

I. Naipaul and Satire

V.S. Naipaul uses satire in portraying the people of Trinidad as “crazy people,” who speak and behave with each other that they sound serious and sincere about things, at the same time, they act and speak in such a way that make the whole thing funnier. He trickily presents them that they seem more serious about colonial situation and surrounding but they fail to sustain themselves within it. Most of the salty cast of its earthly extravaganza, however, is crazy as foxes: Ramlogan, Ganesh’s knavish father-in-law, tries to welsh of the dowry. Narayan is treasurer, and chief benefactor. Indars is the social Hinduism. And of course, the transcendental massager himself has an eye for the main chance. He describes these cheerful rogues with the oblique statement of the true satirist. The story of Ganesh, he opines, is “in a way, the history of our times” (8).

Naipaul uses satire as a weapon to display existing weaknesses in the colonial Carribean society, which is debris from wounded civilization. *The Mystic Masseur* uncovers a rich vein of ethnic humor in the world of the Carribean Hindu. Naipaul works in terms of good natured satire. Everyone speaks a dialect halfway between Calypso and Uncle Remus as he describes the progress of a likeable chameleon that unselfconsciously metamorphoses from Ganesh Ramsumair, turbaned faith healer, to Ganesh Ramsumuir, sack-suited diplomat. The satire is embedded in the ‘biographical mode of portrayal’ itself. “The narrator’s formal treatment of the history of Ganesh’s is really a carefully controlled piece of satiric inflation” (5). He uses satire on the Trinidadian society in which men like Ganesh are ready to do anything to enter into the capitalist world and achieve political clout and standing. He uses satire to correct their behavior.

Naipaul's three collections of short stories are seen by critics as some of the finest expressions of the dilemmas and struggles of colonized people striving to make both their individual and social lives meaningful in a postcolonial context. *Miguel Street* drew almost universal praise for its comic irony and colorful dialect used to illustrate the author's own need to flee his home and family to establish him in a culture of perceived high traditions and customs.

The Mystic Masseur is highly commented and criticized by distinct critics in various ways from the time of its publication. Many of them considered the work as picturization of postcolonial situation whereas some of them have seen the aspect of social-grown in protagonist career.

Naipaul is experienced enough to narrate the story in the way he prefers. But hereby he has followed the customary technique and seen how comic elements function in the text. The narration is chronological, except for the narrator's introduction of himself and Ganesh at the novel's beginning, and shows a skillful use of the participant narrator.

The plot itself is humorous. A bookish student named Ganesh Ramsumair is wedded to the plucky Leela through the machination of a crafty penny-pincher named Ramlogan. Having found out prior to the wedding that Ramlogan charges him for his relatives' food without his consent, Ganesh proceeds to swindle his father-in-law, during an elaborate Hindu marriage ritual - details of which are hard to explain. Having realized that he must now make a living, he tries a few odd jobs before he hits by luck on the one profession that his island needed most mystic. Even Ganesh himself is half-incredulous, but sooner or later people flock from all over the country, wanting his help in driving some demon out of someone or other. From there on, his fortune never wanes. The final metamorphosis converts Ganesh into a democratic

politician, a destiny that culminates in his transformation into the thoroughly anglicized G. Ramsay Muir OBE.

What supports this edifice is a wonderful cast of characters, quasi-cartoonist in their presentation, but still very human. To take an example, the Great Belcher is thus named because of her unfortunate habit of eructation. But she redeems herself to the reader through a string of remarkably level-headed advice. Ramlogan is almost a cardboard cut-out villain, but his fluctuation from resentment to respect for Ganesh is so transparently tied to his greed that it's almost understandable.

But the irony of it is that he will end up speaking impeccably correct English and irony is where this novel truly shines. As a matter of fact narration remains fairly detached from his subject, the end result being innocent pokes and wry fun. The sign at his house welcomes the customer with suitably mystic overtones in Hindi, but in English the message is harshly business-like. His "election" is hardly democratic, and very corrupt. His abrupt transformation from a leftist politician to a rightist one comes not from conviction but from petty affront.

This is the story of Ganesh, a masseur, mystic and faith healer in rural Trinidad. Ganesh, a Hindu Indian, makes an improbable rise to political power and eventual knighthood. This provides an opportunity for Naipaul to playfully describe colorful characters and village life among Hindus transplanted to Trinidad. Naipaul's trademark ironic style is more over-the-top here than as seen in later works. The quirky characters are lovable but not completely believable. This is not to say that the book is bad but that it would be of much less interest were it not for the fact that it is the new Nobel laureate's first novel-length. The first fruit of Naipaul's escape from the colony was a series of gently satiric short novels set in Trinidad. In *The Mystic*

Masseur (1957) a semiliterate medicine man makes good as therapist to his village community because of the ignorance and gullibility of the local people.

The Mystic Masseur is more subtle in its social criticism than I had come to expect from Naipaul's semi-autobiographical works and collected essays. The author does not break narrative to make explicit commentary about Indian culture in Trinidad, but the characters that populate this novel represent types that undeniably speak of the cultural experience of Indians living in Trinidad. Naipaul's portraits aren't unequivocally positive, or negative for that matter. This book was a great read, and rather funny. Naipaul balances between humor and sincerity, between mysticism and reality. The book leaves wondering and questioning the true nature of the main character.

The Mystic Masseur is more complex and directly satirical. The anti-hero, Pandit Ganesh Ramsummair, through the fraudulent assumption of powers as a mystic and writer, rises from humble beginnings to the position of G. Ramsay Muir, Esq., M.B.E., Member of the Legislative Council. The satire on popular superstition and the unstable roots of political power in Trinidad is sharply focused by Ramsummair himself, who tells his story both in direct narrative and in the form of a suppressed diary, significantly called *The Years of Guilt*. *The Suffrage of Elvira Naipaul* again turns Naipaul's mordant satire on popular politics in Trinidad.

In *The Mystic Masseur* there are numerous instances of humor on Indian masseurs who kill patients rather than treat; superstition of Indians as in the novel a patient see clouds trying to kill him. Mention must be made of the marriage ceremony of Ganesh and Leela, a very long process which creates a sense of boringness in me as a reader, thus Naipaul makes humor of Indian rituals.

The Mystic Masseur shows the rise of the protagonist Ganesh from a boy of a village to a successful writer, masseur and politician. Naipaul shows us success doesn't come in a day as we see in the life of Ganesh who got initial failures in his life but throughout he stands firm and eventually success kisses his feet. Naipaul may show the use of English among Indian communities at Trinidad as we also find Hindi words in the discourse of the characters.

There are instances of humor on Indian rituals, superstition, customs etc. In the novel author makes humor of masseurs who kills the patients rather than saving them; shows superstition as patient sees clouds going to take his life. The long marriage ceremony of Ganesh is boring to me as a reader. But as the first novel of Naipaul we can't expect too much as the novel paves the way for *India: A Wounded Civilization* a novel by the same writer critiquing Indians.

Satire is both a specific literary genre and a literary manner. As a genre, it has reference to a poetic form originated in the second century BC by the Roman satirist Lucile's, practiced with distinction by its successors, Horace, Perius and Juvenal and best described by Quintilian in his institution oratorio (about 50 A.D.). A satire generally speaking, is an attack on foolish or wicked behavior by making fun of it often by using humor, sarcasm and parody. C. High Holman defines satire as a literary manner in which the follies and foibles or vices and crimes of a person, humankind or an institution are held up to ridicule or scorn, with the intention of correcting them" (293). This manner may be present in various art forms and may employ many methods. Satire is also applied to magic songs and ritualistic invective in Greek, Old Irish and Arabic literatures, where the ritual curse was believed to have powerful effects.

Satire has usually been justified as a corrective of human vices and follies. Satires are the jokes about serious things. Although satire is often comic, its object is not to evoke laughter for a corrective purpose. It always has a target such as pretense, falsity, deception, arrogance-which is held up to ridicule by the satirist's unmaking of it. The satirist usually cannot speak openly or does not wish to do since s/he chooses a means that allows her/him to utter the unspeakable with impunity. Thus satire comments on others' weaknesses in a humorous way to correct human follies. It is a belly-laughing weapon in literature. The following chapter is theoretical modality and the next one is the text analysis.

II. Satire as a Tool for Social Criticism

As a literary tool, “satire” originated in the second century B.C. It was first used with reference to a poetic form by the Roman satirist Lucile. Later it was practiced with distinction by his successors: Horace, Persius, and best described by Quintilian in his *Institutio Oratoria* (500 A. D.). This formal verse satire written in Latin hexameters was dramatic, with the satirist, through a dialogue with an adversary, exposition of vice and folly but means of critical analysis. Alexander Pope’s *Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot* is an eighteenth century English example.

A satire is both a specific literary genre and literary manner though in practice it is also found in the graphic and performing arts. In satire, human or individual vices, follies, abuses, or shortcomings are held up to censure by means of ridicule, derision, burlesque, irony, or other methods, ideally with the intent to bring about improvement. Although satire is usually meant to be funny, the purpose of satire is not primarily humor but an attack on something of which the author strongly disapproves, using the weapon of wit. A very common, almost defining feature of satire is its strong vein of irony or sarcasm, parody, burlesque, exaggeration, juxtaposition, comparison, analogy, and double entendres are all frequently used in satirical speech and writing.

The word “satire” comes from Latin word *satura lanx* and means “medley, dish of colourful fruits” – it was held by Quintilian to be a “wholly Roman phenomenon” (*satura tota nostra est*) (Ullman 173). By implication, it means a hotchpotch in literature. But its origin often has been confused with the Greek satyr play- the fourth play in the dramatic bill, with a chorus of ‘goat men’ and coarse comic manner. According to Gilbert Highet, “The essence of the original name was variety -- plus a certain down-to-earth naturalness, or coarseness, or unsophisticated

heartiness” (231). Therefore, to be true to its original derivation and first conception, a satire must be varied, it must be large enough to fill the bowl, and finally it must be coarse and hearty.

A satire, generally speaking, is an attack on foolish or wicked behavior by making fun of it often by using humor, sarcasm and parody. C. High Holman defines satire “as a literary manner in which the follies and foibles or vices and crimes of a person, humankind, or an institution are held up to ridicule or scorn, with the intention of correcting them” (293). This manner may be present in various art forms and may employ many methods. Satire is also applied in magic songs and ritualistic invective in Greek, Old Irish and Arabic literatures, where the ritual curse was believed to have powerful effects.

Satire has usually been justified as a corrective of human vice and folly. Satires are the jokes about serious things. So, although satire is often comic, its object is to evoke not mere laughter but laughter for a corrective purpose. It always has a target such as pretense, falsity, deception, arrogance- which is held up to ridicule by the satirist’s unmaking of it. The satirist usually cannot speak openly or does not wish to do as he chooses means that allow him to utter the unspeakable with impunity.

With regard to a satirist, C. High Holman comments:

His viewpoint is ultimately that of the cold eyed reality, which penetrates sham and pretense for a didactic purpose. The portrayals generally are at variance with outward appearances, but they contain recognizable truth, and it is this truth that gives the satirist his license to attack.

(293)

However, satire differs from the ‘comic’ though both use laughter. Comedy evokes laughter mainly as an end in itself, while satire derides; that is, it uses laughter as a

“weapon and against a butt that exists outside the work itself” (275). That butt may be an individual, or a type of person, a class as institution, a nation, or even the entire human race.

A satirist thus attacks them with a motive of correcting human vice and folly. In this regard, Alexander Pope remarked, “those who are ashamed of nothing else are so of being ridiculous” (276). Its frequent claim has been corrigible faults, excluding those for which a person is not responsible. As Swift said speaking of himself in his ironic, “Verses on the Death of Dr. Swift”:

Yet malice never was his aim;
 He lashed the vice, but spared the name
 His satire points at no defect,
 But what all mortals may correct
 He spared a hump, or crooked nose,
 Whose owners set not up for beaux? (276)

Satirists like ironists say one thing and mean another. Wayne C. Booth introduces the term ‘stable irony’, by which he means that once a reconstruction of meaning has been made, the readers are not then invited to undermine it with further demolitions and reconstructions. But irony to D.C Muecke is:

A way of writing designed to leave open the question of what the literal meaning might signify: there is a perpetual deferment of significances. The old definition of irony-saying one thing and giving to understand the contrary- is superseded; irony is saying something in a way that activates not one but an endless series of subversive interpretations. (31)

Satirists present one thing or situation under the garb of another, which may appear ridiculous on the surface. The combination of just and earnest is a permanent mark of satiric writing- the central method of device. A satirist, though he jokes and makes readers laugh, tries to reveal human vice and folly, which (to him) is the truth.

Satirists declare that their truth is what people do not want to hear. While tracing the history of satire back to the ancient time, we find two main conceptions of its purpose: one is to wonder, to punish, to destroy, and the other is to warn and cure. The first type of satirists believe that the rascality is triumphant in the world, and are pessimistic. Jonathan Swift says that though he loves individual, he detests mankind. These misanthropic satirists look at life and find it, neither tragic nor comic, but ridiculously contemptible and nauseatingly hateful. Gilbert Highet draws the distinctions between pessimistic and optimistic satirists and their writings:

The misanthropic believes it (evil) is rooted in man's nature and the structure of society. Nothing can eliminate or cure it. Man, or the particular gang of miserable mankind who are under his scrutiny, deserves only scorn and hatred. The satirist is close to the tragedian. He believes that folly and evil are not innate in humanity, or, if they are, they are eradicable. They are disease which can be cured. They are mistakes which can be corrected. Sinners are not devils, fallen forever. They are men self-blinded, and they can open their eyes. (236)

The two most important Roman satirists were Juvenal and Horace, who represent pessimist and optimist respectively. Juvenal illustrates rhetorical or tragic satire of which he is at once the inventor and the most distinguished master. His satire attacks vices or abuses in a high-pitched strain of impassioned declamatory eloquence.

Horace and his followers assail the enemies of common sense with the weapons of

humor and sarcasm so that the wrong doer will get rid of the wrongs. These types of satirists believe in the doctrine “no one errs willingly” (Highet 201). The optimistic satirists write in order to heal and the pessimistic satirists in order to punish. In Horatian satire, according to Abrams, “the character that the speaker manifests is a witty and tolerant man of the world, who is moved more often to wry amusement than to indignation at the spectacle of human folly, pretentiousness, and hypocrisy” (188). But in Juvenalian satire the character of the speaker is that of a serious moralist who decries modes of vice and error in a dignified and public style.

Satirists always aim at revealing the bitter truth; no matter whatever motives they may have behind their works. Early experiences of life make the people view the world differently. In this regard, Highet says:

In fact, most satirists seem to belong to one of two main classes. Either they were bitterly disappointed early in life, and see the world as a permanent structure of injustices; or they are happy men of overflowing energy and vitality, who see the rest of mankind as poor ridiculous puppets only half-alive, flimsy fakes and meager scoundrels.

(241)

Satirists wish to stigmatize crime or ridicule folly, and thus to aid in diminishing or removing it. Dryden says he who draws his pen for one party must expect to make enemies of the other. According to him, the true end of satire is the amendment of vices by correction. He says he who writes honestly is no more an enemy to the offender than the physician to the patient, when he prescribes harsh remedies to an inveterate disease; for those are only to prevent painful surgery.

Practice of Satire

There has been common and widespread practice of satirical writings.

Hight's over implication on history of satire is: "[M]ost of us are apt to think that the history of satire begins with the Romans of republic, continues in Latin for three centuries, and diverges into Greek with Lucian" (35). Hight sees it as one of the most original, challenging and memorable forms of literature, and says:

[I]t has been practiced by some energetic minds – Voltaire, Rabelais, and Swift; by some exquisitely graceful stylists – Pope, Horace, Aristophanes, and occasionally, as a paragon, by some great geniuses – Lucretius, Goethe, and Shakespeare. (3)

One of the chief kinds of Greek satirical writings was philosophical criticism, which is supposed to have begun with the Ionian Xenophanes. The lines below, from his poem "Leers or Looking Askance", satirized the whole human race:

Now, if hands were possessed by oxen, by horses and lions, and they could paint with their hands, and carve themselves statues as men do, Then they would picture the gods like themselves with similar bodies. Horses would make them like horses, and oxen exactly like oxen. (qtd. in Hight 36)

It is already mentioned that the satire is as old as literature itself. But in England in the eighteenth century it was the basic form of literature. There was social, political and religious unrest among the people. People of the Augustan age wanted certain freedom and excellence in their constitution which resulted in revolution. There were naturally different groups of people holding different views and opinions demanding different kind of freedom. In this concern Halifax, a statesman, demands in his *The Character of Trimmer* (1688) an impartial law based on faith and a healthy

compromise between monarchy and republicanism. Though James II, a catholic, threatened constitution tradition, it was reduced by William III and he was praised by Locke calling him their great restore. Any how conventional parliament was reinstated in 1689. Thus we see that the aim of Politian of that age was to deal with the needs of normal man. It was not philosophical. The authors from 1668 to 1800 such as Samuel Butler, Dryden, Addison, Burke and others were concerned more with current practical practices than with philosophical principles. At that time, religion politics were intermingled with a party, business, election contests, foreign policy, church and state. The prevalence of corruption, perpetual agitation, pamphlets and news sheets cries for liberation were the catchwords voiced by the people. Richard Sargged wrote in his "Epistle to Sir Robber Walpole": "from liberty each nobler science spring bacon, brightened and a Spenser song; a clerk and Locke new treats of truth expose and Newton reaches heights unknown before" (176).

After various struggles among themselves, they got political liberty. As they got freedom they wanted "full freedom." There was a sudden and speedy change among the people. They wanted to jump from one pole to another at once. Most of them, particularly aristocrats misused their rights and duty. They broke some conventions which were necessary for harmony in the society. Consequently there was a lack of social order. Flirtation of girl was very common. W. H. Hudson says that "the manners of the Augustan Age were coarse; political was scandalously corrupt. Dryden (comparatively) it would be better to quote Dr. Johnson views as revealed in his the lives of poets. Johnson says:

Dryden drew more of man in his general nature and Pope in his local manners. The notions of Dryden were formed by comprehensive speculation and these of Pope by minute attention. There is more

dignity in the knowledge of Dryden and more certainty that of Pope.

(123)

The notions of Dryden were formed by comprehensive speculation and those of Pope by minute attention. There is more dignity in the knowledge of Dryden, and more certainty in that of Pope. Hence, Dryden knew more of man in his general nature and Pope in his local manners.

The style of Dryden is precious and varies, that of Pope is cautious and uniform, Dryden obeys the motion of our mind, and Pope constrains his mind to mind to his own rules of composition. Dryden is sometimes vehement and rapid; Pope is always smooth, uniform and gentle. Again Johnson says:

The dilatory caution of Pope enabled him to condense his sentiments to multiply his images and to accumulate all that study might produce or chance might supply. The flights of Dryden therefore are higher, and Pope continues longer on the wings if Dryden's fire be ablaze brighter, of Pope's the heat is more regular and constant. Dryden often surpasses expectation and Pope never falls below it. Dryden's read with frequent astonishment and Pope with perpetual delight. (231)

Similarly, Jonathan Swift was a satirist of more rapid and sweeping type than Pope. His *Gulliver's Travels* (1726) is a bitter satire on human race. Swift once said of Pope "I hardly hope or detest that animal call man" (265). This remark is an elaboration of his cynical attitude. He is also considered as a misanthrope. All these aforesaid authors contributed in the amelioration of the 18th century society by their satirical writings.

Pope has a unique place among them. He does not write personal satires only. For instance, most people would accept *The Rape of the Lock* as a true masterpiece of light satire that is to say, which is amusing and good tempered, yet not with an

element of social criticism. The poet has universalized the poem making Belinda, a symbol of the fashion of the 18th century.

In the 19th century, Mark Twain became the best-known American satirist, publishing satires in a variety of forms, including 'news satire and full-length books. In Britain, at roughly the same time W.S. Gilbert created seemingly harmless and unobjectionable comic operas that often tore apart the customs and institutions held so dear by the British public.

In the 20th century, satire has been used by authors such as Aldous Huxley and George Orwell to make serious even frightening commentaries on the dangers of the sweeping social changes taking place throughout Europe. The film, *The Great Dictator* (1940) by Charlie Chaplin, is a satire on Adolf Hitler and his Nazi army. A more humorous brand of satire enjoyed a renaissance in the U.K. in the early 1960s with the satire boom, led by such luminaries as Peter Cook, Alan Bennett, Jonathan Miller, David Frost, Eleanor Bron and Dudley Moore and there is an increasing perception that satire must be explicitly humorous, which has not always been the case.

Forms of Satire

Although the purpose of satire has always been to correct the fault and weaknesses of human beings, it has been expressed in different forms. One of the chief means of satire is Humor. Humor means to arouse laughter or create comic situations. The origin of the word 'humor' is Latin, which is used for 'liquid', 'fluid' or 'moisture.' In early western physiology, one of the four fluids of the body that was thought to determine a person's temperament and features, and these four fluids of the body (yellow bile, black blood, and phlegm) were in proper proportion. When one fluid exceeded its normal amount, then disproportion occurred. These four fluids are

to remain in balance otherwise, the normal temperament of a person happens to be misbalanced.

It was believed that the individuals in whom this disproportion occurred would be in a choleric humor if yellow bile were predominant. There would be melancholy humor if blood were predominated and phlegmatic humor if phlegm were predominant. Whatever humor predominated, the lack of balance indicated a deviation from normal, an excess that requires correction.

As far back Plato and Aristotle, they took laughter as a proper corrective of the excessive. When we laugh there emerges excessive of one element. The object of humor is to create laughter to satirize the event or situation. Humor is an artistic device to correct one's excessiveness and to ridicule upon an incident and situation. The person who possessed an excess of any humor becomes humorist. *The New Encyclopedia of Britannica* defines humor as "the only form of communication in which a stimulus on a high level of complexity produces a stereotyped predictable response on the psychological reflex level" (682). It means the response can be used as an indicator for the presence of the illusive quality that is called humor. The study of humor provides clues for the study of creativity in general.

Satire is activated through humor. In humor, both the creation of the subtle joke and the secretive act perceiving the joke involve the delightful mental movement of a sudden leap from one plane of associative context to another. An example of a masochist is taken for the humorous state. A masochist is a person who likes a cold shower in the morning so he takes a hot one. It is a twisted manner. One does not believe that the masochist takes his hot shower as a punishment: he only pretends to be believed.

There is a bewildering variety of moods involved in different forms of humor including mixed or contradictory feelings. In the subtler types of humor, the aggressive tendency may be so faint that only careful analysis will detect it like the presence of salt in a well-prepared dish. In Aristotle's view, laughter was intimately treated to ugliness and debasement. Cicero held that province of ridiculous lay in a certain baseness and deformity. Rene Descartes believes that laughter was a manifestation of joy mixed with surprise or hatred or both. In Francis Bacon's list of what causes laughter, the first place is given to deformity. One of the most frequently quoted utterances on the subject is this definition in Thomas Hobbes's *Leviathan* (1651). "The passion of laughter is nothing else but sudden glory arising from a sudden conception of some eminency in ourselves by comparison with the infirmity of others or with own formerly" (683).

How the humor came into use in western literature is a wide range of research. It goes back to the time of Plato and Aristotle in Greek literature. In Greek tragedy, the humorous characters were presented in plays, and later in Shakespearian comedy they appeared as successfully as in the Greek stage. James Bergson says, "laughter is the corrective punishment inflicted by upon the unsocial individual" (683). In laughter, we always find an intention to humiliate and consequently to correct our neighbor. Sir Max Beerbohm, the 20th century English wit found "two elements in the public humor: delight in suffering contempt for the unfamiliar" (87). The American psychologist William Mac Doug argues that "laughter has been involved in human race as an antidote to sympathy a protective reaction shielding us from the depressive influence of the shortcomings of our fellow men" (683).

Much of theorists agree that the emotions discharged relief in laughter always contain an element of aggressiveness. Laughter provides relief from tension. It also

satirizes the situation considered to be opposite from the reality. Sigmund Freud involves Spenser's theory of humor into his own with special emphasis on the release of repressed emotions in laughing. In the mind of man, a vast amount of stored emotions exist derived from various, often unconscious, sources: repressed sadism, unavowed fear and boredom. These released by the help of humor. Humor is a task as delicate as analyzing the composition of a perfume with its multiple ingredients, some of which are never consciously perceived while others would make one wince. People are literally poisoned by their adrenal humor; it takes time to take a person out of a mood. Fear and anger show physical after effects long after their causes have been removed.

So, the purpose of humor is to laugh at people to rectify their faults. Laughter is not acquired skill but a natural gift. But there are other outlets such as competitive sports or social criticisms which are acquired skills.

Satirical works often contain 'straight' (non-satirical) humor – usually to give some relief from what might otherwise be relentless 'preaching'. This has always been the case, although it is probably more marked in modern satire. On the other hand some satire has little or no humor at all. It is not 'funny' nor is it meant to be. Humor about a particular subject – politics, religion and art for instance – is not necessarily satirical because the subject itself is often a subject of satire. Nor is humor using the great satiric tools of irony, parody, or burlesque always meant in a satirical sense. As satire and irony are closely related, it is desirable to talk about irony briefly.

Similarities and Differences between Satire and Irony

A satire, on the surface, appears to be full of aesthetic feelings or like a romance, but its underlying intentions attack a particular target in a disguise. Satire, according to Abrams, is "the literary art of diminishing or derogating a subject by

making it ridiculous and evoking towards its attitudes of amusement, contempt, scorn, or indignation” (187). *New encyclopedia Britannica* defines it as “artistic form, chiefly literary and dramatic in which human or individual vices, follies, or shortcomings are held up to ensure by means of ridicule, derision, burlesque, irony or other methods, sometimes with an intent to bring about improving” (467). The ‘militant irony’ or sarcasm often professes to approve or at least accept as natural the very things the satirist actually wishes to attack. But all ironies are not satires. However satires are often stable ironies. Morton Gurewitch, in his PhD. Dissertation on European romantic irony, describes irony as only corrosive. He says:

Irony, unlike satire, doesn’t work in interests of stability. Irony entail hypersensitivity to a universe permanently out of joint and unfailingly grotesque. The ironist doesn’t pretend to cure such a universe or to solve its mysteries. It is satire that solves. The images of vanity, for example, that world’s satire are always satisfactorily deflated in the end; but the vanity of vanities that informs the world’s irony is beyond liquidation. (qtd. in Booth 92)

Irony, as dictionaries tell us, is saying one thing and meaning the opposite. For its clarification, quoting Booth, we have:

Irony is usually seen as something that undermines clarities, opens up vistas of chaos, and either liberates by destroying all dogma or destroys by revealing the inescapable canker of negation at the heart of every affirmation. It is thus a subject that arouses passions (Preface ix).

Northrop Frye believes that the ironic fiction writer deprecates himself and, like Socrates, pretends to know nothing, even that he is ironic. In this regard, Highet says that “any author, therefore who often and powerfully uses a number of typical

weapons of satire – irony paradox, antithesis, parody, colloquialism, anticlimax, topicality, obscenity, violence, vividness, exaggeration is likely to be writing satire” (18).

The term “irony” basically refers to the contrast between the statement of what is said and what actually it means. The importance of irony in literature is beyond question. One need not accept the view that all art, or all literature, is essentially ironic — or the view that all good literature must be ironic. In short, irony, in drama and literature, is a statement or action whose apparent meaning is underlain by a contrary meaning. *Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary* of current English defines the term irony as, “The amusing or strange aspect of a situation that is very different from what you expect; a situation like this: the use of words that say opposite of what you really mean.” Likewise, *The New Encyclopedia Britannica* defines the term irony from the point of view of its literal implication. It defines irony as, “Either Speech (verbal irony) in which the real meaning is concealed or contradicted by the literal meanings of the words, or a situation (dramatic irony) in which there is an incongruity between what is expected to occur.”

Tracing out the definitions we come to know the very basic meaning of irony as a situation in which ‘what is’ always differs from ‘what appears’. We come to know that A satire is both a specific literary genre and literary manner though in practice it is also found in the graphic and performing arts. In satire, human or individual vices, follies, abuses, or shortcomings are held up to censure by means of ridicule, derision, burlesque, irony, or other methods, ideally with the intent to bring about improvement. Although satire is usually meant to be funny, the purpose of satire is not primarily humor in itself so much as an attack on something of which the author strongly disapproves, using the weapon of wit.

All good literature entails irony as a device — every work of art can be viewed from ironic perspective though it may have more or less ironic instances. One need only list the major writers in whose work irony is significantly present: Sophocles, Euripides, Plato, Aristotle, Chaucer, Swift, Pope, Austin, Fitzgerald and many others. Such a list implies the impossibility of separating an interest in irony as an art from an interest in great literature, one leads directly to the other. Irony in the present context is a way of writing designed to leave open the question of what the literal meaning might signify. The old definition of irony — saying one thing and giving to understand the contrary — is superseded. Thus latest sense of irony says something in a way that activates not one but an endless series of subversive interpretations. The following chapter analyzes Naipaul's novel, *The Mystic Masseur* as a text with political satire and irony.

III. Satire in Social Institutions in *The Mystic Masseur*

V. S. Naipaul renders the people of Trinidad as unwise people who speak and behave with each other that they sound sober and earnest about things, at the same time, they act and speak in such a way that make the whole thing funnier. Hereby the writer carves a picture of the society where people are detached from their original ways in different aspects of their life. They are aggravated by the colonizers' life tendency and system. They are the victims of mimicry and do imitate the way European people speak. Thus their entanglement with sophistication and simulation obliges them to remain suspended in the domain of nuisance and alienation. He trickily presents them that they seem much serious about colonial situation and surrounding but they fail to sustain themselves within it.

The characters portrayed in roles of discreet forms embodying features of Trinidad society are the chunk of jokes and humors. The light Naipaul has thrown on the customary trends of the people inhabit there reflects the fact that they represent the side that is subject to harsh criticism. And of course, the transcendental massager, Ganesh himself has an eye for the chief prospect. And he describes these cheery rogues with the tilted statement of the true satirist. The story of Ganesh, he opines, is in a way, the history of our times. Hence he reflects the contemporary society and its features existing which signify the genuine plight of people. Ganesh whose life and vocation is outlandish represents people of Trinidad. In the attempt of introducing characters depicted in *The Mystic Masseur*, Ratna Sharma, a keen reader and critic expresses his views as such:

Ganesh Ramsumair, the son of an Indian immigrant to Trinidad seems to be blessed by fortune. His fate steps in and gently nudges him in the right direction. Indarsingh leaves for Oxford upon graduation. Ganesh

then attends a teacher's college, and takes a position as an elementary school teacher. He is not a success and resigns his position for a life of idleness, which is ended when his father dies, bequeathing to him some land and some royalties from an oil company. When attending his father's funeral he meets his formidable relation, The Great Belcher, who is one of these wise elderly Indian women who are accustomed to running funerals, marriages, businesses and lives for their younger folk. (31)

Characters such as Ganesh, Indrasingh and Great Belcher having distinct traits appropriate to their roles greatly evoke the sense of human virtues and vices.

The narrator is much critical to Ganesh who embodies the character of imperfection. He is a man of strange qualities and the way he lives life ensures us a chunk of idiosyncratic features. The eccentricities his activities evoke are confusing. The narrator in this regard portrays him as such: "I myself believe that the history of Ganesh is, in a way, the history of our times; and there may be people who will welcome this imperfect account of the man Ganesh Ramsumair, masseur, mystic, and, since 1953, MBE" (8). The writer through this kind of portrayal of Ganesh tells us a lot about follies of people of Trinidad. Ganesh is a typical character that depicts people of that society.

Right from the beginning of Ganesh's student life, he is mocked at. He is a person who is a stuff of laughter and nothing more than that. He is much traditional and follows the customary trends in such a way that it is quite natural for people around who laugh at him. In this reference the narrator presents him how he is behaved with by peer group: "He ran home to Dundonald Street and sat on the back steps reading. He went to sleep with the hens and woke before the cocks. 'That

Ramsumair boy is a real crammer, boys laughed; but Ganesh never became more than a mediocre student” (11). Ganesh is a student who cannot surprise people and fails to win their favor since he does not have any extraordinary talent. After all the way he is presented in the text entails the fact he is no more modern. He pretends what he is not. He reads sitting on the back steps. His intention is to let people know that he is a devoted and disciplined reader. He demonstrates his daily activities and mostly those which could help his personality to be popular.

The writer brings about frivolous feature of Ganesh that arouses laughter. The characterization of Ganesh either at the level of physical appearance or at the mental one draws attention of people in his surrounding. He looks like a typical Indian who is indifferent to the current fashion and style of people which pushes him to problems. As a matter of fact it is his shortcoming which needs deleting but he doesn't. Naipaul thus demonstrates him: “His head was still practically bald when he went back to school, and the boys laughed so much that the principal called him and said, ‘Ramsumair, you are creating a disturbance in the school. Wear something on your head.’” (11). He is suggested not to remain unusual in the class since it violates academic environment of the class. In one sense he is the person whose presence in the school invites disturbance. He fails to adjust among people at school which is a great flaw on his part. The writer thus throws satire on his crucial aspect of life that is school life which affects his socialization to a larger extent. Even the principal at school advises him strongly to wear something that keeps his appearance sound and commendable.

The seed of jealousy sprouts in Ganesh when his only friend Indrasingh goes to England by winning a scholarship. He undermines his talent and capability and feels troubled at his success which is a terrible human shortcoming. He does not think

that his friend's success and academic progress will benefit the entire society. Hence Naipaul discloses his polluted mind in this way:

Indrasingh was Ganesh's only friend, but the friendship was not to last. At the end of Ganesh's second year Indrasingh won a scholarship and went to England. To Ganesh, Inrdasingh had achieved greatness beyond ambition (12).

The pious and selfless relationship that friendship gets dismantled due to the negative perspective of Ganesh towards his friend Indrasingh. Hereby Naipaul by qualifying Ganesh as a jealous person attempts to show drawbacks of people in Trinidad who are not reformed yet despite the fact they have come across the colonial experiences. Fragmentation and alienation in Ganesh is because of his narrow concern which is prevalent almost throughout Trinidad. People there are not sentimentally attached with each other. Rather they are emotionally and socially fragmented and consequently are obliged to live lonely life.

The mischievous aspect of Trinidad society is that people are so traditional, superstitious, and hypocritical that they confide in shamans, *Vaidaya* and witch doctors that they lose both money and life. Naipaul satires on the superstitious aspect of society by displaying the incidence in which Mr. Ramsumair kills a young girl while massaging. The death of the innocent girl due to customary trend of diagnosis and treatment implies that blind faith in divine power and the traditional way of treatment creates many great problems on the part of both the subject and the doctor. Naipaul thus narrates the incidence:

For years old Mr. Ramsumair had this reputation until, his luck running out, he massaged a young girl and killed her. The Princes Town doctor diagnosed appendicitis and Mr. Ramsumair had to spend

a lot of money to keep out of trouble. He never massaged afterwards.

(25)

The violation Mr. Ramsumair's reputation and loss of job and money indicates his foolishness and ignorance. Naipaul shows how people suffer due to their ironclad attachment to the harmful and vicious tradition and activities. There is identity crisis of both the people having white and red skin and those whose skin is brown but pretend to be European. This kind of juxtaposition creates vexes to readers. People, who are white, look crazy to the residents of Trinidad. The major character Ganesh around whom almost all incidents move in the text is confused about Mr. Stewart's identity. He is sure whether he is Indian or European since he has appeared in Trinidad recently. The way Mr. Stewart has dressed is unusual and funny to people of Trinidad. This is why, they feel much shocked at him and somewhat his personality frightens them as well. Naipaul thus demonstrates the incidence where Ganesh gets vexed at the ambivalent pose of Mr. Stewart:

He just did look crazy to me. He had funny cateyes that frighten me, and you should see the way the sweat was running down his red face. Like he not used to the heat. Ganesh learnt that Mr. Stewart had recently appeared in South Trinidad dressed as a Hindu mendicant. He claimed that he was Kashmiri. Nobody knew where he came from or how he lived, but it was generally assumed that he was English, a millionaire, and a little mad. (27)

Mr. Stewart is dressed in Indian gown but by name he is European which creates dualism in his identity. People are unknown about the country he belongs. People commonly think that he is an English tycoon. The ignorance of people is satirized hereby. English people are so cunning that they do their level best to adjust in the

society they are. In contrary to them, people of Trinidad are not intelligent and sociable enough in the matter of changing environment and accommodating with the ups and downs of life. For instance, Ganesh who fails to respect the rules and demands of fellow students at school is not able to comprehend the currency of time. Rather he remains bald-headed without any coverage. Thus, Naipaul by contrasting Ganesh with Mr. Stewart tells us the fact that people of Trinidad are far backward and superstitious and their social, political and economic progress is much sluggish due to their narrow concern.

Naipaul basically draws attention of readers towards the cultural aspect of Indian society that enigmatically evokes the sense of shame and male-dominated trend which binds women to a certain limit. Leela whose identity is associated to her marriage and the role and position she has received from the conjugal relationship is obliged to remain inside the boundary drawn by the conservative society, Trinidad. Hence, Naipaul by exposing domain and place of women in Indian society attempts his level best to throw critical light on the very culture. Especially the society that advocates in the favor of its own people seems to have failed to respect the freedom of women. This is why the entire society is subject to harsh criticism. Naipaul in this regard says: "Is the sort of girl she is, sahib. She don't like people to boast about she. She shy. And if it have one thing she hate, is to hear lies. I was just testing she, to show you." (32). In fact, Leela by virtue of being woman is not shy but it is discriminatory laws of the society that have motivated her in such a way that she appropriates her role according to the time and place. She is hereby a subject of mockery and teasing simply because she is an uneducated woman. Women in Trinidad are illiterate to a larger extent is bitter truth which is intensively brought about by Naipaul in the text, *The Mystic Masseur*.

Despite the fact that Ganesh is an educated person, his English is not so commendable that suits to his qualification. Hereby the writer demonstrates the linguistic drawbacks of people in Trinidad. It is crystal clear that the language of Ganesh is poor which further signifies the fact people in the society do speak even worse than he does. It is a satire on language of those who imitate others' language and pretend to be so. It is almost impossible to exactly speak as the English do simply because that is their mother accent. But people in Trinidad are in illusion that they can appropriate and enhance their position by English which is indeed a kind of flaw they commit. Many people like Ganesh run after mimicry and get engaged in imitation being detached from the things that are their own. In order to exemplify the very fact, Naipaul avers:

Leela say is the law to have the sign up, sahib. But, smarter fact, I don't like the idea of having a girl in the shop.' Ganesh had taken away the booklets on salesmanship and read them. The very covers, shining yellow and black, interested him; and what he read enthralled him. The writer had a strong feeling for colour and beauty and order. He spoke with relish about new paint, dazzling displays, and gleaming shelves. These is first-class books,' Ganesh told Ramlogan. (33)

There is first class books, is evidence that carves the fact that his English is poor since this sentence is syntactically incorrect. The hierarchical relationship between the colonizer and colonized is still extant in Trinidad and they behave with other accordingly. Though European colonizers are physically not there but the relics of colonization they left over there are still in existence. The middle class-educated people of Trinidad are honored and paid due respect by those who are illiterate and they have ever resided in the realm of ignorance. Thus the dichotomy is overtly seen

in the excerpt: “Education, sahib, is one hell of a thing. When you is a poor illiterate man like me, all sort of people does want to take advantage on you” (39).

Assimilation made by the illiterate hereby, carves out the picture of their ignorance and helplessness. They are dependent on the educated and bear the fact in their mind that all educated whether they are European or people from Trinidad are subject to being respected and paid homage. It is an attack on educational and social aspect of the society by Naipaul. By exposing their shortcomings, the intention underlain would be to correct the society.

Marriage system is much extravagant and time-consuming. It is terribly perfunctory to the family of brides since all the family members get worried and tensed at pleasing the family of the groom. The most disgusting trend that is dowry is greatly effective in the so-called civilized society of Trinidad. The writer is terribly critical to the dowry trend practiced widely in Indian continents. The father of bride feels overloaded and wants to unload the very burden by hook and crook. Naipaul asserts the very reality as such:

He said, ‘Well, look. If is the dowry you worried about, you could stop. I don’t want a big dowry. Is the shame, sahib, that eating me up. You know how with these Hindu weddings everybody does know how much the boy get from the girl father. Look Ramlogan marrying off his second and best daughter to a boy with a college education, and this is all the man giving. Is that what eating me up, sahib. (40)

The conversation that takes place between Gansesh and Ramlogan is as if it is a bargaining between the customer and the salesman whereby one looks for discount and the other unwillingly reduces the price of commodity. As a matter of fact dowry is a sort of social evil since it invites many psychological and social problems and

compels the bride side to bow down before the groom's family. One's position is heightened and the other's is lowered. Thus without any genuine reason people with daughters in Trinidad suffer a lot. Naipaul despises this kind of practice. Though Ramlogan is much senior to Ganesh, he feels morally and socially obliged to respect Ganesh but Ganesh is no more inclined to Ramlogan and does not pay even due respect to the father-in-law who is almost his own father. The more educated people are in Trinidad, the worse they behave in Hindu dominated culture. The writer wants to eradicate such social evils by exposing their worst facets.

Pretension and hypocrisy are the crucial aspects that are attacked at by the satirist. Naipaul in *The Mystic Masseur* shows the situations where people evoke the sense of pretension:

All through the ceremony he had to pretend, with everyone else, that he had never seen Leela. She sat at his side veiled from head to toe, until the blanket was thrown over them and he unveiled her face. In the mellow light under the pink blanket she was as a stranger. She was no longer the giggling girl simpering behind the lace curtains. Already she looked chastened and impassive, a good Hindu wife. (44)

The way bride and groom are made to sit at the altar of marriage, is pretentious in the sense that both of them are like strangers. The groom cannot see the bride who is going to be the life-partner. As a matter of fact this kind of cultural practice is frivolous. It is the matter of mockery. Though Ganesh has already seen Leela, he pretends he hasn't which discloses his hypocritical nature that almost all grooms in Trinidad are supposed to do.

To please and satisfy the groom by providing him money on the day of wedding is another dark aspect of that society. Despite the fact that Ganesh is highly

educated, he does not initiate having meal until he is contented with the big amount of money. Hence, Naipaul seems to have picked up the minute aspect of the Trinidad society. He reveals customary practices in such a way that cultural evils underlain and handed-down from generation to generation become crystal clear. As Naipaul presents in *The Mystic Masseur*, “he put down another hundred dollars. Eat, boy, eat it up. I don’t want you to starve. Not yet, anyway. He laughed, but no one laughed with him” (45). People on the day of wedding are serious about the customary practices and are committed to obeying each and every thing. The boy, Ganesh is a groom who is being convinced by his father-in-law to eat but he doesn’t begin immediately. Not to start eating up has some cultural significance as well in Trinidad that Ganesh respects.

The barbaric nature of Ganesh is given due respect in the text. Though he is an educated and literate person, he beats his wife, Leela. It is much disgusting in the sense that Leela is not an animal that needs beating by her husband. Rather she needs love and respect as a wife. She is after all, his life partner. Hereby Naipaul attacks at Ganesh’s brutal nature in *The Mystic Masseur*:

She cried out, ‘Oh God! Oh God! He go kill me today self!’ it was their first beating, a formal affair done without anger on Ganesh’s part or resentment on Leela’s; and although it formed no part of the marriage ceremony itself, it meant much to both of them. It meant that they had grown up and become independent. Ganesh had become a man; Leela a wife as privileged as any other big woman. Now she too would have tales to tell of her husband’s beatings; and when she went home she would be able to look sad and sullen as every woman should.

(49)

The ritualization of beating signifies the fact that brutal behavior by male members to females especially to wives is very normal and women do not feel privileged provided that they are not beaten by their husbands. Hence, Naipaul by portraying the character of Leela intends to send a message that Trinidad is still backward and is run by illogical force. Though Ganesh and Leela are mature, both of them are not equally independent. Ganesh is independent but Leela is not simply she is his wife. As a wife she is obliged to appropriate her to the social pattern of Trinidad.

Ganesh is subject to being suspected. He is so pretentious that people in his surrounding question his acts. Whether he is a serious reader or not is the matter of attention over here. He wants people to believe that he is a commendable reader. This is why, he most often reads before people. Regarding this matter, Naipaul sheds light on his reading aspect in the text as such:

He does close up the shop if I don't keep an eye on him, and he does jump into bed with the books. I ain't know him read one book to the end yet, and still he ain't happy unless he reading four five book at the same time. It have some people it dangerous learning them how to read. (59)

It is the matter of inquiry whether he treats with the entire book or just touches few lines from each. He is a hypocritical person. He shows more than he is. Hence he represents the so-called intellectuals of Trinidad. He knows how to fool innocent and ignorant people in his society. This is why, he takes benefits of blind believers' faith. Since he is educated, it is a bit easier for him to win the faith of people. Likewise, he outsmarts each and everyone who are in relation. Naipaul critiques the immoral nature of Ganesh hereby: "And the next thing we hear is that he borrow money to buy one of them dentist machine thing and he start pulling out people left and right, and still

people going. Trinidad people is like that” (61). He borrows money from people and they lend him as he is successful in overcoming the heart and mind of people and is not suspected in the regard what he does with the borrowed money. In one sense the colonization is lingered and is still in existence due to the presence of corrupt and self-centered people like Ganesh in Trinidad. On the whole such things are all rubbish for a civilized society guided by reason and certain human principles.

Social institutions and organizations either they are religious or political are corrupt and contaminated. Naipaul turns his suspicious eyes towards things that are in Hinduism. What is said there is whether is assimilated in day to day practice or not is much prominent. This is the reason Naipaul entails the similar fact in the lines as follows : “It had appeared simple enough in the beginning-white paper for notes on Hinduism, light blue for religion in general, grey for history, and so on- but as time went on the system became hard to maintain and he had allowed it to lapse” (72). Time and space demand due change in morals and principles scripted in Holy Scriptures and other books that forward systems. With the pace of time, things change and it becomes difficult for system to maintain itself. Hereby Naipaul directly attacks at the traditional social system of Trinidad.

Due to the fact women in Indian subcontinents are mostly dependent on the male figures in their family. The males are economically powerful and this is why they control almost all institutions and impose their authority. This is a thing that weakens the position of women. As Leela is an instance of such women who suffer in hands of males, Naipaul presents her pathetic plight: “She cried a bit more; and then stopped abruptly. Don’t mind, Ganesh. These girls these days does behave as if marrying is something like rounders. They run away but all the time they run away only to come back” (81). Though Leela wants to stay away from Ganesh, a brutal

husband who does not respect her fundamental rights any more, cannot simply because she is socially and economically marginalized. If she did attempt, she would fail to remain away longer. This suppressed and oppressed circumstance of women is clearly exhibited.

How petty and insignificant nature Ganesh has got is another clue to show hypocrisy and exaggeration of meaningless people in Trinidad. Naipaul centralizes on trifle and mean nature of Ganesh as such:

He produced it with a flourish. Look at the book. And look here at my name, and look here at my picture, and look here at all these words I write with my own hand. They print now, but you know I just sit down at the table in the front-room and write them on ordinary paper with an ordinary pencil.' (88)

After the publication of book Ganesh has written, he goes out of control and thus demonstrates much to those who are not even least interested in seeing his progress and academic success. Hence he wants to popularize him as an author and for this he by hook and crook, spreads message about. The people who deserve to receive great appreciation and high remark do not cry a lot about themselves. Ganesh does little but shows much which results in futility. Thus Naipaul satirizes him in a severe way.

The deep-rooted trend of untouchability in Hindu religious groups is another subject of severe criticism. There are layers of people on the basis of caste and the so-called lower caste-people are not allowed to touch any edible things. In case they happen to touch, things get contaminated and the so-called higher caste people do not tend to eat. Naipaul brings about such issue in *The Mystic Masseur*:

Bissoon drank the water in the orthodox Hindu way, not letting the jar touch his lips, just pouring the water into his mouth; and Ganesh,

sympathetic Hindu though he was, resented the imputation that his jars were dirty. Bissoon drank slowly, and Ganesh watched him drink. (97)

There is no sense of fraternity among Hindus. Rather there is fragmentation and division due to the caste practice. People despite having human blood, are all not equally treated in the society like in Trinidad where reason does not work rather people are indoctrinated with false and rubbish customary practices which are no more good in the domain of human betterment.

Ganesh demonstrates him to be much engaged in reading which genuinely he is not. He buys a number of books though he fails to manage to read. Indeed it is the indication of hypocrisy and over ambition which Naipaul attacks at. He says in the text in regard to this:

On Saturdays and Sundays he rested. On Saturday he went to San Fernando and bought about twenty dollars' worth of books, almost six inches; and on Sunday, from habit, he took down Saturday's new books and underlined passages at random, although he no longer had the time to read the books as thoroughly as he would have liked. (129)

To live a true life is required for the benefit of the entire human society since it preaches people to maintain peace and harmony in an honest way. Falsehood and hypocrisy create many more problems and the genuine flavor of social system gradually fades away. Ganesh has got shams, lies, weaknesses, and petty vanities. The narrator's judgments, however, never drain sympathy from Ganesh, but allow readers to sympathize with his miserable mental and social state. Thus by portraying the humorous character of Ganesh, Naipaul has been successful to carve out weaknesses, drawbacks, and evils of the society with the consideration of bringing about improvements in distinct social institutions of Trinidad.

IV. Conclusion

Naipaul carves out a clear picture of existing weaknesses in the colonial Caribbean society, which is debris from wounded culture. *The Mystic Masseur* embodies distinct situations and events which are humorous and interesting in nature. By presenting various forms of humors and frivolous incidents Naipaul satirizes on the society of Trinidad in the postcolonial period. Much vividly the writer exposes what happen to people of Trinidad after the colonial period is over. In this way Naipaul basically focuses on Ganesh Ramsumair whose acts are ridiculous. He is a typical character who undergoes distinct sorts of situations in the course of his life. By portraying Ganesh, Naipaul evokes the sense of problem of belongingness as well.

The use of satire tends to meet the purpose of bringing about social and cultural improvements on the parts of people of Trinidad. Thus Naipaul uses this literary genre to expose human or individual vices, follies, abuses, or shortcomings. As a matter of fact satire is a weapon used to attack on something which badly affects the society's original attributes.

To emphasize the tone of satire on Caribbean society, Naipaul presents an anti-hero, Pandit Ganesh Ramsumair who is a dynamic character and appears in different positions such as masseur, writer, and politician. The way he is pictured in *The Mystic Masseur* creates confusion on the part of readers. The society of Trinidad is much superstitious and is grounded on the traditional framework which Naipaul attacks at bitterly. The people who are as shamans and *Vaidayas* hold power and suck blood of the innocent and ignorant in such a way that no one feels they are evils of the society. Rather almost all people pay homage to them. Ganesh does hold power as a masseur accumulates property as well. Naipaul indeed seems much critical to such irrational acts performed in Trinidad.

People strongly believe in masseurs despite the fact that there are numerous instances of killing patients by treating in such a manner. Similarly the social institutions such as marriage are the stuff of criticism and Naipaul severely criticizes the negative aspects promoted in the marriage ceremony. He as having observed all incidents taken place in the course of the Indian marriage ceremony such as demand of dowry clearly presents them and throws satires over. Much problematic aspect of marriage is that the position of bride is made inferior and the groom's is vice versa. The very situation distracts Naipaul and thus he carves a beautiful picture of scene wherein Leela and Ganesh as bride and groom act out of cultural norms and values and receive the presupposed positions. Thus Indian rituals are ridiculous and humorous.

Naipaul does emphasize the linguistic aspect of the people who attempt to speak English in the British accent but cannot especially Ganesh. He is a learned gentleman in that society but fails to speak correct English. Naipaul discloses the facts that people in Trinidad, imitate the language of the Britishers and pretend to be so, remain suspended between two locations. They stay neither completely Caribbean nor do they become English which in one sense puts their identity under erasure. However, they are in illusion that they can appropriate and improve their position by English which is undeniably a kind of blemish they consign. Numerous people like Ganesh mimic and get engaged in imitating by trying to get detached from the things of their original culture.

Works Cited

- Bergson, James. *Laughter out of Place*. New York: New York University Press, 1956.
- Booth, Wayne C. *Rhetoric of Irony*. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.
- Brown, John. *Critiques and Satires in Indian Literature*. New York: Ann and Doug Publishing House, 2002.
- Chakrabati, Santosh. *Naipaul's Discourse of Aspiration: A Study of The Mystic Masseur and A House for Mr. Biswas*. New York: Brown Brothers Publication, 1999.
- Doug, William Mac. *Psychological Therapy to Human Defects*. New York: Peninsula Press, 1999.
- Hight, Gilbert. *The Anatomy of Satire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962.
- Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*. England: East and West Publication, 1651. 683.
- Holman, C. High. *Satire as Rhetorical Play*. London: Duke University Press, 1972.
- Muecke, D.C. *The Compass of Irony*. London: Routledge, 1969.
- Naipaul, V.S. *The Mystic Masseur*. London: Pan Macmillan, 2002.
- Pope, Alexander. "Verses on the Death of Dr. Swift". *Pope's Poetry*. London: 1667.
- Ram, Harihar and Kartik Chandra Mishra. "The Mystic Masseur: A Study in Third- World Politics". *Indian Literature in English* Jan.2001. London: Routledge, 2000.

Ray, Mohit K. "Preface". *V.S. Naipaul: Critical Essays*. Ed Rohit K. Ray. Delhi: Atlantic Publishers and Distribution, 2002.

Sargged, Richard. *Epistle to Sir Robber Walpole*. London, Pan Macmillan, 1823.

Sharma, Ratna. "A Critical Glimpse to *The Mystic Masseur*." *Indian Literature in English*. 13 (1998): 31.

Ullman, B. L. "Satura and Satire." *Classical Philology* 8.2 (1913): 172-94.

Xenophanes, Lonion. *Leers or Looking Askance*. England: Oxford Enterprises, 1990.