
through the lenses of gender, sexuality, and love studies. These stories can also provide a valuable reading experience. For me, reading from *Have I Got a Story for You* was something of a *mechayeb*—it gave me new life—not only when the stories brought me laughter or tears, but also when they put me in the mind of my family’s and people’s history. I visualized my great- and great-great-grandparents on both branches of my family tree uprooting themselves from Austria-Hungary, Prussia, and the Pale of Settlement and making new roots in Brooklyn and Manhattan. They may have browsed the *Forverts* while discovering for themselves what Gliner calls “immigration and its discontents.” They were able to find relative success in America, and ultimately, that’s how I’m here. More broadly speaking, though, *Have I Got a Story for You* represents archival research and editorial work producing something wonderful for readers and scholars.

Alan H. Goldman, editor. *Mark Twain and Philosophy*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2017. 235p.

B. W. JORGENSEN
BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY

Mark Twain and Philosophy is the third volume in Rowman & Littlefield’s Great Authors and Philosophy series, preceded by volumes on Stephen King and Jane Austen (both 2016). The series resembles the earlier Open Court Popular Culture and Philosophy series, which numbered 109 volumes as of *The X-Files and Philosophy: The Truth is In Here* in May 2017. Wiley/Blackwell got into the game with a Philosophy and Pop Culture series with 51 volumes with *Alien and Philosophy: I Infest, Therefore I Am*, also May 2017; and the University Press of Kentucky rolled out a Philosophy of Popular Culture series, recently listing 32 volumes on its website, e.g. *The Philosophy of TV Noir* and *Tennis and Philosophy: What the Racket is All About*. Is this a Trend, or what?

The UP of Kentucky’s goal is “to demonstrate how philosophical inquiry has been reinvigorated by the increased scholarly interest in the intersection of popular culture and philosophy, as well as to explore through philosophical analysis beloved pop culture phenomena,” thus making “traditional philosophical ideas. . . accessible to the general public through examples of popular culture.” The series “seeks to publish both established and emerging scholars” while “eschewing ephemeral trends of philosophical and cultural theory.” This whole popcult and philosophy thing looks like a small but burgeoning economy of competing cottage industries that, one may hope, promotes the careers of “emerging” academics and perhaps enlivens the latter years of the “established” (read: long-tenured). Contributors to one series

sometimes turn up in others. The General Editor for the Rowman series, Jacob M. Held, edited or co-edited volumes on Dr. Seuss, Roald Dahl, James Bond, and Terry Pratchett for Open Court, and his Stephen King volume for Rowman looks like a sort of bridge between the two series. The main difference in the newer Rowman series looks to be the absence of jokey subtitles. The volumes normally run 200–300 pages, with a general introduction by the editor[s] and with contributors' essays numbered consecutively as "chapters" and (usually) bunched into roman-numbered "parts" under subtitles: "I. Dr. Frankenstein's Easy Guide to Eternal Life"; "III. I Made a Monster! Now What?" and so on, in the Open Court series; Rowman sounds more staid and "academic" with "Part I: Morality in *Huckleberry Finn*" or "Part V: Comparison to Other Philosophers," and so on.

The partitioning, not surprisingly, often looks ad hoc and arbitrary (editor Jacob Held did not partition *Stephen King and Philosophy*). In *Mark Twain and Philosophy*, the two essays in "Part IV: Literary Devices" — the "devices" are "serious humor" and "Socratic irony" — might just as well fit in "Part II: Mark Twain and Religion," since one deals with "that Peculiar Institution: Christianity" and the other with "Twain's Skeptical Religious Jeremiads" (but is *Personal Recollections of Joan of Arc* a "jeremiad"?). "Part III: Moral Issues" looks logically separable from "Part I: Morality in *Huckleberry Finn*," since the "issues" are "The Noble Art of Lying" and "Twain's Critique of Human Exceptionalism" and the texts are two essays on lying and several anti-vivisection pieces. Mostly running ten to twenty pages, the essays generally lack room for patiently attentive extended close readings of substantial quotations, even when their topics, e.g. "Huckleberry Finn's Struggle between Sympathy and Moral Principle Reconsidered," warrant a focus on just a few paragraphs of primary text. Startlingly, editor Alan Goldman's "Huckleberry Finn and Moral Motivation" barely cites *Huckleberry Finn* at all, just "No'm. Killed a nigger" in support of the claim that Huck's "sympathy for Jim [. . .] does not generalize to other slaves" (25) (it might be part of Huck's deception of Aunt Sally); which is not to say the philosophical argument about the rationality of "sympathy" is weak, only that it doesn't get very close to the concrete and particular terms of the text.

Not a Twain scholar but (since age 14) a huge and diehard fan of *Huck Finn*, I notice with some surprise that none of the five essays in Part I cite the California edition but rather reprints from Signet Classics to the Folio Society; only Kristina Gehrman in "Twain's Last Laugh" cites any of the voluminous literary scholarship on HF. Other parts of the book almost universally take up other, less often studied or sometimes posthumously published Mark Twain texts like *Life on the Mississippi*, *The Mysterious Stranger*, *Letters from the Earth*, the *Diaries of Adam and Eve*, and most of these do cite the Califor-

nia editions; some cite the literary scholarship on Twain.

Of the essays in Part I (roughly 30% of the collection), three comprise a dialogue with Jonathan Bennett's "The Conscience of Huckleberry Finn" (1974). Yet Bennett's essay and the others too easily slide from chapter 16 into chapter 31 and back, as if these two critical episodes were entirely equivalent in presenting Huck's struggle with "conscience" and "sympathy," when clearly the ante gets much higher in Huck's decision to "go to hell" — not just the "risk" of "an eternity in Hell" (16; cf 20, 54) but the certainty of hell. It makes historical sense to try "sympathy" as a moral term for articulating Huck's crises of conscience, and to invoke Adam Smith as Fudge does (36–37) or to mention Bentham and Mill as Michael Lyons does (49). Yet although "sympathy" occurs three times in the text of *Huck Finn*, it's always in weepy contexts where Huck (who uses the term just once, having picked it up from other characters) distances himself from those appealing for "sympathy" — especially the King and the Duke defrauding the Wilks girls. As I read him, Huck never thinks about his own "sympathy" for Jim (which I grant may be implied in how he thinks and acts), much less about any "reasons" it might logically entail.

Indeed in his most acute crisis (ch 31), Huck thinks only "I see Jim," "I'd see him," "and see him." Surely Goldman is right to mention friendship and "emotional attachment" (16, 18), as is Fudge to mention "personal relationship" (33) and, all the more, Gehrman to notice Huck "eventually coming to love Jim" (53; cf 54). Yet none of them takes the point quite far enough: Huck has no other "reason" to decide "I'll go to hell" than "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." If there is a more heartbreakingly beautiful and morally truthful sentence in Mark Twain or in American literature, I've yet to read it. (Read it aloud and see what it does to you.) And I've yet to see this one discussed adequately. To invoke Levinas, Derrida, Blanchot, or Aristotle — as I might here — might only spoil it. Or Nietzsche, whom Twain said he'd never read, "nor any other philosopher" (67): "What is done out of love always happens beyond good and evil" (Aphorism 153 in *Beyond Good and Evil* [1886], trans. Marianne Cowan [South Bend: Gateway, 1955]: 86). Maybe no discussion can be adequate.

Still, we will discuss (we've been paid to), as will our philosophy colleagues and friends. What do philosophers—or academics (adjunct to tenured) teaching in philosophy departments — do with literature etc.? In *Mark Twain and Philosophy*, it seems to me they rather too often treat a book like *Huckleberry Finn* as a "case" or "illustration" or "example" with "lessons" (the words turn up noticeably in Part I [5, 15, 17, 19, 22, 26, 28, 32, 42, 45, 47, 48,

51]). But let's be fair: so do we in literature departments, perhaps especially if we're committed to a "theory." It's one thing, though, to "argue that Huckleberry's sympathy is sufficient for his own heroism, although his moral status would be much higher if it derived from moral principle" (Lyon 41)—in his greatest crisis, alas, Huck has no principles—and quite another to offer, as Gehrman does, "a *developmentally attuned* perspective on Huck's character and his moral capacities" (55). Taking cues from Aristotle and Iris Murdoch, she tracks "the tale of a traumatized child whose upbringing has left him deeply damaged: he is largely bewildered about the difference between right and wrong, he is incapable of acting in ways that are consistent with his own choices and values, and he is just as racist as the other White members of his community" (56). I might quibble with some of that ("incapable of acting"?), but Gehrman does get into the dynamic movement of "Huck's story" and make her case that the "greatness" of Huck Finn "is not triumphant or celebratory, but rather *Socratic*—to provoke and humiliate us "for the good of [our] souls" (63). She makes a useful contribution to our discussions—our and our students' understanding and knowing—of a book we shall not soon "get shut of."

Gehrman's is the best essay in Part I and perhaps in the book, but it's not the only one I learned something from; indeed all of them might inform an interested reader of Twain, or provoke slower and closer re-reading of *Huck Finn* or any other text they take up. Are they "good philosophy"? My philosophy friends will have to judge that. For my part, I value James McLachlan's "Mark Twain and the Problem of Evil," Brian Earl Johnson's "The American Diogenes," and Jeffrey Dueck's "Making the Heart Grow Fonder" as informative, well-written, and generative.

Fernando González Lucini. *Mi vida entre canciones*. Madrid, Spain:, 2017. 272p.

ELIA ROMERA FIGUEROA
DUKE UNIVERSITY

Mi vida entre canciones (*My Life Among Songs*) allows readers to immerse themselves in the life story of the most well-known chronicler of Spanish and Latin American singer-songwriters. The result is an inspiring book that encourages us to begin our own *life among songs* by including references to unfinished projects, books and music that we might further explore. While reading it, Spotify and Google would be good accompaniments in order to listen to the core songs such as *Somniem*, and to travel to Lucini's *lieux de mémoire* like the street *Las Novias* or the notable concert hall *Toldería*. Readers will want to read