International Journal of Arts and Humanities Studies
ISSN: 2754-4311
DOI: 10.32996/bjahs
Journal Homepage: www.al-kindipublisher.com/index.php/Ijahs

IJAHS
AL-KINDI CENTER FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

| RESEARCH ARTICLE

The Rhetoric of Satire in Kingsley Amis's *Lucky Jim*

Lect. Abbas Murad Dohan
Al-Imam Al-Kadhim University College for Islamic Science, Iraq
Corresponding Author: Lect. Abbas Murad Dohan, **E-mail**: Abbas.murad@alkadhum-col.edu.iq

| ABSTRACT
The current research paper argues that Kingsley Amis's *Lucky Jim* not only employs satire, irony, and paradox dexterously—an issue that has been approached by many—but also demonstrates a rhetorical variability of a Menippean kind of satire. The writer addresses the issues raised in the novel from new and different angles. He provides a rhetoric of satire that has enabled him to touch upon some uneasy and disturbing facts of his society, yet maintaining an uncensored and immune position to deplore. Therefore, the present study intends to investigate in depth the multilayered style and satirical wit in the novel based on Menippean satirical rhetoric of inquiry and provocation, play and display, employing Dustin Griffin's interdisciplinary notion of satiric discourse. It will address the various elements incorporated and deployed by the writer in the course of satirizing the novel.

| KEYWORDS
Rhetoric of Satire – Satire - Menippean Satire – Enquiry and Provocation – Play and Display

| ARTICLE INFORMATION
ACCEPTED: 15 October 2023 **PUBLISHED:** 04 November **DOI:** 10.32996/Ijahs.2023.3.4.3

1. Introduction

Since the publication of *The Muse of Satire* in 1951, an article by Maynard Mack, the rhetoric of satire has been a focal interest of modern critics. Critics such as "Ronald Paulson and Leon Guilhamet, and others up to Garry Sherbert, have studied rhetoric as a wellspring and continuing influence on satire" (Sinding, 2003, p. 1). The rhetorical features of satire to be examined in this paper are argued to be distinguishing features of Menippean satire. Critics like Frye and Bakhtin affirm the feasibility of a possible connection between satire as a genre—in general and Menippean satire in particular—and rhetoric, which would establish the ground of this argument.

Amis's *Lucky Jim* shows satiric qualities assumingly germane to the Menippean tradition. The novel introduces in its narrative a satiric in the form of "mixing humor and seriousness much more thoroughly" (Parker, 2016, p. 28). It, in addition, exhibits an abundance of question-like interrogations in repetition, play, irony, and paradox, characteristics that introduce Amis as a rhetorician of the greatest kind. Usually, when certain things become subjected to questioning and doubt, other things, too, fall under investigation. The narrative language of fiction, then, embodies the perfect medium of playing with, transforming, and shifting language to communicate the writer's points. Menippean satire plays a significant role in "the development of the novel" in general and consequently in "the conception and depiction of character" in particular (Sinding, 2003, p. 3).

Moreover, the novel under investigation exposes different and deviating opinions on a variety of questions in relation to academia, politics, and social norms. All those issues are analyzed in a lively manner in the novel. Hence, the narrative fiction in *Lucky Jim* demonstrates that the writer's notion of satire is profoundly rhetorical. The rhetoric of satire in the novel is nourished on various concretely practical issues. Accordingly, the current study also proposes to investigate the rhetoric of satire in Amis's *Lucky Jim* in line with the notion of satiric discourse advanced by Griffin, as it seems more adequate.

As long as Griffin's notion of satiric discourse will provide the theoretical background for the study's argument, it seems more suitably fitting to have an idea about his perception of satire in general and of Menippean satire in particular. In that order, Griffin generally perceives satire in a broad sense, but necessarily rhetorical and moral:

> Satire is a highly rhetorical and moral art. A work of satire is designed to attack vice or folly. To this end, it uses wit or ridicule. Like polemical rhetoric, it seeks to persuade an audience that something or someone is reprehensible or ridiculous; unlike pure rhetoric, it engages in exaggeration and some sort of fiction. But satire does not forsake the "real world" entirely. Its victims come from that world, and it is this fact (together with a darker or sharper tone) that separates satire from pure comedy. Finally, satire usually proceeds by means of clear reference to some moral standards or purposes. (Morton, 1983, p. 1)

However, Griffin himself has set out to question this earlier agreement on satire "to bring satire theory up to date with the state of criticism of individual satirists and their works" (Sinding, 2003, p. 2). He asserts that the nature of satire is usually confusingly indefinite, complex, and uncertain, in which he "uses facts about what satire actually is to challenge views based on idealized visions of what it should or might be" (*ibid*). Satire—more particularly Menippean—is thus perceived not only to be "problematic, open-ended, essayistic, ambiguous in its relationship to history, uncertain in its political effect, resistant to formal closure" but is also "more inclined to ask questions than to provide answers, and [is] ambivalent about the pleasures it offers," (Griffin, 1994, p. 5).

In that respect and in line with Griffin's discourse notion, the current study is going to approach the rhetoric of satire in the novel with relation to inquiry, provocation, and rhetoric of play and display. The basic purpose would be to direct attention to the discourse of satire in the novel in order to highlight how it functions within the broad tradition of satire. That is to say; the focal point will be examining the purposes and drives of the satirical rhetoric in the novel chiefly through reference to characters and how they proceed in the novel. As a result, the rhetoric of satire could be better comprehended and observed in the novel.

2. The Objective and Purpose of the Study

The present study intends to investigate in depth the multilayered style and satirical wit in the novel on the basis of Menippean satirical rhetoric of inquiry and provocation, play and display, employing Dustin Griffin's interdisciplinary notion of satiric discourse. It will address the elements incorporated and deployed by the writer in the course of satirizing the novel. The study assumes that the writer's intention is to satirically condemn certain undesirable social practices and features and will, therefore, attempt to highlight and explore the different satirical rhetoric through which the writer has set out to communicate such a goal.

3. Methodology of the Study

The study assumes that the writer's intention is to satirically condemn certain undesirable social practices and features in a Menippean style and will, therefore, attempt to highlight and explore the different satirical rhetoric through which the writer has set out to communicate such a goal. For its methodology, the current research study will apply Dustin Griffin's interdisciplinary notion of satiric discourse in its argument. It will address the elements incorporated and deployed by the writer in the course of satirizing. Assuming the novel's satire to be of a Menippean kind, the study will thus, for applying Griffin's notion of satiric discourse, go for a critical analytical approach to explore and investigate the different satirical rhetoric in the novel's narrative. Critics like Frye and Bakhtin will be referred to in the course of the discussion. They affirm the feasibility of a possible connection between satire as a genre—in general and Menippean satire in particular—and rhetoric, which would establish the methodological ground of this argument as well.

3.1 Satire: Juvenalian, Horatian and Menippean Satire

Satire, In terms of more inclusive definitions, is defined as "a genre of literature whose goal is not only to point out a social vice but to make it clear that this vice is intolerable" (Draister, 1994, p. xxi). In terms of the nature of satire, it is generally perceived as being either "genial or harsh, tolerant or punitive", that principally targets "general social abuses or the vices of specific individuals", aiming to "expose, to reform, to enlighten, or merely to amuse," (Yearling, 2016, pp. 43-44).

In turn, satire is a literary genre that has the power and capability to condemn flaws and vices of man, society, and life and maintains the impervious status of the satirist. It addresses such issues with ironic, humorous, and even entertaining style. The power of satire lies in following two basic strategies; one is the fact that it does not explicitly point to its objects of criticism, and the second is that it does so in a funny way, and thus "satiric laughter may become a source of both catharsis and redemption for satirist and reader alike," (Bloom, 1979, p. 129).

Satiric writing aims principally at addressing undesirable traits in society by exposing them and inviting the attention of the audience to their existence so that they may be modified, improved, or changed. Flaws and defects that satire addresses would

hence be divergent and include all walks of life. Satire is not confined to addressing moral issues, as some might suppose. It covers a wider range of life issues as the human perception might reach. Satire is assumed to have more effect and be morally acceptable "when it attacks stereotypes, hypocrisies, illusions, deceptions, strict dogmatism, manifestations of evil, and corruption of any kind", for its job is "to scourge the persistent and every recurrent follies of the human condition," (Hussein, 2014, p. 28).

The supremacy of satire is embodied by its capacity to thoughtfully ridicule certain sensitive and untouched issues of society while simultaneously maintaining the satirist's natural freedom to satirize and condemn. Hence, in terms of more inclusive definitions, satire can be defined as:

> A literary technique in which behaviors or institutions are ridiculed for the purpose of improving society. What sets satire apart from other forms of social and political protest is humor. Satirists use irony and exaggeration to poke fun at human faults and foolishness in order to correct human behavior. (Applebee, 1997, p. 584)

Going back a long way in history, most critics agree that "satire began with the ancient Greeks but came into its own in ancient Rome, where the 'fathers' of satire, Horace and Juvenal, had their names given to the two basic types of satire," (Applebee, 1997, p. 584). Therefore, most literary people would be familiar with Horatian and Juvenalian types of satire. Yet, the distinction between these two types of satire is not only confined to the peculiar names they have come to acquire through time and use; rather, they differ in use, purpose, and style.

The Horatian satire, for example, is "playfully amusing, and it tries to make change gently and with understanding (Applebee, 1997, p. 584). Hence, Horatian satire has gained great appeal and appreciation by many as its urbanity "pleased readers discomfited by more sharply honed criticism," (Bloom, 1979, p. 60).

Examples of literary works of all kinds that have employed Horatian satire are plenty in the history of literature. *The Rape of the Lock* by Alexander Pope is a case in point. It is a satiric epic poem that lampoons a long and fierce feud between two aristocratic families over a matter of triviality. The function of satire is not just to mock; it also "heals with morals what it hurts with wit "and at its best ", addresses itself to problems that have general implications and support conclusions" (*ibid* 99).

As for the second type of satire, the Juvenalian type, Jonathon Swift's *Gulliver's Travels,* can illustrate its case. Unlike Horatian satire, Juvenalian satire is harsher; it punishes and "provokes a darker kind of laughter. It is often bitter and criticizes corruption or incompetence with scorn and outrage" (Applebee, 1997, p. 584). In addition, the Juvenalian satire "gloats over the punishment of wrongdoers" (Bloom, 1979, p. 39). For instance, in the narrative of *Gulliver's Travels,* Swift harshly criticizes the British overruling over and ignorance of the colonized peoples. From a broader perspective, Swift could as well be assumed to address "man's failure to acquit himself decently" (Bloom, 1979, p. 41).

In that order, the job of the satirist is diverse and multitasked. A satirist censures vice but also admires good. A satirist also has to demonstrate a persuasive capacity in order to reach a third option, between the good and the bad, to achieve his goal. Hence, a satirist's job is eventually to "reproach the bad or praise the good, to correct or reconcile the inequilibrium between flaws and virtues. He must persuade a third party, the reader, that a case for justice or against injustice has been made beyond all doubt" (Bloom, 1979, p. 99). Besides, a satirist is expected to establish links between people for satire generally "depends on the creation of a bond between author and reader against some third party," (Hammond, 2005, p. 5).

Respectively, the prompting of change or estrangement of people does not represent the sole task of satire. It longs for a change, a positive one, as its main objective, yet it recognizes the nature of people and the possibility of time delay for that change to materialize. Looking at the works of many satirists, it could be observed that most of them "are realistic enough to understand that public response to their complaints may be painfully long in coming if it comes at all" (Bloom, 1979, p. 33).

Menippean satire is the third type, and it amalgamates the characteristics of the previous two types: Horatian and Juvenalian satires. Menippean satire is suggested by some to be the representative mode of satire as a whole. The reason is, they argue, that satire generally "employs a Menippean cynicism to attack systems of reasoning and their social effects" (Frye, 1957, p. 227). It is neither too harsh nor too genteel. In historical terms, Menippean satire is an ancient genre, just as the Horatian and Juvenalian genres are, which "arises through a mixture of works in several genres" (Sinding, 2003, p. 38).

It is further assumed that Menippean satire "deals less with people as such than with mental attitudes" (Frye, 1957, p. 309). Therefore, people with biases, preconceptions and conventional ideologies "are handled in terms of their occupational approach to life as distinct from their social behavior" (*ibid*). A Menippean satirist would thus "use a loose-jointed narrative form" that "relies on the free play of intellectual fancy and the kind of humorous observation that produces caricature" (Frye, 1957, pp. 309-10).

Above and beyond, Menippean satire is usually seen to fit within "a 'dialogical' tradition as opposed to a 'monological' one, associated with institutional absolutism, dogmatism, and repression" (Sinding, 2003, p. 40).

However, Menippean satire does not seem to have enjoyed the same popularity and prevalence associated with Horatian and Juvenalian types of satire. It owes much credit in its revival and flourishing to the Russian theorist and philosopher Mikhail Bakhtin, who has greatly contributed to its development and rise "and other anti-official genres in the development of the novel, its 'heteroglossia', its philosophical dimension, its remarkable developments in the conception and depiction of character," (Sinding, 2003, p. 3).

As a matter of fact, Mikhail Bakhtin has not only enriched our perception of the role of Menippean satire but also made an enormous impact on "our understanding of the folk-culture roots of satire" in general, and more particularly on "the relation of literary style and structure to various genres of speech as well as writing," (Sinding, 2003, p. 3). In addition to Bakhtin,

Frye, too, takes credit for "the resurgence of interest in the more specific genre known as Menippean satire" (*ibid*, p. 4). There have been several books that deal with Menippean satire, such as "Eugene Kirk's bibliography of satires from antiquity to the 11th century (1980); F. Anne Payne's 1981 Chaucer and Menippean Satire; and Frank Palmeri's Satire in Narrative (1990)" to name only a few, (Sinding, 2003, p. 4).

3.2 Lucky Jim: Satire as a Rhetoric of Inquiry and Provocation

Forms of satire vary greatly and thus need to be understood accordingly. Establishing such a perception of satire contributes, in Griffin's words, to "broadening our recognition of satiric forms" and attracts our attention to "satire's immense and perhaps incomprehensible variety" (Griffin, 1994, p. 3). Satire, too, could be perceived as "a mode and a procedure rather than a literary kind" that makes it "appear[s] at any place, at any time" (*ibid* 3). Consequently, Griffin's notion of satiric discourse would be more suitable than any other notion of satire as it is progressive and all-inclusive, more particularly in relation to fiction:

Satire typically complicates narrative fiction. If satire is not viewed simply as derisive reduction and rejection, if we broaden our conception, ..., to include inquiry and provocation, play and display, anything from Menippean fantasy to learned anatomizing, then we can find satire's mark not just presented in satiric set pieces,..., but woven into the fabric of several different varieties of [narrative writing]. (Griffin, 1994, p. 4)

Compared to traditional conservative theories of satire that perceives it as only moral, Griffin favorably presents his theory as it disapproves of the traditional ones in various respects. He states that "satirists, like everybody else, are ambivalent and aware of complexity" and that rhetoric «can be, and historically, has been, conceived of in quite different terms" (Griffin, 1994, p. 4). He suggests that in order to get a better understanding of the mechanism of satire in fiction, one needs to perceive satire in terms of a set of "a rhetoric of inquiry, a rhetoric of provocation, a rhetoric of display and a rhetoric of play" (*ibid*).

In that vein, in order to highlight and study the rhetoric of satire in Kingsley Amis's novel *Lucky Jim*, it would be orderly to approach that as a rhetoric of inquiry and provocation as the first concept. It is thus argued that flexibility and open-endedness are designated characteristics of satire in the novel. That is why a satirist's job is supposedly to "discover, to explore, to survey" and "to attempt to clarify" (Griffin, 1994, p. 39).

Such openness is a common quality of all forms of satire as any "satirical form lends itself to open-ended inquiry rather than to steady progress toward conclusion", in which it advances forward "a vision of the world", "does not embody a truth", but rather "tests it," (Gallego, 2013, p. 87). However, such perception of satire is perceived to be more relevant to the "tradition of Menippean satire —with its mixture of prose and verse, its digressions, its mingling of forms, its openness to everything new, ..., that preserves the inquiring impulse," (Griffin, 1994, p. 40). This is so supposedly because the Menippean satire is widely recognized as a satirical form of "ultimate questions" that are posed but not certainly responded to (Bakhtin, 1984, p. 41).

Rhetoric of inquiry is argued to be valuable for more comprehension of Amis's novel. As it is going to be observed, Amis employs satire to touch upon certain moral issues that spare neither particular individuals nor class, nor does it turn a blind eye to the variety of the discursive elements of society like politics and culture. Hence, satire in the novel is directed at class structure, the state's politics, and, more particularly, the academia.

Having been aware of the moral significance of the issues raised in the novel through its characters, Amis chiefly treats his fictional characters in a satiric manner. Those characters, in return, demonstrate a pledge to inquiry. Professor Welch, for instance, is not just ridiculed, but education and the institution of academia are also questioned and clouded with skepticism and mockery. In addition to the urgency to confront such moral vices, the message imparted to the novel's readership is that the novelist himself

seems to be stirred by a sense of determination about the moral viciousness of such issues. Setting the university as its main platform of events, the novel indeed approaches it and its staff as a miniature of society as a whole.

In the light of enquiry and provocation, *Lucky Jim* seems to present as its focus concern with the status of education, especially academic education in Britain, by the end of the first half of the twentieth century. The novel suggests that standards of academic education were weakening and deteriorating. The novel satirizes an official educational policy at the time that has loosened standards and requirements for university education, hence providing the common people access to it.

The point the novel attempts to impart, in a satirically enquiring and provoking way though, is that government grants allowing the common people access to university education are disastrously consequential because such people "do not go to the university to acquire culture, but to get a job, and when they have got one, [they] scamp it," (Wilson, 1966, p. 276). This objection against academic masses is celebrated in the novel and is shared by others, for this category of people is held to "have no manners", as their basic "idea of a celebration is to go" to the university without having that sense of cultivation and responsibility, (*ibid*).

The novel suggests, and others like Edmund Wilson agree with the novel's rhetoric, that such masses "are scum" who "will in due course leave the university. Some will doubtless sink back, perhaps with relief, into the modest class from which they emerged," (*ibid*). However, the novel never indicates or advances such assumptions explicitly. It merely and implicitly enquires into the validity of such educational policies, thus provoking reflection, controversy, and perhaps skepticism.

As discussed earlier, though dealing with mental attitudes, Menippean satire deals mostly with people. Therefore, it addresses people with biases, preconceptions and conventional ideologies from the perspective of their occupational approach to life as distinct from their social behavior. In that order, the major character in the novel, James Dixon, shortly called Jim, is first introduced to the readers as a fresh academician who has hopes and ambitions of being a member of academia. The narrative highlights Jim's occupation as an academic member of a university. Yet, the description the novel offers about him communicates the idea that he belongs to a lower social class, therefore fitting with the masses. He is depicted as "fair and round-faced, with an unusual breadth of shoulder that had never been accompanied by any special physical strength or skill" (Amis, 1954, p. 19).

In line with the rhetoric of enquiry and provocation of the novel's satirical narrative, such portrayal of Jim indirectly indicates a status and quality of mediocrity about him. As a professor at Redbrick University, he is necessarily to be compared and contrasted with other members of the academia. In such a setting, Jim would seem to be thrown into a racecourse that is way out of and beyond his league. He is a fresh and ingenuous university professor who has little or no experience in academic work and life in comparison to the academic experts surrounding him and whom he has to live and deal with.

Similarly, the novel satirizes a conventionally occupational bias embodied in Professor Welch. Whereas Jim is an unpretentious, fresh, and ingenuous colleague, Professor Welch is an overbearing, cloudy, and self-important fellow. Therefore, Jim does not appreciate him and is uncomfortable working with him; yet, he is supposed to hide his abhorrence and rather replace it with traditionally pretentious courtesy of the profession. Jim innately despises his university post, but he understands its importance for his survival.

The novel presents Professor Welch as the ideological embodiment of traditional occupation and conventional class bias; he stands for everything and all things Jim abhors. Nonetheless, he is the superior of Jim and is in charge of his probation work period, and Jim has to get along with him and gain his favors. Consequently, Jim is presented as a gullible professor who is "trapped in someone else's culture, who always sees that the emperor wears no clothes, receives the comedy's ancient blessing, good luck and good fortune" (Bradbury, 1994, p. 320).

To highlight the notion of enquiry and provocation in the novel, a keen reader has to question the merit and fittingness of low class people granted free access to university education. According to the novel, though Jim is qualified and abled as a university professor, he seems to be "lifted by social opportunity out of his familiar culture into one he cannot accept or indeed understand" (*ibid*). Furthermore, the presentation of Jim clearly indicates that he is a "lower class intellectual in middle class society, not knowing the rules (or dominant clichés), nervous of mistakes and resenting his vulnerability, clinging obstinately to his own clichés for comfort", which communicates "a fine comic paradigm for Ionesco's vision of man," (Parker, 2016, p. 35).

Likewise, the novel provokes its readers to question Professor Welch's pretentiousness, arrogance, and officiousness as to whether or not these are the true and desirable qualities of academic staff. As mentioned earlier, Menippean satire mostly deals with people, thus with characters with relation to their occupation as well. In that respect, Jim's character is questioned, too. He provokes doubts and contradictions and is generally presented as "intentionally, even scrupulously, clumsy. His face, when not vacant, is set in a growl of irritation. […] He is inconsistent with his traditional college degree; however, he comes for the most part from a well-

known college" (Bura, 2020, p. 831). However, in explicitly bringing Professor Welch to the satirical light, it could be assumed that the satirist intends to emphasize a kind of a pattern that is "centered on an anti-intellectual, intellectual sniping at society, rewarded with, or returning to, the love of a straightforward, no-nonsense girl," (Parker, 2016, p. 27).

3.3 Lucky Jim: Satire as a Rhetoric of Play and Display

Kingsley Amis in *Lucky Jim* seems to have sometimes an interest in displaying his rhetorical skills of satire rather than attempting to persuade or encourage his readers to take it for granted. Every now and then, according to Griffin, a satirist might "implicitly (and sometimes explicitly) ask that we observe and appreciate their skill" (Griffin, 1994, p. 73). Therefore, in fiction, argues Griffin, satire's "rhetorical appeal becomes a kind of fiction," which "in itself introduces the element of performance and display" (*ibid*, p. 75). In the novel, the subsequent argument is going to demonstrate how the novelist employs the elements of play and display in the description and portrayals of certain events.

In addition, concerning play and display, A Menippean satirist would thus "use a loose-jointed narrative form" that "relies on the free play of intellectual fancy and the kind of humorous observation that produces caricature" (Frye, 1957, pp. 309-10). Above and beyond, Menippean satire is usually seen to fit within "a 'dialogical' tradition as opposed to a 'monological' one, associated with institutional absolutism, dogmatism, and repression" (Sinding, 2003, p. 40).

In view of that, the novel presents a range of circumstances through which readers could observe a contrasting existence between what appears and what really is, between appearances and reality in a narrative of dialogical play and display. A case in point, Jim prepares a research paper and hands it to an editor for revision and publication but is shocked to find out that the editor has translated it into Italian and published it in his name. This occurrence of plagiarizing other people's academic work and efforts and attributing it to a different person is one of many instances of conspiracies and duplicities that people in academia plot against one another. It is also a rhetoric of satiric play that has to eventually be displayed. While in his office, Jim spotted the title of his paper already published in Italian under the name of a different author. Then, in a dialogical tradition, the narrative presents and shows such an incident through Jim:

> A title in the journal on his desk. ..... he'd never learnt any Italian, but the name at the head of this article, L. S. Caton, presented no difficulty, nor, after a minute or two, did the general drift of the text, which was concerned with shipbuilding techniques in Western Europe in the later fifteenth century, … . There could be no doubt about it; this article was either a close paraphrase or a translation of Dixon's own original article. … . So that was how people got chairs, was it? Chairs of that sort, anyway. (Amis, 1954, p. 20)

Likewise, John deceives Jim for the second time while he has done nothing wrong to deserve such fraudulence, nor has he expected it. In satiric rhetoric of display, Jim wonders over the cause that has generated such betrayal; he "pondered for a moment; had he done anything to deserve Johns's two betrayals?" (Amis, 1954, p. 21). Besides, this incident is significant in two ways. For one thing, it clearly demonstrates Jim's innocence and artlessness. He deals with his colleagues and judges them at face value. Jim perceives the routine flattery and etiquette of his colleagues as intrinsic qualities of who they really are and not as a common courtesy of the profession. Consequently, he does not expect any plotting or conspiracies on their side. Besides, once he falls victim to their scheming, it surprises him and even shocks him. On the other hand, such instances of deceit and dishonesty expose and portray in satirical rhetoric of play and display certain undesirable and disparaged attitudes that are even practiced in the midst of academia.

Moreover, Johns is not the only one who deceives Jim, nor is it the sole example of deceit and treachery. The novel presents a series of played betrayals and dishonest scheming and displays them, too, indicating that the environment of academia is rife with such fraudulent practices. To illustrate, Jim is also betrayed by another academic colleague, Margaret, a female colleague who has gone through a disappointing love affair with Catchpole. After losing Catchpole, Margaret plays the role of Jim's girlfriend; not that she is really in love with him, but rather she only schemes to make up for Catchpole's loss.

Similarly, Bertrand orchestrates another deceitful and insincere scheme against Christine. Bertrand is Professor Welch's son, and Christine is the niece of an affluent Scotch man. In a played performance, Bertrand pretends to be in love with Christine while he is actually having a liaison with the wife of some academician at the same time. He does not harbor any authentic feelings or true intentions towards Christine; he merely plays to be in love with her so that he may acquire her uncle's good favors and hopefully works for him. Yet, as cunning as they might have been, both Margaret and Bertrand's craftily deceitful attempts are displayed and frustrated firstly by Catchpole and then by Jim and Christine.

In terms of the academic milieu, the novel does not seem to have come across such an environment through sheer coincidence. On the contrary, the novel specifies the setting of academia as an object for its satire and ridicule. Against traditional and long-

held perceptions of academia, the novel satirizes such an environment, presenting it as the arena of play and display of numerous unattractive idiocies and quirks.

Essentially, Amis's *Lucky Jim,* thought of as "a classic comic novel", is generally perceived to have heralded a novel track for the English novel, a track that would come to be known as "the seminal campus novel" (Lodge, 1992, p. v). According to Bosco, a novel that specifies the academic surrounding for satirizing and ridiculing aims principally at the 'ethical dimensions', which should satirically be exposed. Such a novel reflects academic life and introduces it to the community of readers. It thus enables readers as outsiders to that environment to unsympathetically engage in their negotiations with people there, the nature of their community, and the university as an academic institution (Connor, 2007, p. n. p.).

As mentioned previously, *Lucky Jim* heralds a novel genre called 'campus novel.' However, this type of novel is principally "critical of one or the other aspects of life and are usually comical or satirical" (Padhi, 2017, p. 2). Due to the deterioration in long-held traditions and principles of academia, the novel attempts to "reflect the reality of the academic world" and highlight "the follies and foibles of the academic life" (*ibid*). It, hence, gets more and more obvious in the novel that "there is little hope for education. Education has become more and more business-like and materialistic desires have engulfed the minds of the academics" (Mgallad, 2018, p. 10). The novel has determined the academy and its people to be the object of its satire and ridicule because it has become an institution that operates through unethical competitiveness.

In that respect, novels of that sort targeting the academic milieu for satirizing are deemed highly significant in that they enclose within their narrative an expression of irony that articulates sensitive issues germane to several aspects of life, including identity and culture. When Jim is first presented in academia, he seems to have harbored idealistic views and opinions of it. Therefore, he finds himself entrapped by those romantically uncompromising views and perceptions. In a kind of implicit comparison to other academicians, Jim is presented as an inexperienced professor in the sense that he shows gullibility and innocence in the face of the scheming and trickery of others.

Though the novel condemns the conspiracies and evil of other academic figures represented by Professor Welch, Jim is shown to be in no better position as it is eventually luck, not other virtues, that works in his favor. The novel also shows Jim to be not devoted to his subject, and it becomes obvious when he is dismissed from college that he only "collects some references and notes and ignores tomes connected to medieval History" (Amis, 1954, p. 230). In a further satirical display, Jim confides to Bessley that the motivation behind selecting medieval history was because it was "the easiest way of obtaining a college degree" (*ibid*).

By the same token, the Welchs' constant attitude to boast their social and intellectual status is on display in the novel. For example, Professor Welch is shown in his study of British History to venerate the past victories of the British Empire while in a way relating to such times as an upper-class member. Jim, on the contrary, neither shares nor shows the same feelings, which indicates a contrast in social class between the two. Besides, the novel presents a further satirical comment about Professor Welch when Jim meets him at the door of the library, unable to open its door. What's more, Jim spots "the remaining parts of an egg-yolk on Welch's tie, which adds to the image of Welch's ungainliness and idiocy" (Amis, 1954, p. 172).

Correspondingly, the novel satirically delineates Welch's son, Bertrand, as a haughty, arrogant social climber. Bertrand also claims to be an artist and to have a liking and a taste for art. Therefore, in his relationship with Jim, Bertrand merely condescends in dealing with him on the ground that he belongs to a superior class. Nonetheless, such satiric display of the Welchs as "snobbish show offs who are constantly projecting themselves on a higher sophisticated plane is actually a farce considering their modest scholarly achievements" (Bura, 2020, p. 832). Hence, not only Jim but also readers come to avert the Welchs and their pretense and shallowness. Equally, the French names given to the Welch's children, assumed to make them special and superior, cause Jim to feel scorn and disdain. This impression is displayed in the novel "when the perusing of an Anouilh's play is on the program at the Welch's specialty end of the week", and "Jim needs to suffer it and later on asks why French and not an English writer were picked," (Amis, 1954, p. 44).

Such circumstances and events as satirically presented in the novel apparently display and reflect substantial realities of educational and otherwise post-war Britain, in which "the less splendid understudies were admitted to college and along these lines could get a degree, despite the fact that they didn't merit it," (Bura, 2020, p. 833). It is observed that in the novel as well Beesley displays her resentment and disenchantment at such an educational policy in which "specialists lean toward amount to quality" (Amis, 1954, p. 170).

Following World War II, the British government had modified its educational policies and introduced a package of reforms, particularly in connection to university education. The novel, hence, voices certain doubts and criticism against those new educational policies. It is obvious that the novel, through its main character, Jim, frowns on the rules that would enable too many

to join university education. According to the novel, the facilitation of such education for the masses would only result in bad quality education and a deterioration in the standards and criteria of university education because "more will mean worse" (Moseley, 1993, p. 3).

4. Concluding Remarks

It could be summed up that the novel has skillfully employed a rhetoric of satire in the means of enquiry, provocation, play, and display, as shown in the main argument, in order to criticize some follies and foibles of the academia and, by extension, all obstinately frequent follies of humanity as a whole. The novel has not only satirized the lower worth of the understudies and their poor academic achievements but also depicted Professor Welch in a way that derides the traditional elite of academia. Such satiric display of Welch's leading position while lacking enlightening potential has caused Jim and readers alike to disparage and disdain. Eventually, it could as well be concluded that through satirizing the academic surroundings and its members, the novel is, in extension, satirizes the stupidities, sophistries, and tedious follies of the human race, and not of particular individuals. For many, *Lucky Jim* is highly valued not only as a satirical work of literature but also as "a social document" (Wilson, 1966, p. 276).

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers.

References

[1] Amis, K. (1954). *Lucky Jim: A Novel.* London: Penguin Books.
[2] Applebee, A. N. (Ed.). (1997). *The Language of Literature: British Literature.* Evanston: McDougal Littell.
[3] Bakhtin, M. (1984). *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics.* (C. Emerson, Ed.) N. p.: University of Minnesota Press.
[4] Bloom, E. B. (1979). *Satire's Persuasive Voice.* Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
[5] Bradbury, M. (1994). *The Modern British Novel.* London: Penguin Books.
[6] Bura, T. (2020). Kingsley Amis's Lucky Jim: A Parody on Changing Social Order in Post War England. *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology*, 828-836.
[7] Connor, M. B. (2007). *Academic Novels as a Satire: Critical Studies of an Emerging Genre.* N. p.: Edwin Mellen Press.
[8] Draister, E. (1994). *Techniques of Satire: The Case of Saltykov-Scedrin.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
[9] Frye, N. (1957). *Anatomy of Criticism.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
[10] Gallego, M. T. (2013). The Rhetoric of Satire in Evelyn Colon's Telling (2000). *Revista Clepsydra*, 81-97.
[11] Griffin, D. (1994). *Satire: A Critical Reintroduction.* Lexington: University Press of Kentucky.
[12] Hammond, B. (2005). *Pope Amongst the Satirists 1660-1750.* Horndon: Northcote House Publishers.
[13] Hussein, A. M. (2014). The Satirical Art in Kingsley Amis's Lucky Jim. *Journal of the College of Arts. University of Basra*, 1-30.
[14] Lodge, D. (1992). *Introduction to Kingsley Amis, Lucky Jim.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
[15] Mgallad, A. H. (2018). Satirizing Some or All? A Comparative Study of In J. D. Salinger's The Catcher in the Rye and Kingsley Amis's Lucky Jim. *Journal of Tikrit University for Humanities*, 1-12.
[16] Morton, R. (1983). "*Introduction: Satire and Reform.*" *Satire in the 18 Century* (Vol. 10). (J. D. Browning, Ed.) New York: Publications of the McMaster University Association for 18th Century Studies.
[17] Moseley, M. (1993). *Understanding Kingsley Amis.* Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.
[18] Padhi, P. K. (2017). Indian Campus Novels: An Emerging Genre in Literary Writing. *Journal Of Humanities And Social Science*, 1-12.
[19] Parker, R. B. (2016). Farce and Society: The Range of Kingsley Amis. *Wisconsin Studies in Contemporary Literature*, 27-38.
[20] Sinding, M. (2003). *The Mind's Kinds: Cognitive Rhetoric, Literary Genre, and Menippean Satire.* Hamilton: McMaster University.
[21] Wilson, E. (1966). *The Bit Between My Teeth: A Literary Chronicle of 1950-1965.* New York: Farrar.
[22] Yearling, R. (2016). *Ben Jonson, John Marston and Early Modern Drama, Satire and the Audience.* England: Palgrave Macmillan.