

Tribhuvan University

Politics of Irony in Philip Roth's *Operation Shylock: A Confession*

A Thesis Submitted to the Central Department of English, T.U

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for the

Degree of Master of Arts in English

By

Jiwan Acharya

T. U. Regd. No.: 6-2-1-0024-2011

Symbol No.: 6075

Central Department of English

Kirtipur, Kathmandu

February, 2019

Tribhuvan University
Central Department of English
Letter of Recommendation

This thesis entitled “Politics of Irony in Philip Roth’s *Operation Shylock: A Confession*” carried out by Mr. Jiwan Acharya has been completed under my supervision. I hereby recommend this thesis for upcoming viva voce.

Laxman Bhatta
Supervisor /Assistant Professor
Central Department, Kirtipur
Date: _____

Tribhuvan University
Faculty of Humanities and Social Science
Central Department of English

Letter of Approval

This thesis entitled “Politics of Irony in Philip Roth’s *Operation Shylock: A Confession*” submitted to the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University by Jiwan Acharya, has been approved by the undersigned members of the research committee.

Members of the Research Committee:

Internal Supervisor

External Examiner

Head

Central Department of English

Date: _____

Acknowledgements

I owe my heartily gratitude to my supervisor Mr. Laxman Bhatta, Assistant Professor of the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University, who, despite his busy schedule encouraged me to complete this thesis providing me scholarly and valuable complements and related essential materials. Any attempt to express my gratitude to him in words becomes inadequate.

I am grateful and indebted to Prof. Dr. Anirudra Thapa, Head of the Central Department of English for the valuable directions in conducting the research. I would like to extend sincere acknowledgements to the entire Professors, Readers, and Lecturers of the Department for their valued inspiration. The successful completion of this work would not have been possible without their productive encouragement, inspiration, constructive insights, and assistance.

I would like to express my special regard to my loving parents: Padam Prasad Acharya and Netra Kumari Acharya for their long and continuous sacrifice, encouragement, love and support. I am equally indebted to my colleagues and all my well-wishers who directly and indirectly help me to the successful completion of this research work.

February, 2019

Jiwan Acharya

Abstract

This research paper examines Roth's politics behind using irony in Operation Shylock: A Confession. It explores the ways of using history to oppress the exilic community and also investigates their resistance for authentic history. The brutal violence towards subordinated group is presented ironically in order to mock at Israeli Jews' incapability of forgetting the past and to challenge their authenticity by proposing the Jews to return their home. By taking the theoretical insights of irony as proposed by Linda Hutcheon and Claire Colebrook, this paper investigates Roth's politics of making comic and political use of irony. By using irony's trans-ideological and subversive function, this research reveals how irony helps to question dominant discourse of history and at the same time to reinforce the marginalized values. The research further uncovers how Roth employs irony to raise voice of the voiceless and aware the ruling elites by unmasking complexities, dualities, ambiguities, and shifting realities of dominant culture.

Keywords: Irony, trans-ideology, subversion, reinforcement, memory, history, Holocaust

Politics of Irony in Philip Roth's *Operation Shylock: A Confession*

This research paper investigates politics of irony in Philip Roth's *Operation Shylock: A Confession* (1993). Roth in the novel makes comic use of irony in order to demonstrate post-Holocaust Israeli society, political turmoil, effects of war, conflict, radical Israeli government and military systems. Instead of adoring the violence, the novel rather represents the state of violence comically and raises awareness to the Israeli Jews to be rational. The irony helps him to bring the brutality of the Israeli government and military and unseen threat in future. Moreover, it also helps him to demonstrate socio-political scenario of his time and resistance of Palestinian people against domination of Israeli government and military force. Roth raises Palestinian, oppressed people's voice and deconstructs the boundary between Israeli and Palestinians through comic use of irony.

This paper also concerns about the ironical situation of the characters in the novel, their dual and conflicting identity, shifting nature of reality, questionable facts which signify the reason of employing irony in Roth's *Operation Shylock: A Confession*. The ultimate politics of using comic irony in the novel is to satire the methods of solving contemporary problems of Israel and Israelis customs. Roth in the novel comically merges the factual and fictional characters through which he attempts to create incongruity within the readers and makes the serious and tragic history convincing to the readers.

Roth in the novel presents the characters ironically in order to show the shifting identity and ambivalent state of their lives. By creating his double character, Roth not only is challenging the discourse created by right wing elite Israeli but also is representing the existing multiple views of reality. George Ziad, a radical Palestinian, represents the counter character to question the authenticity of Jews in Arabs. Irony helps Roth to question the truth and testimonies of Holocaust survivors. The shifting nature of existential self, brutality of right wing Israeli Jews towards Arabs and others, their contradictory testimonies to

regard themselves victims, creating violence by using Holocaust memories are ironically represented in the novel to demonstrate the unstated violence of Israeli Jews.

This research project focuses on the use of irony for mocking purpose as well as giving voice to the marginalized group. Irony helps Roth to present the brutality, inhumanity of hierarchical and radical post Holocaust society. Similarly, it also helps to present complexities, ambiguities, dualities and identity crisis of post war and modern human conditions. Roth uses farcical details to represent dead serious matter like Holocaust and ravages of war. Its main aim is to mock Israeli Jew for incapable to forget their horrifying past and repeating the same to others. The double of the narrator Roth, thin wall of historical facts and fictional characters, Halcion-induced madness, leaving eleventh, the most significant chapter, movement of returning Jews to Europe, the controversial scene of trial, and the shifting realities of self are presented ironically in the novel to question the authenticity and history of Holocaust victim Jews at the same time to reinforce oppressed and marginalized Palestinians who are exiled within their own home.

Roth's novel *Operation Shylock: A Confession* presents a two-sided controversial discussion about the justification of the existence of the state of Israel. Philip Roth, the protagonist is the author himself who has just overcome a period of Halcion- induced depression and preparing to fly to Israel on a journalistic assignment to interview a Holocaust survivor author, Aharon Appelfeld. The events such as trial of John Demjanjuk, a Ukranian American citizen who has been accused to be a sadistic guard Ivan the Terrible at the Treblinka camp during the Second World War, occurs simultaneously in the novel. Roth's novel has universally recognized numerous critical applause since its publication. Various critics have set forth diverse criticism about the text itself. The novel has drawn the innumerable attention from various critics, writers, researchers, and scholars even from Jews and others all over the world. Some critics have observed it as satirical; others

categorized it as comic and farcical whereas some review it as blend of fact and fiction as well. Unlikely, some have criticized the novel for its heavy Jewishness and others have described it as anti- Semitic because of the mission of double Roth. However, there are few critics who analyze this novel as piece of comic art.

Elaine B. Safer states, “Philip Roth, like other postmodern novelists, uses comic irony to mock rational methods of solving contemporary problems, particularly problems with regard to traditional Jewish issues that people hold dear” (157). Roth’s major intention of representing Jewish issues ironically is to mock their rationality. Those farcical actions of protagonist Philip Roth and his double, Pipik are merged with details of recent history of Israel. Whenever readers are concerned to the factual details presented in the novel, Roth directs its narrative towards picaresque description of protagonist and his double. Safer, concerning with this technique, states:

We do, however, become disoriented when fanciful details merge with details of recent history: Court testimonies about prison guard Ivan the Terrible (from Treblinka Death Camp survivors); distressing narratives of Holocaust experienced; reference to the violence of the present-day Israeli-Arab conflict; and troubling questions about the definition of a Jewish identity, and the responsibilities of Jews- American and Israeli. (158)

Through these merging facts with imaginative and comic actions, Roth is trying to make clear that even some history can be false and fiction can be the source of truth. Roth reduces the readers back to split depiction of the protagonist and his imposter when readers are more concerned about actual details described in the novel. This act of merging realistic details and farcical elements in narratives from current Israeli context, from Roth’s Jewish background, and exactly to the verifiable facts of Roth’s lived life during his middle fifties help to develop it as an ethnic tragic comic novel.

Likewise, the subject matter of Roth's novel is within the context of Jews and the issues of contemporary Israel. As Alan Cooper, in his recent book on Roth, observes:

Ideas in *Operational Shylock* revolve around its locales, its people, and the topics of its obsessive discussions: the Holocaust, the creation of Israel, Israeli justice, Ivan the Terrible, gentile anti-Semitism, rights of Palestinians, the Jew in history, and, of course, the Jewish writer. All are paradoxes: they are what they seem and they are also the direct opposites of what they seem. (257)

Cooper here tries to analyze Roth's work as product of Holocaust and the subject matters revolving around the context of contemporary Israel. However, they are presented paradoxically which representations differ as they seem. He seems to address the ideas in the novel are ironic not in the sense of its opposition of appearance but in the sense that it is paradoxical in nature: they are as it is and they are exactly opposite of their appearance.

Harold Bloom in his review admires the novel for its comic art, its ability to cause the reader to "wonder whose photograph frowns at us on the dust jacket. Is it Roth or Moishe Pipik 'Philip Roth?'"(46). Bloom praises Roth's novel in terms of its comic presentation that is successful to gain its motifs of mocking.

The mainstream Israelis use their past experience to impose their values and to exclude others. As Sylvia Barack Fishman states:

As *Operation Shylock's* lapsed and then politically reborn Palestinian, Ziad insists that the plight of the Palestinians has been immeasurably worsened because of the cynical way in which Israeli politicians have used the Holocaust for propaganda value. After the Israeli victory in 1967, Ziad insists, members of the government, who had previously been embarrassed by their victimized progenitors, found it expedient; to remind the world,

minute by minute, hour by hour, day in and day out, that the Jews were victims before they were conquerors only because they are victims. (148)

Fishman insists on the fact that Israelis regard them as ‘victims’ to bypass others. Most affected by this propaganda are Palestinians who are excluded within their own homelands. Fishman here is pointing out Roth’s intention of creating his imposture and mocking so called ‘victims’ whom are reminding world that they are victims before they are conquerors.

Peter L. Rudnytsky writes, “Operation Shylock is at once one of Roth’s most radical experiments in narrative form and the novel with which he sets his abiding theme of Jewish identity in its widest historical and cultural context” (26). Rudnytsky focuses his analysis on Roth’s experimentation in narrative form and merging factual details with fanciful imaginations which create comic mode in the novel.

The publication of *Operation Shylock* in 1993 reopened and added fire to the debate about Roth’s Jewish credentials. Jewish communal criticism of *Operation Shylock* coalesced on the fact that characters in the book articulate a variety of opposing attitudes about sensitive subjects, such as the meaning of Israel to American Jewish identity and the impact of the Holocaust on contemporary Jewish life. Many criticize Roth of being self absorbed and self indulgent. Literary critics disapproved Roth’s increasing preoccupation with Jewish materials and Jewish related attitudes, which they perceived as being not only repetitive and self reflexive but also journalistic and thus dated. The most direct of these critics was John Updike, who, while he eloquently admires *Operation Shylock* in other ways, complains about what he sees as Roth’s pointless inclusion of Judaic materials:

The novel stops pretending to coherence and becomes a dumping ground, it seems, for everything in Roth’s copious file on Jewishness: a slangy American anti-semitic monologue... The touchingly bland and banal journal of Leon Klinghoffer (fictional), searing testimony on the Demjanjuk trial

(actual), and pages of uninterrupted discourse on the saintly nineteenth-century rabbi chofetz chaim and his desire that Jews abstain from loshon hora- evil speech, especially against other Jews. (112)

Updike is unhappy with witless use of Jewish elements by Roth which makes novel disconnected. Updike also accuses Roth's novel as a lavish copy of heavy Jewishness.

Similarly, Robert Alter, who had admired Roth's earlier novels, had little to say about *Operation Shylock*, which to him incorporated "neither linear plot development nor panoptic vision, rather meandering verbal extravaganzas"(34). Additionally, Alter expresses his dissatisfaction that "Roth has the skill to make these themes resonate, but their only sounding-box remains the limiting theater of self presentation that remains the venue of all his novels" (34).

Afore mentioned critics analyze the novel as product of Holocaust, piece of experimentation, comic art, merge of facts and fiction and so on. But this research paper explores why Roth makes comic use of irony in *Operation Shylock: A Confession*. He uses irony intentionally to mock and break down the hierarchy and violence in the society. Violence and the idea of resettlement are used by oppressed Palestinian people as a weapon to resist the imposed power and culture in Israel. Most of the characters are presented ironically in order to show the dual nature of modern human being, brutality and resistance. This paper focuses on the ways of challenging the existed norms, values, and system and enforcing the marginalized values and culture in *Operation Shylock: A Confession*. Roth uses irony to present the unspeakable truth, chaotic and disruptive condition of oppressed people. Roth by proposing European Jews to return their own land ironically warns Israeli people about upcoming catastrophe due to their activities. Roth employs irony to project how Israeli government is unable to create harmony in country because 'other' people like

Palestinians cannot get proper land and space and they revolt against tyrannical elitist Israeli government and authority.

Irony is characterized as the gap between saying and the actual meaning. It is a device that can be used to convey the message distancing oneself in a literal way. It creates layers of meaning and complexities to problematize the established norms, values, and beliefs. Claire Colebrook points out the historical development of irony from Socrates to Post modern time and also demonstrates the changing definition of irony that is used in order to represent the complexity and duality of modern life. Ironic meaning is always hidden in the text and the readers are expected to explicate the meaning through it. However, irony cannot give exact meaning alone rather it is always contextual and socially depended that have significant role to provide intended meaning of the writer. Irony has various functions such as; subversive, enforcing, corrective, satiric, and so on. Irony has double edge that helps it to challenge the oppressive and high values and at the same time it enforces the low values too. Irony is also used in order to satire and mock the unwanted socio-political scenario and development just like Roth has used comic irony, the concept of 'double' to reassert postmodern skepticism. Similarly, this non-fiction work intertwines fictional account of 'trial' which lays a foundation for the postmodern comic view of the nature of reality.

Irony is an expression of meaning by using language which normally signifies the opposite of it. The purpose of using irony is typically for humorous or emphatic effect. In literary term, Irony is a technique by which the significance of a character's words or actions is crystal clear to the audience or the reader though the characters are unknown about it. Irony deals with the verbal play of meaning in which the stated and unstated come together in a certain way in order to make real or intended meaning. Irony is often only recognized well after an original statement or event since it often takes current perspectives to shed a

greater light on an earlier issue, situation or statement. In short, irony is the difference between what I think and what I actually live through.

For Colebrook, “Irony is both a figure of speech – saying one thing and meaning another- and an attitude to existence, in which the ironic subjects adopts a position of skepticism and mistrust in relation to everyday language”(1). Irony was originally used in Greek tragedy. It has long history that goes back to the time of Plato and Socrates. The concept of irony was formed at the moment of cultural insecurity when the tribal cultures of Ancient Greece were opening out to imperial expansion and the inclusion of others. It was the time Socrates used irony to challenge received knowledge and wisdom at a historical moment when security of small community were threatened. As Colebrook opines, “The word ‘eironeia’ was first used to refer to artful double meaning in the Socratic dialogues of Plato” (1). ‘Eironeia’ was used in the sense of lying however it is no longer lying or deceit but a complex rhetorical practice whereby one can say one thing but mean quite another. It is clear that there was the practice of using irony as an art of playing with meaning.

One of the earliest and well-known uses of irony comes from Socrates as appeared in Plato’s dialogues, which is usually called ‘Socratic Irony’. Socrates’ technique produces irony by showing that the arguments his opponent puts forth cannot be taken at face value. Colebrook writes, “Throughout Medieval and Renaissance Europe, irony was taken as saying the opposite of what is meant” (9). And, only in the eighteenth century the word became more widely used in literature, and was developed in various forms such as satire. Along with the rise of Romanticism at the turn of the nineteenth century, the concept of irony took on new meanings during this period. Whereas before irony was something directed by someone at someone, it could now be something unintentional, observable, and representable in art. Before the explicit and extended theorization of irony in the nineteenth century, irony was recognized but it was considered as minor and subordinated figure of

speech. In the twentieth century irony was often used to emphasize the multilayered, contradictory nature of modern and postmodern experience. This century has seen many attempts to formulate irony as a coherent concept. Literary critics such as D. C. Muecke and Wayne Booth have come up with scores of names describing different types of ironies, and different ways in which irony is used. Classifying and tracking the history of irony not only clarifies the concept but also shows how it changes throughout time. Colebrook points out, “this modern way of looking at irony by maintaining a distance from it and thinking of its use in discontinuous contexts is itself an ironic attitude, because by doing so we see the ‘truth’ of the past without holding to those truths” (3-4). Irony brings about some intended or added meanings to a situation as all the other figures of speech. Ironical statements and situations in literature or in any fictional narratives promote readers’ interest on it. Likewise, it helps the work of art to be more interesting, and forces the readers to use their imaginations to decode the underlying meanings of the texts. Moreover, real life is full of ironical expressions and situations. Therefore, the use of irony gives life to the work of art.

Colebrook presents the history of irony and its fluctuating definition from Socrates to postmodern time. Irony has been used variously in different time. It does not have steady definition as Colebrook states:

The history of irony’s elitism goes back to its emergence in Greek thought. Not only was irony defined as an art in keeping with an urbane and elevated personality, it was also recognized as practiced primarily in sites of political power. Irony, as a trope, is a means of effective persuasion in speeches...As a figure or extended mode of thought irony allows a speaker to remain above what he says. (19)

The above lines suggest that the origin of irony and its use situates in Ancient Greece where it was practiced simply to persuade people. However its function and use get shifted as

Colebrook argues, “Because of its ambivalent political history, perceived both as a force of liberation and as a mode of elitism, there have been recent attempts to move beyond or definition of irony. If irony means something other than what it says, then this will allow language to be liberated from a stable context” (19-20). The redefinition of irony gets continued over time.

One of the postmodern critics Hutcheon observes the transgressive function of irony makes it distinct from other figure of speeches. She states:

Unlike metaphor or metonymy, irony has an edge, unlike incongruity or juxtaposition, irony can put people on edge; unlike paradox, irony is decidedly edgy. While it may come into being through the semantic playing off of the stated against the unstated, irony is a “weighted” mode of discourse in the sense that it is asymmetrical, unbalanced in favor of the silent and the unsaid. (35)

Her major claim is that irony simply does not show the difference between said and unsaid rather it dares to challenge the hierarchy, instability, injustice, and bourgeois values at the same time it enforces marginalized values also by bringing the stated and unstated things together. Unlike other’s definition of irony, Hutcheon recognizes that irony is not and should not just be a disbelief or distance from what one says. Irony has a political and ethical force. For instance, one speaks the language of colonialism and reason ironically to display its violence, force, and delimited viewpoint. The writer’s attitude also plays important role in postmodern irony. Said is not completely opposite to unsaid like traditional definition of irony rather both said and unsaid come to be complimentary and relational. The unsaid meaning plays as significant role as said meaning in postmodern definition of irony. Irony cannot give exact meaning alone because it is always contextual and social. The writers can use irony in their texts which also demonstrate the specific

socio-political context. Most importantly, context plays pivotal role to decode intended meaning of irony on the text. In modern use of irony, all contexts, stated, and unstated, mode of the writer, political scenario, and so on come together relationally not unlikely.

Irony is generally perceived as the rhetorical trope where one says something other than what s/he actually means as Wayne W Booth regards it as “saying one thing and mean another” (21). For Booth, “Reading is in some ways like translating, like decoding, like deciphering, and like peering behind the mask” (33). To read any text ironically, readers are supposed to understand not only the literal meaning but at the same time s/he is supposed to figure out the intended meaning which is stated within the text.

In modern time, irony has become unavoidable literary trope of writings. Irony always is the matter of interpretation. Irony and interpretation are inseparable as Hutcheon says, “Irony is not irony until it is interpreted as such” (6). Interpreter may interpret the text as ironic through the eyes of the ironist. Definition of irony is unstable as Mueeke argues, “the word irony does not now mean only what was meant in earlier centuries, it does not mean one century all it may mean in another, nor in the street what it may mean in the study, nor to one scholar what it may mean to another” (8). From the above definitions, it is understood that irony is not static rather it varies according to person, context, and situation.

Irony does not have exact definition in the age of complexities and controversies. As Colebrook points out:

Despite its widely complexity, irony has a frequent and common definition: saying what is contrary to what is meant, a definition that is usually attributed to the first-century Roman orator Quintilian who was already looking back to Socrates and Ancient Greek literature. But this definition is so simple that it covers everything from simple figures of speech to entire historical epochs. Irony means as little as saying. It can also refer to the huge

problems of post modernity; our very historical context is ironic because today nothing really means what it says. We live in the world of quotation, pastiche, simulation, and cynicism; a general and all-encompassing irony. Irony then, by the very simplicity of its definition becomes curiously indefinable. (1)

Though its long-lived history and wide use as rhetorical device, it is extremely uncomfortable for the critic to deal with the notion of irony because of its complexities because today nothing really means what it says. Ultimately, irony becomes indefinable. The former definition of irony developed in Socrates' time when it was practiced as simply saying one thing and mean another has been outdated in post modern time: the time of duality and complexity.

Ironic meaning is always fluctuating because it always depends upon certain political context and it is the matter of interpretation where intended meaning definitely differs. Irony in any fictional narratives gives opportunity to the writer to mean above or beyond what s/he actually says. In other word, it creates dare to question elitist values and at the same time reinforce oppressed values through the medium of literature. Irony is employed in any text according to its function for various purposes like subversion, correction, satire, reinforcement and so on. Finally, it creates an alternative way to unravel the brutality, violence and hierarchy among people in the society and eventually it indirectly contributes to create balance in the society through the help of fictional narratives and other literary writings.

The novel introduces two Philip Roths: Roth (i) and Roth (ii), former is author himself who is remarkable and widely appreciated writer and later is a fictional character appears to having same name and appearance as narrator Roth. The narrator or a character named Philip Roth, who is living in Connecticut with his wife Claire and has in the

aftermath of knee surgery recently suffered an agonizing nervous breakdown on being prescribed Halcion for the relief of its pain. Roth calls this second Roth as Pipik in later part of the novel. Pipik is an American Jew from Chicago, worked as private detective, running his own agency in Chicago, which specialized the cases of missing person. The pretender Roth has assumed real Roth's identity in order to publicize his scheme to establish a new Diaspora that will lead Jews out of Israel and back to their pre-Holocaust cultural roots in Europe. The protagonist and narrator Philip Roth is presented as a writer who continuously spies his double in fear of losing his own identity. The imposter is deliberately not given the true identity. The setting of novel is Israel and the novel explores connection between the Holocaust and the establishment and continuing development of the state of Israel. The relationship between the narrator, the narrative, and the historical contexts are interwoven with the themes of Jewish identity. The thematic substance of novel grows out of the current American Jewish environment and, in particular, American Jewish obsession with Jewish identity.

Philip Roth, an American Jewish writer, is in his Connecticut home, recovering from the knee surgery. He shifted to the Manhattan hotel with his wife and still staying since almost five months. In the first month of 1988, Roth received a call from his cousin Apter, informed that Israeli radios had reported about Roth's presence in Jerusalem attending the trial of John Demjanjuk. Later, Roth received another call in New York from Holocaust survivor writer Aharon Appelfeld who is one of the close friends to Roth with whom Roth is going to take an interview few months later in Israel. Appelfeld confirms the news reported by Apter and also reported that Roth is going to give lecture about Diasporism in King David Hotel in Jerusalem.

From the very beginning of the novel it is exposed that the narrator Roth learned about another Roth attending the trial of John Demjanjuk in Jerusalem. Firstly, Roth's

cousin called and reported him about his presence in Israel without informing him. At first Roth was unable to conform himself that if he was in madness because of the side effect of using Halcion medicine after his knee surgery. Later, Aharon Appelfeld also called Roth and conformed about his presence in Israel. Roth surprisingly telephoned in King David hotel to talk with his imposter pretending to be French journalist. In this conversation Roth learned about the imposter's plan and motives of his movement called Diasporism: the only solution to the Jewish problem. He reported that his plan is to move all the Jews of European origin to their own homeland in order to prevent another Holocaust organized by Arabs.

And, Roth decided to travel to Israel for the purpose of interviewing Aharon Appelfeld. He meets Appelfeld in Israel and talks about contemporary politics. He also meets with his friend George Ziad who is anti-Zionist and supports Pipik's diasporism. Along with this story, the most part of the novel is Israel in background, where John Demjanjuk is on trial for being the former Ivan the Terrible at Treblinka camp during the period of Holocaust. The survivors claimed that Demjanjuk is the same guard who operated gas chamber torturing thousands of Jewish before their mass murder. On the other hand, Demjanjuk and his defense lawyers insist that testimony of survivors are meaningless and claim that he is the Ohio autoworker, and Ivan and he are not the same.

More importantly, most part of novel revolves around the encounter of two Roths. The narrator Roth first meets with Pipik and talks about his intention of imitating his identity. Roth repetitively spies Pipik both being real Roth and being his double. Roth explores Pipik's girlfriend, Jinx, and is unknowingly attracted to her. During their meetings, Roth comes to know about Anti-semites Anonymous, a group founded by Pipik to correct Genile of Anti-Semitism. Jinx also states about how they met and what they are doing recently in Israel. Roth gets a chance to know about Pipik and his motives very vividly.

Likewise, Roth meets another important character, Louis B. Smilesburger, an elderly, disable Holocaust victim. He meets with Roth and gives him cheque because he was convinced by Pipik's idea of diasporism and is ready to contribute million dollars. Roth accepts a million dollar cheque though he knows that it was not for him and Smilesburger has been mistaken about Roth and his double. But Roth unluckily loses the cheque given by Smilesburger while returning back from Ramallah. Roth successfully escapes from the search of Israeli soldier and reaches his hotel and discovers that Pipik is waiting him in his room. Pipik asks him to hand over his cheque but Roth could not find it in his pocket. Pipik gets angry and left the hotel. On the other hand, Roth decides to leave Israel next morning and sits to complete his final interview questions for the Appelfeld. Finally, divided in his own beliefs and identity, Roth, encounters Lewis Smilesburger, a spymaster for the Mossad who influence him to involve in a secret mission for Israeli intelligence.

The novel is considered as Roth's most experimental and post modern novel which challenges the demarcation of fact and fiction. It deals with some of the factual events we already know or that have actually occurred in the history and other events may or may not have experienced by the author, and some events that are imagined by Roth. Roth challenges the reader's expectation about fiction and reality by the framework of the novel. Firstly, Roth states in the 'Preface' that the work is drawn from notebook journals that he experienced during his fifties in 1988. Finally, in the novel's 'epilogue' narrator claims that he was asked to omit the last chapter which significantly includes the 'operation'. However, in the 'Note to The Reader' at the end of the novel, narrator states, "this book is work of fiction but this confession is false" (399). It creates the state of confusion that whether the term 'confession' refers to the 'Note to The Reader' or to the novel's subtitle. Despite the difficulties encountered by the readers in trying to distinguish Roth's thin wall between the

real and the fictional, the novel tries to touch upon serious social concerns of Israel and its objective of satire is directed to the Jews and their customs.

It is also a post modern text in a sense that Roth has made meta-fictional experimentation where he talks about real authors and books. Also Roth engages in experimentation with multiple narrators in terms of their comic consciousness of their own fictivity in which Roth playfully uses factual details from his own life, many other real characters, merging with the fictional events. Roth, with using comic irony and creating the double face is trying to represent post modern skepticism about self and identity, meta-fictional aspects of history, and multiple faceted views of factual events. The trial is significant in the novel because it signifies that there not only exist multiple views of reality but also shows that how people create narratives so as to adjust to the events according to them. It is clear that the novel lays the foundation for posing the question of the nature of reality. Roth's fictions mainly touch on the comic connection between the writer's life experience, treating the writer's predicament with humor and the creative process itself. This process of mingling fiction and autobiography helps Roth's novel to be postmodern. Roth uses comic irony as postmodern tool to mock the way of solving the contemporary problems of Jews particularly in Israel.

Roth has made multi voiced novel where ideologies of the characters compete with each others. There are different character's political voices which compete with each other such as, Smilesburger, a right wing Jew who thinks that Arabs and anti Zionists are threat to the Israel. Unlike, is George Ziad, who presents the contrary view and supports Pipik's plan of resettling Jews of European origins to their ancestral lands and insists for Arab to have an independent state. And, more importantly, Pipik, Diaspora American Jew, leads the movement to get Jews back to their real home.

Roth has manufactured two versions of himself for the principal characters, as well as minor characters. Roth creates the imposter in the novel and uses it to revive himself and his ability through fictional character. The double in the novel allows Roth to be in two positions at the same time, insider and outsider. Pipik signifies Philip's American Jewish self through which he desires to erase his own capacity for himself in the double self. More importantly, Ziad as a representative of Palestinians can be seen as one more impersonation of Philip who offers counter voice against those Jews of Israel and their success of transforming from victims to jailors.

It is fact that this novel does not fall into the category of historical fiction, but it replicates the history of Israel, Palestine, and even American. Roth combined the actual war brutalities, trial of John Demjanjuk, real interview of Appelfeld to his imagination or fiction. This mixture may signify the fact that there is nothing factual in anyone's life. Another significant aspect is Roth's psychotic state induced by Halcion, a drug he takes to make relieve from pain after his knee surgery. Because of Halcion effect he was unable to distinguish illusion from reality which enables reader to doubt the fact that Roth's novel is accurate account from his notebook journal.

Roth, in this novel has used the device of literary double to parallel his identity and history in the text's two Roths. Roth creates ambiguities in the novel where readers try to search the sensible meaning but Roth engages the reader in incongruity to find which the real Roth is. The novel is also a kind of socio-political satire. Roth uses Jewish serotypes for creating humor in the novel. Much of humor arises from the fluctuating realities of what defines self and what defines Jewish identity. Roth uses dark humor in a sense that he juxtaposes glimpses of the ravages of war with farcical scenes. Roth's ultimate intention of using humor is just to make the tragic aspects of life agreeable to the reader. More importantly, Roth has created his vision of ironic comic by exploring outgrowth of the

double. The competing characters and their method of arguing is set in comic contrast which is also significant in the novel to mock the modern dialecticians of contemporary Israel.

This paper attempts to address the political and comical use of irony. Roth presents violence of radical right wing Israeli, post-Holocaust ravages of war, and shifting nature of existential self through the use of irony. The characters like Holocaust survivors such as Rosenberg tries to create violence by accusing John Demjanjuk as Ivan the Terrible to be the notorious gas-chamber operator. Roth through the witty use of irony presents the state's brutality and inhumanity upon marginalized especially to those Palestinians. Apter and Aharon are the representative of Holocaust survivors where former represents those who are less successful in separating themselves from their camp experience, and later is capable of transforming history into art. On the other hand, Ziad represents the marginalized group and presents opposite view that supports Pipik's movement and claims for the Arabs to have an independent state. By using political irony, Roth indirectly satirizes the rational methods of solving contemporary problems of Israel particularly with regard to traditional issues of Jews. In short, Roth using comic irony creates the double politically to proclaim post modern suspicion about identity of the self, to call attention towards meta-fictional aspects of storytelling and about the multifaceted views of factual evidence.

Irony is used to unmask the hidden motifs of the contemporary and earlier discourse established by ruling class or dominant force in the society. According to Colebrook:

Post modern irony is argued to be inherently politically liberating; because no common ground is assumed, a life marked by irony remains open and undetermined. But the extension of irony from being a local trope within an otherwise literal language to characterize life and language in general has also served clearly conservative political tendencies, tendencies that have

closed literature off from its political and cultural forces. At the very last, irony is elitist: to say one thing and mean another, or to say something contrary to what is understood, relies on the possibility that those who are not enlightened or privy to the contest. (18-19)

Colebrook claims that irony always is politically oriented and culturally depended on context. Unsaid meaning is always intended and hidden implicitly in the text. Irony consequently creates two level of meaning, denotative and connotative in which is readers are expected to discover out the both levels of meaning from the text.

Context plays vital role to discover the intention of the ironist. Within the book, the author not only displays fictional stories but also presents the contemporary state domination, socio-political scenario of any place. As Booth states:

If in a play, a character comes in dripping and says “its raining”, the author may well want us to think about it means to say something so obvious as all that. It may suggest literal-mindedness, or even stupidity. Or perhaps the author speaks it in an ironic tone, after the other character look at him standing there, dripping, for about thirty seconds. In literature as in life, “its raining” can mean an unlimited number of things, depending, on the context. (8-9)

Booth’s concept shows the importance of context in any individual and literal use of words. The same statement may refer to multiple meanings depending on the situations. In the same idea, Booth asserts, “Irony is made evident to the understanding either by the delivery, the character of the speaker or the nature of the subject” (49). The intended meaning of the writer can be understood only when characters and context is known to the reader.

Roth challenges contemporary socio-political scenarios by using irony. The context of the novel plays significant role because it reflects various significant historic information

about post-Holocaust society. It sets forth the upcoming danger of second Holocaust if Israel continues its violence towards others such as Palestinians and their enemies. By creating double Roth is signifying the solution towards Israel to abort second Holocaust through the character Pipik. After the end of Second World War, Jews who became successful to survive from the brutal Holocaust are settled to the state of Israel. It is undeniable fact that they are victims of Nazi soldiers during Second World War in different Camps. Unfortunately, they could not forget their past as they started to repeat same violence towards other marginalized people in Arabs. Israeli Jews use their gruesome past as cause of their victory and transform themselves from victims to perpetrators.

In the novel, the author on one hand claims to be the work of fiction and declares that all the names, characters, places and incidents are the products of the author's imagination, on the other hand it questions its own fictionality or lack of it when author proclaims it is an accurate account drawn from his notebook journals. The novel moves around the events that we know to have actually occurred and some events may be from author's imagination.

The significant aspect of the novel is its beginning and the end. The frame of the novel ironically disputes the expectation of the readers about the boundaries of fiction and reality. In other words, proclamation of the author that it is a work of fiction is itself brought into question with the assertion in the 'Preface' in which author says:

I have drawn *Operation Shylock* from notebook journals. The book is as accurate an account as I am able to give of actual occurrences that I lived through during my middle fifties and that culminates, early in 1988, in my agreeing to undertake an intelligence-gathering operation for Israel's foreign intelligence service, the Mossad. (13)

This statement of the author resembles that the work is an actual account that he lived. This can be strengthened with the fact that Philip Roth himself takes the roles of the implied author, the narrator, the protagonist and even that of the antagonist. Indeed, the novel focuses on the narrator Philip Roth, the imposter Philip Roth and also the real-life author. Roth merges real and fictional characters in the novel. His interlink between fictional Philip Roth or the narrator of the novel with himself by including details about his date of birth, his ancestral Jewish background, including references of his books, his wife and many more about him resembles the novel to be factual. And even interview with Israeli writer Aharon Appelfeld and more importantly the trial of John Demjanjuk are real events.

However, Roth at the end of the novel in 'Note to the Reader' ironically confesses that the novel is the work of fiction and all the characters and events are the product of imagination, as he states, "This book is a work of fiction...the names, characters, places, and incidents either are products of the author's imagination or are used factiously. Any resemblance to actual events or locales or persons, living or dead, is entirely coincidental. The confession is false" (399). This confession of the author creates readers in the state of confusion that whether he is referring to the subtitle *A Confession* or the 'Note to the Reader' at the closing of the book. But ironically Roth is confessing to the 'Note to the Reader' that he declares the book is the work of fiction. He tends to claim that the novel is based on factual account. Another reason to declare the book as a fiction is that the fear of author that readers may not entertain his life. Thus, Roth merging fictional characters and events with his own life comically makes the reader engaged.

Similarly, Philip was experiencing Halcion madness due to taking Halcion drug to relieve pain from Knee surgery. This drug produced a strange side effect as a result of which he felt depressed and frightened and he was asking his wife Claire, "Where is Philip Roth?... Where did he go?" (22). The narrator Roth is not sure that he is still in state of

Halcion madness until Aharon Appelfeld called him and conform the news of Roth's presence in Jerusalem. Philip Roth is not certain whether the other Philip Roth is real or imaginary. He now wonders whether the other Philip Roth is the answer, an ironic answer to his search for real himself through the other Roth. Similarly, most of the time we are unable to decide whether what he is reporting as happening is dream or reality. Irony is that Roth himself wonders if all of it is happening or not. It is because he had gone without food, sleep or rest for twenty-four hours before his night encounter with the other Philip Roth and then with Wanda Jane. In this way, Roth uses irony to unmask the brutalities of the state of Israel through the fiction.

Trial is significantly important in the novel because it resembles the very practice of punishing many innocents as they were against of Jews. Roth juxtaposes the sights of the ravages of post Holocaust Israel with farcical scenes is ironical in the sense that the tragic aspects can be represented to the reader comically. And also because the practice of Jews itself is comic because they are admitting they were victims so they should victimized the others. Roth's reports of the Trial of John Demjanjuk and Eliahu Rosenberg's contradictory testimonies make the novel meta-historical which ironically means that people create narrative structure so as to adjust to events or in favour of themselves. Moreover, the trial is important in the novel to show the post modern multiple views of reality.

Rosenberg and other Holocaust survivors testify that John Demjanjuk is the same guard Ivan the Terrible who operated gas chamber in the camps. On the other hand, Demjanjuk is repeatedly denying that he is not Ivan, the notorious gas chamber operator. During the process of court, it is found that Rosenberg has written with his own handwriting in 1945, Ivan the Terrible was murdered by two Jewish boys who jumped him and took his rifle. But Rosenberg insists that he has written what he heard from other as he states; "Revolution in Berlin! There is a revolt in Berlin! And Mendel and Chaim, two other boys,

then jumped the Ukrainian barracks guard and took the rifle from his hands” (292). And when Rosenberg had to answer about this statement written by him he asserts; “I think I have to explain. Because what I say here, I had heard. I hadn’t seen it. There’s a big difference between two” (292). He claims that he hadn’t seen himself but had written reporting what others had seen and told about it. This is ironical in the sense that every written history may not be real rather it can be fictional or intentionally created. It also adds for questioning post modern nature of reality. And this emphasizes the novel’s ironical theme that written world may differ from the real world.

Likewise, to secure his controversial statement, Rosenberg, the Holocaust survivor who testifies John Demjanjuk and the Ivan are the same, further states that his desire to have Ivan dead motivated his earlier narrative:

It was a symbol of our great success, the very fact that we heard what had been done to those vachmanns, for us it was a wish come true...can you imagine, sir, such a success, this wish come true, where people succeeded in killing their assassins, their killers? Did I have to doubt it? I believed it with my whole heart. And would that it had been true. I hoped it was true. (293)

Therefore, the identification of Demjanjuk as Ivan the Terrible by Holocaust survivors in the novel is dramatic and interesting for readers and even for the audiences of the trial. Such incongruities jostle against each other and develop a shocking irony. Thus, the context provides the way to analyze any book ironically. Roth makes comic use of irony in order to mock the contemporary practice of trial and justice system.

Irony is set with in the relationship between the reader, writer, and the context that is always political. Irony has discursive power sometime it creates humor and at the same time raises serious issues. Hutcheon states, “The trans-ideological nature of its politics means that irony can be used either to undercut or to reinforce both conservative and radical

positions” (26). Irony can not only function as deconstructive tools to bring consciousness upon marginalized group but also to subvert high values which helps to create balance between margin and the center. Hutcheon insists that discourse created by dominant group is ambiguous and complex to the minor group. The ultimate function of irony is to unmask the multiplicity of discourse and also to make aware to those people of margin.

The nature of irony is that it contrasts between the outward indication and the real meaning of the text. Irony helps to examine the text from its explicit saying and actual meaning that is literary criticism as Colebrook observers:

Process if ironic re-reading, where we dare to imagine a text as somehow meaning something other than what it explicitly says, characterizes much of what counts as literary criticism. Indeed, one could argue as many twentieth-century critics were to do that literature is characterized by its potential for irony, its capacity to mean something other than a common sense or everyday use of language. (5)

Ironic re-reading is necessary to understand the hidden meaning that is not presented but can be understood while reading the text. Irony always gives the indirect meaning or the writer’s mode and attitude that are hidden in the text. Here, Colebrook is trying to raise the daring capability of irony which is different from daily use of language.

Roth creates his double conducting a movement called Diasporism which aims to resettle the Jews of European background to their own homeland. When Roth heard about his presence of Jerusalem he phones and confirms that there is another Philip Roth and he decides to trip to Israel to interview the Israeli writer Aharon Appelfeld. While in Israel, Roth encounters with the other Philip Roth which he calls Moshie Pipik. Philip meets with Pipik several times and learns about Pipik’s plan. Pipik requests Philip to permit him using his identity but Philip always denies.

Pipik or the imposter is a comical shadow who walks around as the whole Philip Roth is only a fragment of real Roth in reality. Pipik uses novelist Roth's identity to promote his movement based on the theory "Diasporism: The only solution to the Jewish Problem" (18). The line is ironical because the only solution means the final solution which signifies that there is upcoming danger of second Holocaust in Israel and Philip through irony warns the Jews of Israeli to be aware.

The central irony in the novel is 'double' of Philip. It is believed that the 'double' is always person's own unacceptable desires by which person's unconscious desires are acted through. In this case, Roth by using double is manifesting his ability to elevate himself through the fictional characters. In other words, Roth himself is making his unconscious desires act through the characters of his imagination, as reviewer D.M. Thomas asserts that, "Roth's double permits him to explore territory that, even for Jewish writer of notable courage and independence, must still seem impermissible. Perhaps in Israel, through, he would be smart to have a double take his promotional tour" (20-21).

Additionally, duality posed in the novel is controversial and comical as Harold Bloom praises the novel for its "comic art, "its ability to cause the reader to wonder whose photographs frowns at us on the dust jacket. Is it Roth or Moshie Pipik or the real Philip Roth?" (18). Roth creates his comic vision by creating his own double and contradicting voices. The narrator questions, "Where is Philip Roth?" becomes key for the reader that it ironically not only asking about the imposter but also asking about who the narrator is Philip or Roth, intended or real respectively. It is understood that Roth ultimately is advancing his ideas through the uncanny resemblance of double.

Pipik uses novelist's identity to promote an absurd movement in which he aims to have the Jews of European background return to European countries. He states, "It is time to return where we have every historical right to resume the great Jewish European destiny

(32-33). Pipik further argues, “There will be crowds to welcome them. People will be Jubilant. They will be shouting. ‘Our Jews are back! Our Jews are back!’” (45). Though Pipik strengthens his movement convincing Jews to return back, his notion of joyous welcome for the Jews by Europeans is ironic because it is opposite from what reader expects would really happen. In fact, the aim of the author is to make them feel guilt of their atrocities and practice of punishing others. If Jews return back to the place where they were assassinated and brutally tortured they will remember the things and felt guilty of their victimization towards Palestinians and others. On the other level, the belief in the return of the Jews to Europe may reflect the author Philip Roth’s nostalgia for the homeland as reflected by various writers of Jewish background.

Roth by creating ‘double’, imagined life or counter life is questioning the authorities of Israel being incapable to forget the past and live happy life instead they still remember the atrocities done to them and repeat same to Palestinians or Arabs. The appearance of the double not only generates uncommon state but also give rise of comic possibilities though it is serious matter. The existence of the double, on one hand locates Roth in an extraordinary situation, on the other hand, it encourages him to test his idea and counter man posing ultimate questions. Roth employs irony to raise serious subject matter such as Holocaust though it is comical in manner, functions to subvert discourse and at the same time aims to make aware marginal group.

In conversation with Philip and his wife Claire, before leaving to Israel when they come to know about imposter in Israel, Claire suggests him to contact Israeli police and to report about him. In a response to Claire, Philip states; “I think the Israeli police may find themselves facing problems more than mine right now. What would I tell them? Arrest him? Deport him? On what grounds? As far as I know, he hasn’t passed a phony check in my name, he hasn’t been paid for any services in my name” (38). These lines are ironical

because it signals that Philip may supporting Pipik's plan indirectly by not contacting Israeli police and complain about him. And, he does not regard Pipik's attempt of using Philips's identity to promote his Diasporism movement as serious offense. Likewise, another reference to this is when Philip and Aharon were at hotel, Smilesberger came and handed him a million dollar check to the Roth. Where Roth describes:

He removed an envelope from his breast pocket, a process that, because of his bad tremor, one had to wait very patiently for him to complete, as though he were a struggling stammerer subduing the nemesis syllable. There was more than enough time to stop him and direct his contribution to the legitimate recipient, but instead I allowed him to hand it to me." (110)

Even when Roth realizes that Smilesburger has taken him for other Roth, he does not protest either that the other one is fake or that he is the original. We as a reader normally expects the reaction from the Roth is to correct Smilesburger and reject his check, but he allows himself expect from Author Roth. In this case, the original tries to become his own double or in other words Roth deliberately lets others to take him for his double and impersonate as his double. Author Roth's rhetoric, impersonating the other Roth in favour of Diasporism reveals the ironic aim of the author. When author Roth narrates to Ziad how he spoke in support of Diasporism, not only impersonating the double, but also advocating the cause of the double, Ziad is amazed by author's ingenuity. It is ironical state of the character, as we reader also get shocked of finding that Roth, who hates Pipik and his movement, later seen advocating in favour of the same issue. It functions as author's projection of post modern, shifting nature of existential self comically and as well as with total seriousness.

Through the character Smilesburger, author is claiming that Jewis in Israel are soulless. Smilesburger expresses his frustration of living in Israel as; "And every day I am

living here I want to run away. I think of my Jews in Poland. The Jew in Poland had terrible enemies too. But because he had terrible enemies did not mean he could not keep his Jewish soul. But these are Jews in a Jewish country without a Jewish soul” (109). Through this ironical expression author is trying to satire Jews in Israel have forgotten their real essence and started to live soulless lives. Even if there is threat in Poland, the Jews in Poland are real Jews not the Jews in Israel. Here, irony functions as a satirical tool to mock the Israeli Jews of forgetting Jewish tradition and creating narratives according to them to victimize others.

The use of irony can be varied from writers according to their issue and subject. The writers employ irony in their texts for various purposes and it depends on the functions of irony such as subversive, reinforcing, corrective or satiric. Irony in any texts helps to demonstrate multiplicity in discourse and makes aware people about the situation, fallacy of discourses created by ruling class people. Hutcheon further asserts:

Irony’s edge, then, would seem to ingratiate and to intimidate, to underline and to undermine; it brings people together and drives them apart. Yet, however, plural these functions, we still seem to want to call the thing itself by a single name: irony...The complexities of irony’s inferred motivations, though: an awareness of the range of the operations that irony can be interpreted as carrying out may help resist. (53)

Hutcheon here puts forward the examples of irony’s functions and names it ‘irony’. She claims that Irony has binary edge that play a role of motivator to unite oppressed voices together and challenge the brutal high values, at the same time it reinforces the low values also.

Hutcheon talks about the transideological nature of irony. As she argues, “Irony can be provocative when it’s conservative or authoritarian as easily as when its politics are

oppositional and subversive: it depends on who is using it and whose expense it is seen to be” (15). It is not only used to question the established attitudes but also to reinforce it. Hutcheon further argues, “Irony can and does function tactically in the service of wide range of political positions, legitimizing or undercutting a wide variety of interest” (10). Irony is double edge’s device which subverts as well as reinforces at the same time. Additionally, irony has been used in order to satire or to mock the undesirable socio-political scenarios and development.

Furthermore, Hutcheon claims that irony can be applied to counter the hierarchical values and to establish marginalized values. She talks about various functions of irony. As she points out, “Irony not only works to point out the complexities of historical and social realities but also has the power to change that reality at least for a time...enemy” (28). Irony can be a powerful tool when it applies to literature. The writer may use irony to elevate the values of marginalized or oppressed. Hutcheon further argues:

The subversive function of irony is often connected to the view that it is a self critical, self knowing, self reflexive mode that has the potential to offer a challenge to the hierarchy of the very site of discourse, a hierarchy based on social relations of dominance. Such a challenge, such an ability to undermine and overturn, is said to have politically transformative power. (28)

Here, Hutcheon tries to define the subversive power of irony that can break the hierarchy.

In the novel Roth creates certain characters to challenge the oppressive authority. Firstly, Roth’s character Ziad is revolutionist and counter character to Israel and Jews. Through the character Ziad, Roth is indirectly questioning the authenticity of the state of Israel. Likewise, Demjanjuk, his trial and Rosenberg’s narratives ironically doubt the testimonies of Holocaust survivors. Similarly, Smilesburger’s fund to support Pipik’s plan of resettlement European Jews reveals the hatred towards Jews by Jews within Israel. And

Pipik, an alter ego of author himself is campaigning the exodus of Jews represent author's intended plan and his love for ancestors land. In this way, Roth by using irony as a tool and through different characters tries to subvert the elitist values, to counter the authority and to break down the hierarchy.

After the end of Second World War, Jews were settled in Israel in Arab. But after founding the state of Israel, they began to exterminate Palestinian Arabs and started to conquer Arab territories that had been their homeland for two thousand years. It is irony because what they have been done by the Nazis is exactly repeated in the case of Palestinians. In this respect, another character, George Ziad, a Palestinian, Roth's graduate school friend presents the opposite idea and fights for independent Arabs state, accuses Israel of being "a military state, established by force, maintained by force, committed to force and repression" (271). Ziad claims:

These victorious Jews are terrible people...here they are authentic, here, locked up in their Jewish ghetto and armed to the teeth?...who do they think they are, these provincial nobodies! Jailers! This is their great Jewish achievement to make Jews into Jailers and jet bomber pilots. And just suppose they were to succeed...what would they have here fifty years from now? A noisy little state...the creation of a Jewish Belgium, without even a Brussels to show for it. (124-26)

The above statement of Ziad reflects the fact that Jews were victim in the past before they are victorious. They had got great achievement though they were victimized before.

Through Ziad's voice author ironically is pointing the fact that in spite of their achievement of establishment of the state of Israel they do have gain nothing just of repeating the same atrocities which was done to them now with Palestinians and Arabs. Their achievement is just shifting the role from victims to brutal assassinator. They even fail to jump out from

their traumatic past. Ziad further asserts that Jews use the Holocaust to justify their actions: “It becomes official Jewish policy to remind the world, minute by minute, hour by hour, day in and day out, that the Jews were victims before they were conquerors and that they are conquerors only because they are victims” (132-133). Israeli Jews are using their past as dominating tool to others in the modern time. The above lines ironically mock the tradition of accusing and punishing Arabs and others just because Jews were tortured in the past. It is comic to the other world but Israeli Jews are unaware of it. Roth uses irony in order to counter the practice of so called victims ‘Israelis’ as torturing and killing others. Thus, author tends to educate Jews of Israel to be aware of other emerging force within Arabs and threat of second Holocaust by using comic irony.

The Palestinians are represented by Philip’s friend Ziad, who also can be seen as one more impersonation for Philip as it is for Pipik. Through, Ziad, author finds a way to counter those Israeli who are still shaken by traumatic experiences of Holocaust. Ziad also represents the counter argument for the Modern Israeli history and narratives. More importantly, author through the fictional voice of Ziad, is targeting to their exploitative recall of their history and mocking their use of history of victimization to buy moral immunity for them. Not only Ziad, but also other Philip Roth or shadow self of the author provides a challenge to Jewish identity by proposing a return to the Diaspora; their homeland, which may erase Israel and its identity. Thus, Roth presents Ziad as well as double as a counter force to dismantle the hierarchy or domination of the Israeli Jews.

Roth attempts to give fictional voice to those survivor characters through Apter and Aharon. On one hand, Aharon is shown to be able to forget his past and capable to transform his history into art, whereas Apter is presented as a man whose life still remains filled with stories of continued victimization. Roth, ironically compares Jews of Israel with the character Apter and it signifies that as Apter’s lives of those Israeli Jews will also

remain filled with memories of Holocaust and war. Apter's and Aharon's stories of Holocaust turns to be the educating tools for Roth and also for those Israeli Jews. It is for demonstrating that fiction and truth are not merely opposite but rather fiction can also play significant role to understand the truth, even the subject matter is as grave as the Holocaust.

The research reveals that Roth uses irony in order to break down the mainstream Israeli value, culture, and discourse and to give voice to the marginalized group. The study portrays the harsh reality of post Holocaust political condition of Israel and Jews. People who were 'othered' and tortured by rightwing Israeli authority are revolting against those torturers or so called 'victims'. Roth, by using irony as a tool displayed violence, injustice, tussle of contemporary Israel. Roth has combined his own historical background with some fictional characters and events to make assure reader about the current situation.

Likewise, Roth has unmasked the contradictory history of Israeli Jews by presenting the real trial comically. By proving Rosenberg's testimony false, Roth's intention here is to question the authenticity of history itself. More importantly, Roth insisted on the fact that even sometime fiction can be the source of truth and history can be constructed. Irony thus helps Roth as an educating tool for the readers that people can twist history according to their desire and comfort.

Similarly, Roth has employed irony in comical manner for political purpose and to laugh at the face of poor Israeli who could not separate themselves from their horrifying past. Roth ultimately warns those elitist that there may have second Holocaust and may erase them all. More importantly, Irony has been used in order to demonstrate ultra violation of Israeli government and excessive encouragement on armed force. Roth gives voice to the voiceless Palestinians by using irony's edge that has transgressed high values and reinforced value of common people.

Therefore, Roth uses irony in order to display unrest political situation, ravages of war, conflict, resistance of Palestinians against domination of Israeli government and military force of post Holocaust Israeli society. Roth has used comic and political irony in order to mock the existing value, practice, and discourse in Israel. Irony in the novel assists Roth's purpose of contesting elitist value and boosting up exiled group. Irony subverts existing value and also exhibits violence, conflict and injustice within the state of Israel. Irony also helps Roth to exhibit brutality of the Israeli government and military force towards Palestinians and also to foreshadow unseen threat in future. By using irony as a tool, Roth raises voice of oppressed people and disrupts the boundary between Israeli and Palestinians. Real characters and events in the novel are ironically invented with fictional characters which enable Roth to prove even history can be discursive. Finally, comic use of irony in the novel is for mocking those Israeli who failed to disconnect themselves from their gruesome past experience and at the same time for warning them about upcoming catastrophe. Thus, by using irony as a tool, Roth subverts the established values, defies the authority, dismantles the hierarchy, and ultimately gives voice to marginalized Palestinians.

Works Cited

- Alter, Robert. "The Spritzer, *Operation Shylock: A Confession*, by Philip Roth," *The New Republic*, 5 April 1993, pp. 31-34.
- Bloom, Harold. "Operation Roth." *New York Review of Books*, vol. 22, 1993, pp. 45-48.
- Booth, Wayne W. *A Rhetoric of Irony*. University of Chicago Press, 1974.
- Colebrook, Claire. *Irony: The New Critical Idiom*. Routledge, 2004.
- Cooper, Alan. *Philip Roth and The Jews*. State U of New York P, 1996.
- Fishman, Sylvia Barack. "Success in Circuit Lies: Philip Roth's Recent Explorations of American Jewish Identity." *Jewish Social Studies*, vol. 3, no. 3, 1997, pp. 132-155. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/4467507.
- Huteheon, Linda. *Irony's Edge: The Theory and Politics of Irony*. Routledge, 1995.
- Roth, Philip. *Operation Shylock: A Confession*. Vintage, 1994.
- Rudnytsky, Peter L. "True Confessions in Operation Shylock". *Philip Roth Studies*, Purdue University Press, vol. 3, no. 1, 2007, pp. 26-43. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/42922071.
- Safer, Elaine B. "The Double, Comic Irony, and Postmodernism in Philip Roth's Operation Shylock." *MELUS*, vol. 21, no. 4, 1996, pp. 157-172. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/467647.
- Thomas, D. M. "Face to Face With His Double." *New York Times Book Review*. 7 March 1993, pp. 20-21.
- Updike, John. "Recruiting Raw Nerves." 15 March, 1993, pp. 112.