of it in the immediate and practical animal sense as well. Santiago is very much like "the small delicate dark terns that were always flying and looking and almost never finding" (29). Even though they are seldom successful, these birds demonstrate their expectation that a meal will appear. Santiago himself has "gone eighty-four days now without taking a fish," yet he goes out again every day to try
again (9). He expects that he will eventually catch a fish. He tells himself that "I worked the deep wells for a week and did nothing... Today I'll work out where the schools of bonito and albacore are and maybe there will be a big one with them" (30). As he carries out his plan, he thinks "My big fish must be somewhere" (35).

Santiago also demonstrates this expectant hopefulness concerning his meals in the village. Once again, however, Santiago demonstrates that he is not totally unhuman. He and Manolin perform a mutually-agreed subterfuge that disguises his bad luck and lack of food:

"What do you have to eat?" the boy asked.

"A pot of yellow rice with fish. Do you want some?"

"No. I will eat at home. Do you want me to make the fire?"

"No. I will make it later on. Or I may eat the rice cold."

"May I take the cast net?"

"Of course."

There was no cast net and the boy remembered when they had sold it. But they went through this fiction every day. There was no pot of yellow rice and fish and the boy knew this too (16).

Manolin's devotion rewards Santiago's expectation that
food will appear. While Santiago shows little interest in food and does nothing but wait and sleep, the boy presently returns with Santiago's evening meal. The ease with which he and Santiago go through this fabrication strongly implies that they do so often, perhaps every day. 8

Unlike Santiago, Manolin's expression of his own innocence is incomplete. Surprisingly enough, he does not demonstrate primitivism; he only appears on shore, in the village, during the novel. He speaks to Santiago of his days spent fishing, but he does not indicate whether he feels as Santiago does about the ocean or its creatures. Also, while Santiago's emotional life and his identity are dependent on his experiences on the ocean, Manolin is more of a conventionally social creature. He has a family (10, 125), and he knows where he "can always borrow two dollars and a half," as well as get food for Santiago when the old man has none (18-20).

Manolin does demonstrate sensibility and active morality, and his expression of these qualities generally resembles that of Huck more than that of Santiago. The only important difference between the two boys is that Manolin does not experience Huck's moments of indecision. Manolin's sensibility, like Huck's, is based on a need to follow his compassion. Also like Huck, Manolin's active morality is directed toward another rather than himself. The focus of
his compassion is Santiago, and his active morality is composed of his efforts to take care of the old man.

Manolin demonstrates these qualities each time he is with Santiago. His thoughts at the novel's beginning summarize his deep concern for Santiago's welfare:

Where did you wash? the boy thought. The village water supply was two streets down the road. I must have water here for him, the boy thought, and soap and a good towel. Why am I so thoughtless? I must get him another shirt and a jacket for the winter and some sort of shoes and another blanket (21).

Through his identification with the sea and its creatures, Santiago expresses his natural innocence. His primitivism arises partly from his differences with society. It also arises from the fact that he is not a part of society at all. Because he is an outcast, he has managed to retain his innocence without trying. Santiago demonstrates his sensibility and active morality as he follows his compassion and empathy. He feels and acts upon these emotions when he is at home with the creatures of the sea. He feels and acts upon his hope as a personal defense against failure.

Early in the novel, while discussing with Manolin his still-acute vision, Santiago says, "I am a strange old
man" (14). This description applies to Santiago not only for his surprising physical abilities but also for his continued innocence. Santiago’s age, like Nick’s "is never mentioned" (Young 30), but he has managed to live a long and difficult life while still maintaining his innocence. This old man is able to retain his innocence because he is not subject to the corruption of society. He is insulated from this erosion because he is not a part of society, finding the majority of his companionship and kinship on the sea.

Santiago is strange as well because he combines qualities of the beasts and of men. He shares several qualities with his nonhuman friends, yet he retains enough human qualities to remain unmistakably a human being. The result is that he is actually more human than most other men. One way in which Santiago resembles the animals is that he acts by the necessity of his nature: he was "born to be a fisherman as the fish was born to be a fish."

Unlike the animals, however, Santiago is true to his own innate nature by choice. He has the human quality of free will. In regard to making choices, Santiago is more human than most men because he is true to himself.

Alone on the ocean, Santiago asks himself questions that a formally educated man might call theological or cosmological. Although he believes that he lacks the ability to answer these questions, just as his "brothers"
lack this ability, Santiago has the human ability to understand and answer them. He shows once again that he is more, not less, human than most men, for he bases his answers on his own insights, not the opinions of others.

Santiago's empathy sets him apart from both men and animals. The beasts of the sea do not feel it. This emotion is a uniquely human quality, yet most men also do not feel empathy. Santiago expresses this emotion not only in his thoughts but also in his actions. This feeling is even reflected in his attitude toward fishing and in the way he fishes. Santiago knows that it is his true nature to be a fisherman and that as a fisherman he must kill his "true brothers," yet he regrets his actions. The only way his fishing equipment could be simpler would be if he fished with his hands. He does not seek domination over the sea or its creatures as do the young men with motorboats and floats on their lines.

The old man thinks about hope in the abstract sense of human beings, such as when he consciously renews his courage and strength through his memories. He also considers hope in the immediate and practical sense of the beasts. Like the marlin he admires or the small bird he pities, Santiago demonstrates an expectant hopefulness while waiting for the great fish that he will catch and sell, and, more immediately, while waiting for his own meals. On land,
Santiago takes no action to feed himself but merely waits with the hope that food will appear. Manolin brings his food.

Manolin also demonstrates natural innocence, but he is not as primitive as Santiago. Based on the fact that he has a family and that he easily borrows from others to meet Santiago's needs, he seems a conventionally social human being. Manolin does not explicitly express the feelings of brotherhood or empathy Santiago feels for the beasts, but he says to Santiago that "I remember everything from when we first went together" (13). If he has learned his lessons well at all, he probably shares at least some of these feelings. Although Manolin is exposed to the corrupting influence of society, the novel closes with the possibility that he may retain his innocence as Santiago has done: "You must get well fast for there is much that I can learn and you can teach me everything" (126).
NOTES

1 The American edition of In Our Time, containing "Indian Camp" and "The Doctor and the Doctor's Wife," was published in 1925. The Old Man and the Sea was published in 1952.

2 Some of Weeks' criticism rings true, but I reserve judgment concerning whether Santiago could battle his marlin for three days, kill sharks, and then sail home.

3 This interpretation ignores Santiago's emotional bonds to Manolin.

4 Santiago is at least basically literate. He can read well enough to recognize names and places in the newspaper and follow the baseball games, but his education is primarily through experience.

5 Because he shows no emotional ties to the religious life of his village, Santiago does not likely truly believe that hopelessness is a sin, at least in the sense of conventional religion. In defining it as such, however, he at least emphasizes its importance.

6 Baker also adds that "Hemingway early establishes a clear symbolic connection between the boy and the lions," linking the strength of the boy and Santiago at the same age with the happiness he finds in the memory of the
lions (306-307).

7 Santiago's prayers are similar to those of a young soldier in an intercalary chapter of *In Our Time*:

He lay very flat and sweated and prayed oh jesus christ get me out of here. . . . If you'll only keep me from getting killed I'll do anything you say. I believe in you and I'll tell every one in the world that you are the only one that matters. . . . The shelling moved further up the line. . . . The next night back at Mestre he did not tell the girl he went upstairs with at the Villa Rossa about Jesus. And he never told anybody (Hemingway, *Short Stories* 143).

8 This "fiction" is the equivalent of Huck's subterfuge through which he satisfies his conscience and his need for food:

Towards daylight we got it all settled satisfactory, and concluded to drop crabapples and p'simmons. We warn't feeling just right, before that, but it was all comfortable now. I was glad the way it come out, too, because crabapples ain't ever good, and the p'simmons wouldn't be ripe for two or three months yet (80).
CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY


Hemingway's comment that "all modern American literature comes from one book by Mark Twain called Huckleberry Finn" (Green Hills 22), becomes a useful analytical tool when applied to his own work. Hemingway's work in general resembles Twain's in that they both successfully use vernacular speech, and both write of protagonists who are social outcasts in some fashion and who live in worlds of violence and suffering. More specifically, elements of Adventures of Huckleberry Finn appear in some of Hemingway's Nick Adams stories and his novel The Old Man and the Sea. All of the major characters and several minor characters in these works share the quality of natural innocence. Hemingway's Nick, Santiago, and Manolin, and Twain's Huck Finn and Jim reflect their authors' similar backgrounds and experiences and themselves come from similar environments. These environments are directly related to their continued possession and expression of their natural innocence.

Twain's and Hemingway's characters sometimes differ considerably from each other, but this fact does not weaken
the link between them. Their shared natural innocence does
not determine their identities; it is simply a common
quality. Huck, for instance, demonstrates more conclusively
than his comrades that his innocence is innate. Twain gives
him a fairly detailed background, and the influences of his
childhood can be evaluated with those of the present. Even
though Huck is influenced by several people who display at
least some of the elements of his innocence, he is not
deeply influenced by any of them.

The only society in which Huck feels comfortable is the
one he and Jim create on the raft. Huck's innocence places
him in conflict with any other community, and he expresses
his primitivism as he flees them. Huck seems to be always
fleeing something: the widow, Miss Watson, Pap, a wrecked
steamboat, the Duke and the Dauphin. He flees for his
natural life.

The elements of his innocence that lead Huck into
conflict with conventional society are his sensibility and
active morality. These qualities are shown most clearly in
his attitude toward slavery. Huck's compassion and his
repeated efforts to satisfy his sensibility, through freeing
Jim, place him in direct conflict with the institution of
slavery and those who support it. This group seems to be
composed of everyone except Huck.

Natural innocence in the Nick Adams stories varies from
that found in *Huckleberry Finn*. Philip Young hints at Nick's difference when he comments on the title of *In Our Time*, in which Nick makes his first appearance:

It is almost certain that he [Hemingway] intended here a sardonic allusion to that phrase from the Book of Common Prayer which Neville Chamberlin was later to make notorious: 'Give us peace in our time, O Lord,' for the stories are mainly of violence or evil in one form or another. It is that there is no peace in them (30).

While Huck and Santiago live in worlds that similarly contain violence and evil, they also frequently escape these influences and so protect their innocence from being eroded. Nick's world affords no meaningful escape from corrupting influences, so his innocence is worn away as he ages.

Romantic primitives, of course, are not the sole property of Twain and Hemingway. James Fenimore Cooper presents romantic primitives in several of his works, especially his Leather-Stocking novels. In his 1895 essay, "Fenimore Cooper's Literary Offenses," Twain attacks Cooper for his violation in this work of eighteen of the "nineteen rules governing literary art in the domain of romantic fiction" (1241). Some of these rules cover stylistic matters, but most of them concern character development. This group of rules is perhaps best summed up in Twain's
rule number 9:

They require that the personages of a tale shall confine themselves to possibilities and let miracles alone; or, if they venture a miracle, the author must so plausibly set it forth as to make it look possible and reasonable (1242).

Twain simply requires that Cooper's primitives, both Indian and white, be presented in a believable fashion, and Cooper fails this test, according to Twain. Twain's own effort at presenting a romantic primitive, Huckleberry Finn, passes his test. The characters of this novel, Huck included, violate none of Twain's nineteen rules that Cooper continuously trips over.

If Twain's test is applied to the Nick Adams stories and The Old Man and the Sea, Hemingway also passes. The Nick Adams stories must be passed with some qualifications, but not because Hemingway makes mistakes in Nick's presentation. Twain's and Hemingway's primitives all differ in some respects, but Nick is further removed from Huck and Santiago than these two are from each other. Nick's difference is not that he lacks believability but that he is not and cannot be as primitive as Santiago and Huck. Perhaps no one born in suburban Chicago can be a true primitive, regardless of the amount of time spent in the woods of Michigan. Better to come from rural Cuba.
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