

Robert D. Tindol¹

Guangdong University of Foreign Studies

Faculty of English Language and Culture

Guangzhou, China

A DELEUZIAN READING OF THE WHIPPING BOY IN *THE PRINCE AND THE PAUPER*

Abstract: The role of the whipping boy in Mark Twain's 1881 novel *The Prince and the Pauper* can be explained via an application of Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari's *Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. A reading of the plot reveals that neither Edward Tudor (the crown prince of England) nor Tom Canty (a street urchin) would normally be inclined to enact the type of social disruption that Deleuze/Guattari identify as a "deterritorialization." However, they both manage to do so only because of their unlikely exchange of roles, which is further enabled by the crown prince's official whipping boy and by a disenfranchised member of the peerage who performs a similar function. Thus, the whipping boy acts as a catalyst who enables the deterritorialization to take place.

Keywords: Mark Twain, Gilles Deleuze, Felix Guattari, Anti-Oedipus

A minor character by any fictional standards, the whipping boy from the 1881 comic novel *The Prince and the Pauper* seemingly gets little more regard from author Mark Twain than he receives from the courtiers who beat him whenever the studies of the young Prince of Wales go poorly. With only two appearances in the short novel to his credit -- neither of which involves a beating, mercifully -- poor Humphrey Marlow could almost be dismissed as a sideline joke on Twain's part. After all, the historical role of the whipping boy is to receive the punishment intended for the crown prince, with the presumed assumption that suffering on the part of the former will result in soul-searching and self-motivated improvement on the part of the latter. Today, as in Twain's time, we tend to dismiss the very role of the whipping boy as farcical humor at best, if not downright mockery.

¹ roberttindol@hotmail.com

Comic effect was likely what Twain had in mind when he devised the role of the whipping boy as a servant for the future Edward VI. One may recall that Twain is the fellow who once dropped a watermelon on the head of his best friend and travel companion from the upper deck of a steamboat, so a bit of rambunctious joking was certainly not beneath him.² However, we may also ponder the question of whether Humphrey Marlow serves some paradigmatic purpose in the narrative. Even though I have characterized *The Prince and the Pauper* as a comic novel, the action can also take exceedingly grim turns, so it is more proper to say that the novel readily blends the ridiculous with the horrific, and does so literally in the space of a few words. This is a book in which people are burned alive for no good reason, but also one in which a nefarious kinsman gets his come-uppance in a classic comedic resolution. But is the whipping boy merely a touch of sardonic or even dark humor and no more, or does he really provide a narrative continuity that serves a larger purpose? My purpose here is to argue that the latter can be explained via the notion of “deterritorialization”³ from Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari’s *Capitalism and Schizophrenia* series, but first it is necessary to review other critical commentary on the novel.

As one might expect, the critical literature on *The Prince and the Pauper* is relatively scanty when compared to that of other Twain novels, especially *Huckleberry Finn*. Dedicated readings of the novel are even more sparse, with many critics opting to reference *The Prince and the Pauper* along with other works. Will Kaufman, for example, argues that “Twain was groping towards a psychological definition of the conscience” in many of his novels, and that his familiar preoccupation with twins and

² Twain recounts this story in his autobiography *Roughing It* (2014): “One day this editor gave me a watermelon which I made preparations to devour on the spot, but chancing to look out of the window, I saw John standing directly under it and an irresistible desire came upon me to drop the melon on his head, which I immediately did. I was the loser, for it spoiled the melon, and John never forgave me and we dropped all intercourse and parted...”

³ I have in mind a fairly straightforward definition of “deterritorialization” as the sort of individual disruptions that can result in social change. In other words, the young prince is “deterritorialized” because he gains new knowledge of the lower classes that simply does not let him continue in the former blissful ignorance of his opulent life of luxury. This is not to say that he abjures luxury after his adventure as a “pauper,” but merely that his former attitude has been deterritorialized. An example from Deleuze and Guattari is far more eloquent than any attempt to paraphrase them: “Each of these becomings brings about the deterritorialization of one term and the reterritorialization of the other; the two becomings interlink and form relays in a circulation of intensities pushing the deterritorialization ever further” (Deleuze, 1987: 10).

other closely-linked pairs was in part a means of addressing various conflicts through “his radical splitting of the psyche into a ‘sound heart’ and an ‘ill-trained’ or ‘deformed’ conscience (2006: 464). Kaufman is primarily addressing Huck’s inner conflicts, but he nonetheless notes that the twin issue shows up in *The Prince and the Pauper* as well (2006: 465). Jeffrey Bilbro, in a reading of *A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur’s Court* as an elaborate hoax, notes in passing that the various madcap circumstances in so many of Twain’s writings are in fact aimed at encouraging his audience to dive “into the center of a story’s action” in order “to see their implicit beliefs from a different perspective.” This may result in an enhanced ability “to see life from a different social position,” and Bilbro cites *The Prince and the Pauper* as a characteristic example (2011: 216). Christopher Morris, in an essay on Twain and Charles Dudley Warner’s *The Gilded Age*, sees the novel as a complication of the word “age” in order to elicit a double-meaning. In other words, “age” refers to “the times,” in both *The Gilded Age* and in the Renaissance of *The Prince and the Pauper*, but also to the observation that the main characters in both are “people at the age of deciding their future” (2011: 227). Thus, it is possible to see *The Gilded Age* as a critique of “speculative capitalism” as well as a biting satire -- and perhaps one can see the duality in *The Prince and the Pauper* as well. After all, the gilding of an object involves the placement of real gold foil on a surface, so the question of what is valuable and what is phony becomes a bit complicated.

Undoubtedly the most extensive reading of the novel in recent years is Bill Brown’s 2003 book *A Sense of Things: The Object Matter of American Literature*. Brown is especially interested in commodity fetishism as a dimension of the novel and how the object has been inadequately imagined in the past by critics. Playing on the famous confusion of the Royal Seal as a simple nutcracker, Brown posits that the complicated duality between a material object and the human society in which it finds usage is a fertile avenue to deciphering Twain’s nuanced sense of comic irony. This is the novel, Brown explains, “where Twain strives to imagine, within history but also (as it were) beyond history, one dialectic by which human subjects and inanimate objects may be said to constitute one another” (2003: 25). The comic misplacement of the Roayl Seal is the final episode in the novel, and its unveiling leads to the restoration of the rightful king. All’s well that ends well, as someone once said, and the novel indeed ends with a comedic resolution -- except for the presence of that half-sister waiting in the wings.

In sum, these and various other critical readings have either focused on or stipulated that Twain tends to ride an interesting line between comedy and paradox. My original question about the whipping boy, then, is whether his minor presence can be dismissed as a merely comical moment of confusion, or whether he represents a deeper narrative intent. One way the answer can be resolved is by looking at *The Prince and*

the Pauper in general and the whipping boy in particular as an Anti-Oedipal text. The aforementioned two-volume *Capitalism and Schizophrenia* series by Giles Deleuze and Felix Guattari may be employed to suggest that the more serious side of the whipping boy's function is constructed in such a way that the future Edward VI is led by external circumstances to become a "deterritorialization" that leads to a "plateau," in Deleuze and Guattari's way of thinking. In other words, the young prince is in normal circumstances an absolute monarch who is brought up to have little true regard for the sufferings of ordinary people – or at least other commoners aside from the whipping boy. But the unique circumstances of his switching roles with the pauper of the story, Tom Canty, along with his prior sensitization to moral responsibility as clarified by his observation of Humphrey Marlow's occasionally taking his punishment, results in an amalgamation that lead to a historic plateau. He may in the future rule England as a near-absolute monarch, just as his father and ancestors have all done, but at least he will be a monarch with a modicum of insight into the needs of the common people.

An interesting review of the relevant history of Edward VI is included in a scientific commentary published in 2001 in the *New England Journal of Medicine*. According to the authors, Edward VI was already displaying tremendous political promise during his mid-teen years before he died at the age of 15 in an "untimely and tragic" manner, in no small part because his demise left open the pathway for the accession of the aptly-named Bloody Mary (Holmes, 2001: 60). The somber history of heads rolling and flesh burning in the Bloody Mary years is too familiar to discuss here, although Twain also alludes to the brutal career of Edward VI's half-sister at the end of the novel. However, the *NEJM* writers also proffer the observation that the young king's death was markedly different because of the poor medical knowledge during his lifetime. As the writers put it, today's "'princes' of the developed world are better protected now than in the time of Henry VIII; it is the 'pauper' children of some developing nations who may still suffer the fate of young King Edward VI" (Holmes 2001: 61).

Regardless of how promising young Edward VI may have been, Twain does not justify the monarchy as an alternate form of government for America. Instead he delves in the possibilities of outward mutations of the power structure, which can apply to a presidency, an absolute monarchy, or a powerful corporate monopoly alike. To demonstrate the argument, one may consider the very name of the two-volume series, *Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. While my argument is by no means that any character in the novel should be lionized because he or she confronts the world of commodity consumption with a bit of "craziness," the works by the two French philosophers nonetheless point at a pathway departing from the "state-sanctioned" philosophizing by which the powers-that-be invariably run the world. Deleuze and Guattari suggest that it

is the very breach of decorum that the world of power imposes on us that allows a way around the seeming inevitability of a state-sanctioned capitalist society.

Now, lest the objection be made that the novel is set in Tudor England at a time before the brand of capitalism that Karl Marx wrote about even existed, it should also be pointed out that *The Prince and the Pauper* is an American novel, even though monarchy has never existed in the United States at all. The reason that the *Capitalism and Schizophrenia* argument works is not because the novel concerns the specific fiats of the young hereditary monarch in the story, nor because of the economic system that was dominant in his time, but rather because a certain madcap set of circumstances converged in such a way that alteration of the social system appeared possible, if only for a moment. As Deleuze and Guattari's English translator and commentator Brian Massumi explains, "schizophrenia is the enlargement of life's limits through the pragmatic proliferation of concepts" (1992: 1). The *Capitalism and Schizophrenia* series was ostensibly intended to explain the peculiar circumstances following the celebrated French protests of 1968 when students perplexed their leftist elders by rejecting both the established order and the Marxist alternative simultaneously (Buchanan, 2008: 2). Nonetheless, the work has broader implications that readily extend to a nineteenth-century novel concerning the chaotic exchange of a crown prince with a street urchin who happens to resemble him physically. In short, the *Capitalism and Schizophrenia* project suggests a way in which an established power can be altered through a unique set of circumstances that are relatively independent of the workings of the traditional power base. The theorist Fredric Jameson, in discussing the work of Deleuze and Guattari, states the following in *The Political Unconscious*:

What is denounced is... a system of allegorical interpretation in which the data of one narrative line are radically impoverished by their rewriting according to the paradigm of another narrative, which is taken as the former's master code or Ur-narrative and proposed as the ultimate hidden or unconscious meaning of the first one. (1981: 6)

Thus, the novel discoveries of the young Edward Tudor are not provided free reign via his natural predilections, but rather by the inadvertent hijacking of his accustomed story-line by a second narrative imposed by an outside agent who is equally as unlikely to wander out of his own comfortable preconceptions. Edward may be sensitized by his angst over the previous beatings of his whipping boy, but it is only when he loses total control of his circumstances that the possibility of a new relationship between the powerful and powerless is impressed upon him.

But even though the actors themselves are pushed toward reterritorialization,⁴ the economic underpinnings remain the same, as Humphrey Marlow himself reminds Tom Canty. When the death of King Henry VIII makes the advancement of Edward imminent, Humphrey fears that the education of the crown prince may have come to an end:

“Then I will speak it out, for it lieth near my heart. Sith thou art no more Prince of Wales but King, thou canst order matters as thou wilt, with none to say thee nay; wherefore it is not in reason that thou wilt no longer vex thyself with dreary studies, but wilt burn thy book and turn thy mind to things less irksome. Then I am ruined, and mine orphan sisters with me!”
(Twain, *Prince*)⁵

And why would Humphrey worry about such a consequence, considering that it also entails the cessation of his occasional beatings? The answer he gives Tom is quite telling:

“My back is my bread, O my gracious liege! If I go idle, I starve.”
(Twain, *Prince*)

In the space of a few sentences, Humphrey not only explains his role but also stitches it permanently together with economic exigency. In addition to the function of the whipping boy in catalyzing a deterritorialization, he is also inextricably linked to the economy. Furthermore, he is one of the lowly proletariat who is eager to sell his services for remuneration -- perhaps in hopes of his own advancement, but nonetheless in a manner that comports with Marx’s understanding of capitalism. The analogy may not be perfect, but in a manner of speaking, Humphrey is selling his services to the brokers of capital.

With this explanation in mind, it is necessary to back up just a bit and provide a general outline of the plot. Young Edward Tudor, the son of King Henry VIII and his third wife, Jane Seymour, is about nine years old at the time of the novel and is living a luxurious but somewhat sheltered life in the palace. In one of those coincidence that can

⁴ “Reterritorialization” is used here as a diametric opposite of “deterritorialization” as explained in the third footnote. The previously quoted passage by Deleuze and Guattari from *A Thousand Plateaus* is once again helpful in describing the symmetry of the two terms.

⁵ All quotations are from the Gutenberg on-line edition of the novel; hence, no page numbers.

occur only in a fictional work, the prince encounters a young urchin boy one day near the palace gate and invites him inside. The two boys look so much alike that the prince persuades his new friend to exchange places for a few hours, but circumstances quickly prevent them from reassuming their rightful places. Their respective families are fooled by dint of their identical appearance, and while neither displays the knowledge of family and other matters he should possess, the families of both merely assume that the odd-acting boy is suffering from a touch of mental derangement.

The novel then launches into a series of adventures in which the respective experiences of the two boys proceed in sharp contrast. Tom Canty is treated royally -- quite literally -- and takes rather naturally to the prerogatives of the high office he has assumed when his "father," King Henry VIII, suddenly dies. Meanwhile, Edward Tudor embarks on an adventure in which he experiences and learns more about his own country than a sheltered monarch could possibly learn in a lifetime of luxury and privilege. Edward returns to the palace a changed individual, having experienced firsthand the social inequalities of which he never otherwise would have become aware. When he eventually assumes his hereditary title as Edward VI, he resolves to correct as many social ills as his power will allow.

The novel is therefore a comedy of errors in which the comedic resolution of the conflict works in such a way that the world becomes a better place -- at least in some ways and for a certain period of time. But to explain how the whipping boy himself fits into the scheme necessitates a closer perusal of the plot development after the swapping of places has occurred. Although the situation is portrayed as having its comic and farcical elements, Edward's dilemma becomes glaringly real when the ruffians amongst whom he is thrown -- those would normally be dismissed as minor characters who are indeed "comical or grotesque" -- are suddenly able to cuff the king to their heart's content simply because they do not recognize him as king. By the same token, Tom Canty receives the privileged treatment of royalty rather than be dismissed as an equally minor dose of comic relief who would otherwise reside at the periphery of both the palace and the reader's cognizance.

If the situation is so absurd, then what keeps the plot from flying apart? Why is Tom not locked away as a hopelessly insane young heir who must be supplanted by his elder half-sister Mary? How does young Edward avoid pushing the ruffian associates of his villainous "father" a bit too far with his back-talk and thereby suffering even more serious consequences? In both cases the answer is that the two are well served by their whipping boys -- Humphrey Marlow in the case of Tom Canty, and Miles Hendon in the case of Edward. Both characters provide assistance at crucial times that serves to normalize and stabilize the respective situations of the two boys. Simply put, Humphrey agrees to instruct Tom in the ways of the court so that he will minimize the awkward encounters that lead others to think he is crazy, while Miles humors Edward and treats

him as royalty in his presence, but secretly considers the boy to be deranged and in need of assistance from a hostile and uncaring world. The responses of the two characters are thus diametrically opposed -- the former proffering assistance as part of a subterfuge in which he and his master willingly cooperate, and the latter providing his master no clue as to his motivations -- but the end result is exactly the same. The two boys not only survive, but both survive long enough to learn new lessons and gain new insights which will allow them to change social circumstances and correct social ills insofar as it is within their power to do so. But how these inequalities came about in the first place is hardly the focus; rather, it is sufficient if an occasional hybridization leads to social progress. This is the economic ideology of *The Prince and the Pauper*.

In this sense, Twain's story embodies a version of capitalism akin to the "robber barons" who were steadily gaining economic and political power when the novel appeared in the early 1880s.⁶ Just as Twain's novel appeared in a world in which the underlying reasons for the economic changes in the wind were ineffable, the young prince and pauper are born in a world in which social classes are already highly polarized and privileges understood to be literally divine right. And even though Twain cannot help himself in poking a bit of fun at the opulence of the court when he describes the dressing of the young prince with the help of some two dozen servants, his cynical tone abates somewhat in the description of the royal procession following the death of Henry VIII. A bit of quotation from Chapter XI ("At Guildhall") illustrates the argument quite well:

The royal barge, attended by its gorgeous fleet, took its stately way down the Tames through the wilderness of illuminated boats. The air was laden with music; the river banks were be ruffled with joy-flames; the distant city lay in a soft luminous glow from its countless invisible bonfires; above it rose many a slender spire into the city, incrusting with sparkling lights, wherefore in their remoteness they seemed like jeweled lances thrust aloft; as the fleet swept along, it was greeted from the banks with a

⁶ "Robber baron" is a disparaging term for the venture capitalists who quickly rose to prominence in the latter part of the nineteenth century, at a time when the United States itself was rapidly gaining in global power and influence. A modern conservative would probably argue that the robber barons were not robbers and certainly not barons, but rather were highly capable businessmen who merely used their resourcefulness to take advantage of money-making opportunities that presented themselves. Those of a different political stripe, however, might well counter that these were the individuals who best exemplified the dangers of capital that Marx predicted in his various works.

continuous hoarse roar of cheers and the ceaseless flash and boom of artillery. (Twain, *Prince*)

The reason for these sights and sounds, and more pointedly, for the enormous expenditure on frivolities at a time when people are still living in squalor? The answer is that the king has died and that ancient institutions and conventions mandate an ostentatious show in his honor. Little surprise, then, when we discover that the palace and various other places on the royal circuit such as Westminster Abbey are equally adorned and equally immune to the second-guessing of those who would ask how such disequilibria in public spending can be justified. The answer in the age of the robber-barons is that this is the way things are.

However, the next question is whether the glaring disequilibria can be minimized in order to alleviate human suffering and social injustice. The answer within *The Prince and the Pauper* is a qualified yes: perhaps just a bit of balance can be restored if the proper catalyst allows the requisite interactions to take place. Thus, the madcap bouncing back and forth from the opulence of the king's place to the squalor of the streets draws a bright contrast between the two worlds, but at the same time provides no insights into the underlying reasons for the differences. Certainly the privileges of the crown prince and the other royalty have accreted in time, and just as surely, the squalor of the inhabitants of the crowded city has also increased. Such disequilibria is independent of ideology in this particular fictional world, but "just is" in the circumstances in which we find the prince and the pauper. Only a madcap misadventure will allow the disequilibria to abate ever so slightly, and even this will require the unlikely addition of a catalyst -- in this case, the literal whipping boy in the castle and the metaphorical whipping boy on young Edward's adventure through London and the surrounding countryside.

To return to the argument of Deleuze and Guattari, the whipping boy catalyzes a unique brand of production that allows a freedom from the normal constraints imposed by the offices of the crown prince (and now king), as well as those suffered by the young street urchin. As Deleuze and Guattari explain by invoking Freud's Oedipus complex, such normally oppressive socializations as these can occasionally be lightened under unique circumstances to allow for plateaus -- in this case, the social progress initiated by Tom, who cannot abide the glaring injustices he witnesses, and then by Edward, who assumes his hereditary kingship having acquired the same distaste for social ills. This is not to say that young Edward VI is suffering from an Oedipus complex, and certainly not from a literal dysfunction within his nuclear family, for in fact he never knew his mother and was barely acquainted with his father. Rather, the notion is that one's upbringing and early socialization result in a confinement that is difficult to transcend; to do so is often considered a bit "crazy," but may nonetheless lead inadvertently to some alteration. Anti-Oedipus is inherently postmodernist because

the god-like exigencies of the father figure and the almost inescapable constraints of the family dynamic are not, in fact, an underlying level of truth, but are transitory social constructs themselves. Thus, the Oedipus complex is an onerous infection of sorts rather than an eternal truth – and hence the name “Anti-Oedipus.”

On the other hand, one can hardly say that *The Prince and the Pauper* is in any way a postmodernist text, in large part because the underlying ethos clearly imagines a world in which social evils can be ameliorated and society improved. *The Prince and the Pauper* joins the various other texts and historical periods analyzed in the *Capitalism and Schizophrenia* volumes as new cultural interactions and hybrids involving not primordial unities, but rather amalgams of other interactions that have occurred in the past. Further, the analogy holds because the “getting of wisdom” on the part of both the prince and the pauper -- further catalyzed and exacerbated by their respective whipping boys -- is a deterritorialization in Deleuzian/Guattarian parlance. In both Twain’s fictional world and in the world of the various other plateaus critiqued by Deleuze and Guattari, there is always a rhizome that connects living things through an interlocking system.

To extrapolate, the prince and the pauper enjoy their respective adventures in a manner that neither presupposes a heightened unity and clarity (although they both achieve these), nor a nostalgia for a “golden age” when the world was in better order, nor even a better world to come. Instead, their experiences have led directly to a new plateau involving a reterritorialization, which in this case is a momentary and probably temporary revoking of certain judgments on those who show insufficient fealty to the crown by committing some vulgar misdemeanor or other.

Nor is the disruption of normal routine always unambiguously good, either in Deleuze/Guattari or in *The Prince and the Pauper*. In fact, one of the more noteworthy minor characters in the novel is the ex-monk who refers to himself as the Archangel. Now a hermit after having lost his comfortable berth due to Henry VIII’s dissolution of the monasteries, the Archangel not only believes the young king’s story, but attempts to murder him out of revenge. But surely such bad deterritorializations are to be expected if no foundation exists. As Jameson says in explaining Deleuze and Guattari’s Anti-Oedipus, we should get away from the idea of Ur-narratives.

However, in the case of Edward VI and Tom Canty, all has worked out for the best -- at least in this particular instance. A slightly smaller number of people will be burned alive in the coming years, and fewer juvenile pickpockets will be hanged. But as Twain clearly tells us at the end of the story, the liberalizations of Edward VI will come to an abrupt end just a few years after the story takes place, and Bloody Mary will make up for lost time and diminished corpse-counts, perhaps putting that Royal Seal once used to crack nuts to the figurative use of cracking heads. At best, the temporarily exchanged roles of prince and pauper will lead to further deterritorializations and

reterritorializations. The most one can hope for is a few moments that compare to the plateau that occurred when the prince and pauper briefly traded places -- and furthermore, a plateau that is helped along by a convenient whipping boy to provide the proper backing.

Summary

Mark Twain's 1881 comic novel *The Prince and the Pauper* concerns a fictional encounter between the historical crown prince of sixteenth-century England, Edward Tudor, with Tom Canty, a young boy from the lower classes who bears an identical resemblance. The boys decided to temporarily change roles, but circumstances then separate them and force each to assume the other's life for several days. The crown prince has a whipping boy named Humphrey Marlow who provides Tom with crucial information to allow him to maintain the subterfuge, while Edward falls in with a good-hearted but disenfranchised member of the peerage named Miles Hendon who also serves to protect his young friend whom he secretly considers deranged. In both cases, the role of the whipping boy can be explained via an application of Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari's *Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. A reading of the plot reveals that neither Edward Tudor (the crown prince of England) nor Tom Canty (a street urchin) would normally be inclined to enact the type of social disruption that Deleuze/Guattari identify as a "deterritorialization." However, they both manage to do so only because of their unlikely exchange of roles, which is further enabled by the crown prince's official whipping boy and by a disenfranchised member of the peerage who performs a similar function. Thus, the whipping boy acts as a catalyst who enables the deterritorialization to take place.

References

- Bilbro, J. (2011). "That Petrified Laugh": Mark Twain's Hoaxes in the West and Camelot. *Journal of Narrative Theory* 41.2: 204-234.
- Brown, B. (2003). *A Sense of Things: The Object Matter of American Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Buchanan, I. (2008). *Deleuze and Guattari's Anti-Oedipus*. London: Continuum.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Trans. Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1977). *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lane. New York: Penguin.
- Holmes, G., Holmes, F., & McMorrhough, J. (2001). The Death of Young King Edward VI. *New England Journal of Medicine* 345.1: 60-61.

- Jameson, F. (1981). *The Political Unconscious*. London: Routledge.
- Kaufman, W. (2006). Mark Twain's Deformed Conscience. *American Imago* 63.4: 463-478.
- Massumi, B. (1992). *A User's Guide to Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Morris, C. (2011). Hermeneutic Delusion in Mark Twain and Charles Dudley Warner's *The Gilded Age*. *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 66.2: 219-243.
- Twain, M. (2014, July 18). *Roughing It*. *Project Gutenberg*. Retrieved from: <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/3177/3177-h/3177-h.htm> [07.07.2015]
- Twain, M. (2014, July 18). *The Prince and the Pauper*. *Project Gutenberg*. Retrieved from: <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/1837/1837-h/1837-h.htm> [28.02.2015]

Robert D. Tindol

ДЕЛЕЗИЈАНСКО ТУМАЧЕЊЕ ИЗВУКОВИЋА У ДЕЛУ *КРАЉЕВИЋ И ПРОСЈАК*

Резиме: Роман Марка Твена из 1881. године под називом *Краљевић и просјак* бави се фиктивним сусретом између историјске личности енглеског престолонаследника из шеснаестог века, Едварда Тјудора, и Тома Кентија, дечака из нижих слојева који му је физички идентичан. Дечаци одлучују да привремено замене улоге, али их онда околности развоје и присиле да неколико дана воде замењене животе. Престолонаследник има извуковића Хемфрија Марлоуа, дечака који уместо њега прима батине, и он Тома снабдева информацијама неопходним да избегне разоткривање, док се Едвард спријатељује с доброћудним али обесправљеним припадником племства по имену Мајлс Хендон, који такође служи да заштити свог младог пријатеља, кога потајно сматра поремећеним. У оба случаја, улога извуковића може се објаснити применом *Капитализма и шизофреније* Жила Делеза и Феликса Гатарија. Анализа фабуле открива да ни Едвард Тјудор (енглески престолонаследник) ни Том Кенти (улични деран) не би иначе имали тежњу да учествују у врсти друштвеног ремећења коју Делез и Гатари називају „детериторијализација“. Обојица, међутим, у томе успевају само услед замене улога, коју даље омогућују престолонаследников званични извуковић и обесправљени члан племства који има сличну функцију. Стога, извуковић служи као катализатор који омогућава да се детериторијализација догоди.

Кључне речи: Марк Твен, Жил Делез, Феликс Гатари, Анти-Едип

Датум пријема: 9.7.2015.

Датум исправки: 8.10.2015.

Датум одобрења: 20.10.2015.