der sensibility and masculine identity. He argues that the “affective soft-bodied masculinity of Ginsberg and the Beats morphs into a Dionysian sensibility ... a mode of behavior where the male figure can ... occupy opposing subject positions at the same time” (165). Other exponents of transformative masculinity that Penner discusses are William S. Burroughs, Timothy Leary, and The Living Theater’s 1968 production of Paradise Now. In his perceptive analysis of Paradise Now, Penner shows how the new soft male and the sexual politics of the counterculture “did not necessarily produce a more enlightened or progressive view of women and their bodies” and “often resembled the chauvinism of the previous generation” (211).

It hardly comes as a surprise that as the alternative masculinities became more mainstream, they were met by a homophobic and hypermasculine backlash. Penner uses the Black Panther movement and Eldridge Cleaver’s Soul on Ice in particular as examples of “the mythic fascination with hypermasculinity” in the late 1960s and early 1970s (213). And to make the picture even more complex, Penner outlines the deeply contested nature of the feminist struggle and shows how the radical feminist Kate Millett both deplored masculine hardness and remained suspicious of effeminate and passive males.

Some of Penner’s examples and points have already been made in Peter Schwenger’s Phallic Critiques: Masculinity and Twentieth Century Literature (1984) and Michael Kimmel’s Manhood in America: A Cultural History (1996), books that for some reason are not found in Penner’s bibliography. That said, Penner has written a fascinating, well-researched, and perceptive survey of a complex and still relevant issue. Nuanced and written in clear, lucid prose, Pinks, Pansies, and Punks is a welcome contribution to gender studies and a fresh angle on American literary studies.

Thomas Ærvold Bjerre  
University of Southern Denmark

Mark Twain’s World Readership

The collection is international in that two essays are by American scholars, three are by Iranian Twain scholars, and six are by Romanian schol-
Shelley Fisher Fishkin’s impressive essay on “Mark Twain as a Transnational Writer” (pp. 7-33) outlines how he became a writer with a world readership. How did Twain, “the most American of authors,” become a universal writer and a household name everywhere? Fishkin points to Twain’s refreshing boisterously irreverent humor, the irony and compassion of his social criticism, his New World vigor, and his use of the vernacular of ordinary Americans, as just some of the reasons for his reputation. She points out that Twain spent about a third of his life outside the United States, which helped him develop global perspectives and resulted in his anti-imperialism in the final decades of his life. Some of the information referred to in the inspiring essay can be found in *The Mark Twain Anthology: Great Writers on His Life and Work*, which Fishkin edited for the Library of America in 2010.

Lawrence Howe’s essay “Mark Twain and History” (pp. 35-58) shows that “Twain, the writer, was often troubled by history,” “read widely in history throughout his adult life,” and, it is argued convincingly, that Twain’s writings were often “a response to history.” It would be wrong to read *Huckleberry Finn* without gauging “the influence of the historical context” on the meaning of the text, both during the time of composition and at the publication of the novel. A more doubtful claim is that Twain should have been plagued by a sense of guilt “for having subtracted himself from the Civil War.” Twain’s time as a journalist in Nevada is seen as his attempt “to mitigate” his “absence from history.”—It is true, of course, that Twain blamed Sir Walter Scott for romantic delusions, which Twain named the “Walter disease” and saw as “the virulent cause of the Civil War.” One antidote to the disease is Twain’s *A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur’s Court*, an “explicitly anti-historical narrative” that demonstrates how little difference there is between fiction and history. Howe gives us insight into how Twain with his imagined alternatives, managed to disrupt rigid conceptions of history: “Twain perceived history as multilayered, accretional, synchronic, rather than continually progressive or diachronic.”

Two essays (of eleven) in the collection share a distinct feature: they are in Romanian. This linguistic choice allows the authors, Anca Hendrea and Maria Tereza Pirâu, to use conceptual depths and notional strengths provided by their language in order to address the focal point of the volume. Maria Tereza Pirâu’s essay, “About the Childhood of a Demonstrative Individual: A Psycho-pedagogical Reading of Tom Sawyer” (pp. 59-76), consists of a new approach in trying to place one of Twain’s characters in the panoply
of the memorable literary figures of a century. Analyzing the character and his evolution from a psycho-pedagogical point of view, the author argues that signs of “histrionism, chameleonism and narcissism” may be traced in Tom Sawyer’s behavior; all defining features of an “accented personality” or a “demonstrative nature” (59). The starting point of the argument rests with the work of Karl Leonhard, author of Akzentuierte Persönlichkeiten (1976). Leonhard examines elements of the psyche that “by their presence, absence or excess … can draw the line between normal, exceptional and pathological behavior” (60). Leonhard uses an array of real life subjects as well as literary figures to portray each type of personality he analyzes. The works of Shakespeare, Dostoevsky, Cervantes, and Molière abound with characters endowed with psychological width and depth that allow them to be of great interest, beyond their roles within the narratives. Pirâu applies Leonhard’s technique to Tom Sawyer—one of the many characters whose development can be accounted for by closely analyzing the causes that trigger specific actions. The causes, the argument goes, are mainly psychological, linked to the character’s accentuated personality, and present throughout Twain’s novels. Consequently, a lengthy part of the chapter is structured around instances of Tom Sawyer’s demonstrative demeanor and restless nature. Convincing examples are selected as clear traces of a multitude of features gathered under the concept of a “demonstrative childhood”: an overflowing imagination, a constant desire to be the center of attention, and a measure of narcissism. The author reaches a threefold conclusion, which emphasizes the possibility of using Leonhard’s research method both for psychological analysis and in literary criticism. Pirâu underlines the pedagogical gain with a double perspective: it offers a new understanding of the literary work and projects this understanding into the complex relationships between professors and students.

Anca Hendrea’s essay “A Baroque Universe” (pp.155-76) employs a similar technique. She seeks to “depict an epoch” by describing and theoretically investigating its Baroque style and offers examples of works where its characteristics are most distinct. The main literary trope associated with the Baroque is, according to this essay, the labyrinth, which is closely connected to the motifs of the mirror, the double, and the liminal (157). Starting from a brief account of these themes in Mark Twain’s The Prince and the Pauper, Hendrea shifts her focus to Cartea de la Metopolis (The Book from Metopolis) a novel by țefan Bănulescu, a Romanian author. The essay manages to skillfully present both texts with relation to their Baroque
elements of style and it succeeds, with academic rigor, in emphasizing the importance of the concept in literary history.

Mohammad Exir’s essay on “Huckleberry Finn: Realistic Narrative or Narrative Realism?” (pp. 77-102) attempts to detail and evaluate the narrator’s realism. Exir takes up the classic discussion about applying the labels ‘realistic’ or ‘romantic’ to the novel and points out that as a comment on “the social integration or political inclusion of African Americans in 1885,” interpretation becomes “much more slippery.” The essay tries at length to define the terms “Realism” and “Romanticism” and becomes a regular survey of critical opinions on Twain’s realism in his most famous novel. With many others (including Hemingway) Exir sees the text as realistic, up to and including chapter 31. After which we get ‘comedy and farce,’ or ‘Romanticism’ and indebtedness to ‘sentimentalism.’ The essay, which reads as an outline for a book, concludes that “the realism of the novel” prevails, among others due to the photographic descriptions and the number of dialects used.

Ligia Tomoiaga’s essay is also on Huckleberry Finn, but with an emphasis on its picaresque character (pp. 103-17). There are five pages on the origin and nature of the “picaresque” and this essay also reads as a very short summary of some much longer text. The question seems to be: is Huck Finn really a picaroon, a true rogue? Is his progress really much more realistic than picaresque? The two primary debaters of the issue are Angela Willis, who sees the novel as a classic picaresque text, and Ulrich Wicks, who cannot see the novel as a true representative of the picaresque genre. The essay presents a continued discussion among Twain scholars, without taking sides, as Tomoiaga remains on the fence between Wicks and Willis, which is somewhat disappointing.

Andrea Popescu’s anthropological reading of Huckleberry Finn is also in the impressive Romanian and French traditions of constantly defining man’s nature (pp. 119-36). Somehow the essays can be read as an index of every literary preoccupation of the last sixty years, which is not necessarily an advantage in reading them. Trying to define the profane space and the sacred space in the novel, Popescu invites us to see the influence on the novel of Coleridge, Cooper, Emerson, Thoreau, Whitman, and Melville, but also to see it as a rewriting of the American tradition. The essay outlines Huck Finn’s development from innocence to experience. There is nothing new or surprising in this traditional interpretation of the novel; but it covers the spectrum of most readings of Huckleberry Finn.
It is refreshing that Neda Akbari’s essay has picked Twain’s *Connecticut Yankee* in which to trace his interest in politics and technology (pp. 137-153). Mark Twain was very enthusiastic about technological and industrial progress most of his life, but in 1898 he changed his mind, according to Akbari, and began to see material progress as “useless and meaningless,” “as long as man himself had not improved,” on the contrary had become “imprisoned by the machines” he creates. (And Twain realized this before the Internet was thought of.) Twain anticipated that capitalism would lead to imperialism and involve attempts to dominate the globe; it was a problem for him that he found it difficult to distinguish between old royal conquests and republican American political aims at the end of the 19th century. As Akbari outlines it, Twain was way ahead of his time in his fear of what technology can be used for.

Luminita Todea, who is a linguist, has contributed a short essay: “Politeness and ‘Unselfish Lying’ in Mark Twain’s Language of Humour” (pp. 177-85). The essay tackles issues such as politeness, social interaction, and humor as an aspect of communication. Todea praises Twain for showing that “the vulgar coinage of American speech carried as much beauty and meaning as any of the English models used by his predecessors.”

Masoumeh Rahimi’s essay returns us to *A Connecticut Yankee* to try “A Hermeneutic Approach” with the idea that Twain’s story deconstructs “the Enlightenment” (pp. 187-99). The main point seems to be that “so far no one has thought that fictional Twain might have been deceived and Morgan the narrator might be a con-artist.” This idea which is exciting, if a bit far-fetched, leads into an attempt to clarify the relations “among text, intertext, and authorial intention.” The essay is an excursion into literary theory, and the application of it. Does it help us understand the relationship between Twain and Hank Morgan, beyond showing that it is complex? It seems that the critic’s willed relationship with hermeneutics, and readings and misreadings, complicates the reading of the novel tremendously, and quite unnecessarily.

Ramona Demarcsek, the editor of the book, has contributed an entertaining final essay to the volume. It is on “Eve’s Diary: A Different Angle to Diarism” (pp. 201-208). “Eve’s Diary” is from 1905. The diary is defined as a literary genre, with many problems for its first diarist. How to keep a diary without dates or a calendar? Eve uses the days of the week and her leaps in time are extraordinary in the era before the fall. She wants to write about her “masculine,” but he has no name yet. She has to discover speech, gram-
mar, and give names to everything. Later she uses bits from Adam’s Diary and takes a great leap of forty years. Demarcsek’s point is to see Eve as a modern woman, who starts writing to “become self-aware, with the obvious purpose of discovering herself and the world around her.” After Eve has matured, and knows herself, she does not write in it for forty years, except for an entry written shortly before she dies. But it ends with Adam adding the words he said at Eve’s grave to her diary. He intrudes on her work, becomes the first reader without her permission, and then makes himself her co-author! Demarcsek does not spell it out, but the meaning is obvious: ‘how male!’ It would have been natural to use extracts from Twain’s “Adam’s Soliloquy” from the same year, where perennial gender issues are so delightfully in focus. It is, of course, a mock diary, and the first, so Twain did not have to write in accordance with any convention. “Eve’s Diary” (and “Eve Speaks” also from 1905) gave Twain an opportunity to challenge traditional Christian behavior and beliefs, and offered Demarcsek the chance to subtly challenge traditional male behavior.

The collection offers much insight, and several surprising readings, and it is a fine contribution to international Mark Twain studies.

Jan Nordby Gretlund University of Southern Denmark, Odense
Elena Stanciu University of Southern Denmark, Odense

Noble Effort, Prof. Haidt, but We’re Not Convinced


Moral Jonathan Haidt argues for a new appreciation of conservative thinking and traditional religion in The Righteous Mind: Why Good People are Divided by Politics and Religion (Pantheon Books, New York, 375 pages). His research focuses on the moral foundations of politics and on ways liberals and conservatives can move beyond the culture wars and engage in more civil forms of political discourse. He is not convincing that reconciliation is possible, however, and if he is right that politics is religion, we can easily understand why the Conservative Right did as well as they did in November.

The 2012 Presidential election campaign was a fierce and costly contest for power between Democrats and Republicans, two groups with different