

Tribhuvan University

Social Satire in Mark Twain's *The Prince and the Pauper*

A Thesis Submitted to the Central Department of English in Fulfillment  
of the Requirements of the Degree of Masters of Arts in English

By

Dal Bahadur Gaha

Central Department of English

Kirtipur, Kathmandu

March 2015

Tribhuvan University  
Central Department of English

Letter of Recommendation

Dal Bahadur Gaha has completed his thesis entitled “Social Satire in Mark Twain’s *The Prince and the Pauper*” under my supervision. He carried out his thesis from May 2014 to March 2015. I hereby recommend his thesis to be submitted for viva voce.

Professor Birendra Pandey

---

Supervisor

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Tribhuvan University  
Central Department of English

Letter of Approval

This research titled “Social Satire in Mark Twain’s *The Prince and the Pauper*” submitted to Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University by Dal Bahadur Gaha, has been approved by the undersigned members of research committee:

Members of the Research committee:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Internal Examiner

\_\_\_\_\_  
External Examiner

\_\_\_\_\_  
Head

Central Department of English

Tribhuvan University

Date \_\_\_\_\_

### **Acknowledgements**

First of all, I would like to express my heartiest thanks to my supervisor Dr. Birendra Pandey for his indelible prescription and invaluable guidance, without whose corroboration this thesis would ever have been completed in determined time.

I am also indebted to my teachers Dr. Amar Raj Joshi, Dr. Dhruba Karki, Maheshwar Paudel, Pradeep Giri, and Chitra Kumar Karki who cooperated during the time of preparation of my thesis. I also acknowledge JSTOR library, Battish Putali Baneshwor, Central Library TU, and Central Department of English, Kirtipur, for allowing me to use the library and resource materials for my thesis.

Also, I would like to remember my father Mukta Bahadur Gaha and mother Man Kumari Gaha for their continuous love, support, patience and encouragement. I would also thank Mek Bahadur Rana for his encouraging support and suggestion.

Finally, I would remember my friends Tilak Thapa, Chiranjivi Gharti, Chandra Sartunge, and Ganesh Bastola for their emotional support and words of inspiration. Here, I would like to acknowledge that any merits in this thesis are because of the guidance and suggestions from my teachers and supports from my family and friends and inconsistencies and weakness are all my own.

## **Abstract**

*The Prince and the Pauper* is a satire on social differences and inequalities based on class system. It depicts vices, abuses, pretensions and foibles, from which characters like Edward and Tom suffer during their adventures. The core focus of the research is the quest for their lost and true identity. The two young boys from distinct classes, the prince Edward and the impoverished Tom, trade their places discovering similarities in their appearances. In fact, they change their identity for fun but their single fault turns to be grotesque. The unfortunate prince is assumed to be a poor beggar and is kicked out from the palace. Throughout the remainder of the text, he is laughed at and is maltreated for claiming of higher station. In the same token, he witnesses cruelty, deception, and hypocrisy of the power holders. So, this thesis has tried to prove that the presentation of class difference and inequality is the main concern of Mark Twain in *The Prince and the Pauper*.

## Table of Contents

	<b>Page No.</b>
Acknowledgements	
Abstract	
I. Chapter One	
The World of Satire and the Design of the Thesis	1
II. Chapter Two	
Satiric Edges in <i>The Prince and the Pauper</i>	14
III. Chapter Three	
Satire as a Tool for Reformation in <i>The Prince and the Pauper</i>	40
Works Cited	

## Chapter One

### The world of Satire and the Design of the Thesis

Satire, a literary technique of writing, is derived from Latin adjective *satira*, and it suggests a hotchpotch or a mixture in literature. By implication, it means a bowl of displaying colorful fruits or food dishes (*lanx satira*). In satire, human abuses, follies, shortcomings are held up to censure by means of derision, parody, burlesque, and ridicule, directing toward the positive change. Satire evokes an attitude of amusement, contempt, scorn, or indignation toward human failings and wretchedness in the hope of somehow rectifying it. Satire, fundamentally lashes out or laughs at any sort of folly and hypocrisy. Satire thus launches attack upon an individual's evil activities, as an expression of discontent. Charles A. Knight comments that, "The skeptical but observant satirist recognizes that some people are evil but all are foolish not only because they do foolish things but because they are unaware of their follies. They are errant in action but blind in perception" (4). Knight, thus, admits that individuals need to change their perception.

In simple parlance, satire is a literary device to disclose the gap between what appears to be true, and what the exact reality is, in the form of irony, parody, and joke. Satire is matter of criticism, and its purpose is to castigate on despicable, with an acquired sense of what the human world should be. Satire most often concerns about the ridiculous, wicked and absurd behavior of human society. Satire, thus, firstly reveals the truths of human arrogance, hypocrisy, and lacuna, and secondly hopes something to be changed, that is correction of the perception. Charles A. Knight in his text *The Literature of Satire* writes:

Satire takes the form of specific attack, even when real subject of satire is not object of attack. The element of play that usually marks

that attack may make matters worse, in so far as, from the victim's point of view, being mocked may seem more distressing than merely being disagreed with, however strongly or publicly, or it may, to the audience, make the attack more tolerable by making it entertaining. (3)

Satire's core concern is to attack, it does not matter, whether the subject of satire is the object of attack or not, and its only aim is truly to attack. Actually, the direct insult may cause the things worse. So, satire laughs at, presenting the matter in an amusing way.

Satire, in a general sense, is a tool to dig out human pretense, deception, arrogance, and hypocrisy of the society. Satire's concern is not to target an individual in itself, but his bad behaviors. The corrigible human evils essentially need the amendment for their betterment.

Ronald Paulson admits, the punishment is "the most extreme, and at the same time most common, consequences in satire" and "conveys a definite admonition: this is the consequence your foolish act, this is the effect of X's evil act; or, beware! This is what you could look like or, what X in fact looks like" (10,14). The evil act should be an evil of error, not pure evil so that satire can cure the evil of an error committed by the individual or human institutions. Philip Wylie, in his highly controversial text, *Generation of Vipers* (1942), comments that honesty promulgates criticism. He explains, "Criticism ... and the doubt out of which it arises, are the prior conditions to progress of any sort" (xiv). For Wylie, satire as a criticism is result of doubt which are prior conditions to emerge satire.

Satire is a strategy or technique to make individuals aware of their weaknesses. It has, in frank, shamelessly boundless facility at cuckoo nesting in different media and genres. Satire, thus, most often is pervasive in its nature. Satire

denounces as an genre itself but ultimately it comes to be borrower or exploiter of other genre characteristics.

Knight considers satire is neither a genre nor a mode in itself, instead, exploiter of other genres. It needs to borrow genre, so that satire can express its ideas as representation. Knight explains satire as:

Satire is thus pre-generic. It is not genre in itself but an exploiter of other genres. Nor is it quite mode in usual sense. In what I will come to call Quixotic phase, satire is modal, and the identifying genre the genre that provides readers with the richest set of signals as to how to read the work is the novel. In contrast, Lucianic or Menippean fiction is satire that takes the form a novel. As a pre-genre, satire is a mental position that needs to adopt a genre in order to express its ideas as representation. (4)

Since satire castigates the representative bad behavior or thought of an individual, it criticizes all of human wretchedness and wickedness of the human living. Satire vows to heal errs of an individual either expressing vicious anger or producing a laughter but its objective is not to attack an individual. In the context of it, Samuel Johnson in *Dictionary* (1755), precisely differentiates *satire* and *lampoon* while defining the genre of the formal verse satire: “(Satire is a) poem in which wickedness of folly is censured. Proper satire is distinguished, by the generality of the reflection, from a lampoon which is aimed against a particular person; but they are too frequently confounded” (Quintero, 5). Johnson insists that wickedness of an individual should be eradicated.

Knight further represents satire:

Satire, like Satan, as “roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour.” It is a predisposition to find an appropriate object of attack that embodies its sense of human evil and folly and to utilize effectively a pre-existent form in order to represent that object in such a way as to make its objectionable qualities apparent. Its characteristic element of attack is often formal: the satirist means the attack but may also use the attack to imply further meaning. (4)

Knight represents satire as an aggressive lion who is seeking to engulf whatever he finds as his prey. That is why, satire finds human follies as the objectionable. Satire, thus, attempts to erase the idiocy and bad taste by expressing scorn, contempt, and indignation for the betterment of the human society.

In general sense, satire is a critique. As satire is a critique, its usual function is to disclose the cruelty, injustice, and even politeness, recognizing as an object of attack. And its target most often is morally unusual and socially unacceptable facet, for instance, misguided power structure and status quo. In contrast, satire is not exactly the comedy but sometimes it represents an object of attack pleasingly. To present the matter in funny or hilarious way, satire takes the forms of imitation, joke, spoof and raillery. Thomas Jemielly recalling Shakespeare’s word in *King Lear*, “Jesters do often prove prophets” (Quintero, 8), beautifully demonstrates the likeness of ridicule and preaching.

Thomas Jemielly, in *Satire and the Hebrew Prophet* (1992), explains the equivalence of satire and prophecy as:

“The nature and characteristics common to both prophecy and satire explain their frequent intermingling and shared identity (in the scripture). The message of biblical prophecy is pervasively and

predominantly criticism, and criticism is always the content of satire.

Things as they are profoundly dissatisfy prophet and satirist alike.”

(84, 85)

Jemielity claims that virtually all the functions of prophecy and satire are the same in terms of criticism. Both prophet and satirist dissatisfy are alike.

In fact, the origin of satire is differently interpreted by different satirists and critics. Despite their distinct interpretation, what the common point amongst them is, to unmask the human frailty, abuse and hypocrisy. Alvin Kernan explains that “The idea that poetic satire had its origin in a dramatic form distinguished for its viciousness of attack and spoken by rough satyr was the basis for nearly all Elizabethan theories of satire” (55). The critics believe that public festivals and entertainments caused irresponsibility and disorder in the society. Matthew Hodgart in that context admits, “The essence of the carnival and saturnalia is the glorification of irresponsibility, even to the point of anarchy,” and “there are strong elements of travesty and anarchistic parody in all good satire” (1969: 24). Hodgart claims that public festivals glorified irresponsibility from its chaos.

Satirist like ironist presents one thing and means another. Satirist, suggests to another layer of meaning, he intends, quite distinct from what is said or written. Initially one meaning, the appearance, presents itself as the obvious truth or reality, but as the context of meaning unfolds in depth, it discloses the conflicting meaning. So, satire is a medium to explore the defective, unusual, and unacceptable ways of our society. Though satire is often comic, its objective is to evoke not merely laughter. It has something more than that, and, that is rectification of perception. Ruben Quintero, in *A Companion to Satire* (2007), describes the purpose of satire and satirist:

The satirist attempts more than visceral laughter or corrosive spite. Surely, a satire may fall dully flat, and the satirist may appear unfairly prejudiced or sanctimonious; or a satire vacuously humorous, playful, witty, or ridiculous without point. But any satirist deserving the name, must be more than a partisan advocate or a clownish entertainer, for a true satirist must be a true believer, a practicing humanitarian, responsible even in his or her own subjective indulgence or personal indignation. (3)

Quintero delineates the function of satire and satirist. Satire's prime purpose is not just to herald destructive malice and the laughter. In apparent, satire seems to be alike the comedy and clownish work, in terms of bringing laughter in the faces of readers or audiences. But in the deeper meaning, it has something more than mere entertainer. And satire's genuine task, in one sense, is to point out at the silliness, foibles and crimes with vicious anger or making fun of it.

Satire by its nature, covers wide ranges of genres. As the context or time-period varies, the meaning of satire gets variation. Different satirists define satire differently and that causes conflict in the way to progress a universal definition. In this regard, the more we try our best to define satire, the more satire gets confined. In the context of endless contradiction, W. Scott Blanchard in his *Scholar's Bedlam: Menippean Satire in the Renaissance* (1995) comments on the satire: "Menippean satire refuses to allow an ideal type to emerge from its chaotic sprawl, where as Roman satire achieves its effects by contrasting the debased world of the present to models of human behavior that are acceptable" (18 – 19). Menippean satire denies utopian world to emerge from worst one. In contrary, Roman satire believes in remodeling of human behavior.

In frank word, satire is profusely rich in terms of diversity. George Test, in *Satire: Spirit and Art* asserts, “satire is by no means confined to written forms”: Despite their ephemeral nature, folk expressions in graffiti, almanac, office memoranda, and mock festivals ought not to be excluded from consideration. In many preliterate cultures satire occurs in trickster tales and oral poetry (8). Test suggests for the inclusion of the rock music, cartoon strips, and films as the satirical forces. Dustin Griffin, in *Satire: A Critical Reintroduction* (1994) explains about generic origin of satire. He observes, “most satiric theory, at least since the Renaissance, is polemical, ranging itself against previous practice or claim and attempting to displace it” (6). He admits that satire ranges to the boundless limitation.

Ruben Quintero simply attempts to distinguish the satire from comedy and tragedy. He describes:

As with the agon of tragedy and comedy (the conflict of characters), satire also moves heart and mind through building tension and provoking conflict, but, unlike tragedy and comedy, stops short of any reconciliation with its subject. And as the prism does to light, it leaves its subject refracted and disharmonized. Satire remains militantly rhetorical and hortatory. (3)

Satire carries some qualities to move heart and head, as tragedy and comedy do. But satire does not carry centripetal nature to reunite its subject, instead it is centrifugal type. That is why, satire lets to spread its subject as the glass does to light.

Ronald Paulson in the text *The Fiction of Satire* (1967) observes satire: “As a structure of exposition, *satira* is like a house of mirrors in which one theme (or vices) is reflected over and over, with distortion and variations but without essential change” (43). He examines modern fictions of satire from the perspective of classical satire

and rhetoric. Satire being a broad and vast genre in itself, its form inevitably varies as the context changes but most importantly without essential change.

Howard Weinbrot in *Menippean Satire Reconsidered: From Antiquity to the Eighteenth Century* (2005), concisely defines satire:

Menippean satire uses at least two other genres, languages, historical or cultural periods, or changes of voices to oppose a threatening false orthodoxy. In different examples, the satire may use either of two tones, in which angry satirist fails and becomes angrier still, or the muted, in which threatened angry satirist offers an antidote to the poison he knows remains. (297)

According to Weinbrot satire most often applies two tones (especially Menippean satire), first is corrosive criticism and the second is that of dispassionate observation. The first tone of satire directly and aggressively attacks on the follies and vices of the individuals or human institutions. In contrast, the second one seems milder and safer in most situations. The threatened angry satirist thus viciously expresses his condemnation toward the irrationality, irresponsibility and vanity of human living. At the same time the angry satirist encourages to upgrade the social harmony. He offers an antidote to cure all the evils and vices of an individual.

In the society, we most often see the individuals who do not want to acknowledge their faults and turn aggressive. An individual's ignorance to recognize his weakness directly leads to the negativity. Then we need satire, as a tool to unmask the arrogance, cruelty, deception, and crime. As such, satire firstly spreads the human defects on the surface, and then, demands the correction in the evil perception. As a change is essential for satire, Patricia Meyer Spacks in the text *Some Reflections on Satire* (1971), states:

Satire has traditionally had a public function and its public orientation remains. Although the satirist may arraign God and the Universe ... he usually seems to believe \_ at least to hope \_ the change is possible. Personal change, in his view, leads to social change; he insists that bad men make bad societies. He shows us ourselves and our world; he demands that we improve both. And he creates a kind of emotion which moves us toward the desire to change. (363)

Spacks assumes satire has a specific public function. According to him, a satirist usually believes that change is inevitable. The satirist often attempts to heal the illness, wickedness, and wretchedness and ultimately recover the ideal world. He assures that a change or correction of thought takes the initiation from an individual and it ends with the change of society. He fears that mentally sick people create just an unhealthy society. And there needs the satirist to rescue the society from being misguided by knaves and rascals. He creates a strong emotion which moves our heart and head leading us toward change.

Ruben Quintero, reminds us the borderline of a satirist. He even admits satirist's core concern, and comments:

The satirist's responsibility is frequently that of a watchdog: and no one expects a watchdog to do double duty of alarming others that the barn is on fire and of putting out the blaze. Satirists, that is, rouse us to put out the fire. They encourage our need for the stability of truth by unmasking the imposture, exposing fraudulence, shattering deceptive illusion, and shaking us from our complacency and indifference. (4)

As the satirist notices maltreatment, vices, arrogance, pride, and silliness of human beings, he immediately makes aware of their wrongs by the means of parody, humor

and burlesque. Satirist nothing more can do, what he can is, just to show the way that something is going to be wrong. Similarly he attempts to change the attitude of wrongheaded human being. So Quintero appropriately comments that a satirist plays the role of a watchdog, who alarms people that the barn is on fire but he cannot put out the blaze. He fuels us for the stability of the harmonious society by shattering the illusion and waking up from the ignorance.

Satire, in usual sense, cannot make ridiculous the immutably good or bad quality unless through a humanizing perspective. Satirical poet John Milton in the *Paradise Lost* (1667), mocks a foolish Satan. Milton represents Satan as a parody of Christ. Through this poem, he has universalized portraying Satan as a representative of wretched and wicked fool of 17<sup>th</sup> century. According to Ruben Quintero, satire in the English language prospers most completely during seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and more satires were written during these centuries than any others.

In the 18<sup>th</sup> century, most prominent satirist Jonathan Swift, in his masterpiece *Gulliver's Travels* (1726) bitterly ridicules on human race. Despite of exclusion of women writers on satire before 20<sup>th</sup> century, Jane Collier dares to write about. Her highly successful satire in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, *An Essay on the Art of Ingeniously Tormenting* (1753), adopts the mock advice to apply it with several layers of irony. Similarly in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, Mark Twain emerged as the best known satirist, publishing satires in a variety of forms, including 'news satire and full length books'.

The most of the satires, in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, take the form of satirical fictions. Satires overlapped in the form of novels during this period. The film, *The Great Dictator* (1940) by Charlie Chaplin, is a disclosure of atrocity of the Adolf Hitler and his Nazi army. Similarly in Mel Brooks's film *The Producers* (1968), Hitler implicitly becomes the butt of comedy. The masterpiece *The Heart of Darkness* (1902) by

Joseph Conrad, gives a prominent contribution on the genre of satire. Conrad explores the political satire of colonial exploitation in the Congo and the mystery of human evil.

Satire on war in the 20<sup>th</sup> century ranges from the masterly novel sequence *The Good Soldier Svejk* (1920-23) by Josef Hasek to the ribaldry of *Catch-22* (1961), a novel by the American writer Joseph Heller that became the object of an appreciative cult. Heller's World War II novel, exposes poor condition of the most victims except advantageously situated military bureaucrats who profit from destruction of the war.

The presented masterpiece *The Prince and the Pauper* by Mark Twain is an autobiographical novel. The author appropriates the dual identity of his real name and the pseudonym to the lost identity of characters in the novel. The author's name was Samuel Langhorne Clemens before he has adopted pen name *Mark Twain*, at the age of twenty-eight. He even appropriates his experience of adventure to the adventures of characters Edward and Tom. At the age of eighteen, Samuel Clemens left home, travelling to New York to Washington. Since the publication of Twain's *The Prince and the Pauper* (1881), the novel has been responded in various ways. Different critics and reviewers have visited the novel from different perspectives. Among them, Catherine Dominic, Bradford Smith, Leon T. Dickinson, Arthur Lawrence Vogelback are some prominent critics. Catherine Dominic opines: "Through the experience of mistaken or lost identity, Twain depicts one's personal identity as something with dualistic nature. For Twain, as these characters' experiences demonstrate, identity exists as a composite of how we view ourselves and how we are viewed by others" (189). Dominick interprets *The Prince and the Pauper* as a story of dualistic identity, that is how individuals rate themselves and how they are rated by others.

Critic Bradford Smith comments on the novel in critical essay: “His humor therefore is a philosophy and an act of faith. Droll comedian in him as well as the romancer served the indignant moralist who could not abide any sign of cruelty, ingratitude, sham or disloyalty”(196). He explores Twain's pre-occupation with identity and disguise in his writings. Similarly another critic Leon T. Dickinson examines on Twain's influence from varying numbers of writers and their writings. In the article *Modern Language Notes* Dickinson tongues that Twain is failed to avoid the flavor of other writings:

The work most frequently cited in connection with Clemens' book is Charlotte M. Yonge's juvenile, *The Prince and the Page* (1865). No critic, however, points to similarities in the two books, for they are entirely different. Clemens' biographer believed that the earlier story, an historical romance laid in the thirteenth century, might have “inspired” the later tale; but he concludes, rightly, that “no comparison of any sort is possible between them.” (103)

The novel hugely inspired, Leon T. Dickinson admits, from earlier writings of contemporary time because he used to read numbers of books before and during writing. In this context, the critic Robert L. Gale too, explains on the profusely resemblances between *The Prince and the Pauper* and *King Lear*. He opines: “The two works are similar in character relation, in plot situation, and in ultimate ethical import” (16). Gale admits that *The Prince and the Pauper* is inspired by *King Lear*.

Arthur Lawrence Vogelback, one of the prominent critics, probes into the critical response to *The Prince and the Pauper* upon its publication. He insists on the praiseworthy departure from a mere humorist and droll comedian. Twain succeeds to avoid the impression of a funny writer, to most readers. The sudden and widespread

recognition of the novel astonished many reviewers because of Twain's descriptive power, skillful constructor of plot and style of character portrayal. Vogelback includes in *American Literature*:

The *Transcript* found "a quality so refined and so searching as to excite wonder that it should flow from the same pen which wrote 'The Innocents Abroad' ...." *Harper's* spoke of the tales as being "charged with generous and ennobling moral." The critic in the *Atlantic Monthly* found the story "pure and humane in purpose"; and the *Century* called the writer of *The Prince and the Pauper* "a satirist and ... true philosopher." (53)

After the arrival of *The Prince and the Pauper*, Twain incredibly reached high reputation. Most of the critics and reviewers found the novel as a milestone of his writing career. The author has been introduced descriptive talent and excellency in character portrayal. The novel is departure from humor and droll comedy.

This chapter has presented an origin of satire as a literary device. Satire is simply a criticism, and it judges human or social behavior with the purpose of remodeling ideal alternative. Thus, the tendency of criticism on satire is to focus on global issues, on comparison and contrast among various people. Satire continues to evoke those who have lost their way. This chapter has also presented critical reviews of various critics on the novel. And, the study applies satirical perspective to dig out vices and follies of the individuals and the society as a whole.

The second chapter named as textual analysis explores various aspects of satire under title of Satiric Edges in *The Prince and the Pauper*. It applies various concepts to dig out vices, vanities, pretensions and follies of the society. Finally, third chapter will be the conclusion, satire as a reformation. And the conclusion will be highlighted that all the wrongs made right as the major ideas and findings of the study.

## Chapter Two

### Satiric Edges in *The Prince and the Pauper*

Social satire is one of the genuine instruments to depict the idiocy and hollowness of society. Mark Twain's *The Prince and The Pauper*, exposes individuals' vanity, hypocrisy and evil facets of the society. The aristocrats are fast losing their morals and ethical essence, however, they do not feel it. The class of socially high rank, imposes its phony pride upon the lives of poverty. The upper class people are so spoilt that they take fun causing trouble on lowly ones. They enjoy in their hypocrisy and insanity thinking their superiority. And they impose unreasonable punishments on the beggars who have done nothing wrong. This sort of hierarchy further enlarges a distance so far between these two classes. This research thus, aims to sort out the chaotic sprawl, seen in the novel *The Prince and the Pauper*, with the ultimate purpose of intending improvement.

Twain's *The Prince and the Pauper* makes mockery of the human foibles prevailing in the English and American societies. The novel carries themes of pretention, adventure and disguise. It helps individual readers reach the depth of mystery through the means of social satire. Satire, in the present novel, chiefly launches attack on the vices and follies of humans in the society. Satire formerly criticizes, blames, and attacks on the aspects of human and institutional defects and weaknesses. Then, it directs to heal or rectify the chaotic flaws and imperfection of social manner and attitude.

Major characters prince Edward, pauper Tom, and Miles Hendon become the victims of derisive laughter and grisly humor in their varying circumstances. The ridiculous and ironic situations, created by silly and cruel behaviors of characters, are precisely depicted in the present text. As such, individuals inhuman acts are

beautifully weaved, intending to reform the society. The act of an inadvertent switch places of the prince as pauper and the pauper as prince respectively play the prominent role to implement the principle of satire in *The Prince and the Pauper*. In the present research the character of rag beggar mostly suffers from cruelty and derision of the society in a hilarious way. Either, the prince's disguise in ragged beggar or real pauper turn out to be a synonym for the matter of laughter and ridicule. In other word, the voiceless and fragile creatures are oppressed by superiority or authority.

*The Prince and the Pauper* explores vast contrast between two social classes, the noble and the lower. And, the huge difference between aristocrats and paupers are represented by the prince Edward and pauper Tom respectively. As such, the research revolves around the little prince of England and “the prince of poverty” (13). It clarifies that the society merely insults and laughs at the facet of poverty and fragility but not at the aristocrat and their strength. From the very beginning of the novel, the narrator underscores apparent disparities in the English society. Social disparity begins from one's birth. As a baby takes birth in the nobility, it gets warm and cozy cloths. People raise their excitement for new baby and they give much attention to it. They keep other affairs aside and celebrate the birth as if they have overcome the realm. In contrary, if a baby is born in poverty, it gets poor rags and none of them takes in the lap. People think that the poor baby has just come to trouble his family. In this spectacle, the child comes to be a burden in the extreme poverty. The novel depicts the poverty as a crime.

There was no talk all in England but of the new baby, Edward Tudor, prince of Wales, who lay lapped in silk and satins, unconscious of all this fuss and not knowing that the great lords and ladies are tending

him and watching over him and not caring. But there was no talk about other baby. Tom Canty, lapped in his poor rags, except among the family of paupers whom he had just come to trouble with his presence.

(6)

So, the power produces bad impacts in the society that is because the authority establishes its cold and sophisticated rules. The very fact hikes distance between the haves and have not, and the rulers and the ruled without mutual relationship in them.

Tom's only dream is to see the prince in lively blood and flesh. So, he strongly desires to fulfill his single passion. When Tom approaches the grandeur palace gate in delight and he earnestly longs to get close to the prince. But, poor Tom is snatched by sentry person and sends him towards crowd of London idlers. The guard harshly threatens the beggar and does not allow look at the palace. The soldier says – "Mind thy manners thou beggar" (12). The derisive crowd humiliates and insults him vehemently. Later, the prince Edward takes beggar to the beautiful palace cabinet, he gets delighted by the exciting lifestyle of the beggar. The little prince genuinely wants to enjoy the life of beggar for once. The prince's desire grows stronger to have fun and amusement. Then, they decide to exchange their garments for short time before anybody comes to abuse them. They actually intended to make merriment just once but this desire leads to the unwelcoming result. As the prince and the beggar exchange their garments, the strange likeness makes them puzzle. They seem quite similar, as if they are twin brothers. They carry the qualities of same appearance and same voice. Further, they bear the same height and same expression which trouble the guys almost throughout the text.

After the disguise, the little prince in rag shouts for unbar the palace gate but a harsh sentry of the gate maltreats him throwing in the mud. Poor little prince shouts at sentry that soldier shall hang for mistreatment. The sentry then mockingly says:

“I salute your gracious highness.” Then angrily – “Be off, thou crazy rubbish. The ridiculing crowd pushes him far and shouts ‘way for his royal highness (17). This very fact reveals that contemporary society mocks only at the poors and their miserable economic condition. Edward is the prince by his born but now his identity is poor vagabond in rag. In this spectacle, poverty is vehemently abused by the society. The underline poverty is portrayed as vicious crime and poor as the criminal. As such, the little prince Edward threatens the mob royally but it just comes to be means to laugh at and he becomes as an entertainer for others. At the ‘Grey Frair’s Church’, crowd of boys flock about him and tease him. In that situation, Edward’s fancy of having a sword and still in the dignity of the prince heralds a laughter. “Ho swine slaves pensioners of his grace’s princely father, where be ye manners? Down on your morrow bones, all of ye, and do reverence to his kingly port and royal rags” (19). Edward boldly claims, he is the rightful prince of Wales but there is none to trust him or even listen to him. Instead, the crowd makes merriment, kneeling before Edward for his mocking reverence.

The twin-like appearance of Tom and Edward leads to ridiculous attitude of the society upon them. In the little prince’s adventure, the narrator unfolds idiocy and stupidity. Masquerade of Edward as pauper and Tom as prince produces ground for the satirical shower. Disguise is means for duality of the characters in the text because of which prince experiences the life of a vagabond and pauper enjoys luxurious life of royal family. That double characters trouble both, the pauper and the prince. Since they have miraculous resemblance, John Canty abuses the little prince too, supposing

his own son Tom. John Canty embodies beastly behavior, who cannot feel pathos and woes of others. John Canty demonstrates such a savage and inhuman manner that he does not deserve the human life. As John Canty is poor and drunken, he is abusive and wicked person. The brutal Canty blows a cudgel on the head of priest named Father Andrew, the disastrous hit later kills the priest. Canty forces Edward to join his band of vagabonds and thieves. Canty often exposes lacunas and demonic manners, he treats his own son or supposed son, as an object to use for personal interest. So, when John Canty meets with lost and homeless prince, collars him thinking his son Tom. The prince boldly and with full of confident denounces that he is not his son but the prince of England. The little prince speaks about his exact identity of the honor and bravery. He does not escape from his determined position of truthfulness. The cruel society punishes Edward for being correct and speaking the truth. However, Edward never admits his mistakes considering himself right. He rebels against the harshness of English law. And this fact goes with something wrong as he comments:

‘Oh, art his father? Sweet heaven grant it be so then we will fetch him away and restore me! His father? I know not what thou mean’st but know I am thy father, as you shalt soon have cause to’

“Oh jest not, palter not! I am worn, I am wounded, I can bear no more. Take me to the king my father, and he will make thee rich beyond thy wildest dreams. Believe me! I speak no lie but only the truth! Put forth thy hand and save me! I am indeed the prince of Wales!” The man stared down, stupefied upon the lad then shook his head and muttered “Gone stark mad as any Tom o’ bedlam! then collared him once more , and said with a coarse laugh and an oath, but mad or not mad, I and thy

grammer Canty will soon find where the soft places in thy bones lie  
or I am not true man!” ( Twain 20)

Edward has embarrassed and worn with insane behavior of John Canty. Edward honestly pleads to take him to the palace. John Canty makes joke, gives torture for speaking the truth. John Canty’s hypocrisy overwhelms the prince. In fact, the prince does not tell any lie but he comes to be liar in the eyes of John Canty. The prince decrees that the king will make John Canty so rich beyond his dream, if he saves and fetches the prince to the palace. He gives all his effort to convince John Canty but, the attempt goes in vain. Canty is not ready to believe in the prince rather ironically claims that he has lost memory. He thinks, the prince has fallen in a great insanity supposing his son Tom. Demonic Canty laughs unkindly and oaths to beat finding the soft places in the body. Thus, he has no heart, no feeling, and no emotion. He enjoys in woes and miseries of other members in the family.

Canty drags the prince to his hovel forcefully. On the one, prince consistently denies his son; on the other, Canty claims Edward as his son Tom Canty. This conflicting situation troubles to the helpless prince of Wales vehemently. Through Edward’s miserable circumstances, *The Prince and The Pauper* abundantly explores the ridiculous and ironic atmosphere. Along with the ironic situation, the novel portrays the vices and wicked nature of people in the society. Each and every time, the prince tells truth but it comes to be absurd for John Canty and encourages Grammer Canty to enjoy beating the prince.

The poor and impoverished Mrs. Canty too believes the same what John Canty believes, Edward as her son Tom Canty. All of Edward’s truth telling goes in vain, instead they suppose Tom is gone mad. Mrs Canty convinces herself that boy is her own son, refuses to ‘give him up’ and asserts that he must be her child. All the matters

are going through solemnity and gruesome situation that Mrs. Canty gives way to heartbroken sobs and wailings. And ironically believes foolish reading made all the things chaos.

“Oh, my poor boy! Thy foolish reading has wrought its woeful works at last and ta'en they wit way. Ah! Why didst thou cleave to it when I so warned thee 'gainst it? Thoust broke my heart.”

(...) “The king thy father! Oh my child unsay these words that be frightened with death for thee, and ruin for all that be near to thee. Shake off these gruesome dreams. Call back thy poor wandering memory. Look upon me. Am not I thy mother that bore thee, and loveth thee (44).

As such Mrs. Canty has portrayed her foolishness within blind love for her son. She thinks, due to the readings about the prince and the palace caused Edward to be mad. And she ironically pleads to call back poor wandering memory and wits. She warns Edward not to stick with devastating dream. Her heart is broken by unusual behavior of Edward, that is what she assumes. She insists Edward give up a claim that the king is his father because she has grave fear for the death of Edward. She does not want to lose the prince at any cost. There appears a situation of the juxtaposition between what she believes and what the truth is. Mrs. Canty asks the prince to shake off the gruesome dream and recover his wits. She pours deep love to the prince but it is just wastage of time. Neither Edward belongs to Canty family nor he accepts his belonging to it. So, she pathetically inquires if she is not his mother, who has reared and loved him. At the meantime John Canty gives coarse laugh and insults. “Let the show go on shouted Canty. What Nan! What Bet! Mannerless wenches! Will ye stand on prince's presence? Upon your knees ye pauper scum and do him reverence” (44).

Canty wants to take an amusement mocking the prince. He commands his daughters to kneel down their feet to show mocking reverence for Edward.

In the adventurous journey, Edward reaches at Guildhall, he beholds Tom in his high seat, staring in the wild dancing, lost in admiration of dazzling commingling. So, the unfortunate prince of Wales renounces Tom's wrong rights. He denounces the impostor who has stolen the privilege of royalty. The crowded people extend their necks to watch the small rioter. They give unkind remarks and tease him severely. The prince Edward tears his eyes in humiliation but does not leave his ground of truthfulness. The insult does not cease, that added mocking stings him and he speaks to save himself from the wild crowd "I tell you again, you pack of unmannerly curs am the prince of Wales! And all forlorn and friendless as I be with none to give me a word of grace or help me in my need, yet will not I be driven from my ground, but will maintain it" (53). The rascals make joke as Edward claims, he is the prince of Wales. Their behaviors are so worst that they annoy Edward till he tears eyes. Even in the solemn and disastrous situation, he does not allow to degrade his royal honor. And this fact often troubles and tortures him. The prince Edward has got a tag of mad pauper and day dreaming beggar. Actually, there is nobody to show him grace or help him, at the time he needs. He gets no love and affection in that cruel society. Here Edward feels lonely and friendless but he is firm and has a beautiful art to cope with it. In this spectacle, he might be ready to die but never gives up his pride and honor.

Mark Twain, creating the heartless and headless characters like John Canty, explores the vicious crime, drought of morals and good conducts, prevailing in the nineteenth century American society. John Canty destroys the familial values and the dignity. People forget their values and customs. Even their morality creates such a blunder that it can hardly be forgiven. In *The Prince and the Pauper*, a beastlike John

Canty commits murder and leaves home. Canty insists the prince to do the same as he did, supposing his missed son Tom Canty. John Canty announces that he has changed his name, he calls it 'for wise reason'. Canty names himself John Hobbs and Edward of Jack. He orders to set Edward's mind accordingly:

I have done a murder and may not tarry at home neither shall thou,  
seeing I need your service. My name is changed, for wise reason, it is  
Hobbs John Hobbs, thine is Jack charge thy memory accordingly.  
Now, then speak where is thy mother? Where are thy sisters? They  
come not to the place appointed knowest whither they went? (96)

John Canty does have such a cold heart that he fails to be connected emotionally with his family members. Canty is bonded in the tie, if there is any utility purpose. John Canty intends to take Edward with him seeing need of Edward's services. He is totally fragmented by emotionally and socially. And he eventually obliged to live alone. John canty commits shuddering crime of murder and escapes to hide him from the authority. The demonic creature committing murder prepares to leave his home and he insists Edward not to tarry at home. John Canty introduces him and Edward with novel names to avoid potential punishment. He has no sense of responsibility as a loving father or a good husband. The irresponsible Canty even does not know, where his wife and daughters are suffering. Now, the criminal ends even the biological connection leaving his wife and daughters in extreme poverty. He further pushes his family to the underlined poverty leaving his family in starvation.

*The Prince and the Pauper* is an exploration of social differences and inequalities. The contemporary American society was made up of hierarchical designation. So, the author depicts the large pit between power holders and powerless people. There is wide a distance between aristocrats and paupers. In a general sense,

aristocratic people belong to a group of people who have especial advantage and authority. They possess the lands and titles. As the prejudice of superiority grows stronger within aristocrats, they begin to abuse their privilege. And its bad impact directly falls upon the paupers who are homeless beggars. The beggars have to struggle hard to maintain their subsistence level economy, to manage their daily expenses for food and cloths. They are blamed to be illiterate and do not deserve to be job holders. So they are obliged to beg or steal beyond their desire. Actually paupers do not have ambition.

The present novel is portrayal of social inequality and injustice. The aristocratic people suppose themselves the most civilized and at same time they think lower class people as savage creatures. So, they tend to exploit the paupers. The aristocrats use the lower class people as their will. The present text exhibits difference between misery and luxury. In such designation, peasants and beggars suffer from the oppressive law of the authority. They even cannot raise voice against the oppressive law. Since the power corrupts men, they intend to do inhumane activities. Beggars and peasants are forced to get punishment for minor faults or no fault. In the Southwark, band of vagabonds and thieves relate their bitter experience of English law. Young to old, wench to hag opine about the abuse of tyrant monarch. In the group of vagabonds, most of individuals have their varying experiences under the grim tyrant law. Some of them are starve because their farms are seized from and changed into sheep ranges. Peasants strive to recover their rightful possession, instead they get whip from English authority. The more they plead, the more they get punishment. They even get body damage like ear damage and hot iron spot on the cheek. Finally they are sold for slaves. This sort of extremity, cruelty, and inhumanity

depicts disgusting sixteenth century English society. *The Price and the Pauper* vividly portrays the vices and wickedness of contemporary English society:

Some yes. Particularly new comers such as small husbandmen turned shiftless and hungry upon the world because their farms were taken from them to be changed to sheep ranges. They begged and whipped at cart's tail, naked from the griddle up, till blood ran then set in the stock to be pelted; they begged again, were whipped again and deprived an ear, they begged a third time poor devils, what could they do? and were branded on the cheek with a red hot iron; then sold for slaves, they ran away. (99-100)

This sort of social differences and inequalities trouble especially who are low and weak in their status. According to law, none is above the law. But there is lack of proper implementation of it. Lower class honestly follows the law but so called nobles boast their social rank and discard the law. In fact, homeless, jobless, poor beggars and vagabonds are the products of tyrant monarch and its law, are pathetically tortured for no wrongs. So, the acts 'whipped at the cart tail', put into stock and deprived an ear' are the sufficient evidences of extremity and inhumanity in the English society. The heartless and inhuman acts of aristocrats shake the entire England. Whether rag beggar or aristocrat have equal right to live peaceful life. The torturous punishments and executions seem to be the justice and equality for socially lower class people, what the novel depicts.

Different walks of people, especially of lower class, are obliged to join the band of vagabond and thieves. The vagabonds have to earn a morsel, have to save breath. Amongst the vagabonds, Yokel was once a farmer and has peace and prosperous life, is now victim of evil law. Tyrant Monarch displaces peasants' homes,

seizes their fields and separates from their children, wives and mothers. Yokel pathetically moans and makes a wish his wife and kids to be in heaven or happy. Yokel's blameless mother gets burn for charge of witch, on accidently death of a sick at hospital. The evil law ruins peace and harmony in the society. English Monarch discriminates the people who are socially not strong. So, vagabonds, beggars and peasants often come to be victim of evil law and the aristocrats. Yokel speaks

I am Yokel, once a farmer and prosperous, with loving wife and kids  
 now I am somewhat different in estate and calling; and wife and kids  
 are gone; mayhap in the other place but the kindly God be thanked!  
 They bide no more in England! My good blameless mother was burnt  
 for witch; whilst my babes looked and wailed. English law! Up, all,  
 with your cups now all together and with a cheer drink to the merciful  
 English law that delivered HER from the English hell! Thank you,  
 mates, one and all. I begged from house to house I and wife bearing  
 with us the hungry kids but it was crime to be hungry in England so  
 they stripped us and lashed us through three towns. (100)

To get burnt for witch at the death of serious sick, itself is vicious crime. English law burns an innocent woman because of poor social rank. It is extremity of injustice and discrimination. The English law paves the wide way to vast social disparities. The English law suppresses weak and lower class people with no logical reason. In the violent world of vagabond and beggars, they deserve for mercy and justice. In fact they have done no vices to get such evil punishment. Instead they are deprived from possessiveness and inheritance of home and lands. The English law abuses physically and mentally all the lower class lives. That is how, they joined in the band of vagabond and thieves, are physically damaged and disables. Some are blind

mendicants and cripple ones, others with bandaged eyes, crutched feet and diseased body. So, *The Prince and the Pauper* exposes vices, hypocrisy and bitter reality.

Satire evokes attitudes of amusement, contempt and scorn toward its wrong subjects. It shows indignation for social follies and imperfections. It often blames and criticizes human silliness and disgusting mannerism. As such, the present text is work of satire, work of pathos and work of insightful art. All the humans young to old, aristocrat to beggar, capable to disables have foibles and the satire comments on foibles intending to reform the manners. So, the English Authority shows its follies and vices upon the rags and paupers. Yokel, one of the beggars and thieves admits his solemn pathos exposing cruel slavery system in England.

(...) I begged and here is the other stump to keep me minded of it. And still I begged again and sold for slave here on my cheek under this stain the red S branding left there! A SLAVE! Do you understand that word? An English SLAVE! that is he that stands before ye. I have run from my master, and when I am found the heavy curse of heaven fall upon the law of the land that has commanded! I shall hang!" (100)

The present text exposes the heart rendering pathos of poor peasant. In fact, all the homeless and jobless vagabonds strongly abhor terrifying English law and wants for warm English law. The evident of red 'S' on the cheek and sale for slavery, expose how English law was. All the time, so called noble class imposes animalistic acts on the lower class. The noble class maltreats vagabonds as market objects to be sold and bought. So, it depicts the wickedness and devastating defects of English society. The text gives precise picture of vices and inhumanity existing in the society. So, satire is easy tool to bring the evils and vices on the surface and condemn them.

The members of lower class are taken as insane and inhumane by arrogant noble class people. The paupers are forced to suffer harsh punishments for smallest crimes. They respect the aristocrats because they have high morals despite of their poverty. But the aristocrats take it as a matter of superiority. They boast their phony reputation and reveal degraded morals. When the newly king and Miles Hendon are jailed, they encounter twenty fettered prisoners for trifle offences. The prisoners are of both sexes and varying ages. One of the prisoners, is a half witted woman, jailed for theft of cloth from weaver. The sorry thing is that the stony hearted wretches will dispose of her for smallest crime. Another prisoner man is jailed for convicted of stealing a horse. The unfortunate creature is forced to suffer for no crime. The heartless jailers fail to prove the theft. But they do not free the poor victim rather charge him for killing deer in the royal park. And this time the jailer illegally proves crimes against the prisoner. As such, an innocent lower class falls on the trap of power holder. For his undone crime, the court decrees against him. The king in his adventure helplessly observes, the pathetic and woeful condition of the prisoners. The prisoner becomes the scapegoat of the circumstances. The evil fate leads him to the gallows.

Third one, finds a stray falcon, brings it to home. The youth honestly assumes that the bird might be escaped from it's owner. But it's master convicts the theft of the bird. The court proves the crime of stealing the pet. The evil fate falls upon the poor guy, sentenced to the death. These inhumanity and harsh law terribly shudders hearts. On the one hand, lower class people are in the dire problem of poverty and on the other hand, the noble class troubles them, imposing severe punishment for the minor crimes or no crime. So they have mere woes and sorrows in both hands.

The royal blood Edward never allows to defile his pride and honor. He keeps strong commitment even in deadly situation. Throughout the adventure, he gets the chance to see several vices and insanity of headless creatures. The lust for power and titles defiles man's elevated status. The greed makes man blind, dumb and ruins the morals. Tom Canty is not quite worst man by his innate nature. But everybody has foibles, in this way or that. Gradually, the royal dignity and luxury attract Tom. Since the time and tide waits no man, it becomes a great chance to him. Tom Canty deeply longs to experience the royal dignity. He moves ahead to crown and conduct the throne. Now Tom Canty is overpowered by stolen royalty. He leaves behind all his good conducts and carries ahead his lust for power. So, society rates of man, is mostly fake. The novel exposes the nature of pretension or role of impostor. Tom canty is intrigued by double role character. At the recognition procession, the false king catches a sight of a pale and astounded face of his mother. The sickening dismay haunts him. Then, he raises his hand palm outside to hide his face, perpetuated by innate habit. Mrs. Canty immediately notices the action and recognizes switched her son. She wastes no time, rushes in excitement for the lost son. She pours her deep love, embraces him and kisses him. Mrs. Canty is overjoyed finding true son but the broken hearted woman remains in dismay once more. She cries "O my child, my darling! (...) I do not know you woman!" (170). The pretension of Tom "I do not know you, woman!" terribly wounds the heart of his mother. So, the stolen royalty devastatingly ruins his morals.

Twain's present novel generally explores the vices and insanity of humans in the society. The author picturesquely draws the distrust, pretense and betrayal amongst the characters. It is hard to believe whether things spread in the society all real, a satire to the nineteenth century American society. The perception of society

largely depends on what is said and spread rather than they actually know about. Furthermore, it is about disbelief people feel and possess about themselves and others. This sort of pretense keeps the society in a state of confusion and illusion. It brings hypocrisy and extravagant manners intending improvement. In fact, there exist both best and the worst humans in the society. Amongst them, Hugh Hendon, a fox hearted man too, exists in the same society.

Hugh frames treachery to possess Hendon property and titles in the absence of Miles Hendon. The Hendon estates and titles' rights belong to Miles Hendon. As the rightful heir reaches to 'Hendon Hall' he finds all the things unexpected or shocking. Hugh pretends to not know his elder brother Miles Hendon. *The Prince and the Pauper* portrays Hugh as a wicked creature to its extremity. Hugh has no pity or sympathy for his own brother. He derisively treats, molests physically and sends to jail. Hugh warily scans Miles in insulting manner, and denounces his brother's claim. With little hope, Miles helplessly asks to call their father and the older brother, to prove his belongingness. But, sorry to learn is that they are already dead. The bloody cheater claims his possessiveness on the Hendon estates and the titles. Hugh makes a plot to spread rumor of death of Miles Hendon in military. Then the wicked creature forces Edith, girlfriend of Miles to get marriage with him. Hugh has not any humility and affection for others. He uses others only for his personal benefit. Hugh even threatens Edith to deny Miles Hendon, otherwise he would have her life. But it does not work. Then, Hugh threatens to murder her lover and spare her life. As such, Edith is obliged to be silent, forced to deny otherwise there happens horrible things. Hugh even fires twenty two servants out of twenty seven. The five servants remain there for blind support and assistance, to deny Miles Hendon.

Edith warns Miles Hendon to depart from Hendon Hall and not to appear again in that region. In fact, Edith does not exactly warn but shows her inner love for Miles Hendon. So, she cannot bear any sort of physical torture upon her darling man.

“It is the more dangerous for that you are like what our lost lad must have grown to be if he had lived.” “Heavens, madam, but I am he!”

“I truly think you think it. I question not but I warn you that is all. My husband is master in the region, his power has hardly any limit; the people prosper or starve, as he wills. If you resembled not the man whom you profess to be, my husband might bid you pleasure yourself with your dream in peace; but trust me, I know him well; I know what he will do, he will say to all that you are but a mad impostor, and straightway all will echo him. (148)

Through Edith’s mouth, all the things get unveiled. As Hugh grips the power of the region, he comes to be the master in his region. His cruelty and insanity has hardly limitation. The extremity of inhumane activity torments the people in the realm but none can protest against him. The fox keeps the people in terror, gives torture both physically and mentally. The people get prosperous or starve, as the false master wills. It is not the big deal to murder or to give death punishment for Hugh Hendon. So, Miles Hendon’s beloved warns him not to claim in a sense that Hugh tags him as a mad impostor. All the people would believe or listen, as Hugh calls. And nobody will raise voice in support of Miles Hendon.

Basically the text exposes the stupidity and the silly manners prevailing in the society. Satire aims to discover the hypocrisy and shallowness of human behaviors. It comments on the evils and the vices of the society. Since, the novel *The Prince and the Pauper* is an adventure of the king, he collects varying experiences in his journey.

The newly king faces different hardships in his disguise of rag beggar. The lost and despondent king approaches to the hermit for the shelter. He gets shocked as he encounters the ghostly and the barbaric hermit. Generally, a hermit inherits qualities of fair and holly heart and fears to do sin. But, in this text, the hermit exposes his hypocrisy and insanity. The hermit's ghostly act makes the king horrible and grotesque. So, the text explores the shallowness and the phony manners of so called holly hermit. In fact, the holly hand and fair heart does not attempt murder or any harm. The hermit attempts to kill the king for the revenge of late king Henry viii. The author exposes the conflict between christianity and the monarchy.

At the king's grave sleep, hermit ensues his animalistic business. He fetters king's hands and feet at king's slumber. Then, the hermit whets his knife to make grow sharper and sharper till late night. The duty of hermit does not allow to commit such a woeful disaster. The helpless king is shocked and bewildered by hermit's devilish act. The wicked hermit even exposes his hypocrisy that he has seen the deity face to face. The hermit claims that he is an archangel and is destroyed by his prevented ambition to be appointed pope. He blames king Henry to end England's official to the roman catholic church. He exposes extreme indignation to the cold monarchy. The hermit thinks, he is prevented to ride to this powerful catholic position. Because of late king Henry's action leaves the hermit as a poor obscured and unfriendly monk. So the hermit suffers from insanity and attempts for disastrous murder.

“Then pray again. Pray the prayer for the dying!”

A shudder shook the boy's frame, and his face blanched.

Then he struggles again to free himself turning and

twisting himself this way and that; tugging frantically,

fiercely, desperately to burst his  
 fetters, and all the while the old ogre smiled down upon  
 him and nodded his head and palsidly whetted his  
 knife, mumbling, from time to time. "The moments are prosperous,  
 they are few and prosperous pray the prayer for the dying!" (123)

The boy desperately struggles to release himself from the hell. He strongly engages his body twisting and turning, this way and that as possible as he can. All the effort or attempt goes in vain. At the same time, the old demon gives a mocking smile, nodded his head, and whets the knife leisurely. In fact, the hermit defiles himself attempting barbaric and inhumane murder. The conflict between the Christianity and the monarchy leads the society into injustice and crimes. A great deal of conflict between Christianity and monarchy was prevailed in contemporary English society. The conflict stems largely from the king's break with Roman Catholic Church.

The king Edward in his journey gets chance to observe the religious injustice and sin. As Edward and Miles Hendon are imprisoned by the Hugh Hendon, they behold a cruel punishment given to two Baptist women. They see the women, who demonstrate kind and gentle natures. The women dealing with Edward are loving and friendly in the prison. They are being burned alive for their religious belief. As Edward inquires their crime, they simply answer that they are Baptists. The answer gives shock the king. The moment of cruel punishment is truly shuddering, horrible and solemnly pathetic to behold.

The unfortunate women are burned at the stake, before huge crowd. Other prisoners helplessly watched, could do nothing, having fear of same severity or punishment. Simultaneously, two young girls come with mourning. The young daughters cry overwhelming scream and throw themselves upon the women. The girls

mourn pathetically and fight for freedom but it ends with terrifying disaster. Edward cannot bear it and he mutters:

That I have seen, in that one little moment, will never go out from my memory, but will abide there; and I shall see it all the days, and dream of it all the night till I die. Would God I had been blind! (157)

This sort of religious intolerance gravely endangers the society. In fact, Edward himself is not free from religious prejudices. He exposes his prejudices against Roman Catholic Church. Edward's hatred to Catholics, hints on comment about his half-sister Mary. The princess Mary later, as queen repairs the bond with Roman Catholic Church. In contrary, Edward as a king, continues to end the connection. Edward speaks derisively about Mary's unfriendly and disapproving attitude and her constant talk of sin.

Social satire is a means by which humor is used to subtly criticize the human foibles of the society, and intends to improve the defects. Humor firstly aspires to smile or laugh, and later aims to reform the follies and vices. In the novel *The Prince and the Pauper*, the mystery of identity plays the great role, to make the situation humorous. The double role character of the prince and the pauper carry a mystery of identity. Mark Twain as a social satirist, uses "switch place" instrument in the present novel. The lacunas and extravagant manners of people bring the humor in the society. And they frequently carry deeper meanings. As Tom meets Edward's whipping boy, he insists to protect the boy from further harm. But the whipping boy makes clear the fact that taking the lash is how he earns his living. He has to receive punishments for the faults of the prince as his duty. So, the more the prince fails in his reading, the more the boy gets penalty or earns his living. Tom therefore, assures him that he will

“study so ill” that the whipping boy’s wages must be tripled. The whipping boy is grateful, and the incident is so funny that it produces the humor. The humor disguises the wretchedness of the society. So, the novel portrays the wretchedness through the whipping boy. The whipping boy introduces “taking lashes” as his office and livelihood. Tom shows his humility and mercy to poor creature. But Humphrey Marlow denounces:

My back is my bread, O my gracious liege! If it go  
idle, I starve. An thou cease from study mine office  
is gone thou ‘It need no whipping-boy. Do not turn me  
away!

Tom was touched with this pathetic distress. He said a right royal burst of generosity.

Discomfort thyself no further, lad. Thine office shall permanent in thee a forever. Then he struck the boy a light blow on shoulder with the flat of his sword exclaiming, “Rise Humphrey Marlow, Hereditary Grand whipping boy to the Royal House of England! Banish sorrow\_

I will betake me to my books again, so and study so ill that they must in justice treble the wage, so mightily shall the business of thine office be augmented. (78)

Humphrey Marlow relates Tom that his back is his bread and breath. If the back goes without business he will be starved. The prince or the false prince has to give continuity his reading, it is because the whipping boy’s back requires the lashes to acquire bread. That is why, he appeals Tom not to stop study. Humphrey Marlow demands as more lashes as possible so that he can earn better for his livelihood. Despite of pathetic scene, the author applies strategy of humorous attitude. Tom

shows his honest sorrow for the whipping boy and at the same time he asks the whipping boy to banish sorrow. Tom promising to study worst, decrees not to stop the office of whipping boy. He assures the grand whipping boy that he will resume the study. He promises to study so ill so that the whipping boy's back will not go idle. When Tom vows to save the office of the whipping boy and at the same time he pushes the boy for further destruction. In one sense, he intends to rescue the boy from pathetic scene of taking lashes. In another sense, he promises to save the woeful job of taking lashes which further gives gruesome pathos. This defective behavior appeals for humor in the society.

Tom Canty, most of the time behaves in funny and silly manners. He becomes as an object for entertainment in heavenly palace. Attendant lords and ladies inspect or perceive his lacunas but they do not even smile rather show their honest awe and reverence. The lords and ladies show grave sympathy and sorrow, supposing him gone mad. They suppose him, as the true prince, Edward of Wales. At the first royal dinner, poor Tom eats with his fingers. He looks his napkin with grave curiosity and with deep interest, it is neck made of a delicate and beautiful fabric. He is unaware of his messy manners. He asks to remove the napkin from his neck telling it is not necessary. He fears of getting soiled it. He further inquires pointing food items and speaks in amusing way, if they are to be eaten. Tom gets answer with grave awe but no laugh manifests. The poor prince does all things wrongly. He does not realize his blunder wrongs. As he finishes dessert, he fills pockets full with nuts.

Tom examined the turnip and lettuce with interest, and asked what they were, and, if they were to be eaten, for it was only recently than men had begun to raise these things in England in place of importing them as luxuries

from Holland. He question was answered with grave respect, and no surprise manifested. When he had finished his dissert, he filled his pockets with nuts, but nobody appeared to be aware of it or disturbed by it. (35-36)

So, Tom's improper and unprincely acts make the incident amusing and funny. He fails to maintain royal manner.

After the dinner is over, Tom feels twitch on the muscles of his nose. He shows his growing woes and he lifts and wrinkles the organ. The twitch troubles solemnly that tears come into his eyes. The attendants rush forward and backward with dismay to remove the trouble. Tom says with genuine anguish\_ "I crave your indulgence: my nose itcheth cruelly. What is the custom and usage in this emergence? Prithee, speed, for a little time I can bear it (36). As Tom inquires about "custom and usage" to heal the problem of itch, all the servants glance one to the other in solemn trouble for counsel. But sorry thing is that there was on traditional scratcher as he presupposes. Tom's foolish thinking makes the situation humorous. So, the prince's ruined manners make the atmosphere funny and amusing amongst the lords and ladies. Tom Canty expecting hereditary scratcher as there is hereditary whipping boy shows his hypocrisy.

In fact, most of Tom's acts were done or ended with humor at his dinner. Tom frequently exposes his stupidity even after meal was ended. As the meal ends, a servitor brings a broad, golden dish of rosewater for the prince's usage. Actually, the servitor brings the rosewater dish to cleanse Tom's mouth and fingers. And the Hereditary Diaperer serves with napkin for the prince's use. But the prince denounces the napkin because he is not habituated with "undesired services" (37). In this sense,

these grand services exactly discomfort Tom and he wants to avoid undesired services. The lords and the ladies get shock with his improper acts. The false prince speaks that he does not deserve the grand services. The prince claims, the rosewater dish and napkin are made for powerful one. In this way or that, Tom often acts in unusual manner. The prince further acts in amusing way when all the servants depart from his sight. Now he prepares to eat nuts, brought from the dinner. Tom catches the proper chance of free from inspection of servants or “undesired services.” He even feels relief from the “grand hereditaries” (37). Then, he becomes happy as he remains alone. Tom thinks that God made him prince for his sin. To belong to the royalty is not exactly his desire. So, he earnestly wants to be free from grandeur and luxury of living.

Basically, humor is a situation in which something gets repeated. Once we begin to notice, it becomes predictable and we are inclined to laugh. So, as our expectation is fulfilled, we aspire to laugh. In case of the prince Edward, he repeats the same words in several places and times. This sort of repetition makes himself funny. He does not shake off his true belonging. Edward defiantly continues to insist that he is the true prince of Wales. He never gives chance to fade the truthful words even in the minority. But, multitude of people, suppose him as an insane pretendor and they abuse him verbally and physically. The unfortunate prince comes to be a mere rag beggar for the derisive crowd. The act of switch place troubles him vehemently. During the adventure Edward has seen varying vices and crimes. People are forced to be hanged for smallest crimes. So he promises the victims of social inequality and injustice to correct the social disorder. Edward strongly criticizes the harshness of law and vows to improve the derisive punishments which are given wrongly. He declares that, from today onward the end of that harsh law is come.

Edward proclaims “Thou shalt not\_ and this day the end of that law is come! ... “I am the king of England”. A wild burst of laugh followed, partly in derision and partly in delight in the excellence of the joke(101). Edward’s consistently repeated claim comes to be a subject of laughter. This strange and unusual behavior entertains the huge crowd this is what the crowd of people think. People laugh at him partly in derision and partly in delight. They think that Edward has told an excellent joke which made them to laugh. In this spectacle, Edward is just a joker in the eyes of laughing people. A tinker warns Edward not to jest on the serious subject in the name of amusement. The traveler suggests him not to be so base on the matter of royalty. As such, the huge mobs suppose him as an insane jester. At the time, a tinker shouts out and mocks as the king of mooncalves! And all shout at once insulting:

Long live Foo-Foo the first king of mooncalves! Followed by hootings,  
cat calls and peals of laughter.

Hale him forth and crown him.

Robe him.

Spectre him.

Throne him. (102)

The huge crowd shouts at once before the helpless victim. Edward was crowned with a tin basin, robed in an old and torn blanket, and throned him upon the barrel. Then all kneel to the ground. They make a chorus of ironical moaning and insulting prayer. The poor king feels himself most tragic or grotesque. Actually, it is not his treason to stand firm on the behalf of truthfulness. As such, the frank and no secret nature makes the king himself the subject of humiliation.

The author’s prime goal is to concern on the social discrimination based on economic system. It has established hierarchical position between nobles and

peasants. The contemporary English society criticizes the poor people and their worst status. Through the mouthpieces Edward and Tom, the author intends to eradicate all the malicious attitudes of aristocrats upon the poor people. Thus, Twain communicates the widening gap between the two social classes, caused by discriminative English law. By depicting the contaminated English environment and law, the present text challenges the whole rules and regulation of England. So it is a great satire to the lifestyle and mode of living of the people of England.

## Chapter Three

### Satire as a Tool for Reformation in *The Prince and the Pauper*

Generally satire exposes wickedness and wretchedness prevailing in the society. It comments on the social vices and hypocrisy of the people. So, satire precisely depicts human flaws in their activities. Satire even portrays the cruelty and extremity of inhuman behaviors. Humor is a one of the instruments to subtly criticize the human defects or foibles. Humor explores human insanity and silly behaviors in amusing manners. Satire further requires remedy for human and social imperfection. As such, satire formerly blames and comments but it's ultimate purpose is to rectify wicked and folly manners. It intends to improve all the defects of the society and maintain a prosperous society.

Twain's social satire is applicable to the contemporary society of the United States as it was to the society of sixteenth century England. Through the adventure of both Edward and Tom, the author portrays the best and worst of the highest and lowest classes of this sixteenth century English society. Eventually the best one overpowers upon the worst manner of the society. Edward's adventure as pauper teaches him humility and kindness. So, Edward's journey of experience encourages him to improve the social behavior. During the adventure, Edward always stands firm against the harshness of the law. So, Edward vows to repair the things as he returns to the throne. Edward diligently strives to make the positive changes in his realm. He rewards the people who had helped him and punishes people who had done crimes. He does not make any compromise to rectify the society. When the mystery of identity becomes clear, he restores the people in their original places or appropriate places. He rewards for good mannered people and punishes the worst mannered people.

Edward rewards Miles Hendon with the title of Earl of Kent and restores his estates from Hugh Hendon. Hendon receives reward for his kind, protective and generous manners. Tom Canty is rewarded with the title of the king's ward for his law of mercy. He has governed the realm with right royal gentleness in the absence of Edward. The king Edward decrees that Tom has throne's protection and has crown's support. The newly king seeks the farmer who was sold for slave. Edward provides the farmer a comfortable livelihood. The king provides good homes for the daughters of two Baptist women. He pours his mercy for a boy, convicted of falcon bird theft. Edward saves the boy from the cruel punishment of execution. He further releases the woman, convicted to be hanged, for the crime of the theft of cloths from weaver. The young king punishes the people who had committed vicious crimes and sins. The king banishes Hugh Hendon to the continent. He proclaims John Canty to be hanged for his crimes. Finally, Edward rules the realm with law of mercy and ends the law of blood.

In fact, the credit of merciful law goes to Tom Canty in a sense that he had initiated or established law of mercy displacing the law of harshness and cruelty. In the absence of rightful king, he takes a grand chance to learn the confidence of royalty. Tom's first act as king is to forgive the Duke of Norfolk. Actually the late king Henry VIII was intended to execute the Duke of Norfolk. He shows great intelligence, and he improves vices and extremity. Tom decrees that from this day onward, there will be no more law of harshness. This sort of inherent kindness rebels against cruel law of Henry VIII. Tom's decisive acts as the king, change the outdated and stale laws replacing the kind and public friendly law. Then, Edward as the king, gives continuity to the law of mercy. Eventually, he restores the true king Edward to

the throne. As such Tom learns confidence he never had. And he feels sense of worthiness and happiness for the first time.

Since time itself brings change, it is right time to make positive change in the society. And it is time to repair unjust and abusive law of the contemporary American society, which often obstructs on the peaceful existence of whole lowly people. So, the study applies the social satire to remove the unease of contemporary society. In nutshell, this research showing evils of social hierarchy, attempts to reform the society for its harmonious development and proper balancing.

## Works Cited

- Blanchard, W. Scott. *Scholar's Bedlsm: Menippean Satire in the Renaissance*.  
Lewisburg: Bucknell, 1995.
- Dickinson, T. Leon. *Modern Language Notes*. The Johns Hopkins University Press,  
64.2 (Feb. 1949): 103-106.
- Dominic, Catherine. *Critical Essay on The Prince and the Pauper in Novels for  
Students*. Gale: Cengage Learning, 2010.
- Fry, Northrop. *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton  
University Press, 1957.
- Gale, L. Robert. *Mark Twain Journal: The Prince and The Pauper and King Lear*.  
University of Pittsburgh, 12.5 (Spring 1963): 14-17.
- Griffin, Dustin. *Satire: A Critical Reintroduction*. Lexington: University of Kentucky,  
1994.
- Hodgart, Matthew. *Satire*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1969.
- Jemielity, Thomas. *Satire and the Hebrew Prophets*. Louisville: Westminster/John  
Knox Press, 1992.
- Kernan, Alvin. *The Cankered Muse: Satire of the English Renaissance*. New Haven.  
CT: Yale, 1959.
- Knight, Charles A. *The Literature of Satire*. New York: Cambridge university Press,  
2004.
- Paulson, Ronald. *The Fictions of Satire*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins  
University Press, 1967.
- Quintero, Ruben. *A Companion to Satire*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2007.
- Relihan, Joel C. *Ancient Menippean Satire*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins  
University Press, 1993.

Smith, Bradford. "Mark Twain and the Mystery of Identity", in *College English*, 24.6 (March 1963): 425-30.

Spacks, Patricia Meyer. *Some reflections on Satire*. In Ronald Paulson (ed.), *Satire : Modern Essays in Criticism* 1971, 366-78.

Test, George A. *Satire: Spirit and Art*. Tempa: South Florida, 1991.

Twain, Mark. *The Prince and The Pauper*. PSU-Hazleton: The Electronic Classic Series, 2000.

Vogelback, Arthur Lawrence. *American Literature*. Mary Washington College: Duke, 14.1 (Mar. 1942): 48-54.

Wienbrot, Howard D. *Menippean Satire Reconsidered: From Antiquity to Eighteen Century*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins, 2005.

Wylie, Philip. *Generation of Vipers*. Marietta: Larlin Corporation, 1970.