

## I. GENERAL INTRODUCTION

### Introduction

This research work is an attempt to prove Jim Dixon, the protagonist, as an anti-hero in Kingsley Amis' *Lucky Jim*. Jim Dixon is engaged in a struggle with the entrenched social order and with an examination of his own conflicting feelings about love, class and sex. His activities are centered to comic vitality, hypocrisies and on farcical linguistics exchange. He is not particularly morally upstanding. His quest is not altruistic; he is in self serving moves. Thus, he lacks the attributes of the traditional heroic protagonist who is known for his deeds of bravery, generosity and goodness.

*Lucky Jim*, published in 1954, is a story about Jim Dixon who is a junior lecturer of history in Provincial University. But he shows his disdain towards academic, artistic and socio-cultural values that could be expected to interest him. His appearance, his accomplishment and his talents are absolutely unremarkable. Everything about him is extra ordinary. The only thing that is not good about him is the comic strength of his contempt for those people around him.

He has no courage to show his revolt in front of his rivals. He channels and diverts his anger humorously in silence or in secret by resorting either into interior monologue or by breaking out into one of several appropriate facial postures. Thus, most of the time he disguises himself in the mask of trickery and deception. He only reveals his true identity under the influence of alcohol.

Jim Dixon demonstrates his huge contempt by delivering disastrously drunken lecture on the theme of 'Merrie England'. As a medieval historian, he was expected to provide eulogy for the past. Instead of this, he delivers opposite message. As a result, his impression upon the faculty professor Welch becomes worse and eventually he

looses his teaching job. But luck comes his way and at the end of the novel he is seen embarking on a train for London to work as a private secretary of a wealthy business man. He also succeeds to make his professor's son's Fiancé Christine Callaghan, as his girlfriend. Here, Jim's success is not heroic; it is the reward of the luck over which he has no real control. Dixon, at first dislike both Snobbish, blooms bury style culture of academic superior but finally, he is interested to involve into the same system to fulfill his material satisfactions. Since the novel deals with an anti-heroic issue, it deserves genuine discussion.

#### Literature Review

The writings of Kingsley Amis provide unique pleasures and pose persistent challenges. His fiction has always provoked more criticism including some serious objections to his personal prejudices and his inability to transcend them in his art. The question of identification between author and characters, some of them objectionable, some obnoxious, has animated responses to Amis from the outset of his career. In many of his narratives he seems massively ubiquitous.

Gareth Jenkins in his most famous essay, "Why *Lucky Jim* Turned Right - An Obituary of Kingsley Amis," examines, Jim Dixon as a mouthpiece of author's likes and dislikes. He says, "The hero of his novels appear [...] for Amis' pet hates, uttering a never ending stream of extremely funny and narrow minded attacks on gays, nuclear disarmers, women libbers, and so on" (1).

When Kingsley Amis published his first novel *Lucky Jim*, Somerset Maugham contributed an article in the *Sunday Times*, to which Richard Bradford in his book *Kingsley Amis* finds inaccurate but immediately recognizable summary of the fictional activities of Jim Dixon. He writes:

They do not go to university to acquire culture, but to get a job, and when they have got one, scamp it. They have no manners and are woefully unable to deal with any social predicament. Their idea of celebration is to go to a public house and drink six beers. They are mean, malicious and envious. They will write anonymous letters to harass a fellow undergraduate and listen to a telephone conversation that is no business of theirs. Charity, kindness, generosity are qualities which they hold in contempt. They are scum. (Bradford, 23)

Bradford opines that Maugham helped to create the image of a literary tendency which would eventually be regarded as the instrument of the 'Angry Young Man'. He notes, "it would seem that Kingsley Amis is Jim Dixon, that Dixon represents a straightforward mouthpiece for Amis's drunken, class-conscious, philistinism and that Amis is a sadly typical manifestation of an entire generation of 'educated' opportunists" (Bradford, 24).

It would be easy to reflect upon these assessments as evidence of the kind of class tension which the 'angry young writers of the 1950s were supposed to have reflected and inspired. But the authors of this period not only manifest the social anger; they also produce the new trend of realism.

Probably the most significant thing about Lucky Jim, Amis' most famous book is that it put in a new generation in literature. The change, it represents is cultural; it shifts the registers of fiction and puts a new paradigm into a play.

The decade of 50s questioned about representation, regionality and culture. There were also the questions of their hero's status, their moral purpose and social order.

Roxana Maisel in her essay, "The Unexamined Life: Celebrating Anti Intellectualism in Kingsley Amis's *Lucky Jim*", sees Dixon as simply lazy, unwilling to use his mind who prefers blissful ignorance to trial and its consequent failure: "Dixon does not search to sense of his predicament for the sake of truth itself, he desires only to understand it enough to escape it" (Maisel, 2).

In her very essay Maisel insists *Lucky Jim* as an anti-intellectual novel, which usually chooses the academy as the most productive setting for the collision of intellect with our more basic instincts:

Philistinism in *Lucky Jim* is more than a simple distaste for learning and knowing: it is a warning against the disconsolation of philosophy. Philosophy offers little comfort in the modern world, it is best to ignore the reason for events happening, as fate often deals a discourteous living to the overly philosophic. The best way to avoid suffering is to live one's life without questing, sans examination. (Maisel, 1)

David Lodge was the first critic to reflect upon the tension between Jim Dixon's inner and outer world. He shows Jim's incapability of boldness and competence. In his book *The Modern, The Contemporary and Importance of Being Amis*, he opines:

The world of Jim is one of the farcical vitality and advanced power of ridicule. He performs most of his revolt in secret or in silence; pulling faces or writing insults on bathroom mirror. It provides only a form of psychological compensation for him. (255)

Lodge states that with this kind of behaviors much of the comedy of the novel derives due to Jim's attempt to keep his anger in secret. In this context in *Post War*

*British Fiction* James Gilden rightly notes Jim Dixon as comic hero. He says, "The elements of farce so strongly felt in *Lucky Jim* have decreased in Amis' subsequent work together with the tendency to treat the hero as an entertaining incompetent and tendency to filter perception through him" (43). Though Jim's Luck brings him not only victory over his Professor Welch; he too gets the good job in London and wins the favour of the most desirable girl, Christine, who brings Dixon into a usable relationship with her godlike Uncle Gore- Uruqhart.

Richard Fallis in his essay, "*Lucky Jim* and Academic Wishful Thinking" considers *Lucky Jim* as an academic novel. It has special attraction to academic readers. It is Jim's lively awareness of absurdities and hypocrisies of his world that Amis constricts the plot. It raises serious opinions on art, academia and the state of society. He sees Jim Dixon as a fantasized version of our unrealized selves:

Jim's final revelation learns us howling too, and it has a special meaning for academic readers. We associate with Jim because we see the story as a fantasy of our unrealized selves. His story is what we might wish ours would be if fantasies were real [...]. We see ourselves as Jim because he sees the world as we see the world; we wish we had his luck because it could provide us [...] meaningful "wishful thinking". (71)

Richard Fallis further emphasizes, "if we examine Jim's career by means of heroic experiences described by Joseph Campbell, we as readers can see the large pattern of his experience, the pattern which Jim himself almost fails to see" (70). He claims:

His "call to adventure" comes in the invitation to the Welch's weekend. Before going on that adventure, he encounters the "protective figure

with amulets" in the person of Bill Atkinson and the magical telephone, [...] ogre [...] Christine is the Queen Goddess of Jim's World, and the fight from the Ball is emotionally; if not physically, a mystical marriage which prepares him for the reconciliation with Uncle Julius, the god and father-surrogate with whom he must make some accommodation [...] with heroic laughter. (70)

Viewing the novel from characters perspective, Robert H. Bell in his essay "Introduction to Critical Essays on Kingsley Amis" writes that Amis' characters like Jim Dixon achieve only partial self awareness. They create difficulties because of their sexual desire and conduct:

Nothing is more characteristic of an Amis hero than the difficulties caused by his sexual desire and conduct. Though most of his protagonist would do better if they could, rarely do they reform. More likely the resolution is that uncertain feeling, ambivalence, or confusion produced by the inadequacy of the hero to the complexity of the situation while the characters remain ambivalent; our perceptions of them differ and shift. Typically an Amis hero precipitates notoriously mixed reactions -- volatile blends of compassion and indignation. The hero may have no more than vacillating sympathy for himself struggling [...] Amis's heroes are notable Sham - Detectors, mockers of fools, phonies and bastards, they may themselves also be, and remain egregious bastards. (1)

In 1954, Walter Allen greeted Lucky Jim as a product of formidable and uncomfortable talent. In his book *New Novels*, he observes Jim Dixon as an intellectually complex character to define:

A new hero has risen among us. Is he the intellectual tough, or the tough intellectual? He is consciously, even conscientiously, graceless. [...] it is the phony to which his nerve-ends and tremblingly exposed and at the least suspicion of the phony he goes tough. He is at odds with his conventional university education, though he comes generally from a famous university: he has been through the academic racket as he sees through all the others. A racket is phoniness organized, and in contact with phoniness. In fiction I think he first arrived as the central character of Mr. Wain's *Hurry on Down*. He turns up again in Mr. Amis's *Lucky Jim*. (162-163)

David Handy reviews Eric Jacobs' book *Kingsley Amis: A Biography* and looks *Lucky Jim* "as a product of Amis' abiding hatred towards snobbery, the arrogance of unearned rank and his dissatisfaction with the syllabus of English which he taught in Swansea" (66).

Dixon is hardly morally qualified and positively deserving characters in terms of the benefit he deserves. Ralph Caplan in *Contemporary British Novelists* delineates, "Amis's heroes are, by and large, not disqualified rather than positively qualified for their jobs and for life generally" (Shapiro, 11). He also adds, "Instead of being unequivocal hero profiting morality and reaffirming justice in a tired world, the hero in Amis's novel *Lucky Jim* tends to be like an anti-hero [...], except for the fact that he is not incredibly immoral" (Shapiro, 11).

Viewing the protagonist Dixon from similar perspective as envious, mean and malicious, Malcolm Bradbury says that Dixon lacks the heroic ideals because he is not true to his profession, rank and status. In his book *The Modern British Novel 1978-2001* he forwards his ideas:

His personal horizons are narrow, his attitude is provincial and ordinary, his engage to his academic subject quite incidental, words like 'culture', 'art', 'history', sound offensively in his ears, his basic theory of life and culture is "nice things are nicer than nasty things." (340)

Similarly, Kenneth Allop in his book *The Angry Decade: A Survey of the Cultural Revolt of 1950s* sees, "Jim Dixon is bored and philistine meritocrat lifted by social opportunity into a world he cannot accept" (Allop, 339). Relating with this comment Elan Showalter observes, "This lad is not angry young man at all, not an existential rebel or political reactionary, but rather someone who would prefer to be happy, loved and settled" (4).

Patrick Sweden in his book *The English Novel History and Society* relates Jim Dixon's several kinds of pomposity with the changing function of the academic establishment in the contemporary England. He writes:

Dixon hates his job, thoughts of books, libraries, middle ages, anything that could concienely be expected to interest a university lecturer of Medieval history which of course, Dixon knows nothing at all about. This is reflection upon the charming idiosyncrasies of the academic mind. (33)

These critical views show that the issue of anti-hero in the novel *Lucky Jim* needs serious attention. The critics, despite differences in their findings, agree on the fact that Jim Dixon is morally unappealing and his character is completely opposite to the characters of traditional heroes. Thus, he is truly an anti-hero.



## Kingsley Amis and His Works

Kingsley Amis was born on April 16, 1922 in South London. He was the only son of lower middle class parents. His family background was ordinary, and suburban. He first attended the City of London School on scholarship and later enrolled at St. John's College at Oxford to study English literature. His university education was interrupted by his service in the army between 1942 and 1945. He served as a lieutenant in Royal Corps of signals in Normandy, Germany and Belgium. After the war Amis returned to Oxford and continued his study as a research student. In 1948 he married Hilary Anna Braddwell. For the next twelve years he worked as an English Lecturer, at Swansea University in Wales. His head of department James Kinsley describes him as a loyal colleague and provocative teacher.

Initially Amis made his literary career not as a novelist, but as a poet. He was a part of the post-war writers, who revolted against modernist writings. The movement, in which the poetry was dominant, rejected the internationalism and artistic experimentation of modernism. It favoured mostly the modest and ironic exploration of artistic situations. In his earlier period he began to write about critical study of Graham Green's novels. In 1947, he published his first volume of poetry *Bright November*. In 1958-59 he was visiting Fellow in creative writing at Princeton and from 1961-63 he served at Petershouse Cambridge as Fellow and Director of studies in English. During this period he also worked as a reviewer and columnist. Amis gained a first class degree in English from Oxford and continued his research work in various subjects. His thesis about 'English Non-Dramatic Poetry 1850-1900 and the Victorian Reading public' was rejected. In 1975, in an interview on BBC with Melvyn Brugg which was reprinted in the magazine *The Listener* (Feb, 20) he remarked about his writing as: "no doubt what I produced was boring but its quite an

interesting subject it still interests me" (240). This mixture of skepticism and sustained enthusiasm is an accurate reflection of Amis attitude towards writing about literature.

His first novel *Lucky Jim* (1954) came as a breath of fresh air in the stale world of 1950s fiction. This text identified Amis as one of the 'angry young men' of the period, irreverent and iconoclastic in revolt against the 'established' and its 'culture' of modernism. As a group of contemporary, he shared his interests in literature and in the promotion of anti modernist trends. He dismissed the characteristics of modern writings. But he attempted to recreate the protocols of social realism, maintained within a tradition which includes Henry fielding, George Eliot and Charles Dickens. It is also the picaresque technique of Defoe that one can easily locate the most vivid resemblance to *Lucky Jim*.

The novel which followed *Lucky Jim*, is *That Uncertain Feeling* (1955) is recognizably the same trend, is set around the public library. Amis life in the South Wales provided background for this novel. It manages some useful satire at the expense of Dylan Thomas and his Welch romanticisms, as well as telling the story of an adulterous affair that brings home some of the importance of domestic ordinariness. The protagonist John Lewis, a horny librarian marries Jean and carve another relationship with Elizabeth, a married women. Here Amis offers the theme of relationship between men and women. The social tension within a novel is more vivid and plausible than they were in *Lucky Jim*. Though Lewis and Dixon are curious inventions of Aims, neither of them is intended to be an instrument of coherent social insight, yet their close relationship with the texture of the novels provide them with wide opportunities for observation on human absurdity.

Amis next novel *I Like It Here* (1958) is a story about a writer named Garnett Bowen who goes to write in Portugal, meets the world of 'bloody abroad'. More than Jim Dixon he is a hero prejudice: anti-foreign, anti-Blomsbury, anti-Modern as well as anti-London. There are good comic set pieces, but the tone is over ironic.

Amis' novels from *Lucky Jim* to *One Fat Englishman* (1958) were written during 1950s and 60s regarded as representatives of movement as the 'angry young men' but these texts provide a misleading simplified background to a stylistic and representational individuality which was to find a more explicit manifestation in the division of his later fiction, like 'The Experiments' and the 'Realist Tendency.' His novels such as *The Anti-Death League* (1966) and *The Green Man* (1969) are mixed genres of ghost story, metaphysical speculation, spy thriller and political prophecy. These are enough to evade the conventional categories of 'experimental' writing. And he does so to maintain the balance between his textual adventures and his ability to reflect and comment upon twentieth century society.

The 'Realist tendency' in Amis' writing is more explicit in *Girl 20* (197) and *Stanley and the Women* (1984). These books are part of an extensive literary response to mainly British society as it developed from the 1960s to 1980s a period, during the time people were obsessed to drugs, youth culture and they were irresponsible towards social concern. These works have generated the most extreme attack on Amis as, amongst other things, a sexist, bigoted, reactionary and literary opportunist. But such judgements were not wholly valid because his novels after sixties have mixed up satire, black humour, vivid reality and compassion.

Amis' skills one might say, he is addicted to 'comic incident' and 'funny dialogue' is also the most consistent feature of his works. He has succeeded in extending modern comedy beyond its limited role as a form of light relief. Such bleak

exercises are presented in *The Anti Death League* (1966) *The Alternation* (1976) which leaves the readers shaking with hilarity. The form of writing he offers here is very funny.

The tendency for critic to interpret Amis' novels as straight forward output of philistinism is widespread. What is remarkable about it is his carefree dismissal of form in its pursuit of contents. Early and late he is a virtuous stylist creating the inflection, accents, idioms that define and expose characters. He reveals characters attitude in linguistic follies and endows ordinary language with vitality. His torte is can't and cliché especially the descent into banality or stupidity.

Some critics like Rubort Borton and James Michie consider that Amis invents some literary characters to forward his complain towards academic intelligentsia, hotels meal, scuffing girls, feminism, foreigners and taxi driver. Even he shows his unappealiness of old school, publisher and other nasty people as Roger shows in *One Fat Englishman*. Yet he also shows complexities of evaluation and loath to simplify moral problems. His great vexing issue is sex, its origins in individuals' psychology and its perpetual implications for personal identity and relationship. Amis also highlights farcical features, picaresque plots and parody. But some novel like *The Old Devils*, his common sense is regarded as too sentimental. He sketches circumstances as gloomy. The funniest writer of the contemporary time is also one of the most troubling.

At the end of the fifties, Amis changed his track and produced a book, *Take a Girl Like You* (1960), which ranks among the finest of his novels. The book is based on Samuel Richardsonian plot of romance, reduction and rape, seen from the female point of view, and leading finally to male repentance and virtue, the story is seen through the eyes of a strong and interesting heroine Jenny Bunn, and addresses issues

of moral change, shifting gender relations and sexual habits in the world changed by contraceptive pills. Amis' later works were commonly accused of misogyny, but this novel takes its heroine deep seriously, confronting her with another Amis' anti-hero, Patrick Standish, a local Casanova who is himself associated with psychology of mortal fear: his grasping at love is part of his fear of death. Here, Amis is unlocking some of the themes that would run through later works.

While visiting as a Fellow in creative writing Princeton University, 1958-59, Amis gave lectures on science fiction. He collected materials of lectures and published a fiction casted on *One Fat Englishman*. It presents another fragrantly unappealing hero, Roger Micheldene. He emerges as Amis' 'angriest hero'. Amis' close proximity to his central characters was to produce tensions between satire and farce, love story and depressive and meditation, morality and hedonism and other binary distinctions in the novel. The novel appears to readers entertained by hero's hasty perceptions.

Among several novels from the mid sixties, Amis' representation of the contemporary world has been remarkably varied in their thematic and stylistic emphasis. Novels like *I Want It Now* (1968), deal observantly with changing manners and style in the era of sexual liberation. Meanwhile Amis' sharp sense of human mortality and urgency of personal salvation were distilled in other works in powerful supernatural story *The Greenman* (1969) which contains a self portrait of Amis as an alcoholic and lecherous innkeeper. And the novel ending up (1974) tells the story of old people and their problem of salvation.

By the late 1960s, Amis was associated with cold war politics. He had become a close friend of Robert Conquest and collaborated with him on a novel called *The Egyptologists* (1965). Amis claimed, 'he was some sort of man of the left' when the

conquest belonged to the libertarian right in 1959. So there is more on Amis' part from being a 'man of the left' to a 'sound reactionary'. Later, Amis came to be a political supporter of Margaret Thatcher, because of her appearance and manners and not because of her politics. Amis' charming personality can be seen as an instance of several things. He had abiding hatred for snobbery, the arrogance of unearned rank and elites; both the conservative class based, pre-war British establishment and the bogus elites of talentless.

In his book *Jake's Things* (1978) he examines the changing world of gender relations and their impact on male psyche. Here, Amis has developed the misogynistic tendency. Amis marries Elizabeth Jane Howard as a second wife in 1965, but eventually grows apart. The novel like *Stanley And The Woman* which was widely attacked for its apparent misogyny, mirrors Amis' disenchantment with his second wife. He also contemplates the enclosed, impenetrable condition of insanity as the worst form of human misery.

In 1986, Amis wrote his best and most congenial book *The Old Devils*. It provides the vision of old age. He goes to interpret the mellow tone of the old Devils as an outgrowth of his renewed friendship with Hilary, his first wife. The plot centers around Alun Weaver's return to his Celtic roots. This allows Amis to revive his assault on a variety of cultural tendencies all in some way connected with modernism. Alun Weaver shows his cantankerously moral sensibility, still capable of sustaining what had now become the dark comedy of life into older years, when the once comically angry young man had turned into an even angrier and a very mortal one. Here, the comic touch changed but never disappeared, however the tone is less sardonic. And its female characters are treated with consideration than its male figure in *The Biographers Mustache* (1996). *Difficulties with Girls* (1988) is the only book

by Amis which revisits characters from earlier novels. Here, he added one more theme of his writing, homosexuality.

*The Biographer's Mustache* is Amis' last publication and another artful comment upon life. It is zestfully articulating the dull biographer and satirizing even more savagely the pompous, second rate author, who is more devoted to aristocrat's parties rather than literary endeavors. Near the end of his career in 1991, Amis came out with *Memoirs*, a series of disconnected essays, through it is not truly worthy of the author.

When Kingsley Amis died at the age of 73, the general verdict was that he had been the greatest comic novelist of his generation. After making his mark with *Lucky Jim*, he never looked back. This novel won the Somerset Mougham prize in the same year. The book went through ten impressions on the year of its publication. Prior to publication, extracts were read on BBC Radio Program and later it was filmed. Such was the continued acclaim for his work that in 1986 he won the Booker prize for *The Old Devils* (1986). As a contributor to *The Spectator* (1995), Eric Jacob puts it, "Amis was above all quick-minded, verbally agile, and terribly funny, a rigorous persecutor or 'bores', 'pseuds' and 'wranker's and 'a tremendous mimic" (28).

To sum up Amis's career, one explanation is that he is the product of his period. His tastes seem to have solidified early in his life and did not change. Whole continents of human experiences and endeavors were uninteresting to him: all of sport most of the visual arts, religion, modern languages, travel, opera, dance, science and nature, Fair enough, there is a kind of stubborn integrity in that. His output was twenty five novels, eight books, on poetry, more books on drinking, science fiction as well as criticism, TV screenplays, even restaurant reviews. He was a writer all through, a master and exemplar of his trade.

## II. THE CONCEPT OF ANTI-HERO

### Aristotle's Concept of Hero

The supreme form of individual being seeks to fulfil its purpose to grow and mature. Because an individual's highest faculty is his intellect and that intellect brings himself into a kind of communication with god. Aristotle's renunciation of self subsistent ideas has major implications for his ethical theory. The proper aim in ethics is not to determine the nature of absolute virtue but to be a virtuous person. The goal of human life is happiness; the necessary precondition for happiness is virtue. But virtue itself has to be defined in terms of rational choices, in a concrete situation, where virtue laid in the mean between two extremes. Good is always balanced between two opposite evils: the midpoint between excess and defect. He says:

Temperament is a mean between courtesy and indulgence; courage a mean between cowardice and fool. Hardiness; proper pride a mean between arrogance and abasement and so forth. Such a mean can be found only in practice in individual cases relative to their specific condition (67).

Aristotle emphasizes physical body's active involvement in love, war and feasting as the essence of hero. His attention is a high valuation of the body which is more directly reflected the widespread classical Greek, appreciation for the human body as expressed athletic prowess, personal beauty or artistic creation. In *Poetics*, he talks about the ideal hero, whose tragedy arouses in us pity and fear without our likeness to the tragic sufferer, our sympathy wouldn't be out listed. The remembrance on which Aristotle insists on is one of the moral characters where his hero is not a man of flawless perfection, nor yet does one of the consummate villainy; by which



we must not understand that he has merely arranged or mediocre qualities. He rises, indeed, among the common lender moral elevation and dignity but he is not free from frailties and imperfections. S. H. Butcher in his book *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art* opines:

Aristotle's hero is rich and full in humanity, composed of elements which other men possess, but blended more harmoniously or more potent quality. So much human nature must there in him that we are able to sense some of identification ourselves with him, to make his misfortunes our own. At the same time, he is raised above us in external dignity and station. He is a prince or famous man, who falls from the height of greatness (277).

Apart from the impressive effect of contrast so presented, there is a gain in the hero being placed at an ideal distance from the spectator. He is disengaged from his petty interests of self, and is on the way to being universalized. If his quest ends in tragedy, he is blamed because he sacrificed for a much higher duty. He has self-assertive energy, single direction, goodness and at the same time, he is unselfish. The death of the hero who leads a farlon home of the benefactor of mankind who bears suffering with unbinding fortitude and through suffering he achieves moral victory - this fills us with emotions of wonder and admiration for him. He is a man of noble nature, like emotional feelings and emotions; idealized indeed, but with so large a share of our common humanity as to eager our interest and sympathy.

The fate of the hero is determined by forces, outside the control of the human will which constitutes his destiny. So ideal hero has ideal tragedy because the great frailty is moral frailty in which hero does sinless crime. Aristotle's hero is ideal in the sense that he has been raised above the trivial and accidental, by virtue of a universal

element which answers to the true idea of the object and it transcends the limitation of the individual. Aristotle adds that comedy which concerns itself with the foibles, the flaws and imperfections of mankind, cannot on this reasoning idealize or universalize it. He says "good fortunes following upon a course of bad action is frequent enough in life, none the less it is to be rigorously excluded from tragic and indeed from all art" (213).

Aristotle aims at four things for his hero. The hero must be good, appropriate, true to type and consistent or true to his action and nature. There should not be sudden changes in the nature of the character. Then only the character is appropriate for plot. The hero is like us having infirmities and virtues, tilted more to the side of good than evil. He is neither a blameless character nor a notorious villain. Aristotle's concept of the hero of high rank goes unquestioned in classical tragedy. The principle of Aristotle about the plot allows the hero passing by a series of probable or necessary stages from misfortunes to happiness or from happiness to misfortune. So, there should be unity in time, place and action. For Aristotle, plot is the most important formative element. The action of the story is not there to portray but characters. Characters exist for the sake of the action.

Characters and their actions will be either good or bad, either superior or inferior than ourselves, and this is what distinguishes tragedy from comedy. But Aristotle does not proceed to press a theory of moral value on this basis. He is careful to explain that in comedy the imitation of men becomes worse than us but it does not mean worse as regards of any and every sort of faulty. It only regards as one particular kind, the ridiculous. And the ridiculous may be defined as a mistake or deformity not productive of pain or harm to others. Aristotle allows an aesthetic value

even in descriptions of what is unpleasant. He identifies characters as what makes us ascribe certain moral qualities to the agents and thoughts.

Aristotle's moral argument describes the purpose of life and the various qualities of mind for characters that are supposed to be necessary for moral conduct. It continues with a detailed description of friendship before concluding with the view that contemplation of good is the highest form of happiness. For those who are not fully committed or suited to the life of pure contemplation, the friendship becomes the ideal forum to exercise all the virtues; the virtue being those morale and intellectual characteristics, which have been fashioned by habit and education. Morality finds part of its true expression in friendship. In *Nicomachean Ethics*, he says, "every art and every investigation and similarly every action and pursuits is considered to aim at some good" (63). For Aristotle, final aim of life is good; not only the good for oneself but the good for all humanity.

For Aristotle, a person is primarily a member of a group, be it a family, a household, a village or a city state. There is no such thing as a purely free thinking individual. Our individuality is already partly decided for us by group or groups of which we are only a part. Hence, the overall well being of a group is more important than the well being of any single member within it:

For even if the good of the community coincides with that of the individual, it is clearly a greater and more perfect thing to achieve and preserve that of a community; for while it is desirable to secure what is good in the case of an individual, to do so in the case of a people or a state is something finer and more sublime. (64)

According to Aristotle, moral virtue and the characters include courage, liberality, temperance, modesty and so on. And inside intellectual virtue he includes

art or technical skills and scientific knowledge. To cultivate these entire virtues one must be aware about the doctrine of mean. One must regulate own emotions and responses to people and situation so that one is eventually able to conduct himself with dignity. According to Aristotle by constantly learning through habit to control feelings one should begin to:

Have these feelings at the right times on the right grounds towards the right people for the right motive in the right way [ . . . ] this is to feel them to an intermediated, that is the best degree; and this is the mark of virtue. (101)

Finally, without friendship, none of the virtues either moral or intellectual would be of any value. For Aristotle, friendship is essential for every individual that is the supreme good of human beings called hero.

#### Traits of Anti-Hero

Antihero is a protagonist of the play and the novel who lacks traditional heroic virtues and noble qualities and he is sometimes inept, cowardly, stupid or dishonest, yet sensitive. The anti-heroes' entire motivation is selfish because they feel the need to live against society's code for their own will. Selfishness enforces the antihero's break from the code of the traditional hero. Antiheroes refuse to serve society to serve only for themselves. The antihero has an ego and pride to go against the society. But he judges that his way is the right way. M. H. Abraham in *The Glossary of Literary*

*Terms* defines anti hero as:

The chief person in a modern novel or play, whose character is widely discrepant. From that which we associate with the traditional protagonist or a hero of a serious literary work. Instead of manifesting

largeness, dignity, power or heroism, the antihero is petty ignominious, passive, ineffectual or dishonest. (11)

Antihero lacks the superior capabilities which tradition has guaranteed to him. Low level of human capability and little sincerity reflects the special gift of antihero. He has the power to hypnotize his victim by subverting family feelings or religion. The successful quests of antihero turn vile towards heroic wisdom as he transforms heroism and fortitude into hypocrisy and tyranny. His primordial nature links to his physical side, with his animalistic nature. The journeys of antihero reveal the dark and downside of the cycle. He personifies the negative selfish side of his ego. He wants to possess everything without limit; his characters define as large number of greed, temptation, lower self impulses and regression. The goal of anti hero is to fulfil his desires and needs which has to be accumulated, controlled and enjoyed. He is obsessed to enhance security, wealth and territory. The antihero's humanity has been shut down. His generosity has become uncontrolled greed; his compassion has become hatred and loathing.

The hallmark standpoints of antihero are his anti-social act who marches, or dwells, to be a different drumbeat, the cadence of his own iconoclastic sensibility. His quest gradually narrows from common humanity to the single good life to self-knowledge. Antihero is observed by his desire to hurt and be hurt, blindly imitating the desires and movements of those he hates; he remains a coward and a slave. He lives only with earthbound self. Rather than facing more difficult challenges requiring the hero to rely on his own sense of judgement, antihero takes advantage of his inside knowledge. He has been flashed or dominated by negative traits or questionable behaviour.

The anti-hero has occasionally been conflated with the role of antagonist or villain, by definition the antagonists' limited role is clearly intended as an ultimately opposing force to the hero's quest. In this context, Victor Bromberg in *Praise of Antiheroes* writes:

The appeal of antihero resides in his 'human all too human' characters, his virtue often amounting to pointed inversions or ironic twists of the heroic ideals. The aesthetic effectiveness of the anti hero depends on the very absence or negative presence of the heroic paragons of tradition. (168)

Antihero accepts life and the process of change instead of struggling against nature and his own nature. His struggle against society occurs only when he finds himself at odds with a particular social force or condition produced by society, such as poverty, political revolution, a social convention, or set of values. If this seems to denote passivity, it is not negative, not death bearing. There is, of course, a good measure of irony implicit in this objective way of seeing one's role in society - wisdom permeates the awareness of dichotomy between the world of appearances, of illusion and metaphysical reality as well as healthy humour. The latter results from the antihero's feeling that he is not different from any one else, that he shares in the general human condition. So, it's not true to say that antihero is not heroic as Bromberg suggests, "they evolve from the traditional hero with a new code of ethics" (168).

The birth of antihero arises to rebel against history and to change the emptiness of society. But his rebel is for his own sake not for the interests of community.

The element that makes it more than simple heroes and villainism lies within the character of antihero. The antihero probably existed first (before conventional heroes) perhaps predating the sanctifying influence of organized religion. Many of the protagonists of western and eastern literature and classical mythological stories fit into the broad antihero model, especially those who are shown as having turbulent, violent and conflicting motivations. Frequently, it is the mental conflict that serves to the discrete episodes which compose such stories. So, antihero is a parody of hero as Hegel in *The Philosophy of Fine Art* defines "anti hero is a person whose life is not so circumscribed that he cannot take personal vengeance, a person who acts for himself and takes responsibility for everything that he does (248).

Such characters often behave immorally or in a cowardly fashion, and do not always have good intentions which distinguish them from the typical everyman or reluctant heroic characters; for anti-hero 'the ends justify the means'. He wants to preserve himself and his integrity by compromising to the people and situation. For this he manages to label himself simultaneously as a scholar, a social idealist, and an excellent employer. But he feels distrust with conventional values and is often unable to commit to any ideals. The antihero feels that he is no different from anyone else that he shares in the general human condition. Thus, he is a common man of comic, or tragic comic mode.

The hero/antihero dialectic is one of the basic manifestations of the opposition between the tragic and the comic. The consciousness of these polar modes is embodied in the balance between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, the tragic and comic epic of Homer. The protagonist of tragedy defines his individual code of behaviour in regard to the nearness of death, giving up his life to safeguard the survival of his

society; the comic hero leaps into the heart of chaos, armed with sanity and imagination. Katherine Lever in her book *The Art of Greek Comedy* states:

The *odyssey* despite its tragic implications is essentially comic in character and technique: the crafty hero, the romantic episodes, the humorous situation, who escapes from the dangers of war by craft and above all, a belief in survival, is the first antihero. (19)

Supporting this idea of anti-hero in *odyssey* Albert Cook points out Odysseus crafts made him unheroic. He says:

The success of Odysseus is not self-destructive, as that of Achilles, or Oedipus; it is a comic success. Then we added lover, the ingenious adulterer who eats, drinks makes love to calypso and Circe without for one moment that he is due home, a wonderer, a passionate realistic [...]. The man who dwelt with the witch, 'the hark' . . . (165)

Thus, in the heroic tradition, there may be found the seeds of antiheroes.

Aristophanes, a dramatist shows his audience not merely a human anti-hero, but an antiheroic god. Rosette C. Lamouth in his essay "From Hero to Antihero" writes: "the wonderings of Dionysus, a divinity in search of his own and the city's solution are a parody of the heroic voyage" (16).

With the human evolution the early cave man ran from danger instead of facing it to protect himself, his family or his clan. Historically embedded as it is in a century and a half of industrial and political revolution, the ascendancy of materialistic bourgeoisies, the human nature carried out by Darwin and psycho analysis and the catalysms of the World Wars, post romantic literature has been teaching that the traditional idea of the literary hero has become not only alien but dangerous to the culture. So, the antecedents of antiheroes can clearly be seen in the



novels of picaresque tradition especially of Cervant's *Don Quixote*, Defoe's *Moll Flanders*, Henry Fielding's *Tom Jones* and the literature of Post-war Britain. As Rosette Lamout claims, our is the age of antihero. He quotes the voice of Frederick the Great, "we do not like heroes; they make too much noise in the world . . . the more radiant their glory, the more odious they are" (22).

#### Antiheroic Characters in Picaresque Novels

In literature, the first of the picaresque, a genre often defined as having a protagonist called an antihero. 'Picaro' is Spanish for 'rouge', and a typical story concerns the escapades of an insouciant rascal who lies by his wits and shows little if any alteration of character through the long succession of his adventures. Picaresque fiction is realistic in manner, episodic in structure and often satiric in aim. The great quasi-picaresque narrative *Don Quixote* (1605) was the single most important progenitor of the modern novel; in it, an engaging madman who tries to live by the ideas of chivalric romance in the everyday world is used to explore the relations of illusion and reality in human life. After these precedents and many others -including eighteenth century characters of Defoe's *Moll Flanders* which is still picaresque in type, in the sense that its structure is episodic rather than in the organized form of a plot; while Moll is herself a colourful female version of the old Picaro - twelve years a whore, five times a wife, twelve years a thief, eight years a transported felon in Virginia.

Eventually, the Picaro's life as an outsider was accurately identified with modern man's despair and existential anguish. The disparities between the sensibilities and moral promises of various epochs did not seem to be taken into account. Another important feature of the genre is the singleness of view point. The picaresque singleness of view point consists in distinguishing appearance from reality and fiction

from fact with exaggeration. The most trivial detail or insignificant action is integrated into this overall perspective, sometimes seeming to be more important than the narrative itself. This effect requires a consistency of style. Moreover, truthfulness in the picaresque novel is achieved through doubt, insecurity and cynicism of the Picaro. With the help of its unique style, Picaro is able to work upwards and laugh quietly, simply indicating the hypocrisy and false pretension. More clearly, it brings together many loose ends and blends different sections of the narrative which strictly presents moral decay of the characters.

The basic situation of the picaresque novel is solitude in the world, of its principal character. This is not the retreat of the hermit or exclusion from society. The Picaro is lonely in the world totally isolated from society, and cut off from any foundation of security such as family, money and friends or social position because of his poor ability for friendship. Similarly, he is unattached, boundless, at a loss in a hostile as special position. The extent of his isolation includes solitude, insecurity and restlessness. In addition, life appears to him primarily as a long wondering without end. Therefore, solitude, confusion, disaster and misery are some of the most widely used terms used to describe the situation of the Picaro. He is not heroic in its character traits. He is simply faced with the immediate problem of his existence such as food, shelter and heating.

The Picaro has not past nor any trust in the future. But for survival he is equipped with both offensive and defensive weapons. His greatest defensive weapons are his resiliency or capacity for adaptation as well as his stoical good humour. He is not willing to learn and make concessions, but in case of failure, he will not whine and brood, but forget and be merry. Sacrifice does not appeal to him very long, as he shirks responsibility or permanence and laughs at honour or reputation. He needs two

things: comfort and ease; yet, by temperament he is willing to obtain them by deceitful and improvised means which are closer to anti-heroic acts.

For Picaro, each master becomes enemy and each colleague a new rival and the cruelty of the world is progressively shown by each situation. He achieves through his suffering a measure of wisdom as well as a final liberation from the strokes of fortune. Miller, S. in his book *The Picaresque Novel* writes about the episodes of Picaro which links with his occurrence. He says,

The picaresque novel has the highly episodic plot whose sole link was their occurrence in the life of the Picaro, the agile antihero who joins together all the events by sole reason of the fact that he is the important actor in them all. (12)

The episodes in the picaresque novel are rarely linked by rationally comprehended cause and effect. And since there is only evolvment, not development of the Picaro's character, the potentially unifying factor is missing as well. Fortune also plays a special role in the picaresque novel. As to fortune, Miller puts his idea, "In the picaresque novel the Classical and Renaissance motive of fortune dominates the entire action which is full of statements, laments, and complaints about fortune" (9).

For the Picaro, there is no grand providence, no logical cause and effect, no obvious author hovering about to shape the plot of life. Only fortune dominates, and fortune holds continuation. The Picaro can not be reconciled to it in a dynamic, organic relationship. He can only wend his way as best as he can through the obstacles which fortune has set up for him. The life of Picaro is never static, full of cycles, events following events with many characters. But without establishing any meaningful relationship to the characters, Picaro appears mechanical encounters to

them. Therefore, the Picaro's world is inherently chaotic. As Miller points out, "it is a world fully beyond the creative scope of human action and relationship" (36).

The Picaro dramatizes chaos; he is the offspring of a chaotic world and has a fundamental will to survive. For survival, he uses masking and wit as his main trait. Picaro learns that society allows no survival to those who have no sense of belongingness to any section of society he lives. The Picaro also displays some inner characteristics which enable him to survive in his disjointed world. For instance as anti-hero, his wit is one of his traits, the word 'wit' has double duty; it means both humour and mental quickness luckily, the Picaro usually has both.

The Picaro is not a social reformer. Alter, R. in his essay "Rouge's Progress; Studies in the Picaresque Novel" opines that Picaro is not linked to the hero because he has neither the time, nor the temperament for reflections. He writes:

Events only produce in him an immediacy of despair. He is forced to live loosely, to keep himself detached and his loneliness is brought into sharp focus by his inability and unwillingness to love. In a sense, his apartness prevents love. So, love is a very difficult emotion to obtain in the Picaro's life. (10)

Sean O' Faolain, in his book *The Vanishing Hero* implies that, as a form of Picaro, the antihero begins with *Don Quixote*. He says, "the interpretation of Don Quixote as a character, it has been shown, has evolved through the centuries to generalize he has and bolt of ridicule to a twentieth century Christ figure" (32).

Here, O' Faolain does not go back far enough when he traces the antihero to Don Quixote and at the same time P. G. Walsh in his book *The Roman Novel* claims that "The Romans rather than the Spaniards invented the picaresque novel around the travels and adventures of an antihero" (2). These ideas make clear that Anti-hero

includes almost all characteristics of Picaro, which does not bear heroic ideals; he is founding, immoral, wanton and who believes in fortune. The heroic tradition left the seeds of antihero in form of new tastes, new form and new heroes in fiction.

There are so many kinds of Picaro in the seventeenth and eighteenth century novels. However, there are so many protagonists who are totally unheroic or only partially or doubtfully heroic. That one can glance at merely a few, who may by any of the plethora of twentieth century definitions, or implied definitions be called antihero.

A. J. Close in his essay "Introduction to Don Quixote" presents Quixote as the reflection of vanity of worldly ambitions, who is completely unheroic in nature. He writes:

The individuality on Don Quixote and sacho - the folly of building castle in the air of empty position of honour of opportunistic social climbing and his quasi-epic of rebellion against the social order and common sense are misapplication of heroic traits. (X)

Don Quixote's vainglory, literary affectation crackbrained ambition, empty heroics, superstition, and love blindness, the passion of anger, envy and revenge all symptoms are apparent in his anti-heroic character. Quixote's aim is to be the hero of chivalric romance that is of a chivalric history. With his self-glorifying speech he tries to act as the heroic part and he himself pompously forecasts a hero. Though, he separates himself from word and deed. Most of the time we see him imagining only but does not act. He is full of diverse notions, a mischievous bookish, vein of humour, flights of fancy, such widely nourished and elegant always idiosyncratic wisdom.

Don Quixote was reading his books of chivalry and really, really wanted to be a knight. He decides he is a knight, what was so touching and pathetic about Don

Quixote was that he didn't realize that he wasn't really a knight. The episodes are romantic but ridiculous. So, he is an antihero because of the traits he exemplifies including his inability to learn from the mistakes and his careless action. He is coward and incompetent. He is alienated passive and completely unheroic. All these standpoints make him anti-hero.

Though Antihero is not completely villain, however sometimes able to feel pricks of conscience, nearly always a man of intellectual powers, a dominating person who brooks no opposition, sometimes unholy schemes even murderers. As Byronic hero and other immoral, selfish and an opportunistic characters presented in Defoe's *Moll Flanders*. Moll, of even lower birth, receives a genteel education, is seduced and then, in what she considers self-defence goes through the series of husbands and gains a supreme knowledge of the London under world - prostitution, thievery, new gate - unconvincingly achieving a kind of peace in old age. Perhaps the best known anti-heroine modelled in *Picaro*, who lives a wrong kind of life what society calls. So it can be said that like Moll, anti-hero is an ordinary man and woman of low life who completely lacks the particular heroic quality.

Moll uses her beauty to try and achieve financial security. Here, sex is commodity for her. She has no moral sense at all, only a deep and constant sense of the value of money. She says "I was more confounded with the money then I was before with love" (*Moll Flanders*, 13). She continually applies the vocabulary of finance and commercial negotiation to the affairs of the heart. 'Stock', 'contract' and 'credit' are words that reoccur in accounts of her relationship.

She is continuously anxious about the uncertainty of her arising and her identity. She may be a homeless and a wonderer but she says "I knew that with money in the pocket one is at home anywhere" (17).

Here Moll registers the impact of rival social views, but she does not rise to any comprehensive or theoretical vision. From the beginning of Moll's erotic experience, we are left wondering whether love is natural or economic ones in which are secondary to financial dealings.

The most advanced, quintessential stage of antiheroism remains by and large foreign to the romantic hero. The obvious example is of course Byron, whose constant sardonic commentary on his titular hero's adventures in *Don Juan* effectively pricks the heroic bubble and cuts his characters' size to antiheroic size. Thorslev, Peter in *The Byronic Hero: Types and Prototypes* writes that, Byronic hero is the true representation of an antihero. He forwards his ideas:

A Byronic hero exhibits several characteristic traits and in many ways he can be considered a rebel. But Byronic hero does not possess 'heroic virtue' in usual sense; instead he has many dark qualities. With regard to his intellectual capacity, self-respect and hypersensitive, the Byronic hero is larger than life and with the loss of titanic passions, his pride, and his certainty of self identity he loses his status as a [traditional hero]. (185)

The Byronic hero is moody by nature or passionate about a particular issue. He rejects the values of moral codes of society. Quite often the Byronic hero is characterized by a guilty memory of some unnamed sexual crime.

Therefore, the Byronic hero does not fulfil the traditional heroic roles because of his petty subsistence - level anxieties, his frequent physical imperfections, and his embroilment in the grotesque messiness of day to day living. His overwhelming presence is the expression of that total self-absorption that makes his universe and that

of the work in which he appears pivot entirely on his idiosyncratic ego. In such egocentric self-assertion lies one of the turning points towards anti-hero.

In this concept one important element plays a crucial role to create antihero i.e. irony and more especially self irony. And it is applicable to the Byronic hero because he disconnects himself with what he speaks. His alienation has progressed so far as to breed a genuine detachment not only from his world but also from himself. Often admittedly his self-mockery has the bitterest flavour, nonetheless its very presence denotes an ability to stand back from his own problems and to some extent at least to rise above them by seeing them from a point outside himself. Because of his dual vision, the anti-hero is frequently a tragic comic figure, envisaging with characteristics ambivalence the black humour as well as the pathos of his situation. He may in fact be the clown, masking behind grotesque laughter, his shattering perception of the abyss.

It is no doubt Byron came at the crest of a great heroic tradition in literature. It is only fair to enjoin that he went over that crest too, and on down towards Byron's famous invocation for Don Juan, as a hero is as Harry Levin has so astutely pointed out in his essay "Society as Its Own Historian" in which he claims, "The dominant position of Don Juan stands already well on the way to the modern antihero" (176).

Byronic hero's dominance stems not from his activity, but from the interest in the psyche. Since his heroic assertion is the egocentric one of his own personality, far indeed from the hero's traditional commitment to a cause outside of himself. This reversal is, of course, the outcome of the romantic cult of the exceptional individual, who is called anti-hero.

Physical passion plays a crucial role to anti-hero which appears dominant in the Byronic hero. It represents ultimate loss of identity. Like Henry fielding's famous



protagonist Tom Jones come close to incestuous passion, only to be rescued by comically elaborate twists of the plot. Tom Jones is a lusty, passionate highly sexed young man, as well as impulsively generous and easily moved by others sufferings. David Daiches points out the characteristics of Tom Jones, he says, "Tom was besides active, genteel, gay and good humoured and had a flow of animal spirits which enlivened every conversation where he was present" (719).

Fielding also draws on the picaresque tradition to set his characters on the road and by involving them in a great variety of misadventures by the roadside at inns, and in various situation through which they pass, gives a sense of the colour and variety of unheroic acts.

The description of Tom Jones as a 'founding' is built round the question of the identity of Tom. What keeps the plot going is Tom's continuous betrayal by his indiscretions into the hands either of his enemies or of fortune. Each time the consequences of his imprudence or folly seems to be leading to disaster, until in the end he is in prison about to be accused of murder. But Tom wins through to reconciliation with All Worthy, to fortune, and to the hand of the beautiful and virtuous Sophia. Fielding here attack those person, who broods for self interest that acts out virtue on the public stage but is privately selfish and cruel. Tom Jones is in anti-heroic stance because of his selfishness cruelty and lack of compassion.

*Tom Jones*, a novel, is the most meticulous response to the challenge of classical epic and most considered comic redefinition of the role of the epic hero. *Tom Jones* is presented as confused and morally suspected. But the reward that comes by fate to Tom not because he deserves it. He is an unheroic hero who is sentimentally saved at the end.

Therefore, the picaresque form offered the opportunity to expose the protagonist of the corrupt influence of the world. Picaro is an anti-hero because of his character traits. The characters are shown to be self-deceived pursuing phantoms which elude their grasp, or when achieved bring no satisfaction or sense of fulfilment of hero.

#### Anti-Heroes in Post-War British Literature

As the racing motion of an ideal pursuit slows down, there emerges the figure of the anti-hero. The earlier heroes of Evelyn's brilliantly explored the possibility of such hero as fool, reversing the traditional English view, as old at least as Henry Fielding, that ignorance of the wicked world, innocence, virtue and heroism go together. This produced an extremely sophisticated and cruelly ironical kind of comedy. He remains witty in his inventiveness of character and incident. The novels of Graham Greene explored the disparities between human decency and theological virtue, between moral intention and irreligious so as to produce impossibility of heroism in the modern world.

With the establishment of the welfare state and the emergence of the generation of young writer such as Aldus Huxley and Waugh, they reflected the theme of heroic parody. The sensitive young man looked back to the promise of a world of high culture, which never was and never will be his world, with the sense of having been cheated. This effect is closely seen on the drama of fifties; it can be seen in less degree in the novels. One begins to see in English fiction from the beer drinking provincial student, schoolmaster or university lecturer surrounded by a philistine affluent society which is utterly indifferent to the job they are doing and implicitly denies the value which such a job stands for, mocking his own cultural pretensions and playing the role of compromiser. This theme and attitude, which

touched the new generation closely, led them, towards the larger problem of possibilities of life and art of modern individual. The characteristic novelist's attitude here is not anger but partly self-pity masochism, partly concern.

The general mood of the people in Britain during 1950s was that of frustration, disillusionment, cynic, rebellion and even despair. Jimmy Porter, a protagonist of John Osborne's *Look Back in Anger*, who explored the status of protagonist as an anti-hero, cleverly represents this mood of people.

He is raw, unpolished even unwashed, certainly unwilling to take the role assigned to him by society and his parent's expectations. He is a bore; a self-pitying, self-dramatizing intellectual rebel who drives his wife away, taken a mistress and then drops her. He is perhaps a character who should have gone on a psychiatrist than have come to a dramatist. He is insufferable, but the author intended him to be representative of the younger generation. Jimmy, a provincial graduate, who most of the time is roaring his contempt for the middle and upper classes and intended for any orderly plan of living. He has chosen to quarrel with everyone, run a sweet-stall, and live in an animal way in an extremely sordid one-room flat. There is no ordered society into which he can enter, no tradition that he can inherit. The war has left him a derelict character, and he sees society such as it is, as some thing hostile. The old standards have broken down and their old opportunities are missing. He has had some sort of university education. But society is so mixed and he himself so weak, hysterical and rudderless that he is unable to make any use of his education. Osborne portrays him as living a mean and ineffective way with a friend on the proceeds of a sweet-stall.

Still, the fifties was the decade when post-war generation began to feel itself energetic in the cultural mood. Some of the signs of new energy appeared in the

writing of Graham Greene and Philip Larkin. John Wains' protagonist Charles Lumley, on completing education becomes a window cleaner; a hospital orderly, chauffeur drug courier, nightclub bouncer-to end up finally in the highly fashionable but classless occupation of a BBC radio comedy script writer. Lumley is another common-sense anti-hero, with a lot of social and literary hostilities to gratify; he has giving truthfulness too, which makes the story closer to realistic picaresque. He is in revolt against his grammar-school upbringing and his university education, which promises a life of convention. He decides not to go 'up' to a conventional life in society, but 'down'. So he tries to purge his class background by taking a variety of odd jobs.

In similar spirit it was left to other new writers of the fifties to explore a spirit of social or rebellion protest protagonist seemed frankly accepting of a society in which a new offence was available. Joe Lampton, a protagonist in John Brain's *Room at The Top* exploits his looks and sexual magnetism to make his way upward out of the drab Yorkshire to London and success where he fantasizes about a successful life. Lampton's success is not heroic because he corrupts himself in the process in order to achieve his goal. He is anxious to rise above his working class origins to become a flourishing member of the affluent society whose conspicuous consumption he cannot help envying, destroys the integrity of his personal relationships. He is dissatisfied, sarcastic and cynic as Jimmy Porter,

Some of the protagonist of post war novels seemed to be a return to the working class fiction of the thirties. The protagonist of Allen Siltoes reflected this mood. Arther Seaton in *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning* worked as a captain in a Nottingham bicycle factory. Wage-rises make him in increasingly affluent but he hangs on the old working class resentments and hatred for all authority. He wants to

take his pleasures, financial and sexual, have his fun and cheat the world before it cheats him. His weapon is cunning, but his pay pocket and his sexual needs limit his rebellion. His anarchist's passions for freedom are finally stifled in the usual way, by having to get married. His characteristics stand him purely an antihero because of his animalistic passion, isolation and cunningness. Malcolm Bradbury in his book *The British Novel* views Arther Seaton as a true anti-hero:

The message down with the ruling class can here with the voice of Seaton who is a sort of anti-hero who is honest to himself or at least tries to be but whose gorge rises at the thought of having to conform to the expectations of the establishment. (242)

The writer as angry young man who finds the classical trainings they received at university was useless in the outside world. So they slide down their education career's ladder into increasing mundane jobs. The humorous novels, and others in the same vein, represented an attack on the unworldly intellectualism and protected existence of socially privileged people. The large number of writers who reflected their disillusionment in their writing had marked this trend. In result, the characters they portray were not heroic. Their ideas of antihero they created on the basis of the complexities of ethical choice, a disenchantment with simple solutions often it reveals a certain bitterness but also the establishment of new taste individual who enveloped self-sacrifice, courage and justice.

The gritty new working class sensibility, which was associate with the Angry young men started off in a low-key way with the writers, who created no heroic protagonist. They were, however, though unsure about their creation. They covered their characters with aggression, not willing to fit it with their expected place in society. Such heroes wanted to experiment with sex, without settling down and

getting married to the first person they sleep with. Philip Larkin, better known as a poet, echoed such characters in his novel *Jill*. He presented his hero as crippled by caution and self-doubt, which is the man to whom nothing happens. He is self-centered and irrational because of his biased and unfair behaviour.

On a different plane more directly but no less potently, the anti-hero may and does become the object of implicit or explicit critique on the part of the author. The obvious example is, of course, the post-war novelists who lay great stress on the act form of novels. They rejected the irrelevancies of Victorian; they're moralizing and direct appeal to the readers instead. They exposed social pretence and the sexual trap which lays the waiting for the male. Predominantly an amusing force, its main subject in the boorish provoked by insufferable sham culture in provincial backwater. They accentuated the individual will with money, status and class and traveled in the disintegration of its plot construction. The anxiety or dilemma seems very characteristics of many novelists of the period. They persist and even attain a form of anti-heroic success by steadfastly changing their goals. In that age the faith, as traditional heroes are here to come by and harder still to come because of their blood stained hands and back unbowed by the consequences of their options. Victor Brombert shows how a new kind of hero has risen from the anti-heroic model. He says:

Post-war hero fails by design to live up to conventional expectation of mythic heroes. Coming from diverse cultural and linguistic tradition they are all figured as anti-hero by embodying the spirit of an uneasy age. (27)

Sometimes the uncertain relation of artist to person is a characteristic of anti-heroic literature like James Joyce's *Portrait of the Artist*, the writers' commitment to

his varies, and this oscillation between sympathetic self-identification and irony is not an artistic flow but a necessary element in the post-war anti-heroic fictions. It is true that this anti-heroic neutrality tends towards Philistinism, as many critics have suggested. The anti-hero doesn't have the confidence in his own values which world allows him to interfere, to impose his own strong opinions on other people. His lack of heroic aspirations appears to end inevitably in passivity. He admits that he is superior to most of the people he observes. But his lucid account of his inadequacies, his fear of heroic postures and his compassion bring him out in a frightening manner which creates dilemma of the ideas he presents.

By observing the manner in which an anti-hero resolves, one can gain insight into their qualities, values and personality as an antagonistic force towards society where a character is at odds with a particular social force or a condition produced by society, such poverty, political revolution, a social convention or set of value. These aspects may be emotional, intellectual or moral. A moral conflicting might pose a choice between honoring family or country. Such conflicts typically leave the character indecisive and agitated. When such conflicts are resolved, the resolution may be successful or unsuccessful even though he fits readily into the anti-hero mold.

From the beginning post-war literature draws the attention of the reader to observe 'unheroic hero' or the prototype of heroes of inaction. Anti-hero designates a multifaceted concept in which no single definition or theoretical approach would do justice. For Brombert, "it is above all a 'question of mode as of mode', which "implies the negative presence of the subverted or absent model " (2).

Paradoxically the new hero is the anti-hero C.B. Cox quoting the ideas from John Fowles, in his essay "Philip Larkin; Anti-heroic poet" presents the ideas about the future of antihero:

The smallest hope, a bare continuing to exist is enough for the anti-hero's future; leave him, says our age, here him where mankind is in its history, at a crossroads, in a dilemma, with all to lose and only more of the same to win; let him survive but give him no direction, no reward....(155)

#### Anti -Heroes Standpoints

The anti-hero is not adhering to ethical or moral principles. He is characterized by wickedness and immorality; deviating from what is considered right or proper or good. He is very selfish in case of his personal well being and desires to harm anyone who comes between him and his personal happiness. He is also known as Picaro, a wonderer who tends to favor violent acts. He is mean, possessive, cowardice and fatalist, no sterling moral qualities he has displayed.

Anti-hero is not true to 'type', 'status', 'age', 'profession', 'sex', and his social rank. He is a sole individual as an outsider because he has no belongingness to particular community, tradition and the ideas of social welfare. He finds himself at odd among the crowd because he never represents the common human nature. He is not life-like and only his choice determines his action not others. He develops his own code of conduct reversing the traditional and historical personage. He is often witty, comic and opportunist. His action and words doesn't match to determine his goal. He is wanton, wicked and servile. He has no guaranteed identity; he lacks the dignity in his life. He is not brave; he tries to revolt towards his enemies with trickery in secret not boldly in front of them. He is a hedonist; only obsessed to find his way of benefits, neglecting social values, norms and his nobility.

Even he is not true to his own nature. He is a rash and impulsive who acts rarely; if he acts he goes rashly and impulsively. In course of action he has ability to



disguise himself and capacity to change his goals according to the situation. He seems immature and a source of evils. He is greedy limitlessly to possess material satisfaction. Therefore sometimes, he makes us laugh at him.

He undermines the coherence of civilization and its own medium of language itself. He is quick to transform reality into fantasy and his speeches sometimes damns his own self but he never cares about it. He deviates from conventional values, he is graceless and his size, stature, nobility attire, action and speech are ordinary. He is immaculate, liar and seducer. He is incapable of sacrifice because he promises to perform fraud and has a lost moment of remorse. His identity is unstable who starts off possessing unlikely traits such as prejudice, cockiness or a single-minded focusing on things such as wealth, revenge and profit. So anti-heroes are insignificant, weak or flawed in the novels and plays. The reader or viewer is forced to sympathise or relate to a wholly unlikable character and to directly confront their feeling for this kind of protagonist.

Inexpedient and philistine are other standpoints of anti-hero. When a person is called a philistine; he is said to despise spiritual values. Philistines are also said to be materialistic to favor conventional social values unthinking, and to favor forms of art that have a cheap and easy appeal. The philistines embody a smug, anti-intellectual concept. Anti-hero is quite often unsure about his origin. Pretension, hypocrisy and mechanistic behaviors always appeal to him. His farcical linguistic exchange among characters shape itself sometimes into correspondence or sometimes misunderstanding. He frequently shows critical attitude towards the people around him. The plot and incidents covers comic and funny dialogue to label anti-hero as perfect idiot.

To sum up with anti-hero and its traits from picaresque narratives to modern period is confined to individual quality of disillusioned, trickery, inept and wanton. Post-war literature like of angry young man and many other social writers played an influential role in formulating anti-heroic concept. At present the anti-hero comes from the gap what one thinks a precious gift to perform anti-social acts. He is as a mirror for social commentary and political critique. His character is taken as fatal role in the story, skirting potentially negative attention that lacks any last-minute salvation.

### III. APPLYING THE IDEAS OF ANTI-HERO TO JIM DIXON

#### Story in Brief

The narrative of *Lucky Jim* centers on the thoughts and feelings of Jim Dixon. He is an unremarkable young lecturer in the history department of a provincial college in England. Dixon is meek in every way except for his sardonic mental commentaries on the people around him, which focus on the nuances of other people's voices appearance, or language. He also vents his frustration with others through faces he makes to himself in private, some of which have actual titles such as the Martin-invader face or the Evelyn Waugh face. In general, Dixon spends most of the novel trying hard to seem honest and decent on the outside when on the inside a different voice urges.

At the beginning of the novel, Dixon is a gentleman, although his thoughts are not. His indecisive actions and quite demeanor habit reflect his fear of being fired from his post at the end of the term of the college. Dixon's meekness also reflect his fear of being fired from his teaching post as well as fear of hurting Margaret, a girlfriend and colleague. Dixon despises unnecessary complexity, pomposity, hypocrisy towards those people like artists, singer and other high classes. Dixon has not made a good impression upon the faculty and knows that his superior professor Neddy Welch could ask him to leave the job at the end of term. Fearful of making further bad impression or revealing his inner disgust for Welch, Dixon agrees to give the end-of-term lecture on the theme of 'Merrie England' and to stay with the Welch the following weekend of music and arts. At the party Dixon meets Welch's son Bertrand and his girlfriend Christine. He quarrels with the Bertrand, gets drunk and sets Mrs. Professor's bed on fire with a cigarette. Afraid of further chances of firing

from job, Dixon attempts to hide the damage. Christine unexpectedly finds Dixon's dilemma very funny and she agrees to help him. Dixon rallies towards Christine and wins her favour. He finds out that Christine's uncle Gore Urquhart is a business tycoon where Dixon hoped to work for.

Dixon spends the following week planning to write his 'Merrie England' lecture in a nostalgic way that will appeal to the professor Welch, but Welch himself keeps Dixon preoccupied with menial fact checking for Welch's own work. On the day of Dixon's lecture, Bertrand comes on to Dixon's room and accuses Dixon of seeing Christine behind his back. Shaken up and nervous, Dixon drinks quite a lot at the reception before his lecture. Dixon rounds out the lecture by expressing his contempt for the subject. He starts to imitate the values and accents of those whom he reviles before proceeding to articulate in his own clear voice. He inadvertently imitates the voices of professor Welch and the college principal. He makes him loathe to what he calls, "the Merrie England crowd as well as homemade pottery crowd, the organic husbandry crowd, the recorder playing crowd" (240). The performance loses Dixon his job but luck finally comes his way and he is offered a well-paying job in London. Dixon embarks on the train for London with Christine, to work as a private secretary for a wealthy patron of the arts, Gore Urquhart.

Not only does Dixon exchange his unchallenging teaching job at a drab provincial university for well paying job in the capital, he also trades in his girlfriend Margaret for a ritzy upper-middle-class woman, Christine Callaghan, whom he had originally loathed as a representative of the very class that stood for privilege phony and pretentiousness. This turnaround seems curious and suggests that, despite Dixon's earlier posturing against upper-class elitism, he seems to content himself eventually to include into the same system.

The striking quality of Jim Dixon, after all, is that he is able, for the most part of the novel to repress and keep at bay in delightfully comical ways his frustration and anger about living in a class-ridden society. Dixon is mainly involved in humorous encounters with class rivals. He is inwardly and comically at odds with the academic, artistic and socio-cultural values in which his philistine values are more important than others. Therefore the present study attempts to analyze this text with the help of theoretical modalities taken from the concept of anti-hero.

#### Dixon's Attitudes towards the Values of English Society

Dixon identifies himself as a new British social type : the working or lower middle class university graduate who has been educated out of his own class but who has no ambition to become gentleman; who has been taught to relish the prerequisites of power but who regards to power game, as it is played in Britain as ridiculous and immoral. Jim Dixon's resentment of his department head professor Neddy Welch is very heavy because Welch, who holds power over him and personifies the self-loving aristocratic old teacher that represents the history speaking man, the traditions. Dixon evidently dislikes both the aristocratic cultural ambiance at college and the antiquated English Syllabus. But he tries to intrigue himself with Welch to save his job that to whom Dixon regards as a pretentious buffoon. Dixon's probationary period in the college nearly finished so he breaks his true feelings and becomes willing to accept the ideas of Welch. The discrepancy between the venomously critical thoughts Dixon has created about the people around him but outwardly he shows meek behavior towards them. This habit has been clearly seen in the conversation with professor Welch:

He pretended to himself that he'd pick up his professor round the waist, squeeze the fury grey blue waistcoat against him to expel the

breath; run heavily with him up the steps, along the corridor to the staff cloak room, and plunge the too-small feet in their capless shoes into a lavatory basin, pulling the plug once, twice and again, stuffing the mouth with toilet paper thinking of this he only smiled. (2-3)

This is the comic strength of Dixon's contempt for those around him. He invents and imagines horrific faces for himself to express his inner frustration, and he describes Welch's absent-minded behavior to himself with vivid metaphors. This provokes the irritation towards the old-guard faculty. Welch is 'cultured' in the ivory tower sense to swearing himself 'my word' but due to this expansion of the British college system World War Second Welch and others like him find themselves working at newly build colleges and teaching a student population that suddenly includes students of different social backgrounds. The incongruity of Welch and other faculty in the new learning environment furnishes much of the critical attitude of Jim Dixon.

Dixon loathes his subject, his job and all the social and cultural affectations of university life. He is filled with impotent fury and bunching his fists, thrusting his hands in his pockets. He hated his professor's cat as a symbol of domesticity and old tradition. Most of all, he hates the academic world. In course of his conversation with his friend Beesley Dixon expresses his disdain towards his own subject. He says to Beesley, "Haven't you noticed how we all specialize in what we hate most?" (33). This paragraphing is the result of a meticulous collaboration of the headings like the library, the lecture, the job and the medievalism. Dixon's boredom is caught when he reviews his own sentences, "In considering this strangely neglected topic, it began. This what neglected topic? This strangely what topic? This strangely neglected what?" (14). Dixon hates the primitive, even though he hates his particular area of

specialization, the Middle Ages. He broods upon its values in study. Therefore he reflects that:

Those who profess themselves unable to believe in the reality of human progress ought to cheer themselves up [...] by a short study of the Middle Ages. The hydrogen bomb, the south African Government, Chiang Kai-Shek, senator Mccarthy himself, would then seem a light price to pay for no longer being in the Middle Ages [...] people ever been as nasty, as self-indulgent, as dull, as miserable as cocksure, as bad at art, as dismally ludicrous or as wrong as they'd been in the Middle Ages?. (87)

The narrative of novel moves quickly from episode to episode, in a reminiscent of picaresque without achieving much character growth. While the form seems similar, one cannot yet tell whether Dixon will have grown by the end of the novel or not. Dixon does not reveal his contempt directly for academia to Welch because of the fear of loosing his job and even he cannot reveal his frustrations to his girlfriend Margaret for her sensitiveness towards Dixon. Just as Welch holds fast to traditional scholarly hierarchies, Margaret also holds fast to traditional gender hierarchy. But Dixon is very perceptive about the outward appearances and actions of others. Therefore, his conversation with Margaret is described in terms of strategic warfare and he associates this with deceptive language not only with her but also with all women:

Look, Margaret, you know as well as I do that I can't sing, I can't act, I can't hardly read and thank God I can't read music. Welch wants to test my reactions to culture, see I'm a fit person to teach in a university?' [...] you will have to start finding out what he's got lined

up for me. So I can start thinking up reasons for not being able to do it.

(24)

Dixon's disagreement against approved high culture, aestheticism, music, art, indeed the hangovers of Bloomsbury seem demonically bent upon the emotional professional and social ruination. He is inspired as much by fear of unemployment rather than cultural ideals. But he seems very unable to cooperate with this reality. Instead he imagines entangling himself longing for London for a better town, which could fulfill his desire. He imagines:

Out there, he thought how nice it would be if he could give up his dual role of conciliator and go right away from here. Five minutes would be ample for a vituperative phone-call to Welch and a short statement of the facts of the case to Margaret. Then he would go and pack a few clothes and get on the ten forty for London. He was certain it was an image of London, and just as certain that it wasn't any part of London he'd ever visited. (26)

In Bathroom Dixon's longing for an imaginary London sky space, introduces as his deep desire to escape to such places. He feels the urge to runaway but the combination of economic necessity forces him back into provincial university. This provides a form of psychological compensation for the hypocrisies of being pleasant to such works he does not like. He imagines avoiding reality, seeing no benefit in knowing the reasons that causes events to happen. He possesses an avid imagination: his child like daydreams and imaginings reveal an underlying longing for material and emotional comfort. He has various moments of self-projection in which he injects himself into fantastical scenes. He wishes for a fairy godmother to come by and rescue him.



Dixon exhibited an unashamed philistinism rejecting mercy towards anything. He appreciates his philistine values rather than those of Welch's Madrigal singing session's and Bertrand's endorsement of modernist aesthetics. He had a few truths inscribed in his phylactery. Among them, one is "nice things were nicer than nasty things" (133). The nice things include girls, strong drinks and cigarettes. The nasty things are such as music and art, "When he overhears someone singing he identifies the tune as "some skein of untiring facetiousness by filthy Mozart" (16).

Dixon is more at home in the pub than at musical soirées and academic activities. He says, "I've never been much of dancing and singing man [...] far as I am concerned it would be just money thrown away" (49). But he spends money for drinking beers and smoking. He counts his cigarettes with care, for reasons of cost, not for health. He describes the bar as a peaceful home, "He goes to local pubs, unlike the city pubs and the hotel [...] till ten-thirty during the summer. As a result he drunk more than he ought, he spent more than he could afford, and yet he felt nothing but satisfaction and peace" (54).

There is a touch of the picaresque rouge in Jim Dixon's character. Jim perpetrates a succession of jokes, tricks and deceptions on other characters in the novel. He registers embarrassment of the most acute sort when he reflects upon the Margaret, to whom "he had been drawn by a combination of virtues he hadn't known he possessed: politeness, friendly interest, ordinary concern, a good natured willingness to be imposed upon, a desire for unequivocal friendship" (156).

The social world of Dixon became increasingly stuck in a narrow realm of pubs and parties. Though Jim is enabled by his wit, but hindered by his humorous instincts and attitudes, even when he is being very funny. His wit is too reckless and too nimble to be contained or focused; animosities invariably spill over and frequently

rebound upon himself. Dixon is excessive, out of control and beyond the pale. His activities are as rouge's progress. Like Picaro, Jim overflows with vitality "As he left the bar with Christine at his side, Dixon felt like a special agent, a picaroon, a Chicago war lord a hidalgo, an oil baron, a mohock" (187).

#### Relationships to the People around Him

Dixon is casted into unfavourable relations with other characters in the novel who make his existence quite trying. His involvement with Margaret is marked by his desire to see their relationship at end. His association with Professor Welch incessantly lands him in a disagreeable position. Moreover, Dixon does nothing to amend this, and the reader becomes frustrated with Jim's inaction, and his ready acceptance to let things carry on as they are. However, Dixon's extraordinary comic sense continually lightens the severity of his predicament and makes living with his problems much easier. His relationship with Margaret is the source of considerable anxiety and distress; yet he dodges the need to remedy to his anxiety. He sees Margaret as a girl possessing "Minimal prettiness" (505), a person who is not enjoyable to spend time with, and whom he knows as manipulative. So, according to his toughness, he judges Margaret in different ways.

At the same time, he wishes to see Margaret continuously. Because he thinks that beautiful girls are not for him. As well, it seems to come from an unprecedented, yet sense of duty combined with pity; and a belief that he hasn't "got the guts to leave her" (201). His sensual feelings towards Margaret hardly disappear. He tries to manipulate Margaret:

Dixon is sitting beside Margaret on the bed, putting his arm round her shoulders and kissing her firmly on the mouth. Whatever his motives his wish is to bring their relationship in crisis. His worry about his job

all came into it and he kissed her again harder. He remembered dimly he'd advised her not to get into even the mildest sexual entanglement. He thinks has it far to him? Only handling her as a female friend as a lover? (57-58)

Essentially, Dixon lacks confidence in his relationship with Margaret.

Furthermore, it is extremely frustrating because he makes no attempt at freeing himself from his laborious relationship, which he recognizes as antagonistic. He notes with precision that Margaret's behaviour is theoretical, not natural, but he planned ahead of time to secure a certain response, however he chooses to ignore this at the same time. This shows his confusion towards his relationship. To make matters even worse for Dixon, he spends more time with her. For instance, he is often "averting his attention from the thought that Margaret would be there" (204). Dixon again makes no effort to relieve him from her acquaintance. He fails to act. Jim's failure to action against Margaret is very disconcerting which leaves him as coward and dishonest.

Much like Jim's involvement with Margaret, his association with Professor Welch is very discouraging. Moreover, he hates Welch because he belongs to upper-class and Dixon is fed up with the upper class people, their parties and calling of their children by French names. Dixon is bored not only by Welch's account but by the musical concert itself. He has not of course to express his frustration but suppresses it. His disapproval of having to express disgust to Welch points out that Dixon lacks confidence to free himself from the burden and the dull company of Welch. He only imagines Welch's down and fantasizes, "intended to tie Welch up in his chair and beat him about the head and shoulders with the bottle until he disclose why?" (15).

Instead of expressing real feelings towards Welch, Dixon forcefully writes an article, and tries to publish in order to gain favourable standing with Welch. Though

inwardly he reveals his dislike for any form of writing which reflects his position as a lecturer. He randomly writes, "It was a perfect title, in that it crystallized the article's niggling mindlessness, funeral parade of yawn-enforcing facts, the pseudo-light it threw on non problems" (14).

Notwithstanding that Dixon association with Welch and Margaret is frustrating and hindering, Dixon's wit and inclination toward the absurd counter to them creates dilemma. In one instance, Dixon is attending an extremely bore (as Jim says) "arty-get together" (23) in Welch's home. Following the excessive drinking of the evening, Dixon smokes a cigarette and coaxes himself to sleep on one of Mrs. Welch's guest beds. Upon awakening the following morning, his head was throbbing. He discovers that his cigarette has burned several gaping holes in the sheet. Desperately not wanting to confess what he has done, he plots to conceal the incident. In contrast to the dreary get-together, this outrageous incident lightens up his mood, of trick, fear and rage.

Dixon exhibits further ridiculous behaviour in celebrating the completion of a laborious task that Welch has assigned to him. He feels it is a very disgusting task and for him he acts as a comedian.

With a long jabbering belch, Dixon got up from the chair where held been writing and did his ape imitation all round the room with one arm bent at the elbow so that he fingers brushed the armpit, the other crooked in the air so that the inside of the fore arm lay across the top of his head, he wove with bent knees and hunched, rocking shoulders across to the bed, upon which he jumped up and down a few times, gibbering to himself. (205)

Initially, the reader is relieved that Dixon has finished his assignment, yet with the addition of this slapstick monologue, the moment becomes a delightful departure from the annoyances of his world. He also vents irritation through off-handed, comical thoughts he has while in the company of Welch and Margaret. This hysterical digression allows him to endure Welch with certain degree of composure. In order to maintain self-respect, Dixon resorts to a comic fantastic world in which he can express rage or loathing towards Welch.

Likewise in spending time with Margaret, he illustrates the therapeutics nature of his humorous fantastical attacks. In a scene where Margaret is attempting to manipulate Dixon, one perceives his hilarious mental outbursts. There is a calming effect in his voice, “Do you hate me? James? She said. Dixon wanted to run at her and tip her backwards in the chair, to make a deafening rude noise in her face, to push a bead up her nose. How do you mean? He asked” (156). One notices the sharp contrast between the farcical animosity of Dixon’s thoughts and his smooth verbal response immediately. This is Dixon collecting himself by means of releasing hostility while keeping it all contained in his head.

Bertrand, a son of Professor Welch, is almost ridiculously portrayed by Dixon as his father. Thus Bertrand seems to be a worthy rival for Dixon rather than merely the butt of Dixon’s contempt. Christine, Bertrand’s girlfriend, is the only character who truly sets herself apart from the Welch family. When Dixon hears about the wealthy uncle of Christine, Gore Uruqhart, he casts eyes upon her because he is nearly loosing position in the Department. Bertrand furiously accuses Dixon of deliberately provoking him and walks away with Christine. Dixon begins to choose his own fate. He praises the beauty of Margaret and flirt for Christine. He tries to pretend that he does not like Christine. He says to Margaret, “I don’t like women of

that age, who try to act the gracious lady. Bit of prig too. She does seem rather as if she's tarred with the same brush as Bertrand. (44)

This pretentious and showy behaviour of Dixon towards Christine and Margaret is coincidental. But Margaret's response to the conclusion of their relationship comes to strike Dixon as a fool. She says, "You don't think she'd have you? A shabby little provincial like you or has she had you already? Perhaps she just wanted a beer drinking scholar out?" (157).

Bertrand's unpleasant presence as his Head of Department's son and Christine's current boyfriend makes Dixon irritate on one hand and his quarrel with Bertrand raise a question of his standing position in the department on the other. Dixon rouses up the courage to ask Welch about his standing period but Welch tells Dixon nothing has been decided yet. Dixon becomes furious but he does not expose his fury to Welch. At the same time he recalls the conversation with Mrs. Welch in which he pretended as a Newspaper reporter in phone call. He was still in fear of rude behaviour from the side of Mrs. Welch too, who could put his job on the stake. But Christine really appreciates Dixon's phone calls to Mrs Welch that provides a set of good relationship between them. But it can be no accident that the first signal of Christine's attraction to Dixon comes when she admits that "I thought that the evening phone calls was brilliantly funny" (191).

There are some aspects of Dixon's life which ring surprisingly familiar tones. For instance his urgency to get something published: his article on 'Ship Building' and his keenness to get the three good-looking girls of his class. It is clear that Michie is his only student who calls him 'sir'. But Dixon does not want to take him into his class because Michie is a very talented student and Dixon fears from his talent. When Michie said the syllabus is quite interesting, Dixon plans to change it because if he

does not like it, he would be out of class and Dixon could play with other three pretty girls. He mentally resolves to further change it to attract girls and to discourage Michie. Dixon says, "I will have another look at it, anyway and see if anything can be cut out. Because I think feeling of ladies is that, the reading is a good deal on the heavy side" (97).

But when later Michie said three pretty girls are not interested in his subject this announcement pained Dixon. He wanted "three pretty girls to have conquered their objections and opted for his subjects because he was so nice and so attractive" (124).

This clearly reflects the mood of Dixon in which he is obsessed to follow the beautiful girls despite his academic purpose. He even chooses his course not according to the interests of mass but the interests of beautiful girls of the class. Similarly, Jim's pursuit of Christine is an antagonism to Margaret. So he is selfish completely. Dixon shows respect to Gore-Uruqhart, a patron of art because he offers a job to Dixon. Therefore Jim Dixon is a man who possesses saving grace but not heroic blessings. His comic behaviour and his jokes help him to deserve the place what he had imagined. But he includes him in such system that he used to hate and showed contempt.

#### Unheroic Journey and Misadventures

Jim Dixon has the gift of precipitating the most impossible situations, situation which can't be explained away. Thus, on his first appearance in the university, he appears to have gratuitously assaulted the professor of English. He is not able to gather his courage and tells Welch his vexations but instead he tells "himself that what was that this man had decisive power over his future" (8). In the beginning of novel, he is in the arty-get together. In the middle of the party he comes back disliking

the guests and jumps through the pub. This shows Jim's irresponsibility in his job on the one hand and insincerity towards the people on the other. His way of overcoming obstacles are by eating, drinking and smoking.

Dixon is not going through the series of character developments to show his courage and confidence. He is certainly lax and unskilled at self-examination; he seems happiest pretending to be someone else, impersonating people on the telephone or forging letters. This unheroic hero, with conflicts and tensions beyond his own comprehension, sustains a high wire desperate action which keeps his audience, including readers, off-balance. His volatile energies are very funny and quite desparating.

Dixon stands for anything; he defines himself mainly by what he despises. He is a contemporary descendent, the Picaro, attractive but fundamentally mischievous and self seeking, a rogue or a bit of a bastard. We indulge the rascal, perhaps to the Sextent that recognizes him as infantile, libidinal and unrealized impulses. Yet under scrutiny his character is bound to cause confusion and ambiguity. It omits rather less appealing qualities one might just as readily attribute to Dixon, such as cowardice, passivity and timidity. He often behaves unscrupulously, in way that may provoke both amusement and impatience.

Jim Dixon's origin is not identified clearly in the novel. But his chronology of education is slightly presented. In his schooling, he studied in the grammar school and got scholarship in the provincial college; where he was teaching. He is clumsy and careless and even sneaky and mean to those people who provided him education. He directs his disdain at everything insight, including his own scholarship.

Dixon's actions are motivated by a lower, primordial nature with insatiable greed for materialistic satisfaction. Welch's incitation in the weekend and Dixon's



fight with Bertrand for the sake of Christine is quite unheroic. The weekend and the events which follow, the Ball, and the preparation for his lecture upon Merrie England, all serve as a Dixon's petty behaviour towards the people. His true identity, he reveals himself only at the end of novel as he says, "I am the boredom detector I am a finally turned instrument. If only I could get hold of a millionaire I'd be worth a bag of money" (134). Dixon does not want to face the situation of disaster, i.e. his teaching job and cannot overcome Margaret. He only desires to escape from all disaster. When Gore Uruqhart offers him a job for his secretary he thinks "It was been luck, that had freed from pity's adhesive plaster" (243).

In fact Dixon's Journey to setting new job is not his intellectual victory. It's just luck and his comic behaviour to obtain new post. Gore Uruqhart is impressed by Dixon's contempt for Merrie England's drunken lecture in which Dixon reflects, "Listen and I'll tell you. The point about Merrie England is that it was about the most un-Merrie period in our history. It's only different sorts of crowd and Esperants" (191).

As the lecture continues, it shifts into the public display of Dixon's debased position, as his remorse for his miserable job and he takes over his own lecture with purpose. He reads the materials he has written with blatant contempt, and changes the actual text to articulate his complete disgust. Dixon begins to seize control of his performance, he speaks with an exaggerated version of his own northern accent, and this adds to his statement setting him off from redefined accents of Oxford or Cambridge. Professor Welch and the principal approach Dixon to drag off-stage, but Dixon passes out first. He loses his teaching job. But the morality behind ending of novel is not difficult to pin down. Dixon overcomes the burden of Margaret, Christine

leaves Bertrand and Gore-Uruqhart offers Dixon job-seems entirely like happy ending.

Dixon finally become able to articulate his interior frustration with those around him but does not seem to have improved himself in any specific way. The ethics that Dixon and Christine subscribe to the end of the novel center hedonistically on acting on their desires, rather than taking other people into consideration. This sort of self-centered ethos can be seen in Dixon's final explosive laughter at the Welch which also points to Dixon's new alliance with Christine,

Dixon drew in breath to denounce them both, then blew it all out again in a howl of laughter His steps faltered [...] with Christine tugging at his arm he halted in the middle of the group, slowly doubling up like a man with the stitch.[...] Dixon allowed Christine to lead him away up the street. (251)

Here, Dixon flight from university to personal secretary is not heroic. He hurts Margaret and persuades Bertrand's fiancé Christine. He is inconsistent in his position and rank. He desired to denounce all the academic values and achievements. His being is based upon discrete. He has no past and no future. He asserts his freedom in the imagination. Dixon is imaginings and his behaviours show that he identifies himself as a representative of the traditional figure of trickster clown. His inability to see the whole, his absorption, in particular the repetitions in his experience, and his tendency to ignore causality on the large scale all incline with his multiple roles he plays. And he starts to parade unheroic journey with multiple personality.

Farcical Linguistic Exchange as an Indication of Personality

The activities of Dixon also extend itself to language and he is gifted in his ability to subvert the hackneyed language of others. For example, when Welch

exclaims "My word; the narrative continues, quickly deciding on his own word, Dixon said it to himself" (130). Thus Welch is made ridiculous by Dixon as his own language is turned back on him. Jim uses language full of jokes and attunes to the egocentric conversational style. When Dixon prepares to telephone Christine to cancel tea-date, Mrs. Welch receives the calls and in a panic, Dixon pretends to be an operator ringing someone from London, then asks to speak with Christine in a strange accent:

‘Who’s that speaking, please?’

Dixon rocked to and fro as if in grief, bringing his mouth up to the phone and back again as he spoke; Hallaher, hallaher . Fortes kyahhyah’

I’am sorry, I didn’t quite catch.....’

‘Forteskyaw.....Forteskaw’

‘Who is that speaking/ It sounds like.....’

Hallaher....Is thet yow Miss Kellerhen?’

Is that you, Mr....?’

‘Farteskyah’ Dixon bawled desperately, muffling his mouth with is hand and trying not to cough.

‘That’, Mr Dixon, is not it? What are you trying too....?’

Hallaher....’

..... (190)

Dixon’s assault upon sham and pretense includes self-loathing highly disorienting conversation. His impertinence and antipathy to languages illustrate the way his satiric assaults rebound upon himself. Dixon is not nearly the centre of value and voice of the satirist but the object of humorous and substantial circulations. Here

for example he fends off his ardent student Michie, the veteran intrigued by scholasticism, whatever that is, "Clearly the more students, within reason, Dixon could get 'interested' in his subject, the better for him; equally clearly, too large a number of interested" .....(30). Through such revelations Dixon exposes him as cynical, manipulative and lazy. He is maker of his own muddles. His only solace is a gradual clarification of his own weaknesses; "I am sticking to Margaret" he tells to Christine, "because I haven't the guts to turn her loose... so I do that instead of doing what I want to do because I am afraid to" (201).

Jim Dixon's activities do not depend upon a series of recognitions and evaluation because he humorously fulfills his wishes without measuring merit. This discovers the some facts to bring fantasy and reality very closer in a sense, as when Dixon thinks and says out loud and same insult, terming Bertrand a " Bloody old towser. Faced boot-faced totem-pole on a cramp reservation" (134). When thought and speech, the inner and outer world coincide then only things start going right for Dixon. But he designs language to transform reality into fantasy. The thought processes behind this strategy owe much to one of the great hangovers of *Lucky Jim*, during which Dixon decides its best not to move his eyeballs and that "His mouth has been used as a latrine by some small creature of the night, and then as its mausoleum" (61).

Dixon does not like Welch's singing programmed in the weekend. He loathes professors singing under his breath, "you wordy old, truly old, gripping old, piping old bum" (28) This linguistic awareness, without being fully explicit in a technical or obtrusive way, is increasingly central to Dixon's sense of what concerns him as an anti-heroic protagonist. The force and linguistic aspects of Dixon lie in a number of basic substitutions he performs. A dissenting account every situation is substituted in

Dixon's use of language itself. Through his view point cultural issues that are normally framed in one language can be more simply re-framed in another. He remembered a character in modern novel while exposing his frustrations "a character..... Who was always feeling pity moving in him like a sickness or some such jargon. The parallel was apt; he felt very ill" (197).

Even Dixon self ironic appeal is normally a winning trait exhibit the title of his article, "The Shipbuilding" (15). His self glorifying speech for his article produces humor towards self-abuse. He correctly describes himself as "quick off the mark" (133). Because that article could save his ruined job.

Dixon is a great mimic, an inventive actor with outrageous vitality. At one point enjoying his plot against Bertrand, he "threw back his head and gave a long trombone laugh of anarchistic laughter" (130). Dixon's anarchistic laughter, mocking conventional morality and the decorum, is the stock-in trade of his contempt. Such humorous energy is amusing but often excessive, infantile as when Jim writes, 'Ned Welch is a sappy Fool with a Face like a Pig's Bum' on Welch's steamy bathroom mirror, or imagines devoting the next ten years to "working his way to a position as art critic on purpose to review Bertrand's work unfavorably" (50).

While laughter is crucial to Jim's survival and sanity, it contains more anarchic fury than he realizes and controls. His favorite means of contempt is facial expression. But he acknowledges that his imitations frightened him. He is less aware how much self-hatred he has but in order to maintain warm relation between Welch he resorts to it in the world of comic fantasy in which he can express his rage or loathing towards Welch. His true nature and voice emerges only from his drunkenness, and he takes over his own lecture 'Merrie England' with this purpose. He reads the material he has written with blatant contempt, and changes the actual

text to his own language to articulate for the tired and useless sentiments. He introduces his northern English but the lecture was expected to in the language of South London. His rages and inner sentiments he combines with the face like Evelyn Waugh, which actually arouses negative influences upon the audiences. His frequent biting lips and gripping his tongues expands the wonderings and almost ridiculously portraying gesture to display about his true feelings. The more he repeats his own word, the more he changes his facial gestures, "I thought something like 'Merrie England' not too academic, and not too... not too... too... do to?" (17).

The baying quality of his voice, especially in the query he speaks with blurring of certain consonants using double negatives provides the expression of rage. For this, he produces new words like, 'er', 'compos', 'mentis', 'bart', 'maying' and so on. Dixon marches humorously from episodes to episodes and he is not integrated with what he talks and behaves. His random thoughts and incompetent actions are articulated with modes of language in which he names the people and hangs title to them according to his mood. His rough and immature use of English language is clearly seen in the letter which he writes to threaten his colleague John, whom he has accused of carrying on with one of the secretaries. Dixon writes as if he were the secretaries young boyfriend and he tries to harass his fellow without any particular reason; "He wrote, gripping his pencil like a bread knife. "This is just to let you no that I no what you are up to with young [....] and has got no tim for your sort, I no your sort [...] yours fathfully, jo Higgins" (153). He read it through, thinking how admirably consistent were the style and orthography. Here lies his self glorifying speech.

Jim's farcical linguistic exchange and facial expression becomes a matter of his survival. His monologue and facial manipulation frequently fits to his frustrations and anger, or hope or contemplation. But these are truly pretentious, not real. His use

of language seems mostly unacademic, sometimes hypnotic and incoherence which fits in his anti-heroic activities.

#### Celebration of Anti-Intellectualism

Intellectualism is the business of knowing. To discover truths, to find the unknown, having a love of learning – these all are things native to the academic what is particularly intriguing about Jim Dixon is his anti-intellectual stance. Dixon asks himself how he could possibly be a professor of History, and usual, he shelves this question, telling himself that what matters is that Welch has decisive power over his future. Dixon does not feel the need to understand the particulars of his misery because he thinks that it will only make him feel worse. The truth, for Dixon, is simply such a negative notion that he cannot conceive of truth ever being positive. As a defense he imagines, “When with Margaret at a bar Dixon has the urge to sprint for the door as quickly as possible until boarding a city bus” (25). Just moment later thought occur him, "how much he, [likes the barmaid] and [has] in common with her, and how much she'd like and have in common with him if she only knew him" (25).

It is apparent from the two visions so close in proximity that he does not like Margaret one bit, or at least at the time desires everything but her presence. He seems so helpless fantasizing about running away and finding a new girl that he seems to be wishing for a rescue. Dixon's daydreams do become reality through a string of good luck and blessings. Dixon cannot help but release a “Long trombone-blast of anarchistic laughter”(103). Dixon's visions also reveal his not-so-secret love of beauty and visual perfection. Dixon likes to take things at face value. He wants aesthetic simplicity in the midst of a complex age. After hiding a ruined table in a cluttered attic, Dixon notices:

The effect, when he (steps) back to look [is] excellent; no observer could doubt that these objects (have) lived together for years in just this way. He [smiles], shutting his eyes for a moment before slopping back into the world of reality. (74)

In contrast sometimes images of aesthetic beauty strike Dixon as apparitions of the change he needs in his life; he sees things that disturb him to feel helplessness, longing, even a distinct desire for change. During his first viewing of Christine, Dixon recalls that “the notion that women like this is never on view except as the property of men” (39). Dixon obviously enjoys objects of aesthetic beauty, but his attitude towards those objects is one of scorn and agitation. He seems to think that all aesthetically pleasant things belong to another class.

On other hand, perhaps Dixon is simply lazy, unwilling to use his mind because he prefers blissful ignorance to trial and its consequent failure. The assumption here is that Gore-Urquhart liberates Dixon. He consciously decides that he will be completely honest with Gore-Urquhart, which is the true essence of his liberation in respect to his new job. But its not completely sure because of his inconsistent characteristics.

Luck for Jim Dixon, is a four letter word. He hardly understands it, aside from understanding that he does not experience much of it. But ‘luck’ brings him not an intellectual victory but a life with Christine and the cheerful exchange of academia for a well paid job in London, and it was with such endorsements of hedonistic ‘philistinism’. It is undoubtedly Dixon that desires happiness and love indirectly, but this happiness he tries to possess with negative influence, a form of lying rather than honesty.



A sense of abandonment arises in Dixon as he pursues his new life; no longer will he feel the binding restraints of deceit and lying, as he is now able to enjoy life with the new faith he entrusts in his luck. Dixon begins the novel as a self-ignoring victim; he avoids questions, ignores his predicaments, and accepts things as they are. Dixon hopes suddenly to navigate his miserable life celebrating anti-intellectualism rather than inclining within it.

#### Role of Luck

Dixon's attempt to climb the social ladder in the light of anti hero luck plays a crucial role in his life. The title of the novel is *Lucky Jim* but not Jim Dixon or something else. He seems lonely and outsider in the very beginning of the novel. The identity he has got of an assistant lecturer in the Provincial University but later on he is identified as a personal secretary of Gore-Uruqhart, a businessman and the patron of art. On different occasions he pretends and plays the role of a reporter, Mr. Caton and James. All these identity makes him unappealing, deceptive and tricky.

The importance of luck is signaled first by the title and then by the repetition of the concept throughout the text. The novel charts both the bad and good luck of Jim Dixon. But his feeling towards luck becomes more elaborate as the story proceeds. Dixon's bad luck provides much of the humor of the novel, but when he steps to rue his misfortune, the passage set aside of self-pity. In his words Christine brought very good luck in his life. He says," how lucky he was to have Christine there. For once in his life Dixon resolved to bet on his luck. What luck had come his way" (136).

At other points in the story however such as the incidents with Mrs. Welch's burned Sheets, bad luck is used to downplay Dixon's role in his own downfall. Once Dixon learns to trust luck, things turn around him and he begins to have a say in his fate. Although Dixon's passive surrender to 'bad luck' can be pathetic, it is also

indicative of his concern for other characters of the novel. "It was luck you needed all along; with just a little more luck he has been able to switch his life onto a track" (204).

It had been luck, too, that had freed him from pity's adhesive plaster: If Gore Uruqhart had been a different sort of man, Dixon would still wrap up as firmly as ever. He got doses of luck and proved to be use for somebody. Due to this previously mentioned idea, Jim Dixon is lucky so he is successful but his success is not in a refined or respectable manner because but luck grants him to create his survival not his actions completely.

#### Self-Centrism

Self-centrism refers to the state in which a person gives priority to oneself at each and every decision. When one talks about self-centrism, it refers to that sort of behaviors which is oriented towards the self. Self centered man does not care for other's pains and pleasures and only thinks of what pleases and pains him. Dixon gives priority to himself, rather than his superiors, colleagues and girlfriend. Therefore he is a self-centered man. He is ruthless in his love relationship and has no conscience. He is ready to trespass his lover and to destroy everything that comes in his way to reach his aim. Once when his girlfriend Margaret (What he calls neurotic) tries to kill herself with sleeping pills, he doesn't go to meet her. Dixon does not care after Margaret because he found Christine is both physically and financially attractive than Margaret. His choice towards Christine begins with sensual attraction. He says love as, "indignation, grief, resentment, peevishness, spite sterile anger, all the allotropes of pain [...] ordinary sexual feelings, and full breasts" (134).

In spite of this, Dixon unwillingness to self-sacrifice and his preference for Christine is really no more than a consequence of his frequently articulated conviction

that 'nice things are nicer than nasty things' (140). The nice thing is Christine's character which is 'workable' while Margaret is not for him. His unrepented guilt, over the way he has treated Margaret, supposes his victory of fear over irritation and victory and pity over boredom. He claims fat job that Gore Uruhart was going to offer Bertrand at first but Dixon's self-centered ego blinds him and he at any cost desires to deserve that job. All these happen by means of which he conveys his exasperation, irritability and general dissatisfaction with the world. Upon this foundation his ideas are built only for his individual self. He does everything to preserve his personal happiness and he uses deceptive language to implement his self-centered strategy.

#### Failure, Frustration and Anger

Jim Dixon, soon to be labeled the Angry young man, who is an unlikely hero-discontented, intentionally graceless, exasperated, impatient, and above all suspicious of anything that seems phony. Anger is crucial to Jim's survival and sanity, it contains more anarchic fury than he realizes or compromises. The aggression we see so often is a far more dangerous quality than comic justice of Dixon. His enacting roles, performance of mimicry and making different faces show his anger. He only expresses disgust by pretending someone else, not as Dixon himself. His feelings towards Margaret are confused, irritation and evasive having little desire. He arouses his anger in secret to professor Neddy Welch, who puts Jim's job on the verge of collapse and similarly Bertrand seems a true rival of Dixon. He fights with Bertrand in the summer ball and beats him. For Neddy Welch, he expresses his disgust at the end, delivering drunken lecture and imitating his voice. His anarchic anger comes with anarchic laughter at the end of novel. It is clear that his anger is towards the society that is represented by Needy Welch, Bertrand and Christine Callaghan.

In fact, Dixon's hope and dread remain finally balanced until quite late in the novel. Given Jim's malaise and uncertainty, failure seems more likely than success. He drifts back to Margaret, "directed by something outside of himself.....not out of any willing on his part" (186). He and Christine meet, each prepared to renounce each other at first. In result the reader has only pity for Dixon "poor James, whose spirits were so low that he wanted to down and and part like dog: jobless, Christineless, and now grand-slammed in the Margaret games" (22). Not until the very last scene, improbable but plausible can we perceive that comic destiny has, all along been disguised as tickle fortunes for Dixon. Dixon makes unremarkable, indeed quite slight progress. This of course makes it ethically easier to identify Dixon as hypocrite as well as a pompous who efforts to steal Christine from Bertrand at the end. Even though after successful attempt his life remains relatively fixed, but he seems incapable of radical transformation. He makes his limited progress as his final gesture but a howl of laughter he spreads at the Welch family, for the things he has learned delight, but they don't instruct all that much, and won't take him much beyond gleeful victory.

Dixon is not particularly dedicated to his job, having taken it because he feels that he is unable to obtain work in any other field. He is clearly not a happy chap. His girlfriend, Margaret, is a bundle of neurosis, still recovering from a bad relationship that resulted in her attempting suicide. In fact, throughout the novel, she is more a girlfriend by proxy than any romantic interest. More burdensome again is Dixon's boss, professor Welch, who, what Dixon says is the epitome of those upper-class academic boors. However as Dixon was still working probationary period, he seems to have no option but to bite his tongue and kowtow to his idiosyncrasies and whims-the section with attending Welch's classical music and writing article according to the

Welch's interests. Dixon's frustration appears when Welch orders some priceless works. He says, "No other professor is Great Britain... set such store by being called Professor" (14).

He has to deal with Welch's appalling wife and even worse artist's son, Bertrand too. Thus, this causes Jim's confusion towards his job, his lover and the people around him. Dixon then reveals a slight helplessness in reaching a conclusion. Welch gives Jim Menial tasks to Perform, which chip away at his dignity. Not being "able to spend anytime pottering about looking things up in the library himself" (173). The professor pompously assumes and Dixon does listing of several subjects which he was expected to research for a lecture. Dixon does as Welch's was ordered of him, "not without some loss of time and integrity" (173). Setbacks like this and other Welch aggravations are exceedingly frustrating and discouraging for poor Dixon. These setbacks cause him feelings of ineffectuality. Dixon, who was beginning to do what he'd have described as "feeling his age, sat down in a chair and began drinking his drink and smoking a cigarette. How hot it was; and how his legs ached; and how much longer was all this going to go on?" (119).

Dixon is not bold physically or spiritually. Without overdrawing Dixon's picture of powerlessness and entrapment, Amis depicts his mediocre physique, "on the short side, fair and round faced, with an unusual breadth of shoulder that had never been accompanied by and special strength or skill" (8). He further gifts him with "shabby clothes, alack of funds, provincial manners, expert in the uses of humiliation" (8). His disasters and triumphs are rendered in such a way as to put us in mind of manic-depressive mood swings and his lack of physical strength. But Dixon's behaviors are automatic over which he himself has no control what so ever. He speaks his voice with increasing exaggeration and insincerity. His low physical appearance

parallels with his contemplation over very tiny incidents. His presence on the teaching-staff of a university is in any but superficial sense irreverence. For Dixon University is nothing but a geographical location, a building with people rushing about inside it. So, Dixon is frustrated about the academic life. His obsession towards Material quest is clearly seemed from the following quotes:

I am the boredom-detector. I'm a finely tuned instrument. If only I could get hold of millionaire I'd be worth a bag of money to him. He could send me on ahead into dinners and cocktail parties and nightclubs, just for five minutes, and then by looking at me he'd be able to read off the boredom-coefficient of any gatherings like a carry down a mine; same idea. Then he'd know whether it was worth going in himself or not. He could send me in among the Retardants the stage crowd and the golfers and the arty types talking about statements of potties rather than volumes and musical [...] (215)

#### IV: CONCLUSION

In this research an attempt has been made to study Jim Dixon, the protagonist of *Lucky Jim* in the light of anti-hero. The study examines the character traits of Dixon; what he does how he does and why he does is the central question that moves the research forward.

Amis, in most cases, deals with the problem of an individual inside the norms of the society. Therefore most of the characters of his novel reflect the mood of the people around him. Similarly in the context of *Lucky Jim* he remarked, "My intention in this novel is to show the people who are not physically repellant, who are up tight about sex, suspicious of the graces of life, non musical and philistine" (Qtd. in Richard Jones 1). Here, Amis indicates Jim to stress on his characteristics motive and the society in which he has to act. He stands against the academic values and achievements in which a university lecturer has to stand for. As a history lecturer, he disdains history, especially middle Ages. He hates his department head for his belongingness to upper class origin. He hates art, music, culture and academic ceremonies. But all these disgust he does not expose in public rather he keeps secrets into himself.

He is very coward and incompetent in his behaviour. He loathes his subjects, his job, and all the social and cultural affections of university life. He is equipped with nothing better. Frustrated to the point of explosion, he dreams of outrageous revenges, risks small acts of sabotage, makes faces up his sleeve. At last, when he becomes obliged to deliver a public lecture on 'Merrie England' he shows up drunk and imitates prominent member of faculty. This however is mostly because he is sick of running and has nothing to do with bravery.

Jim is a wonderer like a Picaro or rouge. He is highly imaginative but he never puts his thoughts process in the action. Much of the comedy can be derived from his imagination. He uses his wit and comedy to subvert neddy family, friends and seniors. He is inconsistent to type, status, rank and character traits. His journey from asst. history lecturer to an assistant of businessman is the journey from light to dark. He is very self-fish and opportunists in his actions. He does not care for his girlfriend Margaret Peel's suicide attempt. He rather runs after a beautiful lady Chirstine Callagham, a fiance of his department head's son Bertrand. He has no respect towards his specialization. He chooses course and classes on the desire of pretty girls. He is immoral in his activities. His responsibility towards the self is important than towards society, community and nation.. He has unidentified origin or birth. He has been always conflicting upon tiny incidents and trivial subject matter. He is inwardly and comically at odds with artistic and social-culture of his elders. he perpetrates a succession of jokes, tricks and deceptions to the people around him. He is frustrated and infuriated by established traditional values. His social status is as an outsider, lonely and bore. He says "I am a boredom detector. I am a finally tuned-instrument" (215). He feels as a helpless victim of his professor, when he sacks him from teaching job.

Meantime, he gets the blessings of luck as good girl, fat job and good fortune. But luck at the end of the novel exemplifies only a tendency towards reconciliation with society rather than Dixon's any desire to reform it. Dixon's new boss was a real patron of art, in which he had to work talking about art, culture, beauty and society. Therefore, Dixon at the end enters into the same system which he used to hate.

Dixon's thoughts are narrow, he defines relationship on the basis of benefit. His decision to leave Margaret Peel and sever relationship with Chirstine Callagham



is the result of his search for material satisfaction. He does not believe in self-sacrifice. Therefore, he is simply not a hero material. He does not stand up enough to be a hero. He is an anti-hero charting his social gaffs, cultural philistinism, and inept relationships and crawling to superiors.

Dixon seems malicious, mean, and envious and scum in his activities who chronicles the misadventures, soon finds out that his interest is beer girls, combined with disrespect for the academic establishment of university life. He is not particularly dedicated to his job, having taken it because he feels that he'd be no use as a teacher and unable to obtain work in any other field. Having made a particularly bad impression he is concerned about being fired, he has been frustrated and humiliated. And he evaluates all the relationship and profession as bundle of frustration. In course of novel, Dixon illustrates some of his favorite, vitally comic and only modestly penetrating credos, "Doing what you want to do is the only training for doing more of what you want to do?" (27). At the end, he fulfill his wishes but it does not measure merit.

The reward of luck for Dixon is only the result of his comic justice and resilience rather than for any more profoundly ethical attributes. He remains relatively superficial in his ethical growth, even though his character is far from simple. He mocks over institution, superiors and hypocritical people but Dixon himself is not free from mockery. For him it is self mockery, and demonstrates Dixon's critical attitude towards himself. Slowly and relentlessly Dixon develops himself into an unforgettably odious character, all the more fact that he does nothing good for himself and more importantly to others.

Dixon is all the time - he's clueless, bumbling, and subtly hilarious. He is a lecturer of Britain at first and secondly personal secretary of businessmen. He mostly

does not know what he's doing, and often falls into embarrassing situation, escaping just in the nick of time.

Dixon is a solely an anti-hero because he is not in hero model and his actions are pointing towards self fulfilling will. His philistine values, obsession to material succession, tricks and vain glory makes him unappealing. Therefore, he is truly an anti-hero.

### Works Cited

- A.J. Close. "Introduction to Don Quixote". *Don Quixote*. London: David Campbell Publisher Ltd., 1991.
- Abraham, M.H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 6th ed. India: Prism books Ltd., 1993.
- Amis, Kingsley. *Lucky Jim*. London: Penguin Books Ltd., 1954.
- Bell, Robert H. ed. *Introduction to Critical Essays on Kingsley Amis*. New York: G.K. Hall, 1998.
- Bradbury, Malcolm. *The British Novel*. London: Penguin Books Limited, 2001.
- Bradbury, Malcolm. *The Modern British Novel: 1878-2001*. London: Penguin Books Ltd., 1993.
- Bradford, Richard. *Kingsley Amis*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1987.
- Bromberd, Victor. In *Praise of Antiheroes: Figures and Themes in Modern European Literature (1830-1890)*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1999.
- Butcher, S.H. *Aristotle's Theory of Fine Arts*. New York, Dover Publication, 1951.
- Campbell, Joshep. *A Hero with a Thousand Faces*. New York: Meridian, 1956.
- Caplon, Ralph. *Contemporary British Novelists*. London: James Press Chicago, 1991.
- Cook, Albert. *The Dark Voyage and the Golden Mean; a Philosophy of Comedy*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949.
- Cox, C.B. "Philip Larkin; Anti-heroic Poet." *Journal of Humanistic Counselling, Education and Development*, 44.2. (2005): 134-144. *Ebsco Host*. 3 Aug. 2005  
<<http://www.google.com.hk/search?.q=+philiplarkin,antiheroic+poet&hl=en>>
- Daiches, David. *A Critical History of English Literature*. 2nd ed. Vol. 3. New Delhi: Allied Publishers Ltd., 1979. PP. 719-726.
- Defoe, Danial. *Moll Flanders*. Britain: Penguin Books Ltd., 1994.

Fallis, Richard. "*Lucky Jim* and Academic Wishful Thinking". *Studies in the Novel*.

9.1. (1977): 65-73. *Proquest*. 5 June 1992

<<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/masterpiece/luckyjim/Amis.html>>

Faolain, Sean O'. *The Vanishing Hero*. Bostani: Little Brown, 1956.

Gilden, James. *Post War British Fiction*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982.

Google.com. Alter, R. "Rougue's Progress; Studies in the Picaresque Novel". 13 Sept. 1993.

<[http://72.14.203.104/search?q=cache:p\\_zM73/izgcIJ:www.Kho.edu.fr/yayinlar...03/13/2006](http://72.14.203.104/search?q=cache:p_zM73/izgcIJ:www.Kho.edu.fr/yayinlar...03/13/2006)>

Google.com. Jenkins, Gareth. "Why *Lucky Jim* Turned Right-An Obituary of Kingsley Amis." 10 March. 1996.

<<http://www.pubs.socialistreview.index.org.uk/Amis.html>>

Google.com. Maisel, Roxana. "The Unexamined Life: Celebrating Anti-intellectulism in *Lucky Jim*". 12 Feb. 1978.

<<http://www.gwu.edu/~uwp/Fyw/euonymous/maisel.pdf>>

Hegel, G.W.F. *The Philosophy of Fine Arts*. London: G. Bells and Sons, 1920.

Jacobs, Eric. Rev. of *Kingsley Amis: A Biography*, by David Hardy. *Literary Supplements*. 3.1. (1993).

<[http://web34.epnet.com/citation.asp?+b=1&\\_ug=sid+59...11/12/2006](http://web34.epnet.com/citation.asp?+b=1&_ug=sid+59...11/12/2006)>

Jones, Richard. "A Severe Case of Memorities." *The Virginia Quartely*. March 2006. 10 May 2006

<<http://www.vqronline.org/viewmedia.php/prmMID/7171/3/23/2006>>

Kenneth, Allsop. *The Angry Decade: A Survey of the Cultural Revolt of 1950s*. London: Penguin Books Ltd., 1993.

- Lamont, Roseltee C. "From Hero to Anti-hero". *The Literary Imagination*. IX, 1 (Spring 1977). PP. 65-73.  
<<http://web24.epnet.com/hero+antihero/.ire/cite/sid.bh.index...>>
- Lever, Kathrine. *The Art of Greek Comedy*. London: Methuen, 1956.
- Levin, Harry J. "Society as Its Own Historian." *Context of Criticism*. Cambridge: Howard University Press, 1957. P. 176.
- Lodge, David. "The Modern, The Contemporary and The Importance of Being Amis". *The Language of Fiction*. London Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966.
- Miller, S. *The Picaresque Novel Cleverland: Case Western*. London: Reserve University Press, 1907.
- Salwak, Dal. *Kingsley Amis: A Reference Guide*. Boston: G.K. Hall, 1978.
- Sapiro, Charles. Ed. *Contemporary British Novelists*. Cambridge: Southern Illinois University Press, 1965.
- Swinden, Patrick. *The English Novel of History and Society*. London: The Macmillian Press Ltd., 1984.
- Thorslev, Peter L. *The Byronic Hero. Types and Prototypes*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1962.
- Vardy, Peter & Grosch, Paul. *The Puzzle of Ethics*. Great Britain: Harper Collins, 1994.
- Walsh, P.G. *The Roman Novel*. Cambridge: The University Press, 1970.
- Walter, Allen. "Twentieth Century Statesman." *Newstatement*. 29 November 1999. 14 January 2000  
<<http://search.epnet.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=afh&an=2546887>>
- Walter, Allen. *The Modern Novel*. New York: Dutton, 1968.