INTRODUCTION

“In George Eliot’s novel *Middlemarch*—a novel not generally characterised by parodic playfulness—there is a scene in which Mr. Brooke, who is standing for election, has to make a speech to an unruly crowd. As he speaks from the balcony of an inn, an effigy of himself is displayed which, by virtue of a ventriloquist’s skill, derisively repeats everything that Brooke says. As George Eliot writes, “the most innocent echo has an impish mockery in it when it follows a gravely persistent speaker, and this echo was not at all innocent” (Eliot 413); the crowd is amused, Brooke is humiliated, and his political opponents score a victory. This can be taken as an exemplary instance of parody, albeit a fictional one” (Dentith1).

Imitation is an innate part of human nature. Even toddlers can imitate various sounds like a bird’s chirping and a cow’s mooing as well as actions like grandfather’s gait, father’s anger, mother’s scolding and typical religious chanting. It is in this innate human nature that we can find the root of parody as a form. Every generation prides itself on its favourite parody rhymes in school life. In Marathi, some of the very famous parody rhymes include *Jaydev jaydev jai Laxmikaku tumcha mulga odhato ganja tambakhu* (“Laxmi aunty, your son smokes ganja and tobacco”), or those based on a traditional *aarti* and songs in musical plays like *Tell fatherla Ganpati thronavari Sitala* (“Tell father that Ganapati sat on the throne.”)
The first recorded usage of the actual Greek word, or the English word ‘parody’ occurs in Aristotle’s *Poetics*, wherein Hegemon of Thasos [fifth century BC], author of the *Gigantomachia*, is referred to as ‘the inventor of parodies,’ a metrical verse form.

*Parodia* is the ancient Greek word which the modern term parody derives from. The word is made up of a prefix (para), which may mean either “against” or “beside”, and a noun (“ode”), which means “song”. The etymology of the word “parody”, then, suggests two meanings which seem to oppose each other to a certain extent. Does parody mean a song sung “against” another or does it mean one sung “beside” another without any intent to oppose or to “counter”? Both the definitions can be equally valid in their own ways, and it can be suggested that this etymological vagueness forms the basis of the ongoing difficulty in providing an exhaustive definition of parody. It is as though the indefinite etymology of the term is reflected in the diversity of the examples which we tend to label as “parody”. Parody, as all writers on the subject have been compelled to admit, has never been an easy term to define.

Robert Mack’s following statement is significant in showing the pervasive nature of parody, when he says, “Ours is destined to be an age of parody” (Mack 1).
Definitions and the Theories of Parody

The word *paratragoedia* or *paratragedy* from the Greek *paratragodein*, which is defined as ‘to mockingly imitate the style of tragedy’ by Walther Kranz in his article *Paratragodie*, in ‘Paul’s Real–Encyclopadie der classischen Alterturnwi-ssenschaft,’ has been used to describe those ancient Greek plays which involved the parody of tragedy.

Fred W. Householder connects the usage *parodia* to an earlier use of the term *parados* (plural *paradoi*), to describe an “imitating singer,” or “singing in imitation,” and to the derivation from those words of the noun ‘parode’ and the idea of a song or ‘ode’ sung in imitation of another” (Householder 1-9). Macus Fabius Quintilianus, c.35 AD–d. after 96 AD, had described the word *parode* in his book *Institution Oratoria* as ‘a name drawn from songs sung in imitation of others, but employed by an abuse of language to designate imitation in verse and prose’ (Rose 8).

Middle English had often employed the homonym *parodi (e)* or *paradoie*, a (distorted form of the Old French *periode* or, formerly, the Medieval Latin *periodus*) to signify ‘death’ or ‘termination of life.’ The aurally proximate Greek word *odos* was itself used to signify a ‘pathway,’ an ‘entrance’, an ‘approach’; metaphorically, *odos* connoted not only a ‘journey’ or a ‘voyage’, but also ‘the way’ or ‘the method’ as in ‘a method of thinking’ or ‘a mode of belief.’
In his essay ‘Parodies’, Isaac D’Israeli begins with the definition of parody as ‘a turning of another’ which is reminiscent of ‘Florio’ earlier, and relatively neutral definition of term: “Parodies were frequently practised by the ancients, and with them, like ourselves, consisted of a work grafted on another work, but which turned on a different subject by a slight change of the expression” (Ibid 10).

In his introduction to “The Oxford Book of Parodies”, John Gross defines parody as: “Imitation which exaggerates the characteristics of a work or a style for comic effect” (Gross xi).

A Dictionary of World Literature, edited by J. P. Shipley defines parody thus: ‘‘A composition in which characteristics of manner and spirit of an author or class of authors are imitated so as to make them appear ridiculous’’ (Shipley 298-99). A prose or poetic composition structured more or less as per the original piece and in which the expected grave meaning is however, distorted satirically can be called a parody.

The English term ‘parody’ was translated into Marathi as ‘vidamban kavya’. The term ‘parody’ means ‘caricature of a poem made by applying its words with burlesque effect’. Now ‘burlesque’ means composing a poem similar to an original one and mocking and ridiculing the serious content of the original poem while imitating its structure. While engaging into such a parody, one must keep in mind the specific diction used by the
original poet, his styles and faults. It is also necessary to consider the stresses on the specific words in the original poem.

In order to make a proper study, three kinds of parody have been proposed. The first of these kinds is “parodies of texts and personal styles”. (E.g. Henry Fielding’s Shamela, a parody of Samuel Richardson’s Pamela). The second kind of parody is “genre parody”–a category labelled by some as “general parody” as opposed to “specific parody.” (E.g. Cervantes’ Don Quixote)

The third kind of parody is “discourse parody” (e.g. Jonathan Swift’s A Modest Proposal).

The humour contained in a parody is mainly mocking in tone. Poetry is more prone to being parodied than prose. The renowned parodist Acharya Atre’s definition regarding this is very pointed. He says: “A parody of a poem means structuring a new poem more or less similar in structure to the original one and creating a misinterpretation of the original serious meaning of the poem by imitation to give rise to mockery” (Varti 127). Such an imitation should include the specific words used by the poet, his or her personality, specific styles, linguistic faults etc. Just as it is important to create a subtle and humorous imitation of the flaws in the poem, it’s equally important to bring in the word level stresses of the original. Parody can be called the caricature with the soul of humour. However, the more the content of humour and mockery in this caricature,
the more successful the parody will be. It would not do to create a deformity in or imitation of a famous poet’s work; there should be a mockery of the unique improper linguistic style or belief system. In addition, there should be sufficient spices added—overstatement or understatement for highlighting the foundation of humour.

There are two methods of creating literary humour: 1) trivial expression of a grave subject matter, and 2) grave expression of a trivial subject matter. Parody is loosely called burlesque or caricature, too. Burlesque is parody of action, used mostly in plays. Caricature is parody of appearance, used mostly by cartoonists. Parody that we are generally discussing is parody of style that can further be divided into the following types:

1) Diction based, 2) Appearance based or method based, and 3) Mixed or comprehensive.

1) Diction based parody: In this type, the words in the original structure are altered or reversed. There are two subtypes of this type:

a. Laughter-resultant: there are many examples in which the original words are changed. Example: the word *zendu* is used in the place of *chendu* in the first couplet of *Wahawa wahawa zendu ha| Sundar kiti khachit ha*| similarly, changing the
original words *Santh wahate Krishnamai* to *Santh gatase Krishnabai* results into laughter.

b. Gravity-resultant: B. S. Mardhekar has achieved a desired effect by altering and moving around some words using the structure of the said poem. There are two clear examples of Mardhekar’s diction-level modifications to bring home the bitter reality of the disillusionment and meaningless empty lives of human beings in the mechanical age.

Instead of

*Jethe jato tethe, tu maza sangati||*

(“Wherever I go, you accompany me.”)

Mardhekar uses

*Jethe jato tethe, meech maza sangati|
Dolyanchyach bhinti zalya aisha||*

(“Wherever I go, I accompany myself.”)

Similarly, he converts

*Sarvepi sukhina santu, sarve santu niramaya||*

To a very crude

*Sarve jantu routina, sarve jantu nirashaya||
Sarve chhidrani panchantu, ma kashchit dukkh log bhavet||*

(“The life having full of worms is a routine, and the worms are healthy.”)

2) Appearance or method-based: in this type, the external style of a well-known work is imitated. Again the motive behind imitation is not mockery of the original. There are further two sub-types:
a. Common tendency based: we may include works like *Chalchalu Bhagvad Geeta* by J. K. Upadhye, Mangesh Padgaonkar’s *Udasbodh* and N. G. Limaye’s *Ballavdoot* on the lines of *Meghdoot*. All these parodists don’t intend to laugh at the original work. Keshavkumar’s *Manache Sloka* on the lines of Samarth Ramdas’s *Manache Sloka* fall under this same category.

b. Specific tendency based: this type focuses on pointing out specific tendencies rather than common ones, and showing the faults of an individual rather than of the society at large. Sometimes while imitating a work, the original may be laughed at. Example may be Keshavkumar’s parody poem *Chapha*. Here, Keshavkumar didn’t want to criticise the poet Bee but his target was S. N. Chaphekar.

3) Mixed or comprehensive: in this type, the style and content of the original is mocked. In other words, mockery is expected on both levels-expression and content. A major example would be Keshavkumar’s *Shyamale*, which is a parodic version of Madhav Julian’s *Shyamales*.

J. C. Scalinger, in his *Poetica libri septem* of 1561, had used the word ‘ridiculus’ in describing the basic meaning of parody as the singing of the song which ‘inverted’ or changed around the words of the songs sung
by the Homeric ‘rhapsodist’ or the bards and turned their sense in to something ‘ridiculous.’ Scalinger’s word *ridicula* could be translated as ‘laughable’ in the sense of ‘funny’ or ‘amusing’, the word derives from ‘rideo’, to ‘laugh’, and had been used in Madius *De ridiculis* of 1550 with relation to Aristotle’s comments on laughable, the same word had also been given the sense of ‘to mock’ by Horace and has more often been translated as to make ‘ridiculous’ in the sense of ‘absurd,’ and as a mocking ‘laughing at’, rather than as a ‘a laughing with’ by critic in English.

Ben Jonson’s use of the word parody in Act V, scene v of his *Every Man in his Humour*, to describe an imitation of popular verses (A Parodie! a parodie! with a kind of miraculous gift to make it absurder than it was), had clearly emphasised the more ‘ridiculous’ aspect of the form, and D’Israeli could describe parody as including variations which stretched from the fanciful to the malignantly ridiculing. D’Israeli had described the *parodoi* who followed the Homeric rhapsodists as ‘buffoons’: ‘‘When the rhapsodists, who strolled from town to town to chant different fragments of poems of Homer, had recited, they were immediately followed by another set of strollers–buffoons, who made the same audience merry by the burlesque turn which they gave to the solemn strains which had just so deeply engaged their attention’’ (D’Israeli 511), though he was of the opinion that parody was not simply ‘buffoonery’
The renowned Marathi critic G. M. Pawar states that parody is a means of mocking meaningless symbols and lifeless styles in literature on a priority basis. He doesn’t believe that parody is an independent type of humour but it is a specific technique that generates humour. Parody can display two types of this technique- satire and witticism (Pawar 210).

Many definitions of parody have paid insufficient attention to its ancient heritage. Even the original *Oxford English Dictionary* follows a largely eighteenth century view of parody while defining it as a ‘burlesque’ poem or song and thus describes it deriving from the ancient Greek word *parodia*. Several misunderstandings have been generated by the definition of parody as burlesque. The word burlesque is not just a more modern word than *parodia*, but has been derived from quite different terms.

Simon Dentith has defined parody, in a deliberately widely drawn definition, as “any cultural practice which makes a relatively polemical allusive imitation of another cultural production or practice”. (Dentith 9). According to Dentith, “parody is to be thought of as a mode, or as a range in the spectrum of possible intertextual relations” (Ibid 9).

In his article *The Basis of Ancient Parody* of 1954, E. J. Lelievre defines ‘parode’, as “singing after style of an original but with a difference” (Lelievre 66), and also points to the ambiguity of the prefix ‘para’ and its ability to describe both nearness and opposition.
Lack of attention to the historical background of the terms used to define parody has been one of the major problems of definition of parody. The restriction of the description of parody to one or two aspects of that term or its usage is another problem. In the past, parody had been defined by most of its lexicographers in terms of -

1) its etymology,

2) its comic aspects,

3) the attitude of the parodist to the work parodied,

4) the reader’s reception of it,

5) The text in which parody is not just a specific technique but the ‘general’ mode of the work itself, and,

6) Its relationship to other comic or literary forms.

There are differing opinions in descriptions of the ancient uses and meanings of the word for parody. Of all the terms still used to describe comic quotation, imitation, or transformation, parody alone is named in the classical literature and poetics of Greeks and it has gained some importance in the Western tradition from this fact. Due to its long history, to some extent, the term parody has become the subject of so much argument. It is not owing to the length of time involved that has allowed the dispute to propagate itself, but because it can be assumed that in that time, records of its earliest uses and meanings have been lost.
The lack of such records may be due to the fact that the subject was not considered to be sufficiently ‘serious’ in the sense of either ‘grave’ or ‘important’ by the ancient scholars. In his chapter 5 of ‘Poetics’, Aristotle asserts that though successive changes in Tragedy and their authors are not unknown, we cannot say the same of Comedy; its early stages passed unnoticed, because it was not as yet taken up in a serious way.

When Margaret Rose published on the subject of ‘Parody’ many years ago, it was being treated by many critics as a rather lowly comic form. It had little real significance in the history of literature. Even the structuralists and the post-structuralists also described parody in negative terms and didn’t think it necessary to pay attention to analysing it.

Perhaps the most widely available study of parody in the late twentieth century was Linda Hutcheon’s slim but ambitious *A Theory of Parody: The Teachings of Twentieth-century Art Forms* (1985). Hutcheon, like Rose, stressed the fact that those texts that we label ‘parodic’ need not necessarily involve any denigrating comparison between the derivative work and its ‘target’ text. Hutcheon stressed the fact that the prefix *para* meant not only ‘counter’ or ‘against’ but also ‘close to’ or even ‘beside’. Hutcheon herself initially defined parody simply as self-conscious “repetition with difference” (Hutcheon 37). According to her, the pragmatic range of literary parody in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries was widened to include not only the mocking and ridicule traditionally
associated with the kind, but comprehended those works that might likewise invite admiration and imitative respect as well. The poetry of T. S. Eliot was one of the examples of this extended form of parody. Some definitions in the eighteenth century specifically qualified parody as a ‘burlesque change of another’s words’. Critical commentaries in the period were likely more often to hedge their bets by defining the verb ‘parody’ simply as to ‘copy,’ many willingly recognised that literary parody does not always carry with it any Sneer at the Author parodied. The mock epic is an excellent example of a parodic form in which the ethos is one of light-hearted respect towards the background or target text, rather than scorn.

Alfred Liede has argued in his article on parody in the second edition of the *Reallexikon der deutschen Literaturgeschichte* that parody is but one special form of conscious imitation, which he sees as an age old human activity, and is above all an exercise in learning or perfecting technique or style. According to Liede, the most wide-spread of parody is, moreover, ‘artistic parody’, the ultimate goal which is ‘complete imitation’, in which it is success of similarity of the parody to its model which determines its level of artistic quality (Quoted in Rose 30, 31).

Linda Hutcheon’s study (*A Theory of Parody: The Teachings of Twentieth Century Art Forms* (1985) throws light on examples of Parody produced in twentieth century. Her major concern is to account for modern parodic forms, and for the same reason she opposes Genette’s definition.
Genette wants to confine parody to such short texts as poems, proverbs, puns and titles. Modern parody, however, discounts the same limitation and disregards Genette’s restricted definition of parody as a minimal transformation of another text. Hutcheon proposes the definition that greatly broadens the gamut of parody. According to Hutcheon, parody and especially modern parodic art can be defined as “imitation with critical distance”, or in other words “repetition with difference” (Hutcheon 37). Her theory of parody involves an important element that differentiates it from the theories of intertextuality. This element is the “encoder” (i.e. producer) of parody, and the role of the encoder and the existence of shared codes between the encoder and the “decoder” (reader) is a very essential element in parody. While justifying her definition of parody, she asserts, “although my theory of parody is intertextual in its inclusion of both the encoder and the text, its enunciative context is ever broader: both the encoding and the sharing of codes between producer and receiver are central to my theory” (Ibid 37).

She further contends that parody does not necessarily involve comic elements, and blames the “stubborn retention of the characteristic of ridicule or of the comic in most definitions of parody.” She, here, proposes “a range of pragmatic ‘ethos’, from the reverential to the playful to the scornful” (Ibid 37).
Hutcheon’s disregard of the element of comedy in her definition of parody is vehemently disapproved of by Margaret A. Rose. Her *Parody: Ancient, Modern and Post-modern* (1993) is a definitive work presenting an analysis and history of theories of parody from ancient to contemporary times. It expands and elaborates on her previous study on parody titled, *Parody // Metafiction* (1979). Rose can understand recent attempts like Hutcheon’s to eliminate the element of comedy from parody. She asserts that Hutcheon’s approach represents an attempt to elevate modern parody to a higher status—to a status it deserves—by divorcing it from the comic, which is mostly associated with “lower” form like ridicule or burlesque. Rose, however, argues that elevating parody to a higher status does not necessarily require the elimination of the comic from its definition. She is of the view that parody can and should comprise both comic elements and intertextual elements—elements that critics like Hutcheon advocate. She, then, defines parody along these lines as “the comic re-functioning of preformed linguistic or artistic material” (Rose 52). She emphatically asserts that in her definition, the essential and distinguishing characteristic is ‘comedy’. The term ‘re-functioning’ can be used to define parody only if it is coupled with the adjective ‘comic’. In fact, Rose’ study is marked with the emphasis on the comic aspect of parody and on the possibility of engaging in discussions of parody both as a comic as well as a complex form.
Simon Dentith’s brief but comprehensive volume *Parody (2000)* is the most lucid and accessible modern discussion of the fundamental nature of parody. Dentith argues in the same book that disputes over definition may often prove to be “a fruitless form of argument”. According to him, parody is such an old and versatile form that formulating a single definition to comprise all examples is often a hopeless endeavour. “Because of the antiquity of the word ‘parody’, because of the range of different practices to which it eludes, and because of differing national usages, no classification (of parody) can ever hope to be securely held in place” (Dentith 6). He formulates his own definition in line with his study’s major concern, which is the cultural politics of parody, and suggests the following definition:

“Parody includes any cultural practice which provides a relatively polemical allusive imitation of another cultural production of practice” (Ibid 9). Here, ‘cultural’ and ‘polemical’ can be regarded as the keywords of this definition. Dentith’s approach appears rather useful and practical, especially when we consider the fact that it is almost impossible to come up with a fully satisfactory, comprehensive definition of parody.

Different kinds and diverse examples of parody have been produced from the Middle Ages to the present. What is required is a definition that is comprehensive enough but will also limit the scope of parody by distinguishing it from other double-coded or intertextual forms. Rose’s emphasis on the comic aspect of parody may appear helpful. It is, of course,
contended that humorous aspect is an essential part of parody. This may, however, prove problematic as putting too much emphasis on the comic aspect in a definition of parody may inevitably lead to a misunderstanding that these various definitions are not wholly adequate for the purpose of the study of parody. Following comprehensive definition of parody, therefore, is proposed: ‘Parody is an intentional imitation—of a text, style, genre, or discourse—which includes an element of humour, and which has an aim of interpreting its target in one way or the other.’ The last phrase in the definition ‘an aim of interpreting its target in one way or the other’—is related to the attitude exhibited by the work of parody towards its target. As the phrase signifies, this attitude may range from denigration, mockery, and ridicule to respectful admiration. A work which makes an explicit use of humour to mock or ridicule its “hypo text”, may probably aim at making a harsh criticism of any idea, convention, style, stance or philosophy represented by the ‘hypo text’. On the contrary, if a work expresses explicit admiration for its hypo text with the inclusion of the element of humour—no matter how subtle—then the aim of this humour may not be to criticise whatever is represented by the hypo text but to make a witty and/or critical comment about some other phenomenon not directly represented by the hypo text but somehow activated by the re-writing of it. It is pertinent at this juncture to describe the various features of parody in a detailed manner.
Features of Parody

Parody is basically an imitation, which contains a magnification of the original styles and defects, just as a cartoon magnifies a character’s nose or face. In fact, we are very well aware of a person’s defects and styles, but we may not be able to put them across in detail. Those strike us when an imitator presents those defects and styles to us in an exaggerated fashion. Needless to say, this exaggerated imitation results in laughter. Parody lies in showing the similarity between two unrelated objects, for which exaggeration and creative fantasies have to be used liberally.

Parody is an art of humorous caricature. The more this caricature mixes with humour and satire, the more successful the parody. In order to underline the humour, it needs to be spiced up with exaggeration as well. Once all these tips are noted, the physiology of parody is ready.

Parody is a main category of humorous literature. There have been some writers like P. L. Deshpande who were successful in prose parody. However, the true realm of parody is poetry. Imitation is the soul of parody. Even the etymological meaning of *vidamban* is distorted imitation. This imitation becomes enjoyable only if it is of a familiar object. This is why popular poems are given the first preferences for parody. Parody contains the imitation of musical composition, diction and other specifics of the original. Therefore, the reader of the poetic parody has to understand poetry too.
At times, the readers believe that parody of their favourite poet is nothing short of ridiculing him and they may not approve of the same. At times, there is also the possibility of the original poet being hurt. S/he might feel that the readers are laughing at him or more specifically his poem, which he cherishes more than his life, rather than at the fun generated out of the imitation. He feels insulted by this and when the readers, while complimenting the parodist, say that the parody has really torn apart the original poem, injury is added to the poet’s insult. The parodist may sometimes be tempted to include the original poet’s personal references in order to heighten the fun, which further infuriates the original poet. The poet can take the parody sportingly only when s/he is convinced that the parody is written only for the sake of laughter. Nonetheless, it is a fact that the parodist works towards opening the eyes of the readers.

“Parody is a type of humour. Parody does not mean disgrace but rather means teasing. Even while teasing, one cannot be apathetic. There is a hint of defamation in teasing, which needs to be bearable. It may be scorching, but it should not burn or explode. Real fun lies if the victim feels like laughing while scratching the wound!” (Madhav Julian 40, 41).

Like a graft, parody is a born parasite, though it has an independent laughter value. Parody is not a distortion; it is an independent action. However, parody is not acceptable just for the sake of humour. Real parody does not imitate just the external form; it imitates even the internal content.
An excellent parody imitates everything right from the prosody, style and features to the minute characteristics of the content. Therefore, even if parody is a parasite, it can stand independent of the original creation if the parodist has an equal amount of creativity and ideas.

We can distinguish between different kinds of parody. One distinction often made is between ‘specific’ and ‘general’ parody, the former aimed at a specific precursor of text, the latter at a whole body of texts or kind of discourse. Thus, Lewis Carroll’s poem ‘How Doth the Little Crocodile’ (How Doth the little crocodile/Improve his shining tail…) is a specific parody of Isaac Watts’ poem ‘Against Idleness and Mischief’ (‘how does the little busy bee/improve his shining hour…’). On the contrary, Cervantes’ novel Don Quixote is general parody of the chivalric romance as a genre. Normally, there are two objectives behind poetic parody. One is to show the defects of the original poet, an example being Atre’s Shyamales. Another objective of parody is to use the good material of the original and to apply it to an ordinary object in a pseudo-serious way and thereby, mock that ordinary object. This second objective is more comprehensive as compared to the first one. The parody Chalchalau Bhagvad Geeta doesn’t aim to laugh at the great scripture Geeta; it uses the scripture as a weapon to laugh at cowardice and lack of courage as human vices. When a poem is made into a parody, it’s not always that the poem is insulted. There have been numerous parodies which
don’t insult the original poem in the least. Keshavkumar’s parodies like *Manache Sloka, Parita yeshil kadhi paratun* fall in the same category.

Just as art brings to notice the consistencies in life, it is also important to search for the inconsistencies in life. Humour that is produced while looking for natural and wonderful essence of life and in the process exhibiting the flawless nature of human life is a grand art, and irrelevancy is the soul of humour. Verbal inconsistency, semantic inconsistency, incidental inconsistency, unnatural inconsistency, exaggeration-related inconsistency, act-induced inconsistency and many types of inconsistencies display the wonder of life and bring home the philosophy of life in a light hearted way. Saint Dnyaneshwar says:

\[ ‘Ka laghaviyache vichitra| vinod te|| ’ \]

(Dnyeshwari 18:38, 97)

The real purpose of humour is to draw the true picture of life using the inconsistencies. Saint Dnyaneshwar also believed that humour is the mirror of an embellished mind or humour is as enriching in human life as knowledge; he says:

\[ ‘Taisa vidya vinod vibhave| Dekhe pudhilanchi daive|| ’ \]

(Ibid 242-16)

(“Humour is the glory of knowledge.”)

The basis of the success of a parody is that it should instantly remind the reader of the original. Keshavkumar’s *Parita, yeshil kadhi paratun?*
invariably reminds of Rev.Tilak’ Pakhara, yeshil kadhi paratun? S. S. Rege’s stanza *Ek vidi ahe mazya manat khol dadun* again invariably reminds of Padgaonkar’s *Ek gypsy ahe mazya manat khol dadun*. Renowned lyricist and music composer Yashwant Deo has a famous parody: *Patnichi mujori, tichi nitya seva, maran dhad deva ata maran dhad deva*. These lines immediately remind us of the very famous movie song by another renowned lyricist Jagdish Khebudkar: *Dehachi tijori, bhaktichacha theva, ughad dar deva ata ughad dar deva*. This reminder juxtaposes the original song and the parody, and puts a smile on one’s lips highlighting the inconsistency of the content in both.

The famous poet in Marathi F. M. Shinde states, “Company is a frame that shows inconsistency when it changes place or shape. When inconsistency offends the eye, it pricks the mind subtly. This prick is especially irritating for humour. When a humorist designs this irrelevancy, it does give rise to laughter, but his ulterior motive is to reform the society. The prick of his mind is genuine and it’s a sad fact that such a prick can be exhibited only through imitation. Those who make others laugh move around with the heaviest heart” (Preface: F. M. Shinde; Phutane 11).

Pretences are all pervasive—from domestic life to community life. Pretence is an external role that deceives even the pretender. A parodist mainly focuses on such social and political pretences. He takes stock of
pretentiousness by way of ridicule or sarcasm. That brings the abnormal to
the forefront, clarifying the irony within.

In his book *Sahityacha Swabhav*, Marathi critic G. M. Kulkarni states that parody is a genre unrelated to poetics. He further says: “The emphasis of parody is on inconsistency rather than consistency, on rationalism rather than emotions and on incompleteness rather than perfection. Even though humour is linked more closely to prose than poetry, right from ancient times, humour has resorted to rhythmic behaviour of language. The primary foundation of a higher level of humour is empathy and aestheticism. However, these elements are expressed in humour rather differently. The reason is that humour displays intensely the slivers and splinters that hurt the aesthetic sense rather than the real expression. They take the form of exaggeration, satire, irony and parody. The main objective of humour is to identify the inconsistency and distortion in a person or object and pinpoint them in a playful and naughty manner. Humour is expressed in various forms like subjective, incidental and linguistic, just to achieve this objective. The humour contained in Acharya Atre’s poem *Premache Advait* has been strengthened by both the factors-subjective and incidental” (G. M. Kulkarni198).

A telling example of how an original incident takes on the graft of irrelevancy was once given by the poet Mangesh Padgaonkar. At a school, students were waiting for the teacher. His chair was empty. Something
strange happened thereafter. A monkey entered the classroom from the window and went straight towards the teacher’s chair and sat on it. It sat there in exactly the same posture as the teacher! Naturally the students couldn’t contain their laughter. Now the original serious incident was that the teacher used to sit on the chair. However, the funny turn it took was by the monkey sitting in the same chair. This is like a grafted plant. If the same monkey had sat on a dusty chair in the corner, nobody would even notice or laugh at it. The chair belonging to the teacher is an integral part of the parody for creating laughter in this incident.

Serious and humorous are two inseparable parts of human nature; they are complementary, rather than in opposition. Parody can be compared to the type of strange images of ourselves that we see when we look in the concave or convex mirrors in a fair. A parodist should be a master of prosody. Prosody is the arithmetic concerning alphabet, syllables and feet. However, this arithmetic is somehow connected to the mysterious process of creation. Parody is a parasitical plant; it can survive only when it is allowed to live on an original work or creation. This naturally means, one has to select the song that can be made into a parody. This poem or song has to be familiar to the public. The readers, while reading the parody, carry with them the original song with all its nuances. The new slant experience of a parody can be enjoyed only within the dimensions of the original references. In such a structure, an original incident takes on the graft of a
totally irrelevant incident. In fact, this happens numerous times in human life; man might have explored the idea of a parody for the very first time through this direct experience.

It is true that parody needs the foundation of a sense of humour as well as temperament. In fact, parody is basically one’s temperament that picks up topics.

V. N. Dhavle says in his book titled ‘Sahityache Tatvadnyan’ that “in order to enable mockery in poetry, a poet has to consider the meaning and sound of every word” (Dhavle 258).

An excellent parody entertains as well as provides with rich intellectual joy, beyond doubt. However, this medium can also correct some flaws without preaching or in a light hearted way. When you tease someone, that person also becomes aware of the extreme tendencies in him or her. The same principle applies to literature. When it sees extremes, a creative mind cannot help but imitate and parody, which is a literary teasing, we can say. The imitation is on the level of intellect and humour. If the author who is parodied is a sportsman, he or she also takes pleasure in the imitation and corrects his flaws. In short, the art of parody has the power of showing flaws while entertaining. This reminds of an anecdote Acharya Atre shared once about his college life. He says: “A student from my class was always sleepy. He used to sleep off near us every day in the class. Now if his sleep was harmless, we wouldn’t mind. However, he
accompanied it with a horrible snore. We found his daytime snoring very irritating. Once, while I was listening to his snoring, I was suddenly reminded of the Maruti Stotra I had learned by heart as a child. I took a couple of other friends sitting next to him in confidence and we started teasing him using the Maruti Stotra. Instead of a particular line ‘Mahabali pranadata sakala uthavi bale’, (“Maruti is mighty, that lifts the entire universe”), we used to say ‘Mahabali zop gheta sakala bhivavi bale’. (“Maruti here is fast asleep, that frightens the entire class”). The poor student was quite embarrassed with this parody. Nonetheless, we used to chant this Stotra continuously and irritate him no end. We troubled him for days on end. Finally, that Mahabali who slept in the class gradually got rid of the bad habit because of our constant recital of the parodied Stotra” (Doke 2).

Parody does not mean defamation; it is a literary form of criticism. An ordinary writer does not possess the creativity for parody. It requires something out of the world. Just making fun for the sake of laughter does not mean parody. It should have depth of thought and sympathy towards society, from which the process of parody generates. Parody is a very cultured and effective type of literary criticism. The weapon of parody must be used skilfully and tenderly. The literary taste of a parodist must be high class and he must have minute observation power for aesthetics. Even the tiny shades of sound and meaning should not escape him. Excellent prose
and poetic parody can be created only in those languages where the literature is matured and rich and the speakers of which have excellent high class taste for literature. The meaning of the term *vidamban* is copying ridiculously or teasing and the word is similar to *vitambana*. For these reasons, the common man is hammered with the idea of this type of writing being bad. Atre insists that such a concept is wrong. It is an illusion if people think established authors should not engage into parody. Atre believes that “parody is a type of contrast devotion. The poem and poet to be parodied has to be popular for the parody to be good. Therefore, choosing a poet for parody is like showing respect to him” (Atre 2005: 56).

It is impossible to write parody without mastery over poetic techniques and subtleties of poetic writing. In a circus, a clown parodies horse riding and makes the audience laugh. But he needs to be a practiced horse rider for this. The one who can write flawless poetry can only parody the flaws in another’s poetry or let us say he gets a right to that. However, this is not all that a parodist needs. He must be blessed with an acute sense of humour for writing effective parodies.

The renowned author and the recipient of the Dnyanapeeth Award G.V. alias Vinda Karandikar uses the term *virupika* instead of *vidamban* in Marathi. He believes making the language a better carrier for sentiments and meaning even after making irregular changes in the usage of the language is the change in form. Sometimes this change is complementary
while at other times it is incongruous. This change in form is many times obtained while transforming the references. However, it can also be seen independently at times

Karandikar has given some of the following examples of incongruous change of form.

1. *Sarve jantu routina| sarve jantu nirashaya||*
2. *Kiti kiti sangu tula ga, maj chain nase*
3. *Dole he filmi gade| khokuni maj pahu naka||*
4. *Ghanashyam sundara shreedhara girinoday zala*
5. *Sah nau taraktu| sah veeryam daravavahai||*
6. *Panchshavyagar khalil agache|*
7. *Tingle amuchi karito yamahi*
8. *Bhukekangalistan ka| zindabad||*

(Karandikar 207)

Like poetry, even prose may contain parody. One way of a prose parody includes imitating certain stylistic features of the writing styles of a writer. There have been numerous such parodies written earlier, like Atre parodying the style of Chaphekar’s prose writing style. Atre has written a heavy and lofty preface to his *Zenduchi Phule* under the heading *Ekach Vakya*, which literally means just a sentence. This one sentence in the preface is made up of 12 lines full of bombastic and knowledgeable Sanskritised words. Other examples of prose parody can be *Ek Nave*
Saundaryavachak Vidhan, Shambhavi-ek ghene, Majgharati Phoenix, Sahanubhav Vangmay by P. L. Deshpande. These contain perfect imitations of the writing styles of various writers as also an apt satire of eccentricity-driven literature, bookishness of criticism and excessive symbolism in general in the literary world.

G. M. Pawar regards parody as a specific technique that generates humour. According to him, parody can display two types of this technique—satire and witticism. One expression of parody is in the form of satire and it can also be in the form of witticism, states G. M. Pawar. He further says that satirical parody aims at an exaggerated picturisation of literary shortcomings or flaws of some form for insulting the original work, the display of the faults and cleansing the literary field. However, a witticism based parody is different. It aims at creating laughter by imitating a literary work taken for support from a very different angle.

Raja Badhe has written a poem titled Dene Thaklyavar, where the hero says to his beloved:

\[ Kothe tari jau ithuni sheeghra nighoni Adnyat thikani \]

(“We shall go immediately to an unknown place.”)

This poem by Raja Badhe is a parody of Madhav Julian’s poem Tethe Chal Rani. The reference in the original poem is that of social injustice and pressure. The romantic hero wants to go away to a distant place in order to get rid of the social injustice and pressure. In the said
parody, the reference is transferred. The hero of the parody wants to go away to a distant place with his beloved, but for avoiding debt. With this transfer, the experience in the poem is brought across eccentrically and the humour in the witticism based parody is found.

Even N. G. Limaye’s parody *Ballavdoot* based on *Meghdoot* has a transferred reference. The estranged hero in this parody sends his cook to his beloved as a messenger and gives her address thus:

*Thakurdwrajavali wilase New Willington Saloon|
*Thethoniya bhavan amuche uttarelagi saan||

("There is ‘New Willington Saloon’ near ‘Thakurdwar’, from that place, our house is northward.")

Here we can see a reference full of attributes opposite to the original honourable, sober, emotional references, giving rise to laughter. When reading this parody, the sense of the gravity of the original poem awakens in the reader’s mind and the parody newly creates the reference of the petty subject, cutting across the original effect. This is how transfer creates laughter. J. K. Upadhye’s parody *Chalchalau Bhagvat Geeta* is also similar in nature.

At times, even if a piece of writing is imitative in nature but does not create a positive impact but creates rather a different feeling in the readers, it cannot be called humorous writing. The following poem by B. S. Mardhekar is an example of this type:
The quoted lines from the above poems sound parodic in nature. *Dinapali* instead of *Vanamali*, *giranoday* instead of *arunoday* and even in the later lines some words like *malakamprati*, *rinsampahi* used in the Sanskrit *sloka* achieve the effect of eccentricity. However, the satirical lines in this poem are used to show the heartrending reality of the mechanical, essence-less and lifeless existence of the labourers in the horrible city of Mumbai. They don’t create a positive sense but reveal the tragedy and horror of life.

“Both the above poems satisfy the parodical structure because of imitation at some points but the intent of the parody and imitation is not generation of a positive feeling. On the other hand, parody is used here to bring home the bitter reality and achieve the serious effect desired by the poet. Therefore, these cannot be termed as poems creating humour out of parody” (Pawar 241,242).
In parody, the comic incongruity created by parody may contrast the original text with its new form or context by comic means of contrasting the serious with the absurd as well as the ‘high’ with the ‘low’, or the ancient with the modern, the pious with the impious, and so on.

The sudden destruction of expectations which accompanies the perception of such incongruities has long been recognised as a basic ingredient of humour.

According to M. Rose, the most frequently found signals from parody can be broadly listed under the following categories.

I. *Changes to the coherency of the text quoted.*

1) Semantic changes
   
   a) Apparently meaningless, absurd changes to the message or the subject matter of the original.
   
   b) Changes to the message or subject matter of the original of a more meaningful, ironic, or satiric and comic character.

2) Changes to the choice of words and/or to the literal and metaphoric functions of words taken from the original.

3) Syntactic change (which may also affect the semantic level).

4) Changes in tense, persons or other syntactical features.
5) Juxtaposition of passages from within the parodied work, or with new passages.

6) Changes to the associations of the imitated text made by the new context and other co-textual (and ‘beyond the sentence’) changes.

This might also include, for example, the transformation of criticism in to the subject–matter of fiction, as in Malcolm Bradbury’s *Mensonge*.

7) Changes in sociolect, in idiolect, or in other elements of the lexicon.

8) Changes to metre or rhyme in verse parodies, or to other such ‘formal’ elements in drama or prose works, as well as to subject-matter.

II. *Direct Statement*

1) Comments on the parodied text or on the author of the parody, or on their readers.

2) Comments on or to the reader of the parody.

3) Comments on the author of the parody.

4) Comments on the parody as a whole text.
III. Effects on the reader

1) Shock or surprise, and humour, from conflict with expectations about the text parodied.

2) Change in the views of the readers of the parodied text.

IV. Change to the ‘normal’ or expected style or subject-matter of the parodies.

(Rose 37, 38)

It has been argued that history proves that only parodies of well-known and powerfully poetic works survive. While it has been seen already that several of those maintaining this argument have overlooked the fact that the parody itself keeps its target alive at least to some extent, by quoting or imitating something of it within itself, parody should also have something new to say about these works for it to survive independently as a parody.

Qualities of Parodist

Acharya Atre has written an independent article titled ‘Mi Vidambankar Kasa Zalo?’ in which he explores the process of his turning into a parodist. S. G. Malshe has measured it up in his rather long preface while re-editing Zenduchi Phule. In his article Mi Vidambankar Kasa Zalo?, Acharya Atre says: “At that time, we were enamoured with the neo poetry of Keshavsut, Balkavi, Govindagraj, and B. R. Tambe and so on. We were awoken by the Ravikiran Mandal of Pune from this stupor. They
didn’t just wake us up; they virtually soaked our brains with a new vision. I cannot say how this affected anybody else, but as for me, I threw away the serious wrapping of sentimental poetry and the naughty parodist dormant in me leapt out like a lion from a cage. The only real sun in the Ravikiran Mandal was Madhav Julian; the rest were only the rays. Madhav Julian’s thoughts and language was filled with various miraculous styles and mannerisms. The Parsi fashionable cult practiced by Madhav Julian was entirely inconsistent with the puritan convention of neo poetry created by the followers of Keshavsut. Imagine the *Ganpati Aarti* in progress. How would a religious person feel if somebody blurts out ‘God Save the King’ at that place? That’s how I felt! Turning to parody was my literary reaction to those hurt sentiments” (Atre 2005: 45).

However, Acharya Atre later says in the same article: “Parody is a type of attraction of opposites. It is not possible to parody any ordinary poet or poetry. Parodying a poet is an indirect way of showing respect towards him or her” (Ibid 56). The inspiring factors of parody are the excessive familiarity with the original as well as the dazzle and abundance of symbolism in the same.

Some people are humorous and critical by nature. In fact, they are popular in their circles because of their sense of humour. Even if they show people’s foibles, others don’t take offence as their nature and purpose is clean and good. In summation, for such a task to be achieved through the
medium of parody, all these ingredients must be properly combined. “A food connoisseur has to have very sensitive senses of taste and smell. He should immediately smell if something is wrong in the recipe and the taste must tell him instantly which spices are lacking or in excess. The same applies to a parodist. His or her ear should be extremely sensitive and finely tuned towards the diction, its rhythm, and beauty in stresses” (Atre 2005: 44). It is impossible to pen a great parody unless one has acute knowledge of even the tiniest aspects of the intricacies of poetry.

According to Bal Gadgil, fun is the inspiration of parody. He further says: “it is absolutely impossible that any poet would reform after reading a parody of his poetry. Some ridiculous major tendencies and writing styles must have been stabilised for parody” (Jogalekar 161). Vidyadhar Pundlik has written a critique on the same collection. He believes “a parodist chooses a parody to provide a creative option to the original” (Ibid 61).

Hemant Joglekar, when describing his experience of how a parody comes about, says that “only that poem which has made a mark in the parodist’s mind can be parodied. Its features would be understood by the parodist as well and those would be worth parodying. The first feature is diction, the second being structure. Complete content or some part thereof can also be a topic of a parody. A form of writing can also provide zameen for a parody. (If a poet uses another poet’s first line for his poetry, it is called zameen)” (Jogalekar 164). Developments in the literary world can
also provide a topic for parody. Vishwas Vasekar says in his preface to *Bandgule*: “When sacrilege in literature reaches its height, a parodist appears. Our envy of some poets is our second inspiration” (Quoted in Jogalekar 161). Vasekar is not bothered about metrical variation, impropriety, mismatching poem in parody. His role is that of breaking the original poet’s limitations. A parodist is basically a thoughtful critic. He exactly knows the meanings of depth and superficiality. His aesthetic sense makes him identify the precise inconsistency and ugliness. It is only a parodist who understands that some ill practice is taking root into life, the society is being carried over by it and this road will lead to deterioration of the society. His care, sympathy and love for the society does not allow him to sit back and watch the chaos created by ridiculous tendencies. At such times, the teacher in the parodist gets up and strikes with his cane, admonishing one and all together. The skilled society-loving teacher has the responsibility of warning, bringing people back on track and making people alert. Even if Atre has exemplified this responsibility later from time to time, *Zenduchi Phule* was the beginning of this process. That’s why his *Zenduchi Phule* which is socially and culturally all-pervasive has become immortal. This collection is produced intentionally from an intense urge, rather than for fun. Humour is not meant just for fun. Its main idea is to entertain but it also aims at correction. A good student and well wisher of society can become famous as a parodist. His thoughtfulness, good wishes
are genuinely concentrated in a parody because he is intensely aware of the surreal. This might be a part of the education imparted by the saint literature. This education gives rise to social love and the mind guesses where parody can fit in to do well. It must be entertaining to write a parody, but it also contains lot of research and study.

An excellent parodist needs the imagination of an excellent poet. He also needs command on language, narrative style and succinct humour that catches the deformities. A good parodist reduces the big to small but never enlarges the small. If the subject of a parody is not big or popular, it would not interest anybody. If one sees a commonly observed big thing suddenly reduced to tininess and deformed in a parody, one is happy at the miracle. No one would know or understand if petty or unknown things are parodied.

Since a good parodist is a good poet, he can create independent poetic beauty by virtue of his huge imagination and subtle observation, as Zenduchi Phule evinces numerous times. A parodist is a critic who shows the faults while making you laugh. Zenduchi Phule possesses in abundance the laughter, poetry and critique required of superb parody.

The easiest method of laughing at somebody is mockery. This form includes gentle exaggeration and stretching of original styles. Original styles don’t give rise to laughter unless they are darkened to a deeper level. A parodist, therefore, must be armed with some playful rascal-quality. A
poet who possesses the understanding of consistency can easily spot inconsistency.

“What makes a parodist select a poem for parody? One, it should have impressed the parodist; two, the specialties of the poem should be well understood by him; three, those specialties are appropriate for parodying. He selects only that poem that can accept the grafting of the new ideas generated by him and the new poem made out of it is perfect. For parodying, the parodist has to adopt the specialties of the original, for which the poet and parodist need to be finely tuned with each other” (Ibid 162).

For a parodist, the inspiration for parody is as good as that of a new creation. He makes available a creative alternative for the original poem. The alternative resulting into humour gives rise to fun. While making such fun, it is shown how one (or many) specifics of the original may be ridiculous. Thus, the joy the parodist gains out of parodying is that of the joy of new creation.

What the reader gains in a parody is sheer fun. A parodied poem also has to stand on its own without the references of the original poem. The humour therein is independent, but it gives rise again to fun. At times, the reader might be unfamiliar with the original. But he is familiar with the specifics that are parodied and this understanding adds to the fun element. In case the reader recognises the original from the parody, this fun multiplies. At such times, he feels so content about recognising the original
and the specifics that are parodied that in his pride he idolises the parody. The parodist, too, is pleased because of the idolisation (Ibid 165).

Dwight Macdonald, while making the anthology entitled “Parodies: An Anthology from Chaucer to Beerbohm and After”, has followed three rules:

1) The authors parodied must have some currency today. As it is significant that parody ages faster than any other literary form.

2) The broader the worser.

3) No parody involving fleas or seasickness is enjoyable. (Macdonald xi)

Yashwant Deo, the very famous lyricist, music composer as well as parodist of Marathi literature remarks that it would be incorrect to consider only serious and prose writing to be quality writing. Writing anything that provokes laughter also needs intelligence. It’s not everybody’s job. Even a parody song gives us an opportunity to laugh and this medium of laughter should not be lost, because man is a laughing animal! Yashwant Deo believes that two things are required for creating a parody:

1. Composing lyrics and

2. Possessing strong memories of the old famous songs and the words therein

(Bapat 165)

After remembering the old famous song lines, new and parallel lines should be composed as per word groups in the original. The listeners
should once in a while, remember the original famous song, too. The topics for new lines might be anything, provided the structure gives rise to ample laughter. If one tries to write with an open mind, one can also create something naughty. One must avoid stretching the words somehow and fitting them into the parody structure. The diction, on the other hand, must be smooth and spontaneous. (When Yashwant Deo decided to write parodies some of his friends were quite dissatisfied with him because they felt that writing parodies was *infra dig*. However, Deo reprimanded them in his typical style, saying there are many incarnations of Deo—God. You may imagine my form to be that of a clown.) (Ibid 164, 165).

A parodist must have a good mastery over language in order to imitate the expression and to precisely target the content with his humorous style. Let us see a couple of examples here. The character of an insane person in a play cannot be played by real lunatic; you need a sane actor for that purpose. A stupid person cannot play the part of a stupid; you need a skilful actor there. A clown in a circus jumps in all sorts of ways but he needs to be an expert acrobat to entertain the audience. They say in English: ‘Set a thief to catch a thief.’ Similarly, a parodist must know how an original poet works.

Sometimes, excessive growth of meaningless symbols hampers the prosperity of the poetic genre. This surfeit of symbols provides a subject to the parodist. He makes the conventional as well as progressive
temperaments aware of the reality. We can even say criticism in the guise of a parody is more effective and intense than ordinary criticism.

Identifying the exact subject of parody and expressing them with pseudo-seriousness needs that the parodist has intelligence and creativity. Pseudo-seriousness contains witticisms, puns, taunts, sarcastic remarks and slant statements. Both the parodist and his readers need to have understanding, taste, creativity and intelligence. Without prior preparation, one cannot fully understand the specific expressions, nuances and subtleties of the parody.

The special linguistic tricks used in the comic style for attaining some specific result include word-plays, humour and parody. These are the main tools that the comic vision needs in order to concretise the principle of acceptance after encountering the incompleteness and contrast in human life. Witticism is rational and neutral in nature whereas humour is neutral in a way, but it still contains some sympathy. Parody is different from both of these because it is generated from a strong moral inspiration. However, these three elements contribute to create a particular temperament. It would be difficult to describe this particular temperament in precise words, but we can say it’s a state of critical amusement. “Witticism, humour and parody are the rational tools to face the human condition in various ways” (Et.al. Padgoankar 245, 246, 247).
Dr. Malshe, while explaining the nature of parody as a style of writing, says: “The imitation used in parody is distorted, excessive and exaggerated because it wants to focus on marking the defects. Such exaggerated and blunt defect marking proves beneficial. Due to it, the dimensions of enjoyability of parody get extended. Like a graft, parody is a born parasite. With time, the original difference diminishes in case of a graft. However, that doesn’t happen with a parody. Sometimes, even the later generations can enjoy a parody without even knowing the original reason or work because the parody is so clear that the defect-marking is obvious. Defects like bookish knowledge, sluggishness, show, greed of fame and self pride have a value of commonality and these are the ones a parodist wants to project. Therefore, a successful parody is more than just imitation of some writing- it has an independent humour value. Even the condemnation of it being a parasite is acceptable within limits. A parody can be enjoyed as just a humorous piece which can stand alone without the help of the original. However, the parodist must have tremendous creativity and imagination in order to bestow that level of enjoyability to the parody. Parody is another world. Overall consistency must be maintained even in this pseudo-serious world. The parodist has to carefully see to it that the pseudo-serious picturisation is not hampered by any anti-poetic element. This means a parodist is a humorist but basically a genuine artist. While identifying the essence of the original, he needs to be analytical like a critic.
Simultaneously, while tying up all loose ends and creating a uniform humorous structure out of the design, he needs to be creative like an artist. An excellent parody is undoubtedly a creative artefact of its own kind” (Usha Kulkarni 118).

For parodying, the poet must be filled with pure and innocent love for poetry. He needs to delve deep into the stylistic attributes that he wants to parody in detail. There is a clear difference between the ridiculous and the humorous thing. The difference between rusticity and vulgarity must be understood, too. Most importantly, none of the external reasons of the poem should account for the selection. Care should be taken that the selected poem does not pollute the entire poetic scenario. The enjoyability must be resultant rather than unyielding. It is based on some political social ill and wants to be human-centric while moving away from the tendency of believing that only the naughty people enjoy humour. Its rationale must be more maturing, comprehensible and all pervasive. If we can separate our poetry from that loose end after identifying its power and limitations, “Marathi poetry will prosper from a totally new angle. Such parody will enjoy the benefit of serving art and people both at the same time” (Jamkar 85, 86).

**Distinguishing Parody from Related Forms**

There are some terms, which have been confused or contrasted with parody during the modern period. Parody differs not only from satire, but
from the travesty, persiflage, and other forms of criticism or imitation of literary or artistic works. In her “Parody: Ancient, Modern, and Post-Modern”, Margaret Rose has extensively dealt with these various forms. It is pertinent to deal with in brief, but basic description of the distinguishing features of these various forms.

**Burlesque and Travesty**

The modern reduction of parody to a type of burlesque in descriptions given of it in eighteenth century and after has limited the meaning of the more ancient definitions and uses of parody. “Not only is the term ‘burlesque’ of more recent origin than the Greek words for parody, but it is usually described as being derived from the Italian *burla* meaning a joke or a trick, rather than from equivalents for the words from which the term parody is derived” (Rose 54). The word ‘burlesque’ has been used to describe a variety of types of comic and even non-comic entertainments.

Henryk Markiewicz states on the history of the term burlesque that the word for which it was imported from Italy, where it had been in uses in sixteenth century, to France, where, in the seventeenth century, it acquired more diverse meanings, sometimes of a pejorative colouring. Richmond P. Bond writes in his *English Burlesque Poetry, 1700-1750* of 1932 that Blount’s *Glossographia* of 1656 had described burlesque as meaning ‘drolish, merry, pleasant’(Bond 19), but ‘le burlesque’, according to Markiewicz, could also mean grotesque, rank or flat comicality, extravagance of imagination or style, no matter to what literary genre the word belonged.
Many twentieth century works of criticism have not only defined parody as burlesque but have attributed to burlesque some of the characteristics and the history of the more ancient form of parody. E. Bradlee Watson’s articles on the burlesque of the 1940s suggest, burlesque is parody “when the imitation humorously parallels the style or mannerisms of a particular work or author or school, but with a trivial or ludicrous purpose” (Rose 55). W. J. MacQueen–Pope’s article ‘burlesque’ in *Cassell’s Encyclopaedia of Literature* of 1953 claims, it can be said that Aristophanes used burlesque, and John Jump has introduced the chapter on ‘The Mock-Poem’ in his *Burlesque* of 1972 with the statement that “High burlesque flourished in the Classical literature of Greece and Rome” (Jump 37).

Richmond Bond had divided the burlesque into both high and low as well as specific and general in his book of 1932, and had claimed that “all burlesque may generally be called diminishing or magnifying, degrading or elevating, low or high” (Bond 11). According to William Adams, “a brilliant burlesque does harm to nobody; and a bad burlesque does but recoil upon the head of its author and his exponents” (Adams 122).

**Travesty**

Like burlesque, travesty is a term that was in vogue in the seventeenth century, both in England and French, and derived from an Italian word *travestare*, to distinguish. The most popular examples of travesty are
Scarron’s *Virgile Travesti*, and Cotton’s English imitation of it. The first two lines of Cotton’s Scarronides evince:

I Sing the man, (read it list,

A Trojan true as ever pist).

(Dentith 195)

The modern meaning of a ludicrously or deliberately insufficient imitation (e.g. ‘a travesty of justice’), is derived from this earlier literary usage.

The travesty lowers a particular work by applying a jocular, familiar, undignified treatment, and the Hudibrastic poem uses the same procedure on more general matter, the difference being one of particular and general. The parody mimics the manner of an individual author of poem by substituting an unworthy or less worthy subject, and the mock poem copies the manner of a general class of poetry without specific reference to a poet or a poem, again the difference being one of strictness of imitation. Thus, travesty and the parody imitate some definite work or style. Parody and travesty have in common closeness of satirical representation, mock heroic and Hudibrastic lack of closeness. Jump defines parody in similar terms to Bond as the “high burlesque of a particular work, achieved by applying the style of that work to a less worthy subject” (Jump 72). Jump gives the example of Fielding’s *Shamela* as an example of such parody, and echoes Bond in describing the mock–epic as a form high burlesque which lavishes
“the style characteristics of the class upon a trifling subject” (Ibid 18). Travesty is then defined by Jump as “the low burlesque of a particular work achieved by treating the subject of that work in an aggressively familiar style” (Bond 18), and Byron’s *Vision of Judgement* given as an example, while ‘hudibrastic’ is described as ‘the low burlesque of a less confined material’

In *Art of Satire* David Worcester defines the low burlesque as creating a standard below its victim and as making the reader measure him against that standard, and the high burlesque as placing a standard above the victim to spotlight his faults. He adds, just prior to making mention of Richmond Bond’s distinctions, that “conventionally, high burlesque treats of trivial subject in an elevated manner’, and that low burlesque ‘treats an elevated subject in a trivial manner” (Worcester 47).

Bond begins his 1932 book by arguing: “the essence of humour lies in incongruity, and when imitation is added, burlesque is the result’ (Bond 3). Burlesque consists, then, in the use of imitation of serious matter or manner, made amusing by the creation of an incongruity between style and subject. This inconsistency between form and content, this opposition between what is said and the way it is said, is the necessary qualification of burlesque.

Home says that “the burlesque that aims at ridicule, produces its effect by elevating style far above the subject”, and then, warns of taking
this too far, as in the ancient *Batraschmyomachia*. Home makes some specific comments on parody in which he distinguishes it from ‘every species of ridicule’, and writes that “it enlivens a gay subject by imitating some important incident that is serious: it is ludicrous, and may be risible; but ridicule is not a necessary ingredient” (Home 359). Later, however, Home adds that “though ridicule, as observed above, is no necessary ingredient in a parody, yet there is no opposition between them: ridicule may be successfully employed in a parody; and a parody not less successfully to promote ridicule” (Ibid 360).

**Persiflage, pekoral**

The term *persiflage*, which is derived from French, is defined in the OED as ‘light banter or raillery; bantering, frivolous talk’, or as a ‘frivolous manner of treating any subject’ (OED 595). It has also been used to describe the light satirical mocking of another’s work and like some applications of the word ‘burlesque’ can also denote a comic or mocking ‘mimicry.’ When applied to something parodic the term ‘persiflage’, is, however, usually more descriptive of the attitude of the parodist than of the structure or techniques of the parody, and while it may sometimes be used to describe mimicry, is not necessarily concerned with the comic quotation and transformation of literary works, as is the literary parody.

In his article ‘Was parodiert die parodie?’ Hans Kuhn has introduced the term *pekoral* from the Swedish, where it can designate an
unintentionally comic or stylistically incompetent piece of writing by ‘would be’ but untalented poet or writer. The word *pekoral* also may be applied to unintentional parodies written by incompetent authors, or poetasters, who have unsuccessfully imitated another style of work. Kuhn further defines the pekoral as “implying a certain naiveté on the part of the author, a discrepancy between intention and capacity, and a lack of stylistic sensitivity and judgement as to which devices are suited to which subject”, but also suggests that “the perception of the ‘pekoral’ character of a work may vary depending upon the education of the reader and the literary norms of their time” (Quoted in Rose 68).

**Pastiche**

Pastiche has also been described as a type of literary *forgery* by some, although it has not always been associated with the intention of forge, or to hoax. Peter and Linda Murray’s *A Dictionary of Art and Artists* is but one work which defines pastiche as forgery. It describes ‘PASTICHE, PASTICCIO’ as an imitation or forgery which consists of a number of motives taken from several genuine works by anyone artist recombined in such a way as to give the impression of being an independent original creation by the artist.

Despite its more recent history and differences from parody, pastiche has also been used as a synonym for parody, and especially in French literature, where it has, for example, been used to describe both conscious
and unconscious parody. Pastiche, however, is not only a much more recent term than parody, but differs from the latter in describing a more neutral practice of compilation which is neither necessarily critical of its sources, nor necessarily comic.

One authority on the subject pastiche, Leif Ludwig Albertsen, has further distinguished pastiche from parody by describing both parody and travesty as being different from pastiche in polemically reforming their models.

“The term ‘pastiche’ as applied to the arts today derives from the Italian word ‘pasticcio’, and means in general terms (from the translation of Italian pasticcio as a ‘pasty’ or ‘pie’ dish containing several different ingredients, and from the application of that word to certain paintings), the compilation of motives from several works” (Dentith 195). Such definition is also suggested in OED, where the word ‘pastiche’ is described as deriving from the Italian pasticcio, and where the latter is defined as meaning a ‘medley of various ingredients; a hotchpotch, farrago, jumble.’

Examples of the use of the term pasticcio given in the OED include a statement dated 1706 on the art of painting which describes ‘those pictures that are neither originals nor copies’, which the Italians call pastici.

Some evaluations of pastiche have stressed its positive potential in order to counteract the more negative descriptions given of it or of its
related forms by others. Some critics who have described the term as neutral have also felt the need to defend it against accusations of being derivative or lesser literary form.

As an example of pastiche, we can mention Pope’s mock-heroic poem *The Rape of the Lock* (1714), which imitates epic verse without direct transformation of it, in a generally playful way. The term pastiche has been given particular currency by Frederic Jameson, in the essay ‘Postmodernism, or The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism’ in which he distinguishes pastiche from parody, on the grounds that pastiche takes no critical distance from the material it recycles: pastiche, in fact, is ‘blank parody’. “Pastiche is then seen as characteristic of postmodernism and thus expresses the cultural logic of late capitalism.” (Dentith 194). According to Hutcheon, “both parody and pastiche not only are formal textual imitations but clearly involve the issue of intent. Both are acknowledged borrowing” (Hutcheon 38).

**Montage**

While the even more modern form of *montage* may be distinguished from parody because it does not necessarily involve the comic contrast of works found in parody, it can also be distinguished from the pastiche in works of art when objects are mounted together with less of the integration than is usual in pastiche. ‘Montage’ (from the French ‘mounter’or ‘to mount’) has been defined in OED as meaning figuratively, ‘the process of
making a mixture, blend, or medley of various elements; a pastiche; a sequence, miscellany.’

**Satire**

Parody has often been used for what have been described as satiric purposes. There are significant differences between satire and parody. Some dispute has surrounded the definition of satire. ‘The Oxford English Dictionary’ notes that formerly the word satire was often confused or associated with ‘SATYR’ and that this confusion was based on the notion that the Latin *satira* (from which the word satire is said to derive), came from the Greek *satyr* (OED, 2nd edn, vol. 14, 500). OED, however, suggests that the word *satira* is to be regarded as a later form of *satura*, meaning ‘medley’, from the phrase *lanx satura*, meaning a ‘full dish’ and, by extension, ‘a medley of ingredients’.

In addition to describing satire as deriving from the word *satura* the OED goes on to define satire as meaning in both ancient and modern usage a poem, in which ‘prevailing vices or follies are held up to ridicule.’

John Dryden’s *Discourse Concerning the Original and Progress of Satire* of 1693 had also referred to the derivation of satire from *satura* and had described the latter as meaning a ‘full dish’ or a ‘hotchpotch’ and referred to the critical functions of satire. One major factor which distinguishes the parody from satire is the parody’s use of the preformed
material of its ‘target’ as a constituent part of its own structure. Satire, on the other hand, need not be restricted to the imitation, distortion or quotation of other literary texts or preformed artistic materials.

The differences between the satire and parody are that the satirist may be concerned with attacking either that which is considered normative or distortions of the norms which they wish to protect, but that the parodist may also recreate or imitate certain norms or their distortions in order to attack or defend them in the parody text.

The flaws, errors, and absurdities that parody often reveals in its content are satiric. If, in nineteenth-century Cambridge, parody at times resembled a gentlemanly homage, in the previous centuries it had also proved to be a potent political weapon. Satire and parody have a natural affinity for each other. To use Frye’s wonderful terms, cranks with new ideas, or established conventions invented by dead cranks, provide particularly enticing targets for literary parody and social satire, both separately and together.

One earlier example of a work in which both ‘irony and parody are used in a satire’ of other writers is Alexander Pope’s Receipt to make an Epick Poem, which was first published in June 1713 and later used in chapter 15 of The Art of Sinking Poetry of 1728. In the same, Pope mocks the poetasters who had borrowed their poetic machinery from the ancients, but used it without genius.
“Eugene P. Kirk’s Menippean Satire: an Annotated Catalogue of Texts and Criticism of 1980 refers to Menippean satire living on in Swift, Fielding and Sterne. The same satire was an often used form of humorous polemic over the history of disputes up to the eighteenth century. The chief mark of the Menippean satire was unconventional diction, Neologisms, portmanteau words; macarons, preciosity, coarse vulgarity, catalogues, bombast, mixed languages and protracted sentences were typical of the genre, sometimes appearing all together in the same work. The Vision of Judgement, was a parody of Southey’s poem written in the Ottavarima of which Byron was a master. In these splendid stanzas all the weapons of satire are employed one after another, jibing, irony, humour, invective and contempt; and they alternate with the passages of a tempestuous imagination. The author of The Vision of Judgement ranks with Dryden, for in satire he was the chief of the great Romantic Movement, which expressed the ideals of the time. And the Romantic Movement was a vivifying, not a regulating force, like Classicism” (Previte-Orton 202,236).

Kirke names many different practitioners of Menippean satire, from Menippus himself to Varro, Petronius, Lucian, Seneca, Erasmus, Swift, Fielding, Rabelias, Cervantes, and Sterne.

Many people are dissatisfied with the term parody and suggest other terms for the genre based on the inclusion of satire or twisted humour. They unnecessarily link parody to disgrace, which is of stronger nature. Parody
should contain pure humour that doesn’t prick people. There was no doubt
good sentiment behind the birth of parody. The original word nears
mockery. Even English literature uses parody to mock especially literary
defects. However, English parodists have shown that even without such a
purpose, humour may be generated by creating a parody of serious poetry
like Gray’s Elegy. In short, parody can be used for showing defects as well
as for pure humour. The word *vidamban* applies to both types of imitation-
good and bad-in Sanskrit.

“The dictionary maker Fowler did not consider parody as a separate
type of humour. It may be because parody is mainly satirical in nature.
Parody is made generally of the ill practices developed in social, political,
religious or literary behaviour. The readers can see the negative nature of
these practices only when they are shown in an exaggerated manner. A
parodist condemns these practices and their followers to ridiculousness and
in a way, instructs the audience of reforming the relevant behaviour” (Usha
Kulkarni 40).

Arthur Pollard’s discussion about parody in his small book *Satire* is
quite significant. He has clearly differentiated between parody and satirical
similes and shed more light on the job that satirical similes fulfil.

“He has included biographies of criminals, tales of animals and
plants like Aesop fables, thought provoking imaginary tales, imaginary
tavelogues and mythology-like tales under satirical similes. All these types
do contain some amount of parody. However, the effect brought about by the same is not limited to shedding light on the defect or inconsistency in the original matter. In fact, the original matter is used as a standard to achieve some other purpose. Parody criticises the original matter while satirical simile exploits the original matter for the subject that it wants to ridicule. Let us take an example. Poems in Atre’s Zenduchi Phule are excellent examples of parody. However, P. L. Deshpande’s Angustan Vidyapeeth is a great example of a satirical simile” (Ibid 40).

According to Jamkar, contemporary poetry is distanced from parody. He believes Marathi poetry has a convenient mixture of politics and social sense, due to which it cannot be purely political or even social in its concerns. The type of humour Mardhekar’s poetry generated by means of satire and irony in his poetry happens entirely on the level of art; that poetry effectively commented on life.

According to renowned writer Baal Gadgil, satire and irony, like ridicule, are the weapons used by a humorous writer. Incidents and people in social, especially political life disturb a humorous writer, giving his writing a distinct sharpness. Literary parody is comparatively soft. Such parody aims just at poking fun at the exaggeration and pseudo-sentimentalism exhibited by various poets and playwrights. (Maharashtra Sahitya Patrika Deepavali Vinod Visheshank 1982: 136,137)
B. R. Malik says that as satire is concerned mainly with finding faults with the opponents and is destructive in its intention; it cannot reach great literary heights. What Malik says is true to the extent that since satirical writing is aimed at showing others’ faults, it can never be comparable to classic literature. However, the content of satire and irony in literature does not necessarily make it violent in nature. This critique by Malik is not universally acceptable because Swift, Stephen Leacock, Cervantes, Gogol, Shaw wrote ample works full of a lot of irony despite being detached from tasteless gossip. Malik’s suggestion that a writer should not use satirical writing as a means to laugh at someone may be acceptable. However, it would not be just to say that someone who possesses the skills of satire and irony innately should relinquish his pen’s natural tendency and try to focus on serious and mature writing. “One’s natural tendency cannot be forgotten. It can at best be expected that he should use that tendency for constructive purposes” (Deshpande 79, 80).

Satire is certainly one of the ways of bringing the “world” into art, and parodic satire and satiric parody enable parody too to be “worldly.” “Satire is the best agent to keep us free from taking words for substance” (Ibid 240).

**Irony**

The term ‘irony’ generally describes a statement of an ambiguous character, which includes a code containing at least two messages, one of
which is the concealed message of the ironist to an ‘initiated’ audience, and the other, the more readily perceived but ‘ironically meant’ message of the code. One example of irony in speech which can also illustrate the structure of at least some literary irony is that when one person looks out through a window at some unpleasant weather and passes the comment to another viewer of ‘oh, what a lovely day!’, he or she may be understood to be meaning something different to that which their statement says and appears to mean. The more common definitions of irony which describe it as ‘saying what one does not mean’, or as ‘meaning something different from what one says’, are also more easily understood when the duality of the messages given in an ironic statement or code is spelt out.

The pragmatic function of irony is one of signalling evaluation, most frequently of a pejorative nature. Its mockery can, but need not, take usual form of laudatory expressions employed to imply a negative judgement; on a semantic level, this involves the deployment of manifest praise to hide latent mocking game. Although parody is by no means always satirical, satire frequently uses parody as a vehicle for ridiculing the vices or follies of humanity with an eye of correction. According to Hutcheon, “irony and parody become the major means of creating new levels of meanings—and illusion” (Hutcheon 30). There are the two functions of irony: the semantic, contrasting one and the pragmatic, evaluative one. On the semantic level, irony can be defined as a marking of difference in meaning or, simply, as
antiphrasis. The second, evaluative function of verbal irony has always been assumed but rarely discussed. Hutcheon further states that “both irony and parody operate on two levels – a primary, surface, or foreground; and a secondary, implied, or backgrounded one. But the latter, in both the cases, derives its meaning from the context in which it is found” (Ibid 34).

**Aims and Objectives of the present Research Work:**

In order to provide a comparative statement on select parodies in English and Marathi poetry, the present study attempts to put forth various definitions of parody in English as well as Marathi. It also makes an extensive survey of the tradition of parody in English and Marathi poetry. The study candidly attempts to throw light on the glorious tradition of parody in both English and Marathi poetry. Most of the parody poets have remained ‘unacknowledged legislatures’ in the world of parody. It is, therefore, sincere endeavour of the present researcher to unfold the importance and greatness of parodists with their outstanding work and evince the value of the parody in both English and Marathi poetry. People do have a relish for a parody, but are ignorant and oblivious of the work and achievement of the parodists. It would, therefore, be pertinent to travel in the realms of the tradition of English and Marathi parody poets.

1) The study sincerely intends to introduce the relatively unnoticed works of parodies in English and Marathi poetry.
2) It also intends to discuss the tradition of the parodists in both English and Marathi poetry.

3) An attempt has been made to throw light on the entertaining and instructive elements in the parody.

4) It is proposed to regard parody as a re-creative exercise.

According to the researcher’s knowledge, no such study on the tradition of parody in English and Marathi literature has been undertaken by any other researcher or authority. As such, the topic has been chosen for deeper investigation titled: “The Tradition of Parody in English and Marathi Poetry–A Comparative Study.” The study uses the following Chapter Scheme.

CHAPTER SCHEME

Chapter I – INTRODUCTION

This chapter deals with the various definitions and the theories of parody. It also pertains to the features of parody as well as the qualities of the parodists. It throws light on some terms such as burlesque, travesty, satire, persiflage, pekoral, pastiche, irony. It introduces the concept of parody in English and Marathi poetry. It discusses the three types of parody: diction based, appearance based or method based, and mixed or comprehensive. It further sheds light on the definitions and views of parody by the various Marathi critics and writers.
Chapter II – THE TRADITION OF PARODY IN ENGLISH POETRY

The same chapter deals with the tradition of parody in English poetry. It ranges from the Middle Ages to the Post-Modern Period. The prominent parodists in the Middle Ages include Rabelais and Chaucer. The same period is followed by The Renaissance that included parodies directed at text. The chapter further deals with the Restoration and the Eighteenth Century. It introduces John Dryden, Alexander Pope. It also introduces some noteworthy collections of parody like ‘Anti-Jacobin’, ‘A Pipe of Tobacco.’ The chapter throws light on the nineteenth-century. In the nineteenth century, there was a proliferation of parodies directed at individual texts and personal styles. There was an intense reciprocal animosity among the Romantics. So the romantic poets parodied each other. Wordsworth was the most frequently parodied serious poet in the nineteenth century. The same period is known as ‘Golden Age’ of parody, which begins with George Canning’s ‘The Anti-Jacobin’, and the Smith brothers ‘Rejected Addresses’, and culminates in Beerbohm’s ‘A Christmas Garland’. ‘The Rejected Addresses’ are generally taken among the best parodies ever written having practically marked the birth of the modern parody and their authors. The noteworthy Victorian parodists such as Calverley, Carroll, Hilton, Stephen, and Traill are introduced in the same chapter. The chapter further throws light on the extensive use of the parodies of Shakespeare. While dealing with the twentieth-century, the

Chapter III – THE TRADITION OF PARODY IN MARATHI

PARODY

The third chapter introduces the glorious tradition and the monumental parody work of some significant parodists in Marathi poetry. Beginning with Saint Eknath’s Arjdast, it throws light on the pioneering work of Mangesh Telang, and the significant contribution of P. K. Atre and his iconic work Zenduchi Phule. The same chapter deals with the other noteworthy Marathi parodists such as J. K. Upadhye, Dattu Bandekar, Suresh Khedkar, Raja Badhe, P. L. Deshpande, Yashwant Deo, Mangesh Padgoankar, Dr. Dilip Kulkarni etc.

Chapter IV – THE AESTHETIC VALUE OF PARODY

This chapter deals with the entertaining as well as instructive elements in the parody of English and Marathi poetry. The chapter chiefly introduces us to the entertaining elements of parody in English poetry, as the instructive elements are rarely found in English parody

Chapter V – CONCLUSION

This last chapter deals with the three kinds of parody. It introduces the division of the two classes of parody: parodies of sound and parodies of sense, and the three great divisions: word- rendering, form-rendering, and
sense-rendering. The same chapter is the gist of the traditions of parody in both English and Marathi parody. It finally throws light on the omnipresent and ubiquitous nature of parody.

**Conclusion:**

Parody is a true and legitimate branch of art. To enjoy parody, one must have an intense sense of the humour and a humorous sense of intense. Parodies are not for those who cannot understand that parody is not necessarily ridicule. Like most other forms of literature, unless the intent of the writer be thoroughly understood and appreciated, the work is of very little value to the reader. It has been said that a good parody makes us love the original work better. A good parody may lead us to know the original work more thoroughly. The true parodist requires an exact mental balance, a fine sense of proportion and relative values, a good humour refinement, and unerring taste. Self-control and self-restraint are also needed; a parodist may go to the very edge, but he must not fall over.

Parody remains, after all, the product of literary technique that, however one chooses to define it, seeks not to hide but rather to flaunt its status as marked and dependent, or even as fragmented or deliberately decentred.

*****