

**THE PLAYWRIGHT-PERFORMER AS SCOURGE AND BENEFACTOR:
AN EXAMINATION OF POLITICAL SATIRE AND LAMPOON IN SOUTH
AFRICAN THEATRE, WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO
PIETER-DIRK UYS**

by

Mervyn Eric McMurtry

**Submitted in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the
Department of Speech and Drama, University of Natal
Durban 1993**

ABSTRACT

During the 1970s the plays of Pieter-Dirk Uys became causes célèbres. In the 1980s he was, commercially and artistically, arguably the most successful South African satirist. By 1990 he had gained recognition in the United Kingdom, the United States of America, Canada, Australia, the Netherlands and Germany. Yet relatively little research has been undertaken or published which evaluates his contribution to South African theatre as a playwright and performer of political satire. This dissertation aims to document and assess the satiric work of Uys and that of his precursors and contemporaries.

The first chapter identifies certain characteristic features and purposes of satire as a creative method which cannot be defined in purely literary terms. The views of local practitioners and references to its manifestation in various non-literary and indigenous forms are included to support the descriptive approach to satire in performance adopted in later chapters.

Of necessity to a study of Uys's lampoons, Chapter 2 discusses the origins of lampoon and the theatrical presentation of actual persons by Aristophanes (the first extant Western playwright to do so). Both the textual and visual ridicule of Socrates, Euripides, Cleon and Lamachus are considered, to argue that Aristophanes employed the nominal character as a factional type to exemplify a concept for humorous rather than meliorative purposes.

Part One of Chapter 3 is a necessarily selective survey of the diversity, style and censorship of satire in South Africa in various theatrical, literary and journalistic forms. Part Two describes the use of satire by Adam Leslie, Jeremy Taylor, Robert Kirby and, more recently, Paul Slabolepszy, Mark Banks, Ian Fraser, Eric Miyeni and the 'alternative' Afrikaners in plays and in revue, cabaret and stand-up comedy.

Chapter 4 examines the principal themes of Uys's plays to date, the 1981-1992 revues as entertainment and as a reflection of certain social and political issues, the similarities between his theatrical praxis and that of Aristophanes, and his satiric strategies in performance: his preparatory and visual signifiers, his concern with proxemics, and his mastery of kinesics, paralanguage and chronemics in depicting a spectrum of fictional and non-fictional personae, including Evita Bezuidenhout, P.W. Botha and the Uys-persona.

DECLARATION

Unless otherwise acknowledged in the text, this dissertation is an original work by the author and has not been submitted in any form to another university.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I acknowledge with gratitude the award of a bursary by the Human Sciences Research Council. Opinions expressed in this work are my own and should not be taken to represent the views of the Human Sciences Research Council.

I am indebted to all those who have made this work possible: Pieter-Dirk Uys, Robert Leslie, Joan Blake and Ralph Lawson for access to unpublished performance material, press-cuttings, photographs and recordings (as stated in the footnotes, despite personal research, it has not always been possible to ascertain page numbers for some newspaper clippings in these scrapbooks); the research assistants, librarians and archivists at the Human Sciences Research Council in Pretoria, the National Drama Library and Afrikaans Literary Museum in Bloemfontein, the Star in Johannesburg, and the Daily News and Natal Mercury in Durban; the satiric performers and others who readily granted interviews; my supervisor, Professor P.J. Scholtz for his interest and encouragement; Clare Hull for the efficiency displayed in the arrangement and typing of this thesis; and, as always, Kay McMurtry for her unfailing support.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	i
DECLARATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
CHAPTER 1: NOTES TOWARDS THE DEFINITION OF SATIRE, WITH REFERENCE TO SOUTH AFRICAN PERFORMERS	1
1.1 Attempting a definition: the problems	1
1.1.1 Literary preconceptions to satire in performance	4
1.1.2 The views of South African performers	10
1.1.3 'Non-literary' manifestations	13
1.2 The characteristic features of satire	19
1.2.1 Criticism and humour	19
1.2.2 Direct and indirect satire and the Horatian-Juvenalian spectrum	22
1.2.3 Topicality	27
1.2.4 Distortion and exaggeration	32
1.2.5 Norms and ideals in satire and comedy	34
1.3 Satire and its theatrical presentation	39
1.3.1 Satire and satiric forms	40
1.3.2 The theatre of convention and the theatre of illusion	43
1.4 The effectiveness of satire	50
1.4.1 Demolition or town planning	50
1.4.2 Preaching to the converted	53
1.4.3 Overt and covert strategies	56
1.4.4 Awareness, pleasure and release	60
Notes to Chapter 1	64
CHAPTER 2: THE LAMPOON AS A SATIRIC STRATEGY IN ARISTOPHANIC COMEDY - THE THEATRICAL PRESENTATION OF 'LIVING' PERSONS	80
2.1 The origins of the lampoon	80
2.1.1 Personal ridicule in ritual and drama	82
2.1.2 The playwright's right to ridicule	86

2.2	The lampoon seen	93
2.2.1	Masks as portrait-likenesses	94
2.2.2	Textual support for portrait-masks	100
2.2.3	Type-mask and type-costume	103
2.3	The lampoon heard	108
2.3.1	Socrates: the lampoon of the philosopher-type	109
2.3.2	Euripides: the lampoon of the tragedian-type	114
2.3.3	Cleon: the lampoon of the demagogue-type	120
2.3.4	Lamachus: the lampoon of the military-type	132
2.4	The moral and political purpose of the lampoon	137
2.4.1	The question of moral intent	137
2.4.2	The question of political intent	143
2.4.3	Aristophanes' loyalties	148
	Notes to Chapter 2	150
 CHAPTER 3: SATIRE IN SOUTH AFRICA - A DESCRIPTIVE SURVEY, PRINCIPALLY OF THE MANIFESTATION OF SATIRE IN ENGLISH IN THEATRICAL FORMS		 165
PART ONE: A SURVEY OF THE DIVERSITY, STYLE AND CENSORSHIP OF SATIRE		166
3.1	Examples of satire in early theatre and the contribution of journalists	166
3.1.1	From Boniface to Bain	166
3.1.2	Black's "Stage Satires"	172
3.1.3	'Black-face' and 'white-face'	180
3.1.4	Journalists and satire	183
3.2	The censorship of satire	189
3.2.1	Censorship as hegemonic control	189
3.2.2	Censorship of theatre works and performances	197
3.2.3	Censorship of satire in other forms	202
3.2.4	Censorship and black writers and performers	207
3.3.	Satire and 'non-literary' theatrical forms	212
3.3.1	Cabaret, revue and burlesque	213
3.3.2	Music-hall, vaudeville and variety	218
 PART TWO: THEATRICAL PRACTITIONERS OF SATIRIC FORMS SINCE THE 1960S		 224
3.4	Adam Leslie: satire in intimate revue	224
3.4.1	<u>Two's Company</u>	225
3.4.2	The format of Leslie's revues	238
3.4.3	The Adam Leslie Theatre	242
3.4.4	Leslie's legacy	249

3.5	Jeremy Taylor and Robert Kirby	252
3.5.1	Taylor: the Horatian approach	252
3.5.2	<u>Wait a Minim</u>	254
3.5.3	Taylor: humour and confusion	256
3.5.4	Taylor: subversion to nostalgia	258
3.5.5	Kirby: the Juvenalian approach	261
3.5.6	<u>Beyond the Fringe</u> and Mort Sahl	263
3.5.7	Kirby: patterns and properties	266
3.5.8	Kirby: style and approach in revues and plays	271
3.6	Satire in the work of 'alternative' writers and performers	276
3.6.1	From the Comedy Store to the Black Sun	276
3.6.2	Mark Banks	278
3.6.3	Ian Fraser and stand-up comics	284
3.6.4	Paul Slabolepszy	290
3.6.5	The 'alternative' Afrikaners	293
	Notes to Chapter 3	298
 CHAPTER 4: PIETER-DIRK UYS: SATIRIC PLAYWRIGHT AND PERFORMER		 316
4.1	The concerns of the plays: demythologizing past, present and future	316
4.1.1	The differences between the plays and the revues	316
4.1.2	The plays: 1974-1982	321
4.1.3	The plays: 1987-1992	330
4.2	Playwriting strategies in the 1981-1992 revues	335
4.2.1	The personae of the fictional monologues	336
4.2.2	The Uys-persona and the Aristophanic <u>parabasis</u>	343
4.2.3	Verbal and visual shock as a satiric strategy	346
4.2.4	The range of Uys's satiric strategies	351
4.3	Evita Bezuidenhout	355
4.3.1	'The Rise of the First Ambassador Bezuidenhout'	355
4.3.2	Evita Bezuidenhout's fictional actuality	363
4.3.3	Female impersonation in Uys's revues and Aristophanic comedy	369
4.4	Uys and Aristophanes: lampoons of non-fictional personae	373
4.4.1	The cartoon connection	374
4.4.2	Uys's theatrical caricatures: the process	382
4.5	Production and performance aspects of Uys's revues	388
4.5.1	Preparatory and visual signifiers	389
4.5.2	Strategies in performance	399
4.6	Conclusion: Uys as scourge and benefactor	408
	Notes to Chapter 4	419

PRODUCTION CHRONOLOGY: WORKS BY PIETER-DIRK UYS, 1969-1992	437
SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY	443
1 Works by Pieter-Dirk Uys	443
1.1 Plays and revues	443
1.2 Books	444
1.3 Articles	444
2 Works on or referring to Pieter-Dirk Uys	444
2.1 Books and theses	444
2.2 Journals and magazines	444
2.3 Newspapers	445
3 Other sources consulted	449
3.1 Books	449
3.2 Journals and magazines	461
3.3 Newspapers	463
INTERVIEWS	467

CHAPTER 1

NOTES TOWARDS THE DEFINITION OF SATIRE, WITH REFERENCE TO SOUTH AFRICAN PERFORMERS¹

"I don't know whether satire has any relevance in South African politics - the political situation is beyond satire I can't think of a definition that is relevant to what we are faced with here What comes out of parliament is so crazy it's beyond satire."

- Pieter-Dirk Uys.²

1.1 Attempting a definition: the problems

"Is satire a genre at all?", asks Patricia Meyer Spacks, with justification, considering the number of studies which have attempted to explicate the term and distinguish its generic form.³ Of the various methodological approaches to satire adopted by recent scholars in Britain and the United States of America, the most readily identifiable are the archetypal, the historical, the rhetorical and the anthropological.⁴ Most scholars agree that it is a protean term and species; Leonard Feinberg cautions "that no two scholars use the same definition or the same outline of ingredients".⁵ Those ingredients could include parody, burlesque, travesty, caricature, grotesque, allegory, fantasy; indeed, the satirist has, it would seem, few restrictions and great freedom for he can employ wit, sarcasm, invective, ridicule, and irony within forms as varied as the monologue, epic, narrative poem, ballad, sonnet, novel and play.⁶ Robert C. Elliott maintains:

No strict definition can encompass the complexity of a word that signifies, on the one hand, a kind of literature ... and, on the other, a mocking spirit or tone that manifests itself in many literary genres but can also enter into almost any kind of human communication.⁷

It would prove fruitless, then, to attempt an all-encompassing definition of a phenomenon which is so imprecise and diverse in manifestation. As Georg Lukacs states, the critic or researcher is not dealing with a species of literature, but a creative method. ⁸ A method, that is, whose effect is determined by the intention of the author or playwright or artist or speaker within a specific context, not necessarily literary, for it is perfectly valid to use the term to refer to satire in the monologue of a stand-up comic, speak of a film as a satire, discern a newspaper cartoonist's satiric point, or describe the satiric elements within a sculpture. ⁹

Faced with such differences in style and disparate manifestations in form it is no wonder that scholars despair of categorizing satire in a specific genre, especially if "genre" can be defined "as a grouping of literary works" (emphasis added) in terms of similarity of "outer" and "inner" form.¹⁰ By this definition outer form describes specific metres and structures, inner form attitude, tone and purpose (or subject and audience). While critics have analysed the works of individual satirists and the specific conventions they have employed for satiric effect, nevertheless, as Elliott has warned, satire "has lost for us any sense of formal specification".¹¹ Indeed, the definition of genre cited above would appear to exclude satire which is neither exclusively literary, nor does it seem to have a single characteristic form of its own since it is evident in non-satiric genres which the satirist has adapted for his purposes. ¹² If this is so, one distinctive feature which can be attributed to satire (and which differentiates it from other types of literature, at least) is its adaptive quality. The particular form employed (whether it is a love song, heroic poem, biography, political pamphlet, folk tale - the list is almost inexhaustible) has been chosen to relate to the satirist's intention and to the person or object being criticized.

In this, there is a similarity to parody (the imitation and exaggeration of the style or structure of a particular work or writer); but not specifically with the purpose of ridiculing or criticizing that work or writer, for the satirist often employs such adaptation for a different purpose, and not necessarily to engage in literary criticism. James W. Nichols

prefers the word "pattern" and uses it to denote any adaptation of an original work or writer's style for satiric intent when the principal aim is not parody. However, when the reader or spectator recognizes the original the impact of the satire can be heightened and hence the object of satire is more strongly condemned. An example of a pattern by this description is Robert Kirby's adoption and adaptation of the Beatitudes (Christ's blessings in Matthew 5: 3-11) to the South African context for a 'filler' in a revue. The contrast between the 'Christian' promises of the highest happiness in the original and the sudden inversion in the adapted pattern makes Kirby's satirical point even more effective and shocking than a direct statement regarding the hypocrisy of using theological justifications for a system which resorts to forced removals could :

Blessed are the pure in heart.
 Blessed are the poor.
 Blessed are the meek and mild.
 For they will inherit the Cape Flats. ¹³

Furthermore, by the satiric tactic of association, those who might preach the sentiments of the first three lines are themselves culpable for not opposing the situation in the fourth, implying that such religious faith is naive within the context of forced removals. The satire is sharpened for those members of the audience knowing the original, for the blessings contained in the words which Kirby has chosen to omit (for example, "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven") are ironically contrasted with the only line ending given, and that is itself a distortion of the original ("Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth").

Nor must the pattern be adapted from a literary source or style. Pieter-Dirk Uys has employed the pattern of a religious sermon to lampoon Dr Andries Treurnicht, then leader of the Conservative Party (CP), and ridicule the type of religious fundamentalism prevalent in political meetings in his "O Moenie Treurnicht" in his revue Adapt or Dye (1981). ¹⁴

1.1.1 Literary preconceptions to satire in performance

The first difficulty encountered by the theatre researcher in finding an adequate definition is that, with only the briefest allusions to drama, most scholars confine their descriptions of satire to literature: to published texts which are essentially non-dramatic structures, meant to be read.¹⁵ While the most influential studies of the last few decades have contributed to the critical appreciation of, and created a revival of interest in, satire, those works do not concern themselves specifically with the methods and effects of satire in theatrical performance. Many scholars, in fact, deliberately avoid referring to satire in relation to drama; as justification for such exclusion Nichols states that the "satiric effect of a play is often profoundly affected by the art of the actor, the director, even the set designer".¹⁶ Furthermore, most scholars deal almost exclusively with formal verse satire (satire proper began in English literature as a poetic form, imitating the style and preoccupations of Horace and Juvenal) and particularly with the achievements of the eighteenth-century practitioners (John Dryden, Alexander Pope, Jonathan Swift, Samuel Butler and Dr Samuel Johnson) who produced, in the English literary scene, "our best satire".¹⁷ It could be argued, with justification, that criticism of satire has, as Gerald O'Connor states, "taken up permanent residence in the eighteenth century".¹⁸ Dr Johnson's oft-repeated definition of satire restricts it to "a poem in which wickedness or folly is censured" in his A Dictionary of the English Language (1755). Such eminent scholars of satire as Elliott, James Sutherland, Gilbert Highet and Feinberg have a relatively patronizing view of much contemporary satire, partly because their investigations point to the origins and parameters of the form as displayed in texts which have been incorporated into a selected and reified canon of literary 'masterpieces'.¹⁹

A dramatic text which is inherently satiric or contains satiric strategies can be no more than a transcript, a convenient means of recording the creative choices of the playwright and also often the contribution of the performers, director and designers as co-authors, who make significant additions to the ultimate goal: the text realized in performance, and

to the reception to that text presented as an audible and visible phenomenon, for there exists a special intimacy in theatrical presentation which goes beyond the confines of the printed work. This study is concerned, wherever possible, with performance, where everything that is presented for sight, hearing and imagination contributes to the import of the work, of which the text is one element.²⁰ These difficulties are exacerbated in the non-literary theatre and theatre-related forms in which satire can appear.

Failure to acknowledge the essential quality of satire in the theatre has limited and hampered the scholarly appreciation of the work of satiric performers. In a study of the satiric strategies of Christopher Hope, Terry Winstanley compares the novelist's work with that of Uys.²¹ Both, she writes, ridicule the State and both attack a spectrum of South African individuals and stereotypes; while admitting that "Uys's art ... represents a simple solution", nevertheless she asserts:

Hope's methods are creatively much more complex, for while he draws from the same material which Uys uses, Hope incorporates the rhetoric and the unbelievable event into carefully-crafted fiction. So, for example, while Uys merely repeats the convictions of the Regime - "The separation of the races happened long before the Nationalist Government. God separated the races" [a quotation from P.W. Botha In His Own Words (1987), p.24] - Hope satirises this same absurd belief in fictional form in A Separate Development [1980].²²

The inference is unmistakable: Uys repeats the content, Hope gives the same content a form; fiction, being carefully crafted, is more complex and creative than the theatrical representation of non-fictional material. This unfortunate distinction ignores the art of the performer himself in using P.W. (Pieter Willem) Botha's words in a theatrical presentation in which he impersonated the State President, and the act of presentation was in itself a comment on the original speaker and denoted an attitude to that original figure and his words. In the theatre, what is seen is as valid as what is heard: any criticism of performance must evaluate the work within its own medium. Destructive analysis of what is presented theatrically is, J.L. Styan argues, based on "literary preconceptions" which take from the presentation "its sensory qualities, its essential visual and aural, spatial and temporal rhythms and expressiveness".²³ Winstanley, proceeding from a literary

standpoint, ignores all the aspects on non-verbal communication which dominate any act of communication, including kinesics (bodily expression, including gesture, posture and facial expression), paralanguage (tone, volume, articulation and enunciation), objects (such as clothing and properties), proxemics (the use of space and distance from the receiver or audience) and chronemics (variations in time, rhythm and pace).²⁴ Every one of these elements was given the most careful consideration by Uys in preparing for and presenting a figure such as P.W. Botha on the stage. (These performance strategies are dealt with in greater detail in Chapter 4.)

Winstanley continues her comparison between Hope and Uys, highlighting (unintentionally) through praise of the former, the very qualities that the latter employed to lampoon the same figure: the features of performance. To realize this, the passage needs to be quoted at some length:

And while Uys is content to document Nationalist Party paranoia ("It's a psychological onslaught, an economic one, a diplomatic one, a military onslaught - a total onslaught" [quoting the State President from P.W. Botha In His Own Words, p.45]), Hope recreates it in a more extended and entertaining way.²⁵

Here she cites a passage from Hope's Kruger's Alp (1984) which reproduces P.W. Botha's 'words' in a new context:

In the time of the Total Onslaught, of course everyone was in the armed services ... this force represented a great army ... able surely to withstand the Total Onslaught Of course the Total Onslaught might also show itself from within ... the huge black townships had to be encircled with wire Total Onslaught required total preparedness.

She continues, by comparing the response of the two satirists to the original:

This passage is effective because it mockingly embodies the repetitive quality of the original on which it is modelled, and because it ironically reveals the extent of the fear and the seriousness of the response to this supposed threat. In so doing, Hope advances the dimensions of critical analysis and personal comment to an extent which Uys cannot begin to achieve.²⁶

But in the work of Uys, "personal comment" was achieved precisely because his portrayal "mockingly embodie[d] ... the original" and did so in an "entertaining way". The satirist

(Hope in fiction and Uys on stage) succeeds when the reader or spectator recognizes the original; the strategy involves both the accurate presentation of the target's words and the distortion of those attitudes and qualities to devalue and ridicule them. The challenge of and to a stage satirist lies in the concreteness with which the issues are presented rather than in the abstraction of verbal argument: the ideas are not merely documented, they are embodied. "The actor," writes Martin Esslin, "is the iconic sign par excellence: a real human being who has become a sign for a human being."²⁷ And, as Nichols points out, the most subtle effects of certain satiric tactics are primarily oral, for the voice can, by the slightest change in inflection or emphasis, convey a meaning which cannot be adequately captured in print.²⁸ Of course, certain aspects of paralanguage can be indicated by means of punctuation (through the writer's use of inverted commas, exclamation points, italics and so on) but even so, oral satirists must not only be heard (as on radio) but also seen (on the stage or screen) and their impact is dependent on the range of the human voice and on the body as a whole. Every signifier which is at the satirist's disposal is used to ridicule the target, iconic, deictic and symbolic: gestures, voice, clothing, properties, lighting and scenery.

What Winstanley has also ignored is the fact that, in portraying the State President in Beyond the Rubicon (1985), Uys used the same "repetitive quality of the original" in his manner of speech to likewise comment on his paranoia regarding the "Total Onslaught" and South Africa's isolation, accompanied by P.W. Botha's repetitive gestural patterns, such as the wagging of his index finger (which is itself referred to). The following extract ridiculed, and thereby devalued, not only his diction (mixed metaphors, errors in syntax, malapropisms) and his abrupt, aggressive style of oratory, but the final repetitions (five in the original), followed by a symbolic blackout, undermined the "confidence" of everything stated in the monologue:

The total onslaught is upon us in all its totalitarianism. And it is because of this totality. That I am here tonight. To assure you all. That. In spite of what you fear. All is not lost. For I am still here! ... He who slaughts onto us will get his fingers burnt. Let it be known to all those who need our raw materials in order to survive:

Let anyone point a finger, he will get our fist.
Let anyone steal a glance, he will get a glare.

Let anyone throw a stone, he will get an avalanche of Hippos [armoured police vehicles]

I say it here to the world with determination.

I say it here to the world without fear of contradiction.

I say it here to the world with supreme confidence.

South Africa won't ... South Africa won't ... South Africa won't ... ²⁹

Winstanley concludes her devaluation of Uys by stating that Hope's power and danger as a satirist is reflected in the fact that his A Separate Development was banned in South Africa "whilst Uys has not been restricted in this way".³⁰ This, in terms of Uys's fiction (his plays) is wholly inaccurate: his revues, which reproduce non-fictional persons and their words, have never been banned (though the video recordings of the revues do have age-restrictions imposed upon them). In fact, Uys earned the 'distinction', during the 1970s, of having had more of his plays banned or censored than any other playwright in South African theatre. The script of Selle Ou Storie (1974) was banned, as was the production of Karnival (1975) after ten performances at the Outer Space in Cape Town: as Uys has repeatedly stated, and he included the details again in his 'final' revue, An Evening with Pieter-Dirk Uys (1992), he "had Selle Ou Storie which you could see but not read, and Karnaval which you could read, but not see".³¹ Neither play, incidently, contained lampoons of prominent politicians, nor quoted contentious political material.³² Such bannings have contributed to his success as, Ian Steadman has noted, they "provided him with the notoriety - and attendant fame and wealth - of being an outrageous satirist".³³ One of the reasons the revues were not banned is because, Stephen Gray asserts, Uys presented the figures "as they are, frequently verbatim".³⁴ But Uys did not simply repeat their words or impersonate them physically, he frequently commented on those figures 'out of character' as well, using the stand-up comic routine in an extended manner: a personal 'set-up' which introduced the character he was about to present, thereby arousing anticipation, before transforming himself for the 'punch'. The stage direction prior to the impersonation of P.W. Botha cited above reads: "PDU talks out [that is, directly to the audience] as he changes to P.W. Botha", and as he did so, Uys revealed the hypocrisy of a State President claiming to be the leader of a country when he had been voted into power by eight per cent of the population.³⁵ Because of this set-up, which contained a

specific attitude, the actual words of the character were seen to be ludicrous and laughable (the punch). Admittedly the words were exaggerated (for theatrical and satirical effect), but nevertheless they did have a basis in reality, for Uys gleaned phrases and sentences from various documented sources and speeches on South African Broadcasting Corporation (SABC) television:

Having often been accused, through my impersonations of our present State President P.W. Botha, of being responsible for the general state of our land, allow me to put the record straight and give full credit to the man himself. It has always been my intention (and I have done so often in the past), to acknowledge the South African Government as my scriptwriters. ³⁶

Because satire is essentially destructive it has, as Sutherland indicates, never been welcome to those in power; if it is personal, he adds, it is perhaps at its most dangerous in the theatre, for its destructive qualities would be enhanced by the presence of an audience.³⁷ Even the comic playwrights in Athens, participating in state-organized festivals but enjoying great freedom to attack prominent members of state, did not have complete license. "Were that the case," as Jeffrey Henderson points out, "they could not have expected anyone to take what they had to say seriously." ³⁸ Aristophanes was, on two occasions, brought before the Assembly by Cleon, once for slandering him and once for supposedly slandering the city before foreigners. (These examples, and the results thereof, are considered in the next chapter.) In 1737, in England, the Licensing Act was passed as a result, chiefly, of Henry Fielding's outspoken exposure of political corruption (of Sir Robert Walpole and the Whig Government) in his burlesques and farces. ³⁹ The censorship of plays was vested in the Lord Chamberlain who acted on the advice of an official known as the Licenser of Plays. Such powers of censorship remained the jurisdiction of the Lord Chamberlain until 1968 after the Lord Chamberlain's banning of Edward Bond's *Saved* (1965) had been debated in the House of Lords (where Laurence Olivier defended the play) and a subsequently appointed joint committee recommended the Lord Chamberlain's function as censor of all stage plays be abolished. (The issue of censorship in the South African context is discussed in detail in Chapter 3.)

1.1.2 The views of South African performers

To return to the consideration of the term satire and its definition: theatre practitioners themselves react with hostility or incomprehension when confronted with it, and not one of those interviewed for this study would accept the 'label' when referring to their productions, finding it too vague, restricting or inappropriate to their forms of theatrical presentation. Their understanding of satire is often naive and uninformed, as will be evident in the discussion of the features of satire thereafter. In 1990 Uys was invited by the 1820 Foundation to present an address on satire at the National Arts Festival in Grahamstown. To support his premise that the term is impossible to define, he quoted random and contradictory definitions he had gleaned from festival-goers. He then produced a small South African flag and a miniature tyre to convey a visual definition: "S.A. (flag) + tyre = satire".⁴⁰ In a personal interview he admitted:

I never think about them [definitions], I just have to do what has to be done. I don't find myself slotting into any one definition, which is why I say I'm a political gossip, a *skindergat*. I have been called a court jester; God knows, the only place I jest is in court.

Nevertheless, like other South African performers, though he does not want reviewers to label his work as satire, he frequently refers to it in those terms: in No One's Died Laughing (1986) he describes Adapt or Dye as "a political satire".⁴¹ One definition Uys repeatedly cites is that which he states was coined by Lenny Bruce, quoting it variously as "Satire is tragedy plus time" or "Tragedy plus time equals satire"; even this is inadequate: "But here [in South Africa] there is no time. It's not like I've got to wait 20 years to make a joke about the Vietnam war...I've got to talk now, about what happened today."⁴²

Mark Banks objects strongly to being labelled a satirist, and to the words 'satire' and 'satirical', maintaining that if he described himself or his work in those terms it would confuse audiences and critics who associate, he believes, "satire solely with politics", or view his revues with preconceived notions regarding the satirist's "moral obligation to society", or criticize his work for not being true to satire, for being "farce" or "pastiche". Even so, the advance publicity for his revues describes him as a "popular satirist".

Although he does use the term, Eric Miyeni is angered by other categories he terms "cages": he regards his one-person presentations as "a lot more satirical, a lot deeper" than conventional stand-up comedy; what he finds "insulting" is being categorized as a "black artist" rather than as an artist, especially since in his work he aims to break down stereotypical categories. ⁴³ Kirby tries to avoid the term because it is used, he asserts, indiscriminately and inaccurately to describe works which should be categorized differently. In a personal interview and in those conducted with journalists he routinely relates examples of such misuse:

When people don't know what else to call something on the stage or screen they always seem to fall back on satire. Thus we have 'gentle' satire and 'costume' satire and, worst of all, 'compassionate' satire. That last one is a contradiction in terms. You cannot be both compassionate and satirical, not at the same time. The term for that sort of thing is 'badinage' or 'light parody' ... I don't know. But satire in the full, corrosive sense of the word is what is to be found in Juvenal and Pope, not in mild leg-pulling. Too much is going around these days which, while passing itself off as satire, is exactly what Kenneth Tynan complained of back in 1960. Speaking of the London stage, he said, "It has always excelled in turning out complacent, self-congratulating and fundamentally inoffensive wit" [*sic*]. We see this about, don't we, nowadays in South Africa. It's all hints and nudges. And, yes, I admit to being a satirist when I'm being one One does tend to get pigeon-holed though. ⁴⁴

In the article Kirby refers to ("A Gap Defined: 1960") Kenneth Tynan lamented the lack of true satiric writing in Britain, where it was "neglected, degraded and traduced" in "West End revues" and did not match the "satirical cabaret" of the Americans Mort Sahl, Bruce, Mike Nichols and Elaine May. ⁴⁵

Adam Leslie described the revues he presented throughout South Africa in the 1960s and 1970s as satirical, and justified his lampoons of cabinet ministers, the British Royal Family, prominent couturiers, beauty queens and professors by asserting that "A satirist must feel free to use anything and anyone for his material." ⁴⁶ Though this aim echoes Juvenal, his outlook was far closer to Horace: Robert Leslie maintains that his father's approach to satire was dictated by his attitude towards his audience:

Adam's whole attitude to satire was that you can't entertain and make your point with a broad sword. You have to use a rapier, because if you do the hacking à la Kirby, you're losing humour. Adam believed he was there to entertain and to educate by lancing people's preconceived notions, to make them squirm. But

again, the purpose was to instruct and use humour concurrently, as opposed to making people feel so uncomfortable and so bashed over the head that they had to crawl up the aisle to go and buy their box of Nutties.

Jeremy Taylor never considers the term in writing or presenting his material, believing that if reviewers or audiences "want to say, 'That's satire', that's up to them". Attitudes or incidents strike him as "odd" or "make [him] laugh" or infuriate him and he attempts "to find a way of dramatizing ... or singing about" such issues without preconceived ideas about their effect on listeners or viewers. He, Kirby and Uys were singled out by Newsweek as the examples of satirists performing in "an age of political satire in South Africa".⁴⁷

Ian Fraser distinguishes between his plays (which he describes as "political Absurdist plays") and what he terms his "satire shows", in which the style and format of presentation is similar to that of stand-up comedy:

My satire shows to me aren't really "satire" - what they are is a collection of thoughts and concepts that, individually, are not long enough to make a full length play. Some concepts can only run for a minute or two before being exhausted So the "satire" show is ... two or three hundred assorted ideas all pushed together ... [with] a sweet, gentle and charming title - Look Back in Panga [1992].⁴⁸

Caspar de Vries does refer to himself as a satirist, partly due to the fact that the format of his one-person presentations is influenced by the "European tradition, particularly the Dutch, where satirical cabaret is a form of complaint".⁴⁹ He maintains, however, that being a satirist is only one of the following descriptions of himself as an entertainer: comedian/ actor/ song-writer/ cabaret artist.⁵⁰

Commercial theatre has long regarded satire with disdain, if not contempt: George S. Kaufman distilled this attitude by saying that "Satire is what closes Saturday night."⁵¹ Attempts to avoid or dismiss traditional prescriptions by formulating criteria and terminology better suited to contemporary manifestations have been made; for example "Savage Comedy" was coined to describe works which are, in the main, satiric, but it has not been incorporated or accepted into widespread use.⁵² Interestingly, the words "savage comedy" have been frequently employed by reviewers to describe the plays of Uys.⁵³

1.1.3 'Non-literary' manifestations

Neither the label 'satire' nor a published text are requisites for satiric communication to take place, if "throughout history ... the chief vehicle for satirical comment" has been the so-termed 'popular' entertainment forms, according to Matthew Hodgart.⁵⁴ Performances by the Roman mimus, the medieval minstrel, strolling player and court jester, and their successors in the commedia dell'arte, music-hall, vaudeville, cabaret, revues and television variety, are "by their very nature," he continues, "the most fugitive forms ..., and therefore the hardest for the historian to record".⁵⁵

Such performance-oriented, essentially 'non-literary' and characteristically improvisatory and oral manifestations are by no means restricted to Western European countries. Autochthonous oral performance forms on the African continent have all employed satire in the various identifiable types, and praise poems, work songs, dance songs, folk tales and even funerary dirges have all been adapted to or exhibited satirical intentions.⁵⁶ As in fifth-century BC Athens, criticism and ridicule have been traditionally permitted, if not encouraged, within orally performed and transmitted poetry and song. This unusual freedom explains not only the vitality of indigenous satire, but also its continued relevance in the manner in which it has been adapted and developed into hybrid or new forms to criticize conditions in colonial Africa, in apartheid Southern Africa and in the 'homelands' and other 'free' states following 'flag' independence. The Chope musicicians of Mozambique are known as 'poetic justice' (their function as 'jesters' was described by Friar Joao Dos Santos who visited a Chope royal court in 1586). Trevor Cope suggests that, through criticism, the oral poet or performer expresses the opinion of the people by acting as an "intermediary between the chief and his subjects".⁵⁷ Noleen Turner describes the function of izibongo as the "recognized public voice of censure".⁵⁸ In satirical oral compositions directed at specific individuals, the poem or tale is created to criticize social misdemeanours (drunkenness, dishonesty, promiscuity, even failure to provide adequately for the person's family); as Turner contends, such censure can be more constructive than

destructive for it not only points to certain aspects which need correcting, but also draws attention to the person described, placing him or her within a particular societal context, as well as serving as a biographical record.⁵⁹

The rendition of contemporary praise poetry or clan praises of the more informal, non-specialist type are performed in various ways (by chanting, singing, accompanied by the mimicking of 'war' movements) in a variety of social gatherings (including weddings, coming-of-age celebrations and sporting events). In whatever form or context, oral performance has remained a community activity in which the audience is an integral part of the presentation. In the political context izibongo are frequently performed (by both non-specialists and professionals) at rallies, and include the most overt and virulent satire of prominent politicians and chiefs. The following is an extract from the izibongo to Nelson Mandela performed by Madlinyoka Ntzanzi in Zulu at the African National Congress (ANC) Rally at King's Park Stadium in Durban on 7 July 1991:

The horned viper with the feathered head
Roared at Robben Island
It roared at Botha's house
So that he had diarrhoea
And left his post.

Botha, who left Pretoria at midnight
Said: "I am leaving the throne
Take it De Klerk, I have failed."

The horned viper that roared and South Africa shook
As I listened Ulundi shook
As I listened traitors shivered
They followed saying they want to irritate it
Saying, try to stop it
Saying, it is a Xhosa
Saying, it is not allowed to enter Zululand.⁶⁰

Although the performance did not include direct impersonation of P.W. Botha or F.W. (Frederik Willem) de Klerk (or for that matter George Bush, Margaret Thatcher or Mikhail Gorbachev who were also ridiculed), the satirical thrust was not weakened for the listeners reacted with jeers and abuse at the mention of these international leaders. Nor should the more covert criticism of Dr Mangosuthu Gatsha Buthelezi in the third stanza

quoted be ignored. Clearly too, satire was not the only or primary purpose of this praise poem, as it also functioned as an historical record of Mandela's activities between 2 February 1990 and July 1991 when it was performed.

Although the izibongo by Ntzanzi was recorded (by Jurgen Brauniger at the Culture and Working Life Project and University of Natal (Durban) Music Department) it was never intended to be published. In fact, very few of these manifestations were or are directed at a publishing market or the select reader, but at the community, or a spectrum of the society which would recognise the targets, or a mass popular audience, as in the case of Aristophanes, whose 'play' was prepared for a single performance, with little prospect of a subsequent performance or production (the only known exception being The Frogs (405), though it was possible for a production to tour the local theatres of Greece). Contemporary approximations of an Aristophanic performance, in style and atmosphere, would be, states Kenneth McLeish, non-literary, popular entertainment forms "such as circus, the variety stage, music-hall, television and films".⁶¹ In terms of audience-performer relationship, Peter Walcot includes the annual pantomime as well.⁶² In all these, the audiences are a broad cross-section of the population, and in all the visual and verbal dimensions are equally significant mediums for conveying the form and content of the presentation.

From Roman times, according to McLeish, there has existed an unfortunate dichotomy, still present today, between 'cultured' and 'popular' entertainment so that comic artists of the so-termed 'legitimate' theatre are considered different, even superior, to those of the more popular forms listed above.⁶³ Such a notion has undoubtedly affected the critical acceptance of such forms as significant works of 'art'; it is true to assert that the performance style of the non-literary tradition (which relies closely on physical skills, including juggling, falls and slapstick) is also considered inappropriate and foreign to the type of comedy which is classified, by such scholars, as part of the literary tradition. What is heard is considered more important, artistically and critically, than what is seen.

Thus the non-literary tradition (which often incorporated satire as one of its features) has been treated with neglect by many scholars of drama. Yet, as Oliver Taplin asserts, the word 'theatre' was first used in fifth-century Athens (theatron) and its etymological derivation is to a place where things are 'seen'; the audience was hoi theatai, those who 'look' on.⁶⁴

The involvement of the Athenian playwright did not conclude with the 'script', but continued through to the performance itself.⁶⁵ To assume that the performers of comedy (and tragedy) were given scripts from which to memorize their lines is unfounded. Though some form of scenario obviously existed, the production process was described in non-literary terminology as 'to make' (poiein) and 'to teach' (didaskain). Teaching, that is, the performers, who were trained by the didaskalos (or director), usually the playwright himself. As poet-director, the playwright often composed the music and arranged the choreography, trained the actors and the chorus in all aspects of staging (and organized and supervised every aspect of stage production, including the selection and making of masks, costumes, properties and the use of the stage machinery). It is probable that such 'teaching' was conducted orally and by demonstration. Clearly the performers needed the skills of both non-literary and literary comedy, distinctions which were only later applied. The script as a completed work within a literary genre, distinguished and differentiated from the production, was an unknown concept. As Henderson points out, the original script was essentially a rehearsal text that later circulated as a text for readers.⁶⁶ It contained only the words to be spoken, with few (if any) lines attributed to characters and no stage directions. These had to be inferred from the text itself, so that all translations and editions, both ancient and modern, differ in reconstructing the text for performance.

An essential feature of Athenian Old Comedy was the relationship between performers and spectators; the same cannot be said of tragedy of the same period, in which the characters ignored the audience. Taplin maintains that there is "not one single place in the whole of

surviving Greek tragedy where there is direct audience address, or specific reference to the audience or to members of the audience" by a character, if not the chorus.⁶⁷ This is most clearly observed in the parabasis (translated as 'stepping forward' or 'aside') which the comic playwright could use as a medium, verbal and visual, for satire, for castigating particular individuals and offering advice and reproach to the spectators, a direct communication which, by its content and context, demanded the involvement of the audience. The spectator, unlike the reader, had a close involvement in the act of communication; an involvement that is a feature of almost all forms of satire in the theatre, although McLeish is here referring to Aristophanic comedy:

The actors' awareness of their own performance and their alliance with the audience in watching and enjoying that performance, leads to a particular kind of intimacy between players and spectators. The performers constantly comment on this intimacy, and make full satirical use of it. ⁶⁸

The satirical effect lay in the use of all the resources of drama and theatre, from the written and spoken word to the signs inherent in the choice of a particular mask or the actor's use of a particular property. Writing of Greek tragedy, Taplin claims, with forceful clarity, that the "words - which are, after all, almost all we have - contain and explain the visual dimension: there could be no play and no meaning without them", and that, equally, "visual meaning is inextricable from verbal meaning".⁶⁹ The same is true of Old Comedy, with the significant addition that one cannot only deduce the visual stagecraft from the hints and clues which underlie the printed words, for the performance was based on much that was extra-textual. The production of a comedy, that is, exploited techniques beyond the scope of the words, relying as it did on clowning and slapstick, routines which would depend upon and be created from the skills of the individual performers, improvised and rehearsed, but not necessarily recorded in any detail. The plays of Aristophanes abound in situations where stock routines, or lazzi, would accompany the dialogue or action (types of bawdy gesture, the use of the crane or revolve, knocking on doors, for example, are all prepared for in the words); part of the humour would derive from the repetition and recognition of such routines. There would thus be no reason to record them.

This performance-dominated quality points to the difficulty in locating or perusing a script by a performer of satire. Very few texts recording performances by practitioners in South Africa, past or present, have been published. In 1975 Kirby selected monologues and sketches from his revues for publication under the title Trebor Ybrik Versus the Rest (these were made from the few copies which still existed and drawn from memory). Uys compiled a chronological sequence of monologues from his revues of the first half of the 1980s, with details regarding his intentions and comments on the particular selections under the title No One's Died Laughing in 1986. Hennie Aucamp has published the texts of the performances of his 'cabarets' which he describes as "beskaafde protes" ('civilized protest'); these include Die Lewe is 'n Grenshotel (1977) and Met permissie gesê (1980). No single, authentic text can exist, as each performer alters and adapts the material not only to what is topical or of interest to the particular audience, and to the particular place of performance, but does so in the performance itself according to audience response (more so than in other forms of theatre, and especially so because most performers are presenting their own material). Banks describes how the audience affects the length of a particular sketch in performance:

No two audiences are alike, from place to place and night to night there are differences, but I try to monitor responses The same sketch can vary between two and ten minutes. The backstage crew isn't ever thrown by this because I ensure that the cue line at the end of the sketch remains the same, but I want to be able to react when I see the audience is getting bored.

It should be clear why performers find it difficult to define the term and tend to avoid the labels satire, satirist and satirical if these are restricting in any way: in the theatre satire flourishes best in forms of entertainment less bound by the limitations of 'tradition' or literary conventions; in revue and cabaret, for example, particularly in forms in which the theatrical illusion is destroyed, where the performers address the audience directly, and where the action is often interrupted for asides, comment, song or dance. The various manifestations of satire in diverse literary and theatrical forms indicate that it is not restricted to a particular form, but is determined more by the intentions of the satirist. (When a satiric play is staged, it must be added: by the intentions of the director and

designer and performers as well.⁷⁰) For, as Edward W. Rosenheim maintains, the satirist is under no literary or formal prescriptions to adhere to satire throughout a work or performance, or sustain a single mode of satiric strategy, or limit the number of targets or objects under attack, or strive for any kind of "unity" which might be expected in other genres: satire is unpredictable and flexible and therefore "elude[s] narrow analytical procedures".⁷¹ Clearly then, it is wise to approach satire, not by attempting a single, all-encompassing definition, but by a description of the features by which it can be recognized. And such a description indicates that the South African performers whose presentations are being discussed were using the strategies of satire, despite the reservations they have stated and their misunderstanding of the term.

1.2 The Characteristic Features of Satire

1.2.1 Criticism and humour

Contemporary studies generally agree that the satirist intends to criticize, condemn, expose, or hold up to ridicule individuals (or types), or institutions, or current values, ideologies, customs or events, or even mankind in general. Further, most scholars identify and link two prominent (some would say, essential) features of the method, not the function, of satire: criticism and humour. Criticism ranges in scope from Dr Johnson's "censure" to Northrop Frye and Rosenheim's "attack" to Ronald Paulson's "vituperatio"; humour can be of the broadest scope, from Frye's "wit" to "black" or "gallows humour", very often "founded on fantasy or a sense of the grotesque", though there are works in which humour is rare.⁷² Satirists frequently emphasize the humorous aspect as primary: Kirby cites "amusement", Uys refers to "comedy". Nevertheless, there is a danger in espousing laughter as a principal means of satire. In his column in the Observer on 13 January, 1963 Tynan warned that laughter can adversely effect the satirical point of some forms of satire:

To the satirist ... a sense of humour may ... be an embarrassment, since the idea of disinterested laughter - laughter for its own sake, an end rather than a means -

clearly subverts the premise on which his purposeful art is based. To the satirist, pure humour is a waste of valuable laughter.⁷³

The laughter must be associated, that is, with the criticism for the satire to attain its purpose. Uys claims that "laughter is the only weapon [he has] left" (in part to attack those who would obviously use their own weapons - including bannings and censorship - to counter his attacks). If so, the type of laughter he refers to could be defined as satiric rather than essentially comic; for it is generally accepted that comedy evokes laughter mainly as an end in itself whereas satire derides by using laughter as a weapon against a particular target. The reason why laughter is important in satire is due not only to its association with ridicule, but also to its value in engaging the reader or spectator in the work by entertainment. Uys proposes a psychological reason as well. In an interview he was asked "What are you trying to put over to your audience ultimately?" and he replied:

That they are still in charge of their lives; that they can still change what they think is unchangeable. I try and make fear less fearful; expose it as being absurd. Fear is usually there because of lack of information and the lack of education. Once you make fear less fearful, it can be handled. Every time somebody laughs at the recognition of the absurdity, it will make that problem (fear) less of a monster; it's still there, it certainly doesn't solve the problem, but it makes it less of a 'demon'. It's not 10ft high, it's 10 inches.⁷⁴

Exposure, arousing awareness, revealing absurdity and diminution are all satiric functions. To respond with laughter at "lunacy" may be the only means of "survival" when the situation is absurd, as Athol Fugard maintains:

Nowhere in the world today - and I am sure that it is equally true of the past - has there ever been a society where the dominant political philosophy, aided and abetted by the dominant Christian theology, has led seemingly rational men and women into ... logic-defying lunacies And what makes it even more astounding is the all-pervasive nature of this madness there is not an area of our lives, from the most private to the most public, that has not been affected by it. I've always believed that laughter was an essential South African survival mechanism.⁷⁵

These two features of satire (criticism and humour) parallel those which Aristophanes repeatedly claimed were inherent to his work, and are, in part, the reason why his plays contain satirical interludes and portraits: in the parabasis of The Frogs, the chorus of Initiates declares to the audience that it values two privileges: "To amuse you citizens, and

to advise". This line has been variously translated to include "exhort and instruct" or "teaching", or as "It's the right and duty of our sacred chorus to determine better courses for our city".⁷⁶ So too, in the parabasis of The Acharnians (425), the chorus esteem Aristophanes' worth as a "Public Benefactor"; that is, Aristophanes through the chorus, is supposedly placing himself in that position.⁷⁷ (Pollard states, speaking of satirists in general, that they must convince their audiences of the value of their criticism, and that they often do so by claiming "the magnitude of the need for satire and the satirist's role as a public benefactor".⁷⁸) Though the moral intention which could be deduced from teaching and advising as a sacred duty within the parabasis, if not the play, might be lighthearted (the question of Aristophanes' moral purposes is discussed more fully in the next chapter), nevertheless there are clearly elements of what might be termed a related attack through exposing, ridiculing or criticizing named individuals, types and institutions. The number of satiric targets is limitless; Juvenal claimed that satire has an interest in everything men do.

If, as Dr Johnson claims in his Dictionary satire intends to censure "wickedness and folly", then clearly the individual satirist will determine what is "wicked" and what is "folly" and then proceed to persuade his audience that he is correct in determining this. Kirby maintains that "in its effect [satire is] almost objective, but in its motives and its urgings it's very subjective"; Uys admits his work is "very personal", that it is his "ten fears" but that, even so, he "can guarantee" that the spectator "will share at least three of those ten fears". For this reason Nichols claims that, from the point of view of the audience, satire is a work in which the author or performer attacks "what is made to seem worthy of blame" (his emphasis).⁷⁹ The question of authorial comment is contentious. Many satirical works (particularly formal verse satire of the eighteenth century) use the personal pronoun 'I' to identify the speaker. However it must be acknowledged that the 'I' persona is a conventional figure adopted by the writer; a part (or character or role) which is a creation, even if the speaker is (or can be identified as) the author of the satire. Significant as the biographical origins or references may be (and this was prevalent in the

revues of Uys), nevertheless it is the persuasive, rhetorical function of the speaker which is of primary importance: the speaker, writes Nichols, "is first and foremost an artistic creation shaped to serve the purposes of the satire".⁸⁰

The satirist not only selects the target or object of attack, he employs various tactics to convince, to manipulate the audience to his point of view, or at least direct attention to the absurdity through humour. Even then, wickedness, like comedy, depends on the view or value of the individual reader or spectator. Uys states: "My comedy is in the eye of the beholder. I don't make the jokes, the audience decides what is funny because of what it recognizes." This belief indicates the means by which the audience is involved in the criticism. Such criticism can be expressed (using a variety of devices, tactics or strategies) either directly or indirectly.⁸¹

1.2.2 Direct and indirect satire and the Horatian-Juvenalian spectrum

The most characteristic is indirect satire, in which the satirist proceeds indirectly or obliquely, by inference or insinuation, forcing the reader or spectator to participate in the satire by interpreting and having to recognize the inferences and insinuations, thereby being involved in the criticism and becoming, through this participation, a satirist himself. Thus the satirist most often supplies details which have been carefully selected to imply negative or adverse criticism. In this form, the satirist does not principally use direct address; he frequently uses forms such as fictional narrative, in which the targets of the satire are characters who make themselves and their opinions ridiculous through their words and actions. One example of this form is Menippean satire.⁸² The satirist does not appear to be the dominant figure in indirect satire.

In direct (or formal, as it is sometimes termed) satire, the figure of the satirist is dominant. Direct satire is strongly aggressive, it is characterized by invective and abusive

language, and openly attacks a victim or ideology. It can be identified by its direct and deliberate exaggeration and overstatement; the positive characteristics of the target are ignored in the emphasis on the negative aspects. Thus the less seemingly objective or fair the portrait, the closer the audience is to recognizing direct satire. The most distinctive manifestation is formal verse satire, which displays a characteristic feature of direct satire: the satiric 'persona' speaks in the first person.

There is, and this makes the recognition of the forms more difficult, a third form or strategy: that which combines features of both the direct and the indirect within a single work or performance. For convenience, this is termed "mixed" satire by Nichols, since the word "mixed" suggests the dish of mixed fruit or satura from which the word satire is often said to be derived (this is discussed in the next section). Revues are of this type as mixed satire allows the use of direct exaggeration and distortion to contrast with and heighten the impact of the devices employed in indirect satire.

The range of tones which feature in satire is consequently broad. The satiric spectrum is still customarily ranged between the Juvenalian and the Horatian (descriptions derived from the names of the two most prominent Roman satirists): the former adopts the posture of the serious moralist who finds little amusing in the corruption and degradation of humanity and whose anger and indignation continuously emerge in bitter condemnation and scathing malice; the character of the satirist as projected by Horace, writing a century earlier, is that of the urbane man who views human folly with a more tolerant, amused contempt, using gentle mockery and playful wit as the most effective means to attain his purposes.⁸³ The polarities between these two were formulated by Dryden as 'tragical satire' (Juvenalian) and 'comical satire' (Horatian), each having its own legitimacy, and this formulation is generally regarded as marking the boundaries of the satiric dispensation.

Uys has, since his first one-person satirical revue in 1981, stated that he attempts to maintain a balance between the extremes on this spectrum:

I don't think I really do the right satirical combinations in my work. I try to keep a balance of forty-nine per cent anger and fifty-one per cent comedy [a definition Uys gleaned from the American comedienne Joan Rivers], but I feel I'm losing that now, definitely. I'm losing my compassion and my sense of humour because the whole situation here is so predictably arrogant.

Where Uys would prefer to remain closer to Horace than Juvenal (insisting that, although it became more difficult, he wanted to retain a sense of "compassion and not merely blame"), Kirby would align himself to Juvenal, and has criticized Uys for including humour in his portrayal of the State President "as rather avuncular and bumbling". In response, Uys would argue that he recognized the dangers of presenting P.W. Botha as "a bumbling fool" as he was not, but the mere fact of accurately presenting that leader's constitutional changes in the context of Rearranging the Deckchairs on the S.A. Boat (1987) evoked laughter. He was fully aware that the final sketch of that revue (the original rehearsal text described it as a "pantomime") in which he sang a version of the song "My Way" (originally by Anka, Revauz and Francois) in the character of P.W. Botha as the captain of a sinking ship, was "a horror combination: a cheap laugh at the stupid policies". Kirby's response was far more hostile and aggressive:

I think P.W. Botha is intensely and deeply evil and I think he should be treated in that way. He's not only a fool; he's only interested in sectional Afrikaner matters to which this whole country is being sacrificed and I don't think there is any time for pussyfooting around people like that. I mean, I think if you could hit him with a bazooka all the better We have no luxury for finesses any more.

If it is agreed that satire is, in essence, a form of attack upon an individual, institution or belief, there must exist a degree of anger (which could range from irritation to outrage) to initiate the criticism. However, as Uys indicated above, most satirists are aware that extremes of anger can alienate the reader or spectator or arouse scepticism which would undermine the entire thrust of the satiric strategy. Clearly, if one of the purposes of satire is persuasion, it is vital to maintain the interest and engagement of the audience in the process of satire. Pollard states that the first task of any satirist is to convince the audience of the value, and even more so, the necessity, of his criticism, that he is a "Public Benefactor". There must therefore be a recognition of shared attitudes or values.

With such an implicit agreement the satirist can "exploit more fully the differences between appearance and reality and ... expose hypocrisy".³⁴ Without it, he remains a lister of vices who might lose his potential audience, as is the case with Fraser who, for various reasons, deliberately antagonizes those audience members who are offended by four-letter words. Uys would regard this as an indication of failure:

The worst thing in the theatre is an empty house because then as a performer you cease to exist. You are as loud as your last applause. But I'm alienating my audience now, I'm killing the goose, there's no question of it, no question you have got to reflect something to an audience that doesn't frighten them into closing their eyes. In this country you get the finger wag all the time, you're beaten on the head, so I give a little tickle with a feather first, then I hit and say, "Sorry".

To Horace, the function of all literary activity, including satire, is both instruction and delight. To Uys, though "anger" is a vital element in his work, in the theatre "it always has to be ... entertainment first".

As intimated earlier by his son, on the Horatian-Juvenalian spectrum, a performer such as Leslie would be far nearer to the Horatian pole than Kirby, Fraser or Miyeni:

He [Leslie] had to write material that would make sure that people would end up having a good night out: do his work as a satirist, make the foibles of the time apparent, the political situation, the ridiculousness of the status quo, but again, educate people and humour them at the same time, send them on their way with a laugh, but with that laugh a thought, an underlying awareness. Adam wanted people to laugh, and, inside, actually set thoughts or ideas in motion.

Banks aims for, he says, a "medium", to expose hypocrisy, to "hit without upsetting too many people, to avoid alienating too many members of the audience". However, he like the other South African satirical performers, does regard the issue as related to the response of individuals in the audience: some demand the Horatian, others plead for a stronger Juvenalian attitude.

The imprecise connotations of Dryden's two poles serve as a reminder that satire has never been, nor, it must be acknowledged by now, can it be adequately defined. The derivations of the word 'satire' itself points to its very broadness of applicability, its lack

of specificity: although it has been mistakenly linked to the Greek satyr-play (as satyrs were rude and outspoken creatures), the word is of Latin origin (satura) where it denoted, at first, a dish of mixed fruit, a 'medley' or 'miscellany'.⁸⁵ Before Greek comedy, there existed in Italy a theatrical form known as saturae, a form similar to revue or vaudeville, not plays, which comprised character sketches of persons or types, with many of the elements of which could be associated with satire: humour (often coarse), ridicule, impersonation, a range of subjects and an improvisatory quality. Only Livy mentions these dramatic saturae; but certain scholars believe that his source Varro created the notion to "give the ... uncultivated Romans a sort of original primitive drama corresponding to the early stages of Greek drama".⁸⁶ The first formal verse forms in Latin became known as saturae because they too dealt with a mixture of subjects and contained a medley of several literary techniques. These were first written and named by Ennius. The earliest use of the word satura then, is as a title for works with a literary, not theatrical, association. Further confusion results from Quintilian's claim for the Romans that "Satura is wholly our invention".⁸⁷

Satire did not, however, await the invention of the Latin term, for the elements are clearly evident in the works of Aristophanes, though there is no exact equivalent for the word in Greek; the synonym of the Latin was komoidein: literally, 'to comedize'.⁸⁸ The confusing result is, as Elliott has indicated, that the English word 'satire' is derived from the Latin satura (which had no verbal, adverbial or adjectival forms); but 'satirize' and 'satiric' are of Greek origin.⁸⁹ While Aristophanes' plays are themselves a medley of spectacle, slapstick, obscenity and fantasy, unlike satura (which referred to a poetic and literary form) they are aimed at performance without observing any critical prescriptions regarding satirical strategies; rather the satirical content was defined and motivated by sociological factors and the context which generated them. And although the Roman writers claimed 'satire' as their own invention, Horace in his Sermones (I, 4, 1-7) clearly acknowledges the influence of the Old Comedy of Athens. Where satire referred in the Roman and Renaissance periods to specific literary forms, it is now generally seen to refer not to a genre, but to an attitude or "structural principle".⁹⁰

1.2.3 Topicality

Where subject matter varies considerably and is no guide to defining satire, it can be said that the type of subject with which it deals "is always concrete, usually topical, often personal", as Highet claims.⁹¹ (Uys prefers the following order: "personal, topical, concrete".) That is, the target is generally an identifiable or familiar contemporary person or persons, institution, custom, belief or event, if such an attack is to have an impact; hence, although the presentation is usually distorted or exaggerated (for humorous effect, most often) or presented in the guise of an allegory or fantasy, it is usually claimed or is seen to be based on fact. Satire has little concern with the transcendental: its field of operation is human society; it is essentially a social and political mode. "Politics," states Hodgart, "is the pre-eminent topic of satire", which is "the most political part of all literature" owing to its efforts to "influence public behaviour".⁹² Rosenheim is more specific than Hodgart: his entire premise regarding satire is that it can be identified by its concern with historic "particulars", which partly distinguishes satire and comedy: "All satire," he writes, and the emphasis is his, "is not only an attack; it is an attack upon discernible, historically authentic particulars." ⁹³ These particulars are fictional creations, but with definite referents in the 'real' world: the targets of satire are not fictions, they, or the objects they represent, exist or existed. No matter what the satirist claims as his purpose, if any, he must obviously be understood, and the targets under attack must be, even if distorted to heighten the satiric presentation, clear, familiar, "recognizable" and "manifest" fictions.⁹⁴ Banks states that he "learnt through bitter experience" that he could "only present people who are known" to the audience. The visual aspect of theatre can reinforce the satiric effect by elements of design (enhancing familiar associations in costumes, properties or setting; this will be discussed in Chapter 4 in relation to the staging of Uys's revues) and through styles of acting (imitating or reproducing the gestures, mannerisms and vocal quality of the familiar target; this too will be examined with regard to Uys in Chapter 4) in ways which literary forms cannot.

This concern with the concrete, discernible particulars of the here and now of the 'author' raises the issue of the permanence of satire: the tragedy of topical and personal satire is that the jokes die with the subjects, while, if the satire does last, there is the tragedy of bestowing immortality on those who perhaps deserve to be forgotten. Many jokes become the objects of extra-textual studies by scholars seeking the original relevance of a reference (this is as true of Aristophanes as of practitioners of the early 1960s in South Africa, such as Leslie); the spectator at a revived performance or a reader perusing the material in the 1990s can no longer discern or be familiar with the individual, group, institution or ideology which was being ridiculed. As Uys states: "No matter how successful the one-line gag or the character, when the issue passed into history, so does the interest of the audience." ⁹⁵ Since the resignation of P.W. Botha on 14 August 1989, Uys could no longer impersonate him for topical satirical effect; P.W. Botha was incorporated into subsequent revues only as a figure of failure: "Losers are simply not funny." ⁹⁶ In what he claimed to be his last revue, An Evening with Pieter-Dirk Uys, Uys asked the audience: "So what do you think you'll get? P.W. Botha? For God's sake! ... He's a hasbeen. Yesterday's bad smell. Weg na die Wildernis. Gone with his own wind. You want to see P.W. Botha? O.K. (Does P.W. Botha.)" ⁹⁷ The essential features of satire, as enumerated by Hightet and Rosenheim, can cause it, paradoxically, to become obscure, remote, without immediate relevance to the present day reader or spectator. The moment of laughter created by recognition of the familiar cannot be recovered. When Leslie was approached by a recording company to produce a record with the proposed title "The Best of Adam Leslie" he initially agreed, but subsequently decided not to do so: "When I thought about it, although it was flattering, there is nothing as dated as topicality. It may have had a certain nostalgic value, but we don't have a sufficiently big population." ⁹⁸

This is one of the necessary limitations and strengths of satire, for though the material might become dated, the impact of using and exploiting current events is undeniable. Hence, like Aristophanes in the past, the "modern satirist or nightclub comedian", states Kenneth J. Reckford, creates his material from that which is topical by working "with

newspaper sometimes literally in hand".⁹⁹ The "material" is therefore dictated by the media, changing, of necessity, as the headlines change. (A note below the title of Uys's Beyond the Rubicon reads: "This material is dependent on P.W. Botha and therefore subject to daily change."¹⁰⁰) All the performers interviewed find it essential to consult the newspapers daily and, with caution, the SABC news broadcasts. Nevertheless a performer such as Uys found that he could retain the structure of his presentations and adapt to the situation in the United States of America, Canada, Australia, the United Kingdom or the Netherlands, taking his "characters to their reality", not bringing the "audience to South Africa". Similarly, in South Africa, he changed material to the changing social and political situation: the coloured man who described the effects of the Group Areas Act on his family appeared in revues in 1981 and 1986 (in Beyond the Rubicon), first in 'Cape Coon Carnival' costume, in the later revue as a member of the South African Police patrolling the townships. Uys maintains that "circumstances change but the essence remains".¹⁰¹ So too, Uys has altered his plays to reflect the present condition. Paradise is Closing Down (1977) has been revised twice since its first production: in 1987, published in 1989 as Paradise Is Closing Down, with greater emphasis on the coloured man who "now ... has a name and a gun and he's been involved", and in 1992 adapted for an all-male cast, as Paradise Is Closing Down (A New South Africa Look). Uys states that he can continue to adapt the play until "Paradise" has closed down, that he can still maintain the impetus from the events of June 1976:

I see no reason why a play written 15 years ago should not have something as valid to say today, once the dated political decorations have been replaced and brought into perspective. And hopefully in 15 years time Paradise ... will be able to slip into the new tailored jacket provided by a 'new' New South Africa and have an impact on the audiences then, to whom 'the beginning of the end' in Soweto on 16 June 1976, is just the reason for another public holiday.¹⁰²

While it is possible to revise and update plays involving fictional characters, the survival and continued production of those which contain long dead persons and forgotten events is due not primarily to their original satiric intentions, but because of their enduring theatrical qualities, their adaptability to present-day conditions and their relevance to the context of the new time and place of production. Theatre does have an advantage over

'literary' forms in this respect.¹⁰³ According to Reckford, the plays of Aristophanes "most read and taught in Byzantium were those that treated broader social and educational issues", such as The Clouds (423), The Frogs and Wealth (388).¹⁰⁴ As regards performances of Aristophanes' plays, the guiding principle in a revival should be to remain truer to the spirit than the letter, a spirit that the translator or adapter, director, designer and performers can locate and emphasize in the new context. As authentic and irrefutable details regarding the distribution of lines to speakers, exactly how they were performed and where in terms of 'stage' or orchestra do not exist, an 'authentic' production is impossible; anyone "performing an ancient comedy has a perfect right to bring the text to life in any way that seems appropriate", claims Henderson.¹⁰⁵ Geoffrey Chapman argues convincingly that, to be effective, "faithful versions" of Aristophanes' plays are not required, but rather "scripts which convey the meaning of the original, rather than the words, to a non-specialist audience".¹⁰⁶ To do so, the adapter has to remove all barriers to understanding and, while appreciating the original text and context (which can never be recreated or duplicated) find equivalent local and topical names, places, institutions, themes or verbal expressions, so as to "strike the same chord in a modern audience as that struck by Aristophanes in his original audience".¹⁰⁷ (It is the same principle as that used by Uys in performing his work overseas: not taking the audience at a contemporary production of an Aristophanic comedy to fifth century Athens, but placing the characters and situation in the "reality" of the audience.) This is particularly important as a means of revitalizing the satiric intent and targets, for, as Erenstein maintains, to a "later age a satiric scene becomes comic if it no longer retains its original relationship to historical reality"; in the absence of a contemporary equivalent, he might have continued, it would no longer be a source of comedy either.¹⁰⁸ The function of the satirical attacks, in choice of subject and style of presentation, has to be considered in both the original and translated or adapted texts, within their specific contexts (the original and new audience).

¹⁰⁹ Such an approach acknowledges the fact that, while the present-day audience cannot have the exact experience of the original audience, it can, nevertheless, experience an equivalent in and for its own context.

Within the South African context, it is possible to localize almost all of Aristophanes' plays. Lysistrata (411) was the basis of Dermot Judge's "new script" based in South Africa in Lysistrata S.A., directed by Dorrian McLaren at the Space in Cape Town in 1977.¹¹⁰ To Brian Astbury this production "was one of the major successes of The Space" in the way in which it defused the tensions of the "political and social climate" of the time.¹¹¹ Chapman has translated Thesmophoriazousae (411) as Women in Protest (1980), and his The Afrikaanians (unperformed and unpublished to date) is based on The Acharnians.¹¹² The former is set in "no particular place or time" and the references to Athenian people, places and institutions are "generalised" in translation but, Chapman found, "the modifications which were necessary [were] remarkably few, since the targets of the author's satire ... are to be found in any society at any time".¹¹³ The text was specific to the place of production, Pietermaritzburg, but Chapman indicated where another director could introduce the names of people and places known to his specific audience, in an endeavour to keep the play as topical as the original Athenian production.

The Afrikaanians explicitly recreates the "political satire-cum-fantasy" of the original within South Africa in the late 1980s with references to the controversial 'Peace Song' sponsored by the government; the African National Congress (still banned at his time of writing); the Dakar meeting (in Senegal in July 1987); and local personages such as Uys (as 'Dirk-Uys' who appears dressed as Evita Bezuidenhout ; Euripides in the original Aristophanic play), and a chorus of belligerent 'Afrikaanians', farmers in paramilitary gear with Afrikaner Weerstandsbeweging (AWB) insignia (the rural Acharnians in Aristophanes). While purists may criticize this approach for distorting or imposing upon the original text to the point where an audience would receive a different play from that originally written, nevertheless it could be advocated as a method, for it makes Aristophanes accessible once more, and it does approximate part of the impact the original production might have had on its audience. There have been, in Afrikaans, several 'faithful' translations of Aristophanes, notably Lysistrata by J.P.J. van Rensburg and Die Paddas by Merwe Scholtz.¹¹⁴ But 'faithful' translations are generally more satisfying to

the scholar than the performer or spectator: Uys recalls his involvement in a production of The Frogs whilst a student at the University of Cape Town (directed by Peter Kleinschmidt), and felt, at the time, that the production should have included "recognizable" South African elements (in terms of language and personalities). The absurd "illusion" of an identical, word-for-word translation for the scholar, not the spectator, is also obvious: there cannot be, asserts Susan Bassnett-McGuire, a "sameness between two languages" for "they stem from different cultural systems".¹¹⁵

1.2.4 Distortion and exaggeration

The translator's task is made somewhat easier by the mode of characterization within satiric texts. In his Dictionary, Dr Johnson defines lampoon as "personal satire; abuse; censure, written ... to vex". This limits lampoon to a written medium, unfortunately, and to term a verbal attack on an individual 'invective' is not satisfactory either. A lampoon is a form of burlesque, not of a literary work, but of the character and appearance of a specific individual; it often employs caricature, for it exaggerates and distorts (as in the graphic arts) the person's distinctive physical features or mannerisms, and on the stage his vocal peculiarities as well. What invective lacks, and what features in satire prominently, is irony. Dryden, as Patrick Murray points out, provided a useful image of the difference between the effect of satire involving irony and that of simple invective without it, when he wrote of the "vast difference between the slovenly butchering of a man and the fineness of a stroke that separates head from body and leaves it standing in its place".¹¹⁶ Even so, the personal, particular nature of a lampoon can have a broader, general application (out of the confines of the work) as a lampoon in a satiric work can be both individual and type; both the named, identifiable person and an embodiment of that person's qualities, thereby becoming a device for criticizing all those who resemble the original in attitude or attribute. (It is for this reason that the translator's task is made easier, for he can substitute a similar, contemporary 'type' for the original individual who is unknown or

forgotten.) Kirby frequently revives his monologues, "putting new names to the new dishonesties" in the revivals, "because one thing you can be sure of is ministers are consistently dishonest".

Clearly a lampoon can possess a limited independence within the satiric framework. (Such non-fictional characters are "restricted", Uys claims, "by life, by reality" as well.) As a character, he illustrates and embodies a position; to Pollard, he "does not become; he is" ¹¹⁷. And even if the character is clearly based on a living person, as a creation he remains in the control of the author or author-performer's intention. So, too, characters do not generally develop, they most often begin and end with the same outlook, with the reader or spectator's interest aroused and maintained by the creator's ability to play on the variations of his theme or vary the context in which the lampoon is introduced.

Therefore, to a certain extent, a degree of two-dimensionality is to be expected of satiric characters, and especially of lampoons; to Uys the "non-fictional" characters in his revues had fewer "dimensions" than the fictional; in fact, on stage, he maintains, they "did not need dimensions". If too many extenuating details would lessen the impact of satire, then Uys is correct. Feinberg would argue that this is as true of fictional and non-fictional characters: "the more profoundly a character is developed, the less likely he is to be a character suitable for pure satire".¹¹⁸ If the two most commonly accepted features of satire are criticism and humour, then the humour is not an end in itself, as it often is in comedy, but a method of criticism, of attack, a "weapon" as Uys stated earlier. In creating that laughter, the satirist cannot be impartial and treat the person object under attack objectively, he has to, as Michael Seidel puts it, "fight dirty".¹¹⁹ Horace, in his *Sermones* (I, 1, 24) claimed that the satirist aims "to tell the truth with a laugh", but it is a distorted truth, or only one aspect of the truth, for in presenting the truth of his cause and securing the agreement of the spectator or reader, the more positive or acceptable aspects of the target have to be partially or wholly ignored, while the specific attitudes under attack have to be exaggerated. Pope refers to this as "magnifying" or "diminishing": magnifying the

target of satire makes the faults appear greater, whereas diminishing the target will cause that target to seem more petty or even absurd.¹²⁰ The satirist "fight[s] dirty" by employing burlesque, parody, travesty or caricature.¹²¹ Uys frequently used exaggeration and distortion to heighten the comic incongruity for satiric ends: as an oral performer who aimed to expose the hypocrisies associated with the ideology of those in power he deliberately burlesqued individuals. His "Koornhof offers Kyk" monologue was devised after he had seen a television interview in 1981 in which Dr Piet (Pieter) Koornhof, then Minister of Co-operation and Development, discussed conditions in the Crossroads squatter camp. Uys not only repeated Koornhof's justifications in the published version, but in performance he mimicked his voice and mannerisms and exaggerated his physical features, by wearing "a rubber latex mask with two hugely prominent ears and a nose to match".¹²² In this sketch Uys portrayed the inhumanity of a system which can create the "appalling conditions of malnutrition and the lack of adequate shelter at the Crossroads squatter camp".¹²³ More particularly the ineptness and ridiculousness of those who perpetuated it were ridiculed by revealing Koornhof's inability to justify his government's policies (his continual evasion of questions) and his solution to the situation: "If they don't have bread, give them Kyk!"¹²⁴ The monologue worked by a distorted allusion: the pun on "cake" (from "Let them eat cake", the remark attributed to Queen Marie-Antoinette, on being told that the people could not afford bread) and Kyk (a banal romantic photo-magazine, which Koornhof proposed as a means of shelter) forced a recollection in the spectator of the violent revolution in which the former was beheaded.

1.2.5 Norms and ideals in satire and comedy

The degree of distortion, oblique or overstated, will indicate whether the satirist is employing the tactics of indirect or direct satire. In indirect satire the satirist attempts, by various strategies, to conceal that the process is taking place as it is, states Sutherland, "fatal to satire if the reader or spectator should reflect that much might be said on both

sides".¹²⁵ Furthermore, the reader and spectator must agree or be made to agree on the rightness of the satirist's attack, that he is indeed a 'Public Benefactor', and in the endeavour to maintain the focus only on those aspects he wants to ridicule or expose or criticize, a satirist (like Uys) resorts to various tactics: "by throwing dust in our eyes, by fascinating us with the verisimilitude of his presentation, by so delighting us with his wit that we never pause to question his argument".¹²⁶ Clearly, the subject must have been, a priori, an object worthy of criticism; but criticism does not exist in isolation: if a target is worthy of blame, there must exist some point from which blame can be assessed, an assumed or implied standard or norm on which the author can base his attack and against which the target can be compared: "a Platonic ideal, or its approximation in reality", as Peter Petro describes it.¹²⁷ Thus there is, in most satirical works, a two-sided vision in which the actual and the ideal are juxtaposed or set in opposition. A normative value (not necessarily moral) is bestowed upon the counterpart by the satirist, so that the "ideal counterpart, whether explicitly (rarely) or implicitly (generally), is the norm [Petro's emphasis] from which the satiric target is an aberration".¹²⁸ Uys would agree that the ideal is not explicitly posited: it is "the background" to his plays and revues, it is what "everybody wants", whereas the "actual" is what is presented, the absurd political and social situation which can and does "destroy the ideal". Most often, particularly in indirect satire, it is difficult to identify or formulate precise norms since the satirist, as Nichols points out, does not indicate how one should act, but how one should not act.¹²⁹

If, as some critics contend, the 'Augustan Age' produced the most esteemed works of satire in English, it was in part because the writers "felt sure of the standards to which they could refer", for, Pollard maintains, the "best satire, that which is surest in tone, is that which is surest in its values".¹³⁰ It was, too, an age in which satirists appeared to agree that they were performing a morally and socially beneficial function (Dr Johnson's "censure", Dryden's "amendment", Daniel Defoe's "reformation").¹³¹ Pope's satires often include a figure to represent his moral standpoint and remind the reader of his moral purpose; Spacks states that such moral figures are rare in contemporary satire.¹³² Uys

agrees that a moral standpoint or purpose might have been appropriate to the age and situation in which Dr Johnson was writing, with its "definite framework of good and evil", but, he argues, that framework does not exist in and is irrelevant to the present South African context. Discussing Swift as a moral satirist, A.E. Dyson writes that "satire, fiercer than comedy in its moral intentions, measures human conduct not against a norm but against an ideal", and that the "intention is reformative".¹³³ There are critics who would dispute this contention, but Dyson, to substantiate, argues that Fielding (unlike Swift) in a novel such as Tom Jones (1749), though he employs satiric strategies, "uses ridicule in the service not of idealism, as a satirist would, but of ordinary benevolent good sense".¹³⁴ One such critic is Nichols, who would question the moral implication of norms as opposed to ideals; after a discussion of this aspect in various satirical works he concludes:

The norms of satire need not be based upon a received body of opinion, nor based upon 'reason', nor stated or implied with great precision, nor even be consistent or congruent with norms the reader would accept outside the context of the satire A satiric norm is essentially a vantage point from which something else may be viewed. Since it is a means to an end, rather than an end in itself, it may work successfully if the satiric view is a satisfying one. What use the satirist makes of it, what happens within the satire, is crucial.¹³⁵

A norm, then, is implicit within all works of satire if satire can be said to criticize, as criticism suggests a "vantage point" from which someone or something has deviated. The satirist is by no means obliged to create a figure to represent a moral norm: it is the reader or spectator of the satire who is responsible for bringing to the work the moral norm.¹³⁶ (Of course, what is being criticized must be apparent. As Rosenheim pointed out earlier, the reader (and spectator) should be able to recognize the individual or group or institution or idea which is being attacked.) In a stage presentation this issue is compounded by the fact that the point of view is removed even further: a performer interprets the character (whose view might not necessarily be that of the playwright), and that performer has been guided by the interpretation of a director. Each reader, spectator, performer and director may have a unique sense of what the norm is, or should be, dependent on the combined personal experiences which determine an individual's political, social, religious and moral

views. This complex of views is the context in which the satire will exist, a context varying from individual to individual, country to country and historical period to period. Uys, speaking of Rearranging the Deckchairs on the SA Bothatonic, pointed to this fact in the context of a single performance:

With this sort of show 384 [the number of seats in the Elizabeth Sneddon Theatre] opinions attack me every second. There's so much more work going on in the audience than on stage, because no matter what I do every single person has an opinion for it or against it, or even more passionate than that, about it. I mean I've been accused of a thousand different things every time I do something Everybody has their opinion. But because it is a personal opinion I can accept their argument.

Kirby frequently refers to Dyson's distinction between satire and comedy in relation to an ideal and a norm quoted above (though he errs in stating that Dyson was writing of Fielding: in that chapter of The Crazy Fabric Dyson was, in fact, discussing Swift). In an extended legal confrontation regarding his It's a Boy! (1982), the Publications Appeal Board described the play as a "Political Burlesque", a term Kirby rejects:

That has a fine and ominous ring about it, but it is not the right definition. It is too close to being a metaphor for good old satire. Of quite a few critical abstracts I have read on the metaphysics of comedy and humour, the least pretentious was by A.E. Dyson, writing in a study of Fielding [sic]. He suggests that satire judges man against an ideal, while comedy sets him against a norm. In this light it is clear that It's a Boy! is a comedy.¹³⁷

It's a Boy! reflects, accurately, the bigotry of a very specific race (white) and class (lower-middle) and locale (it is sub-titled "A Strydom Crescent Love Story"; the action takes place in the living-room of the Knoesen home in the Johannesburg suburb of Bez Valley). In a personal interview, Kirby claimed it is "a mirror up to that society", that he is not attempting to "destroy Jiggs Knoesen's family". Their racial attitudes are clearly ridiculed but they are treated as objects of laughter (in the sense of Fielding) rather than of disgust (in the sense of Swift). If satire tends to ridicule the deviations from the norm within a context, then Kirby is correct in claiming that It's a Boy! is not a satire; within the context in which this family is presented, their attitudes are the norm. The laughter of tolerance is not a feature of direct satire. This discussion leads to that of the differences between satire and comedy.

As in the examination of the characteristic features of satire earlier in this section, it is wiser to identify tendencies rather than attempt absolute distinctions between satire and comedy for, as they can be close in structure and tone, confusion can result. No differentiation has satisfied all critics in all periods, for the distinctions depend upon variables such as historical context in which a particular work is or was received, and the differing contexts which individuals bring to the work.¹³⁸ Comedy employs similar strategies to satire (distortion, parody, typing of character), but in a different spirit and for different ends; there is a difference in intention: in satire the desire to ridicule and condemn is more dominant. In satire, a person or system or belief is censured, ridiculed or exposed, but the object of attack is not necessarily reformed as usually occurs in comedy (and as occurs, indirectly, in *It's a Boy!*). Satire concludes without the belief in or assurance of happiness. Both explore and expose weakness, folly and hypocrisy, but where comedy tends to induce acceptance through a measure of empathy or identification, satire tends to rejection of the target: both the satirist and the comic writer dramatize the discrepancy between the actual and the ideal, what is and what could be, but the satirist rejects and is intolerant of what is, while the comic writer generally accepts the weaknesses of humanity. Thus, while both focus on incongruity of some sort, the stress in satire is not the incongruity, but upon the faults of one of the incongruous elements. The writer of comedy indicates why characters deserve to be laughed at, and, as a prerequisite to laughter, arouses a measure of understanding and empathy; most often the satirist cannot accept, must denounce and attack. The former provokes undestructive laughter at weakness, whereas the latter arouses laughter that is often destructive, aiming, some would contend, to cure folly or even punish, and if that purpose is not achieved, at least to jeer and create feelings of contempt.

If it is accepted that persuasion is the chief function of rhetoric, then satire is allied to rhetoric, for while the comic writer might be content to amuse, the satirist could be said to use language in an attempt to persuade, not necessarily only reform, but to influence or change an attitude or belief towards a person or object; in fact to make the reader or

spectator agree with the satirist's judgement and viewpoint, to think and believe as the satirist does. The intent to persuade through exposure, ridicule or condemnation is one of the principal means of distinguishing between the creator of satire and the creator of comedy.

1.3 Satire and its theatrical presentation

For the reasons given above, full-length dramatic texts are rarely "pure" satire: it "offers both a more fantastically distorted vision and a sharper criticism of life" than what Hodgart terms the "traditional stage comedy can support if it is to meet its audience's expectations".¹³⁹ Hodgart believes that satire is generally allegorical (the characters representing something else, "beyond the literal level"), but

stage drama tends to avoid allegory, for very good reasons. The very circumstances of play-acting are allegorical in themselves - everyone in the audience knows that ... what takes place on the stage is on a different plane from ordinary life. The actors are clearly symbols. In this case it is difficult for the audience to accept yet another level of allegory, or to enjoy with comfort the spectacle of an actor representing a 'character' that represents an idea.¹⁴⁰

Exceptions to Hodgart's contention include Ben Jonson's Every Man in his Humour (1598), Volpone (1606) and The Alchemist (1611), Molière's Tartuffe (1664) and George Bernard Shaw's John Bull's Other Island (1904). A further reason why pure satire is unusual in full-length texts could be that the satirist (if he is not the director as well) is no longer in complete control of his creation, for his effect is mediated not only by the director's interpretation, but also by the physical attributes and artistic abilities of the performers and the visual and aural surroundings created by the designer, composer, and the lighting and sound technicians. Uys admits to "hating" many of the productions of his works by other directors, so much so that he has considered "putting an embargo on [his] work". His objections relate mainly to directorial misinterpretation. In drama, asserts Alvin B. Kernan, the satirist is restricted if he must express himself in and through some type of structure or plot, when he can "no longer merely rail and commend himself as the only absolute foe of vice".¹⁴¹ Satirists do not feel compelled to create the linear and direct

progression which is generally conceived as 'plot'; approaching a satire with prescriptions and formulations of what should constitute plot in drama would result in misunderstanding and confusion, for satires are characterized by variety, by a succession of "loosely related events" and "little apparent development", which point to the origins of saturae, a medley or miscellany.¹⁴² Ralph Lawson directed Uys in Rearranging the Deckchairs on the SA Bothatanic and also a production of his Panorama (1987).¹⁴³ He expressed reservations regarding the "construction" of the latter, which he found to have "loopholes" and "contrivances":

I feel that he is the best director of his own plays: he can impart some of that 'keeping the ball in the air' spark which they really need. If you analyse them too carefully or start applying theatrical laws to them they tend to fall apart I'm open to correction here because public opinion in many ways belies this: his plays are very popular.

1.3.1 Satire and satiric forms

Hodgart makes no distinction between pure satire (or satire proper) and the satiric. Satire proper is a complete, highly patterned denigration of a person, institution, attitude or characteristic.¹⁴⁴ (A literary example of satire proper would be Dryden's Absalom and Achitophel (1729).) Revue artists and stand-up comedians who piece together seemingly unstructured political and social anecdotes, observations and lampoons are practitioners of the satiric: non-formalized, 'unpatterned' ridicule, usually of a variety of subjects. But the satiric is not confined to revues and performances by stand-up comedians: comedies (such as Panorama and It's a Boy!) accommodate the satiric without being satire proper. So too, Aristophanic 'comedy' was a vehicle and a medium to express political and social ideas in a humorous format. Satire is part of Aristophanes' polemical impulse, but not the exclusive purpose for he was clearly also a poet and a comic writer: his "mode", to McLeish, was satiric, his "means" theatrical (humorous "dialogue, slapstick, spectacle and lyrical fantasy").¹⁴⁵

Generally, in comedy, the objects of ridicule do not demand an authentic reality, whereas the objects of satiric attack should be identifiable, should be historically authentic, "manifest" and "recognizable", or the impact of the satiric work is weakened.¹⁴⁶ In Aristophanes, according to Henderson, characters are generally of two major types: the "sympathetic" and "unsympathetic" (or eirons ('outsiders') and alazons ('imposters') to Rick A. Eden).¹⁴⁷ Satiric characters are created for a particular purpose: while they may be individualized, they are a means to an end, rather than an end in themselves. (For this reason it has been argued that satirists are more concerned with the failings that the characters represent than in those characters as fully developed human beings.¹⁴⁸) The sympathetic (such as Lysistrata, and Pisthetairos in The Birds (414)) are fictitious creations representing citizens, or a class of citizens, who are victimized or frustrated by the conditions in society and therefore advocate views held by those in the social and political minority.¹⁴⁹ To McLeish, the protagonist (the sympathetic character) is generally the only "sane" being in an "insane world".¹⁵⁰ The unsympathetic characters embody disapproved behaviour and most often represent specific, named individuals or institutions (Cleon in The Knights (424), the Sophists in The Clouds); that is, they embody aspects of the current status quo, the world of 'reality'. (The presentation of these characters is examined in detail in the next chapter). As satiric targets they are depicted almost entirely unsympathetically as self-interested, misguided and corrupt imposters.

Nevertheless, by a fantastic scheme, the fictional, sympathetic protagonist evades or alters the situation present at the outset and which caused him/her to complain or express dissatisfaction, and succeeds in bringing about a triumph of wish-fulfilment. The action thus progresses from reality to fantasy, and the deeds of the sympathetic character invert the 'laws' by which the other characters operate. In this Utopian scenario, those who embody the status quo are defeated or discredited, and the play concludes with a restoration of 'normality', or an inversion of the initial order, in some form of celebration. In this way, Aristophanes' plays combine the features of comedy and satire, for persons or systems are ridiculed, but also reformed or replaced: the non-fictional (or

unsympathetic) characters, the principal targets of satiric attack, are lampooned within a work which may not be termed a satire proper (though, even so, The Knights is a patterned and sustained denigration of Demos ('the people') and Paphlagonian, clearly a representation of Cleon).

Aristophanes controls the unity of his plots by two methods: firstly, the transition from the world of fantasy to that of reality is made to appear both attractive and, more importantly, logical; secondly, the non-fictional characters and events depend for their success on the creation of a very particular relationship between spectator and performer, a relationship indicated earlier in this chapter. Since Aristophanes, McLeish argues, this relationship has been lost in literary comedy, but still exists in such performance forms as revue and stand-up comedy, forms which include the impersonation of particular individuals:

Like such a comedian, Aristophanes invests the people and events taken from real life with a kind of illusory, fantasy existence, often either allegorical (as in the case of Kleonymos, the eternal symbol of cowardice) or burlesqued (as in the cases of Euripides, Socrates or Lamachos). Because both comedian and spectator know that the comic creation is distorted from the original in a particular way, a state of conspiratorial irony is established between them, with the parodied person or event as its butt.¹⁵¹

One must be wary of speaking of breaking or disrupting the dramatic 'illusion' in Aristophanes, especially as it is invariably associated with or set in opposition to 'realism'. In Old Comedy, as Frances Muecke demonstrates, "there is no illusion, in the sense that there is no attempt to make the audience believe that it is watching a slice of life", and therefore it is questionable whether there can be a "breaking of the illusion".¹⁵² It is feasible to speak of breaking the 'dramatic illusion' (as the actors and choruses do when they "step half out" of their, up until then, sustained roles to refer to the audience, the theatre, or the festival itself), if by illusion one does not mean aspects of visual production but simply, as Kenneth J. Dover defines it, as "the uninterrupted concentration of the fictitious personages of the play on their fictitious situation".¹⁵³

1.3.2 The theatre of convention and the theatre of illusion

While the spectator is an essential element in the act of theatre, a special rapport exists in the theatrical presentation of satiric works which distinguishes satire from other forms of theatre; this gives credence to Hodgart's contention that "pure satire is very rare in the drama".¹⁵⁴ The involvement of performer and spectator is treated differently in the theatre of convention (such as the Greek, Elizabethan and Noh theatres; other epithets include 'presentational' and 'formal') and the theatre of illusion (such as Realism and Naturalism). (These are broad and simple distinctions, but are convenient for the present discussion.) All theatre involves illusion and pretence, but there is a marked difference in the extent to which such pretence is admitted or employed.¹⁵⁵ In the theatre of illusion, since its advent in the late-nineteenth century, the performers are involved in their individual roles and in the action in which the characters are placed for the duration of the play. The audience is separated from the play by the proscenium arch, the invisible 'fourth wall'. All the techniques by which the performer consciously includes the spectator in the presentation, and which openly admit the artifice of theatre (such as soliloquy, aside, speeches by a chorus, any form of direct address) do not appear. The play, in essence, is something heard and watched, an illusory world in which the audience participate imaginatively through the "willing suspension of disbelief" (in Samuel Taylor Coleridge's phrase from Biographia Literaria (1817)), but from which they are otherwise excluded. The spectator is asked to be involved by absorbing himself so completely in the illusion created by the total presentation of the play that the fact of performance is ignored. In this type, the theatrical effects "simulate" reality, whereas in the theatre of convention, effects (such as masks, costumes, properties, even verse and music) "symbolize" reality.¹⁵⁶

Prior to this type, in the theatre of convention, the performers demonstrated an explicit and active awareness of the presence of the spectators, speaking directly to them, taking them into their confidence, even asking for their involvement in the action verbally, if not physically. (In the case of Greek theatre, these features are characteristic of comedy, not

tragedy.) The spectators were continually kept aware of the fact of performance. Styan states that forms of direct address "seem to shatter the frame of realism", and cites Luigi Pirandello's Six Characters in Search of an Author (1921) and Each in His Own Way (1924) as plays which, in this century, began once again to merge play and audience.¹⁵⁷ Since then the features of the theatre of convention have been popular once again in spite of, or in opposition to, the theatre of illusion.

These distinctions can also be made of "literary" and "non-literary" comedy (to use McLeish's terminology). In literary comedy which is intended for sophisticated audiences, action is subservient to speech, language is often elegant and civilized, and the performer remains 'in character' throughout (even when direct address is made to the audience - as in Molière - it is done so in character and does not refer to events outside the action of the play, or to the world outside the theatre in which that play is presented), whereas in non-literary forms, such as Aristophanic comedy, stand-up comedy routines and revues, the performers present characters in role and 'step out' of character to comment on that character or entertain the spectators through song or dance. In Aristophanes the characters frequently abandon their specific roles (Dionysus is made to do so in The Frogs, a play which is itself concerned with the effects of theatrical performance), with a further dimension which does not exist in literary comedy: the characters have to portray actual, living persons as symbols within the 'illusion' of the play, for satiric purposes. This "dynamic fusion of fiction and fact, plot reality and performance reality" is, to McLeish, most evident in the parabases within Aristophanes' plays.¹⁵⁸

The playwright and performers employ, in the theatre of convention, a technique allied to Bertolt Brecht's Verfremdungseffekt: encouraging the spectators to see the events or characters in a new way, from a different angle. Briefly, Brecht demanded the retention of a critical distance, instead of the complete absorption of the performer in a role: the performer should not attempt just to be the character (to present it entirely from the inside)

but, while understanding the character's motivations, present it in such a way as to imply an attitude towards it. Brecht was not opposed to empathy between performer and character, but against unthinking subjective identification. The character was to be performed with an awareness of being watched, of showing and demonstrating. Thus the audience, rather than passively empathizing with the characters and becoming completely absorbed in the action (as an audience would tend to do in the theatre of illusion), is encouraged to remain sufficiently distanced as to judge critically and draw its own conclusions. This is not to deny emotions, but to channel them, accurately: the performer should be as emotional as is consistent with the character's position in a particular context, revealing social and historical influences as the determinants of behaviour. The basis of Brecht's theatrical method is the exploitation of the theatre not as a place for pretence, but as a place for performance, as a theatre. No attempt is made to pretend that the events or effects are 'real': to reinforce this, the theatricality of the performance is stressed through the same devices used in Athenian comedy, such as interruptions to the action, choral commentary and narration, direct address, and use of different styles within a single play. Uys acknowledges his affinity with Brecht, stating that he was influenced "in retrospect". He describes his form of Verfremdungseffekt as "re-gearing" the audience in a "dual" presentation, using "the cotton-wool and the blade" to jar the spectators out of a sense of complacency, often through shock, to make them aware.

Most satiric performers, it can be deduced, use techniques identified with the theatre of convention, particularly from such practitioners as widely disparate as Aristophanes and, different as he is in purpose, Brecht. The theatre of convention's great advantage is its freedom; hence its appeal to performers of satiric works. Satire, as mentioned earlier, flourishes in forms not bound by prescriptive literary traditions, and the theatre of convention allows the performer to use direct address which is vital in engaging the audience, to include topical references, to comment on and adjust the performance to incorporate audience response. Spectators are constantly reminded, by various techniques, that they are present at a performance. Satiric performers tend to use little or no

illusionistic scenery, the setting seldom if ever depicts a particular locale, the stage is most often neutral, a tabula rasa, a non-illusory performance area defined as and when necessary for a monologue or sketch. In the performance forms which contain satire (from street theatre to stand-up comic routines to cabaret and revue) there is an open communion between performer and spectator, and little attempt is made to disguise the theatricality of the performance.

In An Evening with Pieter-Dirk Uys the stage was bare and the houselights remained up for the opening sketch. The only lighting effect used was a follow spot. Uys entered through the auditorium as a bergie, dressed, appropriately, in black refuse bags and carrying refuse bags (one a cardboard box containing the properties and costumes necessary for the first half of the revue). After preliminary exchanges with individuals in the audience, begging for money (to point up comments on the current economic situation and the continued decline in the value of the rand) Uys, still in the character of the bergie, confronted the audience directly with a question which indicated clearly the non-illusory quality of his form of performance, the requirements for such a form, and which ridiculed the requirements and purposes of other forms:

What did you come here for?

Spectacle? No man, you should have gone to the Playhouse [the Natal Performing Arts Council (NAPAC) theatre complex] for spectacle. There they like making a spectacle of themselves! There at least you can see your tax money wasted on stage: marble pillars and persian carpets and golden staircases and satin dresses

You come [sic] here for Protest Theatre? Man you're two years too late. They don't protest here anymore, they repent.

Satire? Vir wat? Real life is more ridiculous. And what's up here that you can't do yourself in your garage at home? Look, black curtains, 'n klomp ou dose present company excluded.

"An Evening with Pieter-Dirk Uys"¹⁵⁹

At this point the houselights faded but Uys remained in character to comment on the performances of Pieter-Dirk Uys, and performed his impersonations of P.W. Botha, Koornhof and Bishop Desmond Tutu. In what he claimed to be his swansong, Uys stripped away all that made the artist, to comment on the art and artifice of theatrical performance. The production was both a revue and a review, recalling and commenting

on both the characters he had performed and impersonated in previous revues and his experiences in South African theatre since his work at The Space in Cape Town in the early 1970s. In his revues between 1981 and 1992 Uys openly and consciously incorporated the overt theatricality of the theatre of convention, including multiple aspects of persona-character, narrative intrusions or links between items, the "conspiratorial irony" between performer and spectator regarding lampoons (mentioned by McLeish), but in supposedly his last revue they were predominant.

When the performer operates on multiple planes in this manner, alternately revealing and concealing himself, discussing his craft as he creates it, to the point where form becomes content, the performance is concerned with performance itself. As a self-conscious representation of the dialectic between reality and illusion, it is metafictional, a form of metatheatre.¹⁶⁰ Drama, as June Schlueter maintains, has incorporated the self-referential quality present in metafiction since the inception of Western theatre, for, if any intentional disruption of the dramatic illusion can be termed 'self-conscious', then the choruses of Greek tragedy (and the satirical attacks of the parabasis in comedy in particular) could be said to be the first evidence of the conscious presence of the author in a dramatic work.¹⁶¹ Many of the practices of the non-illusory theatre, the theatre of convention (direct address, the play-within-the-play, intrusions in the action, all forms of structural dislocation) are self-referential, and exist to remind the audience that it is watching a play which cannot purport to be 'reality'. Many contemporary dramatists have presented dramatic characters who are simultaneously both real and false, to explore both existential questions of identity and the relationship between reality and illusion.¹⁶² As a stage performer, Uys, in An Evening with Pieter-Dirk Uys, presented himself as a metafictional persona, portraying characters to make the audience constantly aware of the division between self and role and between reality and illusion, heightened by the simultaneous presentation of actor-writer (and director) presenting artistically created fictional and non-fictional figures from life (including himself) in a single performance. As a metafictional persona, then, he went beyond the traditional role of the character, maintaining its pretence of 'reality', yet also asserting its fictive existence.

A consideration of the characteristics of the theatre of convention and non-illusion indicates why satire is prevalent in those most self-conscious of theatrical forms: cabaret and revue. These, and vaudeville and burlesque, are all types of popular entertainment which, in their original forms, were all inseparably linked to satire in their topical political commentary.¹⁶³ In the above forms a close relationship exists between performer and audience which encourages and generates outspoken satiric humour and comment. There is, too, seldom the maintenance of a single persona or any 'fourth wall' dividing performer and spectator.¹⁶⁴

Brecht's interest and involvement in cabaret (from his youth where he performed in bars in Munich, to his first appearance before the public in Berlin, at a cabaret venue The Wild Stage, where he performed his "Legend of the Dead Soldier") was a major contribution to his theory of Verfremdungseffekt, in the features of that theory enumerated above and also in his use of a 'poor' stage, almost bare of properties and effects (in venues which encouraged drinking, smoking and talking).¹⁶⁵ The satirical songs incorporated in his plays, some set to music by Kurt Weill, are modelled on those which he performed in cabaret and which, he claimed, contained the essential feature of gestus (the possibility of simultaneously presenting attitude and gesture). The format of cabaret is clearly evident in his The Threepenny Opera (1928) (with a ballad-singer who performs the functions of a conférencier) and in Rise and Fall of the City of Mahoganny (1930). The instant success of the former was due, perhaps, to the popularity of satirical cabaret in Berlin, and many of his performers (including Lotte Lenya, who appeared in The Threepenny Opera) were originally cabaret artists. Indeed, cabaret in pre-Hitler Germany was closely allied to the most avant-garde political and artistic movements, exerting influence on not only Brecht, but the 'legitimate' theatre of that period. However, the milieu in which Brecht created these works did not survive the rise of Hitler to power, as the satirists were driven into exile. From the 1960s, in Britain, America and Germany, the satirical element of cabaret was once again revived, and many of the most influential satirical performers emerged from the cabaret circuits.¹⁶⁶

Interestingly, two editors have made a connection between satire in revue and Aristophanes. In 1913, the editor of Play Pictorial, B.W. Findon, described political satirists who performed in a revue format as "the modern Aristophanes", but regretted that audiences in Britain had "not yet been educated properly as to the possibilities of politics on the stage".¹⁶⁷ In South Africa (apart from the political and social comedies of Stephen Black, whose work and influence will be mentioned in Chapter 3), the prevalence of satirical comment on the stage was relatively scarce during the first half of this century, dominated as theatre was by 'traditional' and imported drama; this contention is supported by the impact of the revues of Leslie in the late 1950s early 1960s. In 1960, the editor of the Natal Witness, Ronald S.L. Moon, reviewed Leslie's Two's Company (which opened in February, 1960, in Cape Town, toured South Africa and Rhodesia for eighteen months and was performed by Leslie and Joan Blake); he described that revue as a uniquely South African form which, though it developed spontaneously in response to the social and political situation in South Africa, nevertheless had its basis in what he termed a much older "art-form":

The old art-form to which Two's Company is compared is the ancient Aristophanic drama of lively, robust and frequently irreverent comment on current political affairs - and indeed public affairs in general. It was brilliantly developed in Athens of the fourth [sic] century B.C. by Aristophanes. South Africa may pride itself in producing some wholesome gusts of Aristophanic laughter to blow away some of the asphyxiating stuffiness of so much of the contemporary political atmosphere. The historian of mid-twentieth century culture may well give South African culture some credit for this.¹⁶⁸

Though the claims made for the uniqueness of Leslie's revues are extravagant, nevertheless the inclusion of biting political and social comment in the satirical format of a revue proved enormously popular with South African audiences and strongly influenced subsequent performers. The manner in which these performers, like Aristophanes, lampooned public figures is examined in Chapters 3 and 4.

1.4 The effectiveness of satire

1.4.1 Demolition or town planning

Before his first one-person revue in 1981, Uys admitted, in an interview, to always carrying a quotation by Bruce as a reminder of what he ought to accomplish in the theatre: "People should be taught what is ... not what should be."¹⁶⁹ Satirists are almost always concerned with recognizable particulars, they do not discover or reveal anything new, rather they uncover what exists, what might have been concealed or ignored, and should be criticized and exposed. In the same interview Uys ascribed much of the frustration felt by South Africans to an inability to voice political and social protest or comment. A satirist feels compelled to react to the situation, feels driven to protest, to expose. Shaw stated, in his The Quintessence of Ibsenism, that the salvation of the world depended on those who would not accept evil good-humouredly, those whose laughter would destroy the hypocrite rather than encouraging him. Uys felt compelled to respond, and did so by ridicule, by arousing laughter:

Satire?
 It's a desperate thing.
 The only thing I can do
 besides going out and shooting people,
 is to write about them,
 and make people laugh at them.
 I've a tremendous frustration of not being able to do anything:
 politically - socially.
 I'm very frightened of banging
 people on the head - with a stick
 or with a concrete boxing glove, you know.
 So I'd rather make them laugh,
 and that works very well for me.¹⁷⁰

In a sense, the satirist is more concerned with how to expose (by direct or indirect tactics), not simply with what to expose, but how to distort and exaggerate in a manner which conceals the whole truth, without "banging" the audience "on the head". Most importantly, the satirist is, as Sutherland argues, interested only in what he finds and does not need to question how or why it came about.¹⁷¹ Nor is he under any obligation to produce an

alternative for what is attacked, to communicate some vision of a better world, or propose an ideal substitute. He is, as Tynan observed of Shaw in the Observer of 22 July 1956, "a demolition expert"; it is pointless and irrelevant to

ask a demolition expert, when his work is done: 'But what have you created?' It is like expecting a bulldozer to build the Tower of Pisa, or condemning a bayonet for not being a plough. Shaw's genius was for intellectual slum-clearance, not for town planning.¹⁷²

Nevertheless, reviewers continually demand that satirists provide alternatives or point to particular solutions. The theatre critic for New Nation admitted to being disturbed by the "politics" of Rearranging the Deckchairs on the SA Bothatonic. While conceding that the revue made a demand for change in South Africa, that reviewer criticized Uys for not stating "how that change should come about".¹⁷³ The review continued: "Uys cannot argue that it is not for the artist to prescribe or provide guidance" and that if "the country is heading for a major tragedy", then the "artist will not remain unscathed". What this reviewer failed to comprehend is that the satirist has never been obliged to provide glib solutions; such prescriptions are irrelevant, as Tynan commented in relation to the work of Shaw. To add that Rearranging the Deckchairs on the SA Bothatonic "falls squarely into a liberal framework" pointed to the political attitude of the reviewer, not the satirist.¹⁷⁴ The import of such a revue did not consist in a declaratory assertion such as "South Africa is heading for a major tragedy"; that statement could be argued more convincingly in the editorial of New Nation. Rearranging the Deckchairs on the SA Bothatonic employed satiric strategies of humour and ridicule to expose not simply the inequalities within South African politics, but how it was and is still so (by placing the words of its proponents - Chris (Jan Christiaan) Heunis, Denis Worrall, P.W. Botha, Koornhof - in a ludicrous context) and how that affected the individual lives and attitudes of those who inhabit the country (the domestic worker, the young 'troepie', a security policeman, the 'kugel', and so on). In a revue format which presents various characters and hence various perspectives it is difficult to establish or ascribe a single viewpoint: the critic expecting or searching for clear indications of a particular ideological allegiance will be disappointed. This does not signify an abdication of political responsibility on the part of the satirist, however.¹⁷⁵

Uys has never allied himself to what he terms "protest" theatre of the type which provides "answers". His role, particularly in the context of the 1990s, is to "ask questions".¹⁷⁶ (Similarly, Banks states that "politically" he has neither "a message" nor "a solution".) A frequently proposed (and paradoxical) characteristic of satire, and in particular most pre-twentieth century satire, is that it is both subversive and conservative: satirists are regarded and described as iconoclasts in the most literal sense (they shatter cherished beliefs or images), but instead of calling for a new order, hark back to the restoration of older values. Discussing the plays of Jules Feiffer, John Lahr writes:

The satirist's venom and his vision generally spring from a conservative impulse, a distrust of the present, and a tacit hankering for the past. If this is true of Aristophanes, Swift and [Evelyn] Waugh, the Feiffer plays belong to the more progressive Shavian tradition, interested in criticizing the present in order to influence the future.¹⁷⁷

Uys, like Feiffer, is in the "Shavian tradition", criticizing and exposing the present (and the past that has created the present, notably in a work such as God's Forgotten (1975), his futuristic play which warned then of the destructive upheavals that would take place if ideologies of the past were not reformed in the present; the play exposes the religious, educational and historical mythologies which have been used to justify apartheid as a political system, and how inherited beliefs and attitudes are inhibiting factors in the personal development of the protagonists), for the sake of a better future (the "ideal"), rather than proposing what the new order should be.¹⁷⁸ By explicitly informing audiences of what they should be against, Uys is implicitly advocating what they should be for. This is the unexpressed principle which underlies the satirical impulse in his revues and plays. To the extent that it must be shared with his audience, it is to the satirist's advantage to speak from a standpoint that is confirmed by the majority. Though he may often be a "minority figure", Pollard claims that the satirist cannot be a "declared outcast", for to be effective "society should at least pay lip-service to the ideals he upholds".¹⁷⁹

Ridicule depends on shared beliefs or like values against which the target can be seen to deviate. One of the strategies employed by Uys in the performance of the revues was to

first establish a bond between himself and his audience, a contact through shared laughter before shaping a collective response to the targets of satirical attack. Obviously, because of the topical nature of satirical revues and cabarets, those targets had to be recognizable and discernible to the audience; this "familiarity of repetition", as Uys describes it, is dependent on the audience being able to read the daily newspapers or own a television set.¹⁸⁰ Thus most revues had to have an audience that was relatively sophisticated and aware (as said of the audiences attending Leslie's revues by a designer (Patti Slavin) and dancer (Lucille Henderson) involved in his productions). Banks admits to catering to a socially aware audience as well, to "people who know who Reeva Forman [founder of a cosmetics business; lampooned by Banks in "Raver Foreman"] is, who know all about Sol Kerzner's [founder of a chain of hotels and gambling casinos in the 'homelands'] new jet".

1.4.2 Preaching to the converted

Uys was consistently criticized for "preaching to the converted". His reply (in his address in Grahamstown in 1990) was that the "converted are all in Perth".¹⁸¹ It is difficult to assess why his revues were so well attended: a part of the audience probably agreed with his criticism; the majority did not attend to be "converted", but to be entertained, not by the 'message' as such, but by the presentation. Furthermore, Uys maintains that he scrupulously avoided specific political affiliations within the context of his revues, and in response to those who criticized his supposed lack of a particular ideology, he stated in 1986: "I feel that I have to cover as much of the spectrum of white South Africa, from left to right, with equal sympathy and equal disgust."¹⁸² That spectrum, by the early 1990s in South Africa, broadened to include criticism of political parties banned before 2 February 1990: "There are no more sacred cows. The African National Congress is just another political party."¹⁸³

This attitude is shared by other South African satirists. Kirby claims that he has "no political affiliations at all, they're personal affiliations". Like Uys, he updates the sketches he created for earlier revues and justifies doing so by maintaining, as cited earlier, that as politicians "are consistently dishonest", it is "just a case of putting new names to the ... dishonesties". Banks says that he attempts to "go down the middle of the road and ridicule both sides". Taylor, too, refuses to align himself to "any kind of political party or belief or religious dogma" because, firstly, he personally does not desire any such allegiance and, secondly, in his "profession it would be undesirable": "Your power as a court jester, and I think a satirist in a way is a kind of court jester, resides in the fact that you have no power in terms of temporal power or the power of politicians." Fraser refused an offer by the Democratic Party (DP) to perform at one of their functions because he is "wary" of political parties: "After the Revolution, I'll continue being a thorn in the flesh of President Mandela, or [Oliver] Tambo, or whoever gets put in the hot seat."¹⁸⁴

During the 1980s Uys became increasingly disturbed to discover that his work was not only regarded as "fashionable", but also as part of the political strategy of those being attacked: the Department of Foreign Affairs invited black American diplomats to performances of Adapt or Dye in 1981, to point "out that in a real police state / totalitarian state / et cetera a political satire" of that nature "would never be tolerated".¹⁸⁵ Such "acceptance" led to criticism of his position and a questioning of the effectiveness of his satire, his power to influence opinions: "I began to wonder," he states, "who I was working for." Even the polemical and politically volatile Cry Freemandela - The Movie (1987), which openly defied emergency regulations and quoted banned material, was ignored by the South African censors.¹⁸⁶ Clearly, as Steadman wrote in 1985, such "cultural appropriation" did not exist in the townships where frequent bannings were imposed:

Hegemonic control in South Africa extends to a view of theatre - outside the townships - as a middle-class enclave where potentially disruptive plays can become cultural commodities in the same way that militant poetry is turned by publication into literary commodities. For the South African government, the valuable by-product of such a process is the impression that the State in South Africa allows a considerable amount of 'free expression' and 'cultural criticism' - an impression which, in the context of a proclaimed reformist climate, has obvious benefits.¹⁸⁷

It is a fact that, under extreme conditions of totalitarianism, satire directed at the institutions or party or figures in power is difficult if not impossible, and political analysts gauged political hegemony in the former Soviet Union by the amount and character of satire permitted.¹⁸⁸ Furthermore, the risk of oppression, retaliation or death does exist, and the relationship between satirists and those in power can be difficult and dangerous, as is evidenced by various forms of retaliation in various countries and various periods: Juvenal (who was exiled by the Emperor Domitian) hoped to protect himself by claiming, at the conclusion of his first satirical work, that he would write only of those who had died; the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London issued a proclamation in 1599 that not only prohibited the printing of satires, but also decreed the burning of the works of Joseph Hall, John Marston, Thomas Nashe and others; Dryden was assaulted by men hired by the Earl of Rochester; Voltaire (Francois-Marie Arouet) was imprisoned in the Bastille; the poet Osip Mandelstam died in a concentration camp for satirizing Josef Stalin.¹⁸⁹ The first revue-type entertainment in Britain to include the impersonation of politicians was W.S. (William Schwenck) Gilbert's The Happy Land presented at the Royal Court in 1873; it included a grotesque dance by three performers lampooning the Prime Minister, William Gladstone, and two members of his cabinet; the Lord Chamberlain demanded immediate alterations to the sketch in question.¹⁹⁰

In a situation of efficient tyranny, satire has always continued to exist however, and often the most inventive, if not outspoken, satire is produced when, according to Kenneth Burke, the satirist knowingly takes risks and cannot be sure whether he will be acclaimed or escape punishment.¹⁹¹ A response which satirists resort to in such circumstances is that of using the strategies of indirect, rather than direct, satire (that is, by the markedly greater incorporation of parody, innuendo, irony and allegory, for example) to make the work more palatable or acceptable or even obscure. Satirical journals in Germany prior to 1914 competed, despite harsh censorship laws, to see how close they could get to publishing caricatures of Kaiser Wilhelm II without actually producing them. As the Austrian satirist Karl Kraus, who continued to criticize those in power, stated: "Satire which the censor understands, deserves to be banned."

1.4.3 Overt and covert strategies

In the African context, an established playwright such as Wole Soyinka has openly and virulently satirized the heads of various states (thinly disguising the identity of those attacked) and specifying the policy or ideology being exposed. Two examples will indicate that, overt as the content of the works were, the method and form (and the type of production venue) were more covert to avoid or hinder suppression.¹⁹² In an effort to expose the political corruption of the Shehu Shagari administration, in 1982 the Guerilla Theatre Unit presented short dramatic sketches (by Soyinka) at bus stops, car parks and on street corners in Ile-Ife. Soyinka's anti-Shagari campaign was therefore taken to 'the people', and in a fugitive form, with the only advance publicity being an announcement by a 'town crier' that the Guerilla Theatre Unit was about to perform. The sketches dealt with issues related to the people: some indicated that named government officials stole and hoarded bags of foodstuff, such as imported rice.

Soyinka's A Play of Giants (1984) is described by the publishers (Methuen) as "a savage portrait of ... dictatorial African leaders at bay in an embassy in New York"; Soyinka identifies the heads of state being satirized in the introduction to the play:

No serious effort is made here to hide the identities of the real life actors who have served as models for A Play of Giants. They are none other than: President for life Macias Nguema ... of Equatorial Guinea; Emperor for Life (ex) Jean-Baptiste Bokassa of Central Africa, Life President Mobutu Sese Seko ... of Congo Kinshasha ... and the Hero of Heroes ... Field Marshal El Haji Dr. Idi Amin of Uganda.¹⁹³

In the play these leaders are the characters Gunema, Kasco, Tuboum; Amin retains his name. What makes Soyinka's strategy more covert are his fictionalized locale (the "Buganda" Embassy in New York) and the allegorical presentation of the figures satirized: these heads of state are posing for a sculpture commissioned in response to a United Nations request from each nation for a representative artwork to be placed on exhibition in the foyer of the United Nations building. The play satirizes not only those figures, but also the various foreign governments which have supported their rise to power and sustained their

tyranny. Soyinka could freely attack these figures from another perspective: in 1983, at the peak of the Shagari administration's intransigence, election disruption, and a general breakdown of law and order, he emigrated from Nigeria.

A further strategy employed by dissident writers is to avoid any form of publication. The extended opening monologue by Styles in Sizwe Bansi Is Dead (1972), devised by Fugard, John Kani and Winston Ntshona, not only includes a discussion of topical issues (from that day's newspaper and place of performance) but satirizes the actual foremen at the Ford Factory in Port Elizabeth and a visit by "Mr Henry Ford Junior Number two or whatever the hell he is" to the plant.¹⁹⁴ In his Notebooks (1983), in an entry in July 1968, Fugard recorded details of "John Kani's stories about working at the Ford Motor factory.... The visit of Henry Ford Junior Translating for the foreman, 'Mr Baas Bradley'".¹⁹⁵ No script of either Sizwe Bansi is Dead nor The Island (1973) existed: partly due to the fact that the works were improvised and collaborative, but also, because, in the case of the second 'play', it was illegal, under the internal security laws, to publish material related to conditions on Robben Island.¹⁹⁶ When Security Branch policemen demanded a copy of Sizwe Bansi Is Dead to read they were informed that there was no complete written text (Fugard had, of course, transcribed some sections from the improvisations for shaping and revision). When Oscar Lewenstein of the Royal Court requested copies of the plays for possible production at that theatre, Fugard had to supply tape recordings of both in performance. Fugard compares this measure to the period in Russia when dissident poets would memorize each other's works and pass them on orally in lieu of publication.

These two plays (with Statements After an Arrest Under the Immorality Act (1972)) were presented at The Royal Court in September 1973 as a so-called 'South African Season'. Fugard believes that they might never have been scripted were it not for the pressure of the London production (he found it enormously difficult to reproduce a performance text on paper, besides), and the published texts in Statements: Three Plays are based on the production in London and differ somewhat from the original productions in South Africa.¹⁹⁷

In rehearsal, other strategies were resorted to: Kani recalls Fugard's advice to him and Ntshona as they were working: what they first produced to show him would not, he said, "survive the censor board", so they had to "Find a simpler statement. Disguise this statement. That is politics."¹⁹⁸

Like Uys, Fugard believes that the writer cannot remain silent, whatever the difficulties: "Witnesses are needed", he has stated, to break the "conspiracy of silence" that exists in South Africa.¹⁹⁹ In an interview in 1978 he stated:

Sometimes we've got to take a hammering, as Pieter-Dirk Uys is taking now [referring to a production of Die Van Aardes van Grootoor (1977),²⁰⁰ which opened on 20 September 1978 as the first production in the Laager at The Market, Johannesburg, and was banned on 19 October 1978] But we've got to go on, hoping we'll get a second audience, knowing we live in a country with short horizons, with low-ceiling cloud. We've got to let ourselves go as far as we can, knowing that we are walking into a wall, or that our candles could be blown out by a wind we didn't anticipate.²⁰¹

Uys, to "go as far as" he "could", employed various strategies in his revues, what he terms a "humoristic barbed-wire environment", which meant that they, unlike his plays, never faced the threat of closure or banning (these strategies are examined in detail in Chapter 4). He, like Fugard, is unequivocal regarding the necessity of continuing to arouse awareness:

The realisation that our society had been systematically neutered into submission through the fear of authority, the laws, and what is allowed, gave me even more reason to push ahead with my exploration into the limits of acceptability. If I did not acknowledge those limits and work within them, I could never stretch them and so infiltrate into sacred meadows where sacred cows low. The government were my inspiration; they were my script-writers; they said it all. I simply repeated their political pornography.²⁰²

The examples of individual repression and the tactics resorted to by satirists cited in the previous pages would seem to substantiate the belief of the American president Harry Truman (who frequently used the most direct satire to castigate his Republican opponents in the 1948 elections); he asserted that a demagogue cannot tolerate laughter.²⁰³ This would not appear to always be the case, however. How effective is satire? It has often been stated that the aim of satire is reformatory, from Defoe's oft-quoted "the end of satire is reformation."²⁰⁴ But, as Uys has pointed out, the "targets" of his satiric presentation

"seemed to enjoy their notoriety".²⁰⁵ They were certainly not shamed: Uys recalls Ministers Koornhof and Hendrik Schoeman attending the opening of Total Onslaught 1984 in Cape Town in May 1984, and commenting on the sketch in which the former was lampooned. As Swift observed, the targets are likely to see other faces than their own in the satirist's mirror (in the Preface to The Battle of the Books). Or ignore it, or appear to ignore it: Sir Robert Walpole led the applause at the premiere of John Gay's The Beggar's Opera (1728).²⁰⁶ Or find it flattering: Hermann Goering ordered the release of an actress arrested for ridiculing him: "If people make jokes about me, it only proves how popular I am," he is reported to have said.²⁰⁷

Perhaps satire directed at particular figures is regarded as or acts as a 'safety-valve'. Elliott contends that audiences tend to identify with the satirist (and Uys strove to create that identification even before the performance commenced, by his programme notes, for example), laugh at his humour, and "thereby discharge their own aggressive feelings" (Uys would stress the diminution of the audience's "fears" rather than "aggressive feelings"), even when the satirist is openly criticizing a prominent politician or dealing with such sensitive issues as "racial discrimination".²⁰⁸ Satirical works have been cited as effective instruments of reform (Nichols refers to Swift's The Drapier's Letters (1724) as an example, for its effect on Irish public opinion).²⁰⁹ Nevertheless the paucity of examples, and the difficulty of proving a connection between a satiric work and a particular reformative action, would indicate that the purpose in creating satire is only incidentally an impulse to reformation. According to Kirby, the only thing he has changed by his work is the issue of tear-off self-adhesive parking tickets, rather than those that have to be 'licked' by traffic wardens, in Cape Town; he claims greater success in "changing the thinking of the Publications Appeal Board and the censors". Uys, in reply to a question regarding his "purpose", stated that it is to become "redundant". He, too, is sceptical regarding actual change brought about by satirists in South Africa. In his address at the National Arts Festival referred to earlier, Uys said: "I won't answer the question of whether satirists have changed anyone's minds here in the last 20 years. If I did, there would be satirists hanging themselves from trees."²¹⁰

1.4.4 Awareness, pleasure and release

If the aim of producing satire is not primarily reformatory, what is it then? Unlike comedy, which creates laughter as an end, satire ridicules by using laughter as a means of persuasion, a form of rhetoric, not only to expose 'evil' and indicate hypocrisy, but to arouse awareness, to influence opinions. Ian Jack believes that "satire is born of the instinct to protest".²¹¹ Taylor, the least aggressive of the satirists interviewed for this work, believes that "underlying the humour is a seriousness", because he wants people to notice, to become aware. Such humour is often deliberately anarchic: in an interview for New Nation, Uys stated that to "make a government ridiculous in the eyes of the people who are supposed to respect it is to undermine its authority"; in this way "humour is a very, very powerful weapon", of the type Uys defines as "the comedy of prejudice, of putting something that is very real on stage".²¹²

Furthermore, the effectiveness of satire in the theatre is also open to question. While he has quipped that South Africans who attended the theatre during the 1980s cannot claim that they were unaware of conditions within the country, he is as aware that "of our 32 million people, one per cent go to the theatre once a year and a half per cent go twice a year".²¹³ For this reason Uys disseminated the impact of his work through other means: he released five videotape recordings of performances of his one-person revues, including Adapt or Dye (recorded in 1982) and for a time the most popular videotape on the local rental market, Total Onslaught 1984, and A Kiss on Your Koeksuster (1990), which he claims have been seen by an estimated "ten million" South Africans of all races, due in part to the fact that the censors imposed an ineffective four-to-eighteen age restriction on the viewing of the videotapes.²¹⁴ Not only was this "the ultimate audience investment", but also, Uys believes, "the essence of subversion: to take the political pornography into everyone's homes".²¹⁵

Perhaps, finally, one must concur with Nichols in his contention that, although the aim of most satirists is not amendment or reformation, nevertheless professing an intent to reform

is a common satiric strategy.²¹⁶ A strategy, that is, which might denote to the reader or spectator a quality of gravity and altruism in the satirist. Even so, if satire cannot directly change a government, it can, nevertheless, arouse awareness in a period which, to Lisa Appignanesi, desires and demands the acerbic and astringent qualities of satire (hence its revival in cabaret); for this reason Brecht's sardonic comment is still pertinent to the satirist's purpose: "I could do but little, but the rulers would have sat safer had I not been. I hope."²¹⁷ This could be said to be an explicit purpose, but there is, undoubtedly, an implicit, often unstated, aim in creating satire on the part of the satirist. Swift cited two purposes: one public, that is reformation, the other private, for the personal satisfaction and pleasure of laughter for the satirist and his friends. Criticism of those in authority or in the public eye would appear to be not only a source of "discharge" of "aggressive feelings" (as Elliott maintained earlier), but also of pleasure to the satirist and his audience. After citing Sigmund Freud's Jokes and Their Relation to the Unconscious (1905) to discuss the pleasure derived from humour, Nichols summarises these purposes in satire:

The satirist may be actuated by a desire to reform, or to correct foolish or vicious sets of ideas or attitudes; however, he is also actuated by the pleasure of employing satiric devices and of evading the usual restrictions put on the expression of aggressive impulses. The effect upon the audience of the satire appears to parallel the impulses which actuate the satirist. The audience may find that the satire makes them aware of certain follies or vices in themselves and the world around them and move them to do something. But a good part of the satiric effect depends upon the pleasure produced by the aggression itself, the pleasure of responding to the satirist's devices, and the power these devices have to open sources of pleasure that are normally forbidden in the world outside the one the satirist creates.²¹⁸

A further means of distinguishing between comedy and satire lies in the shock value of the latter. Satire does not have to preserve conventional decorum or respectable codes of behaviour dictated by authority or society or morality: "Stones and dirty words whistle through the air of satire," claims Highet.²¹⁹ Although the deliberate and provocative use of so-called 'dirty words' by Kirby and, in particular, Fraser, and the frank discussion of 'taboo' subjects by Fraser, Banks, Miyeni and Irene Stephanou (these include abortion, sex education, methods of police interrogation, pseudo-religion and paedophilia; in 1992 Stephanou won a Vita award for a revue provocatively entitled Is Every Sperm Sacred?), does anger some audience members, most would seem to take pleasure in the evasion of the

restrictions which exist outside the theatre, and the standards adopted by the satirist would seem to be accepted as the norm, at least for the duration of the performance. The plays of Kirby and Uys were restricted not primarily for their political content but for their use of 'dirty words'; within the sphere of political revues, different standards seem to exist, however, as Uys points out: "If I tell lies in my material I know that I am asking for trouble, but the truth, no matter how awful, is acceptable as long as I remain within the boundaries of Calvinist good taste by leaving out kak, poep and God."²²⁰ To charges of "tastelessness" (especially in relation to Cry Freemandela - The Movie) Uys's response is that "ultimately apartheid can't be criticized in good taste".

The examination of the intended effect and effectiveness of satire, particularly in the theatre, indicates that there is no consistent intention or ideological standpoint which unites all the practitioners included for discussion, nor can they be conveniently placed on a spectrum which ranges from the conservative to the polemical. While all purport to entertain, a varying degree of persuasion can be included in that entertainment, from raising awareness to provoking anger. Interestingly, the only description Uys claims to be an accurate assessment of him and his work is that coined by the Australian critic Bob Evans who reviewed his revue Skating on Thin Uys (presented at the Footbridge Theatre in Sydney in January 1987) and described him as "the complete subversive comedian".²²¹ Perhaps he prefers this description for the manner in which it combines both the stress he has always placed on humour and entertainment with the iconoclast's desire to subvert and challenge existing or cherished political, social and religious policies, attitudes and beliefs through satiric strategies. Laughter is an important component of satire: "Laughter," states Henri Bergson, "is always the laughter of a group laughter always implies a kind of secret freemasonry, or even complicity, with other laughers".²²² If the satire is to be effective, the satirist must reach as wide an audience as possible, and the laughter of "complicity" helps create an audience that is prepared to be in agreement with the satirist, and accept his views as their views. The audience thus becomes a participant in the process of attack and criticism through such a communal attitude, particularly the "conspiratorial

irony" established in relation to lampoons. As success in this regard depends on the spectators' recognition of the targets, these performers ensure that they simultaneously mimic (with varying degrees of verisimilitude) the words, gestures, features and mannerisms of those targets, and exaggerate or distort them, all for humorous and satirical effect. The next chapter examines in detail the performance strategies utilized by Aristophanes (the earliest extant playwright in Western drama to do so) to lampoon particular individuals.

Notes to Chapter 1

1. The title for this chapter is a deliberate re-wording of T.S. Eliot's Notes towards the Definition of Culture and with the same justification he makes for his treatise: his aim is, he states, "to try to find out what this one word means" for just as "a doctrine only needs to be defined after the appearance of some heresy, so a word does not need to receive this attention until it has come to be misused" (T.S. Eliot, Notes towards the Definition of Culture (London: Faber, 1948), pp. 13-14).
2. The views of Pieter-Dirk Uys, Robert Kirby, Jeremy Taylor, Mark Banks, Ralph Lawson and Robert Leslie (concerning his father, Adam Leslie) expressed in this work are, unless indicated otherwise in the notes, derived from personal interviews conducted by the writer of this work.
3. Patricia Meyer Spacks, "Some Reflections on Satire", in Satire : Modern Essays in Criticism, ed. Ronald Paulson (Englewood Cliffs : Prentice-Hall, 1971), p.360.
4. These approaches have been identified and outlined by Gerald O'Connor, who concludes that no single approach "can fully accommodate the diversity and complexity of the genre". (Quoted in Peter Petro, Modern Satire: Four Studies (New York : Mouton, 1982), p.2.) The main representatives of the four approaches, as studied by O'Connor, are, respectively, Northrop Frye, Edward W. Rosenheim, Alvin B. Kernan and Robert C. Elliott (whose works are referred to elsewhere in this study and are listed in the bibliography).
5. Leonard Feinberg, Introduction to Satire (Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1967), p.vii.
6. This list is by no means complete: A. Melville Clark, in describing one form, regular verse satire, indicates that the variety of satire is almost infinite:

It fluctuates between the flippant and the earnest, the completely trivial and the heavily didactic; it ranges from extremes of crudity and brutality to the utmost refinement and elegance; it employs singly or in conjunction monologue, dialogue, epistle, oration, narrative, manners-painting, character-drawing, allegory, fantasy, travesty, burlesque, parody and any other vehicle it chooses; and it presents a chameleon-like surface by using all the tones of the satiric spectrum, wit, ridicule, irony, sarcasm, the sardonic and invective. (Quoted in Arthur Pollard, Satire (London: Methuen, 1970), pp.4-5.)
7. Robert C. Elliott, "Satire", Britannica Macropaedia, 15th ed., 23 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986), p.182.
8. Quoted in Petro, Modern Satire: Four Studies, p.3.
9. Numerous examples of satirical comment in the visual arts within South Africa are included in Sue Williamson, Resistance Art in South Africa (Cape Town : David Philip, 1989).
10. René Wellek and Austin Warren, Theory of Literature (New York: Harcourt, 1956), p.221.

11. Robert C. Elliott, The Power of Satire: Magic, Ritual, Art (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960), p.185.
12. This and the following points on parody are dealt with in greater detail in Chapters 1 and 4 of James W. Nichols, Insinuation: The Tactics of English Satire (The Hague: Mouton, 1971).
13. Robert Kirby, Trebor Ybrik Versus the Rest (Cape Town: Don Nelson 1975), p.11.
14. Pieter-Dirk Uys, Adapt or Dye, in No One's Died Laughing (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1986), pp.54-55. As Uys claimed that An Evening with Pieter-Dirk Uys (1992) was his final revue and as the content of his revues between 1981 and 1992 was largely dependent on and referred to topical events and issues, they are, in this work, described in the past tense.
15. Robert L. Erenstein describes the difficulties of approaching a non-literary form with literary preconceptions in "Satire and the Commedia dell'Arte", Western Popular Theatre, eds. David Mayer and Kenneth Richards (London: Methuen, 1977).
16. Nichols, Insinuation, p.12.
17. Pollard, Satire, p.3.
18. Quoted in Petro, Modern Satire: Four Studies, p.4.
19. See James Sutherland, English Satire (London: Cambridge University Press, 1958), p.132; Elliott, The Power of Satire, p.233; Gilbert Highet, The Anatomy of Satire (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962), p.3; Feinberg, Introduction to Satire, p.17.
20. Theodore Shank, employing practical and theoretical approaches, argues cogently that not only is each theatrical performance itself a unique work of art, but one in which the various components coalesce to form a whole which is more than the sum of its elements (in The Art of Dramatic Art (New York: Delta, 1972), Chapters 2-6).
21. Terry J. Winstanley, "South Africa's Enigmatic Political Realities: Christopher Hope's Strategies of Satire in A Separate Development and Kruger's Alp" (M.A. dissertation, University of Natal (Durban), 1987). Winstanley refers in her discussion of Pieter-Dirk Uys to his P.W. Botha In His Own Words (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1987), but errs in approaching this work as fiction when it is a collection of quotations, drawn from speeches, interviews and statements in the press, and in not differentiating between this non-fictional work and his use of P.W. Botha's words on stage, in theatrical performance.
22. Winstanley, "South Africa's Enigmatic Political Realities", p.5.
23. J.L. Styan, "The Perceptual Criticism of Drama", Speech and Drama 24 (Autumn 1975), 3-5.

24. See Raymond S. Ross for a detailed consideration of the aspects of non-verbal communication in Speech Communication, 5th ed. (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1980), Chapter 4.
25. Winstanley, "South Africa's Enigmatic Political Realities", p.5.
26. Ibid., pp 5-6.
27. Martin Esslin, The Field of Drama (London: Methuen, 1987), p. 56.
28. Nichols, Insinuation, p.102.
29. Pieter-Dirk Uys, Beyond the Rubicon, in No One's Died Laughing, pp.125-127. A similar portrayal was presented in the final sketch of his Rearranging the Deckchairs on the S.A. Bothatonic, performance text (Cape Town, 1987).
30. Winstanley, "South Africa's Enigmatic Political Realities", p.6.
31. Pieter-Dirk Uys, An Evening with Pieter-Dirk Uys, performance text (Cape Town, 1992), p.13. Karnaval and Selle Ou Storie were first published in Johannesburg by Ad. Donker in 1982 and 1983 respectively.
32. Pieter-Dirk Uys has described the proceedings in "The Saga of Selle Ou Storie", in Speak 1 (March/April 1978), 53-57, and in the published version of the play (pp. 76 - 80).
33. Ian Steadman, "The other face", Index on Censorship 14 (February 1985), 27.
34. Stephen Gray, "Desegregating the theatre", Index on Censorship 14 (August 1985), 14.
35. Uys, Beyond the Rubicon, p.124.
36. Uys, P.W. Botha In His Own Words, p.7.
37. Sutherland, English Satire, p.133.
38. Jeffrey Henderson, Aristophanes' "Lysistrata" (Cambridge : Focus, 1988), p.5. The examples of limitations he cites are: "malicious and unfounded" abuse and slander, "speaking ill of the dead", compromising "the integrity of the state religion" and criticism of the "democratic constitution".
39. Sutherland (in English Satire, Chapter 6) deals with the issue in greater detail.
40. Reported by Darryl Accone, "Uys's bread and Botha", Cue, 4 July 1990, p.3.
41. Uys, No One's Died Laughing, p.41.
42. Pieter-Dirk Uys, interview with Penny Smythe, "Penny Smythe talks to Pieter-Dirk Uys", Fair Lady, 14 February 1990, p.58.

43. Eric Miyeni, interview with Philippa Garson, "The funny man who is not amused", Standard Bank National Arts Festival supplement, Weekly Mail, 19-25 June 1992, p.9.
44. Robert Kirby, in "Scenaria interviews Robert Kirby", Scenaria, September 1984, p.12.
45. Kenneth Tynan, "A Gap Defined: 1960", in A View of the English Stage (St Albans: Granada, 1976), pp. 301-303. This article appeared, originally, in the Observer in October 1960, after he had visited the United States of America.
46. Adam Leslie, in an untitled interview, Natal Mercury, 24 March 1966, p.9.
47. Joseph Treen (with Peter Younghusband), "Satire, South African Style", Newsweek, 23 July 1984, p.47.
48. Ian Fraser, "Ian Fraser on Ian Fraser", Capab at the Festival, July 1992.
49. Caspar de Vries, interview with Barry Ronge, "'Fat little pygmy' gives satire life", Sunday Times, 20 March 1988, p.18.
50. Caspar de Vries, interview with Marianne Thamm, "Everyone laughs when Caspar's around", Weekly Mail, 24-29 April 1992, p.33.
51. Quoted in numerous articles and scholarly works. For example, see John Lahr, "Jules Feiffer: Satire as Subversion", in Acting Out America (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972), p.90.
52. During the 1975 Modern Language Association meeting in San Francisco a seminar on "Savage Comedy" was proposed by Kenneth S. White. A seminar was held in New York in 1976 at which papers on the topic "Savage Comedy and Structures of Humor" were presented by academics and theatre practitioners. The works of, principally, Alfred Jarry, Samuel Beckett, Friedrich Dürrenmatt, Slawomir Mrozek and Dario Fo were discussed in relation to the concept. Definitions, not always consistent, pointed to the relation between "Savage Comedy" and satire: to summarise aspects from the seven papers, "Savage Comedy", in confronting the idea of the universe with its fears and imperfections, is an ideal vehicle for ridding men of self-delusion, and does so by combining the comic spirit with shock techniques and jarring theatrical effects in order to laugh with and at what is savage. It is a disturbing laughter, for the values are those of the brutal, rebellious and uncivilized, the anti-heroes and anti-heroines who are situated in a world beyond morality. The papers were collected and edited by Kenneth S. White in Savage Comedy: Structures of Humor (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1978).
53. See, for example, Maureen Cleave in the Standard for reactions to the production of Paradise is Closing Down at the Edinburgh Festival and the Young Vic in London in August and September 1979 in Maureen Cleave, "Jarring the censor's funny-bone", Standard, 26 September 1979, page number unknown.
54. Matthew Hodgart, Satire (London: World University Library, 1969), p.7.

55. Ibid., pp. 202-203.
56. A fuller discussion appears in Jack Mapanje and Landeg White, Oral Poetry from Africa (Harlow: Longman, 1983), where specific examples of protest and satire, within the types of oral performance forms mentioned, are given. Further historical references and examples are taken from Peter Larlham, Black Theatre, Dance, and Ritual in South Africa (Ann Arbor: UMI, 1985), pp.17-19, and David Coplan, "Dialectics of Tradition in South African Black Popular Theatre", Critical Arts 4 (3/1987), 8-13. In her M.A. dissertation "Elements of Satire in Zulu Oral Traditions" (University of Natal (Durban), 1990) Noleen Turner has isolated the specific forms in which satire is manifest, and discusses izibongo (praise poetry), izithakazelo (clan praises) and izinganekwane (folk tales). 'Praise' is not a wholly accurate description, for it is common for censure, criticism and even invective to occur in izibongo. However, her work is largely restricted to an examination of the function and prevalence of satire within these forms and to what she terms the "literary analysis" of specific examples, rather than a detailed description of exactly how they are performed.
57. Trevor Cope, ed., Izibongo - Zulu Praise Poems (London: Oxford University Press, 1968), p.28.
58. Turner, "Elements of Satire in Zulu Oral Traditions", p.4.
59. Ibid., p.159.
60. Madlinyoka Ntanzzi, "Praise Poem to Nelson Mandela", Soho Square V, eds. Steve Kromberg and James Ogude (London: Bloomsbury, 1992), p.96.
61. Kenneth McLeish, The Theatre of Aristophanes (London: Thames and Hudson, 1980), p.18.
62. Peter Walcot, "Aristophanic and Other Audiences", Greece and Rome 18 (1/1971), 35-36. The term 'popular', as employed in this work, refers to those forms of theatre which are a source of mass entertainment, most often arising from, reflecting and enjoyed by the majority of the community in which they are or were performed.
63. McLeish, The Theatre of Aristophanes, pp. 17-21. McLeish considers and defines the use of 'non-literary' and 'popular' in the context of comedy.
64. Oliver Taplin, Greek Tragedy in Action, revised ed.(London: Methuen, 1985), p.2.
65. See Taplin, Chapters 1-2, McLeish, "Introduction", and Kenneth J. Reckford, Aristophanes' Old-and-New Comedy (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987), Chapter 3, for further discussion on the involvement of the poet-director in the production process. The points made are from these sources.
66. See Henderson, Aristophanes' "Lysistrata", p.11, for this and the next point.
67. Taplin, Greek Tragedy in Action, p. 187.

68. McLeish, The Theatre of Aristophanes, p.87.
69. Taplin, Greek Tragedy in Action, p.5.
70. For this observation, the writer is indebted to Erenstein, "Satire and the Commedia dell'Arte", pp.29-30.
71. Edward W. Rosenheim, "The Satiric Spectrum", in Satire: Modern Essays in Criticism, p.325.
72. For the origin of these terms, see Dr Johnson's Dictionary definition ("a poem in which wickedness or folly is censured"); Northrop Frye, Anatomy of Criticism (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957), p. 224; Rosenheim, "The Satiric Spectrum", p.317; Ronald Paulson, The Fictions of Satire (Baltimore: John Hopkins, 1967), p.3; for a summary of the views Petro, Modern Satire: Four Studies, p.8, may be consulted.
73. Kenneth Tynan, quoted in Nichols, Insinuation, p.130.
74. Pieter-Dirk Uys, interview with Iaine Harper, "Man of Many Face(t)s", Weekend Argus, 14 May 1988, p.3.
75. Athol Fugard, "Foreword", Apartheid: The Lighter Side, comp. Ben MacLennan (Plumstead: Chameleon Press, 1990), p.6.
76. These translations are taken from, respectively, versions of Aristophanes' play by David Barrett, The Frogs (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1964), p.181; Patric Dickinson, Frogs, in Aristophanes (Plays: 2) (London: Oxford University Press, 1970), p.207; Dudley Fitts The Frogs (London: Faber, 1957), p.63; Richmond Lattimore The Frogs (New York: Mentor, 1970), p.65. Where possible, page numbers are referred to as the line numbers are either inconsistent or differ from version to version or are not included; the same approach will be adopted in referring to specific lines quoted from other plays by Aristophanes.
77. Aristophanes, The Acharnians, trans. Douglass Parker (New York: Mentor, 1961), p.64.
78. Pollard, Satire, p.73.
79. Nichols, Insinuation, p.24.
80. *Ibid.*, p.29. For the source of various points made in this discussion, see Nichols, Chapters 2 and 5.
81. These terms, "direct" and "indirect" satire, are formulated and described by Edgar Johnson, A Treasury of Satire (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1945) and Nichols, Insinuation. The distinctions between the forms are derived from these sources.

82. Named for its origination, the Greek cynic Menippus (also termed Varronian satire after a Roman imitator, Varro). Such satires are written in, principally, a loosely constructed narrative prose form. The major characteristic of Menippean satire is that it is a series of dialogues and debates (often set at a party) in which the speakers (professional and literary pedants) make the attitudes and viewpoints they typify ludicrous by the arguments they deliver to support their views.
83. Horace, Quintus Horatius Flaccus, (65-8 B.C.) and Juvenal, Decimus Junius Juvenalis (c. A.D. 60- c.130).
84. Pollard, Satire, p.3.
85. Highet, in The Anatomy of Satire, (pp. 232-233), describes satura and its relation to satire.
86. Ibid.
87. The validity of this claim is examined by G.L. Hendrickson, "Satura Tota Nostra Est", in Satire: Modern Essays in Criticism, pp. 37-51.
88. Harry Levin, Playboys and Killjoys (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), p.195.
89. Elliott, "Satire", p.182.
90. Frye, Anatomy of Criticism, p.310.
91. Highet, The Anatomy of Satire, p.16.
92. Hodgart, Satire, p.33.
93. See Rosenheim, "The Satiric Spectrum", pp. 317-318, for this and the following observations.
94. Ibid., pp. 323-325.
95. Uys, No One's Died Laughing, p.24.
96. Ibid.
97. Uys, An Evening with Pieter-Dirk Uys, p.4.
98. Adam Leslie, interview with Roy Christie, "Dramatic change of pace for Adam", Star, 5 September 1975, page number unknown.
99. Reckford, Aristophanes' Old-and-New Comedy, p.131.
100. Uys, Beyond the Rubicon, p. 105.
101. Uys, No One's Died Laughing, p.27.

102. Pieter-Dirk Uys, Paradise Is Closing Down (A New South Africa Look) (Cape Town: Peninsula, 1992), p.1. The play was first published in Theatre One: New South African Drama, ed. Stephen Gray (Johannesburg: Ad. Donker, 1978) as Paradise is Closing Down, then in "Paradise Is Closing Down" and Other Plays (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1989).
103. The Grub-Street writers in Pope's The Dunciad (1728) or Thomas Shadwell in Dryden's MacFlecknoe (1682) resist transposition in any meaningful way, so tied are they to the particular targets, situation and period that motivated their satiric creation. Conversely, Shakespeare has, within the last few decades, been adapted and reworked to make fairly convincing satiric parallels not present in the original: in 1967 Barbara Garson satirized American president, Lyndon Johnson in Machbird!, a reworking of Macbeth (1606), while Richard III (1592) was revised, to greater acclaim, as a political satire against President Richard Nixon and the Watergate affair in David Edgar's Dick Deterred (1974). Ruby Cohn discusses the former and other examples in Modern Shakespeare Offshoots (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976).
104. Reckford, Aristophanes' Old-and-New Comedy, p.134.
105. Henderson, Aristophanes' "Lysistrata", p.11.
106. Geoffrey Chapman, "Aristophanes for all?", Acta Classica 26 (1983), 42-3.
107. *Ibid.*, 43.
108. Erenstein, "Satire and the Commedia dell'Arte", p.31.
109. The problems, aesthetic and practical, facing the translator for the theatre are examined in detail by Susan Bassnett-McGuire, "The Translator in the Theatre", Theatre Quarterly 10 (40/1981), 37-48.
110. Brian Astbury, The Space/Die Ruimte/Indawo (Cape Town: M. and A. Fine, 1980), no pagination.
111. *Ibid.*
112. Geoffrey Chapman, Women in Protest (Durban: University of Natal, 1980).
113. Chapman, "Introduction", Women in Protest, p.i.
114. Lusistrata, trans. J.P.J. van Rensburg (Cape Town: Human and Rousseau, 1970) and Die Paddas, trans. Merwe Scholtz (Johannesburg: Perskor, 1978).
115. Bassnett-McGuire, "The Translator in the Theatre", 39.
116. Patrick Murray, Literary Criticism (Harlow: Longman, 1978), p.143.
117. Pollard, Satire, p.54.
118. Feinberg, Introduction to Satire, p.238.

119. Michael Seidel, Satiric Inheritance: Rabelais to Sterne (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979), p.10.
120. Quoted in Nichols, Insinuation, p.115.
121. These terms are often used interchangeably. The following are the most generally accepted features of the four terms: a burlesque is an exaggerated imitation of another literary work or of people's attitudes and actions, which aims to deride or amuse by distortion, or by an incongruity of subject and style; parody is a form of burlesque which imitates the literary or dramatic or critical style of other writers or artists (as mentioned earlier, with examples from Kirby and Uys, Nichols prefers the term "pattern"); travesty is a kind of burlesque in which the characters or themes from serious or classical literature are diminished; caricature is an extreme example of distortion and exaggeration, selecting only the prominent or objectionable characteristics of an original, and confining the descriptions of the target to that characteristic.

A Dictionary of Modern Critical Terms, edited by Roger Fowler (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982) states the following:

Distinctions can seldom in practice be sustained, since one parodic work habitually exploits a whole range of incongruous juxtapositions, and the categories obscure the complex intermingling of parodic effects. Both terms [burlesque and travesty], however, are useful to indicate the kind of response a work appeals to: 'travesty' (as in its popular use) implies something savagely reductive, and 'burlesque' the comic immediacy of a theatrical 'spoon'. A distinction can be made, however, between all forms of parodic imitation and 'caricature' Parody attacks its butt indirectly, through style; it 'quotes' from and alludes to its original, abridging and inverting its characteristic devices. The caricaturist's 'original' is not some other already existent style or work: he holds a distorting mirror up to life, whereas parody is a mirror of a mirror, a critique of a view of life already articulated in art. (p.138)

Henryk Markiewicz (quoted in Petro, Modern Satire: Four Studies, p.13) posits these distinctions:

Parody Sensu Largo: comical recast or imitation of literary model;

Parody Sensu Stricto: comical exaggeration and condemnation of the features of the literary model;

Low Burlesque: comicality of discrepancy between serious subject and low style;

High Burlesque: comicality of discrepancy between common or trifling subject and high style;

Travesty: close imitation of the plot with details and style changed, or close imitation of the pattern of style and composition of the model, with change in content.

According to these distinctions, the Uys sketch which is discussed in the ensuing pages is a form of Low Burlesque.

122. Uys, No One's Died Laughing, p.42.
123. *Ibid.*, p.45.
124. Uys, Adapt or Dye, p.45.

125. Sutherland, English Satire, p.16.
126. Ibid.
127. Petro, Modern Satire: Four Studies, p.17.
128. Ibid., p.18.
129. Nichols, Insinuation, p.26.
130. Pollard, Satire, p.3.
131. Included among the critics who refer to the eighteenth century as the greatest period of English satirical writing (again the emphasis is placed on literary forms to the exclusion of theatre) are Pollard, Satire, Chapter 1; Humbert Wolfe, Notes on English Verse Satire (London: Hogarth, 1929), Chapters 4 and 5, and The Satirist's Art, edited by H. James Jensen and Malvin R. Zirker (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1972), in its entirety.
132. Spacks, "Some Reflections on Satire", p.362.
133. A.E. Dyson, The Crazy Fabric (London: Macmillan, 1965), pp. 2 - 3.
134. Ibid., p.15.
135. Nichols, Insinuation, p.27.
136. Frye, at a symposium on norms in satire held in 1964, stated these views. See Petro, Modern Satire: Four Studies, p.20.
137. Kirby, "Preface", It's a Boy! (Johannesburg: Triad, 1983), p. xxvii.
138. For the differing tendencies associated with satire and comedy, the writer is indebted to Frye, Anatomy of Criticism, Parts Three and Four; Sutherland, English Satire, Chapter 1; Rosenheim, "The Satiric Spectrum"; Hodgart, Satire, Chapter 6; Dyson, The Crazy Fabric, Chapters 1 and 2; Hight, The Anatomy of Satire, Chapter 4; Nichols, Insinuation, Chapter 7; Paul H. Grawe, Comedy in Space, Time, and the Imagination (Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1983), Chapters 5 and 8; Neil Schaeffer, The Art of Laughter (New York: Columbia University Press, 1981), Chapter 4.
139. Hodgart, Satire, p.189.
140. Ibid.
141. Alvin B. Kernan, The Cankered Muse: Satire of the English Renaissance (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959), p.143.
142. Alvin B. Kernan, The Plot of Satire (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965), p.97.

143. Pieter-Dirk Uys, Panorama, in "Paradise Is Closing Down" and Other Plays (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1989).
144. Grawe, Comedy in Space, Time, and the Imagination, p.115.
145. Kenneth McLeish, "Introduction" to Aristophanes: "Clouds", "Woman in Power", "Knights" (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), p.xi.
146. See Rosenheim, "The Satiric Spectrum", pp.322 - 323. Rosenheim would argue that such characters must, not simply should, be identifiable and authentic as "recognizable fiction".
147. For these descriptions of character types, the writer is indebted to Henderson, Aristophanes' "Lysistrata", pp. 5 - 11, and Rick A. Eden, "Detective Fiction as Satire", Genre 16 (Fall 1983), 285.
148. Nichols, Insinuation, p.131.
149. Even so Lysistrata and Pisthetairos are, some scholars claim, based on or at least refer to particular individuals: the former on Lysimache, the most prominent woman in Athens and the priestess of Athena Polias, the latter on Alcibiades who had urged the Athenians to undertake the disastrous Sicilian Expedition of 415 and who, in exile thereafter, advised the Spartans to occupy and fortify Deceleia against the Athenians. For sources, see Henderson, Aristophanes' "Lysistrata", p.10, and Maurice Croiset, Aristophanes and the Political Parties at Athens, trans. James Loeb (New York: Arno Press, 1973; reprint of 1909 ed.), pp. 126 - 131.
150. McLeish, The Theatre of Aristophanes, p. 64. McLeish discusses the character of the protagonist, the 'plot' of Aristophanes' plays and the audience-performer relationship mentioned in the ensuing paragraphs in greater detail in Chapters 1, 6 and 9.
151. *Ibid.*, p.17.
152. Frances Muecke, "Playing with the Play: Theatrical Self-consciousness in Aristophanes", Antichthon 11 (1977), 54.
153. Kenneth J. Dover, Aristophanic Comedy (London: Batsford, 1972), pp. 55 - 56.
154. Hodgart, Satire, p. 188.
155. The points made in the discussion of the theatre of convention and that of illusion are derived from McLeish, The Theatre of Aristophanes, Chapter 6; the second section of Chesley J. Taylor and G.R. Thompson's Ritual, Realism, and Revolt (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1972), on "Psychological Realism"; and Peter D. Arnott, An Introduction to the Greek Theatre (London: Macmillan, 1962), Chapter 1. The concern in this section is not with the obvious differences in purposes and style or even content, but principally with presentation and performance.
156. McLeish, The Theatre of Aristophanes, p. 80.

157. J.L. Styan, Drama, Stage and Audience (London: Cambridge University Press, 1975), p. 207.
158. McLeish, The Theatre of Aristophanes, p. 79. McLeish also makes the connection between Aristophanes' techniques and Brecht's Verfremdungseffekt examined in the following paragraphs. This term should not be equated with the mistranslation 'alienation' which has negative and misleading associations, and for which the German is Entfremdung. Verfremdung, which has no precise equivalent in English, is 'the making strange' or 'the making foreign'. Brecht's theories, here briefly enumerated to indicate certain similarities of presentational techniques employed by satirists in performance, are gleaned from various sources, principally two standard works: Brecht on Theatre, ed. and trans. John Willett (London: Methuen, 1964), and Martin Esslin, Brecht: A Choice of Evils, third, revised ed. (London: Methuen, 1980).
159. Uys, An Evening with Pieter-Dirk Uys, pp. 3 - 4.
160. Patricia Waugh, in Metafiction: The Theory and Practice of Self-conscious Fiction (London: Methuen, 1984), defines metafiction as follows (though it is confined to fiction in literary forms, there are relevances to a theatrical context):
 Metafiction is a term given to fiction which self-consciously and systematically draws attention to its own status as artefact in order to pose questions about the relationship between fiction and reality. In providing a critique of their own methods of construction, such writings not only examine the fundamental structures of narrative fiction, they also explore the possible fictionality of the world outside the literary text. (p. 2)
 Metafictional novels are characterized by structural dislocation, narratorial intrusion, the story-within-the-story, digression and parody (features present in the theatre of convention and employed by stage satirists). The reader is given a sense of the characters as constructs, as the writer of metafiction often deliberately destroys the illusion concerning the life-like qualities of characters which is maintained in a novel dominated by a mimetic purpose. Alternative terms used by critics to define metafiction include 'surfiction', 'parafiction' and 'postmodern fiction'.
161. See June Schlueter, "Introduction" to Metafictional Characters in Modern Drama (New York: Columbia University Press, 1979), for a fuller discussion.
162. Representative examples of metatheatre include Pirandello's Six Characters in Search of an Author (in the first version, the play ended with the contradictory exclamations of "Pretence! Reality!") and Henry IV (1922); Thornton Wilder's Our Town (1938); Jean Anouilh's Antigone (1942) and The Rehearsal (1951); Jean Genet's The Maids (1947) and The Balcony (1957); Beckett's Waiting for Godot (1953) and Endgame (1957); Peter Weiss's Marat/Sade (1964); and Tom Stoppard's Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead (1967) and The Real Thing (1982).
163. See Hodgart, Satire, Chapter 6, for a fuller discussion.
164. The distinction between cabaret, revue, burlesque, vaudeville and music-hall is discussed in detail in Chapter 3.

165. For the source of these influences of cabaret on Brecht and his theories, see Lisa Appignanesi, Cabaret, revised ed. (London: Methuen, 1984), pp.130 - 131 and 141.
166. The American comedians who were prominent in the late 1950s and 1960s (Sahl, Shelley Berman and Bruce, for example) emerged from the New York and San Francisco cabaret venues. (See also Chapter 3.)
167. Quoted in Raymond Mander and Joe Mitchenson, Revue (London: Peter Davies, 1971), p.24.
168. Programme note to Adam Leslie's Nothing Sacred (1962). Also in programmes for subsequent revues Adam's Rib (1963) and Adam's Apple (1963).
169. Reported in Pieter-Dirk Uys's interview with Rosemarie Raphaely, "Uys, distilling our traumas into one big joke", Star, 23 November 1978, p.16.
170. Pieter-Dirk Uys, in Avril Herber, Conversations (Johannesburg: Bateleur Press, 1979), p.90.
171. Sutherland, English Satire, pp.17 - 18.
172. Kenneth Tynan, "Bernard Shaw", in Profiles (London: Nick Hern Books, 1989), p.103.
173. "The artist will not stay unscathed ...", New Nation, 4 - 10 June 1987, p.13.
174. The relationship between the ideology of liberalism (or liberal humanism) and the literary tradition it has created or influenced in South Africa received much attention from literary scholars and critics in the 1980s (by Stephen Watson, in particular, Michael Vaughan and Paul Rich, amongst others).
175. While it may have been usual, in the 1980s, to distinguish between cultural work which merely 'domesticates' rather than 'liberates', Albie Sachs, in his "Preparing Ourselves for Freedom" (presented at an African National Congress leadership seminar in Lusaka in January 1990) aroused controversy by arguing strongly for freedom of opinion, debate and conscience, for culture not being simply seen as "a weapon of the struggle", and for artists, writers, singers and performers to "break free" from "formulas of commitment" (extracts were published in Weekly Mail, 2 - 8 February, 1990, pp.22 - 23).
176. Pieter-Dirk Uys, interview with Marianne Thamm, "Uys back on the table", Weekly Mail, 26 June - 2 July 1992, p.29.
177. Lahr, "Jules Feiffer: Satire as Subversion", p.91.
178. See Jacoba Wilhelmina Bedford, "The Presence of the Past in Selected Works by Pieter-Dirk Uys" (M.A. dissertation, University of Potchefstroom, 1988), for a fuller discussion of this issue in relation to Karnaval, God's Forgotten and Panorama. God's Forgotten was published in Theatre Two: New South African Drama, ed. Stephen Gray (Johannesburg: Ad. Donker, 1981), and in a revised

version, in English, in "Paradise Is Closing Down" and Other Plays (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1989).

179. Pollard, Satire, p.3.
180. Uys, No One's Died Laughing, p.23.
181. Quoted in Accone, "Uys's bread and Botha", p.3.
182. Uys, No One's Died Laughing, p.50.
183. Pieter-Dirk Uys, interview with Raeford Daniel , "We've got to ask questions, says Pieter-Dirk", Weekend Mail, 12 - 18 October 1990, p.10.
184. Ian Fraser, "Frazer's Edge", Living, October 1988, p.89.
185. Uys, No One's Died Laughing, p.41, for this and the following reference.
186. See Pieter-Dirk Uys, interview with Patricia Morris, "Cry Freemandela and don't be such a bloody fool", Index on Censorship 17 (March 1988), 22. The issue of censorship will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 3.
187. Steadman, "The other face", 26.
188. See Elliott, "Satire", p.185.
189. For the source of these retaliatory measures, the writer is indebted to Levin, Playboys and Killjoys, pp.201 - 203, and Elliott, "Satire", p.185.
190. See Mander and Mitchenson, Revue, p.25. The first 'revue' in English is generally regarded, however, as Under the Clock (1893), written by Seymour Hicks and Charles Brookfield, also presented at the Royal Court theatre.
191. Quoted in Elliott, "Satire", p.185. Elliott also refers to the statement by Karl Kraus quoted later in this paragraph.
192. The material on Wole Soyinka is derived from Oluremi Omodele, Traditional and Contemporary African Drama: A Historical Perspective (Ann Arbor: UMI, 1988), Chapter 14. He cites further examples of satire in Nigeria, Kenya and Cameroon.
193. Quoted, *ibid.*, pp.578 - 579.
194. Athol Fugard, John Kani, Winston Ntshona, Sizwe Bansi Is Dead, in Statements: Three Plays (London: Oxford University Press, 1974), p.4.
195. Athol Fugard, Notebooks: 1960 - 1977, ed. Mary Benson (Johannesburg: Ad. Donker, 1983), p.171.
196. Athol Fugard, John Kani, Winston Ntshona, The Island, in Statements: Three Plays.

197. Details of the publishing history and of the production process of these plays is to be found in, among other sources, Russell Vandenbroucke, Truths the Hand Can Touch: The Theatre of Athol Fugard (New York: Theatre Communications Group, 1985), Chapter 5.
198. Quoted in Vandenbroucke, Truths the Hand Can Touch, p.118.
199. Athol Fugard, quoted in Athol Fugard, ed. Stephen Gray (Johannesburg: McGraw-Hill, 1982), p.56.
200. Pieter-Dirk Uys, Die Van Aardes van Grootoor (Johannesburg: Taurus, 1979).
201. Fugard, quoted in Athol Fugard, p.64.
202. Uys, No One's Died Laughing, p.49.
203. Cited in Nichols, Insinuation, pp.21-22, and Levin, Playboys and Killjoys, p.202.
204. Quoted in Pollard, Satire, p.1, and Nichols, Insinuation, p.30, for example.
205. Uys, No One's Died Laughing, p.40. Uys is referring here to Adapt or Dye; the example cited thereafter is to the production of Total Onslaught (also titled Total Onslaught 1984, and sub-titled Ja-No-Orwell-Fine as a reference to George Orwell's 1984 (1949). See Pieter-Dirk Uys, Total Onslaught 1984, in No One's Died Laughing.
206. Cited in Nichols, Insinuation, p.30.
207. Quoted in Leonard Mosley, The Battle of Britain (Alexandria: Time-Life, 1977), p.74.
208. Elliott, "Satire", p.184.
209. Nichols, Insinuation, p.31.
210. Quoted in Accone, "Uys's bread and Botha", p.3.
211. Quoted in Pollard, Satire, p.7.
212. Pieter-Dirk Uys, in "Pieter-Dirk Uys: Humour is my only sanity", New Nation, 30 March - 5 April 1989, p.17.
213. Uys, interview with Daniel, "We've got to ask questions, says Pieter-Dirk", p.10. From a CESAT study in 1987 Temple Hauptfleisch found that "only 3 - 5% of South Africans attended the theatre, and almost 50% of them were university graduates in one of the so-called professions". These figures are not unique to South Africa. Hauptfleisch continues: "This is in line with international trends today. Theatre - at least in the Western sense as we usually teach it in this country at this time - is an elitist activity for the most part, even in the black community." Cited in "Citytalk, Theatretalk: Dialect, Dialogue and Multilingual Theatre in South Africa", English in Africa 16 (May 1989), 87. The statement by Uys

regarding the awareness-arousing possibilities of theatre during the 1980s is reported in "The 1989 Grahamstown Festival", South African Theatre Journal 3 (September 1989), 118, by Adrienne Sichel.

214. Cited by Uys, interview with Smythe, "Penny Smythe talks to Pieter-Dirk Uys", p.57.
215. Uys, No One's Died Laughing, p.58.
216. Nichols, Insinuation, p.32.
217. Quoted in Appignanesi, Cabaret, p.190.
218. Nichols, Insinuation, pp.35 - 36.
219. Highet, The Anatomy of Satire, p.212.
220. Uys, No One's Died Laughing, pp.47 - 48.
221. Bob Evans, "Uys plays with fire", Sydney Morning Herald, 12 January 1987, page number unknown.
222. Henri Bergson, "Laughter", in Comedy (New York: Doubleday Anchor, 1956), p.64.

CHAPTER 2

THE LAMPOON AS A SATIRIC STRATEGY IN ARISTOPHANIC COMEDY - THE THEATRICAL PRESENTATION OF 'LIVING' PERSONS

"Gentlemen, in the name of Dionysus to whom I owe my nurture as a poet, I intend to confront you with my personal complaints frankly and freely, as a poet should.
My ambitions, of course, are very simply stated:
the First Prize and a reputation for talent and wit."

- 'Aristophanes', The Clouds.¹

2.1 The origins of the lampoon

Aristophanes' "frank" and "free" representation of Socrates in The Clouds has been the subject of much retrospective critical debate, to the extent that it is referred to as the 'Socratic Problem', a problem compounded by the difference between the generally unsympathetic contemporary record of the man presented in Old Comedy and the more positive and idealized posthumous opinion.² Plato, in particular, attributes Socrates' trial and subsequent condemnation almost a quarter-century later, in 399, as due in part to the questionable manner in which he was portrayed by Aristophanes in The Clouds (in his Apology). The official charges against Socrates at his trial do mirror the prejudicial public image presented by Aristophanes in his play: Socrates is a corrupter of youth, an atheist who did not believe in the gods of the City, and a follower of strange gods. In reply to the "false accusations" levelled against him, Socrates proposed reading a "pretended affidavit" of his accusers: "Socrates is a criminal and a busybody, prying into things under the earth and up in the heavens, and making the weaker argument the stronger, and teaching these same things to others." He then, in Plato's account, continued:

It is something like that; for that is what you saw in the comedy of Aristophanes, a certain Socrates there being carried about, and claiming to be treading on air and talking much other nonsensical nonsense about which I don't understand one jot But I have nothing to do with such things, gentlemen.³

What is unquestionable is that Socrates and his fictional counterpart in The Clouds are not the same 'person': Socrates condemned the acceptance of payment for the teaching of oratory, had no school (the "Thinkery" in The Clouds), was not an atheist, did not have the philological and scientific interests of the Socrates of the play and, in fact, consistently attacked the methodology of the Sophist movement with which Aristophanes associated him.⁴ Why, then, did Aristophanes select Socrates as a representative for the Sophists, and why attribute to him the negative qualities of his contemporary teachers? Socrates was well known in Athens; he did engage in moral enquiry in an unconventional manner; many of his rival teachers were not, in fact, Athenians, but visitors to the city, whereas he was an Athenian citizen. So if a playwright wished to lampoon an individual to represent a group of philosophers, Socrates was the most conspicuous target to select.⁵ As to 'his' negative qualities, those, as will be discussed below, were a matter of theatrical convention.

Socrates himself, it would appear, was not unduly concerned by this representation or misrepresentation. Interestingly, it is Plato who gives evidence for this in his Symposium, written soon after the death of Aristophanes and purportedly an account of a dinner party, hosted by the tragic poet Agathon seven years after the first production of The Clouds, at which Aristophanes and Socrates compete in a congenial and witty debate. Another guest, Alcibiades, refers to The Clouds without apology or seeming embarrassment, in praise of Aristophanes' depiction of Socrates' "swaggering gait and rolling eye".⁶ Two further anecdotes appear to substantiate Socrates' lack of resentment: Plutarch quotes Socrates as saying, "I am twitted in the theatre as I would be at a drinking-party";⁷ and an unproven and much-disputed anecdote records that, at the original performance in 423, which was enjoyed by Socrates, he rose in his seat when his "character" appeared wearing a mask which was "a particularly good likeness", to allow the spectators to compare the real and the fictional "Socrates".⁸

2.1.1 Personal ridicule in ritual and drama

Such slanderous impersonation of public personages was certainly not unconventional. The allusion to The Clouds in Plato's The Apology is followed by a reference to the fact that such accusations were regularly made against all philosophers and that it was a feature of Athenian Old Comedy to ridicule everything and anyone. The Clouds, which Aristophanes regarded as his finest comedy to date, received only third prize in the competition at the Great Dionysia in 423.⁹ Yet, to add insult to injury, the second prize was awarded to Ameipsias' Connos which, like The Clouds, satirized Socrates and the Sophist movement, and included a chorus of Sophists. (The winning comedy was Pytine ('The Wineflask') by Aristophanes' chief rival Cratinus.)¹⁰ The repetition could have been coincidental, or because, as Gilbert Murray contends, Socrates, for some reason, had attracted public attention at that time and was, "so to speak, the obvious subject for the current comic cartoon".¹¹

Ridicule was, therefore, not only conventional but, indeed, expected of the comic playwrights. The investigations of Frances M. Cornford, amongst other scholars, have linked the spirit and conventions of Old Comedy to rites of fertility celebrating the annual rebirth or regeneration of the plant and animal worlds.¹² However tentative these conclusions must remain, it seems likely (partly on the authority of Aristotle) that the komos (or 'revels'), in which comedy may have had its origin, was associated with the phallic worship then practised in Greece. Evidence for this pre-dramatic komos is strong, despite the views of scholars who dispute the link, particularly when the etymological link is considered (komodia, 'comedy', from komos and 'ode', or 'song') and when the phallus is so frequently referred to in the extant texts. Significantly, as mentioned in Chapter 1, though the verb "satirize" is of Latin derivation, its synonym in Greek was komoidein, 'to comedize'. These revels were most strongly associated with Dionysus (whose name means 'twice born', from the manner of his birth from the thigh of Zeus), as both a fertility god and as the benevolent giver of wine, and included phallic songs, an

essential feature of which was invective and ridicule of particular persons. The function of the entire rite was magical: according to Elliott, it invoked positive influences (fertility in particular), through the magic potency of the phallus, while expelling evil influences through the magic potency of abuse.¹³

The presence of satire in the non-literary history, in the magic and ritualist activities of peoples as disparate as the Irish and the Arabs and the Greeks, as Elliott has convincingly argued, testifies that the impulse to condemn, expose and destroy people (their health, if not their lives even) or institutions through ridicule is as old as the history of man. Oluremi Omodele asserts that such forms were, and are, prevalent in Africa where, for example, among the Luo of East Africa, in a pakrouk ('verbal assault') two performers, representing different clans or interests, confront each other in verbal display and abuse, cheered on by their supporters (similar exchanges of abuse, to precede the agon (or 'contest'), are included in various plays by Aristophanes, such as The Knights (between Paphlagonian and the Sausage-seller), The Clouds (between Right and Wrong), and between Aeschylus and Euripides in The Frogs); Omodele cites, further, the types of traditional punishment meted out to offenders in public parades in which they are exposed to communal ridicule.¹⁴

Aristotle states in his Poetics (probably correctly, though somewhat vaguely) that both tragedy and comedy originated in improvisation: the former with those who led the dithyramb (songs associated with Dionysus), the latter with the leaders of the phallic songs. Where the "graver" poets produced hymns and panegyrics, those of the "meaner sort" composed invectives (variously translated as satires or lampoons) written in the iambic metre.¹⁵ Hence to "iambize" a person was to make him the target of abuse. The earliest recorded poet after Homer, the legendary Greek satirist Archilochus, (celebrated for his "iambicks" by Jonson in his satirical comedy The Poetaster in 1601) made such verses against Lycambes and his daughter, when her betrothal to him was broken, causing them to hang themselves.¹⁶

When comedy as an 'art' form developed, states Aristotle, "those naturally drawn to the one line of poetry became writers of comedies instead of iambs" because the new form was "of more esteem" than the old; a development, presumably, from invective to dramatizing the ridiculous.¹⁷ This 'nuclear' theory (according to which comedy, and tragedy for that matter, developed from particular rites) cannot account for the many and varied elements incorporated in and revealed by Aristophanes' dramaturgy, nor do the plays consist mainly of personal abuse, containing, as they do, fantasy and lyricism, obscenity and parody. Moreover, it is not exactly clear to what extent Old Comedy was influenced by other forms such as the Megarian farce, phlyakes (the 'tragic' burlesques of Southern Italy) or Sicilian mime performances. The ridicule of individuals is largely present, but broadened to include attacks on policies, groups and classes; no person or idea or institution is exempt. Aristophanes makes use of the komos, not as an appendage to the plays, nor as a ritual element, but generally as a revel that derives from the events of the play itself: a festive tribute to the triumph of the protagonist, the sympathetically presented fictional creation, over the unsympathetically presented non-fictional character or group or institution, most often. Nor can Greek comedies or tragedies be considered primarily as rituals; any rituals associated with the productions took place at the opening and closing of the festivals at which they were presented: the events on stage had little to do with such activities. What remains are the conventions, retained for comic purposes. Nevertheless, a scholar such as Cornford maintains:

There can be no doubt that the element of invective and personal satire which distinguishes the Old Comedy is directly descended from the magical abuse of the phallic procession, just as its obscenity is due to the sexual magic; and it is likely that this ritual justification was well known to an audience familiar with the phallic ceremony itself.¹⁸

To Cornford, from the magic and ritual of satiric delivery developed the art: the tradition of personal abuse was formalized and retained, principally, in the parabasis. This is not quoted to agree that Athenian comedy was a clear-cut progression from ritual to the self-contained play. Many scholars dispute any theory which merely accepts the ritual theory for the origin of drama. Others, including Muecke, state that the function of ridicule is

primarily comic, and argue that the putative ritual origins of the element of ridicule and abuse do not account for its function in Aristophanes. Further, it is dangerous (and perhaps, untenable) to generalize about the development of such comedy when only eleven of Aristophanes' forty (at least) plays survive, and not one of the other fifty or so Athenian comic dramatists. Reckford, in support of Elliott, maintains that magic and ritual 'grew' into 'art' in three ways: through developing adherence to social norms of behaviour; through the institutionalization of limits, including limits on ritual; and through the emergence of artistic technique and self-conscious design. In this way satirical, personal abuse became controlled in the interest of public values as it was incorporated into 'art' forms.

Abuse was not restricted to individuals for, besides known persons, the comic playwright could ridicule the audience itself as well as the citizens as a group. The parabasis was a distinctive and popular feature for the opportunities it allowed the playwright to address the audience directly, through the chorus which often dropped its assumed character to do so and 'speak' on behalf of that playwright, not simply on matters of state importance or to attack individuals, but also to plead for the first prize in the competition.

Aristophanes' audience, if Aristotle is correct in stating that the phallic songs "still survive ... in many of our cities", was probably aware of the ritual origin of the abuse, even if it had lost its magical purpose.¹⁹ Such satire was controlled and sanctioned by the society which influenced its rhetorical strategies: the 'art', according to Elliott, grew out of a recognition of the social value and the dangerous power of satire, for the social setting was particularly important for satire, which has aggression (not reformation, Elliott argues) as its primary impulse. All societies, he continues, developed controls over the expression of aggression in life and in art forms, controls which ranged from censorship and libel laws to beliefs that a curse returned to plague the curser if he did not speak the truth. In this manner, the vital and socially necessary power of satire to attack corrupt men and institutions which defy ordinary controls is preserved, and the malignant potential

of satire is curbed. Such controls, Elliott believes, dictated many of the characteristics of satire, such as the use of allegory, the assertion that satire reports the literal truth, and the protestation that evils rather than individuals are attacked.²⁰ These are all

literary or linguistic forms of social restraints imposed on the powerful aggressive force of satire as it developed from a magical force with power literally to harm its object, to ritual, and ultimately to an art which still evokes some of the old primitive fears associated with 'hard attack'.²¹

Abuse then, served (and still serves) a number of functions. On one level it is a communally applied sanction: the fear of ridicule, and of a subsequent loss of eminence in the society, discourages deviant behaviour. (The Chorus-leader in The Knights confirms this: "If we upbraid the wicked, it should be begrudged by none;/ ... it's just what should be done."²²) The use of abuse by Greek orators was equally common, and a "scrupulous respect for the truth" was equally not expected; rather the tendentious distortion of facts, for, as Malcolm Heath states:

By distorting the known facts in an unfavourable way, or even by inventing 'facts', so long as the inventions have some recognizably apt point of attachment to the victim, a speaker can raise a laugh at his opponent's expense, inflicting on him a loss of face and so subverting the audience's capacity to give his case their serious attention.²³

Where such ridicule is incorporated into 'art', that ridicule need not be connected to the truth or to any hostile feelings towards the victims (though of course both the truth and hostility can also be present). Whereas in oratory the speaker may be indifferent to false facts so long as he can make his opponent lose face, in comedy there is a clear interest in falsehood, for a perceivable discrepancy between fiction and reality is a further source of humour at the playwright's disposal.

2.1.2 The playwright's right to ridicule

In Athens the release from restraints was permissible: playwrights and orators had almost complete freedom to attack individuals and institutions with impunity. Those ridiculed

had little legal means of redress, though the influential (and now unknown) person referred to by the chorus of Initiates in The Frogs, in reprisal for his comic lampooning, seems to have had some revenge in proposing a reduction of the fee payable to Aristophanes from state funds: "Some people there are who, when guyed in a play,/ Take it out on the poet by cutting his pay."²⁴ Resentment of ridicule was to be seen as improper and in itself ridiculous. In Reckford's translation of these lines, the words "in a play" are "in Dionysus' ancient rites", and the person is "a politician", to serve as a reminder that, however exaggerated the connection, making political comments as well as personal jokes belongs to Old Comedy's festive authority, to reaffirm that "Old Comedy is a privileged form of laughter, deriving its rights and upside-down authority from the worship of the gods", and that anyone "who would censor it directly or indirectly, or curtail its ancient rights, is an enemy of life and of the gods".²⁵

While there were certain limitations (cited in note 38 to Chapter 1), nevertheless these playwrights (and orators) would seem to have enjoyed unusual freedom of word and action, a freedom for which Athens was renowned: "In no other place or age were men of all classes attacked and ridiculed in public and by name with such freedom as in Old Attic Comedy," asserts Victor Ehrenberg.²⁶ (Though, of course, as Elliott has argued, ritual abuse existed in many countries prior to this, but not in dramatic form in the 'Western' sense.) As mentioned above, there existed almost no laws of libel or slander. The execution of Socrates was most unusual and has been attributed more to political than philosophical or religious issues: he had been associated with Critias, who as one of the Thirty, had ruled Athens with brutality after its defeat by Sparta and her allies in 404.²⁷

A playwright such as Aristophanes could, for example, criticize Athenian imperialism and the ruthless exploitation of her subject 'allies', whilst still receive state funding for himself and his actors. 'Aristophanes' does exactly this in the parabasis of The Acharnians (the seriousness of his intent and the distortion of historical facts, aside), in which the koryphaios states that Aristophanes demonstrated, in a previous play

Exactly what 'democracy' means to a subject state.

That's why, next Dionysia-time, when all your allies bring
 Their tribute, every one enthusiastically will sing
 The praises of our poet, of that rash and headstrong youth
 Who actually dared to tell the Athenians the truth

Be sure, though, and hold on to him. He'll carry on impeaching
 Every abuse he sees, and give much valuable teaching,
 Making you wiser, happier men. There won't be any diddling
 Or flattering or bribes, or any other kind of fiddling,
 Nor will you drown in fulsome praises, such as all the rest
 Bestow on you: he thinks his job's to teach you what is best.²⁸

In order to be selected for entry into one of the two Athenian dramatic festivals, comic and tragic writers had to apply to one of the city archons (or 'magistrates'): to the archon eponymos for the City Dionysia, who controlled all aspects of civic life apart from military matters and religious ceremonies, and to the archon basileus for the Lenaia festival, who controlled public religious ceremonies. Their choices were obviously affected by artistic and political concerns, although how they reached their decisions is not known. These archons took office in mid-July; the Dionysia was held in late March, the Lenaia earlier, in January. Clearly, if application was made some six months before the production was to be mounted, the playwright would need at least a synopsis to submit. A play such as The Knights, in which a prominent politician was ridiculed, must have provoked some debate; nevertheless permission was granted to finance and mount the production.²⁹ The choregos, the sponsor who paid for the costuming and training of the chorus, was equally open for attack by the comic playwright. Antimachos is singled out by Aristophanes in The Acharnians; he had evidently been Aristophanes' choregos in 427 or 426 for The Banqueters and is criticized for not inviting the playwright to the feast he gave to celebrate the victory of the play in the competition.³⁰

Abuse of this sort must, however, be considered within the context of "a festival in a season of license", as George Meredith describes it, in which the playwright and his targets could (or in the case of the victims, had to) ignore social and political restraints: a "regulated license of plain-speaking" which the playwright could claim as his "inalienable right".³¹ Every Athenian who is known to have achieved political prominence between 445 and 385 was attacked and ridiculed in plays by Aristophanes and his contemporaries,

according to Dover.³² Nor was the abuse restricted to political practice, it was frequently personal: politicians are not only presented as self-seeking, dishonest and pompous, but also as ugly or diseased: Neocleides, the "politician whom no sighted man can outdo in thieving", and his attempt to cure his severe eye ailment are subjects for comedy in Wealth. This example is fairly mild, however. As McLeish notes, regarding an extended exchange of insults in The Knights, 'buggery' is a common Aristophanic metaphor for the manner in which politicians treat the citizens of Athens. Further instances of this metaphor are found in The Acharnians and The Clouds.³³

It could be argued that such insults were tolerated because there existed a distinction between the license permitted during the time of the dramatic festivals and the 'normal' life of Athens. In a similar vein, ridicule of the gods is common in comedy (the promiscuity of Zeus, Dionysus' cowardice, Hermes' gluttony), but clearly as part of the convention of comedy rather than as a general attitude. In 415 the Athenian government conducted an investigation into the mockery of the Eleusinian mysteries and the mutilation of statues of the gods, and some of those found guilty were executed.³⁴ But such abuse was also, one can assert, popular with audiences if the proliferation and repetition of abuse against individuals (and even against the spectators themselves) in the plays is considered. The comic playwright was not merely given license to ridicule, it was not simply expected, it was enjoyed, part of the criteria for success. McLeish states:

No ambitious playwright would go on for years writing material which his public totally disliked. Predictably slapstick, bawdy and lampooning of notorious individuals like Kleonymos ... come first; a marked vein of surrealist fantasy runs through all the plays; less predictably successful - but no less common, and therefore presumably what the audience wanted - are political caricature (often extremely subtle) and tragic parody, both of which need an audience of some sophistication.³⁵

Aristophanes' success as a 'popular' playwright indicates that he knew what his public expected. His primary aim was not reformation, it was to please his audience. Most critics agree with this statement; however critical disagreement exists concerning the extent to which, in addition to that primary aim, Aristophanes intended his plays to be

didactic or as vehicles for personal abuse.³⁶ It is tempting to infer that Aristophanes' ridicule of the Sophists was in keeping with the attitude of the average Athenian towards such movements and that the same could be said of the attitude to the other people or institutions frequently ridiculed. Presumably those ridiculed had to regard it as dictated by convention and to be expected within the confines of a festival. Presumably, too, the victims were meant to accept it with good humour, as Socrates did (though Cleon did not). If so, as William Arrowsmith points out, a conclusion of "moral irresponsibility" (or personal animosity) on the part of Aristophanes for his presentation of Socrates in The Clouds is somewhat difficult to accept.³⁷

Athens, at the time of the performance of The Clouds, had a relatively small population with the parochial tastes and interests of an enclosed community.³⁸ Naturally, then, prominent figures in politics (Cleon) or philosophy (Socrates) or the arts (Euripides) could expect to appear in the comedies, and as major characters. Allusions to local events, to minor personalities and current tastes had to be known to gain their satiric effect, had to be immediately discernible to the spectators, of concern to them, and so likely to sustain their interest, enjoyment and applause and thereby influence the judges in their decision. (The judges swore an oath to remain impartial but would obviously have been influenced by the popular response of the spectators.) From the personal insults of lesser-known individuals it would seem, as Peter D. Arnott contends, that the "smallest departure from the norm is potentially risible".³⁹ A citizen could be ridiculed for being a fat coward (Cleonymus) or for his thinness (Cleocritus), for his haircut (Cratinus) or his baldness (Aristophanes himself), even if he had difficulty controlling the plumes on his helmet (Pantakles). Except from the existing references of ancient scholars, it is impossible to know anything significant of Theognis, Moschus, Dexitheus or Chaeris, all mentioned in the opening lines of The Acharnians. Aristophanes is specific: in Ecclesiazusae (c.392), for example, the first woman points into the audience and states that she had caught sight of Epigonus (who although unknown, is, because of the context of the remark, being mocked for his effeminacy).⁴⁰ Such reference to, and address of, the spectators occurs

frequently in Aristophanes. It is reasonable to assume that such individuals were present at the performance; if not and they were well enough known, the actors could pretend to see them without damaging the comic effect of the reference. Similarly, Amynias is directly addressed in the opening of The Wasps (422) and the priest of Dionysus, by Dionysus himself, in The Frogs.

It is impossible to recover, despite the assistance of scholarship, the force and humour of the once-topical joke in performance. But, as Arnott indicates, the fact that "these apparently trivial characters and incidents are considered fit material for humour tells us much about the nature of Athenian society and the popular mode in comedy".⁴¹ When comedy became less political in its concerns and Athenian society more restricted (especially after defeat in the Peloponnesian war), the historical personages began to disappear from the stage. So too, as the role of the chorus became less prominent in the fourth-century plays, this type of public and individual abuse features less in the parabasis which had been, conventionally, the place for "large scale passages of formal abuse", according to Raymond K. Fisher.⁴²

Old Comedy was inseparably linked to the life of the polis (generally translated as 'city'); because of the social role of the artist in Athenian society, Aristophanes remains a sensitive (albeit often distorted for comic effect) mirror of his time. What can be asserted with confidence is that he, more so than the social and political historians, presents the actual texture and quality of life in Athens: every age and class is presented, every topic, public and private, is discussed, including sex, clothing, food, money, theatre. All the conflicts of the period are reflected: the war between Sparta and Athens and their 'allies', the rise of a politically active middle-class, the awareness of feminine individuality, the ambivalent attitudes towards Persian power, and significantly in relation to The Clouds, the controversy over education which placed the traditional values in opposition to the new Sophist thinking.⁴³ Clearly, too, Aristophanes ridicules the attitudes of more than one side in these polarities, exploiting them to comic effect; nor should an attack on one signify unqualified acceptance of the other.

If he was writing to please his audience as a 'body', Aristophanes could not risk alienating or boring sections of that audience by including topics of interest to a select minority. Although, as Walcot claims, that audience included "every shade of opinion, every range of ability, and every degree of knowledge", it was nonetheless "a homogeneous body".⁴⁴ Nor should the awareness of that audience be underestimated: The Frogs requires an extensive understanding of the works and techniques of Aeschylus and Euripides to be appreciated, which, one can presume, it must have been as it won the first prize. Even so, Aristophanes was conscious of maintaining a wide appeal, to the 'high' and 'low', as is stated in the following lines by the chorus-leader to the audience and judges in Ecclesiazusae:

Let the wise and philosophic
 choose me for my wisdom's sake.
 Those who joy in mirth and laughter
 choose me for the jests I make.⁴⁵

This summary of Aristophanes' method indicates why many 'faithful' translations fail to satisfy: in part because many of the jokes are untranslatable, the allusions obscure, the criticism not relevant. A further reason is one levelled at many satirists (and Aristophanes' plays, whatever other areas of the comic they employ, are inherently satiric in strategy): his comedies are a series of loosely related episodes, not 'well-made', and riddled with inconsistencies and absurdities. But 'plot' is secondary to the "wisdom" and "laughter": "Aristophanes begins with", as Kenneth Cavander states, "a central idea derived from a particular social or political fact of his day" which is extended and developed into a series of episodes, interspersed with song, dance and commentary with the intention of pleasing his audience.⁴⁶ In Aristophanes, as in satirical cabaret and revue, there are conventions of style and form, even to the type of humour the audience expects to witness. As such, while Aristophanes often criticizes his rival comic playwrights for coarse humour and disclaims the intention of reducing his work to their level, he introduces the same joke he has pretended is below him. To Cavander this is "the conclusive proof that he belonged to a truly popular theatre and that his instinct, above all, was to please".⁴⁷ And that joke could be as crude, as explicit and as scatological.

(Examples of Aristophanes' criticism of low humour in other playwrights are to be found in the parabases of The Clouds, The Wasps and Peace (421) and in the opening exchange of The Frogs. In the parabasis of Peace the Chorus-leader claims that Aristophanes has "given us works of art, great towering structures / Of words and thoughts, and jokes that are not vulgar" .⁴⁸)

The frequent and explicit reference to sexual activity and bodily functions in Aristophanes' comedies (in Ecclesiazusae the word 'shit' is used three times in a single sentence, yet it hardly ever occurs in other literature of the time), has led to the hypothesis that obscenity was both founded in the pre-dramatic rituals and also a form of humour acceptable within the license allowed comic playwrights, an integral part of comedy.⁴⁹ Once again, such frequency of occurrence indicates that it pleased the masses, not simply the 'groundlings', if Aristophanes' success as a playwright is any measure.

2.2 The lampoon seen

As indicated above, contemporary Athenians are often referred to in the comedies of Aristophanes. Many are simply mentioned as sources of humour, to underline a joke; the more prominent figures, however, are impersonated on stage, appearing as major characters involved in the action itself. The visual form of such impersonation raises various questions: were Socrates and Euripides presented as instantaneously recognizable portraits, or as generalized but familiar types, or as comic characters in themselves, so distorted from the originals that only the names are the connections? Or, as Katherine Lever suggests, does the answer lie "in accepting the paradox that they were both individuals and abstractions" .⁵⁰ In this sense they can be regarded as 'factions', combining elements from fact with fiction. Was Socrates, if the anecdote mentioned in the previous section is not merely apocryphal, standing so as to compare physical likenesses? If so, to what? The mask or the costume or the whole figure presented on the stage?

2.2.1 Masks as portrait-likenesses

The use of masks as portrait-likenesses, as visually recognizable images or caricatures of living persons to emphasize the aspect of personal lampoon, has aroused much scholarly debate, and the presence or absence thereof is a significant factor in evaluating the visual impact of the theatrical portrayal of actual historical personages.⁵¹ All agree that both actors and chorus wore masks, recognizably human in detail, but with some heightening of the features. (In this discussion, masks refer to a full mask which, in Greek theatre, covered the whole head, with apertures for eyes and mouth.) The use of the mask in Athenian theatre may have had its origins in religious ritual as masks were in existence before the development of drama, according to T.B.L. Webster, as a means of impersonation of gods and goddesses by priests and priestesses, as well as those worn by dancers and choruses.⁵² These functions of the mask are an anthropological commonplace. The mask transformed the priest from a mortal to an immortal being; so, too, the mask transformed the actor into a hero, king or queen. The origins of the dramatic mask, in Greek theatre can be, according to ancient sources, traced back to Thespis who himself represents various stages in its development, as he first used white lead, then leaves, and finally linen to disguise his face. The simulation of the human face on a mask is credited to Aeschylus by Horace, who calls him the inventor of the tragic mask. The inventor of the comic mask is not known, according to Aristotle. For both comedy and tragedy the mask is an emblem of Dionysus: it had (and still has) the power that transforms the person into the figure from legend or myth. The actor submitted himself to Dionysus' inspiration and shared in the god's power to transform.

In performance, on a more practical level, it was a convenient device to indicate to the spectators that, with a change in mask, the actor was now playing a different character. To this extent the mask (and costume) were the character. Without masks the convention of doubling or sharing parts among two or three (or four in some instances) actors could not be accomplished. Furthermore, the mask and costume were a convenient means of

changing gender, for the portrayal of female characters by male actors. (The masks were generally white for female characters and a dark red for males, with exceptions for humorous purposes, such as the First Woman in Ecclesiazusae who has "oiled herself" and "stood in the sun all day to get brown".⁵³)

The mask and costume as both elements of theatrical presentation and as connections between performer and character are exploited and parodied by Aristophanes, not only in, for example, the presentation of Dionysus in The Frogs which deals, to a large extent, with the development of a fully-fledged, integrated persona in a play about the elements and conventions and purpose of theatre, but also in his parody of Euripides' use of costume and disguise in the lost Telephus (438) within The Acharnians, partly to point to the different dramaturgical concerns of Euripides and Aristophanes himself, but also to the latter's own self-conscious use of costume as an element of his plays.⁵⁴ When Dicaeopolis approaches Euripides for a costume to 'disguise' himself as a suitable character and selects, from various ragged costumes, those which Euripides required for his Telephus, Aristophanes is satirizing Euripides' 'realism' (and possibly his reduction of an effective theatrical device into a cliché through overuse). But the costume also denotes more than what might be expected. To Muecke:

Costume here is the link between the poet and character, and it stands for the metamorphosis of actor into character effected by the dramatist. Disguise, being a doubling of the costume, calls attention to that transformation, which Aristophanes shows happening before our eyes as Dicaeopolis puts on the rags and acquires the other props for his performance of Euripides' Telephus. Aristophanes presents the assumption of disguise as an image of the actor's dressing in a costume and taking on a new character, or rather, he comically confuses the two transformations. His awareness of costume as costume easily leads him into the realm of the meta-theatrical.⁵⁵

The use of the mask has remained a self-conscious meta-theatrical device in itself. An actor wearing a mask is performing an act different in quality from the actor who disguises his face with make-up to portray a character: the latter, usually, does so to convince the audience that he has become a different persona, that he is something he is not, whereas the former is openly conceding that, for the performance, he can be seen to

be pretending to be something he is not. The assumption of the mask (even a portrait-mask) is an explicit acknowledgement of artifice, and serves to remind the audience of the fact of performance. (The same is as true of the use of masks in the lazzi of the commedia dell'arte and as employed by Brecht to enhance his Verfremdungseffekt in The Caucasian Chalk Circle (1954).) Masks, as with performance style, the limited number of performers, the continuous presence of the chorus are all features which, in the theatre of convention, avoid any notion of vraisemblance, and which indicate an implicit acceptance of the performance as performance.

In addition, the performer who wears a full mask is deprived of any use of changes in facial expression to reinforce characterization which is a major element of kinesics: it presents a person in a role rather than the changing aspects of a personality. Characters in Greek comedy and tragedy may laugh or weep or refer to facial expressions, but emotions are presented in the words, and through other aspects of kinesics (bodily gesture and posture), through paralanguage, the use of objects, proxemics and chronemics. This, too, is parodied by Aristophanes: Mnesilochus in Thesmophoriazusae hides his face (masked anyway) in a parody of Euripides' Helen in the play of that name (412), presented a year earlier.⁵⁶ Where specific references are made to changes in facial expression, they are accepted as part of the convention of wearing a mask in which changes in emotion are explicitly stated in the text: in Lysistrata, for instance, Calonice observes that Lysistrata is "knitting" her "eyebrows", and Lysistrata accuses the women: "You're all going pale - I can see tears!"⁵⁷

Furthermore, the immense size of the theatron dictated that subtle facial expression and physical gestures would not be visible to the entire audience. (The capacities of the Theatre of Dionysus (between fourteen and seventeen thousand) and that at Epidauros (approximately twenty thousand) are dwarfed by the Theatre at Ephesus which could accommodate fifty-six thousand.) Even those closest - the spectator in the 'priest's seat' in the first row at the Theatre of Dionysus - would find it difficult to discern all the

expressions of an unmasked performer some twenty metres distant (across the orchestra), standing in front of the skene, whereas a spectator in the last row of that theatre would be approximately ninety metres from the acting area. The mask, with its bright colouring and heightened expression, would assist in overcoming the disadvantages associated with distance, and outdoor, 'unlit' conditions, and would direct attention to the figure whose "constant ethos", in Taplin's description, it presents.⁵⁸ Even so, the emphasis in impersonation would clearly depend more on the clarity and projection of the performer's voice. The theory that the mouth aperture amplified the voice has been disproved, for this theatrical period at least. So too, action and gesture would have to be distinct and broad to convey meaning: because the masked actor cannot rely on facial expression to portray emotion, he must, as J. Michael Walton points out, utilize a "total physical expression to amplify his words".⁵⁹ One can assume, as Arnott does, from the combined evidence available (principally from the plays themselves), that a "repertoire of gestures that we would now consider operatic" existed, a repertoire designed to be "clear, meaningful and immediately comprehensible", to be learned as part of the performer's technique, and employed, as mask and costume were employed, to convey meaning".⁶⁰ The verbal and non-verbal aspects could not be separated: the masked performer has to (and had to) give greater emphasis to his whole body as it relates to the mask, so that each or any part is as graphic as any other. Walton describes this process clearly:

In a theatre as large as the Theatre of Dionysus, the unmasked actor might be able to see the whole audience. This the masked actor could not do. In compensation, the masked actor discovers that it is possible to relate the position of the head to the rest of the body, so that the whole head is given outline and meaning by the way in which it relates to neck, shoulder, torso and stance. The human figure becomes more indeed like a piece of sculpture, in which each line and curve complements the dominant emotion. The difference from a piece of sculpture is that the outline is fluid.⁶¹

In his production of Aeschylus' The Oresteia (458) which opened at the Olivier Theatre in London on 28 November 1981, Sir Peter Hall chose to present it as an all-male, masked presentation. The production was filmed and broadcast on the British Broadcasting Corporation's (BBC) Channel 4 on 9 October 1983, and seen by an estimated quarter of a million viewers. (As the recording was of the play in performance, relatively few changes

were made to suit the medium of television, though, naturally, what the viewer sees has been selected by the technicians involved.) Hall gave the most careful attention to 'Greek' conventions: besides the masks and all-male cast, this was observed in the setting, the anti-naturalistic language and the style of acting. But, in subordinating the action to the primacy of the spoken word, with every rhythm pointed up (the actors rehearsed with metronomes), the production remains an intensely aural experience with sustained visual tableaux rather than movement enhancing emotion. The chorus is basically static, a masked group that recites, and occasionally, sings the text, with movement restricted to rising and sitting and gesture confined, mainly, to arm movements. From the first rehearsals in mask technique, the assumption of the full mask was a preparation for the speaking of the text, which the actors had had to learn beforehand: "If you read in a mask you are a man reading a script," wrote Hall in his diary.⁶² Throughout the rehearsal process he had a preconceived notion of how he wanted the "project to be, to look, to sound".⁶³ Despite the fact that Tony Harrison, the translator, stated in a note to the published text that it "is written to be performed, a rhythmic libretto for masks, music and an all-male company", and is a considerable accomplishment in itself, in performance the musically controlled rhythms become mechanical, almost hypnotically so.⁶⁴ The dangers of such an approach are, in viewing the production, apparent: when sound dominates sight, as Walton states, the mask is the loser.⁶⁵ Taplin, who admired the production, had himself warned of this approach when he wrote that all too often what is said in Greek plays is regarded as more significant than what is seen, so that "Greek tragedy is often thought of as static, verbal, ... alien".⁶⁶ To some extent, Hall's production of The Oresteia reinforced, and in viewing, continues to reinforce, these unfortunate views.

The few surviving representations of fifth-century masks (on vase paintings) suggest that they were in keeping with other conventions of performance, such as movement and gesture: simplicity and heightening. The highly exaggerated, stylized masks with large gaping mouths and high foreheads, which has become familiar from terra-cotta models was, in fact, a later development.⁶⁷ Though this is true of tragic masks, the masks used in

Old Comedy were designed to point up the grotesque qualities of the characters and were exaggerated in keeping with this feature. The manufacture of the masks of Old Comedy was, Laura M. Stone claims, both refined and flexible so that comic grotesquery as well as accurate caricature could be produced. From scholars such as Stone it would seem, then, that Aristophanes would employ both the exaggerated visages associated with Old Comedy as well as recognizable, but comic, portrait-masks on stage at the same time.

A consideration of portrait-masks for particular individuals might be aided by an examination of portraiture in art in Aristophanes' lifetime; it must be acknowledged, however, that while the observations made are true of portraiture it does not necessarily mean that the theatre artists (designers and mask-makers) used identical techniques and approaches. From the remains of the funerary reliefs, which were sculpted from the middle of the sixth century to the end of the fourth, the persons depicted by the artists have a remarkable similarity: the "same generalized and symbolical mode of expression", according to R.P. Hinks.⁶⁸ Of actual portraiture there exists hardly a trace. In such funerary portraits was exhibited a

tendency to dwell upon the past rather than to provide for the future, to regard as piety the remembrance of something gone rather than the service of something present, [which] explains why the classical art of Greece idealized the man in general terms instead of fastening upon his accidental characteristics; and why the portrait, as we know it ... appears so late in Greece.⁶⁹

Rather than creating specific likenesses, the Greek artists of this period aimed to present the type rather than the actual, to embody the character in what Hinks describes as "a collection of traits" instead of an exact portrait.⁷⁰ This has a bearing on Aristophanes' mode of characterization, his satiric method, if not the masks which his performers would wear to portray specific individuals. Even the existing copies of portrait-busts made of the four playwrights whose plays have survived (Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides and Aristophanes, that is) cannot be considered as exact likenesses. It was only in the fourth century, and the subsequent 'Hellenistic' period, that realistic portraiture, in the sense of an accurate representation of an historic personality, as an artistic genre, developed. John

Barron contrasts the change in outlook by designating the period c.450 - 380 as "Classical Idealism" (the final play we have of Aristophanes, Wealth, was produced in 388; critics are divided, however, as to whether it remains, in essence, an example of Old Comedy, though it has indications that a transition to New Comedy may be discerned), and that from c.380 - 300 as "Fourth Century Naturalism".⁷¹ In the period following the decline of Old Comedy, portrait-masks were less frequently used, and the masks of the fictional characters gradually became more life-like and less grotesque, as the concerns of New Comedy began to demand a different type of characterization.

This demarcation would be supported by G.M.A. Richter, who maintains that the idealizing tendency of the second half of the fifth century retarded the "realistic" trend, and that it was only in the fourth century that the idealizing conception that characterized the earlier portraits began to wane.⁷² Despite this, she does assert, but without textual evidence, that portraits were included on theatre masks (for Socrates, Aeschylus and Euripides) which, she claims, "however conventionalized and caricatured", must have been sufficiently like the originals "to have been recognized by the audience".⁷³ But portraiture and visual caricature depend for success on their resemblance to the subject, and a realistic likeness in a mask would, in the Theatre of Dionysus, not have had impact beyond the first rows of spectators.

2.2.2 Textual support for portrait-masks

Nevertheless, evidence from the plays must also be considered, as there are indications in the text to support the view that portrait-masks were worn on stage. In The Knights Aristophanes makes his most explicit allusion to the use of such a mask. Paphlagonian has won Demos over and gained control of his household. The political and satiric parallel and meaning of the action is apparent (to the Athenian audience, at least): Demos, the old householder, is 'the people' of Athens, themselves; Paphlagonian is the

demagogue, Cleon, and the two slaves, Nicias and Demosthenes are the two generals who Cleon slandered and whose achievements he assumes as his own. Demosthenes prepares the Sausage-Seller (and the audience) for Paphlagonian's entrance with the reassurance:

In any case, you wont see Cle ... er, HIM
 In person. The mask-makers were all too scared
 To model him. But everyone sitting here
 Will recognize him. No one here's a fool.⁷⁴

Stone cites the scholiast's comments on this passage: "It was the custom in comedies to make masks resembling those who were lampooned, so that they were recognizable, and to place these [masks] on the actors".⁷⁵ From this it would seem reasonable to deduce that portrait-masks were an accepted feature of the presentation of living persons. If, as discussed in the first section of this chapter, ridicule and abuse of particular individuals is an element of Aristophanic comedy (if not Old Comedy, as Aristophanes claims in the parabasis of The Clouds), then physical caricature would conform to the verbal lampooning and the emphasis on personal humour present in the texts, and would have increased the audience's enjoyment of such humour. The fact that Paphlagonian is not wearing a portrait-mask is through the fear, not of Aristophanes, but of those who manufacture the masks. Aristophanes' own fear of reprisal is unlikely, as The Knights treats Cleon (in the guise of Paphlagonian) with such abuse that the use or absence of a portrait-mask would not detract from the attack; indeed, he is actually named by the knights further in the play:

For everyone that's here,
 One thing they'll all agree on:
 They'll greet with cheer on cheer
 The overthrow of Cleon!⁷⁶

Dover believes that Aristophanes did not use a portrait-mask because Cleon's face was unremarkable, so that the mask would not be instantly recognizable, and that, by not having a likeness, he was free to express his own attitude to Cleon by making Paphlagonian's mask "hideous in the extreme".⁷⁷ Thus, to Dover, Aristophanes emphasizes this humorously, for Demosthenes states that the mask-makers were too afraid

to manufacture a mask that is more than hideous, and something more than hideous would be Cleon. The extremely grotesque features of the character who represents him is reinforced by the grotesque quality of his actions in the play. A political cartoonist requires something unusual in appearance or habit about the subject to develop in a cartoon, and in a society in which beards were usual (in Aristophanes' plays the unshaved are frequently associated with effeminacy), no one wore spectacles or smoked a pipe or cigar, this form of portraiture cannot always have been simple to produce. Obviously, too, visual caricature of this type depends for its effect on the visual similarity to the original's appearance, which suggests that only the most unusual elements of physical appearance could be included, and elements generally known by most Athenians.

In addition, the technical requirements of a mask itself, including larger than human apertures for the mouth and eyes, would have made individualized treatment most difficult. Portrait-masks, then, could (if they were) be manufactured only if there was something remarkable in the subject's face which could be reproduced on the mask after the requirements of the eye and mouth aperture were fulfilled, and after the conventional beard and dark hair (most Athenian men were not only bearded but had dark hair) had been included.⁷⁸ While the use of bold paint on the original plastered linen of the masks would allow greater accentuation of all features and while the length and shape of the nose and placement of the cheekbones might have lent themselves to caricature as well, it must be remembered, once again, that subtle details would not be visually discernible to many spectators in Aristophanes' mass audience. As with the portrait-mask, so too with the costume, where a symbolic association (such as rags for Euripides in The Acharnians) cannot be completely discounted, but would have to have been visually strong to convey meaning.

Finally, then, the reference to a 'likeness' of Cleon suggests that the actors who impersonated individuals would wear an appropriate mask of some sort, but the style of portrait sculpture in this period indicates that this would not necessarily entail, or indeed

could entail, an exact replica of those individual's facial features. Unfortunately there is little archaeological or further textual evidence: of the other significant historical personages present in the surviving texts (including Socrates, Aeschylus, Euripides, Lamachus and Cleonymus) there are no textual references which explicitly connect their portrayal on stage with portrait-masks. To this must be added the point that Aristophanes tends to include verbal references to enhance the identification, and leaves his audience in no doubt as to who is being impersonated. As Lever indicates, fifty-one of the eighty-six characters in the extant plays are named within ten lines before or after entry.⁷⁹ Those not named are either unimportant or so important that names are not essential. And where pseudonyms are assumed, the association is also clarified, as between Cleon and Paphlagonian, as soon and as often as possible: in The Knights Cleon's military success at Pylos (which he claimed as his rather than the general Demosthenes'), his stock-in-trade (tanning ox hides) and his nickname ('The Dog'), his supporters (Thuphanes and Phanus) are all referred to to make the identification as strong as possible.⁸⁰

2.2.3 Type-mask and type-costume

What is apparent from a reading of the extant Aristophanic corpus is the notion that certain 'type' characters (apart from the direct presentation of individuals, though there are very strong similarities between the 'real' and the 'type') definitely existed (including farmers, slaves, sycophants, informers and soldiers), and there are indications that such characters were masked and costumed in keeping with the concept of a comic stereotype. Ancient sources (Pollux is one such source) state that playwrights could draw their masks from a common stock: forty-two types have been identified, which would add credence to those scholars who contradict the notion of portrait-masks.⁸¹ From Cornford's research, it would seem that a set of conventions (somewhat rudimentary rather than rigidly defined) regarding the visual appearance of general masks did exist, and that those conventions facilitated the identification by the spectators of the gender, status and age of the mask-

wearer, whilst still allowing a degree of individuality. The unsympathetic characters, those who bear the names of historical personages, Cornford regards as alazones (as he argues that they "are all of them touched with some form of pretentiousness, swagger, conceit") who would wear, not a portrait-mask, but "one or another of a definite set of stock masks", as they conform to the traits of those masks.⁸² Among those he identifies are the Swashbuckler (for Aeschylus and Lamachus), the Learned Doctor (for Euripides and Socrates) and the Parasite (for Cleon). Other researchers, including Stone, argue that a stock system existed in New, not Old Comedy, however.

Similarly, while the evidence is, as with masks, confused and contradictory, it would appear that there existed a conventional comic costume (tights over heavy padding and a tunic cut very short to reveal the phallus), but that a 'character' costume (which probably included a longer or full-length chiton which would have concealed the phallus) could be worn by such characters as Aeschylus and Euripides in The Frogs, possibly the full-length tragic actors' garments associated with tragedy, appropriately, and which Aeschylus refers to when criticizing Euripides for dressing his characters in rags.⁸³ If so, it would seem reasonable to assume that historical personages could have worn costumes in keeping with the types presented by stock masks.

The treatment of three known individuals (Euripides, Agathon and Cleisthenes) as they are impersonated in Thesmophoriazusaë will indicate how they could have been differentiated in mask and costume. Euripides attempts to persuade Agathon to attend the women's meeting (the title means 'Women at the Thesmophoria', the annual festival, attended by women only, in honour of the goddess of soil-fertility, Demeter) and defend him against charges of, principally, speaking ill of womankind. It would be possible, Euripides argues, because whereas he has "grey hair and a beard", Agathon is "fair-complexioned, clean shaven".⁸⁴ Clearly, Agathon is wearing a white, unbearded mask and a yellow or saffron costume (yellow dresses were regarded as particularly seductive). No doubt it was a full-length chiton, concealing his phallus, as is evident from and gives added humour to

Mnesilochus' lines: "What are you - a man? Then where's your cloak? Where are your shoes? And what have you done with your tool? But if you're a woman, what's happened to your bosom?"⁸⁵

There is disagreement among scholars as to whether Aristophanes' actors wore the phallus, but the text demands it in places (as in Lysistrata). Arthur W. Pickard-Cambridge believes, from its representation in vase-painting, that it was grotesque and not at all 'realistic': such grotesqueness made Old Comedy obviously "unreal", Chapman argues, and this explains, perhaps, the latitude comic playwrights enjoyed in presenting behaviour not permitted in "real life".⁸⁶ In keeping with the confusion of sexuality underlying this exchange, the mask, too, would have been an exception to the conventional colour code (that of white faces for female characters - the pallor of Athenian women, attested in vase-painting, was due, perhaps, to their lives spent indoors and enhanced by cosmetics such as white lead - and dark red for males), to emphasize Agathon's effeminacy.

In comedies where women were not only played by men, but in which transvestism is a recurring theme, such a colour code would provide an instant point of reference to the audience, and assist in distinguishing the male actor portraying a male character in female disguise (as Mnesilochus does in Thesmophoriazusae) from the male actor as a female character (such as the First Woman, Micca, the wife of Cleonymus) in the same play. The presentation of both Agathon and Cleisthenes, who is evenly more markedly transvestite (he is mistaken for a woman by the chorus of Athenian women when he first enters), suggests, contends Stephen Halliwell, that their exaggeratedly feminine visual presentation is "the type, not a particular likeness, which the audience is expected to appreciate", especially since there are no indications in the text to any individual portrayal or caricature in their masks.⁸⁷ Though he may have worn the same garment as he would later in The Frogs, there is no trace in this text of any noteworthy physical likeness to Euripides employed for satirical purposes.

More surprisingly, Aristophanes does not, in the presentation of Socrates in The Clouds, make use of any of the contemporary references to his appearance which would have been easier to caricature than was the case with Cleon: Socrates was, apparently, a Silenus-like figure, with prominent eyes and a snub-nose.⁸⁸ In The Symposium, Alcibiades describes Socrates as "exactly like" both Silenus and a particular satyr, a description Socrates is invited to, but does not, refute.⁸⁹ As to ease of caricature, Dover argues to the contrary: Socrates' features were, he states, the "common elements of gross caricature", and therefore a mask-maker would have found it exceedingly difficult to produce a caricature without exaggerating the features out of all proportion, to distinguish this from most other comic masks, which were already exaggerated.⁹⁰ And even if these distinctive features could have been incorporated on a portrait-mask, and were one used, Aristophanes adds no verbal comment on them in the text itself.

If a type-mask was worn by the actor, it would have been pale or even yellow, for there are numerous textual references to the pallor of Socrates and his students, from time spent indoors, studying.⁹¹ Stone suggests that the differences between the negative terms associated with the colour of the complexions of philosophers and the more positive terms applied to female complexion may have been reflected on the masks, so that those of the philosophers were yellowish, while those of all female characters, as well as the effeminate, were white.⁹² (Chaerephon, one of Socrates' earliest and most ardent followers, is here and elsewhere (in The Wasps) described as having such a complexion.⁹³) The question as to whether the performer who played Socrates wore a portrait-mask has to, for lack of definite evidence, remain open.

The costume worn to present Socrates would, in all probability, have been in keeping with the general view of philosophers as emaciated, unwashed, barefoot and short of clothing. Such views are supported in the text, particularly by Strepsiades.⁹⁴ It is reinforced visually, too, in that Strepsiades, on entering the 'school', has to divest himself of such extraneous comforts as shoes and cloak. Clearly this was the general attitude to

philosophers, employed by the other comic poets, one of many visual stock-jokes, familiar to audiences through repetition, but nevertheless containing an element of truth, since otherwise humour of this caricatured form would fail to make its effect. The Clouds is aimed at and exploits the average Athenian's stereotyped view of philosophy, philosophers and science in general. Socrates, the real man, the non-fictional personage, is hardly referred to: his walk is mentioned, but nothing of his features or his personal life, not even what would have been a potentially rich comic point of reference, Socrates' shrewish wife Xanthippe.

The ridicule is aimed, then, at Socrates' profession, so that Aristophanes attributes to him attitudes in keeping with a generalized and negative stereotype, in keeping with and suited to his presentation as an unsympathetic character, as referred to in Chapter 1. If philosophy is generally regarded as not only impractical, and irrelevant to 'ordinary' life, but also, and even more negatively, seen as a threat to 'traditionally' held moral and religious values, then such attributes would be expected in the presentation of a philosopher-type. The repetition becomes a stock-mask in itself, and answers any allegations of personal dislike in the ridicule, as it is shown to be generalized and conventional. Private and public ridicule is not only a stock theme in Aristophanes, but the kind of criticism itself conforms to certain stock types: accusing rivals of crudity or lack of originality, politicians of bribery or embezzlement, the citizen body of gullibility and litigiousness; hence, to Fisher these "off-stage objects of ridicule are themselves stock masks requiring their own standardized treatment".⁹⁵ It is, Dryden noted in his Discourse Concerning the Original and Progress of Satire (1693), relatively "easy" to create lampoons or write invective, to call a man a "rogue and villain", but much more difficult "to make a man appear a fool, a blockhead, or a knave, without using any of these opprobrious terms".⁹⁶ Aristophanes does both, by verbal and visual means.

2.3 The lampoon heard

Halliwell contends that Aristophanes' form of satiric attack does not focus on particular features or traits, that his fundamental procedure is rather to alter the nominally real individual into an easily recognizable and exaggerated type, a type that can be more easily appreciated by a large, popular audience.⁹⁷ This does not mean that characters are so distorted that the name is the only clue to identity or that such fictional characterization excludes the possibility of a greater degree of individualization for certain characters. They are 'factional' creations. But, as Halliwell argues, "the main thrust of this type of satire is towards the simplification and exaggeration of salient characteristics, and ultimately towards the assimilation of the individual to a generalized or typical comic conception".⁹⁸ That is, they tend more to fiction than fact.

If Halliwell is correct, then it is conceivable to state that, as the characters in general represent or conform to types, it follows that the basic comic conflict in Aristophanes is centred in the confrontation of opposing types and opposing sets of values. As such, there are sets of antitheses in his plays, antitheses which are the value systems exemplified in and embodied by the characters.⁹⁹ The principal target of The Clouds would, initially, appear to be Socrates, but he is, however, deliberately employed as a comic representative of intellectual, not merely sophistic, fraud, an embodiment to highlight the antitheses and opposing values of the play: old and new, tradition and innovation, country and city, peace and war. These polarized issues are incorporated in all the extant comedies, as Arrowsmith states, "locked in a life-and-death struggle for the soul of Athens".¹⁰⁰

Such antitheses are included, thematically and structurally in the 'contest' or agon of Aristophanes' comedies, a contest which, as Cornford hypothesizes, as with abuse and ridicule, originated in older festivals, in the annual ritual combat between the partisans of summer and winter in the rites of autumn or spring. Whatever the origins, however, the agon is frequently a similar life-and-death conflict, at its most literal, perhaps in The

Frogs, where the literary contest is between two dead playwrights to select one to return to life, and save a dying Athens. The survival of Athens is a recurring motif in the extant corpus. Though there is often an element of ironic fantasy associated with this theme, the repetition indicates the importance thereof: the Clouds hope that the affairs of the city will improve, the Wasps espouse the benefits they have brought upon the city, Agoracritus (in The Knights) and Trygaeus (in Peace) are hailed as saviours of the city, Lysistrata and Praxagora attempt to rescue the city from its mismanagement by men.¹⁰¹ In The Wasps Aristophanes is, in the parabasis, himself described as "a benefactor" and "a champion" who will "cleanse and purge [the] city".¹⁰² (Such claims of a reformatory function are discussed in the final section of this chapter.)

2.3.1 Socrates: the lampoon of the philosopher-type

The primary antithesis in The Clouds is that between the Old Education (here exemplified by the traditional values of properties families, in outdoor sports such as gymnastics and physical health, and the morals and manners and the correct attitudes that accompany these values) and the New (exemplified by false argument, trickery, banal scientific theories, self-assured immorality, and an indoor, pale complexion), and the rustic, practical and 'traditional' contrasted with the urban, intellectual and 'modern' (as a consequence of the Peloponnesian war which must have contrasted these two - country and city - by juxtaposition, with large numbers of rural people obliged to seek refuge in Athens for protection; Strepsiades is himself an old farmer compelled by the war to take up residence in the city). Paradoxically, a member of the younger generation (Pheidippides) is opposed to the New education, while his father (Strepsiades) supports it. Whether Aristophanes believed Socrates to be part of the New, the Sophist movement, or whether he was familiar with Socrates' own beliefs (and these questions inform much of the scholarly criticism of The Clouds and the 'Socratic Problem') are, to Halliwell, issues which are "independent of the satirical techniques used to create the dramatic character of Socrates".¹⁰³

Socrates is the dramatic emblem of not only the New education or the Sophists, but of philosophers in general, in his appearance and in what he says. As such, the doctrines of Protagoras, Anaxagoras, Diagoras, Gorgias, Prodikus, among others, are ascribed to Socrates and his school.¹⁰⁴ The Clouds is, however, the text of a play intended for performance (and originally, a single performance), no more; it is not a documentary source on Athenian education and philosophy in principle and practice. To fully distinguish Socrates from his contemporaries remains an impossible task.¹⁰⁵

Strepsiades begs his son to enrol at The Thinkery for explicitly stated reasons: "If you pay them well, they can teach you how to win your case - whether you're in the right or not".¹⁰⁶ The audience at the original performance would have been at once reminded more of Protagoras (the formulator of the 'Doctrine of the Two Logics') and of the Sophists' claim to instruct their pupils in the art of persuasive speech for fees, than of Socrates, without Aristophanes having mentioned either by name. Aristophanes is ridiculing the general, rather than the particular, but, for effect, the particular who is perhaps the most well-known has to embody the ideas and attitudes and faults of the general. His scope is as wide as Strepsiades' extravagant claim for the school: it deals, he says, with "all the knowledge in the world".¹⁰⁷ Strepsiades, in giving his son a reason for enrolling at The Thinkery, is preparing the audience for the action of the play, and to underline the point, if the audience has not grasped it yet, he reiterates his purpose:

They say they have two Arguments in there - Right and Wrong, they call them - and one of them, Wrong, can always win any case, however bad. Well, if you can learn this Argument or whatever it is, don't you see, all those debts I've run into because of you, I needn't pay anyone an obol of them ever.¹⁰⁸

The plan Strepsiades proposes is, of course, not only nonsensical and illogical, but also corrupt (his name is derived from 'twisting' or 'wriggling') and to associate it with the New learning is to make that new learning appear nonsensical, illogical and corrupt as well. Inversion and incongruity develop rapidly to create an 'upside-down' world: the father/son relationship is reversed; the younger rejects the New while the older supports it; the rustic farmer who was never "brainy" and has hardly "any memory" must not only

study the sophistications of "logic-chopping and hair-splitting", but be its spokesman and exemplar.¹⁰⁹

The first appearance of Strepsiades' instructor in this 'logic' is a forceful visual image. Aristophanes intends to make it an apt visual pun and as surprising and comic as possible, given the technical resources of his theatre: Socrates does not enter through the skene (the most probable location for The Thinkery) as would be expected, but swings into view above, suspended on or from the mechane or crane, which could swivel out laterally from the roof of the skene. The similarity with the use of the mechane for the deus ex machina (literally, 'god from the machinery') of tragedy (particularly by Euripides) is significant: Socrates is immediately recognized as being detached from the earth and earthly concerns, as having his 'head in the clouds' (which prepares the audience for the later entrance of the clouds themselves), besides impiously associating himself with the gods.

The specious nature of the teaching in this school is discredited by Socrates himself: he claims that the Clouds are the source of nourishment of "the brains of the whole tribe of Sophists" and also, damningly, "the prophets and teachers of medicine and other such dirty long-haired weirdies - anyone in fact, so long as he doesn't do any useful work".¹¹⁰ Aristophanes is ridiculing all intellectual pretentiousness, not merely Socrates and the Sophists. The Clouds are the source and symbol of the nebulous thinking and their qualities, as enumerated, are insubstantiality, airiness and, as 'new' divinities, they are linked to the vague and ambiguous atheism, rhetoric and logic of specious intellectualism. (Characters in plays by Aristophanes do ridicule the many absurdities pertaining to the 'traditional' ideas concerning the gods - in The Birds they are easily deposed - without ever denying their existence or that of the 'new' divinities, which was later included in the charges against Socrates. Here Socrates claims of the Clouds: "They really are the only gods you know. The rest are rubbish."¹¹¹)

Arrowsmith maintains that the only "major structural flaw in the play is the abrupt change in the role of the Chorus ... when the Clouds suddenly reveal they are actually celestial agents provocateurs masking as the patrons of the Sophists".¹¹² Yet, clearly, this is part of their quality as clouds: they are infinitely changeable, suggestive of delusion and, more importantly, self-delusion, altering their attitude and behaviour to suit whoever they encounter. They are in no doubt that Socrates is a "high priest of the subtlest rubbish", and end this, their first direct address to Socrates, with the ambiguous and ominous line: "Whatever mischance or evil may befall you."¹¹³ As clouds cannot help but change, so too with the Clouds, and as said of Aristophanic fantasy in Chapter 1, they are presented as 'real' clouds with precise geographical locations, referring to themselves as living in the air, and associated with thunder and lightning. Strepsiades' confusion, his inability to differentiate between the Clouds as abstractions and as embodied on the stage before him and the audience, men dressed as women, serves to heighten the comic confusion of 'illusion' and 'reality'. Their garments were probably delicate and transparent with billowing sleeves, but there is, as Stone points out, no textual evidence that they resemble clouds more than this, or that they wore distinctive masks.¹¹⁴

To add to Strepsiades' confusion, the Clouds give him advice which is contrary to that Socrates has given (they advocate a life of hard work), in keeping with their image of being consistently contradictory. It is the audience's awareness of this inconsistency, allied to the fact that the action will consist of Socrates' attempts to educate Strepsiades and the escalations and reversals which are bound to take place, which Aristophanes exploits for comic effect. His purpose in The Clouds is then, not to convince his audience of the faults of Socrates, but to bring together Strepsiades, Pheidippides and Socrates to see what will occur, comically and dramatically, when these three, each in his own way a fool, interact and conflict.¹¹⁵ If Socrates is a symbol of intellectual fraudulence, Strepsiades can only be duped because he too was corrupt before he enrolled at The Thinkery: both the New and the Old are corrupt, and if Strepsiades is Aristophanes' comic symbol of that corruption, then Socrates is a symptom of it. Pheidippides'

behaviour is equally questionable: in the past he was a cause of his father's bankruptcy, now he beats his father and proposes justifications for the same treatment of his mother.

From the arguments presented by Right and Wrong in the agon it is equally apparent that neither is morally superior. The dialectical arguments and logical ingenuity are as Strepsiades would view them, and the fact that Wrong wins is consistent with the Sophists' claim to manipulate logic. That it is a victory for Wrong (or False logic or Sophistry), and that it is, as Fisher points out, "seen to be no worse than the disreputable Better Argument, is of a piece with the ambiguous nature of the chorus and the confused morality" of the whole play.¹¹⁶ The agon is a contest, in fact, between two wrongs; to underline this fact, the outcome does not influence the subsequent events. In the first version of The Clouds, the two rival arguments were costumed as fighting-cocks, brought on stage in "wicker cages", according to a scholiast.¹¹⁷ Following this, translators of the extant, revised version such as McLeish and Arrowsmith, suggest that Right and Wrong be dressed as wrestlers, but with tail-feathers and crested rooster-masks. Although there is no textual evidence to support this visual presentation in The Clouds, not only does it occur elsewhere (Pisthetairos and Euelpides would appear in a similar costume after their acceptance by the birds in the comedy of that name) but it would heighten the satiric humour as the rivals, while representing abstractions, are seen as half-human, half-bird, have 'human' pretensions and weaknesses, and the 'ethical' standpoints they propound become more and more suspect, more inhuman in fact.

Both Socrates and Strepsiades are punished, and the new divinity, the Clouds, have, as agents of Zeus, caused such punishment. The Clouds concludes not with the revelry of the 'traditional' komos, which would hardly be appropriate as no regeneration is possible in this moral confusion (and which, it could be surmised, may have been a factor in its placing in the competition). The play, as Aristophanes claims in the parabasis of the revised version, was too subtle, "unworthily defeated" as it was by "vulgar works of vulgar men".¹¹⁸ The Clouds is more than negative abuse of Socrates, or the Sophists, or

the New (and Old) Education. It is also more than a satire. It is a "dramatic confrontation of cultural change itself, the pain and confusion of transition", claims Reckford, who judges it "our first extant comedy of ideas".¹¹⁹

McLeish believes that a part of the catharsis (the 'cleansing') "provided by comedy arises from the debunking of authority - but it does not follow that real authority is seriously weakened by such debunking, or that the playwright intended it to be", so that the intention is ridicule rather than reformation as such.¹²⁰ Aristophanes is not concerned with the reformation of Socrates; his fictional 'Socrates' is a creation, a popular and generalized type who can hardly be reformed. The use of a name from the world of 'reality' enhances the topicality of the lampoon. If it is distorted, it is to be understood as distortion: as Arrowsmith contends, "The comedy lies in the disparity between the known truth and the degree of distortion achieved."¹²¹ And, as with Socrates, so with Euripides: the comic presentation of Euripides is enhanced because it is, and is to be perceived as, a fiction, a type created and personified from the material the non-fictional Euripides created, a 'factional' creation.

2.3.2 Euripides: the lampoon of the tragedian-type

Though the celebrated tragedian Agathon is presented in Thesmophoriazusae, and Aristophanes frequently ridicules his rival comic playwrights - in the same play he likens their characters to their poetry: "Ugly Philocles writes ugly poetry, and the evil Xenocles writes evil poetry and the insipid Theognis writes insipid poetry" - but without presenting them on stage (in the surviving plays, that is), his chief interest was not in a rival, but in Euripides.¹²² At a conservative estimate, Aristophanes quotes from, parodies or alludes to forty plays by Euripides.¹²³ Such allusions extend even to Euripides' use of stagecraft: the use of the mechane by Euripides is referred to in almost every instance in which Aristophanes himself uses it. So fascinated was he by Euripides' ideas and style that a

contemporary comic playwright, Cratinus, coined the term 'Euripidaristophanizein' to describe this association, and did so in the play which defeated The Clouds, Pytine in 423.¹²⁴ The association is, of course, unfavourable as it implies that Aristophanes had been transformed into the 'intellectual' and 'modern' Euripides, using oversubtle and clever sophistry.

In the surviving works, Euripides appears in Aristophanes' first extant play The Acharnians in a minor role, next as a major character in Thesmophoriazusae and finally, also as a major character, in The Frogs (a year - or two - after the death of the tragedian). There are no references in these texts of the actors portraying Euripides wearing a portrait-mask: the only explicit reference to his features is that of his having grey hair and a beard in Thesmophoriazusae (quoted earlier).

The character of Euripides is, in all three plays, a fiction created from the substance and features of his own works. Aristophanes exploits the notion that an author's work is a reflection of himself and hence transforms the "stylistic and dramatic features" of the plays into "traits" of his nature, according to Halliwell.¹²⁵ Euripides is made to speak, most often, in an idiolect created from the discourse of his own characters (and does so almost wholly in The Acharnians). In Thesmophoriazusae Aristophanes presents and exploits an additional dimension: he develops the action on two of the recurring stock-jokes regarding Euripides (his supposed misogyny and his improbable, convoluted plots, accusations levelled at him once again in The Frogs). Thesmophoriazusae presents not only the first of these stock-jokes in action, but the 'plot' of the comedy is itself convoluted, fashioned largely from parodies of scenes and theatrical devices from three Euripidean tragedies: Alcestis (438), Hippolytus (428) and, in particular, Helen (with additional material derived from his lost Stheneboia, Phoinix and Andromeda).

Neither Aristophanes, nor his Athenian audience it can be assumed, regarded the 'Euripides' of these plays as a serious biography. The character is a personification of

Euripidean tragedy and presenting Euripides ‘himself’ on the stage embodies the concept of ‘parodying Euripides’. He speaks in the manner of a character from his own plays and characteristic features of his plays are comically transformed into aspects of his character.¹²⁶ In Thesmophoriazusae Euripides and Mnesilochus use Euripidean plays to escape a situation brought about by the non-fictional playwright Euripides. The two characters perform as a double-act to parody the original Euripides’ works, to the extent that Euripides the woman-hater has to perform the role of a woman. Added irony would have been given to Euripides’ impersonations in the rescue scenes if the actor had worn a portrait-mask of Euripides.

As a stock-type Euripides is, like Socrates, the Learned Doctor, intellectual, arrogant, aloof from ordinary men and their concerns. As Reckford states, this is not merely casual slander; it suggests that he (like Socrates) has placed himself outside, or above, society.¹²⁷ The two characters are associated in their concerns by Aristophanes himself. In The Frogs, once Dionysus has selected Aeschylus rather than Euripides the winner of the literary agon, the chorus commend that choice as correct, sensible, for the good of Athens (and Hades) and as a rejection of Socrates: in relation to Aeschylus, whom, unlike Euripides, Aristophanes does not associate with the Sophists

How different is Socrates
 And his sophistic school
 Of Tragic Art. There, if you please,
 The smart twist is the rule.
 The Sisters Nine,
 The craft divine,
 Languish in clever phrases,
 While tasteless lips
 Pollute with quips
 Our placid public places.¹²⁸

Bruno Snell asserts from the above that Aristophanes believed that the Sophist philosophers and Euripides were responsible for the demise of the art of tragedy for, if the function of playwriting is, as expressed in The Frogs, to make men into better citizens, then Euripides has dissipated and destroyed them:

In the earlier plays he [Aristophanes] holds Euripides up to ridicule, but it is in his Frogs that his criticism becomes a matter of principle. He accuses him of corrupting the Athenians, poisoning the patriotic spirit of the citizenry, and advancing the cause of immorality. The long dead Aeschylus, solemn and respected, ... had answered to a moral demand: that genuine poetry makes better men of us (1008ff.). The Sophists also claimed to be able to make men better, but according to the view of Aristophanes they merely corrupted the youth. This judgement he transfers to Euripides whatever the differences between Euripides, Socrates and the Sophists, in Aristophanes they are indistinguishable.¹²⁹

As Socrates in his way was viewed as a catalyst for change, so was Euripides, who exemplified the force and rigour of the New in a popular medium: the older traditions of democracy, family and religion are scrutinized, consciously and often negatively in his plays, in the same manner in which in Socrates' teaching those same traditions are subjected to the scrutiny of logic.¹³⁰ It was Socrates who claims, in The Republic, that "most people think that tragedy is full of wisdom and Euripides is at the head of it".¹³¹ Cornford, as mentioned earlier, identifies both Socrates and Euripides as "archpriest[s] of cleverness", and the stock-mask he proposes they wore as that of the Learned Doctor.¹³² It is a matter of no wonder then that Aristophanes treats both in the same way, and that, as Reckford contends, in The Clouds and The Frogs, "he goes beyond satire to deal with deeper issues, of cultural and educational change, to which Socrates' teaching and Euripides' writing point".¹³³

The reason for the choice of Aeschylus rather than Euripides in The Frogs needs to be considered in greater detail.¹³⁴ Aeschylus and Euripides are composite images, not simply individual lampoons, each representing different stages in the social, political and cultural history of their polis, Athens: they are reflections of their times of living and writing, and their works reflect that history. Aeschylus is the image of Athens in her glory and greatness, the past, the romantic idealist who upholds her beliefs and promotes the concept of the solidarity of her citizenry. Euripides reflects the image of contemporary Athens, the polis of the time of the production of The Frogs: he is modern, realistic, the restless intellectual, questioning and undermining moral discipline through his sophistic methods, and thereby subverting the traditional structures of the polis. What Aristophanes ignores for the purposes of his play (Snell states that he fails to understand), is that opposition to

tradition and the appeal to other authorities, whether it is reason or the demand of conscience, are as moral as obedience to tradition.¹³⁵ Dionysus, as the god of the theatre, a god of the festive aspect of the communal life of Athens, represents that community itself, disjointed in character, and in searching for a tragedian to save the city (for an aspect of himself), he gradually regains a coherence. His journey to the world of the dead is a quest for his own and his city's salvation; the agon is not merely a literary contest to determine the survival and regeneration of one tragedian, it is a contest for the survival and regeneration of Athens itself. Without Athens, tragedy and comedy, and hence Dionysus, would die.

Does Dionysus select Aeschylus as the better playwright? He cannot decide on the basis of artistic merit, and clearly does so on the basis of his subjective feeling: "I've such affinity of mind with one, of heart with the other," he states, before posing his final questions on how the polis should be saved.¹³⁶ The contest has not been quite as impartial as many scholars believe: in all five sections of the agon (criticism of plots and purpose; prologues; lyrics; poetic 'weight'; practical advice to the city) Aeschylus is the second speaker, with the advantage of the last word. Whitman contends that the concern is not with the justice of the claims made by either Aeschylus or Euripides, that it is untrue that the former always wrote about wars or the latter about sex, that the former's choruses are seldom obscure or the latter's trivial; what matters is the parody, and parody exists for the sake of humour primarily.¹³⁷ David Barrett (who claims, incorrectly, that the "debate proceeds ... with the utmost fairness") believes that on the "moral issues", Aeschylus begins to emerge as the obvious winner.¹³⁸ Such a deduction is, as will be discussed later, questionable.

Aristophanes makes it apparent that both are great playwrights and that the final choice cannot be made on artistic grounds. In fact, G.M.A. Grube asserts that the decision is "explicitly subjective" and based neither on artistic merit nor (as Barrett would have it), on "moral - didactic grounds".¹³⁹ Certainly Euripides is parodied, but then so is Aeschylus.

The parody of Euripides is executed with a skill and knowledge that indicates Aristophanes' understanding and appreciation of Euripides' work, in a manner that expresses homage as much as disapproval. Placing him opposite the revered Aeschylus is tribute itself. Aristophanes assumes that his audience appreciates Euripides and as a comic playwright, he presents the agon in such a way as to increase the enjoyment by the spectators. The tactics of satire - simplification and repetition - are present, but ridicule is not the primary purpose. Arnott, in a lengthy analysis of the 'oil-flask' scene of the agon, argues that the principles of comic writing, the use of traditional comic devices (essentially those of the popular theatre) are more valuable in the interpretation of the scene:

Earlier critics have attempted to explain its humour in terms of something external to the scene, with the implication that the audience must be familiar with these extraneous factors before the scene can amuse. I have argued, on the contrary, that the scene is largely self-contained, and that in attempting to find esoteric meanings in the various quotations, commentators have been considering the scene the wrong way round. Euripides' lines do not suggest the joke. Rather it is the joke, the rudimentary device of the repeated tag, that dictates the choice of lines, and their selection is determined not by their content but by the mechanics of scene construction.¹⁴⁰

Clearly, what succeeds in performance in a comic play is of more importance than personal ridicule of Euripides in the three plays considered, at least not of the type directed at other individuals. Certain stock-jokes are repeated (the rumour of Euripides' wife having had an affair with a servant or lodger - his name, Cephisophon, is mentioned in The Frogs; he is referred to in The Acharnians as the leading actor in many of Euripides' tragedies, and was also rumoured to have collaborated in writing the plays - and the joke of his mother having kept a market-garden to sell herbs, in The Acharnians, Thesmophoniazusae and The Frogs), but there exist no accusations of cowardice or avarice or bribe-taking.¹⁴¹ Euripides, like Socrates, is a more composite than complex character and his individuality is subordinate to his presentation as a comic type. As Murray points out, it is difficult to assess Aristophanes' attitude to the actual Euripides and his work; if he disapproved of the tragedian's writing, he probably felt "officially bound to disapprove of it, just as he disapproved of Socrates, and the sophistic movement in general".¹⁴²

2.3.3 Cleon: the lampoon of the demagogue-type

From a consideration of Aristophanes' presentation of a prominent philosopher and a leading playwright, his treatment of an equally prominent politician, Cleon, needs to be examined. Murray asserts that the portrayal of Cleon in Aristophanes' comedies indicates that the playwright "was a good hater, and did his hating in a good and generous cause".¹⁴³ The implication of personal outrage and animosity towards Cleon is apparent in such an opinion. But for a demagogue such as Cleon, Aristophanes employs a distinctive type of ridicule, once again standardized or conventionalized in keeping with the target.¹⁴⁴ The demagogue was, to Aristophanes, by definition an alazon, the bragging upstart who factiously claims attributes or achievements which are not his own or his by right, and who uses his position to further his political career and financial situation by illegal means. Aristotle asserted the alazon one of the three principal character types in comedy; the others being the homolochos (or buffoon, literally the 'hanger-about for scraps') and the eiron (a man who ironically dissembles his actual abilities or qualities).¹⁴⁵

After the death of Pericles in 429 his successors, including Cleon, tended to be self-made men who followed rather than led public opinion, according to Alan H. Sommerstein.¹⁴⁶ As such, in The Knights he is depicted as a sycophantic servant of Demos, the personification of the people of Athens. Cleon was known not only for his skill as an orator, but also for the loudness and ferocity of his oratory, which earned him the nickname 'Dog'. His power in the Assembly was due to this, and also to his grasp of the emotions of the people and his ability to manipulate public sentiment; these attributes were noted by Thucydides, and are reflected in the theatrical presentation by Aristophanes.¹⁴⁷ The eternal gullibility of the Athenians and the ease with which they could be manipulated by such demagogues is a frequent comment in the comedies of Aristophanes. As the son of a leather tanner, Cleon was the first man of 'low birth' to become a political leader in Athens.

These newer politicians were clearly more sensitive to the abuse of satire, as Pericles had

never prosecuted a playwright. Cleon evidently did, however, and that playwright was, according to Aristophanes, himself. Thucydides described Cleon, in the period of a year between The Acharnians and The Knights as "the most violent of the citizens and most influential with the people"; furthermore, in the same period he greatly enhanced his prestige and power by ridiculing the competence of the generals Nicias and Demosthenes in the Assembly, taking over the former's position when he resigned his command and challenged Cleon to defeat the Spartans at Sphacteria, near Pylos, which he did within his boasted twenty days.¹⁴⁸ As Sommerstein points out, however, Cleon had private information that Demosthenes planned to attack the island, and this occurred shortly after Cleon's arrival; he returned in triumph to Athens with three hundred hostages who, it was decided, would be executed if the Spartans invaded Attica.¹⁴⁹ Since 431 the Spartans had invaded annually; now, in 425, Athens took the offensive and Cleon was credited with this, and granted numerous civic honours. Aristophanes chose to attack him openly in The Knights, despite this power.

Probable reasons for the feud between the two are given in The Acharnians, the earliest extant play by Aristophanes. The protagonist, Dicaeopolis, is twice identified with the playwright. Dicaeopolis, in preparing his defence of Sparta, suspends the non-existent 'dramatic illusion' to comment on the dangers of his task:

I know
 What I suffered from Cleon in last year's comedy,
 How he dragged me before the Council and fulminated,
 Perjured, and swore like a sewer in spate, till I
 Nearly died from his smears.¹⁵⁰

That comedy was the lost The Babylonians. Cleon had arraigned Aristophanes before the Council on a charge of slandering the polis in the presence of allies and other foreigners visiting the city. Though the Athenians encouraged the caricature and abuse of individuals, the deriding of the demos was not tolerated. The meaning of the 'law', if there existed one, is disputed and uncertain; Ehrenberg believes it may not have been a law but simply a practice.¹⁵¹ Clearly it was possible for a playwright to be brought before

the Council by an individual for offending 'public' interests. The Babylonians contained scathing indictments of all the prominent politicians then in office and their policies: the 'allied' cities (subjects would be a more accurate description) were represented by a chorus of Babylonian slaves working on a treadmill. It was performed at the City Dionysia festival when representatives from the tribute-paying subject-allies were normally in the audience. Though it is disputed, Cleon may have secured a conviction. That the play had won first prize is a measure of Athenian 'free' speech, however. Even so, as is evident in the parabasis of The Acharnians, Aristophanes was prepared to continue his attacks:

Let Cleon direct against me
 As much smear and smut as he likes -
 I've got Right on my side. I don't mind!
 My conscience is clear, as regards the State.
Him! Well you know what a coward he is,
 And what sort of jobs for the boys he finds ...
 You know I am not like that!¹⁵²

As Rosemary M. Harriott points out, this speech begins with defiance (with a change from third-person singular to first), moves to a "fervent assurance" of the rightness of his cause, and ends with personal abuse.¹⁵³ Some believe, without substantial evidence, that Aristophanes himself played the part of Dicaeopolis.

However, Aristophanes is more cautious: The Acharnians was presented at the Lenaea festival, a festival at which foreigners were unable to attend in large numbers owing to the difficulty of travel in the winter months. Aristophanes draws attention to the fact to protect himself, as Dicaeopolis states (and the identification is renewed):

At least this time I can speak freely, with no risk of being charged by Cleon with slandering the City in the presence of foreigners. This time we're all by ourselves; it's only the Lenaea, and there aren't any foreigners here yet, either with tribute or with troops.¹⁵⁴

Dicaeopolis (the name means 'just city') replies to the charges by ascribing the initiation of the events which led to war to individuals who are "crooked, dishonest, degenerate, double-dealers".¹⁵⁵ The City is not to blame: "Athenians, mind you, not Athens, remember

that, not the City".¹⁵⁶ The Acharnians is essentially an appeal for the termination of the destructive Peloponnesian war rather than a direct attack on Cleon as, for six years, Sparta and her allies had, every May, met at Corinth, marched into Attica and devastated the countryside. The Acharnians had, in particular, suffered from these annual invasions, having had to surrender their lands to retreat into the city, according to Pericles' war plan. The farmer, Dicaeopolis, personifies the desire for peace and that of returning to rural life. The Acharnians, who were principally charcoal-burners also distressed by the war, confront him, for their hatred of the enemy is paramount and with that, a desire to continue the war.¹⁵⁷ That Dicaeopolis makes his plea with his head on a 'block' symbolizes the risk Aristophanes knew he was taking in having a protagonist promulgate a peace plan. What must not be forgotten is that Dicaeopolis' costume is an absurd visual joke (borrowed from Euripides to make fools of the chorus of Acharnians with his sophistic arguments), that his account of the war's origins is a series of comic exaggerations and that much of the speech is a parody of Telephus: clearly, a serious point is being conveyed by means of a comic vehicle.

The Acharnians is, despite the comic presentation, political, as its title and the names of the protagonist and chorus indicate. As Lowell Edmunds asserts, Dicaeopolis' name and his justification of his action reveal that far more is at stake than the private - and selfish - claims and truce made by Dicaeopolis.¹⁵⁸ In dramatizing the name to show what 'Just City' would do, Aristophanes is arguing the case for peace. Athens, the city at war, will appear in a worse light when compared with 'Just City', the city at peace. Even though Dicaeopolis is motivated by basic needs (the wine of Dionysus, the love of Aphrodite), Athens, the city at war, is dominated, as the parabasis states, by malicious sycophants and orators and ludicrous decrees. The 'Just City' is devoted to peace, to family, to the festivals, especially those in honour of the regenerative Dionysus.

If Cleon is not a character, nevertheless in a comedy which is concerned with a longing for peace, Aristophanes is indirectly opposed to him as a champion of the warlike policy.

And The Acharnians does hint that Aristophanes will have his revenge: the chorus of Acharnians inform Dicaeopolis that they also loathe Cleon, that they will cut him into pieces "to make shoes for the knights": this is an apt metaphor, with its reference to Cleon's livelihood, for Cleon had made an enemy of the knights (the young aristocrats who furnished the Athenian cavalry) who forced him to hand over a bribe of thirty thousand drachmas to the Treasury he had induced from some of the allies in the hope of having their tributes reduced. This, says Dicaeopolis, "warmed the cockles of my heart".¹⁵⁹ In Sommerstein's translation, the suggestion that Aristophanes already had his next comedy, The Knights, in mind is explicitly stated by the chorus:

When your wickedness we scan,
 Cleon seems a virtuous man!
 (Addressing Cleon)
 Don't you grin, though; never fear,
 It'll be your turn next year!¹⁶⁰

A year later, in 424, Aristophanes did attack Cleon in the fiercest manner in The Knights, with Cleon, in all probability, present in the front row (Sommerstein suggests this in the excerpt from The Acharnians just quoted), for he had the right conferred since his success over the Spartans, and Paphlagonian himself states it in The Knights: "I swear by the front seat I won at Pylos".¹⁶¹ Cleon's 'victory' (in which he "stole a march on the general, Demosthenes") is referred to ten times in the play.¹⁶² The daring of the attack cannot be underestimated, for the power of Paphlagonian (Cleon) is immense:

There's nothing he doesn't see. He bestrides the world, one foot in Pylos and the other here on the Pnyx [the Assembly, that is]. He's the All-Present - he can have his arse in Bigholia, his hands in the public purse, and his mind in Robber's Vale, all at one and the same moment!¹⁶³

This quotation is from an exchange between two slaves of Demos ('the people'), Demosthenes and Nicias. Demos is a gullible, complacent, doddering fool whose new and favourite slave is Paphlagonian, the grasping sycophant, in keeping with the image of Cleon as following and feeding on public opinion. Cleon appears in the play more indirectly in name as Paphlagonian (from Paphlagonia in Asia-Minor, the source of many slaves; Aristophanes also puns on paphlasdon ('foaming at the mouth') to indicate Cleon's

combination of bluster and temper) but could be identified if not visually by portrait-mask, then by his deeds. Some suggest that he could be recognized verbally: Aristophanes is said to have mimicked a well-known quirk of Cleon's speech in The Knights.¹⁶⁴ During the course of The Knights it is implied that Cleon received large sums of money or property confiscated from wealthy citizens convicted on trumped-up charges; organized special religious festivals with state banquets to appeal 'through their stomachs' to the urban poor; exacted excessive sums as tribute from the islands of the Athenian 'alliance'; imposed unfair duties on the rich in fitting out ships for the navy; encouraged informers; sought to continue the war even when Sparta had offered a treaty so that in the state of confusion associated with war his activities would not be detected; brought armed gangs into Athens to intimidate possible opponents, besides taking credit for the victory at Pylos. The abuse is not simply personal; Cleon is accused, in public, of extortion and political blackmail.¹⁶⁵ Paphlagonian's defence (in the 'Assembly') is that he is the "sole champion and defender" of the people: "Didn't I fill your Treasury full? I'd rack and throttle and extort - I didn't care a fig for the rights of the individual, so long as I pleased you."¹⁶⁶ The presentation is justifiably extreme, for "cartoon-like caricature" pervades the comedy, asserts McLeish, and "its political commentary (the most overt in all his [Aristophanes'] work) is rammed home with all the delicacy of [William] Hogarth, [James] Gillray or Gerald Scarfe".¹⁶⁷

The Knights is more than an attack on Cleon, though the abuse is almost unmatched by any other of Aristophanes' extant plays: it is a satire on the whole nature of politics and political leadership in Athens. The chorus of Knights point out that the Sausage-seller defeats his rival, Paphlagonian, by out-matching him in the very qualities which make Cleon despicable; the inference being that there is no other method to win influence over 'the people' of Athens, that it would take someone even worse, and thereby better, to win the favour of 'the people'. McLeish recalls the "axiom of political philosophy that a state should seek its rulers from the best men available"; however, in the "cartoon-politics" of The Knights, the reverse is applicable.¹⁶⁸ The chorus of twenty-four Knights is opposed to

Cleon: the Athenian cavalry consisted of a thousand young men of wealthy (they were expected to provide their own horses) and aristocratic families; naturally, they would not side with the son of a tanner now in power, so they side with the reprehensible Sausage-seller. Furthermore, the original Nicias and Demosthenes were, unlike Cleon, from established upper-class families.

The Knights won first prize at the Lenaea, but Cleon's popularity was not affected by it, for a few weeks after the performance he was elected one of the board of ten generals, a position he retained for the remaining two years of his life. In the revised version of The Clouds Aristophanes reminds the audience that he had "punched" Cleon in "the paunch in his hour of pride" and then, despite the warnings of the clouds (and the moon, for an eclipse had taken place some months before the election), on a "black day ... a low tanner, a repulsive atheist nicknamed Paphlagon" was elected.¹⁶⁹ According to Sommerstein, Cleon was enraged by The Knights and since his previous charges would no longer hold (no foreigners being present at the Lenaea), he threatened to prosecute Aristophanes for falsely claiming to be an Athenian citizen.¹⁷⁰ This attempt to deprive Aristophanes of his citizenship never came to trial. Perhaps, as McLeish suggests, Cleon realized that authority is not weakened by political lampoon in the theatre, and that his silence (or decision not to prosecute) is a "far wiser acceptance of the nature of comic lampoon, and the respective standing of himself as a demagogue and Aristophanes as playwright", than was his lawsuit after The Babylonians.¹⁷¹

The Knights then, despite the honour of first prize, did not damage Cleon's political career or change his methods, and though Demos was shown to be led into error by the false rhetoric of unscrupulous demagogues, the audience, 'the people', tolerated and enjoyed the comic abuse and exposure of a figure in power without allowing it to overtly influence their political outlook in the Assembly. The dramatic festival did not alter political support in 'real' political life: one could laugh at jokes in one and vote for the targets in the other.¹⁷²

The Knights, as satire, is nonetheless effective: Aristophanes attacks and criticizes, and does so through humour, albeit often coarse and crude, not only Cleon but the demos itself. Ultimately, through the even more unscrupulous Sausage-seller (himself transformed at the comedy's end into the noble Agoracritus, literally 'Chosen in the Assembly' or 'Chosen in the Market') Demos is rejuvenated to the youthful and energetic prime of the time of Marathon. Only Paphlagonian-Cleon suffers: the erstwhile champion of Athens is condemned to peddle dog-meat sausages at the city gates; for the other characters, events turn out to their advantage. The problems of irresponsible politics, economic bribery, class conflict, terrorist accusations and the gullibility of 'the people' can only be resolved in fantasy. What, to Reckford, "elevates the Knights from what might have been merely a political satire, though a great one, into a genuine comedy", is the triumph of the Sausage-seller.¹⁷³ Through that triumph conventional restrictions or notions of morality and law are inverted. Reckford believes that to see The Knights as satire only is to

miss the relaxation of inhibition with which comic catharsis begins, the delightfulness of ... [returning to] a childish world the monde renversé of carnival, where "the powerful are put down from their seat, and the humble are exalted" (...as people chanted at the medieval Feast of Fools). What may have begun in Aristophanes' mind as a satiric idea, at the expense of the vulgar "tanner" Cleon, is taken up into a comic fable that reaches deep into human nature and human wishes. The Sausage-seller who climbs from nowhere to the top of the greasy pole has much in common with ... [the] lucky tricksters of fairy tale ... only, since this is a comic fairy tale for grown-ups, he also incorporates, and brings to advancement, the genuinely low aspects of our human nature that are ordinarily hidden or kept down : the greed, lust, and violence; the eating and drinking, evacuating and regurgitating, and all the shameless words, gestures and actions that go with these. Some of this naturally, reflects Celon's vulgarity; but, still more, it looks to a lost wholeness of human nature, and of Athens.¹⁷⁴

While Reckford is certainly correct in describing the "comic catharsis" of The Knights, the points he makes to distinguish between the play as a satire and a comedy (which, through the use of terms such as "elevates" would seem a somewhat loftier 'genre' than satire) are precisely those which carry the satiric force and power: discussing the political situation and the deception of the demos by demagogues in terms of bodily processes (eating, drinking, sex) and abusing and reducing those in authority without advocating solutions to complex political and economic issues are the very strategies of satire,

accommodated within a comic vehicle. When a short-lived peace was achieved three years later, it was on far less favourable terms than Athens would have secured earlier. As Sommerstein asserts: "Much as Aristophanes liked being laughed at, and winning prizes for it, he would probably have liked even more to be listened to."¹⁷⁵

A year after The Knights, The Clouds was presented at the City Dionysia and though Cleon is mentioned, he is not the principal target (as has been discussed). In 422, in The Wasps (presented at the Lenaea) a character, Xanthias, informs the audience of the plot (and in doing so, proclaims a new approach to comedy with characteristic Aristophanic self-awareness, after the successes and failures of the previous plays):

Don't look for anything too high-brow from us;
 or for any slapstick smuggled out of Megara
 As for the aesthetic bit - that's out. We won't
 bring on Euripides to get another working over.
 Now Cleon's illustrious, thanks to luck - no matter,
 we won't chop him up into hash again: No Politics.
 We merely have a little plot with a moral -
 not too refined and dainty for you, of course,
 but rather more intelligent than smutty farce.¹⁷⁶

The comedy proceeds, however, to resort to the subjects and methods it will avoid. Instead of such an approach, The Wasps, as Douglass Parker notes, is a play dominated by slapstick and knockabout farce, which, though avowedly non-political has as principal characters Philocleon ('Love-Cleon') and Bdelycleon ('Loathe-Cleon'), in which, if the scholiast is to be believed, Euripides does appear (in a portrait-mask, Parker maintains; other translators name the character a "Citizen" or "Angry Man"), which, though professedly chaste, has a chorus of jurors costumed as wasps who are distinguished by their phalluses, and in which, finally, the intelligence of the audience is repeatedly gibed at.¹⁷⁷ The failure of the "too high-brow" The Clouds of the previous year is mentioned, too, in the parabasis. This play, in giving the audience what it wants (rather than The Clouds), thereby damns them and their choices.

Cleon himself does not appear on stage as a character, nor is he the sole target, as would be

expected in a play with a Cleon-lover and a Cleon-hater as leading characters. The chief target is the manner in which the Athenian jury system was being abused and exploited to the advantage of Cleon and the other demagogues to whom the jurors owed their pay. (Cleon had increased the pay for a jurymen to three obols a day in 425 or 424. If the state treasury was not kept sufficiently enriched from fines and confiscations from convictions, especially during a time of war, the reduction in this meagre pay was a real possibility and threat.) Aristophanes, characteristically, simplifies the situation: to him, the jurors were in Cleon's service and power and, because of their poverty (jury service attracted those with no other source of income or chance of any, in other words, mainly the aged), open to bribery. The fickleness of 'the people' (the jurors) is exposed once again: when the *Wasps* realize that the annual tributes of the 'allies' were not spent on jury pay, they drop their devotion to Cleon and the politicians of 'the people'. Bdelycleon succeeds in demonstrating that Philocleon, the litigious old man (with clear affinities with Demos in *The Knights*) is the Athenian people, and has allowed himself to be duped. Equally, the opponents of Cleon, with their love of luxuries and effeminate habits are not suitable leaders.

The Wasps satirizes the same political style of the demagogues and the gullibility of 'the people' Aristophanes exposed in *The Knights*. The wildly farcical conclusion to *The Wasps* is ironic: Philocleon reformed is worse than Philocleon the jurymen: human nature cannot be changed. In *The Clouds* of the previous year the protagonist also changed, under instruction and the application of logic by his son, and reversed his former views. The difference is that in *The Clouds*, the father was taught for the worse, whereas in *The Wasps* he is taught for the better, but the result did not and does not improve the situation, and Philocleon's final triumph in the manic dance at his lecherous bacchanal is that of the irrational, his defeat as a rational being. Philocleon is, like Athens, wildly excessive, immoral, corrupt, selfish, lacking moderation and wisdom, yet, in a sense, true to himself. Bdelycleon, with the supposedly right and altruistic motives, the reformist and Cleon-hater, who is accused of anti-democratic, subversive leanings is like Aristophanes

himself, and the play dramatizes his dilemma, which he points to in the parabasis: the failure of his teaching to reform his fellow citizens for the better, whether it is electing the best political spokesmen or choosing the best comedy.

If the audience expected to 'see' Cleon, they were not disappointed: Cleon is not ignored, is in fact 'presented' on stage. After Bdelycleon has convinced Philocleon that a juryman is not an all-powerful magistrate and that he and his fellow jurors are the dupes of Cleon's regime, Philocleon, unable to forego litigation, sets up a court in his own home and tries the watchdog named Labes for stealing a cheese. The Greek for dog is kuon; the case is clearly a parody of Cleon's prosecution of a general called Laches for embezzlement. A second dog acts as prosecutor; Cleon's nickname was 'Dog', and it is tempting, though it cannot be proved, of course, to assume that the association would have been heightened were the actor to have worn a mask which combined Cleon's features superimposed over those of a dog. In the parabasis the chorus of *Wasps* compare Aristophanes' services to those of Heracles cleansing Greece of monsters; as Heracles faced and fought the Hydra and the dog Cerberus, so Aristophanes faces and fights the Cleon-hound.¹⁷⁸ These lines Aristophanes repeated in the parabasis of *Peace*.¹⁷⁹

If there did exist a feud between Aristophanes and Cleon, they were certainly not reconciled as Aristophanes is at pains to state in *The Wasps*, through the words of the koryphaios:

Some people have been saying that since Cleon tanned my hide
I've made a coward's peace with him and let my wrath subside.
They heard me scream blue murder when the dirty deed was done,
And rolled up in their hundreds - it was their idea of fun.
They didn't care a rap for me: they shouted 'Treat him rough!
He may say something funny if you squeeze him hard enough.'
And so I bluffed them for a while, but now it's time to stop:
And won't the vine look foolish when I pull away the prop!¹⁸⁰

The reference could be a return to the legal action taken by Cleon after *The Babylonians*, or the attempt to disprove Aristophanes' Athenian citizenship, or in "bluffing" the audience through the lack of sustained attack in *The Clouds*. The opportunity to lampoon

Cleon on stage never arose again: he and the Spartan leader Brasidas were killed in battle at Amphipolis in the same year as the production of The Wasps. In Peace of the following year (performed at the City Dionysia some two weeks after a peace treaty, motivated most strongly by Nicias, and said to last fifty years, was sworn) Trygaeus, a farmer, flies to the gods, symbolically mounted on a dung-beetle (in an extended parody of the flight of Bellerophon, mounted on Pegasus in a lost play, entitled Bellerophon, by Euripides of which a fragment exists), to fetch Peace down to earth. But Trygaeus finds that the gods have left heaven in anger at the continual violence of humans. War, and his companion and servant Havoc, appear, before the rescue of Peace is possible, to prepare a meal. War wishes to pulverize the various aggressive cities (symbolized through their agricultural products) in a mortar, but a pestle cannot be found. Athens and Sparta have both lost their pestles, Cleon and Brasidas, and hence War cannot continue without his implements, his tools for war. In the confusion, Peace is rescued and brought to earth. In the fantasy world of Aristophanic comedy, peace is real and panhellenic: unlike Dicaeopolis, Trygaeus obtains a universal, not a private, treaty, and not only for his city, but for all Greece. In reality, peace lasted a mere six years. In Peace Hermes informs Trygaeus and the chorus of farmers how Peace vanished, and of the involvement of Athens in the Peloponnesian war:

The City was pale and frightened, and any bit of juicy slander anyone threw at it, it snapped up. when the allies realized what was happening they rushed to stop the politicians' mouths with money. So a few men became richer and richer, while Greece was being bled white under your noses. And you know who was the greatest exponent of all this. It was the Tanner!

To which Trygaeus replies: "Let sleeping Cleons lie."¹⁸¹ To postulate that the various portraits of Cleon are motivated by hate, as Murray states, or that they were intended to bring about political change cannot, then, be accepted as the principal reasons for their inclusion. Cleon is a recurring character in the comedies of Aristophanes primarily because he was a highly prominent and influential public figure. To affect an alteration in political outlook cannot have been a primary purpose either, for Aristophanes' abuse of Cleon continued after his death. A personal feud, though there could be reasons for it, is

questionable when one considers that Cleon was mocked by other playwrights as well. This type of ridicule, even though Cleon features more strongly than other characters and is attacked with greater virulence, may be seen as a stock theme. Allegations about the target's background and character were to be expected, as was the exaggeration and distortion of these features, standardized through repetition.

To Fisher:

It is reasonable to conclude that Cleon is prominent in Aristophanes because he was the first and the most influential demagogue. Because he, above all others, represented the new trend in politics ..., Aristophanes saw him as par excellence the upstart demagogic type. And because such a type is, to the comedian, already an "abnormal" character before he becomes the subject of comedy, the possibilities for extreme exaggeration are rich.¹⁸²

2.3.4 Lamachus: the lampoon of the military-type

The fourth, and last, alazon character to be discussed in relation to Aristophanes' lampoons is, after a philosopher, playwright and politician have been considered, a general, Lamachus. In The Acharnians, Dicaeopolis, dressed in rags borrowed from Euripides, and so imbued with sophistic arguments, convinces half the chorus-jury of the necessity of making peace with Sparta. Those unconvinced and still hostile to Dicaeopolis invoke their champion, Lamachus, in terms which indicate and anticipate burlesqued exaggeration:

Lamachus, Hero of Lightning and Lord of the
Gorgon Crest,
Our tribal champion, come quickly, thy servants
are sore distressed!¹⁸³

These lines are a parody of a religious prayer according to Halliwell, and in the original were written in the dochmaic metre, usually employed in tragedy for moments of extreme emotion or tension.¹⁸⁴ Verbally, Lamachus is associated by his opening words, paratragic or mock-heroic in themselves, with the braggart, the miles gloriosus, the swaggering

soldier of Cornford's description.¹⁸⁵ He begins, bombastically: "Whence came the cry of battle that I heard? ... Who has aroused the Gorgon on my target?"¹⁸⁶ The etymology of his name itself could have been a reason for Aristophanes' selection of the actual individual to represent the epitome of the officer-type: it is derived from the Greek for 'intensive' and 'battle'. Lamachus was, furthermore, a member of the Acharnian 'tribe'. Edmunds asserts that the implicit metaphor of his name is used literally and dramatized by a paradostic presentation.¹⁸⁷ It is clearly not the historical person, but as a type, as a representative of specific attitudes, that the portrayal of Lamachus should be considered. Aristophanes required a character to represent the pro-war factions; Lamachus is his choice by name and by profession. His other qualities are ignored for dramatic purposes. Lamachus was killed in battle in 414 at Syracuse and Aristophanes is not aiming to convince his audience that Lamachus was a coward (like Cleonymus supposedly was, from the stock insults in the comedies). In The Frogs, nearly ten years after his death, he is praised by Aeschylus for his bravery.¹⁸⁸

If Lamachus was a proponent of an aggressive war policy this, in itself, would not have made him unpopular, as Halliwell points out, since in The Acharnians it is suggested that, generally, Athenians at the time were in favour of the continuation of the war.¹⁸⁹ The chorus of Acharnians, initially, hate Dicaeopolis the peace-maker even more than Cleon, the demagogue who was regarded as the enemy of farmers: "You disgusting traitor/ To your country, .../ I loathe and detest you, even more than Cleon", they inform Dicaeopolis.¹⁹⁰

But the adventitious play on the name, Lamachus, is not as exploited as his visual appearance, for he is extravagantly and absurdly costumed as the type, the embodiment of inflated military power: his helmet has a huge triple crest and large featherers, his shield is ridiculously large and it is highly probable that the phallus is prominent: Dicaeopolis describes him as "very well armed".¹⁹¹ The physical presentation is so exaggerated it can hardly be deemed real criticism of the actual person. It is not known what office

Lamachus held, and he was certainly not a general at the time of The Acharnians.¹⁹² But in name and in his determination to continue fighting he is, for the purposes of the play, elevated to the rank by Aristophanes. He is the spokesman of the war party.

The 'tragic' beggar-hero (dressed in rags) ridicules the general (in all his finery), and makes the figurative nausea evoked by Athenian aggression literal and visual: he manages to extract a plume from Lamachus' helmet to tickle his throat to vomit into the general's shield. The implication is clear: the accoutrements of war are only useful for purging the body of waste. When Lamachus accuses Dicaeopolis of being a beggar, he removes his rags to reveal himself as "an honest citizen".¹⁹³ The citizen proceeds to rebuke the general: while citizens have "been in the front line", Lamachus has "been in the pay queue", profiteering by the various offices and situations created by the war.¹⁹⁴ Only in the fantasy world of comedy could the average citizen abuse a military leader of such status, particularly in time of war, and when, at the Lenaea festival during the winter months, when fighting came to a virtual halt, military personnel would no doubt have been present in the audience. Yet Lamachus is ridiculed, is exposed, through his costume (and later his deeds) as, as Halliwell describes it, a "shell of inflated pride and mock bellicosity".¹⁹⁵ Since it is useless to be "an honest citizen" in the military and aggressive Athens which sustains and promotes a Lamachus, Dicaeopolis becomes, taking his own name literally, a 'just city' unto himself. Lamachus is, of course, not the only target: Aristophanes attacks all self-seeking officials and racketeers and informers who benefit from the economic and social effects of the war.

In the final moments of The Acharnians, the superiority of peace over war is graphically presented verbally and visually, by what is heard and seen. Lamachus returns from battle, wounded in the leg and supported by soldiers, lamenting his condition in appropriately 'tragic' terms:

Alas, alack,
Hateful and bloody woes!
Sorry my lot,
Stricken by furious foes!¹⁹⁶

The words echo those of the dying Hippolytus when he returns to the stage, supported by his servants, in Euripides' play of that name presented some three years prior to The Acharnians, in 428.¹⁹⁷ Visually, the change in the costume worn by Lamachus reinforces his condition: his Gorgon "leapt clean off his shield" and his "feathers flew off" his helmet.¹⁹⁸ Stone suggests it would add to the humour if the former was taken literally, so that "the shield no longer has its emblem, which was very visible and very important earlier".¹⁹⁹ The return of Dicaeopolis is a parallel and parody of that of Lamachus: he is as unsteady (he is drunk, however), he too is supported (but by two young women, probably), he is crowned (by vine leaves, possibly) and in metrically corresponding verse to that of Lamachus, a verbal antithesis is created between the tragic lament of Lamachus and the victory song of Dicaeopolis:

What perfect breasts,
How good and firm to nuzzle!
A kiss, my sweet,
A real lascivious snuzzle!
I've won the prize,
The victory is mine:
I've come here now
To claim my skin of wine!²⁰⁰

His prize, a wine-skin, is in keeping with the revels of a Dionysian festival, and with Henderson's suggestion that Lamachus was wounded not by a spear, but a vine-pole.²⁰¹

The lampoon of Lamachus and that of Euripides in The Acharnians has an added dimension lost in print. If, as McLeish contends, the spectators could recognize the same performer in another role, in spite of a change in costume and mask, then in this play such an awareness of the doubling could have added to the comic effect if the same performer played Euripides and Lamachus in a mock-tragic style, and added to the satiric effect as well: that Lamachus "is a Euripidean character remote from true reality", and Dicaeopolis "for all his borrowing of Euripides' costumes ... is not".²⁰²

Furthermore, here, as elsewhere in Aristophanic comedy and in Greek tragedy, the costume is the character, and changes in fortune in the plot are incorporated into changes

in physical appearance: the costume communicates visually the altered status, to support the change, which is most often heard. Dicaeopolis, in the rags of Euripides, is altered by those rags: he is a beggar, pleading for his life, and using the rhetoric of Euripides to do so. Costume and persona are so closely associated that any alteration of one indicates or is followed by an alteration of the other. Taplin, among others, suggests that, in tragedy, the removal or loss of the costume is the removal or disintegration of the character it denotes.²⁰³ The same is true of Aristophanic comedy: Lamachus, extravagantly costumed as the swaggering-soldier is seen to be defeated with the change in that costume, becomes a beggar pleading for help, while Dicaeopolis is elevated from the moment he discards his rags and is eventually the victor.

Dicaeopolis in rags indicates that disguises and masks, as in the Noh theatre, are external, physical means that are the character, and as they can be assumed and changed, so too can the character. Consistency of characterization is not to be expected in Aristophanes. Dicaeopolis assumes three levels of impersonation in his rags: firstly as Dicaeopolis-Aristophanes (to mention Cleon's prosecution over The Babylonians, completely outside the present action of The Acharnians), then, when Lamachus enters, as Dicaeopolis-Euripides' beggar, then on discarding those rags, as Dicaeopolis-honest citizen. In Aristophanic comedy the character is whatever the changing situation necessitates, even what it does not necessitate, and the character can, variously address the audience, the chorus or another character in the guises of performer as character, performer on behalf of the playwright (here), or as performer on behalf of the production (as in the opening of The Wasps discussed earlier).

From this discussion of the lampoon of Lamachus it is clear that Aristophanes has not attempted to create an individual character and that the ridicule is of a general nature. As Halliwell states, the force of the burlesque is closer to deflation than sustained or coherent attack.²⁰⁴ The ridiculous traits which Aristophanes imputes to Lamachus are those of his profession, portrayed to the point of caricature: the passion for military dress and

weaponry and the bluster and arrogance associated with the type. The satirical presentation is heightened by the visual and verbal reversal of those qualities.

2.4 The moral and political purpose of the lampoon

Scholars are divided in their evaluation of Aristophanes' political, moral and religious purpose and personal convictions: one could term their viewpoints those of the adherents, the agnostics and the atheists. Their contradictory conclusions are argued with varying degrees of plausibility from the textual and historical evidence. Few substantiate their assumptions from the primary purpose of the texts: the comedy in performance. Again, this is due to the paucity of substantial facts: the texts can be regarded as incomplete, librettos without any notation concerning music, dance, movement or gesture in particular. With this in mind, this chapter has examined the satiric presentation of real-life individuals from its probably source in pre-dramatic activities to not only what was heard (from the texts), but, as far as possible, from what can be assumed to have been seen in performance.

2.4.1 The question of moral intent

The scurrilous nature of the personal lampoons in Aristophanes (and Old Comedy in general) has, virtually since their inclusion in comedies, been condemned by scholars. Plutarch, in an essay comparing Aristophanes and Menander, criticized the former for his "licentiousness and malice"; to Jonson, Old Comedy was "insolent and obscene"; to Voltaire the "government" which authorized "such infamous licenses well deserved what befell it".²⁰⁵ Others have attempted to justify Aristophanes as a moral satirist; hence the lampoons and obscenity were aimed at reformation: Horace viewed the writers of Old Comedy as chastisers of criminals and reprobates, Quintilian described them as "pre-

eminent in the censure of vice".²⁰⁶ More recently, to take Highet as but one example of a contemporary adherent, scholars have pursued similar arguments: "For all his crudity and absurdity, for all his frequent cheapness and Dionysiac wrong-headedness, Aristophanes is a moral and political reformer."²⁰⁷

As evidenced earlier in this chapter, ridicule may have functioned as a communally applied sanction in that the fear of mockery and resulting loss of standing would discourage unacceptable behaviour. This was, and remains, a custom in various communities. In Aristophanes' *Ecclesiazusae*, the theory is expounded by Praxagora: in the dining-halls (formerly law courts) of post-revolutionary Athens, children "will recite poetry about the men who fought bravely in the war. And about those who haven't, so that they'll be ashamed and stay away."²⁰⁸ Old Comedy, to a scholar such as Highet, is justified as a deterrent of vice and for its reformatory value; moral functions such as these would elevate it above the conventions of abuse. Ridicule, in the service of reformation, was thus the end, not the means. As to the obscenity which often accompanies personal ridicule, this was, and is, viewed as acceptable within the licenses permitted Old Comedy, or, as Murray saw it, a ritual element, in other words, not an integral aspect of the play.²⁰⁹

Such moral intent is questionable when applied to Aristophanes' plays. Any ideal, norm or limit by which those who need reformation can be measured or which can be imposed is absent. If "morality implies limit", then to Cedric H. Whitman, such prescriptions do not apply to the "comic hero" in Aristophanes, for they are often unprincipled and shameless.²¹⁰ These protagonists, whose adversaries are the unsympathetic, non-fictional victims of lampoon, are, in Whitman's description (which gives further reasons for the revulsion and approbation of early scholars, perhaps) defined by their *poneria*: "the ability to get the advantage of somebody or some situation by virtue of an unscrupulous, but thoroughly enjoyable exercise of craft".²¹¹ They may profess to be social saviours, yet are characterized by their self-centredness, cowardice, their ability to argue, their limitless ambition and appetite. Dicaeopolis, Strepsiades, the Sausage-seller, Pisthetairos,

Bdelycleon, Trygaeus, Lysistrata and Praxagora all convert their desires into fulfilment by cunning and bravado and all refuse to defer to 'authority' and, furthermore, they free the world, on the stage at least, from the restraints of morality and society. For this reason, to Whitman, the "primary mode" of Aristophanic comedy is fantasy rather than the critical aspect of satire.²¹²

Nor are these amoral characters punished for their 'faults'. Instead, the protagonists are often regenerated physically or spiritually or bring about physical and spiritual regeneration. The physical regeneration is generally sexual; in The Knights this is transferred to Demos, to the rejuvenation of the Athenian people. It is accompanied by excessive drinking and feasting, which is hardly in keeping with the intention of a moral reformer, as is the spiritual association, most often appropriately linked to Dionysus. And however fantastic the scheme, Aristophanes maintains a close dialectical relationship with reality, by the focus on the present, or existing, topical issues and individuals. The real is the satiric, the comic the possible, the fantasy. Robert M. Torrance states it thus:

The comic attitude toward the confinements of existing reality is satire, just as revelry is the comic response to release from those bonds - a release attained, in Aristophanes' poetry, through transfiguring fantasy. Thus satire and celebration are the poles of a single vision; and even the most audacious comic hero will necessarily appear as an object of ridicule to the extent that his very struggle still links him, while unregenerate, with the real.²¹³

In Aristophanic comedy, then, two planes or worlds exist: the 'real' world of Athens from which the material and characters are derived, and the 'unreal' world created by wish-fulfilment, the plane of fantasy. The former may be a distorted version of reality, may be incorporated into the fantasy world, whereas the latter is often presented as 'real'. The two are not mutually exclusive either, for the unreality of the real Athens (with its gulls and rogues, its delusions and irrationality) is set against the reality of the fantasy world (where the aims of the protagonists become tangible, their desires logical). This presentation of two worlds is evident in all the comedies and is most clearly seen in The Birds and Ecclesiazusae. The world of fantasy gives perspectives on the reality being criticized, but is not a simple utopia: Cloudcuckooland is dominated by a very Athenian

tyrant who had left that city in disgust; the ideal state proposed by Praxagora is lampooned in practice. Reckford puts forward a third plane which reconciles these two, that of the comic theatre of Dionysus itself which incorporates performers and audience within the precinct of Dionysus, so that, while remaining aware of the fact of watching a play, the "illusionary transformations that they [the audience] watch and enjoy have their root and final meaning and justification in the god's festival, which they are presently celebrating".²¹⁴

Moral intent on the part of Aristophanes cannot, it should be clear from the above, be readily accepted without reservation. One hesitates even in declaring an intent to influence his audience in a particular direction. What is apparent is Aristophanes' tolerance of contradiction and paradox, exemplified by the protagonists and the action of the plays: in The Acharnians the spokesman for civic morality is a self-seeking rogue; in The Knights corruption is thwarted by greater corruption; the character requiring reformation in The Wasps is ultimately more engaging and less repulsive than his reformer. Aristophanes deliberately includes that which would (and does, frequently) undermine the initial impulse or point of attack and criticism. He is critical without being disillusioned or idealistic in the proposal of solutions.

McLeish poses the question: "Satire or entertainment - which came first?" in relation to Aristophanes.²¹⁵ Perhaps neither, he continues, for to insist on the "primacy" of one rather than the fusion of the two could lead to a misunderstanding of Aristophanes' purpose. The polemical impulse is vital to the comedies, but is not the overall impact of the texts, or the plays in performance. Each has its own 'unity' of spectacle, lyricism, slapstick, obscenity and fantasy, each is a comedy of ideas, encouraging through varying perspectives an awareness of the contradictions of life in the polis, self-contained poetic and theatrical worlds that are more satisfying in themselves than in the reformation of the 'world' from which they were created.

Aristophanes does satirize individuals and institutions, commenting critically on the social and political and economic aspects of contemporary life in Athens, but satire is a means within and not the end of Aristophanic comedy. Fisher (who could be described as an atheist in his rejection of any serious intention other than laughter and enjoyment in Aristophanes) believes, narrowly and prescriptively, that satire has a moral purpose in that it is "laughter at a person or thing in order to expose faults or to change attitudes".²¹⁶ The limitations of such a definition have been discussed in Chapter 1, but he argues further that Aristophanes' ridicule of Socrates and the Sophists in The Clouds is too general to qualify as satire as the more closely the objects of the satirist's attack resemble their real-life originals, the more likely the attack is likely to be understood and recognized. The inference is obvious: if satire requires detailed, personalized references to succeed and is aimed at reformation, then Aristophanes is not a satirist. But satire is not necessarily reformative, does not have to have a moral intention and Aristophanes does use satiric strategies. The range of criticism and humour accommodated within the satiric spectrum is very wide and is not always "serious" in the manner in which Fisher employs the word: banter and raillery and badinage aimed at the trite, the conventional and the pretentious can be viewed as satiric (though Kirby would not concur).

Satiric attack is but one aspect of Aristophanic comedy: the negative aspect of festive celebration.²¹⁷ Cornford propounded the balance between the positive and negative elements of such celebration by referring to their source in the dual, complementary aspects of primitive agricultural fertility rites. These were to evoke the positive blessings of prosperity and increase on the one hand, and to expel or avert the negative forces such as damage or harm to people, animals and crops on the other hand. This balance, to Cornford, is discernible in the parabases which alternate between hymns of praise and passages of criticism (of individuals, politics, social mores, the judges, the audience). Although this is a hypothetical generalization, it is true of most of Aristophanes' parabases, particularly those in The Knights and The Clouds.

Are the lampoons negative in function? What is their theatrical function? The question is

difficult to answer, even if scholars are able to discover why individuals (apart from the well-known personages) were selected for lampoon by Aristophanes. Topicality is one reason for their inclusion, as is convention, and also the spectators' enjoyment thereof, if frequency of repetition is a guide. Such momentary references are often incidental to the action and to attempt to explain a moral conviction behind their inclusion is to ignore the primary reason for that inclusion: humour, not to expose weakness and scourge vice. As lampoons are often delivered in choral songs Harriott believes they may even have become temporary 'pops'.²¹⁸

Perhaps the theatrical function of the extended lampoons lies in the focus that the use of a particular individual's name provides: the force of the ridicule is heightened when it is individualized, when it has an exemplar, an identifiable exponent. Even though the portrait of a major character is generalized to conform to a popular conception of a type and to exemplify a concept such as sophistry, demagoguery, war-mongering, love of litigation, to give that concept (no matter how allegorical) a recognizable embodiment (no matter how distorted) from the 'real' world of the audience, is to give the satiric lampoon an added 'factional' dimension and thrust.

Although they are types, the lampoons are nevertheless detailed comic creations, as detailed, McLeish asserts, and as "much part of the stage illusion, and as real within it, as any of the created characters".²¹⁹ Nor (and this, in part, answers Fisher) can they be so generalized as to be utterly depersonalized, for there would be no reason for the humour if Socrates, Euripides, Cleon or Lamachus did not exhibit some features of their originals. And, as McLeish writes, once they are characters within the stage 'illusion', they are seen by the spectators to be part of the conventions of that illusion and not those of the real world.²²⁰ Once the fantasy world dominates the action, verisimilitude is not a primary consideration. Therefore, to McLeish, to attempt to find the 'real' Socrates or Euripides or Cleon or Lamachus in Aristophanes' comedies can be "little more than an after-dinner intellectual game".²²¹ As part of a satiric strategy they are dramatic cartoons, visual and

auditory metaphors with degrees of likeness to their real-life counterparts.²²² (This concept will be examined in detail in relation to the non-fictional characters of Uys in Chapter 4.)

2.4.2 The question of political intent

The question of Aristophanes' political convictions has aroused as much debate as that of his moral intentions. From the first extant play, The Acharnians, through the words of the chorus in the parabasis, Aristophanes claims to be a political adviser, a teacher. As such, the spectator (and reader) would expect to discern a serious intent, a commitment to political reform within this and other comedies, for similar claims are repeated in The Knights, The Wasps, Peace and The Frogs.²²³ Arnold W. Gomme, in an influential article, agrees that while Aristophanes "must have had" political opinions, these were not directly expressed in his comedies and, more importantly, were scholars able to discover such opinions, they are not "essential to an understanding of his plays".²²⁴

Such atheism is not accepted by an ardent adherent like G.E.M. De Ste. Croix who asserts, in refuting claims made by, principally, Gomme, that he has "not the slightest doubt" that Aristophanes consciously communicated political opinions in the comedies, that although they "remained primarily comedies", they were "vehicles for the expression of serious political views - about the Athenian democracy, its institutions and its leading figures, and about the Peloponnesian war".²²⁵ His contention is that humour is essential, as the funnier the comedy, the greater the likelihood of the 'message' being received. But to attribute to Aristophanes opinions expressed by his characters in the context of comic business or exchanges has its own dangers. Serious political ideas can be termed such only when they are removed from their context. And it is difficult to support the idea of seriously motivated political criticism when it is an expression of a licensed freedom to abuse and ridicule.

Chapman could be considered an agnostic, but with leanings to the atheistic: in an article

which criticizes De Ste. Croix, he maintains that the answer lies between the extremes proposed by Gomme and De Ste. Croix.²²⁶ The fallacy in viewing Aristophanes as a propagandist rather than a playwright primarily, and not as a comic playwright who exaggerates and distorts facts for humorous effect or even invents 'facts', is demonstrated by the acceptance by certain scholars of the 'causes' of the Peloponnesian War expounded by Dicaeopolis in The Acharnians and by Hermes in Peace as the real facts.²²⁷ For this reason, perhaps, contemporary practitioners of oral satire are reluctant to be labelled "satirists" if the term denotes that their comedy, paradoxically, must be taken seriously, that they should have a moral purpose, that what their characters say is their viewpoint and that if they deal with political issues or portray political figures, distortion or exaggeration of those issues and figures is not acceptable. In Aristophanes, at least, the interpretation of a particular 'fact' must remain subjective because of the passing of time and consequent lack or loss of evidence, so text and context will mean different things to different readers. And in performance, to different spectators: Uys stated in Chapter 1, for every idea he presented at the Elizabeth Sneddon Theatre in Rearranging the Deckchairs on the SA Bothatonic there would be 384 individual opinions in response. To Chapman:

The quest for objectivity in a thing as personal as the interpretation of comedy and satire can seldom produce more than qualified observations about the probabilities and possibilities of the situation underlying the humour; a subjective stand must often be taken to stimulate debate and provoke objections the last thing that can be assumed is that he [Aristophanes] was trying to give us the information we claim to have found, and that his words speak for themselves.²²⁸

In the parabasis of the The Acharnians Aristophanes' chorus deliver political advice in keeping with the function they have claimed as their right. That advice can be construed as asking Athens not to accept the Spartan appeal for peace if it means returning the island of Aegina (originally pro-Spartan, but since its capture by Athens, settled with Athenians, one of whom was, possibly, Aristophanes' father or, in fact, himself).²²⁹ With the cautions enumerated above in mind, the advice need not be wholly serious as it is part of an extended joke and defence of Aristophanes' position as a playwright (the Spartans would demand Aegina because they want Aristophanes who gives the Athenians useful

advice which will help Athens win the war), it is part of the abuse of the audience, and it is part of the fantasy world created within the play. Furthermore, such 'advice' is contradicted by the peace-fantasy of the action of the comedy as a whole. The role of adviser, as Heath states, is absorbed "into the realm of the purely comic".²³⁰

The advice given to the spectators, the demos present at the performance, by the choruses in the parabases of the comedies is overshadowed by assertions of Aristophanes' superiority as a comic playwright and by the absurdly comic suggestions, although relevant to their identity, that the choruses propose: a separate legal system of the "old folk" is submitted by the elderly Acharnians; the militant jurors demand that the "three obols" jury-pay be paid only to those who have fought "in their country's service" in The Wasps; the Birds point out the advantages of worshipping them rather than the Olympians, for which they guarantee health, wealth, happiness, longevity, laughter, peace, dancing and plenty of food.²³¹

In the parabasis of The Frogs (quoted earlier) the role of adviser is again directly asserted; it does bear repetition: "We chorus folk two privileges prize: / To amuse you, citizens, and to advise."²³² This is followed by an appeal to the wisdom of the Athenians: if slaves and allies who fought against Sparta could be given the franchise, would it not seem reasonable to forgive and grant amnesty to those Athenians who were disenfranchised for their participation in the Oligarchical revolution of 411.²³³ This section of the parabasis is both serious and feasible (and amnesty was granted in the year of the play's production). Its seriousness is, to Heath, "unique in extant Aristophanes, and it would therefore be an unreliable basis for generalisation about the adviser's role in his work".²³⁴ Similar advisory functions are claimed for the tragic playwright by Aeschylus and Euripides in the agon.²³⁵ Such claims to an educational, didactic function are made in earnest and are traditional, too, but whether a comic playwright must adhere to the claims is another matter, especially since here, in the agon, parody and a spirit of burlesque dominate. And, as discussed earlier, Aeschylus is not selected on the basis of the advice he gives

Athens, but for what he represents and for the comic possibilities inherent in Euripides' reaction to that choice.

How seriously did the spectators and judges take Aristophanes? The Frogs was, after all, given the honour of a second performance. The answer can only be speculative. Chapman believes his audience took him as seriously as "we take a modern political cartoonist or political satirist", or (a closer parallel to Chapman) the popular television series "That Was The Week That Was" (also referred to as "TWTWTW"), as "it was irreverent, provocative, slanderous and often obscene, but hardly likely to influence a General Election, or public political opinion".²³⁶ That may be so, but Aristophanes, it must be remembered, did not enjoy the impact of weekly repetition to reinforce his viewpoints, serious or not. Chapman does, however, correctly evaluate Aristophanes' impact as a comic rather than a political playwright:

There is no good reason to believe that anything Aristophanes said in his plays had political repercussions from the Acharnians onwards, and therefore no reason to regard him as a political propagandist. There is no telling, of course, whether the poet nursed a secret ambition to be taken more seriously than he was, but I suspect that his genius lay in his ability to reflect the many nuances of public opinion and prejudice rather than to generate them.²³⁷

Aristophanic comedy was political in that all aspects of life in the polis was its source and starting point, aspects presented by the strategies of satire often are transformed through the realm of fantasy; furthermore, it was political to the extent that it maintained an awareness of exploitation and corruption and hypocrisy rather than in advocating solutions in political reality. This does not mean that comedy cannot or should not aim to be a major political force, but that Aristophanic comedy, given the historical evidence, was not and did not aim to be such. If Chapman is correct, if the comic playwright aimed to appeal to a mass, popular audience, that playwright was more likely to appear to mirror opinions, to be consensual rather than partisan, to give the spectators what they enjoyed seeing and hearing. So, too, the ridicule of prominent politicians was meant to be abusive and gratify popular sentiment more than be reformative, and as a licensed jester who was not in the Assembly, that playwright could make statements in the theatre in a way which few politicians, and fewer citizens, dared to.

If lampoons are aimed at individuals, the frequent abuse of the audience as a corporate body could be seen as a kind of lampoon. Chorus and characters ridicule the spectators en masse. After surveying the audience, both Right and Wrong describe them as "convicted buggers" in The Clouds; in The Frogs, Dionysus sees "murderers and perjurers"; Chremes in Ecclesiazusae maintains the audience is composed of "rogues, thieves and liars".²³⁸ The audience is also addressed directly, without prior observation of the spectators, as "war-mad" by the first servant in Peace and by Strepsiades in The Clouds as "dumb fools" and "a flock of sheep".²³⁹ Such observations are obviously more light-hearted than vicious, and a stock device for evoking laughter. Clearly, Aristophanes enjoyed a relationship with the audience that was based on disparaging banter rather than obsequious deference. The response of the spectators can only be guessed at, but was, given the ridicule they were subject to, no doubt vociferous. In worship, in government and in the theatre, passivity was unknown: to Arnott, who cites examples of audiences disrupting performances by comic and tragic playwrights by shouting, throwing fruit, or drumming their heels on the (earlier) wooden benches used as seating, in all three spheres, the "public was an active partner, free to comment, to be commented upon, to assist, or to intervene. The playwright, no less than the orator, could turn this to account."²⁴⁰ If Aristophanes does mean to criticize the audience, it is by inference and by the association with the institutions with which the effectively male audience would be linked: with the demos, the jury system and the Assembly. And even if it is in comic fantasy, the male citizens are easily overcome by women in Lysistrata and Ecclesiazusae.

To summarize: Aristophanic ridicule cannot be equated with personal animosity or hostile intent on the part of the playwright; such satiric abuse was enjoyed by the spectators (if his success as a comic playwright is considered) without affecting their attitude towards the target outside the festival; the attacks on individuals, institutions, the audience itself were understood to be the expression of the license permitted within that festival; the tendency towards the presentation of individuals as embodiments of concepts or typical characteristics was in keeping with general perception and conventional conception and

was not intended to reform; his claims to be an adviser of the citizens can be seen as serious when isolated, but are placed in a comic context or are absorbed into a comic situation; finally, it is untenable to assess his personal convictions from the political and social comments or action of his plays.

2.4.3 Aristophanes' loyalties

Peace opens with two slaves kneading cakes of excrement to feed the giant beetle on which their master, Trygaeus means to ride to Olympus. But what does the beetle represent? The First Slave comments:

One of the spectators might say,
 a young man who thinks he's clever: "What's
 going on here? What's the point of the dung beetle?"
 And a man sitting next to him ...
 says, "In my opinion, the riddle points to
 Cleon - seeing that he is eating shit in Hades!"
 Oh well. I'm going in, to give the beetle a drink.²⁴¹

These lines are humorous in themselves; in addition they provide Aristophanes with the opportunity to add some comments on where the recently-dead Cleon is now situated, deservedly. But they are also a caution to and ridicule of the would-be intellectual critic and scholar, both then and since, who wishes to interpret and elucidate the political or social relevance of the symbol, the allegory, the embodiment, the play rather than appreciate the verbal and visual humour of the joke as a joke. The relaxation derived from communal laughter even in 'low' comedy produces what Reckford terms "the preliminary relaxation required by the comic catharsis: ... the gift of relaxation ... is the necessary catalyst for their [the spectators'] larger recovery of good temper", and with such recovery comes recognition, a recognition of the fallibilities and possibilities of men and states:

Aristophanes' business is to make people laugh; it also aims, by means of good humour, to bring them (together with himself) to see the world through a clearer lens. Interpreters of Aristophanes' plays have usually pointed to certain limited attitudes, and limited purposes: that he wants to end the war; that he disapproves

of demagogues like Cleon; that he wants the Athenians to be less gullible, and less suspicious, and quicker to co-operate with the rest of Greece, and especially with Sparta. Now all this may be true, but like the man ... [who attempts to explain the dung-beetle in Peace], it may not do full justice to the nature or the effect of Aristophanes' comedy. Rather, all those separate political, social, psychological, or aesthetic recognitions embodied in the plays and conveyed to the audience should be seen as subordinate to the larger recognition that goes closely with the recovery of feeling and of perspective.²⁴²

Rather than approaching Aristophanic comedy with notions of discerning a political or social or moral intent, the scholar should acknowledge his "loyalties", to use Reckford's term, loyalties discernible through and behind the comedies.²⁴³ These loyalties are, firstly, to the "comic truth" (to evoke laughter, to expose pretence, to abuse, not the constitution of democracy, but those who lead the demos astray in the Assembly, the Council, the jury-courts or through education); secondly, "to human nature in all its diversity and its creative possibilities" (the 'ordinary' people who triumph over obstacles and thereby exemplify the Athenian belief in human potential: Dicaeopolis, the Sausage-seller, Trygaeus, Pisthetairos, Lysistrata and Praxagora); thirdly, to a term derived from Victor Turner, that of communitas (experiencing the polis behind the polis, of being, in the theatre at least, in a group temporarily freed from divisions of role and status, united in the shared enjoyment of laughter and experiencing thereby a re-generated sense of self and of community); lastly, underlying the above, a loyalty to the "affirmation and celebration of life itself", an "ultimately religious loyalty", to Reckford. Only in a full reading of the extant plays is there justification for returning to Aristophanes' claims of artistic and moral integrity and, despite their exaggerated repetition in the parabases, in taking them seriously, as those of the true komoidodidaskalos: the 'comedy director' or 'comic poet as teacher'. In the 'factional' world of Aristophanes' comedies, as in the revues of Uys (and to use the description by Uys), the loyalty to the "ideal" is implicit, the "actual" is explicit.

Notes to Chapter 2

1. Aristophanes, The Clouds, trans. William Arrowsmith (New York: Mentor, 1962), pp.53-54. (See note 76, Chapter 1, regarding the use of page rather than line references. Furthermore, since, like Shakespeare in Jonson's tribute, this writer knows "small Latin, and less Greek", the accuracy (and theatrical honesty) of various translators has had to be relied upon.) In the original text, this speech was probably spoken by the koryphaios ('chorus-leader') as is usual in the opening of the parabasis; Arrowsmith assigns it to Aristophanes, with the justification that the parabasis in The Clouds "is unique in having the Chorus speak, in the first person, as the poet himself" (his emphasis), p.142. (See also McLeish, in his translation, Clouds, in Aristophanes: "Clouds", "Women in Power", "Knights", pp.25 - 26.) Despite Aristophanes' hopes for the prize, in 423, when The Clouds was first produced, it was placed third (and hence last) in the competition. The extant version is a revision, never completed or produced, revised between three and six years after 423. In the parabasis of The Wasps, presented in 422, Aristophanes expresses his bitter disappointment at the placing of The Clouds (see The Wasps, trans. Douglass Parker (New York: Mentor, 1962), p.82, and The Wasps, trans. David Barrett, in Aristophanes: "The Frogs" and Other Plays (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1964), p.76.)
2. See Eric A. Havelock, "The Socratic self as it is parodied in Aristophanes' Clouds", in Studies in Fifth-Century Thought and Literature, ed. Adam Parry (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972), for a fuller discussion. Havelock attempts to match the contemporary and posthumous records, rather than choosing between them.
3. Plato, The Apology, in Great Dialogues of Plato, trans. W.H.D. Rouse (New York: Mentor, 1956), pp. 424-425.
4. The word sophistes originally meant a clever, wise or skilled man. By the fifth century it referred to a class of professional teachers and thinkers who offered, for payment, a new type of 'education' at Athens (and elsewhere). The two most prominent were Gorgias and Protagoras. The Sophists claimed to teach skill in rhetoric, in particular, and were accused of training their pupils to argue both sides of any question with equal plausibility. As thinkers they were noted for their scepticism, for they questioned accepted moral, social and religious values. They strongly influenced literature of the time, and other playwrights, particularly Euripides (who is also connected to the movement by Aristophanes). (See Andrew Brown, A New Companion to Greek Tragedy (Beckenham: Croom Helm, 1983), pp. 172-173, for further details.)
5. For this point the writer is indebted to Alan H. Sommerstein, "Introductory Note to The Clouds", in Aristophanes: "Lysistrata" and Other Plays, trans. Alan H. Sommerstein (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973), p.108.
6. Plato, The Symposium, in Great Dialogues of Plato, trans. Rouse, p.114.

7. Quoted in William Arrowsmith, "Aristophanes and Sokrates", in Aristophanes, The Clouds, trans. William Arrowsmith (New York: Mentor, 1962), p.11. The reference is from Plutarch's De educatione puerorum, xiv. For consistency, the various spellings of the names of Greek characters, persons and plays have been standardized. These include Socrates, Calonice, Cleon, Cleonymus, Dicaeopolis, Dionysus, Ecclesiazusae, Lamachus, Lysistrata, Mnesilochus and Thesmophoriazusae, for example. The titles which translators have selected for the plays have been retained for ease of reference to the particular versions, however (Ecclesiazusae is variously entitled Women in Power, The Assemblywomen and Women in Revolt by McLeish, Barrett and Chapman). In this work the word playwright is employed to describe the 'profession' of Aristophanes; generally, he refers to himself as a poet, however.
8. The story made its first appearance in literature long after the incident, in Aelian's Varia Historia. Cited in Peter D. Arnott, Public and Performance in the Greek Theatre (London: Routledge, 1989), pp. 12 and 193; Laura M. Stone, Costume in Aristophanic Comedy (New York: Arno Press, 1981), p.34; and Reckford, Aristophanes' Old-and-New Comedy, p.147, among others.
9. Aristophanes, The Clouds, in Aristophanes: "Lysistrata" and Other Plays, trans. Sommerstein, p.134.
10. See Gilbert Murray, Aristophanes: A Study (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933), p.102.
11. *Ibid.*, p.103.
12. See Frances M. Cornford, The Origin of Attic Comedy (New York: Anchor, 1961). (This work was originally published in 1914, causing much scholarly debate regarding its anthropological approach; since then some of this theory has been strongly disputed, particularly the view that Old Comedy was derived from phallic rituals.) Also, Robert M. Torrance, The Comic Hero (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978), Chapter 2, for this and the following observations.
13. Elliott, The Power of Satire, p.5.
14. Omodele, Traditional and Contemporary African Drama, pp.101 and 578.
15. Aristotle, On the Art of Poetry, trans. Ingram Bywater (London: Oxford University Press, 1954), p.30. (This is a reprint of the 1920 edition, and the sections quoted in the paragraph are from the Poetics, 4.)
16. Cited in Hodgart, Satire, pp.18-19, and Kernan, The Plot of Satire, p.10.
17. Aristotle, On the Art of Poetry, p.31.
18. Cornford, The Origin of Attic Comedy, p.113. Detractors from this theory include Muecke, "Playing with the Play", who cites various examples and scholars to discredit the 'nuclear' theory. See also G.M. Sifakis, Parabasis and Animal Choruses (London: Athlone Press, 1971), pp.15-22. Reckford's theory of 'magic to art' is found in his Aristophanes' Old-and-New Comedy, pp.475-482.

19. Aristotle, On the Art of Poetry, p.31.
20. See Elliott, The Power of Satire, Chapters 2 and 6, for the points included in this section.
21. Alvin B. Kernan, "Robert C. Elliott: 1914 - 1981", in English Satire and the Satiric Tradition, ed. Claude Rawson (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1984), p.4.
22. Aristophanes, The Knights, in Aristophanes: "The Birds" and Other Plays, trans. Alan H. Sommerstein (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1978), p.83.
23. Malcolm Heath, Political Comedy in Aristophanes (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1987), p.25. The next point, regarding the difference between oratory and comedy, is also derived from Heath, p.37.
24. Aristophanes, The Frogs, trans. Barrett, p.171.
25. Reckford, Aristophanes' Old-and-New Comedy, pp.416-417.
26. Victor Ehrenberg, The People of Aristophanes (New York:Schocken, 1962), p.26.
27. Cited by C.M. Bowra, The Greek Experience (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1957), p.183.
28. Aristophanes, The Acharnians, in Aristophanes: "Lysistrata" and Other Plays, trans. Sommerstein, pp.77-78.
29. The information concerning the submission of plays is derived from McLeish, The Theatre of Aristophanes, Chapter 2, and David Barrett, "Introduction", in Aristophanes: "The Frogs" and Other Plays, pp.15-17. The standard scholarly treatment of the procedures governing presentation is probably Arthur W. Pickard-Cambridge, The Dramatic Festivals of Athens, 2nd ed., rev. J. Gould and D.M. Lewis (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968). Pickard-Cambridge criticized Cornford's theories concerning the origins of Old Comedy.
30. Aristophanes, The Acharnians, trans. Sommerstein, pp.101-102.
31. George Meredith, "An Essay on Comedy", in Comedy (New York: Doubleday Anchor, 1956), p.5.
32. Dover, Aristophanic Comedy, p.34. The writer is indebted to Dover for the following observation regarding personal abuse.
33. These references are from Aristophanes, Wealth, in Aristophanes: "The Birds" and Other Plays, trans. Sommerstein, pp.294-296; McLeish, notes on Knights in Aristophanes: "Clouds", "Women in Power", "Knights", p.185; his translation of Clouds in the same volume, p.48; The Acharnians, trans. Sommerstein, p.52.
34. Cited in Geoffrey Chapman's translation of Ecclesiazusae (literally, 'Women in Assembly'), entitled Women in Revolt, unpublished performance text, p.61.
35. McLeish, The Theatre of Aristophanes, p.37.

36. Raymond K. Fisher, Aristophanes' "Clouds": Purpose and Technique (Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1984), considers these questions in detail, particularly in Chapter 1.
37. Arrowsmith, "Aristophanes and Sokrates", p.13.
38. Estimates of the population of Athens vary considerably (some say 150 000, including slaves), but the plague of 430 killed more than a quarter of the population, including Pericles (in 429) and the Peloponnesian War reduced numbers even further. When Aristophanes wrote Ecclesiazusae, a population of only "thirty thousand or more" citizens is mentioned (see Aristophanes, The Assemblywomen (Ecclesiazusae), in Aristophanes: "The Birds" and Other Plays, trans. David Barrett, p.262). The Theatre of Dionysus at Athens, incidentally, seated between fourteen and seventeen thousand spectators.
39. Arnott, Public and Performance in the Greek Theatre, p.8. Arnott lists the examples of departures "from the norm" cited after this quotation. Those from The Acharnians, are, however, personal observations.
40. Aristophanes, The Assemblywomen, trans. Barrett, p.228. Geoffrey Chapman, in his unpublished translation, Women in Revolt, also makes the points regarding audience address, p.15.
41. Arnott, Public and Performance in the Greek Theatre, p.8.
42. Fisher, Aristophanes' "Clouds", p.164.
43. See Kenneth Cavander, "Aristophanes", in World Drama, eds. John Gassner and Edward Quinn (London: Methuen, 1970), pp.28-29, for a further discussion of the manner in which Aristophanes reflects his city and his times, and for the treatment of these themes in his plays.
44. Walcot, "Aristophanic and Other Audiences", 41. Walcot believes that women were included in Aristophanes' audiences.
45. Quoted in McLeish, The Theatre of Aristophanes, p.22, from a translation by Benjamin Bickley Rogers.
46. See Cavander, "Aristophanes", p.29, for this and the following observation.
47. Ibid.
48. Aristophanes, Peace, in Aristophanes: "The Birds" and Other Plays, trans. Sommerstein, p.123.
49. Cited by Chapman, Women in Revolt, pp.25, 26 and 36. Jeffrey Henderson has compiled a glossary of terms, both euphemistic and explicit, and their use in the plays, in The Maculate Muse: Obscene Language in Attic Comedy (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975).

50. Katherine Lever, The Art of Greek Comedy (London: Methuen, 1956), p.116. Patrick Fish uses the term 'faction' to describe the genre to which Rian Malan's My Traitor's Heart (1990) belongs. He limits the definition to "a book that incorporates elements of fiction in its portrayal of fact and vice versa". See Patrick Fish, "Malan, the Movie: The BBC version of Rian Malan's My Traitor's Heart", South African Theatre Journal 5 (May 1991), 98. The term is, this writer believes, equally applicable to lampoons in the theatre.
51. The information regarding the use and function of masks is derived from, principally, Peter D. Arnott, The Ancient Greek and Roman Theatre (New York: Random House, 1971), Chapter 2; Stone, Costume in Aristophanic Comedy; McLeish, The Theatre of Aristophanes; Reckford, Aristophanes' Old-and-New Comedy; Taplin, Greek Tragedy in Action. T.B.L. Webster, Greek Theatre Production (London: Methuen, 1970), and Richard and Helen Leacock, Theatre and Playhouse (London: Methuen, 1988), both provide details of the dimensions of the theatres discussed.
52. T.B.L. Webster, "The Poet and the Mask", in Classical Drama and its Influence, ed. M.J. Anderson (London: Methuen, 1965), p.5.
53. Aristophanes, The Assemblywomen, trans. Barrett, p.224.
54. A full account of the parody of Telephus is given in Frances Muecke, "'I Know You - By Your Rags': Costume and Disguise in Fifth-century Drama", Antichthon 16 (1982), 17-34.
55. *Ibid.*, 22-23.
56. Aristophanes, Women in Protest, trans. Chapman, p.66.
57. Aristophanes, Lysistrata, in Aristophanes: "Lysistrata" and Other Plays, trans. Sommerstein, pp.180 and 185.
58. Taplin, Greek Tragedy in Action, p.14. Although Taplin, as his title makes plain, is concerned with the theatrical presentation of Greek tragedy, his observations are frequently as applicable to Aristophanic comedy in relation to the use of the mask in performance.
59. J. Michael Walton, The Greek Sense of Theatre (London: Methuen, 1984), p.68.
60. Arnott, Public and Performance in the Greek Theatre, pp.62 and 71-72.
61. Walton, The Greek Sense of Theatre, p.57.
62. Peter Hall, Peter Hall's Diaries: The Story of a Dramatic Battle, ed. John Goodwin (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1983), p.420.
63. *Ibid.*, p.419.
64. Tony Harrison, Theatre Works: 1973-1985 (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1985), p.187.

65. Walton, The Greek Sense of Theatre, p.172.
66. Taplin, Greek Tragedy in Action, p.1.
67. See Brown, A New Companion to Greek Tragedy, p.11, and Stone, Costume in Aristophanic Comedy, pp.18-31, for a fuller discussion.
68. R.P. Hinks, Greek and Roman Portrait Sculpture (London: British Museum Publications, 1976), p.11. The information concerning portraiture has been derived from two sources, primarily: Hinks, and G.M.A. Richter, The Portraits of the Greeks (Oxford: Phaidon, 1984).
69. Hinks, Greek and Roman Portrait Sculpture, p.10.
70. Ibid., p.14.
71. See John Barron, An Introduction to Greek Sculpture (London: Athlone Press, 1981), for the implications of and reasons for his demarcations.
72. Richter, The Portraits of the Greeks, pp.40-41.
73. Ibid., p.26.
74. Aristophanes, Knights, trans. McLeish, p.138.
75. Cited in Stone, Costume in Aristophanic Comedy, pp.31-32.
76. Aristophanes, The Knights, trans. Sommerstein, p.73.
77. Dover, Aristophanic Comedy, p.29. The writer is indebted to Dover for the observations concerning the portrait-mask for Cleon, and political cartoons following this quotation.
78. For the source of this information, and for a more extensive treatment, consult Stone, Costume in Aristophanic Comedy, p.36, and K.J. Dover, "Portrait-Masks in Aristophanes", Komoidotragemata: Studies in Honour of W.J.W. Koster (1967), 17.
79. Lever, The Art of Greek Comedy, p.134.
80. Aristophanes, The Knights, trans. Sommerstein, pp. 42, 55, 74, 77 and 83.
81. Cited in Webster, "The Poet and the Mask", p.10, and Stone, Costume in Aristophanic Comedy, p.38. Stone provides cogent arguments both for and against the existence of such a 'stock', particularly in relation to Old Comedy, as New Comedy deals in abstract types rather than the real people of the polis. Webster argues that thirty-eight mask-types were sufficient. Pollux mentions twenty-six (cited in C.W. Dearden, The Stage of Aristophanes (London: Athlone Press, 1976), p.126. Dearden provides a hypothetical allocation of masks for each play by Aristophanes on pp.128-142).

82. Cornford, The Origin of Attic Comedy, p.134. The belief in a set of traditional, fixed character types in comedy has been disputed; see, for example, Halliwell, "Aristophanic Satire", in English Satire and the Satiric Tradition, p.12.
83. Aristophanes, The Frogs, trans. Dickinson, p.222.
84. Aristophanes, Women in Protest, trans. Chapman, p.15.
85. Aristophanes, The Poet and the Women, in Aristophanes: "The Frogs" and Other Plays, trans. Barrett, p.105.
86. For the representation of the phallus in vase-paintings, see Pickard-Cambridge, The Dramatic Festivals of Athens, figs. 77c and 78, and p.211. Chapman's statement concerning the license allowed at the festivals is from his Women in Revolt, p.78.
87. Stephen Halliwell, "Aristophanic Satire", pp.9-10.
88. For the derivation of the ease of caricaturing Socrates, see Cornford, The Origin of Attic Comedy, pp.136-137.
89. Plato, The Symposium, trans. Rouse, p.109.
90. Dover, "Portrait-Masks in Aristophanes", 26-28.
91. See Aristophanes, The Clouds, trans. Sommerstein, pp.116 and 118.
92. Stone, Costume in Aristophanic Comedy, p.24.
93. Aristophanes, The Wasps, trans. Parker, p.106.
94. See Aristophanes, The Clouds, trans. Sommerstein, p.147.
95. Fisher, Aristophanes' "Clouds", pp.164-165.
96. Quoted in Pollard, Satire, p.72.
97. Halliwell, "Aristophanic Satire", p.10.
98. Ibid.
99. Fisher, Aristophanes' "Clouds", pp.17-20, and Ehrenberg, The People of Aristophanes, pp.82-89 and 207-211, formulate these antitheses in detail.
100. William Arrowsmith, "Introduction: The Clouds", in Aristophanes, The Clouds, trans. Arrowsmith, p.9.
101. Lever, in The Art of Greek Comedy, discusses Aristophanes' recognition of the magnitude and seriousness of his function as teacher and saviour of Athens in Chapter 4.
102. Aristophanes, The Wasps, trans. Parker, pp.81-82.

103. Halliwell, "Aristophanic Satire", p.12.
104. For the list of these philosophers, the writer is indebted to Arrowsmith, "Introduction: The Clouds", p.9.
105. For this reason Fisher, in Aristophanes' "Clouds", Chapter 13, strongly opposes Martha Nussbaum's examination of Aristophanes' contribution to the debate about the 'traditional' and 'modern' methods of education, and in particular the relationship between the portraits of Socrates presented by Aristophanes and Plato. See Martha Nussbaum, "Aristophanes and Socrates on learning practical wisdom", in Aristophanes: Essays in Interpretation (Yale Classical Studies: 26), ed. Jeffrey Henderson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), pp.43-97.
106. Aristophanes, The Clouds, trans. Sommerstein, p.116.
107. Aristophanes, Clouds, trans. McLeish, p.38.
108. Aristophanes, The Clouds, trans. Sommerstein, p.116. (Sommerstein and McLeish use personifications of these opposing arguments, Right and Wrong, for the agon, Dickinson names them True Logic and False Logic, Arrowsmith makes the strongest association: in his translation they are embodied as Philosophy and Sophistry. The translations by Sommerstein, McLeish and Arrowsmith have all been referred to. That by Patric Dickinson is in Aristophanes (Plays:1) (London: Oxford University Press, 1970), and is entitled Clouds.)
109. *Ibid.*, p.117.
110. *Ibid.*, p.126.
111. Aristophanes, Clouds, trans. McLeish, p.19.
112. Arrowsmith, "Introduction: The Clouds", p.8.
113. Aristophanes, Clouds, trans. Dickinson, p.123.
114. Stone, Costume in Aristophanic Comedy, pp.323-324.
115. For this point the writer is indebted to Kenneth J. Dover, "Comedy and Society", in Twentieth Century Interpretations of "The Frogs", ed. David J. Littlefield (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1968), p.109.
116. Fisher, Aristophanes' "Clouds", p.193.
117. Cited in Fisher, Aristophanes' "Clouds", p.193, and Arrowsmith in his translation of the comedy on p.145.
118. Aristophanes, The Clouds, trans. Sommerstein, p.134.
119. Reckford, Aristophanes' Old-and-New Comedy, pp.393-394.
120. McLeish, The Theatre of Aristophanes, p.58.

121. Arrowsmith, "Aristophanes and Sokrates", p.13.
122. Aristophanes, Women in Protest, trans. Chapman, p.14.
123. See Rosemary M. Harriot, "Aristophanes' Audience and the Plays of Euripides", Institute of Classical Studies Bulletin 9 (1962), 1-8, for a discussion of the extent of Aristophanes' references to and 'borrowings' from Euripides' works.
124. Cited in various works. See, for example, Reckford's Aristophanes' Old-and-New Comedy, p.535.
125. Halliwell, "Aristophanic Satire", p.12.
126. This observation is from Muecke, "Playing with the Play", p.66. An extended treatment of the implication of it, in Thesmophoriazusae, is given in McLeish, The Theatre of Aristophanes, pp.138-140, who assumes the actor playing Euripides wore a portrait-mask.
127. Reckford, Aristophanes' Old-and-New Comedy, p.176.
128. Aristophanes, The Frogs, trans. Fitts, p.109.
129. Bruno Snell, "The Death of Tragedy", in Twentieth Century Interpretations of "The Frogs", pp.98-99. Friedrich Nietzsche formulated a similar connection in his The Birth of Tragedy from the Spirit of Music (1872), to the extent that Euripides, influenced by Socrates and the philosophers, developed the intellectual feature of tragedy to the detriment of its basic emotional (or "musical") nature. Nietzsche proposed that tragedy arose from the ritual celebration of Dionysus and was expressed through music, in the song and dance of the dithyramb. The 'plastic' arts, like drama, arose from the emotional and irrational Dionysus in man, while the lucidity, reasonableness, and harmony of Apollo imposed form upon it; these two forces had remained in opposition until they were united in tragedy. Besides the translation by Francis Golffing, See N. Joseph Calarco, Tragic Being: Apollo and Dionysus in Western Drama (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1969).
130. Reckford, in Aristophanes' Old-and-New Comedy, p.428, makes this connection between Socrates and Euripides and the 'Old' as opposed to the 'New'.
131. Quoted in Plato, The Republic, in Great Dialogues of Plato, trans. Rouse, p.367.
132. Cornford, The Origin of Attic Comedy, p.140.
133. Reckford, Aristophanes' Old-and-New Comedy, p.428.
134. The concept of the two playwrights representing Athens is developed from observations made by Cedric H. Whitman, "Death and Life: The Frogs", in Twentieth Century Interpretations of "The Frogs", pp.74-96.
135. Snell, "The Death of Tragedy", pp.100-101.
136. Aristophanes, Frogs, trans. Dickinson, p.235.

137. Whitman, "Death and Life: The Frogs", p.90.
138. David Barrett, "Introductory Note to The Frogs", in Aristophanes: "The Frogs" and Other Plays, p.152.
139. G.M.A. Grube, "The Literary Criticism of the Frogs", in Twentieth Century Interpretations of "The Frogs", p.72.
140. Peter D. Arnott, "Aristophanes and Popular Comedy: An Analysis of The Frogs", in Western Popular Theatre, ed. David Mayer and Kenneth Richards (London: Methuen, 1977), p.183.
141. These references are to be found in The Frogs, trans. Barrett, pp.191 and 194; The Acharnians, trans. Sommerstein, pp.67 and 70; The Poet and the Women, trans. Barrett, p.113; and Frogs, trans. Dickinson, p.213.
142. Gilbert Murray, "A View of Euripides", in Twentieth Century Interpretations of "The Frogs", p.59.
143. Murray, Aristophanes: A Study, p.68.
144. For these views, the writer is indebted to Fisher, Aristophanes' "Clouds", Chapter 7, and McLeish, The Theatre of Aristophanes, pp.53-54 and 74-75.
145. See Cornford, The Origin of Attic Comedy, pp.119-123, for the classification of these characters and their counterparts in the comedies. Pickard-Cambridge, in The Dramatic Festivals of Athens, opposes such types.
146. See Alan H. Sommerstein, "Introduction" to Aristophanes: "Lysistrata" and Other Plays, pp.13-14, for this and the following observations. Sommerstein also points to the fact that Pericles had never prosecuted a comic poet.
147. Lever, The Art of Greek Comedy, pp.115-119, refers to Thucydides to support her contention that the lampoons of Cleon, Demosthenes, Nicias and Lamachus "were reasonable caricatures" of the originals (p.116).
148. The quotation by Thucydides is cited in Murray, Aristophanes: A Study, p.39; the details of Cleon's victory over the Spartans is also contained in this work.
149. See Alan H. Sommerstein, "Introductory Note to The Knights", in Aristophanes: "The Birds" and Other Plays, pp.31-32, for this and the next points.
150. Aristophanes, Acharnians, trans. Patric Dickinson in Aristophanes (Plays:1), p.18.
151. Ehrenberg, The People of Aristophanes, p.25.
152. Aristophanes, Acharnians, trans. Dickinson, p.27.
153. Rosemary M. Harriott, Aristophanes: Poet and Dramatist (Beckenham: Croom Helm, 1986), p.36.
154. Aristophanes, The Acharnians, trans. Sommerstein, p.71.

155. Aristophanes, Acharnians, trans. Dickinson, p.22.
156. Aristophanes, The Acharnians, trans. Sommerstein, p.72.
157. For the source of the information regarding the stance of the Acharnians, see, among others, Hans-Joachim Newiger, "War and peace in the comedy of Aristophanes", in Aristophanes: Essays in Interpretation (Yale Classical Studies: 26), pp.220-221.
158. These observations are derived from Lowell Edmunds, "Aristophanes' Acharnians" in Aristophanes: Essays in Interpretation (Yale Classical Studies: 26), pp.1-41.
159. Aristophanes, The Acharnians, trans. Sommerstein, p.49 (and notes 1 and 30 on pp.239 and 241).
160. Ibid., p.62.
161. Cited in Ehrenberg, The People of Aristophanes, p.25, and in Aristophanes, The Knights, trans. Sommerstein, p.62.
162. See Aristophanes, Knights, trans. Dickinson, p.79, for one of these references to Cleon's success at Pylos.
163. Aristophanes, The Knights, trans. Sommerstein, p.38.
164. Cited, unfortunately without textual or other evidence, in Levin, Playboys and Killjoys, p.195.
165. See Murray, Aristophanes: A Study, pp.41-46, and Dickinson, Aristophanes (Plays: 1), p.47, for a discussion of Cleon's activities.
166. Aristophanes, The Knights, trans. Sommerstein, p.65.
167. McLeish, "Introduction", p.xii.
168. Ibid., pp. xii-xiii.
169. Aristophanes, The Clouds, trans. Arrowsmith, pp.55 and 57-58.
170. See Sommerstein, "Introductory Note to The Knights", pp.32-33.
171. McLeish, The Theatre of Aristophanes, p.58.
172. Heath, in Political Comedy in Aristophanes, treats the difference in outlook in greater detail on pp.12-13 and 16-18. Heath does not view The Knights as satire; the observations hereafter are derived from Reckford, Aristophanes' Old-and-New Comedy, pp.113-114, to whom the writer is indebted.
173. Reckford, Aristophanes' Old-and-New Comedy, p.114.
174. Ibid.

175. Alan H. Sommerstein, "Introductory Note to The Acharnians", in Aristophanes: "Lysistrata" and Other Plays, p.45.
176. Aristophanes, The Wasps, trans. Parker, p.18.
177. Douglass Parker, "Introduction", in The Wasps, trans. Parker, pp.9-10, and notes to pp.18 and 106. The arguments proposed by Parker in his discussion of the motives of the characters he terms Phobokleon and Philokleon form the basis of the ensuing examination of The Wasps.
178. See Aristophanes, The Wasps, trans. Barrett, pp. 75-76, and Wasps, trans. Dickinson, in Aristophanes (Plays: 1), p.204.
179. See Aristophanes, Peace, trans. Sommerstein, p.123, and Peace, trans. Dickinson, in Aristophanes (Plays: 1), pp.248-249.
180. Aristophanes, The Wasps, trans. Barrett, p.91.
181. Aristophanes, Peace, trans. Sommerstein, p.119.
182. Fisher, Aristophanes' "Clouds", p.166.
183. Aristophanes, The Acharnians, trans. Sommerstein, p.74.
184. Halliwell, "Aristophanic Satire", p.11.
185. See Cornford, The Origin of Attic Comedy, pp.135-136, for a fuller description of the character type of Lamachus as the first of such soldiers in comedy. Cornford believes he is the ancestor of Ancient Pistol and the Capitano of Italian comedy.
186. Aristophanes, The Acharnians, trans. Sommerstein, p.75.
187. Edmunds, "Aristophanes' Acharnians", p.14. The writer is indebted to Edmunds for the succeeding remark concerning Lamachus as a 'type'.
188. Aristophanes, The Frogs, trans. Barrett, p.194.
189. Halliwell, "Aristophanic Satire", p.11.
190. Aristophanes, Acharnians, trans. Dickinson, p.15.
191. Ibid., p.24. Sommerstein adds a stage direction to describe his appearance: "He is dressed in full armour, his shield bearing a horrific Gorgon's head, and wears a helmet with an enormous triple crest and two ostrich feathers" on p.74 of his translation. Though the description does not exist in the original, it is inferred by the ensuing exchange and action between Dicaeopolis and Lamachus.
192. This fact is cited by Murray in Aristophanes: A Study, p.34.
193. Aristophanes, The Acharnians, trans. Sommerstein, p.75.
194. Ibid.

195. Halliwell, "Aristophanic Satire", p.11.
196. Aristophanes, The Acharnians, trans. Sommerstein, p.102.
197. See Euripides, Hippolytus, in Euripides: "Alcestis", "Hippolytus", "Iphigenia in Tauris", trans. Philip Vellacott (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1974), p.124.
198. Aristophanes, Acharnians, trans. Dickinson, p.44.
199. Stone, Costume in Aristophanic Comedy, p.406.
200. Aristophanes, The Acharnians, trans. Sommerstein, p.103.
201. See Henderson, The Maculate Muse, p.62.
202. McLeish, The Theatre of Aristophanes, p.150.
203. See Taplin, Greek Tragedy in Action, Chapter 6, for example. In the Agamemnon in The Oresteia of Aeschylus, Agamemnon literally and figuratively diminishes his character when he removes his boots to walk on the 'carpet' Clytemnestra has prepared; so too, Cassandra in stripping off and destroying the emblems of prophecy prepares for the destruction of the prophetess whose character they denote. Arnott, in Public and Performance in the Greek Theatre, Chapter 6, describes this aspect of costume in a discussion of character and continuity, and the remarks concerning Dicaeopolis and his 'inconsistency' of character are derived from this source, pp.179-181.
204. Halliwell, "Aristophanic Satire", p.11. Croiset, in Aristophanes and the Political Parties at Athens also speaks of the generalized nature of the presentation of Lamachus, pp.54-55, and he makes the point regarding the 'general's' traits.
205. Quoted in Torrance, The Comic Hero, p.38.
206. Quoted in Halliwell, "Aristophanic Satire", p.6.
207. Hight, The Anatomy of Satire, p.27.
208. Aristophanes, The Assemblywomen, trans. Barrett, p.245.
209. Murray, Aristophanes: A Study, p.10.
210. Cedric H. Whitman, Aristophanes and the Comic Hero (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964), p.22.
211. *Ibid.*, p.30. The qualities of the comic hero are listed on p.52 of the same work.
212. *Ibid.*, p.7.
213. Torrance, The Comic Hero, p.45.

214. Reckford, Aristophanes' Old-and-New Comedy, p.200. Reckford summarizes the 'worlds' in Aristophanes as proposed by various scholars, on pp.198-200. Reckford also discusses the awareness of scholars of Aristophanes' tolerance of contradiction, pp.285-289.
215. McLeish, "Introduction", p.xiii.
216. Fisher, Aristophanes' "Clouds", p.112.
217. This is noted in Reckford, Aristophanes' Old-and-New Comedy, p.41. Reckford is in agreement with Cornford's formulation of the positive and negative aspects of fertility rites which he describes on pp.40-41 of the same work. Although he does not refer to the original, Cornford's formulation of those aspects can be found in The Origin of Attic Comedy, pp.83-84, 95-97 and 106-109.
218. Harriott, Aristophanes: Poet and Dramatist, p.52.
219. McLeish, The Theatre of Aristophanes, p.91.
220. Ibid.
221. Ibid.
222. The description of Aristophanes' non-fictional characters as cartoons has been made by various scholars. The most succinct appraisal is by Elder Olson, The Theory of Comedy (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1968), pp.68-75.
223. Aristophanes, Acharnians p.26; Knights p.71; Wasps p.204; Peace pp.248-249; Frogs p.207, all trans. by Dickinson.
224. Arnold W. Gomme, "Aristophanes and Politics", in More Essays in Greek History and Literature, ed. David A. Campbell (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962), pp.81-82. The essay was first published in 1938 and is still regarded as a seminal work in advocating Aristophanes' impartiality in political matters.
225. G.E.M. De Ste. Croix, The Origins of the Peloponnesian War (London: Duckworth, 1972), p.356.
226. Geoffrey Chapman, "Aristophanes and History", Acta Classica 21 (1978), 62.
227. Ibid., 65.
228. Ibid., 70.
229. Aristophanes, The Acharnians, trans. Sommerstein, p.78. See also the note to the passage on p.243 for the 'reasons' for the appeal by Sparta and by Aristophanes.
230. Heath, Political Comedy in Aristophanes, p.19. The writer is indebted to Heath for his observations regarding the poet as adviser and the suggestions made by the chorus in the parabasis in Chapter 6 of his work.

231. Aristophanes, The Acharnians, trans. Sommerstein, p.81; Wasps, trans. Dickinson, p.206; The Birds, trans. William Arrowsmith (New York: Mentor, 1961), p.69.
232. Aristophanes, The Frogs, trans. Barrett, p.181.
233. Ibid., pp.181-182.
234. Heath, Political Comedy in Aristophanes, p.20. Heath points to the dangers of accepting the claims of Aeschylus and Euripides out of their comic context stated by this writer in the same paragraph.
235. Aristophanes, The Frogs, trans. Barrett, pp.191-192, 194 and 195.
236. Chapman, "Aristophanes and History", 62. De Ste. Croix also compares Aristophanes to a political cartoonist, for the mixture of seriousness and foolery that exist in the comedies, in The Origins of the Peloponnesian War, p.357. "That Was The Week That Was" is discussed in the following chapter.
237. Ibid., 63.
238. Aristophanes, Clouds, trans. Dickinson, p.149; The Frogs, trans. Barrett, p.167; The Assemblywomen, trans. Barrett, pp.236-237.
239. Aristophanes, Peace, trans. Dickinson, p.226, and Clouds, trans. Dickinson, p.152.
240. Arnott, Public and Performance in the Greek Theatre, pp.6 and 11.
241. Translated by Reckford, Aristophanes' Old-and-New Comedy, p.10, from whom this writer has derived the points regarding the fallacy of attempting to explicate the humour in Aristophanes.
242. Ibid., p.11.
243. Ibid., p.288. Aristophanes' "loyalties" are discussed in detail in Chapter 5 of Reckford's work. The word is subjective, but is the most apt this writer has encountered to describe Aristophanes' commitments. The concept of communitas is derived from Victor Turner in Chapters 3 - 5 of The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1969).

CHAPTER 3

SATIRE IN SOUTH AFRICA - A DESCRIPTIVE SURVEY, PRINCIPALLY OF THE MANIFESTATION OF SATIRE IN ENGLISH IN THEATRICAL FORMS

Attend my fable if your ears be clean,
In fair Banana Land we lay our scene -
South Africa, renowned both far and wide
For politics and little else beside:
Where, having torn the land with shot and shell,
Our sturdy pioneers as farmers dwell,
And, 'twixt the hours of strenuous sleep, relax
To shear the fleeces or to fleece the blacks:
Where every year a fruitful increase bears
Of pumpkins, cattle, sheep, and millionaires ...

- Roy Campbell, The Wayzgoose (1928)¹

In a country in which only those with "brain and muscle have to starve", where "donkeys" can become "statesmen", "worms ... magistrates", "Beetroots ... sit in editorial chairs" and where "pumpkins to professors are promoted", then, Campbell wrote elsewhere in 1930, satire will be "directed by fearless individuals, at close range, against powerful groups, prominent contemporary figures, and against the follies and shams which they represent".² With such a wealth of material available for ridicule and abuse, satire is, and always has been, prevalent in various theatrical, literary and journalistic forms in South Africa. Chapter 3 is divided into two parts. Part One is a necessarily selective review of the diversity, style and censorship of such manifestations in English.³ Part Two considers the contributions made, principally, in the revue, cabaret and stand-up format since the 1960s.

PART ONE: A SURVEY OF THE DIVERSITY, STYLE AND CENSORSHIP OF SATIRE

3.1 Examples of satire in early theatre and the contribution of journalists

3.1.1 From Boniface to Bain

The credit for the first extant full-length satirical work published in South Africa belongs, in all probability, to Charles Etienne Boniface, the French immigrant who was variously a journalist, editor (in Cape Town and Pietermaritzburg, where he began the first newspaper in Natal, De Natalier, in April 1844, which soon became bilingual), translator, teacher of seven languages, musician, and a pioneering director, performer and playwright of the colonial theatre. The play, which Boniface described on the titlepage as a "burlesque comedy in four acts" was De Nieuwe Ridderorde of De Temperantisten ('The New Order of Knighthood, or The Abstainers/Temperance League'), published in 1832, but apparently never produced on stage. F.C.L. Bosman describes the work as a milestone in the history of theatre and literature at the Cape, for it is the oldest existing original dramatic work in South Africa (in print, that is), one of the oldest "monuments" of purposefully-written literary Afrikaans and, moreover, the first direct satire of social conditions in "Hollands-Afrikaans" literature.⁴

Written mainly in the Dutch colloquial dialect, De Nieuwe Ridderorde nevertheless included all the ethnic varieties spoken at the Cape: English, French, Portuguese, Spanish and Italian, besides a mixed-patois 'Hottentots'. Boniface's impulse to write the satirical comedy was the first meeting of the Cape of Good Hope Temperance Society held in Cape Town on 28 January 1832, chaired by George Hough, the Senior Colonial Chaplain, who appears in the play as the Chairman, "Stoeleman Puff". The vigorous and exaggerated Methodist 'philanthropy' underlying the movement for prohibition forms the basis of the

plot and provided Boniface with his targets. The characters are thinly disguised lampoons of local churchmen, academics, editors, medical practitioners and businessmen. The dramatis personae is, in fact, a spectrum of the prominent personages and concerns of the time. John Fairburn, the editor of The South African Journal (1824) is "Sir John Brute", the Reverend Doctor John Philip (of the London Missionary Society) is the Reverend "Humbug Philipumpkin", Doctor S. Bailey, the surgeon at the Somerset Hospital who cites, as he did at the first meeting, examples of delirium tremens caused by alcohol among his patients, is "Delirium Tremens, Chief Doctor of the Order". Their professions are all appropriate to their characters' positions within the Temperance society, as depicted by Boniface. Real-life opponents of the Society are also lampooned: "Doctor Macthirsty" was Doctor Macartney, a phrenologist from Grahamstown, who is supported by local wine merchants and distillers who also appear as characters. The characterization is clearly stereotyped and exaggerated rather than individualized and the topicality of the piece is of greater importance than character development. The fictional characters include similar simplification into recognizable types: Andrew Everdry, an Irishman is designated a "Settler-type", a Hottentot recently 'incorporated' into the Temperance society is his counterpart Hans Droogekeel (or 'Dry-throat').

That the cast list consists almost entirely of 'British' colonials is itself a comment on the most recent change in the rulers of the colony, for in 1814 Great Britain had again assumed control of the Cape. (Cape Town was captured by the British from the Dutch in 1795, restored to the Dutch in 1801, retaken in 1806, and finally ceded to Britain in 1814.) In 1799 the English-based Garrison Theatre had already established itself by the military, under the protection of charitable patrons. Consequently, the Governor, Sir George Yonge sanctioned the erection of the first permanent theatre building in South Africa in the first years of the nineteenth century in Hottentot Square (now Riebeeck Square). This was the so-called African Theatre which functioned between 1802 and 1839. It subsequently became, and is still, a church (St Stephen's Church). 'African Theatre' is an ironic choice of name considering that the production which celebrated its inauguration was Shakespeare's Henry IV (1597).

The first play in English to be printed in South Africa is also satirical in intent and also written by Boniface: Kockincoz, or the Pettifogging Lawyers' Plot (1843), which indirectly attacks J.J. de Kock, a general agent and sworn translator who had, in all likelihood, won a lawsuit against Boniface. On the title page Boniface claimed that the farce in one act was "Translated from the Burlosutacrifanpatoistish - Language", which hints not only at the chicanery of the burlesqued legal proceedings suggested by the title (among the characters are Lord Demur, "A Judge and His Court at the same time", Squire Ricordo, "Master of the Rolls" and Harry Clamorous, "Usher of the Court"), but also the difficulties of English pronunciation for those conversant in the supposedly 'ridiculous - South - African - patois - language' (of local characters such as Margaret Slaaibek (literally, 'salad-mouth', but used to mean 'gift of the gab'), "A Bastard Hottentot Young Lady", and Abdol Trambambuli, "A Malay Gentleman").

Although he recognizes that Boniface's targets are dishonest lawyers and that the "pun is his chief weapon of satire", Mervyn Woodrow criticizes the farce by describing it as "peopled by flat and dull caricatures".⁵ But this is surely in keeping with Boniface's satiric intention: to present the 'pettifogging' lawyers as ludicrously exaggerated types, indiscriminately characterized as Mr Crow, Mr Crump, Mr Crab and Mr Clash, a convention discernible in the dramatis personae of eighteenth century comedies in English, of the type presented at the Cape during the early nineteenth century. (These include George Farquhar's The Beaux-Stratagem (1707), Oliver Goldsmith's She Stoops to Conquer (1773) and Richard Brinsley Sheridan's The School for Scandal (1777). Mrs Candour, Sir Benjamin Backbite, Crabtree and Snake in The School for Scandal verge upon caricature; indeed, the characters all live up to the names with which Sheridan has christened them.) Boniface's work is scurrilous and mocking, a manifestation of his frequent wrangles with his contemporaries who were meant to accept it presumably, as the motto of the amateur theatrical company he managed and which performed in the theatre which existed in Hottentot Square in Cape Town was honi soit qui mal y pense ('shame to him who evil thinks').

Perhaps the most enduring satirical character created in the nineteenth century is Kaatje Kekkelbek (the name means 'Chatterbox'), appearing as she does in different guises in plays by, amongst others, Stephen Black, Guy Butler and André Brink.⁶ Her language usage alone has made her an object of study within Afrikaans-medium High Schools in South Africa as the one-person revue piece which bears her name is considered one of the forerunners of spoken Afrikaans. Kaatje Kekkelbek, or Life Among the Hottentots by Andrew Geddes Bain and George Rex was first performed by the Graham's Town Amateur Company in 1838.⁷ Butler, in his Cape Charade (1967) includes an adaptation of the original in a play-within-the-play in his work on Bain and his meeting with the Russian novelist Ivan Alexandrovich Goncharov in 1853. He describes Kaatje Kekkelbek as "perhaps, our first successful fictional character: she caught the popular imagination of her day, and has survived into our own century".⁸

Although not the first female protagonist to resist her political, social and cultural oppression (that honour, according to Gray, belongs to a Muslim woman, Galiema, in a play of that title transcribed in Arabic manuscript, circa 1740), she remains one of the most outspoken.⁹ In her 'creolized' language she castigates the English colonial process: her missionary education, the justice of the white courts, the reformatory benefits of her jail sentence, the policy which created her Kat River 'homeland'. Through her repetition of the importance of what must be her people's most elemental priorities, the starvation wages, policies of border control, passes and enforced convict labour are ridiculed. Despite the attempts by the 'philanthropic' missionaries to educate and 'civilize' Kaatje, she revels in presenting herself to be what the anti-philanthropic colonialists (English and Boer) considered the stereotypical characteristics of her people. The irony is clear: in spite of, indeed because of missionary, settler and boer she has learned that education is not "half so good" as brandy, that a sentence of "six months hard" labour would mean, "in Dutch", six months of sweet living. To her, the English settler, the "Jan Bull is een domme moerhond - een kleine kind kan hom vernuik" ('John Bull is a stupid dog - a small child can cheat him'; the wording in the original could be translated more strongly, as

moer could mean 'dregs' or 'womb' and furthermore, as an obscene utterance, vernuik would be equivalent to 'fuck'). The Boer is also a "moer", but is more astute: he "was eerst net so stom als de settlars, en christemense, maar Hotnots en Kaffers het hom slim gemaakt ('the Boer was just as dumb as the settlers and christians, but the 'Hotnots' and 'Kaffers' made him clever/sly'; the last eight words are italicized in Bosman's version of the original).¹⁰

As in the works of Boniface, her mixed-patois idiolect (of English, Dutch and 'Hottentots' principally, but peculiarly her own) is employed both for its comic possibilities and as a reflection of the collision of races and cultures and beliefs occurring in the Cape. The topical issues are similar too, in their ridicule of the legal system and judges, missionary endeavours and temperance movements. Specific individuals, such as Philip, are lampooned in both De Nieuwe Ridderorde and Kaatje Kekkelbek. The extract quoted above is indicative of what Gray terms Kaatje's "satirical double-talk": her idiolect is derived from the market-place where various languages fuse when they are connected by the same concerns of land, stock and stock-theft, food, liquor and justice and would have had, in performance, the impact associated with recognition; furthermore, as it was presented within an English theatrical context, the impact associated with her supposed linguistic errors and lapses, her mix of Dutch and English puns (unusually apt: "Jan Bull" for John Bull, 'Temper Syety' for Temperance Society), must have heightened the humour for the more sophisticated members of the audience.¹¹ Kaatje was, no doubt, originally performed by a white English colonial in travesty, which would have increased the humorous and satirical edge.

Kaatje Kekkelbek is an indication, too, of the strength which inherited traditions had, and still have, within the South African context. The piece was intended as an interlude between the acts of a full-length play or as part of a bill of farcical plays, similar to vaudeville entertainment (music-hall originated in Britain in the 1840s) and follows the format of such an entertainment, in that it alternates between song and commentary: the

sung sections are set to the tune of the English airs "Cawdor Fair" or of "How Cruel was the Captain" while the spoken sections are topical. The format might have been inherited then, but the content is indigenously, for the entertainment of a South African audience.

Kaatje demands the right to exist in her own right. Two of her compatriots (she mentions Jan Zatzodoene and oom Andries, apparently Andries Stoffels) had been taken to England by Philip to give evidence before the Aborigines' Committee of the House of Commons at Exeter Hall (which she terms "Extra Hole"). If she cannot be sent "to England to speak de trut", nevertheless she herself has "een tong in haar smoel" ('a tongue in her jaw') and "mijn redt wil ik hebbe" ('I will have my say'). Of course, in the act of performance, she has already done so, she has spoken on her own behalf. Gray asserts that

although Bain [Gray does not include George Rex] is dealing with types, he wants to point out that politically 'staged' Hottentots are categorizable, but that once an audience sees through the staging, they can perceive the actual individual human being behind the frumpiness Kaatje comes across through all the devious techniques of the theatre as wonderfully actual - in her own voice, unprompted, uncontrollable, unmanipulated. Presentation matches theme here, for her whole plea is that she be allowed to keep doing her own thing, that she be allowed to be.¹²

Kaatje's exit, to speak to the "Gov'neur" herself, has a satirical edge: the view of her steatopygous buttocks (the performer was, in all probability, wearing padding) might arouse laughter in the audience, but that laughter is ultimately degrading for the compatriots of that audience 'back home', the same "Engels ... met ope bek" ('Englishmen ... with open mouths') taking in the stories of her fellow Kat River Settlement Hottentots at Exeter Hall, would also have gaped in wonder and amusement at her compatriot 'Hottentot Venus' (Saartjie Baartman, whose steatopygous buttocks were exhibited in funfairs throughout Europe by an Englishman).¹³

Kaatje Kekkelbek was first performed in the Commercial Hall in Grahamstown, the home of the Graham's Town (sic) Amateur Company. In Butler's Cape Charade the performance takes place in Potter's Inn, appropriately, as music-hall and variety

programmes have their origin in hostelrys and public-houses in England, where, from the eighteenth century, 'turns' in bars, tap-rooms and dining-rooms of inns became customary. The same custom was introduced in South Africa in the nineteenth century.

For the remainder of the nineteenth century the chief exponents of satire would seem to have been journalists, although satirical sketches, not full-length plays, continued to be performed within eclectic mixed-bill entertainments which included such skills as juggling, balancing acts, equestrian gymnastics, short melodramas and farces and musical and other entr'actes. The 'turns' of individual performers or of small companies began the staging of variety and vaudeville. In South Africa, music-hall proper began in the latter part of the nineteenth century. The most prominent 'serious' playwrights of the early twentieth century, John Clark and H.H. Bell, remained "detached from the actualities of the local scene, and in no way [did] they betray any vestige of concern or interest in any problems or aspect in their environment", according to Woodrow.¹⁴ The titles to their plays demonstrate this: Clark's Hannibal (1908) and Bell's Sigh No More, Ladies (1912) are typical examples.

3.1.2 Black's "Stage Satires"

It was "A Stage Satire in 3 Acts" (the subtitle) which was to be "the christening feast of the National Drama", according to the reviewer of the Cape Argus Weekly of 9 December 1908; the play was Black's Love and the Hyphen (1908).¹⁵ Black was the first self-consciously 'South African' playwright and his claim to be so was supported by his popularity: Love and the Hyphen had, by its twentieth performance, played to an estimated thirty thousand patrons. Moreover this "Stage Satire" and his Helena's Hope, Ltd (1910) were each performed more than six hundred times from Cape Town to the Rhodesias. Black was, in addition, South Africa's only professional playwright-actor-manager with his own company performing South African scripts for more than two decades.

Unlike other managers, such as William Luscombe Searelle, Black was South African by birth and devoted his theatrical output to works set in and about South Africa. As an impresario, Searelle, who arrived in South Africa in 1887 from Australia, built and owned the corrugated-iron Theatre Royal in Johannesburg (it was transported, along with costumes and properties, by ox-wagon from Durban in 1889 and re-constructed in Commissioner Street) and the Queen's Theatre in Kimberley, and brought companies and productions from England and Europe, particularly the 'Savoy Operas' of Gilbert and Sullivan. As a playwright Searelle is remembered for his operatic works, such as Mispah (1906), rather than for his staging of musical comedy and satirical sketches in Johannesburg in the 1890s. The same is true of the Wheeler family, Captain Disney Roebuck and Sefton Parry (who in 1857 had set up the first company of professional actors in Cape Town and built the Harrington Street Theatre).

The core of Black's popularity in this and his more than a dozen other plays was in his comic use of the language resources of the period and place and in the creation of local characters. Boniface, Bain and Rex had created stock caricatures already, but Black was unique. The Tivoli theatre had closed down in 1908 owing to the economic recession after the Anglo-Boer War and the cost of importing artists and productions, and was to re-open with a new policy, that of maintaining the theatre on 'local lines' with 'local talent' and more reasonable admission prices. (At this time only Leonard Rayne, who had arrived in Johannesburg in 1896 as an actor-producer, with his company presented 'drama' at the Standard. The only consistently presented forms of entertainment were circuses and the new travelling 'bioscopes'.) Black supplied the local work: "I loved dialect," he wrote in 1925, "I loathed snobbery; the combination to me cried out for the spoken word. I put my views to Mr de Jong [Arthur de Jong, the producer], and he asked me to go ahead ... the result was Love and the Hyphen".¹⁶ The performers ranged from two English sisters of the D'Oyly Carte Opera Company who were unable to pay for their Union-Castle fare to return to England, to retrenched civil servants, to a Mr Charles Leonard, a Jewish comedian who had been touring the platteland with a one-person show in which he

impersonated the 'Afrikander', the Englishman and the Black. The style of the latter performer was to be the basis of Black's work. To Black, writing in 1908, a caricature

is admittedly not a portrait; but it conveys much more than any portrait could do. A caricature, to be a good one, must be based on the existing traits of the subject. There is the foundation of Truth To those who say that Van Kalabas, the society girls [Cicely Mushroom and Gwendoline and Lynda de Gadde], Captain Hay-Whotte, and others have been caricatured, I would reply that the stage is an artificial world. One has to give an epitome of time and action.¹⁷

To a large degree Love and the Hyphen, in pointing up the foibles and particularities of the 'upper' classes in a relatively cultivated milieu, is a South African example, though not to its degree of sophistication, of Oscar Wilde's The Importance of Being Earnest (1895), which he subtitled "A Trivial Play for Serious People". The similarities are in names (Gwendolen Fairfax and Cecily Cardew in The Importance of Being Earnest, Gwendoline de Gadde and Cicely Mushroom in Love and the Hyphen), in action (in both the 'society girls' are in pursuit of husbands) and in character (Lady Mushroom is a local version of Lady Bracknell). A conversation regarding the 'worthiness' of Jack Worthing as a suitor to Gwendolen is extended to the worthiness of being English:

LADY BRACKNELL : Do you smoke?
 JACK : Well, yes, I must admit I smoke.
 LADY BRACKNELL : I am glad to hear it. A man should always have an occupation of some kind.¹⁸

In Love and the Hyphen the exchange is between Lynda de Gadde and Gerald van Kalabas who is desperate to impress her:

VAN KALABAS : Do you mind if I smoke?
 LYNDA : On the contrary - it may give you useful occupation.
 VAN KALABAS : (lighting up) Baie dankie.
 LYNDA : What?
 VAN KALABAS : (in misery) A thousand apologies, Miss Lynda. Dat's soemaar an expression - I caught it playing at Stellenbosch. Dose Boer jongs speak rotten English.¹⁹

Furthermore, Lady Bracknell's interview with Jack Worthing has its counterpart in Lady Mushroom's interview with Robert Austin. In both, the characters (apart from the servants) are depicted at leisure and in urban surroundings or from the point of view of the city. Both have complicated plots, largely concerned as they are with seductions and intrigues, with episodes selected to display the characters in amusing situations. Rudyard Kipling encouraged Black in his writing endeavours, stressing the value of incorporating local characters, and also giving advice on such aspects as plot: "Leave plots alone ... just describe", he advised, and there is a sense that in Love and the Hyphen Black took him at his word, for inconsistencies are ignored.²⁰ At times, too, the comedy is, in Black, laboured rather than seemingly spontaneous. What seems to have most impressed Black in his conversations with Kipling was that author's contempt for trying to "teach" through writing:

'Of course not ... why did I write? ... To please myself. It made no difference in salary.' He left on my mind the impression that the current of a man's thoughts should run through his work ... if people then believed in a hidden 'message' it did not matter ... art taught by the beauty of its expression rather than by visible efforts to preach.²¹

Perhaps the same could be said of Wilde, for those "Serious People" who viewed his "Trivial Comedy" certainly did not conclude that he was dealing with significant issues and were delighted by its verbal wit rather than its exposure of their pretensions, as is evidenced by his trial and imprisonment in the same year that it was produced.

Black's 'comedy of manners' was deliberately subtitled "A Stage Satire", however, and is akin to a 'society drama'. As Gray has pointed out, the cast list is explicit in its concerns: Lady Mushroom is "a leader of Cape society"; Gwendoline is "in Cape society"; Captain Hay-Whotte is "wanted by society"; Gerald van Kalabas is "on the fringes of society"; Sophie September and Frikkie January are "servant[s] to society".²² Social barriers and distinctions distinguish each group, whether it be the 'Home'-born Englishman, the colonial Englishman, the Afrikaner who is aspiring to English manners or the servant who will not remain in her socially-and racially-dictated position. Black has satirically

juxtaposed the values, manners and mentality of each group and the determination of its members to rise above that group.

Perhaps it is the inherent bigotry of the English class ideal which is most ridiculed, for many of the characters display the negative connotations of 'colonial' attitudes, particularly in their firm attachment to and retention of all that is 'English' in the 'new' country so that no attempt is made to relate to or understand the mores and attitudes of indigenous peoples. Lynda de Gadde is fortunate enough to have been educated at "Home"; as such she has an arrogant disregard for local men:

LYNDA : Well, you know what I think of the Cape man ... about the lowest known form of animal life. A bare degree above the anthropoid apes. Of course I wasn't serious about Van Kalabas [she had suggested that her sister, schooled locally, should encourage him] - the social stigma would be too awful. Do you know Gwen, I have heard Van Kalabas speaks Dutch in his home.

GWEN : Dutch! Does he? How amusing.²³

Van Kalabas, in attempting to impress Lynda, reads her an eight-line poem he has written ("not quite a sonnet", as he says) which concludes with the couplet: "Oh yes I'm going to roam -/ When I get my leave I'm off Home"; this prompts her to enquire:

LYNDA : Have you been Home before?

VAN KALABAS: Well, not exactly Home, but I once went with the football team to Robben Island.²⁴

Patriotic support for the soldiers from "Home" is all important (to the extent of ignoring historical accuracy), especially in the search for a suitable husband for one's daughter:

GWEN : Are the other men of the regiment eligible, Lady Mushroom?

LADY MUSHROOM: Eligible? Eligible? They're charming, exquis! Of course, they'll be dreadfully spoiled. Everybody is waiting to lionise them. They distinguished themselves fearfully against the Boers - Pretoria society went mad about them.²⁵

The satirical strategy is implicit in Black's revelation of the 'try for' attitude of members of the social groups. Lady Mushroom, for instance, is 'trying for' a hyphen for Cicely, in Captain Hay-Whotte (hence the title). Lynda is a little sceptical:

- LYNDA : I met a family of Hays in Surrey when I was Home and I know some Watts who live near Windsor, but I don't know any Hays or Watts joined by a hyphen.
- LADY MUSHROOM: No dear, doubtless the hyphen was adopted by the family to distinguish itself from others. I think the hyphen such a clever invention - the only punctuation mark of the slightest use.²⁶

Her objection to Robert as a suitor for Cicely is, she is finally forced to admit, "one of caste".²⁷ (The word recalls T.W. Robertson's pioneering social drama Caste (1867) which exposes the antagonisms inherent in social distinctions by exploring various social actualities.) What is gradually revealed is the fact that the Mushroom 'empire' has been built on diamond digging; the family are, in fact, nouveau riche colonials, not true-blood aristocrats, and hence the hyphen of a double-barrelled surname is sought for social respectability. Black deliberately exposes each barrier as hypocritically imposed, by associating the prejudiced and arrogant with those they feel are beneath their social class: Lady Mushroom's second cousin, it turns out, is a Dutch woman.

Van Kalabas, the Afrikaans civil servant, is 'trying for' English, which results in a futile pretence to be 'Home'-born, to eradicate any trace of an Afrikaans accent and rural associations, to aspire to the education, the culture of an Englishman. Austin, amazed by his 'literary' endeavours, enquires:

- AUSTIN : Who are your favourite poets - Shakespeare, Shelley, Tennyson?
- VAN KALABAS: Theunissen - what, the one who plays fullback for Stellenbosch? ...
- AUSTIN : Do you know Paradise Lost?
- VAN KALABAS: Did he - what was the winner?²⁸

By presenting ultimately serious issues in a ludicrous context - equating social distinctions based on education with the members of a rugby team or a racehorse - Black gives added

attention to the ridiculousness of such pretensions. As the exemplar of the affected and self-conscious manner of 'English' talk and behaviour, Van Kalabas selects Captain Hay-Whotte. He farcically emulates the Englishman's style of dress and his mannerisms: "Hay-Whotte adjusts trousers, flicks boots, etc. Van Kalabas scrupulously imitates every movement. The Captain fans himself with the menu card: Van Kalabas in desperation uses the tray."²⁹ The model of manners (for Van Kalabas) and respectability (for Lady Mushroom) is revealed as a philanderer and embezzler, not someone to be, in Lady Mushroom's words, "lionized" (the play on the British symbol is apt). Even his sought-after hyphen is illusory for in the closing moments he is revealed, by Van Kalabas, to be John Watt, "a fraud. A Tommy who rose from the ranks."³⁰ (The facts and fictions of colonial attitudes and values have been a source of satiric writing for such diverse poets as Campbell in The Wayzgoose and Hope in Englishman (1985), and in a less satirical vein, the protective myths created by white South Africans is explored with ironic humour by Christopher Mann in First Poems (1977) and New Shades (1982).) Ironically, Van Kalabas exhibits the very qualities he seeks in Hay-Whotte: his speech is equally affected and pretentious, and if the aristocracy are idle and wealthy, he as a caricatured example of the Civil Service, is essentially idle and becomes wealthy.

The version of Love and the Hyphen discussed above was written and produced in 1908 and constantly revised (for topicality) and revived until 1912. In 1928 Black revised it once again, adding a preface and a postscript. Gray's version is an amalgamation of the various scripts, with five acts. The 1928 version is far more serious in intent, more akin to Shavian problem play than Wilde's The Importance of Being Earnest, more concerned with social questions than 'society', particularly in relation to Sophie September, the coloured servant, described by Gray as Kaatje Kekkelbek's successor in "twentieth-century urban society".³¹ Sophie was, incidentally, also played in travesty. In the last act of the first version, Sophie enters the white-owned Select Tea Tooms, demanding service as, in her finery, she is "yis so good as der missus".³² That finery is supplemented by Cicely's feather boa and Lady Mushroom's parasol. The distinction between mistress and servant

is blurred, temporarily at least. Further, mistress and servant have the same ambitions, irrespective of race or colour. Her exit line, after a proposal of marriage by Frikkie January, is "I will never marry a Colonial bloke so long as dere's a soldier left on der battlefields!"³³ Sophie, as with the other characters, has 'try for' aspirations, associated with those born in England. And even though she is forced to be served behind a partition (an action which could be seen as both theatrically necessary for the ensuing dialogue and as a political comment on the part of Black), Sophie warns that she will "get [her] own way".³⁴

In the 1928 version she succeeds to an extent. In the prologue Sophie is defiantly courting the Kipling-type Corporal Smith. In the postscript twenty years have passed and Smith returns to discover that, as she intended, Sophie has a nineteen-year old daughter, Camelia Violet Smith who can, because of her colour, 'pass for' white. If she herself cannot 'try for' white, Sophie has consciously exploited the situation to her own advantage. The 1908 version ended happily; the 1928 version has Frikkie, rejected and dejected, alone on stage, deliver the bitter curtain line: "You can all go to hell."³⁵

Love and the Hyphen premiered in the same month of the first sittings of the pre-Union National Convention: union is one of the earlier play's central concerns. Black's topical references and political commentary, throughout his playwrighting career, should not be underestimated, or ignored because his theatrical works were comedies. Frikkie has grounds for the response to this exclusion on stage and in reality. In 1908 the leading delegates of the National Convention had attended Love and the Hyphen. The Cape Argus Weekly reported:

While our statesmen debate the national problems with closed doors, the wide-open door of the [theatre] let in the people to witness the artistic solving of the final problem of all - the solidarity of race and race, wherein is wrapped up the future of South Africa. Without seeming unduly to praise Mr Stephen Black, one must render him this meed of acknowledgement, that he has set Briton, Boer and Black ... laughing at each other's foibles ... Was [this] not the christening feast of the National Drama?³⁶

But the Union of South Africa in 1910 fulfilled no such promises for Frikkie and his kind, and between 1908 and 1928 the most draconian measures were passed to expand the body of discriminatory law, laws which severely limited his rights, including those of franchise, labour, land and marriage, laws which were aimed at division, not union of all races.³⁷ What was possible in "National Drama" was not achieved by the Union of South Africa. Black's plays deal with the issues of the time, if not through topical reference, then through the effects that the political context and historical changes have on the social and economic lives of his characters. Love and the Hyphen was viewed as outspoken; in Helena's Hope, Ltd. (1910) subtitled "a play for serious people with a sense of humour - a study of social evolution" (marrying, in a sense, the concerns of Wilde and Shaw) the effects of gold-mining and industrialization of the Transvaal underlies the clash between urban and rural values; Van Kalabas does His Bit (1916) reveals the effects of the Great War on both Britain and South Africa and South African status is achieved for all whites, but, as Gray maintains, "the characters are poised at making a new choice, between nationalism and internationalism, an issue which hits differently at the roots of their identities".³⁸ The historical particulars and the theatrical style of Black may be dated, but the issues which arise from the former are still of concern and the topical commentary included in the latter remains a satiric strategy. Perhaps for these reasons, Gray terms Black "the Pieter-Dirk Uys of the 1910s".³⁹

3.1.3 'Black-face' and 'white-face'

An accepted theatrical feature of Black's time has, in more recent times, become a satirical ploy in itself. In Helena's Hope Ltd. Black played Jeremiah Luke Mbene (who 'evolves' with the action, occupationally and linguistically, from Xhosa farmhand speaking pidgin Xhosa-English, to mineworker and liquor runner speaking 'fanagalo', to Nonconformist convert and lay preacher speaking, says Gray, "the unctuous circumlocutions of his Exeter Hall mentors"), in 'black-face'.⁴⁰ Sophie, played in black-face by a man

derives from the coon band tradition and from minstrel follies. Minstrel shows, outlawed in the United States on grounds of their racism, found a last refuge in South Africa late in the nineteenth century. Here Black, however, turns the racial connotations of coon shows inside out.⁴¹

In 1961, the year of the Republic's independence from Britain, Fugard staged The Blood Knot (1961) in the Rehearsal Room, a privately owned venue of the Union Artists at Dorkay House. This was partly due to economic necessity (the facilities were rudimentary), and to the fact that, while he performed the role of Morris, the lighter-skinned brother, the darker-skinned brother, Zachariah, was performed by Zakes Mokae. To Vandembroucke the production was a milestone as it had been the custom until then for white actors to 'black-up' to portray blacks.⁴² This choice was the first defiance of and, in its success, indicated the absurdity of legislated racial segregation which is supported by the themes of the play itself, The Blood Knot. The Group Areas Amendment Act (1965), however, destroyed what racial freedom the theatre had previously enjoyed as it included a ban on racially mixed casts and racially mixed audiences in all forms of live entertainment; any contravention was liable to a maximum fine of four hundred rand or two years' imprisonment, or both. Only by a successful (and infrequently granted) application for a special permit, with various regulations governing where one might legally sit, eat, drink or use toilet facilities, could this restrictive Act be circumvented. Certain theatres, such as The Space in Cape Town (which opened on 28 March 1972) and The Market (which opened on 19 October 1975), evaded audience segregation rulings. After Fugard's "An Open Letter to Playwrights" in September 1962, which informed playwrights internationally of the situation, the international playwrights' boycott began in June 1963, signed by 276 playwrights, who refused performing rights "in any theatre where discrimination is made among audiences on grounds of colour".⁴³ The opportunity to perform before mixed audiences did not last, for the Group Areas Amendment Act of 1965 made such performance conditions illegal.

Two examples of the effects of these measures on play production must suffice. Ronnie Govender's The Lahnee's Pleasure (first performed as a one-act play in 1972, later

developed into a two-act version in 1977) satirically contrasted, through the idioms of dialect and sociolect, the viewpoints and attitudes of a stranger and patrons and those of the 'Lahnee', the 'white' boss, in a 'non-white' bar of a hotel in Mount Edgecombe on the Natal North Coast, to expose the social and political aspirations, pretensions and dilemmas of a section of the South African Indian community. In a reversal of earlier procedures, the white boss was, and had to be, played by an Indian. Although not satirical in purpose, Kanna Hy Kô Hystoe ('Kanna Comes Home', published in 1965, but only produced later) placed Adam Small in an invidious position in 1974: whether to agree to a production of the 'all-coloured' play by the 'all-white' company of the Performing Arts Council of the Transvaal (Pact), before 'whites-only' audiences? He finally acquiesced, arguing that despite its being mounted by a state-subsidized council, the "play's plea against apartheid's institutionalisation of poverty in the lives of the ghettoised community he depicted" would not be compromised.⁴⁴ Only in 1985, in an English version, was the play presented by a mixed cast before an unsegregated audience at the Baxter Studio in Cape Town.

In February 1975 the Nico Malan Theatre Complex in Cape Town was opened to all races and in the same month the first desegregated concert by the Cape Town Symphony Orchestra in the City Hall was held. In 1977 theatres were officially opened to all races. Maishe Maponya is regarded as the first black playwright to direct a white actor in his satirical Dirty Work (1984), a play which ridiculed the security paranoia of white South Africans. Prior to this production black performers in his plays had represented whites in masks; a convention employed for satirical effect in Woza Albert! (1981) created collaboratively by Percy Mtwa, Mbongeni Ngema and Barney Simon, in which the performers played whites by wearing a clown's rednose.

Despite the relaxations in the rulings, white theatre-goers were reluctant to accept non-racial casting. In 1985 Bobby Heaney directed August Strindberg's Miss Julie (1889) at the Baxter Concert Hall in Cape Town with Sandra Prinsloo as Julie and John Kani as the

manservant; the on-stage kiss met with protests in Pretoria, and an organized 'walk-out' took place during its run at The Market.

These attitudes have themselves been the target of satirists. Kirby's Separate Development (1980) (and It's a Boy! two years later) demonstrated the absurdities of apartheid by deliberately employing multiracial casting. In March 1993 two satirical comedies (Loneliness for Tsumphumf by Ian Roberts at the Windybrow and the Ghanaian playwright Kobina Sekyi's The Blinkards at the Wits Theatre) dealing with the politics of identity both underscored their themes by the use of integrated casting, whereby actors play their characters regardless of their own race and colour; those issues are deemed as irrelevant or deliberately exploited to ridicule such stereotypical notions.⁴⁵

3.1.4 Journalists and satire

In this survey of satire in South Africa, the contribution by journalists cannot be ignored as it has been considerable. As a means of commenting on topical issues, newspapers and journals have always been an adjunct to satire in other forms, and many journalists have become satirical writers and performers; conversely, many satirical writers and performers have ridiculed the South African condition in newspapers and journals. (Performers who have written regular columns for newspapers and magazines include Black, Leslie, Kirby and Uys.) Before Kaatje Kekkelbek, Bain had published satirical poems on settler life (such as "The British Settler") in early Cape periodicals. Sam Sly (the pseudonym of William Sammons) contributed numerous sketches and poems to his popular and largely satirical weekly Sam Sly's African Journal (1843) which lasted for eight years after being absorbed into the African Journal three years after the first edition. Further thoughts and observations by Kaatje Kekkelbek appeared in the journal. In the 1870s Louis Cohen ('Majude') wrote satirical sketches of diamond-mining life in a regular column of the Du Toit's Pan Herald, sketches he later expanded into novels and short verse-plays such as

The Land of Diamonds which was performed at the Lanyon Theatre in Kimberley soon after it was erected in 1876. The play was subsequently revised and performed for Sadler's Wells and Astley's Amphitheatre in London. Ian Colvin, as assistant editor of the Cape Times between 1903 and 1907, wrote not only political commentary in editorials, but also satiric verse under the pseudonym 'Rip van Winkle': his anthologies The Parliament of Beasts and Party Whips appeared in 1905 and 1912. Leo Marquard and Joel Mervis, in Blame It on Van Riebeeck (1952), Nat (Nathaniel) Nakasa (who later founded the quarterly periodical The Classic in 1963) and Casey (Karabo) Motsisi, among others, in Drum magazine (begun in 1951), Molly Reinhardt (during the 1960s and 1970s she was reputed to be the most widely read columnist in South Africa and selections from her acerbic column in the Sunday Times were published as With Love and Hisses (1972) which became a best-seller followed by More Love and Hisses (1975)) all used criticism and humour to confront English-speaking South Africans, mainly, with the follies and contradictions inherent in their condition. More recently, in an allied field, Geraldine Aron, who manages a freelance copy bureau in Cape Town, satirized the vulgar commercial environment in her play The Spare Room (1981).

The titles (and contents) of various journals indicate the satiric bent of the editors. The purpose of Voorslag (the meaning of which - 'whiplash' - indicates the intention of the journal which first appeared in 1926; a facsimile edition was printed in 1985), edited by Campbell with William Plomer and Laurens van der Post (as Afrikaans editor), was, Campbell explained in a prospectus, "to sting with satire the mental hindquarters ... of the bovine citizenry of the [South African] Union".⁴⁶ The first issue (of only three) contained a defence by Campbell of Plomer's Turbott Wolfe (1925), an attack on white morality and supposed superiority, the second an article by Plomer on the 'colour question'.

Adverse reaction, negative criticism in the local press and withdrawal of financial support were immediate, and prompted Campbell to write The Wayzgoose in which he scurrilously lampoons South African journalists (hence the title: a wayzgoose is a dinner

for printers; here it is a literary picnic attended by all he wishes to attack), statesmen, artists and writers. In a letter Campbell described it as "a satire in doggerel heroic couplets making fun of South Africa and my fellow colonials ... slightly modelled on Churchill ... and Marvell".⁴⁷ The action and the ironic praise of dullness invite comparison with Pope's The Dunciad and Dryden's MacFlecknoe (mentioned in The Wayzgoose), however. Those lampooned include H.H. Wodson, editor of the Natal Advertiser (who appears as "Wod's Godson"); the journalist and business manager of Voorslag Maurice Webb ("Polybius Jubb"); Leo Francis, President of the Natal Society of Artists ("Vermilion"); and the artist Edward Roworth ("Pollio"). Such lampoons are a means of ridiculing larger issues of provincialism, parochialism and prejudice, not simply opposition to Campbell, Plomer and Voorslag, although his own patriotic championing of the English literary heritage and his loyalty to England as 'home' are manifestations of the same colonial attitudes he attacks:

Show first that English blood you love to brag
And prove the spirit - if you claim the Flag.
Is yours the giant race in times of yore
That bred a Dryden, or a Marvell bore?⁴⁸

Instead of displaying the satiric power of wit, South African writing, to Campbell, is feeble and powerless. The pen is no longer a weapon to attack the "blows [of] Tielman" (Tielman Roos, an Afrikaans Appeals Judge and Nationalist politician), no longer a "huge harpoon" as Andrew Marvell employed it, or a "boomerang that Dryden threw / To crumple Flecknoe as I crumple you?"; instead, in "Wodson's hand it scratches like a pin" and "Jubb's soft hand" is "wrapped around it like a woollen bib".⁴⁹ While justifiably condemning the apathy, ineffectuality and bigotry of his fellow South Africans, particularly Natalians ("Is it the sign of a 'superior race' / To whine to have 'the nigger kept in place?'"), Campbell tends to ally himself to attitudes and traditions beyond the confines of his own "Banana Land" as he "sail[s] on Satire's wings":

For there is one in this most sacred place,
English in wit - whatever be my race -
In Durban here - unmentionable brute! -
Who dares the voice of Dullness to refute
Your small horizon, from Berea to Bluff,
Rings you with peace: you may be grim and gruff,

But out beyond - the World will laugh enough!
 My words, O Durban, round the World are blown
 Where I, alone, of all your sons am known.⁵⁰

Jan Christiaan Smuts, who succeeded Louis Botha (the first Prime Minister of the Union of South Africa from 1910) as Prime Minister in August 1919, is lampooned in The Wayzgoose, primarily as the creator of the philosophic theory of Holism (his Holism and Evolution was published in 1926). A far more explicit satiric attack is made by Campbell in a four-line epigram entitled "Holism", published, according to David Wright, "some time after two Native villages had been wiped out, one of them for failing to pay a dog-tax" while Smuts was Prime Minister.⁵¹ The book referred to in the epigram is that on Holism by Smuts:

The love of Nature burning in his heart,
 Our new Saint Francis offers us his book -
 The saint who fed the birds at Bondleswaart
 And fattened up the vultures at Bull Hoek.⁵²

Such outspoken political commentary in verse was virtually unrivalled until the appearance of the lengthy The Last Division (1959) by Anthony Delius. In mock-heroic style, Delius satirizes the ideologies of 'Nat', 'Sap' and 'Liberal' (National Party, South African Party and Liberal Party) and the beliefs of English- and Afrikaans-speaking South Africans. The publication of "Canto Two" of The Last Division in Africa South evoked controversy and was quoted at length in the then Union Parliament. As a journalist, Delius had been a Parliamentary correspondent for the Cape Times during the 1950s. The following extracts from the "Ethnic Anthem" appeared in Canto Two:

Ethnasia will last a thousand years,
 Our land is studded with its glories,
 Its monuments are separate bars
 And segregated lavatories.

God has through us ordained it so
 Post Offices are split in two
 And separate pillar boxes fix
 That correspondence does not mix, ...

O ethnic trains and buses daily hurry
 Divided hues to earn divided bread,
 The races may not fornicate or marry,
 They even lie apart when they are dead

Yea, in our law men stand or fall
 By rule of thumb or finger-nail,
 So sensitive's our Roman-Dutch
 It notes if lips protrude too much

For such success in our researches
 We thank Thee, Lord, in separate churches.⁵³

That such comment was rare is testified by the editorial review from Die Transvaler quoted on the end-flap of the published version: "Into this desert [of political satire] has come Anthony Delius with a true satire on South African politics." For reasons that must remain speculative, but could possibly be ascribed to the political climate, the 1950s (the 'Malan' and 'Strijdom' decade, named after the Prime Ministers Dr D.F. (Daniel Francois) Malan, who took office in May 1948 to form the first all-Afrikaner Government, and Dr J.G. (Johannes Gerhardus) Strijdom who succeeded him in 1954) was a decade in which few literary works were published. Into the same "desert", in the theatre, Leslie appeared with his political revues.

Black, at the end of his life, returned to journalism (he began his career as a professional boxer before joining the Cape Argus as a sports and crime reporter in 1906) to found and edit the journal The Sjambok (again the satiric intent is clear, for a sjambok is a type of whip), which ran from 1929 until a fourth libel action forced him to cease publication in 1931, but not before he had promoted the writing talents of, amongst others, R.R.R. Dhlomo and Herman Charles Bosman. I.W. (Isidore William) Schlesinger, the founder of the African Theatres organization had funded Black in this enterprise. It was such journalists who created the 'backvelders', the rural types who have been a frequent source of humour and pointed satirical comment in South African literature. Douglas Blackburn was an outspoken opponent in newspaper columns, novels and poems (his "The Converted Missionary" is an example) of race and class attitudes and practices of white English colonials who satirized, through parodies of Rider Haggard's romantic quest-novels and the 'tourist-writers' of the Boer War (such as Winston Churchill and A. Conan Doyle), the notions of heroism and honour through the exploits of Sarel Erasmus in Burgher Quixote (1903, reissued in 1984). Perceval Gibbon and C.R. Prance, journalists who

wrote for the Natal Witness and Natal Mercury respectively, were the originators of such 'backvelders' as Gibbon's Vrouw Grobelaar (in the short-story collection The Vrouw Grobelaar's Leading Cases in 1905) and Prance's Tante Rebella (in Tante Rebella's Saga in 1937).

Kaatje Kekkelbek's male counterpart, the rogue Hottentot Ruiter who appears as a character within his own narrative, first appeared in the short stories of Aegidius Jean Blignaut in The Hottentot's God (1931) and Dead End Road (1981). This character may in turn have influenced Bosman, his co-editor of the literary monthly The Touleier (a touleier is a leader of a span of oxen; the intention of this magazine was not primarily satirical) (1930), to create possibly the best-known of the 'backvelder' narrators, Oom Schalk Lourens. The pilot issue of The Touleier included the first story to feature Oom Schalk, written under the pseudonym Herman Malan. As the epitome of the 'backvelder', Oom Schalk is unsentimentally endowed with the ignorance and cunning, wisdom and naivety, bigotry and openness of his people, and the stories of this fictional narrator have the effect of satirizing, by placing in ironic relief, those same qualities in the people he describes. Prejudice is presented with disarming frankness and genial innocence; through these qualities, seemingly without moral judgement, issues and values and beliefs are portrayed as they are. The compilers of the Companion to South African English Literature have noted a quality in the work of such writers that is relevant to this work:

A notable feature of many of the stories or collections of stories by ... writers is the way in which one of the basic components of the oral tradition, the story-teller himself, becomes a 'character' in the story. His function is not simply to tell the story, but, by the way in which he tells it, to reveal a great deal about himself, his supposed audience, and the world in which they have their being.⁵⁴

This feature is significant as part of the performance strategies of South African oral satirists, and will be discussed in relation to Uys in the next chapter. Suffice to say, at this point, with regard to Bosman and those satirical performers who use fictional narrators in the monologue form, both place a particular character in a particular setting to

create, through the reminiscences and observations of that character, a reflection of the myths, attitudes and history of South Africa pertinent and applicable to the received audience.⁵⁵

3.2 The censorship of satire

3.2.1 Censorship as hegemonic control

As vehicles for satire, journalism and theatre which are concerned with political issues have, in South Africa been the targets of control or suppression from the earliest days of colonial administration. Yonge issued a proclamation on 19 February 1800 which stated that no "Club or Society" could exist without "sanction and approbation of Government", and the payment of an annual license of fifteen Rixdollars. Contravention of such proclamation would result in a heavy fine. As Bosman points out, these measures were aimed at controlling theatrical performances of both an immoral and political nature.⁵⁶ In the early decades of the nineteenth century at the Cape, the "sinful practices" of the burgeoning theatrical scene were opposed by the Methodist and the Dutch Reformed churches; through their influence the first theatre building in South Africa, the 'African Theatre' was converted into a church for emancipated slaves.⁵⁷ (St Stephen's Church, now a national monument, is the only church in South Africa originally built as a theatre and the only Dutch Reformed Church named after a saint. It has, besides, an entirely coloured congregation.) Only when Lord Charles Somerset, a succeeding governor, had been recalled to London in 1826 and, with his departure, a subsequent greater freedom of the press, in particular, was there an increase of satirical writing in verse and on stage. (Somerset had, however, supported the productions presented at the 'African Theatre'.)

Thomas Pringle had raised Somerset's anger by an article entitled "Some Account of the

Present State of the English Settlers in Albany" in the monthly South African Journal (1824), the first English literary review and general magazine in South Africa. The magazine ceased publication after two issues when Pringle had received an ultimatum from Somerset. The Commercial Advertiser (1824), edited by Pringle and Fairburn (who appeared in De Nieuwe Ridderorde as "Sir John Brute" for his championing of Philip's London Missionary Society policies) was temporarily closed after it had criticized Somerset for misusing his powers. The situation today has changed little. To cite one example, in terms of the Media Emergency Regulations (1986) the Minister of Home Affairs, Stoffel (Jan Christoffel) Botha prohibited the publication of the Weekly Mail during the month of November 1988 as it had published material which was "a threat to the safety of the public ... the maintenance of public order ... [and for] causing delay in the termination of the state of emergency".⁵⁸ The history of the alternative press, outside the white-owned commercial media, has since the founding of Imvo Zabantsundu (meaning 'People's Opinions') (1884) in Kingwilliamstown, been one marked by censorship and bannings.

Contemporary South Africa has since earned the reputation of being equated with the Soviet Union in the severity of its censorship rulings. As stated in The Cambridge Guide to World Theatre in 1988: "Perhaps no system of modern censorship has kindled more adverse publicity and obloquy than South Africa's, where the laws abbreviating intellectual and artistic freedom have a comprehensiveness and rigour unmatched outside the Soviet bloc."⁵⁹ In the last three decades the State has attempted to eradicate all elements that can be harmful, heterodox or otherwise disruptive of its aims. Furthermore, the increase and intensification of the State's mechanisms of coercive control is not only a manifestation of ideological domination, but a means of maintaining its power. Opposition is silenced by two principal means: by banning or censoring a work in some way, or by silencing the writer or playwright by laws such as the Suppression of Communism Act (1950), which provided for the arrest of anyone who attempted to bring about "any political, industrial, social, or economic changes within the Union by the

promotion of disturbance". As Minister of Defence and Leader of the House of Assembly P.W. Botha had, in 1977, in a White Paper on Defence, written:

The resolution of a conflict in the times in which we now live demands interdependent co-ordinated action in all fields - military, psychological, economic, political, sociological, technological, diplomatic, ideological, cultural, etc. ... We are today involved in a war The striving for specific aims must be co-ordinated with all the means available to the state.⁶⁰

At this time there existed at least twenty Acts (including the Suppression of Communism Act, the Public Safety Act (1953) and the Riotous Assemblies Act (1956)), which were permitted censorship of every aspect of life in South Africa, from political cartoons to slogans on T-shirts. Because the major newspaper owners had adopted self-censorship codes, they had generally avoided open control by the State.⁶¹ With his inauguration as the eighth Prime Minister of South Africa on 28 September 1978 (retaining the portfolios of Defence and National Security) however, P.W. Botha introduced the "total military strategy" to face the "total onslaught" referred to in Chapter 1. In December 1979, he appointed a commission to inquire into press reporting of defence activities and to make recommendations for new press laws.⁶² Justice Marthinus Theunis Steyn was appointed to head the commission; significantly the remaining members were all from the military. The Steyn Commission (1980), which resulted in the immediate bannings of reports of police actions and a prohibition on the publishing of the names of detainees, proposed a state-controlled Register of Journalists and recommended the formation of a punitive body. (The Media Council was subsequently created; the Directorate of Media Relations was established in 1987 to monitor newspapers not regulated by the Media Council.) In an interview published on 18 March 1979 with the Sunday Telegraph in London, P.W. Botha stated: "An irresponsible Press is the greatest enemy of democracy."⁶³ Uys has indicated the means whereby such a "democracy" is hegemonically maintained:

I'm sure the reason the world has been so anti-South African for so long, is because they are just jealous.
I mean, **hell**, how do you rule a country of 32 million people representing only 5% of the **population** for 42 years and get away with it?
Not **difficult** - if you control your newspapers, your radio, your TV. If you control the police and the army. If you control the education.
If you control the fear - and all with God on your side.
So much for the democratic process.⁶⁴

The alternative press is frequently accused of being "undesirable". The term is the key word of the law in the various Publications Acts passed. The censorship of the press is too large an issue to discuss in detail within the scope of this work, which will focus on the restrictions placed on satirists (and, in particular, satirists in the theatre) as the extent of the bannings is enormous: between 1963, (with the passing of the Publications and Entertainments Act which established the Publications Control Board) and 1977 over twenty thousand publications, and an average of seventy films each year, were placed on the banned list.⁶⁵ Clearly, if satirists demand the right to question, to expose and to criticize, they will be regarded as dangerous by those in power. The same is true of all writers. Brink believes that the "moment of change", when artists had no choice but to turn against the State which felt threatened by dissenting voices and brought in repressive measures to safeguard not society, but its own power-interests, occurred in South Africa in 1966.⁶⁶ In that year, of the fifth celebration of the Republic, Hendrik Verwoerd, the Prime Minister (in office from 1958 until his assassination on 6 September 1966) quarrelled with the highly respected Afrikaans poet and academic, N.P. (Nicolaas Petrus) van Wyk Louw:

Why, asked Verwoerd, should a writer feel driven to ask, Wat is 'n volk? ('What is a nation?')? What is required of the writer, said the Prime Minister, is not a question but an affirmation. While Verwoerd believed that we were still living in the epic age Van Wyk Louw realized that we had progressed beyond it. And it can be no accident that this clash more or less coincided with the introduction of official, codified censorship in South Africa.⁶⁷

The "official, codified censorship" Brink refers to is the Publications and Entertainments Act of 1963. In 1972 a Committee of Inquiry into Censorship recommended stricter controls as it reported that, since the late 1960s, "South Africa has been inundated by a flood of permissive writings ... aimed at undermining ... good morals and customs", and as the youth were the "targets", the "flood" was believed to be "but one of the methods of international communism".⁶⁸ This report resulted in the Publications Act in 1974 which repealed and replaced the Publications and Entertainments Act and which took effect, notoriously, on 1 April 1975. This Act abolished the Publications Control Board and created a new administrative structure. At the centre of this structure is the Directorate of

Publications, appointed by the Minister of the Interior. The Directorate itself does not have the power to decide whether any object or entertainment is "undesirable"; that power is vested in committees operating throughout the country. The members are appointed by the Directorate from a list compiled annually by the Minister of the Interior. Two further significant changes were the abolition of the right to appeal against a banning in a court of law (previously the right to appeal could be made in the Supreme Court) and the formation of a specially constituted tribunal, the Publications Appeal Board to consider appeals arising from committee decisions in camera, as a separate decision-making body from the Directorate of Publications. (The Directorate of Publications issues its bannings from Cape Town; appeals are heard by the Publications Appeal Board in Pretoria.) The first chairman was the Honourable J.H. Snyman (previously a judge of the Supreme Court). He was succeeded in 1980 by Professor J.C.W. van Rooyen. Kirby maintains that the

old Publications and Entertainments Control Board was very overworked, there were only about six members with Jannie [Johannes] Kruger at the head, mainly, but at least their operations were overt. What the new Act imposes is secret censorship. Once a year the names of all the appointed committee members in South Africa ... are published in the Government Gazette. Their qualifications seem only to be the fact that they were appointed by the Minister of Home Affairs; no other qualification seems to be necessary. Thereafter, the whole process is anonymous for them and their anonymity is secured: their names may never be brought up in any hearing.

The scope of what could and can be censored is broad, covering all non-newspaper publications, artworks, objects (even key-ring emblems), amateur photography and any form of public entertainment. The offences listed in Section 47(2) are related to what is deemed "undesirable": anything that offends or might offend "public morals" or "religious convictions" (indecency, obscenity and blasphemy); anything that "brings any section of the inhabitants of the Republic into ridicule or contempt" (the implications for satirists is obvious); anything that "is harmful to the relations between any sections of the inhabitants of the Republic", and anything that "is prejudicial to the safety of the State, the general welfare or the peace and good order". There are some ninety-seven definitions of what is officially 'undesirable' in literary works alone. It is also an offence to "insult, disparage, or belittle any member of the Appeal Board".

By these means the State, which controlled and had privileged access to the principal ideological institutions (education, communications media and performing arts councils), not only used such institutions to propagate values to support its position and censor opposing or alternative views, but also defined what is legitimate, inoffensive and desirable. In 1976, in The Fantastical History of a Useless Man, devised by the Junction Avenue Theatre Company, the character "Jan van Riebeeck" states that the "motto" of this country was established in 1652 as "Calvinism plus 5%"; this could be said to be the measure of control by which the Publications Act operates.⁶⁹ Nevertheless, as Brink maintains, censorship "is invariably a political act, not a moral or religious one, and it derives from the urge of power to protect itself, to perpetuate itself, to prevail".⁷⁰ (Novels by Brink which have been banned include Kennis van die Aand (published in English as Looking on Darkness) (1973), reputed to be the first novel in Afrikaans to be taken off the market for depicting sexual relations between a white woman and a coloured man. (By contrast, Fugard's Statements after an Arrest under the Immorality Act (1972) portrayed the same situation, with nudity, on stage, but was never censored or banned.) Brink's novel was released, with an age restriction, in 1982.)

The success of such hegemonic control is evidenced by a single example. In 1973, Leslie's revue Group Hairier (the American musical Hair (1968) which was, in part, the origin of the title, remained banned until the film version was released in the 1980s) prompted the following response by a United Party Johannesburg City Councillor Sam Moss (in support of a National Party Councillor, Gerrit Bornman):

What Adam Leslie doesn't realise is that the Afrikaner person represents the present social and political scene. This show degrades him and makes him out to be an absolute idiot.

It also undermines everything of serious value, like the Church, Christian education, law and authority - yet it offers no alternative system.⁷¹

Moss unintentionally highlighted the most effective aspects of the hegemonic process: the suppression of alternative views, and furthermore, the unawareness of or the refusal to acknowledge alternative values and alternative presentations of the social and political

scene. His demands for an "alternative system" were spurious: no alternative system was seen to exist. In the absence of visible alternatives no large-scale and effective opposition could or can emerge to challenge the structures in power. Censorship and state propaganda must be viewed, in South Africa, as components of a political strategy which has intended to maintain minority privilege and control.

Under the chairmanship of Snyman, the Publications Appeal Board took into consideration the 'reasonable' reader or viewer or spectator (the 'ordinary man' concept of Snyman, patronizingly exemplified by him as the "average man in the street with a Standard Seven education".⁷²) More recent judgements of the Publications Appeal Board indicate that the 'likely' reader, viewer or spectator is the deciding factor (and the fact that the work should be judged in its entirety). To Van Rooyen:

A balancing of interests has become the hallmark of control in the Republic: general or sectional interests are continually weighed against minority interests such as dramatic, artistic, and literary interests as well as the interests of likely viewers and readers There is in general an attempt to cater to diverse interests by imposing age and place restrictions on films and theatre, and by imposing conditions on the sale of books by way of age, display or bookshop restriction.⁷³

Despite this seemingly more reasonable and rational approach, what did not alter, as Nadine Gordimer indicated in an article entitled "New Forms of Strategy - No Change of Heart", was the Publications Act itself; furthermore the practice of embargo could continue, with the same anonymous committees at work.⁷⁴ What has changed is that the Act is now supported by even more restrictive measures such as the Media Emergency Regulations. The more 'liberal' views regarding censorship must be seen as part of the 'reform' initiatives of the 1980s: in 1980 the Senate was abolished and replaced by the President's Council, comprising white, coloured and Indian members (its proposals, presented in 1982 and voted for by the white electorate in November 1983, made provision for the Tricameral three-chamber parliament); legislation during the first session of the Parliament under the new constitution included the abolition of the Mixed Marriages Act of 1949 and Section 16 of the Immorality Act of 1927; the removal of 'unnecessary discrimination'; the return to a free-enterprise economy; the removal of the

pass laws; and blacks were granted the right to permanent residence in the urban centres. (Nevertheless blacks were excluded from the Parliamentary process, and the homelands, the Group Areas Act (1950) the Land Acts (the first in 1913) and the Population Registration Act (1950) remained, indicating that separate development was to continue to exist.⁷⁵)

In the hope of, Madi Gray contends, attracting international investors and immigrants, the "image" of South Africa had to "appear more liberal, peaceful and intent on change; it must claim to be concerned with reforms, while tightening the screws behind the scenes".⁷⁶ To her, the facts belie this image: the "'reforms' are primarily window dressing".⁷⁷ In the context of theatre (for blacks, that is) control takes other forms, as Steadman has pointed out:

In the so-called 'reformist' climate of the Botha government's policies, there are more covert ways to prevent Maqina [Reverend Mzwandile Maqina, who attempted to present his play Dry Those Tears (1983) in the townships] from reaching his audience. He has been unable to hire a hall or any other building Government-appointed Administration Boards control municipal halls, and screen all applicants. Maqina has been silenced without a banning order Creating the impression of loosening the reins of censorship, the state is utilising other methods. Concomitantly, the international arena provides no threat to the State in the cultural sphere: successful plays about South African politics create a desirable impression of the freedom of expression in South Africa.⁷⁸

Hence Woza Albert! could be presented for more than six hundred and fifty performances in twenty-three seasons in South Africa, Britain, Europe and America and be screened twice by the BBC; hence black diplomats were invited by Cabinet Ministers to performances of Uys's Adapt or Dye; hence theatres were desegregated, but the admission prices continue to determine the structure and attitude of the audiences; hence Maponya could present his double-bill Dirty Work and Gangsters at the Laager at the Market but not both plays in the townships; but even so, despite lifting bans on locally written novels and plays, in Parliament in May 1988 the then Minister of Home Affairs, Stoffel Botha, could warn theatre practitioners who "under the banner of art and literary merits wanted to bypass the Publications Act" and attack the "morality, religion and dignity of South Africans and the safety of the State" in forms of theatre which would "agitate the

audience".⁷⁹ (The "particular discourses" the Minister had in mind, contends Martin Orkin, "include versions of Afrikaner Calvinism and nationalism, within which are imbricated racist investment in white supremacy".⁸⁰)

3.2.2 Censorship of theatre works and performances

The ensuing discussion of satiric theatre works affected by censorship rulings indicates the inconsistencies in the decisions made: inconsistency would indeed appear to be the hallmark of the application of the Publications Act and the decisions made by the Publications Appeal Board. If so, it is inconsistency for the insidious purpose of maintaining a sense of insecurity among those regarded as dissidents, who are unsure whether their work will be banned or ignored.

The lampooning of prominent politicians has always been an issue of contention. Cecil John Rhodes was satirized in a verse-play by Harold Bolce entitled A Slump in Heroes: a Transvaal War Drama without Warriors at the time of the Jameson Raid of 1895-1896. The play was banned in Johannesburg. B.J.(Balthazar Johannes, also referred to as John) Vorster, who succeeded Verwoerd as premier in 1966 was vocally impersonated by Michael Mayer as an animated cartoon portrait in a sketch by Kirby in his revue Eight Birds in the early 1970s; when it was performed in a subsequent revue the Dot Dash Dot Show (1974) he was ordered by the Censor Board to omit the cartoon of the Prime Minister. As it was still possible to appeal to the Supreme Court, Kirby did so and the decision by Kruger was overruled.

In contrast P.W. Botha's thoughts on the "total onslaught" have been repeated on the stage and in novels, in satirical works as diverse as Woza Albert! (by Percy Mtwa wearing a clown's rednose) and Hope's Kruger's Alp, without restriction. Between 1981 and 1989 (the year he resigned) he was impersonated by Uys in revue after revue, again without

restriction. In his biography of Evita Bezuidenhout, A Part Hate A Part Love (1990), Uys weaves her life story into factual incidents in South African history (principally the years 1948-1990), linking the family dynasty of the Bezuidenhouts with those of the architects of apartheid (the Malan, Hertzog and even the Smuts families). Every major constitutional change, the passing of every major Act is featured. Verwoerd, Vorster and 'all the Bothas' appear as characters. A Part Hate A Part Love demythologizes South African history and culture by fictitiously exposing the 'real' motives and beliefs and actions of its premiers and their opponents. The lampoons are deliberately accurate while verging on caricature; historical events (the assassination of Verwoerd) and constitutional reforms (the Tricameral parliament) are held up to ridicule. In a personal interview Uys stated: "It aims to make total absurdity of the great sacred symbols of our history." Yet the biography was published, perhaps, in part, owing to Uys's self-protecting description of it as a "fairy tale about a person who never existed in a fictitious country somewhere on the southern tip of a mythical continent in a world long since changed"; hence the characters are "also fictitious", so that the "occasional similarity with the real lives and experience of people and persons living or dead is therefore obviously purely coincidental".⁸¹

A further reason in the difference regarding the censorship of the lampooning of individuals after 1974 is that the wording of the Act mentions the concept "section" (sub-section (c) refers to "bring[ing] any section of the inhabitants of the Republic into ridicule or contempt"; the words "section" or "sections" are also used in sub-sections(b) (to refer to "religious convictions") and (d) (to refer to what "is harmful to the relations between any sections of the inhabitants"). To Van Rooyen the Publications Appeal Board interprets the concept as "a substantial number of people who as a result of an inherent characteristic or characteristics regard themselves as a distinctive community and are accepted as such by the rest of the community".⁸² By this definition the legislature, the government and the Cabinet, the police, the Broederbond, among others, are not "sections", and the Act does not protect "the interests of individuals even if they are the leaders of a particular section".⁸³

Various deletions were initially demanded of Kirby's It's a Boy!, including the joke made regarding the leader of the Ciskei, Chief Lennox Sebe (Theunis: "Chief Sebe goes into a filling station. He says to the boy, fill her up and pump my lips to two comma three"), but were passed on the grounds that they were not harmful to relations between "sections".⁸⁴ In the late 1970s and early 1980s Kirby's revues and plays were frequently discussed by the Publications Appeal Board to ascertain whether blacks would be likely to be affected negatively in their relations with whites as a result of degrading language, jokes or situations. For It's a Boy! Tutu gave evidence on behalf of Kirby. He stated that although expressions like 'kaffir' and 'nigger' were unacceptable in everyday life, within the context of a play which presents racial bigotry black viewers would understand their use.⁸⁵ (Similarly, Kirby's Quodlibet (1979) and Academy Rewards (1981) and Barney Simon's Jo'burg Sis (1978) were passed, after appeal, as not affecting race relations.)

Tutu pinpointed the use of derogatory language and racial insults by satirists: they are devices to humorously, but critically, expose bias and prejudice. As Gray has stated: "Whether or not expunging the words of racial abuse from the everyday public vocabulary by statute [or] by censorship ... expunges the racialism they imply is debatable."⁸⁶ He indicates that Black's comedies were filled with racial and national insults, not simply to reflect the attitudes of the time but also as a satiric strategy

to exorcise racial feelings by indulging in a carnival of racist terminology. No stereotypical slur in a Black play is ever made gratuitously; it is always connected to a moment of revenge, of embarrassment, of outrage, of wheeler-dealing, or of social awkwardness. In other words, use of invective is always a result of social factors clearly enough illustrated by the situation which causes it ... [Present-day] children of apartheid have been born into an age of glorious ramifying euphemism in which the very words of racial contempt are now taboo, inarticulable. Black's simple antidote to this - making racism sound funny - has not been applied on the South African boards for a long time.⁸⁷

An exception, Gray admits, would be Uys's Die Van Aardes van Grootoor. Although Uys had attempted to avoid censorship by creating linguistic substitutions (with scatological and sexual connotations) for everyday objects and expressions, after a run in Cape Town and a capacity season of four weeks at the Laager at the Market (it was the

opening production in the venue), the production was banned on 19 October 1978, under sub-sections (a), (b), (c) and (d) of Section 47 (2) of the Publications Act . The play was, complained the committee responsible for the decision, obscene and blasphemous, ridiculed a section of the population and could result in racial friction. Members of the Publications Appeal Board viewed the production at a special performance. On 24 October the Appeal Board, under the acting chairmanship of Van Rooyen, passed the play with cuts and a two to eighteen age restriction.⁸⁸

Despite Van Rooyen's definition of "section" and the fact that the Act does not protect the dignity or reputation of individuals, he stated at the appeal hearing:

It is good for the Afrikaner to laugh at himself - but the ridiculing must not be overdone.

Some of the ridicule is sharp and vicious and could be painful to a large section of the Afrikaans community.

Particularly offensive is the mocking of the heroes of the Afrikaner nations - Prime Ministers John Vorster, Danie Malan and Hendrik Verwoerd.

To mock these people was like mocking the whole Afrikaner volk.⁸⁹

To which J.H. de la Rey, who appeared for the appellants (the Market Theatre and Uys), replied that all sections of the community, not only Afrikaners, received their share of mockery. "Furthermore," De la Rey continued, "the Prime Ministers are mocked far less than they would be in newspaper cartoons". This was the third play by Uys to go before the Publications Appeal Board in 1978; the others were Selle Ou Storie and Karnaval. Apparently two people had complained to the Directorate of Publications regarding Die Van Aardes van Grootoor, which prompted the initial banning. Uys's revue Info Scandals (1979) though not banned, had cuts made to the "crude language". More recently, the Publications Appeal Board has tended to impose restrictions rather than make cuts. This was the decision regarding Kirby's Weed Killers (1985) where the language was ignored, but as a result of a controversial scene involving an artificial penis, an age restriction of two to eighteen was placed on the production.⁹⁰

It has been reported that, in 1981 at least, more than half of all the material submitted for

publications control was political.⁹¹ Yet in terms of theatrical presentations by and for whites, this would not appear to be the principal factor. Taubie Kushlick's production of Edward Albee's Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf? (1962) was banned in 1963 on the grounds of its crude language. It was regarded at the time as the first play to be banned in South Africa, although the anti-Rhodes play by Bolce may have earned that distinction. Kirby describes the meetings of the Publications Appeal Board as "a stock exchange in genitals". In Beyond the Rubicon Uys recounts a conversation between dissident writers at a convention in America, writers who had been "battered ... bruised ... tortured", and he was asked what happened to writers in South Africa:

'They get imprisoned, in solitary confinement, tortured ...'
 'This all happened to you?' they asked.
 'No,' I said, 'I'm white ...'
 They stared at me
 'But my plays were banned!'
 'Bravo Pieter Apartheid. Your plays were banned, because you stood up against the hated apartheid regime, because you defended your Christian principles, because you believe in human values; that is why your plays were banned, no?'
 I said: 'No, my plays were banned because I used the word poep on page three...'⁹²

In response to such bannings, Leslie, Kirby and Uys have all satirized the censors in their revues. The Sunday Times published a photograph of a scene from It's a Boy! in which Vuzi Dibakwani (as Pepsi) kissed Bo Petersen (as Juliana). Kirby maintains that for the first time, under the Act, the Minister of Home Affairs referred the play to the Publications Appeal Board. After a hearing lasting seven months the Board imposed certain cuts. Kirby then

rewrote the kissing scene in the play and that was definitely satirical because when Juliana was about to kiss her boyfriend, her father stepped in and said, "No, the Immorality Act does not allow you to kiss a black man." But the Immorality Act is not at all specific on matters of black men and white men kissing, so Jiggs said: "Theunis, you kiss Pepsi for her." Of course it was a little sketch itself because Theunis who was a terrible bigot had to go and kiss the black man.

Furthermore, Kirby wrote "parodies" of Shakespeare in "bad blank verse" and inserted these with genuine quotations from the plays which his counsel Johan van der Vyfer unknowingly read to the members of the Publications Appeal Board to support the argument that profanity is "common in great works of literature". In addition, restrictions

on the works of Leslie, Kirby and Uys have all had the effect of increasing the popularity of the plays or revues. Kruger imposed a four to eighteen restriction on Adam Leslie's revue Sweet Fanny Adam's (1972) after a run of seven months throughout South Africa: the final performances were sold out and the run extended. When Kruger ordered that the sketch "Thespian Lament" be removed from Leslie's next revue, Group Hairier, stating that he did not want God thundering and being portrayed on the stage, 'God' was changed to "God of Thunder" and the sketch remained.⁹³ Die Van Aardes van Grootoor was originally booked at the Laager at the Market for a month; instead it ran for eight months, the longest ever run for an Afrikaans play in Johannesburg, with references to the censors incorporated in the script.⁹⁴ It's a Boy! remains, claims Kirby, the South African play with the longest run; it toured South Africa for more than a year.⁹⁵

3.2.3 Censorship of satire in other forms

Productions are usually ephemeral, however, and cannot, of course, be 'possessed'. Books are treated differently: it is an offence to possess a banned book. There would seem, in truth, to be two types of banned books: those which are deemed 'undesirable' and those which it is an offence to have in one's possession. The distinction, as pointed out in the Companion to South African English Literature, would appear to be a fine one and is of importance, primarily, to librarians, who may permit " 'bona fide' students to read and/or to take excerpts from some, but not others - provided the necessary permissions have been granted by the relevant government department".⁹⁶ What the state did not anticipate was the strength of public support from fellow-writers and more 'enlightened' members of the National Party (some prominent within the censorship body) in relation to the banning of certain works.

To avoid a clash between the government and the literary establishment as a consequence of the banning (on the grounds of indecency, obscenity and profanity) of what many

critics regarded as the best satiric novel in Afrikaans, Etienne Leroux's Magersfontein, O Magersfontein (1977), the Publications Act was amended in 1978 (on the recommendations of Alwyn Schlebusch, Minister of Internal Affairs) to introduce a new committee of experts to advise the Publications Appeal Board on the literary and/or artistic merits of a work, and the imposition of conditions of age and display to in recognition of the interests of the 'likely' reader or viewer.⁹⁷ The fact that the novel had been passed by one of the anonymous committees, later referred by the Minister of the Interior, then banned by the Publications Appeal Board, won the most prestigious Afrikaans literary prize and was then unbanned in 1980 when the 1978 amendments to the Act came into effect, indicates the weaknesses of the system. Although Van Rooyen claims that the Publications Appeal Board is an autonomous body, the Minister of Home Affairs is responsible for the Act and he may direct the director to bring a public entertainment to the notice of one of the committees and, further, also direct the Publications Appeal Board to reconsider the decision of a committee, as occurred with Magersfontein, O Magersfontein and It's a Boy! As has been mentioned in 1988 the Minister indirectly criticized the leniency of the Publications Appeal Board.

The first novel to overtly satirize and expose the realities of apartheid, Sylvester Stein's Second-Class Taxi (1958), was banned within a week of publication. (It became a best-seller overseas and was re-issued by David Philip in 1983 after its unbanning in 1982). Tom Sharpe's Riotous Assembly (1971) which employs bizarre farce to underscore the bigotry and absurdities of recognizable institutions (the title contains a persiflage of the Riotous Assembly Act) was banned in the year of publication. His Indecent Exposure (1973), concerned not only with infringements of the Immorality Act by the Security Police who are meant to safeguard it, but as the title indicates, with mockery of the censorship laws, was also banned. These bans were lifted in 1983. Hope's A Separate Development, a caustic exposure of the effects of racial classification on the 'separate development' of the fictional narrator Harry Moto was temporarily banned in 1980. Hope has also produced poetry of a strongly satirical nature in his Cape Drives (1974) and In the Country of the Black Pig (1981).

In 1984, with Kruger's Alp, Hope adopted a different satiric strategy, one which often succeeds in by passing censorship: the use of allegory. The action of Kruger's Alp is patterned on that of John Bunyan's The Pilgrim's Progress (1678) and fuses fiction with burlesqued but recognizable descriptions of historical events and depictions of politicians to satirize the self-seeking and corrupt machinations of the State. The principal focus in the novel is on the 'Information Scandal': "Augustus Karel Kuiker", Minister for Parallel Equilibriums, Ethnic Autonomy and Cultural Communications is, in word, in method and in physical description, Dr Connie (Cornelius) Mulder, Minister of Information; "Trudy Yssel", the secretary of the Department of Communications is Dr Eschel Rhodie, secretary to the Department of Information.⁹⁸ (Kruger's Alp also contains lampoons of other prominent South Africans, including Harry Oppenheimer ("Himmelfarber"), Alan Paton ("Ezra Savage") and Mimi (Maria) Coertse ("Maisie van der Westhuizen").)

In the final report of the Commission investigating the Department of Information, headed by Judge R.P.B. Erasmus and tabled in June 1979, it was revealed that public funds - more than sixty-four million rand - had been used for National Party political ends in a secret propaganda war to improve the image and opinion of South Africa internally and internationally by, for example, financing books and periodicals (Panorama), the founding of a new daily newspaper (Citizen), and the loan of public money to Nationalists to buy opposition newspapers. Mulder (who resigned and formed the Conservative Party in March 1982), General H.J. van den Bergh (the head of Boss, the Bureau of State Security), Owen Horwood (the Minister of Finance), Rhodie (who was sentenced to twelve years in prison; this was reversed on appeal) and Vorster (who resigned as Prime Minister, partly for health reasons) were all implicated in the irregularities.⁹⁹

Uys lampooned the same figures within the format of satirical revue in Info Scandals in 1979, with himself as Mulder, Richard Haines as Rhodie and Sybil Coetzee as Van den Bergh at the Wena Naude Theatre, Pretoria. In July of the same year it was presented at the Laager at the Market as Info Scandals (The Rhodiest Show in Town) directed by

Dawie Malan. The addition to the original title is significant: Uys had warned, in the rehearsal stage, that the content would change daily as more information was revealed.¹⁰⁰ The revue was censored, not for its lampoons or for its political comment, but for crude language and for its contravention of sub-section (c) of section 47 (2) of the Publications Act ("bring[ing] any section of the population of the Republic into ridicule or contempt"). This decision contradicts the earlier definition of "section" by Van Rooyen already cited (although he did concede in 1987 that the offence would have been solved by the imposition of a place restriction).¹⁰¹ The Publications Appeal Board ordered the removal of the scene in which a performer in 'traditional' Voortrekker costume removed her clothing while singing "Afrikaners is plesierig, dit kan jy glo! / Hulle hou van partytjies en dan maak hulle so ...". Six years later Uys employed the same lyrics in Beyond the Rubicon (in a monologue by Billie-Jeanne Bezuidenhout) to introduce a routine which satirized P.W. Botha's 'Rubicon' speech delivered in Durban on 15 August 1985.

To support the facade of a free society and of a state bent on reform, a degree of political comment and criticism has been permitted. Dario Fo, a satirical performer, writer and political activist, stated in a debate held after a performance: "The end of satire is the first alarm bell signalling the end of real democracy."¹⁰² To continue to ban the satiric works of internationally known practitioners such as Hope (who now resides in England) and Uys would destroy that facade and focus international media attention on the repressive and crisis-ridden South African situation. Hence, in 1987, the censors ignored or overlooked the contravention of the Media Emergency Regulations and the Internal Security Act by Uys in Cry Freemandela - The Movie. Thus the distortion of facts and the lampooning of politicians by whites is allowed. Steadman asserts, with Uys as an example, that "cultural appropriation is becoming increasingly more effective than the formal structures set up by the Publications Act".¹⁰³

But the direct exposure of facts, it would seem, is not to be tolerated. It was investigative reporting by leading South African newspapers which disclosed the large-scale

irregularities in the use of State funds by the Department of Information. In 1985 the Rand Daily Mail and the Sunday Express ceased publication, in part because of financial problems and competition from other newspaper companies, but in large part, Madi Gray claims, for political reasons, as they had publicized the Information Scandal.¹⁰⁴ Since the advent of small format video facilities in South Africa in the early 1980s, theatre has been relatively ignored in comparison with the newer forms of documenting facts: police raids on video-producing groups (such as Afrascope and Afrapix) were frequently undertaken and, through amendments to legislature on publications fines, of twenty thousand rand or five years imprisonment could be imposed on anyone found to be in possession of 'undesirable' films.¹⁰⁵

Bannings continue to be issued by the Directorate of Publications on lesser known works and companies, such as the City Theatre and Dance Company's production of Sunrise City in 1988 for its obscenity and crudity. Generally, as in this case, the Publications Appeal Board imposes an age restriction of two to eighteen.¹⁰⁶ Inconsistency is still the norm: Monty Python's lampoon of the gospels, The Life of Brian (1979) was unbanned; Martin Scorsese's The Last Temptation of Christ (1988) was banned by the Director of Publications, Dr Braam Coetzee, in 1992.¹⁰⁷

Clearly, too, a form of self-censorship exists, either by writers themselves (although as Leslie stated in 1975 regarding his revue Adam's Laugh-In one cannot produce with one eye on the censors) or by publishers or by the Performing Arts Councils.¹⁰⁸ The Executive Committee of the Cape Performing Arts Board (Capab) banned a scheduled production of the English translation of P.G. du Plessis's satirical comedy An Oak Falls in Bishop's Court (originally 'n Seder Val in Waterkloof (1977)) in 1979 as it was "undesirable" and could "give offence" to the English "community".¹⁰⁹ By employing the term "undesirable" Capab's Executive Committee equated itself with the wording of the Publications Act.

The SABC retains the state monopoly for virtually all television and radio. The SABC has

its own code of conduct, strictly applied. It is by law an independent organization; however the board of governors, until 1993, was appointed by the State President, and it does report to Parliament. As an arm of the state, employees were obliged to take a special oath of allegiance to the principles of Christian Nationalism.¹¹⁰ Taylor's "Black-White Calypso", performed in the musical revue Wait a Minim (1961), which ran for seven years, was censored by his recording company for the cast album. SABC-radio was even more careful. As Taylor recalls:

Composers and artists generally have throughout the forty-year reign of the Nationalist Party been viewed as a slight embarrassment by recording companies who have preferred the 'safe' product from overseas and sought to appease the government-controlled broadcasting corporation by exercising their own censorship. Even without the last verse the SABC refused to play it, so their toadying was to no avail.¹¹¹

Taylor's "Ag Pleez Deddy" and "Mommy I like to be" were banned by the SABC for "incorporating slang and for mixing English and Afrikaans" and thereby "destroying the purity of the languages"; "Confession" for "corrupting the morals of the youth"; "Black-White Calypso" and "Piece of Ground" for political reasons; "Northern Side of Town", a satire on the "English-speaking G and T brigade" for being "insulting to a section of the population".¹¹² All were written and performed between 1961 and 1962 before the passing of the Publications and Entertainment Act of 1963. In 1970, partly as a result of the broadcast of a sketch "Radio South Africa Calling (Again)" in Britain in the late 1960s (in which he attempted to explain the reasons for the cricketer, Basil d'Oliviera, being refused entry into South Africa with the Marylebone Cricket Club (MCC); he was a South African-born coloured), Taylor was refused re-entry into South Africa. The ban lasted almost a decade, until 1979, when Taylor was allowed to return permanently (due in part to the lobbying of the impresarios Des and Dawn Lindberg).

3.2.4 Censorship and black writers and performers

The situation for black writers and artists has been, as is well known, far more strictly con-

trolled. Satire by whites is more acceptable than the presentation of the truth by blacks. Hence their work has been banned or embargoed by other forms of legislature besides the Publications Act. The Suppression of Communism Act (now the Internal Security Act (1982)) empowered the Minister of Justice to 'silence', by means of a banning order, what is vaguely and widely defined as 'Communist': Vorster invoked the Act against a generation of black writers living abroad in 1966. Thus, technically, permission still has to be granted by the Minister of Justice for the publication of works by Can (Daniel) Themba and Bloke (William) Modisane. Black writers are treated more severely, to control not only what may be written or produced, but also to control what blacks might read or see. The actors who performed in Mthuli Shezi's Shanti (only published in 1981 in South African People's Plays; the collection was banned; he was killed in 1972) were charged under the Terrorism Act (1967) in 1975 and the play appended to the charge sheet as an example of an "anti-white, racialistic, subversive and/or revolutionary" work.¹¹³ Apart from lack of facilities, funding and media support, playwrights have been banned, detained and interrogated by the security police. By 1978 the three black theatre groups which spearheaded the Black Consciousness Movement (the Theatre Council of Natal (TECON), the People's Experimental Theatre (PET), and the Music, Drama, Arts and Literature Institute (MDALI)) had all disintegrated owing to the repeated banning and detention of their members.

As a form of oppositional practice, theatre by black practitioners has tended to avoid what, in Western terms, might be regarded as satire. Hence, while the compilers of the Companion to South African English Literature note the satiric verse produced by such poets as Wopko Jensma, Mongane Serote and Sipho Sepamla, they state that it is, like "much of the verse written with satiric intent in the 1960s and 1970s ... too stridently propagandistic to qualify as satire".¹¹⁴ Serote and Mafika Gwala, among others, view themselves as contemporary equivalents of praise singers, or imbongi: avoiding the view of poetry as individual expression, they present public and community-inspired 'messages' in English, delivered through oral-based rhythms, the invocatory character of which suits

a performance context. The works of one such oral-poet Ingoapele Magingoane were popular with audiences at the time of the Soweto disturbances of 1976. (When they were collected for publication in 1979 in Africa my beginning the work was banned.) Besides the aim of raising the level of social consciousness and protest against political conditions, such performers not only articulate the aspirations of the community, but also revive folk heroes and recollect historical incidents from the past.

One theatre work which succeeded in achieving those very aims in a satirical manner was Woza Albert! (The title, 'Rise up Albert!' or 'Come back Albert!' refers to Albert Luthuli, the revered Christian, Zulu chief, African National Congress President, Nobel Peace Prize Winner (1960) who died in 1967, and also, ironically to Albert Street, Johannesburg, where the pass office was located.) Christ and Luthuli, who defied their oppressors in the past (Luthuli was arrested and banned for, in part, organizing the Defiance Campaign of 1952) are called to rid the country of its oppressors in the present. As with Uys's God's Forgotten, the revue-type play exposes the fact that underpinning the ideology of apartheid is the theology of apartheid: the theology that supports the concepts of the Afrikaners as the 'chosen' people, that whites have the divine right to political domination and that their position is a result of God's will.¹¹⁵ The programme note emphasized the irony which gave rise to Woza Albert!: "Most of the South African government's policies are the result, they say, of their Christian Nationalist principles. Woza Albert! is our fantasy of a Second Coming to South Africa by Morena, the Saviour."¹¹⁶

Eschewing the conventional Western traditions of dramatic character, plot and dialogue in favour of image, movement and dance the 'narrative' develops in a series of parallels between the New Testament story of Jesus, the saviour, and the satiric contemporary re-working of that story in South Africa: the prophecy of His coming (by a man who is released from prison - a John the Baptist figure - for pass offences in scene 5); the reactions to that (from the Herod-like Prime Minister to the people in the streets in scenes

6-15); the arrival (ironically, and as in the New Testament, not in a palace or an international airport as would befit a returning dignitary, but in the street, among the people, and the street He chooses is Albert Street), followed by the gathering of the disciples (scene 16); the effects of His teaching and its interpretation (scene 17); His arrest (by a paid Judas figure and the arrival of thirteen police cars at 'Coronation' Brickyard in scene 18); His imprisonment (as a potentially dangerous political activist, on Robben Island, in scene 22); His crucifixion (by bombing in scene 24); and His resurrection (in a graveyard after three days, and His calling to life of others who resisted apartheid, in scene 26). The first and last name called is that of Albert Luthuli, as "the Father of our Nation!"¹¹⁷

What occurs in the play reveals that those who have used Morena, the saviour, to justify their policies will deny, denounce and kill Him. The "fantasy" becomes an apocalyptic parable, for those who justify policies on "Christian Nationalist principles" are the cause of leading people to a white Calvary beyond the play. Although Morena's return was to be used as a publicity coup by the State to endorse the Republic and as a means of vindicating its policies in the eyes of its critics, as soon as He becomes politically conscious He is seen as part of the 'total onslaught'. In attempting to 'crucify' Him, Cape Town, the mother city and home of the parliament is obliterated; the explosion precipitates the day of resurrection and with it, the ideals of freedom and emancipation.

The two performers conjure up a whole society in the 'fantasy' guided tour of the townships which exposes the present socio-political 'reality' by the limited aspirations indoctrinated by apartheid, for the people cannot envisage anything beyond white-dominated South Africa. Happiness is equated with the symbols of white success, for whites have the food, the cars, the bricks for houses; 'reality' intrudes through the mirages which are the symbols of political hegemony: police dogs, tear gas, bulldozers and Casspirs (armoured vehicles; an anagram of the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research and South African Police).

A week after the murder of Ruth First by letter bomb on 17 August 1982, her name was added to the list of those who are 'called up' in a performance at the Edinburgh Festival that was dedicated to her memory. Those who are 'raised up' were all crusaders against apartheid; 'rise up' is also a direct appeal to those who, in the present, could be the saviours of South Africa. No matter where Woza Albert! is performed, the same appeal is made, and audiences are treated as part of the presentation and the call. Where the earlier scenes are principally satiric, the final scene is affirmative, a challenge to the audience in the 'now' of performance: Ngema points into the audience to see Luthuli, and the final moments are "ecstatic", filled "with joy", not bitterness.¹¹⁸ Wole Soyinka, in the Foreword to Woza Afrika!, An Anthology of South African Plays (edited by Duma KaNdlovu) describes it as

a 'theatre of poverty' [Mtwala has acknowledged the impact of Jerzy Grotowski's Towards a Poor Theatre (1968) and his methods, rather than his style and content] at its most affirmative, a reflection of the cultural reality that brought it into being, yet transcends its stranglehold on the human spirit.¹¹⁹

Woza Albert! remains, largely, an exception. Van Rooyen gave the assurance, on taking over the chairmanship of the Publications Appeal Board, that "satirical writing will be allowed to develop".¹²⁰ As Gordimer has stated, however, this is "an elitist concession" for it will not prevent anyone, no matter what colour, from producing satire; nevertheless

in the relation of literature to life at present, satire is unlikely to appeal to black writers. It requires a distancing from the subject which black writers, living their lives close within their material, are not likely to manage; it requires a license for self-criticism that loyalty to the black struggle for a spiritual identity does not grant at present.¹²¹

Gordimer was writing in 1980; with little respite during the 1980s, new forms of oppositional theatre have become more relevant to black practitioners: as a means of providing tools for development, forms of Community theatre evolved to conscientize urban and rural communities by collectively identifying and discovering means to cope with and resist the problems that pertain to the particular community; in 'worker plays' (or 'Trade Union Theatre') the field of industrial relations has provided the context for instruction through performance to indicate, through solidarity, means for worker action;

and, principally in the townships, hybrid forms of melodrama, musical comedy and agit-prop theatre are seen as vehicles for the advancement of resistance and are popular in the political sense. All these forms are collaborative in conception and performance and invite participation between performers and audience as to means of creating social and political change in the status quo.¹²² Here Gordimer is correct: the lives of the participants provide the material. In "African aesthetics," to Zakes Mda, "art [can]not be separated from life", as the artist was and is "a social critic" in the same way that "the praise singer ... also became a social critic".¹²³

"We shall not be rid of censorship until we are rid of apartheid," writes Gordimer (the emphasis is hers).¹²⁴ There can be no question that censorship has been a factor in the continued existence of apartheid, and that it has been a strategy to maintain and uphold the dominant ideology. The State, its censors and dissident writers and performers have been bound together in a hostile triumvirate. Whether the situation will alter, despite probable amendments to the legislature concerning censorship in the post-apartheid 'New South Africa' heralded since Nelson Mandela's release from prison on 2 February 1990, the unbanning of thirty-four organizations (including the South African Communist Party (SACP) and the African National Congress, after a thirty-year ban) and the lifting of most Media Emergency Regulations, is questionable. Uys is sceptical regarding the disappearance of censorship with apartheid: "The spectre of self-important cultural commissars demanding to be consulted on what is to be written, to be performed, to be sung, to be toured on the stages of our future Utopia is enough to make the ... satirical juices start flowing."¹²⁵

3.3 Satire and 'non-literary' theatrical forms

Some distinctions must be made between the forms of theatre, as opposed to 'straight' plays, in which satire has appeared, and which have been mentioned in this work. All are

forms of entertainment composed of a collection of items, mostly separate and varied, all have been inherited from the Western tradition, all have been transformed by local practitioners in style and content, and almost all had, originally, satiric purposes. These forms are cabaret, revue, burlesque, music-hall, vaudeville and variety.

There are difficulties associated with attempting to differentiate between the forms as the distinctions are imprecise. Most, like satire itself, have never been limited by notions of consistency or purity of style or technique. As such, they have not, until recently, been viewed as 'legitimate' theatre. And to be legitimate a work has, unfortunately, to have a label and be part of a category. The danger in labelling such a work a 'satire' has been noted by Jonathan Miller, one of the devisers of Beyond the Fringe (1960). In retrospect he would regard that revue as satirical in effect, as part of a tradition exemplified by German cabaret and Brecht, but satire was never the initial intention of the devisers:

We simply said, "The following things seem to us to be very funny." And then along comes the critic who has, as it were, to artificially harden the outlines of a thing of this sort and create a movement out of it, and because it makes a good journalist point, turn it into satire People were diffusely aware of the fact that this was new in some way, but in order to make it identifiable, it ... had to be labelled. Labelling also tends to artificially sharpen certain elements at the expense of others and means, in the end, that the thing acquires in memory a purity which it never had at the outset.¹²⁶

Nevertheless some of the characteristic features of the forms need to be identified to avoid a confusion in terminology and to avoid describing, as Miller has had to, a theatrical work of this nature as "a thing".¹²⁷ Where possible productions in South Africa will be cited.

3.3.1 Cabaret, revue and burlesque

Cabaret is an intimate form of entertainment, performed most often in venues where an audience can eat and drink (in a restaurant, hotel or night-club). The word is derived from the French for 'tavern'. Generally, cabaret is presented by a small cast (or a single performer) either on the floor or a small stage seldom having a proscenium or scenery,

with a minimum of properties. From its contemporary inception at Chat Noir in Paris in 1881, cabaret has been, although entertainment remains its essence, characterized by topical and satirical comment. It is, however, often regarded as a programme consisting of songs and dances. Tynan, in "A Gap Defined: 1960" regretted the lack of satirical cabaret in Britain. He was referring to a particular style of cabaret performer, one who "can speak freely on any subject from the Cuban revolution to the Immaculate Conception" in a performance that is "socially, sexually and politically pungent".¹²⁸ Such forms, he claimed, were truly satirical, not only in themselves, but the basis for satire in other forms. Tynan cited the manner in which German theatre in the 1920s was nourished by the satirical wit of the night-clubs, on which Brecht and Weill based their theatrical style.

Revue is a hybrid form. The word is also of French derivation, meaning 'survey', and the entertainment it denoted was developed by the Cogniard brothers in the mid-nineteenth century as a theatrical presentation which surveyed current affairs, or as an 'end of the year review' which recalled the notable individuals and events of a year in a succession of scenes, sketches and songs with a satirical quality. It came to mean a theatrical show in which a rapid selection of short items (monologues, sketches, songs and dances) were ostensibly organized around topical subject matter, at times connected by a single theme or by a master of ceremonies, a conférencier who introduced and commented on the items. Unlike music-hall and variety, revues always had titles which arose from the theme.

The two principal types of revue are the 'spectacular' and the 'intimate'. The former (exemplified in the early twentieth century by André Charlot in England and Florenz Ziegfeld in America) is a dance-dominated form with large casts, lavish scenery and costumes, substituting sentimentality for satire and catering for music-hall audiences. (The Bijou in Jeppe Street, Johannesburg, built in 1910, was the first proper cinema in the city, and the first to stage revues of this type.) C.B. (Charles Blake) Cochran is generally credited with introducing intimate revue in his Odds and Ends in London in 1914; this did

not rely on spectacle and used few performers who presented sketches and songs aimed at an educated audience. In these first revues Cochran wanted, he wrote in 1933, to "follow the French method closely, making every item as pungent and humorous a commentary as possible on some event".¹²⁹ He later created such revues to exploit the particular talent of a performer such as Beatrice Lillie or a singer and writer and composer such as Noël Coward. (Coward performed selections from his revues and plays in South Africa in 1944.) One of the greatest theatrical successes of the 1940s were the intimate revues Sweet and Low (1943), Sweeter and Lower (1944) and Sweetest and Lowest (1946) with Hermione Gingold, which ran for more than a thousand performances. By then, however, 'revue' had lost its original significance and came to be applied to any entertainment which lacked a plot. A characteristic feature of intimate revue, and one which Leslie was to employ, was its reference to, and parody of, current theatrical tastes and success. Sheridan Morley writes that "'intimate' ... signified an almost incestuous devotion to proper names, stage jokes and theatrical gossip".¹³⁰

Leslie, who had the distinction of introducing sophisticated intimate revue to South Africa, had lived and performed in London at this time. (Musical revues, with topical songs, had appeared in South Africa towards the end of World War I and competed with the 'legitimate' theatre, as had cinema proper, then organized on a permanent basis by Schlesinger.) With Eve Lynd Leslie presented a series of cabaret shows at the Bagatelle, the Berkeley and the Savoy hotels (entitled Adam and Eve) in 1939, before joining the Entertainments National Service Association (ENSA) to present revues and musical entertainments with Lillie (who later backed his own revue Let's Get To-gether at the Farnham Playhouse), Douglas Byng and Joyce Grenfell. He presented a further revue Take a Peep (1942) with Lynd at the Torch Theatre, Knightsbridge, and wrote material and lyrics for Leslie Henson's The Gaieties (1945) with Hermione Baddeley (for whom he wrote "The Sneak of St. Swithin's"; the revue included in the cast the South African Graham Payn, cousin to Blake and later a close friend of Coward's) and Audrey Hepburn's first and second revues, Sauce Piquante and Sauce Tartare. The satirical

revues, as in those of Coward, was aimed at the manners of the class who supported them; although critical they tended to celebrate rather than castigate. Entertainment can never be politically neutral, even if Coward believed it so: "The prime purpose of the theatre is entertainment," he stated in a BBC interview in 1961, and continued:

If, by any chance, a playwright wishes to express a political opinion or a moral opinion or a philosophy, he must be a good enough craftsman to do it with so much spice of entertainment in it that the public get the message without being aware of it.¹³¹

Nevertheless, the popularity of his revues and plays celebrated the status quo, which Lahr describes as "that most entrenched of political positions".¹³² To a commercial theatre practitioner, the measure of success is box-office appeal. His talents were exploited to consolidate patriotism and reinforce morale: Churchill told Coward "to sing his songs to the troops while the guns were firing".¹³³ As an associate of Coward's, Frank Rogaly, the Port Elizabeth-born captain in charge of the Entertainment Unit of the Union Defence Force, devised and directed revues presented to the armed forces in Potchefstroom and Johannesburg in 1940 and later in North Africa, the Middle East and Europe. After the war he continued to do so, in the style of the English format. John Cranko (who was born in Rustenburg and joined the Sadler's Wells Ballet School in 1946 to become a leading choreographer for the Sadler's Wells Company, Covent Garden and director of the Stuttgart Ballet) devised the notable revue Cranks (1955) in London, which introduced contemporary techniques of presentation, together with innovative subject-matter. It was followed by More Cranks.

Leslie's contribution was to find a means to use the format of intimate revue to deliver outspoken political views, even if to homogeneous white audiences, that shared similar tastes and attitudes, possessed a degree of urbanity and were socially and politically aware.

A major development in the style and content of revue occurred in 1960 with Beyond the Fringe (conceived and performed by Miller, Alan Bennett, Peter Cook and Dudley

Moore) as it incorporated satirical material in the manner of the original revues and was considered revolutionary in style: "Four young men in ordinary dress, without make up, on a bare stage save for rostrums, made history overnight."¹³⁴ It included irreverent references to the Queen, the Prime Minister (Harold Macmillan) and God, but satire was not its only appeal. What was different was that Beyond the Fringe humorously exposed English idiosyncrasies in a manner far more pointed than Coward had done. Where intimate revue tended to satirize society people rather than society in general, Beyond the Fringe signalled a departure. Roger Wilmut and Peter Rosengard claim that Beyond the Fringe "established techniques of comedy including direct political satire, hitherto unheard of on the stage or television" and that by doing so, "it also killed London stage revue for the next twenty years".¹³⁵ (The influence of Beyond the Fringe was seen in the comedy shows which dominated British television, and in particular, in "Monty Python's Flying Circus".) The revue ran for a record 2 200 performances in London and New York.

Beyond the Fringe was presented in South Africa in 1961 and 1962 (the first production outside London; the script was transcribed from tape-recordings of that production) in a production directed by Leonard Schach for the Cockpit Players with Siegfried Mynhardt, Nigel Hawthorne, David Beattie and Leon Eagles. After a season at the Hofmeyr theatre in Cape Town, the production toured South Africa and the Rhodesias.¹³⁶ Judging by its popularity, the iconoclastic style of the revue must have influenced practitioners of the form in this country.

With the decline of intimate revue in Britain in the 1960s (although Leslie's revues were popular with South African audiences well into the 1970s) the form was altered to a 'survey', not of a particular year, but of a particular composer's work, exemplified by Jacques Brel is Alive and Well and Living in Paris (1968), Oh, Coward! (1972), Side by Side by Sondheim (1976) and the revue devoted to the work of the pianist Fats Waller, Ain't Misbehavin' (1978). All have been produced in South Africa and all have had box-office appeal.

Burlesque was, as the word implies from literary terminology, originally a satirical stage play which parodied other plays: the most notable, in the eighteenth century, was Sheridan's The Critic (1779), which satirized, after the manner of George Villier's The Rehearsal (1672), not only the sentimental quality of current theatre, but also the virulent literary criticism of the period. Later, in America, burlesque came to refer to a light entertainment with music which gradually emphasized sex and comedy to the exclusion of satirical parody, presented to exclusively male audiences, and including performances by conjurers and acrobats. To compete with the popularity of cinema, in particular, striptease was introduced into burlesque. (Nudity had suddenly flourished in British variety and revue from 1940 - popularized by the Windmill Theatre in Soho - but Watch Committees decided to continue to allow nude posing, while banning suggestive dancing or striptease in the same year. Striptease was banned in New York in 1942.)

An offshoot of burlesque is the form which combines both intimate revue and the original qualities of burlesque: a type of satiric entertainment which parodies current theatrical successes and particular performers. The first was, apparently, Grand Street Follies which opened in New York in 1924. A current equivalent of this form of burlesque (or skit as it is also known) in South Africa, in both name and intention, is Jo'burg Follies which has toured the country since 1989 and in 1992 presented its third version as Jo'burg Follies 3 (billed as "a musical send-up of famous celebrities", many of whom are South Africans, including entertainment personalities such as Joan Brickhill, Kushlick and, more recently, sports people such as Bruce Fordyce, Gonda Betrix and Brian Mitchell).

3.3.2 Music-hall, vaudeville and variety

Music-hall began in the taverns and supper rooms in England (hence 'song-and-supper rooms') in the 1840s, as an entertainment consisting of an organized collection of disparate acts, such as songs and comic monologues and turns, at which the audience

could purchase food and liquor. As stated earlier, its origins lay in the varied entertainments presented in hostelries and public-houses, not theatres as such, from the eighteenth century onwards. It was usually presented in a large room or hall with a small stage, as the main form of amusement for what was termed the 'working class'. Music-hall is generally held to have begun in 1852, when Charles Morton opened the Canterbury Music-hall in London and presented more organized entertainments by professional artists. The format was presided over by a chairman who introduced the acts, which, apart from songs and monologues, consisted of performances by acrobats, animal acts and turns featuring ballet dancers and actors from the legitimate theatre. It flourished in Britain until the First World War and was popular in all the colonies. The Tivoli, at which Love and the Hyphen opened, was previously known as the Tivoli Music Hall (or Tivoli Theatre of Varieties) when it opened in 1903; it featured Marie Lloyd, Little Tich, George Robey and Harry Tate. The first theatre in Durban, the Trafalgar theatre, began as a music-hall venue in the 1850s. It was attached to the Trafalgar Hotel in Nelson Street (now Pine Street). In 1869 that was replaced by a concert room, the Trafalgar Hall, the major venue for concerts, operas and plays in Durban.¹³⁷ In Johannesburg, the firm of Aubrey and Edgar Hyman and Moss Alexander pioneered the presentation of imported music-hall artists from England at the Empire Theatre, which they opened in 1894. During the 1880s, in Kimberley, music-hall featured in venues in hotels, such as Burn's Music Hall at Burn's Hotel and another at the Queen's Hotel.

The most popular artists of the music-hall were the comics, who usually presented a character study in song, or a song with patter (spoken comedy material); nevertheless the core of music-hall lay in the varied range of entertainment it provided.¹³⁸ (These character studies were by no means exclusive to music-hall or the early 1900s: Kaatje Kekkelbek is just such a study, using song and patter.) Performers often created their own distinctive character or mannerism (Robey's eyebrows, Vesta Tilley with her dandyish masculine dress, the elongated boots of Little Tich). These performers relied largely on comic songs, usually sung in a character costume and often 'narrating' a story, or a song with patter. Dan Leno's style of appearing in the guise of a particular character remained the

standard for comics. They have been referred to as stand-up comics and may have been the forerunners of monologists and stand-up comics (but the technique of not adopting a 'persona' to tell a series of seemingly unrelated jokes had not been invented). An element of strong social, rather than political, satire was evident in the monologues of these comics. Max Beerbohm stated that audiences attended music-hall to be cheered by the presentation of a life uglier and more sordid than their own.¹³⁹

Among the first of the comics from the music-hall to visit South Africa, in a one-person show, was the Irish actor and journalist Charles du Val who toured with his Odds and Ends, first presented in Dublin in 1863. One of his most popular creations was Bella Dashaway, presented in travesty.¹⁴⁰ He presented Odds and Ends at the Trafalgar Theatre in Durban in 1880. He later recorded his experiences of touring virtually the whole of South Africa by horse-wagon between 1880 and 1881 in With a Show Through Southern Africa (1882). The music-hall performers Lloyd and Harry Lauder also toured South Africa, performing in Johannesburg at the second Empire Palace, opened by the Hymans in 1906 as a music hall "with green and gilt interior decor, a capacity of 1 200 people and lounges and bars on every floor", according to Arnold Benjamin.¹⁴¹ Many South African performers acknowledge their indebtedness to practitioners of this theatrical tradition. Taylor writes:

My only British compost was the music hall. I felt very close to that. Indeed I had been taken to see the inimitable Sid Field at the London palladium when I was very young [he first appeared in London in the revue Strike a New Note in 1943] and had been suitably transported. And the memory of George Formby [Taylor recalls listening to his "Leaning on a Lamp Post" on the gramophone as a child; Formby toured South Africa in 1946] ... had never left me.¹⁴²

On 22 August 1967 the Adam Leslie Theatre opened with Music Hall Revue, directed by Anthony Farmer. In 1973, as Music Hall Review, the production toured South Africa. Music-hall survives in London at the Players' Theatre, which re-opened in 1990 at the Arches, under Charing Cross Station, where an old-time Victorian music-hall bill is offered. (The original Players' Theatre had opened in Covent Garden in premises which had formerly housed Evans's Song-and-Supper-Rooms.)

Vaudeville, like cabaret and revue, is of French origin, possibly a corruption of Vau (or Val) de Vire (meaning 'songs from the Valley of Vire', in Normandy), and referring, in the fifteenth century, to a satirically humorous song. In the early eighteenth century the word changed in meaning to denote a play of a light satiric nature (interspersed with songs) presented by strolling players to avoid the monopoly of the Comédie Française. Still later, in America, it changed its meaning and became the equivalent of the British music-hall: though strictly meaning a predominantly musical type of entertainment, the programmes featured comic and acrobatic items, for family entertainment (and therefore in opposition to burlesque). The heyday parallels that of music-hall.

In American vaudeville, the visual jokes, use of dialect, and outlandish costumes of solo comics were gradually displaced by verbal humour, presented by performers more conservative in dress, who developed the storytelling form of monologists and jokes of stand-up comics. The first comedian to discard character make-up and costume and utilize verbal humour alone was Julius Tannen. Such performers were regarded as the only 'civilians' on the bill, performing in street clothes and speaking like normal people. (Naturally, the conservative appearance was itself the monologists' equivalent of baggy pants, and clear diction their equivalent of dialect.) Bert Lahr was one such vaudeville clown who developed into a monologist.

When the music-hall venues were adapted to normal theatre seating and dispensed with the individual supper-tables, much of the boisterous element which had characterized music-hall disappeared. Most music halls were then renamed 'Palaces of Variety', and the turns were billed as 'variety'. The term 'variety' seems to have been first used on Easter Monday 1841, by Samuel Haycroft Lane who presented a melodrama, an opera, a ballet, and six turns under the title "A Variety of Artists" at the Britannia Theatre, Hoxton.¹⁴³ Variety is characterized by the presentation of varied, unrelated items. One of the first Palaces of Varieties in South Africa, known as the Empire Palace of

Varieties or Empire Theatre of Varieties was the Empire Theatre built by the Hyman brothers; *The Bells* (1871), the melodrama by Leopold Lewis was the first production, in which the mining magnate and amateur actor Barney Barnato appeared.¹⁴⁴ In 1896 the first projected motion pictures in South Africa were shown at the Empire Palace of Varieties by Carl Hertz. (This was the first of three different Empire Theatres in Johannesburg; Lauder and Lloyd appeared at the Second Empire Palace which the Hymans opened in 1896. For a town of its size in the 1890s, it was believed to have more theatres than any other.¹⁴⁵) The Pekin Palace of Varieties opened in Cape Town in 1898. In the early 1900s in Durban, His Majesty's was also known as The Palace of Varieties; in 1910 it became Thornton's Bioscope. The Criterion, which opened in 1912, was built as a 'vaudeville-bio', for both films and variety acts within a single programme, and also for visiting theatre companies (South African companies who performed at the Criterion included the Gwen Ffrangcon-Davies/Marda Vanne Company, the Munro/Inglis Company, the Brian Brooke Company, besides visits by the Royal Ballet, the Old Vic Company and the Folies Bergère). In 1926 the Criterion advertized a "Variety Program which included the world's master Uni-cyclist, an accordionist, a soprano, and two celebrated Eccentric Equilibrists ... followed by a movie".¹⁴⁶ With the introduction of commercial radio in South Africa, on 1 July 1924, the 'vaudeville-bio' faced competition for audiences.

In South Africa, mixed-bill entertainments of the early variety type existed throughout the nineteenth century, however, most often presented by visiting military units. Dennis Schaffer has described the entertainment presented at the earliest theatre venue in Natal, the Victoria Theatre, formerly and briefly known as the Garrison Theatre, by the "Amateurs of the 45th Regt.":

The form of the programme presented was typical of the age. It consisted of a comedy, tragedy or melodrama to start with, followed by a series of entertainments including such items as clog dancing and songs, and concluding with a 'laughable farce' Essentially the programme consisted of two main items with an interlude or 'series of entertainments' in between.¹⁴⁷

Unlike early music-hall, variety was not associated with the consumption of food and liquor in the auditorium. By World War I, music-hall was threatened by the advent of revue; furthermore, in 1912, as Wilmut notes,

the law on the licensing of theatres was amended to remove the anomalies between theatres and halls. Both were brought under the Lord Chamberlain; and food and drink finally disappeared from the auditorium (though not from bars elsewhere in the theatre). This, perhaps more than anything else, changed the style of music-hall; there was less of the everybody-sing-along type of act, less of a free-and-easy feel to the proceedings, and gradually the presentations - though still in a similar format - became more of a theatrical experience for the audience. The chairman, and his function as compère, had in most cases disappeared, to be replaced by a printed programme.¹⁴⁸

This form of theatrical entertainment, then, developed in its own right both parallel to, out of and with the decline of music-hall, and flourished until the late 1950s as a popular form. Where early music-hall had a strong element of social satire (in its depiction of the lives of 'ordinary' people) and lost this tradition as the halls became respectable, variety had no such element: it was a purely theatrical entertainment, with little sense of social reality. In South Africa the format of variety was structured on the attraction of an imported performer as the 'top-of-the-bill' with, most often, a supporting bill of local acts. So, for example, the third Empire opened in Johannesburg in September 1936 with a variety bill which included Nora Williams, "the famous American whistling songstress and blues singer", and can-can dancing performed by a troupe of sixteen Empire Girls, "all South African".¹⁴⁹ And at the Prince's in Durban, on 7 September 1939, the world renowned singer Richard Tauber presented a patriotic programme; on the supporting bill was Aubrey Ranier, the "famous South African boy cellist".¹⁵⁰

As General Manager of African Theatres from 1951, Alfred Henry (Jim) Stodel negotiated with numerous foreign entertainers, among them Danny Kaye, Sophie Tucker, Johnny Ray, Marcel Marceau, Maurice Chevalier, Stanley Holloway, Zizi Jeanmaire and Liberace during the 1950s and 1960s. More recently, Pieter Toerien has imported such performers as Marlene Dietrich, Shelley Berman, Françoise Hardy, Peter Nero, Tony Martin and Cyd Charisse. South Africans who have topped the bill include Eve Boswell,

Al Debbo and Brickhill (the last in two editions of Minstrel Scandals, Follies Spectacular and Follies Fantastique in the 1970s).

The decline in variety during the late 1950s is attributable, largely, to the increasing popularity of television in Britain and America.¹⁵¹ In South Africa the appeal of variety, for fairly sophisticated white audiences, would last until the beginning of television broadcasting in 1976. The pressure from television resulted in a similar falling-off of radio comedy in the 1960s; having developed from and sustained variety, radio comedy, after the peak of the surrealistic "The Goon Shows" (originally created by Spike Milligan, Harry Secombe, Peter Sellers and Michael Bentine in 1951 as "Crazy People"; in 1952 it was renamed "The Goon show" and lasted until 1960) and Tony Hancock's realistic comedy, was itself declining in popularity. The so-called 'satire boom' of the early 1960s that was said to have gained its impetus from Beyond the Fringe in the theatre was not sustained in television until "Spitting Image" made its debut in 1984. "Steptoe and Son", "Monty Python's Flying Circus" and "Yes Minister" indicate that television comedy has departed from its origins, through radio, in variety. Paradoxically, the main force against it, television, has revived an approximation of the form in 'Variety Specials'.

PART TWO: THEATRICAL PRACTITIONERS OF SATIRIC FORMS SINCE THE 1960s

3.4 Adam Leslie: satire in intimate revue

When Adam Leslie (born Leslie Jacobson) died on 25 April 1979 the tributes in the South African press acknowledged his contribution to the development of theatre in the country. Not only was he known as 'Mr Satire', the performer who had been "long established as the maestro of barbed revue and politico-social comment", but he was credited with

"introducing intimate revue - that pungent mixture of topical satire and light-hearted entertainment - to South Africa" and for establishing, in the Adam Leslie Theatre, one of the showplaces of Johannesburg.¹⁵² Between 1956 and 1977, as far as can be ascertained, he devised, directed, wrote the lyrics and composed the music for thirty-four revues, cabarets and adaptations which visited every major city in South Africa and the Rhodesias. To him, the "job of the satirist is to pin point, pin prick but not be pointless", to be "a social commentator" who is aware of the "umbilical chord" [sic] which links theatre and politics, to realize that in "satire the basic ingredient is humour, for without it, it ceases to be satirical but merely vicious".¹⁵³

This discussion of Leslie will focus on three aspects of his work mentioned in the tributes cited above: how a particular revue would reflect the current social, political and theatrical issues of the time, the format and structure of his revues, and the creation of the Adam Leslie Theatre.

3.4.1 Two's Company

Two's Company opened in Cape Town in February 1960 in a cinema named the Broadway on the foreshore. The revue was devised and written by Leslie as a vehicle for himself and Blake. It ran for more than eighteen months, playing in Cape Town, Durban, Pietermaritzburg, East London, Port Elizabeth, Bloemfontein, Welkom, Johannesburg, Pretoria and Salisbury, with return seasons in the major centres. He and Blake had, prior to Two's Company, performed in cabaret at Ciro's, Johannesburg (Adam's Apple, Fig for your Leaf, Snake in the Grass are some titles presented between 1957 and 1958; almost all his productions had titles cross-referring to his own name, a device he had employed for his first revues during the war and for his cabaret appearances at the Berkeley Hotel, the Savoy, Bagatelle and Ciro's in London). These early revues were, in part, burlesques of theatre personalities and socialites in the manner of the original Grand Street Follies.

On the strength of their success as a cabaret partnership, Leslie proposed presenting a revue in a theatre. As there were no venues available in Johannesburg at the time he converted a lecture hall which became known as the Intimate Theatre (Blake credits him with "creating the Intimate"; either Leslie or the Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA) or the two together established the Intimate Theatre in Braamfontein, Johannesburg, as it opened in 1955) for his Let Your Hair Down, which opened on 18 December 1958 and ran for nineteen weeks, followed, owing to its popularity, by Let Your Hair Down Again and Let Your Hair Down Again Again. (Blake, an accomplished actress, singer and dancer - she had appeared in numerous productions in England during the 1940s and 1950s, including the British premières of Anouilh's Thieves' Carnival (1937) and Ardèle (1948) with Sir Barry Jackson's Birmingham Repertory Company - won two Johannesburg Star Awards for 1958: for her performance in Ray Lawler's Summer of the Seventeenth Doll (1955) and as 'Best artist in a musical or revue' for Let Your Hair Down.) After an unsuccessful attempt to expand the size of the cast in For Love or Money? in 1959, he rewrote the material from that revue for Blake and himself ('The Company of Two') and called his next revue Two's Company, which Blake describes as "the real tour de force of political satire in this country. They'd never seen it before, they'd never seen it before at all."¹⁵⁴ Ivor Jones in the Cape Times described it as "an intimate, sophisticated entertainment wickedly observant of many of our South African social and political foibles, and with its topical slings and arrows aimed unerringly at the public's risibility".¹⁵⁵

In the original performance script, after the overture played by Albie Louw, the stage directions read:

Curtain up on lounge set with small table. Crystal chandelier suspended from the flies. Joan wearing a revealing black dress reclines on a chair; she toys with a pair of Virginia Jones sunglasses. Adam with cocktail glass in hand stands nearby.

Clearly the material was not only communicated verbally, but also through the setting and style of delivery. Furniture (hired from Garlicks), costumes, and accessories were exploited to counterpoint the political content. The opening dialogue was delivered in 'cocktail'-type patter:

JOAN : Pardon my bare majority.
 ADAM : Her Senate is still enlarged.
 JOAN : (lifting sunglasses) I may have a slight colour prejudice, and my Bantustan vision's miraged. So pardon my bare majority.
 ADAM : Who has confidence in her remark?
 JOAN : When all's said and done
 A white majority of one -
 ADAM : May well keep this continent dark.

This opening encapsulated and commented on the political situation in February 1960. Strijdom had died in office on 24 August 1958, and Verwoerd was elected the next premier. His era was marked initially by two decisive changes in the political orientation of South Africa, as, according to Godfrey Le May, he "believed in two things with passionate intensity - the necessity, for South Africa, of achieving the status of a republic, and the possibility of apartheid being made to work".¹⁵⁶ The first lines of the sketch referred to these "two things" as a set-up, with the general theme leading to specific examples in escalating absurdity, until the final, unexpected punch, with its sudden change in tone. In a contrast to the supposedly glib and flippant ambience, the set-up established a 'reality' based on historical fact, while the punch line communicated a particular attitude (perhaps an echo of the 'Winds of Change' speech delivered by the British Prime Minister, Macmillan, to a combined meeting of the Senate and Assembly in Cape Town on 3 February 1960).¹⁵⁷ One of Leslie's strengths as a writer of satiric material was his ability to invert the humour created within a monologue or sketch by a deliberately shocking punch or black-out line, and as a performer he was noted for his instinctive ability to hold back the delivery of the line until the correct moment, for the maximum effect that could be gained by the reversal.

On 20 January 1960 Verwoerd had announced in Parliament that legislation would be introduced to provide for a referendum later that year, in which white voters would choose whether South Africa should become, even if by a majority of one vote, a republic within the Commonwealth. (The Referendum Bill was introduced on 11 March.) The establishment of a republic was opposed by the United Party, the Liberal Party, the newly-formed Progressive Party (which favoured a multi-racial republic) and the English-language press (with the exception of the Cape Argus, which adopted an independent line, neither in favour nor against).¹⁵⁸ Nevertheless it was clear that Verwoerd would brook no opposition as all the important symbols of the new Republic had been introduced by 1960: one citizenship, one flag and one national anthem.

The condensed set-up material of the opening to Two's Company (with its reference to a "white majority of one" allowed for callback techniques later in the revue: the tenth item, entitled "Majority of One" (performed by Leslie) referred directly to the proposed referendum, to expand the point of view of the first sketch. It was a technique Leslie repeated for subsequent revues: an opening, with music, which established both the theme and a rapport which could be enlarged and exploited once they had been communicated and established. In his front page cartoon in the Rand Daily Mail of 23 January 1960, Bob (Robert) Connolly depicted a bikini-clad woman on the beach with two men in the background, one of whom refers to the "proposed bare majority republic" which Blake, in similarly suggestive attire, also referred to.¹⁵⁹

The apprehensions of the satirist (and more indirectly) the cartoonist were not unfounded. On 22 March 1960 the headline of the Rand Daily Mail read: "54 Dead, 191 Hurt in Riots" for its leading article on the Sharpeville massacre (the final toll was sixty-nine killed); on the same page it was reported under the heading "A Republic even if voters say no" that Verwoerd had stated in the House of Assembly that if the Government lost the referendum on the Republic (to be held on 5 October 1960), he would then allow the

decision to be taken by the great majority of parliament. It was apparent that, as was stated in the Pretoria News of the same day in an article entitled "Verwoerd's 'About Face' called Dishonest", Verwoerd would ignore the result and enforce his hegemonic control by making use of the National Party majority in parliament, whereas all his followers, including his Press, took it for granted that he meant a majority, even of one vote at a referendum, and then, the article continued "a parliamentary majority to carry the decision obtained at the referendum to its logical conclusion".

During the run of Two's Company Leslie constantly revised and updated material. When the revue returned to Cape Town in August 1960 for a season in the Labia Theatre, the fourth item performed by Leslie was "Voting Song" in which, six weeks before the referendum, he appeared

attired, like Ruth Draper [the American monologist who toured widely, always performing solo in monologues she had written; the dowager opening the bazaar was one of her most popular creations], as a Dowager Duchess about to open a charity bazaar, and bearing a banner with the device "Are You on the Voting Roll?" advised on political things to come, giving a tug now and again to the Black Sash slung over his shoulder [the Black Sash was founded in 1955 as the Women's Defence of the Constitution League aiming, in the first instance, to resist the intended removal of coloureds from the common voters' roll]."¹⁶⁰

In the event, the result of the referendum was a victory for Verwoerd, with 850 458 votes for a republic, 775 878 against in a percentage poll of just over ninety per cent, by white voters. Interestingly, many English-press reviewers, effusive in their praise of Two's Company, and believing or hoping in the efficacy of theatre to change opinions, had thought otherwise: "... if it [Two's Company] were heard in enough talks it would lose the Nats 100 000 votes in the referendum. The show is as up to the minute as this mornings' newspaper."¹⁶¹

To return to the original Two's Company opening, however: the line in the sketch which stated "Her Senate is still too enlarged" referred to the constitutional crisis which had

recurred throughout the 1950s. On 8 March 1951 Dr T.E. (Theophilus Ebenhaezer) Dönges introduced the contentious Separate Representation of Voters' Bill in the House of Assembly, promulgated by Malan (then Prime Minister). The principal objectives of this Bill included the removal of coloureds in the Cape Province from the common voters' roll, the placing of their names on a separate voters' roll, and the division of the Cape Province into four electoral areas, each of which would elect a white representative to the Assembly. In spite of opposition from the United Party, this legislation was passed in May 1951 (the Separate Representation of Voters Act). The United Party took the case to the Appeal Court, which ruled against the government. The Act was shelved until 1955 when Strijdom announced that the composition of the Appeal Court would be amended, the Senate would be enlarged and the Separate Representation of Voters Bill would be resubmitted to a joint sitting of the House of Assembly and the Senate. After an election in August 1955 the Senate was enlarged from forty-four to eighty-nine members, and the bill to remove coloureds from the common voters' roll was passed with the requisite two-thirds majority in 1956. With such a majority of Nationalists in the Senate, Strijdom and hence Verwoerd secured their position in power, making opposition futile. This Leslie exposed through ridicule.

In a similar callback technique to that used in his "Majority of One", in the second Cape Town season Leslie presented an item which was to become one of his most praised, "Coon Carnival" which called back to the "Voting Song" sketch with its visual references to the Black Sash and the coloured voting issue. This sketch won a spontaneous round of applause on the opening night. It was an appeal for tolerance and predicted the destruction of District Six. (The 'development' of District Six was announced in the Assembly five years later, in June 1965, by P.W. Botha, then Minister of Community Development.) Leslie performed the sketch in black-face as a 'coon' preparing for the carnival:

I got my mouth, I got my tongue
I made my cross so what the heck

A Senate packed
 I have to vrek
 I had my say so pardon me
 It's all a farce, hey, this
 Democracy
 Ha, ha, ha,
Daar kom die Alabama
 Hapy, happy, happy ... ¹⁶²

According to Robert Leslie this sketch was, to his father, "the zenith of all the elements coming together: political content, delivery, strength of emotional depth and range that [he] had to project to make the point work".

In 1959, Verwoerd insisted that the policy of 'white leadership with justice', hitherto the cornerstone of Nationalist ideology, be rejected in favour of a Commonwealth which would end racial discrimination in South Africa. This was to be brought about, Verwoerd announced, "by the gradual evolution of independent Bantu states alongside an independent White state within the borders of the Union".¹⁶³ The Promotion of Bantu Self-Government Act (also known as the Bantustan Act; the word was coined on the analogy of Pakistan, to denote a separate black area, with eventual self-government) was passed in that year, envisaging eight 'national units' for the Bantu people, defined in tribal terms, and so excluding blacks from permanent residence, schooling and forms of employment outside these Bantustans. Blake, as the representative of 'Nationalist' ideology had, appropriately, to lift her sunglasses to state: "I may have a slight colour prejudice / And my Bantustan vision's miraged."

In May 1961 South Africa was declared a republic; the ceremony took place on 31 May when C.R. (Charles Robberts) Swart, the last Governor-General of the Union, was installed as the first State President of South Africa. Natal had been the only province with a clear majority against becoming a republic in the referendum: 135 598 against, 42 299 for. In the version of Two's Company which opened in Durban in the same week, the opening sketch was entitled "Garbage". Blake and Leslie climbed out of large black

dustbins, on which were painted the words 'South Africa' in white, singing "South Africa's a dustbin / And we are feeling fine ..." (patterned on "My Old Man's a Dustman"). The song alternated with patter in which topical issues were discussed. In another sketch, in Natal, they appeared on stage as buxom female supporters of the United Party, in "Buckingham Palace hats", carrying Union Jacks and singing: "We're fighting the Republic. We want it overthrown. / We only swear allegiance to the Madame on the Throne."¹⁶⁴ This lampoon of flag-waving jingoists was received in "almost stony silence" according to Leslie, who recalled the response:

And then suddenly the audience saw it as an emotional outlet. They laughed and clapped and in that moment there seemed to be an acceptance of the inevitable Where else [except Natal] at that time could such a guying be accepted without malice? It wasn't as though it was accepted with a lack of consciousness. The audience was only too aware of the implications.¹⁶⁵

Leslie, in describing the reactions of the audience, has recorded some of the features of his approach: in outspoken revues he provided an outlet for his white, English-speaking audiences whose members had to have a level of awareness of the current political situation (an anonymous reviewer stated that "if you haven't been reading your newspaper regularly many of the quips will escape you") and be able to accept the ridicule of their foibles or pretensions or beliefs. In the same manner and tone in which reviewers praised Black in 1908 for providing release through satirical exposure during a period of political tension, so those of the 1960 and 1961 years responded to the revues of Leslie, who inserted extracts from the reviews of Two's Company in subsequent programmes. Two from the programme for Nothing Sacred (1962) indicate clearly this response on the part of reviewers:

Two's Company did more than entertain us - it gave the glorious relief of laughter to a community that has been politically tense and unhappy for weeks.

- Natal Daily News.

South Africa has a long way to go before it can laugh at itself. One reason is it gets so little practice; our politics in particular is so terribly grim. All the more reason why we should welcome the Adam Leslies of this world.

- Stephen La Rochelle,
"The Political Scene", Sunday Tribune.

The political tension referred to in these reviews was a result of various factors, including the referendum, Sharpeville, the anti-pass campaigns of March 1960, the boycotts organized by the Anti-Apartheid Co-ordinating Committee in London also in March, the banning of the African National Congress and the Pan-Africanist Congress in April a week after Sharpeville (and the founding of Umkonto We Sizwe (the meaning 'Spear of the Nation' is significant), the armed underground section of the African National Congress, a year later), the declaration of a state of emergency and the first of the 'treason trials' and of legislation aimed to eradicate opposition of all forms. Besides a nation-wide crackdown on dissidents by the South African Police, the Minister of Justice, Vorster, announced a succession of laws that would "limit the freedom of speech and movement of agitators".¹⁶⁶ The authority to place individuals under house arrest by Ministerial fiat (in addition to listing or banning them under the Suppression of Communism Act) was granted by statute in the General Law Amendment Act (1962) (the so-called Sabotage Act). The Suppression of Communism Act had been passed in 1950 but the South African Communist Party established itself as an underground movement in 1953. (Leslie exploited the fear of Communism in "Red Spy" performed by Blake (glamorously costumed in white with fur trimming) as a spy with a 'hot-line' to Nikita Khrushchev in the Kremlin informing him of events in South Africa from that day and city's newspapers, including the names of those detained. This monologue was, in part, the reason why the Special Branch attended performances.) Police officers were empowered, in 1961, to detain suspects in solitary confinement; by 1962 it had risen to renewable periods of twelve days, rising through ninety in 1963 (through amendments to the General Law Amendment Act), one hundred and eighty in 1965 (under the Criminal Procedures Act), for an unlimited period of detention if authorized by a judge (under the Terrorism Act of 1967), or even if not so authorized (under the Internal Security Act of 1976).

A contentious sketch in Two's Company, entitled "Strange Birds", depicted two ostriches named Eric (the English-speaking South African) and Hendrik (the Afrikaans-speaking

South African) who attempted to keep their heads in the sand so as to ignore critical comment and remain unaware of the political situation. Blake recalls: "We were telling South Africans to get their heads out of the sand and know what was going on." Leslie believed that white South Africans were living a "blinkered" (a favourite word) existence, and that through this work he could make audiences aware of what should not be ignored. In a scathing lampoon of Japie (Jacob) Basson, Leslie ridiculed the hopes of alternative opposition (Basson had left the National Party after opposing Verwoerd on various issues, one being the latter's proposal of apartheid applying to church worship, the notorious church clause known as the kerkklausule (he was also opposed in this by P.W. Botha, who backed down saying that he realized his "leader" was determined), and was joined by a right-wing United Party rebel Bailey (Peter Bailey) Bekker to form the National Union, a party between the United Party and the National Party in ideology):

I was once a little rebel
 But I've rippled through the pebble
 That I threw into the Nationalist stream.
 Now the future seems quite lekker
 I've been joined by Bailey Bekker
 To promulgate a National Union Dream.

Within months the "dream" of a National Union had faded.¹⁶⁷ Leslie was also to repeatedly lampoon Dr Albert Hertzog, son of the former Prime Minister (General James Barry Munnik Hertzog, premier from 1924 - 1933), a right-wing Nationalist later to form the Herstigste Nasionale Party, but more so through song and patter than direct physical impersonation. The characters which Leslie performed tended to present generalized and composite satiric portraits to expose a wide range of social or political viewpoints, rather than detailed and individualized figures.

Direct impersonation tended to be the area in which Blake specialized, and in keeping with the features of intimate revue, Leslie devised monologues and sketches which lampooned local theatrical tastes and celebrities. Included in Two's Company were skits on Moira Lister ("The Nora Blister show"), Dulcie Howes (as a swan painted by Tretchikoff, played

by Leslie, in "Tretchi") and Coertse (who had recently returned to South Africa and at the airport, when asked, "What is it like to be back on your own home ground, Mimi?" had replied, "Ag, it's lekker to be back with a bang, man" which was incorporated into a monologue "Welkom Onse Mimi"). According to Blake, Lister, Howes, Tretchikoff and Coertse all attended and enjoyed Two's Company.

As a reflection of the contemporary theatrical scene Leslie wrote a song for Blake entitled "The Warning" for the second season of Two's Company in Cape Town. This item indicates the manner in which Leslie incorporated political material of a pointed nature within the format of intimate revue in a style unique to theatre in South Africa (and would arouse interest elsewhere, for the BBC recorded "The Warning"). Jones admired the "throbbing sincerity in Miss Blake's 'The Warning', in which she foreshadowed things to come in the light of present unrest in the Congo".¹⁶⁸ On 30 June 1960, the Belgian Congo became independent. The civil war which followed had been exploited by Verwoerd in a personal appeal, sent in a facsimile of his own handwriting in a letter to voters before the referendum, specifically as an appeal to the 'moderate Englishman'; it also attempted to link the British monarchy with the forces prepared to sacrifice whites to appease African nationalism. The letter began "Dear Friend" and contained the following argument:

The struggle between Eastern and Western nations, between Communism and Christendom, is such that both groups of nations will grant and concede anything (including the white man of Africa, his possessions, and his rights) to seek the favour and support of the black man. This has led to chaos in the Congo.¹⁶⁹

If the result of the "chaos in the Congo" was to lead to support for Verwoerd's policy of separate development (separate or 'self'-development came into use by the SABC in March 1961), then Leslie intended to predict the outcome of Verwoerd's policies once the referendum had taken place from the point of view of those excluded from the process. "The Warning" was performed, remembers Blake, "against a huge black shadow - you couldn't see my face at all - a huge black figure", and included the following lines:

Once the motto used to be
Strength will come from unity,
But there's something that puzzles me
Where will the Bantustan boundaries be?

Nowadays you must prove your right
 Ethnically to "Try For White"
 With Independence we'll hit back,
 Who knows one day you may "Try For Black"
 Apartheid must go let's integrate,
 Or else pack and be forced to migrate.

The song was as sung by "Joyce the 'Voice' from the 'Back of the Moon'". Leslie was referring to two sources: Basil Warner's 'lost' play Try for White which opened at the Hofmeyr Theatre, Cape Town, on 27 January 1959 in a production directed by Schach with the Cockpit Players (it toured South Africa during 1959 and 1960), and King Kong, written by Harry Bloom with lyrics by Pat Williams, directed by Leon Gluckman (brother of Leslie's wife, Judith), with music composed by Todd Matshikiza performed by the 'Manhattan Jazz Band', and presented by Union Artists at Dorkay House, Johannesburg in 1959. Miriam Makeba had performed the song "Back of the Moon" (the 'Back of the Moon' was a shebeen; the proprietress was Joyce, played by Makeba) in King Kong. Peter Bode described this Leslie version as "an astringent political satire that looked forward ten years and beyond".¹⁷⁰ (The extract above is from a revised version of the original, repeated in Don't Stop the Carnival (1965) and performed in the style of Lena Horne by Heather Lloyd-Jones.)

Almost all the satirical songs, monologues and sketches in Two's Company were linked by their concerns with the referendum and the imminent Republic. "The Spoken Word", performed by Leslie, warned audiences that as South African English is more expressive than English English, they could expect to find the language spoken in the idiomatic vernacular in the Republic, and in "De-Aar" (a pattern of "The Rain in Spain" from the Alan Jay Lerner-Frederick Lowe musical My Fair Lady (1956)) Leslie as a Henry Higgins figure attempted to instruct an English girl (Blake) in the correct pronunciation of Afrikaans:

So waar
Jou pa en ma
Is in De Aar.
Ek dink sy het dit!
Ek dink sy het dit!

Of a less pungent nature, items in Two's Company included "Ladies of Rondebosch" (the name of the district was altered to suit the particular place of performance, but the ladies were all in the same mould: hence "Ladies of Musgrave" and "Ladies of Rosebank") and "Mr Woodstock" to expose the social and cultural pretensions of 'Society' hostesses and body builders. (Leslie had opened his own couturier business, the "Adam Leslie Boutique", in Rosebank in 1950; many of the costumes for Blake and the dancers were originally from this source.) However outrageous the characters in these sketches were, they were based on particular individuals.

"Beryl from Ermelo" was, for example, created from a Post Office worker Blake had observed attempting to convert pounds, shillings and pence to rands and cents in the Jeppe Street Post Office. (The Decimal Coinage Bill was passed in 1959, and came into operation early in 1961.) She telephoned Leslie to inform him and they both passed more and more coins across the counter for 'Beryl' to convert.¹⁷¹ Leslie wrote "Rands don't make sense to me" for Blake; a song whose patter consisted largely in reciting the conversion formulae from the official instructions at moments of desperation with argumentative members of the public. From the individual Leslie created a recognizable type. After the tour of Rhodesia Leslie created the astringent "The Hostess with the Mostes'" (patterned on "The Hostess with Mostes' on the Ball" from Irving Berlin's Call Me Madam (1950)) for Blake to perform. Leslie and Blake had been invited to a multi-racial party by a society hostess with, apparently, liberal views. Blake remembers that

we went and on the one side of the room was the Stuart crystal and champagne and on the other side the chipped glasses and bobotie balls. She had some very, very important people there, she had negroes from America to do with atomic energy, most erudite people. In the middle of the party she was asked, "Pardon me, Ma'am, but can you tell me where the little boy's room is?", and she snapped back "The native lavatory is in the yard." Well, when we did a sketch on that it caused a sensation. They didn't want us to do it here, they didn't think it was right. But Adam stuck to his guns.

3.4.2 The format of Leslie's revues

Two's Company owes its format, in many respects, to Coward whose This Year of Grace (1928) maintained a topical quality throughout and his Words and Music (1932) which was not the work of a collection of writers, lyricists and composers, but a 'one-person' creation in that he was the sole author, composer, lyricist and director, although not the only performer.¹⁷² (Leslie did not see these revues, having arrived in London from Johannesburg in 1937, but their impact was discernible in the revues of that time.) Leslie was assisted by Blake and, more so, by his wife Judith Gluckman, who contributed ideas and had the facility to edit and clarify his sketches which could be loosely structured. Nevertheless the responsibility for the writing, composing, directing and designing was largely his.

Coward, in describing the "principal danger spots" in the format of revue, wrote in 1931: "The opening of the whole show ... must be original and extremely snappy."¹⁷³ Leslie's dictum was, similarly:

When you do a show, there's one principle you must never forget: you've got to have a good opening and you've got to have a good ending. What you do in the middle can fluctuate, but when you get on there you've got to grab their attention, and when you leave they must want more.¹⁷⁴

The original Two's Company had a cast of three, besides Louw providing the musical accompaniment. The third member was Sonya Morris, a professional mannequin who, during the entr'actes between the items, would model gowns designed and made by Leslie (and, in the second season in Cape Town by a Mr Oppenheimer of Trick) to allow Blake and Leslie to change costume and make-up. With the introduction of dancers (Henderson, Janice Fellowes-Smith and Jimmy Bell) the entr'actes became interludes incorporated into the themes of the revue, with costumes and choreography linked to the preceding monologue or sketch. The impactive dances, choreographed by Fellowes-Smith who had recently returned from London, were themselves regarded as innovatory in the early 1960s. Henderson recalls: "The rehearsal period was totally knitted, knowing what he

was doing and what we were doing There was a theme, always, it wasn't just dance routines and sketches, it all related." The opening sketch would involve the entire company, followed by Blake and Leslie singing, and then individual monologues or sketches involving the two, with interludes by the dancers. The finale to the first and second half of the revue would, again, involve the company.

As with Coward's revues, so with Leslie's: the finale of the first half had to be the 'high spot'.¹⁷⁵ Leslie would ensure that the penultimate item of the first half was a single performer monologue or song to enable the cast to prepare for the finale. This first half finale, particularly in the later revues, was a pattern of an existing theatrical success. An example is Lerner and Lowe's Camelot (1960) in Leslie's Strike it Rich (1967), the year in which the filmed version was released in this country. As a pattern rather than a parody, the tactic was not to burlesque the original through an imitation and exaggeration of the style and structure, but to adapt what was currently accessible and topical to make satirical comments in a localized version. Thus the characters from the original Camelot were retained and transposed into the South African context for the sketch "Gasalot", with Guinevere transformed into Helen Suzman, Arthur as Vorster equipped with golf clubs and Mordred as Hertzog with a vierkleur (the flags of the former South African Republic and the Orange Free State) attached to his characteristic hat. After complaints to the Publications Control Board, Kruger himself attended a performance of Strike it Rich; "Gasalot" was permitted to be performed, and Leslie thanked the Control Board for the publicity generated, in his newspaper column. ("Gasalot" was so successful that it was revived in Music Hall Review six years later.)

These patterns became a dominant feature of the revues presented in the Adam Leslie Theatre. Perhaps the most pertinent and powerful was the pattern employed in Group Hairier in 1973, in content and visual style. This was, in part, a continuation of Hair Hair patterned on Gerome Ragni, James Rado and Galt MacDermot's Hair (1967), but was most strongly influenced visually by a production of John-Michael Tebelak and Stephen

Schwartz's Godspell (1971) which was banned in South Africa until 1974 (Des and Dawn Lindberg opened a production in Maseru in Lesotho in September 1973), but which Leslie saw in London. The designer of the original Godspell, Ian Dow, enclosed the action in a wire surround. Leslie saw in the idea an encapsulation of the South African context; this and musical selections from Maxwell Anderson and Kurt Weill's Lost in the Stars (1949), the musical based on Paton's Cry, the Beloved Country (1948), were employed to communicate the sense of isolation, of imprisonment and the polarization of black and white in South Africa.

In the first half of Group Hairier the company used white pancake make-up to highlight the lack of individuality and facelessness of the majority of 'white' South Africans. From Hair the idea of youthful rebellion against the mores of society was incorporated, with an ironic play on the use of hair as a means of racial classification and hence, separation of 'groups'. The point behind Group Hairier was the exposure of the deceptions of group domination, of appearance against the inner qualities of individuals. In his review, Robert Greig identified the purpose of Leslie's use of these varied influences:

For Fugard, [South Africa] ... is the bleak wasteland of Boesman and Lena [Boesman and Lena (1969)]. Adam Leslie's South Africa is the ambiguous wire fence surrounding the space of his stage for Group Hairier, his latest revue Group Hairier's significance is not in its bawdy wit or unsubtle double meanings but in the way it acts out images of South Africa ... when custodians of public morals stalk angrily from Group Hairier, they prove the accuracy of the satire. The satire provides a laughter of recognition; the sharp social comment a tentative applause The comment is escaping its sugar coating; the playground fence resembles a prison camp's.¹⁷⁶

Leslie was not solely concerned with the writing and performance of material with a political slant. His revues could be described as saturae, a miscellany, as they juxtaposed direct and indirect satire, social and political material and spoken and sung items. The pointed social items reflected his awareness of the idiosyncracies associated with a particular social set. His experience as a couturier and his newspaper columns in the Sunday Express ("Eavesdrop with Adam" in the 1950s, which was described as "vitriolic") and for the Saturday Star ("Adam's Column" in the early 1970s) provided

material which he could interpret theatrically. According to Robert Leslie, the "blown-up egos, the neuroses, the outward dressing" of the ladies of Rosebank was reflected in a great deal of his material, in "timeless ... humoristic essays on characters". These society monologues and sketches performed a dual function: the political material was so powerful that the audience needed the diversion of a song-and-dance interlude or a comic send-up; two political sketches could not run consecutively. Furthermore, the balance between the laughter evoking material and that with a political message was carefully planned, so that the contrast would intensify the effect of both the political and the social satire. As such, the revues ranged from the mockery of political beliefs to raillery, from pungent lampooning to bawdy, from apocalyptic warning to song-and-dance routines.

The social characters were stereotypes, necessarily so given the constraints of revue, which relies on material that has to be brief and to the point. One of his most enduring characters (partly because the public actually demanded curtain monologues), was the wealthy but jaded Houghton-Muizenberg-Berea kugel with her distinctive idiolect, whose 'nanny' with pass problems was a welcome diversion from boredom, shopping and bridge. "La Grande Kugel" was written and performed by Leslie (and later Mel Miller) in travesty. The intention was never to impersonate a woman, to convince that he was a woman, but rather to play at being and enact, in gaudy make-up, jewellery and clothing, a stereotypical caricature in the style of a pantomime dame.

As would benefit a production aimed to tour, the setting for Two's Company was minimal: a black and white checked floorcloth in perspective, a blackamoor (these were to become trademarks of Leslie's and were featured in his theatre), and only properties which would enhance the material. The furniture was loaned from stores in the town or city where the performances took place. So compact was Nothing Sacred that the scenery (some painted screens and drapes) and costumes were transported in and on a station-wagon. Leslie was primarily concerned, in the revues, with pace, with creating the impression of a fast moving production which necessitated the use of minimal changes in scenery and properties.

It became more and more difficult for Leslie to find venues available for and suited to his productions. In Pietermaritzburg Two's Company was performed in the Great Hall of the Natal University campus. His revues had been presented in cabaret venues (the Causerie at The Edward Hotel, Durban), cinemas (Two's Company opened at the Broadway in Cape Town) and small theatres (the Labia in Cape Town, Durban's Y Theatre, the Library Theatre in Johannesburg, the Breytenbach in Pretoria), apart from the municipal halls of Oudtshoorn, Queenstown and Welkom. Henderson believes that Leslie "built the [Adam Leslie] theatre because he needed his own venue, and it became more difficult to find the kind of theatre that suited his type of intimate audience relationship".

3.4.3 The Adam Leslie Theatre

At some time during 1966 Leslie (and Lloyd-Jones) discovered a derelict six-roomed building in Doornfontein, Johannesburg, and conceived the plans for converting it into his own theatre. Some confusion exists as to the original purpose of the building which became the Adam Leslie Theatre between 1967 and 1975. In February 1967 it was announced in the press that Leslie intended converting a "house" in End Street, Doornfontein, "designed by Sir Herbert Baker for Lady Farrer [sic] in 1906" into a theatre.¹⁷⁷ Blake maintains it was "built as a concert hall" for Lady Farrar (the wife of Sir George Farrar) "and her daughter". However, the building was neither a house nor was it built as a concert hall for Lady Farrar: it was designed by Baker (and his partners Francis Masey and Ernest Sloper) as The School of Music, "under the patronage of Mrs John Dale Lace, in 1904 as a means of promoting polite accomplishments among the young", according to Doreen E. Greig, who has documented Baker's architectural designs in South Africa.¹⁷⁸ The site on which it was built was originally owned by Sir George and Lady Farrar, who played tennis on a court built there; they sold it to a Mr Karnovsky when the Farrars moved to their new residence in Bedfordview (also designed by Baker); he in turn sold the site to a certain 'Herr' Josef Tressi who, with donations from many of the leading

personalities of the time, commissioned Baker to design a music academy, the first in Johannesburg.

The confusion may have arisen from the fact that, as was reported in the press, on the afternoon of Saturday 29 January 1906, "Mr Lionel Phillips thanked Lady Farrar for laying the corner stone of the new College of Music".¹⁷⁹ Baker had, furthermore, designed residences in Johannesburg for Mr and Mrs Lionel Phillips and Mr and Mrs John Dale Lace, and the association between these leading members of the mining corporations was extremely close; Farrar and Phillips had both been Presidents of the Chamber of Mines.¹⁸⁰ (Phillips, Farrar and Lace had, incidentally, been imprisoned in Pretoria in January 1896 for participating in the abortive Jameson Raid.¹⁸¹) To Robert Leslie, the building reflected the entire gamut of Johannesburg's social history; it was even rumoured to have been a brothel at some stage. It has also been claimed as the first theatre to present a Gilbert and Sullivan production in Johannesburg. Confusion also exists as to the street number; at the time it was, according to Leslie, still numbered 62 End Street, and was presumably later re-numbered 96 End Street. On completion in 1905 it was valued at three thousand, five hundred pounds.

The exterior appearance of the building has been well documented and described, however. The facade is dominated by three large and unusual round flanking Dutch gables which, to the best of Greig's knowledge, are "the only unplastered brick gables in the Transvaal".¹⁸² The building is constructed of a soft red brick, also unusual for Baker's work in the Transvaal, with frontage on the pavement. The gables, in Greig's description,

are widely curved and end with quaint scrolls and ornaments. Two side gables and tall, slim chimney stacks flank a higher central gable which has a squared, elongated, ornamented top with a shallow curve In addition to those belonging to the gables, curves of various kinds dominate the composition; all window openings and the windows themselves are variations of the 'Venetian' type and both entrances are arched. In the gallery over the entrance, on the upper floor, is some unusual window detail with a shell motif. The facade was, for Baker, a fanciful piece of work rather gay and far removed from the sober architectural moods with which we associate designs ... [by Baker] being built in Johannesburg about the same time.¹⁸³

Between 1906 and 1913 the academy flourished, with twenty teachers and four hundred pupils (among them the Farrar's daughter, Gwendoline, who later became an opera singer) and, besides being the venue for plays and operettas, the premises were hired for parties and wedding receptions. Burdened with financial difficulties, Tressi disappeared in 1913; his wife attempted to keep the academy open, but failed and it was temporarily absorbed into the Farrar estate.¹⁸⁴ By 1915 the School of Music had changed dramatically as it had become 'Joel's dancing academy' (where the tango was first taught, apparently, in South Africa), then a printing works and later a warehouse. By 1918 it was empty and neglected. In 1921 it was purchased by a concern known as the S.O.S. Boot Company which manufactured gum boots for mine workers. In 1927 it again changed hands to become the Sunshine Macaroni Factory, the business and home of the Benini family until 1963 when this family concern moved to new premises. By 1966 the building was closed and described as being in a very poor condition.

After protracted negotiations with the Johannesburg City Council and various setbacks associated with re-zoning and the right to convert the original building into a theatre, Leslie succeeded with his application to do so in June 1967. He had even sold his residence in Morningside to provide the finance for the renovations. (Brian Astbury, the founder of The Space in Cape Town was more fortunate: the original Space was housed in a building in Bloem Street which had stood empty for a year; the owner, Raymond Sebba, a theatre-lover himself, and his fellow directors made many concessions (including no rental between 1 January and March 1972) to assist the conversion into a theatre.¹⁸⁵)

André Hoffe was commissioned to supervise the conversion of the macaroni factory into a theatre (he found the vaulted, six-panelled wooden ceiling in the large room planned for the auditorium to be acoustically sound), and Leslie himself designed the interior decoration. In 1938 he had, on arrival in London, worked as a cleaner and played walk-on parts at the Players' Theatre in Covent Garden (mentioned in the discussion of music-hall earlier) where, in 1937, Peter Ridgeway decided to revive, under the title of Late

Joys, the song-and-supper-room entertainments which had begun almost a century earlier four floors below in Evans's Music-and-Supper-Rooms in 1844. (These had continued until 1880.)¹⁸⁶ At first the Ridgeway productions burlesqued the Victorians, but gradually there was less guying and a more accurate reproduction of music-hall conventions. Leslie aimed not only to restore the building, but also to both reproduce the quality of the Victorian music-hall he had experienced at the Players' Theatre and incorporate the atmosphere of Johannesburg's past, specifically that of the mining-town of the 1890s and early 1900s. He had collected period pieces and theatrical memorabilia since the 1950s with that intention.

The entrance foyer (painted, wall-papered and carpeted in deep red and gilt, as was the theatre itself), restaurant and cloakrooms contained such items as a Victorian fireplace from a condemned Parktown house, a Georgian mirror, Louis XV chairs, buhl cabinets, a chandelier from the Karnovsky residence above the staircase, a 'honky-tonk' piano reputedly the first imported into the Transvaal in the 1890s, glass doors from a demolished 'pub' in Doornfontein, paraffin lamps acquired from a theatre in Bath in England, photographs of 'old' Johannesburg, and posters and photographs autographed by stage celebrities. The loge in the theatre which occupied the upper floor was fitted with the brass railing from the orchestra pit in the Standard Theatre (which was built in 1891; its intended demolition occasioned a public demonstration with letters of protest received from, among many, Dame Edith Evans, Dame Sybil Thorndike, Athene Seyler and Coward; nevertheless, the demolition commenced in 1959.¹⁸⁷)

Above the raked auditorium (which seated 212 patrons) an oval panel, approximately six metres at its widest dimension, painted with satyrs and nymphs by art students, was attached to the central panels of the ceiling. A raised stage, approximately one metre high, seven and a half metres wide and five metres deep was constructed at one end of the rectangular room. It was painted with Leslie's characteristic black and white checked floor. Two sets of corresponding steps at the sides of the stage permitted access into the

auditorium. A false proscenium, decorated with gilt cherubs and containing small lights on the inner edges, was built less than one metre from the front edge of the stage, creating a narrow apron. Robert Leslie recalls:

The stage was very small, so the format had to be simple. By dividing the stage with curtains, Adams made it possible to use the foreground to do a 'point' number with, most often a follow spot, while the area behind the curtain could be prepared. So, during or at the end of the 'point' number, the curtains would open on another set piece. He had a very simple but most adequate sound and lighting system. [The lighting and sound was controlled from the loge, which could seat, in addition, twenty patrons.] The theatre was economical The essential feature was to use the imagination.

Owing to the narrowness of the room converted into the auditorium and stage, there was virtually no wing space for storing items of scenery, and the two side entrances opened almost directly onto the stage. The canvas fire curtain (with painted reproductions of Victorian, Edwardian and contemporary advertisements, ranging from "Dr Bunyon's Arch-Supports" to "Fly BOAC VC10") and a row of ten footlights, in the form of shells, added to the music-hall ambience. As Leslie could not locate Victorian light fittings he constructed them himself from fibreglass. Appropriately, the production which opened the theatre on 27 August 1967 was Music Hall Revue (which featured Leslie and Blake in the cast; the musical director was Shirley Shearman, who was largely responsible, in almost all his revues, for arranging what Leslie termed his "music"), as it was not only in keeping with the visual style of the building, but also gave Leslie the opportunity to recreate part of Johannesburg's early history, besides being commercially viable, as Robert Leslie indicates:

Music Hall Revue had been sold out, initially, for the first few weeks, to certain mining houses ..., and Adam wrote material that was directed at the histories of those companies. It was a marketing ploy; he styled the whole evening around that, with, in the music-hall context, songs like "Goodbye Dolly Gray" which would flash back to the Boer War, and then further back to the beginnings of Johannesburg and the discovery of gold in 1886.

The concept was reinforced by projections of historical personages (such as Horatio Kitchener) and titles (for the Jameson Raid). Although the material was derived from music-hall (other songs included "Burlington Bertie" and "Bird in a Gilded Cage"), the

revue was patterned on Littlewood's Oh, What a Lovely War! (1963) in its musical evocation of a particular period and a similar use of projections. (The format of music-hall was also the source of Junction Avenue Theatre Company's Randlords and Rotgut (1978) and Janice Honeyman's The Black and White Follies (1987), both of which included documentary material to similarly, but more critically, review the history of Johannesburg from its beginnings.) The restaurant below the theatre afforded Leslie the opportunity to indulge his culinary interests. Percy Baneshik, the theatre reviewer and arts editor for the Rand Daily Mail and later the Star, whose reviews had angered Leslie, nevertheless described him as "a true innovator in more than one field. His restaurant fare, for example, offered in his Doornfontein Theatre (itself a discovery) was full of unusual dishes."¹⁸⁸ Leslie found the menu regulations required by the liquor licensing laws a restriction, and during the eight years of the theatre's existence, would seem to have encountered ongoing difficulties in this regard. There was, however, a theatre bar where liquor was served before the commencement of performances and during the interval. From the outset Leslie envisaged that the ambience would result from various contributory factors, not merely in the productions presented. As one reviewer observed:

Adam Leslie's theatre in Doornfontein, Johannesburg, is far more than an auditorium and on that truth rests at least part of its continuing success ingredients other than the show itself constitute a sizeable part of the entertainment. The theatre, the restaurant and the pleasing nostalgia evoked by the myriad theatrical icons that adorn all the walls - all these factors must influence the critic.¹⁸⁹

The conversion (which would have included alterations by previous owners) of the original building did not appeal to architectural purists: to Greig, writing in 1970, it

survives in what was once a fashionable but is now a run-down, seedy part of the city. Such architectural merit as it once possessed has been dissipated. Apart from the facade and some rooms immediately behind it, little remains of the original building. At the time of writing it is used as a theatre.¹⁹⁰

Revue presented as Adam Leslie Theatrical Productions in his theatre included (and many were also to tour South Africa), after the opening production of Music Hall Revue, Strike it Rich, Strike it Richer (1967), the enormously successful Hair Hair which ran for three

years, Mr Skinflint (1971) (his adaptation of The Miser (1668) by Molière), Sweet Fanny Adam's, Group Hairier, They Sing Cole Porter (1973), Satire Schmatire (1974), Adam's Follies (1974), Adam's Speck-tacular (1974), Adam's Laugh-In (1975), a further revival of Adam's Music Hall (1975) and Adam Scrapes the Barrel, the final production with which the theatre closed after a gala performance and tributes on 31 December 1975.

In early 1970 he had suffered a mild heart attack and on 20 June of the same year a slight stroke during a performance of Hair Hair. On 12 October, again during a performance of Hair Hair, he suffered a second heart attack, which resulted in his decision to retire from the stage. Adam's Follies in June 1974 marked his return to the stage, but in a limited number of items (only four of the twenty-nine on the programme) including "Tele-Time", a prophetic vision of the quality, political bias and racial exclusivity of the impending introduction of television broadcasting in South Africa, a service he entitled Southern Hemisphere Instructional Television, and the monologue revived in many past revues, "La Grande Kugel".

In July 1975, after a further heart attack he and his business manager and partner Bill Hudson put the theatre up for sale. There were no buyers at the price he required and the theatre closed five months later. On 25 March 1976 the Adam Leslie Theatre was put up for auction but again there were no buyers. On 5 April the collection of bric-a-brac, memorabilia and antiques was sold by auction at the theatre. By June, after a further stroke, Leslie was in frail health and had lost eighty percent of his vision. (He was to die almost three years later from the debilitating effects of a weakened heart, cancer and diabetes.) At the time he was writing a new revue, Turn A Blind Eye which eventually opened, without him, in July 1976 at the Mezzanine Room at the Casa Mia Hotel, directed by Hudson. (Turn A Blind Eye was the first revue, since the advent of television, to parody personalities who had become celebrities through their appearances on SABC-TV.) According to his son, Leslie had approached the Johannesburg City Council and the Johannesburg Historical Society to purchase the theatre without success. (The City

Council's Management Council Committee, with, maintains Pat Schwartz, "its lamentable record in the field of preservation of its city's architectural heritage" had, however, agreed on 29 April 1975 to lease the old Indian Fruit Market, built in 1916, to The Company with no rent due for the first three months of the lease.¹⁹¹⁾

When Turn a Blind Eye opened he had found a tenant for the theatre, although strictly speaking the building was no longer a theatre, having been gutted of seats and all technical facilities. (The seats had originally been salvaged, repaired and re-upholstered by Leslie from a burnt-out cinema in Durban. They were bought by Mannie Manim at two rand each for the Upstairs at the Market (which opened in June 1976). These seats were removed two years later to refurbish the Laager at the Market.¹⁹² Interestingly, the Laager at the Market opened on 20 September 1978 with the production of Uys's Die Van Aardes van Grootoor referred to earlier for its censorship problems.) The first tenant to take over the lease was Caroline Riez who intended converting the building once more, "into a discotheque with a difference", according to Leslie.¹⁹³ It became Mandy's, a nightclub. There is some discrepancy as to the cause of a fire that razed the original auditorium and destroyed the roof: Robert Leslie believes a fire was deliberately started at three o'clock in the morning for a fraudulent and unsuccessful insurance claim; Blake maintains it was damaged by a rival club. The academy of music, originally conceived "as a means of promoting polite accomplishments among the young" is now known as Idols. Robert Lang paid tribute to Leslie's theatre in 1973, two years before it closed, when he stated:

The Alexander [named after Muriel Alexander who founded the Johannesburg Repertory Players in 1927], the Brooke [named by Brian Brooke who, with his wife Petrina Fry, bought and converted a church hall in De Villiers Street in 1954] and the Adam Leslie Theatres are theatrical treasures which any city in the world would cherish with pride.¹⁹⁴

3.4.4 Leslie's legacy

There is no doubt that the political and social content of the revues presented in the Adam

Leslie Theatre was tempered not only by his illness but also by commercial factors. Blake believes that the earlier revues were the most powerful as they consisted of "plain hard hitting satire. Those were the best shows because we relied totally on the material. They were the start of political satire, of making people aware, in a revue." What must undoubtedly have also affected the choice of material for the later revues was the interior of the theatre itself, with its opulent music-hall surroundings, which demanded a particular style of performance, furthermore; hence, perhaps, the decision to enclose the stage with a fence surround for Group Hairier, to focus the audience attention to a confined space. Leslie stated that Hair Hair would mark his return to the field of political satire, which suggests that he had included more social comment in the time since Two's Company. Although he maintains these revues were as pertinent, satirically, Robert Leslie concedes that his father's

business sense was not great. He was an artist primarily and Bill [Hudson], who was the General Manager, had to remind him of his overheads - the restaurant, sixty workers, rents, leases - which made it very difficult for Adam to reconcile his sense of artistic integrity coupled with commercial necessities.

And reviewers did not all welcome the return to political satire: Evelyn Levison, in a review of Hair Hair commented that although "Inyanga" was "frighteningly prophetic" and "Hostess with the Mostest" was "an uncomfortable" depiction of the "English cocktail set in Darkest Africa" (both performed with "great skill" by Blake), nevertheless the revue was "overweight in political comment. Adam must watch that delicate balance of entertainment versus message."¹⁹⁵ The convention-bound reasoning underlying this judgement indicates the difficulties many reviewers found in approaching revues which contained "political comment".

Leslie would never accept the notion that his form of entertainment could be presented without reference to the political substance of the life of those who attended his productions. To him there existed the closest relationship, an "umbilical chord" [sic] as quoted earlier, between theatre and politics. His intent was not reformation, but the communication of his consciousness of political inequalities and social follies. While he

attempted to make audiences aware, through ridicule, of repressive state legislation, of the indignities and injustices and future results of racial division, and of the absurdities of censorship rulings, and while a major feature of his satirical effect depended upon the enjoyment of audiences in the act of criticism, he felt bound, too, to include material of a less pointed nature if that was what his target audience expected of theatrical entertainment. That his revues were, mostly, well patronized is an indication that he did fulfill a particular need and that his audiences were in sympathy with the norm from which he based his ridicule, even while he criticized their apathy and indifference.

Generally reviewers would appear to have responded not so much to the rightness of his attacks as to the uniqueness of his type of entertainment, the virtuosity of the performers, and the outspoken nature of his satiric thrusts. As one wrote of Don't Stop the Carnival: Adam Leslie is "one of the most intelligent entertainers we have ever had on the South African stage his savage political barbs are as courageous as they are delightful and in a country where some people are inclined to be acutely sensitive they are quite uninhibited".¹⁹⁶

Nevertheless, the posters advertising Adam's Rib were daubed with swastikas and Stars of David in Pretoria for his presentation of so-termed anti-Afrikaans material; in Durban hecklers threatened to stop a performance for his depiction of the British Royal Family. It is true, however, that his audiences shared in Leslie's own pleasure in eschewing the restrictions upon criticism placed on South Africans by state control and those of morality. As Blake has said, the revues "acted as a safety valve".

While the material that remains appears, in some instances, to be trite in stating the obvious, or deliberately exaggerated for effect, or too lengthy or derivative, clearly it depended largely on the ability of the performers for its impact in performance. His work, Slavin believes, was "aimed at performance, at audience response". Analysis of literary merit would be largely futile, then. Leslie's strength lay more in writing material

that reflected the time and in producing material which suited the performers which he employed. His contribution in promoting and utilizing the talent of many white, English-speaking performers should be recognized: these include, besides Blake and Lloyd-Jones, Zelide Jeppe, Kendrew Lascelles (both prior to their success in Wait a Minim), Diane Wilson, Ziona Garfield, Cy Sacks, Mary Harrison, and in revues at the Adam Leslie Theatre, Richard Loring, Mel Miller, Anthony Fridjhon, Len Davis, Maureen Donne, Peter J. Elliot and Shelagh Holliday. Furthermore, not only was he to influence the style of subsequent oral performers of satire (such as Taylor, Kirby and Banks), but his localized revue format was adopted (as were many of his monologues and sketches) by Joe Stewardson, Gordon Mulholland, Hal Orlandini, Patricia Sanders and George Korelin. Unfortunately very little of his revue material exists in print or in recording and therefore any assessment of its impact in revival is difficult. Robert Leslie claims

part of Adam's strength and the tragedy of South Africa, was that he could write political material that is timeless, that shows that people may think that things have changed, but they haven't. Adam's material is, I believe, a barometer by which you can pick up social and political change in this country.

3.5 **Jeremy Taylor and Robert Kirby**

3.5.1 **Taylor: the Horatian approach**

Since his first performances at the Cul de Sac coffee bar in Hillbrow, Johannesburg in 1960, Taylor has employed music to express and reflect, rather than ridicule, the anomalies and absurdities of the social and, to a lesser extent, political context in which he has performed, whether it be South Africa in the 1960s and 1980s, or England in the 1970s. "That is what I'm about," he stated in an interview for the Sunday Times, "a creator of ballads and stories about people and contemporary life around me."¹⁹⁷ On Dryden's satiric spectrum, Taylor would be allied more to Horace than Juvenal as he presents the follies of individuals and the pretentious beliefs of groups with amusement,

using mockery and badinage to communicate, through the lyrics of his songs, his reactions to those follies and pretensions.

From the outset of his career as a performer (he was to have pursued the craft of a writer on the strength of the Richard Hillary Fellowship for aspirant writers awarded him in his final term at Oxford University) he was influenced by a diverse range of singers and stage performers, including such music-hall and variety performers as Formby and Field, the French philosopher-poet-singers Georges Brassens ("His songs are quite magnificent, full of wisdom and poetry and humour") and Brel ("I saw him perform: he was overwhelming, he battered you with passion"), Burl Ives ("because the folk revival was heralded by him") and Josh White ("the first singer to upmarket the blues").¹⁹⁸ As a musician, he is largely self-taught and developed his material and style from those sources as a response to conditions in and as a reflection of his impressions of South Africa since his arrival in Johannesburg from England in August 1959.

His first works were calypsos and talking blues modelled on the artists mentioned above, but when performing his own compositions he "noted that people were so much more galvanized by personal, original work". He has always preferred a direct communication with an audience, believing that the essence of his success lies in performing to a live audience, in creating a rapport: "I don't need a P.A. [Public Address] system - anything that gets in the way of me and my audience is only a distraction."¹⁹⁹ His appearances on stage have, generally, been in one-person productions, characterized by simplicity in conception and setting so as to achieve immediate and unhampered rapport. It is a performance form he has an affinity with: "In a one-man show you're your own script-writer, your own performer, your own director, your own financier, and if the show misses, you carry the can." He achieved recognition, however, in a production which relied for success on the strengths of the ensemble.

3.5.2 Wait a Minim

In 1961 Taylor auditioned for Gluckman for a revue which was scheduled to run for two weeks at the YMCA Theatre in Braamfontein, Johannesburg.²⁰⁰ Gluckman planned to direct (or "stage" according to the original programme) the material contributed by the eight young performers who had successfully auditioned to fill the theatre while his leading actress from another production recovered from an injury to her ankle. The original cast for the revue, entitled Wait a Minim, were, besides Taylor, Lascelles, Andrew and Paul Tracey, Jeanette James, Michel Martel, Madeleine Usher and Verna McPhee whose abilities in various forms and styles were exploited to create an entertainment consisting of sketches, mime, dance, folk songs and so-called "traditional" African music. Five of the twenty-one items were devised solely by Gluckman. Taylor performed his "Black-White Calypso", "Jo'burg Talking Blues", "Confession" and "Ballad of the Southern Suburbs". "Black-White Calypso" was the most controversial, politically, of the items in Wait a Minim. In it Taylor exposed the absurdity of "the black people using skin lighteners and straightening their hair, while the white people were trying to get black in the sun and 'perming' their hair and all that nonsense". What caused offence was not such raillery but, in the words of the final stanza of the song, his "remedy for all this frustrated energy":

Don't waste your time buying creams and jellies
 trying to change the colour of your bellies
 but follow the example of my brother
 he married a black girl, they love each other
 And she give him a little bit of black in the night
 and he give her a little bit of white
 That's the solution!²⁰¹

Wait a Minim made use of fifty-three different string, wind and percussion instruments, many of which were improvised and hand-made by Andrew Tracey, the musical director. (Tracey is at present the director of the International Library of African Music in Grahamstown and the leader of South Africa's only 'steel' band; his father, Hugh Tracey, was a pioneer in the recording and transcription of autochthonous music.) The revue included performances on Choep timbila and mbira instruments.

Owing to its popularity Wait a Minim ran for a year, in Johannesburg and on tours of South Africa and Rhodesia. In 1962 Gluckman staged a second revue, Minim'bili with most of the original cast. Taylor's solo items were "Double Trouble", "Publications Calypso" ("Ag Pleez Deddy" had been released, but was banned, as were all his other compositions, from play on SABC radio programmes) and "The Lift Girl's Lament". His most controversial contribution was "Transkei Xha-Xha" in which he portrayed the Minister of Bantu Affairs. It was, however, not an attempt at a lampoon in the sense of a personal likeness; the 'Minister' was a representative of an aspect of National Party ideology and the song revealed the patronizing and insidious motives underpinning the policy of 'separate development' (the Promotion of Bantu Self-Government Act had been passed three years before; since 1961, as stated earlier, the word 'self-development' rather than 'apartheid' had been used by the SABC): "you will be free, in your/own territory" with education "to improve your minds ... / along your own lines".²⁰²

In late 1963 Gluckman presented selected items from the two revues as Minim Export in South Africa prior to its opening in London on 9 April 1964 at the Fortune Theatre as Wait a Minim, where it ran for two years. Jeppe and Dana Valery replaced Usher and McPhee from the original cast. Taylor performed "Ag Pleez Deddy" for the BBC in May 1964. John Russell Taylor reviewed the production and attempted to define its appeal and qualities:

The humour of the revue is mostly broad and simple: the idea of a sort of panorama of South Africa in comedy and song allows a succession of jolly, naive national caricatures The main novelty of the show is the extent to which it relies on music and mime rather than on the spoken word - necessary, perhaps, in the multi-racial, multi-lingual circumstances in which it was devised Even in the songs a minimum of the humour is verbal, though some of the original songs contributed by Jeremy Taylor get in a few shrewd knocks at apartheid.²⁰³

Clearly the material relied on the humour arising from the reactions of one racial, national or linguistic group to another, not necessarily South African, or even African, in origin. The 'national caricatures' were of Gluckman's devising: Germans in lederhosen yodelling in "Die Meistertrinker", French singing saucy songs in "Viva La Difference", Japanese

wrestling and photographing one another in "Out of Focus", rugby players and various Shangaan, Karanga, Lozi and Xhosa songs in "This is Africa". Nevertheless, the revue did reflect the multi-national and multi-lingual nature of this country: in performance the cast informed the audience that, although the revue was devised in South Africa, only two of the eight performers were South-African born, four were recently arrived immigrants from England, one was Italian and the last, Mauritian, because, as they explained, "that's the way South Africa is".²⁰⁴

Wait a Minim was subsequently performed in New York for fourteen months after opening at the Golden Theatre on 7 March 1966, the third-longest run of a revue on Broadway in the ten years from 1957 to 1967. After completing a twenty-city tour of the United States of America on 23 May 1968, it opened in Wellington, New Zealand before touring Australia in 1968 and 1969. Taylor had left the cast to remain in England in 1965. He returned to perform three times in South Africa (once on a variety bill with the pianist Russ Conway) before being refused re-entry to South Africa at Jan Smuts Airport, Johannesburg, in 1970.

3.5.3 Taylor: humour and confusion

Taylor, the least hostile and aggressive of the white, English-speaking oral performers under discussion, has been personally banned and his work censored. Yet his writing is characterized by its tolerance and lack of personal abuse of individuals, institutions or beliefs. Rather than as a satirist, he describes himself as a humorist who rejects the "kind of humour that knocks everything down", of the sort based on criticism or hate.²⁰⁵ Perhaps the banning was due, in part, to the fact that he produced material that was accessible to listeners on a wider scale than is possible in the theatre: in 1961 the Gallo Record Company chose not to record "Ag Pleez Deddy", regarding it as unlikely to be a commercial success; when it was recorded a year later it sold more than a hundred

thousand copies. He believes, too, that the banning was a result of the monologue cited earlier, concerning Vorster's refusal to allow D'Oliviera to tour South Africa, broadcast in England on "Late Night Line-Up". Primarily, he claims, he was banned because

I made no secret of my opposition to apartheid so an apartheid government must surely be expected to take exception to being mocked. Mockery hurt far more than "serious" criticism which at least did them the honour of taking them seriously. But to send them up was unforgivable and I paid the price Those were the rules of the game.²⁰⁶

Although he concedes that some of his material was satirical (particularly "Black-White Calypso" and "Piece of Ground"), nevertheless the label has been attached to compositions whose intentions were not polemical. "Ag Pleez Deddy" was banned by the SABC, yet

that wasn't a satire. As far as I was concerned I was trying to write a song for children on the model of Woody Guthrie's songs for children in America. It struck me as very odd then - I'd only just arrived in South Africa - that whenever South Africans sang, they always sang with American accents. I thought "Why?", because when Woody Guthrie sings he sounds exactly the same as when he speaks; his singing is just an extension of his normal speaking voice. I thought to myself, "Right, I'll take the normal speaking voice of the school children that I'm teaching [Taylor was teaching English at St. Martin's in Rossettenville, Johannesburg], put it into a song and give it back to them." The reaction to it was interesting because journalists said, "This is a satire." To me it was a children's song.

Furthermore, in his songs the subjects are, most often, generalized rather than individualized. By the early 1970s he had established himself on the 'folk' circuit in England and performed with Spike Milligan in productions such as For One Week Only or For One Night Only depending on the number of performances in the venue (in 1973 he also performed with Milligan in Rhodesia); however, the issues he dealt with in his songs remained similar to those he had written in South Africa and had similar titles: racial prejudice in Notting Hill Gate in "London Talking Blues" ("They got two-way traffic up there - blacks moving in and the / whites moving out"), class resentment in Barnes, London, in "Neighbours" ("what do wanna come and stay 'ere for? / You ain't our kind at all") hypocritical 'liberal' attitudes in "Liberal Man":

I am a liberal man
I do the best I can
but there's nothing I hate more
than that bloke who lives next door
He's just a racist, a jingoist, a white man to the core
a ghastly empire loyalist, a monumental bore

he talks about the fuzzies and the sambos and the wogs
 the chinkies and the Ities, the dagoes and the frogs
 I bet he isn't even English
 HE'S JUST ANOTHER BLOODY JEW!²⁰⁷

Many of the targets of his songs were satirized more pungently by other performers: the eccentricities and snobbery of English colonialists he depicts in "Northern Side of Town" were castigated by Black in Love and the Hyphen and by Leslie in "High Life" in Two's Company which presented, according to Blake, a cutting and astringent view "of the mink and manure set at Inanda [the Inanda Club in Johannesburg]". Taylor's "Northern Side of Town" refers to the same club.

Taylor aims to share his confusion rather than any convictions with his audiences, whether in South Africa or England or Kenya or Australia: "Nothing frightens me more than certainty", he admitted in a personal interview, and in Ag Pleez Deddy! (1992) he states: "Most of the major horrors in this world are committed by people who are convinced", convinced, that is, of the rightness of their cause.²⁰⁸

3.5.4 Taylor: subversion to nostalgia

Ironically, the banning of his works by the SABC was an incentive to write "pointedly anti-apartheid material", to "send up the policies of apartheid because they were ridiculous". The most critical was his "Piece of Ground", first performed in 1963, which reviewed the white colonization of Southern Africa from 1652, was addressed to white South Africans and concluded with the warning (reminiscent of Leslie's "The Warning"):

but how can a life for so many be found
 on a miserable thirteen per cent of the ground? ...
 White man don't sleep long and don't sleep too deep
 Or your life and your possessions how long will you keep?
 For I've heard a rumour that's running around
 that the black man's demanding his own piece of ground.²⁰⁹

Leslie's "The Warning" was based on a song sung by Makeba; in exile in America she recorded Taylor's "Piece of Ground" and included it in her repertoire of freedom songs. Taylor has been motivated by anger at prevalent conditions and has responded with material that is uncharacteristically sharp. In 1980, in "Arme Mense", he attacked the cheapness of life and violence in South Africa to highlight the indifference the country's inhabitants display in the face of gratuitous death. Anger motivated him to write "Immorality Law" two years prior to the removal of the Act from the statute books; he aimed "to give it an extra shove to help it on its way into the dustbin"; so, too, the exclusion of blacks from the proposed constitutional changes and the referendum of 1983 spurred Taylor to write "Referendum Referenda":

Now a hundred guests came knocking at the door
but the table was only laid for four
So they stood outside and they made a din
and they said some day you're going to have to let us in
to your referendum, your referenda.²¹⁰

What militates against aggressive impact in his work is the rendition within the format of a song and the easy-going 'folk-style' of the presentation. His recreation of a bus tour of Soweto run by the West Rand Administration Board is a revelation more of the guide's manner of delivery and affable personality than a pointed indictment of the conditions caused by the creation of such a township.²¹¹ So, too, the intent to ridicule P.W. Botha's arrogance and self-promotion in "I am P.W., I am!" is negated by the approach and the source (although Taylor conceded that the performance of the song would not have affected the State President's position in any way):

It's just like the boasts of Mr Toad in The Wind in the Willows [by Kenneth Grahame, published in 1908 as a book for children], and I'm just having fun because I think P.W. is a burlesque character, a bit grotesque as well, so I just had fun with that. Now I don't think it's cruel. It's making him larger than life but it certainly means you can't really take him seriously. Unfortunately, if there's one thing P.W. understands it's power He terrifies everybody, all his Cabinet, all the Nationalists are terrified of him ... and even the blacks recognize it.

During the 1960s he was regarded as subversive by the State and his songs were described by reviewers as innovatory, as "South Africa's first folk songs in English".²¹²

Increasingly, during the 1980s, by his own admittance, he was "outflanked" by what he describes as Uys's "particular brand of camp satire" and "David Kramer on the singer - songwriter side", who he claims, "was going on from where 'Ag Pleez Deddy' left off". (Kramer, the poet, songwriter and performer, whose multilingual work ranges from satire to character sketches, has released several recordings of his songs, some of which were published in Short back and sides (1982).) Taylor's most recent one-person productions An Evening with Jeremy Taylor (which opened in Pretoria in November 1990; his first solo performance in four years) tended to rely on past material and on reviewing his career, and the autobiographical monodrama Broederstroom Diaries (which opened in Grahamstown at the Standard Bank National Arts Festival in 1991) was composed of reminiscences and anecdotes, interspersed with songs, recounting his experiences and telling of the characters in Broederstroom, south of the Magaliesberg in the Transvaal, where he has lived since his return to South Africa in 1979.

Both were based largely on nostalgia and sentiment, and there any comparison must conclude, for the productions indicate his present position as a performer. In the former he sang "Ag Pleez Deddy" and other past successes, recalled his eviction from the country, alluded to his advertisements promoting Joko tea, and defended white South Africans against international criticism. Reviewers questioned whether the irreverent iconoclast of the 1960s still had any relevance, whether he had developed in style and technique to reflect the context of the 1990s and whether he was able to critically view the country he had adopted:

Listening to Jeremy Taylor in 1990, one has the impression of a man looking backwards in time Satirists should set their own agendas, should illuminate the weaknesses of society in new ways. But Taylor seems to have become a follower rather than a leader, and his humour has lost its incisiveness far more cutting satirists have moved in to slip their stilettos between the ribs of the country's holy cows.²¹³

Taylor clearly relied on appealing to an audience which derived satisfaction from familiar, humorous material rather than incisive political satire. Broederstroom Diaries depended for its appeal on the same tactics by presenting a Bosman-type array of characters and

incidents: Caspar Kruger who fired cannon into the sky but lost his crop of tomatoes in a hailstorm, Koos Visagie who made his mark in music before eloping with Daisy de Lange, the election day when the 'Progs' (the Progressive Federal Party) had to rely on Conservative Party supporters for coffee and koeksisters. Taylor's achievement, in his work written in and about South Africa between the 1960s and 1990s, lies more in his creation and depiction of recognizable characters and social issues than in his satirical analysis of the political situation. Reviewing Broederstroom Diaries, Michael Coulson wrote:

What sets Taylor aside from many satirists is that he seems to care about and for the people that generate his material. His humour is warm and gentle rather than fiercely biting, but it's extremely funny for all that, and delivered with an unflinching throwaway charm.²¹⁴

Ironically, if his satire is marked by a sense of sympathy for those he is characterizing, if he is regarded as politically ineffectual, nevertheless it is Taylor who has most recently been banned once again: after opening in a production of Robert Hewett's Gulls (1985) at the Baxter Theatre in Cape Town in 1987 he was blacklisted by the United Nations Centre Against Apartheid as a "British-born" actor who had performed in South Africa: "I had come full circle. Having been banned for nine years from performing in South Africa I was now banned by the United Nations from performing anywhere else, because I performed in South Africa."²¹⁵

3.5.5 Kirby: the Juvenalian approach

In the programme for his play Panics (1991), Kirby included a quotation by Francis Bacon which encapsulates his views of the targets of his satiric works: "He doth like the ape, that the higher he climbs the more he shows his arse." Anyone or any group who has achieved prominence in South Africa, politically or socially, has been virulently ridiculed and attacked, from heads of state (Vorster, P.W. Botha, De Klerk) to all political groups (the former United and Progressive Parties, the National Party, the African National

Congress); indeed Kirby would appear to have employed the spectrum of Campbell's The Wayzgoose for his targets: critics of art and theatre, armchair liberals, the censorship board, the SABC, academics, the women's liberation movement, traffic policemen, theatre and radio and television personalities and rival satirists have all been satirized in his revues and plays. He has not consciously attempted, through those works, to present a spectrum of South African society. Instead, he stated in a personal interview, he has presented "all the people I find revolting".²¹⁶ To employ a phrase he has taken from Shakespeare's Hamlet, his work is characterized by "Poison in Jest".²¹⁷ Kirby is an exponent of direct satire as his work is aggressive, overstated, cannot be deemed objective and, particularly in his revues in the late 1980s, presented in his own 'person'.

Kirby had attended Leslie's revues and Blake had hoped that the two would collaborate but, owing to disagreements, the project never materialized. It was at the suggestion of, and in collaboration with, Lang that Kirby presented his first revue Finger Trouble as a 'supper-club show' in December 1968 at the Backstage Restaurant in Johannesburg. Since then he has presented eighteen revues, including Eight Birds, Eight Beasts, The Receiver of Revenue Show, The Dot Dash Dot Show, How Now, Sacred Cow?, Quodlibet (his first one-person show, in 1978), Academy Rewards, Separate Development, Brave New Pretoria and A Talent To Abuse, most often in cabaret and 'pub' venues.

Kirby openly acknowledges that he aims to be purposefully destructive: "Why not? Satire is brutal destruction of pompousness, vice and folly".²¹⁸ In 1973, in The Receiver of Revenue Show, Don McCorkindale lampooned Sir David de Villiers Graaf, Leader of the Opposition and head of the United Party in a piece written by Kirby. The Sunday Times political columnist, Hogarth, reported: "It is a fateful moment in a politician's life when he becomes the object of serious satire; there is not much left over of the United Party leader at the end of five minutes."²¹⁹

Since 1960, when he joined the SABC English Service as a radio announcer, he has aroused

controversy. After three years he left South Africa for Britain and was employed by the BBC as an Announcer on the General Overseas Service (later the World Service). Here he saw and was influenced by the rash of satire on television in the early 1960s, "That Was The Week That Was" (or "TWTWTW") and "Not so Much a Programme, More a Way of Life". He had, in Johannesburg, attended the Schach production of Beyond the Fringe and very much enjoyed the laconic approach of the revue.

3.5.6 Beyond the Fringe and Mort Sahl

In 1961, in England, after the success of Beyond the Fringe, and some eight months after Tynan had complained of the paucity of satirical cabaret in his Observer column cited earlier, the Establishment Club opened in Soho in London. Satirical cabaret "is out of practice", Tynan had stated, as it lacked a "training-ground" like those in America:

Messrs Sahl and Bruce rose to fame from a cellar-club in San Francisco called 'the hungry i' ['i' for intellectual]. At the same time, a similar haunt in Chicago [Mister Kelly's] was fostering the talents of Mike Nichols and Elaine May, in whose work delicate verbal surgery replaces the machine-gun of Sahl and the cobra-fangs of Bruce Shelley Berman [who was to tour South Africa in 1980 and influenced Uys], Jonathan Winters and Bob Newhart [are] all cabaret-bred We lack a place in which intelligent, like-minded people can spend a cheap evening listening to forthright cabaret which is socially, sexually and politically pungent.²²⁰

Cook, one of the devisers of Beyond the Fringe supplied that need by founding the Establishment Club (he was also to be a founder of the mordant magazine Private Eye in 1961). This was to become the training ground for many of the British oral performance satirists of the early 1960s, a period described by Appignanesi as a "satire boom of a kind unseen since the eighteenth century".²²¹ This "boom" was at its peak in 1963 when the Establishment closed (it had hosted performers like Bruce before he was deported from Britain in 1963 and Barry Humphries, the creator of Dame Edna Everage), a favourite target, Prime Minister Macmillan, resigned, and "That Was The Week That Was" was terminated by the BBC. As Beyond the Fringe popularized satire in revue, so "That Was

The Week That Was" popularized topical and political satire on British television during 1962 and 1963. With David Frost as compère, the programme returned to the original idea and meaning of revue: a 'survey' or review of the week in a medley of monologues, sketches and songs. (Later, in America, Dan Rowan and Dick Martin's "Laugh-In" similarly reviewed topical events in a satirical vein.) By February 1963 this late-night programme was being seen by an estimated twelve million viewers, according to David Nathan, who describes it as "hard-hitting political journalism, usually disguised as biography, and partial to an extent never known on television before".²²²

As much as he was influenced by this "satire boom" in Britain, so too was Kirby influenced by recordings of Sahl who was, he has stated, "commenting on the whole political scene in New York and Washington [in a] wonderfully satirical" manner. Sahl was, in the late 1950s and early 1960s, recognized as the first notable American political satirist since Will Rogers in the 1920s and early 1930s.²²³ (Uys, unknowingly, frequently states a comment similar to that of Rogers who insisted that "there is no credit in being a comedian when you have the whole government working for you".²²⁴) As a satirist working the night-club circuit, Sahl was a notoriously outspoken critic of all American politicians, whether Republicans or Democrats. In the 1960 Presidential Campaign (between Richard Nixon and John Fitzgerald Kennedy) Sahl's stated ambition was to overthrow the government: "The choice is between the lesser of two evils, anyway," he said in performance. "Some people claim Nixon is trying to sell the country, and Kennedy is trying to buy it."²²⁵ His performances were attended by prominent politicians, including Hubert Humphrey and Adlai Stevenson; Kennedy used Sahl's observations in a speech in November 1959.

Sahl's performances were characterized by a nervous, frenetic delivery, often with that day and that city's newspaper in hand. In 1960 he was regarded as the patriarch of the so-called 'New Comedians' (listed by Tynan above), all deviating from the joke-book comics of vaudeville, performing set pieces which were extended monologues, almost playlets.

The material of Sahl's contemporaries was less political but, like Sahl, all displayed a determinedly different, individual style. Sahl's routines established a format which became standardized, no matter what the content or approach of other stand-up comics. A feature, also employed by Sahl, which distinguishes recent practitioners of stand-up comedy from most of their predecessors is that the material is not presented in an identifiably assumed character; the performer speaks in the first person, which links it to direct, rather than indirect, satire.

In the routine he would commence by stating his theme, followed by an improvisation on that subject - or seeming improvisation. The following is a description of one such routine (on the theme of the Soviet war threats):

He does not tell jokes one by one, but carefully builds deceptively miscellaneous structures of jokes that are like verbal mobiles. He begins with the spine of a subject, then hooks thought onto thought, joke onto dangling joke, many of them totally unrelated to the main theme, till the whole structure spins but somehow balances. All the time he is building toward a final statement, which is too much part of the whole to be called a punch line, but puts that particular theme away forever.... he sprays his monologues with far-out terms such as cool it, bug, dig, weird-o ..., mixes in a never-ending supply of phrases parodying academic [and political] jargon Between jokes, he draws on a ... glossary of verbal rialsos that counterpoint the laughter, indicate his attitude to the material. "Wild, huh?" he will say, standing in the ruins of his most recent target, or "You can't go too far, fellas," or "Is there any group I haven't offended yet?"²²⁶

The set pieces were consistently made topical by the inclusion of material from the newspaper or from television broadcasts, particularly, in 1960, from remarks or promises made at presidential press conferences. While politics always remained the core of the material, the digressions would include trenchant humour on such topical subjects as psycho-analysis, lung cancer tests, folk singers and religious fundamentalism.

With these influences, Kirby rejoined the SABC in Johannesburg in 1966. He was a commentator at Verwoerd's funeral in Pretoria on 11 September 1966. In 1967 he began an early morning radio programme for which he became widely known. After a year it was withdrawn as, he believes, it had become too satirical, and he opened in the first of his revues in December 1968. His revues tend to be reviews of the current social and

political scene, and although he does employ techniques similar to those of Sahl in stand-up routines, with satiric attacks at individual politicians in patter, often interspersed with piano accompaniment (he studied at the University of Cape Town's Music School in the late 1950s in the hopes of becoming a concert pianist, but did not complete the course), nevertheless in the early sketches topical political comment tended to be an incidental support to the satire rather than an integral feature of the material. These extracts are from a 'telephone' monologue performed by Terry Lester in the Dot Dash Dot Show:

Today's the day I am bringing Mr and Mrs the Honourable van Tonder home to dinner And may I remind you that Mr van Tonder is terribly important to the company, Genevieve. As a Deputy Minister and a member of the Schlebusch Commission [in February 1972 Vorster appointed a Select Committee under the chairmanship of Schlebusch to investigate NUSAS (National Union of South African Students), along with the University Christian Movement, The Christian Institute and the South African Institute of Race Relations; the final report was tabled in 1975] I think I can safely say that Mr van Tonder is terribly important in his own right as well What do you mean Timmy is bringing his lecturer home!? What sort of impression do you think that's going to make on a member of the Schlebusch Commission? You know how he's bound to feel about people from the University. I suppose he lectures in something ideal like Political Science? He doesn't. He lectures in Zulu. What's his name Genevieve? Dr Dhlamini. And his wife. Are they Bantu Genevieve? ... Gevevieve I am bringing home the deputy minister and his lovely wife and you are inviting natives. All right ethnic brothers, I don't care what you call them. I am not being racial Genevieve, I am being practical. What do you mean I voted Progressive. That's got nothing to do with it. I'm a middle-of-the-road Progressive, Genevieve.²²⁷

3.5.7 Kirby: patterns and properties

Unlike Sahl, Kirby's work has two consistent features: patterns and visual properties. Kirby refers to the patterns as parodies, although as indicated in Chapter 1, Nichols defines them more accurately as patterns, as parody is generally an attack on the style of the original work, whereas a pattern is modelled on a work for the purposes of criticism of others. Kirby's sources range from songs to music to plays, poetry, prose, even panel-games on the radio.

Coward's "I Wonder What Happened to Him?" (written in India in 1944 as a satire of the

Empire spirit of the old-guard Indian Army Officer types) has been a frequently repeated model for Kirby; for example in Hout Cuisine presented at the Cellar in Durban in 1989, the song was performed as though by a member of the exclusive Durban Club, wondering what had happened to such people as Kushlick, Worrall (a founder of the Independent Party) and Vause Raw (former leader of the New Republic Party). In revues in the early 1970s Kirby had employed The Schedule to the Abuse of Dependence Producing Substances and Rehabilitation Centres Act (the Drug Act) as material for a pattern on Arthur Sullivan's music for "I am the very model of a modern Major-General" from The Pirates of Penzance (1880).

Shakespeare has been a source for many of Kirby's monologues, sketches and songs. Hamlet's "To be or not to be" soliloquy was delivered as it would have been performed by the race commentator Ernie Duffield at the 1973 July Handicap in The Receiver of Revenue Show. He and Lester devised

a series of sketches on Shakespeare as if he was writing today for Hollywood. So we had the Fool as the Pink Panther singing "I've grown accustomed to his Grace" and Noël Coward singing "It's really such a bore in Elsinore", Terry did Jimmy Durante as Richard III with "Homicidal Monarchy is a little absurd", and "O Calpurnia here I come", "He's a jolly Othello" and "Iago again".

Frequently, sketches terminate, not with a punch line, but with the character reciting a pattern based on a source unrelated to the content: a prostitute reciting an adaptation from The Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam (first published in an English translation by Edward Fitzgerald in 1859), or, a source he has used for a lecture to British immigrants and a member of the 'Immorality Squad' in different sketches, Rudyard Kipling's much anthologized "If". In the former sketch, the pattern was delivered by Lester to the newly-arrived immigrants as a lesson in what will "stand ... [them] in good stead":

If you can smile at Afs ['Africans'], don't mean you want to,
And let your women talk in slender lisps
Of great domestic traumas with the Bantu:
Then read your Sunday Times and eat your Simba Crisps.

If you can fill the undemanding minute
With sixty seconds' worth of circles run;
Yours is the earth and all that's in it,
And - which is more - you'll be a South African my son.²²⁸

Prose works have provided Kirby with the title and concept of revues. Brave New Pretoria (1984) was patterned on Aldous Huxley's Brave New World (1932) in title and purpose, for Huxley described the novel as his "Pyrrhonic vision of the future"; Kirby's Brave New Pretoria, set in South Africa in 1994 (and also a play on Orwell's 1984, which Uys referred to in the same year in the title of his Total Onslaught 1984), worked from the supposition that it "is easier to be sceptical about the future than to be optimistic if one can be sceptical about the future one can also be satirical about it ... scepticism is an intrinsic part of satire".²²⁹ Scepticism of election promises, new policies and reform initiatives has underpinned Kirby's approach. A telephone sketch in A Talent to Abuse in 1988 (the title of the revue is incidentally, a further instance of Kirby's borrowings, in this case from Coward), first performed in 1977 by Maureen England, was inspired by Kirby's view of

a bumbling, foolish cabinet and so I present that sketch [more accurately, a monologue] about 'phoning the Maximum Security Prison for a new minister because I think that that is a sub-culture from which they draw ministers. They're all deeply criminal; they just don't happen to be in jail Of course the idea is preposterous, but it's amazing how the audiences react, because they immediately see the correlation, that ... it's not actually far from reality ... Diederichs [Dr Nicolaas Diederichs, Finance Minister between 1968 and 1975, State President in 1975] was sequestered for financial chicanery.

This sketch was repeated in Hout Cuisine; De Klerk was enquiring from the Security Prison the credentials of future black politicians. As indicated earlier, Kirby frequently updates monologues and sketches from past revues to reflect the changes in the political situation. The United Party disintegrated when the Progressive Federal Party became the Official Opposition in 1979 and Kirby presented an item for the 'funeral', with himself officiating as the priest. In 1988 the same sketch was used to present the 'funeral' of the Progressive Federal Party (the Party merged with Worrall's Independent Party and Wynand Malan's National Democratic Movement to form the Democratic Party in 1989). To Kirby "one day it [the 'funeral' in the monologue] will be the National Party".

The Springbok Radio panel-game "Nice Work" was the origin for a sketch in which Kirby as the presenter and England as the guest panellist (a lampoon of Joyce Waring, United

Party Member of Parliament) attempted, within twenty questions, to ascertain the profession of people; in this case, "a special investigator for the Immorality Squad" who was comically dressed in a "light blue safari suit. Arranged and hanging about his person are a large coil of rope, a pair of binoculars, a vast pair of handcuffs, one white and the other black, a short step ladder, climbing pitons et cetera".²³⁰

The example above indicates Kirby's tactic of employing both verbal and visual humour in his satiric portraits. Revues are often structured according to the use of properties which are selected or made for their distinctive associative qualities. One of the first, and most well known, was his 'censorship machine': the "Foolproof Anti-Pornographic Naughtiness Neutralising Youth-Protector. Or FANNY for short", devised to replace the Publications Control Board.²³¹ It was constructed of sirens, hooters, bells, steam whistles and flashing lights that went off whenever he used a 'four-letter' word. An example of a work fed into the machine was D.H. (David Herbert) Lawrence's Lady Chatterley's Lover (1928), which was later, in 1980, unbanned by the Publications Appeal Board. According to Joseph Treen, the censorship board unknowingly allowed itself to participate in his revue by sending him a telegram which demanded the removal of the epithets.²³² The telegram quoted the words in question; Kirby responded by demanding an apology, not only to himself but also to "all the young ladies in the Central Telegraph Office who had to handle - and no doubt read - this offensive message". Enlargements of the telegram were placed in the foyer to indicate to patrons how "our authorities conduct themselves". In Eight Beasts (1972; subtitled An Evening of Satirical Anthropomorphism), the items were listed allegorically; that which dealt with censorship was listed as "Scaly Anteater", with the following justification:

What puzzles one about the Scaly Anteater is why he needs all that armour just to protect himself from ants. The first law of a science called palaeontology (the study of fossils) says that the over-armouring or over-ornamentation of a species is a sure sign of its imminent extinction.

Kirby was mistaken in this prediction, however, as two Supreme Court cases, five appeals and eight "eviscerations of shows" was to prove.²³³

Almost every Kirby revue and play has exploited visual and aural effects to make political comments. In 1978, when the Mostert Commission made public the evidence gathered on the Department of Information, including the misuse of public money and the financing of the Citizen, Kirby in his revue Quodlibet, symbolically crumpled a copy of that newspaper after contemptuously scanning its contents. Magically it unfolded itself neatly and continued to do so, despite his attempts to destroy it. In Hout Cuisine, Kirby played "Thanks for the Memory" as a response to a tape recording of De Klerk's 'reform' initiatives and, in a manner similar to Uys's treatment of P.W. Botha in Beyond the Rubicon, the recording broke down; the same revue incorporated a television monitor with visual material of the State President's speeches, intercut with images of Dr 'Danie' (Daniel) Craven, President of the South African Rugby Board announcing "I don't believe a word of it", a black man laughing and a wide-eyed white television viewer. A Talent to Abuse began with a deliberately powerful visual shock: a coffin on stage with plastic lilies on top, illuminated by a green light, reinforced aurally by organ music playing for ten minutes prior to the opening of the first item, the monologue on the death of the Progressive Federal Party discussed earlier.

Among the most memorable of his properties were puppets. In Brave New Pretoria P.W. Botha, Koornof and other prominent politicians were lampooned in a sketch in which their large heads were manipulated by three puppeteers. A sketch which Kirby revised and developed, "Bonzai Bantu", included a miniature puppet of a black man. Lester first co-performed with 'Gumdrop Gumede' in the sketch in Academy Rewards in 1981, presenting the puppet as a proto-type for the solution to the increasing black population: as with bonzai, growth would be stunted by pruning. (There are distinct parallels with Swift's "A Modest Proposal for preventing the Children of Poor People from being a Burden to their Parents or the Country" (1729).) The sketch was initially banned by the censors. Kirby devised it to satirize white audiences and their paternalistic attitudes:

You can gauge the sensitivity of the audience on "Bonzai Bantu" the broader type find it terribly funny and fall about, to them it's about "a little black kaffir, isn't it?", and the other reaction is a withdrawal, a sense of what the satire is about. That response is potent because the laugh is all on the audience and how

people treat blacks, as pets or things with guarantees which you should neuter, and I can feel that shudder of withdrawal [so] after that sketch I play a sweet little rag-time number.

Kirby seldom impersonates politicians himself; he tends instead to write material for other performers, such as Mayer who reproduced Vorster's vocal mannerisms, or present lampoons in puppets, or reproduce the words of politicians by audio-visual means. He believes that satirizing politicians by means of accurate impersonation can be

a dangerous thing when you do that too much, because people start to identify with the impersonation. Maybe it has its merits as well because if they identify with the impersonation you have then, as it were, opened the door and they're laughing and you can say what you want to, within that. That is a technique I recognize: you lay people wide open and when they're really laughing you can put your spear in and turn it a bit. So it is a conscious manipulation of the audience.

3.5.8 Kirby: style and approach in revues and plays

As with Leslie, the success of Kirby's material in performance is largely dependent on the abilities of the performers. He admits that the monologues and sketches are "always fragile": "The actors have not much to work with in these ... monologues and to them must go most of the credit of their success."²³⁴ The style of the monologues and sketches, since the earliest revues, is not innovative, nor do they reveal new facts; instead they tend to reflect the current political situation (the 'Info Scandal', deaths in detention, financial mismanagement), with similar targets (all politicians, reform policies, security policemen, the censors). Since the late 1970s, however, his revues have gradually been reduced in style and structure of presentation to centre on himself, alternately delivering anecdotes, monologues, playing the piano and singing. He prefers to describe himself as a performer rather than an actor ("I've never trained as such").

If the overall impact of the disparate items revealed a theme of decay in Quodlibet or death in A Talent to Abuse it was not a result of a deliberate intention, but created by

cross-references in the various monologues, references which reflected his preoccupations and responses to the situation at the time. While attacking anomalies and injustices and corruption, Kirby aims, in anecdote, song and patter, to sustain a sympathetic tension between the material and the manner in which it is shared with the audience. He does not consciously pre-plan techniques to establish a rapport, believing it is primarily intuitive, based on "feeling comfortable on stage". He has never employed a director: "I'm undirectable. I just slouch at the piano and talk and that's all there is to it."

Kirby, from his first revue at the Backstage Restaurant, has preferred the intimacy and atmosphere of smaller venues of the theatre restaurant or night-club type, believing it enhances his form of satire. In a description reminiscent of Brecht's views on cabaret venues, Kirby states: "It's a relaxed atmosphere. I like my audience smoking and drinking and clattering cups. On a big stage one has wonderful lighting and a certain distance, which actually works against you in satire." Hence he chooses to perform in venues without any theatrical effects or structures that create a division between himself and his audience: "I prefer to have the feel of the people close by."

Where Taylor has been, in recent years in particular, criticized for his lack of malice, Kirby has always been criticized for it. His reply to such accusations would be that his critics "should read ... Juvenal. I'm quite mild by comparison."²³⁵ More seriously, he has been accused of distorting material to serve his political comments.²³⁶ For instance, William Pretorius reviewed Kirby's Academy Rewards in 1981, and decried the lack of any sense of social dimension or specific individuality in the delineation of the characters. To Pretorius, Kirby's monologue on censorship was weakened by being delivered in the persona of a Joubert Park tramp, his mockery of homosexuals was a means to ridicule 'enlightened' Afrikaners, and an interview with a space-traveller was a facile device to discuss South Africa's international political relations. While it is true that Kirby prefers presenting recognizable types rather than imitating specific personages, these characters were, Pretorius claimed, merely mouthpieces for propaganda, propaganda of one sort set

in opposition to propaganda of another sort. As propaganda, it was therefore rendered harmless in spite of the invective, and Kirby's intent to shock further negated the satiric purpose. While these are the responses of a critic, nevertheless they are representative of the views expressed concerning his work during his career. By contrast, Pretorius praised Uys for retaining a sense of humour, for the warmth that exists in his ridicule, for not losing sympathy while exposing weaknesses. (Nevertheless, as cited in Chapter 1, Uys found it increasingly difficult, during the 1980s, to retain his 'compassion'.)

What is apparent is that Kirby's definition of satire would ally him to Juvenal rather than Horace as his attitude toward his targets is characteristically evident: the prevailing tone of his revues is one of scathing contempt, and because of his scepticism the quality he most often conveys as a performer is that of disengagement, of detached scorn, of seeking to deliberately shock through cruelty. Kirby's response to such views reveals his contempt once again:

It seems to me very odd that the same people who complain of my cruelty usually enjoy telling those unutterably cruel kind of anti-black jokes ... one of them did only yesterday during an interview. And amongst the middle-class you find scores of 'concerned' whites, all misty-eyed about liberalism and franchise and who in the next breath damn the 'bloody Afrikaner'.²³⁷

He claims that his characters (in his plays at least) are often based on people he knows or has known. His play, The Bijers Sunbird (1986) (which had at its base the tragedy of the dissenting Afrikaner, Marius Schoon - in the character of Adam Bijers - who had been imprisoned for subversive activities and whose wife and daughter were murdered by a parcel bomb) was criticized because he had characterized the white liberal imprisoned with Bijers as ineffectual. When the production was presented at the Lyric Theatre in Hammersmith in London in January 1987 it was picketed by members of the Anti-Apartheid Movement. Kirby accused the organization of practising "its own brand of apartheid" by selecting his play, with an all-white cast and anti-apartheid sentiment as a target, but not Mtwá's Bopha! (1985) another South African production, with an all-black cast, running in London at the same time.²³⁸

However, Kirby's most controversial play, to date, is Panics, which opened at the Rhodes Theatre in Grahamstown in 1991. The impulse to write was personal: his wife's thesis had been rejected by the Music Department at Cape Town University. Shortly after the production was publicized in the Cape Times that University approached the 1820 Foundation, (which sponsored the production) for a copy of the script, possibly because Kirby used anagrams of the names of prominent academic staff for his characters. "Bert Groin, Dean of the Faculty of Music" in Panics was an anagram of Gerrit Bon, head of the Cape Town University Music Department, while "Dauntarse Truss, the Vice-Chancellor and Principal" was an anagram of Dr Stuart Sanders, Vice-Chancellor and Principal of the same university. The lack of academic qualifications of the former was indicated in the programme which listed his qualification as "Light Motor Vehicle Driving Licence (Springs)". Kirby claims he was forced to institute legal action to prevent the University from defaming his wife, as that institution had undertaken in writing not to do so, nor to publish anything concerning the rejection of her dissertation until such time as the matter had been ratified in court.

The play was set in a "mythical South African university" (though the anagrams are an obvious indication of which university it was), but Kirby aimed to satirize academic corruption and hypocritical values espoused by all English-language universities in South Africa. The action centred on various issues, including the threat, by a former music student, to sue for dereliction of duty as she claimed that inadequate supervision caused the rejection of her doctoral thesis, and the persistent demands of the leader of the black student body regarding the patronizing aspects of 'affirmative action' (representatives of the body were encamped in the Vice-Chancellor's Secretary's office). The lugubrious and ineffectual Vice-Chancellor, more concerned with the delivery of a paper outlining his research on proctology, had to resort to the corrupt solutions provided by his secretary. One such solution was the conferring of a fraudulent Ph.D. ("Prevarication, hypocrisy and deceit"). The racist and anti-semitic Vice-Chancellor and Principal, Truss, mouthed the prejudices and bigotry most vehemently denied by the mission statement of an academic

insitution. One reviewer believed that the astringency of the satire militated against the impact:

The steamy corruption brewed in the corridors of academic power is a sorry indictment of university life in South Africa, but one is more diverted than appalled thereby, what with rapier-sharp, lustrous dialogue and a reassuring sense that Kirby has taken such liberties with reality that "it can't be as bad as that".²³⁹

Kirby reacts strongly to reviewers, particularly those who formulate prescriptive definitions of satire and the function of a satirist. Humphrey Tyler, in reviewing Hout Cuisine, stated:

Satire is a complex art. It's born of anger, outrage and a desire to expose cant. The danger is it can become snide and drift into diffuse cynicism there were times when Kirby seemed a little too indulgent with himself this time, and not worried quite enough about assembling new material really in touch with the times.²⁴⁰

Kirby responded by describing Tyler as a "hack" and "untalented": "Satire is a subjective business" in that it arises from what makes one angry, Kirby said in an interview in 1989, but "you get people who object because you don't cater to their particular conception of the satirist's Moral Obligation".²⁴¹ He maintains that the major limitation with the "critical establishment in this country" is that "they always recognize profile where they should be seeing perspective, they always hear clamour where they hear resonance".

Finally, he is equally scathing regarding other satirical performers in South Africa, believing that the only satirist, apart from himself that is, who is worthy of admiration is the cartoonist for the Weekly Mail, Derek Bauer, who has assisted Kirby by designing posters and programmes for his revues (he painted a "Pierneef parody" for Panics). In his "Johannesburg Rag" in The Dot Dash Dot Show (itself a parody, in song, of Leslie's "Ladies of Rosebank" sketch) he denounced those of "the social set":

'Cause we like to be admired,
When we're gaudily attired;
And we always meet at Adam Leslie's place.²⁴²

Taylor's 'ineffectuality' in the reality of the South African context was targeted in Quodlibet when, after a brutal sketch which demonstrated "what to do with a terrorist and/or 'red plural'" on a dummy of a black man in camouflage (Uys was to present a similar routine in Rearranging the Deckchairs on the SA Bothatonic some nine years later), Kirby confided to the audience that he had intended presenting, instead, a song about "the boys on the border", a slight piece, perhaps in the vein of "Ag Pleez Deddy".²⁴³ And in a newspaper column in which he purportedly interviewed himself, Kirby claimed that Uys "gave to satire what the koeksister gave to pastry".²⁴⁴

3.6 Satire in the work of 'alternative' writers and performers

3.6.1 From the Comedy Store to the Black Sun

In Britain, with the return of a Conservative Party government in 1979, satirical cabaret was once again revived with the opening, by Peter Rosengard, of the Comedy Store in Soho as a venue for aspiring comedians.²⁴⁵ The success of this venture was reflected in the founding of the Comedy Strip and Cabaret Futura. These venues fostered such performers as Tony Allen, Jim Barclay, 'Fat Bastard' Alexei Sayle, Keith Allen, Rik Mayall and Andy de la Tour, the outspoken 'new wave' or 'alternative' comics, influenced by such diverse sources as the 'Punk' movement of the late 1970s, the style of Bruce and the BBC's "Not the Nine O'Clock News". Although the labels are not entirely satisfactory, these performers were alternative in the sense that they rejected the racist or sexist jokes of most mainstream television and club comics and, furthermore, they deliberately avoided the preceding types of comedy, including the 'learned' but middle-class approach adopted by the so-called 'Oxbridge Mafia' (exemplified by the creators of Beyond the Fringe and "Monty Python's Flying Circus"). They tended, too, to reject any association with mediums which hindered the relationship with an audience, such as television, where stand-up comics cannot sustain the rapport upon which their acts depend. The label

'alternative' is convenient but restricting as these comedians have attempted to exploit their individuality. Though widely different in approach and style, these comics were concerned with

life as it was experienced by their audiences - many of them young, radical, working-class ... and perhaps also unemployed and somewhat disenchanted. Political satire was an important part of their style, but usually looking at the way the behaviour of the government directly affected the lives of the audience Since their comedy not only commented directly on the experiences of the underprivileged, but was also performed in pubs, clubs and small cabarets rather than to well-to-do audiences in theatres, the new generation of comics was in many ways returning to the beginnings of music-hall.²⁴⁶

Even more so, however, they were influenced by the continued popularity of 'rock' concerts, and terms such as 'gig', for a particular event, and 'set', for an individual and uninterrupted stand-up routine, were derived from that source. Richard Strange, who founded Cabaret Futura in Soho (with the intention of recreating Weimar cabaret in the 1980s) also initiated similar cabaret in New York. Subsequently, the Peppermint Lounge, the Mudd Club and Danceteria served as venues not only for satirical cabaret, but also for performance artists such as Laurie Anderson and composers such as Philip Glass. The revival of cabaret in Germany was even more strongly polemical, but not alternative in the sense of the British comics.²⁴⁷

As will be seen in this section, there are many parallels and affinities between such alternative comics in, principally, Britain in the 1980s and oral performers in South Africa during the same period. The National Festival of the Arts in Grahamstown (sponsored since 1983 by the Standard Bank Group) has provided an annual forum for alternative cabaret and satirical comedy; in 1986 the opening of the Black Sun in Berea, Johannesburg, by George Milaris provided a permanent venue.²⁴⁸ Milaris named the theatre (and restaurant) after the publishing house established in the 1920s as a non-commercial venture by Harry Crosby. In keeping with Crosby's literary aims, Milaris established the Black Sun to provide a platform for unknown or 'fringe' performers and playwrights, those who had no other venue in which to perform. (The Black Sun in Rockey Street in Yeoville was the third 'theatre' of that name in Johannesburg; the second, also by Milaris, was in Orange Grove after the closure of the first.)

The range and quality of material presented at the Black Sun was always varied, as it hosted such so-called 'alternative' Afrikaner cabaret performers as André Letoit, the first stand-up comedy routines of Fraser and the opening of Susan Pam's (now Pam-Grant) Curl Up and Dye in 1989. (This play combined documentary and social realism - Grant conducted research and collected material on the lives of the inhabitants of Joubert Park in Johannesburg as the source for Curl Up and Dye - with a satirical exposure of the illogical and inbred prejudices and, in her programme note, "ill conceived laws and policies that control and affect ... [the] daily lives" of those who inhabit "an inner city slum".) The programme for the third opening in 1991 indicated the diversity of the acts presented: it included a cabaret-revue by Natalie Gamsu (In Bed with Natalie Gamsu), a stand-up routine by Fraser and two fictional-persona monodramas, Gilda Blacher's Let Me Listen and Vanessa Levenstein's Sly Stallone Stole My St Christopher. Venues with a similar intent include the Tandoor (which took over from the Black Sun), Café Mozart in Cape Town (initiated by Uys as an alternative performance space) and, for two years, the Blah-Blah Café in Durban.

In the past two years such oral performers have, in addition, been influenced by trends in improvisational comedy. Miyeni participated in Theatresports, an hour of games performed on stage by the Market Laboratory Improvisation Theatre Group ('Improv') at the Market Theatre and at the Tandoor, Johannesburg. The concept was devised in Canada by the Loosemoose Theatre Company; the games provide the framework and the audience the stimulus for the performers who compete in teams. Theatre groups in Britain, Australia and New Zealand have performed Theatresports.

3.6.2 Mark Banks

In 1986, at the Standard Banks National Arts Festival, Banks presented the first of his revues, Stars of South Africa. The influences discernible in his work are varied and

include the alternative British comics. Banks had seen Rowan Atkinson of "Not the Nine O' Clock News" perform at the Globe in London in 1981 and regards himself as "fortunate to see Adam Leslie's last revue at the old Adam Leslie Theatre at the bottom of End Street [Adam Scrapes the Barrel] and thought [he] would do something similar".²⁴⁹ Peter Gilpin, who directed the third of Banks's revues, A Room with a Revue (1989), had recently made a variety special for Thames Television starring Atkinson and Bob Monkhouse, among others. Banks also acknowledges Monty Python as an influence. Though he admires the work of Kirby and Uys (he was Kirby's protégé for a short time) he has consciously not imitated their style, but has attempted to create his own, closer to that of stand-up comics: "I always try not to infringe on their territory. I wouldn't do P.W. Botha on stage, Pieter-Dirk Uys does him better."

Banks had worked on what he terms the "periphery" of theatre for ten years after he had matriculated in Cape Town in 1976 (in Stage-, Company- and Production-Management, playing 'bit' parts and painting scenery for Toerien, Brooke, at the Baxter, The Market and for Capab) before he presented his first one-person production, Stars of South Africa. By his own admittance, it was "under-rehearsed" and Diane Wilson (who had appeared in revues by Leslie and Kirby) offered to assist him if he should produce another revue. The result was We're Not On Top, We're Inside which opened at the Baxter Studio in Cape Town only six weeks later, directed by Wilson. The revue played in Cape Town, Johannesburg, Durban and Pietermaritzburg for almost a year. Since, Banks has written and performed in It's Getting Harder (in 1988, also directed by Wilson), A Room With a Revue, A Bit Off the Mark (1990) (his only revue with another performer) and Laughing All the Way to the Banks (1992; directed by Fred Abrahamse).

Banks maintains that his primary purpose is to "entertain an audience, to make people laugh". Although many reviewers believed We're Not On Top was political (the government had declared a State of Emergency in June 1986, known as the 'Second Emergency') Banks claims the revue was not "political in that sense I'm just holding

up what we see as precious and showing the ridiculousness of it." Partly for this reason he shuns the label "satirist" as it is generally, but incorrectly, associated with politics by reviewers and members of the public. He believes that his material has substance, that he has made audiences aware: "I like to make people think. I want people to say, 'Oh, I've never seen it like that. Ray McCauley [the leader of the Rhema Church] does drive a Mercedes Benz, he must have made money out of religion.'" The monologue, entitled "Creepy Cawley", aroused controversy, with patrons leaving or shouting "Blasphemer!" at him, misinterpreting the satire of the materialism of leaders of Reborn Christian movements as a satire on God. As he is sceptical of reform, his brief to himself is primarily to entertain rather than simply state what is right and what is not in contemporary South Africa. Audiences

might see things in a different light, and they might pick up things which they've never noticed before, but I don't think ... it's going to change the way they think The last area of protest in South Africa is the theatre, where you can actually still stand up and shout your mouth off. The only thing is that protest theatre has lost its market completely, because it's been the same drum banging away for the last 10 years. People are bored with it.²⁵⁰

He terms his productions "topical revues" and the criteria for selecting material is topicality, which limits his targets not only because material dates very quickly but also his audiences, who have to be socially and politically aware; furthermore he is "limited by the fact that the South African public has been brainwashed by the Nationalist-run SABC which has total monopoly of the airwaves and indirectly the brainwaves of the public".

For this reason too, he has deliberately attempted to formulate an individual and distinctive style:

In all my work I try to be original - and people are now realizing that. At first people said it was all the old Pieter-Dirk Uys, Robert Kirby bits and pieces - but I try to be original. That's very difficult in South Africa because you've only got 30 people that the nation knows. The most commonly recognized man in South Africa is Clive Weil [who, as one of the heads of a chain of hypermarket stores had appeared on television advertisements promoting the chain; Banks had lampooned him in "Chubby Checkers" in We're Not On Top].²⁵¹

Like Uys, Banks satirizes the entire spectrum of South African society: he is non-discriminatory and non-partisan in his choice of targets, qualities which are unusual and "engaging", according to John Campbell, in an era of "agendas, interest-groups and the politically correct".²⁵² As his spectrum is wide, Banks expects to offend:

Laughter is always at the expense of someone else. Someone has to pay for a joke. As far as I'm concerned we are all in the same boat. I won't take out anything that offends any one group. I'll treat them all the same way, the gays, the blacks, the whites, the trolls, the lesbians, the Jews, the disabled, the reborns. We're all human. When you shoot barbs across the board you will stand on toes.²⁵³

Banks has never been subjected to censorship of his material, although he has attacked virtually every prominent politician and all political parties. What has been censored was his publicity poster for A Bit Off the Mark, released when the Chippendales first performed in South Africa, which incorporated a photograph of his head on that of a nude male. Banks was forced to cover the pubic hair just visible on the photograph. Banks's frequent use of expletives has, however, been ignored by the censors. His indiscriminate and scathing references to personages and his scatological humour are deliberately provocative. "I am a political observer," he stated in an interview with Marianne Thamm, "I'm not a banner waver but I like being risky."²⁵⁴ As such when Banks opened A Room with a Revue at the Stage Door at the Baxter, the management stated that the views expressed in the revue had nothing to do with the theatre or its management. At the conclusion of Laughing All the Way to the Banks Banks himself excused the theatre's management from any association in whatever offence he may have caused before adding, "But I don't give a shit."²⁵⁵

To those who are offended by his material, Banks would counter with the generalization that South Africans are "very polite about South African people", partly because of the bland and obsequious conduct of television interviewers: "there is no hard-hitting questioning ... no intuitive interviewing, no one asks Chris Heunis who the 'foreign influences' are that made him only beat Denis Worrall by thirty-one votes or whatever, he's left to say that". (Banks is referring to the narrow National Party victory for Heunis

over Worrall of the Independent Party for the Helderberg seat in the 6 May 1987 elections. Worrall lost by thirty-nine votes.) He defends a monologue, entitled "Don't Worrall Be Happy", which lampooned Worrall and satirized the ineffectuality of the Democratic Party (which Worrall joined when it was formed in 1989) by maintaining that the politician is "prominent" and this fact justifies the attack:

When you're a Denis Worrall, you're public property. You go into people's homes, you're on the covers of magazines, in books, in interviews, you're selling things on television, you're telling people what to do, you're here, there, everywhere. You're public property, you're public domain.²⁵⁶

Unlike most stand-up comics Banks presents a series of character monologues of his own devising and could be regarded therefore as a monologist, but, like Sahl, the delivery is often frenetic and rapid, and, like Sahl, the material is interspersed with caustic 'throw-away' asides, acerbic topical observations or current jokes. Unlike the 'new wave' British comics, he is not sensitive regarding racial or gender issues. Like stand-up comics and most cabaret and revue performers, Banks prefers venues which promote a close performer-audience relationship (and here there is a similarity with Kirby as well). Although he performed We're Not On Top in the Elizabeth Sneddon Theatre, he

find[s] a rigid relationship between audience and performer in a proscenium arch theatre: they buy their tickets, they sit and watch and at the end they go, nobody shouts out, a few might leave. In a cabaret situation, like the Cellar at the Playhouse, which is a pretty international format really, people are eating and drinking and going to the toilet. They aren't afraid to say, "Oh rubbish, get off!" which is perfectly acceptable. It's your moment of terror as a performer, and you can be free to reply to it. [Banks has a repertoire of stock responses to such interjections.]

In A Room With a Revue Banks began to experiment with the format of his 'topical revues': the first half consisted of a series of monologues (ranging from the Worrall monologue to one as a domestic worker on an African National Congress "crash" course on "how to win the white man's house from the inside" to "Alice from Athlone" in which a coloured 'char' reminisced about her cleaning duties at Buckingham Palace and the British royal family); after the interval, in the Loft at the Playhouse in Durban, he used the living-room set of a previous production (Dalk (1988) by Pieter J. Swanepoel) for a

single monologue, presented in the character of Dave Rabinowitz, an inveterate bigot who first appeared in It's Getting Harder.

Where most contemporary stand-up comics rely on personalized jokes, linked into a structure and delivered in the first person in an improvised style, Banks placed the jokes in the framework of a character monologue. This type was popular with the solo comics of music-hall or monologists such as Draper. Thus he initially appeared as though he was not addressing the audience directly; rather he performed the monologue on which the audience eavesdropped (a common revue technique), but gradually Banks as Rabinowitz began to speak to individuals, incorporating their responses into the monologue and drawing more and more audience-members into his situation, working directly to and off individuals in the manner of a stand-up comic and improvisational comedy. (Other South African satirical performers had previously presented similar blends of structured monodrama and improvised stand-up comedy. A notable exponent was Guy Willoughby in his Quo Vadis Schistirrer? (1985) which satirized the South African Defence Force through the persona of Major Schistirrer.)

From an armchair, Banks presented a complete portrait of the racist and bigot, revealing his neuroses and prejudices in a manner which simultaneously shocked and amused. Ultimately, it was the audience who was satirized. As Brigid Keeley observed in her review: "As Rabinowitz rants and struts, where does Mark Banks stand? Are we intended to be laughing at Dave or with him? Is Banks a racist ... or are we, because we laugh?"²⁵⁷ In that sense, Banks is indirectly subversive, and such a monologue has its roots in Menippean satire. He has aimed to make people laugh "at what they think about and a lot of the time people talk about their fears, about sex, Telkom [Telecommunications; the company was formed on 1 October 1991], politics and money".²⁵⁸ His domestic worker was not simply a stereotype, she was the embodiment of the white stereotypical view of a domestic worker. Banks's work reveals the actual attitudes behind the hypocritical facades and he places such exposure of the discrepancy within a familiar context, such as the average middle-class white home.

Though he claims that it is the commonplaces and annoyances of everyday life which motivate his work (such as the inflated fares of the South African Airways, the inefficiency of Telkom, why Anneline Kriel (the former Miss South Africa) should appear continuously as the cover girl on local magazines) and although he has sought to differentiate his work from that of much South African theatre and comedy which has concerned itself with political protest in the recent past, nevertheless not only is his work influenced by it, but there are marked similarities.²⁵⁹ While such work in South Africa may have been overt in its purpose, the same anger which motivated those playwrights and performers has motivated Banks. Where British 'new wave' comics such as Billy Connolly or Ben Elton deliberately offer an alternative to past subjects and approaches, their "cracks and jibes", asserts Campbell, are "disembodied, inoffensive products of the imagination"; Banks, however, does not deal with the abstract, but centres on the actual individuals and organizations.²⁶⁰ Hence he did not simply attack the South African Airways, he targeted its chief executive, Gert van der Veer, as well. In encapsulating the issues most dominant in the consciousness of the average white South African, in delivering the sort of humour they respond to, in dealing with personalities and issues they recognize, Banks is ruthless. If there is a characteristic feature of alternative comedy in contemporary South Africa, it is its implacable and pitiless disregard; it disregards propriety, it is completely non-discriminatory, it is offensive:

Sometimes people say, "That's terrible," then I'll say, "Yes, that is terrible, I want you to think that's terrible because it is." ... Calvinistic Christian morally wonderful South Africa has the highest suicide rate in the world, and I think that shows there's something wrong somewhere. Calvinistic Christians, no drinking or dancing on a Sunday ..., and cut this and that out of the movies, and don't do this and that ... have the highest suicide rate So I put in a sketch [a monologue] about suicide and it offended a lot of people.²⁶¹

3.6.3 Ian Fraser and stand-up comics

During the National Arts Festival in 1992, the Weekly Mail convened a forum of South African comedians, including Pam-Grant, Stephanou, Miyeni and Paul Slabolepszy.²⁶²

The major feature of current South African humour, they agreed, is that it reflects both the pathos and horror of a fragmented country: "The violence and depravity of our society is in all our work ... humour is the only way to tell a sad story", maintained Pam-Grant. And considering the situation, Slabolepszy believes that their "humour is harsh. It has very sharp edges", because it is affected by the situation.

Similarly, in a profile of Bruce, Tynan argued that the existence of comedy such as his was "evidence of unease in the body politic", and his description of America in the 1960s is particularly relevant to contemporary South Africa:

Class chafes against class, ignorance against intelligence, puritanism against pleasure, majority against minority, easy hypocrisy against hard sincerity, white against black, jingoism against internationalism, ... suspicion against trust, death against life - and out of all these collisions and contradictions there emerges the troubled voice of Lenny Bruce The message he bears is simple and basic: whatever releases people and brings them together is good, and whatever confines and separates them is bad.²⁶³

In South Africa, from the late 1980s, Bruce has been the exemplar for Fraser. Like Bruce, who began working in small clubs in Greenwich Village in New York, Fraser's initial routines were performed in venues such as the Black Sun and at Jameson's where he performed improvised stand-up poetry (in this he acknowledges the influence of John Cooper-Clarke, who presented his form of poetry in 'rock' venues in Britain); both gained notoriety for the liberal use of expletives and for their attacks on establishment hypocrisy, both developed acts which became intimate and improvisational harangues of the audience to satirize organized religion, sexual taboos and race relations. In 1988, at the Black Sun, Fraser acknowledged his debt in a tribute to Bruce, entitled SuperJew, in which he reproduced Bruce's style and material:

I did Lenny Bruce by taking chunks of his material and rearranging the sequence - to present something of meaning to local audiences. Then I simply performed this (my) perception of Lenny Bruce. I gave people an insight into the real man - even though I look completely different from him.²⁶⁴

Fraser first achieved prominence, however, with a fictional persona monodrama, Bring Me Gandhi (1988), written in a distinctive and individual 'poetic' form, which satirizes

vice by alternating between macabre overstatement and detached comedy, to present the confessions of a security policeman. When it was presented in Grahamstown it was described by one reviewer as "the most disturbing and unsettling piece on the festival".²⁶⁵ Audiences were disturbed by the accuracy of his portrayal of the beliefs of a sadist and fanatic who described his torture, rape and murder of a political detainee. (A woman fainted during one performance and had to be resuscitated by ambulance men.²⁶⁶) Threats to ban Bring Me Gandhi and the warnings by Stoffel Botha, as Minister of Home Affairs, to those who were attempting to "bypass the Publications Act" by producing inflammatory theatre, prompted Fraser to create his first self-devised stand-up "satire show", In Search of Stoffel Botha's Brain in 1989, but in the style of both Bruce and Cooper-Clarke. In this one-person show he attacked censorship, the South African Defence Force ("join up and die"), marriage (with an alternative wedding ceremony, ending with the groom handcuffing his bride as the priest pronounced them "man and housewife") and Scientology ("did you know that Charles Manson was trained by those freaks?").²⁶⁷

His approach in his "satire shows" at the National Arts Festival since (Uncensored in 1990, One Man One Pizza in 1991, Look Back in Panga in 1992) was based on aggression, although skilfully controlled so as not to offend at least the majority of his audience. Fraser insists that the audience is all important: "I write plays and perform for audiences What they perceive is my chief concern."²⁶⁸ Despite the fact that the reaction of the public is mixed, Fraser uses laughter as a means to control the perceptions of the audience. He tempers his aggressive style with self-deprecatory charm. Look Back in Panga opened with Fraser repeatedly screaming an expletive. One Man One Pizza began with Fraser advising audience members to leave if they found expletives, which he then listed, offensive. Ian Jennings reviewed Look Back in Panga and criticized Fraser as he "coyly agrees to shock us. And we all know there's nothing middle-class audiences like more. It's cosy being liberated."²⁶⁹ Liberation from restrictions is, as mentioned in Chapter 1, a characteristic tactic of satire, however; furthermore Fraser's shocks elicit laughter, laughter as a means, not an end in itself. Initially what is shocking may appear

gratuitous, the jokes incidental, but both reveal and expose the attitudes and perceptions of those who are shocked or who laugh. Fraser is most angered by "dishonesty, moral corruption whether it's political or sexual or religious".²⁷⁰

A description of Look Back in Panga reveals Fraser's intention. Fraser screamed the "obscenity ... until he seem[ed] sure everyone ha[d] gotten the message. Then he smile[d] sweetly, genuinely sweetly, and settle[d] down to skewering" his targets.²⁷¹ The link between the obscenity and the targets was deliberate: Fraser challenged the audience to redefine what caused offence, to reconsider priorities. The hypocritical values of those who were shocked was exposed as Fraser forced the recognition that expletives are merely a flouting of prescriptive conventions of decorum, whereas racial intolerance, religious fundamentalism and political corruption are offensive and should provoke righteous indignation. This was "the message" underlying the scream.

As an avowed iconoclast ("Part of me a total anarchist, but I have developed a rigid system of [personal] value and ethics"), Fraser aims to destroy all that is, to him, mistakenly cherished as having moral, political or social value.²⁷² He would deny Jennings's inference of using offence simply to appease his "middle-class" white audience's desire to feel "liberated". "If anyone was offended," he said of his work at the time of In Search of Stoffel Botha's Brain, "they probably deserved to be."²⁷³ In fact, Fraser would concede that in his determination to reflect reality as he sees it, he would be prepared to resort to the use of even more 'shocking' tactics than have been tolerated before.

In keeping with the style of most stand-up comics, Fraser never permits a single comic idea to dominate his routine; he deliberately ranges over a variety of topics in no way connected to the title of his act. Dishonesty is the core of his material: dishonest liberalism ("Tolerance for another because of his race is racism"), dishonest politicians ("The same people that supported the Nazis during the Second World War are still in

power over us. I watch these Boereorkes numbers on TV and I think, at least the Nazis had Wagner", and "If I were in charge, this country wouldn't have enough meathooks") and dishonest theatre:

In the foyer count the berets
stroking egos in boring plays
avant garde stylish presentation?
it's artistic creative constipation.²⁷⁴

It may seem that, like Juvenal or Swift, he is contemptuous of society as a whole, but as Tony Jackman asserted in his review of The Gospel According to the Mafia (1991) and One Man One Pizza, what "leaven[s] the shock value of Fraser's satire is an unexpected gentleness which points to the obvious compassion he has for things that concern him, whether politics, social injustice or human foibles".²⁷⁵

As with other stand-up comics, Fraser primarily expresses attitudes; hence his material cannot be emotionally neutral.²⁷⁶ Audiences respond not only to the content, but the emotional attitude of the delivery which, in Fraser's "satire shows", is frequently abrasive and hostile. The material would seem to be a collection of jokes in a set-up and punch format, centering on what disgusts Fraser (more so than what he admires). As such, almost all his attitudes are expressed in the first person ("I wouldn't tell a child that someone had died in agony on a cross, especially for them").²⁷⁷ Fraser invariably includes some self-deprecating humour ("I don't need a majestic view to make me feel insignificant") as a means of appearing fallible and 'ordinary' and thereby gaining the confidence of the audience.²⁷⁸ Revealing one's own, rather than an assumed persona's hates, fears and concerns makes this form of one-person presentation appear an extreme form of self-disclosure and self-risk.

Although his routine has a core of prepared material, alternating most often between short jokes, topical asides and a form of 'rap', the impression conveyed is one of spontaneous free-association, which it often is as well, as Fraser adapts moment by moment to responses and is clearly in control of audience laughter. Fraser has stated: "With the

satire [show] I ... amble onstage casually and look at the audience and wonder what I feel like saying."²⁷⁹ This may convey that Fraser is at ease in his "satire shows", but nevertheless there is clearly an element of risk. Olivier, who played the stand-up comedian Archie Rice in John Osborne's The Entertainer (1957), wrote that the stand-up comic "lives dangerously, he is always on the razor's edge. One moment of mistiming and his audience will turn on him."²⁸⁰ For those who remain until the conclusion, perhaps even more so than other forms of solo presentation, the performer has had his colloquy with the audience, as Olivier asserts; it was not a soliloquy, as the audience had to be the 'feed' for the solo-comic and a form of 'dialogue' took place.²⁸¹

If the fact that, at the National Arts Festival at least, Fraser has consistently broken attendance records between 1988 and 1992, he has been influential. And he is prolific: in the same period he presented fourteen productions, including the award-winning Dogs of the Blue Gods (the AA Life Vita Award for Comedy) and Blitzbreeker and the Chicken from Hell (a Pick of the Fringe award in 1990) and the 1992 Amstel Playwright of the Year award for Heart Like a Stomach.

Fraser's counterpart at the 1991 Festival was Miyeni. Where the former appears to make little effort to ingratiate his audiences, the latter explicitly does so, even while satirizing prevailing attitudes. Believing that comedians have to take risks, in Twisted and Vile he challenged the "major black and white thinking situation" by making "white jokes, black jokes, jokes in Sandton and Soweto".²⁸² Like Fraser he is an iconoclast who, by using the techniques of stand-up comedy, aims to destroy stereotypical assumptions and categories particularly in his presentation of 'untouchable' material, whether bestiality or clitoridectomy: "I would twist things ... all the time ... in effect saying that you can listen to the most opposite of views to what you believe in and its O.K. You won't start bleeding, your hands won't fall off and you might even laugh".²⁸³

The technique of combining a character monologue with stand-up delivery, described in relation to Banks's Dave Rabinowitz monologue earlier, has been similarly exploited by other

satirical performers. Miyeni's Khazamula the Nerd (1992) extended the preoccupations of his earlier stand-up routine to probe the absurdities of the South African obsession with skin colour. The monologue was delivered by a white Afrikaner Weerstandsbeweging supporter trapped within the body of a black person (Khazamula). The concept afforded Miyeni the opportunity to adopt and satirize the attitudes of white racism. In her monologue Let Me Listen in 1991, Blacher examined the predicaments and incongruities that beset the minds of white South Africans. She describes the format as a combination of theatre and stand-up comedy: "We need to find a new format, and a new way of dealing with old topics," she maintains, adding that humour is vital: "It's not enough to hammer at people Humour is a way to engage them."²⁸⁴ Stephanou's intent matches Blacher's, by helping people to cope "with the insanity by making people laugh at it If we were to make our topics the tragedy they are, nobody would be interested."²⁸⁵ In her Is Every Sperm Sacred? Stephanou presented such issues as abortion, racist and sexist attitudes and sex education, combining stand-up jokes in an array of character sketches of immediately recognizable average South African personae. In 1993 Blacher and Stephanou collaborated on Twin Shrieks, a double bill which aimed "to get beyond 'the razor wire fences and 14 rottweilers' at the entrance to the average white South African mind".²⁸⁶

3.6.4 Paul Slabolepszy

Opening the barriers "at the entrance to the average white South African mind" is an apt description of the theatre work of Slabolepszy who in a sense, through his focus on recognizable characters in a particular social context and his use of character monologue and fictional persona monodramas, influenced these alternative performers. Though he avoids the label satirist, he does acknowledge that the characteristic features of satire are evident in his works, which he describes as "laughs all the way to a punch in the guts".²⁸⁷ His goal has been "to 'shake people up' while entertaining them".²⁸⁸ His plays are satirical

in the sense that they evoke laughter and thought as a response to the actions of plausible characters in a familiar situation; while criticism could be levelled at those characters, most often it is the context which has created their attitudes and actions which deserves greater criticism. Racism, most often seen from the vantage-point of white, working-class characters, is implicitly revealed to be "an attitude with historical roots and observable causes", observes Campbell of his plays.²⁸⁹ "It's easy," Slabolepszy asserts, "to write plays about South African politics. What's more difficult is to write plays about characters who are more complex than their apparent political identities."²⁹⁰ Slabolepszy openly admits to making "commercial theatre" as he wants people to attend his productions and, through laughter, make them "aware".

His work does indicate a marked sensitivity to the manner in which the political situation colours not only the thoughts and emotions of his characters but also the action of his plays, revues and monologues.²⁹¹ His plays and monologues are, as Steadman noted in relation to David Mamet in the United States of America and Barrie Keeffe in Britain, "steeped in, but not about, political contexts".²⁹²

Saturday Night at the Palace (1982) reflects accurately the class distinctions in the white polity and its implications during the 'reform' initiatives of the early 1980s. The play is concerned with the victims of apartheid, with the inbred and illogical fears and prejudices among South Africa's different social and racial groups created by apartheid discourse underpinning every exchange of dialogue. The play is not simply located in South Africa, it is a metaphor for the country, a country which can nurture a Vince and a Forsie and a September. No resolution is advocated, the play is unresolved and ends in mid-catharsis with a despairing "No" at the inhumanity that has resulted in the "growing darkness" of the final stage direction.²⁹³

The bleak pathology of the failure of 'reform' was evident in the unpublished Making like America (1986) in which, within the confines of the nuclear family, the fears and

aggression of the white community were captured, while the aspirations of white, English-speaking youth was examined in Boo to the Moon in the same year. In Travelling Shots (1988) the theme of retribution emerged in a revue of seven satirical vignettes linked by the metaphor of travel, with its associations of escape and emigration. "Abnormal Load", a monologue delivered by a divorced salesman, captured the essence and dilemmas of the stereotypical white South African: a self-justicatory and self-pitying failure, the person who lost his employment (and wife) owing to the effects of international sanctions against and disinvestment in the country, a man who threatened family violence whilst terrorizing the invisible listener (the audience) in the bar of a hotel. This image of destructive isolation was extended into a parable in Smallholding (1989). Slabolepszy claims the stimulus to write the play was derived on the day that the Conservative Party became the official opposition after the May 1987 elections. South Africa was presented in the metaphor of a smallholding inhabited by stereotypical representations of inherited and conflicting ideologies, surrounded by 'fairy' lights, "cut off from the world" and "impoverished spiritually". However, in the play's unexpected denouement the narrator, significantly named Christiaan, indicated that perhaps it was still possible to change the course of events and alter direction in a play, if not in the world of reality outside the theatre, that some hope of regeneration was still possible.

Since that work, Slabolepszy has concentrated his focus to one-person or two-hander works. The setting for Braait Laaities (1991), appropriately sub-titled a "white black comedy", was dominated by a portrait of Verwoerd (regarded in South Africa as the 'architect of apartheid') and the action took place in the Hendrik Verwoerd hall in Springs. Its theme of the reconciliation possible between black and white when the anger, confusion and conditioned defences instilled by apartheid in young South Africans are removed was echoed in Mooi Street Moves (1992) in which a white South African was dependent on a black for personal survival, physically and emotionally. In a fictional persona monodrama in the same year (The Return of Elvis du Pisanie) Slabolepszy returned to reflecting the waning quality of life and a consequent decline in values of a

white middle-aged South African, who reviewed the failure of his life in a series of contrasting episodes and reminiscences. What the similarly unemployed, white, middle-aged South African salesman threatened in the monologue in Travelling Shots occurred in The Return of Elvis du Pisanie, but it did so in the past. In the present, the power of fantasy and the transforming qualities of belief seemed to redeem the dilemmas of the individual.

If not directly polemical, Slabolepszy has succeeded in humanizing the victims of apartheid while presenting its dehumanizing effects on believable individuals who are, most often, outcasts or failures. He has, too, indicated an ability to mirror the prevailing qualities and attitudes of the time in which he was writing, whether in the commonplace perceptions of a limited range of characters whose linguistic idiosyncrasies he accurately captures or in his sensitive absorption and depiction of the social and political context which formed the values of the characters. He has achieved this through works which can both entertain and disturb. Slabolepszy has, to Campbell, absorbed

the perceptions and attitudes of a new generation of ... South Africans, the hardened realism and lack of sentiment that distinguishes today's anti-apartheid youth from their parents [He] writes with tremendous empathy about the "other" victims of apartheid - victims of broken promises and dishonest ideology drawing on the society around him without recording the material in the way that a more consciously political playwright might do.²⁹⁴

3.6.5 The 'alternative' Afrikaners

The dehumanizing effects of apartheid have influenced the works of 'alternative' Afrikaners. Aucamp, one of the finest exponents of Afrikaans short-story writing, utilized the format of cabaret to make literary, social and political comment in the late 1970s and 1980s, beginning with Die Lewe is 'n Grenshotel, based on European, principally German, models, thereby pioneering the use of cabaret for the 'alternative' Afrikaner movement. His published works combine a refined and deft use of poetry with humour and seriousness. Aucamp views cabaret as 'civilized protest' (a term De Vries adopted),

believing it can achieve, artistically, what flags, strikes and violence cannot, that humour is its basis and humour is a survival tactic, and that cabaret can create a bridge to a public estranged from the arts as it has the appeal of popular entertainment.²⁹⁵ The techniques of his cabaret works are derived from Brecht's Verfremdungseffekt for the manner in which the particulars of an issue (censorship, permissiveness, politics, age, love) are presented, with direct address and commentary disrupting any sense of 'dramatic illusion'. Both the term and style were adopted by young Afrikaans-speaking performers as a means of questioning the mores of their society, but in a more outspoken manner. De Vries in Hello South Africa (1986) was amongst the first (he insisted on the term cabaret to describe the production, which included a lampoon of P.W. Botha).

After the first season of Adapt or Dye in Durban in 1981, Uys performed the revue, which he termed a konsert, in a new cabaret venue at the Market Theatre. Uys recalls:

In those heady days of '81, however, there was a lot of energy and the need for an outlet, especially among young Afrikaans artists who realised for the first time that their crafts had to be used as weapons: there were singers, composers, actresses and comics. Afrikaans writer Hennie Aucamp had written Met permissie gesê which was a Boere version of a Berlin cabaret. It was directed by Janice Honeyman and I performed late after they had finished.²⁹⁶

In 1988, at the National Arts Festival Piekniek by Dingaen, a satirical cabaret workshopped by a Capab company and directed by Gerrit Schoonhoven, won the Fringe award. The production revealed the anger and bitterness of those associated, through language, with apartheid: the chorus, costumed in the Afrikaner Weerstandsbeweging colours of black and red, called themselves the "children of Verwoerd"; the lyrics were couched in traditional folk songs. That Capab had demanded thirty cuts to the cabaret before it was due to be presented is indicative of the controversy it aroused.²⁹⁷ In its anarchistic and irreverent style and its outspoken defiance, the production encapsulated the 'alternative' Afrikaner movement. In the cast were Johannes Kerkorrel, Letoit, Marthinus Basson and Nathaniel le Roux. Those identified with the movement (including musicians, cabaret performers, stage and film directors and performers, academics, novelists and poets) propound alternative views to those generally accepted by the Afrikaner

establishment, morally, socially and politically. As with the 'alternative' movement in Britain, not all agree with or associate themselves with the label, as they are often opposed in aim, approach and the format employed; indeed, as Carol Coetzee maintains, "their individualism and independent thought is their foremost common characteristic".²⁹⁸ That, and the fact that they share the same background and education.

In November 1988, with the founding of Vrye Weekblad, the movement had an advocate in the alternative press. The book review section was edited by Koos Prinsloo, whose satirical novel Die Hemel Help Ons (awarded the Rapport Prize in 1988) had elicited comment in the National Party for its lampoon of P.W. Botha. The editor, Max du Preez, has articulated the reasons for the movement's defiance:

The church, the Broederbond, the National Party and the Federasie van Afrikaanse Kultuurverenigings have always thought on our behalf. The educational system is still geared to that. Most Afrikaans students still believe in ... Afrikaner Nationalism, in Christian Nationalism.... They conform. But the minute you realize what has been done to you, you get angry you reject, you defy.²⁹⁹

The movement achieved prominence with Afrikaans youth partly through the continuing tradition of dissidence initiated by such writers as the exiled poet Breyten Breytenbach, but principally through music. Music sketches for Piekniek by Dingaen were composed and written by Letoit and Kerkorrel, the leader of the avowedly subversive Gereformeerde (the word means 'reformed' and refers to the Dutch Reformed Church) Blues Band. (The musical practitioners use real and adopted stage names, Kerkorrel ('church-organ') is one such name; others include 'Koos Kombuis' ('kitchen'; another pseudonym for André Letoit), 'Joos Tonteldoos', (Joos is a name for the devil, as in the expression "Mag die joos jou haal" ('The devil take you'); Tonteldoos means 'tinderbox') and 'Randy Rambo', as a rejection of their inherited past and as a sign of their self-chosen individuality, changing those names to suit a particular occasion or event.) Kerkorrel has stated his intention to "liberate" the Afrikaans language: "If you can make a language into rock and roll, it can't be an oppressive language any more it's not the exclusive property of the volk".³⁰⁰ Nevertheless, five educational institutions cancelled scheduled performances of such groups during the so-termed 'Boere-punk' Voëlvy Tour in 1989.

The music is derivative (Kerkorrel favours rock and roll, rhythm and blues and jive, Letoit a folk style, Anton Goosen has collaborated with Lucky Dube to present tri-lingual musical albums), performed in various venues (from the Black Sun to school halls, in an attempt to reach a youthful audience) and is not performed exclusively in Afrikaans (many performers began initially, in English). The performances are notably multi-lingual: "Afrikaans has always been a bastertaal," claims Letoit (who terms himself an "Afrikaffer", the word itself a hybrid of Africa, Afrikaans and kaffer), "a fusion of different languages ... Dutch, Slaams, Hottentot, English I'm just carrying on with the fusion."³⁰¹ He believes that when the Afrikaans language became "official ... they stopped this process of bastardisation and growth".³⁰² Of this "fusion", Ivor Powell maintains that such performers are "playing the cultural history of Afrikaans in reverse":

When the Federasie vir Afrikaanse Kultuur, the National Party and the Broederbond developed their programme of purifying and standardising the language in the first place, they were guided by political imperatives. By consolidating - and ossifying - the language, they were also consolidating what had become a dispersed and politically aimless people into what they construed as a chosen nation. Simultaneously ... they were pursuing the policies which grew out of the mythology of the chosen race.³⁰³

If so, such performers have deliberately aimed to demythologize the past: if language and policy are, as Powell claims, inseparable, then in 'bastardizing' one, the other will be deconstructed. Thus Goosen (who was banned by the Afrikaanse Taal en Kultuurvereniging for ridiculing the national flag in performance) was one of the principal authors of the Houtstok festival which took place on 31 May 1990 in deliberate opposition to the Republic Day festival of Afrikaans music at the Voortrekker Monument in Pretoria.³⁰⁴ So, too, many performers have parodied Afrikaans folk tunes by placing the lyrics in a political context; Letoit has used the tune for the national anthem, but altered C.J. Langenhoven's "Die Stem van Suid Afrika" to what Coetzee describes as "a scathing and bitter reminder of the apartheid society in which we live".³⁰⁵

Such defiance is necessary and appropriate, asserts the academic and satiric writer Etienne van Heerden, who cites the failed concept of loyal resistance ("lojale verset") as an

example of dissidence without defiance.³⁰⁶ The term was coined by Van Wyk Louw to describe the strategy to contain potential dissidents within the fold and promote change from within, particularly after his confrontation with Verwoerd. But, using a phrase from Gordimer, Van Heerden states that Afrikaner intellectuals realized that it was not enough to be "negatively present within the system If you want to struggle and change things, you must address yourself to the people who have power."³⁰⁷

A performer with an Afrikaans cultural, political and educational background who addresses himself to those in power, employs the laughter of satire as a "weapon", has achieved "exactly what the new generation of Afrikaner attempts to do" is, maintains Coetzee, Uys: "He wants to make people aware of their ability to think for themselves".³⁰⁸

Notes to Chapter 3

1. Roy Campbell, The Wayzgoose, in The Collected Poems of Roy Campbell (London: Bodley, 1949), p.243.
2. Ibid. Campbell's thoughts on "real satire" are from his "A Rejected Review: Reviewer's Preface" (a review of The Apes of God (1930) by Wyndham Lewis, later included in that author's Satire and Fiction of the same year), in Roy Campbell, Collected Works IV, eds. Peter Alexander, Michael Chapman and Marcia Leveson (Johannesburg: Ad. Donker, 1988), p.259.
3. The principal sources of information for the survey of satire in South Africa in the past and present are F.C.L. Bosman, Drama en Toneel in Suid-Afrika, Deel 1: 1652 - 1855 (Amsterdam/Pretoria: De Bussy, 1928); Stephen Gray, Southern African Literature: An Introduction (Cape Town: David Philip, 1979); Thelma Gutsche, "Theatrical Artistes", and "Theatrical History", Standard Encyclopaedia of Southern Africa, 10 (Cape Town: Nasou, 1974), pp.471-474 and 474-481; Temple Hauptfleisch, "From the Savoy to Soweto: The Shifting Paradigm in South African Theatre", South African Theatre Journal 2 (May 1988), 35-63; Margarete Seidenspinner, Exploring the Labyrinth: Athol Fugard's Approach to South African Drama (Essen: Blue Owl, 1986); and Companion to South African English Literature, comps. David Adey, Ridley Beeton, Michael Chapman, Ernest Pereira (Johannesburg: Ad. Donker, 1986).
4. Bosman, Drama en Toneel in Suid-Afrika, p.300. The dramatis personae for De Nieuwe Ridderorde of De Temperantisten appears on pp.302-304; that for Kockincoz, or The Pettifogging Lawyers' Plot on p.496.
5. Mervyn Woodrow, "South African Drama in English", English Studies in Africa 13 (September 1970), 394.
6. The writer is indebted to Hauptfleisch, "From the Savoy to Soweto", 42, for this observation.
7. Bosman, Drama en Toneel in Suid-Afrika, cites P.W. Laidler's Annals of the Cape Stage (1926) who, in discussing theatre in Grahamstown, describes Kaatje Kekkelbek as "a charming characteristic song" presented in 1838. Bosman maintains that this date is incorrect as the 'play' refers to Judge Musgrave who was only appointed in October 1843. He therefore dates Kaatje Kekkelbek to early 1844 (pp.388-389 and 541).
8. Guy Butler, "Kaatje Kekkelbek", in Cape Charade (Cape Town: A.A. Balkema, 1968), p.iv.
9. See Stephen Gray, "Women in South African Theatre", South African Theatre Journal 4 (May 1990), 75.
10. The original is reproduced in Bosman, Drama en Toneel in Suid-Afrika, pp.541-543.

11. Gray, Southern African Literature, p.53.
12. Ibid., p.54.
13. Reported in *ibid.*, pp.50 and 56. Saartjie Baartman's skeleton is still on view in the Museum of Man in Paris.
14. Quoted in Seidenspinner, Exploring the Labyrinth, p.38.
15. For the information on and the scripts of Stephen Black this writer acknowledges the indefatigable labours of Gray, who revived the academic interest in Black when his work was virtually unavailable and his contribution to theatre in South Africa all but forgotten. Woodrow in his "South African Drama in English" presented at the Conference of the English Academy of Southern Africa in Grahamstown in 1969 made a plea for Black to be "resurrected" (p.403), but it is undoubtedly Gray who has achieved that through his Southern African Literature, pp.58-61 and pp.192-193; "Our Forgotten Drama", Speak 1 (March/April 1978), 13-16 and 46-47; "Stephen Black and Love and the Hyphen (1908-1928)", Critical Arts 2 (July 1981), 51-59; the selections of the writings of Stephen Black for English in Africa 8 (September 1981); "The Theatre of Stephen Black: An Example of Cultural Discontinuity in South Africa", in Literature and Society in South Africa, eds. Landeg White and Tim Couzens (Harlow: Longman, 1984), pp.101-109; and in the "Introduction" to Stephen Black: Three Plays, ed. Stephen Gray (Johannesburg: Ad. Donker, 1984), pp.7-41.
The review quoted is cited in Gray's "Introduction" to Black's Three Plays, p.11.
16. Stephen Black, "How I Began to Write", English in Africa 8 (September 1981), 88.
17. Stephen Black, "Love and the Hyphen: Its Friends and Foes", English in Africa 8 (September 1981), 70.
18. Oscar Wilde, The Importance of Being Earnest (London: Methuen, 1966), p.16.
19. Stephen Black, Love and the Hyphen, in Three Plays, p.57.
20. Black, "How I Began to Write", 87.
21. Ibid.
22. Gray, "Stephen Black and Love and the Hyphen (1908-1928)", 54-55.
23. Black, Love and the Hyphen, p.52.
24. Ibid., p.60.
25. Ibid., p.54.
26. Ibid., p.55.
27. Ibid., p.75.

28. Ibid., p.27.
29. Ibid., p.92.
30. Ibid., p.102.
31. Gray, Southern African Literature, p.58.
32. Black, Love and the Hyphen, p.99.
33. Ibid., p.103.
34. Ibid., p.100.
35. Ibid., p.125.
36. Quoted in Gray, "Introduction", p.11.
37. Between 1908 and 1928 the following Acts were passed: the South Africa Act (1909) (by British parliament) barred all non-white South Africans from the Common roll and therefore from direct political representation; the Mines and Works Act (1911) formalized job reservation by regulating the issue of certificates of competence in such a way as to exclude black craftsmen from numerous categories of skilled work; the Natives Land Act (1913) prohibited the acquisition of land for black South Africans outside the existing 'tribal' lands and set aside just over seven per cent of the country for black occupation; the Native Affairs Act (1913) made provision for separate community-based, government-appointed councils to represent the interests of the blacks; the Natives' (Urban Areas) Act (1923) controlled the influx of black labour into urban areas and established peri-urban locations, paving the way for the Group Areas Act (1950); the Industrial Conciliation Act (1924) excluded black unions from the collective bargaining process; the Minimum Wages Act (1925) regulated ethnic "graduation" of paid labour; the Immorality Act (1927) prohibited sexual intercourse between black and white; the Liquor Act (1927) prohibited the consumption of alcoholic beverages in facilities for whites by non-white persons. This information is from various sources; see for example, Peter Joyce, The Rise and Fall of Apartheid (Cape Town: Struik, 1990), pp.8-13, for a more complete description.
38. Stephen Black, Helena's Hope, Ltd., adapted by Stephen Gray, in Three Plays, p.127, and Gray, "Introduction", p.33.
39. Gray, "Our Forgotten Drama", 46.
40. Gray, "Introduction", p.29.
41. Ibid., p.41.
42. Vandenbroucke, Truths the Hand Can Touch, pp.47-48.
43. Ibid., p.56. Quoted from the Anti-Apartheid Movement declaration, London, 25 June 1963.

44. Quoted in Gray, "Desegregating the theatre", 11. Small was, incidentally, permitted to attend the premiere by special dispensation.
45. These productions were reviewed in the Weekly Mail, 26 March - 1 April 1993, the first by Bafana Khumalo in "Downside up, upside down" (p.33) and the second by Ferial Haffajee in "The Blinkards" (p.40).
46. Quoted in Elliott, The Power of Satire, p.242. Elliott attributes the quotation to Plomer, other scholars to Campbell and Plomer; for example, see Peter Alexander, Roy Campbell: A Critical Biography (Cape Town: David Philip, 1982), p.52.
47. Quoted in Alexander, Roy Campbell: A Critical Biography, p.69.
48. Campbell, The Wayzgoose, p.250.
49. Ibid., pp.250-251.
50. Ibid., pp.251-253.
51. David Wright, Roy Campbell (London: Longmans, Green, 1961), p.16.
52. Roy Campbell, "Holism", in Collected Poems, p.197.
53. Anthony Delius, The Last Division (Cape Town: Human and Rousseau, 1959), pp.30-31.
54. Adey, Beeton, Chapman, Pereira, comps., Companion to South African English Literature, p.182.
55. Bosman's use of the Marico district as a literary device to create a fabular account of South African society is discussed in Martin Trump, "The Short Fiction of Herman Charles Bosman", in Herman Charles Bosman, ed. Stephen Gray (Johannesburg: McGraw-Hill, 1986), pp.164-178.
56. Bosman, Drama en Toneel in Suid-Afrika, p.102.
57. Reported in Seidenspinner, Exploring the Labyrinth, p.34.
58. Quoted in "Weekly Mail Closed", Index on Censorship 17(December 1988), 6. The story of the alternative press is reviewed in Shaun Johnson, "'Barometers of the Liberation Movement': a history of South Africa's alternative press", Media Development 32 (3/1985), 18-21.
59. The Cambridge Guide to World Theatre, ed. Martin Banham (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), p.171.
60. Quoted in Leila Patel, "How small media can organise communities", Media Development 32 (3/1985), 13.
61. A digest of these Acts (up to 1975) are to be found in Gerald Gordon, "South Africa's censorship laws", Index on Censorship 4 (Summer 1975), 38-40, and

- Jeanne Marie Colleran, The Dissenting Writer in South Africa: A Rhetorical Analysis of the Drama of Athol Fugard and the Short Fiction of Nadine Gordimer (Ann Arbor: UMI, 1991), Chapter 3.
62. For a comprehensive account of the restrictions imposed on South African media, see Madi Gray "Coercion, control and censorship", Media Development 32 (3/1985), 25-27. The details on press restrictions are gleaned from this source.
 63. Quoted in Uys, P.W. Botha In His Own Words, p.111.
 64. Pieter-Dirk Uys, "Time Is Not On Our Side", Face to Face (Durban: Durban Arts Association, 1992), p.16. The processes of hegemonic control as postulated by Antonio Gramsci are derived from numerous sources; in particular, this writer acknowledges David L. Sallach, "Class Domination and Ideological Hegemony", The Sociological Quarterly 15 (Winter 1974), 38-50.
 65. Further articles which deal with recent press controls, all in Index on Censorship, include "Legislation controlling the media" 15 (July 1986), "Pretoria's new press controls" 16 (February 1987) and "What the papers don't say" 17 (March 1988). The Publications and Entertainments Act of 1963 made no provision for an official list of banned items. In terms of the 1974 Act, the Directorate of Publications annually publishes all banned items in the Government Gazette.
 66. André Brink, Mapmakers: Writing in a State of Siege (London: Faber and Faber, 1983), pp.233-234.
 67. *Ibid.*, p.234.
 68. Quoted in Anthony Akerman, "'Prejudicial to the Safety of the State': Censorship and the Theatre in South Africa", Theatre Quarterly 7 (28/1977-1978), 54. The information on the Publications Appeal Board is from this source and from R.E. Goldblatt, "Censorship", Standard Encyclopaedia of Southern Africa, 12 (Cape Town: Nasou, 1976), pp.52 and 54; and Gilbert Marcus, "Blacks treated more severely", Index on Censorship 13 (December 1984), 14-21. The decisions of the Publications Appeal Board are derived from J.C.W. van Rooyen, Censorship in South Africa (Cape Town: Juta, 1987).
 69. Junction Avenue Theatre Company, The Fantastical History of a Useless Man (Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1978), p.14.
 70. Brink, Mapmakers, p.213.
 71. Quoted in Heather Sutton, "Nat. Councillor slams Leslie show as 'Un-Afrikaans'", Sunday Express, 3 June 1973, p.4.
 72. Quoted in Keyan G. Tomaselli, "Ideology and Censorship in South African Film", Critical Arts 1 (June 1980), 1.
 73. Van Rooyen, Censorship in South Africa, pp.3-4.
 74. Nadine Gordimer, "New Forms of Strategy - No Change of Heart", Critical Arts 1 (June 1980), 27-28.

75. The manner in which external pressures have interacted with internal developments in the crisis in South Africa in the 1980s, and the nature and results of the government's attempts to resolve this through a programme of reform are examined in South Africa in Crisis, ed. Jesmond Blumenfeld (Beckenham: Croom Helm, 1987).
76. Gray, "Coercion, control and censorship", 25-26.
77. Ibid., 26.
78. Steadman, "The other face", 27-28. The example of Maponya's Dirty Work and Gangsters is from the same source, 26.
79. Quoted in Martin Orkin, Drama and the South African state (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1991), p.1.
80. Ibid., p.4.
81. Pieter-Dirk Uys, A Part Hate A Part Love (Johannesburg: Radix, 1990), p.vi.
82. Van Rooyen, Censorship in South Africa, pp.90-91.
83. Ibid., pp.99-100.
84. Kirby, It's a Boy!, p.49
85. Reported in Van Rooyen, Censorship in South Africa, p.104.
86. Gray, "Introduction", p.32.
87. Gray, "The Theatre of Stephen Black", pp.107-108.
88. Reported in Pat Schwartz, The Best of Company: The Story of Johannesburg's Market Theatre (Johannesburg: Ad. Donker, 1988), p.90.
89. "Ridicule of Afrikaner not to be 'overdone'", Natal Mercury, 24 October 1978, p.7.
90. Reported in Van Rooyen, Censorship in South Africa, pp.80 and 123.
91. See Gray, "Coercion, control and censorship", 27.
92. Uys, Beyond the Rubicon, p.119.
93. Reported in Sutton, "Nat. Councillor slams Leslie show as 'Un-Afrikaans'", p.4.
94. Reported in Schwartz, The Best of Company, p.90.
95. This fact is also stated on the front-flap of the published version.
96. Adey, Beeton, Chapman, Pereira, comps., Companion to South African English Literature, p.25.

97. See Van Rooyen, Censorship in South Africa, pp.9, 14-15, 56-57, 66 and 77 for an account of the Magersfontein, O Magersfontein banning and unbanning, and the legislature introduced as a result of the case.
98. See Winstanley, "South Africa's Enigmatic Political Realities", Chapter 3, for an analysis of Hope's achievements in combining political comment and satirical observation in Kruger's Alp.
99. For details of the 'Information Scandal' see Winstanley, "South Africa's Enigmatic Political Realities", pp.47-48, and T.R.H. Davenport, "The Apartheid Debacle, 1961-1990", in A New Illustrated History of South Africa, ed. Trewhella Cameron (Johannesburg: Southern, 1991), Chapter 20.
100. "Stage Satire on Info Scandals", Natal Mercury, 27 March 1979, p.8.
101. Van Rooyen, Censorship in South Africa, p.101.
102. Quoted in Tony Mitchell, Dario Fo: People's Court Jester (London: Methuen, 1984), p.9.
103. Steadman, "The other face", 26.
104. Gray, "Coercion, control and censorship", 26.
105. This information is derived from Keyan G. Tomaselli, "Progressive film and video in South Africa", Media Development 32 (3/1985), 15-17.
106. Reported in Ivor Powell, "Sunrise saves it all for the censors", Weekly Mail, 20-26 May 1988, p.21.
107. Reported in Mark Gevisser, "Last Temptation of the censors", Weekly Mail, 23-29 October 1992, p.32.
108. Leslie's comment is quoted in Desmond Blow, "Adam Leslie ill as new show opens", Sunday Times, 27 April 1975, page number unknown.
109. "Capab says banned play slurs English", Natal Witness, 22 November 1979, p.2.
110. Cited in Gray, "Coercion, control and censorship", 26.
111. Jeremy Taylor, Ag Pleez Deddy! (Pretoria: Jeremy Taylor Publishing, 1992), p.10.
112. Ibid., p.30.
113. For these details, see Orkin, Drama and the South African state, pp.1-2. The difficulties facing black theatre practitioners are documented in, besides the works by Steadman, Brink, Marcus and Orkin already referred to in this work, Dorothy Driver, "Control of the black mind is the main aim of censorship", South African Outlook, June 1980, pp.10-11; Daniel P. Kunene, "Ideas under arrest: censorship in South Africa", Research in African Literatures 12 (Winter 1981), 421-439;

- Beatrice Hollyer and Carola Luther, "Five Playwrights", Index on Censorship 14 (February 1985), 28-30; David B. Coplan, In Township Tonight! (Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1985); Ian Steadman, "Stages in the revolution: black South African theater since 1976", Research in African Literatures 19 (Spring 1988), 24-33.
114. Adey, Beeton, Chapman, Pereira, comps., Companion to South African English Literature, p.104. The details of the oral-performance poets is also derived from this source.
 115. These ideas were articulated by Dr Allan Boesak in 1985, and are quoted in Orkin, Drama and the South African state, p.224.
 116. Percy Mtwa, Mbongeni Ngema, Barney Simon, "Introduction", Woza Albert! (London: Methuen, 1983), p.v.
 117. *Ibid.*, p.73.
 118. *Ibid.*, pp.76 and 79.
 119. Quoted in Schwartz, The Best of Company, p.100.
 120. Quoted in Gordimer, "New Forms of Strategy - No Change of Heart", 32.
 121. *Ibid.*
 122. Theatre forms of the 1980s which demonstrate these aspects of collaborative activity and participation are described in detail in Ian Steadman, "Collective Creativity: Theatre for a Post-Apartheid Society", in Rendering Things Visible, ed. Martin Trump (Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1990), pp. 307-321.
 123. Zakes Mda, "Theatre for Liberation", Media Development 32 (3/1985), 21.
 124. Gordimer, "New Forms of Strategy - No Change of Heart", 27.
 125. Uys, "Time Is Not On Our Side", p.18.
 126. Quoted in David Nathan, The Laughtermakers: A Quest for Comedy (London: Peter Owen, 1971), p.82.
 127. The features of these forms have been gleaned from Appignanesi, Cabaret; Mander and Mitchenson, Revue; Nathan, The Laughtermakers; John Russell Taylor, The Penguin Dictionary of Theatre; Hartnoll, The Oxford Companion to the Theatre; Roger Wilmut, Kindly Leave the Stage!: The Story of Variety (London: Methuen, 1985). The information on South African practitioners and theatres and of performers who visited South Africa is derived from research in the archives of the Daily News and the Natal Mercury in Durban and the Star in Johannesburg; Arnold Benjamin, Lost Johannesburg (Johannesburg: Macmillan, 1979); Peter W. Bode, "A History of South African Theatre, Part 3", Scenaria, January - March 1981, pp.37-38; Thelma Gutsche, "Vaudeville and Music-Hall", Standard Encyclopaedia of Southern Africa, 11 (Cape Town: Nasou, 1975), pp.179-181; Robert Lang, comp., The Stage Door Cookbook, second ed. (Johannesburg: The

- Limelight Press, 1980); Malcolm Woolfson The Long Road that led towards the Natal Playhouse (Durban: Natal Performing Arts Council, 1986).
128. Tynan, "A Gap Defined: 1960", pp.301-303.
 129. Quoted in Mander and Mitchenson, Revue, p.34.
 130. Sheridan Morley, A Talent to Amuse: A Biography of Noël Coward (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1974), p.148.
 131. Quoted in John Lahr, Coward the Playwright (London: Methuen, 1982), p.103. This writer acknowledges Lahr's response to Coward's views on politics and entertainment.
 132. Ibid.
 133. Ibid., p.109.
 134. Mander and Mitchenson, Revue, p.36.
 135. Roger Wilmut and Peter Rosengard, Didn't You Kill My Mother-in-Law? : The Story of Alternative Comedy in Britain (London: Methuen, 1989), p.xiv.
 136. This information is derived from Donald Inskip, Stage by Stage: The Leonard Schach Story (Cape Town: Human and Rousseau, 1977), pp.78-80.
 137. These facts are contained in Vivien Allen, Du Val Tonight! : The Story of a Showman (Worcester: Square One, 1990), pp.73-74.
 138. Wilmut, in Kindly Leave the Stage!, discusses the reasons why such comics were popular on pp.13-16.
 139. Quoted, *ibid.*, p.14.
 140. See Allen, Du Val Tonight!, pp.73-76, for details of Du Val's presentation of Odds and Ends in Durban.
 141. Benjamin, Lost Johannesburg, p.32. Gutsche dates the opening as 1896 in "Vaudeville and Music-Hall", p.179.
 142. Taylor, Ag Pleez Duddy!, pp.47-48.
 143. Stated in Wilmut, Kindly Leave the Stage!, p.13.
 144. Benjamin, Lost Johannesburg, p.32.
 145. *Ibid.*, p.1. Bode, however, in "A History of South African Theatre, Part 3", p.37, claims that "nowhere in South Africa has there since been a nest of so many entertainers" as in Kimberley in the 1870s and 1880s.
 146. The information on the Criterion Theatre is contained in Woolfson, The Long Road, pp.8, 9 and 15, from which the 1926 programme is quoted.

147. Dennis Schaffer, "The First Theatre in Natal", South African Theatre Journal 3 (May 1989), 36.
148. Wilmot, Kindly Leave the Stage!, p.16.
149. Quoted in Benjamin, Lost Johannesburg, p.34.
150. Quoted in Woolfson, The Long Road, pp.16-17.
151. In Britain, for example, 126 000 television licenses were issued in 1949; by 1960 the figure stood at over ten million. Cited in Wilmot, Kindly Leave the Stage!, p.160. The information on the decline of variety is from this source.
152. These tributes are from various newspapers, principally Raeford Daniel, "Final Curtain for 'Mr Satire' ", Star, 26 April 1979, p.3, and Bill Edgson, "The Lights go out for Adam Leslie", Citizen, 27 April 1979, p.2.
153. Leslie, programme note in Satire, Schmatire, which opened at the Adam Leslie Theatre in March 1974.
154. Joan Blake, from a personal interview. All quotations by Blake, unless indicated otherwise, are from this interview. Blake kindly supplied material from the original Two's Company; only a few items exist and the rest were fragments quoted from memory. Additional material was supplied by Robert Leslie who controls the rights and to whom acknowledgement is given. All quotations by Robert Leslie are extracted from a personal interview.
155. Ivor Jones, "Another Ovation for Satirical Revue", Cape Times, 18 August 1960, p.12. Jones is describing the first run in Cape Town in his second review of Two's Company.
156. Godfrey Le May, Black and White in South Africa (London: MacDonald, 1971), p.103.
157. In his speech, Harold Macmillan spoke of the 'winds of change' blowing through Africa, and warned the South African government that it could no longer rely on British support, either in the Commonwealth or in the United Nations. South Africa, he stated plainly, had become a source of political embarrassment. He called for a policy based, not on racial discrimination, but on individual merit. Information from Le May, Black and White in South Africa, p.109.
158. For further information see Vic Alhadeff, A Newspaper History of South Africa, second ed. (Cape Town: Don Nelson, 1986), p.80.
159. The newspaper front pages referred to in this work are to be found in Alhadeff, A Newspaper History of South Africa.
160. Jones, "Another Ovation for Satirical Revue", p.12.
161. These thoughts are extracted from an anonymous and untitled review kept by Blake in a scrapbook.

162. Copies of the first version of this monologue do not appear to exist. The extract quoted is from one used in a later revue, in all probability Hair Hair (1970) or Group Hairier (1973).
163. Quoted in Joyce, The Rise and Fall of Apartheid, p.40.
164. Quoted in 'Catullus', "A genius within clamouring to get out", Star, 18 January 1969, page number unknown.
165. Leslie, in an anonymous and untitled interview, Natal Mercury, 24 March 1966, page number unknown.
166. Quoted in Joyce, The Rise and Fall of Apartheid, p.44.
167. The information on the National Union was kindly supplied by Ray Swart, former member of parliament of the Progressive, later the Progressive Reform Party, and then the Progressive Federal Party. P.W. Botha's position is derived from Dirk and Johanna de Villiers, P.W. (Cape Town: Tafelberg, 1984), pp.39-40.
168. Jones, "Another Ovation for Satirical Revue", p.12.
169. Quoted in Le May, Black and White in South Africa, p.109.
170. Peter W. Bode, "A History of South African Theatre, Part 11", Scenaria, May 1982, p.48. Details of the Try for White production are to be found in Inskip, Stage by Stage, pp.60-68; King Kong in Robert Mshengu Kavanagh, Theatre and Cultural Struggle in South Africa (London: Zed Books, 1985), Chapter 6.
171. The incident is reported in Bode, "A History of South African Theatre, Part 11", p.48.
172. This information is from Mander and Mitchenson, Revue, pp.34-35, and Morley, A Talent to Amuse, pp.198-199.
173. Quoted in Jacqui Russell, comp., File on Coward (London: Methuen, 1987), p.89.
174. Quoted by Slavin, a dresser for Blake in Two's Company and costume and setting designer for Nothing Sacred (1962), in a personal interview with Slavin and Henderson, a dancer with the later versions of Two's Company and Nothing Sacred.
175. See Russell, File on Coward, p.89, and Noël Coward, "Foreword", in Mander and Mitchenson, Revue, pp.vii-viii, for Coward's views on what he termed 'Running Order'.
176. Robert Greig, "Folk menagerie", To The Point, 14 July 1973, p.32.
177. "Adam Leslie in New Venture", Daily News, 6 February 1967, page number unknown.

178. Doreen E. Greig, Herbert Baker in South Africa (Cape Town: Purnell, 1970), p.256. Further information on the Adam Leslie Theatre has been gleaned from Robert Leslie, who supplied photographs and certain specifications, and from Robert Lang, "These Theatrical Treasures are Unique", Star, 26 May 1973, p.17; Hazel Goldstein, "A Night Out in Jo'burg's Gay Past", Sunday Times, 10 September 1967, page number unknown; and Natalie Knight, "No reprieve: it's curtain down for Adam Leslie's theatre", Star, 23 January 1976, page number unknown.
179. This report was included in a programme note entitled "The Adam Leslie Theatre Story" for Adam's Follies (1974).
180. For Philips, Baker designed "Villa Arcadia" (1905), for Farrar, "Bedford Court" (1904) and for Lace, "Northwards" (1904). See Greig, Herbert Baker in South Africa, for further details.
181. Farrar and Phillips, with Colonel Frank Rhodes (brother to Cecil John Rhodes) and Hays Hammond were sentenced to death by the Transvaal High Court, presided over by Judge R. Gregorowski. Like those sentenced to imprisonment, however, they were allowed to ransom themselves. (See Eric Rosenthal, Gold! Gold! Gold!: The Johannesburg Gold Rush (New York: Macmillan, 1970), for further details.)
182. Greig, Herbert Baker in South Africa, p. 132.
183. *Ibid.*, p.257.
184. Tressi's clothing was discovered on the banks of the Wemmer Pan, Johannesburg. A verdict of suicide was returned at the inquest, but it was later reported that he had emigrated to the Argentine, probably with a pupil at the academy who disappeared at the same time. This information is from various sources; see, for example, Lang's "These Theatrical Treasures are Unique", p.17.
185. Astbury, The Space / Die Ruimte / Indawo, no pagination.
186. The information on the Players' Theatre is derived from Norman Marshall, The Other Theatre (London: John Lehmann, 1950), pp.216-217.
187. This information is derived from Benjamin, Lost Johannesburg, pp.1-4.
188. Percy Baneshik, "Tribute to Adam", Daily News, 28 April 1979, page number unknown.
189. Richard Beynon, "A disappointment", To The Point, 5 January 1974, p.41.
190. Greig, Herbert Baker in South Africa, pp.256-257.
191. Schwartz, The Best of Company, p.23.
192. The facts regarding Manim's purchase of the seats from the Adam Leslie theatre are reported in Schwartz, The Best of Company, p.56.

193. Stated by Leslie in "Eye satire from Adam", Daily News, 22 June 1976, page number unknown.
194. Lang, "These Theatrical Treasures are Unique", p.17.
195. Evelyn Levison, "First Lady of Fun gets a new Hair-Do", Sunday Express, 9 April 1972, p.21.
196. "Don't Stop the Carnival", Daily News, 12 April 1966, page number unknown.
197. Jeremy Taylor, interview with Carrie Curzon, "Ag Shame, It's Jeremy!", Sunday Times Magazine, 28 January 1990, p.52.
198. These observations are derived from a personal interview conducted with Taylor. Unless acknowledged otherwise, Taylor's comments have been extracted from this interview.
199. Stated in "Ag Shame, It's Jeremy!", p.52.
200. This information is from research undertaken at the archives of the Daily News, the Natal Mercury and the Star, from the personal interview with Taylor, and from his Ag Pleez Deddy!, pp.9-40.
201. Taylor, Ag Pleez Deddy!, p.9.
202. *Ibid.*, pp.35-37.
203. John Russell Taylor, "Wait a Minim", Plays and Players 11 (June 1964), 39.
204. Quoted, *ibid.*
205. Taylor, Ag Pleez Deddy!, p.33.
206. *Ibid.*, p.74.
207. *Ibid.*, pp.47, 42 and 54-55.
208. *Ibid.*, p.16.
209. *Ibid.*, p.23.
210. *Ibid.*, pp.121 and 113. See the same source for "Arme Mense", pp.103-104.
211. See "Soweto Talking Blues", *ibid.*, pp.116-121. "I am P.W., I am!" is to be found in the same source, pp.133-136.
212. Ann Corley, "Wait a Minim", Theatre World 60 (June 1964), 5.
213. Brigid Keeley, "Oh, Jeremy", Daily News Tonight, 8 February 1990, p.1.
214. Michael Coulson, "Vintage Taylor", Cue, 4 July 1991, p.1.

215. Taylor, Ag Pleez Deddy!, p.136.
216. Kirby's comments are extracted from a personal interview. Unless acknowledged otherwise, all quotations are from this source.
217. Quoted by Raeford Daniel, "A more benign edge to Kirby bite", Weekly Mail, 11-17 October 1991, p.28. The quotation is from Hamlet, III, ii, 220.
218. Robert Kirby, interview with Ilse Biel, "There's more to Kirby than the 'S' word", Daily News Tonight, 11 November 1988, p.3.
219. Quoted in the foreword (by Peter Reynolds) to Kirby's Trebor Ybrik Versus the Rest, p.9.
220. Tynan, "A Gap Defined: 1960", pp.301-303.
221. Appignanesi, Cabaret, p.173.
222. Nathan, The Laughtermakers, p.102.
223. The information on Sahl and Rogers is derived from an article entitled "The Third Campaign", Time, 15 August 1960, pp.56-60.
224. *Ibid.*, p.56.
225. *Ibid.*
226. *Ibid.*, p.57.
227. Kirby, Trebor Ybrik Versus the Rest, pp.56-57. For information on the Schlebusch Commission see T.R.H. Davenport, South Africa: A Modern History (Johannesburg: Macmillan, 1977), pp.307-310. It was Schlebusch who, as Minister of Internal Affairs in the late 1970s, proposed amendments to the Publications Act in 1978 to introduce a committee of experts to advise the Publications Appeal Board.
228. Kirby, Trebor Ybrik Versus the Rest, p.70.
229. Kirby, "Scenaria interviews Robert Kirby", p.11.
230. Kirby, Trebor Ybrik Versus the Rest, p.36.
231. *Ibid.*, p.72.
232. The incident is reported in Treen, "Satire, South African Style", p.47.
233. Robert Kirby, interview with Pnina Fenster, "Robert Kirby: Braai the Beloved Country", Sunday Times, 3 December 1989, p.8.
234. Kirby, Trebor Ybrik Versus the Rest, p.50.
235. Kirby, "Scenaria interviews Robert Kirby", p.12.

236. See William Pretorius, "Kyk net hoe lyk ons twee stouterds nou!", Rapport, 28 June 1981, p.26. Pretorius reviewed Academy Rewards (he titled it Academy Awards) by comparing the approach of Kirby and Uys with regards to characterization in particular. The comments are presented in translation.
237. Kirby, "Scenaria interviews Robert Kirby", p.12.
238. Quoted in "Kirby slams picketers", Star, 29 January 1987, p.2.
239. Beverly Brommet, "Satirical look into academe", Cue, 2 July 1991, p.1.
240. Humphrey Tyler, "Theatre", Sunday Tribune Today, 29 October 1989, p.7.
241. Robert Kirby, interview with Sam Sole, "It's a cruel business admits satirist Kirby", Sunday Tribune, 5 November 1989, p.14.
242. Kirby, Trebor Ybrik Versus the Rest, p.16.
243. Reported in Robert Greig, "Kirby finally buries sunny South Africa", Star, 21 December 1978, p.15.
244. Robert Kirby, "Kirby vs Kirby", Sunday Tribune Today, 17 June 1990, p.5.
245. The information on 'alternative' or 'new wave' comedy has been derived from various sources, principally Appignanesi, Cabaret, Chapter 10, and Wilmut and Rosengard, Didn't You Kill My Mother-in-Law?, Introduction and Part One.
246. Wilmut and Rosengard, Didn't You Kill My Mother-in-Law?, p.xiv.
247. Since the late 1960s in Germany, the most innovative cabaret performers based their critique of society on Marxist lines, advocated revolutionary upheaval and experimented with new forms such as Documentary Cabaret (which is based on facts and combines sung statistics, slides and film excerpts with monologues and sketches).
248. The information on the Black Sun is derived from Jeff Zerbst, "A third incarnation for the Black Sun", Weekly Mail, 15-21 November 1991, p.27.
249. The writer interviewed Mark Banks during the run of We're Not On Top, We're Inside; the latter's views and comments, unless acknowledged otherwise, are extracted from that interview.
250. Mark Banks, interview with Penny Smythe, "Penny Smythe talks to Mark Banks", Fair Lady, 8 November 1989, p.115.
251. *Ibid.*, p.118.
252. John Campbell, "Bankable assets", Weekly Mail, 12-18 March 1993, p.24.
253. Mark Banks, interview with Marianne Thamm, "A joke is at someone's expense. All pay here", Weekly Mail, 15-22 June 1989, p.24.

254. Ibid.
255. These examples are cited in Marianne Thamm, "Down go sacred cows left, right and centre", Weekly Mail, 23-30 June 1989, p.26, and Campbell, "Bankable Assets", p.24.
256. Banks, "Penny Smythe talks to Mark Banks", p.116.
257. Brigid Keeley, "A Room with a Revue", Daily News Tonight, 8 December 1989, p.1.
258. Quoted in Campbell, "Bankable Assets", p.24.
259. The writer is indebted to Campbell, "Bankable Assets", p.24, for these observations regarding Banks.
260. Ibid.
261. Banks, "Penny Smythe talks to Mark Banks", p.115.
262. Reported by Tony Karon, "Laughing when it hurts most", Weekly Mail, 17-23 July 1992, pp.30 and 32.
263. Kenneth Tynan, "Lenny Bruce", in Profiles, p.191.
264. Fraser, "Frazer's Edge", p.90.
265. Rob Amato, "Peeping through the fringe to the mainstream", Weekly Mail, 22-28 July 1988, p.27.
266. Reported in Paola Nanni, "Ian Fraser", Cosmopolitan, November 1988, p.32.
267. Quoted in Fraser, "Frazer's Edge", p.90, and Shaun de Waal, " 'The Poet' makes a pact over new show", Weekly Mail, 27 October - 2 November 1989, p.26.
268. Fraser, "Frazer's Edge", p.90.
269. Ian Jennings, "Look Back in Panga", Cue, 10 July 1992, p.3.
270. Fraser, "Frazer's Edge", p.89.
271. Reported in Thomas H. Arthur and Michael D. Arthur, "The 1992 Grahamstown Festival", South African Theatre Journal 7 (May 1993), 96.
272. Ian Fraser, interview with Raeford Daniel, "Not even success will tame Fraser", Weekly Mail, 29 November - 5 December 1991, p.29.
273. Quoted in De Waal, " 'The Poet' makes a pact over new show", p.26.
274. These examples are derived from various sources, including productions of One Man One Pizza and Look Back in Panga at the National Arts Festival in 1991 and 1992. The last is from "Frazer's Edge", p.89.

275. Tony Jackman, "Fast-food Don Fraser", Cue, 4 July 1991, p.3.
276. For an extended analysis of the techniques of stand-up comedy, see Judy Carter, Stand-Up Comedy: The Book (New York: Dell, 1989).
277. Fraser, "Frazer's Edge", p.90.
278. Said by Fraser in performance in One Man One Pizza.
279. Fraser, "Frazer's Edge", p.90.
280. Laurence Olivier, On Acting (London: Sceptre, 1987), p.137.
281. Ibid.
282. Quoted in Karon, "Laughing when it hurts most", p.32.
283. Quoted in Garson, "The funny man who is not amused", p.9.
284. Gilda Blacher, interview with Celia Wren, "Suzette's a mixture of theatre and stand-up", Weekly Mail Supplement to the Standard Bank National Arts Festival, 21-27 June 1991, p.5.
285. Quoted in Alex Dodd, interview with Irene Stephanou and Gilda Blacher, "A matter of laugh or death", Weekly Mail, 26 March - 1 April 1993, p.35.
286. Ibid.
287. Paul Slabolepszy, from a talk delivered at the Department of Speech and Drama at the University of Natal, Durban, on 31 August 1989.
288. Paul Slabolepszy, interview with Ian Steadman, "A language liberated through rock 'n roll", Weekly Mail, 9-15 December 1988, p.32.
289. John Campbell, "Paul's anatomy of machodom", Weekly Mail, 15-21 November 1985, p.20.
290. Steadman, "A language liberated through rock 'n roll", p.32.
291. This ability has been noted by various reviewers. See for example, John Campbell, "Smallholding an absorbing view of local trends" Weekly Mail, 1-7 December 1989, p.24, to whom this writer is indebted for the ensuing observations.
292. Steadman, "A language liberated through rock 'n roll", p.32.
293. Paul Slabolepszy, Saturday Night at the Palace (Johannesburg: Ad. Donker, 1985), p.75.
294. Campbell, "Paul's anatomy of machodom", p.20.

295. These translated observations by Hennie Aucamp are from his introduction to Die Lewe is 'n Grenshotel (Cape Town: Tafelberg 1977), pp.9-10.
296. Uys, No One's Died Laughing, p.22.
297. The information is derived from various sources, including Annelize Visser, "Boere is bakgat!", Cosmopolitan, December 1989, pp.162-164 and 187, and Carol Coetzee, "The Alternative Afrikaners", Sunday Times Magazine, 16 July 1989, pp.24-26.
298. Coetzee, "The Alternative Afrikaners", p.24.
299. Quoted in Visser, "Boere is bakgat!", p.162.
300. Johannes Kerkorrel, interview with Glynis O'Hara, "It's not just what the okes say, man", Weekly Mail, 9-15 December 1988, p.32.
301. André Letoit, interview with Ivor Powell, "Letoit, the unblushing Afrikaffer goblin", Weekly Mail, 27 January - 2 February 1989, p.23.
302. Ibid.
303. These views are stated by Powell, *ibid.*
304. Reported in Arthur Goldstuck, "Back from behind the times", Weekly Mail 30 October - 5 November 1992, p.33.
305. Coetzee, "The Alternative Afrikaners", p.24.
306. Cited in Visser, "Boere is bakgat!", p.164.
307. Ibid.
308. Coetzee, "The Alternative Afrikaners", p.26.

CHAPTER 4

PIETER-DIRK UYS: SATIRIC PLAYWRIGHT AND PERFORMER

"We are sick and tired of being represented as thugs. I want to warn those who continue to besmirch our public representatives that if they continue in this way they will unleash forces of which the end results cannot be foreseen."

- P.W. Botha, in the House of Assembly,
7 December 1978.¹

4.1 The concerns of the plays: demythologizing past, present and future

4.1.1 The differences between the plays and the revues

Uys makes clear distinctions between his plays and revues. As discussed in Chapters 1 and 3, topical revues arise from and reflect a current situation. That demand is their limitation: "My revues mustn't last," Uys believes, "They must go, here-today and gone-tomorrow, as events and attitudes change."² The only aspects of the revues between 1981 and 1992 which were retained were certain established personae whose characteristic qualities were maintained while their references to topical issues were necessarily altered. Nor were such issues parochial: while the revues were founded in the South African context, Uys adapted the material to the time and place of performance in the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Germany, Canada, the United States of America and Australia. With the exception of Just like Home (1989) his plays are all set in South Africa. He believes that the plays explore "the human condition against the chaos of political upheaval". Despite the fact that the plays are concerned with his own country, the situation "could be Chile, it could be Northern Ireland, it could be anywhere". As such, they can, he hopes, survive, "not for their politics, but for their totally recognizable human element".

On a subversive level, the revues served as daily news reports for a public denied access to or unaware of information. John Connor of City Limits interviewed Uys in London in 1986 after the declaration of the State of Emergency, and Uys expressed his desire to return to South Africa to tour Beyond the Rubicon as theatregoers attended his revues "to find out what's going on. With the news clampdown," he said, "I can still disseminate information as soon as I hear about it and put it in the show immediately."³

In the revues the audience viewed a large number of characters, each with a limited theatrical lifespan (Adapt or Dye was billed as a "one-man, three-woman, 20-politician show" in London in November 1985), whereas in the plays Uys presents a limited number of characters (seldom more than four) who appear for ninety minutes. The plays therefore provide the opportunity to develop character relationships, to use "an alphabet from A to Z"; the revues were limited to "L, M and N, the three letters in the middle". The plays are conventional, based on "the structure of the quote well-made play unquote".⁴

According to Astbury, in 1974 Selle Ou Storie

smashed its way into the consciousness of many young urban Afrikaners as they heard themselves speaking onstage for the first time. The conservatives hated the mixture of English and Afrikaans and the swearing. But for the others their playwright had arrived.⁵

Reviewers attested that the production was revolutionary. That it was so was not owing to experimentation in structure. Selle Ou Storie is conventional in the sense that the action takes place in a realistic setting, the situation presented is plausible, and the characters credible. Structurally, the first act has a climactic blackout, the second a dramatic resolution. The play is derivative, with discernible influences of Albee's Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf? and Fugard's People Are Living There (1968). Most of his plays observe the neo-classic unities of time, place and action. Uys himself describes it as "a Fifties play with a Sixties 'message' - banned in South Africa in the Seventies".⁶ That it was conventional was part of Uys's strategy: if audiences associated the play with the imported bedroom farces which dominated the commercial stage (albeit entirely in Afrikaans, initially), they would relax in the sense of familiarity. With "all defences

down," Uys stated at the time, "I'll let loose a phrase which catches them unawares and hurts".⁷

The revues followed no such prescriptions, not simply for the practical reasons discussed in the later section of this chapter on Uys's performance strategies, but also because he deliberately chose the form for its flexibility:

That's why I call them concerts. In Cry Freemandela I used the theatre of total grotesque: Thatcher played a South African policeman with a pig nose, Joan Collins was Winnie [Nomzamo Zaniwe Winnifred] Mandela, which took burlesque drag into absolute [Harold] Pinter, because when Winnie spoke it was absolutely real, there was no hint of drag comedy, she was just telling the story of her first visit to Pollsmoor Prison. It was the riskiest, most terrifying thing and it worked. I was attacked, especially by the critics. They said, "You can't do that." I said, why not? They said, "You can't mix styles. It doesn't work." I said, of course it works, it works perfectly, otherwise you wouldn't be so angry.

Uys regards the revues, with their structural and stylistic adaptability and the manner in which, like cabaret, they allowed the incorporation of music, songs and commentary, as the ideal vehicles for satire. He is aware of the limitations of revue in terms of characterization: the revues of 1981 - 1992 dramatized "headline issues" (conscription, forced removals, race classification) impacting on the lives of a spectrum of South Africans, but the plays permit those people to be more clearly "defined and dimensioned". Indeed this is Uys's major strength as a playwright: the creation of complex characters, predominantly women, from divergent linguistic or cultural or political backgrounds placed in a situation which reveals their difference in beliefs. The revues were, almost exclusively, intended to focus on himself as writer, director and performer. They remained his "children"; the plays, however, "must grow up and work for themselves". All his work is personal, arising from the fact that he is white, with an Afrikaner, Christian father and a Jewish mother. "I belong to both chosen peoples," he states, and claims not only that he can trace his genealogy to the family of Afrikaner heroes Pieter and Dirk Uys, but that his paternal grandmother's first cousin was the first Afrikaner Prime Minister Louis Botha, and that she sold the family farm to assist in the formation of the National Party in 1914. His mother, a German, fled from Berlin in 1938. Both plays

and revues reflect a sense of culpability, in that he "works through the problems that [his father's] people created" for him personally and for his characters.

There is a clear difference in the presentation of humour. Humour in the revues aimed to be cathartic, Uys believes. He purged himself by presenting his fears and guilt within the framework of a revue. Those who shared the same fears and guilt, by laughing at their embodiment on stage, were provided with the means to reduce their negative potential. This, the reduction of fear through laughter, and ridicule of what was topical and factual, were the "two dimensions in the satiric revues: it was as simple as white and black".⁸ The plays, he insists, are not comedies:

God's Forgotten is not a comedy, Paradise is Closing Down is not a comedy, but the comic element is the absurd horror of these ladies living in their bubble. In Panorama two schoolteachers look at the beautiful view of Cape Town [from Robben Island] because they want to forget about what is just behind them not one of my plays is funny, but the situations are: the situation of God's Forgotten is funny because they think everything is fine, in Paradise it's "Never mind, let's have fun, let's have dinner", in Panorama it's "Just look at the mountain, then we're alright". That is to me, the comedy of disappointment, it is Chekhovian. He [Anton Chekhov] presented a society that believed it was going to survive when it wasn't. That is funny.

What is laughable and lamentable is the manner in which characters view their situation and the disparity between their views and the reality beyond their limited vision. The three plays Uys refers to are set against a background of racial tension which, when it initially disrupts the lives of the characters, is an inconvenience: the difficulty of maintaining a dinner engagement in Paradise is Closing Down; the inconvenience of servants taking enforced leave in God's Forgotten; the number of people allowed in a room with a banned person in Panorama.

In the same way in which Chekhov presents a section of society (the country gentry in The Cherry Orchard (1904), for example) in transition, with the characters seemingly unable to alter the course of events, so too does Uys in a play such as God's Forgotten. The link with Chekhov is deliberate. In the first published version (1981) it was hinted at; in the revised version (1989) it is integral to the play. God's Forgotten reveals the memories

and aspirations of three daughters of an absent, then dead, father.⁹ They are, in effect, Chekhov's 'three sisters' witnessing the destruction of 'the cherry orchard', the family estate; in the context of the developing revolution their culture, their values and their ideologies are meaningless and doomed. Like Masha in The Three Sisters (1901), Sarah (the names of all three are syllabically similar) is the middle sister, the most outspoken and the most trapped: Masha by marriage, Sarah in a form of 'house arrest'. (Sarah had, however, played the role of Olga in a University production, and, like Olga, is a schoolteacher.) Aliza, like Irena, is not only the youngest, but is also the sister in whom great hopes were placed. Tosca, like Olga, is the eldest. Unlike Olga, however, Tosca lives in and for the present, a distorted present moulded by the past. She lives for and through her father and idealizes him to a god-like status. As in Chekhov, the father-figure is not present on the stage. Indeed, in all Uys's work to date the paterfamilias is an absent but omniscient presence, an unseen representative of a patriarchal society. Imogen, like Natasha, is the usurper who has established herself in this family, and at the conclusion is rearranging the rooms of the family home Excelsior.

In both Chekhov and Uys the characters are exiles in time as well as place, nostalgically recalling the past, while dreams of the future are gradually fractured. In the final moment of Chekhov's play Olga states: "The years will pass, and we shall all be gone for good and quite forgotten"¹⁰ In God's Forgotten that speech is placed earlier, as Sarah once again enacts her role of Olga; the future for Uys's three sisters is reflected in what Chebutykin sings after Olga's speech in Chekhov: "Tarara-boom-di-ay I'm sitting on a tomb-di-ay"¹¹ Throughout God's Forgotten, with its references to another play, there is an emphasis on pretence, a recurring theme of Uys's plays. Tosca says: "Pretend everything's normal."¹² Characters live in a fictional world, rejecting reality for illusion, maintaining a pretence of normality. In God's Forgotten they are even 'performed' by others in a theatrically staged funeral after the illusion of his Verwoerd-like death has been created. The historical lessons of the past remain as fictional as the world of Chekhov: when Imogen points out the "amazing similarity between his white Russians and you people", Sarah answers: "Not really. They lost their revolution."¹³

Uys has always been interested in history: "To me our past is very much the future in this country."¹⁴ The turmoil of South Africa at the time of production provided the headline issues personalized in the revues. The situation was presented from the standpoint of the victims (the sympathetically drawn, fictional black and white characters, such as the coloured man whose family was displaced by the Group Areas Act in various revues or the white conscript forced into the townships in Rearranging the Deckchairs on the S.A. Bothatonic), those who exploit or reinforce the situation (the unsympathetic, fictional characters, such as the kugel in various revues or the former security policeman in An Evening with Pieter-Dirk Uys) and the perpetrators of the ideological framework of the system (the unsympathetic, non-fictional characters, from Vorster to P.W. Botha to De Klerk, and including, in more recent revues, those unsympathetic, non-fictional characters who could replace the current system with a similarly repressive one: Winnie Mandela or Buthelezi). The early plays tend to explore the historical past whereas the revues documented the historical present of the production. In a programme note for The Rise and Fall of the First Empress Bonaparte (1977) Uys wrote that it is not simply "History [which interests him] primarily, but what lies behind History - the intrigues, the tears, the laughter and the reality that so often result as a footnote on page 678. It is the footnotes that create History." Josephine's 'fall' is depicted, not by documenting historical events, but by making time and place secondary to the theatrical exploration of the personal motives underlying two such footnotes: "He married Josephine de Beauharnais" and "He divorces his wife". In a sense the revues documented issues which existed only twenty-four hours, which were "here-today and gone-tomorrow"; the characters whose lives they influenced became footnotes to the social and political conditions in South African history.

4.1.2 The plays: 1974 - 1982

The revues demythologized the present; the early plays demythologize the past and the present in relation to the past. Selle Ou Storie, Karnaval and God's Forgotten explore the

beliefs of the white Afrikaner born into the system. In the programme for "A Season of 3 Bilingual South African Plays by Pieter-Dirk Uys" presented at the Outer Space in July and August 1975, Uys stated: "These three plays should be seen as a unity - like the colours of the Flag. [The programme cover reproduced the colours of the South African flag.] They are a representation of a certain section of white South Africa." In all three, the concept of the family, the cornerstone of white Afrikaans South African history and religion is revealed as false or disintegrating. In the revelation of wasted dreams and wasted potential the beliefs and values which reinforce the present are demythologized.

Uys referred to the satirical thrusts which "hurt" in Selle Ou Storie. This "hurt" and the imposition of an age restriction (on 10 December 1974) and subsequent ban on the text-script (on 27 June 1975) arose, from the evidence in the correspondence cited by Uys, from objections to the depiction of the situation not simply in Afrikaans, but an impure form (or, as Rufus informs his former lover Gregory in the play itself, concerning his use of Afrikaans, it is "verroes"), and to Uys's attempts to depict the Afrikaner as ridiculous.¹⁵ The notification received from the Publications Control Board cited all four clauses of Article 47(2). What was apparent from the banning of this work and of Karnaval (on 22 July 1975; it was viewed anonymously by a committee from the Directorate of Publications on 17 July), was that the reasons were not related to the maintenance of literary or artistic standards, but attempts to force theatre to conform to the prevalent political ideology and its religious and linguistic basis. The official notification of the banning of performances of Karnaval mentioned "unrefined and bawdy ... dialogue" and the fact that the decision was in keeping with "the constant endeavour of the population of the Republic of South Africa to uphold a Christian view of life".¹⁶

The section of the flag of "white South Africa" Uys presents in Selle Ou Storie is the "middle-class voter" who he described in the programme note as "the Silent Minority". The central character, Ester Viljoen, is one of the leading actresses of Afrikaans theatre and film, specializing in the portrayal of Voortrekker matriarchs (she is considering

playing in a film entitled Ons Ewige Gebergte; the title derived from Langenhoven's "Die Stem van Suid Afrika"), yet her life is a denial of the Calvinist ethic promoted in the films and plays. This rejection encompasses the conceptual foundations of that ethic: marriage, patriarchy, family-life, child-bearing and divine authority. Ester is unmarried, her younger lover is bisexual, she has had an abortion to prevent her career being jeopardized and, to her, "God is busy."¹⁷ The characters are, like many others, she says, "opdrifsels onder ons uitverkore volk".¹⁸

Karnaval, similarly, presents the flotsam of the chosen nation. The section of white South Africa depicted is the "poor witmense. They all can vote because of their skin colour; few bother. Votes don't pay the rent." What pays the rent is prostitution. None of the characters is fulfilled: physically, conjugal sex results in unwanted pregnancy (Phyllis and Boytjie), prostitution is a means of survival for young women from conservative rural backgrounds (Rita and Letitia); emotionally, secure relationships do not exist, although Dora believes she is the self-appointed custodian of the inhabitants of the Long Street boarding-house; spiritually, the concept of religion is exposed as hypocritical or non-existent.

What Uys exposes in these plays is, in fact, what the text-script of Selle Ou Storie and production of Karnaval were banned for: the failure of the Afrikaner to come to terms with the present rather than hypocritically uphold the values of the past which no longer exist. The values affirmed by the Ester Viljoen in her films, the person who has the maintenance of the ideology in her power, denies those values in her life and situation. As in her film world, so she and the other character in both Selle Ou Storie and Karnaval attempt to create fictional frameworks for their lives, seeking fulfillment through an avoidance of the reality of their situation, their insecurity and their loneliness, in evasion, illusion and self-deception. Karnaval takes place on New Year's Eve, a celebration of new resolutions and the death of the past, a time of revelry and a time to affect change. In the play pretences and facades are stripped away as the characters reveal their fears and

acknowledge the sordid quality of their existence. Ultimately, however, their vision of the New Year, the future, is one of unattainable illusions and a return to the past. From the relative superficiality of the games (a recurring word) in the opening sequence, Selle Ou Storie exposes the realities underlying the relationships through games which become increasingly destructive. Ester Viljoen is the first of Uys's protagonists to question the Calvinist ethic, not verbally as much as in her actions and beliefs. To Orkin: "In Fugard's as well as in Uys's plays, contestation against prevailing discourse is almost always expressed through women and this in a social order the ruling class of which is dominated by strongly patriarchal and Afrikaner Calvinist discourse."¹⁹

In God's Forgotten Uys examines, according to the programme note mentioned earlier, the "lawmakers" who perpetuate that discourse. The programme cover for the first performance of God's Forgotten at the Space in May 1975 featured a Cape Dutch facade and had, above the picture, the sentence: "God's Forgotten is a black comedy or a white tragedy - depending on whose side you're on." The interpretation of the title determines whether the play is a black comedy and a white tragedy or a white comedy and a black tragedy. Uys has deliberately left various possible interpretations open, for it depends "on whose side you're on". Whatever meaning adopted for the title, and hence the play, what is apparent is that God's Forgotten examines the notion of "an active sovereign God, who calls the elect, who promises and punishes", in Thomas Moodie's description of Afrikaner Calvinist belief.²⁰

The title, God's Forgotten could refer to those forgotten by God, God has forgotten, or God is forgotten.²¹ If the apostrophe in "God's" indicates the possessive case, there is a play on the difference between God's chosen people and God's forgotten people. Uys has, however, selected God's forgotten. The implications are either that God does not approve of the actions perpetuated in His name by the "lawmakers" and has abandoned them to their fate behind the security walls of Excelsior, or the forgotten could refer to the majority oppressed by those "Lawmakers". In either case, again, it would depend "on

whose side you're on". If the title echoes God's elect, or chosen people, it recalls the "promises" made on 16 December 1838, the date of the Battle of Blood River, and the covenant associated with that battle. That date, 16 December, was formerly designated 'Dingaan's Day' until 1952 when it was altered, significantly, to the 'Day of the Covenant' (which strengthens the association with God's elect, the biblical Israelites) and in 1980 to the 'Day of the Vow'.

From Paul Kruger until the 1980s, Afrikaner presidents, theologians and prime ministers made explicit comparisons between the history of the Israelites and that of the Afrikaners; furthermore, they claimed that the volk are the elect of God with a God-given destiny.²² Because of this destiny, Verwoerd asserted that white people, as Christians, must preserve their distinction from other races.²³ In the first published version of God's Forgotten, the father J.J. Brand, affirms both this belief and the pledge made before the Battle of Blood River (the victory, to Kruger, demonstrated that God had selected the Afrikaners to be His Chosen People of modern times).²⁴ Gudrun Vanbeck, his wife, (Imogen in the revised version) inadvertently switches on a recording of a speech by J.J. Brand in which he states:

We are white. We are right. We have always been right. Kneel and pray with me: the sacrifices made by our fathers, inspired by our faith in God and passed down to us, are our only heritage. We will defend, we will sacrifice our lives for the truth of our beliefs for God in His Wisdom is with us and all will be well with our land.²⁵

The context in which the speech is placed both reaffirms the link with the covenant and parodies it by the farcical situation: it is heard after a television replay of the 1967 rugby test match between the Springboks and the British Lions and a propaganda film in which a woman states that God had remembered her promise to pledge the lives of her sons for the future of the land.²⁶ Despite such pledges to God, South Africa is not remembered, is cut-off, isolated, forgotten, even in international sport. The elect are being punished.

If the title is interpreted as God is forgotten (in the present that is) the implication is that, in enforcing and justifying political hegemony on theological grounds, God's words have been manipulated and distorted and that the imminent destruction of this, and by extension, all white, Afrikaner families is His punishment for their failure to honour their vow.

The most pessimistic of the various interpretations is the perfect-tense-title, God has forgotten, as it implies that the present and future are futile, absurd even, for all South Africans, white and black.

Each of the daughters is an exponent of the three interpretations: Tosca, the Secretary for Information upholds the God's elect interpretation of the title, regarding herself, in her father's absence, as the political and spiritual representative of the theocracy, leading the chosen out of the "political wilderness" as a divinely appointed task; Sarah ironically claims that her father has joined "the Great White God on his segregated Cloud to celebrate the triumph of the Great South African Dream" and that Tosca "plays" God with human beings; to Aliza "South Africa has ceased to exist".²⁷

Excelsior is a claustrophobic world of stale political ideologies; Tosca, as their exponent, will not acknowledge alternatives: "It's old, it's musty, it's boring, it's impractical, but it's all we've got!" She says of her home.²⁸ Their disease is terminal, a "cancer inside", Sarah informs Gudrun.²⁹ The present generation will die out (there are no children to perpetuate the "chains" of the past) and with it the white tradition and heritage. To reinforce this, and to connect the past and the present, throughout the action the symbol of their culture (the "antique Cape-Dutch" furniture) is being eroded by borer, paralleling the cancer eroding Afrikaners and Nationalism from within; after the chairs the borer will attack "the floor", and the erosion will continue until the foundations of the ideology are demolished.³⁰ Before then, however, this "Familie" is "ideologically contaminated" and forgotten by the very mechanisms it has created to maintain its hegemony.³¹ The security

walls surrounding the Family, the home and the ideology, designed to both protect and isolate, are illusory safeguards. Excelsior becomes "a political prison", the next Robben Island which was "deleted from the official records" in the fictitious present of God's Forgotten.³² In the programme for the version presented in 1975 and in the 1989 revised text, the "time is the future in white South Africa".³³ God's Forgotten remains a prediction of the future but continues to reflect South Africa in the present, a present founded on the destructive philosophic-religious ideologies of the past.

In all these plays the characters live reduced lives in the present and appear unwilling to affect qualitative changes, or are unable to do so as most believe or convince themselves to be conditioned by events over which they had no control.³⁴ The future is seen as being a result of the present, the present as the result of the past and the past as unalterable. Nevertheless they express or are made aware of their culpability, complacency and inertia. Anna, the embittered Afrikaans radio-announcer in Paradise is Closing Down states:

Boredom. A national disease. The symptoms are the good things in life without the need to pay in blood dying pathetically of boredom. Life we shun because we've forgotten what to do with it. Rather hide behind our shells - our cars, clothes, cottages, because it's the only reference we're left with. The colour of our skin has become our sex and the trappings our appeal So cheers, Meide! I drink to us and our orange, white and blue heaven. Let's enjoy it while it lasts, very quietly.³⁵

Enforced change is already taking place: in the streets in Paradise is Closing Down, beyond the walls in God's Forgotten, on the mainland in Panorama. What the characters fear to lose is already lost, what they ignore will occur despite or without them. In Appassionata (1982) the same is true, outside the political sphere. Like Tosca, Maria Rousseau cannot conceive of or accommodate any point of view which is contrary to the controlling focus of her life. In this play it is her musical career, her "Appassionata". What Garth V. Green writes of Maria is as applicable to most of Uys's female characters: her "judgements, principles and habits of thought [are] all conditioned by insecurity and fear of failure" and she cannot or will not "adapt in a rapidly changing social and personal situation".³⁶ The self-delusion of whites is a recurring theme of the plays and

revues: paradise, in the manner in which whites experience it, is closing down yet reality seldom intrudes on their insular concerns. A perspective of the future is given, however, by the inclusion of a character who intrudes on or disrupts the social and political delusions of these 'families': Sandra in Selle Ou Storie, Gudrun Vanbeck (later Imogen) in God's Forgotten, Javanese Jumping Jack in Karnaval, the young man (later William, perhaps after the actor who first played the role, William Meyer) in Paradise is Closing Down and Sibi Makhale in Panorama. These intruders are either the most personally or politically aware or free of the pretensions and neuroses afflicting the other characters. They are both catalysts in the present and representatives of the future.³⁷

In an interview in 1990, Uys conceded that his early plays are "perverse", written from an antagonistic desire to "offend [his] roots".³⁸ The most "perverse" is Die Van Aardes van Grootoor. This epic boeredrama, as he described it in the programme for The Market production, spans fifty years, is presented in seven hundred and eighty episodes, five acts and both official languages. If the plays prior to 1977 were conventional, Die Van Aardes van Grootoor employed a different structure to overtly satirize the establishment and perpetuation of the concepts underpinning the political mythology of apartheid. The structure parodies a form which itself had played a formative role in the cultural development of white South Africans prior to the introduction of state-subsidized television, the radio soap opera.³⁹ All the conventions are present: time announcements, advertisements (for "Kux" toilet soap), theme music ("Rachmaninov's Eighteenth Variation of the Rhapsody on a Theme from Paganini"); voice-over narrative links, and, in content and style, sentimental melodrama performed with the utmost seriousness.

Die Van Aardes van Grootoor commences with Episode 4 in 1928 and introduces the family Van Aarde and their family farm, Grootoor, threatened by landowners, drought, floods, illness and the English. This episode is a parody of earlier melodramatic stage plays in which Afrikaner families were likewise threatened with the loss of their farms.⁴⁰ In language and content this play reflects and parodies the changes in style and concerns of

Afrikaans literature, popular music and social trends. Soap opera depends on the formulation of new intrigues among a relatively fixed set of characters and on the creation of increasingly sensationalistic 'cliff-hangers' to sustain interest. Uys ridicules these characteristics by making each episode increasingly absurd and shocking. In Episode 110 (1948) the family and farm are threatened by drought (again), fire, rape, illegitimacy and insanity; alcoholism, death and destruction in Episode 400 (1958); drugs, transvestism, perversion and lust in Episode 600 (1968); in the final episode, Episode 780 (set in 1978) they are once again threatened by drought, but also decadence, communists, liberals and plural solutions.⁴¹ By this episode the audience is aware that the degenerate and self-destructive Van Aarde family signifies the status quo. Furthermore, an English-speaking black woman, Prof Dr Daphne Quazilezi is revealed to be not only the granddaughter of the former family servant, but also the new owner of Grootoor who is claiming her birthright. The terminally ill Elana van Aarde, head of the family, destroys the family and farm and by extension, South Africa itself. The apocalyptic foreboding of God's Forgotten is grotesquely realized, but now, as Sheila V. Roberts states: "All are dispossessed: English, Afrikaans, and Blacks."⁴²

Uys's iconoclastic intent is also seen in the studied crudity of the text (for which the production was, in part, banned) and the deliberate flouting of the sexual mores of Calvinist discourse: drought and degeneracy are metaphors for the spiritual and moral sterility of the volk. In addition, in stage direction and dialogue the purity of "both official languages" is not sacrosanct (Uys created obscene-sounding Afrikaans words and phrases, or placed innocuous expressions in a new context, some to provoke the censors, such as "sensorsnit"), nor are the "heroes of the Afrikaner nation" (as stated by the Publications Appeal Board, cited in Chapter 3).⁴³ In its satire of the concepts of land, familie and volk, Die Van Aardes van Grootoor was the basis for Uys's subsequent revues; Info Scandals exposed the corruption of the nation's leaders and his first one-person revue, Adapt or Dye had the words "Ons Land, Ons Volk, Onslaught" displayed on the setting.

Reviewing a revival of Die Van Aardes van Grootoor (presented by Pact) in 1987, Temple Hauptfleisch was disturbed by its reception by members of the audience "as a popular farce rather than as a serio-comic commentary on Afrikaner history"; they laughed "at all the obvious points of racist language", rather than realizing "the more subtle points being made through the dynamic use of ... cultural symbols".⁴⁴ The question as to whether Uys's work reinforces racism by allowing audiences to laugh with rather than oppose racism by laughing at it will be addressed, rather than answered with finality, in the conclusion to this chapter.

4.1.3 The plays: 1987 - 1992

In 1987, in Panorama, Uys returned to the setting of God's Forgotten, Karnaval and Paradise is Closing Down and a cast dominated by women, two of whom refuse to acknowledge political change and wish to retreat into self-delusion. Cape Town (or more accurately, Robben Island) is his means to ironically indicate, once more, the self-imposed captivity of the country's nominally free whites. Excelsior, the Long Street boarding house, the cottage in Loader Street, the teacher's house on Robben Island are prisons for those who do not regard themselves as political activists and sanctuaries for those who wish to withdraw from reality. In God's Forgotten Aliza's lover, the black activist Joshua, is sent to Robben Island as a means to protect whites, whereas in Panorama Robben Island is the only place where whites feel protected. Grobbelaar, the warden, informs Karin: "Listen man, this is Robben Island, the safest place in the world!"⁴⁵ Past, present and future do not exist, politically, for the whites. In Panorama Robben Island is, like Excelsior in God's Forgotten, isolated, its black inmates are unable to communicate with the outside world because of their political beliefs and actions, while the white 'prisoners' who live and work on the island have no knowledge of political developments and regard that island as a retreat from the reality of any knowledge of those

developments; the existence of the two white teachers is as safe and as futile as that of the two goldfish 'imprisoned' in the bowl Uys mentions in the requirements for the setting.

In God's Forgotten Sarah, a former teacher, exposes the ideological indoctrination of Christian National Education: "We are white! We are right! ... Repeat after me, children. The decisions made by our fathers and inspired by God and passed down to us are our true heritage."⁴⁶ Rosa and Karin's political attitudes were formed by that 'hidden curriculum' and as teachers they, unlike Sarah, are perpetuating it. Karin, significantly, teaches history. Sibi, the banned activist, asks Rosa: "Beyond those terrible walls are tortured people, angry people, hating people, who will one day come out and get you.... Do you teach that?" to which she replies: "The prison walls are ideal to practise tennis against I teach the kids about culture and beauty and hope and love and a good life."⁴⁷

Sibi is the outsider, the catalyst who exposes their ingrained prejudices. Karin hides "valuables" and "checks the money in her bag" when Sibi leaves the room; she suggests using "the good plates" for dinner as she doesn't want Sibi to think they're "treating her like a black".⁴⁸ Comedy arises from the absurdity of such prejudices; farce from the absurdity of banning orders which restrict a detained person from being in the company of more than one other person, so the whites continually exit to avoid holding an illegal gathering in their sitting-room. Despite the quality of Sibi's education, the unrest it provoked has given her a consciousness of the political realities of the past, present and future. That future, it would seem, is in the hands of they physically restricted but intellectually liberated Sibi (she is, significantly, pregnant, the father a white), and not in those of the two whites who, at the play's conclusion, are straining to see the reassuring panorama of Table Mountain in the growing darkness, hoping "it will all be OK tomorrow".⁴⁹

Uys admits to deriving greater satisfaction from the "writing of plays ... than the shorthand of revues". Both can ridicule hypocrisy and prejudice and expose the reality

behind the facades adopted by the characters, but the plays allow for the presentation of a complete idea rather than the disparate and partial points of view necessitated by the "shorthand" of the revue format. During the 1980s, while Uys as performer concentrated on headline issues in the revues, Uys as playwright developed many of those into full-length plays: his most recent plays concentrate on dispossession and the meaning of 'home' for various race and language groups. However, these plays also explore human issues such as loneliness, separation, age and death, issues he believes inappropriate within revues with their blend of topicality, satire and predominantly two-dimensional characters.

Just Like Home concerns the dilemmas of exiles, South African in particular, living in London. The central character, Cathy September, was formerly a servant from Cape Town who emigrated with her white employers after paradise began closing down in 1976, but has now made a decision to return 'home'. (The character is based on a coloured woman from Athlone the Uys family met in the kitchen of an Indian restaurant in London in the late 1960s.) The title, Just Like Home, is an ironic reference to those British expatriates in South Africa who remain committed to the values, attitudes and conventions of home; here the values, attitudes and conventions of South African exiles are satirized. Cathy says of London: "I've never met so many South Africans fighting apartheid. Just think what they could have done if they'd stayed."⁵⁰

Even more so, the play explores the isolation of those in an environment which remains alien; home is more than a notional affiliation. Despite the liberties denied her in South Africa which are available to her in England, Cathy longs for the sights and sounds (including the Afrikaans language) of her home. Her nostalgic reminiscences are, sadly, for a paradise of the past, a paradise which no longer exists. The reality of the present and future become apparent with the arrival, on the eve of her return, of an outsider, from home, her nephew Trevor Juries. Unlike Cathy and her friends Hector Prince (a white conscientious objector who left South Africa to avoid conscription) and Gupta (an expatriate from India), he is a refugee, without a passport or money. Trevor is

determined to return home to continue the struggle for liberation. Ultimately, the dilemma facing Cathy is the choice between returning home or remaining an alien, freedom for herself or liberation for her home.

In a personal interview in 1988, Uys expressed his thoughts on the focus of satire in South Africa in relation to the focus elsewhere:

Satire in America is about the Culture of Money, satire in England is about the Culture of Class, satire in Germany is about the Culture of Discipline, but in South Africa it's about the Culture of Death: the death of the dream, the death of the mind, the death of the spirit.

Whites are as much victims of this culture as blacks and coloureds are of the system which has fostered it. Scorched Earth (1989) encompasses this focus by depicting dispossessed aliens in the country of their birth. The play, begun six years before, was completed in response to and to comment on the Borders of Particular States Extension Amendment Bill which granted more land to the Transkei and Ciskei 'homelands' in 1989. The title recalls Kitchener's ruthless 'scorched earth' policy during the Anglo-Boer War: the destruction of farmsteads, crops and animals and removal of Afrikaners to 'concentration camps' to remove all means of sustenance and support which might have aided the guerrilla fighters, the bittereinders. In Scorched Earth, however, the Afrikaners are forcing an English family off "World's End", the home and land of the Cartwright family, a paradise inherited in the past. The struggle to retain the heritage and lifestyle of the past is doomed for, despite the Cartwright's allegiance to the party in power, they have to leave their home in the interests of homeland consolidation. Lady Deborah Cartwright wishes to retain her paradise: her children were born and grew up on "World's End", her husband is buried there. But the younger generation wish to pursue their own dreams, have different values and priorities: the son-in-law, Dr Paul Bruwer, an adjunct-minister, is politically corrupt, the son, Christopher, a writer who, in the past, was committed to exposing corruption and injustice now blames the frequent banning of his work for his present ineffectuality. The daughter Catherine is an actress in England. Unlike Cathy September, she does not divulge her South African past and is one of those South Africans Cathy

referred to: those who oppose apartheid in England but not while in South Africa. To this generation, the past does not require to be demythologized; the past, in terms of their inheritance, is the material means to fulfill self-centred ambitions.

By 1992, with An Evening with Pieter-Dirk Uys, the style and content of Uys's revues had altered to include not only topical political and social comment, but a review of himself as performer, his craft and his past work in the theatre. In the same year Die Vleiroos was first presented and it too signified a change in his work. To Uys Die Vleiroos "puts politics in its place; not as a rottweiler in the front door, but rather as one of the pictures of social relevance on the back wall".⁵¹ The vleiroos (orothammus zeyphari Pappé) is one of the most rare and endangered of the South African protea species: only a few plants exist in virtually inaccessible areas in the mountains above Hermanus and Betty's Bay in the Cape Province. Its common name is derived from the fact that its leaves are enfolded in the form of a rose.⁵²

In Die Vleiroos Uys is concerned, again, with dispossession, not of the heritage of English-speaking South Africans, but of the Afrikaner; by association, a recurring idea in Uys's work, all South Africans are endangered. The play is written in Afrikaans; Uys states that he was relieved that he could use the language "matter-of-factly" and not "as a weapon against itself".⁵³ Both Scorched Earth and Die Vleiroos are set in beautiful environments, but in Die Vleiroos Uys indicates that it could be possible to co-exist peacefully on a human and natural level. Lizzie and Nedda, a coloured and a white, servant and mistress in the past, are now soul-companions. Nedda Barnard, a retired botanist whose main botanical interest was the vleiroos, is losing her memory; her support and means to retain her inner and outer worlds is Lizzie. The two are dedicated to maintaining a sane, natural existence. It is possible, Nedda contends, to discard facades and pretences in this environment; nevertheless Lizzie prevents her knowledge of the present which exists in the unnatural world outside their sanctuary by censoring the newspapers she reads to Nedda. As her inner world is threatened by approaching senility,

so is the future of the external world threatened by progress: a stranded oil-tanker is polluting the coastline before her home, a military road has passed through the settlement in which she lives, and mushroom-shaped clouds emanating from a secret missile testing site appear over the mountains behind her home.

The fragile vleiroos is threatened from within her family as well. Her son, Ferdinand, the spokesperson for progress, can only be rescued from financial extinction (after a disastrous involvement in devious property speculation in Pretoria) if Nedda assists him in securing the development of local property. That development is the valuable land on which the priceless vleiroos flourishes. Ironically, just as the military road has prevented fires from destroying local houses, whereas its destination, the missile base, is gradually destroying the flora and fauna, so developing the village will assist the local community while adding to the destruction of the flora and fauna. The older generation acquiesce in the hope for the betterment of the newer generation in the future. Ownership (of property and control of human beings) and dispossession (on various levels) are persistent concerns in Uys's plays, and these concerns are articulated by women. Die Vleiroos is Uys's depiction of the possibilities of and for human and natural, and social and political, change in an interregnum. As Marianne Thamm noted of the play, its "main concern is the fragility of life and the inevitability of death - death of the earth, death of the individual. Not death on a grand, morbid scale, but a series of little deaths which force the old to make way for the new."⁵⁴ Adaptation is inevitable, but not all will survive it. In depicting the time of transition between past and future generations, values and dispensations through the metaphor of the vleiroos, Uys presents his concerns regarding the moral, spiritual and political ambiguities of the present.

4.2 Playwriting strategies in the 1981 - 1992 revues

Die Van Aardes van Grootoor developed from a sketch in Uys's revue Strike Up The Banned (1975). That sketch was revised to become one of the episodes. Not only did the

idea for the play originate in a revue, but with its episodic format, its one-liner witticisms, its two-dimensional characters, its 'headline issues', its depiction of politicians (Uys himself impersonated P.W. Botha in a performance at the Laager at the Market in November 1978) and the manner in which it enables the cast of six to play more than one role, Die Van Aardes van Grootoor was the impetus for his one-person revues and the foundation for the fictional and non-fictional 'stock' of characters he portrayed himself between 1981 and 1992. The time at which Afrikaners could respond to the public ridicule of politicians coincided, Uys maintains, with the exposure of the activities of the Department of Information: "The politicians slid down our Boere Olympus on their big fat behinds and then people suddenly started laughing."⁵⁵

Uys's solo revues were a stimulus to and a reflection of the increasing popularity of one-person shows which presented single-, multiple- and 'non'-personae during the course of the 1980s.⁵⁶ His revues were characterized by three manifestations of the monologic form: fictional monologues, self-revelation and opinion, and the impersonation of non-fictional persons.⁵⁷ In all three Uys presented the thoughts or ideas of a single persona, whose discourse was a response to a situation, issue or policy (the headline issue) within a specific context.

4.2.1 The personae of the fictional monologues

Uys's fictional monologues, whether a repeated vignette (the prison warden's wife extolling the virtues of a detergent in Beyond the Rubicon) or self-contained discourse (Evita Bezuidenhout's speech on coping with a change in the status quo in the same revue), adopted the form of first-person presentation.⁵⁸ Generally the solitary persona provided all the necessary information and motivation as there were no other characters to create conflicting opinions. (Although only one person was present on stage, the influence or physical presence of others could be implied by focus (direct or indirect), by

mechanical means (the voice of the lawyer and security man in Beyond the Rubicon) or a property (the dummy in Rearranging the Deckchairs on the SA Bothatonic).

All that the audience discerned about the persona and what prompted the disclosure was contained within the fictional monologue. In this sense they were self-contained disclosures. The facts, the events and the issues discussed were delivered from a particular standpoint, a limited perspective. Although self-contained, they were, of necessity within a revue format, characteristic and characterizing episodes, each monologue the projection of a partial point of view rather than the illustration of a complete idea. Hence the fictional monologues generally commenced in medias res.

The desire, on the part of the persona, to accomplish a specific objective or action was present in some fictional monologues, but in all it could be said to be subordinate to the act of self-disclosure. Self-disclosure was a result of a need to respond to an issue or situation, but seldom led to a full awareness; it was prompted, more often, by a need to convince the unseen auditor or auditors. For example, in An Evening with Pieter-Dirk Uys, Swanepoel, a former police interrogator at John Vorster Square, attempted to convince and thereby placate a former detainee that the reason for his torture was because, he said, he "love[d] democracy" and did his job to "protect democracy": "I worked for your freedom, Benjamin, for this new South Africa."⁵⁹ Such monologues, and in particular the disclosures by unsympathetic personae, were more self-justificatory than self-questioning. With only a single perspective, there could be no conflict. The unseen auditor, Benjamin (situated in the audience) did not dominate; the audience could only know of his responses through Swanepoel's reactions; nevertheless those responses did not influence the purpose of the self-absorbed discourse.

Absorption in the limited perspective made self-revelation incidental to the fictional persona's purpose. The personae told their truth from what Uys describes as his commitment "to tell the truth". Judgement, like comedy, Uys would maintain, is in "the

beholder". As stated, Uys's monologues were characterized by the use of the first personal pronoun. The 'I' of the monologue was perceived as a persona in his own right, but simultaneously there existed a dual consciousness of the playwright's 'I' speaking through the persona, and in the unsympathetic monologues, speaking critically, insinuating blame or communicating his own attitude. The audience were always involved in the act of performance.

Furthermore, in the solo revues, the playwright was the performer of the personae, and appeared in his own persona as well. The sympathetically presented personae were, more or less indirectly, a vehicle for Uys's own views; judgement was indirect and depended upon the views of the individual spectator. At the other extreme, the unsympathetic personae, such as Swanepoel, condemned themselves by their justification of the unjustifiable.

What was not self-contained within the monologues was the audience's conative contribution, the knowledge of the event or policy which gave rise to the disclosure. The proclamation, on 11 February 1966, of District Six as a white area under the Group Areas Act informed the monologue of the coloured policeman in Beyond the Rubicon; as he stated, without further explanation, "Group Areas Act, ja I'm sure you've heard of it".⁶⁰ Criticism was insinuated in part by what the persona revealed himself and in part by what the audience knew of the effects of the proclamation.

The personae of the fictional monologues tended to focus their disclosure inward or outward, on themselves or on the audience. The mode of address in the first was semi-direct, in the second, more direct. This difference in focus was related to the types of fictional personae Uys created for his revues, who could be placed on a spectrum which ranged from those who engaged in indirect, personal disclosure to those concerned with direct, public address. An examination of two personae from either end of the spectrum of fictional personae will indicate the difference in modes of address and type of character.

The persona of "The Soldier in the Township", a monologue presented by Chris Galloway in Rearranging the Deckchairs on the SA Bothatonic, revealed his doubts and fears in the form of a confessional, his thoughts overheard. This monologue was characterized by self-analysis, with the speaker's attempt to discern the right point of view. He was, in a sense, acting upon himself: "They say what we're doing is right. Jesus I hope it's right. Because I can never one day say I didn't know what was happening."⁶¹ As a form of self-disclosure, this monologue was reflexive, the focus more indirect than direct, presented outwards but without direct verbal acknowledgement of the audience. This persona was of an ingenuous type, the innocent who could not grasp the full implication of the situation in which he was placed or into which he was forced by external circumstances.⁶² He could only describe a situation he himself did not fully comprehend. In revealing his inner doubts openly and frankly the soldier invited an understanding of his dilemma, and this implied a certain sympathy with him, a sympathy which suspended critical judgement of his actions.

Evita Bezuidenhout's monologue (she termed it a "lecture") in Beyond the Rubicon demanded the presence of auditors whose presence she acknowledged. She acted upon the audience in a form which was direct and explanatory: the monologue contained such phrases as "And that is why I say to you, my friends" and "I would now like to give you some important tips".⁶³ This persona lacked any sense of doubt or self-questioning; certain of her own rectitude and that of the cause she represented, Evita Bezuidenhout directed her focus outwards in an attempt to impress her particular viewpoints. The non-fictional persona who corresponded to the same type as Evita Bezuidenhout was P.W. Botha, as both aggressively sought to dominate their auditors and, like alazones, were concerned with their achievements and self-glorification. In their monologues the audience was necessary as a means to maintain their sense of self-importance and control; in that of the soldier the presence of the audience was necessary to his need for understanding and sympathy. Trust and respect were not necessary in the former, but were vital in the latter.

Clearly, unlike the soldier, such personae were presented as targets for satire or as the means by which satiric comment could be conveyed. And whereas the soldier focussed judgement upon himself, Evita Bezuidenhout was, in her commitment to her cause, oblivious of judgement. Where his self-disclosure was personal, her lecture shifted (as indicated by the change in pronoun from "I" to "We"), from personal speech to a general, communal mode in keeping with her solutions to a common condition (common, that is, to white South Africans). By a difference in the focus and style of presentation, Uys's monologues ranged from concern with the macro-political dynamic of the country to a concern with the micro-political dynamic of the individual, the person.

Uys was aware that he had to convince the audience of the actuality of these personae in order to secure engagement (if not sympathy in the case of the soldier in the township). Therefore details, in both content and presentation of the monologues, were included to assist in creating a sense of credibility. Uys has written: "Because no character is just a label, I try to portray them, even in caricature, as real people."⁶⁴ Even so, he has acknowledged the limitations of the fictional (and non-fictional) personae in the revues. As indicated in Chapter 1, satiric characters cannot develop or become, they are, they have to be, and although they may have individual qualities, they are nevertheless a means to an end rather than an end in themselves. And if they are, as Uys has conceded, "extremes", it is not only because the satirist has to emphasize their weakness or blindness or rigidity, but also because in performance "too many similar characters put the audience off". Given these limitations, they had to be recognizable, and not only to the specific South African context:

As a young victim, the 'troepie' [the soldier in Rearranging the Deckchairs on the SA Bothatonic] is ... recognizable to audiences. And they're not just South African characters. The rich bitch [the kugel in the same revue] can be found in any society, as can the young victim who might have to sacrifice his life to preserve the comforts of the rich bitch.

Uys had to, even if they were 'headlines', present people: a variety of characters whose equivalents the audience could recognize in reality. Only through recognition could

audiences be engaged. To facilitate this process, and to make the critical points embodied by the personae understood, Uys had to resort to the use of familiar types (often repeated in successive revues) for the "L-M-N" format of his revues. Compressing a situation into the life experience of a single persona who then became a generic type may not be acceptable within a play, as Green maintains of *Appassionata* (as, he maintains, "at worst it can produce a mere mouthpiece for the playwright's views, a surrogate 'type' rather than a rounded and convincing human being"), but such compression and use of cliché was vital to the revues.⁶⁵ There are obvious dangers: the presentation of Cape coloured personae by the use of a dialect which would foster instant recognition was, by some reviewers, regarded as resorting to racial stereotyping of the kind which reinforced rather than attacked, despite the fact that Uys was exploiting the type to comment on the effects of racial segregation.⁶⁶

An instantly familiar type was necessary too, to suggest the social and political context of the monologue without further explanation. Such types were signs, a means to identify the class, ideology, race or profession of the persona. Furthermore, that persona could be said to have been a metaphoric representative of a group: the young soldier became a signifier for all young white conscripts who, from 1985, were forced to patrol the townships in armoured vehicles. Some remained merely types (the security man in *Beyond the Rubicon*), others were, despite limitations, clearly individualized (*Evita Bezuidenhout*).

Some types were created from real-life incidents. The "White South African Voter" monologue evolved when Uys witnessed a white man abusing an elderly black woman struggling across the pedestrian crossing as the traffic light turned green: "I waited for her, but this man [in the car alongside Uys] with a beer in his hand shouted, 'Come on, you fucking kaffir bitch!' At that instant the monologue ... from beginning to end, flashed through my mind." Others were 'borrowed' in the sense that, as in Athenian Comedy, individuals become conventionalized types through repetition. The kugel was

one such type, present, as indicated in Chapter 3, in revues by Leslie in the 1960s and 1970s, and identifiable by, as Greig noted of Nowell Fine in Beyond the Rubicon, a

flat, bored, nasal voice, those tired repetitions and false emphases. The punch is obvious, a standby that has pervaded such caricatures since the Fifties, but it doesn't matter. What matters is the wicked sense of detail, the capturing of the absent-minded callousness of the type.⁶⁷

Nowell Fine was Uys's satiric means to expose the hypocrisy behind the patronizing facade of white liberalism. Where the soldier was a means to criticize not him so much as the system which caused his dilemma, Nowell Fine was satirized as a representative of white South African vanities, delusions and dishonesties, the type who hypocritically condemned and supported the system: "There are two things I just can't stand about South Africa: apartheid and Blacks!"⁶⁸ Her racist remarks were not at the expense of blacks but a means to highlight particular white attitudes; hence her maid, Dora, was defined and esteemed only for the service she rendered her white employer. If the humour was effective, that was to Uys's advantage: it was a means to satirize those who were laughable as well as those who laugh. In the 1988 version of Adapt or Dye presented in London, Uys provided a glossary in the programme which included a definition of this type: "Usually Progressive Federal Party, usually rich, usually Jewish ... often in exile (voluntary), mostly in Gucci."⁶⁹ In performances in America, however, the type was recognized. She "drew gales of laughter", according to Hugh Robertson, "for in her foibles and failings her local cousin - the Jewish American Princess - could be readily identified".⁷⁰

Uys defended his inclusion of such stereotypes as the coloured and the kugel by stating that he presented a spectrum of South Africans; his revues did not depict or satirize a particular race or class or ideology. Initially the leaders, supporters and policies of the National Party dominated the revues: if Adapt or Dye was characterized by its satire of "Ons Land, Ons Volk, Onslaught", during the 1980s the focus was enlarged to "Our Land, Our People, Onslaught". In each revue individual, disparate, headline issues became, collectively, a review, adjusted to topical issues, but with a spectrum of recurring

types to document periods in South African history. Not only was the individual persona generalized (Evita's duplicity and double-speak reflected that of politicians in general), so too was the context in which the persona was placed: the fictional homeland Republic of Bapetikosweti was not simply a satiric representation of the 'Bantustans', but it became metonymically associated with the country which could create both the politician and the policy, the 'Whitestan' Republic of South Africa.⁷¹

4.2.2 The Uys-persona and the Aristophanic parabasis

If the revue format afforded Uys the opportunity to generically review the country through the views of a spectrum of personae, what held the fragmentary appearance of the spectrum together was the structural link provided by his own presence: the persona of Uys, an authorial mask from the world of reality in the theatrical framework. This mask, of the playwright-performer, presented itself in a direct, expository form to establish a sense of his own reality ("My name is Pieter-Dirk Uys. I'm over 40. I'm a white South African. I'm an Afrikaner. I'm Jewish") or facts about the context in which the personae exist ("John Vorster was responsible for the Publications Act of 1974. He also said: 'You don't have to be a Communist to be banned under the Suppression of Communism Act' ") or his opinions regarding the facts of that context ("700 000 vote for P.W. Botha's government ... out of 27 million. That is not a democratic government, that's a small town council").⁷²

By Total Onslaught 1984, when he was established as a political satirist and a national celebrity, Uys began to express his views in this new persona. It was a distinct persona formed in response to his "need to create [and structure] a character called Pieter-Dirk Uys".⁷³ Like the parabasis it was a 'stepping-aside' to address the audience and to make first-person comment. Similarly, through the medium of this persona Uys could advise and amuse, be a scourge and a benefactor. He could, like Aristophanes, espouse the value

of his work and his allegiance to the betterment of the country through the satiric exposure of those who were destroying it. This view is supported by John Michell's belief that Uys's "two constant themes [were] hope for humans and a relentless uncovering of the Government's foibles".⁷⁴ Furthermore, as in Aristophanic comedy, in which the chorus steps aside from its stage character (the parabasis of The Birds being the only exception in the extant plays), so too Uys stepped aside from the markedly theatrical personae to make personal, social and political comment in his 'own' voice. Uys created the persona as a mask for Uys the playwright as part of the spectrum and as a means to distinguish the playwright-performer from the other personae on that satiric spectrum.

The use of this persona could be likened to that of the fictional narrator in the short stories of Bosman and other South African writers. Ernest Pereira has noted that, in these short stories, the fictional narrator is employed to achieve "verisimilitude, coherence and immediacy of impact - the hallmarks of the orally transmitted tale or personal anecdote".⁷⁵ As in these stories and in oral performance forms, the Uys-persona was a further means to support the relationship created between the narrator-performer (who dramatized, impersonated and commented on what was communicated) and the receivers (who were included in the process of performance). As a type of controlling narrator-figure, Uys prepared the audience for monologues by employing such preparatory indicators as commenting on the context, through a verbal or visual 'punch', or through a physical transformation. The Uys-persona thus influenced the manner in which the meaning and purpose was to be received and allowed the monologue to begin, often, in medias res. The theme, the headline issue, was introduced and the monologue developed around variations or seeming digressions or interruptions to the persona's verbalized thoughts, until the resolution or reversal or punch which pointed to or underlined the satiric intent of the monologue.

In addition, the persona Uys structured was part of his strategy as a satirist. This persona was seen to transform into other personae, but when commenting on the situation that

persona was presented directly and simply, to reveal himself as honest and straightforward in a context of dishonesty, corruption and injustice. There was, of course, an element of artifice for Uys was playing a role to focus the satiric strategy, but it was one which was closely modelled on his own personality. To establish a sense of credibility and to act as a balance to the anger and sadness this persona felt, Uys included self-deprecating remarks (by, for example, commenting on his thinning hair, as Aristophanes referred to his baldness through the mouthpiece of the chorus in Peace).⁷⁶ The informal, personal style and human personality projected by Uys in the guise of this persona was a satiric foil to the apersonal jargon and double-speak of the bureaucracy of apartheid (in items such as the readings from the Government Gazette in Beyond the Rubicon).

In this way the contrast between the persona of the playwright-performer and the targets was maintained. The artifice of the Uys-persona was submerged, it was not as apparent as the artifice adopted to present the more stereotyped personae. Where they were "extremes", the Uys-persona appeared normal and accessible, delivering facts and indicating injustices which disturbed Uys the person. This persona was presented as sane and reasonable (with the inference that the audiences were as sane and reasonable if they appreciated his satire) in an insane and unreasonable situation, a situation which could not help but produce anger:

Beautiful South Africa

Imagine: Cape Town on a perfect day.

No wind. The magnificent Table Mountain etched out against the blue, blue sky. Hot golden sunshine. The sparkling sea. The soft white sand. The ice cold wine. Peace. Tranquillity.

Then move away a few kilometres still keeping the mass of the mountain in the background. Now you're on the Cape Flats - on the sand in the coloured and black townships. Now no peace, no tranquillity: burnt-out cars, smouldering buildings, fear, hatred. Soldiers, police, Hippos and Casspirs. And children: black children with fists in the air, victory on their faces. White children in uniform, guns in hand.

Armskor [Armaments Corporation of South Africa] versus Brickor!⁷⁷

In monologues such as this the Uys-persona presented the norms of sanity and reason; the non-fictional and unsympathetic personal appeared as deviants as set against these norms. Brian Hoad, an Australian reviewer of Uys's revue Skating on Thin Uys, noted this

difference: "Between a dozen or more wickedly funny caricatures of human stupidity, a gentle, kindly man keeps emerging, deeply troubled by the madness which has enveloped the country he so clearly loves."⁷⁸

The anger of the "gentle, kindly man" was in part what led to the creation of the Uys-persona, but with it was the realization that he could not be optimistic regarding reformation of the "madness". In London, in November 1985, Uys had viewed the scenes of unrest on British television which he was to include in Beyond the Rubicon (in the opening of the monologue quoted above). Four months later he stated:

I [chose] to strip myself down to the basics of what I've always wanted to say, without self-censorship, with disregard of the supposed dangers of telling the truth. And ... 40 performances later ... not one thing has happened to change my material.⁷⁹

4.2.3 Verbal and visual shock as a satiric strategy

A frequently employed tactic in the revues between 1981 and 1992 was that of shock: the disturbance or reversal of some expectation or 'set', varying in intensity of effect from mild surprise to strong discomfort or disgust.⁸⁰

Uys has acknowledged the use of verbal shock in his punch lines: "All punch lines must have a shock for their value as a reaction. Laughter is a shock, tears are a shock." If stand-up comedy is distinguished by the organization of the material into a set-up/punch format, then Uys was utilizing a related form of politicized stand-up comedy.⁸¹ The material may have appeared to be the verbal expression of seemingly improvised thoughts, but it was in fact a structured core or set-up/punch material which could be adjusted to what was topical: "According to the Bureau [of Information] 23 people died in unrest situations in the last 24 hours."⁸² This statement introduced the subject; it was a set-up which provided information and created some anticipation of the reaction, the punch. The punch following that set-up was: "However, most of these ran under Putco [Public Utility

Transport Corporation] buses and the rest were dead from yesterday anyway, so they don't count."⁸³ Official ignorance or lack of concern was the shock underlying this punch. This example was delivered in the persona of a newsreader for, presumably, SABC-TV; most often, however, such set-up/punches were spoken by the Uys-persona in moments of self-revelation and commentary between monologues.

If a set-up succeeds best when the information is factual or at least plausible, then Uys created the type of persona best suited to the format. As a stand-up comic his Uys-persona established a sense of credibility and normality by presenting an informational or rational set-up, generally in a serious manner. The punch then gained its contrasting and exaggerated effect by being unexpected and surprising because it was irrational, callous or ludicrous. The set-up established the sense of collective reality, the punch communicated a distinctive, personal response to the situation. In the examples which follow what is lacking is a vital element of stand-up comedy: the performed attitude, those features of paralanguage and chronemics which cannot be conveyed in print.

The set-up/punch could be delivered within a single sentence. In a comment he attributed to Magnus Malan in A Kiss on Your Koeksister (1990), Uys delivered a general, informational set-up ("The struggle for a new South Africa will leave no stone ...") followed immediately by the unexpected reversal of the cliché in the punch ("... unthrown").⁸⁴ This set-up/punch was topical and ironic: during 1990 Malan's position as Minister of Defence was threatened following public revelations of South African Defence Force 'death squads' operating against civilians. A single set-up could also be followed by more than one punch in escalating absurdity, even if based on fact:

Set-up (plausible information): "Of course, apartheid always changes: ..."

First punch (exaggerated): "... the eternal political scrabble - ..."

Second punch (increasing absurdity): "... changing from 'baasskap' to 'white leadership' to 'separate development' to 'plural democracy' to 'co-operative co-existence' to 'constitutional reform', ..."

Third punch (reversal): "... maar 'n kaffer bly nog 'n kaffer."⁸⁵

The reversal revealed that, although terms may have been altered, the attitude remained. The set-up could itself be a shocking truth and the punch, although chilling, also true, to emphasize rather than originate the satiric effect:

Set-up (true): "Here we are deep into our national state of emergency with white against black, black against black, white against white, ... "
 Punch (true): "... While P.W. and Elize Botha spend seven million rand on new curtains at their Tuinhuis."⁸⁶

In this example the facts may have shocked, but the truth furthered the satiric point for which the Uys-persona prepared the audience, and heightened the ridicule of the succeeding set-up (a question) and punch (the answer): "What is the difference between P.W. Botha and the Emperor Nero? Hell, at least Nero could play the violin!"⁸⁷

Because stand-up is static, visually, and does not require the use of kinesics to the extent that impersonation or the portrayal of a character does, Uys as the Uys-persona employed transformations as an integral part of the set-up/punch format. The set-up created the context for the introduction of the character in this example in An Evening with Pieter-Dirk Uys:

Set-up: "While the Zulus hang onto their traditional cultural weapons, the spears and axes and assegais, the ANC hang onto their traditional cultural weapons, the AK47s [Russian made assault rifles, named after the Russian Kalashnikov]. And the National Party hangs onto its traditional cultural weapon: ... "
 Punch: ... (Into Pik [Roelof Frederik] Botha.)⁸⁸

The set-up/punch format was not only a feature of the monologues by the Uys-persona, but was a structural characteristic feature of the monologues which presented a situation and then moved towards a sudden reversal in the situation, rather than in the form of a single joke or punch; for example, in the monologue of the coloured policeman who was patrolling the black and coloured townships and white city for the system which had caused the forced removal of his grandmother to one of those townships, his attitude was revealed only in the concluding moments as a shock to the predominantly white audiences: "Every time we patrol past that house in Cape Town ... and I think of my old Grannie sitting by candle-light and crying for her lost life - I can't help but also hate: each time a little more."⁸⁹

Six monologues and sketches in Rearranging the Deckchairs on the SA Bothatonic (a two-person revue) concluded with such reversals: the cleaner sweeping the deck, the purser's monologue, the sketch involving the police interrogators (this ended with the punch-line to an obscene joke, necessary, Uys believed, as a "release" to allow the audience to recover from the graphic brutality of that sketch), the two children, the 'nanny' on the beach, through to the final moment of the revue, an auditory punch in the sketch entitled "The Final Solution" in which the voice of a black man responded to the pleas to God for salvation from an elderly white couple.

Presenting material in a set-up/punch routine, by disturbing or inverting expectations, was a form of satiric surprise. That surprise was often intensified into shock by other means, which Uys employed to express his own feelings of anger and revulsion and which were intended to arouse similar emotions in the spectators. The following are only two of the most extreme examples of Uys's deliberate use of shock as a tactic of direct satire.

The first, in Cry Freemandela - The Movie, was the enactment of the death of Steven Biko, who had died in detention on 12 September 1977 from "extreme brain damage", according to the final post-mortem (which contradicted earlier official reports).⁹⁰ In the revue Biko, represented by a chained gollywog, was kicked by a faceless policeman while a recording of Frank Sinatra singing "I Get a Kick Out of You" was played. The sequence culminated with the policeman releasing a spray of red confetti over the mutilated doll. This was followed by Uys as Thatcher as the then Minister of Justice, Jimmy (James) Kruger, repeating his statement (made some days after Biko's death to delegates at the National Party Congress in the Transvaal): "I am not glad and I am not sorry about Mr Biko. He leaves me cold."⁹¹ This scene was described by reviewers as "offensive", to which Uys responded:

I hope it does offend everyone enough to ... take notice In my cast list I mention that the play has "a cast of thousands of dead bodies and millions of angry people", and that is not a sick joke, it is true, and I want to know what we are going to do about it People have tried to label me as anti-South African I am pro-South African. I am only anti-apartheid.⁹²

To those who accused him of "tastelessness", Uys replied that apartheid could no longer be criticized in "good taste". Cry Freemandela - The Movie was itself a satire of the distastefully romanticized 'Hollywood' versions of history; movie folly and political folly were interwoven so that in the revue the truth was told, in Uys's description, "as a Disneyland horror story".⁹³ To both counterbalance the tone and reinforce the grotesque shock of that scene, Uys had introduced it by a monologue, presented sincerely and without satirical undertones, in which Donald Woods revealed his beliefs regarding Biko the man and his importance in the south African political consciousness.

Recurring motifs in A Kiss on Your Koeksister were birth and death, on literal and figurative levels. In the revue Winnie Mandela's involvement in the death of the fourteen year old Stompie Moeketse Seipei was alluded to by Evita Bezuidenhout who thereby questioned Winnie Mandela's position as the head of Social Welfare in the African National Congress and her place in the birth of a 'New South Africa'.⁹⁴ But the greatest shock in this revue was a monologue which actually depicted the death of a black child. This monologue was presented in the persona of a "Wit Wolf" dressed in bloodstained pale yellow fur, complete with paws and fangs. He entered carrying a gun and a black baby (a doll) and stated: "I am the symbol of the state of your State. I am the result of forty-two years of Nationalist rule."⁹⁵ He then shot the baby, ripped its head open and devoured its brains. Although some found the violence gratuitous, generally the monologue affected the audience in the way Uys intended; for Barry Ronge the shock of the image "was palpable and the silence, most especially the complete absence of laughter, was the measure of Uys's skill. It was the best kind of applause he could have hoped for because his point went truly home."⁹⁶ The monologue, placed structurally near the end of the revue, pointed again to the brutality which undermined the sense of complacency the other personae had attempted to promote in relation to the New South Africa. In 1990 the concept was, despite changes, "a Wit Wolf in sheep's clothing", as Mark Gevisser noted.⁹⁷ Uys then deliberately changed the tone of the revue by impersonating Thatcher and P.W. Botha (two familiar lampoons) which evoked laughter.

4.2.4 The range of Uys's satiric strategies

Further satiric strategies practised by Uys in the monologues of the revues included association, allusion, patterning, exaggeration, concentration and transposition.⁹⁸

By referring to familiar products or objects Uys satirized, by association, not the product but those who used or promoted it for other purposes. The incongruity between the item and its purpose in a new context was deliberately exaggerated. For example, the prison warden's wife in Beyond the Rubicon testified to the efficacy of a well-known detergent in a linguistic and presentational pattern of that product's advertisements:

I never believed all those advertisements for OMO, that it washed whiter than white, but now I know it's true! My husband is a prison warden and OMO is the only washing-powder to take the blood out of his uniform ... OMO.⁹⁹

The advantages of that product's "whiter than white" promise was taken literally and repeated in three increasingly ludicrous fillers between monologues as the user's obsession with racial purity led her to cleanse the country (finally, the revue itself) of all impurities.¹⁰⁰ In Adapt or Dye, as discussed in Chapter 1, Koornhof offered Kyk as a means to overcome the housing and food shortages at the Crossroads squatter camp. The semantic association was ludicrous and as indefensible as the Department of Co-operation and Development's inability to cope with the situation. "Koornhof offers Kyk" satirized political double-speak at its most frighteningly banal. This monologue not only employed association for satiric purposes, but also, by the inordinate repetition of the magazine's supposed nutritional and protective qualities, exaggeration as a strategy of satire. The choice of that particular magazine was appropriate and contributed to the intent; for the pun from Kyk in Afrikaans to 'cake' in English and for the metaphoric association between what the word denotes ('see') and its related connotations ('sight', 'insight').

In a similarly associative manner, Uys's revues between 1981 and 1992 contained literary and historical allusions, most often through reference rather than an extended pattern, to

remind the audience of a context with likewise blameworthy values or to indicate how other sources justified a situation or, conversely, to work by contrast rather than association and thereby recall a context outside the monologue with values more sound and praiseworthy. The refusal to accept the dangers of the rise of Nazism in Europe in the late 1920s was alluded to in Beyond the Rubicon to point to a similar dismissal of the power of the Afrikaner Weerstandsbeweging in the 1980s; the Bible was utilized in various monologues to justify apartheid; Orwell's 1984 was a source of Total Onslaught 1984 (and referred to in its sub-title, Ja-No-Orwell-Fine), even though, as Uys wrote, "his version of 1984 happened in South Africa in 1973 [the passing of the new Publications Act], but no one noticed".¹⁰¹ Uys patterned monologues on extracts from other theatrical works, not to parody the original through imitation, but by association to lampoon a particular politician such as Pik Botha (discussed in the section on the presentation of non-fictional personae later in this chapter).

The straightforward presentation of a list of figures derived from the Population Registration Act published in the Government Gazette in Beyond the Rubicon (and in the form of clues for a crossword puzzle which could not be solved in Rearranging the Deckchairs on the SA Bothatonic) gained its impact through intensification and concentration. The citing of a single instance of a racial reclassification may not have disturbed; concentrated into a list, however, a series of such reclassifications developed cumulative satiric force. Individuals were reduced to impersonal ciphers, identified only by race, with the permutations made possible by the Act making that Act appear nonsensical and absurd. The concentration required no explicit comment; the Uys-persona interrupted the list to state: "I couldn't make it up if I tried."¹⁰²

As the material for the revues was based in the South African context with identifiable South African types it might have appeared that they were milieu-bound and could not be transposed to a situation elsewhere. Uys ensured that this did not remain a limitation when he performed in other countries, however. He stated in an interview for Index on

Censorship that, from his experiences in America, Canada, Britain, the Netherlands and Australia, "Apartheid is not a chemical virus living on the southern tip of Africa. Racism is an international disease."¹⁰³ Transposition was itself a satiric tactic.

The sign at the entrance to the Footbridge Theatre in Sydney (where Uys performed his revue Skating on Thin Uys) stated: "You are now leaving the world. You are entering South Africa."¹⁰⁴ Nevertheless, on 8 January 1987, on the same day the revue opened, ex-serviceman's league chief Bruce Ruxton's racist comments about Tutu (who had recently visited Australia) concerning the latter's attitude to sporting affiliations between South Africa and Australia and Ruxton's belief in Soviet infiltration of the African National Congress were endorsed by Queensland's Joh Bjelke-Petersen, by various sporting bodies and later by the Australian National rugby coach, Alan Jones. Uys incorporated such remarks in his revue in Tutu's monologue. Furthermore, the revue included a letter (a satiric device supposedly invented by Horace) to Nelson Mandela in Pollsmoor from an Aboriginal who, having suffered from forced removals, and inferior employment and educational opportunities, wished to leave Australia in favour of South Africa. (This letter was incorporated into a sketch, with Galloway, in Rearranging the Deckchairs on the SA Bothatonic in South Africa three months later.) Evita Bezuidenhout pointed to the fact that there were twenty-five million blacks in South Africa while the Aboriginal population had been reduced to a mere 160 000. On simple arithmetical terms, she noted, living under apartheid must have been better than the situation in Australia.¹⁰⁵ Uys also presented the monologue from Beyond the Rubicon in which a salesman promoted anti-riot equipment as a Pretoria-based Australian. In South Africa that monologue was delivered by an Pretoria-based Afrikaner.

Astonishingly, Tutu was recognized in Uys's lampoon whereas P.W. Botha was known to one reviewer "only by name. No doubt it is an accurate portrait but without the aid of personal references the depiction lost a little of its bite."¹⁰⁶ The fictional stereotypes proved to be familiar, however. Hoard noted: "Beneath the veneer of a different accent, his caricatures are only too easily recognizable in Australian terms."¹⁰⁷

In Toronto, Canada, in the same year, the letter to Nelson Mandela was written by a "Red Indian from a Canadian reservation".¹⁰⁸ Furthermore, the Commonwealth Conference was being held in Vancouver in October at the time of the run, so Uys located his characters in that situation and made explicit connections between the separatist policies of the two countries:

P.W. was making a speech to the people of Toronto, Piet Koornhof had flown over from Washington to Canada [Koornhof was then the South African ambassador to the United States of America], Evita Bezuidenhout was there on her way to Vancouver, and I could draw on the Canadian Indian reservation system which Verwoerd used as a basis for the homelands policy.¹⁰⁹

In August 1988, in Utrecht in the Netherlands, Uys presented the same letter as though written by a black man in Bijlmer, the suburb in Amsterdam largely inhabited by blacks. In Dutch, Evita Bezuidenhout reminded the audience of the links between South Africa and that country: "Your Hendrik Verwoerd of Amsterdam with its free university became our Dr Verwoerd."¹¹⁰ So too, in England three months later, Evita Bezuidenhout informed audiences that she had visited Britain since the time it was "a proper democracy", reminded them that the forerunner of the apartheid laws were sanctioned by British Parliament and stated that Thatcher had (as reported by Michael Billington in the Guardian)

managed to achieve in eight years what it took forty years of Afrikaner rule to accomplish. The parallel is not quite exact but at least, through the ... lips of his suave ambassadress, Mr Uys manages to jolt our consciences and remind us of the perennial dangers of one-party rule.¹¹¹

In these countries, criticism of racism and hegemony was more damning for being spoken not by Uys, but by an ambassador of the country ostracized by those countries for its racial legislation and its political hegemony. As a mouthpiece, Evita Bezuidenhout needs to be considered in detail.

4.3 Evita Bezuidenhout

In the persona of Evita Bezuidenhout Uys assumed an ironic mask which enabled him to express attitudes and create a greater impact than he, in the mask of himself, could. This was, Uys admits, the most interesting aspect of his theatrical career.¹¹² Through her he could play his own devil's advocate; she could express "things that [he] would not say because [his] politics are different from hers; things [he] would not dare say because people would take immediate offence; and things that have to be said".¹¹³ As a further distancing device, the persona who expressed these views was a woman, one "swaddled in chiffon and blazing with costume jewellery".¹¹⁴ Evita Bezuidenhout was his clown, a means of completely altering and disguising his persona, a means to be outrageous in appearance and outlook. Before the structuring of the Uys-persona, Evita Bezuidenhout was his principal means of ensuring topicality: in the early Adapt or Dye revues she addressed the audience in a formal speech before a microphone, using cue-cards which allowed for the inclusion of current material.

4.3.1 'The Rise of the First Ambassador Bezuidenhout'

In physical appearance and mannerisms Evita Bezuidenhout was modelled on the Italian actress Sophia Loren, whom Uys met in 1969 and whose "very physical way" of acting he has always admired.¹¹⁵ They maintain a close friendship; in fact, Evita Bezuidenhout's spectacles were a gift from Loren. Evita Bezuidenhout's character is, however, a continuation of Uys's high-powered, ambitious and blinkered protagonists such as Tosca Jansen in God's Forgotten and Elana van Aarde in Die Van Aardes van Grootoor.

She evolved, as a character in her own right, in the Sunday Express column he wrote in the late 1970s, and for the same purposes expressed above regarding the stage persona: to reveal, as the wife of a National Party Member of Parliament the unpublished details of

the activities of the Department of Information. Uys's satire was motivated by his intention to arouse and maintain public awareness; this character was his means to do so in print, by exposing facts which were sub judice, restricted by media regulations or even libellous. Protected by the guise of gossip and innuendo overheard at or gleaned from social functions in Pretoria, Uys could insidiously level telling charges against the corruption of those in authority and use ridicule as a weapon. This became one of the most notable features of the Evita Bezuidenhout stage character: audiences wondered who Uys, through her, would dare to criticize, and how far he could draw them into a collusion in which laughter could be a release and an indictment. She both freed them from the gravity of propriety and tested the limits of acceptability in a repressive society.

Her Christian name, Evita, was derived from a description of her as the "Evita of Waterkloof [in Pretoria]", as a deliberate reference to Andrew Lloyd Webber and Tim Rice's musical based on the life of Evita Peron, Evita, produced in the same year (1978) as the evidence on the Department of Information was publicly revealed by Justice Anton Mostert. (Her surname, which was assumed once the revues had begun in 1981, was acquired from a theatre poster Uys saw for a production at The Market which featured the actress Aletta Bezuidenhout.) The association with Evita Peron was made theatrically explicit in Adapt or Dye. As the wife of the Member of Parliament for Laagerfontein, she opened the revue by delivering a speech as if at a political meeting, recounting her recent support-raising missions and referring to South Africa by the name it would assume after black liberation by singing, "Don't cry for me, Azania, I never knew you", a pattern of "Don't cry for me, Argentina" from Evita.¹¹⁶

Evita Bezuidenhout, like her namesake, was hypocritical, corrupt and self-interested. Her addresses were interspersed with stereotypical racial observations (delivered, mostly, in Afrikaans) as she reiterated her support for the mythologies which reinforced segregation:

I want to thank our great leaders of the past for their God-given policy of apartheid, without which we wouldn't be here tonight, but working in someone's kitchen or deep down in the mines our glorious Afrikaner Republic has survived in spite of [here she listed numerous dissident writers and banned

politicians] ... ja-nee, the blacklist is endless. Hulle sê Swart Mag sal Wit Suid-Afrika breek? Wat ver wag hulle - die Swartes breek mos alles!¹¹⁷

Whereas in plays such as Black's Love and the Hyphen and Helena's Hope, Ltd., stereotypical racial slurs occur within a specified social context (as indicated by Gray in Chapter 3) and arise from embarrassment, anger, revenge or awkwardness, Evita Bezuidenhout employed them openly and freely, crassly ignoring the sensitivity of the audience, or upholding its own prejudices. She was the epitome of bigoted nurturing. Perceptions of the purpose and result of such use of pejorative words differed, in part as a result of the fact that, in the solo revues in particular, Evita Bezuidenhout used direct address, often supposedly to specific individuals, which increased the sense of collusion. Her lecture in Beyond the Rubicon, furthermore, assumed a like-mindedness in the audience, a sense of a unified conspiracy. Alan Cowell, writing for the New York Times noted:

Outsiders attending one of Mr Uys's revues to a South African audience sometimes gain the impression that the relationship between player and audience has something of the nervous shocked giggle of clandestinity (rather than open theater). When Mr Uys says "kaffir" and the audience laughs, there is an underlying uncertainty. They seem to be asking: Should we really be laughing? And are we laughing at our own prejudices or simply escaping briefly from them in the dark secret world of the auditorium?¹¹⁸

Uys would probably reply in the affirmative to all Cowell's questions, believing as he does that "comedy is in the beholder", so that it may be a release to some, an alternative to despair to some, while others might view it as part of an entertainment and not a weapon against their own prejudices.

Uys admits to realizing "instinctively" that if he "created an aura of familiarity using someone like Evita Bezuidenhout with the possible addition of some family", he could "lull the audience into lowering their defences" before delivering the satiric thrust.¹¹⁹ The family was introduced in Farce About Uys (1983) (Uys was partly influenced by John Wells's play Anyone for Denis? (1981) which satirized Thatcher and included her family): her husband, Oom Hasie (Dr Johannes Joubert de Vos Bezuidenhout, almost the only

father-figure in the entire Uys corpus to date), her twin sons De Kock (formerly studying to be a Dutch Reformed Church pastor, but also a ballet dancer and transvestite) and Izan (Nazi spelled backward, a member of the Afrikaner Weerstandsbeweging, accused of assaulting black women at the casino in Bapetikosweti), and a daughter, Billie-Jeanne (a dancer at the casino). When her husband was disgraced by his involvement in the Information Scandal, Evita Bezuidenhout was elevated to the status of South African Ambassador to the Independent Homeland Republic of Bapetikosweti.

Where non-fictional characters, as fictions, combine fact and fiction, Evita Bezuidenhout and her family were themselves fictions, fictional creations, but grounded in the facts of political corruption. In Farce About Uys a security policeman (named Uys and played by Galloway) visited Blanche-Noir, the Bapetikosweti embassy, to investigate "allegations ... insinuations ... [and] intimations" that the family had contravened the Immorality Act and were involved in marijuana dealing (Billie-Jeanne), had engaged in illicit diamond buying (De Kock), smuggled Krugerrands (Izan), placed more than two million rand in Swiss banking accounts (Oom Hasie), while she was suspected of using her position of ambassador to divert thirty per cent of the "aid" from the South African Government into the Evita Bezuidenhout Foundation to purchase locally-produced arms and sell them to anti-apartheid movements.¹²⁰ Clearly, her political principles served her financial principal.

In Uys's film Skating on Thin Uys (1985) he again played the entire family in a vehicle which exposed the machinations of that family and of the South African government in securing rights to the oil discovered in Bapetikosweti. Unfortunately some of the pertinence of the film was undermined by events in actuality as in it Billie-Jeanne prepared to marry Leroy Makoeloeli, son of the black President of Bapetikosweti; Evita Bezuidenhout's outrage was partially undermined when the announcement of the repeal of the Mixed Marriages Act was made prior to the release of Skating on Thin Uys.

In the initial revues and in Farce About Uys Evita Bezuidenhout was both apologist for and critic of apartheid. With blinkered good will she supported the system by espousing its values, but damned it and herself by her unqualified praise of its supposed success, equating herself with those in power, yet critical of those who departed the laager, self-contradictory and complacent:

Ja-nee, as I said to Andries Treurnicht a few days before he resigned to become one of those bobbejane climbing the Soutpansberg [Treurnicht became a leader of the newly-formed Conservative Party on 20 March 1982; the two Northern Transvaal constituencies of Soutpansberg and Waterberg were won by the Conservative Party soon thereafter], I said: "Ag, A.P. [Petrus] what happy political system will greet the end of the world? Tog nie jou Konserwatiewe Party nie?" Hy't nie eers gelag nie, raai. Even today I got a phone call from Cape Town from one of those Labour Party leaders [the majority party in the coloured House of Representatives in the 1980s]. You know the coloureds now also have a little vote, shame. Die kleurling is so ontstoke oor P.W. Botha se referendum ... "Ja-nee, miesies Bezuidenhout," he said, "all men are equal, but only after you make them!" Hy verdien elke stoel teen die kop. So you see, equality breeds subversity, and therefore here in South Africa we've learnt: democracy is too good to share with just anyone!¹²¹

The satire Uys produced through Evita Bezuidenhout took on its meaning in the ear of the receiver. She was the exemplar of political hypocrisy: condemning racism in others while legitimizing it for her own party, interested less in the real concerns of her country and more so with self-interest, critical but hypersensitive to criticism, unable to truly adapt the system but infinitely adaptable in ways of indicating reform:

We are the New Afrikaners! We have swapped the ossewa for the Audi! We have replaced the kappie with courtour [sic]! We have lifted ourselves, and often our faces, out of the doldrums of Calvinist hypocrisy we can now laugh at ourselves because ... we are making the jokes. O dis lekker om te lag, want Baas maak die grappe en Baas bly Baas!¹²²

The impact and strength of the character was founded in, as Uys has maintained, "her total conviction that what she says and does is right".¹²³ In that alone Evita Bezuidenhout was consistent. As a character she was a perspective on and was motivated by a particular political event or issue or change in climate. In Total Onslaught 1984 she was gratified to be a minion of P.W. Botha, and displayed the postcards she had collected after accompanying him in the "Mumbo Jumbo" on his diplomatic tour of Europe; her political malapropisms were a characteristic of her discourse at that stage of her career: "When

P.W. Botha and Pik Botha invited me to join the Diplomatic Corpse, I realized that a great millstone had been reached."¹²⁴ By Beyond the Rubicon in which an indication of the post-revolutionary future resulting from the present was depicted, a sense that her dignity was slighted by having to thank President Nelson Mandela for lifting her banning order and complying with her request to speak at an otherwise "illegal gathering" was evident, for her hair was greyer, her jewellery and furs absent, and disaffection with the party ostensibly suggested:

Look at our own history: did we ever give black consciousness the pride it deserved? Look what we did to old Cremora Machel [President Samora Machel of Mozambique]? We gave him that silly Nkomati Accord [The 'Agreement on non-aggression and good neighbourliness between the People's Republic of Mozambique and the Republic of South Africa', signed by P.W. Botha and Machel on 16 March 1984] and a box of chocolates, en toe's die chocolates ook vrot. We starved Botswana, we invaded Lesotho, we poisoned Namibia, we bombed Zimbabwe - en kyk waar sit ons nou?¹²⁵

Faced with the realities of coping with the situation in a changed South Africa, she urged communication between all races and dispensed advice to whites. Her survival tactics were presented as though entirely reasonable and sincere, given the circumstances, until the premises of the argument and her solutions were exposed as subversive forms of defiance for whites, the same as those employed by the black oppressed before the 'revolution'. Hence she advocated hiding a stone in the palm of one's hand so that "when the police car comes by, you wave and then throw the stone at them and run! Dit werk: ons het dit destyds van die Hotnot kinders in die Kaap geleer!"¹²⁶

By 1987 Evita Bezuidenhout's bitterness was publicly stated: she acknowledged that as "an ambassador on the world stages of diplomacy, it ha[d] been [her] job to explain the inexplicable, to defend the indefensible, to expect the impossible".¹²⁷ If Bapetikosweti was a means to satirize white South Africa's policies, the Bezuidenhouts became a microcosm of the white South African political family. Evita Bezuidenhout stated the above at a press conference she had convened at the Carlton Hotel in Johannesburg on 28 April 1987, before a large contingent of local and international press invited to hear an important announcement and partake of coffee and koeksisters. She told the press that she had

informed the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Pik Botha, of her immediate resignation as the South African Ambassador to the Independent Homeland Republic of Bapetikosweti. In doing so, Uys, through her, indicated not only the divisions among the white polity, but also the absurdity of an all white election on 6 May 1987, presenting her as 'real' as an all-white election:

It was not for me to question a white election costing more millions of rands. It was not for me to remark that a white election is now akin to rearranging the deckchairs on the Titanic. [Rearranging the Deckchairs on the SA Bothatanic was to open in Johannesburg on 6 May 1987, after its run in Cape Town; hence her absence from that revue.] But I can question why my family has been destroyed by irrelevant politics. My husband Dr J.J. de V. Bezuidenhout, as you know, is the Herstigte Nasionale Party candidate in our hometown of Laagerfontein. My daughter Billie-Jeanne represents the Progressive Federal Party. My one son De Kock stands for the National Party and his twin Izan is the Conservative Party candidate and local Afrikaner Weerstandsbeweging gauleiter Laagerfontein faces a four-sided election battle: NP vs CP vs HNP vs PFP: Bezuidenhout vs Bezuidenhout.¹²⁸

Furthermore, she announced her resignation from the National Party, with its "lies and Heunis-speak" (Heunis was one of P.W. Botha's confidants; as Minister of Constitutional Development he introduced the Constitutional Bill in 1983), and her decision to stand as an independent candidate in Laagerfontein, making a five-cornered contest for the constituency; if successful, she promised that she would demand the release of all detained children and the abolition of the Population Registration Act and lobby for "One Man One Vote or No Man No Vote".¹²⁹ Was this a change of allegiance brought on by disillusionment? Was it an election ploy of the sort mouthed by politicians aware that reform was inevitable? Could it have been that in foreseeing the demise of the National Party she was disassociating herself in case of future reprisals? Or was Evita Bezuidenhout seemingly stepping aside from her role to be the mouthpiece for Uys the playwright in the manner of Aristophanes in the parabasis? (To be regarded, in Aristophanic terms, that is, as an example of discontinuity of characterization for authorial comment.) Or was it an indication of the divisions in the white electorate, divisions which would be further polarized by the outcome of the elections?

There were, as in Aristophanes, no clear answers. In all probability, it was another instance

of her poneria, the ability to turn the situation to her advantage, her guile, her drive to dominate. P.W. Botha, the Uys character, remained merely an alazon, two-dimensional and predictable. Evita Bezuidenhout had, through this quality, an extra dimension which enabled her to assert her individuality beyond a type and adjust to any situation; she was representative of all politicians in her corruption and sense of rectitude, but individualized by her poneria which manifested itself in her personality, her manners and her appearance. She was excessive; excessively adaptable, inconsistent and ambitious and revelled in being so.

She was both too lifelike and too much part of any status quo to be suppressed. In publicity released after the election, Evita Bezuidenhout announced that she was the only woman Independent Member of Parliament. Her election promises were not mentioned. However, after a failed coup d'etat in Bapetikosweti, she claimed that P.W. Botha and Pik Botha had persuaded her to resume her position as ambassador "for life" in order "to keep things quiet".¹³⁰ Therefore, in the next revue in which she appeared (Adapt or Dye in Toronto in October 1987), with the National Party still in power, Evita Bezuidenhout was en route to the Commonwealth Conference in Vancouver to attend as South African ambassador to Bapetikosweti.

Having made the transition from MP's wife to ambassador for life with relative ease, Evita Bezuidenhout then shrewdly prepared to assume a position in the new dispensation. In 1992, in An Evening with Pieter-Dirk Uys she appeared costumed in an extravagant gown, consisting of a green-sequined bodice, gold layered skirt (with the traditional white national symbols - proteas and a springbok - embroidered on its panels) and black gloves; a deliberate coalition or combination of the colours of the flag of the African National Congress and those worn by Springbok Sportsmen at the Olympic games in Barcelona (where the traditional white South African flag was not displayed). To reinforce the vestimentary association, and to indicate her adaptability to the process of political change, she carried a reversible flag.

Throughout her career she appeared invulnerable and indestructable, completely in control and completely in character, no matter what the circumstances, able to invite the audience to ask her questions in a press conference in the second half of An Audience with Evita Bezuidenhout (1990) or deal with celebrities in "Evita's Indaba", an eighty-five minute programme screened on Metropolitan Network (M-Net) on 19 July 1989. This "chat show" (recorded in the ambassadorial residence, Blanche-Noir) was clearly modelled on the style and techniques of Humphries's solo stage revues and television specials (the first screened in the United Kingdom in 1987) in which, in the persona of Dame Edna Everage, the social commentator and celebrity, he abused and ridiculed invited guests and public, altering a "chat show" into an extended monologue with interruptions. Similarly Evita Bezuidenhout warned, prior to the screening, "I'll ask the questions, they'll give the answers. And if not, it's their indaba."¹³¹

4.3.2 Evita Bezuidenhout's fictional actuality

The guests, all social celebrities and politicians (including the recently-retired parliamentarian, Helen Suzman, the current Miss South Africa, Michelle Bruce, Coertse, the opera-singer, and Sunday Times editor, Tertius Myburgh, were ostensibly invited by Evita Bezuidenhout to reflect and comment on topical issues. The interviews were conducted in a reception room at Blanche-Noir, divided by the border between South Africa and Bapetikosweti; thus protected by diplomatic immunity, a forum for a frank and open exchange of ideas was supposedly created. The term 'interview' was a misnomer, for the guests' responses were turned against them, became a foil for the comment, amusement and promotion of the beauty products of their hostess. This was, again, part of her poneria, an arrogant self-concern which could not accommodate any views or attitudes which did not focus on her or which could not be turned to her advantage. In a deliberate mixture of reality and fantasy, a confrontation between the fictional and non-fictional (it was billed as "pre-recorded live"), the programme was partly improvised and

partly scripted (the behind-the-scenes views of Evita Bezuidenhout preparing for the interviews contained such fictional characters as her private secretary, Bokkie Bam, the corrupt deputy head of 'Bap-K TV', and Uys performing as members of her family: Oom Hasie, Billie-Jeanne and De Kock).

Bokkie Bam, Evita Bezuidenhout's factotum, was first mentioned in Farce About Uys as her personal secretary ("Ou Dominee Bam se dogter, so 'n oulike klein Bam").¹³² In "Evita's Indaba" and An Audience with Evita Bezuidenhout the character was exploited to be a contrast to Evita Bezuidenhout: Bokkie Bam's browbeaten devotion highlighted Evita Bezuidenhout's overbearing self-aggrandizement; her insecurity highlighted the ambassador's control, her gauche appearance highlighted her employer's immaculate opulence. Bokkie Bam was the ingenuous type, a foil and a feed to Evita Bezuidenhout's dominant and aggressive type. Her ordinariness, parochialism, affectlessness and humourlessness were all a means to reinforce Evita Bezuidenhout's status as a celebrity.

In England and Australia Evita Bezuidenhout was frequently likened to Dame Edna Everage. There were many similarities to support the comparison. During the 1980s and early 1990s both were middle-aged women from parochial backgrounds (Laagerfontein and Moonee Ponds in Melbourne) with a desire for self-aggrandizement and celebrity-status, both had elevated themselves as career moves (the former from MP's wife to ambassador, the latter from suburban housewife to Dame), both criticized their creators (the former wished to sue Uys for defamation of character in A Part Hate A Part Love, the latter frequently attacked Humphries for his lack of talent and his ability as her manager), both had stage families, biographies on both were published (Dame Edna Everage's an autobiography, My Gorgeous Life (1991), was sold by Macmillan on its non-fiction list) and both had a feed character (in Dame Edna Everage's case, the silent and po-faced Madge Allsop).¹³³ The similarities extended to performance: both Evita Bezuidenhout and Dame Edna Everage appeared in 'national' costume and both left the theatre in a limousine. Uys and Humphries made humorous programmes a feature of

their revues and even the titles of the revues were identical (for example, An Audience with).

Edna Everage was conceived (in 1955) as a character to ridicule the bigotry and crassness of the average Australian (Everage as in 'average', her husband Norm as in 'normal') and, despite her rise to prominence, remained primarily a social commentator. (Humphries's Sir Les Patterson, whose large and frequently referred to penis was a deliberate Aristophanic borrowing, was a means to satirize politicians in his role as the Australian Cultural Attaché assigned to the court of St James). With acerbic wit and savage vitriol, she raised to the level of laughter hypocritical attitudes to such sensitive issues as death, sex, handicaps and religion. Evita Bezuidenhout was a politicized version. One Australian reviewer, Jilea Carney, maintained the comparison was unfair to Uys, whom she described as "a much more three-dimensional performer And the absolute difference is that that class commentator, Dame Edna, would never address the ultimate class issue, that of apartheid."¹³⁴

During the 1980s Evita Bezuidenhout developed an independent existence in the eyes of the public: the visual appearance, the specific humour and attitudes were absorbed into the national consciousness, became part, as Uys describes it, of the "public alphabet". His satire, he insists, was a reflection of the reality of the situation. If the context had been normal, he believes, the clown would have needed to be an outlandish figure detached from the values of that context to have an impact and amuse; in a country which is absurd, however, the clown had to be real to have impact: "That's why Evita is real. She's not a 'drag queen'. She is as real as I can make her because the audiences' recognition of her reality makes her work for them."

Where the female personae portrayed by such performers as Leslie and Banks remained characters because little attempt was made to depict them as real women, Uys's purpose was founded on the fact that Evita Bezuidenhout was, firstly, seen to be a woman and,

secondly, believed to be a real woman with a life outside the theatrical framework. The sense of her actuality resulted from the detail Uys invested in her visual appearance and in developing her vocal mannerisms and gestures, from her convincing belief in what she said, from her relaxed control and from the audiences' knowledge of her life, family and career developed over successive revues. This familiarity was reinforced in print by the dynasty Uys created for her biography, A Part Hate A Part Love, which merged fiction and history by linking her with eminent and revered political families. Once accepted as real, once disbelief was not only willingly suspended but ignored, once the sense of man-as-woman was lost, Evita could make the comments Uys could not and be a further satirical mask (and an object of satire) in her own right.

To maintain this sense of her actuality and separate existence, Uys utilized various publicity ploys which made a fiction of reality. She appeared at numerous occasions and on television with well-known figures who treated her as real, thus reinforcing her actuality in the eyes of the public. Authority was ridiculed by Uys as Evita Bezuidenhout, but authority was simultaneously exploited to uphold the reality of the fantasy: Koornhof and Mulder appeared in the film Skating on Thin Uys with her. Evita Bezuidenhout wrote to Stoffel Botha, when he was Minister of Home Affairs, to request that Uys's work be censored. In 1986 she wrote to Equity, in a letter published in the English Stage magazine, to 'congratulate' the British actors' union and compare its 'democratic' decision to support the continuation of the cultural boycott of South Africa (voted for by ten per cent of its members) with the manner in which hegemony is politically maintained in South Africa (by eight per cent of the population). Perhaps the most outrageous of these ploys was her letter, as the Independent Member of Parliament for Laagerfontein, written to Thatcher on 20 June 1987 to congratulate the Prime Minister on her election to a third term of office (in the British general election of that month) and to recall their meeting in 1983. Evita Bezuidenhout received a reply, signed by the British premier, to thank her for her felicitations. The reply ended:

It was vital for the Government to be returned with a clear and decisive majority. We can now continue with our task knowing we have the necessary support at home and confidence abroad.

With every good wish,
Margaret Thatcher.¹³⁵

The 'meeting' mentioned by Evita Bezuidenhout took place during the 1983 version of Adapt or Dye when she met a number of heads of foreign governments, all impersonated by Uys.

The blurring of fact and fiction, the total acceptance of the actuality of Evita Bezuidenhout, is evident in the press conference she called on 28 April 1987 to announce her dual resignation. Besides local and international press correspondents, representatives from British, American, German, French and Italian television networks attended. Many reports presented her announcements factually, with no reference to her being a fictional character. As Michell noted: "She was treated like any other member of the Nat hierarchy with a sensational revelation. A front-page news-maker with no questions asked about the real person behind the facade."¹³⁶

The public played a part in the process of incorporating Evita Bezuidenhout into their "alphabet". Lahr's description of the acceptance of the reality of Dame Edna Everage is as true of the belief in Evita Bezuidenhout: "Identity is a story at once claimed by the individual and conferred by the group. Dame Edna compels belief. The public wills her to be real. And ... she is if you believe in her."¹³⁷ So much so that, in a variation of life imitating artifice, Evita Bezuidenhout look-alike competitions were held in the 1980s. Readers of the Sowetan believed that she had a black grandchild after that newspaper published a photograph of her holding 'Winnie-Jeanne Makoeloeli' (daughter of Billie-Jeanne and Leroy Makoeloeli).¹³⁸ According to M-Net's customer service department, many viewers were not aware that, in "Evita's Indaba", Evita Bezuidenhout was, in fact, Uys.¹³⁹

The total acceptance of her actuality had adverse effects, too. Clearly some guests on "Evita's Indaba" were able to relate to the fantasy better than others. And in January

1987, while she appeared on television in Australia, viewers telephoned the network to demand her removal from the programme for her "fascist" remarks.¹⁴⁰ The dangers of misrepresentation went further: when Uys was interviewed by Martin Sommer of De Volkskrant in Utrecht on 19 August 1988 (to provide advance publicity for Adapt or Dye in Amsterdam the following week), he was reported to have said that "sanctions [other than the cultural boycott] would be a mighty weapon to get rid of apartheid".¹⁴¹ In response to hostile reactions to the statement in South Africa, Uys stated that Evita Bezuidenhout had been speaking, that he and she "seldom shared the same views", and so he supplied an extract from her monologue in the revue to "clear up any confusion":

Let me put you in the picture, my dear friends - for every country that pulls out of South Africa two jump in Gold and uranium never seem to find their way onto your sanctions list. Now isn't that hypocritical? Maar toemaar, we in Pretoria understand. We also know that hypocrisy is the vaseline of political intercourse. The only way sanctions will work against us would be total sanctions But such universal commitment to control the greedy men among you would be too much to expect and we don't. However, your present selective sanctions have been a great success - for us. Ever since you left South Africa in a sulk, taking your investment with you, we don't have to explain anything to anyone.¹⁴²

But when audiences confuse the beliefs of persona and playwright, the vehicle for and of satire with the satirist himself, the satiric impulse is in danger of being blunted. Any satirist has to be at a remove from the subject he is attempting to subvert in order to make it a means for and of ridicule. Evita Bezuidenhout had to be seen to be both distinct from him and in his control. She may have developed a reality for the public that was believed to have absorbed his own persona, but Uys insisted that the two personae, his and hers, remained separate. Only two months after the opening of the first Adapt or Dye he admitted that, of all the characters in the revue, she was the one he held at "arm's length", for she was "a most powerful lady and could easily take over".¹⁴³ Of course, the personality Uys presents in personal interviews is very different to that projected by her on stage: he is unfailingly polite, receptive and modest. She is referred to in the third person, not as an alter ego, but as a character subservient to him: "If you were to ask me to put on an Evita voice now as we sit talking, I simply could not do it. She works for me - I don't work for her."¹⁴⁴

Therefore he promoted and accepted her separate identity: at the conclusion of Total Onslaught 1984 she left the theatre, followed by members of the audience, to be driven off in her white Cadillac, and they would ask her, not Uys, for an autograph. Uys has written: "I called this performance 'Act Three' and it took Evita Bezuidenhout literally out of the theatre and into the real world."¹⁴⁵ To further distinguish between the two personae in the eyes of the public, and as a means to indicate his control, in Beyond the Rubicon he removed her wig on stage before the audience, to transform into Thatcher. Ian Glenn has identified Uys's dilemma in this regard and answered those who believe Evita Bezuidenhout had subsumed his own persona:

She can be racist and ostensibly liberal, resigned to change but with an eye to the main chance, on terms with power but critical of it. Insofar as Uys is the prisoner of his creation, it is because these dilemmas are squarely the dilemmas of white South Africa and because, in laughing at them, we may get some distance from being incapacitated by them.¹⁴⁶

4.3.3 Female impersonation in Uys's revues and Aristophanic comedy

Remaining totally in character while presenting the persona of Evita was, Uys has written, the means to avoid "disintegrat[ing] into tatty camp".¹⁴⁷ Evita Bezuidenhout was a means to display his ability as a female impersonator.¹⁴⁸ In creating a spectrum of South African characters Uys had, of necessity, in his revues between 1981 and 1992 (and obviously so in the solo revues) to include the impersonation of women. He regards it as "part of the theatre". While gratified by the response of audiences to what he terms his "female impersonation", he is "pleased that it developed as only part of [his] spectrum as an entertainer".

Uys is, of course, correct in maintaining that female impersonation has always been a theatrical tradition; indeed it is not only one of the earliest traditions, but has remained so within the theatre of convention, from the 'female' actors wearing masks (in Athenian

tragedy and comedy, the tan of Chinese Opera and in Noh drama) to the impersonators (the onnagata of Kabuki and the boy players in Elizabethan and Jacobean theatre). In all these there was and is no intent to parody women (theatre which employed cross-dressing purportedly had its origins in or was associated with sacred rituals, generally involving fertility myths) and the audiences accept or accepted the convention that men or boys would perform the female roles (whether, in Athens at least, the convention reflected the public and patriarchal suppression of women or, instead, was part of a festival in which the sexual and social worlds were inverted, aside).¹⁴⁹ Uys, did not, unlike the tan and onnagata) perform using highly stylized techniques to reproduce the essence of femininity, nor did he (as in the Athenian and Noh theatres) employ an actual mask corresponding to the kind of woman he was portraying. As will be discussed in the next section, he did create a type of portrait-mask with his own features for his non-fictional personae.

He was perhaps akin to the impersonators of the Elizabethan and Jacobean theatre who relied instead upon their expressive talents and costumes for dramatic effect. That they were skilled and that Shakespeare was confident of the abilities of the boy players is testified in Antony and Cleopatra (1606). He gave the boy playing Cleopatra the lines: "I shall see/Some squeaking Cleopatra boy my greatness/I' th' posture of a whore" (V, ii, 218-220). The effect of the acceptance of boys impersonating women was to focus the attention towards the character rather than the convention. In England, the closure of the theatres by an Act of Parliament in 1642 marked the removal of female impersonation from the serious stage, and by doing so, altered the nature of the theatrical illusion in Western theatre.¹⁵⁰ (In China and Japan the actress is a comparatively recent innovation.)

If Evita Bezuidenhout was perceived as simply a comic creation to display Uys's skill as a female impersonator or as a drag queen or as a pantomime dame the sense of her actuality and hence Uys's satirical purpose would have been negated. How can she be classified? Some references to Athenian comedy and tragedy are useful. In extant Greek tragedy, eighteen leading and forty-five subsidiary roles are female, and their femininity is

accepted as part of the convention.¹⁵¹ While some have dominant, 'masculine' qualities (Hecuba and Medea, for example) they are nevertheless women, and it would have directed attention away from the principal issues of the plays in which they appear if they were thought of as men. In the extant plays of Aristophanes, two leading and twenty-five subsidiary roles are female, and the same degree of acceptance of femininity held. Femininity is established at the first appearance, physically through the colour and style of mask and costume and verbally through identification by others on stage. Significantly, the convention is accepted by all the characters and the impersonation is neither sensationalized nor distasteful.¹⁵²

Indeed, such acceptance by both the audience and the male characters is essential to the action of Ecclesiazusae, in which the impersonation of males by the 'female' characters takes place. Thesmophoriazusae contains three levels of impersonation: the notion that characters who appear as women are accepted as women (by the conventions of performance: such iconic signifiers as a pale, beardless mask, female garments without the phallus, and a lighter tone of voice); male characters who must be perceived as passing for women (Agathon and Cleisthenes, non-fictional individuals noted for their effeminacy and cross-dressing; the actors would have employed the same performance signifiers as those playing women); and a male character, Mnesilochus, who deliberately guys the convention (his unmasking would have been comic only if his portrayal of a woman was seen to be exaggerated and less effective than that of the men-as-women present on the stage).

These three levels are pertinent to an assessment of the presentation of Evita Bezuidenhout. She was real, as real as the women who were, within theatrical conventions, accepted as real in Thesmophoriazusae. Uys's presentation of Evita Bezuidenhout was unlike the depiction of a woman by Mnesilochus, which could be likened to that of the pantomime dame. The dame is never feminine since the male identity of the performer is clearly retained. Like that performer Mnesilochus is obviously

a man parading as a woman and the audience is never in any doubt that it is a man. There is, then, little attempt at verisimilitude and part of the humour is derived from the juxtaposition of the female aspect of the clothes and the maleness of the body. The drag queen is the opposite extreme. Agathon and Cleisthenes are in this mould: men who could be accused of ridiculing women and attempting to titillate other males. Cleisthenes' transformation is so complete as to deny his male qualities, and Agathon reveals that he could not attend the festival of the Thesmophoria as women hate him for depriving them of their night-time pleasures.¹⁵³

In presenting Evita Bezuidenhout, Uys meticulously developed and maintained the illusion of her femininity, but by removing her wig in view of the audience to re-appear as a man, he explicitly ended the illusion. This action drew attention to the impersonation as part of a performance; it was seen as an external disguise assumed and discarded when necessary and was a metafictional comment on the art of performance. Nor did Evita Bezuidenhout make remarks or jokes at the expense of women; Uys, a man, played a woman to comment on society and politics to give an added perspective, not to comment on women. Soli Philander, noted for his impersonation of a coloured woman, Rosie September (the character appeared in a trilogy of theatrical presentations between 1991 and 1992: A Rosie Coloured Spectacle, Take Two and Double Take) expressed his disagreement with a reviewer who described his portrayal as a "drag act":

I don't see Rosie as a drag act. What drag acts do is send up women, and Rosie is not a send-up of a woman. I see her specifically as a character dealing with issues that are relevant today. Women, I think, have more to say and they are also the most oppressed.¹⁵⁴

As a vehicle to satirize stereotypes, Rosie September was rooted in the reality of being a coloured and a woman and a South African, and she exposed and ridiculed, in her often vituperative exchanges with audiences, racial, sociological and gender divisions.¹⁵⁵ Her discourse, as Glenn points out, was "honed by apartheid", but, unlike Evita Bezuidenhout, there "is no naïveté about her and this makes a profound difference from the occupational or false naïveté of Evita Bezuidenhout, where apartheid produces the double-speak".¹⁵⁶

The portrayal of Evita Bezuidenhout was a presentation of a character; she was never intended to offend, but be an integral part of an entertainment which was not to be judged or received on either a psycho-sexual level or on a legal level as a means to intentionally offend or deprave the morals of others. This point is important as, in a society which entrenches the heterosexual outlook of the majority of citizens, the wearing in public of clothes of the opposite sex still constitutes a punishable offence.¹⁵⁷ The security man was "ordered to close" Beyond the Rubicon because it was "subversive ... obscene ... blasphemous ... [and] just an excuse to wear woman's clothes. And that's illegal and also against the law in South Africa."¹⁵⁸

There was an element of ridicule included in the presentation of Evita Bezuidenhout. By reversing the accepted sexual and public roles and depicting a woman who supposedly succeeded and exerted political influence in a society of hidebound prejudices and patriarchal values, Uys gayed those prejudices and values: "This is a republic," Evita Bezuidenhout stated in Adapt or Dye, "There are no queens in South Africa."¹⁵⁹

4.4 Uys and Aristophanes: lampoons of non-fictional personae

The lampooning of non-fictional persons, and in particular, politicians, was a dominant feature of Uys's revues between 1981 and 1992. The first version of Adapt or Dye contained impersonations of Vorster, Koornhof, P.W. Botha and Pik Botha, besides Barbara Woodhouse, the English dog trainer (who appeared on SABC-TV at the time; in the revue she demonstrated how to train Progs, the then Progressive Party). In succeeding revues no politician, of whatever party or race or country, was exempt from satiric parody which, through distortion and exaggeration, aimed to evoke laughter and scorn. During the 1980s it became a convention to ridicule P.W. Botha in the theatre: Kirby and Taylor did so in word and song, while De Vries and Mtwá (in Woza Albert!) added to the ridicule by actually impersonating him. More recently, Billy Prince, who has mastered

the distinctive characteristics of various politicians, including Nelson Mandela, Pik Botha, De Klerk and Amichand Rajbansi (founder of the National People's Party and chairman of the Minister's Council for Indian Affairs between 1984 and 1988), first appeared on SABC-TV in 1992.

The artistry and acuity of Uys's visual and aural imitation of P.W. Botha and other known individuals was frequently noted by reviewers and directors, for as Lawson has stated regarding his direction of Uys in Rearranging the Deckchairs on the SA Bothatonic, "his flesh-and-blood characters are such masterpieces, and he's refined them so well ... that what I did was enhance them technically" through lighting and sound effects. The satiric purpose of such lampoons was, however, not addressed by reviewers. Shaun de Waal, in his review of A Kiss on Your Koeksister, revealed a lack of understanding of the association between the verisimilitude and the intent of the impersonation:

The criticism of Uys as a kind of harmless court-jester is validated by parts of this show. He relies a bit too much on his talent for impersonation, the humour coming from the acuity of the take-off rather than any satirical point Uys is making about the character.¹⁶⁰

"Acuity" and "humour" were the essential aspects of Uys's theatrical lampoons; a merely accurate replication was "harmless" in that it could have been regarded as flattery of the subject. But a masterful impersonator, like a masterful portrait-painter, brings an added dimension to pure imitation. A mediocre impersonator simply reproduces and the awareness of the receiver concludes with the recognition. As indicated in Chapter 1 in the discussion of Winstanley's criticisms of Uys, impersonation can never be neutral: it is not only a comment on the original subject but indicates an attitude to that subject.

4.4.1 The cartoon connection

The "satirical point" underlying the depiction of the non-fictional characters would have been understood by De Waal, perhaps, if they had been seen as cartoons in action, for there

is a discernible analogy between the art of the political cartoonist and that of the performer who caricatures the same persons on the stage.¹⁶¹ Visual and verbal satirists communicate with a shared iconographic vocabulary: Scarfe, the cartoonist of the London Sunday Times (mentioned in relation to Aristophanes' The Knights in Chapter 2, and whose elliptical style Uys admires for its sense of the grotesque), has justified his attacks by stating that "all politicians are fallible. My job is like that of a court jester: I point out to those in power that they may be wrong."¹⁶² Uys believes that political cartoons are "the only real source of issue" when the SABC-TV news broadcasts are "local interest slots" and (at the time of this personal interview in 1988) the English-language press was curbed by the Emergency Media Regulations cited in the previous chapter. Uys readily acknowledges the influence of political cartoonists on his work:

Apart from its biting humour ... and its artful simplicity, the political cartoon showed me that the shorthand of theatrical satire could be used on a subject without losing the audience. I discovered that people understood and enjoyed political cartoons.¹⁶³

Like a newspaper cartoonist and court jester, Uys's art was, in the revues between 1981 and 1992, immediate, with the impact of its comment framed by time and space. And like a caricaturist he developed and fixed an instantly recognizable yet distorted spectrum of particular politicians; likewise these familiar figures were placed in a new context which exposed and re-interpreted them. As a theatrical cartoonist Uys strove to reduce to the essential signifiers a human subject for both satirical attack through humour and as a display of his ability as an impersonator. The visual "shorthand" necessary for caricature taught Uys that a sense of verisimilitude could be achieved not by exact replication, but by the selection and exaggeration of the most readily observable visual (and in the theatre, aural) features of the original figure. His achievement in developing caricatures of the highest order was reflected in his invitation to perform in Two Dogs and Freedom (the gala charity benefit concert for the British Defence and Aid Fund for Southern Africa at Sadler's Wells in London in October 1988) with the "Spitting Image" team, whose work he admires for "creating a brand of satirical shorthand on television". (The influential "Spitting Image", whose cartoonists Peter Fluck and Roger Law designed and sculpted three-dimensional caricatures of politicians and celebrities, debuted on Independent Tele-

vision (ITV) in Britain in 1984.) Uys appeared in a sketch as P.W. Botha with Thatcher, a puppet created and manipulated by "Spitting Image" performers. Their style and approach to caricature undoubtedly influenced Uys, as indicated, in part, by the criticism of "tastelessness" in his revues in the late 1980s, principally regarding Cry Freemandela - The Movie, for "Spitting Image" was likewise accused of tastelessness. Fluck has stated in reply: "What's the point of a caricature if it doesn't go straight to the throat? If you're going to be rude, why not be really rude?"¹⁶⁴

As a theatrical cartoonist Uys incorporated three interrelated elements in his impersonation of a particular politician: the caricature, by visual and aural likeness; the political comment or criticism implied or conveyed by the impersonation; and a particular image, association or context which communicated the attitude underlying the impersonation. These three elements were present, for example, in the lampoon of Pik Botha in the 1981 Adapt of Dye. The monologue was entitled "The Hamlet of Westdene". (Westdene is the constituency in which Uys had intended to stand for election as an Independent candidate in the April 1981 elections; Pik Botha would have been his opponent.) Firstly, Pik Botha was impersonated visually (by means of applying a black moustache and donning a black wig to reinforce Uys's facial mimicry) and aurally (by reproducing the original's nasalized voice). Secondly, the criticism of his ineffectual stance on South Africa's relations with Namibia concerning the United Nations Resolution 435 of 1978 which aimed to prepare for and oversee the territory's independence and the withdrawal of South African troops (the monologue opened: "To be or not to be in Namibia - that is the question") was communicated.¹⁶⁵ Thirdly, the monologue incorporated an association with Hamlet (Pik Botha's views were a pastiche of extracts from the soliloquies in Shakespeare's play and his property, appropriately, a skull) to support the analogy between Pik Botha's vacillation between various options, his contradiction of previous decisions and unwillingness to take decisive action, and the image of the dramatic character who is regarded as indecisive. As indicated in the first chapter, satirists such as Uys employ humour to engage audiences; as a weapon it can, as Uys has stated, make politicians appear ridiculous to those who are

meant to respect them and thereby undermine their authority. This is in keeping with Elliott's belief that the impulse to condemn through ridicule is and has been an international phenomenon. Whether, as claimed, such ridicule would result in an actual loss of eminence and discourage deviant behaviour is questionable. Uys's use of caricatures in the revues was allied to his perception of the duality of the Verfremdungseffekt: the cotton wool (the humour) hiding the blade (the criticism).

In impersonating a politician such as Pik Botha as accurately as possible, in terms of kinesics and paralanguage in particular, Uys was seemingly limiting the lampoon to an individual. Yet, as with Aristophanic lampoons, the individual could be seen as a type, a signifier for a group or party or ideology. In A Kiss on Your Koeksister Pik Botha was impersonated by Uys in the persona of his secretary, Elaine Koen, who had worked in the Department of Foreign Affairs for twenty years and who had been threatened with dismissal if she ever performed her well-known impersonation of the minister again. She was forced to, however, as he did not appear at the potjiekos stand at the bazaar. The implications motivating the impersonation were apparent: Pik Botha the individual was incapable of performing the most menial of official duties. Furthermore, in the alternating dialogue between Koen and Koen-as-Pik Botha, the pervasive duplicity and double-speak of National Party politics and politicians in general was exposed.

In An Evening with Pieter-Dirk Uys, Uys transformed himself into Pik Botha (more stooped physically than before, with a grey wig and slurred speech) in view of the audience to validate his inclusion in the revue:

I'm not here.

I'm not in this show

However I'm in this show for a very good reason. The reason I'm in this show is the following: the first half of the show is over, in other words, it has come to the moment which is usually called the interval. Let me state here most categorically: the word interval means just that. It is not some subversive code for a secret project of the government, for the simple reason that secret government projects no longer exist.

In fact the government barely exists.¹⁶⁶

While speaking he neatly folded a blank sheet of paper into an aeroplane which he threw into the audience as he exited. At the time, October 1992, with a national crisis in unemployment and in education, with rising levels of violence, with uncertainty regarding the future, the negotiators at the Convention for a Democratic South Africa (Codesa) were in deadlock at the second session at the World Trade Centre in Johannesburg. At this time Pik Botha had flown to Luanda to mediate, unsuccessfully it turned out, between the Uniao Nacional para a Independência Total de Angola (Unita) leader Jonas Savimbi and President José Eduardo dos Santos of the Movimento Popular de Libertacao de Angola (MPLA), to avert renewed civil war in Angola (despite the fact that the National Party had, since Angola's independence from Portugal in 1975, sanctioned military intervention into Angola and had, furthermore, financially supported Savimbi and Unita).

The monologue made no mention of these facts, nor were Pik Botha's actual words presented, although the rambling and repetitive syntax and the contrast, in diction, between the emphatic and meaningless which characterized his style of discourse were accurately reproduced. But he as an individual and, by association, the party he represented were damned for their ineffectuality. Pik Botha was caricatured to exploit the reductive powers of ridicule and to exemplify a concept, as Cleon epitomized demagoguery in Aristophanes. Like Cleon, Pik Botha was depicted as an alazon "categorically" claiming qualities and abilities which he and his party did not possess. Even more than P.W. Botha, the archetypal alazon, Pik Botha was presented as the homolochos, the buffoon (as was Koornhof).

If the criticism appeared unsubtle and forced, this was in keeping with political cartoons which necessarily oversimplify issues. The format is two-dimensional, the message direct; subtleties hinder the impact, as would any emotional or psychological complexity. Such caricatures, like cartoons, cannot rely on lengthy explanatory details. Within the format of a monologue in a revue by Uys, in addition, such personae could not develop or change. They were intended to focus on a limited satiric point or exemplify a concept or

issue. Given the requirement for recognition, such caricatures demanded simplicity and distortion, the quintessential peculiarities of the original person at a characteristic moment.

Therefore, Uys admits, his non-fictional personae did not require dimensions and had to be instantly familiar: "You cannot afford an alphabet in a revue. You put on a pair of glasses and in a second they've got to start laughing. If you've got to explain who you are, forget it."¹⁶⁷ Uys did not fail to make three-dimensional characters in his lampoons; he did not attempt to do so.

In Uys and Aristophanes the lampoons were icons in the sense that they had to be recognizable (if not visually in the comedies of the latter, then by word and deed). And such non-fictional characters were deictic in that the lampoon was, often, a generic signifier for a particular group or party or profession. If, in Aristophanes, the factional figures tend more to fiction than fact, the reverse was true of Uys's lampoons in his revues of the 1980s. In both they were visual and auditory cartoons, with differences in the degree of verisimilitude to their real-life sources. Although 'real' in source and depiction, the iconic signs were never accepted as 'reality' as the comedy and the conspiratorial irony (in McLeish's description) established between performer and spectators functioned against any suspension of belief. Nor did the acuity of the presentation dictate any adherence to logic, consistency or accuracy in the words spoken. The metonymic association between the paper aeroplane and Pik Botha's diplomatic travels was deliberately ridiculous. As Olson has written of Aristophanes:

If you want to make dramatic cartoons like those of Aristophanes, you will have to find metaphors which are visual and auditory, and ones that involve actions that can be depicted on the stage. And they will have to be ridiculous - extravagantly so: you can do this by choosing metaphors which debase as much as possible ... and by including the absurd.¹⁶⁸

The greater the sense of the "ridiculous" and "absurd", the greater the possibility of humour and hence audience engagement in the process of ridicule and, ultimately, criticism. As De Ste. Croix has observed of the mixture of seriousness and foolery in

both Aristophanes and political cartoonists, "such comic dress is a necessity of the genre".¹⁶⁹ In Beyond the Rubicon, after presenting facts which belie the slogan that "apartheid is dead", Uys in the Uys-persona and to the accompaniment of "comedy music", changed into Koornhof by donning the distinctive and grotesque half-mask for the persona, and added a party hat.¹⁷⁰ The visual image was deliberately ridiculous and, as in Aristophanes, the portrait was not limited to political issues; the lampoon was personal as well. With a champagne glass in hand, Koornhof began:

Thank you, baie dankie ... we are celebrating change and reform in South Africa, because as you know in 1985, thanks to my President's Council, we chucked out the Mixed Marriages Act, whereby Blacks and Whites can marry, among others, each other. Of course, thanks to the Group Areas Act, there's nowhere they can live, but that's another story.
Apartheid is dead. Gesondheid.¹⁷¹

What had been, in Adapt or Dye, a witty caricature, was, by Beyond the Rubicon, a double-edged portrait of geniality and double-speak (pass law enforcement was, in Koornhof's explanation, "subsidies for black bus passengers ... going to the homelands for a holiday").¹⁷² The repetition of "Apartheid is/are dead", an actual statement made by Koornhof, provided, in the context, an insight into the lie of so-called reform. By Rearranging the Deckchairs on the SA Bothatonic the quality of bonhomie had been removed from the lampoon: the Koornhof of the many promises 'necklaced' a white voter with a tyre named 'apartheid'.

The impact of Uys's lampoons was reinforced by the strategy Uys employed: to base the material in facts, in the truth. In an interview, during his 1987 tour of Australia, he stated: "What I try to do is hold up a true mirror and leave the comedy to the eye of the beholder."¹⁷³ In presenting facts as stage material, characters (and by association, ideologies) satirize themselves. To prove that the government writes his material, at the conclusion of Beyond the Rubicon Uys quoted "from one of our few remaining daily newspapers: the Government Gazette. Now this is the Truth the whole Truth and Nothing but the Truth so help me P.W."¹⁷⁴ He then proceeded to read the lists of the official changes in racial classification for 1985. It became, in this context, a satire of legislative

sophistry in the form of a tongue-twister of pigment permutation. Peter Nichols, the reviewer for London's Time Out described the item as "a monologue at once shocking, stupid, hilarious and tragic truth acts as a monstrous indictment of apartheid".¹⁷⁵

Uys has repeatedly claimed that he is primarily an entertainer and that presenting a political issue through the medium of a lampoon is subordinate to that function. "Apartheid," he said in an interview with the San Francisco Chronicle in 1986, "is an absolute crime against humanity, but there is no point in saying it like that [on the stage] so that it becomes a slogan."¹⁷⁶ For a performer who wished to entertain but who based his material in the 1980s on the facts of apartheid, the means to avoid accusations of exploitation rather than critique was to indicate his commitment:

People say to me, "Do you want to change the attitudes of your audience?" Well, that's a dangerous question. First of all I've got to entertain because I'm in the theatre. But if one was just [delivering] the lines saying "dead children" to get an effect ... without any political commitment then it's obscene.¹⁷⁷

As Uys maintained in 1988, all his work had "been anchored in anger", but "anger adapted for [his form of] theatre". His anger was not expressed in open invective. Sam Sole perceived that, unlike many "satirists who are mere verbal cartoonists, Uys is a political animal".¹⁷⁸ What distinguished Uys from many similar entertainers during the 1980s was the innate sense of subversion underlying his work. In order to subvert he did not "invent" his material. To develop his own image further, his work was subversive in that the cotton wool (the caricature) provided a visible exterior which was humorous and entertaining, whereas the surgical truth of the blade was the means to dissect and expose the corruption or hypocrisy or folly. On its own the blade might not have been tolerated, might have negated the humour necessary to engage interest through entertainment. As a "political animal" he depicted, as accurately as the physical and verbal impersonation, the actual feelings, qualities and motivations which politicians attempted to deny or disguise. So, for example, as Sole observed of A Kiss on Your Koeksister, Uys revealed "the sick and ferocious cruelty of the Afrikaner Weerstandsbewiging; the suspicion of an incipient brutality in 'Ma' Winnie [Mandela]; the dubious trustworthiness of a man who smiles as much as De Klerk".¹⁷⁹

4.4.2 Uys's theatrical caricatures: the process

Political cartoonists cannot be wholly objective. As quoted in Chapter 1, Seidel believes that satirists have to "fight dirty". For this reason no daily cartoon has appeared in the New York Times as, the former publisher Arthur Sulzberger claimed, "A cartoon cannot say, 'On the other hand.'" ¹⁸⁰ Caricature is characterized by selected exaggeration; lampoons are based on truth, but a truth distorted for satirical purposes. Uys's "true mirror" was a distorted glass in which living persons were seen in a transmogrified form. The comedy did not simply lie in the eyes of the beholder for Uys had beheld the living persons prior to and for their presentation as stage personae. The spectators viewed them through his eyes as well and his vision was, of necessity, distorted. Caricature has two fundamental purposes: observing reality objectively, but transforming it subjectively.¹⁸¹ In choosing a target, in arranging that person's words in a format which displayed his ideas and speech patterns, and in selecting that target's most prominent physical peculiarities and characteristic expression, Uys had already begun to speak through his work to the viewer and to inform a response.

Uys's selected exaggeration was a result of direct observation of his targets, studying them on television and videotaped recordings and by consulting photographic sources. Lawson has testified to Uys's "strong visual sense" which enabled him to "reproduce those marvellous impersonations ... in a cartoon-like way". These impersonations were, Uys supposed (in an interview for the Sydney Sunday Telegraph), the product of a gift for observation, for "analysing people's body language. It's a study of communication shorthand."¹⁸² Initially his interest in impersonation was channelled into the classes on make-up he conducted while at the University of Cape Town Drama Department. Loren taught him to observe and concentrate on the mouth and eyes, which first express emotion, and then the extremities of the body, the hands and the feet.¹⁸³ Political cartoonists similarly concentrate on the mouth and eyes, the voluntary aspects of expression, along with the nose and hairstyle, to capture a likeness. For Uys, unlike such

cartoonists, it did not end there; on the stage additional details of the person's use of paralanguage, kinesics and objects, each a deictic signifier, contributed to the total import of the caricature and added to the words spoken:

Particular facial characteristics is one of the factors. To it I add the vocal imitation, the body language and the mannerisms (which are the extremities), the visual characteristics (hats and other props), and of course, topicality. There are so many things to put into that one minute and forty seconds to make a full orchestra, not just the piccolo.

For presenting the lampoons in the revues between 1981 and 1992, the process had to be selective, not simply to capture a likeness but also because he realized that too many details confuse the spectator. What was essential was the minimum number of the most characteristic features to make the caricature instantly recognizable. Uys's technique was akin to the use of the mask in Aristophanic comedy, a means by which (if it was a likeness, it had to be a likeness exaggerated) the target was a recognizable cartoon in action. Such masks were actual (as for Koornhof) or created by facial transformation. In impersonating P.W. Botha, with the aid of only a hat and spectacles, Uys constructed a portrait-mask: a fixed, aggressive expression was maintained, Uys's face became a mask with glaring eyes, the mouth pulled into a grimace, and the face and chin retracted. The tongue protruding to lick the lips was almost the only movement. The stereotypical signs of hostility captured on the mask were supported by similarly stereotypical reinforcing and emphatic gestures, particularly the clenched fist and threatening forefinger. To argue that this impersonation of P.W. Botha was simply caricature of a minor sort was to misunderstand Uys's satiric purpose. As Glenn has indicated:

We see a political figure reduced to an ensemble of gestures, each of which is the result, in Uys's portrayal, of a kind of unconscious force (usually primary racism or Afrikaner self-justification) traversing the character. The effect is surely one of estrangement of a kind of wonder and amusement at the mechanisms at work, a Brechtian *Verfremdungseffekt*, *par excellence*.¹⁸⁴

During the 1980s this caricature did not remain static; like that of Pik Botha, P.W. Botha's caricature not only aged along with his real-life counterpart, but it evolved and was reinterpreted as various political and personal conditions altered. In 1985, Uys

recalled: "When I first did P.W. ... it was in Afrikaans and the character's trade mark was: 'South Africa is ... South Africa is ... South Africa is ...' Now it's in English and he says: 'South Africa won't ... South Africa won't ... South Africa won't ...'"¹⁸⁵ The use of such a portrait-mask was, in addition to being an acknowledgement of artifice (assumed before the eyes of the spectators as a reminder of the performance as a performance), a satiric comment in that its relative immobility presented the character as having a consistent ethos. In Beyond the Rubicon the portrait was that of a man trapped in gesture and mannerism. By Rearranging the Deckchairs on the SA Bothatonic he was trapped in ethos as well, for he was depicted as the perfected alazon, the braggart who consolidated his power by questionable methods. In that revue, in the costume of the captain of the SA Bothatonic, he further resembled the miles gloriosus, bombastic and blustering, boasting of his achievements, and like Lamachus in The Acharnians his career ended abruptly and disastrously.

Perhaps the lampoon did affect the target: it is said that Uys's impersonation of P.W. Botha was responsible for the State President's attempts to control his gestures, particularly the use of the aggressive forefinger. This was, in all likelihood, owing to the suggestions of a media adviser, for P.W. Botha's English became noticeably more 'anglicized'. Despite those visual and aural attempts to alter his image and attract more English-speaking support, the caricature by Uys indicated that little had fundamentally changed, either in his ethos or, by extension, in the political situation. This was reinforced in print in the portrait of P.W. Botha in A Part Hate A Part Love. The following extract exposes the reasons for the Tricameral System and reproduces the gestures and mannerisms of the stage lampoon:

The ultimate power to do anything he liked, would lie in the eager hands of the State President

P.W. Botha would be God

Botha was full of the excitement of his new obsession with a foolproof constitution to retain political supremacy not only in white hands, but in Botha's hands. He lisped and gesticulated, he licked his lips and wagged his fist. He would mould the land in his own image. He would ensure security and law and order above all else and, oh yes, he would remove apartheid forever.¹⁸⁶

The hands and the fist, far from "remov[ing] apartheid forever", would entrench it by force in a "foolproof constitution" which excluded the majority of South Africans. In Cry Freemandela - The Movie, his last appearance in an Uys revue while still in power, P.W. Botha was depicted as an emperor in a toga in the colours of the African National Congress and wearing a laurel wreath, a deus ex machina who brought about a happy and ironic conclusion: reconciliation and concord to South Africa by the stroke of his wand (a police quirt). With the immersion of the world of reality into the fantasy world of the film set, such a feat of wish-fulfillment, as in Aristophanes, appeared not only plausible but logical. By the end of A Kiss on Your Koeksister, P.W. Botha appeared only to deface a poster portraying his successor.

Constructing a portrait-mask, drawing a caricature for a political cartoon and creating a theatrical lampoon all concentrate upon and require (as stated in Chapter 2 of portrait-masks) certain identifiable and distinctive physiognomic features of the original subject. Initially, therefore, Uys encountered difficulties in impersonating De Klerk. In February 1989, when P.W. Botha bowed out from National Party leadership, Uys stated: "F.W. has the same bald head as P.W., but sadly he hasn't got The Finger. I wish he'd start wearing earrings, something that I can hone in on otherwise he's going to be difficult."¹⁸⁷ Therefore, in A Kiss on Your Koeksister, Uys depicted him in the mask of a blandly smiling clown, a satiric comment in itself, for the State President as F.W. de Clown performed a magic routine, 'The New South Africa', but was inept. Like the policy being 'sold' at the bazaar, he was a fake conjurer, juggling concepts and contradicting himself: "Watch my hands, watch my hands. Don't watch my hands," he repeated in performance.

Uys's caricatures have not been restricted to South African politicians. Thatcher appeared in Beyond the Rubicon as a character transformed out of Evita Bezuidenhout. Before vocally mimicking her carefully enunciated and deliberate manner of speaking, Uys created an instantly recognizable physical duplication of her physiognomy, with puckered,

raised eyebrows and pursed lips. Thatcher's monologue began with an attack on apartheid, but she was unable to complete her explanation of why she could not impose sanctions on South Africa to enforce its removal. (In London, Evita Bezuidenhout explained that Thatcher had refused to do so to avoid "two million white refugees on her doorstep".¹⁸⁸) In the same revue P.W. Botha had been unable to complete his thoughts. This sense of political complicity was continued in Cry Freemandela - The Movie in which Thatcher impersonated various characters (including the Minister of Justice, Kruger, before taking over the direction of the 'film' from Sir Richard Attenborough just as she had taken over the 'direction' of the conflict in the Falklands) and was metamorphosed into P.W. Botha at the conclusion to visually reinforce the association. Uys portrayed both as having similar personalities and tactics; to him "Thatcher is like P.W. in a dress: she also lectures people, she bullies them and redefines words to mean what she wants."¹⁸⁹ These qualities of her political demeanour were apparent in A Kiss on Your Koeksister in which, as Madame Maggie the fortune-teller, she displayed her contempt for any who opposed her. Thatcher's complicity with De Klerk was intimated by Evita Bezuidenhout who irreverently described him as Thatcher's "toyi-toyi boy", dancing to her tune.

While it could be acknowledged that the comment underlying a cartoon in print and a caricature on the stage must be readily understood and that they are not suited to the presentation of complex analysis or subtle arguments, this does not negate their use as a means to expose, condemn, ridicule or undermine. Nevertheless, there are dangers in verisimilitude of a high order, as it can be said to draw attention to the craft of the performer rather than the point of the impersonation: the form is then separated from and regarded as having greater import than the content. In Uys's revues of the 1980s and early 1990s this unfortunate dichotomy was exacerbated by reviewers who remarked on the humour of Uys's depiction of Koornhof or the accuracy of his caricature of P.W. Botha without connecting those intentions to the satiric intent. The merit of his work was seen as being outside the sphere of politics, as having style rather than substance.

Caricature is obviously dependent on a model. Some reviewers saw Uys's personae as new creations, as factions divorced from the reality of the original. As Greig indicated in his review of A Kiss on Your Koeksister: "What's deadly about Uys's satire is how, having watched it, one can never see the targets as they actually exist: they become Uys creations, irredeemably stained with his vision. The real figures become fictional."¹⁹⁰

Conversely, the act of caricature is bound to the target being ridiculed so that the satire is sustained by the person or system being attacked. Audiences and reviewers began to expect to see particular lampoons repeated, thus reinforcing their positions. Uys was faced with the paradox of knowing that, although his intention was to ridicule and undermine the authority of politicians, some of the targets professed delight and interest. They had to be prominent in the public eye to be successfully caricatured, and a lampoon confirmed and maintained that position. No matter how offensively a politician may be depicted, perhaps it is worse not to be caricatured. Ridicule was popular with audiences if the repetition of caricatures of specific individuals is considered. But what was true of Cleon's status after such ridicule was as true of P.W. Botha's status; audiences enjoyed the ridicule in the theatre, yet P.W. Botha was re-elected to power and his policies vindicated in referendums in the world of political reality. The P.W. Botha persona created by Uys was clearly regarded as a faction, a character within the illusory framework of the stage, despite Uys's use of distancing devices.

This dilemma is also faced by political cartoonists whose work is seen in print.¹⁹¹ Nevertheless Murray and Elzabé Schoonraad, who have documented the work of South African cartoonists, maintain that political cartoonists do have power, not only to reflect but also to shape history. Of the various examples they cite, two indicate that cartoons have had an impact: a cartoon by Fred Shilling in the Cape Times of 18 June 1946 was the subject of a mini-debate in the House of Assembly, and D.C. Boonzaaier's cartoons were seen as partly responsible for the political decline of the first Prime Minister of the Union, Louis Botha.¹⁹²

By holding up a mirror, albeit distorted, Uys was, through the caricatures presented in the revues between 1981 and 1992, in part reflecting his own anger and cynicism, in part maintaining some awareness of the corrupt and hypocritical within the status quo. As far as possible within the limitations imposed by the two-dimensional format, his objectives echoed those of the South African political cartoonist Jonathan Shapiro, of "offering explanations of their [politicians'] actions other than those given in the official version".¹⁹³ In part, too, Uys was indulging the enjoyment of the public in the reduction of figures in authority. In the eighteenth century the Earl of Chesterfield wrote that "ridicule is the best test of truth".¹⁹⁴ Whatever the impact of his lampoons, Uys administered the test.

4.5 Production and performance aspects of Uys's revues

"It is not the story that counts," observes Oom Schalk in the title story of Bosman's Mafeking Road. "What matters is the way you tell it."¹⁹⁵ Uys told his stories by various means but always, as with Bosman's fictional narrator, with an awareness of the receiver and of establishing and maintaining some relationship between performer-as-persona and receiver prior to and during the telling. The need to relate with, not simply perform for, an audience is a vital aspect of solo performance as the form promotes and demands a character-to-audience relationship and lacks the interest of so-called plot and character-to-character conflict.¹⁹⁶ Uys's personae, by acknowledging the presence of the receivers through focus and by demonstrating a desire to reveal their thoughts or promote their ideological beliefs, declared a willingness to establish a relationship. If, as stated in Chapter 1, one of the intentions of satire is persuasion, then the engagement of the audience in the process and an implicit agreement concerning the rightness of the criticism or ridicule is essential. In Uys's revues, if not all his work, humour was a principle means of engagement.

4.5.1 Preparatory and visual signifiers

Uys executed a powerful influence on the expectations of his audiences, and subsequently the manner in which they would receive the revues, by the use of such carefully designed preparatory signifiers as publicity and programmes. Lawson has testified to Uys's meticulous concern in every aspect of performance, from conceiving the visual aspect of a production to the design for programmes and publicity material. Uys maintains that the basis of his work was his marketing, which he learnt while in the Public Relations Department of Capab: "I do my own publicity," he states, "I control my work, I'm my own producer, my own company, and so I stand or fall by what I do."

He did not simply perform onstage; in a sense he performed before appearing onstage. When planning a revue he began with a title, either a statement by P.W. Botha ("adapt or die" and "beyond the Rubicon"; or one combined with a topical reference, such as P.W. Botha's "total onslaught" and the year 1984 in Total Onslaught 1984) or by cross-referring to his surname (Uyscreams with Hot Chocolate Sauce (1980), Farce About Uys, Skating on Thin Uys). Some titles he had kept in mind for years. If he lost the appeal against the banning of Die Van Aardes van Grootoor in October 1978, the production would have been replaced by a bilingual revue entitled (in Afrikaans) A Kiss on Your Koeksister, a title which he used (in English) eleven years later.¹⁹⁷

To Uys the programmes were "Act One", a means to relax the audience (he likens them to Valium) and introduce not only the content but also the context of the material. For Total Onslaught 1984 a twelve-page booklet, "Mrs Evita Bezuidenhout's Survival Manual for all White Women of Kultuur", served as the programme, and was humorous in itself. In London, the programme for Adapt or Dye (Beyond the Rubicon in South Africa) took the form of an open letter to Thatcher by Evita Bezuidenhout, listing the items in the revue and with a preamble which included excerpts from her "survival manual" for Thatcher's enlightenment. In South Africa, audiences patronizing the same revue were given nine-

page facsimiles of the passport issued to the inhabitants of the Republic of Bapetikosweti and copies of an "Arrival/Departure Form" issued by the Department of Travel of that republic to attend the revue. Countries for which the passport was valid included the "Republic of South Africa (Pretoria)", the "Republiek Zoutpansberg (Tues. only)" and "Sun City State". The travel brochure (in a sea-sick bag) which was the programme for Rearranging the Deckchairs on the SA Bothatonic contained an embarkation card, cruise programme, menu, free postcard and, a forewarning to the theatre-goers, a vehicle sticker which read: "I went down on the SA Bothatonic." In keeping with the bazaar setting of A Kiss on Your Koeksister, the programme contained fictitious recipes for traditional fare and an indirect reference to the prevailing sense of change in South Africa from Evita Bezuidenhout: "Enjoy yourself. You are now safely in a democracy. Just do what you're told."

Visually, the revues were pared to the essentials for the telling of the stories; the simplicity of the staging became a means to highlight the strategies of the performer, the storyteller. From the three cardboard cartons on the stage in Beyond the Rubicon Uys produced what was necessary to make the more than thirty changes in persona. "Since then," he said in an interview, "I've needed three boxes onstage and that's it. Nothing else It must all come out of the boxes." The contents were the only wigs, garments and accessories essential to the transformations. As stated earlier, one-person presentations tend to be performer- rather than production-vehicles, and satiric performers generally present their material on a stage which functions as a tabula rasa, the locale specified as necessary.

Depending on the theme of the revue, some were enhanced by more detailed settings (the barbed-wire surrounded playground for Total Onslaught 1984) and ship's deck for Rearranging the Deckchairs on the SA Bothatonic, for example) but Uys did not find these vital to performance. When Adapt or Dye completed its season at the Donmar Warehouse in London in November 1988, Uys returned to Cape Town to attend Lawson's production

of Panorama. The performances were cancelled for the remaining week's run when an actress fell ill. With the properties and costumes for his revue still en route from London, Uys improvised with what was available to present the twenty-two personae of the same revue as Pieter-Dirk Uys in London at the Nico Malan, rather than allow the theatre to be 'dark'. In an interview in 1992, held after he had initiated the establishment of the Café Mozart in Cape Town to encourage performers to write and present their own material without elaborate facilities, Uys said: "I would like to see people perform without [these]. I can do twenty-seven characters on a kitchen table. Theatre is the only live thing left apart from the church. The rest is all canned."¹⁹⁸

Lawson, when questioned on the design for Rearranging the Deckchairs on the SA Bothatonic, replied: "We [Lawson and Uys] didn't work with a designer per se because this is another of his rare talents: he sees the whole thing with design in mind as well." The setting for each revue was designed to reinforce the theme and title and style of performance. In Adapt or Dye Uys performed before a screen to which was attached the slogan "Ons Land, Ons Volk, Onslaught" in bold lettering. Those words encapsulated the revue: the situation in South Africa in 1981; a spectrum of characters; and characters and country under threat from within and without. Hence the play on P.W. Botha's words, "We must adapt or we will die."¹⁹⁹ In this and the succeeding revues not one among the spectrum presented was an indication or gave any indication that adaptation would be peaceful.

Dawie Malan, who directed Uys in Total Onslaught 1984 added "macabre" elements to the designs for that revue:

The acting area took on the feel of a child's playroom, with a rope ladder extending from the floor up to the flies. On this ladder hung various toy animals representing various Cabinet Ministers, such as those of Defence, Finance, Law and Order - a veritable Animal Farm [an allusion to Orwell's novel, published in 1945; the revue's title had already alluded to his 1984]. On stage was a Junk Box out of which the props and costumes came, toy tanks, a tea-set, and a child's desk and chair. Everything was painted red and surrounded by rolls of barbed wire on which small pink dolls were suspended.²⁰⁰

With repeated warnings by P.W. Botha of the onslaught on South Africa by the 'communists' the dominant red colour was appropriate, as was the choice of portfolios of the Cabinet Ministers represented by the toy animals, for the "total onslaught" P.W. Botha warned of in the House of Assembly in 1978 would be, among others, military, economic and sociological.²⁰¹ In Total Onslaught 1984 Uys inverted the Prime Minister's phraseology by inferring that to maintain his hegemony P.W. Botha was ruling a 'total'-itarian state, one which would result in pink dolls being impaled on barbed wire. The inversion was reinforced by the subtitle, Ja-No-Orwell-Fine, for just as Orwell had reversed the year 1948 for 1984, his vision of a totalitarian state in the future, so Uys reminded South Africans that in its victory in the 1948 General Elections, the National Party had been granted a mandate for a change in the philosophy and purpose of government. In 1984 the National Party's policies were as untenable as in 1948, and the toy tanks which would defend it against onslaught in the political playroom would ultimately prove to be futile.

P.W. Botha opened the revue by warning the nation of the onslaught on television from the set for "Wielie-Walie", an SABC programme for children. Both the setting and the fact that his address was hampered by technical problems undermined the seriousness of his intention. As a reminder of the absurdity of his government's policies, a clockwork monkey imprisoned in a cage struck a pair of cymbals to represent the seventy-one per cent constitutionally 'silent' majority.

On 15 August 1985, during the National Party congress held in Durban, P.W. Botha (by then State President) claimed: "I believe that we are today crossing the Rubicon. There can be no turning back."²⁰² These remarks echoed Julius Caesar's comments at the crossing of the Rubicon river: "Iacta alea est" ('The die is cast'); thereafter Uys had a basis for depicting P.W. Botha as believing himself to be an emperor. What had been expected in this speech were assurances of fundamental political and social reform; instead P.W. Botha, according to Peter Joyce, "gave the world a homily on non-interference.

The effect of this so-called 'Rubicon' speech ... was catastrophic."²⁰³ The speech and its effect provided Uys with the title and theme for Beyond the Rubicon, a vision of what lay beyond the Rubicon as seen through the conflicting eyes of his spectrum: Billie-Jeanne, who repeated her rendition of "No Way RSA" which she had performed at the Paraguayan Song contest; the white South African voter, who was "proud of apartheid"; Koornhof, who claimed "apartheid is dead"; Oom Hasie, who was on trial for "knowingly perpetuat[ing] an evil system in the name of democracy and Christianity"; Nowell Fine, and her schemes to benefit from the situation; and Evita Bezuidenhout, whose "lecture" served to bind the disparate items together.²⁰⁴

A large, tattered South African tricolour of orange, white and blue was suspended centre stage as a permanent backdrop to remind white South Africans that they were no longer victims, that they (like Oom Hasie) had sustained the system. As Garalt MacLiam noted in his review, whites who had seen Uys's previous revues might have believed they were

caught in the trap of history. They were not part of the system of repression They were not the ogres of apartheid being vilified in the overseas Press Today, Uys implies, that self image has become more than somewhat tarnished a question forces itself on the conscience: which of us [whites] is completely innocent? Is it not our taxes which have financed the system? Do we not stand as co-accused in the eyes of blacks?²⁰⁵

The tricolour was defaced by graffiti: the names of the political groups and other organizations who played a part in South Africa's past and future beyond the Rubicon, even those banned at the time of presentation: "ANC/PFP/INKATHA [Inkatha Yesizwe, led by KwaZulu's Buthelezi]/NP/AWB/COSAS [Congress of South African Students]/PAC [Pan-Africanist Congress]/SABC/SADF [South African Defence Force]/SAP [South African Police]/SACP etc."²⁰⁶ The questions as to which of these groups were prepared to adapt, were able to cope with change or were to be permitted into the process of reform were left unanswered, but the three tyres placed onstage throughout provided a visual warning which counterpointed the verbal references to the coercive powers of the state propounded in the State of Emergency. One carton had "Made in South Africa" written on it plus the slogan "Free Mandela"; the second "Made in South

West Africa" and "Free Namibia"; the third, which shocked reviewers in London out of any sense of complacency had "Made in the United Kingdom" and "Free Ulster". But "South Africa won't" and "I cannot" were the leit-motifs of the revue, as expressed by P.W Botha and Thatcher.²⁰⁷

In London, two years before the opening of Adapt or Dye, Uys had informed Maureen Cleave of the Standard that despite "impending doom" he had to "rearrange the deckchairs on the Titanic".²⁰⁸ Uys must have kept the image in mind as a possible theme and title for a revue, with pronouncements by P.W. Botha adding additional ideas. On 12 March 1982 at the opening of the Gazankulu Legislative Assembly in Giyani the Prime Minister admitted, for example: "I may know where I want to go, but not how to get there."²⁰⁹ With a general election scheduled for May 1987 the various ideas coalesced when, Uys told Lawson, he was browsing in a flea-market bookstall in Johannesburg and came across a book on the sinking of the Titanic; at the same moment he noticed some deckchairs nearby. Rearranging the Deckchairs on the SA Bothatonic was the product, a revue with the central image of a doomed ship of state which had travelled beyond the Rubicon into dangerous seas and whose captain, P.W. Botha, declaimed: "I love standing on the deck of my ship and looking north and south and east and west and realizing that we are in the middle of nowhere."²¹⁰ In a pattern of "My Way" he boasted that, although there was no destination, he had chartered the course his way, and that course would be followed.

His self-assurance was bolstered by the fact that the flagship of the National Line, like the Titanic, was unsinkable, despite the fact that he knew there were icebergs in its path. With various politicians acting as crew and entertainers, a wide spectrum was on board: conservative Afrikaners, security policemen, businessmen, soldiers, kugels, servants and children. The audience was on board too, for the signal to enter the auditorium was an announcement that the ship was about to sail. No one could disembark for the lifeboats were non-operational; the alternative would have been to literally and figuratively fall overboard.

The privileged First-, Second- and Third-class passengers were occasionally permitted to mingle, while steerage stayed below deck (a reference to the Group Areas Act); by now comprising seventy-four per cent of those on the SA Bothatonic, they increasingly made their dissatisfaction heard and became more and more difficult to suppress. Ship's regulations were aimed to ensure the comfort and enjoyment of the First-class passengers (a reference to the Separate Amenities Act of 1953). The outline of a boatdeck and bridge were simply and effectively created; downstage centre were three deckchairs in the orange, white and blue of the tricolour. These were, as suggested by the title, rearranged as constantly as were parliamentary seats. The visual image was supported by intercom announcements (between the monologues and sketches) and sound effects (from a ship's hooter to the sound of the SA Bothatonic hitting an iceberg).

The choice of the metaphor of the ship of state was explained by Uys in the programme notes:

The SA Bothatonic is an unsinkable ship owing to its clever constitutional structure, whereby the body of the liner is divided into completely separate watertight Chambers. Each Chamber is carefully isolated, the one from the other, so that in case of a state of emergency the destruction of one Chamber would not affect the survival of the others.

The three "watertight Chambers" (the decks) and the divisions between 'classes' (races) had been promulgated by the captain (P.W. Botha) and his appointment of the President's Council to formulate it in 1983; it was tested and endorsed in a whites-only referendum (thus in the revue the captain refuses to alter course; as he said: "I have my mandate") and subsequently by elections for Second- and Third-class passengers (coloured and Indian constituencies) in 1984, despite the fact that the Chamber for the First-class passengers (the white House of Assembly) was numerically scaled so that it was larger than both the other chambers.²¹¹ Not only was apartheid entrenched in the "constitutional structure" of the State, but the black population, the silent majority, was again excluded. As stated in the previous section, the captain was trapped in gesture, manner and belief, head not of a 'ship of fools' but of the mad.

Onstage in Rearranging the Deckchairs on the SA Bothatonic was a life-size dummy, continually spoken to in sketches and monologues, tortured by a police interrogator in one sketch and 'necklaced' by a lifebelt in another. Of no specific gender, race or name, this ever-present and passive third 'performer' provided its own visual commentary: a black brutalized for opposing the system and a white voter necklaced for sustaining the same system. The latter action was performed by Koornhof, the man who had claimed "apartheid is /are dead" in earlier revues. In this revue politicians were the targets of Uys's anger and bitterness: not only Koornhof and P.W. Botha, but Pik Botha and the "Boland Buddies" Heunis and Worrall, who performed their duet (patterned on "Bosom Buddies" in Jerome Lawrence and Robert E. Lee's Mame (1966)) in the Helderberg bar (Helderberg was the name given to the iceberg; it was the constituency contested by Heunis and Worrall in the May 1987 elections).

P.W. Botha's 'reform' initiatives have been seen as the major cause of further economic sanctions and the resurgence of unrest throughout South Africa, which resulted in the declaration of the first State of Emergency on 20 July 1985 to remain in force for five years, new regulations which gave police wider powers to detain people and suppress information, restrictions on all extra-parliamentary forces and the first patrols of townships by citizen force soldiers in armoured vehicles.²¹² In addition, the period saw the emergence of various paramilitary Afrikaner groups and the use of the necklace method of murdering alleged collaborators by covert organizations. All these were reflected in Rearranging the Deckchairs on the SA Bothatonic, which Uys continually updated, particularly after the elections (with Treurnicht's Conservative Party as the new opposition, the SA Bothatonic was described as "travelling round and round in circles to the right").²¹³

The fictional world created for Cry Freemandela - The Movie (with the design above and to the rear of the acting area incorporating elements of a film set, complete with a director's chair and such props as a clapper-board) was appropriate to the theme and the

fantasy of the denouement. It is necessary to describe the circumstances which gave rise to the use of such a setting. The revue had a two-sided attack. It was based on two films, one concerning Biko and Woods (Attenborough's Cry Freedom (1987) for Universal pictures, based on Woods's autobiography and his biography of Biko), the other on Nelson and Winnie Mandela (Mandela - The Movie (1987), produced for television with a script by Ronald Harwood). The first was set in the past (events leading to 1977), the second in the present (1987). Cry Freedom - The Movie combined the titles of both films and juxtaposed past and present in presenting Attenborough's attempts to make an all-purpose, anti-South African Hollywood epic of his version of the life of the second incarcerated martyr, Nelson Mandela.

Unfortunately both films and the works on which they were based were banned in South Africa which resulted in audiences not always being aware of the allusions made in Uys's revue. Attenborough's Cry Freedom had not been screened in South Africa. The film, which was a box-office failure and had been criticized outside South Africa for its biased, simplistic and dilettantish approach, had been released by the Publications Appeal Board, uncut and without any age restriction in 1987.²¹⁴ A week before the first screening the Minister of Home Affairs, Stoffel Botha, demanded that the board reconsider its decision. The second ruling of the Publications Appeal Board, on 29 July 1988, was that the film did not promote revolution as it relied on "caricature", "sensationalism" and "blatant bias".²¹⁵ It was only passed for viewing by people over the age of nineteen years an hour before it was due to be screened.

Some five hours later, after it had been seen in more than thirty cinemas, the Commissioner of Police, General Hendrik de Witt, banned Cry Freedom and ordered police to seize all copies. The decision was supported by the Minister of Justice, Kobie [Hendrik Jacobus] Coetsee, who stated that Cry Freedom had contravened security legislation which prevented the quoting of "banned" people. Seven months earlier Uys had already satirized the "caricature", "sensationalism" and "blatant bias" of those from

other countries who depicted the situation in South Africa in Cry Freemandela - The Movie, especially since more covert forms of racism existed in the countries which produced such films (hence the portrayal of Thatcher's complicity in the revue). So too, Woods's sincere monologue was counterbalanced by his presentation as a naive buffoon, as opportunistic as Attenborough. At the same time Uys wished to remind South African audiences "that [they] are not allowed to make up [their] own minds about Biko and the Mandelas".²¹⁶ He had deliberately, therefore, flouted the same regulations which were later used to ban the film to inform South Africans of the control and manipulation of their opinions. And, as in the plays, Uys reinterpreted the past by a new perspective of the realities of the present, disguised in the metaphor of film mise en scène.

For A Kiss on Your Koeksister Uys again chose a metaphor which could be reinforced in visual terms: the setting was a representation of the various stalls at a National Party bazaar which aimed to sell the concept of the 'New South Africa'. The bazaar was officially opened by Evita Bezuidenhout, who cut the ribbon and declared it a reality. During the course of the revue, National Party policy was variously and scathingly compared to such things as condoms and three-card tricks. De Klerk presented an inept magic show (alias the New South Africa) and, although the programme had stated there would be no interval, he sent the audience out in a theatrical demonstration of the double-speak of his party. With her customary double-edge blend of innocence and guile Evita Bezuidenhout, after recounting the history of the koeksister, explained why it should be regarded as the symbol of the National Party: "Single yet plural, separate yet unified, with three halves making up one sweet, sticky whole - like us Nats, nê?"²¹⁷

But those invited to attend the bazaar in the new spirit of freedom (for the National Party was "now open to all races, within the framework of group and minority rights", she explained) as well as those who sold their wares were treated with like suspicion. In A Kiss on Your Koeksister, set in the confused political climate of an interregnum, Uys attacked all in or seeking power, cynically destroying any complacency concerning the

future and not accepting any political statement or organization or trust. In a bizarre situation (the pun was intentional) Uys aimed his satiric thrusts at all "mad sacred cows", to "ask the question[s] that people don't expect ... to make them think".²¹⁸

The personae were almost uniformly bizarre as well, and shockingly so in the context of the escalating violence and unrest behind the facade of progress and change. The absence of sympathetic characters was a distinctive feature of the revue. From the fictitious, the young Katryntjie Blanckenberg, a product of a racist upbringing who sold kisses for funds for the party (the suggestion of prostitution reinforced by stories of her own abuse) to the non-fictional, Winnie Mandela, whose entry was prepared for by references to her involvement in the abduction of Seipei ("Our esteemed head of Social Welfare [for the African National Congress] will demonstrate how to discipline a fourteen-year-old boy without spilling your cocktail") to the monologue of the Wit Wolf, the revue presented a bleak vision of brutality, in marked contrast to the setting adorned with bunting.²¹⁹ The futility of a New South Africa was captured in a monologue by a Cape coloured one-star angel (only five-star angels have haloes) who revealed that there is little hope for any South African, no matter what race, class or ideology.

In his last revues, for a purpose, Uys's settings become progressively minimalistic, to focus on himself as performer and the act of performance.

4.5.2 Strategies in performance

The revues commenced with what Uys has described as a "preamble": a means to "break down barriers", create an "umbilical link" between performer and spectator and "bleed over the traditional clear-cut edges of the theatre". This proxemic concern with maintaining a close relationship with audiences was a key concept of Uys's theatrical praxis in the revues of the 1980s and early 1990s, first signalled by Evita Bezuidenhout's

lengthy entrance through the auditorium in Adapt or Dye. In Beyond the Rubicon a security man prowled the auditorium as audiences took their seats and shone his torch on late arrivals. Such preambles did succeed in establishing a relationship. A reviewer described the opening of Beyond the Rubicon as follows:

They [the spectators] begin to giggle as he stiffens like a ... ridgeback at the smell of a seditious slogan [on one of the cartons], and they are laughing freely by the time he cautiously carries off a CNA [Central News Agency] plastic bag (initials reversed).²²⁰

The two kugels, like late arrivals themselves, also entered through the auditorium in Rearranging the Deckchairs on the SA Bothatonic, to embark on the ship of state. Conversely, Uys, as Attenborough, sat onstage for fifteen minutes reading the newspaper while audiences entered for Cry Freemandela - The Movie which had the effect, in a revue which centred on film-making, of causing audiences to speculate who was performing and who was being observed. These preambles led into laughter producing monologues or sketches, a necessary feature of productions by performers who wish to present political material, as it creates the "secret ... conspiracy" of laughter (to use Bergson's description, mentioned in Chapter 1) necessary to unite the individuals who entered the auditorium into a community sharing in the process of ridicule and criticism. (This sense of communal engagement Uys extended to the conclusion of the revues. When conceiving a revue, after the choice of title and theme Uys, like Leslie, concentrated on both the opening and the conclusion "because the last impression is what people take away with them".²²¹ As Evita Bezuidenhout exited in Total Onslaught 1984, she invited the audience to leave the theatre with her. She then sat in her 'state' vehicle (the white Cadillac) and signed autographs; a ploy Uys has explained as "Act Three".)

Uys, while uniting the audience by these means, ensured that spectators were never conscious of a loss of identity. Even in the largest auditoriums (such as the Opera Theatre in the State Theatre, Pretoria with a capacity of 1 326) he maintained a sense of addressing individuals although he could not sustain eye contact with the entire audience:

The first thing to do when you're onstage is incorporate your extreme edges, to make a point of talking from edge to edge to involve them all. If you leave the edges on a limb they get 'cold' and the coldness moves in to the centre I watch, watch, listen, listen, right to the back row.

The process was reciprocal. Particularly in monologues which had a strong satiric punch, Uys remained relatively still (apart from essential kinesic movement) most often in a downstage centre position; this tactic was deictic, a strategy to focus and concentrate the attention of the audience on himself and what he was communicating.

In those revues in which he appeared as the Uys-persona, after a preamble and a humorous first monologue to produce the sense of mutual engagement, Uys could insert his comments on particular items or topical issues and thereby place the monologues in a context, a context shared by performer and spectator. The contrast between the style of address adopted for the Uys-persona and those of the personae constantly modified the relationship between reciprocal agreement to one in which there need not be agreement between persona and spectator. For instance, both the Uys-persona and P.W. Botha were committed to what they said, but the sense of sharing ideas in the former and that of imposing ideas in the latter altered the manner in which the discourse was received, reinforced by the presentation of the former as an open, concerned persona and the latter as rigid, aggressive and unconcerned with the opinions of individuals.

Generally, the most distorted personae were the politicians, the unsympathetically presented non-fictional caricatures. Because of the difference in distortion between such personae and that, for instance, of the Uys-persona, McLeish's "state of conspiratorial irony" was established. Performer and spectators were collaborators in the lampoon. So, during the applause at the conclusion of A Kiss on Your Koeksister, Uys acknowledged the contribution of the spectators as fellow 'conspirators' by facing them as himself, without disguise, and returning their applause. At times the collaborators became themselves part of the target of the satire; again, however, only once humour had been established was the laughter of the audience utilized as a weapon against itself. Uys has

spoken of giving the audience "a big slab of chocolate to make them happy before whacking them with a rubber hose". To do so Uys employed a callback technique (itself a tactic to assist the performer in developing a rapport). The process, from a laughter of recognition to that of shock can be discerned in Campbell's description of the audience's response to the three callback presentations of the then Archbishop Tutu in Beyond the Rubicon:

The first is sheer caricature, playing on - and pandering to - popular prejudice. They loved it. The second was the joke about Tutu walking on water. That went down well, too. The last was a direct quotation about the Nobel Peace Prize winner who did not have the vote. "You think that's funny, hey?" Uys asked his audience. Dead silence.²²²

"You think that's funny, hey?" and "I couldn't make it up if I tried" were Uys's 'tags', his seemingly improvised and genuine responses to the punch. (These are a feature of many such performers and were perfected by Sahl, as described in Chapter 3.) They are a means to either reinforce the punch or restore the sense of rapport between performer and spectator.²²³ Such tags created, in part, the rhythms of Uys's performances and, as they were most often delivered by the Uys-persona, supported the quality of a genuine, frank exchange.

Structurally, the revues appeared loose and improvisational within the self-imposed ninety minute duration Uys adhered to. Yet they were most carefully structured according to four considerations. The first was his principle of opening with a humorous preamble and closing on a high point. When Lawson was questioned about the pre-rehearsal script of Rearranging the Deckchairs on the SA Bothatonic, he replied that Uys

had a very strong idea of the beginning, middle and end, and he'd written most of the sketches in one form or another. The others were gaps in the script with headings, and he outlined what he had in mind for those ... they were a starting-point and at the end of a rehearsal we'd both have ideas and he'd take them away and expand them.

The second consideration was the position of his 'soft bits', the areas of the revue which allowed for the inclusion of topical issues without disrupting the running order. Topicality

was of primary importance in all Uys's revues; on election night in April 1981 he had a radio onstage so that his script could be adjusted in the present of performance to the incoming results.

The third consideration was Uys's concern with changes in rhythm: "The revues are very rhythmically structured because I can sense a restlessness after twenty minutes [and] I have to change gear. My audience has a TV mentality. They want to make tea or go to the lavatory." Such rhythmic variations were the result of deliberate contrasts in tone, by altering the form of audience relationship through focus and by the change in the type of persona. The final four items of Rearranging the Deckchairs on the SA Bothatonic indicated how this technique of altering the rhythm by changing "gear" kept the attention of the audience alert and renewed, and reinforced the satiric point as individual 'stories' interacted on a similar theme. A sketch with two fictional characters, a young boy and girl, who revealed their bigoted nurturing (with patronizing references to their servants) was followed by a monologue performed by Uys as "The Nanny on the Beach", a servant who confessed that she had purchased a maid's uniform to pretend that she was minding white children while she looked at Robben Island where her husband was interred. This monologue was succeeded by one in which Galloway, as a young "Soldier in the Township", confessed his terror at having to "shoot at the kids of the maid that used to bath [him] at home".²²⁴ Finally Uys, as P.W. Botha, in a change into a non-fictional persona, revealed not only that politician's ignorance but the catastrophic end result of such misguided nurturing.

The fourth consideration was practical: "I write for my props table. I'm a very good stage manager," said Uys in a personal interview. "All my shows are structured from the stage management point of view." Uys has listed the requirements for Beyond the Rubicon to demonstrate how his transformations could be achieved.²²⁵ These he personally set and checked before performances. Absolute precision was vital: the transformation from the security man (who wore a safari jacket and shorts, long socks and veldskoene, hat and

mirrored sunglasses (to conceal the false eyelashes necessary for Billie-Jeanne) and carrying a torch, walkie-talkie, CNA/ANC packet) into Billie-Jeanne (in blonde wig, military cap, earrings, khaki shirt, white tights, shoes and gloves and carrying a revolver and flag) had to be made in fourteen seconds.

These considerations were a constant factor in the formulation of the structure of all his revues, despite changes in the context of performance: "Overseas the original structure remained, when hardly a line stayed the same," Uys has stated. "I adapt [the material] according to topicality and the situation." With a proven format and a recurring cast of familiar personae Uys fostered a sense of foreknowledge among his audiences. Predictability was avoided by the response of the personae to the changes or lack of changes in their context.

Die Van Aardes van Grootoor was the first of Uys's works in which the performers had to play more than one persona. In Farce About Uys a single performer (Uys) played a single persona (De Kock Bezuidenhout) impersonating the four other members of his family. These changes were made offstage. From Beyond the Rubicon, a one-person revue, Uys repeatedly revealed and concealed himself as a metafictional persona, in various guises, before the audiences. Increasingly the revues became performances about the creation of performance, concerned with role playing in a format in which characters themselves played roles and culminating, in 1992, in An Evening with Pieter-Dirk Uys. As discussed in Chapter 1, in this (supposedly his last) revue, he defended the essentially non-illusory framework of his revues and revealed the art and artifice of his style of performance.

In the solo revues, where it was impossible to leave the stage for any length of time as was possible in the revues with more than one performer, or where there was no interval, Uys attempted to perform all the changes in character onstage. In Adapt or Dye the central screen was employed to make such changes; by Beyond the Rubicon the theatricality of the performance was a feature of the revue, with Uys consistently

disrupting any sense of sustained illusion in an overtly self-referential manner. Nothing was to be hidden, and sound effects and lighting were to highlight this aspect: "Blackouts are very short - only used as punctuation and not to hide anything. Anything that happens on stage must be seen by the audience."²²⁶

As stated earlier, solo productions are predominantly performance vehicles; transforming into a well-known politician in view of the audience draws attention to the artistry of the impersonator. Uys did so with the minimum of aids, and only those he was unable to create with his own body: a wig and pearl earrings and necklace for Thatcher in Beyond the Rubicon, for instance. Uys was more than a conférencier, there to introduce the personae. As Ronge noted of this revue, "he dominates his creations. They are accessories to his voice and personality. He is the ventriloquist and they are the dolls."²²⁷

Such transformations heightened the contrast between personae and tone, and thereby aided his intention to change 'gear' in performance: "Uys balances the absurdity and horror of his subject by the comic theatrical effect of quickly changing from one character to another without leaving the stage," noted an Australian reviewer. "His trump card is to surprise."²²⁸ A reason for the surprise lay not merely in the acuity of the impersonation and in the rapidity of a transformation executed with minimal external aids, but also by what the juxtaposition between impersonations suggested. One persona was seen through another in the form of a palimpsest: in Beyond the Rubicon Uys transformed himself from Evita Bezuidenhout into Thatcher, and the non-fictional persona's inability to enforce change on the South African government was superimposed over the fictional persona's inability to cope without defiance against a changed South African government. So too, and in a Brechtian manner, the contradictions and similarities between many personae were dialectically placed within the framework of a single presentation. The dialectical comedy of the transformation from the hypocrisy of Nowell Fine, the kugel, into the hypocrisy of Evita Bezuidenhout was, in Beyond the Rubicon, counterpointed by the dialectical shock of the transformation from Tutu, who had no vote, into the white South African who had a vote.

Whereas in Farce About Uys one fictional persona impersonated other fictional personae, in Cry Freemandela - The Movie Uys, for the first time, experimented with multiple-personae impersonations of non-fictional persons by other non-fictional persons. In London, in September 1987, Uys had attended a performance of The Life of Napoleon (1987), a one-person presentation written and performed by John Sessions (known for his vocal mimicry with "Spitting Image") in which he not only impersonated historical figures, but did so as they would be interpreted by well-known actors (Olivier as Charles Talleyrand, Peter O'Toole as Napoleon Bonaparte, for example). Uys was impressed: "It gave an extra dimension of entertainment. So I thought about how I could blind my prejudiced, brain-washed South African audiences [into] bringing down their defences".²²⁹

In Cry Freemandela - The Movie "defences" were lowered by the comic spectacle of Joan Collins (Uys) and James Coburn (Galloway) performing as Winnie and Nelson Mandela. The satire of those who, in Uys's description, "make fiction out of fact" was heightened by Collins's insistence on playing Winnie Mandela so that she could wear her Calvin Klein originals and Coburn's mistaking his role as Nelson Mandela for Horatio Nelson.²³⁰ Uys played Attenborough who was ousted by Thatcher (Uys) who impersonated, among others, P.W. Botha (Uys). Narration was provided by the 'voices' of Olivier, Marlene Dietrich and Orson Welles. Once "defences" had been brought down in this way, Uys inserted factual material from biographical sources which jolted the spectators out of any sense of complacency; masks were stripped away to reveal the actual thoughts and attitudes of those impersonated.

In A Kiss on Your Koeksister Uys again used this multiple-personae impersonation technique. In this instance, however, he transformed himself into Koen, a fictitious character who proceeded to transform herself into a non-fictional character, Pik Botha, with the aid of a potato peel as a moustache. The satiric humour and performance demands of this presentation were reinforced by Uys alternating between the two personae to create their dialogue.

The multiple-personae impersonations of and by non-fictional persons Uys continued in An Evening with Pieter-Dirk Uys: Uys impersonated Collins impersonating Jani Allan, the ex-Sunday Times columnist, who sued Channel 4 TV network for libel in London in July 1992. (The case resulted from an hour-long documentary entitled True Stories - The Leader, His Driver and the Driver's Wife, which revealed Allan's affair with Eugene Terre'Blanche.) In this solo revue/review the Uys-persona both presented and commented on aspects of the life of the non-fictional Uys as a performer, playwright and director: he discussed and he performed previous Uys impersonations, he evoked the past by describing the banning of Uys's plays in the 1970s and he read correspondence from the censors, he recalled South Africa's past and he included topical material to indicate the situation in the present. At times the distinction between self and role were maintained, at others reality and illusion were deliberately merged. Uys interrupted Evita Bezuidenhout's striptease, when clothed in black corset, suspenders and stockings, to remove her wig and forestall any anxiety: "For heaven's sake, there is no Evita Bezuidenhout! It's just me! Relax. I've got a Jani Allan [monologue] coming up and this is one way of getting dressed, or undressed."²³¹

Besides destroying the suspension of disbelief in this manner, Uys also commented on the illusion of creating an exact likeness of all non-fictional figures by prefacing his impersonation of Buthelezi with the remark: "Which brings me to my next character. I won't need to black up to play him, because I will sound like him."²³² The illusion of Buthelezi's desire for peace was similarly destroyed in the lampoon itself:

God bless the Peace Process!
 We Zulus just want peace in South Africa!
 We demand peace in South Africa!
 We kill for peace in South Africa!
 The biggest piece of South Africa!²³³

Where vocal mimicry, aided by such accessories as spectacles, a tail switch and 'leopard' skin, supported the self-contained lampoon of Buthelezi, the transformation from the accurate physiognomic and vocal presentation of Thatcher into another non-fictional

persona became a comment on both personae. Whereas the Uys-persona had introduced Buthelezi, she introduced the next persona by admitting: "Believe me, this will not be a major change."²³⁴ To underline the comic impact of the pun, she removed her wig to reveal another, for a man, already in place and, changing only shoes but not suit, said as the next physiognomic and vocal transformation took place: "Hello, the name is Major ... John Major."²³⁵ His monologue, virtually a continuation of hers rather than being self-contained, was a defence of his position as Prime Minister, yet visually he remained within Thatcher's control.

During the 1980s, in his own form of entertainment, Uys's theatrical style (with its stress on the abilities of the performer, assisted by only the most essential external aids) was not only a reflection of what was arguably the most internationally significant theatre produced by other South African performers or companies, who likewise employed laughter as a weapon to comment on the situation in performer- rather than production-based vehicles (Woza Albert! is one example), but also a reflection of his own poneria: a revel in the display of his craft and his ability to impersonate a large number of living persons (for impersonation is a notable characteristic of the poneros) and a desire to seek some form of superiority over those in authority.

4.6 Conclusion: Uys as scourge and benefactor

Uys claims that entertainment was the raison d'être of his revues. This did not negate their satiric qualities: criticism and humour were discernible means to reflect the prevailing political and social conditions, scourge what was ridiculous by using laughter as a weapon and promote a release of fear through the beneficial power of laughter. He has explained his intent thus:

I have a great sense of the absurd and a sense of the ridiculous My work is the comedy of prejudice, not just in South Africa in every country I've been to ... I've reflected the prejudice of the people there. Prejudice is absurd. When you see it in a theatrical context, you laugh at it because it's ridiculous. You can't

have the arrogance to believe that you've changed their minds. I want them to remember that they actually laughed at their fear.²³⁶

Laughter could reduce the fears and aggression associated with prejudice by indicating that as one thing is, so others may be, ridiculous. This was achieved by the three characteristic elements of these revues and their related functions: through the fictional monologues the present effects of apartheid on the lives and attitudes of a spectrum of individuals (black and white, male and female, young and old, Afrikaans and English, conservative and liberal, opportunistic and oppressed) was depicted; through impersonation those non-fictional persons who were associated with apartheid were ridiculed and their authority thereby undermined; and the Uys-persona could comment on both the fictional and the non-fictional personae and include warnings of the future results of the apartheid system.

In 1986 Andrew Horn accused Uys of "sniping at mores while leaving fundamental questions unasked and unexplained" in his revues.²³⁷ It is questionable whether, within the framework of Uys's revues, detailed analysis was possible; furthermore, what Horn criticized Uys for is a feature of satire: satirists simplify issues, they are concerned with the existing situation rather than with how or why it came to exist. Sutherland goes so far as to claim that the satirist "never asks himself how or why".²³⁸ Clearly, during the course of the 1980s, the tenor of Uys's entertainment altered; by 1986 he was no longer simply "sniping at mores".

MacLiam, in his review of the first of Uys's political solo revues, was surely correct in his description of Adapt or Dye as a "safety valve", an entertainment which, through the "release of laughter" encouraged white South Africans to place "the iniquities and inadequacies of our political system in proper perspective".²³⁹ The same description had been applied to Leslie twenty years before, and for the same reason. This was probably a major contributory factor in the popularity of both Two's Company and Adapt or Dye. In the ten weeks after its opening on 1 April 1981 Adapt or Dye had been seen by almost

twenty-five thousand people at fifty-six performances. (It had a total of 280 performances.) And for almost the first time since Leslie's lampoon of Vorster, South Africans witnessed the live caricature of their premier on the stage: "In 1981 nobody had sent up P.W. Botha before. So you first made a Botha face and said: 'Ja, Suid-Afrika.' And ... the audience laughed."²⁴⁰

This popularity had an ironic double-edge. Uys has claimed that his revues are his personal response to the situation, that he did not "have the arrogance to believe that [he'd] changed [the] minds" of the audience and that any impact would be in the mind of the beholder. To that extent the revues were synchronically multivalent as they signified different things to different spectators at any given moment. Yet, while " 'holding up the cracked mirror' for South Africa to view itself", Uys was, as Nichols noted, "at another level cast as a safety valve for ... white South African liberals".²⁴¹ Thus he was regarded as playing to homogeneous audiences, to those who were predisposed to his style and purpose and who could have their values reinforced by his work. The dilemmas Uys presented were shared by him and his audiences. If their opinions were not altered, the revues nevertheless served to maintain an awareness of the situation and, during the successive States of Emergency when media regulations were increasingly enforced, of arousing an awareness of what had been suppressed regarding the situation. He was, in a sense, acknowledging his and his audiences' white liberal guilt. Even if they were the converted, they needed to be reminded of the inequalities and injustices perpetrated by a system perpetuated by whites.

Primarily, as he stated in 1984, "I write for the whites. I write for the lawmakers. For me to take this show [Total Onslaught 1984] into Soweto would be chauvinistic."²⁴² (With the release of videotaped recordings of the early revues his potential audiences was, naturally, considerably enlarged.) Uys never posed as a spokesman for the aspirations or sufferings of blacks for blacks. In an interview published in 1979 he had acknowledged this:

I always say in this country, writing-wise,

the whites must not try and produce a [Alexander] Solzhenitsyn.
 The blacks must.
 The whites must produce a Lenny Bruce
 But if you are black, it's a different story.²⁴³

As a politicized Bruce, Uys could, through humour, continually remind white audiences that they could not ignore the hypocrisies and iniquities of the system; when he revealed the oppressions endured by blacks it served as a reminder of white culpability and ignorance. He was informing his audiences what blacks knew through experience; they needed others to record their experiences from their perspective.

His was a form of dissidence from within. Uys was a jester whose jests fed off those within the court: "Who would've though that Adapt or Dye would become my bread and botha?" he admitted in Beyond the Rubicon.²⁴⁴ Uys suffered forthright criticism of the purpose of his work. Campbell (who had seen all Uys's revues since Uyscreams with Hot Chocolate Sauce) can be taken as representative of those reviewers who claimed that Uys did not jar the "complacency of his predominantly white middle-class audience" and that, while admitting injustices, he protected his audiences by "bathing" them in a harmless mixture of affectionate parody and gentle caricature which reduced injustices to harmless proportions and immunized them "against any collective flights of conscience, fear and guilt".²⁴⁵ For many such reviewers, Beyond the Rubicon indicated that Uys had himself crossed a personal and theatrical Rubicon. The laughter of the audience was uneasy, the sense of foreboding Uys communicated regarding the situation apparent. For the first time the Uys-persona dominated the revue to reveal the feelings of Uys the man. Campbell was taken aback:

The lack of a real cutting edge; the refusal to draw blood from his victims has always been a major gripe [Campbell had previously written that, unlike Uys, Kirby employed savage lampoon and mordant humour]. I have felt that Uys has tended to cushion his audience against unpleasant truths and certainly any responsibility for them. He has done this by turning S.A. into one huge joke and our rulers into lovable simpletons [This criticism of Uys's lampoons was also made by Kirby and Taylor] this time he does not let them [the audience] off the hook the ribticklers are often transformed into stabs of criticism and conscience. See it, be amused by it and think about it.²⁴⁶

To Campbell the performer who had been "far too nice a man to make his audience wince [now gave] the audience a devastating insight into reform"; as such, what had been "light badinage" was now "purposeful satire".²⁴⁷ The humour necessary to satire remained, but was directed at a preconceived end: the blade beneath the cotton wool inflicted pain. The court jester could no longer be seen as living off the system by satirizing the leaders of the court. He was the nation's jester, the collective conscience and scourge of all whites. He was no longer simply making "jokes" about apartheid as, by 1986, as the Uys-persona claimed, there were "no more jokes, just facts".²⁴⁸ Comedy was still in the eye of the beholder, but Uys made it difficult to laugh with, rather than at, racism (as seen in the presentations of Tutu discussed in the previous section). To counter the accusations that he had been appropriated by those in power, that his satire was permitted to indicate an enlightened attitude to freedom of expression, in Beyond the Rubicon he expressed his abhorrence for apartheid and its supporters in the strongest possible manner. Uys acknowledged that his "anger had become contempt": satire was no longer the expression of anger, but the vehicle for his contempt.

Uys could, like one of his models (Bruce), have chosen to become an outsider. But, as indicated by Pollard in Chapter 1, to be successful, the satirist cannot reject his potential audience. Being a white Afrikaner in opposition to the system still entailed working from within the system, even if it meant "doing the tango in front of the firing squad" in the Opera Theatre in Pretoria, by telling the audiences, as the "white South African Voter": "We all love our country and is [sic] proud of it so fuck you all".²⁴⁹ Uys could no longer be regarded as simply a court jester, a reflecting mirror, a safety-valve: he was a political satirist who was prepared to expose both the patronizing facade of white liberalism and the ingrained racism and stupidity of those with the franchise. Beyond the Rubicon was not entertainment which reinforced but satire which attacked.

In the revues after Beyond the Rubicon the sense of unease countered any complacency which might have resided in spectators who enjoyed the superiority of identifying the

targets as other than themselves. Swift, in his Preface to The Battle of the Books (1704) was aware that satire could be regarded as "a sort of glass, wherein beholders do generally discover everybody's face but their own".²⁵⁰ Uys wanted laughter to be an antidote and not merely, in Campbell's description, a form of immunization: "It's changed now; the laughter is less complacent, much more hungry, much harsher - as if the only way left for people to react against [P.W.] Botha is to laugh at him."²⁵¹

In 1987, at the time of the white general elections, Heribert Adam wrote: "Morally bankrupt and ideologically exhausted, the National Party practises ad hoc crisis management without an eschatology. Complaints about a 'lack of vision' abound."²⁵² Uys translated this lack of vision into theatrical terms in Rearranging the Deckchairs on the SA Bothatonic with an even harsher warning of the inevitable chaos resulting from such "crisis management". If, as Adam continued, "English liberalism has always been more of a silent beneficiary than a ready ally of racial capitalism", then Uys disquietingly foretold the English-speaking white voter of the necklace in the future for such complicity.²⁵³ The victims were no longer to be believed to be others, not themselves, no longer just Afrikaners and overt supporters of the National Party.

In Aristophanic comedy, as noted in Chapter 2, buggery is frequently used as a metaphor for the manner in which politicians treat citizens. In Rearranging the Deckchairs on the SA Bothatonic Uys located his material in the electoral arena and literally and figuratively exposed the pornography of the South African state, repeatedly associating sex, violence and politics in a deliberate flouting of conventional propriety and an inversion of the notion of realpolitik. In the revue Dr Ruth Weissenschwartz (a lampoon of the internationally-known television sex therapist Dr Ruth Westheimer) analysed the expedient political alliances in her double entendre advice to all political parties concerning their elections (erections) and the climaxes attainable on 7 May 1987 at the expense of seventy-four per cent of the population who were orgasmically deprived of "one man, one climax".²⁵⁴ The conservative volksmoeders Ossewania and Kakebenia 'orgasmed' after

mouthed the obscenities they linked to the decline in moral and political 'standards'.

Kakebenia protested:

In die ou dae toe Hendrik en John hierdie skip onder beheer gehad het, toe was dinge soos GESLAGSORGANE en ander vryhede 'n taboe FAK, maar nou word daar openlik gepraat van DEMOKRASIE en SKROTOME, van MENSEREGTE en GENETALIA.²⁵⁵

In another sketch two policemen discussed a newspaper report on the torture of political detainees. One demonstrated his techniques of "wooing" information from his victim by using "a live wire gently" on the dummy.²⁵⁶ In a sadistic equation of torture and intercourse, the political martyr who revealed the "names and addresses" before the "climax" was likened to "a woman with no heart".²⁵⁷

If the political situation was obscene, the leaders of the ship of fools were insane. Campbell, Uys's erstwhile critic, noted in his review that Uys's "treatment of his old targets has gone through a massive transmogrification"; whereas he had previously depicted "the government as incompetent, bumbling and laughable rather than systematically cruel now his portrait of Captain P.W. Botha as a mad dictator is chilling and prescient", so that the conclusion of the revue was Uys's cry of "despair against blind, totalitarian rule".²⁵⁸

By Cry Freemandela - The Movie Uys once again experimented with aspects of performance and with his relationship with his audience. In relation to the work of Uys, Gevisser acknowledged that "satirists always walk a fine line between critique and exploitation", and Uys has been accused of commercially exploiting the sufferings of those oppressed by apartheid.²⁵⁹ Glenn Shelton had ended his review of Rearranging the Deckchairs on the SA Bothatonic by maintaining that despite its "disappointing content", he felt assured that the revue would again transform "South Africa's racial dilemma into Uys gold".²⁶⁰ To such criticism Uys replied elsewhere that he was taking care not to become "manure for the cactus called apartheid" but that this did not mean, in 1988, that he could stop writing and performing political material:

How can I break with politics? I mean, everything is political. I'm dying to write a story about a child and a cat in a tree. But if the child is black and cat belongs to white people and tree has ... barbed wire round [it], you're political again. It is shocking to think that without apartheid there wouldn't be so many people in that specific corner of creativity. But ... I'm 43 and I don't want to be 55 and still spending my creative juices on something that is so wrong and so negative.²⁶¹

One method of answering such critics was the tactic of employing shock far more provocatively. Although Cry Freemandela - The Movie was not banned, the critical complaints regarding its "tastelessness" indicated that Uys had succeeded in shifting the boundaries of acceptability, that he had indeed offended.²⁶² His revues had had to adapt, had to be 'dyed' in a different colour; the comedy had to be more brutal in view of escalating brutality: "It's a necessary form of violence," he told an interviewer in London, "The violence of laughter and ridicule."²⁶³ The savage contempt of Juvenal's tragic satire had begun to overtake the sharp raillery of Horace's comic satire. Uys was concerned that he had altered the balance of his need to theatrically entertain even while expressing criticism: Cry Freemandela - The Movie had moved to "49,9% anger and 50,1% entertainment as opposed to 49% anger and 51% entertainment".²⁶⁴

The loss of what he believed as a necessary sense of compassion to balance the blame was a reflection of his bitterness regarding the "Culture of Death", not only the escalation on the physical level but a corresponding "death of the dream ... death of the mind ... [and] death of the spirit" in contemporary South Africa. The emphasis in the revues of the late 1980s was more on the malady of the State rather than individual turpitude: all South Africans, black and white, were depicted as contaminated by and perpetuating a "Culture of Death". The spectrum of A Kiss on Your Koeksister had broadened to include a virulent attack on representatives of the present and future, so that the brutality of both a "Wit Wolf" and Winnie Mandela were exposed to reveal a collective pathology.

As if to compensate for the disproportion of anger and entertainment these revues foregrounded the craft of the performer while the renewed output of plays in the late 1980s posed the questions he believed inappropriate to revues but appropriate to the

political interregnum heralded by the announcement of the release of prominent political prisoners, the unbanning of numerous political organizations and the lifting of Media Emergency Regulations on 2 February 1990. Theatre needed to adjust: "Before we can get South Africans to think, we've got to get them back to the theatre."²⁶⁵ In his "Theatre for Pleasure or Theatre for Instruction" Brecht had argued, in 1957, that "learning" could be "pleasurable", could be both "cheerful and militant".²⁶⁶ Uys must have realized that he had to redress the imbalance between the pleasure derived from entertainment and the militantly educative potential of theatre. Uys had himself, he acknowledged, lost many of those who attended his earlier revues as they regarded him as "bitter" and "too political"; he had, he informed one interviewer, to change the style and tone of his work as he could no longer appeal "to a middle-class, middle-aged white liberal" audience, but "a South African audience".²⁶⁷

A phrase which recurred in An Evening with Pieter-Dirk Uys was "relax, it's only ...". Audiences were to be provided with the release of laughter once again. In a performance of An Audience with Evita Bezuidenhout at the Elizabeth Sneddon Theatre in October 1991, she asked the audience, "Are you optimistic about the future?" No one replied in the affirmative; a single voice replied "No" after a lengthy silence. As though to answer the prevailing sense of insecurity in dramatic terms these revues stressed entertainment rather than anger or contempt; satire was still present in the exposure of the hypocrisy and folly, but Uys, while displaying his cynicism regarding politicians, expressed his optimism concerning the future and his belief that the "millions of decent people [who] live in South Africa" should not be "paralyse[d] with fear".²⁶⁸ The tension between the actual and the ideal was exemplified in Die Vleiroos. Uys described the play not as a warning, but a roadsign.²⁶⁹ His theatrical work aimed to pose problems, explore issues and provoke audiences to speculation: "Protest theatre used to give us answers. Now we have to ask questions to find new answers."²⁷⁰

Significantly in An Audience with Evita Bezuidenhout Uys, as Evita Bezuidenhout, invited

the audience to do just that. As a more positive commentator she would, Uys stated, "probably be the only one from the present South African diplomatic corps to go into the next cabinet".²⁷¹ Evita Bezuidenhout, for whatever motive, was addressing audiences from a politically central position. She had become, like the Uys-persona, a norm. To Glenn, in discarding old identifications and in formulating the questions which would begin to define a new identity, Uys was reflecting

the dominant mode in South African satire ... [that] of finding a point of accommodation which will rid itself of old style apartheid, but stops well short of endorsing radical alternatives to what might be called, in a kind of political shorthand, liberal values. This is not to say that this is simply a kind of artistic backing for F.W. de Klerk, but that the satirists look with considerable apprehension at Winnie Mandela or the SACP on the one hand and the AWB and CP on the other.²⁷²

By the end of the 1970s, prior to Adapt or Dye, Uys was considered the enfant terrible of South African theatre, a reputation based on the iconoclastic intent of the plays and fostered by his confrontations with the censorship board. By the end of the 1980s, he was recognized as not only a consummate satirist, but as having continued the South African tradition of such talented theatre entrepreneurs as Black, André Huguenot and Leslie, as a leading playwright, performer, designer, director and producer.²⁷³ He had, too, gained international recognition. In Australia and the United Kingdom his revues were considered unique for the manner in which they combined subversive comedy and political commentary.²⁷⁴ In 1989 in the Netherlands, Pieter van Vollenhoven, the husband of Queen Magriet, praised him as "a world talent", of a sort "unmatched" in that country, despite its renown for trenchant satirical cabaret and political revue.²⁷⁵ Uys was invited to deliver a keynote address at the opening of a three-week fellowship at a Massachusetts university where drama students study the character of Evita Bezuidenhout and to conduct master classes at the National Theatre in London in 1993.

Uys has no illusions regarding the transitory nature of his satirical revues; they were "here-today and gone-tomorrow", and this chapter was written in the past tense for that reason and in the mistaken supposition that An Evening with Pieter-Dirk Uys was, as he

claimed, his last revue. At the time of writing he has been touring America, Britain and Europe presenting new revues and developing new stage characters (such as Evita Bezuidenhout's outspoken rival and sister, Bambi Kellerman who resides in Paraguay, introduced to South Africans at the National Arts Festival in 1993 in The Poggenpoel Sisters). No matter how ephemeral, however, the significance of Uys's revues cannot be underestimated; that significance lies in his mastery of his particular form of entertainment, in the techniques he developed to realize his intentions and in the manner in which he reflected, either accurately or through the distorting mirror of satire, the hopes, fears, attitudes and beliefs of South Africans. As playwright and performer he will continue to act as a scourge to those in authority and a benefactor to the public, ridiculing the former while maintaining the awareness of the latter and promoting the sense of release afforded by laughter. As scourge and benefactor he will personify the meaning he bestows to his two Christian names: "Pieter and Dirk Half fascist, half freedom fighter The hyphen keeps them apart."²⁷⁶ As fascist-freedom fighter he will still administer what he terms his "therapy". Gray, writing in 1985, acknowledged his value and importance to South African theatre:

South Africa ... needs that snap of the fingers that wakes it from its long nightmare. In theatre terms that means humour - that electrifying moment when the carnage, the disease, the stupidity is recognized. Truth. Full stop. Start again, now. And the best practitioner of this kind of dramaturgical therapy in contemporary South Africa is ... Pieter-Dirk Uys.²⁷⁷

Notes to Chapter 4

1. Quoted by Uys in P.W. Botha In His Own Words, p.32. P.W. Botha was referring to the media reportage of the Information Scandal and the findings of the Erasmus Report.
2. Uys's opinions, unless noted to the contrary, are derived from personal interviews conducted by the writer of this work. For further distinctions between his plays and his revues, see "Uys: plans, changes and influences", New Nation, 5-11 April 1989, p.17; interview with Mlungisi Kamase, "Scotch and Uys", Sowetan, 3 July 1989, p.17; and interview with Rina Minervini, "The play that got written by mistake", Rand Daily Mail, 24 April 1980, p.10.
3. Pieter-Dirk Uys, interview with John Connor, "Lone Tango", City Limits, 20-27 March 1986, p.17.
4. Uys's reliance on this concept, as originated by the French playwright Eugène Scribe, was noted by various reviewers of the London production of Panorama. Michael Billington wrote in the Guardian: "Uys deals with the political realities of the Eighties; but compared to the free-floating exuberance of exported black theatre, his work suggests the neat carpentry of the pre-war well-made play." (Billington's review was reproduced in London Theatre Record, 17-30 June 1988, p.841.)
5. Astbury, The Space/Die Ruimte/Indawo, no pagination.
6. Uys, "The Saga of Selle Ou Storie", 54. Ian Ferguson, possible the first academic to do so, evaluated the impact and significance of Uys's early plays in "Three Profiles from the South African Theatre", Theatre Quarterly 7 (28/1977-1978), 87-88.
7. Pieter-Dirk Uys, quoted in Mike Nicol, "Hardly the same old story", To The Point, 21 March 1975, p.43.
8. Translated from an article by Pieter-Dirk Uys, "Einde van era vir Pieter-Dirk Uys", Die Burger, 2 October 1992, p. 23.
9. For this point the writer is indebted to Eileen Blumenthal who reviewed a production of God's Forgotten at La Mama, New York, in Voice, 4 June 1979, page number unknown.
10. Anton Chekhov, Three Sisters, in Chekhov: Plays, trans. Elisaveta Fen (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968), p.329.
11. *Ibid.*, p.330. Sarah's use of Olga's words is in the revised version of God's Forgotten, in "Paradise Is Closing Down" and Other Plays, p.40.
12. Uys, God's Forgotten, in "Paradise Is Closing Down" and Other Plays, p.57.
13. *Ibid.*, p.40.

14. Uys, quoted in Herber, Conversations, p.92.
15. Uys, Selle Ou Storie, p.25. The correspondence with the former Publications Control Board is reproduced in the published text, pp.76-80.
16. Reproduced in "Can't stop the Karnaval", Scenaria, January - March 1981, p.23.
17. Uys, Selle Ou Storie, p.69.
18. *Ibid.*, p.71.
19. Orkin, Drama and the South African state, p.230.
20. Thomas Dunbar Moodie, The Rise of Afrikanerdom: Power, Apartheid, and the Afrikaner Civil Religion (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975), p.ix.
21. For these interpretations of the title, this writer is indebted to Bedford, "The Presence of the Past in Selected Works by Pieter-Dirk Uys", pp.64-67.
22. See Moodie, The Rise of Afrikanerdom, pp.26-28, for a fuller description.
23. Cited in Leonard Thompson, The Political Mythology of Apartheid (New Haven: York University Press, 1985), p.69.
24. *Ibid.*, p.170.
25. Uys, God's Forgotten, in Theatre Two: New South African Drama, p.177.
26. *Ibid.*, pp.176-177.
27. *Ibid.*, pp.145, 143, 128 and 153.
28. *Ibid.*, p.159.
29. *Ibid.*, p.174.
30. *Ibid.*, pp.162, 125 and 178.
31. *Ibid.*, pp.157 and 184.
32. *Ibid.*, p.179.
33. Uys, God's Forgotten, in "Paradise Is Closing Down" and Other Plays, p.3.
34. Bedford, in "The Presence of the Past in Selected Works by Pieter-Dirk Uys" examines in greater detail the manner in which the characters in God's Forgotten, Karnaval and Panorama are prevented from achieving self-realization by the active role that the past plays in their present situation and in their vision of a future.
35. Uys, Paradise is Closing Down, in Theatre One: New South African Drama, pp.169-170.

36. Garth V. Green, "Characterization in Pieter-Dirk Uys's Appassionata", Unisa English Studies 25 (September 1987), 21-22. Appassionata was published in Market Plays, edited by Stephen Gray (Johannesburg: Ad. Donker, 1986).
37. This point is developed from an observation by Bedford, "The Presence of the Past in Selected Works by Pieter-Dirk Uys", p.8.
38. Quoted in Smythe, "Penny Smythe talks to Pieter-Dirk Uys", p.56.
39. The writer is indebted to Andrea Vinassi, "Van Aardes is out-dated", Star Tonight, 16 October 1987, p.24, for this point and for the association she makes between "drought and deviant sexual behaviour" and the "barrenness of the volk".
40. Sheila V. Roberts, in "South African Bilingual and Multilingual Drama of the 'Seventies", Canadian Drama 6 (1/1980), 146, refers to Uys's parody of Melt Brink's Grond. What is more likely is that it is Fritz Steyn's Grond (1938) which was written to remind Afrikaners of their duty to protect their rural lifestyle and traditions from the past. Roberts discusses Uys's use of code-switching of languages in detail in the same article, 145-147.
41. This description is from a press release. See Raeford Daniel, "Now an epic Boeredrama", Rand Daily Mail, 7 September 1978, p.9.
42. Roberts, "South African Bilingual and Multilingual Drama of the 'Seventies", 147.
43. Uys, Die Van Aardes van Grootoor, p.35.
44. Temple Hauptfleisch, "Ambiguity in resurge of interest in P-D Uys", Pretoria News Tonight, 10 November 1987, p.15.
45. Uys, Panorama, p.145.
46. Uys, God's Forgotten, in "Paradise Is Closing Down" and Other Plays, p.28.
47. Uys, Panorama, p.150.
48. Ibid., pp.148 and 162-163.
49. Ibid., p.186.
50. Just Like Home is unpublished. Cathy September's lines are contained in a review by Mel Larkin, "Uys puts Evita away and pulls out a few punches", Weekly Mail, 17-22 March 1989, p.25.
51. Pieter-Dirk Uys, in an interview with a Cue reporter, "Playing another Uys", 7 July 1992, p.7.
52. The information on the vleiroos is derived from Catherine Knos, "Pietie, hy kô huis toe", De Kat, May 1992, p.72.
53. Quoted in Thamm, "Uys back on the table", p.29.

54. Ibid.
55. Pieter-Dirk Uys, interview with Joseph Lelyveld, "Afrikaner's Satire a Box-Office Hit", New York Times, 5 July 1983, p.C9.
56. At the Standard Bank National Arts Festival the number of one-person presentations (including revues, stand-up routines and monodramas) on the Fringe (excluding cabaret and musical presentations) increased from fourteen per cent in 1989, to twenty-two per cent in 1990 and, in 1991, to thirty-one per cent. (These figures are formulated from the official brochures issued during those three years.) The reason for the popularity is, particularly at the National Arts Festival, financial. Solo productions are performer- rather than production-vehicles and can be mounted with relatively little expenditure or technical crew hours. The one-person show is generally regarded as a virtuoso piece, with the performer often given as much billing as the title. From a consideration of work viewed during the 1980s and early 1990s it is possible to identify certain categories of solo-person presentations from the persona or personae adopted.

Monodramas, or full-length single-persona presentations tend to be biographical (such non-fictional literary figures as Patrick Mynhardt's presentations of Bosman's Cold Stone Jug (1949) or Gray's Schreiner - A One-Woman Play (1983), or public figures such as Wilna Snyman's presentation of Emily Hobhouse in Dear Mrs Steyn (1991) or Fraser's Charles Manson) or autobiographical (Mynhardt's Boy from Bethulie (1991) or Taylor's Broederstroom Diaries). In the above the audience retained their own personae, adjusting only in their sense of time (returning to a previous historical period or by contrasting then and now) or in their purpose for being present (as a guest, an interviewer, Mrs Steyn herself). In this manner the performer-persona utilized the audience in its own act of supportively witnessing in an atmosphere conducive to a shared experience. (The monodrama is said to have been invented in the eighteenth century by a German actor, Johann Brandes, as a piece presented by one performer, supported by silent figures or by a chorus. From 1775 he popularized the form in his version of Ariadne auf Naxos, based presumably, on Claudio Monteverdi's Ariadne (1608).)

The above were all based on non-fictional characters. Monodramas featuring fictional characters were equally popular. These range from the impersonation of the ape in Franz Kafka's Report to an Academy (1919) first performed by Marius Weyers in a translation by Mario Schiess in 1979, to Slabolepszy's The Return of Elvis du Pisanie, Blacher's Let Me Listen and Andrew Buckland's Between the Teeth (1991). Fictional monodramas offered performers the opportunity to explore and expose aspects of the current socio-political situation and provide an understanding of the events or ideologies that determined the direction of the persona's life, often in the form of a confessional. Other characters were included, but the focus was nevertheless on a central, identifiable persona, and the experiences and persons which influenced that persona's life to the present. Monodramas can be likened to soliloquies in that, like the soliloquy, the convention suggests honest self-disclosure. A mutual sense of trust arose from the intimate nature of the disclosure. A signifying process took place as these performances aimed to develop a strong association necessary to make the disclosed experience a shared experience.

Secondly, one-person presentations which present multiple personae in a number of different monologues were presented by mono-actors (those who perform items written by other authors, such as Mynhardt's various presentations of Bosman's short stories (which he first performed in 1969) or Pat Pillai's interpretation of four short stories by Ronnie Govender under the title At the Edge (1991) or Michael Atkinson's rendition of The Importance of Being Oscar, devised by Micheál MacLiammóir in 1960) or monologists (who presented more than one persona in works of their own devising). With the decline of music-hall in Britain and vaudeville in America, monologists developed solo-presentations of their own material. Ruth Draper and Cornelia Otis Skinner in America and Beatrice Lillie and Joyce Grenfell in Britain all presented a number of character monologues within a single performance. These monologists tended to deal with society figures and what is topical in society. Often, too, these performers responded to invisible characters on stage, and thereby maintained a facade of character-to-character interaction and hence an indirect contact with the audience. More recent South African performers have moved from semi-direct character forms to more direct, expository forms in terms of audience-performer relationship. The concerns of society have become social issues; topicality most often concerned with political issues. In addition, performers such as Uys, Taylor, Kirby, Banks and De Vries incorporate monologues by non-fictional personae and, because of the flexibility of the form (the inclusion of music and songs) and its tendency to review topical events and socio-political issues, their presentations are akin to revue.

For want of a better term, the third category might be described 'non'-persona presentations, as they were presented by a single performer who did not appear to assume a specific character to perform the material. These performers did present an aspect of their personality: their persona-as-entertainer, rather than their persona-as-imagined-character. At the National Arts Festival, poets (as 'platform-readers') presented recitals of their own works (such as Mann in his Mannalive in 1991) and stand-up comics (Fraser and Miyeni) presented material which communicated their personal attitudes. Both used direct address, but where the poets aimed at creating an informal atmosphere and a sense of intimacy and contact with their auditors, the stand-up comics, by revealing their own fears, concerns and dislikes took self-disclosure to an extreme and, in knowing that the material could antagonize, an extreme of self-risk. (These categories are this writer's primarily descriptive response to productions viewed. For a full-length work on one form, monodrama, see Eunice Ruth Eifert, The Fourth-Wall Shattered: A Study of the Performer-Audience Relationship in Selected Full-Length Monodramas (Ann Arbor: UMI, 1989), to whom this writer is indebted, particularly for observations in Chapter 7.)

57. To avoid confusion, Uys's character pieces are termed monologues. This writer's definition of the word, as seen in the revues of Uys, is given in the ensuing paragraph. The difficulty in distinguishing between a monologue and a soliloquy is compounded by the discrepancy between dictionary definitions, current literary usage and the presentation of such forms on the stage. Dr Johnson, in his Dictionary, defined soliloquy as "a discourse made by one in solitude to himself"; most subsequent dictionaries add thinging aloud without consciousness of an audience. Dr Johnson defined monologue as "a scene in which a person of the drama speaks by himself, a soliloquy". In this instance "speaks by" rather than "to" is an important distinction. Contemporary dictionaries add that a monologue

is meant to be heard, and that it is especially used by a talker who monopolizes conversation; they also refer to a dramatic performance in which there is one actor only. There exists too, the literary form, perhaps confusingly termed a dramatic monologue, to denote a poem written as if spoken aloud by a single character (as in Robert Browning's "My Last Duchess" (1842)). Raymond Williams regards soliloquy as an indirect, reflexive type of monologue and disputes the definitions above by arguing that a person in a drama may indeed speak "by himself" but he literally cannot speak "to himself" in the sense of talking to oneself alone, as always, and obviously, there is an audience to whom the deliberation is made available. (See Raymond Williams, "On Dramatic Dialogue and Monologue", in Writing in Society (London: Verso, 1991), pp.31-64, for a fuller treatment. Other works consulted include Robert Langbaum, The Poetry of Experience (London: Chatto and Windus, 1957), and Alan Sinfield, Dramatic Monologue (London: Methuen, 1977), although they deal almost exclusively with the dramatic monologue as a literary phenomenon.)

58. Uys, Beyond the Rubicon, pp.122 and 151-158.
59. Uys, An Evening with Pieter-Dirk Uys, p.27.
60. Uys, Beyond the Rubicon, p.136.
61. Uys, Rearranging the Deckchairs on the SA Bothatonic, p.46.
62. The description of the types of personae is adapted from those formulated by Nichols, Insinuation, Chapter 5. Nichols does not, however, make connections between form of address and persona in terms of performance.
63. Uys, Beyond the Rubicon, pp.153, 154 and 155.
64. Uys, No One's Died Laughing, pp.20-21.
65. Green, "Characterization in Pieter-Dirk Uys's Appassionata", 18.
66. See, for example, Robert Greig, "Uys in a hole", Business Day, 8 January 1987, p.4.
67. Robert Greig, "Uys swamps the satire ...", Business Day, 12 September 1986, p.17.
68. Uys, Beyond the Rubicon, p.149.
69. Alex Renton, writing for the Independent in London, quoted in "Adapt or Dye", London Theatre Record, 21 October - 3 November 1988, p.1526.
70. Hugh Robertson, "Uys tickles the US fancy", Daily News, 27 January 1993, p.19.
71. For this observation the writer is indebted to Greig, "Uys in a hole", p.4.
72. Uys, Beyond the Rubicon, pp.112, 121 and 124.
73. Uys, No One's Died Laughing, p.40.

74. John Michell, "The Uys konsert goes on", Sunday Star, 11 October 1987, p.4.
75. Ernest Pereira, "Tall Tellers of Tales: Some Fictional Narrators and their Function in the South African Short Story in English", in Herman Charles Bosman, p.105.
76. See Aristophanes, Peace, trans. Dickinson, p.249.
77. Uys, Beyond the Rubicon, pp.130-131.
78. Brian Hoad, "The quality in the quantity", Bulletin, 27 January 1987, p.44.
79. Pieter-Dirk Uys, interview with Fiona Chisholm, "Uys Soho Satire is Chilling", Cape Times 12 March 1986, page number unknown.
80. See Nichols, Insinuation, Chapter 3, for an examination of satiric shock, exclusively in literary works.
81. Purists maintain that the only true form of stand-up comedy is based on personal issues in a set-up/punch format, communicated verbally to an audience, without resorting to the impersonation of characters or use of properties or stage effects. See Carter, Stand-Up Comedy: The Book, p.85. The information on structuring set-up and punch into a routine format is derived from this source, pp.45-83.
82. Uys, Beyond the Rubicon, p.135.
83. Ibid.
84. From a performance of A Kiss on Your Koeksister in the Drama at the Playhouse, Durban, in November 1990.
85. Uys, Beyond the Rubicon, p.113.
86. Ibid.
87. Ibid.
88. Uys, An Evening with Pieter-Dirk Uys, p.33.
89. Uys, Beyond the Rubicon, p.137.
90. Quoted in an untitled article in Index on Censorship 7 (January - February 1978), 69-70.
91. Quoted in "Worldwide outcry over Biko's death", To The Point, 23 September 1977, p.55.
92. Pieter-Dirk Uys, interview with Barry Ronge, "Uys: Has he gone over the top this time?", Sunday Times, 13 December 1987, p.15.
93. Quoted in Morris, "Cry Freemandela and don't be such a bloody fool", 23.

94. In January 1989 four youths (including Seipei) were abducted by the Mandela United Football Club which Winnie Mandela had created. Although not found to be implicated in his death (the 'coach' of the football team was charged and convicted of the murder of Seipei), she was accused of assaulting him and other youths. See Shelagh Gastrow, Who's Who in South African Politics: Number 3 (Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1990), pp.163-165, for fuller details.
95. From a performance of A Kiss on Your Koeksister. (See note 84).
96. Barry Ronge, "Uys swops laughter for sharper satire", Sunday Times, 28 January 1990, p.19.
97. Mark Gevisser, "Uys: the once and always queen of the edgy laugh", Weekend Mail, 19-25 October 1990, p.7.
98. These strategies are discussed, with literary examples, in Nichols, Insinuation, Chapters 4 and 6. Transposition as a satiric strategy is not formulated by Nichols, however, and is this writer's addition.
99. Uys, Beyond the Rubicon, p.122.
100. Ibid., pp.132, 141 and 151.
101. Ibid., pp. 122 and 147, and Total Onslaught 1984, p.73.
102. Ibid., p.159.
103. Quoted in Morris, "Cry Freemandela and don't be such a bloody fool", 21.
104. Reported in an untitled column in the Sydney Morning Herald, 13 January 1987, page number unknown.
105. Cited in Evans, "Uys plays with fire", page number unknown.
106. Ibid.
107. Hoad, "The quality in the quantity", p.44.
108. Pieter-Dirk Uys, interview with Dirk de Villiers, "Pieter-Dirk Uys gets rave Canadian reviews", Daily News Tonight, 6 November 1987, p.3.
109. Ibid.
110. Quoted in "Lekker Amsterdam lauds Uys", Star, 31 August 1988, p.1.
111. Michael Billington, "Adapt or Dye", reproduced in London Theatre Record, 21 October - 3 November 1988, p.1527.
112. Uys, "Einde van era vir Pieter-Dirk Uys", p.23.
113. Uys, No One's Died Laughing, p.64.

114. Ibid.
115. Pieter-Dirk Uys, interview with Phoebe Lange, "Sultry Sophia is model for Evita", Eastern Province Herald, 21 June 1985, p.12.
116. Cited by Lelyveld, "Afrikaner's Satire a Box-Office Hit", p.C9.
117. Uys, No One's Died Laughing, pp.61-62.
118. Alan Cowell, "A South African Satirist's Apartheid", New York Times, 5 July 1984, section and page number unknown.
119. Uys, No One's Died Laughing, p.40.
120. Pieter-Dirk Uys, Farce About Uys (Johannesburg: Jonathan Ball and Ad. Donker, 1983), p.12.
121. Ibid., pp.61-62.
122. Ibid., pp.66-67.
123. Uys, No One's Died Laughing, p.66.
124. Ibid., p.64.
125. Uys, Beyond the Rubicon, p.153.
126. Ibid., p.156.
127. Quoted in C. le Grange, "Election countdown - No tears as Evita quits NP and diplomacy", Pretoria News, 29 April 1987, p.5.
128. Quoted in Charlotte Butler, "It's one man one vote or no man no vote, skattie", Weekly Mail, 30 April - 7 May 1987, p.22.
129. Ibid.
130. Pieter-Dirk Uys, interview with Monica Graaff, "Pieter-Dirk adapts to SA boards", Cape Times, 30 November 1988, p.6.
131. Quoted in an interview with a Daily News Tonight reporter, "Lift-off for Evita's Indaba", 19 July 1989, p.1.
132. Uys, Farce About Uys, p.62.
133. The information on Dame Edna Everage is derived from John Lahr, Dame Edna Everage and the Rise of Western Civilization (London: Flamingo, 1992).
134. Jilea Carney, "Skating on Thin Uys", On The Street, 21 January 1987, page number unknown.

135. Reproduced in Gwen Gill, "Evita Bezuidenhout pulls the wool over the Iron Lady's eyes", Sunday Times, 2 August 1987, page number unknown.
136. Michell, "The Uys konsert goes on", p.4.
137. Lahr, Dame Edna Everage and the Rise of Western Civilization, p.11.
138. Cited by Uys, interview with Smythe, "Penny Smythe talks to Pieter-Dirk Uys", p.58.
139. Cited in "Evita acclaimed", Daily News Tonight, 27 July 1989, p.1.
140. Cited in Michell, "The Uys konsert goes on", p.1.
141. Quoted in "Uys in reported call for sanctions", Natal Mercury, 20 August 1988, p.1.
142. Quoted in "Evita Bezuidenhout was speaking, says SA satirist", Citizen, 27 August 1988, p.5.
143. Pieter-Dirk Uys, interview with a Cape Times reporter, "Pieter-Dirk packs up", 16 June 1981, p.6.
144. Uys, interview with Lange, "Sultry Sophia is model for Evita", p.12.
145. Uys, No One's Died Laughing, p.66.
146. Ian Glenn, "South African Satire Now", New Contrast 20 (1/1992), 84.
147. Uys, No One's Died Laughing, p.68.
148. This writer prefers the use of the more neutral description female impersonator to apply to those performers (often solo performers) whose appearance in women's dress is so perfect as virtually to convince the audience that they are women (see The Oxford Companion to the Theatre, ed. Hartnoll, p.276). Contemporary cross-dressing in the theatre is often negatively viewed as a psycho-sexual manifestation. So, for example, transvestism is used to describe cross-dressing on the stage, but is generally associated with the pleasure derived from wearing the apparel of the opposite sex; camp is considered a theatrical version of flamboyant homosexuality; drag parts to refer to female parts played by men, but it too has gained overtones of sexual dubiety. Peter Ackroyd, in Dressing Up: Transvestism and Drag (London: Thames and Hudson, 1979), states that in Europe, between the two world wars, "outrageous cross-dressing developed often performed by transsexuals or by overtly fetishistic transvestites", and that its contemporary equivalent is to be seen in the "explicitly homosexual drag of pubs or clubs [there is] a strong misogynistic element involved in such routines" (pp.106-107). And although travesty acting (from travestir, 'disguise, change the clothes of') is accurate, the word travesty has connotations of a ludicrous imitation and, in a literary sense, with a "savagely reductive" kind of burlesque (see note 121 to Chapter 1).

149. The issue of sacred rituals associated with fertility or harvesting, such as the dengaku in Noh theatre, the Dionysiac dithyrambs or 'birth songs' in Athenian tragedy and comedy and the Indi romani of Roman theatre are discussed in Ackroyd, Dressing Up: Transvestism and Drag, Chapter 5. For the manner in which Greek acting conventions reveal the construction of the fictional gender divisions promoted in a patriarchal society, see Sue-Ellen Case, "Classic Drag: The Greek Creation of Female Parts", Theatre Journal 37 (October 1985), 317-327. It could be argued, conversely, that the seasonal festivals in Greece, of which cross-dressing was an element, were times of license, of the inversion of the normal societal codes, resulting in the levelling of the accepted boundaries between the sexes.
150. It was not until the reign of Charles II that women appeared on the English stage; by 1690 the tradition of female impersonation was no longer a feature of legitimate theatre. Female impersonators ceased to be actors and became, like Tate Wilkinson and James 'Nursery' Nokes, comics instead. Burlesqued impersonation emerged in pantomime. As Ackroyd notes, "in the nineteenth century, disinclined though it was toward the kind of camouflage and alienation which transvestism represented, ... female impersonation took on its most grotesque but acceptable face: that of the 'dame'" (Dressing Up: Transvestism and Drag, p.101). Later such figures appeared in the repertoire of music-hall performers who would perform as dames in Christmas pantomimes. Male impersonators (including Lloyd, Vesta Tilley and Jenny Hill) were also a feature of music-hall, no doubt influenced by Madame Vestris, the French actress of the eighteenth century.
151. The writer is indebted to McLeish, The Theatre of Aristophanes, pp.153-156, for the number of roles for women in extant Greek tragedy and comedy, and for the observations on the establishment of femininity and levels of impersonation.
152. The supposedly distasteful presentation of the old women in Ecclesiazusae, almost unique in Aristophanes, can be accepted if they are, as McLeish contends, not regarded as real women, but presented as males, in a manner similar to pantomime dames. The same could be said of the presentation of Poverty in Wealth. Furthermore, in both plays the scenes could be viewed as taking place on an established dimension of fantasy, not reality. See McLeish, The Theatre of Aristophanes, pp.155-156, for the substantiation for these arguments.
153. See Aristophanes, The Poet and the Women, trans. Barrett, p.107.
154. Soli Philander, interview with Sean Badal, "Rosie and the Puck of all trades", Weekly Mail, 20-26 November 1992, p.33.
155. See Glenn, "South African Satire Now", 87-88, for a description of Philander's Take Two.
156. *Ibid.*, 88.
157. According to the By-Laws of the City of Durban, for instance, in the offences against decency and morality, By-Law number 85 states: "No person, male or female, shall appear in public indecently clothed or wearing garments for the purposes of personating the opposite sex." This, apparently, excludes such cross-

dressing for the intent to entertain and where there is no intent to offend or deprave the moral values of the public.

158. Uys, Beyond the Rubicon, p.159.
159. Quoted in Cowell, "A South African Satirist's Apartheid", section and page number unknown.
160. Shaun de Waal, "P D Uys's Koeksister is no joke", Weekly Mail, 26 January - 1 February 1990, p.28.
161. The definitions of and distinctions between cartoon and caricature are unsatisfactory and contradictory. Most conform to those posited by the Oxford English Dictionary which defines caricature as a portrait or other artistic representation in which the characteristic features of the original are exaggerated with ludicrous effect, and states that to caricature is to make a grotesque likeness of or to burlesque. A cartoon is defined as an illustration in a newspaper or periodical, especially related to topical events (yet the majority of cartoons are not strictly topical); to cartoon is to caricature, to hold up to ridicule, which suggests that there is little distinction between the two words, and in common usage they are generally used synonymously.

A caricature is no longer seen as a portrait which its derivation from Italian would suggest (from caricatura, 'a likeness which has been deliberately exaggerated'). It can be accepted that caricatures and political cartoons are usually satiric, while most cartoons are usually amusing. (See Edward Lucie-Smith, The Art of Caricature (London: Orbis, 1981), pp.7-19 for a fuller discussion.) The first use of the word 'cartoon' to refer to a printed picture, rather than as a preliminary drawing as a design for a painting or other art work, was in Punch in 1843. This referred to a drawing by John Leech, bearing the legend "The Poor ask for Bread and the Philanthropy of the State accords - an Exhibition", which parodied an exhibition of cartoon designs for frescoes intended for the Houses of Parliament in London. Thereafter Punch termed all political drawings cartoons. (See Ross Thomson and Bill Hewison, Cartoons (London: Apple, 1985), p.116.) Political caricature is used to describe the drawings which distort and exaggerate the features and mannerisms of politicians; they are a form of public lampooning, a personal, particular attack (as indicated in Chapter 1) and it is in this sense that they are employed to describe the theatrical impersonations of Uys. (Further information derived from Nicholas Garland, "Political Cartooning", in Laughing Matters, eds. John Durant and Jonathan Miller (Harlow: Longman, 1988), and Martin Walker, Daily Sketches (London: Frederick Muller, 1978).)

162. Quoted in Stefan Kanfer, "Mighty Pens", Time, 12 September 1988, p.97.
163. Uys, No One's Died Laughing, pp.23-24.
164. Quoted in Kanfer, "Mighty Pens", p.96.
165. Uys, No One's Died Laughing, p.13.
166. Uys, An Evening with Pieter-Dirk Uys, p.33.

167. Pieter-Dirk Uys, interview with Peter Bacon, "Pieter-Dirk goes bananas", Natal Witness, 7 November 1983, p.7.
168. Olson, The Theory of Comedy, p.71.
169. De Ste. Croix, The Origins of the Peloponnesian War, p.357.
170. Uys, Beyond the Rubicon, p.138.
171. Ibid.
172. Ibid.
173. Pieter-Dirk Uys, interview with Martin Portus, "Seeing the joke in a black and white issue", Sydney Morning Herald, 3 January 1987, page number unknown.
174. Uys, Beyond the Rubicon, p.159.
175. Peter Nichols, "Satirist or Safety Valve?", Time Out, 9-15 April 1986, p.7.
176. Pieter-Dirk Uys, interview with Louis Freedberg, "South Africa's Court Jester", San Fransisco Chronicle, 20 June 1986, page number unknown.
177. Uys, quoted in Nichols, "Satirist or Safety Valve?", p.7.
178. Sam Sole, "It cuts no Uys", Sunday Tribune, 11 November 1990, p.9.
179. Ibid.
180. Quoted in Kanfer, "Mighty Pens", p.94.
181. For a fuller discussion of this issue, see Werner Hofmann, Caricature from Leonardo to Picasso (London: John Calder, 1957), pp.11-55.
182. Pieter-Dirk Uys, interview with Liz van den Nieuwenhof, "Uys gives apartheid a big serve", Sunday Telegraph, 4 January 1987, page number unknown.
183. Cited in Lange, "Sultry Sophia is model for Evita", p.12.
184. Glenn, "South African Satire Now", 84. Glenn supports the observation that P.W. Botha attempted, unsuccessfully, to alter his public image.
185. Pieter-Dirk Uys, interview with Garalt MacLiam, "He's on his Uys now", Star Tonight, 10 December 1985, p.1.
186. Uys, A Part Hate A Part Love, p.439.
187. Pieter-Dirk Uys, interview with Jean Waite, "Uys gets carried away in the act", Sunday Star, 12 February 1989, p.12.
188. Quoted in "Why 'modest' Maggie won't play her sanctions Uys", Star, 20 November 1985, p.1.

189. Pieter-Dirk Uys, interview with Herman Fourie, "Home with the unconverted", Argus, 30 November 1988, p.11.
190. Robert Greig, "Satire of a different strain", Business Day, 16 October 1990, page number unknown.
191. In 1986 Ronald Reagan invited cartoonists to view his own collection of caricatures and in 1987, at a gathering of members from the Association of American Editorial Cartoonists, he demanded to know who had drawn a particular cartoon: "I don't want you to erase it," he said, "I want you to sign it no politician will ever forget ... the importance of the work that each of you does." (Quoted in Kanfer, "Mighty Pens", p.97.)
192. Murray and Elzabé Schoonraad, Suid-Afrikaanse Spot- en Strookprent-kunstenaars (Roodepoort: CUM, 1983), p.iii.
193. Jonathan Shapiro, interview with Gaye Davis, "Facing the beasts in monster's dark belly", Weekly Mail, 10-16 June 1988, p.29. Shapiro's work appeared in South (suspended by Home Affairs Minister Stoffel Botha in 1988) and in the End Conscription Campaign's mouthpiece Out of Step.
194. Quoted in Kanfer, "Mighty Pens", p.100.
195. Herman Charles Bosman, "Mafeking Road", Mafeking Road (Cape Town: Human and Rousseau, 1969), p.47.
196. The writer is indebted to Eifert, The Fourth Wall Shattered, Chapter 7, for these observations. Her study is, however, concerned with full-length monodramas.
197. Cited by Michael Venables, "New revue by Uys if appeal fails", Citizen, 21 October 1978, p.3.
198. Uys, interview with Thamm, "Uys back on the table", p.29.
199. Stated by P.W. Botha as Prime Minister on 7 August 1979, in an interview with Die Transvaler. See Uys, P.W. Botha In His Own Words, p.129.
200. Uys, Total Onslaught 1984, p.73.
201. Quoted in Uys, P.W. Botha In His Own Words, p.45.
202. *Ibid.*, p.73.
203. Joyce, The Rise and Fall of Apartheid, p.109.
204. Uys, Beyond the Rubicon, pp.111, 147, 138, 142-144 and 153.
205. Garalt MacLiam, "Funny yes, but the laughter is uncomfortable these days", Star Tonight!, 20 December 1985, page number unknown.
206. Uys, Beyond the Rubicon, p.163.

207. Ibid., pp.127 and 158.
208. Uys, interview with Cleave, "Jarring the censor's funny-bone", page number unknown.
209. Quoted in Uys, P.W. Botha In His Own Words, p.72.
210. Uys, Rearranging the Deckchairs on the SA Bothatonic, p.47.
211. Ibid., p.48.
212. See Davenport, "The Apartheid Debacle, 1961-1990", pp.317-320, for a description of the unrest which he associates with P.W. Botha's 'reform initiatives'.
213. Stated by Uys as P. W. Botha during a performance at the Elizabeth Sneddon Theatre in January 1988.
214. See Shaun Johnson's interview with Sir Richard Attenborough, "Darling, I would do it all again", Weekly Mail, 22-28 April 1988, p.27.
215. This information is from various sources, principally Stephen Robinson, "S. African police seize Attenborough film", Daily Telegraph, 30 July 1988 (reproduced in Scenaria, September 1988, p.10).
216. Uys, interview with Morris, "Cry Freemandela and don't be such a bloody fool", 23.
217. Quoted by Méira Cook, "Not one wit less derisive", Sunday Star Review, 14 October 1990, page number unknown.
218. Pieter-Dirk Uys, interview with Keith Bruce, "Shining a torch into South Africa's back yard", Glasgow Herald, 17 May 1990, page number unknown.
219. The quotations from A Kiss on Your Koeksister are derived from a performance attended during the run in Durban and from Gevisser, "Uys: the once and always queen of the edgy laugh", p.7.
220. Eileen O'Carrol, "Sharper barbs at a wider gallery", Citizen, 11 September 1986, page number unknown.
221. Uys, interview with Chisholm, "Uys Soho Satire is Chilling", page number unknown.
222. John Campbell, "What's so funny?", Financial Mail, 19 September 1986, page number unknown.
223. See Carter, Stand-Up Comedy, pp.119-121, for an examination of the use of such "emotional tags" (as she defines them).
224. Uys, Rearranging the Deckchairs on the SA Bothatonic, p.45.

225. See Uys, Beyond the Rubicon, pp.161-163, for his "Beyond the Rubicon: set, props and costumes".
226. Ibid., p.163. One transformation (that from the security man to Billie-Jeanne Bezuidenhout) had to be made offstage, but from then on Uys remained onstage for the duration of the performance.
227. Barry Ronge, "Angry Uys crosses a personal Rubicon", Sunday Times, 14 September 1986, p.20.
228. Portus, "Seeing the joke in a black and white issue", page number unknown.
229. Uys, interview with Morris, "Cry Freemandela and don't be such a bloody fool", 23.
230. Ibid.
231. Uys, An Evening with Pieter-Dirk Uys, p.42.
232. Ibid., p.31.
233. Ibid., p.32.
234. Ibid., p.55.
235. Ibid.
236. Uys, interview with Smythe, "Penny Smythe talks to Pieter-Dirk Uys", p.58.
237. Andrew Horn, "South African Theater: Ideology and Rebellion", Research in African Literatures 17 (2/1986), 226.
238. Sutherland, English Satire, p.17.
239. Garalt MacLiam, "Adapt or Dye", Star, 8 July 1982, page number unknown.
240. Uys, interview with a New Nation reporter, "Uys: plans, changes and influences", p.17.
241. Nichols, "Satirist or Safety Valve?", p.7.
242. Uys, interview with Cowell, "A South African Satirist's Apartheid", page number unknown.
243. Uys, quoted in Herber, Conversations, pp.95-96.
244. Uys, Beyond the Rubicon, p.112.
245. These criticisms are derived from two reviews by John Campbell: "Evita goes skating on the safe ice", Weekly Mail, 12-18 July 1985, p.17, and "Uys writes for the spook inside him", Weekly Mail, 24-30 January 1986, p.18. Reviewers who

- expressed similar reservations include Greig in various reviews and articles (see, for example, "Uys in a hole", p.4), and Gevisser (see "Uys: the once and always queen of the edgy laugh", p.7).
246. Campbell, "What's so funny?", page number unknown.
 247. Ibid.
 248. Uys, Beyond the Rubicon, p.114.
 249. Uys, interview with Connor, "Lone Tango", p.17, and Beyond the Rubicon, p.146.
 250. Jonathan Swift, The Battle of the Books, in Jonathan Swift, edited by Angus Ross and David Woolley (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984), p.1.
 251. Pieter-Dirk Uys, interview with Roger Hutchings, "Making white South Africa pale", Observer, 17 November 1985, page number unknown.
 252. Heribert Adam, "Limits of Ruthlessness", in Transforming South Africa (Cape Town: Centre for African Studies, 1987), p.2.
 253. Ibid.
 254. Uys, Rearranging the Deckchairs on the SA Bothatonic, p.11.
 255. Ibid., p.14.
 256. Ibid., p.35.
 257. Ibid., p.36.
 258. John Campbell, "Rose-tinted Uys grows a bloodier set of fangs", Weekly Mail, 22-28 May 1987, p.20.
 259. Gevisser, "Uys: the once and always queen of the edgy laugh", p.7.
 260. Glenn Shelton, "Botha runs aground - on an Uysberg", Weekly Mail, 10-16 April 1987, p.22.
 261. Pieter-Dirk Uys, interview with Marc le Chat, "Taking the Farce out of Uys", Cosmopolitan, September 1988, p.88.
 262. See, for example, Alice Coetzee, "A Satire of tastelessness", Pretoria News, 15 December 1987, page number unknown.
 263. Pieter-Dirk Uys, interview with Malcolm Hay, "Adapt or Dye", Time Out, 10-17 August 1988, p.59.
 264. Uys, interview with Le Chat, "Taking the Farce out of Uys", p.84.
 265. Uys, interview with Daniel, "We've got to ask questions, says Pieter-Dirk", p.10.

266. Brecht, "Theatre for Pleasure or Theatre for Instruction", in Brecht on Theatre, p.73.
267. Uys, interview with a New Nation reporter, "Uys: plans, changes and influences", p.17.
268. Pieter-Dirk Uys, interview with Patrick Leeman, "In the new SA, a new mission for Evita", Natal Mercury, 24 October 1991, p.11.
269. Uys, interview with Knox, "Pietie, hy kô huis toe", p.73.
270. Uys, interview with Thamm, "Uys back on the table", p.29.
271. Uys, interview with Leeman, "In the new SA, a new mission for Evita", p.11.
272. Glenn, "South African Satire Now", 90.
273. See, for example, Mel Larkin, "He's still tilting at windmills", Weekly Mail, 23-30 March 1989, p.24, for a representative view of Uys's achievements.
274. See Evans, "Uys plays with fire", page number unknown, and John Connor, "Adapt or Dye", City Limits, 10-17 April 1986, page number unknown.
275. Quoted in Ada Struijt, "Pieter-Dirk draws royal praise", Star, 18 October 1989, p.1.
276. Uys, quoted in Herber, Conversations, p.95.
277. Gray, "Desegregating the theatre", 14.

PRODUCTION CHRONOLOGY: WORKS BY PIETER-DIRK UYS, 1969 -1992

(This chronology includes references to significant subsequent or revised productions. Where possible, the date of the first performance is supplied.)

Faces in the Wall

1969

Arc-lamp Theatre (London Film School), London

Directed by Pieter-Dirk Uys

(Upstairs, The Space, Cape Town in March 1973, directed by Pieter-Dirk Uys; Laager at the Market, Johannesburg in April 1980, directed by Pieter-Dirk Uys)

Popcorn

1973

The Space, Cape Town

Directed by Pieter-Dirk Uys

Kitsch

September 1973

Upstairs, The Space, Cape Town

Directed by Pieter-Dirk Uys

Pity About People

1974

Outer Space, Cape Town

Directed by Pieter-Dirk Uys

(Blue Fox, Johannesburg in April 1975, directed by Pieter-Dirk Uys)

Just Hilda

1974

The Space, Cape Town

Directed and performed by Pieter-Dirk Uys

Selle Ou Storie

12 October 1974

Outer Space, Cape Town

Directed by Pieter-Dirk Uys

(Blue Fox, Johannesburg in March 1975, directed by Pieter-Dirk Uys; Arena, Nico Malan, Cape Town in April 1991, directed by Pieter-Dirk Uys)

Snow White and the Special Branch (A Cape Town Fairy Tale)

18 December 1974

Outer Space, Cape Town

Directed by Pieter-Dirk Uys

(Subsequently presented as Snow White and the Special Branch / Black Beauty and the Boss, Labia, Cape Town in 1976, directed by Pieter-Dirk Uys)

God's Forgotten

22 May 1975

Outer Space, Cape Town

Directed by Pieter-Dirk Uys

(La Mama, New York in May 1979, directed by Mavis Taylor; Downstairs (University of Witwatersrand), Johannesburg in October 1985, directed by Lynne Maree)

Karnaval

9 July 1975

Outer Space, Cape Town

Directed by Pieter-Dirk Uys

(Presented with Selle Ou Storie and God's Forgotten as "A Season of 3 Bilingual South African Plays by Pieter-Dirk Uys", Outer Space, Cape Town in July and August 1975; Upstairs at the Market, Johannesburg in February 1981, directed by Dawie Malan)

Strike Up The Banned

November 1975

Outer Space, Cape Town

Directed by Pieter-Dirk Uys

(Toured with God's Forgotten and Selle Ou Storie during 1975 and 1976 to Grahamstown, Stellenbosch, Port Elizabeth and Bloemfontein, directed by Pieter-Dirk Uys; Upstairs at the Market, Johannesburg in October 1976, directed by Pieter-Dirk Uys; Market Café, Johannesburg in February 1978, directed by Pieter-Dirk Uys)

Skote!

April 1976

Hofmeyer, Cape Town

Directed by Esther van Ryswyk (with pupils of Jan van Riebeeck Hoërskool)

Paradise is Closing Down

6 July 1977

Rhodes University Theatre, Grahamstown

Directed by Pieter-Dirk Uys

(Upstairs at the Market, Johannesburg in July 1978, directed by Pieter-Dirk Uys; City Centre, Durban in March 1979, directed by Pieter Scholtz; Old Chaplaincy Centre, Edinburgh in August 1979, directed by Roberta Durrant (subsequently transferred to Young Vic Studio, London in September 1979); John D. Archbold, Syracuse in January 1980, directed by Peter Maloney; screened by Granada TV, London on 23 June 1981, directed by Howard Baker; as Paradise Is Closing Down (A New South Africa Look), Kingswood Space, Grahamstown in July 1992, directed by Lynne Maree)

The Rise and Fall of the First Empress Bonaparte

17 August 1977

Little Theatre, Cape Town

Directed by Pieter-Dirk Uys

(State Theatre, Pretoria in 1983, directed by William Egan)

Die Van Aardes van Grootoor

26 November 1977

Baxter Studio, Cape Town

Directed by Dawie Malan

(Laager at the Market, Johannesburg on 20 September 1978 (opening production), directed by Dawie Malan; Market Theatre, Johannesburg in July 1979, directed by Dawie Malan; Windybrow, Johannesburg in October 1987, directed by Louis van Niekerk;

Theatre on the Bay, Cape Town, and Leonard Rayne, Johannesburg starting in April 1992, directed by Pieter-Dirk Uys)

Info Scandals

April 1979

Wena Naude, Pretoria

Directed by Pieter-Dirk Uys

(Baxter Studio, Cape Town in April 1979, directed by Dawie Malan, and later as Info Scandals (The Rhooiest Show in Town), Laager at the Market, Johannesburg in July 1979)

Uyscreams from the Wimpy Archipelago

1 April 1980

Laager at the Market, Johannesburg

Directed by Pieter-Dirk Uys

Uyscreams with Hot Chocolate Sauce

October 1980

Market Theatre, Johannesburg

Directed by Pieter-Dirk Uys

(Baxter Concert Hall, Cape Town and Oude Libertas, Stellenbosch in January 1981)

Adapt or Dye

1 April 1981

Upstairs, Durban

Directed and performed by Pieter-Dirk Uys

(During 1981 and 1982, toured to Market Restaurant, Johannesburg; H.B. Thom Theatre, Stellenbosch; Baxter Concert Hall, Cape Town; Oude Libertas, Stellenbosch; Observatory, Bloemfontein; André Huguenot, Intimate, Market Theatre, Johannesburg; Baxter Theatre, Cape Town; George; Worcester; Opera House, Port Elizabeth; Rhodes University Theatre, Grahamstown)

Beyond all Reason / Hell is for Whites Only

November 1981

Upstairs at the Market, Johannesburg

Directed by Pieter-Dirk Uys

Appassionata

2 July 1982

Arena Studio, State Theatre, Pretoria

Directed by Mario Schiess

(Transferred to Market Theatre, Johannesburg and Baxter Studio, Cape Town)

Farce About Uys

26 February 1983

Observatory, Bloemfontein

Directed by Dawie Malan

(Toured to Opera House, Port Elizabeth; George; Baxter Concert Hall, Cape Town; Market Theatre, Johannesburg; Alhambra, Durban; Hexagon, Pietermaritzburg; Queenstown)

Total Onslaught 1984 (Ja-No-Orwell-Fine)

February 1984

Observatory, Bloemfontein

Directed by Dawie Malan

(Toured to Guild, East London; Opera House, Port Elizabeth; Baxter Concert Hall, Cape Town; H.B. Thom, Stellenbosch; Alhambra, Durban; Churchill, Pietermaritzburg; Market Theatre, Johannesburg; State Opera, Pretoria; Grahamstown; Vereeniging; Welkom; Sasolburg; Windhoek)

Skating on Thin Uys (film)

12 June 1985

Monte Carlo, Cape Town

Directed by Pieter-Dirk Uys

(Official premiere at His Majesty's, Grahamstown on 5 July 1985)

Beyond the Rubicon

5 November 1985

Market Theatre, Johannesburg (as Adapt or Dye, prior to London season)

Directed and performed by Pieter-Dirk Uys

(Toured during 1985 and 1986 to Windhoek Theatre, Windhoek; Nico Malan, Cape Town; Opera House, Port Elizabeth; Guild, East London; André Huguenot, Bloemfontein; Joseph Stone, Athlone; Grahamstown Festival (subtitled The Emergency Edition after State of Emergency re-imposed on 12 June 1986); State Opera, Pretoria; Elizabeth Sneddon Theatre, Durban; Hexagon, Pietermaritzburg; Baxter Concert Hall, Cape Town; Market Theatre, Johannesburg)

Adapt or Dye

18 November 1985

Tricycle, London (subtitled The Rioting on the Walls of South Africa)

Directed and performed by Pieter-Dirk Uys

(Between 1985 and 1989, revised versions presented Boulevard, London in April 1986; Dublin Festival in September 1986; as Skating on Thin Uys, Footbridge, Sydney in January 1987; Hart House, Toronto in October 1987; Across The Rubicon (film) screened Mark Goodson, Los Angeles on 27 April 1987 (also shown on Public Broadcasting Service (PBS)); Purcell Room, Edinburgh in August 1988; Traverse, Edinburgh in August 1988; Nieuwe de la Marteat, Amsterdam in August 1988; Hackney Empire, London in September 1988; Donmar Warehouse, London in October 1988 (presented as Pieter-Dirk Uys in London, Nico Malan, Cape Town in November 1988); Windhoek Theatre, Windhoek in June 1989; Hamburg Festival in June 1989; Assembly Rooms, Edinburgh (recorded as "Bite the Ballot" and screened on Channel 4TV) in August 1989; "Just for Laughs" Festival of Comedy, Montreal in August 1989; Donmar Warehouse, London in September 1989 (as part of "Perrier Best of the Edinburgh Fringe"); tour of Netherlands, September and October 1989)

Rearranging the Deckchairs on the SA Bothatonic

30 March 1987

Baxter Concert Hall, Cape Town

Directed by Ralph Lawson

(During 1987 and 1988, toured to Market Theatre, Johannesburg (opening on 6 May 1987, to coincide with elections); State Opera, Pretoria; Grahamstown Festival; Elizabeth Sneddon Theatre, Durban; Hexagon, Pietermaritzburg; Opera House, Port Elizabeth;

Rhodes University Theatre, Grahamstown; Warehouse at the Market, Johannesburg; Nico Malan, Cape Town)

Panorama

5 July 1987

Ray's, Grahamstown

Directed by Pieter-Dirk Uys

(Alexander, Johannesburg in September 1987, directed by Pieter-Dirk Uys; King's Head, London on 20 June 1988, directed by Penny Cherns; Nico Malan, Cape Town in November 1988, directed by Ralph Lawson)

Cry Freemandela - The Movie

9 December 1987

Market Theatre, Johannesburg

Directed by Pieter-Dirk Uys

(Warehouse at the Market, Johannesburg and Nico Malan, Cape Town in April 1988)

Just Like Home

7 March 1989

Laager at the Market, Johannesburg

Directed by Pieter-Dirk Uys

(During 1989 and 1990, toured to Baxter Theatre, Cape Town; Grahamstown Festival and Pemads Ford, Port Elizabeth; Embassy Rooms, Edinburgh in August 1989, directed by Pieter-Dirk Uys, transferred to King's Head, London in October 1989; Upstairs at the Market, Johannesburg in April 1990, directed by Lynne Maree)

Scorched Earth

28 March 1989

Market Theatre, Johannesburg

Directed by Pieter-Dirk Uys

"Evita's Indaba"

19 July 1989

Screened on M-Net

Directed by William Faure

"Evita's Last Decade"

31 December 1989

Screened on M-Net

Directed by William Faure

A Kiss on Your Koeksister

19 January 1990

Warehouse at the Market, Johannesburg

Directed by Janice Honeyman

(During early 1990, toured to various centres in South Africa; Renfrew Ferry, Glasgow at Glasgow's Mayfest in May 1990; toured England (played in twelve centres); Edinburgh Festival in August 1990; Amsterdam and Zurich in September 1990; Market Theatre, Johannesburg in October 1990; Drama at the Playhouse, Durban in November 1990)

An Audience with Evita Bezuidenhout

6 December 1990

Baxter Concert Hall, Cape Town

Directed by Pieter-Dirk Uys, assisted by Lynne Maree

(During 1990 and 1991, toured to various centres in South Africa; revised version, beginning in November 1991, toured thirteen centres in Netherlands and in May 1992, a month-long tour in Germany and Yugoslavia)

"Message to Major"

August 1991

Screened by BBC

Directed by Pieter-Dirk Uys

Die Vleiroos

5 June 1992

Arena, Nico Malan, Cape Town

Directed by Pieter-Dirk Uys

(PJ's, Grahamstown in July 1992)

An Evening with Pieter-Dirk Uys

4 September 1992

Baxter Theatre, Cape Town

Directed and performed by Pieter-Dirk Uys

(Elizabeth Sneddon Theatre, Durban in October 1992)

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

1 Works by Pieter-Dirk Uys

1.1 Plays and revues (by dates of first production)

Selle Ou Storie. Johannesburg: Ad. Donker, 1983.

God's Forgotten. In Theatre Two: New South African Drama. Edited by Stephen Gray. Johannesburg: Ad. Donker, 1981.

God's Forgotten. In "Paradise Is Closing Down" and Other Plays. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1989.

Karnaval. Johannesburg: Ad. Donker, 1982.

Skote! Johannesburg: Perskor, 1985.

Paradise is Closing Down. In Theatre One: New South African Drama. Edited by Stephen Gray. Johannesburg: Ad. Donker, 1978.

Paradise Is Closing Down. In "Paradise Is Closing Down" and Other Plays. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1989.

Paradise Is Closing Down (A New South Africa Look). Cape Town: Peninsula, 1992.

Die Van Aardes Van Grootoor. Johannesburg: Taurus, 1979.

Adapt or Dye. In No One's Died Laughing. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1986.

Appassionata. In Market Plays. Edited by Stephen Gray. Johannesburg: Ad. Donker, 1986.

Farce About Uys. Johannesburg: Jonathan Ball and Ad. Donker, 1983.

Total Onslaught 1984 (Ja-No-Orwell-Fine). In No One's Died Laughing. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1986.

Beyond the Rubicon. In No One's Died Laughing. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1986.

Rearranging the Deckchairs on the SA Bothatonic. Performance text, 1986.

Panorama. In "Paradise Is Closing Down" and Other Plays. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1989.

Die Vleiroos. Cape Town: Peninsula, 1992.

An Evening with Pieter-Dirk Uys. Performance text, 1992.

1.2 Books

No One's Died Laughing. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1986.

P.W. Botha In His Own Words. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1987.

A Part Hate A Part Love. Johannesburg: Radix, 1990.

1.3 Articles

"The Saga of Selle Ou Storie", Speak 1 (March/April 1978), 53-57.

"Time Is Not On Our Side", Face to Face, Durban Arts Association, 1992, pp.15-18.

"Einde van era vir Pieter-Dirk Uys", Die Burger, 2 October 1992.

2 Works on or referring to Pieter-Dirk Uys

2.1 Books and theses

Adey, David; Beeton, Ridley; Chapman, Michael; and Pereira, Ernest. Companion to South African English Literature. Johannesburg: Ad. Donker, 1986.

Astbury, Brian. The Space/Die Ruimte/Indawo. Cape Town: M. and A. Fine, 1980.

Bedford, Jacoba Wilhelmina. "The Presence of the Past in Selected Works by Pieter-Dirk Uys". M.A. dissertation, University of Potchefstroom, 1988.

Herber, Avril. Conversations. Johannesburg: Bateleur Press, 1979.

Orkin, Martin. Drama and the South African state. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1991.

Schwartz, Pat. The Best of Company: The Story of Johannesburg's Market Theatre. Johannesburg: Ad. Donker, 1988.

Van Rooyen, J.C.W. Censorship in South Africa. Cape Town: Juta, 1987.

Winstanley, Terry J. "South Africa's Enigmatic Political Realities: Christopher Hope's Strategies of Satire in A Separate Development and Kruger's Alp". M.A. dissertation, University of Natal (Durban), 1987.

2.2 Journals and magazines

"Can't stop the Karnaval", Scenaria, January - March 1981, p.23.

- Ferguson, Ian. "Three Profiles from the South African Theatre", Theatre Quarterly 7 (28/1977-1978), 87-94.
- Glenn, Ian. "South African Satire Now", New Contrast 20 (1/1992), 80-90.
- Gray, Stephen. "Desegregating the theatre", Index on Censorship 14 (August 1985), 11-17.
- Green, Garth V. "Characterization in Pieter-Dirk Uys's Appassionata", Unisa English Studies 25 (September 1987), 18-22.
- Horn, Andrew. "South African Theater: Ideology and Rebellion", Research in African Literatures 17 (2/1986), 211-233.
- Knox, Catherine. "Pietie, hy kô huis toe", De Kat, May 1992, pp.72-74.
- Le Chat, Marc. "Taking the Farce out of Uys", Cosmopolitan, September 1988, pp.84-88.
- Morris, Patricia. "Cry Freemandela and don't be such a bloody fool", Index on Censorship 17 (March 1988), 21-24.
- Roberts, Sheila V. "South African Bilingual and Multilingual Drama of the 'Seventies'", Canadian Drama 6 (1/1980), 134-150.
- Smythe, Penny. "Penny Smythe talks to Pieter-Dirk Uys", Fair Lady, 14 February 1990, pp.56-58.
- Steadman, Ian. "The other face", Index on Censorship 14 (February 1985), 26-28.

2.3 Newspapers (including press releases, articles, interviews and reviews)

- Accone, Darryl. "Uys's bread and Botha", Cue, 4 July 1990.
- "The artist will not stay unscathed ... ", New Nation, 4-10 June 1987.
- Bacon, Peter. "Pieter-Dirk goes bananas", Natal Witness, 7 November 1983.
- Billington, Michael. "Adapt or Dye", London Theatre Record, 21 October - 3 November 1988.
- _____ . "Panorama", London Theatre Record, 17-30 June 1988.
- Blumenthal, Eileen. "God's Forgotten", New York Voice, 4 June 1979.
- Bruce, Keith. "Shining a torch into South Africa's back yard", Glasgow Herald, 17 May 1990.
- Butler, Charlotte. "It's one man one vote or no man no vote, skattie", Weekly Mail, 30 April - 7 May 1987.

- Campbell, John. "Evita goes skating on the safe ice", Weekly Mail, 12-18 July 1985.
- _____ . "Rose-tinted Uys grows a bloodier set of fangs", Weekly Mail, 22-28 May 1987.
- _____ . "Uys writes for the spook inside him", Weekly Mail, 24-30 January 1986.
- _____ . "What's so funny?", Financial Mail, 19 September 1986.
- Carney, Jilea. "Skating on Thin Uys", Sydney On The Street, 21 January 1987.
- Chisholm, Fiona. "Uys Soho Satire is Chilling", Cape Times, 12 March 1986.
- Cleave, Maureen. "Jarring the censor's funny-bone", London Standard, 26 September 1979.
- Coetzee, Alice. "A Satire of tastelessness", Pretoria News, 15 December 1987.
- Coetzee, Carol. "The Alternative Afrikaners", Sunday Times Magazine, 16 July 1989.
- Connor, John. "Adapt or Dye", London City Limits, 10-17 April 1986.
- _____ . "Lone Tango", London City Limits, 20-27 March 1986.
- Cook, Méira. "Not one wit less derisive", Sunday Star Review, 14 October 1990.
- Cowell, Alan. "A South African Satirist's Apartheid", New York Times, 5 July 1984.
- Daniel, Raeford. "Now an epic Boeredrama", Rand Daily Mail, 7 September 1978.
- _____ . "We've got to ask questions, says Pieter-Dirk", Weekend Mail, 12-18 October 1990.
- De Villiers, Dirk. "Pieter-Dirk Uys gets rave Canadian reviews", Daily News Tonight, 6 November 1987.
- De Waal, Shaun. "P D Uys's Koeksister is no joke", Weekly Mail, 26 January - 1 February 1990.
- Evans, Bob. "Uys plays with fire", Sydney Morning Herald, 12 January 1987.
- "Evita acclaimed", Daily News Tonight, 27 July 1989.
- "Evita Bezuidenhout was speaking, says SA satirist", Citizen, 27 August 1988.
- Fourie, Herman. "Home with the unconverted", Argus, 30 November 1988.
- Freedberg, Louis. "South Africa's Court Jester", San Fransisco Chronicle, 20 June 1986.
- Gevisser, Mark. "Uys: the once and always queen of the edgy laugh", Weekend Mail, 19-25 October 1990.

- Gill, Gwen. "Evita Bezuidenhout pulls the wool over the Iron Lady's eyes", Sunday Times, 2 August 1987.
- Graaff, Monica. "Pieter-Dirk adapts to SA boards", Cape Times, 30 November 1988.
- Greig, Robert. "Satire of a different strain", Business Day, 16 October 1990.
- _____ . "Uys in a hole", Business Day, 8 January 1987.
- _____ . "Uys swamps the satire ...", Business Day, 12 September 1986.
- Harper, Iaine. "Man of Many Face(t)s", Weekend Argus, 14 May 1988.
- Hauptfleisch, Temple. "Ambiguity in resurge of interest in P-D Uys", Pretoria News Tonight, 10 November 1987.
- Hay, Malcolm. "Adapt or Dye", London Time Out, 10-17 August 1988.
- Hoad, Brian. "The quality in the quantity", Sydney Bulletin, 27 January 1987.
- Hutchings, Roger. "Making white South Africa pale", London Observer, 17 November 1985.
- Kamase, Mlungisi. "Scotch and Uys", Sowetan, 3 July 1989.
- Lange, Phoebe. "Sultry Sophia is model for Evita", Eastern Province Herald, 21 June 1985.
- Larkin, Mel. "He's still tilting at windmills", Weekly Mail, 23-30 March 1989.
- _____ . "Uys puts Evita away and pulls out a few punches", Weekly Mail, 17-22 March 1989.
- Leeman, Patrick. "In the new SA, a new mission for Evita", Natal Mercury, 24 October 1991.
- Le Grange, C. "Election countdown - No tears as Evita quits NP and diplomacy", Pretoria News, 29 April 1987.
- "Lekker Amsterdam lauds Uys", Star, 31 August 1988.
- Lelyveld, Joseph. "Afrikaner's Satire a Box-Office Hit", New York Times, 5 July 1983.
- "Lift-off for Evita's Indaba", Daily News Tonight, 19 July 1989.
- MacLiam, Garalt. "Adapt or Dye", Star, 8 July 1982.
- _____ . "Funny yes, but the laughter is uncomfortable these days", Star, 20 December 1985.
- _____ . "He's on his Uys now", Star, 10 December 1985.

- Michell, John. "The Uys konsert goes on", Sunday Star, 11 October 1987.
- Minervini, Rina. "The play that got written by mistake", Rand Daily Mail, 24 April 1980.
- Nichols, Peter. "Satirist or Safety Valve?", London Time Out, 9-15 April 1986.
- Nicol, Mike. "Hardly the same old story", To The Point, 21 March 1975.
- O'Carrol, Eileen. "Sharper barbs at a wider gallery", Citizen, 11 September 1986.
- "Pieter-Dirk packs up", Cape Times, 16 June 1981.
- "Pieter-Dirk Uys: Humour is my only sanity", New Nation, 30 March - 5 April 1989.
- "Playing another Uys", Cue, 7 July 1992.
- Portus, Martin. "Seeing the joke in a black and white issue", Sydney Morning Herald, 3 January 1987.
- Pretorius, Willem. "Kyk net hoe lyk ons twee stouterds nou!", Rapport, 28 June 1981.
- Raphaely, Rosemarie. "Uys, distilling our traumas into one big joke", Star, 23 November 1978.
- Renton, Alex. "Adapt or Dye", London Theatre Record, 21 October - 3 November 1988.
- "Ridicule of Afrikaner not to be 'overdone' ", Natal Mercury, 24 October 1978.
- Robertson, Hugh. "Uys tickles the US fancy", Daily News, 27 January 1993.
- Ronge, Barry. "Angry Uys crosses a personal Rubicon", Sunday Times, 14 September 1986.
- _____. "Uys: Has he gone over the top this time?", Sunday Times, 13 December 1987.
- _____. "Uys swops laughter for sharper satire", Sunday Times, 28 January 1990.
- Shelton, Glenn. "Botha runs aground - on an Uysberg", Weekly Mail, 10-16 April 1987.
- Sole, Sam. "It cuts no Uys", Sunday Tribune, 11 November 1990.
- "Stage Satire on Info Scandals", Natal Mercury, 27 March 1979.
- Struijt, Ada. "Pieter-Dirk draws royal praise", Star, 18 October 1989.
- Thamm, Marianne. "Uys back on the table", Weekly Mail, 26 June - 2 July 1992.
- Treen, Joseph, and Youngusband, Peter. "Satire, South African Style", New York Newsweek, 23 July 1984.

"Uys in reported call for sanctions", Natal Mercury, 20 August 1988.

"Uys: plans, changes and influences", New Nation, 5-11 April 1989.

Van den Nieuwenhof, Liz. "Uys gives apartheid a big serve", Sydney Sunday Telegraph, 4 January 1987.

Vinassi, Andrea. "Van Aardes is out-dated", Star, 16 October 1987.

Waite, Jean. "Uys gets carried away in the act", Sunday Star, 12 February 1989.

"Why 'modest' Maggie won't play her sanctions Uys", Star, 20 November 1985.

3 Other sources consulted

3.1 Books (including critical works, biographies, plays and poetry)

- Ackroyd, Peter. Dressing Up: Transvestism and Drag. London: Thames and Hudson, 1979.
- Adam, Heribert. "Limits of Ruthlessness". In Transforming South Africa. Cape Town: Centre for African Studies, 1987.
- Alexander, Peter. Roy Campbell: A Critical Biography. Cape Town: David Philip, 1982.
- Alhadeff, Vic. A Newspaper History of South Africa. Second edition. Cape Town: Don Nelson, 1986.
- Allen, Vivien. Du Val Tonight! : The Story of a Showman. Worcester: Square One, 1990.
- Appignanesi, Lisa. Cabaret. Revised edition. London: Methuen, 1984.
- Aristophanes. The Acharnians. Translated by Geoffrey Chapman. The Afrikaanians. Unpublished performance script. Translated by Patric Dickinson. Acharnians. In Aristophanes (Plays: 1). London: Oxford University Press, 1970. Translated by Douglass Parker. The Acharnians. New York: Mentor, 1961. Translated by Alan H. Sommerstein. The Acharnians. In Aristophanes: "Lysistrata" and Other Plays. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973.
- _____. The Birds. Translated by William Arrowsmith. New York: Mentor, 1961.
- _____. The Clouds. Translated by William Arrowsmith. The Clouds. New York: Mentor, 1962. Translated by Patric Dickinson. Clouds. In Aristophanes (Plays:1). London: Oxford University Press, 1970. Translated by Kenneth McLeish. Clouds. In Aristophanes: "Clouds", "Women in Power", "Knights". Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979. Translated by Alan H.

- Sommerstein. The Clouds. In Aristophanes: "Lysistrata" and Other Plays. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973.
- _____. Ecclesiazusae. Translated by David Barrett. The Assemblywomen (Ecclesiazusae). In Aristophanes: "The Birds" and Other Plays. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1978. Translated by Geoffrey Chapman. Women in Revolt. Unpublished performance script.
- _____. The Frogs. Translated by David Barrett. The Frogs. In Aristophanes: "The Frogs" and Other Plays. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1964. Translated by Patric Dickinson. Frogs. In Aristophanes (Plays: 2). London: Oxford University Press, 1970. Translated by Dudley Fitts. The Frogs. London: Faber, 1957. Translated by Richmond Lattimore. The Frogs. New York: Mentor, 1970. Translated by Merwe Scholtz. Die Paddas. Johannesburg: Perskor, 1978.
- _____. The Knights. Translated by Patric Dickinson. Knights. In Aristophanes (Plays : 1). London: Oxford University Press, 1970. Translated by Kenneth McLeish. Knights. In Aristophanes: "Clouds", "Women in Power", "Knights". Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979. Translated by Alan H. Sommerstein. The Knights. In Aristophanes: "The Birds" and Other Plays. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1978.
- _____. Lysistrata. Translated by Alan H. Sommerstein. Lysistrata. In Aristophanes: "Lysistrata" and Other Plays. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973. Translated by J.P.J. van Rensburg. Lusistrata. Cape Town: Human and Rousseau, 1970.
- _____. Peace. Translated by Patric Dickinson. Peace. In Aristophanes (Plays: 1). London: Oxford University Press, 1970. Translated by Alan H. Sommerstein. Peace. In Aristophanes: "The Birds" and Other Plays. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1978.
- _____. Thesmophoriazusae. Translated by David Barrett. The Poet and the Women (Thesmophoriazusae). In Aristophanes: "The Frogs" and Other Plays. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1964. Translated by Geoffrey Chapman. Women in Protest. Durban: University of Natal, 1980.
- _____. The Wasps. Translated by David Barrett. The Wasps. In Aristophanes: "The Frogs" and Other Plays. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1964. Translated by Patric Dickinson. Wasps. In Aristophanes (Plays: 1). London: Oxford University Press, 1970. Translated by Douglass Parker. The Wasps. New York: Mentor, 1962.
- _____. Wealth. Translated by Alan H. Sommerstein. Wealth. In Aristophanes: "The Birds" and Other Plays. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1978.
- Aristotle. On the Art of Poetry. Translated by Ingram Bywater. London: Oxford University Press, 1954.
- Arnott, Peter D. The Ancient Greek and Roman Theatre. New York: Random House, 1971.

- _____. "Aristophanes and Popular Comedy: An Analysis of The Frogs". In Western Popular Theatre. Edited by David Mayer and Kenneth Richards. London: Methuen, 1977.
- _____. An Introduction to the Greek Theatre. London: Macmillan, 1962.
- _____. Public and Performance in the Greek Theatre. London: Routledge, 1989.
- Arrowsmith, William. "Aristophanes and Sokrates". In Aristophanes, The Clouds. New York: Mentor, 1962.
- _____. "Introduction: The Clouds". In Aristophanes, The Clouds. New York: Mentor, 1962.
- Aucamp, Hennie. Die Lewe is 'n Grenshotel. Cape Town: Tafelberg, 1977.
- Banham, Martin, ed. The Cambridge Guide to World Theatre. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Barrett, David. "Introduction". In Aristophanes, Aristophanes: "The Frogs" and Other Plays. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1964.
- _____. "Introductory Note to The Frogs". In Aristophanes, Aristophanes: "The Frogs" and Other Plays. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1964.
- Barron, John. An Introduction to Greek Sculpture. London: Athlone Press, 1981.
- Benjamin, Arnold. Lost Johannesburg. Johannesburg: Macmillan, 1979.
- Bergson, Henri. "Laughter". In Comedy. New York: Doubleday Anchor, 1956.
- Black, Stephen. Helena's Hope, Ltd. Adapted by Stephen Gray. In Stephen Black: Three Plays. Edited by Stephen Gray. Johannesburg: Ad. Donker, 1984.
- _____. Love and the Hyphen. Adapted by Stephen Gray. In Stephen Black: Three Plays. Edited by Stephen Gray. Johannesburg: Ad. Donker, 1984.
- Blumenfeld, Jesmond, ed. South Africa in Crisis. Beckenham: Croom Helm, 1987.
- Bosman, F.C.L. Drama en Toneel in Suid-Afrika, Deel 1: 1652 - 1855. Amsterdam/Pretoria: De Bussy, 1928.
- Bosman, Herman Charles. "Mafeking Road". In Mafeking Road. Cape Town: Human and Rousseau, 1969.
- Bowra, C.M. The Greek Experience. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1957.
- Brecht, Bertolt. Brecht on Theatre. Edited and translated by John Willett. London: Methuen, 1964.
- Brink, André. Mapmakers: Writing in a State of Siege. London: Faber and Faber, 1983.

- Brown, Andrew. A New Companion to Greek Tragedy. Beckenham: Croom and Helm, 1983.
- Butler, Guy. Cape Charade. Cape Town: A.A. Balkema, 1968.
- _____. "Kaatje Kekkelbek". In Cape Charade. Cape Town: A.A. Balkema, 1968.
- Calarco, N. Joseph. Tragic Being: Apollo and Dionysus in Western Drama. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1969.
- Campbell, Roy. "Holism". In The Collected Poems of Roy Campbell. London: Bodley, 1949.
- _____. "A Rejected Review: Reviewer's Preface". In Collected Works IV. Edited by Peter Alexander, Michael Chapman and Marcia Leveson. Johannesburg: Ad. Donker, 1988.
- _____. "The Wayzgoose". In The Collected Poems of Roy Campbell. London: Bodley, 1949.
- Carter, Judy. Stand-Up Comedy: The Book. New York: Dell, 1989.
- Cavander, Kenneth. "Aristophanes". In World Drama. Edited by John Gassner and Edward Quinn. London: Methuen, 1970.
- Chapman, Geoffrey. "Introduction". In Aristophanes, Women in Protest. Durban: University of Natal, 1980.
- Chekhov, Anton. Three Sisters. Translated by Elisaveta Fen. In Chekhov: Plays. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968.
- Cohn, Ruby. Modern Shakespeare Offshoots. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976.
- Colleran, Jeanne Marie. The Dissenting Writer in South Africa: A Rhetorical Analysis of the Drama of Athol Fugard and the Short Fiction of Nadine Gordimer. Ann Arbor: UMI, 1991.
- Cope, Trevor, ed. Izibongo - Zulu Praise Poems. London: Oxford University Press, 1968.
- Coplan, David B. In Township Tonight! South Africa's Black City Music and Theatre. Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1985.
- Cornford, Frances M. The Origin of Attic Comedy. New York: Anchor, 1961.
- Coward, Noël. "Foreword". In Raymond Mander and Joe Mitchenson, Revue. London: Peter Davies, 1971.
- Croiset, Maurice. Aristophanes and the Political Parties at Athens. Translated by James Loeb. New York: Arno Press, 1973.

- Davenport, T.R.H. "The Apartheid Debacle, 1961-1990". In A New Illustrated History of South Africa. Edited by Trehwella Cameron. Johannesburg: Southern, 1991.
- _____. South Africa: A Modern History. Johannesburg: Macmillan, 1977.
- Deardon, C.W. The Stage of Aristophanes. London: Athlone Press, 1976.
- Delius, Anthony. The Last Division. Cape Town: Human and Rousseau, 1959.
- De Ste. Croix, G.E.M. The Origins of the Peloponnesian War. London: Duckworth, 1972.
- De Villiers, Dirk, and De Villiers, Johanna. P.W. Cape Town: Tafelberg, 1984.
- Dover, Kenneth J. Aristophanic Comedy. London: Batsford, 1972.
- _____. "Comedy and Society". In Twentieth Century Interpretations of "The Frogs". Edited by David J. Littlefield. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1968.
- Dyson, A.E. The Crazy Fabric. London: Macmillan, 1965.
- Edmunds, Lowell. "Aristophanes' Acharnians". In Aristophanes: Essays in Interpretation (Yale Classical Studies: 26). Edited by Jeffrey Henderson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.
- Ehrenberg, Victor. The People of Aristophanes. New York: Schocken, 1962.
- Eifert, Eunice Ruth. The Fourth Wall Shattered: A Study of the Performer-Audience Relationship in Selected Full-Length Monodramas. Ann Arbor: UMI, 1989.
- Eliot, T.S. Notes towards the Definition of Culture. London: Faber, 1948.
- Elliott, Robert C. The Power of Satire: Magic, Ritual, Art. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960.
- _____. "Satire". In Britannica Macropaedia. Fifteenth edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.
- Erenstein, Robert L. "Satire and the Commedia dell'Arte". In Western Popular Theatre. Edited by David Mayer and Kenneth Richards. London: Methuen, 1977.
- Esslin, Martin. Brecht: A Choice of Evils. Third edition. London: Methuen, 1980.
- _____. The Field of Drama. London: Methuen, 1987.
- Euripides. Hippolytus. Translated by Philip Vellacott. In Euripides: "Alcestis", "Hippolytus", "Iphigenia in Tauris". Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1974.
- Feinberg, Leonard. Introduction to Satire. Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1967.
- Fisher, Raymond K. Aristophanes' "Clouds": Purpose and Technique. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1984.

- Fowler, Roger, ed. A Dictionary of Modern Critical Terms. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982.
- Frye, Northrop. Anatomy of Criticism. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957.
- Fugard, Athol. "Foreword". In Apartheid: The Lighter Side. Compiled by Ben MacLennan. Plumstead: Chameleon Press, 1990.
- _____. Notebooks 1960 - 1977. Edited by Mary Benson. Johannesburg: Ad. Donker, 1983.
- Fugard, Athol; Kani, John; and Ntshona, Winston. The Island. In Statements: Three Plays. London: Oxford University Press, 1974.
- _____. Sizwe Bansi Is Dead. In Statements: Three Plays. London: Oxford University Press, 1974.
- Garland, Nicholas. "Political Cartooning". In Laughing Matters. Edited by John Durant and Jonathan Miller. Harlow: Longman, 1988.
- Gastrow, Shelagh. Who's Who in South African Politics: Number 3. Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1990.
- Goldblatt, R.E. "Censorship". In Standard Encyclopaedia of Southern Africa. 12. Cape Town: Nasou, 1976.
- Gomme, Arnold W. "Aristophanes and Politics". In More Essays in Greek History and Literature. Edited by David A. Campbell. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962.
- Grawe, Paul H. Comedy in Space, Time, and the Imagination. Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1983.
- Gray, Stephen, ed. Athol Fugard. Johannesburg: McGraw-Hill, 1982.
- _____. "Introduction". In Stephen Black: Three Plays. Johannesburg: Ad. Donker, 1984.
- _____. Southern African Literature: An Introduction. Cape Town: David Philip, 1979.
- _____. "The Theatre of Stephen Black: An Example of Cultural Discontinuity in South Africa". In Literature and Society in South Africa. Edited by Landeg White and Tim Couzens. Harlow: Longman, 1984.
- Greig, Doreen E. Herbert Baker in South Africa. Cape Town: Purnell, 1970.
- Grube, G.M.A. "The Literary Criticism of the Frogs". In Twentieth Century Interpretations of "The Frogs". Edited by David J. Littlefield. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1968.
- Gutsche, Thelma. "Theatrical Artistes". In Standard Encyclopaedia of Southern Africa. 10. Cape Town: Nasou, 1974.

- _____. "Theatrical History". In Standard Encyclopaedia of Southern Africa. 10. Cape Town: Nasou, 1974.
- _____. "Vaudeville and Music Hall". In Standard Encyclopaedia of Southern Africa. 11. Cape Town: Nasou, 1975.
- Hall, Peter. Peter Hall's Diaries: The Story of a Dramatic Battle. Edited by John Goodwin. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1983.
- Halliwell, Stephen. "Aristophanic Satire". In English Satire and the Satiric Tradition. Edited by Claude Rawson. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1984.
- Harriott, Rosemary M. Aristophanes: Poet and Dramatist. Beckenham: Croom Helm, 1986.
- Harrison, Tony. Theatre Works: 1973 - 1985. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1985.
- Hartnoll, Phyllis, ed. The Oxford Companion to the Theatre. Fourth edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Havelock, Eric A. "The Socratic self as it is parodied in Aristophanes' Clouds". In Studies in Fifth-Century Thought and Literature. Edited by Adam Parry. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.
- Heath, Malcolm. Political Comedy in Aristophanes. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1987.
- Henderson, Jeffrey. Aristophanes' "Lysistrata". Cambridge: Focus, 1988.
- _____. The Maculate Muse: Obscene Language in Attic Comedy. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975.
- Hendrickson, G.L. "Satura Tota Nostra Est". In Satire: Modern Essays in Criticism. Edited by Ronald Paulson. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1971.
- Highet, Gilbert. The Anatomy of Satire. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962.
- Hinks, R.P. Greek and Roman Portrait Sculpture. London: British Museum Publications, 1976.
- Hodgart, Matthew. Satire. London: World University Library, 1969.
- Hofman, Werner. Caricature from Leonardo to Picasso. London: John Calder, 1957.
- Inskip, Donald. Stage by Stage: The Leonard Schach Story. Cape Town: Human and Rousseau, 1977.
- Jensen, H. James, and Zirker, Malvin R., eds. The Satirist's Art. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1972.
- Johnson, Edgar. A Treasury of Satire. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1945.

- Joyce, Peter. The Rise and Fall of Apartheid. Cape Town: Struik, 1990.
- Junction Avenue Theatre Company. The Fantastical History of a Useless Man. Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1978.
- Kavanagh, Robert Mshengu. Theatre and Cultural Struggle in South Africa. London: Zed Books, 1985.
- Kernan, Alvin B. The Cankered Muse: Satire of the English Renaissance. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959.
- _____. The Plot of Satire. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965.
- _____. "Robert C. Elliott: 1914 - 1981". In English Satire and the Satiric Tradition. Edited by Claude Rawson. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1984.
- Kirby, Robert. It's a Boy! Johannesburg: Triad, 1983.
- _____. Trebor Ybrik Versus the Rest. Cape Town: Don Nelson, 1975.
- Lahr, John. Coward the Playwright. London: Methuen, 1982.
- _____. Dame Edna Everage and the Rise of Western Civilization. London: Flamingo, 1992.
- _____. "Jules Feiffer: Satire as Subversion". In Acting Out America. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972.
- Lang, Robert. The Stage Door Cookbook. Second edition. Johannesburg: Limelight, 1980.
- Langbaum, Robert. The Poetry of Experience. London: Chatto and Windus, 1957.
- Larham, Peter. Black Theater, Dance, and Ritual in South Africa. Ann Arbor: UMI, 1985.
- Leacroft, Richard, and Leacroft, Helen. Theatre and Playhouse. London: Methuen, 1988.
- Le May, Godfrey. Black and White in South Africa. London: MacDonald, 1971.
- Lever, Katherine. The Art of Greek Comedy. London: Methuen, 1956.
- Levin, Harry. Playboys and Killjoys. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Lucie-Smith, Edward. The Art of Caricature. London: Orbis, 1981.
- Mander, Raymond, and Mitchenson, Joe. Revue. London: Peter Davies, 1971.
- Mapanje, Jack, and White, Landeg, comps. Oral Poetry from Africa. Harlow: Longman, 1983.

- Marshall, Norman. The Other Theatre. London: John Lehmann, 1950.
- McLeish, Kenneth. "Introduction". In Aristophanes, Aristophanes: "Clouds", "Women in Power", "Knights". Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- _____. The Theatre of Aristophanes. London: Thames and Hudson, 1980.
- Meredith, George. "An Essay on Comedy". In Comedy. New York: Doubleday Anchor, 1956.
- Moodie, Thomas Dunbar. The Rise of Afrikanerdom: Power, Apartheid, and the Afrikaner Civil Religion. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975.
- Morley, Sheridan. A Talent to Amuse: A Biography of Noël Coward. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1974.
- Mosley, Leonard. The Battle of Britain. Alexandria: Time Life, 1977.
- Mtwa, Percy; Ngema, Mbongeni; and Simon, Barney. Woza Albert! London: Methuen, 1983.
- Murray, Gilbert. Aristophanes: A Study. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933.
- _____. "A View of Euripides". In Twentieth Century Interpretations of "The Frogs". Edited by David J. Littlefield. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1968.
- Nathan, David. The Laughtermakers: A Quest for Comedy. London: Peter Owen, 1971.
- Newiger, Hans-Joachim. "War and peace in the comedy of Aristophanes". In Aristophanes: Essays in Interpretation (Yale Classical Studies: 26). Edited by Jeffrey Henderson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.
- Nichols, James W. Insinuation: The Tactics of English Satire. The Hague: Mouton, 1971.
- Ntzanzi, Madlinyoka. "Praise Poem to Nelson Mandela". In Soho Square V. Edited by Steve Kromberg and James Ogude. London: Bloomsbury, 1992.
- Nussbaum, Martha. "Aristophanes and Socrates on learning practical wisdom". In Aristophanes: Essays in Interpretation (Yale Classical Studies: 26). Edited by Jeffrey Henderson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.
- Olivier, Laurence. On Acting. London: Sceptre, 1987.
- Olson, Elder. The Theory of Comedy. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1968.
- Omodele, Oluremi. Traditional and Contemporary African Drama: A Historical Perspective. Ann Arbor: UMI, 1988.
- Parker, Douglass. "Introduction". In Aristophanes, The Wasps. New York: Mentor, 1962.

- Paulson, Ronald. The Fictions of Satire. Baltimore: John Hopkins, 1967.
- Pereira, Ernest. "Tall Tellers of Tales: Some Fictional Narrators and their Function in the South African Short Story in English". In Herman Charles Bosman. Edited by Stephen Gray. Johannesburg: McGraw-Hill, 1986.
- Petro, Peter. Modern Satire: Four Studies. New York: Mouton, 1982.
- Pickard-Cambridge, Arthur W. The Dramatic Festivals of Athens. Second edition. Revised by J. Gould and D.M. Lewis. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.
- Plato. The Apology. In Great Dialogues of Plato. Translated by W.H.D. Rouse. New York: Mentor, 1956.
- _____. The Republic. In Great Dialogues of Plato. Translated by W.H.D. Rouse. New York: Mentor, 1956.
- _____. The Symposium. In Great Dialogues of Plato. Translated by W.H.D. Rouse. New York: Mentor, 1956.
- Pollard, Arthur. Satire. London: Methuen, 1970.
- Reckford, Kenneth J. Aristophanes' Old-and-New Comedy. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987.
- Richter, G.M.A. The Portraits of the Greeks. Oxford: Phaidon, 1984.
- Rosenheim, Edward W. "The Satiric Spectrum". In Satire: Modern Essays in Criticism. Edited by Ronald Paulson. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1971.
- Rosenthal, Eric. Gold! Gold! Gold!: The Johannesburg Gold Rush. New York: Macmillan, 1970.
- Ross, Raymond S. Speech Communication. Fifth edition. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1980.
- Russell, Jacqui, comp. File on Coward. London: Methuen, 1987.
- Schaeffer, Neil. The Art of Laughter. New York: Columbia University Press, 1981.
- Schlueter, June. Metafictional Characters in Modern Drama. New York: Columbia University Press, 1979.
- Schoonraad, Murray, and Schoonraad, Elzabé. Suid-Afrikaanse Spot-en Strookprent-kunstenaars. Roodepoort: CUM, 1983.
- Seidel, Michael. Satiric Inheritance: Rabelais to Sterne. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1979.
- Seidenspinner, Margarete. Exploring the Labyrinth: Athol Fugard's Approach to South African Drama. Essen: Blue Owl, 1986.

- Shank, Theodore. The Art of Dramatic Art. New York: Delta, 1972.
- Sifakis, G.M. Parabasis and Animal Choruses. London: Athlone Press, 1971.
- Sinfield, Alan. Dramatic Monologue. London: Methuen, 1977.
- Slabolepszy, Paul. Saturday Night at the Palace. Johannesburg: Ad. Donker, 1985.
- Snell, Bruno. "The Death of Tragedy". In Twentieth Century Interpretations of "The Frogs". Edited by David J. Littlefield. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1968.
- Sommerstein, Alan H. "Introduction". In Aristophanes Aristophanes: "Lysistrata" and Other Plays. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973.
- _____. "Introductory Note to The Acharnians". In Aristophanes, Aristophanes: "Lysistrata" and Other Plays. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973.
- _____. "Introductory Note to The Clouds". In Aristophanes, Aristophanes: "Lysistrata" and Other Plays. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973.
- _____. "Introductory Note to The Knights". In Aristophanes, Aristophanes: "The Birds" and Other Plays. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1978.
- Spacks, Patricia Meyer. "Some Reflections on Satire". In Satire: Modern Essays in Criticism. Edited by Ronald Paulson. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1971.
- Steadman, Ian. "Collective Creativity: Theatre for a Post-Apartheid Society". In Rendering Things Visible. Edited by Martin Trump. Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1990.
- Stone, Laura M. Costume in Aristophanic Comedy. New York: Arno Press, 1981.
- Styan, J.L. Drama, Stage and Audience. London: Cambridge University Press, 1975.
- Sutherland, James. English Satire. London: Cambridge University Press, 1958.
- Swift, Jonathan. Jonathan Swift. Edited by Angus Ross and David Woolley. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984.
- Taplin, Oliver. Greek Tragedy in Action. Revised edition. London: Methuen, 1985.
- Taylor, J. Chesley, and Thompson, G.R. Ritual, Realism, and Revolt. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1972.
- Taylor, Jeremy. Ag Pleez Deddy! Pretoria: Jeremy Taylor Publishing, 1992.
- Taylor, John Russell, ed. The Penguin Dictionary of Theatre. Revised edition. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1978.
- Thompson, Leonard. The Political Mythology of Apartheid. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.

- Thomson, Ross, and Hewison, Bill. Cartoons. London: Apple, 1985.
- Torrance, Robert M. The Comic Hero. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978.
- Trump, Martin. "The Short Fiction of Herman Charles Bosman". In Herman Charles Bosman. Edited by Stephen Gray. Johannesburg: McGraw-Hill, 1986.
- Turner, Noleen Sheila. "Elements of Satire in Zulu Oral Traditions". M.A. Dissertation, University of Natal, Durban, 1990.
- Turner, Victor. The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1969.
- Tynan, Kenneth. "Bernard Shaw". In Profiles. Edited by Kathleen Tynan and Ernie Eban. London: Nick Hern Books, 1989.
- _____. "A Gap Defined: 1960". In A View of the English Stage. St Albans: Granada, 1976.
- Vandenbroucke, Russell. Truths the Hand Can Touch: The Theatre of Athol Fugard. New York: Theatre Communications Group, 1985.
- Walker, Martin. Daily Sketches. London: Frederick Miller, 1978.
- Walton, J. Michael. The Greek Sense of Theatre. London: Methuen, 1984.
- Waugh, Patricia. Metafiction: The Theory and Practice of Self-conscious Fiction. London: Methuen, 1984.
- Webster, T.B.L. Greek Theatre Production. London: Methuen, 1970.
- _____. "The Poet and the Mask". In Classical Drama and its Influence. Edited by M.J. Anderson. London: Methuen, 1965.
- Wellek, René, and Warren, Austin. Theory of Literature. New York: Harcourt, 1956.
- White, Kenneth S., ed. Savage Comedy: Structures of Humor. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1978.
- Whitman, Cedric H. Aristophanes and the Comic Hero. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964.
- _____. "Death and Life: The Frogs". In Twentieth Century Interpretations of "The Frogs". Edited by David J. Littlefield. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1968.
- Wilde, Oscar. The Importance of Being Earnest. London: Methuen, 1966.
- Williams, Raymond. "On Dramatic Dialogue and Monologue". In Writing in Society. London: Verso, 1991.
- Williamson, Sue. Resistance Art in South Africa. Cape Town: David Philip, 1989.

- Wilmot, Roger. Kindly Leave the Stage! : The Story of Variety. London: Methuen, 1985.
- Wilmot, Roger, and Rosengard, Peter. Didn't You Kill My Mother-in-Law? : The Story of Alternative Comedy in Britain. London: Methuen, 1989.
- Wolfe, Humbert. Notes on English Verse Satire. London: Hogarth, 1929.
- Woolfson, Malcolm. The Long Road that led towards the Natal Playhouse. Durban: Natal Performing Arts Council, 1986.
- Wright, David. Roy Campbell. London: Longmans, Green, 1961.

3.2 Journals and magazines

- Akerman, Anthony. " 'Prejudicial to the Safety of the State': Censorship and the Theatre in South Africa", Theatre Quarterly 7 (28/1977-1978), 54-57.
- Arthur, Thomas H., and Arthur, Michael D. "The 1992 Grahamstown Festival", South African Theatre Journal 7 (May 1993), 88-103.
- Bassnett-McGuire, Susan. "The Translator in the Theatre", Theatre Quarterly 10 (40/1981), 37-48.
- Black, Stephen. "How I Began to Write", English in Africa 8 (September 1981), 84-85.
- _____. "Love and the Hyphen: Its Friends and Foes", English in Africa 8 (September 1981), 69-71.
- Bode, Peter W. "A History of South African Theatre, Part 3", Scenaria, January - March 1981, pp. 37-38.
- _____. "A History of South African Theatre, Part 11", Scenaria, May 1982, pp.47-48 and 55.
- Case, Sue-Ellen. "Classic Drag: The Greek Creation of Female Parts", Theatre Journal 37 (October 1985), 317-327.
- Chapman, Geoffrey. "Aristophanes and History", Acta Classica 21 (1978), 59-70.
- _____. "Aristophanes for all?", Acta Classica 26 (1983), 41-51.
- Collinge, Jo-Anne; Mabuza, Herbert; Moss, Glenn; and Niddrie, David. "What the papers don't say", Index on Censorship 17 (March 1988), 27-36.
- Coplan, David. "Dialectics of Tradition in South African Black Popular Theatre", Critical Arts 4 (3/1987), 5-27.
- Corley, Ann. "Wait a Minim", Theatre World 60 (June 1964), 5.

- Dover, Kenneth. "Portrait-Masks in Aristophanes", Komoidotragemata: Studies in Honour of W.J.W. Koster (1967), 16-28.
- Driver, Dorothy. "Control of the black mind is the main aim of censorship", South African Outlook, June 1980, pp.10-11.
- Eden, Rick A. "Detective Fiction as Satire", Genre 16 (Fall 1983), 279-295.
- Fish, Patrick. "Malan, the Movie: The BBC version of Rian Malan's My Traitor's Heart", South African Theatre Journal 5 (May 1991), 98-108.
- Fraser, Ian. "Frazer's Edge", Living, October 1988, pp.89-90.
- Gordimer, Nadine. "New Forms of Strategy - No Change of Heart", Critical Arts 1 (June 1980), 27-33.
- Gordon, Gerald. "South Africa's censorship laws", Index on Censorship 4 (Summer 1975), 38-40.
- Gray, Mardi. "Coercion, control and censorship", Media Development 32 (3/1985), 25-27.
- Gray, Stephen. "Our Forgotten Drama", Speak 1 (March/April 1978), 13-16 and 46-47.
- _____. "Stephen Black and Love and the Hyphen (1908 - 1928)", Critical Arts 2 (July 1981), 51-59.
- _____. "Women in South African Theatre", South African Theatre Journal 4 (May 1990), 75-87.
- Hauptfleisch, Temple. "Citytalk, Theatretalk: Dialect, Dialogue and Multilingual Theatre in South Africa", English in Africa 16 (May 1989), 71-91.
- _____. "From the Savoy to Soweto: The Shifting Paradigm in South African Theatre", South African Theatre Journal 2 (May 1988), 35-63.
- Hollyer, Beatrice, and Luther, Carola. "Five Playwrights", Index on Censorship 14 (February 1985), 28-30.
- Johnson, Shaun. "'Barometers of the liberation movement': a history of South Africa's alternative press", Media Development 32 (3/1985), 18-21.
- Kunene, Daniel P. "Ideas under arrest: censorship in South Africa", Research in African Literatures 12 (Winter 1981), 421-439.
- Marcus, Gilbert. "Blacks treated more severely", Index on Censorship 13 (December 1984), 14-21.
- Mda, Zakes. "Theatre for liberation", Media Development 32 (3/1985), 21.
- Muecke, Frances. "'I Know You - By Your Rags': Costume and Disguise in Fifth-century Drama", Antichthon 16 (1982), 17-34.

- _____. "Playing with the Play: Theatrical Self-consciousness in Aristophanes", Antichthon 11 (1977), 52-67.
- Nanni, Paola. "Ian Fraser", Cosmopolitan, November 1988, p.32.
- Patel, Leila. "How small media can organise communities", Media Development 32 (3/1985), 12-14.
- Sallach, David L. "Class Domination and Ideological Hegemony", The Sociological Quarterly 15 (Winter 1974), 38-50.
- "Scenaria interviews Robert Kirby", Scenaria, September 1984, pp.11-12.
- Schauffer, Dennis. "The First Theatre in Natal", South African Theatre Journal 3 (May 1989), 18-38.
- Sichel, Adrienne. "The 1989 Grahamstown Festival", South African Theatre Journal 3 (September 1989), 116-120.
- Smythe, Penny. "Penny Smythe talks to Mark Banks", Fair Lady, 8 November 1989, pp.114-118.
- Steadman, Ian. "Stages in the revolution: black South African theater since 1976", Research in African Literatures 19 (Spring 1988), 24-33.
- Styan, J.L. "The Perceptual Criticism of Drama", Speech and Drama 24 (Autumn 1975), 2-5.
- Taylor, John Russell. "Wait a Minim", Plays and Players 11 (June 1964), 39-40.
- Tomaselli, Keyan G. "Ideology and Censorship in South African Film", Critical Arts 1 (June 1980), 1-15.
- _____. "Progressive film and video in South Africa", Media Development 32 (3/1985), 15-17.
- Visser, Annelize. "Boere is bakgat!", Cosmopolitan, December 1989, pp.162-164 and 187.
- Walcot, Peter. "Aristophanic and Other Audiences", Greece and Rome 18 (1/1971), 35-50.
- "Weekly Mail Closed", Index on Censorship 17 (December 1988), 6.
- Woodrow, Mervyn. "South African Drama in English", English Studies in Africa 13 (September 1970), 391-410.

3.3 Newspapers (including press releases, articles, interviews and reviews)

"Adam Leslie", Natal Witness, 24 March 1966.

"Adam Leslie in New Venture", Daily News, 6 February 1967.

Amato, Rob. "Peeping through the fringe to the mainstream", Weekly Mail, 22-28 July 1988.

Badal, Sean. "Rosie and the Puck of all trades", Weekly Mail, 20-26 November 1992.

Baneshik, Percy. "Tribute to Adam", Daily News, 28 April 1979.

Beynon, Richard. "A disappointment", To The Point, 5 January 1974.

Biel, Ilse. "There's more to Kirby than the 'S' word", Daily News, 11 November 1988.

Blow, Desmond. "Adam Leslie ill as new show opens", Sunday Times, 27 April 1975.

Brommet, Beverly. "Satirical look into academe", Cue, 2 July 1991.

Campbell, John. "Bankable assets", Weekly Mail, 12-18 March 1993.

_____. "Paul's anatomy of machodom", Weekly Mail, 15-21 November 1985. X

_____. "Smallholding an absorbing view of local trends", Weekly Mail, 1-7 December 1989.

"Capab says banned play slurs English", Natal Witness, 22 November 1979.

'Catullus'. "A genius within clamouring to get out", Star, 18 January 1969.

Christie, Roy. "Dramatic change of pace for Adam", Star, 5 September 1975.

Coulson, Michael. "Vintage Taylor", Cue, 4 July 1991.

Curzon, Carrie. "Ag Shame, It's Jeremy!", Sunday Times Magazine, 28 January 1990.

Daniel, Raeford. "Final Curtain for 'Mr Satire' ", Star, 26 April 1979.

_____. "A more benign edge to Kirby bite", Weekly Mail, 11-17 October 1991.

_____. "Not even success will tame Fraser", Weekly Mail, 29 November - 5 December 1991.

De Waal, Shaun. " 'The Poet' makes a pact over new show", Weekly Mail, 27 October - 2 November 1989.

Dodd, Alex. "A matter of laugh or death", Weekly Mail, 26 March - 1 April 1993.

"Don't Stop the Carnival", Daily News, 12 April 1966.

Edgson, Bill. "The lights go out for Adam Leslie", Citizen, 27 April 1979.

"Eye Satire from Adam", Daily News, 22 June 1976.

- Fenster, Pnina. "Robert Kirby: Braai the Beloved Country", Sunday Times, 3 December 1989.
- Fraser, Ian. "Ian Fraser on Ian Fraser", Capab at the Festival, July 1992.
- Garson, Philippa. "The funny man who is not amused", Standard Bank National Arts Festival Supplement to Weekly Mail, 19-25 June 1992.
- Gevisser, Mark. "Last Temptation of the censors", Weekly Mail, 23-29 October 1992.
- Goldstein, Hazel. "A Night Out in Jo'burg's Gay Past", Sunday Times, 10 September 1967.
- Goldstuck, Arthur. "Back from behind the times", Weekly Mail, 30 October - 5 November 1992.
- Greig, Robert. "Folk menagerie", To The Point, 14 July 1973.
- _____ . "Kirby finally buries sunny South Africa", Star, 21 December 1978.
- Haffajee, Ferial. "The Blinkards", Weekly Mail, 26 March - 1 April 1993.
- Jackman, Tony. "Fast-food Don Fraser", Cue, 4 July 1991.
- Jennings, Ian. "Look Back in Panga", Cue, 10 July 1992.
- Johnson, Shaun. "Darling, I would do it all again", Weekly Mail, 22-28 April 1988.
- Jones, Ivor. "Another Ovation for Satirical Revue", Cape Times, 18 August 1960.
- Kanfer, Stefan. "Mighty Pens", Time, 12 September 1988.
- Karon, Tony. "Laughing when it hurts most", Weekly Mail, 17-23 July 1992.
- Keeley, Brigid. "Oh, Jeremy", Daily News, 8 February 1990.
- _____ . "A Room with a Revue", Daily News, 8 December 1989.
- Khumalo, Bafana. "Downside up, upside down", Weekly Mail, 26 March - 1 April 1993.
- Kirby, Robert. "Kirby vs Kirby", Sunday Tribune, 17 June 1990.
- "Kirby slams picketers", Star, 29 January 1987.
- Knight, Natalie. "No reprieve: It's curtain down for Adam Leslie's theatre", Star, 23 January 1976.
- Lang, Robert. "These Theatrical Treasures are Unique", Star, 26 May 1973.
- Levison, Evelyn. "First Lady of Fun gets a new Hair-Do", Sunday Express, 9 April 1972.

- O'Hara, Glynis. "It's not just what the okes say, man", Weekly Mail, 9-15 December 1988.
- Powell, Ivor. "Letoit, the unblushing Afrikaffer goblin", Weekly Mail, 27 January - 2 February 1989.
- _____. "Sunrise saves it all for the censors", Weekly Mail, 20-26 May 1988.
- Robinson, Stephen. "S.African police seize Attenborough film", London Daily Telegraph, 30 July 1988.
- Ronge, Barry. "'Fat little pygmy' gives satire life", Sunday Times, 20 March 1988.
- Sachs, Albie. "Preparing Ourselves for Freedom", Weekly Mail, 2-8 February 1990.
- Sole, Sam. "It's a cruel business admits satirist Kirby", Sunday Tribune, 5 November 1989.
- Steadman, Ian. "A language liberated through rock 'n roll", Weekly Mail, 9-15 December 1988.
- Sutton, Heather. "Nat. Councillor slams Leslie show as 'Un-Afrikaans' ", Sunday Express, 3 June 1973.
- Thamm, Marianne. "Down go sacred cows left, right and centre", Weekly Mail, 23-30 June 1989.
- _____. "Everyone laughs when Caspar's around", Weekly Mail, 24-29 April 1992.
- _____. "A joke is at someone's expense. All pay here", Weekly Mail, 15-22 June 1989.
- "The Third Campaign", Time, 15 August 1960.
- Tyler, Humphrey. "Theatre", Sunday Tribune, 29 October 1989.
- "Worldwide Outcry over Biko's death", To The Point, 23 September 1977.
- Wren, Celia. "Suzette's a mixture of theatre and stand-up", Weekly Mail Supplement to the Standard Bank National Arts Festival, 21-27 June 1991.
- Zerbst, Jeff. "A third incarnation for the Black Sun", Weekly Mail, 15-21 November 1991.

INTERVIEWS

- Banks, Mark. Recorded interview, Durban, 11 June 1987.
- Blake, Joan. Recorded interview, Johannesburg, 20 February 1990.
- Fraser, Ian. Unrecorded interview, Grahamstown, 3 July 1991.
- Henderson, Lucille. Recorded interview, Durban, 18 August 1989.
- Kirby, Robert. Unrecorded interview, Durban, 17 November 1988.
- Kirby, Robert. Recorded interview, Durban, 25 November 1988.
- Lawson, Ralph. Recorded interview, Durban 26 October 1989.
- Leslie, Robert. Unrecorded interview, Johannesburg, 27 February 1990.
- Leslie, Robert. Recorded interview, Johannesburg, 31 March 1990.
- Slabolepszy, Paul. Unrecorded interview, Durban, 31 August 1989.
- Slavin, Patti. Recorded interview, Durban, 18 August 1989.
- Swart, Ray. Unrecorded interview, Durban, 11 April 1990.
- Taylor, Jeremy. Recorded interview, Durban, 29 March 1988.
- Uys, Pieter-Dirk. Unrecorded interview, Durban, 13 January 1988.
- Uys, Pieter-Dirk. Recorded interview, Durban, 19 January 1988.
- Uys, Pieter-Dirk. Recorded interview, Durban, 26 January 1988.
- Uys, Pieter-Dirk. Unrecorded interview, Durban, 8 November 1991.