ATILIM UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE
ENGLISH CULTURE AND LITERATURE PH.D. PROGRAM

PETER BARNES' PLAYS AS EXAMPLES OF MODERN MENIPPEAN SATIRE: *THE RULING CLASS, LEONARDO'S LAST SUPPER, NOONDAY DEMONS, AND DREAMING*

Ph.D. Dissertation

Sevcan Işık

Ankara – 2018

ATILIM UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE
ENGLISH CULTURE AND LITERATURE PH.D. PROGRAM

PETER BARNES' PLAYS AS EXAMPLES OF MODERN MENIPPEAN SATIRE: *THE RULING CLASS, LEONARDO'S LAST SUPPER, NOONDAY DEMONS, AND DREAMING*

Ph.D. Dissertation

Sevcan Işık

Supervisor
Prof. Dr. Gülsen CANLI

Ankara – 2018

ACCEPTION AND APPROVAL

This is to certify that this dissertation titled "[Peter Barnes' Plays as Examples of Modern Menippean Satire: *The Ruling Class, Leonardo's Last Supper, Noonday Demons,* and *Dreaming]*" and prepared by [Sevcan Işık] meets with the committee's approval unanimously as [Doctoral Dissertation] in the field of [English Language and Literature] following the successful defense of the dissertation conducted on [28.05.2018].

Signature of the Director

Prof. Dr. Dilaver Tengilimoğlu

Signature of the Supervisor

Prof. Dr. Gülsen Canlı

Signature of the Member

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şebnem Kaya

Signature of the Member

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Zeynep Z. Atayurt Fenge

Signature of the Member

Assist. Prof. Dr. Gökşen Aras

Signature of the Member

Assist. Prof. Dr. Sibel İzmir

ETIDCS DECLARATION

I hereby declare that;

- I prepared this thesis in accordance with Atılım University Graduate School of Social Sciences Thesis Writing Directive,
- I prepared this thesis within the framework of academics and ethics rules,
- I presented all information, documents, evaluations and findings in accordance with ethical and moral principles,
- I cited all sources to which I made reference in my thesis,
- The work of art in this thesis is original,

I hereby acknowledge all possible loss of rights in case of a contrary circumstance. (in case of any circumstance contradicting with my declaration)

28.05.2018

Sevcan IŞIK

ÖZ

[IŞIK, Sevcan]. [Modern Menippos Hiciv Örnekleri Olarak Peter Barnes'ın Oyunları: *The Ruling Class, Leonardo's Last Supper, Noonday Demons, ve Dreaming*], [Doktora Tezi, Ankara], [2018].

Bu tezin amacı Peter Barnes'ın *The Ruling Class* (1968), *Leonardo's Last Supper* (1969), *Noonday Demons* (1969), and *Dreaming* (1969) adlı oyunlarını modern Menippos hicvi örnekleri olarak incelemektir. Bu amaçla, bir edebi tür olarak hiciv, etimolojisi, kökeni, tanımları, özellikleri ve türleri ile çalışılacaktır. Belli bir bozukluğa yapılan rhetorik saldırı olarak tanımlanan ve tartışmanın ortasında bozukluğa karşı bir erdemin övülmesini içeren formel nazım şeklinde yazılan hicvin aksine, Menippos hicvinin tanımı değişken yapısından dolayı zordur. Bu yüzden Menippos hicvini tanımlarken ne olduğundan çok ne yaptığını sormak daha yararlı olacaktır. En basit tanımıyla, Menippos hicvi düz yazı ve nazmın karışımıdır. Ayrıca, bu tür hiciv karnivalesk bir atmosfer yaratarak normlarla, kültürel, dini ya da felsefik doktrinlerle ilgili kesin yargıları reddeder. Bu kesin yargıları reddederken Menippos hicvi parodi, ironi, metinlararasılık, normalde bir arada olamayacak şeylerin yan yana getirilmesi, fantastic öğeler ve, delilik ve düş kurma gibi her türlü psikolojik anormallikleri içeren teknikler kullanır ve tüm bu teknikler aynı zamanda oyunların karnivalesk niteliklerini artırır. Menippos hicvi oyunların sonunda herhangi bir çözüm önermez çünkü herhangi bir ideolojiyi diğerine üstün göstermek yerine tüm ideolojilerin yanlış ve uygulamalarının bozuk olduğunu gösterir. Menippos hicvinin tüm özellikleri Barnes'ın seçilen oyunlarında bulunmaktadır. Bu da bu oyunların Menippos hicvinin örnekleri olarak sınıflandırılabileceğini göstermektedir. Sonuç olarak, Barnes kariyeri boyunca her zaman benzer temalarda Menippos hicvi formunda yazmış olduğu için Barnes'ın oyunlarının, Menippos hicvi olarak kabul edilebileceği söylenebilir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Menippos hicvi, hiciv, nazım hiciv, Peter Barnes, karnevalesk, *The Ruling Class*, *Leonardo's Last Supper*, *Noonday Demons*, *Dreaming*.

ABSTRACT

[Işık, Sevcan], [Peter Barnes' Plays as Examples of Modern Menippean Satire: *The Ruling Class, Leonardo's Last Supper, Noonday Demons, and Dreaming*], [Ph.D. Dissertation, Ankara), [2018].

The aim of this dissertation is to study Peter Barnes' plays, *The Ruling Class* (1968), *Leonardo's Last Supper* (1969), *Noonday Demons* (1969), and *Dreaming* (1969), as examples of modern Menippean satire. To this end, satire as a genre is studied with its etymology, origins, definitions, characteristics, and its types. In contrast to formal verse satire, that is defined as a rhetorical attack upon a particular vice and includes praise for its opposite virtue in the midst of an argument, Menippean satire is difficult to define because of its protean structure. Therefore, whilst defining Menippean satire it is helpful to ask what Menippean satire 'does' instead of what Menippean satire 'is'. Menippean satire is a mingling of prose and poetry in its simplest sense. In addition, it always desires to reject any sort of absolutes regarding norms, cultural, religious or philosophical dogmas by creating a carnivalesque atmosphere. In order to oppose absolutes, Menippean satire makes use of parody, irony, intertextuality, juxtapositions of normally incompatible things, fantasticality, quest theme, any sort of psychological abnormalities such as madness and daydreaming, all of which enhance the carnivalesque quality of the plays. Menippean satire does not offer a resolution at the end of the plays because the genre does not favor any ideology over another but shows all of them as faulty and corrupted. All the features of Menippean satire are found in Barnes' selected four plays. The dissertation will conclude that because Barnes has written about similar themes in Menippean satire form throughout his career his plays may be considered as examples of modern Menippean satire.

Keywords: Menippean satire, satire, formal verse satire, Peter Barnes, carnivalesque, *The Ruling Class*, *Leonardo's Last Supper*, *Noonday Demons*, *Dreaming*.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank to my supervisor Professor Doctor Gülsen CANLI, who read hundred of pages I had sent her and guided me throughout the study. I would not have finished this dissertation without her prompt responses to my endless emails, confidence in my research and careful editing. I am deeply grateful to her. It has been a privilige for me to be her Ph.D. student and to study with her.

I am particularly grateful to my mother, Döne AKÇA and my husband, Hüseyin IŞIK, for their patience and understanding during these four years. I am grateful to them for encouraging and supporting me to finish the dissertation.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

LLS: Leonardo's Last Supper

ND: Noonday Demons

PDP: Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics

RC: The Ruling Class

RW: Rabelais and His World

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Satire is a literary genre in prose or verse which exposes and criticizes individuals, institutions or nations by making use of humor, wit, fantasy, exaggeration, irony, parody and ridicule in an attempt to reform and improve institutions and mankind in general. There are two types of satire: formal verse satire and Menippean satire. In contrast to formal verse satire, that is defined as a rhetorical attack upon a particular vice and includes praise for its opposite virtue in the midst of the argument, Menippean satire is difficult to define because of its protean structure. Therefore, whilst defining Menippean satire it is helpful to ask what Menippean satire 'does' instead of what Menippean satire 'is' (Milowicki and Wilson 292). Formal verse satire emerged in Rome with the writings of Ennius, Lucilius, Horace and Juvenal. Menippean satire emerged with the writings of Menippus of Gadara in the first half of the third century BC. Bakhtin explains that when classical antiquity ended and Hellenism started, many genres were merged and developed. Although they showed external differences, they were united through an inner kinship, which was called the serio-comical, a particular realm of literature. They had an inclination to direct harsh criticism against cultural, social and religious myths.

Menippean satire is considered to be the most important example of the serio-comical genres and it belongs to a dialogical convention rather than monological tradition that is linked with dogmatism, repression, and absolutism. Every ideology is represented without making any of them superior to the other, as all of them are shown as ridiculous. Menippean satire always asks questions without providing answers, uses experimental fantasticality, and makes use of different points of view in the same text. The genre also employs madness, dreams, split personality and scandals as well as inappropriate speech, to create a carnivalesque inversion of the hierarchies prevalent in society. Menippean satire is full of contradictory behavior and characters, and includes a variety of other genres to parody them, all of which contribute to the digressive structure of the genre. At the end of a Menippean text, there is no resolution, either for the characters or for the audience since the aim is not to bring about a social

reform or help people to resolve their problems. The aim of Menippean satire is to make a cynical questioning of social, cultural and political absolutes in a carnivalesque atmosphere.

There will be two main chapters in this dissertation. In the first chapter, satire as a genre will be studied with its etymology, definitions, characteristics, and its types. In the second chapter, Peter Barnes' two full-length plays, *The Ruling Class* (1968) and *Dreaming* (1999), together with two one-act plays, *Leonardo's Last Supper* (1970) and *Noonday Demons* (1970), will be studied as examples of modern Menippean satire, which is the focus of this dissertation. *The Ruling Class* is an early play while *Dreaming* is a later play by Barnes. The reason for choosing one early and one late play from among his other full-length plays is to find out whether Barnes has written in the Menippean form throughout his career. The reason for choosing one-act plays together with full-length plays is also to see whether he has written in the same form, regarless length.

The Ruling Class is about the ruling class and the relationships among its members. The 13th Earl of Gurney dies by accidentally hanging himself. He leaves his estate to his son Jack who thinks that he is the God of Love and that everybody is equal. Other members of the family are not of this opinion and they think Jack is mad (Barnes, *the Ruling* 29). Then, Sir Charles, Jack's uncle, arranges a marriage between Jack and Grace Shelley, Sir Charles' mistress. His plan is that after Jack has an heir, Jack can be put in a mental hospital so that Sir Charles can rule the estate till the baby comes of age. However, after the baby's birth, Jack appears to be 'normal' with the help of his doctor, Herder; yet, he thinks himself as Jack the Ripper and kills two women, Claire, the wife of Sir Charles, and Grace. At the end of the play, in his speech at the House of Lords, Jack says, "the strong MUST manipulate the weak. This is the first law of the universe…The Hard survive, the Soft quickly turn to corruption" (118). Everybody applauses and becomes convinced that he is normal. Thus, the play points out that the mighty always returns to power and the status quo continues through inherited power, even though it may be decayed, corrupt, and anachronistic.

Leonardo's Last Supper takes place in the Amboise charnel house run by the Lasca family- Lasca, Maria and their son Alphonso. They left Florence for France

about ten years earlier as they had a great amount of debt to repay. Now, they dream about going back to Florence after they have buried Leonardo da Vinci, their countryman, with an expensive funeral. However, their plan is ruined when Leonardo sits up in his coffin. Because they will not be paid for a burial that does not take place, they kill Leonardo. The Lasca family does not care about the art and inventions which might be created by Leonardo in future. Neither do they care about the value of a man, or the bond between Florentines. The only thing they care about is profit.

Noonday Demons takes place in Egypt in 392 AD. St Eusebius, a religious hermit, has been living in a cave for thirteen years in solitude. He only drinks muddy water and eats seven black olives daily. His body is chained, covered with dust and sores. A demon comes daily to tempt him but he does not yield to it. One day, another religious hermit, St Pior, comes to the cave claiming that the cave is his abode. Although they are described as almost identical they accuse each other of being a noonday demon. Then, each of them claims that the cave was given to him by God. They fight and St Eusebius kills St Pior crying 'kill for Jesus'. Thus, his murder is considered as holy by St Eusebius since it is a result of his devotion to God. Although the play ends after St Pior's death, there is a curtain call that is a surrealistic scene. St Pior and a duplicate of St Eusebius, St Eusebius II, come to the stage for a curtain call. They bow and smile when the audience applauds them. St Eusebius is standing at the top of a mound of excrement and, looking at them, says tremblingly, 'mercy Lord'.

Lastly, *Dreaming* is about the exploits of a group of ex-soldiers in the aftermath of War of the Roses. Each of them asks for different things. For instance, Davy asks for money, Skelton asks for death and Mallory, the hero of the play, asks for setting up 'home' in a catastrophic post-war landscape. As a poor man, Mallory has destroyed his home by going to war but he wants to remake it. Although the soldiers have different desires they gather around the war hero Mallory who is dismissed from being a captain but still charms others with his dream of a home. However, soldiers including Mallory die one by one before arriving home, which suggests the impossibility of finding a home. The play is a funny story about heroism and human values.

Whilst describing Barnes' theatre, the influence of Jacobean drama cannot be overlooked. Barnes is influenced especially by Ben Jonson as he says that he was an

absolute fanatic; Ben Jonson was one of the greatest playwrights in the world (Dukore 12). Barnes describes Jonson's drama: "It's not sexual, it's a more farty vulgarity. Here we have a classic who can be very coarse; and this is something that makes some people's nostrils twitch…On the one side you get the intellect, and on the other the farts and the lavatories" (qtd. in Dukore 18). Meddling, a feature of Menippean satire, of the high and the low may be observed in Barnes' plays as well. Characters are portrayed as "grotesque in their attitudes and ambitions and at whom we are invited to laugh as they get tangled up through their own idiocy in Ben Jonson's comedies" (Coles 77). Instead of giving a detailed characterization, Jonson gives "a jaundiced and glib view of people as greedy fools" (Coles 78). Similarly, Barnes describes his plays by saying, "All of my own work is extreme. My characters are extreme. A lot of the comedy comes from a character with an obsession which he carries to such lengths that it becomes absurd" (Bly and Wager 48).

Both Jonson and Barnes are comic and disturbing at the same time in their plays. For instance, all of the characters seem at fault at the end of *Volpone* in which the figures in authority seem to be parodies of human beings because of their greedy natures. Three villains in *The Alchemist* are neither rewarded for their effort nor punished for their wrongdoings at the end of the play. These two plays are designed to unsettle moral certainties and convictions. This will also be observed in the four plays of Barnes' that will be studied in this dissertation. Namely, Barnes does not offer a solution to the system he satirizes and does not give a moral lesson at the end of his plays. What he does is to test the accepted ideas through parody, irony or sarcasm and expose them as corrupted. Like Jonson, Barnes is also careful about choosing names. Jonson chooses names for his characters to reveal their dominant characteristics. For instance, Volpone means 'fox' and reveals how cunning the character Volpone is. Similarly, Barnes chooses Tucker as the name for the old butler in *The Ruling Class*, as Tucker means 'exhausted' and 'worn out' (Dukore 48).

Jonson gives resolutions at the end of his comedies. However, they are simple and at odds with the complex structure of the plays because he thinks "in human affairs there is no longer any simple distinction between the true and the false, between the natural and the unnatural, or between the right and the wrong; humankind takes each

of these elements and bends them to suit a wide variety of selfish ends" (Coles 93). Unlike Jonson, however, Barnes does not provide resolutions at the end of his plays. The audience is left with a Menippean questioning as accepted realities are destroyed and are not replaced by other realities. Lastly, like Jonson, Barnes is not successful commercially. Except for *The Ruling Class,* none of Barnes' plays are produced on the commercial stage because of the scale of sets and casts they demand. Yet, Barnes is admired because of the stylistic and thematic characteristics of his work, his inventive use of language, his constant contemplation of goodness and power, his hostility against class distinctions, capitalism, and organized religion, his employment of laughter, and his use of contrasting modes at the same time such as the historical with the contemporary, the serious and frivolous, and the sacred and profane (Demastes 45).

In addition to the influence of Ben Jonson, the impact of Barnes' childhood experiences during the Second World War and the impact of the 1960s with the great changes in terms of culture, politics and religion on his plays, may be considered as influential in placing him as a satirist in the line of Menippean tradition. Barnes (1931-2004) was born in London's East End. After World War II broke out, the family moved to the seaside resort of Clacton-on-Sea where his parents opened amusement stalls and other businesses, which might have been responsible for the carnival atmosphere in his plays. While his parents were working there he used to go to movies in London during the blackout (Dukore 5), which might have contributed to the grotesque and darkly comedic images of his plays. Moreover, Barnes was just nine years old when Hiroshima was attacked with the atomic bomb, which affected him deeply. Barnes stated that nothing could be the same either in society or in art after that explosion: "You cannot actually live on the brink of extinction without it affecting you....I still feel that one day human beings will press the button....Nothing is fixed. Nothing is forever. That naturally shows itself in the splitting, not only of the atom, but in the splitting of art in terms of a set form, like a naturalistic three-act play" (Barker 18). Although his childhood experiences might have affected him, Barnes' plays are not autobiographical. Barnes says that he wrote what he had imagined, believed, feared and thought (Barnes, *The Ruling* vii).

Britain's loss of its imperial identity and its decline as a world power paved the way for an examination of the established values of Britain in the 1960s. World wars may be considered among the most influential factors accelerating the decline of Britain and changing British society. For instance, the First World War had a devastating impact on Britain with two important results: the emergence of a British Middle Eastern Empire and the emergence of the American intervention in colonial affairs, particularly as, during World War One, the British war effort was heavily dependent on American financial and industrial resources. During the Inter-War years, there were riots, especially in colonial countries, as a result of a growing nationalism in the 1930s, while the biggest problem at home was mass unemployment. Between the wars, when the Labour party won the election with an overall majority, the Government was headed by Clement Attlee who was ignorant of economics. For instance, the first economic crisis the Labour party experienced was the result of an attempt to make the pound convertible in 1947 (Williams and Ramsden 420).

The impact of the Second World War was much more disastrous than that of the First World War, as it clearly showed the weakness of Britain and its subordination to the USA. Immediately after the war, there was a period of severe austerity for the British people. Subsequently, the 1950s were considered a golden age with full employment, rising living standards and a welfare state which was a legacy of the Atlee Government. Although the members of the left wing opposed this affluent society, the voters did not agree and they re-elected the Conservatives twice, in 1955 and 1959, with increasing majorities. Culture was influenced by these factors and their effect on society. That is, the years between 1947 and 1955 were described as quite old-fashioned as there was a consensus in politics and society. There were austerity measures, subordination to America because of the devaluation of sterling, and a loss of importance due to the shrinking of the British Empire during the early years. There was an adherence to the Victorian moral codes of respectability, thrift and sexual restraint, and respect for authority, patriarchy and the importance of religion throughout the 1950s. In short, there was a religiously defined moral core lying under conventions in the early 1950s.

Despite the improvements on the surface level during the post-war era people felt that Britain was in decline when they compared themselves with other countries

around the world such as Germany and Japan who were growing fast. After the boom of 1959 spent itself, the economy in early 1961 was seen to be regressing. People were aware that Britain was clearly not a great empire, which resulted in a decline of national self-confidence. With the decline of the Empire, Britain was judged to have lost its role in the world. Thus, the British decline was considered in two senses: its absolute decline as a world power politically and its relative decline in economic performance compared to its major industrial rivals, especially the other states in the EEC, and Japan. Britain's absolute decline as a world power was accelerated by the two World Wars and by the development of anti-colonial sentiment of the United States and the United Nations.

The rise of the nationalist movements was also an important factor in the decline of the British Empire. The 1939-45 war, together with postwar decolonization, promoted nationalism in the Middle East region, including Egypt. The Suez crisis exposed Britain's dependence on the United States, which demonstrated that Britain was neither a colonial power nor a world power anymore (Lowe 585). Brown states that with the Suez crisis "Britain had not lost the will or the capacity to deal with colonial insurgency. What she had lost was the pretense of being a superpower" (342). In addition, the economic results were devastating for Britain. The British economy declined suddenly. Following the Suez crisis, Harold Macmillan became the Prime Minister in February 1957. He was described as a political adventurer and able to change his decisions if it served his purpose. When Harold Macmillan became the Prime Minister Britain was not a great power as most of her empire became independent. Then, she did not join the Common Market (1957) and was rejected from entry in 1963 when she wanted to join. Because of these factors, Macmillan's foreign policy was mostly a failure. As for home affairs, it might be claimed that Britain was going through in "a period of prosperity and rising living standards; however, in the early 1960s, the economy seemed to be stagnating and by January 1963, almost 900 000 people were out of work" (Lowe 574). Macmillan had to resign at the age of seventy because of his deteriorating health and on his sickbed, he asked the Earl of Home to succeed him and Sir Alec Douglas-Home became Prime Minister until 1964.

As the House of Commons was the seat of political power, Lord Home gave up his peerage and stood for the House of Commons. He was described: "He was in

the Lords and he seemed archetypically representative of the old Conservative party of the Scottish shires, of an 'establishment' now under strong attack" (Williams and Ramsden 461). A peer had not become a Prime Minister since 1902 when Lord Salisbury left office. That is why Harold Wilson attacked the choice, as he found it an 'anachronism' and a symbol of the reactionary and aristocratic nature of the Tory Party (Lomas 297). The Conservatives also had difficulty in convincing people that the party had a forward-looking agenda by choosing a peer as Prime Minister, which created an increasing suspicion about the Conservative agenda during the last years of Macmillan and his successor, Home. It was believed that Britain had succumbed to materialism and decadence, and British society was constrained by an obsolete class structure and an obsession with US cultural imports (Childs 125). That is why, in the early sixties, people were asking "What's wrong with Britain?" as Britain was seen as a post-imperial nation in decline: It was ruled by a contented and decadent political class (Williams and Ramsden 458).

Between 1956 and 1962, Britain was a country in transition as rapid social and cultural changes were taking place as a result of increased affluence and consumerism. Old certainties were being questioned, the moral authority of organized religion was challenged, and ideas about social relations such as a classless society were changing. Besides morality, the views about art also showed changes. For instance, rock 'n' roll, jazz and skiffle were very influential in the 1950s, symbolizing "the break with previously accepted attitudes and of the new role of youth as a metaphor for social change" (Bartie 92). There was also a theme of protest in new literature such as the beat movement which was effective in 1957 with Allen Ginsberg's *Howl and Other Poems*. This movement rejected traditional narrative values and materialism and supported sexual liberation and experimentation with drugs.

Moreover, drama, particularly, was found to be very effective in portraying the war between old and new, conventional morality and the 'new' morality, and, tradition and experiment. British theatre was considered to be undergoing a big change. This change emerged as a result of foreign theatrical influences. For instance, *Waiting for Godot* by Samuel Beckett and *The Lesson* by Eugene Ionesco were premiered in London during the 1955 and 1956 season. Also, Bertolt Brecht's Berliner Ensemble visited London for the first time at that time. These playwrights broke away from the

conventions of traditional drama and experimented with new styles of presentation. In response to them, there was an 'Angry Young Man' movement in Britain introduced by John Osborne's play *Look Back in Anger* in 1956. The young protagonist, called Jimmy Porter, was described as frustrated and angry at both his own disillusionment and that of his generation. Besides, there was also the emergence of a satire boom in the early 1960s in Britain. It pilloried and lampooned the 'Establishment', and the culture of deference in British society started to deteriorate. Thus, there appeared an increasing concern about the obvious lowering of moral standards in society.

Contrary to their parents who endured the 'ethic of scarcity', sixties' children had unbridled appetites for life and, as a result of a declining faith in the promise of an afterlife, they found the idea of postponing pleasure meaningless. Instead, there emerged a culture across the West that set a priority for hedonism over self-discipline, for play over work and for sexual gratification over restraint (Donnelly 2). Technological innovation such as colour television, contraceptive pills, moon rockets or computers was important in creating many opportunities and new modes of behavior and expression. Moreover, the post-modernist way of understanding and expressing the world challenged Enlightenment rationalism by opening up unexplored spaces where traditional wisdoms and notions of authority were challenged (Bartie 3).

The nature of capitalism changed in the post-war era, too, as it suggested consuming or spending instead of producing, saving or investment. During the sixties, the culmination of the domestic consumer-oriented economy was a new era of popular capitalism. For instance, people enjoyed new material comforts and self-defining possessions. Even though Britain underwent a declining share of world exports and had a short term crisis in its balance of payments, average living standards in the country were very high. In its middle years, however, there was also a reappearance of poverty and the anti-materialism of the counter-culture towards the end of the decade.

The year 1963 was highly significant in the cultural revolution of the 1960s as there was a sexual revolution. Attitudes towards sex and contraception changed. Besides, the Sexual Offences Act recommended that homosexual acts between two consenting adults were decriminalized in England and Wales on condition that they were over the age of twenty-one and in private. Thus, there was a feeling of liberalization and freedom. Bartie states that "there was no longer a strict 'correct'

moral code to be adhered to…'Moral' and 'immoral' had 'become all but meaningless' in the confusion surrounding the debates on the 'new morality" (156). Furthermore, liberalized attitudes were observed to appear from unexpected quarters. For instance, the public preoccupation with morality was provoked by the Profumo affair. John Profumo who was Britain's Secretary of State for War denied his relationship with Christine Keeler who had been connected to a Russian diplomat in the past. Later, John Profumo resigned in June 1963 after he had indeed had a relationship with Christine Keeler. Donnelly has summarized the Profumo affair as 'a tale of sex, decadence and deceit at the heart of Britain's establishment' (118). The scandal was influential in weakening the power of the Conservative government. However, it also became effective in undermining established beliefs about what was 'political'; therefore, it led people to discuss the nature of authority and tradition. Moreover, the Profumo scandal was supposed to have a connection with the Vassall case. Namely, in October 1962, John Vassall, an Admiralty civil servant, was accused of passing secrets to the Soviets and was sentenced to 18 years' imprisonment. Furthermore, there were many other spy cases which undermined the loyalty of civil servants and the efficiency of the security services. Despite these troubling things, Macmillan claimed 'You've never had it so good' which *Private Eye* changed to 'You've never had it so often' (Williams and Ramsden 460).

The year of 1963 was also important for the Church because, until 1963, Britain was described as a very religious nation and Christianity permeated into the public culture. However, decline in the number of churchgoers was observed during the 1960s. As a result of the cultural revolution in the 1960s, religion underwent "a sudden and remarkable decline as 'the complex web of legally and socially accepted rules which governed individual identity' were swept aside and Britain broke with the traditional 'religious discourses of moral identity" (Bartie 14). Indeed, the decline in the influence of the church was observed before the Cultural Revolution in the 1960s with the wars which started to weaken the importance of religion and the traditional Christian morality in individuals' lives. This can be evidenced by the physical destruction of churches, a shortage of manpower (including clergy), and a decline in churchgoing. Churches tried to recover their deteriorating situation by employing art as a teaching tool especially after the Second World War. However, arts started to take

the place of religion because during the 1960s a ‘new morality’ was attempted to replace the Christian moral code.

The year 1968 became the turning point for the peaceful ‘love’ revolution of 1967. Extensive upheavals and a wave of rebellion in the form of opposition to the Vietnam War, the Prague Spring, and fierce battles during the Democratic Convention in Chicago, student revolts, and student protests and sit-ins in a number of British universities such as Leeds, the LSE and Sussex spread out across the world. Moreover, growing economic difficulties in Britain contributed to a sense that the consensus and affluence of the post-war years were coming to an end. Therefore, the sixties are sometimes known as the ‘long sixties’ as a result of the extent of the changes from its beginning to its end. Understandably, there were different perceptions of the sixties by Britons. There was a positive view of the sixties as they were regarded as a time of social and economic progress and cultural reinvigoration. However, there was also a negative view of the sixties. For instance, social and cultural changes brought by the sixties were not welcomed by the right wing as they saw these changes as the beginnings of a shaking off of “order and authority by privileging a self-indulgence over personal responsibility, a fashionable but dangerous acceptance of moral relativism, a vacuous preoccupation with cultural trivia rather than cultural self-improvement and an uncritical elevation of the new above the established” (Donnelly 4). The conservative right had a more Victorian viewpoint and were upset about the dwindling power of values such as self-discipline, sexual restraint and the belief in moral certainties. Another reason for seeing the sixties as negative was that the following decades fell short in fulfilling the promises of the ‘high’ sixties covering the years from about late 1964 to mid-1967. For instance, by 1970, because of the decline of the economy and the government’s use of austerity measures to defend sterling from 1965 onwards, the hopeful atmosphere of this period was eradicated. The response of the Tories to the problems in society was a mixture of social authoritarianism and free market ‘realism’, which brought them into power in 1970; thus, the 1970s were seen as a period of confusion, decline and economic failure (Donnelly 187).

Although sixties in Britain was defined as a decade appreciating the new and the modern there was also a discourse of anxiety about the future resulting in satire,

crime, scandal, drugs in the late sixties and early seventies of post-war Britain signalling the decline (Donnelly 194). That is, a renewed national self-confidence opposed a sense of anxiety as a result of the country's international decline as a world power. Besides, Sixties Britain was preoccupied with youth and its culture but there was also the 'youth question', identified as a social problem as it challenged established modes of behavior and moral norms (Donnelly 2). What is more, Sixties in Britain was a decade of often striking political idealism. That is why the recurrent overarching themes in the literature of the period would suggest that the sixties were seen as the decade when the world was remade after two World Wars.

The Conservatives came to power again in 1970 with a self-consciously 'right-wing' programme and there was a cultural revolt against the permissive society reforms of the 1960s. For instance, in 1970, the Minister of the Arts, Lord Eccles contended in the House of Lords that Arts Council Funding should not be used to fund sexually explicit and defamatory theatre. This did not change during the Thatcher era, although Margaret Thatcher was observed to be quite liberal in her voting behavior. In the Thatcher era, in addition to the economic revolt, there emerged a revolt against the idea that Britain was not a great power anymore. This appeared as a revolt against Europe, in the form of increasing skepticism about Europe and a hostility to mass immigration, beside the fear of inflation and trade union power. Keith Joseph and Margaret Thatcher claimed that the State had to produce a framework by providing money, stopping inflation and creating an environment in which a businessman could flourish. This gave intellectual self-confidence to the Conservatives by creating a counter-ideology to socialism. Thatcher had come to power in 1979 and there emerged almost ten years of political stability after the instability of the 1970s. Morality was observed to be freed from Victorian mores because conservative values were under attack by 1970 as a result of a significant shift in public attitudes, such as the removal of responsibility for decision-making from public to private spheres (Bartie 229). According to Thatcher, in order to have a high employment rate, one should be more productive, encourage competition, dispense with government controls and be responsible for his/her choices. A great number of public utilities nationalized by the Attlee Government were denationalized by 1990. In this way, Thatcher wanted to achieve popular capitalism. Moreover, by now owner-occupiers had outnumbered

council tenants in the working class because a capital-owning country was being created through the privatization and the selling of council houses to tenants. The aim was to distribute ownership of property and capital.

All these things caused a new understanding of Britain, and its traditional values were questioned, which resulted in the rise of satire in 1960s Britain. Although Quintilian (35-100 AD) claims that 'satura' started in Ancient Rome, it dates back to the Middle Ages in English literature. *The Vision of William Concerning Piers Plowman* by William Langland (1330?-1400?) may be considered as the first example of satire because of its pervading spirit. It is a mixture of theological allegory and social satire. It satirizes the corruptions and depravity of society which resulted in people's misunderstanding of the moral values in the Bible. The Church did not obey the truths of the Scriptures and people did not fulfill their duties as Christians. Another work that may be considered as satire is Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*. The religious figures in this work are satirized in a comic way. For instance, the Friar is described as a greedy hypocrite. People buy indulgences from dishonest pardoners to be supposedly salved from their sins. Thus, *The Canterbury Tales* may be considered as an example of satire in terms of revealing the corrupted nature of the Catholic Church with these religious figures. When it comes to the sixteenth century, there are satires by John Skelton (1460?-1529). He is defined by Erasmus as "the one light and glory of British letters" (qtd. in Furlong 44). Although Skelton himself is a priest he attacks the clergy and the Court, especially Bishop Wolsey who is portrayed as a tyrannical upstart in his satires. Similarly, Thomas More (1478-1535), Sir David Lyndsay (1490-1555), Thomas Nash (1567-1601), Joseph Hall (1574-1656), and John Donne (1572-1631) also attack the clergy and the court in their works of satire.

In the middle of the sixteenth century the satires of Juvenal, Horace and Persius were translated into English so that writers such as Joseph Hall and John Donne could write satires in the Elizabethan period by imitating these ancient practitioners of the genre. For instance, Hall writes in the Prolog to Book I of *Virgidemiarum* (1597; 1598): "I first adventure, follow me who list / And be the second English satirist" (Furlong 64). He writes in the tradition of Juvenalian satire about the abuses in contemporary poetry and drama. He states:

With some pot-fury, ravish'd from their wit,

They sit and muse on some no-vulgar writ;

As frozen dunghills in a winter's morn,

That void of vapour seemed all beforn,

Soon as the sun sends out his piercing beams

Exhale out filthy smoke and stinking steams;

So doth the base and the fore-barren brain,

Soon as the raging wine begins to reign. (qtd. in Furlong 64)

John Donne is regarded as the best Elizabethan verse satirist. He satirized the ape of fashion, the lawyers and the Court. His most impressive satire is considered as his third satire called *Of Religion* which is concerned with finding religious truth. Another important point to note about sixteenth century satire is that there is prose satire as well as verse satire. Thomas More's *Utopia* (1516), Thomas Nash's *Pierce Peniless, His Supplication to the Devil* (1592) and Thomas Dekker's *The Gull's Hornbook* (1609) may be considered examples of prose satire. All of them satirize religious, noble and political figures of their times.

However, political and religious authorities were disturbed by these satires and in the summer of 1599 John Whitgift, Archbishop of Canterbury and Richard Bancroft, Archbishop of London ordered the satires of Joseph Hall, John Marston and Thomas Middleton to be publicly burned, declaring "That no Satyres or Epigrams be printed hereafter" (Sutherland 33). In the seventeenth century, Ben Jonson (1673?-1637), John Cleveland (1613-1658), John Oldham (1653-1683), Andrew Marvell (1621-1678), Samuel Butler (1612-1680), and John Wilmot (1647-80) may be considered as important satirists. Ben Jonson is considered to be supreme in satirical comedy. He renders satirical reflections of the fools and rascals of his time. Besides, "He was a critic of his art who venerated the classics and, through his comedy of humours, sought to assert the realistic and satirical strain of comedy and to free it from romantic extravagance" (Furlong 72). In the prologue to *Every Man in His Humour* he writes his intentions in his comedies as follows:

deeds, and language, such as men do use,

And persons, such as comedy would choose,

When she would show an image of the times,

And sport with human follies, not with crimes. (Jonson 6)

The satires of Cleveland are mainly political, written in verse in a harsh tone. For instance, he criticizes the Scots who oppose Charles I in his satire called "The Rebel Scot". Marvell exposes public abuses and the corruptions of the Restoration court and government, while Wilmot attacks the hypocritical, cruel and selfish nature of human beings. For instance, in his *A Satire Against Mankind* he writes:

Were I, who to my cost already am

One of those strange prodigious creatures man,

A spirit free to choose for my own share

What sort of flesh and blood I pleas'd to wear,

I'd be a dog, a monkey, or a bear,

Or anything not that vain animal

Who is so proud of being rational. (qtd. in Furlong 17)

The peak period of satire is from the late seventeenth to the late eighteenth century, with an increasing interest taken in it through the translations made in the Renaissance period. Important satirists of this period may be considered as John Dryden (1631-1700), Daniel Defoe (1661?-1731), John Arbuthnot (1667-1731), Jonathan Swift (1667-1745), Joseph Addison (1672-1719), Sir Richard Steele (1672-1729), Edward Young (1683-1765), Alexander Pope (1688-1744), Henry Fielding (1707-54), Samuel Johnson (1709-84), Oliver Goldsmith (1728-74), Charles Churchill (1731-64), and Robert Burns (1759-96). Among these, Dryden is regarded as the best verse satirist in English literature. He is excellent at the heroic couplet that remained the medium of verse satire until the nineteenth century. *Absalom and Achitophel* (1681) is a political satire in which Dryden portrays Charles II as a fair and competent king, supports James II's accession to the throne after Charles II and satirizes the Whigs under Shaftesbury's leadership. Defoe's most famous satire is called *The True Born Englishman* (1701) in which he satirizes people's prejudice against William III just because he is Dutch. Defoe writes: "When I see the town full of lampoons and

invectives against Dutchmen only because they are foreigners, and the King reproached and insulted by insolent pedants and ballad-making poets for employing foreigners, and for being a foreigner himself, I confess myself moved by it to remind our nation of their own original" (4). Another famous prose satirist is Jonathan Swift. His most famous satires are *A Modest Proposal* (1729) in which England's policy on Ireland is satirized as England does not allow Ireland to work out their economy, and *Gulliver's Travels* (1726) which exposes the hypocrisy and corruption in society and in the English parliament through the travels of Gulliver. Moreover, *The Tatler* (1709-11) and *The Spectator* (1711-12) initiated by Steele and Addison aimed to raise the moral and social standards through ridiculing the follies of "beaux and coquettes, reproved extravagances, coarseness, and self-indulgence" and recommended "cheerful and considerate behavior" (Furlong 197).

Alexander Pope is another important satirist of the eighteenth century. His satires are not political, but are about universal subjects. For instance, Pope recommends writers to imitate ancient writers such as Homers, Aristotle, and Longinus in his "An Essay of Criticism" (1711). He reveals the vanities and idleness of the eighteenth-century upper class in a mock-heroic style in *The Rape of the Lock* (1712). His most famous satire is considered to be *The Dunciad* (final version 1743). It celebrates the goddess called Dullness and the achievements of her agents who bring tastelessness, decay and imbecility to Britain. It blames the dullness and intellectual pretentiousness in Britain. As the last important satirist of this century, Robert Burns is famous for his passion in his lyrical poems and for his satirical humour. He satirizes the rigid Calvinism of his day in *The Two Herds* (1796). His *Holy Willie's Prayer* (1799) reveals religious humbug through the burlesque of a Calvinist's devotions.

The nineteenth century produced few significant satirists, with the exception of Lord Byron (1788-1824), even though Thomas Love Peacock (1785-1866), Thomas Hood (1799-1845), Winthrop Mackworth Praed (1802-39), William Makepeace Thackeray (1811-63), Charles Dickens (1812-70), and Samuel Butler (1835-1902) all wrote satires. James Sutherland writes that "it is significant that, apart from Byron, the English Romantic poets leave satire alone, or else, like Shelley, make very poor work of it" (15). Byron's two important satires are *Don Juan* (1819-24) and *The Vision of Judgment* (1822). *Don Juan* is described as "a merciless exposure of a petty, canting

society. It is the satire of a sensitive, disillusioned man, a man who hated tyranny and hypocrisy" (Furlong 316). Byron's *The Vision of Judgment* ridicules Robert Southey's poem *The Vision of Judgment* (1821) that treats of George III's entry into heaven. Byron parodies Southey's poem and depicts George III as somebody who fights against freedom.

Although satire has always existed in English literature, it reached its peak when the political and social conditions of the eighteenth century, with the changes in the political and religious structures of England, could be defined as tumultuous. There were three important changes in this period: firstly, the republic established by the administration of Oliver Cromwell was abolished and converted to the form of a monarchy administration under Charles II; secondly, England was ruled by Charles II who showed Catholic inclinations and by James II who was Catholic, and Tory and Whig political parties were formed; and, thirdly, there was a transition to a prime ministerial system with the Hanoverian line to the throne established (Güvenç 123). Satirists write their satires either to defend their political ideas or to satirize dissenting ideas. Thus, satire as a literary genre becomes very important in shaping the political structure of this period.

Even though satire may be observed to have emerged with the works of T.S Eliot (1888-1965), Evelyn Waugh (1903-1966), W.H. Auden (1907-1973), Aldous Huxley (1894-1963), George Orwell (1903-50), and Wyndham Lewis (1882-1957) in the first half of the twentieth century, satire reaches its peak in the second half of the century in England with the emergence of the satire boom.

The term 'satire boom' denoted a group of English satirical writers and journalists in British popular culture between the late fifties and early sixties. It was mainly related to the motivations of people who were usually young, male, politically unaffiliated and privately educated such as Peter Cook, Dudley Moore, Alan Bennett, and Jonathan Miller. Most of them were undergraduates at Cambridge University, as universities were appropriate places for the cultivation of satire. Smart young people who encountered with the conflict with an older generation of academics employed wit and mockery (Carpenter 24). That is, mockery and ridicule of Britain's ruling elite's manners, pretensions and pomposity were satirized in British comedy. An important influence on the satire boom was a British broadcast comedy in the 1950s

called the *Goon Show* that had its origins in a working-class tradition of teasing the pretentions of the aristocracy. The show aimed at attacking all hallowed British institutions: the parliament, the military and the Empire were all satirized.

On 22nd of August, 1960, Edinburgh stage revue *Beyond the Fringe* started a new satire fashion in the public sphere producing innovative sketches on contemporary issues such as capital punishment, the legacy of war, the Cold War, and the nuclear threat, and on institutions such as class, religion, politics, and politicians. Bartie describes *Beyond the Fringe*, writing that "a genuine cultural turning point was the slightly shambolic opening performance of a late-night revue at the Lyceum Theatre, Edinburgh on 22 August 1960…it exposed the widening gulf between the generations, helped to change our attitude towards authority forever and made satire in Britain a practical possibility" (82).

Through *Beyond the Fringe*, it may be observed that youth started to dominate the arts, high culture was challenged. New artistic forms and challenges to censorship and traditional values were achieved the experimentation in the arts. With the decline of the importance of religion in society and with the liberalisation of the arts from moral austerity and secularisation, the importance of the arts increased (Bartie 3). As a result, the relationship between the arts and organized religion eroded. Furthermore, Jonathan Miller, who was an important figure in the satire boom, stated: "We were creatures of the post-war generation, and that was the point at which English society was undergoing a great deal of introspection and change. We coincided with the things that happened perhaps in some ways more significantly in other ways of theatre, like *Look Back in Anger*. Things were on the move, and we simply expressed the mood of that time" (Carpenter 100).

Although *Beyond the Fringe* did not start with a satirical aim, it gradually developed into a devastating survey of the state of Britain in 1960. Nichols writes about *Beyond the Fringe* as follows: "A significant theatrical signpost of the times was the way in which satire against iconic Establishment targets began to voice – and perhaps to instigate a new mood of dissent. The show's willingness to mock politicians and even royalty, and its lack of respect for established values and assumptions brought headlines and controversy" (Nicholson 8). It may also be claimed that *Beyond the*

Fringe was not ridiculing from a specific moral and political standpoint, but was mocking the unthinking attitude of respect, which was prevalent in Britain in the 1960s. Not only politicians, but also pomposity of any sort and stupidity from both right and left, and from newspapers or televison were parodied by the satirists. They explained the reason for their attack as 'complacency', the complacency of Macmillan's England of the late 1950s and the early 1960s which was very parochial, smug and Little England-ish (Carpenter 109). Mark Donnelly states that after Britain had been governed by a Conservative Government for over ten years, satire became an effective tool illustrating that there should be a change of direction. He continues to claim that "*Beyond the Fringe* helped to undermine what was loosely termed 'the Establishment', a 'term coined to explain the interlocking political, social and cultural institutions that seemed to conspire to prevent change'. As such, it was one of the many challenges to tradition that broke through during this period of transition in British society" (82).

Because the satirists in the satire boom of the 1960s were largely from Oxford and Cambridge, they were exemplars of the same privileged elite they parodied. For instance, what was observed in this new wave of satirists' works was that there was a focused assault on the values, social mores and pretensions of the day. In particular, *Beyond the Fringe* portrayed a variety of stereotypical authority figures and it may be said that "the ideal of restraint, self-control and subordination of the self, far from representing the pillar on which Britain's prominence was founded, were shown to result in the kind of repressed, inept and degenerate characters so skillfully rendered by the *Beyond the Fringe* cast" (Ward 97). These comic creations of *Beyond the Fringe* portrayed a ruling elite who were completely out of touch with their own failings. For instance, Prime Minister Harold Macmillan, who was urbane and aristocratic was ridiculed and mocked perpetually as he attempted to pretend that he was a world statesman while trying to repair the damaged prestige of Britain, especially after the Suez fiasco. He was considered ineffective, and his government was ridiculed by *Private Eye*, a satirical magazine. For instance, some political scandals in 1963 such as the Vassal affair that involved homosexuality, blackmail and the security risks in the Civil Service and the Profumo scandal provided a great amount of material for *Private Eye* by exposing the moral bankruptcy of the Macmillan government (Ward

100). Thus, there was a tendency among the satirists to puncture the pomposity and reveal the true character of politicians.

Furthermore, Britain's loss of power may be seen in the representation of the national church presented by Bennett's parson, whose sermon is shown to be meaningless. Besides, Miller's vicar has portrayed God as a trendy caricature by saying that God is as old as he feels, which is the message intended to be given to youngsters (Carpenter 120). Moreover, British intellectual life has been reduced to the almost meaningless prattle of linguistic philosophers. The nation's past glories are ridiculed and sentimentally mythologized. Attitudes to sex are observed to be hypocritical. Culture is described as absurdly precious and elitist. For instance, British theatre is observed to be obsessed with the perpetual staging of Shakespeare plays: One of the sketches ridiculing this obsession is entitled *So That's the Way You Like It.* In short, subjects such as the H-bomb, capital punishment, patriotism, Shakespeare, the clergy, the linguistic philosophers, the Sunday-night religious television programmes, history, lunacy, and anti-Semitism are not only taken as targets but also "rolled in order to gasp and howl in the mire" (Carpenter 117).

The reason why these satirists despised the pretensions and the failings of Britain's governing elite was because Britain's imperial destiny was destroyed with the events of the post-war era, which was especially horrendous for the young generation as they would be the colonial administrators. Therefore, it is not surprising that the social trappings of imperial rule were found to be absurd especially by those who felt most betrayed by the 'illusion of permanence'. Thus, rather than supporting a more modest British role in the world, the young satirists of the early 1960s harshly criticized the British ruling elite who were incapable of securing their imperial inheritance. The satire boom had an important part in creating the popular attitudes towards an imperial nation in decline:

> The comic relief provided by the satirists' relentless parodying of Britain's flagging fortunes in the post-war world provided a welcome pressure valve whereby these dramatic changes in the national self-image could be rendered less threatening. Moreover, in subjecting leading political figures and civic institutions to public ridicule, the

> satire boom undermined the automatic deference and respect that had traditionally occupied the core of British civic culture. (Ward 108)

Although there was a great amount of ridicule of the obsolete habits, attitudes and pretensions of Imperial Britain, it was, equally, a lament for the old exalted image of Britain in the world. The satirists were criticizing the pomposity and the cant of the British establishment, but they did not offer any alternative. Thus, the satire boom was created as a result of a deep disillusionment with the decline of Britain's global fortunes, together with an obvious recognition that going back to the Empire's glorious past was neither achievable nor attractive.

Together with *Beyond the Fringe* and *Private Eye*, *That Was the Week That Was* (TW3) appeared on BBC television contributing further to the undermining of a culture of compliance and acquiescence to authority. The programme began in November 1961 and ended in December 1963 in case it affected the result of the 1964 general election, as politicians were the main objects of its satirical humor. David Frost explained why they started TW3 by saying that they were disillusioned with the recurring failures, hypocrisy and the shabbiness of British politics. The aim of these satirists was to break the "traditional cordon sanitaire of sanctimony" that still surrounded public figures in the 1960s and to address the television audience not as puppets but as mature adults with independent minds (Carpenter 214). It was thought that people considered themselves more as 'persons' and less as 'citizens' on Saturday nights than at any other time of the week. This, therefore, was the best time "to hang this contemporary and vague 'philosophy' on the hook in the hall, to relieve the pressures of earnest concern and goodwill which presses down on us for the rest of the week…There should be room in this programme for prejudice, for cynicism, for Juvenal's 'sacred indignation' " (Carpenter 214).

There was also a West End night club called 'The Establishment'. Although people did perform their shows on stage they still felt the need to open The Establishment. John Bird explains that "the idea of the club was not really to do more outrageous things. It fitted the emerging Swinging London scene, and it freed you from the constraints of conventional theater- you could have a tiny stage and no set, and the audience's expectations were different" (Carpenter 129). The second reason for the

opening of this night club was claimed to be the censorship, because the Lord Chamberlain would have censored all these sketches. The Lord Chamberlain's office has worked as censor under the Theatres Act of 1843, even though there had been an official censor established by the Crown since the sixteenth century. Each new play should be sent to the Lord Chamberlain's office for examination and approval in order to be performed. The play would not be performed if it could not get a license from the Lord Chamberlain as the censor. Even after the Lord Chamberlain gave a license for a play, he could still change his decision and could ask for changes in a line, or scene, or could ban a whole play with no recourse to appeal. Plays, particularly during the 1950s, could be censored for a variety of reasons. For instance, if they were considered 'indecent', or included an act of 'alleged sexual impropriety' or a moving naked body, or had the representations of God or Christ onstage, or referred to 'the forbidden subject', homosexuality, or had coarse language, or defamation of foreign powers if they were allies of the UK, they would be refused a license for performance (Bartie 46). As a reaction to the practices of the Office of Lord Chamberlain, the House of Lords established a joint select committee to deal with the question of stage censorship and one of the Lords named Annan emohasized the arbitrary nature of theatrical censorship in February 1966 (Bartie 175). There was, besides, pressure on the Lord Chamberlain from a variety of institutions ranging from the Public Morality Council, the monarch, the Church, government departments, to newspapers and foreign embassies, as they all wanted to control what could be said and done on stages throughout Britain (Nicholson i).

The biggest effect of abolishing theater censorship in the 1968 emerged with the passing of the Obscene Publications Act in 1959. The intention of this act was to protect literature because this law "crucially stipulated that publication could no longer be an offence if the work in question was 'justified as being for the public good on the ground that it is in the interests of science, literature, art or learning, or of other objects of general concern' (Nicholson 9). Thus, playwrights and theatre managers could challenge the Lord Chamberlain by claiming that what they wrote or wanted to present was for the public good. When the House of Commons accepted the Bill to abolish theatre censorship in February 1968, a small number of people were concerned about

protecting the Royal Family against offensive stage representation and to protect audiences from sexual content or nudity.

The aim of the satire boom was to speak out about politics and culture in the context of art works. It also aimed to say something about the changes taking place in the political and cultural landscape of Britain at that time. Moreover, the satirists participating in this boom realized that they could ridicule contemporary politicians and that the idea of civic virtue was not an unquestionable reality. Before the 1960s, there was a strict code of respectability for the comic performance in the public sphere. For instance, Lord Chamberlain's Office was preoccupied with censoring stage productions when they were found to have exceeded the boundaries of public decency. Most of the new popular culture was thought to be classless, disrespectful of the Establishment, and idealizing youth. Other significant figures in this generation like Lindsay Anderson, Alan Bennett and Bernard Levin undermined the practice of obeying authority without questioning (Williams and Ramsden 458). Similarly, Patricia Waugh explained her idea of satire in 1962: "Satire was seem[ingly] an astonishingly progressive questioning and loosening of authority, a democratisation of that refusal of deference. It was no longer viable. Now it exerted a potentially disabling effect on citizenship and matters of state were often indiscriminately reduced to caricature in a culture [of]…humorous dismissal and throwaway consumption" (qtd. in Wagg 331).

In conclusion, satire may be considered as a response to the decline of the British Empire in the post-War era and as response to the changing of the dominant values of post-war British society. The decline of tradition and deference results in the emergence of a permissive society and cynical contempt towards politicians and public figures. These factors may be considered as the result of the shift from austerity to affluence and of the independence and the rise of purchasing power of the young generation in the 1960s. The satire boom, especially, may be seen to be the precursor to the 'swinging sixties' after ten years of Tory government. The fundemental question related to the emergence of the satire boom was 'what's wrong with Britain?'. Although there was a relative affluence at that time there was also a deep sense of loss as a result of the transformation of an imperial power into an island state in the post-war decades. Satire is the most appropriate genre for this period as satire mostly

appears and flourishes when empires are in a period of decline instead of construction. It emerges when value systems are broken down, questioned, reassessed or challenged, as it contributes to this process. Although Barnes did not belong to the group of undergraduates of the satire boom, he is a self-educated writer. He is known to have written six days a week, from ten to five, in the Reading Room of the British Museum. The spirit of sixties Britain affects his plays which, in terms of form and content, may be considered in the line of Menippean tradition.

CHAPTER ONE
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE RESEARCH

1.1. Etymology and the Origins of Satire

Elliott in *Encyclopedia Britannica* defines satire as an artistic form that suspends the corruptions, vices, abuses, shortcomings or follies in order to condemn them through ridicule, parody, or irony with the purpose of improving the individual or human institution (https://www.britannica.com/art/satire). Generally, Latin writers imitated and developed such main literary forms as epic, tragedy, comedy and, elegy, and, that is why, much of Roman literary history is believed to be a continuation and rival to the Greek tradition except for satire because "the Greek satire was not an independent literary form. This was a unique Roman invention" (Coffey 3). Although there is no Greek word for 'satire', it is, nonetheless, a part of their daily life, as the Greeks are believed to be good haters and to delight in contemptuous laughter (Highet 25). In other words, there is a satiric spirit in Greek literature, as satiric spirit is universal.

The fourth-century grammarian Diomedes explained satire as "a Roman verse form that has been in recent times abusive and composed to censure the vices of men in the manner of Old Greek Comedy, as written by Lucilius, Horace and Persius; but formerly satire was the name given to a verse form made up of a variety of smaller pieces of poetry such as what was written by Persius and Ennius" (Coffey 9). Quintilian claims that satire (satura) is a Roman concept and is something specific and definite, quite different from a contemporary understanding of the genre. Quintilian defines satura as a form of literature, a genus, a distinctive type of literature which was first composed by Lucilius (Elliott 101). It had a definite spirit and metrical form, was established by a group of canonical writers and was given a Latin name (Elliott 101).

Before Quintilian, there were no verbal or adjectival usages of satura such as 'satirize' or 'satirical'; but it was used metaphorically to show the Roman satire. Interestingly, there was also a Greek word 'satyr' with many derivatives in use which had more or less the same meaning and was virtually in the same form as the Roman word satura. The Romans adapted the derivatives of 'satyr' to their native word satura (Elliott 102). Therefore, it may be suggested that satire emanates from Latin satura

which means a mixture or medley whereas ‘satirical’ and ‘satirize’ emanate from satyr, the Greek word.

The original form of the word satire is *satura* and the adjective satur means to be ‘filled with, full of food’, ‘replete’ (Coffey 9). Besides, the adjective also means richness when it is used for describing a deep color or a fertile landscape. Diomedes suggests four possibilities for the origin of the word satire: he suggests that satura either comes from ‘satyrs’ in which funny and unabashed things are told, or from a full dish consisting of a great variety of fruits offered to gods by primitive people in a religious ritual and, thus, it is called ‘satura’ thanks to the plenitude of the offering. Another suggestion is that the word implies a sort of sausage being stuffed with lots of ingredients or that “it was called satura, because the verse form satura consisted of many small poems combined together. The idea came from a compendious law which includes many provisions in a single bill” (Coffey 13).

However, these suggestions have been challenged and found lacking in support. For instance, there is a linguistic problem. That is to say, the Greek adjective meaning ‘connected with satyrs’ becomes satyricus in Latin, as in the phrase satyrica fabula used by Diomedes. Ennius could not have derived satura (singular) or saturae (plural) from these words. If he had wished to base his title on satyrs and plays about them he would have been expected to make some use of the adjective satyricus (Coffey 14). Knight defines satyrs as “woodland spirits goatish, mischievous, and self-indulgent” (Knight 19). They are seen as alternatives to humanity including both rational and animal qualities and they do not have moral self-control. Instead, they have incessant hedonism. The results of the equation of the sature-satyroi can be seen in the humiliations and dirty jokes of Martial and in the Saturnalia. For instance, Martial defends the impropriety of one of his books by saying that he wrote it for the Saturnalia, since Saturnalian satire leaves room for the natural instead of the conventional, and the satires written for Saturnalia may include dirty jokes and humiliations. For instance, Cronos in Lucian’s Saturnalia preferred cheerfulness and equality instead of moral responsibility. Conclusively, it is observed that “the derivation of *satura* from *satyroi* defines satire’s power to articulate elements in

personal, public, and physical lives of men that cannot be expressed by conventional genres; it presents satire as a release from repression" (Knight 19).

Horatian satire is described as "the genial and urban", whereas Juvenalian satire is described as "severe and lashing". While Horatian satire is light hearted and aims at teaching or correcting "with a smile". Juvenalian satire is pessimistic and harsh (Murfin and Ray 357). Nonetheless, a text entitled *De Satyrica Graecorum Poesi et Ro-manorum Satira* (1605) about the theory of satire by Isaac Casaubon shows the distinctions between the Greek and the Roman satiric traditions, by positing that Roman 'satire' is not related to the Greek 'satyr' and that a satire is unified, attacks a single vice and praises virtue (qtd. in Griffin 12).

Diomedes' suggestion that satura takes its name from a cult offering to the gods or from a cook's recipe (that is from lanx satura) also seems weak and is challenged through lack of evidence. The third suggestion from Diomedes is that satura means a sort of stuffing. Coffey writes that "the word farcimen can be used either for the stuffing (or the filling) of the sausage, or the thing that is stuffed, that is, the sausage itself. Perhaps this was true of satura also. Assuming satura here to be an adjective, it is uncertain what the noun would be. Lanx is a possible supplement here, for it is the ordinary word for a serving dish. Other suggestions include patina (pan) and olla (pot) (Coffey 15). What the metaphor implies is again fullness and variety. For instance, Ennius used Saturae, 'the miscellaneous dish', as the title for his collections of miscellaneous poems. Diomedes' fourth suggestion is the least likely, since no proof is provided for the phrase lex satura that is found only in the grammarians' statements (Coffey 17). Moreover, although it is assumed that there was no such word as satura before Ennius in Rome, there are objections to this, too. For instance, while Livy is talking about the different phases of drama in Rome he mentions dramatic satura, which is defined as a musical stage show with lyrics and without a plot (Coffey 19).

There are two more theories linking dramatic satura to the cult of a god. According to the first one, saturi are demonic men, the followers of Dionysus, and satura, an abstract noun meaning 'satiety', is the song of satisfied men. If dramatic satura is based on a cult of Dionysus, it is thus the counterpart of Old Attic Comedy in Rome. The second theory seeks parallels for satura in the banter that was part of certain

Demeter cults in Greece and Sicily and in the mixed potion that had an important place in the religion of Demeter or Ceres. Satura, it is argued, is abstract and means 'fullness'. Dramatic satura is thus the dance and song that belonged to a Ceres festival. However, there is no evidence "for rough jesting at any Roman ritual belonging to Ceres, and the association of the lanx with Ceres seems to be nothing other than the guess of a grammarian who speculated where his predecessors and betters had failed to specify" (Coffey 23).

In terms of satire's origin, Elliot writes that verses of Archilochus, who was a Greek satirist of the seventeenth century B.C., were believed to have demonic power and to have satire killed. According to the story, Archilochus was engaged to Neobule, daughter of the Parian noble, Lycambes. For some reason, Lycambes broke his promise and Archilochus wrote and recited verses against Lycambes at the festival of Demeter. Subsequently, Lycambes and his daughter hanged themselves. When Archilochus died he became the centre of a heroic cult on his native island of Paros. Ancient writers comment on Archilochus' satire by emphasizing the abuse, the hatred, and the bitterness. There is one more thing to be emphasized in his satire: in one of the fragments, Archilochus, asking for justice, writes "he shall not escape for this despite done to me; Lord Apollo, reveal Thou the guilty and destroy them" (qtd. in Elliott 11). This quality makes his satires more than a curse, and rather a demand to punish injustice. What is understood from the story of Archilochus is that the iambic verses of a chief poet, demonstrative of his hate, his will to harm, his mockery, were credited having a sort of baleful power which apparently does not lie in magical mechanics but in the personality of the poet and in his command of the word. It was believed that his words could destroy, as in the story of Lycambes and his daughter (Elliott 15).

In Irish and Arabic literatures also there is a relationship between satire and magic. In Arabic poetry, both encomium and satire were believed to be magical. In pre-Islamic Arabia the poet was believed to have supernatural wisdom as a result of his alliance with spirits, and he was respected by his tribe as being a prophet, teacher, encomiast and a warrior whose function was to compose satire because satire was like a curse, being as important as the actual war itself (Elliott 15). The reason why satire was so effective in war was that preserving one's honor in pre-Islamic Arabia was the

most important obligation; that is, people would sometimes rather die than be satirized (Elliott 16).

The Irish, similarly, did not distinguish between magic and the mocking verses of poets in order to ridicule or shame their enemies. It is important to realize that those producing the magical verses were not simply enchanters, but poets. Thus, they not only produced magical verses but also verses ridiculing vices and follies in a similar vein with Horace and Wyndham Lewis, Rabelais and Pope. Greediness, stinginess, inhospitality, repletion, the grimness of those holding power were among the follies satirized. The magician satirist belittles and embarrasses his victims with ridicule, which is the purpose of the satire of the age. For instance, the supposedly first Irish satire by Cairpe Mac Edaine was written against King Bres who had offered his guest a hovel and dry cakes (Elliott 62).

1.2. Further Definitions of Satire

An emphasis on correcting follies and reforming society is observed in the writings of the satirists. For instance, in *Verses on the Death of Dr. Swift*, the world renowned eighteenth-century satirist Swift writes,

> Perhaps I may allow the Dean
>
> Had too much satire in his vein,
>
> And seemed determined not to starve it,
>
> Because no age could more deserve it.
>
> Yet malice never was his aim;
>
> He lashed the vice, but spared the name;
>
> No individual could resent
>
> Where thousands equally were meant.
>
> His satire points at no defect
>
> But what all mortals may correct. (Swift 11)

In addition, in *The Intelligencer*, Swift defines the motives of writing satire by suggesting that there might be two reasons for the satirist. The satirist writes either to

pleasure and satisfaction to himself, or writes with a public spirit to encourage smart and virtuous individuals to mend the corruptions in society as much as they can (Swift 19). Swift favors writing to mend the corruptions as he finds writing for pleasure or satisfaction for himself less noble. However, Sutherland writes that "there is no reason to doubt that much satire is the outcome of honest indignation at vice or folly, and of a desire to promote the public good…One constant element in satire is the relief, or even pleasure, that it gives to the satirist" (153). By exposing vices, corruptions or follies, the satirist draws the attention of society as he establishes moral standards to these vices. The satirist refuses to compromise with the wrong-doer or the wrong-doing. That is why people are sometimes afraid of satirists. For instance, Alexander Pope says "Yes, I am proud; I must be proud to see, men not afraid of God, afraid of me" (141). Pope was very good at satirizing individuals and, indeed, he meant to give pain as he "hated passionately, and assailed unjustly and spitefully all who had roused his animosity" (Furlong 216). However, it would appear that his aim was to correct the follies, since he mentioned that he intended to write epistles in a Horatian manner.

Dryden also emphasizes the function of satire and satirist as correcting and giving moral lessons in his essay called "A Discourse Concerning the Original and Progress of Satire". He claims that the poet should warn his reader against a certain folly or vice and lead him to virtue (111). He gives a definition of satire, borrowed from Dutch scholar, Heinsius:

> Satire is a kind of poetry, without a serious action, invented for the purging of our minds; in which human vices, ignorance, and errors, and all things besides, which are produced from them in every man, are severely reprehended; partly dramatically, partly simply, and sometimes in both kinds of speaking; but for the most part figuratively, and occultly; consisting in a low familiar way, chiefly in a sharp and pungent manner of speech; but partly, also, in a facetious and civil way of jesting; by which either hatred or laughter, or indignation, is moved. (Dryden 143)

Randolph adopts Dryden's definition of satire and explains that there are two parts in a satire: the first part shows a vice and the second part shows the opposite virtue (qtd. in Griffin 28). This suggests a polarized view of the nature of satire. Satire is first defined as malignant, destructive, humiliating for people and a threat to the virtue of society. However, satirists and critics defend themselves by putting forward the view that satire is notably a moral art, stimulated by virtue and can be used to suppress vice (Griffin 25). This polarized view of satire was also valid during the post-war era, when two main approaches to satiric theory were promoted in Yale and Chicago Universities after World War II. Those who studied at Yale produced a rhetorical theory of satire, suggesting that it was regarded as a rhetorical art form and contained both praise and blame. However, this theory was later opposed by critics who claimed that satire was the result of the creative imagination of the satirist and, thus, there had to be a focus on the satirist's character. In Chicago, satire was acknowledged as including an assault with a palpable fiction on noticeable historical particulars. Moreover, the theoreticians in Chicago criticized the rhetorical view by differentiating the satires as either persuasive rhetoric or as those written for chastising. According to these theoreticians, satire is an explicit and clear attack. (Griffin 30). In a similar vein, Johnson emphasizes that "satire attacks evil, arrogant and triumphant, proud and victorious and riding for a fall. It attacks those conventional respectabilities which are really hidden absurdities or vices blindly accepted by thoughtlessness, habit, or social custom…it is a kind of unmasking" (Johnson 8). Instead of attacking directly, satirists use techniques such as parody, irony, and ridicule, and so on. Thus, it may be said that there are two levels in satire. The first level is the surface level and the second level is what is actually meant. That is why the readers of satire need to be aware enough to understand the deeper level of what they have read. In this regard, Feinberg regards satire as a "playfully critical distortion of the familiar" (Feinberg 19). He believes the corruptions or the vices people have witnessed in their lives should be shown in a distorted way through the techniques mentioned above. Satirists should endeavor to reform and improve human beings or institutions without being devastating because when they openly abuse it is invective; when they become bitter and personal it is sarcasm; when they are unhappy and sullen against the society it is irony or jeremiad (Holman 398). In addition, when complaint and moral teaching are

used with wit and focus, they do not become satire, because there is a common aspect in literary satire: entertainment. Satire is expected to entertain and also to attempt to "influence conduct, and the entertainment comes chiefly from the joy of hearing a travesty, a fantastic inversion of the real world" (Hodgart 20).

Northrop Frye approaches a definition of satire by comparing it with irony: "Satire is militant irony: its moral norms are relatively clear, and it assumes standards against which the grotesque and the absurd are measured. Sheer invective or name calling ("flyting") is satire in which there is relatively little irony: on the other hand, whenever a reader is not sure what the author's attitude is or what his own is supposed to be, we have irony with relatively little satire" (Frye 223). A moral aim, therefore, may be seen as an essential element of satire. Frye adds that satire necessitates humor or wit based on a feeling of the absurd, the grotesque or the fantasy. Not only the writer, but also the audience, should reach a consensus that the thing to be opposed is repellent (Frye 224).

To Frye, there are six phases of satire. The first phase he calls the low norm satire that describes a world in which there are abnormalities, corruptions, injustices and immoralities with no way out in this world. Although it may look humorous on the surface, when the reading is finished something bad is detectable. What is suggested in this kind of reading is to accept the traditional way of life by using a traditional person as a foil for the deviations in public (Frye 226). The most embellished form of low norm satire is the encyclopedic, which is mostly based on the structure of the seven deadly sins. Frye considers Erasmus' *Praise of Folly* as a good example of this tradition "in which the link with the corresponding comic phase, the view of an upside-down world dominated by humors and ruling passions, can be clearly seen" (Frye 227).

Displaying ideas, theories, generalizations and dogmas as inadequate in explaining life constitutes the theme of his second phase of satire. That is to say, this kind of satire deconstructs "the lumber of stereotypes, fossilized beliefs, superstitious terrors, crank theories, pedantic dogmatisms, oppressive fashions, and all other things that impede the free movement (not necessarily, of course, the progress) of society"

(Frye 233). Satirists, famously, have been observed to attack superstitions. Moreover, according to Frye,

> Nashe and Swift hounded astrologers into premature graves; Browning's *Sludge the Medium* annihilated the spiritualists, and a rabble of occultists, numerologists, Pythagoreans, and Rosicrucians lie sprawling in the wake of *Hudibras*. To the scientist it may seem little short of perverse that satire placidly goes on making fun of legitimate astronomers in *The Elephant in the Moon*, of experimental laboratories in *Gulliver's Travels*, of Darwinian and Malthusian cosmology in *Erewhon*, of conditioned reflexes in *Brave New World*, of technological efficiency in *1984*. (Frye 221)

The third phase of satire he calls high norm satire which takes ordinary common sense as a standard. In this phase, a rational and persistent perspective is given by the satirist. With this perspective, the readers can see, for instance, a hero turned into an ass. Through this transformation, the readers may develop an idea about their situation as human beings from the perspective of an ass (Frye 235). This kind of fantasy disintegrates accepted associations and provides many possible categories. They are often adaptations of romance themes such as a fairyland of little people or giants, or the enchanted world of animals.

Frye explains his fourth and the fifth phase briefly. The fourth phase is also a phase of irony in its own right and Frye states that "it looks at tragedy from below, from the moral and realistic perspective of the state of experience" (Frye 236). In addition, it provides social and psychological accounts of devastation, it emphasizes the humanity of its protagonists, diminishes the sense of ritual certainty in tragedy, and tries to show human misery as avoidable and redundant (Frye 236). The emphasis in the fifth phase is on the vicious circle in human life that is a constant cycle of fate or fortune. It is submissive and less moral, also interested not in particulars but in generalizations (Frye 237). He also says that the fifth phase "sees experience, in our

terms, with the point of epiphany closed up, and its motto is Browning's 'there may be heaven; there must be hell" (Frye 227).

This last phase portrays settings as madhouses, places of execution, lynch mobs, prisons, etc. The settings suggest that this phase depicts human life as absolute enslavement and the only way to get rid of the suffering in human life is death. Frye thinks *1984* is a good example of a vision of social tyranny. The human figures of this phase, who are often parodies of romantic roles, are portrayed as figures of madness and misery. For instance, there is a parody of the romantic theme of the helpful servant giant in *The Hairy Ape* and *Of Mice and Men* (Frye 227). What is more, Frye continues, "sinister parental figures naturally abound, for this is the world of the ogre and the witch, of Baudelaire's black giantess and Pope's goddess Dullness, who also has much of the parody deity about her ("Light dies before thy uncreating word!"), of the siren with the imprisoning image of shrouding hair, and, of course, of the *femme fatale* or malignant grinning female" (Frye 227).

The above-mentioned definitions, put down around the 1960s, are summed up by Griffin when he writes that

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

In contrast to modern critics who discuss the complexity and ambiguity of satire and who prefer to write about the satire of a particular writer, instead of writing generally about a variety of satirical works, the critics who wrote in the 1960s were able to make

generalizations about the nature of satire. What this conventional satire theory suggests is that the satirist creates a world in which the boundaries are clear-cut. However, in the modern world it is not easy to talk about clear-cut standards and boundaries. Putting moral standards in a satire may make the theme of the satire look uncreative or boring but the reader does not read the satire to learn that greed is not good. Instead, the reader is attracted to exploring the blurred boundary between a vice like audaciousness and a virtue like staying silent against censure, or to explore the discrepancy between one virtue like justice and another virtue like forgiveness (Griffin 38). This conventional theory may be summarized as depicting the framework of satire as being composed of praise and blame. There are some moral standards established by the society in which the satirist lives, and deviations from these moral standards are revealed and condemned by the satirist, who shares some of the traditional values with the reader, as he and the reader live in the same society. In this sense, the satirist may be viewed as a preacher or a rhetorician, as his aim is to convince his readers of a virtue. Emphasizing virtue is important because merely attacking someone because one does not like him does not make this attack a satire. Writing this kind of attack is called "lampoon" or "epigram" because the writer is only aiming at insulting a particular person or a group of people, whereas satire aims at correcting something while attacking a person or a group of people (Highet 26).

1.3. Characteristics of Satire

Before exploring the characteristics of satire, one should decide whether satire is a genre or a device/ mode used by writers. In order to decide, one should consider the aim of the writer. If the writer is explicitly aiming at revealing the follies, corruptions and hypocritical nature of people and institutions in society, the work may be considered as satire. However, if the plot or characters are more important in the work and constitute the main frame of the work, satire may be considered as a device used by the writer in some parts of the work (Ogborn 15). Therefore, it may be claimed that the aim of the writer and his handling of the material in his work decide if the work at hand is satire as a genre or as a device used in other genres such as novels, drama or poetry.

As satire is an amorphous genre and not easy to define, one should also lay out some rules before deciding whether a work is satire or not. For instance, Kernan suggests that satire can be defined in four ways; one, through following its historical development from archaic forms to its completion by the Romans, two, through comparing the work at hand with the three most important historical satirists (Horace, Juvenal and Lucilius), three, with a formal definition of its quality and, four, with the definition offered by Dryden (Kernan 6). Elliott suggests that the work at hand can be accepted as satire if it has a reasonable number of resemblances to other accepted satires (qtd. in Feinberg 18).

Like Elliott, Highet suggests making use of the method put forward by Aristotle. That is called 'induction' and means to compile as many examples of phenomena as possible. Then, a particular phenomenon may be distinguished from other phenomena by studying the similarities and differences between them. By applying this method to satire, Highet comes up with three shapes a satire may take: monologues through which the satirist directly speaks to the reader either as himself, hiding behind a mask or creating a mouthpiece for himself; or in the form of parodies in which the satirist takes a serious work of literature and makes it ridiculous either by adding incongruous ideas to it or exaggerating its aesthetic devices; and, last, narratives which may be constructed as stories or dramatic fictions (Highet 14). However, because there are some defects in this method while distinguishing a satire from other genres (for instance, parody may be used both in monologues or in fictions, or a reader may misunderstand the symbols or irony in the satire), Highet suggests some tests to measure whether a work is satire or not. For instance, the writer may give a generic definition as in the case of Juvenal who sees the corruption in Rome and says "it is difficult not to write satire" (Juvenal 7). Secondly, Highet offers pedigree, which proclaims that the work is an imitation of an earlier satirist. That is, the satirist as a successor of an archetypal master can look back with an appreciated fidelity and sometimes with criticism, attended with some departures in practice or with some changes in style (Coffey 5). Thirdly, a writer's choice of theme or any method used by satirists in the past may be taken as a reliable test. However, Highet accepts that because people write satires about anything, ranging from the most serious themes to

the most trivial subject matter, subject matter may not always be a reliable test for labelling a work as satire (Highet 16).

Furthermore, Highet writes that in order to test a work to see whether it is satire, one may look at the devices used by the author. That is to say, if an author often employs a reasonable number of the techniques of satire such as antithesis, irony, parody, paradox, topicality, colloquialism, exaggeration, obscenity, violence, anticlimax, and vividness among others, he is most likely writing satire (Highet 19). However, if the author uses them only in some parts of his work, then only, these parts may be called satirical. By making use of these devices a satirist aims at making the audience aware of the foolishness or absurdity of the situation. Apart from looking for these devices in a work, Highet also suggests another test for satire, which is the feeling of the author. The author is amused and is contemptuous at the same time and he wants to arouse similar feelings in the reader (Highet 21).

Satire as a genre has some particular characteristics, one of which is that it often borrows from other mimetic or nonmimetic forms. Depending on the type of borrowing, satire is said to be either 'simple' or 'complex'. If the satire borrows from rhetorical (non-mimetic) forms it is complex satire, or if it borrows from just one literary (mimetic) source it is simple or unmixed satire (Guilhamet 13). This latter has a simpler structural dynamic and is shorter when compared to the complex satire. The style of satire is another characteristic of the genre. For instance, when the earliest examples of satires are taken into consideration, satire may be defined as an independent literary genre with an informal style that is close to everyday speech. The high style is not fitting for satire unless it is a parody. Likewise, using too many vulgarisms is inconvenient in satire (Coffey 6). The practice of obscene language in early satirists after Horace, who slide "noiselessly from plain speaking and ethical advice into ironically lofty and pompous verse from there into sincere and artless emotion and thence into a highly allusive mode, quoting directly from their predecessors, often for ironic purposes" (Griffin 8), serves to achieve a shock effect. It is not an essential part of their language. Besides being shocking and informal, satire is also topical, realistic and funny, albeit often in a grotesque manner.

Another characteristic of satire is suggested by Guilhamet to be "its freedom from restraint, but the movement toward that freedom always implies a circumscribed starting point and boundaries to violate. Satire achieves its freedom by finding its way in a pattern of traditional forms. Once all such restraint is thrown off, the effectiveness of satire tends to diminish" (Guilhamet 46). However, this does not mean that satire is formless. On the surface, it may look formless but deep down its seemingly formless structure derives from its imitating the worst offenders. In short, satire is the best form to represent the chaos in the world or the corruption in human nature. Because its material is distorted, it needs an appropriate structure (Guilhamet 164).

A different characteristic of satire is the ending of a story with an uncertain conclusion, both because a satirist's anger does not end and because satirists know that, no matter how much they endeavor to create a single pattern to explain the vices and follies (Griffin 112). Similarly, Bakhtin also claims that as satire is a carnivalesque genre it has a similar attitude towards closure: "The carnival sense of the world. . . knows no period, and is, in fact, hostile to any sort of conclusive conclusion: all endings are merely new beginnings" (*PDP* 165).

Using humor may be considered as another characteristic of the genre. In order to have a better understanding of humor used in satire, it may be compared with humor in comedy. Although comedy writers, like satirists, are interested in the follies, imperfections and faults of men, they are not interested in setting moral standards. Rather, they show a level of acceptance or tolerance towards the people instead of judging them. The satirist, however, refuses to accept or tolerate. Furthermore, he wants to expose vices and follies as appalling, as he is extremely sensitive towards what is and what should be. The satirist may be compared to a person who, seeing a picture hanging awry, cannot resist straightening it. Similarly, the satirist wants to call attention to any deviation from justice, truth, or honesty (Sutherland 4). He wants to set up a balance and correct the error. To achieve his goal the satirist tries to persuade his readers to share his view, which is another point distinguishing him from the comedy writer, who is satisfied simply with entertainment. The satirist endeavors to convince people to appreciate or to detest, to re-evaluate their assumed realities, to admit unpleasant facts, and to explore what is lying behind external appearances

(Sutherland 5). While doing this, the satirist does not suggest original ideas. Instead, he makes the readers see familiar things with a different perspective, which helps these things seem illogical or untrue. It can be inferred that what makes satire important is its originality of perspective. In short, satire forces us to face established values that are false. Thus, it may be claimed also that the satirist's intention differentiates him from other writers.

Similarly, while explaining the usage of humor in satire Ünal Aytür also compares the humor used in satire and that used in comedy. He writes that "comic humor presents the absurdity of life without judgment, whereas satiric humor is used to attack the follies or vices of mankind. Humor works chiefly by stressing the contrast between the ideal and the real" (35). In addition, Guilhamet also states that, in contrast to the comic, the satiric depicts the ridiculous in a moral way. There is a reconciliation of the ridiculous at the end of a comic plot, but the immorality or corruption is supposed to be corrected at the end of a satire as "the evildoer is stripped and whipped" (Guilhamet 8). It may be suggested that comedy's laughter is to some extent purposeless (Feinberg 4). However, sometimes, it may be difficult to decide whether a work is comedy or satire especially when it comes to individual works, sometimes "the writer of comedy los[es] his moral neutrality and slip[s] into satire, and the satirist occasionally loosen[s] his control over the reader and relax[es] into comedy" (Sutherland 10).

The difference between satire and drama can be helpful in determining some further characteristics of satire. Satire as a genre may sometimes become a sort of mode in order to enrich or color other genres. The reason for this is that satire does not have inherent and certain endings like victory, loss, and stalemate as in tragedy. Neither does it have wonderful singularity of ending as in comedy nor an assured teleology as in the novel. Contrarily, satire has advancement rather than stasis, evolving ideology rather than established truths, and open-endedness rather than a definite ending (Synder 102). In contrast to tragedy in which language implies an action resulting with loss, victory, or stalemate, satire does not imitate action and does not include a certain outcome. Synder continues to distinguish satire and tragedy as follows:

> Satire gesticulates, verbally, at the motives and values of actions, whether they are moral, social, religious, social attitudes, religious principles, and political plans. All satire can 'do', however, is decry and commend, analyze and affirm, criticize and espouse. The language of tragedy is objective; the language of satire is subjective….Satiric language must do the dirty work of evaluation, thus its tendency to be foul, to become topical, even journalistic. Tragedy as imitative language speaks oracularly, even from the seeming heart of violence and violation, in a language of objective presentation, of 'art'. (Synder 145)

Satire consists of words with an aim, not action. This is in contrast to tragedy, which has the threefold possibility of the historical world: victory, loss, and stalemate (Synder 94). Because of the dependency of satire on rationality, instability occurs when there is a shift into other genres especially tragedy, as in the case of Swift, and the novel, as in the cases of Cervantes and Twain. Hence, it is recognized that these works cannot resolve dilemmas "caused by the genre's concern with matters of morality, society, taste, and religion as they are rationally perceived rather than politically engaged. Ironies are the result of rational satiric critiques, which want definitive outcomes yet cannot get them because the discursive formation appropriate to critique is rhetorical-evaluative instead of mimetic-political" (Synder 96).

Knight, for his part, distinguishes drama and satire by mentioning that in drama, an action is imitated through personification of signs. The actor portrays a character both through language and through appearance. In satire, there are only signs, although the readers suppose that the voices of the satirists are in the fiction as the images of the authors. In other words, the readers are able to see irony since they recognize the presence of an ironist (Knight, *the Satire* 4). Furthermore, Knight also differentiates satire from Aristophanic comedy by noting that in the latter a fantasy world is created in which an implausible hero comes up with an improbable idea. Then,

he wants to convince the chorus about this improbable idea. Despite the improbability of the idea, because it aims to overcome a problem, the reader or the audience decides to put aside their real belief about that idea as it frees the repressed impulses by disregarding rules. Therefore, it may be understood that "the relationship of the audience to the play gives the hero's fantastic scheme its thematic significance. The audience's willingness to withhold conventional judgments allows it to participate in the hero's individualistic triumph over authoritarian restraints. The simplistic fantasy releases us from the restraining complexity of actual experience" (Knight, *the Satire* 4). The reason why the reader or the audience find this idea improbable and the hero unlikely is the result of their recognition that this idea is not the real topic of the play. There may be an absurd idea on the surface but the aim of the satirist is to show something different by employing this character. Hence, the satiric theatre reconstructs this realization and includes it within the play. As a result, the real subject of the play located outside the action is pointed out both by the text and by the rhetoric of production. The subject and device of the critical attack are determined by its discourse. In short, it is understood that the imitation of discourse through action is replaced with the mimesis of action through discourse by dramatic satire (Knight, *the Satire* 6). Moreover, Knight concludes by laying out three rules to differentiate satiric imitation from the mimesis of action and the poetic (or fictive) mimeses of ordinary discourse:

> Firstly, the self-conscious satirist seeks to justify assault or his satiric program asserts that stance of his attack, or at least its qualities as entertainment, the anti-social act of attacking…Secondly, in a number of cases the imitative nature of satire indicated by the statements of the author by the nature of the text or by both. But the distance between the satiric and its imitated sources may be further indicated by linguistic formal disjunctions. Thirdly, the audience of satire becomes aware that its subject is significantly outside of the text itself. (Knight, *the Satire* 9-10)

Therefore, a satirical play "may draw its audience into an enchanted world of make-believe, but the dramatist's comments extend to the real world outside the theatre, to the political and moral problems that face the audience when they return to ordinary life" (Hodgart 31). In satire, the subject matter and the author's attitude to it are of primary importance. The satirist is concerned with the problems in society and assumes his readers are also responsive to the problems in society. For instance, Hodgart states: "The satirist does so even though he is aware that he is incurring a double risk, of being unpopular in his own time and of being forgotten by later generations, to whom the day-to-day issues of his time may be of merely academic interest. The satirist appears in his noblest role when he accepts the challenge of oblivion, by taking on an ephemeral and unpleasant topic" (31).

Northrop Frye gives another characteristic of satire while distinguishing it from philosophy. He states that the former is pragmatic as it is concerned with anything in human life, while the latter is dogmatic as it suggests a particular way of life to people. He adds that "the satirist demonstrates the infinite variety of what men do by showing the futility, not only of saying what they ought to do, but even of attempts to systematize or formulate a coherent scheme of what they do. Philosophies of life abstract from life, and an abstraction implies the leaving out of inconvenient data" (Frye 229).

Furthermore, by studying the conditions under which satire appears, some other characteristics of satire may be discernible. It seems that satire appears at certain places and at certain times. That is to say, it tends to emerge when there is no confidence in the values or morals in society or when they become superficial. It tends to disappear when there is an agreement on the values or when there is oppression. Synder summarizes the periods when satire appears and disappears:

> Either when there is little credence in public standards of morality and taste, as in first century Rome, or when morality and taste attenuate to superficial, arbitrarily strict codes of decorum, as in Augustan London. But the satiric impulse wilts when there is a domineering political consensus, as in the Athens of Pericles and Aeschylus, then

> expands in a climate of democracy verging on chaos, as during the subsequent era of Aristophanes. (Synder 100)

Moreover, for the rise of satire there should exist certain conditions both literal and cultural. First of all, there should be a knowledge of the earliest examples of satire. In addition to this knowledge of the conventions of earlier satires, there should be some tolerance of ridicule among the readers. Further, because satire is said to be an urban form, in order for satire to flourish there should be some conditions such as a context, where writers know each other and participate in the public and political life of the city they live in and when there is an audience who has an interest in literary competition and can understand allusion, irony or innuendo (Griffin 137).

Satire's limitations may be considered as characteristics of satire as satire has some limitations. Firstly, satire addresses the intellect rather than the emotions and the detachment inherent in satire restricts the emotional involvement of the reader, allowing little empathy and, as a natural result of this, a small catharsis (Feinberg 264). Secondly, as satire appeals to the intellect it is mostly mystifying, especially to literal-minded people (Feinberg 265). Thirdly, it is hard to keep the attention of the readers of pure satire for a long time, particularly as satire tries to reveal uncomfortable truths that are often hard to admit (Feinberg 266). The cruelty and negativity of satire as it emphasizes criticism may be considered another limitation. The satirist criticizes because he is skeptical of utopias, altruism, and sincerity, and tries to reveal the hypocrisies and the imperfections. Satire dismisses illusions and shows the truth, which may sometimes be unpleasant (Feinberg 270). Another disadvantage is that satire does not have a long life. There are two reasons for this: first, because of the changes in language over time, puns become meaningless and witticisms become confusing. Another problem is the material for satire which is topical and quickly forgotten. Feinberg writes that "depending as it usually does on transient social conditions and values, on external manifestations of behavior rather than depth psychology, and on man's conflict with society rather than with destiny, satire tends to become dated much more quickly than does literature depending for its effect on universal emotions and lasting conditions" (Feinberg 272).

1.4. Types of Satire

1.4.1. Formal verse satire

There are two acknowledged forms of satire as a genre: formal verse satire and Menippean satire. The former is written in the form of a verse dialogue between the satirist and a speaker or an opponent. Formal verse satire is a rhetorical attack upon a particular vice and it includes praise for its opposite virtue in the midst of an argument. Content is not enough for the success of verse satire, form is also important. For instance, the knowledge of the pattern of satire was especially significant during Restoration and the eighteenth century (Weinbrot 401). Formal verse satire is defined by seventeenth- and eighteenth century commentators as a form in which the satirist directly or implicitly praises the opposite of the vice he attacks (Weinbrot 2). For instance, when a satirist attacks stinginess he implies a praising of generosity. Weinbrot distinguishes formal verse and Menippean satire by noting that "Latin satire, however harsh includes an admonition to virtue, and the Greek Menippean kind, which is like some modern satire, is designed only to lash and expose the Vices of Men (Weinbrot 27). Similarly, Hodgart defines formal verse satire as a "miscellany in verse: in a loosely constructed monologue the poet denounces various kinds of vice and folly, and puts up against them his moral ideals. The subject-matter is daily life, not heroic life, and this is treated realistically. The style is 'low', not elevated diction but ordinary speech; and the tone tends to be conversational, rather than declamatory" (Hodgart 132).

Satire's variety is immense. That is to say, in verse satire there are formal satire, lampoon, epigram, epistle, and parodic forms. Besides, it may be found in any literary form through parody and it may permeate into comedy, tragedy or novel. Therefore, if satire is regarded as a mode or procedure instead of a literary genre, it may be found in any context. Juvenal was assumed to be the last person who practiced verse satire while Petronius was the last person who used the Mineppean satire by mixing verse and prose at the same time. Therefore, Roman satire is believed to have been lost in the dark ages and did not appear in medieval times (Coffey 8). Kernan delineates the plot of formal verse satire as being like a newsreel in which the satirist looks at a particular thing and makes comments on it by addressing the people who are

indifferent to that thing, either because they are foolish or are icapable of grasping the severity of the situation. While commenting on a vice or a certain scene the satirist does not focus exclusively on a particular person or a scene, rather, he keeps a moving focus within the scene. Sometimes the satirist pauses to give a short sermon, then suddenly attacks another thing. It may be deduced that formal verse satire is constructed in a rhetorical instead of a dramatic form, since incidents as parts of the satirical work aim at demonstrating a subject, rather than devising a plot where the incidents are expected to have an organic unity and to initiate an essential action of life (Kernan 97-98).

The characteristics of formal verse satire may be understood by examining the first practitioners of the genre. For instance, Ennius is regarded as the inventor of the genre of satire as he collected verses of different topics and meters in the same book for the first time, and gave it the name 'saturate'. This word was not borrowed from Greek. What makes Ennius original is his choice of the word 'satura' for the first time for a collection of poems. However, Lucilius is regarded as the one who devoted himself to this genre by defining the most important features of the genre like 'censorious temper', 'outspoken criticism', using the dactylic hexameter for his poems, and personal and social criticism (Coffey 35). He refuses to adhere to the Muses and writes in an informal manner preferring his own form. In his early satires, Lucilius uses the names of the individuals whom he attacks, which causes resentment among them. That is why, it is assumed, he "had to spend his last years at Naples because of the effects of the hatred of those whom his Satire had offended" (Evans 281). Thus, these early short poems are considered as resulting from malice and to be attacks on personal privacy. For instance, his sixth satire is "about an attack upon the crafty and dishonest tricks of pleaders in the forum; he aims to expose vile, sordid, and avarice" (qtd. in Evans 306).

Furthermore, Lucilius writes about contemporary and near-contemporary famous figures, about military exploits, vices and the extravagancies of the rich, among other subjects. The most outstanding feature of Lucilius' writing is the harshness of his comments on contemporaries. Because of this, he may be compared both to a personal poet in the Greek iambic tradition and to the masters of Old Attic

Comedy (Coffey 47). Although Lucilius does not show similarity with Old Comedy in terms of language, his poems share similar subjects. Poets in Old Comedy condemn or ridicule the public figures by name, give advice about public morality and laugh at the philosophers. For instance, in one of his later satires, Lucilius makes a parody of the divine council, the founding of Rome and the glorification of Romulus. Through this parody, Lucilius aims to attack political and moral situation in Rome (qtd. in Evans 287-89). However, it is also important to note the differences between Old Comedy and the satire of Lucilius. Although Old Comedy is superior to satire in terms of style, Roman satura did not aim to compete with Old Comedy's lyrical richness, sheer bawdry, subtle shifts and multiplicity of tone. The style of all Roman satirists is seen sometimes as rhetorically passionate and informally petty at other times (Coffey 55).

Following Lucilius, Horace is the second most important formal verse satire writer. Horace refers to his satires as sermons. However, as soon as Horace's style becomes sophisticated, dialogue turns out to be an important part of his sermons. For instance, Horace explains his theory of satire as speaking freely in order to make humans laugh at their follies. Moreover, although he praises his satiric predecessor, Lucilius, claiming that he is following Lucilius, he is also making some changes because he finds Lucilius's satires crude while his own works are elegant. To highlight the distinction between his works and those of his predecessor, he does not use the terms saturate or satirae until he is accepted as an artful satirist. Only then, does he adopt the word saturae for his work (Coffey 71). The themes Horace deals with in his satires are the folly and futility of uncontrolled greed, ambition, being dissatisfied with one's lot, avarice and the vice of superstition, among others. For instance, in his Book I satire I Horace questions why everybody works to be rich:

> Yet what good is all that mass of silver and gold to you,
>
> If, fearful, you bury it secretly in some hole in the ground?
>
> If I broke into it, you say, it would all be gone, to the
>
> last
>
> Brass farthing. Yet if you don't what is the point of your
>
> pile?

Though you've threshed a hundred thousand measures of corn

That won't make your stomach hold any more than mine:

Just like the chain-gang where carrying the heavy breadbag
Over your shoulder won't gain you more than the slave
Who lifts nothing. Tell me then, what difference to the man
Who lives within Nature's bounds, whether he ploughs a
hundred
Acres or a thousand? (qtd. in Coffey 12-13)

As a moralist, Horace organizes his satires to reveal the truth with entertainment. To this end, he does not accept the doctrines or morals without questioning; instead, he takes them with detached irony. Horace goes on to write about his genre by saying that it is not popular among the guilty and he does not call himself as a poet, as his style of writing is closer to the spoken language (qtd. in Coffey 73). Being closer to the spoken language should not be, however, misunderstood, as style is important for Horace. For instance, in order to produce humor one should avoid lingering over and being careful with the variation of mode ranging from serious to cheerful by choosing the right words for the right place. For instance, *Satire II* by Persius, another important historical satirist, addressed to Macrinus, is about the hypocrisy of religious people. Namely, people who wish for honorable things when they pray aloud but become very greedy when they are alone. For instance, Persius starts his satire II: "This day, Macrinus, mark with a stone of more auspicious hue, the white day, which adds to your account each year as it glides away. Pour the wine to your Genius. You are not the man to make higgling prayers, asking the gods for things which you can only confide to them when you have got them in a corner" (Persius 35). Another satire by Persius is about people who give advice to other people to correct their faults, but are indifferent to their own flaws. Persius' themes are general and not about the vices of contemporary man living under the increasing tyranny of his times (Coffey 110). However, he still keeps writing satire as he thinks that the society in which he lives is rotten and decayed.

Like Persius, Juvenal does not attack powerful contemporary figures but, rather, he attacks only the dead. His first satires are mainly about real life, past and present, with all its facets. He openly writes about the bounty of vice, especially avarice. He also describes daily life in Rome at length, through the eyes of a poor person (Coffey 125).

The themes of Juvenal's satires are varied. For instance, *Satire 2* is about hypocrisy around homosexual behavior and about the traditions of the betrayal of the Roman governing class, while *Satire 3* compares the decent old Republican life with the corrupt and degenerate modern life (Juvenal 12, 24). While *Satire 5* exploits a dinner party theme to show the position of a client who is exposed to humiliation by his patron, *Satire 6* shows that a woman's beauty, money or aristocratic relations may cause her to be arrogant and prevent her happiness in marriage (Juvenal 34-38). In *Satire 7* and *Satire 8* (54-61), Juvenal reveals the miserliness of private patrons and the worthlessness of aristocrats by advocating that an aristocratic background should be balanced with personal goodness and success, while in *Satire 16* Juvenal shows the situation of a poor civilian as an underprivileged citizen when he is subjected to the attack of a soldier (Juvenal 111). Although Juvenal's themes are old-fashioned they may be applied to his time. For instance, Juvenal's criticism of the behaviors of his characters may be applied to the corruption and inappropriate behavior of high officials of the state and senators. The way in which Juvenal takes his examples from the past to give a moral lesson was a tradition in Roman literature. What makes him different from his predecessors is his choice of words. For instance, he uses many colloquialisms, borrows Greek words with the aim of ridiculing, and uses Greek influence to make use of parody or hyperbole. For this reason, Coffey states that "Juvenal alone of extant satirists derived an urgency and vehemence from the idiom of rhetoric, which left its mark on his methods of composition and structure as much as on the staple of his language" (Coffey 124). As it has been observed, Juvenal demonstrates the vices and hypocrisies of corrupt Rome. He is regarded one of the last writers of Latin from classical antiquity. Later, immorality and corruption were attacked by Christians. When there was a pagan literary revival in the late fourth century A.D. there were some writers such as Ammianus and Claudian who wrote defamations.

1.4.2. Menippean satire

The second form of satire is Menippean satire which is a mingling of prose and poetry in its simplest sense. It is called 'Menippean' after its pioneering figure Greek cynic Menippus of Gadara. Although only a few fragments of Menippus' writings survive, he is referred to as the "Muse" of the genre (Relihan 39). According to Relihan, "Menippean" was not used as a generic term until 1581 when *Satyra Menippea Somnium, Lusus in Nostri Aevi Criticos* was written by Justus Lipsius (Relihan 12). Menippus lived in Thebes in mid-third century B.C. He was born as a slave but earned enough money to buy his freedom through usury. Subsequently, he became the student of the cynic Metrocles. Knowledge about his life is taken from a book called *the Lives of Eminent Philosophers* by Diogenes Laertius. He is also known through the adaptations of some of his works such as *Descent into Hades* or *Auction of Diogenes*. Menippus is defined as "a barking Cynic who bit and jested at the same time, and as a philosopher who combined the serious and the frivolous" (Coffey 162).

He was imitated by Meleager and Lucian in Greek and by Varro, Seneca, Petronius, and Martianus Capella in Latin. Dudley writes, that to Menippus, "the only people to enjoy happiness are the poor man and the Cynic, who are free from illusion in this world and the next…The world was a vast madhouse. Equally absurd are the trappings of wealth, the pedantry of learning, the vanity of beauty…This is the way the world ends, not with a bang, but a grimace" (Dudley 72-74). He also attacked philosophical systems, philosophers, and corrupted institutions in a mocking way. Therefore, Menippus was not respected, and his ideas about philosophy were strictly rejected as he "rejects all dogma and all certainties, and has nothing positive with which to replace it" (Relihan 44).

Moreover, Menippus preferred parody to the conventional genres of philosophic discourse such as symposium, testament, dialogue, in which one cannot distinguish the speaker from the listener, epistle, and treatise. He overstated the arguments of these genres and brought their logic to the extreme so that they were understood literally. He also inserted songs, curses, iambics and some other unexpected rowdy material into the formal, learned genres. Thus, Menippus is observed to have "violated, with indecorum, humor, caricature, and exposed- for surely his travesty did not stop short of pointing out hypocrisy- the traditional picture

of the contemplative life" (Kirk xiv). Moreover, it may be claimed that Menippus added three new features to satire: Firstly, he formulated a seriocomic method that dealt with serious philosophical issues in a comic manner; secondly, he mixed prose and verse in his monologues, which practice came to be known as "Menippean satire"; and, lastly, Menippus wanted to reach a large strata of population (Kaplan 45).

Menippean satire is defined as the most subtle of genres (Blanchard 11). Because Menippean satire, it is claimed, operates on a discursive level like diction, style, theme, structure, and form, it is suggested that evaluating what Menippean satire does, or does not, instead of what Menippean satire is, or is not, can be more helpful in defining (Milowicki and Wilson 292). Thus, it can be seen as an arrangement of various and disparate elements such as a harsh and doubtful tone, mixing the invective and irony, a scholarly content, a collection of clearly detectable motifs and symbols, the repetition of particular plot structures, and a purpose being to deflate (Robinson 140). The Menippean genre rejects the assumed reality, but mixes different voices and puts them to test. As a result of this mixing, moments of absurd scenes appear and, thus, the epic or tragic unity is broken. Bakhtin considers this mixing as a denying of the monologic structures.

One of the difficulties in defining and understanding Menippean satire involves the confusion of purpose and form; in other words, it is easy to confuse form as the criterion for identifying Menippean satire to the exclusion of purpose (Kaplan 51). Menippean satire has characteristic forms but they derive from the analytical purpose of the genre. Kaplan explains that "the chief feature that distinguishes Menippean satire from other categories of analysis is the presence of fictive verisimilitude at some level, or in some capacity. Menippean satire relies upon fictive verisimilitude to properly and comprehensively critique (or anatomize) its topic and promote an accurate vision of a manifold reality" (Kaplan 52). In short, Menippean satire cannot be said to have a precise form as its unconventional heterogeneity, whether it be constructed formally, generically or lexically, is one of its distinguishing aspects compared with other genres. Similarly, its disjunctional nature is claimed to be its imperative feature by Musgrave. He continues by asserting that it is a medley or

mingling of genres in terms of form and it is usually interested in the contradictory, the absurd, and the irrational (18).

Relihan points out that “Menippean satire was an ancient genre informed by Cynic thought, which mocked the ‘high’ forms of epic and philosophical dialogue” (39). It attacked largely the philosophus gloriosus that is learned elite. According to Weinbrot, “in its properly unsentimental mode Menippean satire mingles at least two genres, languages, voices, or even historical periods to resist a dangerously threatening false orthodoxy. It can proceed in a severe form that sees little hope for improvement and scoffs at presumed human achievement” (Weinbrot 110). It can have two tones: “severe, in which a threatened angry satirist fails and becomes angrier still; and muted, in which the satirist offers a partial antidote to the poison he knows remains” (Weinbrot 6). Additionally, for Weinbrot, Menippean satire appears in a period of crisis such as in the presence of broken or rotten cultural, political, religious, intellectual, or national values. It aims at making a somnolent nation conscious, attacking the corruptions or reforming careless readers because the satirist sees that there is a danger in the society. In this sense, Weinbrot describes the Menippean satirist as somebody, who “in his darker mood is more the isolated cynic than either an amiable humorist or a sedately seated narrator” (7). Similarly, Bakhtin describes the period in which the genre emerged as follows:

> It was formed in an epoch when national legend was already in decay, amid the destruction of those ethical norms that constituted the ancient idea of "seemliness" ("beauty," "nobility"), in an epoch of intense struggle among numerous and heterogeneous religious and philosophical schools and movements, when disputes over "ultimate questions" of worldview had become an everyday mass phenomenon…This led to the destruction of the epic and tragic wholeness of a man and his fate. (*PDP* 120)

Therefore, the reason why Menippean satire was seen as the most suitable expression for the age easily may be understood.

Being a sort of intellectual prose satire, Menippean satire parodies existing forms of learned discourse (Sherbert 1). According to Relihan, the menippea can be regarded as an intellectual attitude taken toward the possibility of meaning, the value of truth, and a particular world view, which might appear in many different genres (6). He goes on to define the genre as a "continuous narrative, subsuming a number of parodies of other literary forms along the way, of a fantastic voyage that mocks both the traveler who desires the truth and the world that is the traveler's goal, related by an unreliable narrator in a form that abuses all the proprieties of literature and authorship" (9). According to Abrams, the major feature of the Menippean narrative is having a range of lengthy debates and dialogues "in which a group of immensely loquacious eccentrics, pedants, literary people, and representatives of various professions or philosophical points of view serve to make ludicrous the intellectual attitudes they typify by the arguments they urge in their support" (169). According to Kaplan, Menippean satire is a form through which a range of "particulars, facts and perceptions of events are brought together to form a uniquely comprehensive and yet particular view of reality. It patterns the process called the shock of the familiar. Menippean satire is the reexamination, reformulation, and the renaissance of the knowledge and wisdom which have always been the possession of the human race" (30).

Northrop Frye explains Menippean satire by stating that it is concerned with mental attitudes rather than people. Thus, the Menippean satire may be claimed to deal with abstract ideas and theories, and may be distinguished from the novel in terms of its characterization, which is stylized rather than naturalistic, as the Menippean satire displays people as representatives of the ideas (Frye 309). According to Frye, although the Menippean satire is only known as a prose form, the genre seems to have evolved from verse satire with prose interludes. He writes that "it is not primarily concerned with the exploits of heroes, but relies on the free play of intellectual fancy and the kind of humorous observation that produces caricature" (310). Moreover, he explains that, while folly and evil are considered as social maladies by a novelist, they are considered as maladies of the intellect by the Menippean satirist. The Menippean satire deals

mostly with mental attitudes rather than people, according to Frye. For instance, when pedants, cranks, virtuosi, bigots, enthusiasts, parvenus, and incompetent professional men of all sorts appear, the focus is put on their occupational approach to life as distinct from their social behavior (Frye 309). As Frye contends, Menippean satire "shows literature assuming a special function of analysis, of breaking up the lumber of stereotypes, fossilized beliefs, superstitious terrors, crank theories, pedantic dogmatisms, oppressive fashions, and all other things that impede the free movement of society" (233). Furthermore, he adds that "the Menippean satirist, dealing with intellectual themes and attitudes, shows his exuberance in intellectual ways, by piling up an enormous mass of erudition about his theme or in overwhelming his pedantic targets with an avalanche of their own jargon" (311).

Mikhail Bakhtin also defines Menippean satire in *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* (1929). He calls it 'the menippea' and explains that, in literature, Menippean satire turns out to be one of the central means of reflecting the carnival sense of the world. He states that the most important feature of the menippea as a genre is that "its bold and unrestrained use of the fantastic and adventure is internally motivated, is justified by and devoted to a purely ideal and philosophical end: the creation of extraordinary situations for the provoking and testing of a philosophical idea, a discourse, a truth, embodied in the image of a wise man, the seeker of this truth" (*PDP* 114). Despite the heterogeneity visible on the surface level, Bakhtin emphasizes the internal integrity of the genre. Bakhtin reveals that, although Menippean satire has preserved its inner generic essence, it has shown changes in its external form. That is, it has had inclinations to combine with novels, to penetrate into other kindred genres by subjecting them to a particular transformation. Bakhtin concludes that it is significant to "emphasize that the generic label 'menippea,' like all other generic labels: 'epic,' 'tragedy,' 'idyll,' etc. -is, when applied to the literature of modern times, a means of designating the essence of a genre, and not any specific genre canon (as in antiquity)" (*PDP* 137).

Bakhtin formulates Menippean satire under fourteen characteristics. As the first characteristic of the menippea, Bakhtin proposes the special weight of the comical element in the menippea (*PDP* 114). Nonetheless, the comicality is not for light-

hearted laughter but for liberation from any sort of norms. In order to create comicality, many techniques are employed such as witty language and silences, using inappropriate tone in texts, placing characters in absurd scenes for example, the Menippean genre aims at breaking the hierarchy between the high and the low.

The second characteristic of the menippea is its freedom from the limitation of history or memoir as it does not feel any obligation to answer the demands of the verisimilitude of life. Bakhtin points out that the genre of Menippean satire is identified with a great freedom of philosophical invention and of plot, besides including "bold and unrestrained use of the fantastic and adventure" elements (*PDP* 114). One of the most important characteristics of the menippea as a genre is its use of the fantastic and adventure, which fearlessly aims at creating an unusual situation to provoke or test a truth, a philosophical idea or a discourse represented by a wise man (*PDP* 115). Fantastic is employed in order to test a truth, which is why the characters, especially the heroes, of Menippean satire find themselves in extraordinary situations as a result of their adventures into heaven, the nether world or some other fantastic lands (*PDP* 115).

Bakhtin continues with the fourth characteristic of the genre, which is the employment of crude slum naturalism with the symbolic, the fantastic and mystical-religious element in an organic combination (*PDP* 115). The adventures of the truth under test appear in extraordinary places, such as brothels, prisons, dens of thieves, marketplaces, taverns, or the erotic orgies of secret cults. Bakhtin writes that "the idea here fears no slum, is not afraid of any of life's filth. The man of the idea the wise man collides with worldly evil, depravity, baseness, and vulgarity in their most extreme expression. This slum naturalism is apparently already present in the earliest menippea" (*PDP* 115).

As for the fifth characteristic, Bakhtin demonstrates the combination of free invention and the fantastic with "an extraordinary philosophical universalism and a capacity to contemplate the world on the broadest possible scale" in the menippea (*PDP* 115). According to Bakhtin, the menippea may be defined as the genre of ultimate questions, in which philosophical positions are provoked and tested like other ideas or truths.

A three-planed construction may be considered as the sixth characteristic of the genre, which is related to the philosophical universalism of the menippea, "action and dialogic syncrisis are transferred from earth to Olympus and to the nether world" (*PDP* 116).

The seventh characteristic of the genre is said to be its employment of "a special type of experimental fantasticality" which is not observed in ancient epic and tragedy. This experimental fantasticality provides a different perspective on life as it comes from an unconventional point of view (*PDP* 116).

As for the eighth characteristic of the genre, moral-psychological experimentation is mentioned. That is to say, any sort of "the unusual, abnormal and psychic states of man-insanity like unrestrained daydreaming, split personality, passions bordering on madness, unusual dreams, and suicides among others find places for representations in the genre" (*PDP* 116). By using psychological abnormalities, the binary opposition between reason and unreason, or sanity and insanity is subverted and the concept of normalcy is challenged. Besides, psychological abnormalities are not used only as themes, as "dreams, daydreams, and insanity destroy the epic and tragic wholeness of a person and his fate: the possibilities of another person and another life are revealed in him, he loses his finalized quality and ceases to mean only one thing; he ceases to coincide with himself" (*PDP* 116).

Another characteristic of the genre is to include scenes of scandal, inappropriate speeches and performances, eccentric behavior, in short, any sorts of deviations from conventional norms of behavior, manners of speech, and etiquette (*PDP* 116). The importance of these scandals and eccentricities come from annihilating the world's tragic and epic completeness. They stop the normal run of life for a while and make people avoid the norms in the society. According to Bakhtin, besides these scenes, the inappropriate word is quite an important characteristic of the menippea "because of its cynical frankness, or because it profanely unmasks a holy thing, or because it crudely violates etiquette" (*PDP* 117). Moreover, the genre of menippea includes contradictory and oxymoronic juxtapositions like "the virtuous hetaera, the true freedom of the wise man and his servile position, the emperor who becomes a slave, moral downfalls and purifications, luxury and poverty, the noble

bandit, and so forth. The menippea loves to play with "abrupt transitions and shifts, ups and downs, rises and falls, unexpected comings together of distant and disunited things, mésalliances of all sorts" (*PDP* 117).

The eleventh characteristic of the menippea is that it has social utopia elements especially in the structure of dreams or journeys to unknown places (*PDP* 117). The menippea's extensive use of inserted genres like letters, oratorical speeches, symposia, or novellas may be considered as another characteristic of the genre. Besides the mixing of genres, prose and poetry are also mixed in the menippea. Another characteristic of the genre, its multi-styled and multi-toned nature, derives from the presence of the mixed genres. The ultimate characteristic of the genre is its topicality, as the genre mirrors the ideological concerns of the day. The satirists reflect the societal and ideological life of their time by criticizing public figures of the discourses of the time, which makes it the "journalistic genre of antiquity, acutely echoing the ideological issues of the day…They are a sort of Diary of a Writer, seeking to unravel and evaluate the general spirit and direction of evolving contemporary life" and "this final characteristic is organically combined with all the other traits of the genre" (*PDP* 118-9).

While the genre has been observed to lose popularity from time to time, it is interesting that it has not disappeared since it began in the mid-third century. There are some reasons why the genre is adopted by many satirists. One of them is "the beguiling of a less-initiated audience" (Kirk xiii). Further, the genre is adopted because of its flexibility in terms of form; that is, its ability for display and digression, its ease of composition, its advantageous fictions like a journey to heaven or hell to realize an aim, its handy organizational principles, its possibilities for impersonation, etc., (Kirk xiii). Lastly, the genre was popular as a result of its disrespect for abuse and any kind of tyrant authorities. Kirk sums up Menippean satire by saying: "It had been from the start a blatant taunt to formality, a reaction against decorum and its more ludicrous advocates; the genre was mimetic, vulgar and experimental in its language, addressed ethically to the less-well-to-do in many instances" (xxxiii).

The cynical nature of the genre and the carnival spirit it makes use of may be considered as the two most important characteristics of the genre. Because of its

cynical nature, Menippean satire always desires to reject any sort of absolutes regarding norms, cultural, religious or philosophical dogmas. Moreover, whilst rejecting them, the genre also tests them through parody, irony, or sarcasm without offering any answers to the questions it asks; therefore, when the reader has finished a Menippean text he may not end up with any satisfactory conclusion such as any sort of success for the hero, or enlightenment for the reader who is, instead, left with a Menippean questioning (Akşehir 60). Menippean discourse is ambivalent. It is not cathartic and is largely comical but it is also political even in the most comic or the most absurd moments. Serious works of important figures, pretentious philosophers, any sort of religions, myths or science, historical documents, literary conventions and so on are all parodied in the genre. The genre even parodies itself. Namely, the perspective or the attitude of the author may be parodied in a Menippean text. As a result of the self-parodic nature of the genre, the unreliable narrator is employed in the texts, which results in the destruction of the authorial authority and the authority of the narrator. These characteristics derive from the genre's cynical origins which claim that there is no absolute truth outside us, and even if there is one, it cannot be communicated, which emphasizes the mistrust in language, and explains the usage of unconventional discourse and conflicting discourses in the Menippean texts (Akşehir 18).

As for the carnival spirit of the genre, a carnivalized text is similar to a carnival scene which is comical, uncertain and without hierarchies. To Bakhtin, carnival has worked out an entire language of symbolic, concretely sensuous forms—from large and complex mass actions to individual carnivalistic gestures, and this language may be transposed into a language of artistic images to a certain extent, a transposition which he calls the "carnivalization of literature" (*PDP* 122). Moreover, he continues to explain carnival: "Because carnivalistic life is a life drawn out of its usual run, it is to some extent a "life turned inside out," "the reverse side of the world"…what is suspended first of all is hierarchical structure and all the forms of terror, reverence, piety, and etiquette connected with it that is, everything resulting from socio-hierarchical inequality or any other form of inequality among people" (*PDP* 112). All people, regardless of their rank or social status, become participants in the carnival, freed from the hierarchies or the norms in society. In contrast to real life that is ruled

with order, life in carnival is the opposite version of the world. The distances among people disappear and free and familiar contact among people emerges. This is crucial because people are divided according to hierarchical barriers in real life, which prevents free and familiar contact. This may seem strange, inappropriate or eccentric from the angle of noncarnival life.

Carnivalizing features of the genre like dialogic or multi-voiced attitude, transgeneric, meddling, digressive narrative structure, rejection of hierarchies, fantasticality, and, innovative and comprehensive manner are employed. All the heterogenous and seemingly incompatible elements in the genre like sacred, profane, utopia, fantasticality, slum naturalism, and philosophy and so on are bounded into an organic unity in the genre with carnival and a carnival sense of the world (*PDP* 134). Bakhtin calls the genre having these incompatible elements as carnivalistic mésalliances in which "all things that were once self-enclosed, disunified, distanced from one another by a noncarnivalistic hierarchical worldview are drawn into carnivalistic contacts and combinations" (*PDP* 123). Disparate, heterogeneous and incompatible elements interact in the carnival at the same level: the wise and the stupid, the sacred and the profane, the great and the insignificant, and the lofty and the low (*PDP* 123). There may be references to other books. Besides, different languages, dialects and jargons may be used in the same text. Meddling as a technique is used by Menippean satirists both for the rejection of a fixed, standardized form and for creating absurdity and breaking the epic or tragic unity.

Similarly, Kristeva states that the carnivalesque spirit adds to the multifaceted structure of the genre besides its parodic or comical effect. The genre is serious and unserious, low and high, and comic and tragic at the same time. As a result of this kind of discourse, the question of freedom of speech should be mentioned. Kristeva claims: "There are no boundaries to what the reader can come across in a Menippean text: Adventures unfold in brothels, robbers' dens, taverns, fairgrounds, and prisons, among erotic orgies and during sacred worship, and so forth. The word becomes free from presupposed 'values'; without distinguishing between virtue and vice, and without distinguishing itself from them" (Kristeva 82-83).

Carnivalization infiltrates into menippea both externally and internally. Some menippea especially may depict scenes like carnival. For instance, Bakhtin writes

about “the carnivalistic treatment of the three planes of the menippea: Olympus, the nether world, and earth. The representation of Olympus is clearly carnivalistic: free familiarization, scandals and eccentricities, crownings and decrownings are characteristic for the Olympus of the menippea” (*PDP* 133). Carnivalization also permeates into menippea’s philosophical and dialogic core since carnivalistic thought prevails in the field of ultimate questions; however, it does not embody them with abstract philosophical or religiously dogmatic resolution; on the contrary, it employs them in the shape of concrete sensuous carnivalistic appearances and performances (*PDP* 134). As a result, carnivalization is observed to allow “the transfer of ultimate questions from the abstractly philosophical sphere, through a carnival sense of the world, to the concretely sensuous plane of images and events which are, in keeping with the spirit of carnival, dynamic, diverse and vivid” (*PDP* 134).

Carnivalistic laughter is not a personal reaction to a comic event but it brings people from high and low to the same level, giving a chance to people from the low to explain themselves. It is also “directed toward something higher—toward a shift of authorities and truths, a shift of world orders. Laughter embraces both poles of change… in carnivalistic laughter, ridicule was fused with rejoicing” (*PDP* 127). This laughter is ambivalent: it is gay, triumphant, and at the same time mocking, deriding. It asserts and denies, it buries and revives (*RW* 12). Moreover, material bodily principle becomes one of the most important features of the carnivalesque, which is also associated with the aesthetic of ‘grotesque realism’ (Gardiner 47). Material body principle refers to “images of the human body with its food, drink, defecation, and sexual life” (*RW* 18). However, Bakhtin does not consider grotesque realism as something obscene or negative. Bakhtin states that “the physical body is presented not in a private, egotistic form, severed from the other spheres of life, but as something universal, representing all the people. As such it is opposed to severance from the material and bodily roots of the world; it makes no pretense to renunciation of the earthy, or independence of the earth and the body (*RW* 19).

In the grotesque form, there is no individualization or idealization of the material body or bodily life. On the contrary, there is an exaggeration of the bodily life or the material body. It is important to know that “carnival was often personified in

medieval festivals in the form of a fat, boisterous man, garlanded with sausages and wild fowl, who devoured impossible quantities of food and wine" (Gardiner 49). What the exaggerated images of the material body mean are growth, fertility, and a brimming-over abundance, which makes the bodily element in grotesque realism highly positive (*RW* 19). Besides, the concept of idealized beauty is challenged. In contrast to the classic images of a man in which men are presented as completed and finished, the men are portrayed very differently in grotesque realism. In the classic image of the body "the ever unfinished nature of the body was hidden, kept secret; conception, pregnancy, childbirth, death throes, were almost never shown" (*RW* 28) but "from the point of view of these canons the body of grotesque realism was hideous and formless. It did not fit the framework of the 'aesthetics of the beautiful' as conceived by the Renaissance" (*RW* 29).

Bakhtin considers the most important feature of grotesque realism as the "degradation, that is, the lowering of all that is high, spiritual, ideal, abstract: it is a transfer to the material level, to the sphere of earth and body in their indissoluble unity" (*RW* 19). Degradation brings all sacred things down to earth. Bakhtin indicates that "degradation and debasement of the higher do not have a formal and relative character in grotesque realism. 'Upward' and 'downward' have here an absolute and strictly topographical meaning" (*RW* 21). As in the case of the exaggeration of the material body, degradation cannot be seen as wholly negative. Rather, degrading something means "to hurl it down to the reproductive lower stratum, the zone in which conception and a new birth take place. Grotesque realism knows no other lower level; it is the fruitful earth and the womb. It is always conceiving" (*RW* 21). Hence, in grotesque realism, degradation is observed to have an ambivalent nature.

Furthermore, Bakhtin mentions two main characteristics of the grotesque body image. The first definition says that "the grotesque image reflects a phenomenon in transformation, an as yet unfinished metamorphosis, of death and birth, growth and becoming" (*RW* 24) and the second one is defined as ambivalence. There are two poles of the transformation in a grotesque image such as the new and the old, the end and the beginning of the metamorphosis, and the dying and the procreating (*RW* 24). As may be posited from this, the body images are both ambivalent and contradictory. It

may be suggested that from the perspective of grotesque realism, even death "is not a negation of life seen as the great body of all the people but part of life as a whole—its indispensable component, the condition of its constant renewal and rejuvenation. Death is here always related to birth; the grave is related to the earth's life-giving womb" (*RW* 49). By means of this spirit, the material body is expressed in grotesque realism.

Another feature of Menippean satire is its unconventional use of language. For instance, mixed languages, macaronics, neologisms, bombast, coarse vulgarity, preciosity, portmanteau words, catalogues, and lengthy sentences are often employed in a Menippean text (Kirk 20). In terms of external form, the genre is usually a mixture of alternating verse and prose, occasionally a patchwork of openly digressive narrative. It is also a blend of letters, tales, songs, oration, lists, dialogues, and other brief forms, fact and fiction, contradicting parties or ideologies, different languages, jargons or dialects, different literary traditions, sections from or references from other books mixed together. For instance Fulgentis, by juxtaposing different texts creates intertexuality. Kirk states that "Fulgentius quotes verses frequently; but he often misquotes, and sometimes he alludes to authors otherwise unrecorded in the annals of literature, or to non-existent books and chapters from unknown authors. The imperiled situation of learning in the sixth century hardly permits suspicion that Fulgentius is attempting a travesty or burlesque" (Kirk 24). Moreover, Weinbrot identifies four cognate devices which may be employed by the genre. That is, Menippean satire by addition may enlarge a main text "with new, generally smaller texts that further characterize a dangerous world; sets a work against its own approximate genre and either comments on it or uses it as a backdrop to suggest its own subject's danger to the world; by annotation uses the sub- or side-text further to darken the already dark text; by incursion is a brief guerrilla attack that emphasizes the danger in the text and then depart" (Weinbrot 6-7).

As for Menippean topical elements, they consist of unusual fictions like dreams, talking beasts, fantastic voyages and visions and extreme distortions of argument like paradoxes (*PDP* 116). In terms of theme, Menippean satire is basically engaged with right learning or right belief. The theme is mostly asked to ridicule or caricature some sham-intellectual or theological fraud. However, the theme requires

exhortations to learning, when books and studies have fallen into disuse and neglect (Kirk xi). The Menippean writer considers an audience "less learned, less intellectually committed, than himself; but he believes his audience is curious, sincere, sensible and humor-loving enough to see his point, when that point is presented in an entertaining and knowledgeable way" (Kirk xi). Thus, the genre is assumed mostly to be written "downward" to this audience, in order to assess through the allusions the Menippean writer anticipates his readers will discover (Kirk xi).

When it comes to the Roman tradition of Menippean satire, Varro adapted the works of Menippus into Latin, by imitating the style of Menippus and called his satires which were a mixture of prose and verse, "Saturae Menippeae". Because Varro followed Menippus, he also composed his satires mixing a variety of meters and made fantastic journeys to the underworld and held dialogues with the dead. However, Varro differs from Menippus in terms of writing his own verses since Menippus borrowed or quoted from other verses (Kirk 10). He offers more correction and positive norms than his Greek ancestor Menippus. This moderate form of Menippean satire can offer a potential remedy to eliminate the threatening orthodoxy while observing it, which is a crucial change of direction on the Menippean road (Weinbrot 31). Weinbrot explains that "over several centuries and cultures some kinds of Menippean satire adapted a key structural and moral device of Roman and later French and British formal verse satire. Those forms include praise of the virtue opposed to the vice attacked, while still preserving Menippean resistance to a dangerous false orthodoxy" (Weinbrot 24).

Varro especially was fascinated by Menippus' "criticism of the present and of the false opinions of men, his preaching of the simple life and the scorn for dogmatic philosophical schools" (Albrecht 607). In contrast to Menippus who parodies all absolute truths as a cynical nihilist, Varro criticizes individuals directly. Nonetheless, it may be claimed that Varro is Menippean because he ridicules the concepts and values he earnestly defends beside any sort of dogmas and conventions. Therefore, cynical self-parody may be observed as the most distinguished feature of Varro's work. Lastly, Eugene Kirk summarizes the contributions of Varro to the genre: "Varro concentrates upon more subjects than merely the intellectual arrogance attacked by Menippus. Varro broadens Menippean satire into a genre for social, moral, and

political correction, and for a nearly encyclopedic range of educational topics" (Kirk 9).

Greek Lucian's works also may be considered as Menippean parodies. He uses Menippus as a character and ridicules him in his satires. For instance, Relihan indicates: "Lucian has an impish delight in embarrassing those who desire truth and knowledge; he simultaneously proclaims the vigor of traditional literary culture and directs his laughter toward those who look to literature for truth….Lucian asserts that even writing about the failure of logic and comprehension to define the world is a comic waste of time" (Relihan 117). Thus, it may be claimed that both Varro and Lucian contributed to the genre in terms of strengthening its self-parodic feature. Seneca is considered to be the one who gave the genre a modern quality by employing parody, as he creates an unreliable, intentionally self-parodying narrator in his works. Besides, he parodies historiography and, thus, overthrows the official truths.

Another important Menippean satirist is Gaius Petronius Arbiter who parodies the traditions of the epic and the tragic. He is similar to Menippus in the sense of having no moral or philosophical standpoint. Besides, he parodies literary, political and philosophical issues of his time. For instance, Relihan writes about the work of Petronius called *Satyricon*, which is a parody of the romance tradition as it suggests "a substitution of homosexual for heterosexual love, a triangle for a couple, realism for idealism, a character like Eumolpus for the wise old man such as Heliodorus's Calasiris, a hero running away from rather than trying to discover his destiny, and so on" (Relihan 94). A detailed analysis of *Satyricon* is made by Gilbert. He states "instead of being naive and faithful lovers, the chief characters are intelligent crooks and debauchees. Their names have disreputable meanings, and their morals are unspeakable. Instead of being put through trials which test their fiber to prove their fidelity, they have to endure a series of ordeals which befool and befoul them, although they amuse the reader" (Gilbert 114). Moreover, in *The Satyricon,* there is a difference between an intelligent Epicurean observer and a world full of stupidity and superstition; therefore, this work may be considered as a cynically anti-idealistic one (Gilbert 115). Thus, the work attacks everything ideal. In contrast to a unified work, it

proposes a mix in which it portrays heterosexuality against homosexuality or the low against the high. In short, it may be defined as a parody of everything including itself.

In short, Menippean satire wants to engage in cynical questioning by creating a carnivalesque atmosphere. To this end, it employs some formal and thematic techniques. However, they may show changes from period to period. Bakhtin, for instance, mentions that "the generic characteristics of the menippea were not simply reborn, but also renewed" (*PDP* 121). Bakhtin does not regard the genre as static, and while examining Dostoevsky's novels for example, he concludes that Dostoevsky renews the Menippean tradition in the form of polyphonic structure. The genre changes, evolves or is influenced by other genres as a result of its carnivalesque spirit.

CHAPTER TWO
PETER BARNES' PLAYS AS EXAMPLES OF MODERN MENIPPEAN SATIRE

2.1. The Ruling Class

There are two important characteristics of Menippean satire in *The Ruling Class*: it is cynical in theme and it is carnivalesque in form. *The Ruling Class* may be considered as cynical in its theme because Barnes deals with everything in a questioning manner in the play. Barnes cynically questions the concept of normalcy in the ruling class, the function of organized religion, and the so-called English tradition of servility. He also exposes the absurdity of the class-based society, the preference of human beings for vengeance instead of love, and the malignity of power and authority. While dealing with these themes, Barnes rejects any sort of absolutes regarding norms as well as cultural, religious and philosophical dogmas by showing them to be ridiculous through parody, irony, and sarcasm. The play is highly comical and political as it attacks the existing order even in its most absurd moments as an example of Menippean satire. When Barnes is asked whether the satire behind the play *The Ruling Class* is understood or not he responds by saying: "You can work in a comedic vein, and be intensely serious, which I am" (Hennessy 120). As he says, he employs "wit, pathos, exciting melodrama, brilliant satire, double-edged philosophy, horror, cynicism, and sentiment, all combined in a perfect unity" in his theatrical world of "extraordinary and idiosyncratic creation" (*RC* 3). Barnes' attitude is just like that of Menippus whose writings are described as "jocular, either lacking seriousness altogether or expressing serious ideas in mocking or humorous manner" (Kirk 4). The play has a typical Menippean ending that has no didactic aim as the aim of it is to deflate any sort of absolutes regarding norms and social, political and religious dogmas. As a result, the audience is left with question marks in their minds about the things shown them on the stage.

The play starts with a prologue which is followed by two acts and an epilogue. In the prologue, the 13th Earl of Gurney makes a speech which is a parody of John of Gaunt's speech in "Richard II":

> The aim of the society of St George[1]

Is to keep Green the memory of England

And what England means to her sons and daughters.

I say the fabric holds, though families fly apart.

Once the rulers of the greatest Empire

The World has ever known,

Ruled not by superior force or skill

But by sheer presence.

This teeming womb of privilege, this feudal state,

Whose shores beat back the turbulent sea of foreign anarchy.

This ancient fortress, still commanded by the noblest

Of our royal blood; this ancient land of ritual.

This precious stone set in a silver sea. (*RC* 7)

As it is seen, the last five lines of this speech parody John of Gaunt's speech:

This royal throne of kings, this scept'red isle,

This earth of majesty, this seat of Mars,

This other Eden, demi-paradise,

This fortress built by Nature for herself

Against infection and the hand of war,

This happy breed of men, this little world,

This precious stone set in the silver sea,

Which serves it in the office of a wall,

Or as a moat defensive to a house,

Against the envy of less happier lands;

This blessed plot, this earth, this realm,

This England. (Shakespeare 454)

Barnes parodies, misquotes and mixes up the order of the speech. John of Gaunt's speech is a famous and frequently quoted speech intended to invoke English patriotism since it was written. Some phrases like “this scepter'd isle,” “this happy breed of men, this little world,” “this blessed plot, this earth, this realm, this England” (Shakespeare 454) have become overused. It praises England while the speech of the 13th Earl condemns the basis of English society unintentionally. For instance, the 13th Earl says “teeming womb of privilege” instead of “royal kings” and “whose shores protect it from the turbulence of ‘foreign anarchy’[2] not “of envious siege”. John of Gaunt makes a long speech, claiming that England cannot be harmed by other countries unless it is conquered by internal conflicts and corruption. It is not surprising to see that a playwright who is writing in the late 1960s parodies this speech because England is not safe from the outside world in the second half of the twentieth century having shrunk to become an island nation instead of being an empire. She is subordinate to USA to be safe. Gaunt finishes his speech in a sad tone regretting what has happened to England. The 13th Earl, on the other hand, happily announces that her situation as the greatest empire in the world has not changed. This demonstrates the Earl’s superiority complex.

Moreover, in contrast to the speech of John of Gaunt whose “sceptr'd isle” houses “This happy breed of men, this little world,”, the speech of the 13th Earl of Gurney implies the superiority of the aristocracy by saying that the rulers of the Empire ruled not by skill or force but with presence as a result of the privilege of their blood. Barnes mocks aristocracy and its values here. The aristocratic class is considered as superior to other classes, not because they are smarter or more skilful but because they have ‘blue blood’ and they are born privileged. They are believed to be superior just because they believe they are so. Thus, it may be said that society is ruled by aristocracy and not by meritocracy. This may refer to Sir Alec Douglas-Home’s becoming Prime Minister in 1963 after Harold Macmillan retired. This is a clear example of the persistence of the rule of the aristocracy in the 1960s Britain. A peer had not become Prime Minister since 1902 when Lord Salisbury left office. Harold Wilson[3], a British Labour politician, attacked the choice as he found it an ‘anachronism’ and a symbol of the reactionary and aristocratic nature of the Tory Party

(Lomas 297). It was believed that Britain had succumbed to materialism and decadence, and British society was constrained by an obsolete class structure (Childs 125). This is illustrated by the characters Tucker and Grace in the play. There is no breathing space for the lower classes in the society created in the play. For instance, Tucker is left twenty thousand pounds by the 13th Earl but this neither saves him from being a servant nor from being excluded from the family. Besides, although Grace, Sir Charles' mistress is allowed to marry the 14th Earl, Sir Charles tells her "Madam, you'll never be a Gurney" (*RC* 103). As if to prove what Sir Charles says is true, she is killed at the end of the play by the 14th Earl, even though she is the mother of his son. Therefore, as a satirist, Barnes reflects the ideological concerns of his day in a humorous way, which exemplifies the topicality of the Menippean satire.

Furthermore, the speech of the 13th Earl parodies such values as patriotism and duty. For instance, the 13th Earl explains that the function of the St. George Society is to keep a green memory of England by promoting the English way of life but the values like patriotism, duty and honor have already lost their significance in the sixties. Young people especially start to question all these established values instead of taking them for granted. However, the speech of the 13th Earl is intended to reinforce the existing order of the ruling class as he emphasizes "the royal blood", "the feudal state", and "this teeming womb of privilege" while the speech of John of Gaunt embraces the whole nation by saying "this happy breed of men". The 13th Earl considers England as a feudal state and praises aristocracy; that is why, when Tucker asks about the outcome of his speech, the Earl claims, "Englishmen like to hear the truth about themselves" (*RC* 8). Therefore, through parodying the speech from Shakespeare's *Richard II*, Barnes ridicules English patriotism and the upper class who consider themselves privileged and superior. This is one of the features which make the play a Menippean satire, because Menippean satire parodies serious works of important figures, pretentious philosophers, any sort of religions, myths or science, historical documents, literary conventions and so on, in order to deflate them. Menippus himself parodies learned elites and quotes from different sources with or without reference to the sources he quotes.

After he has finished the speech, the 13th Earl is preoccupied with having an heir. He has lost four sons and the only one left is insane. This shows once more the

degeneration and mental corruption of the nobility. The 13th Earl is thinking of getting married to a lower-class woman called Grace Shelley who is recommended by his half-brother Sir Charles. She is also Sir Charles' mistress, but Charles recommends her because "she is a good breeding stock. Family foals well…It's all based on land," and for the "Sake of the family. Gurney name" (*RC* 9). When Tucker asks if she is anyone the 13th Earl answers that she was no one (*RC* 9) because she is not a lady from the upper class she, therefore, means nothing to them. This attitude of the ruling class, that is, excluding people who are not from the ruling class can be observed many times in the play, which shows how inhumane and cruel the ruling class is. The Earl is not willing to get married to Grace himself as he considers himself too old to have a baby. He thinks that he has done his duty with his four sons. In addition, he complains by saying "there's no end to duty. Every day's like climbing a mountain" *RC* (9). Although he is the leader of his family and an Earl, he actually feels himself to be in a servile position by not being free not to get married. Juxtaposing two contradictory things, upper class and servility in this case, is one the characteristics of Menippean satire.

While recalling his past, the 13th Earl gives a detailed picture of an aristocratic life-style. Displaying a contrast to his aristocratic background, the 13th Earl takes off his clothes, puts on a ballet skirt, a three-cornered hat, and long underwear and holds a sword, in order to relax. This is an important contrast because these clothes create a grotesque appearance while, normally, people respect him as an Earl and as a judge because of the clothes he wears and the titles he bears. When he takes off his normal clothes and wears these odd clothes, his real nature is displayed in a ridiculous way; thus, changing clothes may provide a fresh perspective of the aristocracy. This indicates that aristocracy is in the clothes and appearance not in essence. Next, the memory of an aristocratic breakfast scene is followed by a scene in which the 13th Earl climbs up and down some steps which lead to a mechanism from which he hangs himself for relaxation. This hanging is part of an auto-erotic ritual practised by the Earl. He imagines six vestal virgins smoking and, while drawing his sword, the 13th Earl alludes to a Sudanese uprising against the British in the mid-1880s: "Be of good cheer, Master Ridley, play the man…Form squares men! Smash the Mahdi, and Binnie Barnes!" (*RC* 11). The Earl is obviously fighting for the Empire of which he is an

emblem. The Earl in his ballet skirt, three-cornered hat with his sword is a ridiculous symbol for the mighty British Empire. The empire is shown as ridiculous and in this way its importance is subverted. Then the Earl puts his feet back on the top of the steps. After swinging for a few seconds, he begins to twitch and to jump.

The sword the 13th Earl carries may be considered as a phallic image. When the Earl imagines these virgins, his language becomes obscene and vulgar, which crumbles the existing hierarchies between the aristocracy, or what stands for the empire, and the lower classess. For instance, he lists, "Juicy breasts, white thighs, red hair colour of rust…" (*RC* 10). Although the Earl is fighting for the Empire against an uprising, his obscene language and absurd clothes reduce him to a ridiculous clown, and the 13th Earl, a noble person appears as an embodiment of baseness and vulgarity in its most extreme form through his obscene language, absurd clothes and grotesque behavior on the step. This medley of the high and the low in order to break the hierarchy between them, the inappropriate speech and performance, eccentric behavior, deviations from conventional norms of behavior, manners of speech, and etiquette are all an exemplification of a Menippean satire. That is why the Lord Chamberlain requested this scene to be deleted because he opined: "That strangulation (at least as far as hanging is concerned) is accompanied by spasmodic erection (sic) and emission'…the entire death scene involving the Earl of Gurney should be deleted" (Nicholson 252).

While the Earl is hanging himself, he says "Be of good cheer, Nicholas Ridley[4], play the man" (*RC* 11). With these words, he refers to an auto-da-fe[5] in which Protestant Master Ridley and Hugh Latimer[6] were burnt alive at stakes in 1555 in Oxford by the order of Mary I of England. When Nicholas Ridley is scared, Latimer makes this famous speech by saying to Ridley to play the man because they would light a candle and it would never be put out. As Latimer utters this sentence to give courage to Ridley, the 13th Earl repeats this sentence to himself when he is practising his auto-erotic ritual in his ridiculous costume. In this way, Barnes equates martyrdom with the ridiculous death of the Earl. Besides, Master Ridley, the Mahdi and Binnie Barnes, an American actress, are used in the same context both to have fun through the parody of an auto-da-fe, and to break up any hierarchy among these people.

Apparently, none of these human beings is superior to the others. Thus, as a Menippean satire the play uses different sources and refers to various religious, cultural or political events, parodies them and ridicules them by undermining the hierarchies among them.

After stepping once more the Earl knocks over the steps. He swings for a few seconds and drops the sword while trying to tear the noose free but he cannot. Then, his body goes limp and sways gently at the end of the rope. Tucker comes and finds the dead body of the Earl. Therefore, the serious and the frivolous are combined in order to deflate the idea of superiority of the aristocracy and the rationality of the law, both of which are represented by the 13th Earl. The Earl's death by accidentally hanging himself is both comic and tragic, serious and frivolous, and entertaining and disturbing at the same time, which makes the play a Menippean satire. By mixing the low (the Earl turning himself into a clown with the ballet skirt and the long underwear), and the high (the Earl as a noble judge) the predetermined conceptions about aristocracy are broken down, for the judge is reduced to a fool for hanging himself accidentally. Barnes degrades the aristocracy, the judicial body and the empire, as he thinks that they are overrated and do not deserve as much respect as they ask.

Moreover, the Earl states that he could not act irrationally, because he is a judge and reason is the soul of the law (*RC* 9). However, he acts quite irrationally. The legal system which is under the control of the ruling class may be seen as questionable since members of the ruling class are shown to be mad or eccentric. The institution of law is satirized through creating a noble judge acting irrationally and absurdly ending up killing himself accidentally. In addition, there is little characterization of the Earl in the prologue because the values he represents are satirized as a Menippean satire which deals with mental attitudes or assumed realities rather than individuals. Through this ridiculous judge, Barnes satirizes aristocracy, law, the privilege of class and empire. Thus, instead of considering the ruling class as privileged because of their blood and showing unquestioned respect for them, a new understanding of the ruling class may be developed. The 13th Earl's actions as representative of the attitudes of the ruling class are shown in absurd, irrational and contradictory situations in order to ridicule the hierarchical class structure in the society, because Barnes uses the notion of class as a general term to portray a social structure based on power and powerlessness, or

the rulers and the ruled ones, in this play. That is why his major characters in this play, as well as in his other plays, are aristocrats, kings, saints, popes, capitalists and government officials.

Another thing that may be learned from the prologue is that the 12th Earl is said to have had eccentric behavior just like the 13th Earl. For instance, the 13th Earl says that his father used to take his bed wherever he went in the world (*RC* 8). The 14th Earl, too, has mad behaviors. Barnes shows that the other earls were also mad and Tucker, who has worked with the Gurney family all his life, says: "This house used to be full of mischief…mischief" (*RC* 8). It is interesting, then, to see that, although they are all mad, they have been governing the country for centuries. One of the reasons for this may be that society privileges the aristocracy and accepts their irrational actions as normal. For instance, Tucker is seen to tie the rope to a hook on the cross-beam and the rope hangs down in a noose. Tucker also asks "May I suggest silk tonight, sir?" (*RC* 9). Tucker accepts this absurd behavior of the 13th Earl as normal. Similarly, the 14th Earl says, "behavior which would be considered insanity in a tradesman is looked on as mild eccentricity in a lord" (*RC* 110).

In addition, as a judge, the 13th Earl makes the law. If he is mad and acts irrationally his law-making and his justice should be questionable. As an example of Menippean satire which questions absolutes in a cynical way, the play problematizes all types of absolutes through these ridiculous characters and their absurd actions. As important institutions governing society are in the monopoly of this class, these institutions may be seen as questionable. Claire's brother is a bishop, her son Dinsdale will have a seat in the House of Commons, Sir Charles rules the business world and Jack will have his place in the House of Lords. Tucker summarizes the situation: "The family. I've seen 'em at work a'fore. They got the power and they made the rules" (*RC* 30). Thus, the family is like a political unit and what gives them this position is the power coming from their noble blood as mentioned by the 13th Earl. They put down the rules and make the law, they decide whether something is rational or irrational, or a crime or not and this suggests that nothing is certain and absolute but all is questionable. A cynical questioning of these institutions through parody, ridicule and

irony without offering any alternative for these institutions is the most important feature that makes the play an example of the tradition of Menippean satire.

The Prologue is followed by Act One which starts with the 13th Earl's funeral. The funeral is conducted by Bishop Lampton (who is Claire's brother). At the funeral, the church organ plays 'The Dead March from Saul', a famous funeral anthem in *Saul*[7] by George Frederic Handel. Then, Bishop Lampton quotes from the Bible during the funeral service. These two events may be considered as examples of metafiction and intertexuality respectively. Therefore, the medley of fact and fiction as a characteristic of Menippean satire may be observed from the beginning of the play. Afterwards, Bishop Lampton and the relatives start to sing a hymn: "All things bright and beautiful. All creatures great and small. All things wise and wonderful, the Lord God made them all. The rich man in his castle, the poor man at his gate. God made them high and lowly, and ordered their estate" (*RC* 15). This is an Anglican hymn included in *Hymns for Little Children* in 1848 by Cecil Frances Alexander. This can also be considered as an example of intertexuality. By referring to this hymn, Barnes ridicules the rigid class system in England in the late 1960s. The church tries to justify superior position of the ruling class in society. According to Bishop Lampton's God, this is the way of the world. However, because Barnes has a cynical approach to this idea he creates another God represented by the 14th Earl, Jack, who claims the equality of all men. Therefore, two conflicting ideologies about the class system in this society are shown in comedic and absurd scenes.

Although religion functions as an organization to justify and consolidate the ideologies of the ruling class rather than providing spiritual relief to people, it is also observed to have lost its importance in society, especially among young people. For instance, when Dinsdale, the son of Sir Charles and Claire, says that he has not understood a single word from the service, Bishop Lampton states "hardly expected you to, young man. It was a Church service" (*RC* 16). The young are generally not interested either in church or in religion. Bishop Lampton is asked for only when he is needed to officiate at a wedding or a funeral service. In addition, although he is a Bishop representing the Church he is created as a weak character, and there are many scenes where Bishop Lampton shudders and falls down on the floor exhausted,

especially, when he confronts anything blasphemous as, according to him, he cannot face it. For instance, Jack comes to Gurney's manor in monk's clothing and asks other characters to pray. Peake, the solicitor, says he is a methodist and does not want to join in, but Jack insists. All of them, including Bishop Lampton, pray, without knowing that they are praying to Jack. This serious scene turns into a comic one with Jack declaring that "you are talking directly to God…express your desires freely, don't be afraid, I know them already. For I am the Creator and ruler of the Universe…the God of Love" (*RC* 22). There comes a strangled cry from Bishop Lampton, who slips off his chair and thuds unconscious on to the floor. Because he frequently faints, he is described as the asthmatic Bishop in the play. For instance, he is shown as an imposing figure with his official robes on. He is later described as having shrunk to a "small, bald-headed, asthmatic old man in dog-collar and gaiters" (*RC* 15) after he takes off his robes. Religion is in the clothes not in essence. As a weak man, he does not want to lose his authority and does what is asked of him by the ruling class. For instance, although he does not want to marry Jack and Grace, he does so because Sir Charles asks him to do it. Therefore, Barnes satirizes the church and shows its ineffectiveness and weakness in society through Bishop Lampton who is the highest ranking religious man. There is little characterization of Bishop Lampton, except for his fainting and doing what is asked of him. No other feature of Lampton is shown as a feature of Menippean satire because Menippean satire is interested in the ideas and values represented by the characters, not in the characters as individuals.

In Scene Two, Act One, the fictional time and place are given as the seventeenth century and the large drawing room of Gurney Manor. Although the fictional time is said to be the seventeenth century, there are many references to the nineteenth century and the second half of the twentieth century throughout the play. For instance, Claire is described as being on the sofa with a long black cigarette holder and Dinsdale is lounging on the arm of the sofa while his father stands stiffly apart. These behaviors from a woman and a son would not have been approved of in the seventeenth century. There are also references to Edward Heath, who was Prime Minister of England between 1970-1974, as well as to World War I, a Victorian street and to Jack the Ripper who lived in the nineteenth century. In addition, there are many modern references, ranging from modern songs to modern literary works. There might,

therefore, be three possible reasons for the playwright's claim that the setting is the seventeenth century: Firstly, *The Ruling Class* was licensed at the end of 1967 when there was still censorship in theaters in the UK, before its abolition on 26 September 1968. The playwright was asked for about sixty cuts. The cuts referred to 'the God of the Upright testicle' and 'the Penis-Christ' and 'having intercourse with Princess Margaret'. Barnes' play was eventually licensed at the end of December, two months after it had been submitted. The full text was performed at the Piccadilly Theatre in March 1969. According to the Lord Chamberlain, "Barnes would have us believe that all privileged persons are racked by every kind of perverse desires, and the play is indeed both vitriolic and funny about the British elite" (Nicholson 251).

The second reason for claiming that it is the seventeenth century might be the reaction of the audience, as there are criticisms of the ruling class, working class and religion. The last possible reason might be the playwright's aim of making the play universal instead of limiting it to 1960s England by referring to 1960s England. Barnes may have wished to show that the class divide among did not only exist in the seventeenth century but has always been present. The conflation of the seventeenth, the nineteenth and the twentieth centuries may be considered as another characteristic of Menippean satire, since the genre mingles three different historical periods to show that the system based on the hierarchy between the ruling class and the ruled one has been present for centuries. Besides, when Barnes is asked about the reason for using anachronisms he explains that he uses them to prevent people being immersed in the history of a particular time as he wants to remind them it is also all relevant to their time. Barnes employs the modern quotes in his plays to create an alienation effect: "People must not get too immersed in the thing, you've got to bring them out from time to time…They are not to think it's like a photographic reproduction of those times. They mustn't be allowed to look down on them and say, 'Ah well, this doesn't concern us, that was then' Because that would be absolutely counter to what one was trying to do" (Hennessy 124). Following Menippean tradition, Barnes wants the audience to be aware that the institutions of religion and class have been corrupted.

After the funeral, the will of the late Earl is read by a solicitor. The late Earl leaves twenty thousand pounds to Tucker free of duty and leaves the estate to his son

Jack. Before learning he has been left this sum of money, Tucker behaves like a normal butler. However, after he learns of this bequest, he dances and enters the room with his cigar and announces the arrival of Jack. He also deliberately drops a large hall vase on the floor to attract the attention of the family members. With the coming of Jack, Tucker becomes outspoken as he behaves as an equal of Jack, and this being quite different from traditional butlers, he creates comicality to provoke the other characters or the ideas represented by them. This is achieved with the Menippean carnivalesque quality of the play, which has a dialogic structure allowing Tucker to share his ideas openly. Thus, the distance between people disappears and a free and familiar contact emerges. The scenes in which Tucker appears are comic and also important because his actions challenge the hierarchy between the ruling class and the ruled one. For instance, Sir Charles says: "Can't say I'm the sensitive type, but the strain of the last few months is beginning to tell. I think it's best all round if Jack were put away" (*RC* 78). Tucker replies to this by saying: "I think it's best all round if the whole bloody lot of you were put away" (*RC* 78). He refers to Charles and the ruling class and Tucker degrades the ruling class family. Similarly, when Dinsdale sees Jack who is sleeping on the cross he gives a cry of fright and spills some tea. Tucker reprimands Dinsdale by saying "now look what you've done. (Wipes carpet with foot.) Never get tea-stains out. Show some consideration" (*RC* 33). Tucker reprimands Dinsdale, although cleaning is a job that a servant should do without objecting to it.

Although Tucker has inherited twenty thousand pounds from the 13th Earl, he does not leave his post. Obviously, a butler with twenty thousand pounds may be considered as an example of the contradictory and oxymoronic juxtapositions used in Menippean satire. Barnes states: "That's this country. We are a nation of servants, it's the one thing we do well, produce waiters and valets and servants, and we've always been that way, we're very servile. How else could we have had a conservative government for thirteen years?" (qtd. in Dukore 1). Thus, Barnes satirizes the English habit of servility through Tucker. If there were not a ruled class there would not be a ruling class, as authority needs obedience and perpetuation of the status quo. Barnes defines himself as a socialist and considers the unresponsiveness of people to the existing system in society about the class hierarchy as servility. Barnes sees his nation

as a nation of ruled ones and explains his disappointment with the left and his country's habit of servility as follows:

> I didn't understand that a socialist government is an aberration in this country and that the form of government that the people like is conservative - that they're happy if choices are made for them and they're told what to do...every step forward has to be fought for to remain a part of our lives. I didn't understand that the slippage backwards into a society of selfishness, greed, envy, could be so quick and so thorough. (qtd. in Barker 6)

Tucker, as Barnes's mouthpiece about this subject, continues his speech: "You get into the habit of serving. Born a servant, see, son of a servant. Family of servants. From a nation of servants. Very first thing an Englishman does, straight from his mother's womb is touch his forelock That's how they can tell the wrinkled little bastard's English…I know my history. Masters and servants, that's the way of it" (*RC* 31). Tucker blames English people for being servants willingly. As a servant, he sees that history has always consisted of masters and servants. Barnes deals with the class issue by merging post-war disillusionment with a strong class consciousness because, although by the end of the 1950s, there was post-war affluence, unity and a classless society in Britain under the Tory government, Barnes does not seem to believe them. He explains: "Class hatred's there because class is a total force in England, and in a different way in most western societies…you don't get rid of it any other way than by attacking it" (qtd. in Dukore 110-11). Thus, as a Menippean satirist, Barnes uses the stage to protest and reveal the true nature of English society's values and institutions which are shown as corrupted. However, he uses the notion of class as a general term to portray a social structure based on power and powerlessness.

However, although Tucker is right in his criticism about the system he is also shown as responsible for the existing system, for he keeps working willingly even though he has the money to leave work. This shows him as ridiculous and makes his criticism ineffective. Tucker is aware of this because he says that "a lot yer don't know

about Daniel Tucker. Just old faithful Tucker. Give doggy boney. Just 'ere for comic relief" (*RC* 31). This may be considered as an example of metafiction. As a character, he knows his function in the play which is to create comic relief. Therefore, the speech of Tucker is comic and political at the same time and he talks to the audience breaking the hierarchy between fact and fiction as a Menippean satire. Then, Tucker continues his speech, "Know who I really am? Alexei Kronstadt. Number 243. Anarchist-Trotskyist-Communist-Revolutionary. I'm a cell! All these years I've been working for the Revolution, spitting in the hot soup, peeing on the Wedgwood dinner plates" (*RC* 31). Tucker claims that he is a Communist agent who has worked for the Revolution for years. However, when he says he spits in the hot soup or pees on the Wedgwood[8] dinner plates for the Revolution, he loses his credibility. Far from being a communist agent, he turns into a clown again. Moreover, Tucker is shown as a hypocrite if he works for the Gurney family but is actually a Communist agent spitting in the family's soup and urinating on their Wedgwood dinner plates. Tucker considers himself as working for the Revolution by urinating on the plates, as these plates are expensive and used by the ruling-class families. Barnes satirizes the ruling class by the ridiculous and irrational actions of the 13th Earl in the Prologue and he satirizes the working-class people by the ridiculous and hypocritical actions of Tucker. Therefore, it may be claimed that the working class and upper class-ideologies are questioned and ridiculed but they are not replaced by any alternative ideology in the play. Barnes takes the prevailing ideologies and crushes them as a Menippean satirist.

In Scene Three, Act One, Dr. Herder diagnoses Jack as a paranoid-schizophrenic. Sir Charles responds: "But he's a Gurney" (*RC* 23). Dr. Herder replies: "Then, he's a paranoid-schizophrenic-Gurney who believes he's God" (*RC* 23). Sir Charles states: "But we've always been Church of England" (*RC* 23). This dialogue between an English noble and a Jewish German doctor is very interesting in the sense that their prejudices about the world affect their responses to the events. Jack is simply insane according to the doctor, but because Jack is a Gurney, a noble Englishman, he cannot be blunt with Sir Charles. In addition, Barnes relates organized religion to law and to the ruling class. The dialogue becomes even more interesting when Dr. Herder continues: "The Earl's suffering from delusions of grandeur. In reality he's an Earl, an English aristocrat, a peer of the realm, a member of the ruling class. Naturally, he's

come to believe there's only one person grander than that- the Lord God Almighty Himself" (*RC* 24). Upon this, Sir Charles asks Dr. Herder if he is English or not and he says 'ahh' when Dr. Herder answers no. Obviously, Barnes ridicules the concept of 'Englishness', as English people felt themselves superior to other nations in the twentieth century. However, Britain is no longer an empire in the second half of the twentieth century. Although there were attempts to restore the sinking prestige of Britain, it is seen as a decadent country in the 1960s. Barnes equates the Earl seeing himself as God to the grander delusions of the English people feeling themselves to be leaders of the world.

Jack becomes ridiculous when he insists on being the God of Love. For instance, in Scene Four, Act One, when Jack talks to the family members, he says Lord Jesus is within himself to cure the sick. He states:

> I am that Lord Jesus come again in my body to save the sick, the troubled, the ignorant. I am He that liveth and behold I am alive for everyone. (Opens his arms mimicking American nightclub entertainer Ted Lewis) Is everybody happy? Now hear this, I come to proclaim the new Dispensation. The Gospel Dispensation promised only salvation for the soul, my new Dispensation of Love gives it to the body as well. J. Christ Mark I suffered to redeem the spirit and left the body separated from God, so Satan found a place in man, and formed in him a false consciousness, a false love, a love of self. EXPLODE only FEEL, LOVE, and sin no more. (*RC* 25)

On the one hand, Jack claims that he is the God of Love and Jesus Christ and, on the other hand, he mimics American nightclub entertainer Ted Lewis, thus elevating Ted Lewis to the same level as Christ. This sacred and profane juxtaposition may be considered as an example of Menippean satire. In addition, Jack's equating himself as God with an American entertainer may be considered a comment on America's rise as a world leader. America becomes a world power after England loses her power,

especially during the second half of the twentieth century. Thus, America starts to rule the world and takes up a God-like position. Another important thing in this speech is the emphasis on the body or physicality, which reflects the spirit of the liberated 1960s. Barnes's play brings the bodily realm back. With the sexual revolution which took place in 1963, attitudes towards sex changed. For instance, sex before marriage was prohibited before 1963. Jack as the God of Love recommends having sex and praises the body. His recommendation about sex as Jesus Christ may be considered as another example of medley that is sacred and sexual, with the aim of deflating the hierarchy between physical and spiritual. Through these medleys, the play aims to deflate the conventions regarding religion and the norms regarding sex in the society, as a further example of Menippean satire.

When Claire asks how he knows he is God, Jack answers: "When I pray to Him I find I'm talking to myself" (*RC* 26). This answer is both comic and political at the same time because it defies the authority, that is, God, as an example of Menippean satire. Another interesting thing about this sentence is that language is shown as an unreliable tool because it misleads Jack to believe that he is God. This is another feature of Menippean satire which takes a cynical approach to everything, including language. Next, Claire wants to know how this was revealed to him. Jack answers as follows: "Like every prophet I saw visions, heard voices. I ran but the voices of St. Francis[9], Socrates[10], General Gordon[11], and Tim O'Leary[12] the Jewish Buddha all told me I was God. Pretty reliable witnesses" (*RC* 26). Jack creates an absurd and comic scene by naming these famous people as witnesses to his being God. In a sense, he brings these people to the same level with himself. In addition, it is implied that not everything suggested or uttered by these famous people is true. Instead of taking what they uttered and did for granted they might be questionable. The play refers to religious and literary figures in a comic way because, as a Menippean satire, it takes a cynical approach to them. Jack continues his explanation: "I heard with my outward ear a terrible thunder clap and I saw a great body of light like the light from the sun and red as fire, in the form of a drum…I cried out, Lord what will you do?...And I saw the distinction, diversity, variety, all clearly rolled up into the unity of Universal Love…All this happened outside the public urinal" (*RC* 26). Jack declares himself God because he realizes that he is talking to himself when he cries out, "Lord what

will you do". He actually seems to be rational in his inference, which shows that rationality may not be considered as a criterion for sanity. There is a specific concept of sanity in the ruling class. The ruling class determines that one is sane or insane according to the extent one can fit to the norms of the ruling class. For instance, Jack is labeled as mad in the first act while he is found to be sane in the second act, although he is the same person in both acts. Thus, the notion of normalcy is problematized by Barnes. In addition, Jack receives his revelation of God on 25 August when mad Ludwig of Bavaria[13] was born and Barnes accepts that he knew the date (Dukore 14).

Another interesting thing about Jack's explanation is the place where his being God is revealed to him. It is outside the public urinal, which creates comedy, created by the medley of sacred and profane. Profanity is used in order to degrade the idea of a miraculous revelation. Carnivalizing a text in this way is another feature which makes the play an example of Menippean satire, thus, creates a text without hierarchies. Therefore, the high, the revelation that Jack is God, and the low, outside a public urinal, is used side by side so that the hierarchy between the spiritual and the profane is wiped out. Claire then asks what it feels like to be God. Jack responds: "Like a river flowing over everything. I pick up a newspaper and I'm everywhere, conducting a Summit Conference, dying of hunger in a Peruvian gutter, accepting the Nobel Prize for Literature, raping a nun in Sumatra" (*RC* 26). This quotation reflects the spirit of the 1960s because art and politics were at their pinnacles in that period as art took the place of religion. With the decline of the importance of religion in society and with the release of the arts from moral austerity and secularisation, the importance of the arts increased, and new artistic forms and challenges to censorship and traditional values were achieved with experimentation in the arts (Bartie 3). In terms of politics, the 1960s were very problematic with rebellion in the form of opposition to the Vietnam War, the Prague Spring, and fierce battles during the Democratic Convention in Chicago, student revolts, and student protests and sit-ins in a number of British universities, such as Leeds, the LSE and Sussex. As God, Jack should help the poor who are dying of hunger in a Peruvian gutter. However, he rapes a nun who worships him and, with this act, Jack defiles religion and Barnes shows the corruption in religion. Barnes reflects the concerns of the day when he applies the Menippean tradition to the ideological concerns of the day.

Claire refuses to believe Jack is God as she does not think that God would be as ridiculous as Jack is. Upon hearing this, Jack states: "The prophet Ezekiel lay three hundred days on his left side and forty days on his right. He cut his hair and divided it into three parts. The first part he burnt, the second he chopped into pieces, the third he scattered into the wind. Ridiculous, mad, certifiable. It was all merely a sign of something more important. God teaches by signs as well as words" (*RC* 42). The acts that the prophet Ezekiel[14] performs are ordered by God, according to the book of *Ezekiel* 5:5-1. Thus, God may indeed be seen to be ridiculous as Jack. In addition, Jack is right when he says that if these actions done by the prophet Ezekiel were done by an ordinary person he would be seen as mad. This may provide a new outlook on religion and God. That is, the audience may develop a questioning approach to God and religion instead of taking them as absolutes. In addition, the criteria for sanity and insanity become problematized once more. Jack makes a rational argument about what he says but he is still called mad. Therefore, rationality may not be considered as a criterion for madness. As an example of Menippean satire, the play allows the audience to re-evaluate their ideas about religion rather than accepting it as unquestionable.

In addition, Jack as the God of Love embraces different religions. For instance, although he represents the Anglican Church Jack refuses to drink by saying "not during Yom Kippur" (*RC* 30). Yom Kippur, or the Day of Atonement, is the most solemn religious fast of the Jewish year in Judaism. There are references to many religious events and different religions in the play but Barnes does not create a hierarchy among them, which enhances the carnivalesque quality of the play. In addition, because Barnes is not interested in religion or afterlife, he shows all of them to be on the same level by implying that all of them have similar stories. It is also interesting to see that, although there is only one God represented by Jack, there are many religions, which may leave the audience with questions to answer. The play does not represent any of them as the right or a superior religion and Jack refers and adapts all of them in a ridiculous way as required by Menippean satire, representing all different ideologies as ridiculous without offering an alternative to them.

Furthermore, when Jack insists that he is not Jack and he is the God of Love, Dinsdale asks him to show his Godhead. Jack immediately starts to unzip his flies.

Then, Dinsdale explains that he means a miracle. Jack shows his hand and says that that is a miracle. However, Dinsdale does not accept this and so Jack states: "You see ten billion million miracles a day, yet you want your conjuring tricks, your pretty film-flams, from the incense burners. I can't raise Lazarus again, he's decomposed, so bring me that table" (*RC* 43). Jack says he cannot raise Lazarus because he is decomposed, as it has been centuries after Lazarus[15] died. He implies in a comic way that his power as God is limited, and here there might be a criticism of people's superstitions about religions. Jack is correct in claiming that a hand is a miracle, but Dinsdale wants to see supernatural things. When Jack claims that he can raise the table ten feet through the power of love, Dinsdale accepts this as a miracle. When compared with a hand, raising a table is seen by Dinsdale to be more miraculous. From this perspective, Jack may be seen to be more normal than Dinsdale. However, because the ruling class decides about normalcy, Jack is seen as mad and this gives the audience an opportunity to question the values decided by the authorities, as an example of a Menippean satire. Except for Tucker, nobody sees that table is raised. Tucker says "Ahhh! Look, I see it! Up there! (He lurches forward, grasping a half-empty whisky decanter.) Sh-miracle, sh-miracle, hallelujah sh-miracle. Praise the Lord and pass t' ammunition" (*RC* 43). This miracle is disputable because only Tucker claims that the table is raised. Yet, everything is possible in Jack's carnivalesque world because every rule of ordinary serious life is suspended.

Barnes employs madness to question the idea of a rigid class structure which is seen as normal by the ruling class. Because Jack cannot find equality in this class-conscious society he creates an alternative world in which the laws, prohibitions, and restrictions determining the structure and order of the ordinary world are suspended. As a result, Jack is diagnosed as schizophrenic. In order to challenge this assumed idea about hierarchical class structure, Jack is put into absurd situations. For instance, Jack sleeps on a cross and he talks to animals and plants in his garden. These absurdities and the mixture of incompatible elements such as sacred, profane, fantastical, serious and comical are used in order to test social, religious and political dogmas in a carnivalesque atmosphere as a Menippean satire. For instance, Jack suggests equality for all men and love for one another by stating: "The axe must be laid to the root. Pomp and riches, pride and property will have to be lopped off. All men are brothers. Love

makes all equal. The mighty must bow down before the pricks of the louse-ridden rogues" (*RC* 28). What Jack suggests is radical and a challenge for his class. For instance, Sir Charles says trembling with rage: "Bowing before rogues…destroying property…all men equal…My God he's not only mad, he's Bolshie!" (*RC* 29). Thus, Sir Charles is irritated much more by the idea of the equality of all men than he is that Jack has declared himself God.

As an example of Menippean satire, the play does not intend to give a moral lesson at the end. What it aims to do is to provoke a cynical questioning about all types of absolutes. Although Jack says such a sensible thing about the equality of all men, he also acts in a foolish way from time to time. For instance, he asks, "could a rooster forget he was a rooster and lay an egg?" (*RC* 19). Two explanations may be suggested for this. Firstly, people might react to what Jack says about class and religion, and Barnes can avoid the audience deciding that Jack is mad. Secondly, the audience is left in an ambiguous situation about Jack's mental condition. They cannot decide whether Jack is sane or insane. This questioning even lasts after the play ends. Another interesting thing about Jack's statement about equality for all people is that he refers to the lower class negativity as "the pricks of the louse-ridden rogues" (*RC* 28). In a way, he sabotages what he mentions which shows both his ruling class attitude and it also foreshadows that equality for all men will not be achieved. In addition, when Jack is crucified on a wooden cross Tucker goes to the cross and asks Jack if he wants tea or not. Jack wants tea. Upon this, Tucker asks "Yes, sir. Shall I bring it up?" (*RC* 30), and Jack replies "No thanks. I'll be right down" (*RC* 30). Although Jack says everybody is equal he lets Tucker serve him. His aristocratic nature leads him to behave in this way. Therefore, the ideas about social equality and the abolition of property are subverted. This may also be considered as another example of Menippean satire. According to Relihan, Menippean satire is a continuous narrative that resembles a fantastic voyage mocking not only the traveler who is after the truth but also the world which is the traveler's target (*RC* 9). Thus, Jack who asks for equality of all men in his society lets Tucker serve him. Both Jack, who is after the equality of all men, and his world, the ruling class, are mocked as an example of Menippean satire.

Moreover, the fact that Jack sleeps on the cross is a grotesque scene, but because all the rules are suspended anything can happen as if it is normal in Jack's world. Interestingly enough, this behavior is not found odd by Tucker. For instance, when Dr. Herder asks Tucker if he finds Jack odd or not, Tucker replies: "Yes, he's a nut-case all right, but then so are most of these titled flea-bags. Rich nobs and privileged arse-holes can afford to be bonkers. Living in a dream world, aren't they, sir? Don't know what time o'day it is. Life's made too easy for'em. Don't have to earn a living so they can do just what they want. Most of us'd look pretty cracked if we went round doing just what we wanted to, eh, sir?" (*RC* 41). Tucker means that the notion of normalcy changes according to class and as the ruling class decides norms and conventions, norms and conventions may also be challenged. This is the reason why Menippean satire uses psychological abnormalities like madness; they are used to challenge the hierarchy between normalcy and madness, and sanity and insanity. Thus, if everything is questionable nothing is certain, which makes everything equally right or wrong. Nothing is superior to anything else. All types of absolutes, then, may be rejected.

Sir Charles asks Jack to sign some papers. After Jack signs them, Sir Charles gets angry because he reads: "I the undersigned…Mycroft Holmes? Who's Mycroft Holmes?" (*RC* 29). Tucker answers that he is the "brother of Sherlock Holmes, illiterate oaf!" (*RC* 29). Tucker as a butler reprimands Sir Charles for being illiterate, which is comic and may be political as Tucker poses a challenge to the ruling class by implying that he is more knowledgeable than Sir Charles. Sir Charles gets angry by saying that 14th Earl's name was Jack. In reply to that, Jack tells: "Never call me that! Jack's a word I reject absolutely. It's a word I put into my galvanized pressure-cooker….Jack's dead! It's my old shell-name- sham name" (*RC* 29). Jack rejects his name because it means a world without love to him. Therefore, by rejecting his name he rejects that world. That is why, he adopts many names for himself including God, Jesus Christ and Mycroft Holmes among them. Instead of the world of Jack, he wants to have a new world that is the opposite of that of Jack. In this new world, Jack even has compassion for animals and plants as well as for people. For instance, he states: "What a beautiful day I've made. Look-Soft Thistle and Nigella. My sweet poetics. (Ear to imaginary flower.) What? No water in days. I can't be expected to think of

everything. I'll see to it...(Stretching out hand.) Ah, Mr. Grasshopper, of course I bless you, my chirrup" (*RC* 30). However, for the other members of the ruling class, equality is not acceptable as their world is based on the norms, conventions and hierarchy between the rulers and the ruled ones. That is why, the ruling class labels mad those who do not obey these norms.

In the following scene, Act one, Scene Six, two women named Mrs. Treadwell and Mrs. Piggot-Jones visit Jack. They want him to make a speech about England. Upon this, he says: "Britain is an imaginary island off the continent of Europe, covering 93,982 square miles, with a population of over 52 million, lying in a westerly wind belt. A fly-blown speck in the North Sea, a country of cosmic unimportance in my sight" (*RC* 36). In contrast to his father the 13th Earl, England does not mean 'a precious stone set in a silver sea' to Jack who sees everybody as equal and England as an ordinary state in the world. Then, Jack sings to the two women: "…You can pass many a class whether you're dumb or wise. If you all answer the call, when your professor cries…" (*RC* 34). Suddenly, the two women and Tucker join Jack and they sing and dance: "Everybody down on the heels, up on the toes, stay after school, learn how it goes: Everybody do the Varsity…Everybody do the Varsity…" (*RC* 35). They finish in a line downstage, arms outstretched to the audience, puzzled. In the serious atmosphere, they suddenly start to dance, a meddling of narrative styles which enhances the carnivalesque quality of the play. The lyrics of the song also support the thematic lines. The lyrics emphasize the obedience to authority as it says that one can pass the exams if she/he answers the professor's call to go down on her/his heels, up on her/his toes, and so forth.

In addition, the clothes of the women and their hats are grotesque because there is waxed fruit on the tops of their hats. Jack takes some imitation wax grapes from Mrs. Treadwell's hat and eats them. Mrs. Treadwell and Mrs. Piggot-Jones become irritated at Jack's behavior and want to leave the house. As they are leaving Jack asks them "can you love?" (*RC* 36) and Mrs. Treadwell protests that she is a married woman. Jack continues to suggest to them to love one another but they are frightened by that. For instance, Mrs. Piggot-Jones reacts by saying: "Stay back! My husband is a Master of Hounds!" (*RC* 37). By saying this, Mrs. Piggot-Jones shows her husband

to be an important person. The two women's reactions to Jack's suggestion to love one another are ridiculous. It may be claimed that there is no room for love in the world of the lower class. This is true for the other characters from the lower class as well. For instance, Tucker and Grace do not love anybody and, when Jack explains that Tucker does not leave work after receiving money because he loves the family Sir Charles does not take it seriously, answering "Love? Tucker? Rot" (*RC* 27). There is no room for love in the world of the upper class either. For instance, Claire does not love her husband, Charles. Charles does not love Claire and he has a mistress, Grace, but he does not love her either. He also tells his son that Dinsdale is a disappointment (*RC* 37). The only character who has the capacity for love is Jack and he is considered to be insane. Because the ruling class is conservative in their morals and sticks to their established values they regard the ideas about love as inappropriate and a sign of madness. As a satirist, Barnes illustrates the world of these characters both from the lower class and from the upper class as being without love in a ridiculous way.

After the two women leave, Sir Charles wants Jack to marry and have an heir so that Sir Charles can certify Jack as mad and Sir Charles can run the estate. However, Sir Charles is surprised when Jack says that he cannot marry for a second time. Jack continues by saying that he married a woman on August 28th in 1961, and her name was Marguerite Gautier in fact, she is the main character in *The Lady of the Camellias*[16] (1848) by Alexander Dumas. According to Dr. Herder, because she is a martyr to love, Marguerite is the only person Jack relies on (*RC* 40). Dinsdale brings the book *The Lady of the Camellias* and explains "But I've shown you it's in here. *The Lady of Camelias* by Alexander Dumas. Camille. The opera by *Verdi La Traviata*. Same woman. A figure of romance" (*RC* 41). Dinsdale tries to prove that Marguerite is a fictional character, not as real as himself. Claire also says "No wife. She does not exist. She's fiction. Part of a play. She's not flesh and blood. Not real" (*RC* 44). This may be considered as an example of self-parody because Claire does not exist and is a character in this play by Barnes. Neither she nor Marguerite are real. Barnes makes a self-parody by implying that all the characters in this play are fictional. He ridicules himself by implying that all he is writing is fiction that is not real. By undermining the characters in the play as fictional, he also undermines what they have mentioned so far. Self-parody is employed as one of the characteristics of Menippean satire in the

play in order to break the hierarchy between real and fiction. This also enhances the carnivalesque quality of the play as there is no border between real and fictional in a carnivalesque scene.

As his family cannot persuade Jack that Marguerite does not exist, Sir Charles prepares Grace, his mistress, as Marguerite. While the family members are discussing how Marguerite is fictional, there comes the sound of a woman singing "go diam fie—ga-ca-e-ra-pi-do-e il gan dio dell 'a-mo-re…' (*RC* 44). They look towards the doorway and see *The Lady of the Camellias* standing upstage centre singing the 'Drinking Song' from *La Traviata*: "Eun fior che na-sce e muo-re, ne, piu si puv go-der-Go-diam c-In-vi-ta, c'in-vi-taun, fervi do-ae-cen-to-la-sin-gheer…" (*RC* 44). Jack cries 'Marguerite'. This scene is a typical Menippean scene in which there is a mingling of fact and fiction; of two languages, Italian and English; and, of two narrative styles, prose and poem. There is also intertexuality, with references to *The Lady of the Camellias* and to *La Traviata*. In addition, Sir Charles states: "I phoned Grace and explained the position. She got dressed up in some theatrical togs and came down. Put me on a first-rate show, I thought" (*RC* 45). Grace as a character in the play by Barnes performs another fictional character on the stage, which can be considered as an example of metatheatre. Therefore, Barnes creates a playful narrative style as a result of having a carnivalesque atmosphere in the play through making use of medley, intertexuality, and metatheatre as an example of Menippean satire. Another interesting feature of this scene is that while the characters are discussing the fact that Marguerite does not exist, she suddenly appears in front of them, as Menippean satire uses "abrupt transitions and shifts, ups and downs, rises and falls, unexpected comings together of distant and disunited things, mésalliances of all sorts" (*PDP* 117).

Moreover, parody, another Menippean feature, is employed in this scene. Although Marguerite sacrifices herself for her love, Grace is not interested in love in her marriage with Jack. She does not devote herself to love at all as she is only interested in acquiring the Gurney name. At the end, she and Marguerite both die. Marguerite dies because she is sick, Grace is killed by Jack. Thus, the love story of Marguerite which is full of sacrifices is parodied in the play, in order to show that there is no room for love in this society as Grace is shown as being incapable of loving. In

this society, family is not based on love but only by a desire to continue the family name, and thus, maintaining their power. For instance, Sir Charles says about the 13th Earl that "he understood his duty to the family. Had to start breeding again" (*RC* 17). Claire is also anxious for an heir for the family by insisting that "the Gurneys must have an heir" (56). After the christening of her son, Grace states that the baby "saved Gurneys from becoming extinct" (*RC* 77). Unlike the other characters, Jack insists on love. Dr. Herder says that, because Jack is not loved or shown love by his family, he wants people to "love goodness". Jack thinks that to love goodness means to love God, and to love God means to love Jack. This is the reason why he considers himself as God and rejects being called Jack. When Jack accepts being called Jack it will be a step towards sanity, according to Dr. Herder (*RC* 40).

Afterwards, Sir Charles asks Claire to occupy Dr. Herder while he, Sir Charles, is getting Grace married and pregnant. Claire makes love with Dr. Herder to make sure that he will not object to the marriage between Jack and Grace. Claire does not hesitate to exploit Dr. Herder as she does not regard him as a member of the family. He is the 'other', being a German Jewish person. Although Sir Charles tells Grace how fond he is of her, he arranges a marriage between her and Jack. Thus, the ruling class members are shown as degenerate, immoral and hypocritical. They exploit people who are not from the ruling class. As soon as they are finished with these people they dispense with them easily. For instance, Sir Charles says that Jack will not be the only person to say goodbye, implying Grace, after Jack has an heir. After having performed her role by providing a son she is killed by Jack in the epilogue.

Grace continues to act as if she were Marguerite. She and Jack are talking in the garden. Jack speaks in French and German but Grace does not understand him. Then, they flap their arms and hop like birds, uttering meaningless animal sounds. It is interesting to see that they cannot understand each other through language, but they can understand each other by acting like animals. This shows the distrust in language, which is one of the features of Menippean satire. Menippean satire comes from cynical roots and is suspicious about everything including language, which explains the use of unconventional discourse in Menippean satire. In addition, Grace says "I'll bet even Ludovic Koch wasn't made love to with bird cries" (*RC* 48). Referring to Ludovic

Koch[17] may be another example for metafiction to blur the border between fact and fiction.

In the garden, Grace asks for a white wedding and Jack agrees at once. Upon this, Grace says he deserves a big kiss but Jack opposes this by stating: “Not here in the garden. Last time I was kissed in a garden it turned out rather awkward” (*RC* 49). When Grace says that Judas[18] was a man, Jack nods and tells her it was a strange business. Judas is known as a betrayer and infamous for his kiss. According to the Synoptic Gospels, Judas tells the soldiers: “The one I will kiss is the man; arrest him and lead him away under guard” (Mark 14:44). One of the possible motivations of Judas for betraying his master is greed. It is written that: “Then one of the twelve, who was called Judas Iscariot, went to the chief priests and said, 'What will you give me if I betray him to you?' They paid him thirty pieces of silver. And from that moment he began to look for an opportunity to betray him” (Matthew 26: 14-16). John Ruskin, a Victorian art critic, writes about Judas as follows: “We do great injustice to Iscariot, in thinking him wicked above all common wickedness. He was only a common money-lover, and, like all money-lovers, did not understand Christ, could not make out the worth of Him, or meaning of Him…Judas was a common, selfish, muddle-headed, pilfering fellow; his hand always in the bag of the poor, not caring for them” (Ruskin 44). Although Judas witnesses the miracles of Jesus he still betrays him for money. In this sense, there is a similarity between him and Grace, because Grace is greedy and only interested in material things. For instance, she says that she will go to shopping centers after marrying with Jack. Moreover, when Dr. Herder asks Grace what she thinks about Jack being committed to a mental hospital she cannot decide what to say. She is afraid that Jack might regret having married her when he turns out to be normal. Thus, she wants to get rid of Jack but remain a member of the ruling class. She betrays Jack in a way, although Jack seems to be fond of her. Therefore, Barnes takes this religious story about one of the disciples of Jesus Christ and equates him with a prostitute. Barnes may imply that both Judas and Grace are greedy and their greedy natures lead them to act in an irrational and absurd way.

When Grace leaves the garden, Dinsdale comes to warn Jack about Grace by saying that she is not Marguerite but a close friend of his father. Jack gets angry with

Dinsdale and replies, bending at his knees, "Stop! You're making me a crippled dwarf, a deformed midget, a crippled newt!" (*RC* 50). His actions become absurd and irrational and his speech turns meaningless. For instance, he says that Dinsdale's negative 'insinuendo' reduces him to half-size. He explains 'insinuendo' as 'insinuation towards innuendo', caused because of increased negativism. He continues to act absurdly by breaking his glasses and putting half the frame over one eye. As a Menippean satire, the play makes use of grotesque elements in this scene. Jack's body is shown as grotesque, that is, 'unfinished' and 'deformed', in order to break the idealized notions of aesthetic and beauty. Beside grotesque bodily features, Jack's actions are also grotesque, both of which undermine the classical concepts of beauty and normalcy constructed by the ruling class. Thus, the narrative structure of the play may be claimed to be loosely organized, in the sense that it becomes often absurd and unpredictable without having a strict sense of causality and linearity. This is another feature that makes the play an example of Menippean satire.

Disndale is not the only person who opposes the marriage of Jack and Grace. For instance, in Act One, Scene Ten, Bishop Lampton also opposes their marriage when he learns that Grace is an actress. Bishop Lampton opines that "God in his infinite wisdom has clouded our nephew's senses. But it can only be temporary. I take it as a sure sign of hope that his delusions are at least of a religious nature" (*RC* 52). Bishop Lampton is shown to be a shallow person with this comment upon Jack's madness. He does not understand Jack's claims to be God and Jesus Christ as undermining religion, but as a good sign. As a Menippean satire, the play shows him to be ridiculous as a religious figure in authority. Sir Charles easily persuades Bishop Lampton to perform the wedding ceremony by saying that he cannot wait on God's mercy (*RC* 53). Thus, the ruling class exploits religion to maintain their power. Sir Charles does everything for the marriage of Jack and Grace. Upon this, Dr. Herder comments: "Sometimes it's very easy to forget that outside this comedy Sir Charles occupies a position of responsibility and power" (*RC* 53). Saying 'outside this comedy' is another example for metafictional quality of the play as a Menippean satire. Dr. Herder sees Sir Charles playing a role in a comedy, which is true as Sir Charles is indeed a character in this comedy by Barnes.

During the marriage ceremony, Bishop Lampton says, looking up warningly, "therefore if anyone can show just cause why they may not be lawfully joined together, let him now speak, or else hereafter forever hold his peace" (*RC* 57). Claire, Dinsdale and Sir Charles stare deliberately at the audience. Because Barnes does not want the audience to be immersed in the play, he breaks the illusion from time to time because, as a satirist, Barnes aims to make the audience aware of the follies and corruptions prevalent in society. By doing that, he also challenges the distance and the hierarchy between the audience and the players on the stage. All of them meet on the same level. Seeing that there is no reaction from the audience, Tucker comments: "Load o'British jelly-meat whiskers! Stand up on your tea-soaked haunches and stop it. Piddling, half-dead helots" (*RC* 57). Sir Charles warns him to be respectful and Tucker says: "I'm always respectful. S'what I'm paid for. No one can say I'm not respectful. (Removes his false teeth.) There" (*RC* 57). Tucker criticizes the audience for being indifferent to what is happening in front of them. His criticism is ironic because he also is indifferent. He has worked for the Gurney family for more than forty years but has no feeling for them. In addition, although he might be right in his criticism of the audience he loses his credibility because he is almost always drunk. He is shown to be ridiculous when he removes his false teeth. That is why Tucker's statements are not seen as resistance but as comic and disturbing. As a Menippean satirist, Barnes portrays all of his characters as equal by giving them opportunities to represent their ideas. All of his characters are faulty and none of them is superior to another as the aim of the play, as an example of Menippean satire, is to show that nobody or no idea is superior to another in society. When Menippean satire criticizes a person as a representative of an idea it does not propose an alternative to replace the idea.

As the wedding ceremony continues Bishop Lampton asks if Jack will love Grace. Jack replies that he will, from the bottom of his soul to the tip of his penis (*RC* 57). The language turns vulgar, sexual and low in a serious and religious context and may be considered as a juxtaposition of the sacred and profane. In addition, the inappropriate word is quite an important characteristic of the menippea "because of its cynical frankness, or because it profanely unmasks a holy thing, or because it crudely violates etiquette" (*PDP* 117). The Bishop asks Jack to repeat after him: "I, J.C., take thee Grace Shelley to my wedded wife" (*RC* 64). Jack substitutes: "I, J.C. the Holy

Flying Roller, the Morning Star, known to his intimates as the Naz, take thee Marguerite, called Grace Shelley because she doesn't speak French" (*RC* 64). This scene of marriage is travesty of the traditional marriage ceremony because the words and actions are deviations from conventional norms of behavior, manners of speech, and etiquette with the purpose of breaking the hierarchy between the high and the low. In addition, Jack refuses to repeat what Bishop Lampton has said and says what he thinks, defying the authority of the highest religious rank in the society.

After this wedding ceremony, there are many references to fictional works. For instance, Jack requests a minute's silence for the dead books of World War I, for Mr. Moto[19], the Cisco Kid[20] and himself. By asking for one minute's silence for himself alongside these two fictional characters, he equates himself with them and this may be considered as another example of metafiction. Jack is of course also a fictional character in this play. Another interesting point in this sentence is that Mr. Moto and the Cisco Kid have two different personas. Mr. Moto is a secret agent described as a formidable man and the Cisco Kid is a serial killer who is responsible for at least eighteen deaths. Jack, as the God of Love, equates himself with these two fictional characters, which may be regarded as a foreshadowing for the second act in which Jack acts 'normal' to influence the other characters but, in private, he thinks of himself as the God of Vengeance and as Jack the Ripper. Thus, Barnes makes use of contemporary popular culture by referring to these characters as well as of classical literature since Menippean satire is a potpourri. For instance, in Jack's three successive speeches, Barnes juxtaposes "William Blake's *Preface to Milton* (Jack is horrified that 'England's green and pleasant' land has abolished the death penalty), Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida* (the social discords that follow the elimination of fear, as Jack says; of degree, as Ulysses says in his speech on order), and Browning's *Pippa Passes* (only with an executioner, according to Jack, does one know that God's in heaven and all's right with the world)" (Dukore 93-94).

Moreover, the marriage of Jack as God of Love and Jesus Christ with Grace as a prostitute may also be considered as a medley of the sacred and the profane. Barnes may mean that there is no difference between an Earl from the ruling class and a prostitute from the lower class. Grace gets married to Jack and has a son so she is a

prostitute who also becomes a wife and a mother. Thus, she may remind the audience of Mary Magdalene who has become a symbol of Christian devotion defined as the repentant prostitute. This religious figure is questioned and ridiculed when she is equated with Grace who is a prostitute and becomes a wife and a mother. Unlike Mary Magdalene, Grace never repents: She is always shallow, voluptuous, and only interested in material things. For instance, she performs a striptease for the audience on her wedding night in Act One, Scene fourteen. She throws her stocking to the audience (*RC* 62), which may break the hierarchy between the players on the stage and the audience. She talks to the audience. She tells them that she has performed many shows from Stanislavski to Strip, which is another metafiction example because, by profession, she is a performer and, as a character, she performs on stage. She thinks of herself as a good performer, so she believes that she will fit into the ruling class easily and all she has to do is to play it cool (*RC* 63). She mimes drinking tea with her finger cocked up and says that she can cock her little finger with the best. The ruling class is here symbolized by cocking a little finger when drinking. This shows the ruling class as shallow and superficial because a prostitute assumes that it is easy to fit in this class if she plays it cool. There is a questioning of the class structure in this scene. That is, if a prostitute can fit easily into the ruling class by cocking her little finger, considering this class as superior will be meaningless.

After Grace has finished her striptease show, Jack comes in on a unicycle and, after he rides around for a while, he has sex with Grace on his wedding night. This scene has a carnivalesque atmosphere because there is the God of Love represented by an Earl on the one hand and there is a striptease actress on the other hand. They get married and they have sex. Therefore, the hierarchy between the high and the low is broken as the carnivalized text is without hierarchies. In addition, staging is described as follows: “Spot fades out. Music swells up. From out of the darkness the beating of giant wings as a great bird hovers overhead, followed by the sound of rain falling heavily” (*RC* 63). Apart from the actions of the characters on the stage, music, sounds of rain and the beating of giant wings are heard, all of which enhance the carnivalesque quality of the play, as a carnivalesque text is structureless. As a Menippean satire, the play makes a cynical questioning of the hierarchy between the high (represented by Jack) and the low (represented by Grace) in a carnivalesque atmosphere in which there

is music, slapstick involving a unicycle, a ridiculing of religion through Jack and sex through Grace's striptease performance.

In addition, after the wedding night, Claire asks Grace if Jack was successful. Grace answers: "If you want to keep kibitzing here, belt up on the snide remarks or you'll find yourself horizontal" (*RC* 65). Claire reminds Grace that she is a prostitute by replying: "Horizontal's more your position than mine, dear" (*RC* 65). These lines are important as they show that the play makes use of ordinary conversation as well as sexual, religious and political content as a carnivalized text. Grace becomes pregnant and Jack wants to call his son Bussay d'Ambois[21] (*RC* 67) as he wants his baby to be virtuous. Bussay d'Ambois is poor at the beginning of the play and he believes that his virtue comes from his poverty. However, the Gurney baby will be born into a rich and privileged world. Thus, Bussay d'Ambois is parodied by the rich and privileged world of Jack's son.

Before his son's birth, Jack is cured by Dr. Herder. Dr. Herder aims to make Jack adjust to the society in which they live and, by doing that, Dr. Herder unknowingly serves the interests of the ruling class. His first attempt to cure Jack with a lie-detector is a failure. Dr. Herder asks Jack if he is God, he grins, says he is not and the machine says he is lying. Science is ridiculed with this experiment as it is shown as ineffective and unreliable. The second experiment to cure Jack, which includes-Sackstead, another mad person who claims himself to be God, is more interesting than the first. Dr. Herder tries to prove that both of them cannot be God as two objects cannot be in the same place at the same time. This was an actual experiment conducted by Dr. Milton Rokeach[22] in 1959. Barnes states that "the more bizarre the fact, the more certain one can be that it happened, sometime, somewhere, to someone…Nothing a writer can imagine is as surrealistic as the reality. Everything has happened. The difficulty is finding the record of it" (Barnes, *Plays I* 122). Therefore, Barnes brings together facts and perceptions of events to form a specifically inclusive and a specific view of reality. In a way, he may be held to pattern "the process called the shock of the familiar" (Kaplan 30). Menippean satire here is defined as "the reexamination, reformulation, and the renaissance of the knowledge and wisdom which have always been the possession of the human race" (Kaplan 30).

Jack calls Sackstead one of the Fu Manchu[23] gang and gestures at the audience. A grotesque scene develops as Jack and Sackstead are discussing which of them is. Jack claims: "You can't touch me. I'm the Rock. (Becomes square, massive.) And the Vibe. (Stretching arms up.) The goat. (Springs into chair, fingers as horns.) The East Wind. (Blows.) The Sacred Bug. (Jumps down, scuttles along.) The Upright Testicle. (Jerks upright.) The Bull" (*RC* 70). As God, Jack speaks in a vulgar and sexual way and also acts in a grotesque way. The scene turns into slapstick with the actions of Jack and Sackstead, and while these two would-be Gods are fighting. They make the audience participate in the play as the jury. In this way, the audience is asked to make a decision at the end. Sackstead claims that he is the God of Vengeance. When Jack says that he does not want revenge but he wants love, he is interrupted by Tucker who says that "we don't want love, we want a fat slice of revenge. Kiss me arse!" (*RC* 72). When Jack insists on being the God of Love, Dr. Herder states: "God of Love made this world! I've seen a girl of four's nails had been torn out by her father. I've seen the mountains of gold teeth and hair and the millions of boiled down for soap" (*RC* 72). In response to that, stumbling desperately off the cross and putting sticking plaster over his eyes, the Earl says that "S-S-ome-times G-G-God turns his b-b-back on his p-p-people" (*RC* 72). In the tradition of Menippean satire, a slapstick scene turns into a philosophical and religious discussion. It is comic with the grotesque actions of the two mad people, but also disturbing because God is questioned as being love or evil. Religion was found to be inadequate to solve the problems of people in the 1960s. People lost their faith in religion, especially after the Second World War, as they observed the God of vengeance instead of the God of love. Beside religion, science is also ridiculed and found insufficient in this scene because, even as a doctor, Herder cannot cure Jack and the lie-detector is also faulty.

After the experiment is finished, Jack gives a deep-throated cry and shakes with the force of the imaginary electrical charge. There is a clap of thunder at the same time. The French windows open and a monstrous eight-foot beast enters with a rush of cold wind. Barnes employs expressionism as a device in this scene: he does not say that Jack changes from the God of Love to an evil person. Instead, Barnes creates a hairy eight-foot beast dressed like a Victorian gentleman who shakes Jack until he accepts that his name is Jack. The stage direction continues, "the beast walks upright like a

man, covered with thick black hair swept out from each side of its face like a gigantic guinea-pig, and is dressed incongruously in high Victorian fashion: morning coat and top hat. None of the others see the beast, which grabs the EARL and shakes him violently, to the accompaniment of high-speed jabber from the tape-recorder, thunder-claps" (*RC* 73). Because Menippean satire is free from the limitations of history or memoir, it does not feel any obligations to answer the demands of the verisimilitude of life. There is a surrealistic scene with a beast in it. Although the other characters do not see the beast, the audience can see it through the eyes of Jack. Then, Jack writhes in an epileptic fit, saliva dribbling from his mouth. All sorts of bodily functions are shown, as Menippean satire uses them to deconstruct the concepts of idealized beauty and aesthetic. Jack is described as "legs and arms are twisted, and his face forced back by a heavy paw. He struggles, but his strength soon leaves him. As the background noise reaches a crescendo, the beast slams him down across its knee, tosses him on to the floor and then looking down at the unconscious man, raises its hat, grunts and lurches out the way it came in" (*RC* 73). There is a silence and after which, Grace having given birth, Sir Charles brings the baby and says he is a boy. Jack says: "Jack. I'm Jack. I'm Jack. I'm Jack" (*RC* 74). This may be considered as ironic because, as Jack has become 'normal' he does not now need an heir. In addition, Jack's acceptance of his name would be a step towards sanity, according to Dr. Herder. However, the second act will show that Dr. Herder is wrong as Jack becomes a murderer after accepting his name. Science is ridiculed once more through Dr. Herder's cure.

Thus, on the road to sanity, Jack changes his behavior by saying that he will learn the rules of the game. He states: "I must learn to keep my mouth shut, bowels open and never volunteer" (*RC* 80). Jack now tries to act like other members of his family to show that he is sane. He fires randomly and kills a dove with his gun, to the music of 'Oh for the Wings of Dove'[24], as a sign of normalcy. This is an important sign showing that Jack rejects the world of love and adopts the world of cruelty. Jack says, "I was trying to do what's expected. I recall it's a sign of normalcy in our circle to slaughter anything that moves" (*RC* 83). This shows how hard the survival of individual goodness in a cruel society is. In addition, there is always a question mark over Jack's mental condition. He speaks about the equality of all men, which sounds sane, on the one hand and he acts in an absurd way on the other hand. This makes Jack

as a character comical, as he finds himself in many absurd and funny situations, and disturbing, as he challenges religion and hierarchical class structure in society, at the same time. Sir Charles does not find Jack's actions normal and he asks Truscott, Master in Lunacy, to come and examine Jack so that he, Sir Charles, can remove him as an obstacle to reach his aim to rule the estate. Although Dr. Herder says that Jack is nearly back to normal, Truscott disagrees: "Two doctors recommend you to be put under care, but Dr. Herder says you're nearly back to normal. Of course, he is a foreigner and his idea of normal may not be mine" (*RC* 86). Truscott implies that normalcy is decided according to norms, not according to scientific criteria. Also, Truscott humiliates Dr. Herder because he is German. Dr. Herder is also excluded by Claire and by Sir Charles because he is not English, which shows these English characters' feeling of superiority about Englishness. While Truscott is scrutinizing Jack they start to dance and sing suddenly in a barber-shop duet: "Others will fill our places, dressed in the old light blue. We'll recollect our races. We'll to the flag be true. (They mime rowing.) But we'll still swing together. And swear by the best of schools. But we'll still swing together and swear by the best of schools!" (*RC* 86). The narrative style is digressive with miming and singing as a carnivalized text. In addition, Truscott and Jack are friends from Eton collage. For instance, Jack recalls: "I was pretty low down the school when you were in your glory, Truscott. They said when you got back after the Lords match dressed in a kilt, you debagged the Chaplain and hit the local constable over the head with an ebony shelalee" (*RC* 87). Truscott himself is not seen as normal from this story. Truscott seems to be aware of this and says: "Etonians aren't exactly noted for their grey matter, but I've always found them perfectly adjusted to society" (*RC* 87). This undermines the reliability of Truscott as Master in Lunacy, as he seems to have been appointed as Master in Lunacy because he can adjust to the society and the norms. Therefore, when the norms are questionable, so too are his criteria for sanity. It may be claimed, then, that the ruling class makes the rules and they decide the level of normalcy in society but as a result, these rules may be challenged instead of being assumed to be immutable.

Jack influences Truscott easily when he states: "Our country's being destroyed before our e-e-eyes. You're MOCKED in the Strand if you speak of patriotism and the old Queen. Discipline's gone. They're sapping the foundations of our society with

their adultery and fornication! The barbarians are waiting outside with their chaos, anarchy, homosexuality and worse!" (*RC* 87). The 'Old Queen' referred to by Jack is Queen Victoria because Jack becomes very conservative in his moral outlook. Hearing Jack's advocating of his class principles, Truscott determines that Jack is normal. After Truscott leaves Jack hunches his right shoulder and drags his left leg. He defines himself as deformed, unfinished, and sent before his time (*RC* 89). He also says that doctors of Divinity, McKyle and Dr. Herder cured him. However, after mentioning this, he makes a startling speech: "No more inter-stage friction. See how I marshal words. That's the secret of being normal…I AM GOD. Not the God of Love but God Almighty. God the Law-Giver, Chastiser and Judge...I've finally been processed into right-thinking power. They made me adjust to modern times. This is 1888 isn't it? I knew I was Jack…Jack the Ripper!..Mary, Annie, Elizabeth, Catherine, Marie Kelly" (*RC* 90). Jack who thinks he is the God of Justice and Jack the Ripper is pronounced normal by Truscott and by Dr. Herder. This reveals the unreliability of the 'Master in Lunacy' as an institution and of Dr. Herder as a man of science. Dr. Herder, Sackstead and McKyle convince Jack that the world is a cruel one without love in it and they call it a cure.

Another thing Jack learns as a sign of sanity is to speak properly. Thus, if one speaks properly, adopts the manners of the ruling class and conforms to the rules of this society one is considered sane. However, if one does not speak properly, acts in an eccentric way, and challenges the existing order one is considered insane. It may be deduced that being and acting differently from the ruling class is a sign of insanity which is why Jack says that these doctors have adjusted him to the modern times and made him 'normal'. Nonetheless, Jack is having another delusion. He believes that he is God of Chastiser and Jack the Ripper. He also mentions the names of six women who were prostitutes and were killed by the real Jack the Ripper in 1888 in London. This reference to real people challenges the hierarchy between fact and fiction once more. In addition, Jack, the 14th Earl, believes that he lives in 1888. Barnes here mingles two centuries, the nineteenth and the second half of the twentieth century because historical settings and events are considered helpful in allowing the current political ideas or agendas to be seen more clearly. That is, there are these kinds of

people and there is a conservative attitude towards sex and morality even if it is 1960s England. For instance, Jack kills Claire as he considers her immoral.

When Jack adjusts himself to the rules of his family everybody sees him normal and that is why Grace invites the two women, Mrs. Treadwell and Mrs. Piggot-Jones, for tea. The two women's arrival is described as "two heads, topped with absurd hats, peer round the door" (*RC* 91). They are shown to be ridiculous through their physical appearance. They are nervous about seeing Jack and he explains his absurd behavior during their last visit by stating he was mad with grief because his father had just died. He is lying to influence them. When he is labelled as mad he does not lie, but he starts to lie after he is deemed to be normal. He also wants Tucker to cover the legs of the table as he finds them indecent. Upon this, Mrs. Treadwell says: "I do think young girls nowadays show too much. After all, the main purpose of legs isn't seduction" (*RC* 92). Mrs. Treadwell's statement illustrates the attitude of conservative people towards the liberated 1960s. Although the early years of the sixties are liberal, the late years of the sixties are opposed by the conservative right who find the liberal values immoral and indecent. Thus, because Jack wants to be adjusted to his class he gives up his ideas about equality and sex. For instance, when Mrs. Treadwell reminds Jack that he asked her if she could love or not, Jack says: "Please, not in front of women and children" (*RC* 93). Moreover, Mrs. Piggot-Jones states that she finds the whole subject distressing and asks why God chose "such a disgusting way of producing human beings" (*RC* 93). The two women see themselves as 'normal' and the society sees them as normal because they obey the rules made by the ruling class. This scene is amusing and concerning at the same time as a Menippean satire. The two women's absurd hats, and ridiculous and shallow comments about morality are amusing. It is concerning because Jack agrees with them and he, with his shallow and puritan values, will rule society as a ruling class member. This gives the audience an opportunity to see the people who make the rules in society in a ridiculous way so that the audience may question the prevailing order.

In addition, the two women and Jack are disturbed by the rise of socialism and the abolition of hanging. Jack states: "Why, the Hangman holds society together. He is the symbol of the Great Chastiser. He built this world on punishment and fear. Snuff

out fear and see what discords follow. Sons strike their doddering dads, young girls show their bosoms and ankles and say rude things about the Queen" (*RC* 94). Jack adopts Victorian morality completely. He also wears Victorian clothes and changes his furniture at his home to a Victorian style. Jack does all these things to prove that he is normal. He is successful in this and so the two women admire him. Then, after this serious speech, Jack and the two women start to sing together: "When your head bone's connected from your neck bone, your neck bone's connected from your shoulder bone, your shoulder bone's connected from your backbone. Now hear the word of the Lord. Dem bones dem bones dem dry bones." (*RC* 94). Singing contributes to the carnivalesque quality of the play as it mixes different styles of literature. In addition, it supports the thematic line of the speech as the lyrics demand the breaking of the bones of those who disobey authority. The two women leave the house stating that Jack is sound. Although Jack's ideas about hanging and morality are not acceptable to the people of the sixties they were the norms of the Victorian period, when everybody respected them without question. Therefore, as a Menippean satire the play shows that norms are questionable not absolutes and they may be found absurd and ridiculous as the times change.

Jack judges people around him because he thinks of himself as the 'God of Chastiser' and the 'God of Justice'. He sees himself free to do anything. For instance, Jack kills Claire as he regards her attempting to make love with him as immoral. When Claire kisses Jack, the stage changes into a nineteenth-century slum street in Whitechapel. It is described as follows: "A dark huddle of filthy houses, broken doors, windows stuffed with paper. Beyond, an impression of dark alleys, low arches, row upon row of lodging houses…Drunken singing and street cries can be heard off and the clip-clop of a horse-drawn van over cobbles" (*RC* 94). This detailed description of the street is a factor of the realistic style, whereas Jack utters meaningless words such as "Suuuuck. GRAHHHH. Spinkkk. The flesh lusteth against the spirit, against God. Labia, foreskin, testicles, scrotum...Orgasm, coitus, copulation, fornication. Gangrened shoulder of sex. If it offends. Tear. Tear. Spill the seed, gut-slime" (*RC* 98). His speech becomes disordered again. Claire does not like these words and asks Jack to kiss her. As he does, Jack plunges his knife into her stomach imagining her as a prostitute but also the wife of his uncle. Whitechapel is the place where the real Jack

the Ripper killed six prostitutes in 1888. The fictional Jack the Ripper as an Earl is therefore equated with a historical serial killer, as Claire a lady from the ruling class, is equated with a lower-class prostitute. The immoral and hypocritical nature of the ruling class is shown in this scene as Menippean satire aims to deflate the hierarchy between the high and the low to show that there is no difference between them. Both of them are shown as corrupted.

Afterwards, somebody yells for help and there comes a police whistle blowing shrilly, while a newsboy shouts "Reead all about it 'Orrible Murder. Murder and Mutilation in White-Chapel. Maniac claims another victim. Mary Ann Nichols found murdered in Buck's Row. Read all about it!" (*RC* 98). A newsboy shouting and relaying the news are inserted into the play, which enhances the carnivalesque quality of the play by challenging the unity of its style as an example of Menippean satire. Moreover, this news is a real story. Mary Ann Nichols was killed by Jack the Ripper in 1888. Thus, the hierarchy between fact and fiction is undermined as Menippean satire deflates all types of hierarchy. Another interesting thing is that this scene is shown to the audience through the eyes of Jack, a murderer. For instance, the scene changes into a Victorian slum street because Menippean satire does not have to maintain the consistency, causality or the verisimilitude of life. The style of the play often changes from surrealistic to realistic, and vice versa, as an example of Menippean satire which mingles different styles in a text.

After a while, Tucker comes in and realizes the dead body is Claire. He is shocked at first but later he shakes all over gleefully. He states: "One less! One less! Praise the Lord. Hallelujah. Convulsed with glee he capers creakingly round the corpse in a weird dance. He freezes in mid-gesture as voices are heard off" (*RC* 99). Tragic and comic are portrayed at the same time in this scene and, as a representative figure of the working class, Tucker is also ridiculed with his absurd reaction to the death of Claire: the death of a member of the ruling class does not improve his situation. Sir Charles's reaction to the death of Claire is also interesting, because when he sees the corpse of Claire he turns and explodes indignantly at the audience, asking: "All right, who's the impudent clown responsible for this?" (*RC* 100). He refers to the murderer as an 'impudent clown' as if he were not taking Claire's death as tragic. Obviously,

Sir Charles is also aware that there is an audience watching what is happening on the stage. On the one hand he implies that this is a play, on the other hand he asks the audience who is responsible for this. This may be considered as an example of metafiction as it problematizes the border between fact and fiction. It also functions to break the illusion of the play so that the audience can take a questioning attitude towards what is shown to them instead of watching it passively.

Tucker comes under suspicion after inspectors find copies of Lenin's 'Complete Revolutionary' and Mao Tse-Tung's 'Selected writings' in his suitcase. They react to these books by calling them 'disgusting'. However, Tucker explains that he has just paid his dues to the Party and they have sent the pamphlets and a Christmas card from Mr. Palme Dutt[25]. There is a criticism of the Communist party leader here as Tucker, a Communist party member, pays his dues and gets only a Christmas card from the leader of the Communist Party. As a Menippean satire, the play satirizes not only the leaders of the ruling class but also the leaders of the Communist party. In addition to these books, Grace finds a photo in Tucker's suitcase and turning it round and round, she asks: "How the devil did she get into that position" (*RC* 107), which is an exemplification of the medley of serious and frivolous. While there is an intense atmosphere on the stage as they are searching the murderer there is also comic element, the photo. Tucker is found guilty after Jack says that he heard Tucker's voice in the drawing room before Claire was killed. This parody of detective story as a genre recalls the biggest cliché of detective stories, that is, 'The Butler done it'. Instead of looking further for the murderer, they detain Tucker for an absurd reason and they are convinced that Tucker is the murderer after Jack says that he heard Tucker's voice. The two inspectors are ridiculed in this scene because they do not conduct the case scientifically, but accept Jack's testimony and arrest Tucker. Thus, the innocent Tucker is arrested while the real murderer testifies against him, and justice is perverted by Jack's self-interest. Testimony of Jack, as a member of the ruling class, assumes the role of law. The absence of ordered values in such a convoluted situation brings comedy close to potential tragedy. In addition, these two inspectors lose their credibility. One wonders whether other malefactors arrested by them might in fact be innocent. Therefore, as a Menippean satire, the play reveals the institution represented by these inspectors as corrupt. Tucker asks for help from Jack, but he claims that

Tucker has done this because of his envy, hate and revenge towards the ruling class. After Jack lists Tucker's motives, one of the inspectors admires Jack, saying "My lord, I'd just like to say what a pleasure it's been meeting you…You've shown me what noblesse oblige means" (104). It is clearly shown that these inspectors' job is to protect the interests of the ruling class instead of finding the real murderer.

Then Tucker states: "Upper-class excrement, you wanna' do me dirt 'cause I know too much. I know one percent of the population owns half the property in England. That vomity 'one per cent' needs kosher killing, hung up so the blue blood drains out slow and easy. Aristocratic carcasses hung up like kosher beef drip-drip-drip" (*RC* 107). Tucker's speech may be considered as resistance, but when he takes out a handkerchief to wipe his eyes after this speech, half a dozen silver spoons[26] fall out of his pocket with a clatter. He explains these as a few little keepsakes. Moreover, he brings out some knives and forks from his pocket, saying: "I took 'em for their sentimental value. They call me Mr Softee. (Produces jewel-encrusted snuff box.) A few worthless trinkets to help keep the memory green when I'm swanning on the Cote de Jour. (Finally adds gold bowl from the back of his trousers.)… (Removes hat with feigned surprise and takes out a small silver dinner-plate hidden in the crown.)" (*RC* 107). Through Tucker, another important feature of Menippean satire is exemplified. That is, in formal verse satire one or more viewpoints opposed to the vices satirized are given. However, in Menippean satire both sides are criticized for being responsible for the existing order in society and both of them are left open to question. Thus, in this play both the ruling class members and the ruled ones are portrayed as greedy and faulty. Tucker has twenty thousand pounds and does not need these silver knives and forks, but he still steals them as he is greedy. He is punished by being sent to prison because of his greedy nature.

After Claire's funeral, Bishop Lampton, as Claire's brother, feels very upset and Jack suggests that he trust the judgement of God and comforts him by saying that she has flown up to heaven. There is dramatic irony in this scene because Jack means himself as God, as he now considers himself as the God of Justice. The audience knows this but Bishop Lampton does not. Bishop Lampton says: "I won't forget what you've done, Jack. You were the instrument that restored my faith. I feel reborn. I've found

the way. Now let me walk humbly with my God" (*RC* 108). This statement is also comic and ironic because he walks with Jack while saying that he will walk with his God. Although Jack is the murderer, he manipulates everybody without being recognized as he is considered normal. Another important element in this speech is Bishop Lampton's restored faith has come through with a murderer, even though Lampton himself is a senior religious man. This is ironic and there is a satirical approach towards the religious men.Thus, Bishop Lampton is shown as shallow and weak as a religious figure once more and Jack is shown as hypocritical. Both the people and the values represented by them are debased.

The only person who suspects Jack is Dr. Herder. He states: "I cured you. You could never turn violent. It's not in your illness. If I'd failed I'd know it. You'd retreat back into delusion. You haven't. You've accepted the world on its own terms. You believe more or less what other people believe" (*RC* 110). Jack confirms that he has adjusted to his environment. After Dr. Herder blames Jack for the murder of Claire Jack denies it, saying "I'm cured, Herr Doctor, M.D., Ph.D. You cured me. I was a pale lovesick straw-in-the-air moon-looney. You changed me into a murderer, is that what you're saying?" (*RC* 110). Subsequently, Jack asks whether Dr. Herder has evidence or not and when Dr. Herder says he does not need proof, Jack tells him to kindly leave the stage (*RC* 110). Using the word 'stage' may be considered as another example of metafiction, which enhances the playful nature and carnivalesque quality of the play and challenges the border between fact and fiction as an example of Menippean satire. Then, Jack challenges him: "Physician heal thyself. Don't you recognize the symptoms? You suddenly know against all the evidence…This monstrous belief of yours that I'm guilty is a clear case of paranoia...If they ask about me at the trial, tell them the truth that I'm a hundred percent normal" (*RC* 111). Jack claims that Dr. Herder has paranoid symptoms and, thus, the hierarchy between the doctor and the patient is subverted. As a Menippean satire, the play subverts all sorts of hierarchy prevailing in society. Dr. Herder decides that Jack is normal by explaining: "It's only a feeling. I can't rely on feelings. Everything he's done confirms to a classic recovery pattern. His occasional paralalia is normal. Even his trying to blackmail me into saying he's completely normal, is normal" (*RC* 111). This scene is important in problematizing the notion of normalcy. Jack is judged as insane in the

first act when he says that everybody is equal and everybody should love one another. However, when he kills Claire, he considers sex as a perversion and immoral, and blackmails Dr. Herder, Jack is considered normal. Thus, the hierarchy between sanity and insanity is broken down as Menippean satire aims to deconstruct the binary oppositions. Reason is not glorified and even madness may be seen as preferable after the cruel acts of a sane Jack.

At the end of the play, Jack prepares a speech saying that it will be a perfect storybook ending, which may be considered as an example enhancing the metafictional quality of the play. He emphasizes the importance of making a good speech because he knows that his family is not interested in what he says when he says things in an eccentric or disordered way. The ruling class decides whether people are sane or insane according to their manners and their way of speaking. They consider Jack insane because of his eccentric actions and his way of speaking in the first Act. Just before Jack's speech, the stage is described as follows: "Smothered in age-old dust, there goitered Lords with bloated stomachs and skull-like faces crawl on stage groaning, to take their places beside the dummies and the EARL OF GURNEY. One of them drags a skeleton behind him. The music stops as the FIRST LORD hauls himself as upright as his twisted body allows" (*RC* 118). Barnes employs expressionism as a theatrical device while describing the lords in this way. That is, instead of explaining that the ruling class is outmoded and monstrous he shows them in this way. In addition, the lords are described in a grotesque way in order to break down the hierarchy between the high and the low and to break the aesthetic unity. Also, the lords are positioned next to dummies, which may be considered as a degradation of the lords by equating them with the dummies. The lords talk about the rise of immorality in the society and the need to restore flogging. Then, Jack makes his speech:

> My Lords, these are grave times, killing times...There is no love without fear. By His hand, sword, pike and grappling-hook, God, the Crowbar of the World, flays, stabs, bludgeons, mutilates. Just as I was- is- have been- flayed, bludgeoned… (Recovering.) You've forgotten how to punish, my noble Lords. The strong MUST

> manipulate the weak. That's the first law of the Universe- was and ever shall be world without end. The weak would hand this planet back to the crabs and primeval slime. The Hard survive, the Soft quickly turn to corruption. (Shuddering.) God the Son wants nothing only to give freely in love and gentleness. It's loathsome, a foul perversion of life! And must be rooted you. God the Father demands, orders, controls, crushes. We must follow Him, my noble Lords. This is a call to greatness…On, on you noblest English. (*RC* 118)

All of the lords appreciate and applaud this speech which suggests the hanging and manipulating of the weak and illustrates the cruel and selfish nature of the ruling class in a very overt way. Dinsdale says that the Earl is capable of anything. Sir Charles declares that "he's one of us at last!" (*RC* 118). By saying 'us' he refers to class and normalcy and he excludes 'them' who are abnormal and the lower class. Thus, as Jack has turned to sanity and is now fit to be a Gurney, the maintenance of the conservative politics of the ruling class is assured. The ranks Jack belongs to are the ranks of his ancestors whose principles are outmoded and inhuman (like hanging) since the legislative body consists of lords covered with cobwebs and with skull-like faces. The acceptance of Jack in the House of Lords after his speech may be considered as a debasement of the ruling class because the ruling class prefers cruelty to love. In addition, the acceptance of Jack (as murderer) in the House of Lords is a clear example of Menippean satire subverting the hierarchy between the ruling class and the low people like murderers. In addition, a further example of Menippean satire in the play is when Jack the Ripper becomes a member of the House of Lords and the House of Commons accepts Dinsdale as a member. Menippean satire attacks all ideologies without making any of them superior to another. For instance, Sir Charles helps his son to get a seat in the House of Commons because Sir Charles thinks that Dinsdale is a disappointment and that it is too risky to put him into business. He states: "On time thought of bringing him into the business, but it's too risky. Can't have Dinsdale messing about with money. He's proved disappointing" (*RC* 37). Thus, because Sir

Charles does not want to lose money, he helps his son to have a seat in the House of Commons. Both the House of Commons and the House of Lords are shown ridiculous and corrupted through their members.

Therefore, the play has topical issues and mirrors the ideological concerns of the day through a reflection of the societal and ideological life of their time, by criticizing public figures of the discourses of the time, which is one of the characteristics of Menippean satire. For instance, there are some references to Sir Alec Douglas-Home who is the 14th Earl. For instance, he is from Eton college and has a speech disorder like the fictional Earl, Jack. When Dinsdale and Jack are talking about politics Dinsdale says: "A Tory Leader was the son of a carpenter, after all" (*RC* 79). The Tory leader referred to by Dinsdale is Edward Heath. Jack is surprised and says "Lord Salisbury's a carpenter's son. Really?" (*RC* 79). Lord Salisbury was the leader of the Conservative party from 1865 to 1868. His time as Prime Minister from 1885 to 1902 was known as the great expansion of the British Empire. Thus, the Earl believes that he lives in the Victorian age. Because the 14th Earl becomes Prime Minister as the first peer after Lord Salisbury the fictional 14th Earl, Jack, implies that he will rule the country. Just like the real Earl the fictional Earl, Jack, is old fashioned in terms of his politics.

The mood of the play keeps changing as an example of the way in which Menippean satire employs abrupt transitions and shifts, ups and downs, rises and falls, unexpected comings together of distant and disunited things, mésalliances of all sorts. For instance, the 13th Earl died accidentally, to everyone's surprise, without getting married to Grace and having an heir. He changed his will and left everything to the insane Jack, much to the surprise of the family. In addition the 13th Earl unexpectedly left twenty thousand pounds to Tucker yet he kept working. When he decided to leave his work he was accused of killing Claire. Another example may be when Claire told Jack that there was nobody named Marguerite. When she said this, Grace appeared in the guise of Marguerite. Lastly, although Jack had difficulty in speaking he made a perfect speech at the House of Lords. As it is clear, nothing is predictable in the play, as the narrative does not rely on causality and linearity as a result of its carnivalesque atmosphere.

Moreover, the narrative style in the play is episodic and playful through ironies, parodies and the medleys. All these examples support the cynical attitude of the genre. Besides, the playful nature of the play is supported by the use of language in it. Barnes' words have striking imagery and extravagance that are Jacobean. For instance, Jack says, "You'll be nicked down to your bloody membrane, Mary…You want two seconds of DRIPPING sin to fertilize sodomized idiots" (*RC* 94). Barnes inserts meaningless words and phrases into the language used by the characters. For instance, Jack says, "Must get my grunch thoughts in order" (*RC* 111). 'Grunch' is suggestive of crunching grunts. There are also comedic uses of language. For instance, when Sir Charles says that the Earl should take a wife the Earl asks 'from whom'. There are word games and witty usage of language throughout the play in order to create comedy. Another example may be considered as the speech between Tucker and Dr. Herder. When Tucker announces that Mr. McKyle is there Dr. Herder tells him to show Mr. McKyle straight in. In response to that, Tucker says that he would lay down on the doorstep and let them walk over him (*RC* 67). Lastly, when Jack is nervous before his speech in the House of Lords, Grace tells him not to worry and she adds: "you'll kill 'em" (*RC* 114). Jack says that 'perhaps, in time' (*RC* 114). Although Grace does not mean killing literally, Jack does mean it.

Furthermore, during the process of Jack becoming normal, he adopts many identities from being the God of Love to the God of Vengeance. Adopting these identities may be seen as journeys to Heaven and Hell in order to re-examine a truth as a Menippean satire. For instance, as the God of Love, the role of love in a corrupted and cruel society is examined while, as the God of Vengeance, the concept of normality is tested. Through these metaphysical journeys, Jack finds himself in absurd situations. The journey brings the notion of quest theme, which is popular in Menippean satire as it is a way to gain truth and power for the characters in the text. However, their searches often result in despair, as in the case of Jack who concludes by being a part of a cruel world.

After Jack has finished his successful speech in the House of Lords he meets Grace. She tells him that she only loves happy endings but, ironically enough, she dies tragically at the end of the play. Jack calls her Annie who is another victim of Jack the

Ripper. This is a foreshadowing of the murder of Grace in the epilogue, in which there are romantic words such as "I love him because he's wonderful…He is my Jack" (*RC* 108). These words are derived from a song 'Along Came Bill' from *Show Boat*, a musical comedy. Although this is a highly emotional song, it is played here when Jack kills Grace, which is ironic. It shows the place of romanticism in Jack's world. Jack kills Grace because she has provided an heir and Jack does not need her anymore. By killing his lower class promiscuous wife, Jack aims to consolidate the class structure and a conservative sexual ideology. Therefore, the play may be claimed to be about the desire to preserve, its consequences and the violence authorized by right-wing tradition as represented by Jack. It is interesting to see that although the lower class people, Tucker and Grace, are punished at the end of the play for their greedy nature and irrational actions, the members of the ruling class, except for Claire who either supports or disregards the ideals of the ruling class as she pleases, are not punished for their greedy nature and irrational actions. For instance, Dinsdale has a seat in the House of Commons and Jack has a seat in the House of Lords. However, if all of these characters both from the lower class and from the ruling class are greedy and act absurdly the class distinction will be meaningless. That is why the audience may not have sympathy with any of these characters, as all of them are greedy and faulty. As a Menippean satire, the play does not have any explicit moralizing showing all characters as faulty. As a Menippean satirist, Barnes shows the absurdities and follies in the society in a comic way and lets the audience judge the characters by looking at their actions. As a result, the play as an example of Menippean satire may claim to be highly entertaining as well as philosophic.

As a conclusion, *The Ruling Class*, as an example of modern Menippean satire, cynically questions the established values of morality and the superiority of Englishness and of institutions ranging from the Church to the House of Lords which represent the values of 1960s' Britain, by creating a carnivalesque context. The aim is to ask cynical questions about the idea of absolutes through parody and irony. Without offering any answers to the questions it asks, the play ends with a question mark in the minds of the audience. That is, the audience is left with a Menippean questioning at the end of the play with Grace's dying scream. Barnes only shows his despair and terror of this corrupted social system. The cynical questioning of the absolutes is

achieved by creating a carnivalesque atmosphere as the aim is to reject a fixed and standardized form and to have dialogism as a result of the dialogues between different things. The carnivalesque quality in the play is created through the medleys of various literary styles such as dance, mime, and song; through quoting or misquoting from other books like the Old Testament, the New Testament, and *Richard II*; through referring to both classical literature and traditional songs, to contemporary popular culture and modern songs at the same time; through employing different languages like English, German and Latin; putting contradictory ideas such as the God of love and the God of Vengeance in the same text; through using different ideologies in the same text, such as the ideology of the working class and the ideology of the ruling class and through the medley of fact and fiction. As a result, the play has been considered to be comic and tragic; serious and frivolous; low and high, entertaining and disturbing as a work in the tradition of Menippean satire.

2.2. Leonardo's Last Supper

Leonardo's Last Supper begins with a spotlight on da Vinci's 'Divine Proportion'[27] from the Vitruvius Edition of 1535 illustrating a naked man, arms and legs spread out, the centre of a square and a circle. Leonardo da Vinci uses divine proportion in his paintings. He draws "Vitruvian Man", which explains the ideal human proportions with geometry. These proportions are described by the ancient Roman architect Vitruvius in his book "De Architectura libri decem" which suggests that the ideal body should be eight heads high and da Vinci's "Vitruvian Man" is named after this architect:

An authoritative voice lectures from several loudspeakers in the auditorium as follows:

> The Renaissance began in Italy in the Fourteenth Century and spread over Western Europe. In an extraordinary burst of intellectual energy the human spirit recovered its freedom after centuries of political and spiritual oppression…a radiant beauty was created by artists delighting in the loveliness of the human body. The Gothic night dissolved, making way for the birth of modern man and the

> achievements of our age…Renaissance- a noun, meaning, a new birth: revival: resurrection. (*LLS* 126)

Barnes makes a cynical questioning in a carnivalesque atmosphere of the ideas stated by the lecturer. As a result of his cynical approach towards the ideas about the Renaissance such as freedom from spiritual and political oppression, the beauty of the human body, and the birth of modern man, Barnes creates the Lascas who are superstitious, grotesque, and primitive on account of their sheer greed and of their foul actions as if they were predators. In contrast to the lecturer who shows the Renaissance as an age of flourishing art, as a satirist, Barnes shows that not only art flourishes but also capitalism, as an economic system, emerges during the Renaissance period. According to Goldthwaite, the Italian/Florentine merchant had an acquisitive instinct and was only interested in making ever more money: He was taking big risks in order to grab an opportunity for profit and he developed business techniques for proceeding rationally to achieve his goal (Goldthwaite 3).

After the lecturer's speech, a funeral bell tolls. Bass voices are heard chanting the 'Miserere'[28]. A cortege of four cantors carries a bier on which lies a corpse under a sheet on their shoulders. The cantors are chanting 'Miserere mei'. The insertion of a religious song into the narrative may be considered as an example of a medling of different narrative styles to enhance the carnivalesque quality of the play as an example of Menippean satire, according to Bakhtin. Also, this religious song is in Latin, which again may be considered as a characteristic of Menippean satire as the genre mixes different languages (Weinbrot 10). As Angelo Lasco, the protagonist, follows the cantors, his head is bowed. After the cantors lay the bier centre stage the bell stops tolling. As soon as the cantors leave, Lasca starts to dance from joy around the corpse in his medieval charnel house. Thus, Lasca's character is revealed as hypocritical and unreliable at the very beginning of the play. The audience learns why he is dancing so happily around a corpse when his wife, Maria, comes and says they are burying Leonardo da Vinci. The corpse is identified as that of the great artist of the Renaissance period, Leonardo da Vinci. Lasca and Maria consider the death of Leonardo as a great mercy of God because they can acquire a great sum of money for burying him. Lasca kneels to pray and dreams about going back to Florence after the funeral and pay his

debts. He states that his Saviour, Christ, remembered his humble servant, Lasca and, therefore, sent this 'golden carcass' to make him a profit. He also tells the Lord of Mercy that when he returns to Florence he will make his debtors "grovel like pigs in dung", "tremble till their breeches stink from their droppings", and "lick pomegranate seed" out of his "arse" (*LLS* 128). This may be considered as a parody of piety as Lasca expresses prayer in anti-Christian terms, and speaks about money and revenge in his prayer to Jesus. In addition, he asks for divine mercy but he speaks mercilessly about his debtors. This may be taken as a feature of Menippean satire as the genre juxtaposes incompatible things such as the sacred and the profane, according to Bakhtin. Thus, comedy is achieved by creating liberation from religious conventions, which is one of the features of Menippean satire according to Bakhtin's formulation of the genre. Then, Lasca sings happily:

> Oh Lord,
>
> You delivered David from the slaughtering sword
>
> Oh Lord,
>
> You delivered Daniel from the lions' den
>
> And then.
>
> The Israelite children
>
> From the Fiery Furnace and the Pharaoh's cruel decree
>
> Now me. (*LLS* 128)

In this speech, Barnes changes the narrative style from prose to verse, which is a defining feature of Menippean satire as Menippus also mingled prose and verse in his works. In addition, Lasca equates poverty with a slaughtering sword, a lions' den and Pharaoh's cruel decree. He brings money and the spiritual to the same level in his song. Thus, the hierarchy between the spiritual and the material is broken down in the play, an example of Menippean satire which aims to break all types of hierarchies. This speech also reveals how much importance Lasca puts on money, because he equates poverty with a slaughtering sword, for instance. In addition, while Lasca is talking about Leonardo's death as a source of profit to himself he says "in nomine Patris", "et

Filii", and "et Spiritus sancti" by making the sign of the Cross (*LLS* 129). As an example of Menippean satire, the play puts Lasca in contradictory and absurd situations, as, according to Musgrave, the genre is interested in the contradictory, absurd and oxymoronic juxtapositions in order to deflate an assumed idea (Musgrave 18). That is, Lasca is talking about money and profit at the same time he is making the sign of the cross as a devout Christian who is supposed to have no interest in worldly goods.

Although the lecturer states that humanity recovers from spiritual oppression with the Renaissance, superstitions about religion prevail in society. For instance, Maria says that heaven smiled on them because of her. Upon this, Lasca asks what she has done to make heaven smile. She replies: "Following the ways o' our Lord. Remember Mother Midnight? They could've found her guilty of witchcraft the moment she swore she wasn't a witch. When Father Fulchin asked me to do my Christian duty I spoke straight out. Didn't I stand up and say loud and clear that Mother Midnight had practiced the Back Mass, spawned incubes and kissed Lucifer's arse every night?" (*LLS* 129). When Maria reports a woman for practising the Black Mass[29] she explains that she does this as her Christian duty. Following Maria's speech, Lasca states: "Your testimony may've had Mother Midnight burnt at the stake but you're forgetting I lit the faggots!...I followed my Christian conscience when I put the torch to Mother Midnight" (*LLS* 129). Lasca also is proud of setting fire to her pyre as he believes that he followed his Christian conscience, therefore illustrating Barnes' cynical approach to the ideals of the Renaissance such as freedom from spiritual oppression. This is one of the Menippean features in the play, as Menippean satire seeks to highlight the incongruities of humanity through a cynical perspective and to represent these incongruities in a carnival universe.

Apart from being superstitious, Lasca and Maria are portrayed as greedy. For instance, Lasca recounts how he took fifty florins from Melzi, da Vinci's boyfriend, and he will take fifty more after the burial of Leonardo. When Maria tests the gold coins by biting them Lasca says he has done it already. In response to that, Maria states she is fond of the taste of gold (*LLS* 130). Then, Lasca says, "I fancy a bite too" (*LLS* 130). Maria refuses him by stating gold makes him lechy. Lasca insists by saying, "bumbo, bumbo, hot-tailed bumbo. Now, now!" (*LLS* 130). They roll on the floor and

Lasca cries out "biddy chick, biddy chick, coo coooo oooh!" (*LLS* 130). Words such as 'bumbo' and 'hot tailed' are fabricated by Barnes, which is a feature of Menippean satire. In addition, the language used by these two characters is vulgar and sexual reflecting their greedy and lecherous natures. Moreover, material bodily principle becomes one of the most important features of the carnivalesque, which is also associated with the aesthetic of 'grotesque realism' (Gardiner 47). Material body principle refers to "images of the human body with its food, drink, defecation, and sexual life" (*RW* 18). That is why this scene, in which Lasca and Maria are having sex, is shown. Then, Lasca cries out in pain because he has rolled on top of a thigh-bone. He states: "It's Signor Corbi's thigh-bone…The rest of his bones should've reached his family in Milan by now. No thanks or profit in sending it separately, I suppose" (*LLS* 130). He tosses it aside. Lasca's character is shown as materialistic because he does not care about sending the thigh-bone of Signor Corbi to his family as he knows that there will not be a profit in it.

Lasca and Maria keep rolling on the floor and seem to be fond of each other. Then, they see a skeleton figure of Death. They are scared and, on their knees, make the Sign of the Cross. Then Death, as a messenger of God, is heard breaking wind, which may be considered as a juxtaposition of the spiritual and the vulgar. Thus, the hierarchy between the high and the low is broken with the degradation of Death, and Death becomes a comical figure. Laughter is created with this comical Death figure as liberation from the conventions. This is a feature of Menippean satire as Bakhtin proposes the special weight of the comical element in the menippea ss the first characteristic of the menippea (*PDP* 114). Nonetheless, the comicality is not for light-hearted laughter but for liberation from any sort of norms. According to the conventions, Death is a taboo and one cannot laugh at it, as it is serious and fearful. However, the Death figure in this play creates fear and amusement at the same time, which is a feature of Menippean satire. Lasca says: "Uhhhh, the stench 'tis him, stinkin' Death. He's come f' us. I can't die like this with my breeches down and my bawbell up" (*LLS* 131). This is another Menippean feature of the play because Menippean satire employs grotesque realism which defines its realm as low. That is, the belly, buttocks, and genitals instead of the head or face in the human body, and earth and hell instead of sky or heaven in the universe are shown and emphasized (*RW*

19). Through grotesque realism, Menippean satire both creates a carnivalesque spirit and breaks down the hierarchies between the high and the low. Then, Lasca accuses Maria by stating: “Dragged to hellfire ‘cause o’ you! (He hits Maria who lies moaning.)…Lechery, lechery, it’s all you know! I repent, sweet Jesus. I repent. I’ll wear a hair-shirt every night caked with me own blood. Spare me” (*LLS* 131). Death breaks wind again and holds out his hand. Lasca shouts, “no, not me! Take her! Take her!” (*LLS* 131). Maria tells, “him, him, him. Take him. Master Death. Sweet Master” (*LLS* 131).

Next, Lasca says, “tomorrow, tomorrow, come tomorrow, we will be ready tomorrow” (*LLS* 131). This is an allusion to the play *Everyman* in which the character Everyman asks Death to come the following day (*Everyman* 5). This may be considered a parody of *Everyman* because Death in *Everyman* says: “Lo, yonder I see Everyman walking/ Full little he thinketh on my coming/ His mind is on fleshly lusts and his treasure” (*Everyman* 3). Death appears in the charnel house when Lasca and Maria are talking about money and having sex. However, Death in *Everyman* is spiritual, serious, and fearful while Death in this charnel house is not spiritual but lowly because he breaks wind constantly, a grotesque figure both because it is unfinished or in transformation. That is, it is neither completely spiritual as it breaks wind nor is it a human being as it is Death. In addition, it is ambivalent because it creates fear and amusement at the same time. Menippean satire makes use of the grotesque in order to break down the classical conception of aesthetics and beauty as well as to create ambivalence, as nothing is certain in Menippean satire.

Death continues to break wind and Lasca clutches his throat, saying: “My God, my God, let me breathe” (*LLS* 131). He thinks that Death will kill him by breaking wind. Death breaks wind again, forcing Lasca to cower lower. Death breaks wind once more; Lasca falls lower. Lasca tells he would burn his ‘cundum’ (*LLS* 131). Grotesque realism is employed in this scene because there are references to lower bodily stratum, that is, ‘bumboo’, ‘cundum’, breaking wind, and ‘bawbell’ among others, as grotesque realism claims its realm as all that is low. After a last great breaking of wind, Lasca falls flat. Breaking wind is repeated many times because the grotesque makes use of scatological elements which reduce the lofty to the earthly and erases fear by provoking laughter instead. Death as an angel is degraded and brought

down to the level of the earth and the bodily by breaking wind although the concept of Death is usually spiritual, high and abstract. This may be considered as a Menippean feature in the play as grotesque realism is used in Menippean satire and degradation is one of the most important tools used in grotesque realism, according to Bakhtin.

Death shakes with glee and whips off his skull-mask. It is revealed that it is Alphonso who is the "pimply and moon faced" son of Lasca and Maria. Lasca gets furious and hurls a lot of skulls at Alphonso by calling him a "Scottish buckfaced lobcock!" (*LLS* 132). The concept of masquerading in cross dressing is a typical element of a carnival scene. Lasca hits Alphonso savagely on the knee with the thigh-bone. Lasca asks about the costume and Alphonso explains that it is "For Brother Corton's Pageant, 'Everyman in Hell'. I'm playing Death again as always. This year 'twas my turn to be Jesus…" (*LLS* 133). Barnes makes up a pageant name and refers to a non-existent play, which is a typical feature of Menippean satire, according to Kirk. Lasca looks up and says "Christ…"(*LLS* 133). Alphonso states: "But Brother Corton gave the part to the carpenter's son. He's a pretty, lisping, backgammon player and his bum fits. I only come on at the start and chop down the tree o' life and sing: 'Oh he is dead as you can see, just as you will one day be…" (*LLS* 133). Alphonso means that the carpenter's son is not suitable to the play Jesus but he still plays the role. In addition, Alphonso's saying that he is playing Death 'as always' may be considered as foreshadowing the killing of Leonardo by Alphonso.

Lasca also says Death is his business (*LLS* 129) and Alphonso will take control of the charnel house after his father. For instance, Lasca states:

> Alphonso, in the name o' God and profit, take hold. All this'll be yours, one day. My father, was only a common foot soldier under Sigismundo Malatesta[30] and Federigo da Montefeltro[31], Lord o' Urbino. Fifteen years o' hard slaughter and uncertain pay 'afore he saw there was more profit and less risk in disposing o' corpses than manufacturing 'em. He founded this business and bequeathed it to me, and I to you, and so forth from generation to generation. Times are ripe for thrusting men to make their way. (*LLS* 133-134)

Firstly, Lasca's words 'in the name of God and profit' may be considered as an example of meddling in which profit is elevated to the level of God. Material things, in this case, profit, may be seen as the new god, with the rise of capitalism in the Renaissance period. In addition, there are references to historical figures, which break the hierarchy between fact and fiction. This may be considered as another example of meddling. Lasca's father was like Lasca in terms of recognising an opportunity and profiting by it. By saying that the times are appropriate for thrusting men to make their business profitable, Lasca wants to have property and authority, by taking opportunities. There is nothing spiritual or sacred in the lives of the Lascas.

Then, Lasca recalls his father: "There was this burning light in me; 'twas like the light of revelation they speak o' in the Scriptures. I looked across at my father. He was smiling. There was no need for words. We showed a leg (he bows low) pulled open our codpieces, aimed our dildos and pissed our sweet Adam's water straight into the dead face o' that proud prince" (*LLS* 134-135). Lasca degrades the prince by urinating on his face thus breaking the hierarchy between the high and the low. He mentions urinating on the face of the Prince as a light in himself and compares it with the light of revelation in the Scriptures, ridiculing the 'light of revelation in Scriptures' by bringing it down to the same level as urinating. In addition, Lasca thinks he is taking a sort of revenge on the prince because he describes him as follows: "When he was alive he had an income o' 100,000 florins a year; estates in Tuscany…He walked the streets with eight men at arms dressed in silk cloaks and a man from Pistoia marching in front with a naked sword shouting 'Make way, make way for Fortune's Darling!" (*LLS* 134). Although the prince has a higher position in society, this charnel house is outside the bounds of society. Everybody is equal there. Lasca even feels himself superior as a survivor in contrast to the dead prince. Thus, there is subversion of the social classes with the debasement of the prince. Apart from the prince, Lasca undermines Leonardo da Vinci in a similar way: "His mind was the light o' the world, they saith, but his flesh'll rot, red, green and black, just the same. He'll ooze away like that idiot Notary we dug in last week. His tongue'll swell and eyes pop out like old Gentile Bardi the tom-turd man…And after his stomach's caved in and his guts slide out, we'll find those damned toads gnawing at his face and plae maggoty things crawling out o' his puss" (*LLS* 136). Lasca suggests that there is no difference between

the ‘idiot Notary’ and the genius Leonardo, as both of them die and rot. Because Lasca is only interested in the material bodies of people, he does not find Leonardo as more worthy of respect than the ‘idiot Notary’.

Lasca continues his speech by stating: “Twas wonderful. From that moment there was ne’er a bitter word ‘twixt my father and me. We were like another Abraham and Isaac[32]. Another Saul and Jonathan[33]. Just as I want us to be, lad” (*LLS* 135). Alphonso misunderstands his father’s story because he responds: “Most times I use that bucket or the nearest member-mug, but I’ll water the face o’ the dead if that pleases you” (*LLS* 135). This shows the shallowness of Alphonso. He goes to the corpse, and when he is about to urinate on it, his parents stop him saying that it is Leonardo da Vinci. Alphonso exclaims by saying that he is famous. Lasca says he is nothing, as he has buried cardinals and princes in the past, so undermining an artist by saying that an artist is nothing when compared to a cardinal or a prince. He also states: “I was Apothecary and man o’ distinction as well as a death-hunter…My nostrums cured sufferers of hernia, running ulcers, warts, bone ache and stinkin’ breath. And if I didn’t cure ‘em, I buried ‘em. Profit either way, eh Mother?” (*LLS* 135). Lasca makes fake medicines not because he wants to relieve people from their suffering but because he wants to make a profit out of the sufferings of others. If he does not cure them he buries them and makes further profit. Lasca is shown as a typical Florentine merchant capitalist who is only interested in profit.

While Lasca recalls his old work Maria pulls out a black gown, a flat hat and a half-mask of a bird with a large beak from a trunk. She asks Lasca to try them on to see if they still suit him. Lasca puts on the gown and black hat and utters sounds “quarr, quarr, quarr” (*LLS* 135). Lasca used to wear this costume to protect him from the noxious vapors in the air when he visited the sick. Lasca’s making animal sounds may be considered as an example of unconventional diction as employed in Menippean satire. In addition, Lasca’s wearing a half-mask of a bird with a large beak may be considered as grotesque which is used in Menippean satire to break all types of hierarchies and preconditioned conceptions. When Lasca wears the half-mask of a bird with a large beak he becomes unfinished and in transformation as he is both comic and repellent, which is an important feature of the grotesque. In addition, he creates ambivalence, which is another important feature of the grotesque, because he is half-

human and half-animal. Therefore, the hierarchy between human and animal is broken down. Human beings are not glorified or are not seen superior to animals.

Then, the Lasca family starts to sing Dies Irae[34] mournfully around the corpse of Leonardo. Although they sing it mournfully they suddenly start to chuckle. Their chuckles turn to laughter and they clasp hands dancing. They continue to sing the hymn jazzily: "…quantus tremor est futurus quanto judex est venturus, cuncta stricte discussurus…Ya' Yaaaa!" (*LLS* 136). Although they are singing a hymn about Judgment Day, they dance and clasp hands as if they were singing a popular song, which may be considered as a medling of the profane and the sacred to break the hierarchy between them, as a characteristic of Menippean satire. In addition, the mood of the play changes quickly from a mournful one to a gleeful one, which is another Menippean feature in the play. While they are dancing, the corpse slowly begins to rise up. Lasca hits Alphonso supposing that he is playing another trick. However, Alphonso shows the bier by clutching his stomach in fright. The sheet rises higher and higher and falls aside revealing Leonardo da Vinci. The silence is broken by the sound of a slow release of air from the pit of da Vinci's stomach. Maria says, "Angelo, he's been raised from the dead. Behold another Lazarus" (*LLS* 137). Lasca responds: "Another Lazarus. Wasn't one such nuisance enough? Dear Jesus, it's happened. What every burial-man fears. We've got a bleeding resurrection on our hands!" (*LLS* 138). Although Leonardo's rising up resembles Lazarus' resurrection, the silence is broken by the air from Leonardo's stomach, which is grotesque, as grotesque focuses on the body and its connection to the material world. In addition, the resurrection of Lazarus is considered as a nuisance by the Lasca family instead of a miracle. For instance, Alphonso responds to Leonardo's resurrection by vomiting into a bucket (*LLS* 138).

When Leonardo opens his eyes he states: "I'm dead. But I speak, feel, see, touch. (Touches face.)…But I know I'm dead. (Trembles violently) I am in Hell! Damned and in Hell! (Turns, sees the Lascas.) Two fiends, and a woman with her skirts up. It's the Sodomites' Hell" (*LLS* 137). He believes the charnel house is Hell because Lasca's world would be hell for an artist like Leonardo. Leonardo finds himself in this charnel house with the Lasca family who are greedy and would kill Leonardo without hesitation to get money. In addition, Leonardo is shown as comical here. For instance, he takes Maria to be a torturer and says: "Come, Madame Fiend,

begin the tormenting. I'm ready. (Rips open top of nightshirt.) Here's my liver, stench eagle, start pecking" (*LLS* 138). Lasca says that he is not an eagle but a man like Leonardo (*LLS* 138). Leonardo seeing the Lasca family as fiends is ironic and prophetic as they will indeed turn into fiends at the end of the play. Lasca's claiming that he is not an eagle but a man like Leonardo is also ironic because he will turn out to be a predator like an eagle at the end of the play.

Lasca asks: "You're not just corpse-dancing are you, Signor? My dead 'uns oft thresh about a bit in their coffins, not wanting to go. Corpse-dancing we call it" (*LLS* 138). Leonardo explains: "Rigor Mortis. The muscles tighten after death making the limbs contract and jerk compulsively, giving the appearance of life" (*LLS* 138). Both Lasca and Leonardo are interested in the anatomy of a human being; however, Lasca is interested in it to make a profit out of it and Leonardo is interested in it to study for his paintings. Thus, Lasca is interested in death while Leonardo is interested in life. However, they share a common thing: Lasca uses bodies to make a profit from them, while Leonardo uses bodies to produce works of art.

In order to convince Leonardo that he is alive, Lasca breathes in Leonardo's face saying that it is the living breath of a garlic-scented man. Leonardo shudders at the odour of Lasca's breath (*LLS* 139). Lasca asks Alphonso to show that he too is alive and Alphonso retches into the bucket. They prove they are alive by the stink of their breath or by vomiting, which is repellent and comical at the same time. They are examples of the grotesque, which both enhances the carnivalesque quality of the play and breaks down the hierarchy between the high and the low. Leonardo is still not convinced that he is alive and wants them to talk about Florence and to be their natural selves. Maria states: "I've such a longing to hunt for a bargain along the Ponte Vecchio again. 'Twas always full o' the noise o'buying and selling. The mornings I've spent looking at silks and English wool" (*LLS* 140). What Maria remembers about Florence is only the material things and spending money. She continues: "Angelo, remember the time Rinuccio's old horse[35] bolted and some forty people were knocked down. Everyone was shouting. And they rang the great bell, boom, boom, boom…"(*LLS* 140). Rinuccio is, in fact, a fictional character in a medieval story called "A Runaway Horse". Maria tells this story as if she were in the fictional world of the story. Thus, when Maria claims that she saw this event it puts her on the same level as Rinuccio.

That is, Maria is a fictional character like Rinuccio, which may be considered as an example of metafictional quality of the play. In addition, Barnes' creation of Maria, who implies that she is fictional just like Rinuccio, enhances the playful nature of the play as an example of Menippean satire.

Like his wife, Lasca also remembers the material things of Florence: "We had a 'bottega' in the Mercato Vercchio[36] next to a pimping barber's shop, Signor. You could hear the goldsmiths with their tiny hammers beating out gold just up the Canto di Vaccherecia. I miss the comforting sound o' men making money" (*LLS* 140). In contrast to the Lasca family, Leonardo remembers "the Tuscany light; no haze, everything hard and clear" and he adds, "I never found such light again" (*LLS* 140). Although the Lasca family and Leonardo are remembering the same city, they miss different aspects of it. Then, Leonardo asks them about better days. Lasca says 1494, the plague year, was the best for them. He explains: "Twas a time of fear and opportunity…Luckily I was also Apothecary Lasca. Sweet Apothecary Lasca" (*LLS* 141). Then, Maria explains:

> That's where our profit lay, Signor. How they bought our expensive nostrums to protect their clotted carcasses from the plague! They tried every remedy known to man and mountebank. Some put their trust in speckled spiders and toads trained to suck poison from the air. Some rubbed their bodies with diamonds, sapphires, and jaspers engraved with favoring signs. Pieces o' warm bread were laid on a dying man's mouth to catch the disease as it left his body. The breath of a pregnant horse was said to be a benefit, and the Chancellor of Hungary had a billygoat tied to his sick-bed to absorb the plague air. (*LLS* 141-142)

Although the Renaissance is defined, at the beginning of the play by the lecturer, as the freedom of spiritual oppression, people are still superstitious. The authenticity of some of the events told in this speech is guaranteed by Barnes in the introduction of the play. Thus, Barnes problematises the border between fact and fiction as they are mixed in the play as an example of Menippean satire. In addition, According to

Kaplan, Menippean satire is a form through which a range of "particulars, facts and perceptions of events are brought together to form a uniquely comprehensive and yet particular view of reality. It patterns the process called the shock of the familiar. Menippean satire is the reexamination, reformulation, and the renaissance of the knowledge and wisdom which have always been the possession of the human race" (Kaplan 30). In this sense, the play may be considered as an example of Menippean satire.

Lasca explains that he makes his fake medicines by following Leonardo's method, as Leonardo suggests looking at the facts not looking at superstition or magic. He goes on: "I used me eyes and ears. In time o' their work. The stink clinging to their persons protected 'em from the plague. I wasn't the only sharper who noted it. At the height of pestilence crowds used to stand in front o' private privies sniffing up the smells. (Sniffs loudly.) Privy owners soon got to charging 'em twenty-five denari an hour for the privilege. I set out to manufacture medicinal smells. I bottled farts" (*LLS* 142). As a Menippean satirist, Barnes uses Lasca to make a cynical mockery of rationality. Although he claims that he finds the remedy for the plague by observing people with a rational method not with a superstitious one he comes up with bottling farts. This also ridicules the "extraordinary burst of intellectual energy" in the Renaissance, mentioned by the lecturer.

Alphonso adds that they had a team of "wind-breakers" and that Lasca used to feed them radishes and beans (*LLS* 142). Lasca explains: "When they were in the producing way they'd lift up their skirts, drop their breeches and stick a green bottle up their arse. Ban. And we had a little o' that most healing physic, 'Lasca's sweet Morning Wind'. Price one florin; three denari back on all empties" (*LLS* 142). Lasca even offers three denari if people bring back empty bottles. Thus, Barnes clearly demonstrates a satirical approach towards the consuming society in the twentieth century, and may want the audience to question the quality and the necessity of the things they buy and consume. However, because it is difficult to bottle wind and it is gone after a couple of sniffs the customers asked for something more solid (*LLS* 142). Then, Lasca decides to bottle excrement. He explains: "Pilgrim's salve, 100 percent proof. 'Lasca's Excremental Goodness' came in three sizes. 'Lady's Own' was a tiny bottle most beautifully engraved with signs o' the Zodiac and attached to a gold

necklace. ‘Man Size’ was flat and decorated with the figure o’ Hercules strangling a lion; it sold at six florins. Our ‘Jumbo Family Jar’ cost all o’ ten florins, but it lasted weeks” (*LLS* 143). The name of the product ‘Lasca’s Excremental Goodness’ is an oxymoronic juxtaposition. In addition, Lasca’s making his products in different sizes shows that he knows human nature and how to exploit it. All three different sizes show that Lasca is a typical capitalist who is intent on maximizing his profit. These merchandizing techniques are ridiculed with the lecturer’s saying ‘the achievements of our age”. Thus, the audience may reevaluate their consuming habits. Lasca is proud of himself because he thinks that he is better than learned alchemists who only turn lead into gold, while Lasca turns excrement into gold (*LLS* 143). He believes that he has learned the secret of wealth: manipulating people. Lasca is a Renaissance trader and he seeks profit. The scene is a grotesque one as there is an emphasis on the body and its connection to the material world such as farting and excrement.

Lasca explains he lost his money: “I was forced to join the Apothecaries’ Guild, with their gut and garbage rules for honest trading. Shallow pates! They couldn’t see honesty’s one thing and trading’s something else again” (*LLS* 143). As a capitalist, Lasca does not care for honesty or ethical terms when it comes to business. He continues: “They laid down the price for shit at sixty florins a ton. I told them it was too low. I could get 150 florins without strain. Then they sent this weasel-eyed Inspector o’ Turds round sniffing and spying. Had me up in fron to’ a full Guild Court accused o’ overcharging and watering down my merchandise” (*LLS* 143). The Apothecaries’ Guild does not mind selling excrement but they think Lasca overcharges. Lasca is shown to be a very greedy person, both because he considers that the price is very low and also because he is accused of watering down in the excrement. Although he earns a lot of money from excrement he wants still more profit by watering it down. In addition, even if he is honest in believing that excrement is good for the sick, he is shown as not being really concerned with in people’s health as he waters down the excrement. His only motive is self-interest. Then, Lasca is found guilty and is fined 5.000 florins. Thus, he flees from Florence. Maria says, “We caught a disease worse than the Black Death itself: poverty” (*LLS* 144). This again shows the importance of money for the Lasca family.

Lasca accuses Maria of being proud and covetous while Maria accuses Lasca of being leachy. (*LLS* 144). Alphonso blames both of them. Upon this, Lasca hits him to the ground and claims Alphonso is not his son. Maria opposes him, saying: "He's your son, bumfodder" (*LLS* 144). They start to fight and insult each other. For instance, Lasca says "stinkin' loobys", Maria says "tosspots" and Alphonso says "rabbit suckers" (*LLS* 145). 'Rabbit suckers' is another fabricated word by Barnes. Observing this fight, Leonardo is then convinced that he is alive, in the land of the living, in a natural family (145). It is understood that other families in society are like the Lascas. Thus, all the people in this society are corrupt. Leonardo says: "S' natural to mistake the living world for Hell, the difference is so slight when men are piked and gutted in either place" (*LLS* 145). All of the characters talk about earth and hell rather than sky and heaven, which may be considered as exemplification of grotesque realism as it focuses on the low as an example of Menippean satire which employs grotesque realism.

After Leonardo is convinced that he is alive, the Lasca family ask about Death's land. Leonardo says he does not remember anything. Lasca says: "Keeping it a secret? You can't be blamed for that. People'll pay money to hear how you died and rose again. Wish I'd such a tale to tell" (*LLS* 146). Lasca tries to take any opportunity to make profit. He puts profit above everything else including miracles. Then, Leonardo crosses to the table and eats bread 'wolfishly'. He says: "Come…take…eat. I'm too full of the bread of life to think on death. (Taking the wine-flagon he throws back his head and pours wine into his mouth and over his face.)" (*LLS* 146). Leonardo eats bread and drinks wine, which may be considered as foreshadowing his death like Christ who is betrayed and crucified after his last supper in which he eats bread and drinks wine. Leonardo, then, celebrates that he is alive. He explains:

> I've a live body again. All's mathematical again: heart, lungs, brain, sinews. The span of my outstretched arms equals my height. From the roots of my hair to the bottom of my chin is exactly $1/10^{th}$ of my height. My waist is halfway between the joint of my shoulders and the bottom of my buttocks. My fingers extended and closed thus, are exactly the same width as my foot. My ears are as long as my nose

> and the space between my eyes is equal to the size of one eye. My hand is 1/10th my height. My foot 1/7th. Four palms make one foot, 24 palms make up a man…". (*LLS* 146)

Leonardo uses the golden ratio in his paintings and he also uses it while describing his body. The divine proportions of his body are contrasted with the grotesque features in the bodies of the Lasca family. For instance, Lasca is described as a heavy, middle-aged man (*LLS* 127) and when he takes off his mask his black teeth are shown and Leonardo is irritated by them. Alphonso is described as 'pimply' and 'moon-faced' (*LLS* 132). In addition, Maria says to Lasca about Alphonso: "look at his ugsome face. Only a son o' yours could look like a constipated cockroach" (*LLS* 144). Grotesque bodies are used to break down the concepts of idealised beauty and finished bodies in Menippean satire. In the Renaissance, all portraits are drawn finished and beautiful. For instance, Leonardo da Vinci using divine proportions suggests to the painters: "Measure on yourself the proportion of the composition of your limbs, and if you find any discordant part, take note of it and make very sure that you do not adopt it in the figures that are composed by you, because it is a common vice of painters to take delight in making things similar to themselves" (Kemp 245). As a result, there are two points of view about the body during the Renaissance: the grotesque and the classic. The grotesque body is defined as a body in process, that is, unfinished. The grotesque concentrates on the body and its connection to the material world; therefore, the focus in on the nose, belly, genitalia, urine, excrement, mucous, and bile (*RW* 30). The classic body, however, is defined as idealised, smooth and finished. The two points of view about the body are seen in conflict during the Renaissance. Both of these points of view represented by the Lasca family and Leonardo are satirised by Barnes.

Leonardo decides to leave for Florence and Lasca demands fifty florins from him, because if he had buried Leonardo he would have taken fifty florins. He says that it is not his fault if Leonardo is not buried. Lasca rattles the leather pouch of money and it sounds very loud. Alphonso becomes transfixed and says "more, more, more, more" (*LLS* 146). When Lasca hears this he says there is still hope for his son. Alphonso asks even more than the contracted price. He claims that if they buried Leonardo da Vinci they would be famous throughout Christendom. He claims:

"Twould have been most fashionable to be buried by those who buried Leonardo da Vinci. That custom's lost. We must be recompensed" (*LLS* 147). Maria also tells him that they saved him from the shovel and shroud. Leonardo thanks them for that (*LLS* 147) but Lasca states: "Thanks? Thanks won't feed us, clothes us, gives us back our villa, our slaves, our hot baths. Thanks don't make us sleep contented in our bed, nights. You can't keep a family together on thanks. Thanks is a cheat 'less backed by hard gold and silver. Then we can measure the amount o' thanks we're being thanked" (*LLS* 147). Therefore, the Lasca family members are stripped of their humanity by their interest in material things. The rise of materialism can be seen here as a result of capitalism.

Leonardo cannot understand the Lasca family and says: "I'm an artist and bastard son o' a lawyer. I know why I took this place for Hell. I expected to be punished for my sins. Sins of omission. I only wanted to create masterpieces. But every time I picked up a brush I knew how far below my mark I'd fall. The Holy Father Leo said I'd never finish anything. He didn't know I only wanted to finish masterpieces" (*LLS* 148). While Leonardo is talking about art and masterpieces, Lasca is bored and takes out three rubber balls and starts a juggling act with Alphonso. Maria passes them props such as cigar boxes, hoops and Indian clubs. They continue juggling fluently throughout Leonardo's speech. Leonardo continues with his speech: "A man is judged by his usefulness. All I have to show are notes. Plans to build a bridge across the Bosphorous, to drain the Pontine Marshes, build a new city on split levels with running water in every house and revolving privies to keep the air sweet and clean…Paddle boats, submarines, flying machines...Everything that magnifies man's strength and glory" (*LLS* 149). It seems that while the Lasca family is only interested in material things Leonardo is interested in being useful to future generations. However, Leonardo contradicts himself with his following speech. He remembers his paintings and wonders: "What of the masterpieces that will give me certain immortality? The Adoration of the Magi- unfinished…The Virgin and the Child with St Anne- unfinished. The Last Supper- finished but flaking away. The Virgin of the Rocks- finished by others. That leaves only the Mona Lisa as mine, complete. One painting and a few thousand scattered notes and sketches! Jesu…Jesu…I am in Hell" (*LLS* 149). Leonardo is portrayed as a human being with his weaknesses. Although he is talking

about being useful for future generations he reveals his real intention is to be immortal. Thus, he is not as idealistic as he claims to be. In addition, all these projects and paintings are real. They were produced by the historical Leonardo da Vinci. Thus, Barnes problematises the border between fact and fiction creating a characteristically Menippean carnivalesque atmosphere in which there is no hierarchy between fact and fiction. Leonardo rises up and concludes:

> But as Dr. Johnson will say, 'Depend upon it, Sir, when a man knows he is to be hanged in a fortnight, it concentrates his mind wonderfully'. I know I will die and that time's the enemy- I invented an alarm clock didn't I? I' m still at the height of my powers and can soar like an eagle. In the extra ten, nine, eight, seven, six, five or whatever years I've been given. I'll create monuments to turn Michelangelo green with envy. So ring the bells, da Vinci is risen...Ring, ring, ring 'dem bells for Leonardo's second coming! (*LLS* 148-49)

Leonardo quotes from Dr. Samuel Johnson[37] who is an eighteenth-century English writer even though the play takes place in the Renaissance period. Therefore, Barnes makes an anachronism by referring to an eighteenth-century English writer. He may want to warn the audience not to take the play as a Renaissance play. In addition, Barnes' choosing an English writer to create an anachronism is also important in the sense that Barnes may be trying to show that although the play takes place in France and the characters are from Florence it is about England. There is an example of intertexuality through quoting from Samuel Johnson. There is also a reference to Michelangelo[38] who is also a real person. Therefore, as a characteristic of Menippean satire, a carnivalesque atmosphere is created through intertexualiy and breaking down the hierarchy between fact and fiction. At the end of his speech, Leonardo counts the number of extra years given to him as "ten, nine, eight, seven, six, five, four…" which is ironic because he decreases the time, without knowing that he will soon be killed by the Lasca family. Leonardo reveals another feature of his character by saying that he

will make Michelangelo jealous with his monuments. It may be claimed that he is not an artist creating works for art's sake but for immortality and to make another artist jealous of him. He has his own weaknesses like the Lasca family and they are revealed in his long speech. According to Abrams, the major feature of the Menippean narrative is having a range of lengthy debates and dialogues "in which a group of immensely loquacious eccentrics, pedants, literary people, and representatives of various professions or philosophical points of view serve to make ludicrous the intellectual attitudes they typify by the arguments they urge in their support" (Abrams 169). Therefore, Barnes, like Menippus, attacks all sorts of assumed ideas but does not offer anything positive to replace them with. That is why Barnes attacks the Lasca family, who represent the rise of capitalism and materialism which undermines art, aesthetics and human values, and also attacks Leonardo who seemingly represents art for art's sake but his real nature is portrayed as materialistic and ambitious.

Before leaving, Leonardo asks the Lasca family to keep this event a secret as he does not want the Church involved. He knows that the Church will declare it a miracle although Leonardo says it is only a mistaken diagnosis (*LLS* 149). This may be considered as a juxtaposition of superstition and reality. The Church is satirised for being superstitious. The Lasca family is not willing to let Leonardo go. When Lasca asks for money, Leonardo responds: "You may keep the fifty florins with my blessing. But for the rest, you can hardly claim payment for non-burial or for trade you never had. As for my final burial, you can bury me with pleasure if you're in Florence. I'm going home" (*LLS* 149). When Maria asks about their reward Leonardo says: "Your reward is the gratitude of future generations" (*LLS* 149). Although Leonardo has spent at least a few hours with the Lasca family he still thinks that they will accept the gratitude of future generations as a reward. Alphonso states: "I'm the future, and I'm not grateful. The future'll only be grateful if we survive. We're needed. You're a luxury. We're the new men you scholars prate on about. You put us in the centre o' the Universe. Men o' trade, o' money, we'll build a new heaven and a new earth by helping ourselves" (*LLS* 149). Alphonso continues his speech after a long escape of breath:

> Haaaaaaaaaazzzzz. (Takes up leather pouch.) Dad, I've seen the light you spoke o'. Like the martyr Paul on the Damascus Road[39]. I

> trembled and was astonished. Out o' nothing, no warning, a golden vision. I was blinded and I saw for the first time. I kicked against the pricks but now I'm going to put the locust years o' waste behind me. Dad, I've come to my senses! You're not slipping through our fingers, Signor da Vinci. You're not cheating us o' what's ours. You're our meat, you belong to us. You're our salvation, Signor! (*LLS* 150)

This is a parody of the Apostle Paul's conversion from a persecutor to an apostle after his experience on the Damascus Road. Alphonso turns from an idle son to a persecutor. Barnes also distorts the details of this story. For instance, Paul does not describe exactly what has happened during his experience and how he turns from a persecutor to a follower of Jesus, but explains his conversion as similar to the resurrection of Jesus. Neither can Alphonso explain how he comes to his senses. He says he trembles and is astonished "out of nothing". His conversion also happens after a resurrection, that of Leonardo. He says there is only a golden vision as Lasca rattles his purse. Paul leaves worldly things behind and starts to be interested in spiritual ones, while Alphonso conversely asks for 'more money' after his conversion. Barnes takes a cynical approach towards this religious story. He may have wanted to show that the opposite of the story of Paul, conversion from an apostle to a persecutor, is also possible. When the greedy natures of people are taken into consideration it even seems to be more common.

Alphonso and Lasca look at each other and Alphonso gives an ape-like grunt by picking up the thigh bone. While Maria utters little coos of happiness in the background Alphonso and Lasca, still in their skeleton and bird costumes, crouch slightly, dangle their arms, and advance menacingly on Leonardo. Barnes uses Expressionism as a tool here, he portrays Alphonso and Lasca as a death figure and an animal by their costumes and their sounds. They are scavengers and Leonardo is their prey. Although the play starts with a lecturer talking about the Renaissance as a time of enlightenment, the Lasca family act like primitive people. Barnes shows his cynical approach to the idea of the supposed progression of humanity as the juxtaposition of a

refined human being and an animal results in the grotesque. Thus, human beings are degraded with the pervasive animal imagery.

Leonardo retreats saying, “stay...stay friends” (*LLS* 150). Although he is a genius, he does not know the nature of human beings. He calls the Lascas, who are coming to him in their skeleton of Death and bird costume, friends. When Leonardo tries to run the Lascas take hold of him, saying: “Nothing personal, Signor. This is just business” (*LLS* 150). Leonardo screams, saying: “Let me not die again…let me live…for truth and beauty…flesh and blood…MERCY…I’m a man like you…WE’RE MEN…ME…Mmmm…” (*LLS* 150). Barnes has a cynical attitude to the idea of human goodness as he portrays human beings as greedy and treacherous. The Lascas kill Leonardo to make money from his corpse, which shows their greedy nature. They kill Leonardo without hesitation because Lasca wants money, and its power, to obtain material goods, even though Leonardo is their countryman. Although Leonardo asks for mercy by saying ‘for truth’ and ‘for beauty’ they do not stop their attack as they do not care for truth or beauty. They are only thinking about burying him in order to get the money for the burial, evidence of the rise of materialism and capitalism. Another interesting thing about Leonardo’s speech is that he says they are all men but, in fact, the Lascas are portrayed as predators. Leonardo’s idea about the glorification of human beings is deflated by juxtaposition with the greedy and savage actions of the Lascas, as an example of Menippean satire. Human beings’ base and brutish natures are contrasted with human goodness and superiority in this charnel house. As an example of Menippean satire, the play brings all that is abstract, spiritual, high, and ideal down to the same level as the bodily and earthly by employing degradation and the scatological and sexual imagery.

Leonardo’s voice is cut off as he is plunged headfirst into the grotesque bucket of excrement, urine and vomit. He struggles frenziedly, splattering the Lascas as they hold him under. His struggles become weaker until there is no movement at all. They lift him out, dripping, and carry him to the bier. Alphonso leans over and listens to his heart. Satisfied he nods happily and makes the thumbs-up sign (*LLS* 150). Alphonso says “Father” (*LLS* 150) and Lasca says “Son” (*LLS* 151). Then, Maria approaches and says: “Ave Maria, Bless the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. We’re a family again” (*LLS* 151). The Christian doctrine of the Trinity[40] is debased because it is personified here

by the Lascas who are greedy, materialistic and treacherous. The hierarchy between the sacred and the profane is broken as a characteristic of Menippean satire once more. In addition, Maria is the mother of a murderer not of a saviour. Lasca says: "Son, you're the kind o' son we've always wanted. Mother, what say you to getting our boy those scented gloves?" (*LLS* 151). Upon this, Alphonso states: "I want no such flipperies now. Money's not for pleasure. Let's to business" (*LLS* 151). Then, Maria gives them the iron knives and saws, as she fears that Leonardo may rise again. Lasca states: "Never. It could never happen again. Another blessed miracle'd be too much to inflict on hard-working Christian folk like us. We deserve better o' the good Lord" (*LLS* 151) and all say 'amen'. The Lasca family considers resurrection as 'too much' for hardworking Christians. Thus, the miracle of resurrection is debased by these earthy characters.

The Lecturer's voice comes through loud-speakers in the auditorium again: "Now, he's truly dead, we can safely say we shall never see him like again. A genius at once divine and marvelous. He contained in himself all the quantities of humanity. Painter, sculptor, musician, architect, philosopher and all the rest, he learned the secret of creation. An oracle, a legend, the artist of the world- *l'uomo universale*, Leonardo da Vinci" (*LLS* 151). Alphonso and Lasca stop for a moment and, then, go down savagely on the corpse, hacking and cutting to drain off the blood. Maria gives them a knife and sings gleefully as lights dim down to a final spot on the drawing of the Divine Proportions still hanging from the flies.

The title of the play, *Leonardo's Last Supper*, refers to three things. Firstly, it refers to the famous painting 'The Last Supper'[41] by historical Leonardo da Vinci. Secondly, it refers to Christ's last meal depicted in that painting; and, thirdly, it refers to the abject human waste products such as vomit and excrement which are ingested by the character Leonardo as his last meal. As a result, Christ's last supper is parodied and the Crucifixion is combined with the last supper. This kind of death is not the one expected for such a genius and it implies that Barnes does not consider Leonardo superior to the ordinary Lasca family, so this kind of debasing death may happen to Leonardo as well as to the Lasca family.

At the end of the play, Maria is singing Mona Lisa[42]: "Mona Lisa, Mona Lisa, men have named you. You're that lady with the mystic smile. Is it only 'cause you're

lonely they have blamed you for that Mona Lisa strangeness in your smile? Do you smile to tempt a lover-Mona Lisa? Or is it the way to hide a broken heart?...” (*LLS* 152). Then, all sing: “Are you warm, are you real, Mona Lisa. Or just a cold and lonely, lovely work of art” (*LLS* 151). There is a mixing of different narrative styles, prose and song, a feature of Menippean satire. Barnes makes an anachronism at the end of the play. He may want to warn the audience about the fact that what they have watched on the stage is relevant to their time. In addition, the play shows the meaning of the play to future Lascas. Dukore interprets this final scene by stating: “All Leonardo means to the future Lascas of the western world is a machine-made hit song that trivialises a work of genius and profits those who market it as Lasca did his ‘Excremental Goodness’. To the Lascas and those like them, Leonardo’s painting might be, as the song’s and the play’s final line says *just* a work of art” (*LLS* Dukore 23). Therefore, Leonardo’s legacy is in the hands of the Lascas as *lascito* derives from legacy (Dukore 23).

Barnes also assures his audience of the authenticity of the facts in this play except for Leonardo’s resurrection. He states:

> Mother Midnight could have been found guilty of witchcraft the moment she swore she was not a witch; the goldsmiths did beat out gold along the Canto di Vaccherecia; the Chancellor of Hungary did have a billygoat tied to his sickbed to absorb the plague…And, yes, according to the records, the smell from privies was supposed to be a protection from the plague…Everything has happened. The difficulty is finding the record of it. (*LLS* 122)

Thus, Barnes shows the irrational and absurd actions of men in a comical way creating a specific view of reality. He is observed to pattern “the process called the shock of the familiar” (Kaplan 30). That is, he brings particular facts together from history to create a fresh perspective on them. This may be considered as a characteristic of Menippean satire in the play since Menippean satire is defined as “the reexamination, reformulation, and the renaissance of the knowledge and wisdom which have always

been the possession of the human race" (Kaplan 30). Therefore, the audience may re-evaluate the assumed realities which are shown in grotesque and absurd ways.

In conclusion, Barnes' *Leonardo's Last Supper* may be considered as a work in the tradition of Menippean satire as it constitutes cynical approaches to the values of the Renaissance. Instead of extolling the Renaissance ideals about art and aesthetics, the play poses a clear criticism of the rise of materialism and a hard-core capitalism which undermine art, aesthetic values, and other human values. The play delivers its criticism in a carnivalesque atmosphere through the juxtaposition of prose and verse, different narrative styles such as inserting songs into the narrative, cross-dressing, juxtapositions of incompatible things such as sacred and profane, and material and spiritual, parodies of religious stories, ironies, intertexuality, and the mixing of different centuries through using a Renaissance setting and archaic language while also referring to modern works or writers, modern songs or modern jokes. Thus, through the techniques used to create a carnivalesque atmosphere, the assumed hierarchies are broken down and parallels with contemporary debates about capitalism, religion, and self-interest are emphasised.

2.3. Noonday Demons

At the beginning of the play, the stage is described as having "a giant mound of age-old human excrement, baked iron-hard" (*ND* 155). This giant mound of human excrement may be considered as an example of scatological elements employed by the grotesque. It is interesting to see this giant mound of excrement in the cave because a religious hermit is living in it to become close to God. The lofty, a monk, is equated with the earthly, excrement. Thus, this may be considered as the first example of Menippean satire in the play as the genre makes use of the grotesque in order to break down all types of hierarchies. Moreover, St Eusebius's body is also described as grotesque, because his body is not finished but is in transformation as a result of the sores in his body. For instance, when he looks at his festering arm he says it is "putrid" like his soul (*ND* 156). He notices many worms on his sores and he shakes his arm to get rid of them after he squeezes the pus. There is an emphasis on excrement and pus, because the grotesque focuses on the body and its connection to the material world. Therefore, as an example of Menippean satire, the play portrays a religious figure in a

grotesque body to break down preconceptions about saintliness and religion in a general sense in the minds of the audience. St Eusebius regrets getting rid of the worms after he remembers a line from the Bible 'Thou shalt not judge'. Then, he states: "I agulten thee Lord, forgivest Thou me. These blind worms are Thy creatures too. Come back little ones. 'Twas a mistake. The Devil moved me to throw thee out" (*ND* 156). Although St Eusebius blames the demon when he makes a mistake, the audience or the reader does not see anybody except for St Eusebius himself. He takes some worms and puts them in the sore on his arm and makes the sign of the Cross by saying: "Eat what the good Lord hath provided for thee" (*ND* 156). St Eusebius' behaviour is comical as it creates laughter. However, this laughter is not light-hearted but a sort of liberation from the norms because it is directed against authority, against a religious figure. A religious figure is degraded by being put into an absurd and ridiculous situation. Thus, he is not considered ideal and spiritual but earthly and bodily as an example of Menippean satire as the genre, according to Bakhtin, employs degradation and laughter to break down all kinds of hierarchies.

When the cave is described, a primitive clay bowl and a 'pouch' made of goat's skin are seen on the floor. St. Eusebius stands on a brick and repeats a prayer: "Benedicto Dei omnipotentis Patris, et Filii et Spiritus Sancti descendat super vos et maneat semper. Amen" (*ND* 155). St Eusebius' quotations from the Bible throughout the play may be considered as an example of intertexuality, which enhances the carnivalesque quality of the play as an example of Menippean satire. In addition, the two monks switch their speeches quickly from prose to chanting in order to enhance the carnivalesque quality of the play by creating a digressive and loose narrative structure, which may be considered as another feature of Menippean satire. For instance, when St Eusebius is talking about what he has done during his thirteen years in the cave he starts to chant without warning: "Yea, I have been caught up even unto Heaven and seen the consuming fire o' the Lord a thousand, thousand times brighter than-n-n-n…" (*ND* 157). Besides, two languages, Latin and English, are used throughout the play, which may be considered as a Menippean feature in the play since the genre mingles at least two languages and voices in order to enhance the carnivalesque quality of the play (Weinbrot 110). Apart from these different languages, an ancient dialect, constructed by the playwright, occurs in the play. For

instance, St Eusebius speaks in an archaic idiom with the words 'bler-eyed, mole-eyed, and dimmeth" (*ND* 159). He also utters meaningless sounds and fabricates words. For instance, he speaks to the angels: "Eeeepphh-Zingggeee-Yaaannggg-I said. And Angels answered, 'Eeeepphh-Zingggeeee-Yaaaanngg' to you, too" (*ND* 157). As another example, while St Eusebius is talking about his experiences in this cave he rattles his chains and his speech turns into a frightened gabble as follows: "Adjuro-te-serpens-antique-per-judicem-vivorum-et-mortuorum-m-m-m-m…"(*ND* 157). Conflicting and unconventional use of language is a feature of Menippean satire as the genre has a distrust of language. In addition, the use of different languages, dialects, chantings, meaningless or fabricated words contribute to the carnivalesque quality of the play as an example of Menippean satire because the genre rejects fixed forms and embraces a multi-toned and multi-styled narrative (*PDP* 118).

St Eusebius then steps off the brick, hops four paces and comes to stand in front of the brick while his chains are jangling. He makes the sign of the Cross and eats seven black olives. He pours a little water from the jug into the bowl and puts some dust on the water which is already muddy (*ND* 155). There is a conflict between the spiritual and the earthly and this is emphasized throughout the play. As a human being, he needs to eat and drink but he tortures his body by depriving himself of these basic needs for the sake of 'Christ' as he imitates Christ who suffered in the world. Another example of showing the conflict between the spiritual and the earthly is his prayer, which is spiritual, next to excrement, which is earthly. Furthermore, he sleeps standing against a wall. His body is still tied with chains, and his ankles are shackled. He is hand-cuffed and there is an iron band round his waist (*ND* 155). St Eusebius lives in solitude away from people and worldly goods because he believes that he becomes a 'statue' for his God as he adores Him. He explains: "These years o' prayer and pain hath transformed me. In destroying my body, I destroyed Space and Time. Without leaving this cave in Egypt I travelleth o'er the world and its cities. I have seen first Adam in Paradise, the future life in the Kingdom o' Heaven and all the centuries between" (*ND* 157). Although St Eusebius has been living in this cave under very hard conditions to become closer to God and to be a good Christian, he has become proud which is a sin in Christianity. He portrays himself like God in the sense that he has transformed himself into a new man and destroyed time and space. This contradiction

in St Eusebius' character puts him into absurd situations which result in comedy and in degrading a spiritual figure, as an example of Menippean satire.

The play takes place in the fourth century when demonic powers were believed to be at their highest at noonday (Dukore 24). For instance, St. Eusebius says that the Devil still stirred at noon and that noonday thoughts approached to his soul (*ND* 157). Then, St. Eusebius changes his voice to tempt himself and speaks to himself with two completely different voices: "His old, crabbed, dry voice and a new one which is lighter in tone, glib and edged with a Cockney whine" (*ND* 157). Barnes takes a satirical approach to saintliness and religion by showing them as demonic with this example. New Voice representing a demon, uses a Cockney accent which reminds the audience that the play is not about Egypt but about England. Then, New Voice states: "Ello-'ello-'ello. Yes, yes, yes, yes, YES. It's me. I've arrived and to prove it I'm 'ere. This is Able Charlie Baker. Able Charlie Baker testing 1,2,3,4" (*ND* 157). This cliché of microphone testing belongs to the modern world, which creates an anachronism in the play. Therefore, Barnes alerts his audience to the play's context as being modern, not the fourth century, and places it in England not Egypt, because Barnes may have wished to show the current incongruities in British society as a satirist. Conversely, Barnes may be implying that these kinds of incongruities have always existed. The play may be considered as a work in the tradition of Menippean satire because taking a cynical approach towards assumed realities in order to re-evaluate them is the main objective of Menippean satire according to Sutherland (Sutherland 5).

New Voice continues with his speech: "Great news. No Easter[43] this year. They found the body!" (*ND* 157). Finding the body of Christ means that he is not resurrected. The resurrection of Christ is very important for Christianity. For instance, the apostle St. Paul writes in a letter to the Corinthians that: 'If Christ has not been raised, your faith is futile…If only for this life we have hope in Christ, we are to be pitied more than all" (Corinthians 15: 17, 19). When St Eusebius hears the news about Easter he feels very uncomfortable because it means that he has wasted thirteen years for an illusion. Thus, the dialogues between New Voice and St Eusebius are both comical and disturbing because St Eusebius has a dialogue with himself changing his voice and they have a cynical approach towards the absolutes of religion, which also makes the

play a work in the tradition of Menippean satire as it aims to be comical and disturbing at the same time.

Next, New Voice looks around and states: “Still the same bughouse. (Wrinkles nose in disgust.) What a pong. It must be the odour of sanctity” (*ND* 158). The cave stinks both because there is a huge mound of excrement in it and because St Eusebius neither takes a bath nor changes his clothes. Spiritual and earthly are given side by side throughout the play in order to bring the high and the low to the same level as a Menippean feature employed in the play. St Eusebius responds to New Voice by saying: “I carest not for the odour o’bodies, only the stink o’ souls. In profane days I was bathed, massaged, scraped and rubbed with perfumed oils. Now ‘tis meet I shouldst endure mine own stench daily, that on Judgment Day God mayst deliver Christ’s children from the unimaginable stench o’Hell…” (*ND* 158). New Voice claims, “compared to this hellhole, Hell is a blast” (*ND* 158). This is very humiliating for a monk who aims to be a true Christian in this cave which is degrading, as it is shown as worse than Hell. New Voice may be implying the fact that St Eusebius’ attempt to come close to God is a futile attempt. New Voice points to the mound of excrement and asks: “And what’s that as if I didn’t know?” (*ND* 158). The New voice is very sarcastic in his speech because he knows what the mound is as he comes to tempt every noonday, but he still asks as if he had to perform his role as a demon. The demon may mock the conceptions about himself. That is, as a demon, he has to tempt true Christians with these kinds of clichés and a true Christian will not yield to the demon. New Voice answers the question he has just asked: “It’s a dunghill. A mound of human waste, waste...You’re waste. Look what you’ve got to show for your thirteen glorious years of suffering. It’s a truly miraculous achievement. A fitting epitaph: ‘When the boghouse Saint up and died! They found erected by his side! A tribute to his sacred wit! A monument in holy shit” (*ND* 158). The demon ridicules and humiliates the monk as the monk has lived with only a mound of excrement during these thirteen years of his devotion to God. Normally, a monk would humiliate a demon but the rules of normal life are reversed in this Menippean text. Instead of extolling the hermit, he is described as a ‘monument in holy shit’. In addition, there is an oxymoronic juxtaposition in ‘holy shit’ which is another Menippean feature in the

play as the genre includes contradictory and oxymoronic juxtapositions according to Bakhtin.

When New Voice is finished with his speech he says it is a joke and asks St Eusebius to laugh at it. However, St Eusebius remarks that he has cast out laughter and would not laugh and take delight in worldly pleasures (*ND* 158). Upon this, New Voice states: "All you desert psychos are alike. A right bunch of tight-faced sour-pusses. You're afraid to relax a second in case you start remembering the days when you was normal…I know the jokes are pretty filthy and it's banal to be anal, but that's the only sort you like. Underneath all that dirt you're really a dirty old man" (*ND* 159). New Voice is a cynical man who does not find any of St Eusebius' actions sincere. He finds St Eusebius abnormal and hypocritical and claims that he sees the true nature of St Eusebius as a dirty old man in the guise of a hermit. New Voice is comical rather than fearful. That is why, New Voice as a representation of the demon is shown as a more likable person than St Eusebius representing a true Christian, and this breaks down the hierarchy between them.

New Voice says it is time to "get down to business" by announcing, "it's Temptation Time, folks!" (*ND* 159). He explains that he will tempt St Eusebius with three things. He says cynically: "It's routine stuff, but don't blame me. Blame Saint Anthony[44] with his B-picture Temptations[45]" (*ND* 159). This is an example of intertextuality. *The Saint Anthony Triptych* by Bosch[46] portrays St Anthony being physically tempted by demons. For instance, he is beaten in the air by demons in one of the scenes and is tempted by a naked woman in another scene. Thus, the devils are portrayed as "diabolical illusions to disturb the saint in a *mental* way by enacting blasphemous and disparaging parodies of things that are precious to him and by offensively abusing them" (DeBruyn 60). However, Bosch's diabolical scenes are often considered as entertaining rather than horrifying because Bosch parodies St Anthony's ideas about demons in his paintings. For instance, St Anthony states:

> Often the demons sing the psalms while remaining invisible, shocking as it is to tell. in addition, they recite the sacred words of scripture with a foul mouth, for often when we are reading, they repeat the last

> words like an echo. They also awaken to prayer those who are asleep, so as to deprive them of sleep for the whole night. They disguise themselves as genuine monks and put pressure on many of the monks…A few months later, when they were singing in front of me and quoting to each other from the scriptures, I pretended I was deaf and did not listen. (qtd. in DeBruyn 61)

This inspired Bosch to paint three devils reading from an open book including illegible signs. In addition, one of the devils is dressed like a priest and the other two seem to be dressed as monks. Like Bosch, Barnes ridicules the absurd ideas and actions of St Eusebius. Barnes finds these temptations, which are products of St Eusebius' imagination, boring and ineffective. New Voice also considers these temptations ineffective and boring but he has to perform them as they are expected of him as a demon.

Thus, New Voice starts with the first temptation which is money. The mound of excrement behind him turns into gold. St. Eusebius is standing in front of it, so the image is projected on to the mound and on to his body as well. New Voice starts to sing: 'Money, money, money… nice new bills that we're giving away. Two million, four million, six million, eight million, ten[47]" (*ND* 159). By inserting a popular song into the text, anachronism and a mixture of different narrative styles are created, which enhances the carnivalesque atmosphere of the play. Menuppus also inserted songs, curses, iambics and some other unexpected rowdy material into the formal, learned genres in his works (Kirk xiv). After finishing the song, New Voice turns to prose and states: "Faith can do plenty, but money does everything" (*ND* 159). The hierarchy between the material and the spiritual is broken down. Money is presented as more powerful than faith which is degraded. St Eusebius disagrees with this idea and remarks: "I seest only the dung beneath…Thinkest I would forgo Heaven's eternal riches to regain that which I gladly cast away as worthless? Tis a poor temptation, poorly given…" (*ND* 159). New Voice concurs with St Eusebius by stating, "a bit feeble, I'll admit" (*ND* 159). New Voice snaps his fingers and the image disappears. He continues with temptation number two: Lust. An image of a naked woman is

projected onto the mound. New Voice describes the woman as follows: "Look how she squirms: oceans ebb and flow. (He turns and stares.) Ah, how sweet it is to enjoy a woman: sunlight and birds breaking cover, walls spin, flesh swells. See how flowers blossom on her flesh…" (*ND* 160). St Eusebius responds to the image by saying: "I seest only the dung beneath. She appeareth to me as the Day of Judgment: head bald, eyes sunken, mouth open to catch the snot from her nose, chin covered o'er with black down, cheeks like as apes-bags, belabored body shrouded in black crepe. She bygyle none, 'cept to belch, belke and bolke thro' heart's pity" (*ND* 160).

New Voice snaps his fingers and, again, the image disappears. He suggests power as temptation number three and a ten-foot high image of a purple Pope in full regalia is projected into the mound. New Voice tries to convince St Eusebius by explaining: "You've got charisma as well as halitosis. Join the Big Fellows, be one of 'them'. Ride at the head of a holy army and sweep away the world's corruption…You wanna die unknown in this Egyptian stinkhole? Have your name up in lights. Be one of the all-time greats like Alexander[48], Caesar[49], George M. Cohen[50]" (*ND* 160). New Voice puts Alexander the Great and Julius Caesar on the same level as an American entertainer. This may imply America's rise to the level of these emperors, as America becomes the world leader with England losing her world leadership in the second half of the twentieth century. Another interesting point about bringing these three famous people together in the same text is that, although Alexander the Great and Julius Caesar are military generals George Cohen is an entertainer. This may be a reflection of the spirit of the second half of the twentieth century, especially the 1960s, when the slogan was 'make love not war'. Therefore, an entertainer may have as much respect as military leaders.

St Eusebius refuses power, too, by remarking: "I seest only the dung beneath. I am mortal earth and should become as earth. Where now be thy insuperable Emperors, thy high born Kings, thy Governors, Generals and Captains that 'erst did proudly ride by?…Fool, I have the only power I covet; the power to enter God's house. Thinkest I would trade this for the soul's abyss. 'Tis a stale temptation, staley given…" (*ND* 161). New Voice agrees with the ordinary voice again by saying, "pretty crude, agreed" (*ND* 161). New Voice states: "I knew you couldn't fall for those stupid music-hall tricks, but I had to go through the motions, it's expected" (*ND* 161). This is a

cynical approach towards the conception of a demon because even the demon says that these temptations are boring and stupid. This may provide a new outlook on preconceptions about religion and profane things such as a demon. New Voice says that he was glad to see that St Eusebius was not tempted by these tricks as he, New Voice, wants to show the faults of St Eusebius through logic (*ND* 161). New Voice prefers logic to religious temptations, which breaks down the hierarchy between logic and superstitions. This speech also subverts preconceptions about religion, and profanity as religion is debased for being superstitious.

New Voice continues his speech: "First off, I won't deny you've done great things. But no miracles" and adds, "I'll believe in miracles the day you take a bath" (*ND* 161). This sounds a modern joke. Thus, there is an anachronism creating absurdity with an ancient demon making modern jokes about miracles. New Voice also states:

> You've achieved absolute immobility by torturing your body so much, it's changed its metabolism…But where's all this flitting back and forth across the centuries got you? What've you found? The story's always the same, isn't it? Virtue defeated, justice sold, shame lost, equality loathed, innocence despised, guilt condoned, evil advanced. From the first moment- Bang!- to the another galaxy, men'll never be governed by reason, virtue or love…The world gallops to perdition despite your sacrifice. All you're doing is saving yourself, nobody else. Selfish! (*ND* 161)

In his speech, New Voice questions the value of spiritual devotion. He concludes that spiritual devotion is futile, meaningless and insignificant as it cannot stop evil, injustice, or guilt prevailing in the world. Moreover, New Voice accuses St Eusebius of being selfish as he is indifferent to the evil prevalent in society by living isolated in this cave. New Voice does not respect St Eusebius as a religious figure or a dedicated servant of Christ. Thus, the play may provide a questioning perspective towards religious figures and their so-called 'sacrifices' as an example of Menippean satire. New Voice also predicts that men will not be governed by reason, virtue, or love. However, this is the outcome of their selfish natures and irrational actions rather than the outcome of the temptations of the demon. As long as they keep repeating their

follies and behaving in a selfish way like St Eusebius they will not achieve anything good in future.

New Voice foresees another thing about St Eusebius' future: "You'll die. You'll be resurrected in the second half of the twentieth century as a stage freak. Your agonizing abstinence'll be treated as a subject for laughter. You'll be regarded as just another figment of your author's grotesque imagination: '*Noonday Demons*' by Peter Barnes" (*ND* 161). This may be considered as an example of metafiction as Barnes directly refers to the play being watched by the audience or read by the reader. This example of metafiction reflects the carnivalesque quality of the play by problematising the boundary between fact and fiction. New Voice continues his speech by parodying the first four lines of Hamlet's famous speech[51]: "Are you fact or fiction? That is the question, whether 'tis you standing here or only words made flesh and what of your blood and the Lord's blood and His Son's blood?" (*ND* 162). This speech of Hamlet who is a representative figure of enlightenment is here parodied by a demon. In addition, Barnes writes the speech in prose, not in verse as Shakespeare did. New Voice finishes his speech by remarking: "Going, gong, everything's reduced to laughter, nothought of the hereafter going-g-g-g-g- (He catches his throat but he cannot stop himself giving a strangulated laugh.)" (*ND* 162). There is an imitation of an auction, which takes place in an inappropriate place in order to create absurdity and comicality. Although St Eusebius refrains from laughing and other worldly pleasures, he cannot help himself from laughing at the parody of Hamlet's speech. No matter how hard St Eusebius tries to ignore his bodily needs as a human being, he cannot ignore the fact that he is a human being. St Eusebius fails to be a devoted Christian by being a murderer at the end of the play although he claims he killed for God's sake. This may allow the audience to question the criteria of being a good Christian and to question the role of absurdities in religion and the role of human nature in not being a devoted Christian.

St Eusebius repents for having laughed, and prays but his speech rapidly becomes meaningless: "I be Thy servant Eusebius. (With increasing speed) No true sacrifice is worthless in Thy sight. I BELIEVE Lord h-h-h-helpest Thou my unbelief-as-stut-garments-beaten-I'-the-washing-are-maken-clean-so-so-so-my-strong-soul-is-

maken steadfast" (*ND* 162). Then, St Eusebius tries to vomit to expel New Voice as a demon from his gut. New Voice says that he will stay there and St Eusebius cries: "Out!...I'll have thee out…I'm staying in!...Out!...In!...Out!...In!...OUT, I'LL PLUCK THEE OUT…(He punches himself in the stomach.) Ahhhhhh!" (*ND* 162). There is a conflict between the body and the soul of St Eusebius. As a human being, he needs to laugh, eat, drink and perform other bodily functions. However, St Eusebius refutes them in order to save his soul by being a dedicated servant of Christ. This conflict is shown in a comical way as he tortures his body by considering the soul as superior. Nonetheless, the play deconstructs the superiority of the spiritual by putting this holy monk into the absurd and contradictory scenes as an example of Menippean satire which deconstructs the hierarchies between binary oppositions and rejects the assumed realities (Robinson 140).

After St Eusebius' struggles with himself, he puts his hand into his mouth and pulls out a large, black spider and grinds it underfoot (*ND* 162). At the same time, "there is a scream of pain off, a wall of light and heat flares in from the entrance and from above the troop of horses thunder across the roof of the cave and into the distance" (*ND* 162). The dramatic effect of action is enhanced with the sounds and lightening effects. All these enhance the carnivalesque quality of the play as Menippean satire which is a multi-styled text according to Bakhtin. Upon getting rid of New Voice, St Eusebius is relieved because he believes that he will not be disturbed by any vain imaginings. Having relaxed, he says that he will remain standing on decayed stumps untill he becomes unsubstantial (*ND* 163). Darkness is followed rapidly by light to show that days and nights are following each other. It is noon and St Eusebius is shown standing on the brick still festooned with chains and looking at the ground. He is filthier and covered with dust. A man's figure appears in the entrance. He is dressed like St Eusebius in a filthy loin-cloth and he, too, is covered with sores and festooned with chains. He has a goat-skin pouch water jug, bowl and brick. He is St Pior. He is bulkier than St. Eusebius but otherwise he is almost identical (*ND* 163).

St Pior also fixes his gaze on the ground and steps onto his brick by adjusting his chains around him. Thus, being unaware of each other, the two men stand on their bricks in a deep meditation. Both of them begin to pray at the same time: "Benedicto

Dei omnipotents Patris et Filii…(They stop: Is it an echo? They continue, cautiously.) et Spiritus Sancti…(The pauses after each word grow longer.) descendat…super:..vos…(Suddenly they both speed up.) et-maneat-semper-Amen-Amen-Amen-" (*ND* 163). When St Pior adds one more 'Amen' the two men slowly turn and stare at each other. They say simultaneously: "Tis a noonday demon!" (*ND* 163). Their way in which they call each other 'noonday demon' is interesting because they are described as almost identical. St Eusebius exclaims: "Thou comest unto me in years past as a voice speaking strange tongues. 'Ello, 'Ello, 'Ello'. Thou camest also as a swollen toad and horn'd dragon with eyes like as beacons and claws like as a bear. (Shuddering.) But thou hast ne'er come to me in such a loathsome guise!" (*ND* 164). St Pior responds to him: "I hast seen thee 'afore in the shape of' a dog, a flock o' crows, 'caw, caw, caw', a lewd Friar and two worms oozing out o' my ears. But I smelt thee out always, thy devil's stench betrayeth thee…(Snifffs, cringes back.) Thous must be the mightiest o' demons for thou hast the mightiest o' smell!" (*ND* 164). Through humiliating each other, they humiliate themselves, that is, saintliness. The idea that saintliness and religion are demonic is strengthened with the arrival of a rival saint.

They pray and act in an absurd way. For instance, they step off their bricks and take their water jugs. St Eusebius mumbles a prayer and flicks water into St Pior's face, chanting, "depart, vile spirit, in the name of' the Father, and o' he Son and o' the Holy Ghost!" (*ND* 164). St Eusebius is surprised to see that nothing happens. Next, St Pior flicks water into St Eusebius' face while chanting, "depart, vile spirit, in the name o' the father and o' the Son and o' the Holy Ghost!" (*ND* 165). St Pior is also puzzled after seeing that nothing happens. Then, the scene turns into slapstick with the absurd actions of the two men when they start rapidly flicking water into each other's faces while chanting speedily, "depart in the name o' the Father" (*ND* 165). This appears to be a parody of Catholic Mass at which the priest sprinkles holy water on the congregation. Thus, Catholicism is ridiculed and debased. St Pior throws his bowl of water into St Eusebius' face. St Eusebius gets furious and asks: "This not possible to look like you and not be possessed by the devil…Who art thou?" (*ND* 165). St Pior says he is a monk but St Eusebius tells him: "I hast heard thee o' thee. But how canst I know thou art the real Pior and not some goky dressed in his chains?" (*ND* 165). Upon this, St Eusebius responds: "And be thou the true Pior and not some frantick

goast in his flesh?...We must talk. He who is not human will soon betray himself" (*ND* 166). The play makes a cynical mockery of rationality by showing how absurdly the two men think. Then, they start to talk about themselves. St Pior tells about his hometown and explains why he had to leave his hometown by saying

> When I first set down my brick there, 'twas a true solitude. Then other monks swarmed in claiming to be men o' God…I recall going one noonday to fetch water from the well. Iche step o' the way bearded faces wouldst pop up out o' their holes in the ground and curse me for disturbing their solitude. Their solitude! 'Twas my solitude! I found it, 'twas mine, mine, mine. And when I dropped the bucket down the well for water, instead o' godly splash there rose up a great cry 'ahhhh!' One of those damned monks had made his abode at the bottom o' the well. (*ND* 166)

St Pior's greedy nature is revealed through this speech as he keeps repeating 'mine, mine, mine' while he is talking about a place in his hometown. He considers himself superior to other monks as he calls them 'damned monks'. In addition, St Pior claims he talked to God when he arrived at the entrance of the cave, who said: "This shall be thy abode, Blessed Pior" (*ND* 167). Upon this, St Eusebius explains: "God's house has many mansions, but this one is occupied. A monk is his own Adam. He canst not share his fearful paradise…I seest no sign: no archangel o' light, neither Michael, Gabriel, Raphael or even Uriel or Zachariel announced thy coming" (*ND* 167). St Eusebius considers himself to be so superior that he expects to be informed about the arrival of St Pior by God or by prophets. However, when he sees another monk just like himself he calls St Pior a noonday demon. This may suggest that St Eusebius does not know himself, which creates absurdity and comedy. St Eusebius continues: "No dove at the height o' Heaven stands above thy head, thy fingers are not ten fingers o' fire, thy face doth not shine with a double glory. Thou art not God's messenger" (*ND* 167). Although St Eusebius does not have any of these things, he nonetheless claims that he is the

messenger of God, which is ironic and may be taken as another example showing that St Eusebius does not know himself.

St Pior gestures and says: "He speaks now. List. He speaks. The voice o' God. (Looking up.) Louder, Lord, that he may hear. Lo, the Lord speaks…list…he speaks…shhhh…(Cocks his head to one side and repeats slowly with emphasis.) 'This …is…thy…dwelling-place…Pior….Stay!" (*ND* 167). St Pior shows himself to be smarter than God as he asks Him to speak louder so that St Eusebius can hear Him. Following this, St Eusebius also gestures and pretends to hear: "Thy servant heareth Thee, O Lord…Thou speakest Lord…We hear Thee plain…(He cocks his head to one side and repeats slowly.) This…is…thy…dwelling-place…Eusebius…Stay!" (*ND* 168). The two men are presented as so ridiculous and greedy that they can lie about talking to God. St Pior says that it was not his Lord's voice. St Eusebius says it was his Lord's voice. Then, St Eusebius explains: "They both canst not be God's voice, even if He doth move in mysterious ways" (*ND* 168). They decide that the one who has suffered most for Christ will receive the cave. At this point, a ringside bell is heard, signalling the beginning of the fight. Firstly, St Eusebius tells how he went to a desert and made a tomb as his abode and a corpse as his pillow. He discloses: "We rott together: the dead flesh turned green, sliding off enblaunched bones and the space around was alive with white sluggies swimming in slime. Lo, I saw this body drip away and I prayed ankle-deep in flesh, praising sweet Jesus that my dead flesh too wouldst soon rott…Grrrk" (*ND* 169). Degradation as a principle of grotesque realism is employed in this speech since a living human being and a corpse are existing together and, thus, a living man is not seen as superior to a corpse. St Eusebius as a religious figure who wants to come close to God is degraded with this irrational and repellent action.

Next, St Pior, he tells the tale of one of his sufferings, saying

> I went forth from my hyena-hole and maketh my home in a hollow cedar tree lined wi' thorns. Five years bent double, ne'er able to turn my head or straighten my limbs. Five years pricked bloody by thorns and mosquitos that did infest the place. Till one day anger filled me

> and I killed one that was fat with my blood. Contrite, I stood naked in a swamp…Thus they avenged their dead brother. When I crawled back, men shunned me as a leper. Thus I killed my vile body. (*ND* 169)

This speech is very interesting because it is mixture of archaic and modern, ordinary, at times dirty, language, which may be taken as an example of Menippean satire as the genre juxtaposes normally incompatible things to resist one dimensional way of thought and to create a carnivalesque atmosphere, according to Bakhtin. After finishing his story, St Pior hits himself over the head with his water-jug and St Eusebius half strangles himself with his chain (*ND* 169). Then, they start to sing angrily, shuffling sideways and accompanying themselves by rattling their chains: "I don't know what's wrong with these MONKS today! Who can believe anything they say? MONKS! They are disobedient, disrespectful oafs! Noisy, crazy, lusty, lazy, loafers! (Jerking legs out.) But they still say anything—even if it isn't true! Oh why can't believe like we are, perfect in every way? What's the matter with MONKS today?" (*ND* 170). After they tell these absurd stories about themselves the two monks sing a song which questions the reliability and rationality of the monks. The abrupt transition from prose into song enhances the carnivalesque quality of the play as an example of Menippean satire. They contradict what they have recounted about their suffering for Christ by asking 'What is wrong with the monks today?' in the song. According to Robinson, these absurd, irrational and contradictory actions are often found in Menippean satire as the genre employs them in order to deflate all types of absolutes (140).

After their argument about who has suffered most results in an impasse. They try to prove who has given up most for God. St Pior states that he was a poor farmer before becoming a monk. Upon this, St Eusebius says that St Pior sacrificed nothing because, as a poor farmer, he did not have anything but he acquired power after being a monk. St Eusebius explains that he sacrificed a life of luxury to become a poor hermit by stating: "In my fleshy days I was tutor to the Emperor Theodosius[52] o' blessed memory. I was born in a great house wi' beds decked wi' gold and coverlets most

precious" (*ND* 171). St Eusebius finishes his speech by stating: "Thou only sacrificed a hard life for an easier one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, out. The ringside bell clangs and St Eusebius raises his right arm to acknowledge his victory" (*ND* 172). A spiritual discussion turns into a boxing match in which there is only physical force. That is, the abstract, the ideal and the spiritual are brought to the same level asthe earthly and the bodily. Although St Eusebius claims that he has triumphed, the two men are shown as equally ridiculous and absurd, which may be considered as another feature of Menippean satire as the genre does not show any ideology, class or person as being superior to another. It shows all of them as faulty and corrupted.

Although St Eusebius claims that he is worthier than St Pior as a result of leaving his life of luxury St Pior tells St Eusebius that he cannot get rid of his sins, even if he repents for a lifetime, as he was born into corruption, into a wealthy family. In response to that, St Eusebius explains: "Yea, I am a sinner and proud o' it. For joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety-nine just persons that need no repentance" (*ND* 172). This explanation may be considered as paradoxical because it implies that people can enjoy themselves in Heaven much more if they have sinned before going there. Then, St Pior tries to prove that he is God's messenger through performing miracles. St Eusebius claims that he will beat St Pior in terms of performing miracles he tells him how he has healed the sick and raised the dead (*ND* 172). In this, St Eusebius equates himself to Christ who healed the sick and raised the dead. In order to defeat St Eusebius, St Pior tries to rise up and levitate by chanting: "I am a soul inflamed with the love o' God. Love o'God, love o' God….(He lifts his arms and raises himself slowly up on his toes as his voice changes.) Up-up-up-uuuuup…(He is now standing on tip toes- his eyes are blank, his facial muscles set in a fixed mask and he speaks in a flat voice.) Behold, 'tis done. Now dost thou believe?" (*ND* 172). When St Eusebius tells him he has not moved, St Pior asks why he is looking down at St Eusebius (*ND* 173). St Eusebius stands next to St Pior and he also raises himself on tip-toe. He slaps St Pior across the face but St Pior simply reacts by saying: "Tis only Pior's hollow shell thou seest; his sounding box. Look up, I say, and behold the true Pior" (*ND* 173). St Pior is ridiculed by his own absurd behaviour such as raising himself on tip-toe and claiming to levitate. He does not react for St Eusebius' slapping himself. There is an allusion Christ's advice to his apostles: "But I

say to you who hear, Love your enemies, do good to those who hate you, bless those who curse you, pray for those who abuse you. To one who strikes you on the cheek, offer the other also, and from one who takes away your cloak do not withhold your tunic either" (Luke 6:27-31). Christ's advice is also ridiculed with these two ridiculous monks.

In addition, Barnes also assures his audience of the authenticity of the facts in this play except by stating: "The desert saints did live on black olives, dry bread and muddy water, practiced elevation and 'even' elongation and watered dry sticks in the desert…Everything has happened. The difficulty is finding the record of it" (*ND* 122). Thus, Barnes shows the irrational and absurd actions of men in a comical way, thus creating a specific view of reality. He is observed to pattern "the process called the shock of the familiar" (Kaplan 30). That is, he brings particular facts together from history and creates a fresh perspective through them. This may be considered as a characteristic of Menippean satire in the play since Menippean satire is defined as "the reexamination, reformulation, and the renaissance of the knowledge and wisdom which have always been the possession of the human race" (Kaplan 30). Therefore, the audience may re-evaluate assumed realities which are shown in grotesque and absurd ways.

St Eusebius opposes St Pior by claiming that any monk can practice levitation and tells him that he will demonstrate the miracle of transportation. He claims that he will transport himself to another corner without moving. St Pior responds to it in a comical way by saying: "Out o' that entrance wouldst please God more" (*ND* 174). Then, St Eusebius turns and faces the corner, half-crouching like an athlete at the start of a race. He starts by chanting and changing his voice: "Move me Lord, move me Lord. We adore Thee O Christ, my good Father and Holy Ghost. Behold thou hast come-Behold-thou-hast-come-Behold-Behol-Beeeee- (He speaks in a flat voice.) Behold. I am here" (*ND* 174). Then, a comical dialogue emerges between the two men as follows:

St Pior: Yes. Thou art here.

St Eusebius: No, here.

St Pior: Where, here?

St Eusebius: Here, here.

St Pior: Here, here?

St Eusebius: Here, in this corner!

St Pior: No. Here in front o' me. Thus. (*ND* 175)

St Pior deliberately slaps St Eusebius' face but St Eusebius does not notice. St Eusebius asks St Pior to turn and see him but St Pior sees nothing when he turns. When St Eusebius clanks across to the far corner, St Pior moves back as if he was avoiding St Eusebius. When St Pior scratches the empty space in the corner to where St Eusebius claims he has transported himself, St Esebius jerks his head away and tells: "Take care, thy greasy nails will scratch my face" (*ND* 174). St Pior gets angry and kicks out at the air in front of him, remarking: "Thou knewest thou couldst never perform Levitation, Transportation or even Elongation, so thou accused me o' failing, knowing thou couldst not move thyself" (*ND* 175). In response to that, St Eusebius says: "I grow weary o' these peasants' tricks. Lord Jesus my Savior, draw me back. Arise, through the grace and mercies o' Thy only begotten-Son-Only-begotten-Son-Only-begotten-only-begor-only-be-onlyeee-oneee-eeygng!" (*ND* 175). These absurd levitation and transportation scenes create laughter which parodies the miracles of saints. Thus, miracles and the mysterious powers of the saints are mocked.

Seeing that St Pior is not leaving the cave, St Eusebius takes some of the slack chain from his shoulders and beats St Pior with it. St Pior's face and body are bloody and St Eusebius tells St Pior to look at his body. However, St Pior says that he does not look at his body as it is vanity (*ND* 176). St Pior also takes a slack chain from his shoulders and starts to beat St Eusebius with it savagely. St Eusebius does not react to St Pior and states: "Alexandria is a heathen city again. This the anus, the very sink and drain o' mankind, like as London, Paris, New York. I see them below. They spread and merge. One great city girdles the whole earth. One dark place. Millions upon millions packed back to back. And hundreds more born every minute. They are never

alone, never alone with God. 'Tis a vision o' Hell" (*ND* 177). There is anachronism with references to New York, as America had not been discovered in the fourth century. Referring to the capital cities may be considered as examples of metafiction, too. The language used by the monk is vulgar as there is the word 'anus'. In addition, St Eusebius says that only one city controls the world. He is right in the sense that whichever of these cities becomes more powerful than the others rules the world. St Eusebius also states that because there are millions of people they cannot be alone with God. This is also true for the twentieth century. Thus, St Eusebius's comments are applicable to the life style of the twentieth century, although he lives in the fourth century. The meddling of different centuries prompts different viewpoints about these centuries. For instance, while St Eusebius considers what he has seen of the twentieth century as a vision of Hell. He is considered as a stage freak and his sacrifices to God are seen as a source of laughter by the twentieth century people at the end of the play. This may suggest that nothing is absolute, and values about religion, norms and conventions may be questioned as they can be considered absurd and irrational by different people in different centuries. When St Eusebius says it is a vision of Hell, St Pior says that it was St Eusebius' home and birth place (*ND* 177). This also may be considered as an example of metafiction because, at the beginning of the play, St Eusebius is described as a creation of the grotesque imagination of Barnes who is a British playwright.

Next, the two men start to speak in a modern colloquial style, which may be considered as another anachronism suggesting that similar things may happen in modern centuries, too. In addition, juxtaposition of an ancient dialect and modern colloquial style may be considered as an example of Menippean satire because, cccording to Weinbrot, "in its properly unsentimental mode Menippean satire mingles at least two genres, languages, voices, or even historical periods" (Weinbrot 10). The two men accuse each other of corrupting themselves. They beat each other with brutal force. They reach the top of the mound of excrement. St Eusebius strangles St Pior with his chain. St Pior's neck is broken and his dead body rolls down the mound. At the top of the mound, St Eusebius slowly comes back to himself and sings the 'Gloria in Excelsis[53]: "Glory be to God on high, and on earth peace, good-will towards men. We praise Thee, we bless Thee, we worship Thee, we glorify Thee, we give thanks to

Thee for Thy great glory…" (*ND* 180). St Eusebius sings this hymn after he kills St Pior considering the killing as a result of extreme devotion to God at the top of the mound of excrement. Thus, vulgar and scatological elements such as excrement are used in a religious context, which breaks down the hierarchy between the high and the low. There occurs a silence which is followed by icy winds. Lights are dimmed slowly and the play ends. Although St Eusebius claims that he kills St Pior for God he actually kills St Pior to stay in the cave. Thus, the two monks are shown to be ridiculous and greedy. Barnes portrays St Eusebius as a ridiculous monk who changes his voice to tempt himself, which suggests that saintliness and religion are demonic. This idea is strengthened with the coming of another monk, St Pior who is just like St Eusebius. The title of the play, '*Noonday Demons*' may refer to the two men. Therefore, the play shows two monks and religion as ridiculous and corrupted, and does not offer any positive thing to replace them with, as an example of Menippean satire.

As New Voice, representing a demon, has said at the beginning of the play men will not be governed by reason and justice. The two monks are shown in the fourth century acting irrationally and absurdly and one of them kills another in the twentieth century in a curtain call in which the stage turns into the twentieth century. Barnes may be implying that there has been no progression in human history as mankind has been greedy, selfish and irrational throughout the centuries. The two men start a journey to be close to God. They start their journeys by leaving their hometowns which may be taken as earth and end up in a cave which may be taken as a kind of hell because St Pior is killed there. The three-partite construction, that is, earth, heaven and hell, is a feature of Menippean satire. At the end of these journeys, the quest theme, finding truth, ends in despair in Menippean satire, as the genre considers attempting to find fixed and absolute meaning in life is futile.

Although the play has ended, there is a surreal scene on the stage during the applause and lights are up. St Pior gets up and St Eusebius II enters stage right. St Eusebius II is exactly the same as the original St Eusebius who is still standing on the mound of excrement with his chains unlocked. St Eusebius II and St Pior come to centre stage for their curtain call. All their actions are described as being slightly slower than normal as if they were in a dream, which blurs the boundary between

reality and dream suggesting that nothing is finished or complete. As they smile and bow to the audience, St Eusebius who has been watching St Pior and St Eusebius II from the top of the mound looks at them and at the audience. He shakes violently with fear while stating: "Have mercy Lord…Lord have mercy…Lord have mercy…mercy Lord…" (*ND* 181). He continues praying in the dark as the lights slowly fade. Although he asks for mercy he only gets applause from the audience. Thus, he becomes a theatrical entertainment as New Voice has foreseen at the beginning of the play when he says: "You'll be resurrected in the second half of the twentieth century as a stage freak. Your agonizing abstinence'll be treated as a subject for laughter" (*ND* 161). For an audience in the second half of the twentieth century, the two monks are seen as absurd and irrational.

In conclusion, *Noonday Demons* may be considered a work in the tradition of Menippean satire in terms of content and form. The play has a cynical, questioning approach towards saintliness and religion personified by St Eusebius who changes his voice and tempts himself. This approach is strengthened by the coming of a rival saint, St Pior. Saintliness and religion are ridiculed and portrayed as demonic by these two eccentric and grotesque religious hermits. Assumed ideas about saintliness and religion are overturned in a carnivalesque atmosphere through the parodies of religious stories, ironies, intertextuality, juxtaposition of normally incompatible elements such as the sacred and profane and the religious and earthly, the mixing of different narrative styles such as prose and verse, together with different languages such as a fabricated an archaic dialect and modern English.

2.4. Dreaming

In the Prologue of *Dreaming*, the fictional time is given as the Battle of Tewkesbury,[54] 1471 (Barnes, *Dreaming* 3). The first act starts with many corpses on the stage including a priest crucified on a cross. A group of soldiers, who have fought on the side of York and have won, dream about their future as the war ends. They have different desires for this future. For instance, Davy wants money. Jack Skelton wants to die: "My body's ground-over, but I'm not dead! I killed so many I am become Death but I can't die. Why can't I die? Everybody dies" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 4). Bess wants peace and Mallory, the captain, wants to go to home. He explains: "Our enemies're

crushed without reprieve. The Prince of Wales, Somerset and Wenlock dead, Queen Margaret captured, King Henry deposed and broken. There's no way back for 'em. After twenty years and more, the carnage is over" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 5). The names referred to in the quotation are real people in history and the War of the Roses did indeed last for twenty years. Thus, the play problematises the boundary between the real and the fictional. As an example of Menippean satire, the play brings particulars, facts and perceptions of events together in order to form a particular view of reality. The Battle of Tewkesbury is used to re-evaluate the notion of victory in the war as the soldiers who won the war do not realize their dreams, of 'heroes' of the war as they do not seem to be heroes but plunderers, and of 'home'. Assumed ideas about war, victory, heroes and soldiers will be deflated as an example of Menippean satire which aims to deflate all types of assumed ideas without offering any positive alternative.

After Mallory's explanation about their victory, all of the soldiers start to sing: "Soldier, soldier, no cheers from us./ Our weapons will soon turn to rust./ Soldier, soldier, all's grey ash and fine dust" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 5). Mixing prose and verse is a defining feature of Menippean satire as Menippus, the pioneering figure of the genre, mixed them in his works and this practice came to be known as Menippean satire (Kaplan 45). Menippus inserted songs, curses, iambics and other unexpected rowdy material into the formal learned genres. This enhances the carnivalesque quality of the play as Menippean satire resists a one-dimensional way of thought.

Then, Lord Percy Beaufort, who has fought for Lancaster, is captured and he says: "I only went to battle because my father dribbled on about honour. What's honour compared to my dogs?" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 6). Although he is a lord he does not care for honour, and he even debases it by comparing it to his dogs. Beaufort is also happy because the war is over even though Lancaster has lost. As an example of Menippean satire, this play provides a fresh perspective on war and on the soldiers who fight in the war. Normally, people like Lord Percy Beaufort are portrayed as heroes, give importance to honour and do not become happy when they lose the war. However, Menippean satire brings high figures down to earth and make them familiar. Thus, Lord Percy Beaufort's reaction for the result of the war is that of an ordinary man. He is happy even though he is on the losing side and says: "Now I can go back

home to get married and tend my estates. I'll spend my time with my bride, watching feathers fall on fine summer days" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 6).

Lord Percy Beaufort is a very rich man and he calls himself lucky by stating, "I've always been lucky, for luck favours those who don't need it" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 6). His speech is ironic and implies that life is therefore unjust. Yet, Mallory and his friends kill Beaufort because they know that they cannot gain anything from him, as the Duke of Gloucester, will take all of Beaufort's money. When Gloucester asks them why they have killed him, Mallory explains that he wanted Beaufort's boots as they were his size (Barnes, *Dreaming* 7). None of these soldiers seem to care for honour because they kill a lord as they cannot see any profit in sparing him. They are portrayed as greedy and selfish since they all want to attain their desires, as ordinary people with selfish desires, not heroes. Winning a war does not make them superior to ordinary people in terms of their selfish and greedy natures. Thus, Barnes takes a cynical approach towards the idea of a hero by creating a war hero such as Mallory who kills a lord because he wants his boots.

Gloucester replies to Mallory, laughing: "I wanted his estates, they're my size too. I planned to take them after the battle. It's easier now, he'll have no possible objections" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 7). While these soldiers are shown not as heroes but as people who plunder after the war, their general is shown as even greedier than his soldiers. For instance, Gloucester says to his soldiers: "My brother Edward's King of England now and our family can steal the earth. I need your cold sword and colder heart at court to help me keep what we steal. I've a high destiny and I'll pull you up in my wake. Power and money" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 8). Both the York and Lancaster dynasties have fought for the throne. Gloucester's words reveal the real intention of the Yorks' desire for ascending the throne, which is plundering the country and having power. The House of York and the House of Lancaster have fought for twenty years to have power and many people have died because of the greedy desires of these leaders. As an example of Menippean satire, the play provides a fresh perspective on those who are on the winning side of a war. It does not show the dukes and lords as war heroes but as looters.

In the following scenes and acts, Mallory has many adventures. Fantasticality, adventures and quests are important features of Menippean satire. Bakhtin states that the most important feature of the menippea as a genre is that "its bold and unrestrained use of the fantastic and adventure is internally motivated, is justified by and devoted to a purely ideal and philosophical end: the creation of extraordinary situations for the provoking and testing of a philosophical idea, a discourse, a truth, embodied in the image of a wise man, the seeker of this truth" (*PDP* 114). Mallory, the main protagonist of the play, goes to many different places and meets different people, as he exposes the fragility of assumed ideas. His journeys sometimes become fantastical. He makes all these journeys to get home. In this sense, he is similar to Odysseus who spent ten years getting home. However, in contrast to Odysseus, Mallory cannot reach home as the play is not an epic but a Menippean satire. The quests in Menippean fantastical journeys usually end in despair. Thus, *The Odyssey* by Homer is parodied in the play which suggests that there is no such place as home.

His first adventure takes place in Scene Three, Act One where, as the Dies Irae is heard, a ragged Priest leads a small funeral procession of three scarecrow Peasants carrying a corpse in a shroud. The Priest announces the man, Shem Gehena, died in pain. First Peasant says: "Curse God for the lords who put him to the rack, the servants who turned the screws, the people who stood by and did nothing" (*Dreaming* 9). Second Peasant also curses God "for the beatings and stabbings, for the forcing (them) to bow low" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 9). Third Peasant curses God "for giving (them) no life to live, for making (them) poor" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 9). The Priest warns them not to curse God by claiming that all the pain the peasants have suffered will dwindle when they enter Eden (Barnes, *Dreaming* 9). The First Peasant sees Mallory and asks if that is true or not. Mallory replies: "Even if it is, what's that to you? You're being blessed in another universe. Here and now you're being crushed. Send your crushers into the dark!" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 10). The Priest becomes angry and says that God forbids it. Mallory says that God is therefore their oppressor (Barnes, *Dreaming* 10). There is a cynical questioning of God's justice. Although the priest explains that all the pain of the people will disappear in the afterlife, Mallory blames God for the current miserable lives of the peasants. Thus, God is not seen as absolute but is debased for being unjust towards the peasants.

After Mallory's blaming of God, the Priest is about to attack but Mallory puffs out his cheeks and blows the Priest backwards, and the priest falls into the open grave. This is an exaggerated and comical scene in which Barnes might have desired to show how weak, or powerless the priest indeed is. Mallory explains it by saying: "Nothing's sacred or powerful unless you make it so" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 10). For instance, when First Peasant asks Mallory to lead them, Mallory says that they do not need him as they are many and have the power. Third Peasant says: "Be a true hero. Hold the banner high. We are the crippled and impotent. Teach us to rise, take up our beds and march! The crosses all around fall over and the corpses laying in their graves sit up eagerly" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 10). The play suddenly turns into a fantastical tale as the corpses rise up and the action shifts on to the plane of the supernatural. This may be considered as a feature of Menippean satire in the play as the genre dispenses with the usual conventions of verisimilitude. For instance, the ordinary strictures of time and space that limit the actions of people in the everyday world are not applicable in Menippean satire.

There is also irony in the attitudes of the peasants because, although they are getting rid of a priest who is trying to lead them, they now want Mallory to lead them. Mallory explains: "It's not a matter of armies. When you're confronted with a king in full majesty, you behold him with reverence" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 10). Then, the peasants say that they will not crawl any more. Mallory states that they, then, can do it without him, and he leaves for home. However, suddenly, while the corpses are cheering, the Priest climbs out of the open grave carrying the dead man in his shroud. The corpses immediately go back to their graves and the crosses come back on to them. At this, the peasants cower back in fright instead of fighting for their freedom. The priest goes on with his praying as if nothing has interrupted him. He asks the peasants resume singing 'Dies Irae' (Barnes, *Dreaming* 11). The play has a satirical approach towards those who yield their will to other people. As an example of Menippean satire, the play does not favour any ideology or any class as being superior to another. The play criticizes the powerful people for being greedy and cruel but it also criticizes those who are oppressed by the powerful. For instance, the peasants do not use their power but they always seek somebody to lead them.

Mallory's next adventure takes place in a tavern and the customers are singing: "When you live, live in clover./'Cause when you're dead/ You're dead, dead all over…" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 11). One of the customers in the tavern says: "I started being a Strolling Player, very young, by swallowing spoons. His name's Joss Zadd. The one and only Zadd" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 12). While other characters are talking, he keeps playing, strolling, and dancing to entertain them. Marie, the owner of the tavern, asks Mallory if he is a stranger. Mallory replies that he is a stranger everywhere, implying the impossibility of arriving home. The tavern is like a carnival scene in which there is no hierarchy among people. They talk, laugh, dance, and sing. This carnivalesque atmosphere is enhanced with Zadd's parrot. Zadd introduces the parrot by saying: "This is Josiah. If you pull his right leg he sings the 'Te Deum'. If you pull his left leg he sings the 'Angelus'." (Barnes, *Dreaming* 13). Upon this, White asks: "What happens if you pull both legs?" (*Dreaming* 13).The Parrot answers: "I fall off the perch, dummy!" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 14). The Parrot speaks like a human being and he is smart and comical. Zadd becomes angry with the parrot and says: "You've always been difficult. When I bought a pretty female parrot for you for ten florins, you pulled off all her feathers" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 14). The parrot explains: "For ten florins I wanted her naked!" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 14). Then, the parrot and Zadd sing and the parrot says he is the Father and Zadd is the son. There is a subversion of the hierarchy between man and animal here as the Parrot is claiming that, since he is the father, he is more mature than Zadd. While all those in the tavern, including the parrot, are singing, a man with a long beard named Gratz enters. He behaves in a rude way because he says that people are generous when they are frightened (Barnes, *Dreaming* 14). Mallory cuts off Gratz's beard with his dagger and two birds fly out from under it, twittering loudly (Barnes, *Dreaming* 15). This is nothing unusual, because anything is possible in the fantastic world of Menippean satire. With the two birds, the scene is like a carnival scene because carnivalistic life is a life drawn out of its usual path, it is to some extent a "life turned inside out," "the reverse side of the world" (*PDP* 112). Marie asks Mallory to stay with them by saying: "Stay with us, Stranger. I'll teach you to walk on air and you'll teach me to make rude noises with my mouth…She magically produces a bunch of flowers from each of her sleeves" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 16). In order to convince Mallory to stay in the tavern, Webster says that they were talking about

universal questions. For instance, they are talking about where flies go in the winter (Barnes, *Dreaming* 16). Terle, Marie's father-in-law, wonders if they go to fly graveyards (Barnes, *Dreaming* 16). Because life is distorted in a carnivalistic life, Marie can magically produce flowers from her sleeves and unimportant matters like where flies go in the winter can become worth discussing in the tavern. The scene ends with the occupants of the tavern singing.

In Scene Five, Act One, Mallory's next adventure takes place on a desolate plain with a cold wind and flurries of snow. Mallory enters stage half singing, half shouting defiantly: "When you live, live in clover./I won't be DEAD/ I won't be DEAD all over!" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 17). Singing and prose are juxtaposed throughout the play in order to enhance the carnivalesque atmosphere and to mix prose and verse as a feature of Menippean satire. There is a small pedlar's cart and a drunken pedlar, Cobett, with his teenage children, Joanna and Edward. Cobett seemingly complains about his children by stating: "I was left with them when their mother died. She said they was mine but that don't make it so. I don't feel 'em in the blood" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 18). Joanna suggests that Mallory sleep with her. Mallory refuses and Cobett offers him a drink but Mallory refuses him as well. Mallory tells Cobett to drink first. While Cobett is leaving, Mallory insists that he drinks and points his sword at Joanna. Cobett says: "The times're murderous. A simple act of fellowship is examined for hidden snares…Trust a little, Stranger" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 19). Then, Cobett drinks from the bottle and hands it to Mallory. Mallory asks for forgiveness for not drinking and for suspecting them. This is ironic because Mallory is right to be suspicious. After Mallory leaves, Cobett collapses. This shows that Cobett and his children are hypocritical. They pretend to be honest people but they had planned to poison and rob Mallory. Thus, there is a situational irony in this scene because, while Cobett tries to poison Mallory, he himself is poisoned.

Scene Six in Act one is very interesting as it is a dream that Mallory has. Employing dreams is also a feature of Menippean satire. It gives both an unusual point of view and blurs the hierarchy between the real and the illusion. In his dream, Mallory tells a man, named Gaunt Man, that he used to live in that farmhouse and that he has come back now. Mallory sees some lights and asks about them. Gaunt Man explains:

"The lights of fools. They belong to the greatest fool of all called Mallory who left years ago, leaving a wife and child who're even bigger fools as they expected him to come back" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 20). Mallory says 'he will come'. Gaunt Man says 'he can't'. Mallory says that it was his home (Barnes, *Dreaming* 20). Gaunt Man states: "Home's a place that never was and never can be again. Here farmers fell trees, sow rye and reap it, whilst old men die and children're born. It's always the same for them because they're part of it. But move away and you can see the world has changed. You see it but you're no longer part of it, Mallory, because you rejected it" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 21). Mallory says: "I rejected love too for in the world of war and death, love makes a man vulnerable, opening paths to the heart. I forged myself in a cutting blade. But now I love again…Is all well down there? (Barnes, *Dreaming* 21). Gaunt Man says: "It's all what you hope for, all what you dream of finding" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 21). With the sounds of waves the scene ends. Moral-psychological experimentation as a characteristic of Menippean satire is employed in this scene. Namely, "any sort of the unusual, abnormal and psychic states of man-insanity like unrestrained daydreaming, split personality, passions bordering on madness, unusual dreams, and suicides among others find places for representations in the genre" (*PDP* 116). Mallory has dreams about his dead wife and daughter many times in the play and he comes to the verge of insanity as he cannot distinguish the real from the illusion anymore, especially at the end of the play. The concept of normalcy is challenged in Menippean satire and the binary opposition between reason and unreason, or sanity and insanity is subverted by using psychological abnormalities.

The next scene, Scene Seven, Act One, starts with the sound of a single flute. This scene is also a part of Mallory's dream. Mallory goes to his one-room farmhouse and watches his wife Sarah while she is preparing the dinner. His daughter Anna is sleeping under blankets. Although both Sarah and Anna died two years earlier, Mallory sees them and talks to them. Sarah accuses Mallory of stealing six years from her. Mallory replies that he will buy them back with the diamonds he took during the war but Sarah says that the years are lost and cannot not be bought (Barnes, *Dreaming* 22). Mallory continues to insist: "Diamonds'll keep us safe, Sarah, safe and warm…It's money! Money wipes away all cares. It'll build high walls. There's pain and torment outside. Let them do what they will, they can't touch us, safe and warm behind high

walls" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 22).When Sarah says, "You never watched us grow older, John" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 22) Mallory replies: "Sacrifices had to be made. We were poor" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 22). This shows that Mallory goes to war not to be a hero or out of nationalistic feelings but to become rich. While Sarah and Mallory are talking, Anna half wakes and says: "Mama, Mama, Daddy's come home" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 24). Sarah says: "You're only dreaming, Anna. Go to sleep" (Barnes, *Dreaming*). There is no boundary between reality and dream in this scene because although Sarah talks to Mallory in Mallory's dream she knows that it is a dream. Sarah and Mallory rest in each other's arms. Therefore, psychological abnormalities such as dreams, daydreams and insanity are used to destroy the epic and tragic wholeness of a person and his fate in the play as an example of Menippean satire. According to Bakhtin, psychological abnormalities are employed in Menippean satire because "the possibilities of another person and another life are revealed in the protagonist, he loses his finalized quality and ceases to mean only one thing; he ceases to coincide with himself" (*PDP* 116). Mallory has dreams and daydreams, which bring him on the verge of insanity in order to have a family and home.

In Scene Seven, Act One, Sarah, Mallory's dead wife, sings a lullaby in Mallory's dream: "Only let your heart be true/ All our waking thoughts are of you/ As you lay down to sleep/ No need to weep, my sweet, no need to weep" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 24). Inserting a lullaby into prose narrative introduces different narrative styles into the same text, which results in a digressive narrative style and, thus, a carnivalesque atmosphere. When Mallory opens his eyes he looks around in shock. He looks at the place where Anna was sleeping but there is only a tattered rag doll. Mallory understands that they are dead and says: "The first act of my life ends now home is no longer a place" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 26). It is interesting that the first act of the play also ends here. Thus, it may be claimed that the play is about Mallory's life. This idea is supported by the ending of the play, as the play ends when Mallory dies. At the end of the scene, Bess, Skelton, Davy and Mallory sing and dance around the graves: "Shh/Don't you hear life pour away/Every second of the day/ All blown away like sand/Like tiny grains of sand/Like tiny grains of sand" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 26). People do not normally dance and sing around graves but such scenes of scandal, inappropriate speeches and performances, eccentric behaviour, any sort of deviation

from conventional norms of behaviour, manners of speech, and etiquette can be found in Menippean satire (*PDP* 116). These scenes stop the normal run of life for a while and make people avoid the norms in the society. As an example of Menippean satire, there is juxtaposition of the serious, death, and the frivolous, dance, in this scene.

Mallory's next adventure takes place in Beaufort's estate because Gloucester kills each member of the Beaufort family and asks Mallory and his friends to guard the estate until he comes back. He says: "You're a stone killer and a man of honour- or what passes for honour in this world. That's a rare combination" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 28). When Mallory shows some unwillingness to guard the estate, Gloucester says that it was an order by explaining: "Be grateful. Choice is a terrible affliction most men and women try to avoid at all costs. Choice is why men like me rule. We take the burden of choice from your shoulders. I'm forcing you, Mallory, so whatever foul deeds you commit you have a good excuse: I forced you! The guilt's mine" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 28). This is a satirical approach towards people's avoiding responsibility for their actions. People try to justify their actions by blaming the conditions under which they act or blaming others for forcing them to act in a certain way. Gloucester knows human nature well and acts according to it. Then, the soldiers agree to guard the estate. In return for this, Davy asks for money, Bess asks for love, Skelton asks for death and Mallory still wants to go home (Barnes, *Dreaming* 29). While they are guarding the estate Davy suggests selling everything in the estate in order to make money. Although Gloucester trusts these soldiers as he thinks they are honourable, Davy does not care for honour. Davy is a greedy person and he is only thinking about money. Skelton replies to Davy in a comical way: "On days when I weaken and think of fruit trees and summer skies, I look at you, Davy, and remember why I long for death" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 30). Davy says: "I don't understand why adults won't admit you do it all for money. Money's a perfectly creditable motive, certainly as creditable as fame, lust or power" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 30). Davy does not find other soldiers' attitudes towards money as sincere and his attitude once more reveals the greedy nature of human beings.

While these soldiers are talking, Jethro Kell, the chaplain, appears and says: "There are so many footloose priests cluttering the byways, looking for work now

peace has broken out. In the war, we had jobs. Every troop, red or white rose, needed a priest. Military men always like priests about to justify the slaughter" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 31). Kell reveals the fact that people abuse religion to serve their interests. However, Kell is as faulty as the military men because he knows their real intention but he still works for them. He is also thinking about his own interests. This shows the hypocritical nature of religious figures such as Kell. Then, the scene becomes comical and absurd. Skelton tries to jump out of the window and Bess says: "Jack, it's no good trying to throw yourself out, we're on the ground floor" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 32). As Skelton shouts and struggles violently, Kell takes out three coloured balls and juggles with them. A chaplain acts like a juggler. These kinds of reversals and profanations are employed in Menippean satire in order to break down the hierarchy between the high and the low.

Then, a woman appears and Mallory claims that she is Sarah, his dead wife. Bess opposes Mallory by saying: "She's dark-haired, Sarah was blonde. She's got different coloured eyes, different face, different body, voice, weight and height" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 33). Mallory insists by saying: "But apart from that she's exactly like Sarah" (*Dreaming* 3). Kell introduces the woman: "This is Susan Beaufort, a widow and distant cousin of the dead Duke. She was here to marry lucky Beaufort who died at Tewkesbury. She's been away a week so Gloucester missed her. Massacres are rarely one hundred percent proof, there's usually someone left" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 33). This is a cliché about massacres. One is usually missed and returns years later with a claim on the estate and takes revenge. Susan is missed but she will die at the end of the play and cannot have a claim on the estate. Thus, the cliché is subverted in the play. Kell talks about himself: "I've been a turnip-weeder, cow-juice jerker, and I've even sold gold-painted pisspots to Celts on the wrong side of Hadrian's Wall, telling 'em they were priceless Etruscan vases…" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 33). Although Kell was a cow-juice jerker and lied while selling gold-painted pisspots, he became a chaplain. This shows that a religious figure may not be as respect-worthy and superior to others as he seems to be. The play portrays a chaplain who is no different from ordinary people. As an example of Menippean satire, the play provides a fresh perspective on people who are in authority. Kell and Bess kiss and sing: "We're two lost souls/Wandering past/ One more time/It's just fine/No need to pine/For nothing's

what it seems./We're only strolling, strolling through your dreams/Your dreams, your dreams…" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 34). When Bess says that she cannot imagine Kell as a priest, Kell replies: "I confess I always felt like a deaf mute telling worshippers how a blind man saw a cripple run on water" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 34). Kell is shown as a hypocritical person.

Then, Susan states: "I've been ill. My voices tell me everything but not why I'm alone" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 36). Mallory says: "You're not alone. You've a family, see, you have a mother, father, brother, son and husband!" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 37). Susan looks at Bess, Kell Skelton, and Davy. Kell tells Bess: "Mallory insists on a wedding. He's convinced Susan she's here for their marriage and cast us as her family…We're caught in a story that isn't our story, minor characters, pushed to the edge" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 37). This may be considered as an example of metafiction because Kell is a minor 'character' in this play, *Dreaming*, by Peter Barnes as Kell says in the quotation. The play revolves around Mallory and Mallory's story is told in the play. Bess says: "I'll never be a minor character, pushed to the edge, Kell, I'm too full of piss and ginger. I've got size!" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 37). Bess's explanation is ironic because although she refuses to be a minor character she is, in fact, a minor character in the play. This may be considered as an example of dramatic irony as the audience/reader knows Bess is a minor character although she does not know this. Kell says: "But you're still only part of Mallory's dream, like the rest of us" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 37). What Kell says about being a part of Mallory's dream also implies that the whole play may be Mallory's dream. For instance, Scenes Six and Seven in Act One consist of Mallory's dreams. Thus, nothing seems to be certain in the play. The boundary between real and illusion is blurred. The suggestion that the play may be Mallory's dream is supported by the following dialogue between Mallory and Kell. When Mallory becomes angry and says that Kell is not family, Kell responds to him: "You said we were. You gave us roles to play and we're playing 'em to the hilt" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 38). This may also be considered as another example of metafiction as these characters are playing their roles on stage, too. These metafiction examples enhance the carnivalesque quality of the play as an example of Menippean satire. They also contribute to the cynical approach of the play implying that nothing in the play is certain.

Kell performs the wedding ceremony of Susan and Mallory and as Kell starts the proceedings, Susan looks at the figure of Christ who stirs and comes down off the cross. Christ stretches and talks directly to Susan. He says: "I'm stiff as a board. Golgotha[55] was bad enough but at least it was short. I didn't expect to be left hanging around for centuries…I've come down for you, Susan, I know it's a shock so let me tell you a joke to break the ice. I used to be quite a joker. They cut all that out of the good book. MISTAKE!" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 38). As an example of Menippean satire, the play disregards the usual conventions of verisimilitude. That is why Christ stirring and talking directly to Susan are given simply as fact in the play. In addition, Christ's speech is interesting in the sense that there is a cynical questioning of the religious books. For instance, Christ says that he was a good joker but this was cut from these books. Thus, these religious books which are usually seen as sacred and absolute are shown as unreliable and questionable instead.

Christ also tells a joke as follows: "An atheist was out fishing with friends and he hooked a large stone from the bottom of the lake. Carved on it were the words, 'I don't exist. Signed, God.'…It's an old one, but don't forget I've been out of touch" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 39). Christ is portrayed as a joker instead of a spiritual leader. He continues by saying: "You'd like me tell you the secrets of the universe and other deep-dish stuff, but I can only tell you what I know...like…did you know the Ten Commandments were only a first draft and Adam and Eve only spent twelve hours in Eden, not even enough time to get in some gardening? If Adam were lying on a plate with a pickled herring you wouldn't been able to tell the difference" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 39). As an example of Menippean satire, the play has a profane attitude toward the sacred by bringing it down to earth into a naturalistic setting, by oxymoronic combinations and by a carnivalistic misalliance of the common and the vulgar with the holy. For instance, Christ says that he does not know anything except for unimportant things like the length of time Adam and Eve spent in Eden. As human beings, they committed such sin in just twelve hours that they were expelled from Paradise, which shows the inclination of humans to sin or make mistakes. They are in Eden but can only pass twelve hours there before committing a sin. Christ also mentions that Adam was so ugly that one could not distinguish between him and a

pickled herring. Thus, the sacred is debased with oxymoronic combinations and the meddling of the common and the vulgar with the holy.

Furthermore, Christ explains: "I know you were expecting me to know everything, Susan. That's my Heavenly Father, not me. It always was his trouble. He knows how everything is going to end so He always stands kibbutzing[56] on the sidelines. I try to give Him advice. I tell Him it's His fault there's evil in the world: He didn't create enough money. But He doesn't listen, parents never do" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 39). Although atheists generally blame God for the prevalent evil in the world, in the play Christ blames God for it. Christ even says that he tried to give advice to God but He did not listen to him. God and Christ are brought to the same level as an ordinary parent and child. There is profanation of Christ and God here. The hierarchy between the sacred and the profane is debased as an example of Menippean satire which attacks all types of absolutes to level them and make them familiar.

Christ finishes his speech by saying: "Time's up. Of course you get me down to give you some advice, Susan. But when I was alive all I did was give advice and nobody took it, not then, not now. So I'll tell you another joke instead…Listen, how many Jewish mothers does it take to light a candle?...None!...(Assumes a whining woman's voice.) 'Don't worry about me, I'll sit here all alone in dark'. " (Barnes, *Dreaming* 39). Because Christ here says he knows that nobody listened to his advice, he does not give advice any more but he tells jokes instead. This implies that Christ or religion cannot help people and cannot give advice to solve their problems. Christ is not seen as a saviour. Instead, he is ridiculed as a saviour figure with these jokes. In addition, religion may be claimed to be indifferent to the problems of people as Christ does not take Sarah seriously. Then, Christ climbs back on to the cross. While the wedding ceremony continues Susan bursts out laughing at Christ's joke after saying 'I do'.

After Susan and Mallory are married, Susan says that she is aware that Mallory tricked her and asks Mallory when he recognized that she was not Sarah. Mallory says 'not long'. Mallory asks why she dreamed his dream and Susan replies that she needed a protector. Mallory says that he needed a wife and a family. They do not hesitate to abuse each other before getting married as they get married to serve their own interests.

That is, Susan needs a protector and Mallory needs a wife and a family. Then, Susan suggests going to the Welsh side of the family as they are still intact (Barnes, *Dreaming* 41).

While Mallory and his friends are singing they confront two skull-headed figures, Tor and Faulks, who come to take Susan Beaufort as she is the last living Beaufort. Mallory does not allow Susan to go as he claims that she is his wife. Tor has a badly scarred face, false arm and smashed leg, whilst Faulks has a missing hand, eye and ear. They have grotesque bodies. Grotesque is employed in Menippean satire in order to break down the concept of idealized beauty. Tor's false arm drops off and he picks it up and screws it back in place. Tor's body may be considered as grotesque as it is both repellant and comical at the same time. It is revealed that Gloucester has made Tor the new captain because Mallory has disobeyed Gloucester by marrying Susan. Faulks says: "I lost my right eye at some forgotten battle north of here…(He takes out his right eye.) And my leg somewhere else…(He stabs his wooden leg.) And what about my hand…(He tries to unscrew his left hand, but can't.) They don't make good hands any more. They can't get the wood!" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 44). His body may be considered as grotesque both because it is unfinished and creates ambiguity as it is repellent and comical at the same time, especially when he stabs his wooden leg.

Mallory congratulates Tor on his promotion by saying: "It's always a wonder when a soldier's rewarded. Usually we end up begging in a gutter, shivering in rags. So we grab what we can get" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 44). Although soldiers are usually portrayed as heroes in epics they are reduced and made familiar in Menippean satire. Mallory is portrayed not as an honorable hero but as plunderer when he says that he grabs what he can. As an example of Menippean satire, the play does not just blame one side in the war but it sees both sides as faulty, corrupted, and responsible for the current problem. Therefore, the institution which does not reward veterans is shown as faulty by the greedy soldiers such as Mallory. When Mallory learns that the two men came alone he is surprised. Faulks explains that Gloucester thought his word was enough. Skelton takes this as an insult and Davy says: "He didn't even try to bribe us!" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 46). Mallory kills them, saying that they misjudged him as a friend and that coming there unprotected was a mistake. Upon this, Faulks says that they

came under a white flag of truce (*Dreaming* 46). However, Mallory and his friends do not respect a white flag of truce. They are only interested in their advantage.

After Mallory eliminates Tor and Faulks, two new soldiers come from Gloucester with drawn swords in Scene One, Act Three. First Soldier tells Skelton he must yield or die. Skelton cries: "My saviours! Are your swords viper-sharp? Puncture my heart with 'em…(He rips open his shirt.) Here, here, where it beats!" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 49). As he moves towards them, they yell in fright and rush out. This scene is comic because Skelton wants to die but he cannot. However, because the two soldiers do not know this they are scared and rush out, even though they have swords. Moreover, Davy is missing and Mallory insists on waiting for him as he says: "We're going home together. That's what home means. It's not just a fixed point on a map" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 50). Nonetheless, Mallory loses his friends one by one during their journey, which shows that finding home is impossible for Mallory. Then, Davy comes with a man of Gloucester's to guide them through the swamp. He is Sean Tully. Because Davy pays him, Tully betrays Gloucester. Tully leads them and he says: "Follow, follow, follow. It makes me feel like Moses leading the Chosen People to the Promised Land" (*Dreaming* 51). Kell says: "Moses never saw it, he died on the way" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 51). It is ironic and may be considered a flash-forward because Tully will not see it as he also dies on the road. Skelton suddenly starts spluttering and convulsing violently. He cannot control his movements and lurches away across the swamp. Skelton sometimes splutters and convulses in order to express his feelings, which may imply the insufficiency of language as a reliable tool for communication. This both enhances the carnivalesque quality of the play and shows a distrust of language. In order to save Skelton, Davy chases after him but both sink into patches of quicksand. Tully pulls Davy out but he falls into the quicksand himself. Mallory lies down at the edge of the quicksand and throws a rope of coats to Skelton. Tully sinks fast and Skelton is saved. When Skelton asks why they saved him instead of Tully, Mallory replies that he is family. However, because Tully has sunk they do not know which way to go. The scene finishes with Susan singing: "Light, light/Tread so light/Look with care/Everywhere/On your toes, On your toes/So it goes/Like a cat/Thin not fat/Soft, soft/Tread so soft/If you fall/Do not call…" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 53).

In Scene Three, Act Three, there is a large 'pool' of spring water. Mallory and his friends have saved themselves from the swamp and they are in the pool now. Bess talks about her late husband by saying: "I had enough religion from my second husband. When he was sick he believed if he ate three pages of the Bible, he'd immediately feel better. In his last sickness, he dosed himself on the 'Book of Kings'. He only got halfway through Chapter Fourteen before he choked to death" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 54). People's superstitions about religion are mocked here. Davy explains where he comes from: "Most nights we'd go out and rob one of our neighbours. When we got back we found we'd been cleaned out ourselves. So it was all in balance until one of the villagers died and his brother inherited everything. Terrible thing was, the brother was an honest man and didn't go out thieving nights. That meant the thief who was going to rob him couldn't" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 55). That thief becomes poor and poverty comes into their lives. That is why Davy leaves his home. He also adds: "It's what honesty does for you. One honest apple and it turns the whole barrel rotten" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 55). Because the most important thing in life for Davy is money, he compares honesty to a rotten apple. For instance, in Scene One, Act One, he says: "Gold is my home. Gold is friendship, beauty, wit, courage, honour, reason for living…Gold makes me laugh. The more I have, the more I laugh (Barnes, *Dreaming* 4). As an example of Menippean satire, the play breaks down the hierarchy between the ideal and the abstract, honesty, and the material, money. Even money is elevated above honesty in a comic way.

Mallory recognizes that archers are approaching from the east. Davy receives an arrow in his back. He clasps diamonds and gold to his chest and sighs contently. He says: "It's what I always wanted…I die rich" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 56). Davy asks Bess: "Bess, you said there was a secret reason we were crossing the border…Tell me the real reason" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 56). Bess explains: "There's riches in Wales. Gloucester's enemies've promised five thousand crowns and land if we join them and betray the Duke" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 57). Thus, it is revealed that they follow Mallory not to have a home but to have money and betray their leader. Their only motive is money.

In the following scene, Scene Five, Act Three, there are two blind beggars, Ruben and Waller with white sticks in a line behind a third beggar, Ginger Tom, who is leading them. They come across Susan and Bess and ask for food by singing: "Food, food, give us food/We waste away/More every day/Give us food/Or we're dead/Meat or veg, fruit or bread/Fresh or stale/Hear us wail/Food, food, give us food!" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 58). Susan gives them stale bread but they ask for more and then attack Susan and Bess. Mallory and Skelton arrive and kill the two blind men. Kell has beaten Ginger Tom and drags him over to Ruben and Waller. Kell tells him to look at what he has done but Ginger Tom says he cannot see as he is blind. Because Ginger Tom leads the two blind men Kell thinks that Ginger Tom could see. Ginger Tom replies: "I was their leader because they thought I could see" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 60). This indicates a satirical approach towards people's prejudices about others. Although Ginger Tom is blind like Walter and Ruben, Ginger Tom becomes their leader just because they believed that he could see. What makes Ginger Tom the leader of Ruben and Waller is their belief in his superiority to themselves. A similar idea is stated by Mallory in Scene Three, Act One: "Nothing's sacred or powerful unless you make it so" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 10). As an example of Menippean satire, the play has a cynical attitude towards all types of absolutes in order to deflate them.

Scene Six, Act Three shows Mallory and the others exhausted by their walk. Bess is ill and Susan says she is pregnant. Mallory becomes very happy and tells Bess this news, but Bess is dead. In Scene Eight, Act Three, Susan says that it is less than a day's march across the border and they will be safe there. They decide to move when the mist clears but Kell reveals that he will not be joining them by explaining: "I've lost the taste for adventure. I told Bess we shouldn't've come with you. But she was sucked into your dream of home…It's hard to break out of other people's dreams, they hold you fast and you're lost…I dreamed once, of 'God's goodness'. It's somewhere, I'm sure, but not here, not in this corner or that…Like your dream of home I can't find it anywhere…" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 64). Kell compares himself to Mallory in the sense that both of them are pursuing a dream, Mallory is after 'home' and Kell is after God's goodness, although both of them know that they will not be able to find them anywhere. As an example of Menippean satire, the play has a cynical questioning

towards the notions of home and God's goodness. The scene ends with Kell stabbing himself.

Leaving Kell behind, Mallory and his friends continue their journey. In Scene Nine, Act Three, the mist has cleared enough to show the outline of a magnificent manor house on a hill. Susan points to the house and says: "Home!...It's the Welsh manor…They'll be waiting to welcome you, John" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 66). The mist begins to get thicker again, hiding the house on the hill. Mallory scoops up a handful of mist and smells it. He recognizes that it is not mist but smoke. In addition, there is the sound of a flight of arrows and a muffled cry as they hit their target. Skelton staggers back out of the smoke with dozens of arrows sticking out of him. He says: "I fought up hard to find my death…Why?...It's a secret…It's part of my character and I'm not sharing it with the likes of you! It would diminish me…See, there's a glow in the sky. Stars're dying too and the smoke grows solid and phantoms appear…This way to the city of joy! This way for eternal peace! Tis way to join the saved!..." (Barnes, *Dreaming* 67). He falls dead. Only Mallory and Susan remain.

In Scene Ten, Act Three, Susan and Mallory stand in the ruins of Beaufort Manor house with smoke still lingering round its burnt and blackened walls. Susan says: "This was to be our home, now it's gone in an instant" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 68). Mallory says: "I lost a home before. We'll build another. We're already started" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 68). The pale figures of Davy, Bess, Kell and Skelton appear singing softly: "Ghosts, ghosts, we're ghosts/Don't make sound/While we're around/You won't hear our calls/As we pass through walls/Ghosts, ghosts, we're ghosts" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 68). With the coming of the ghosts, the journey becomes a fantastical one once more, which is another feature of Menippean satire in the play. Susan asks them why they are there. Kell replies: "You called us. The living call the dead. The dead usually don't come but we're only newly dead so we come easy" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 69). Mallory and Susan speak to the dead, which is a feature employed by Menippus in his satires (Kirk 10). Bess says: "I know I can see God mounted on a hummingbird" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 69). Davy adds: "And snails are camels, maggots drink champagne and all shout 'Thank you' " (Barnes, *Dreaming* 69). Thus, normal life is turned inside out in this scene as an example of the carnivalesque

atmosphere. Bess says the secret of the Cosmos…Ghosts (chanting) Ka tangike kiri/kiri/Katangi tem oho/moho/Ka tangi te tike/Ka tangi te tike/tike…" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 69). When Susan asks what that means Skelton says who knows. Ghosts make up a new language. This may be considered as a feature of Menippean satire as the genre embraces unconventional use of language.

In Scene Eleven, Act Three, Mallory sees his dead wife, Sarah, again and talks to her. She says: "I've risen from the dead to be with you, John…You won't leave again, will you John?" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 71). Mallory is on the verge of insanity. Menippean satire employs any sort of psychological abnormalities in order to break the hierarchy between sanity and insanity. This also makes the protagonist/narrator of the play unreliable, thus subverting the authority of the narrator. Menippean satire opposes any sort of authority but it poses a cynical, questioning approach towards it. Then, Susan says: "We're home, John! It's what you wanted, isn't it?...We're home at last, aren't we, John?" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 71). Mallory says: "We're home, Sarah" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 71). Mallory confuses Susan with Sarah, his dead wife. He cannot distinguish between real and illusion any longer.

Mallory and Susan sit huddled together in the freezing cold, walls rise up around them and they find themselves sealed in a cosy room in front of a warm fire. Mallory says: "I made enough sacrifices to make it real. Davy, Bess, Kell, Skelton, all gone, died hard on the hoof…Why did they follow my dream, Sarah?" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 71). Susan says that he is the hero of this story. This is an example of metafiction because Mallory is the protagonist of this play. Mallory does not consider himself as a hero and asks why they followed him. Susan explains: "Most lives're matter-of-fact. We go here and there do this, do that, and count the days. We're practical…We have to be. We build things and knock things down, eat, procreate and die. You gave us something else" (Barnes, *Dreaming* 71). Mallory says that he was never sure what it was. Susan replies that he believed it and that was enough (Barnes, *Dreaming* 71). This may be a criticism of the way in which so-called heroes such as Mallory generate a mass-following. People prefer to follow others instead of taking their own decisions and leading their own lives. Although Mallory believes that he failed, Susan claims that he let them glimpse another world. This shows how the

soldiers wanted to create their own lives by finding "a sociality without having to accept the norms of recognized morality and demonstrating how the power of a dream, and of 'dreamers', allows people to go beyond the relationships and perceptions that characterize everyday life, to realize their own potential, to step outside and oppose 'the sociality of injustice', which Barnes characterizes as Authority and the deathly sickness of obedience to power" (Rabey 253). The fire and the walls round them slowly disappear and they are left seated on a bare, cold mountain top. The snow stops and Gloucester and his soldiers appear. They approach and see the frozen figures of Mallory and Susan. Gloucester says 'goodbye' to Mallory and adds that this is what comes of dreaming. Thus, it may be claimed that *Dreaming*, as an example of Menippean satire, has a continues narrative including parody of *The Odysseus* and a fantastic adventures that ridicule both the traveler, Mallory who, as an unreliable protagonist, desires to get home but cannot, and the world that is Mallory's goal, because Menippean satire can be defined as a "continuous narrative, subsuming a number of parodies of other literary forms along the way, of a fantastic voyage that mocks both the traveler who desires the truth and the world that is the traveler's goal, related by an unreliable narrator in a form that abuses all the proprieties of literature and authorship" (Relihan 9).

In conclusion, *Dreaming* is about the exploits of a group of ex-soldiers in the aftermath of the War of the Roses. Although the soldiers have different desires they gather around the war hero Mallory who asks for constituting 'home' in a catastrophic post-war landscape. While trying to arrive home, Mallory and his friends have many adventures which sometimes become fantastical. Thus, the play is a parody of *The Odyssey* by Homer, suggesting that there is no such place as home since the soldiers including Mallory die one by one before arriving home. The play has a cynical, questioning approach towards heroism, home, and friendship. Instead of idealizing these values, they are ridiculed in a carnivalesque atmosphere which is created through ironies, parody, the juxtaposition of the sacred and profane, the insertion of songs into narrative, and so on. The play has a satirical approach towards heroism and human values by showing them as ridiculous.

CONCLUSION

Menippean satire emerged with the writings of Menippus of Gadara in the first half of the third century BC. Bakhtin explains that when classical antiquity ended and Hellenism started, many genres were merged and developed. Although they showed external differences, they were united through an inner kinship, which was called the serio-comical, a particular realm of literature. They had an inclination to direct harsh criticism against cultural, social and religious myths. Menippean satire is considered to be the most important example of the serio-comical genres.

Because Menippean satire belongs to a dialogical convention rather than to a monological tradition, every ideology in it is represented as something no superior to another ideology, since all ideologies are shown as ridiculous. This is the natural result of Menippean satire's aim of subverting all types of absolutes instead of favoring one over another. Menippean satire always asks questions without providing answers, uses experimental fantasticality, and makes use of different points of view in the same text. The genre also employs madness, dreams, split personality and scandals as well as inappropriate speech, to create a carnivalesque inversion of the hierarchies prevalent in society. Menippean satire is full of contradictory behavior and characters, and includes a variety of other genres to parody them, all of which contribute to the digressive structure of the genre. At the end of a Menippean text, there is no resolution, either for the characters or for the audience since the aim is not to bring about a social reform or help people to resolve their problems. The aim of Menippean satire is to make a cynical questioning of social, cultural and political absolutes in a carnivalesque atmosphere.

Although Quintilian (35-100 AD) claims that 'satura' (satire) as a literary genre started in Ancient Rome, in English literature its beginning dates back to the Middle Ages. *The Vision of William Concerning Piers Plowman* by William Langland (1330?-1400?) may be considered as the first example of English satire because of its pervading spirit. Although satire has existed always since the Middle Ages in English literature, the interest in it began to increase with the translations made in the Renaissance period. Finally, the peak period of it came about in the late seventeenth century and continued well into the late eighteenth century. Satire as a genre gained

great popularity when the political and social conditions of the eighteenth century, with the changes in the political and religious structures of England, were tumultuous.

The second time of satire's reaching its peak period is the second half of the twentieth century. Satire may be considered as a response to the decline of the British Empire in the post-War era and as response to the changing of the dominant values of post-war British society. The decline of tradition and deference results in the emergence of a permissive society and a cynical contempt towards politicians and public figures. These factors may be considered as the result of the shift from austerity to affluence and of the independence and of the increase in the purchasing power of the young generation in the 1960s. All these contributed to the emergence of satire boom in the early sixties and the fundamental question related to the emergence of the satire boom was 'what's wrong with Britain?'. Although there was a relative affluence at that time there was also a deep sense of loss as a result of the transformation of an imperial power into an island state during the post-war decades. Satire is the most appropriate genre for this period as satire mostly appears and flourishes when empires are in a period of decline instead of construction. It emerges when value systems are broken down, questioned, reassessed or challenged.

Two important characteristics of Menippean satire are observed in *The Ruling Class*. The play has a cynical approach towards all types of absolutes and has a carnivalesque atmosphere. Barnes cynically questions the concept of normalcy in the ruling class, the function of organized religion, and the so-called English habit of servility. He also exposes the absurdity of the class-based society, the preference of human beings for vengeance instead of love, and the malignity of power and authority. While dealing with these themes, Barnes shows all types of absolutes regarding norms as well as cultural, religious and philosophical dogmas to be ridiculous through parody, irony, and sarcasm. The play is highly comical and political as it attacks the existing order even in its most absurd moments, making the play an example of Menippean satire. Barnes' attitude is just like that of Menippus whose writings are described as "jocular, either lacking seriousness altogether or expressing serious ideas in mocking or humorous manner" (Kirk 4). The play has a typical Menippean ending that has no didactic aim as the aim of it is to deflate all types of absolutes such as the established

values of morality and the superiority of Englishness and of institutions ranging from the Church to the House of Lords which represent the values of 1960s' Britain, by creating a carnivalesque context. That is, the audience is left with a Menippean questioning at the end of the play with Grace's dying scream. Barnes only shows his despair and terror at this corrupted social system.

The carnivalesque quality in the play is created through a medley of various literary styles such as dance, mime, and song; through quoting or misquoting from other books such as the Old Testament, the New Testament, and *Richard II*; through referring to both classical literature and traditional songs, to contemporary popular culture and modern songs at the same time; through employing different languages like English, German and Latin; putting contradictory ideas such as the God of love and the God of Vengeance into the same text; through using different ideologies in the same text, such as the ideology of the working class and the ideology of the ruling class and through a medley of fact and fiction. As a result, the play becomes comic and tragic; serious and frivolous; low and high, entertaining and disturbing all at the same time as a work in the tradition of Menippean satire is.

In the introduction to *Leonardo's Last Supper* and *Noonday Demons*, which was written to be performed after *Leonardo's Last Supper* as a double-bill, Barnes writes, "the aim is to create, by means of soliloquy, rhetoric, formalized ritual, slapstick, songs and dances, a comic theatre of contrasting moods and opposites, where everything is simultaneously tragic and ridiculous" (Barnes, *Plays I* 122). Thus, while he is defining the aim of his plays he makes a definition of Menippean satire. It is possible, then, to consider these two one-act plays as examples of Menippean satire in terms of form. As for the content, they may be considered also as examples of Menippean satire because these plays have a cynical approach towards assumed realities.

Leonardo's Last Supper constitutes cynical approaches to the values of the Renaissance. Instead of extolling the Renaissance ideals about art and aesthetics, the play poses a clear criticism of the rise of materialism and a hard-core capitalism which undermine art, aesthetic values, and other human values. The play delivers its criticism in a carnivalesque atmosphere through the juxtaposition of prose and verse, different

narrative styles such as inserting songs into the narrative, cross-dressing, juxtapositions of incompatible things such as sacred and profane, and material and spiritual, parodies of religious stories, ironies, intertextuality, and the mixing of different centuries through using a Renaissance setting and using an archaic language while also referring to modern works or writers, modern songs or modern jokes. Thus, through the techniques used to create a carnivalesque atmosphere, the assumed hierarchies are broken down and parallels with contemporary debates about capitalism, religion, and self-interest are emphasized.

Noonday Demons has also a cynical, questioning approach towards saintliness and religion personified in the person of St Eusebius who changes his voice and tempts himself. This approach is strengthened by the coming of a rival saint, St Pior. Saintliness and religion are ridiculed and portrayed as demonic by these two eccentric and grotesque religious hermits. Assumed ideas about saintliness and religion are overturned in a carnivalesque atmosphere through the parodies of religious stories, ironies, intertextuality, juxtaposition of normally incompatible elements such as the sacred and the profane and the religious and the earthly, the mixing of different narrative styles such as prose and verse, together with different languages such as a fabricated archaic dialect and modern English.

Dreaming is about the exploits of a group of ex-soldiers in the aftermath of War of the Roses. Although the soldiers have different desires they gather around the war hero Mallory who asks for constituting a ‘home’ in a catastrophic post-war landscape. While trying to arrive at home Mallory and his friends have many adventures which become fantastical at times. Thus, the play is a parody of *The Odyssey* by Homer and suggests that there is no such place as home. The soldiers including Mallory die one by one before arriving home. The play has a cynical, questioning approach towards heroism, home, and friendship. Instead of idealizing these values, they are ridiculed in a carnivalesque atmosphere which is created through irony, parody, a medley of the sacred and the profane, and through inserting songs into narrative, and so on. The play has a satirical approach towards heroism and human values.

While describing his theatre, Barnes does not refer to his plays as Menippean satire, although they may be considered in the line of the Menippean tradition both in terms of form and content. Barnes describes his theatre as "a drama of expertise and ecstasy balanced on a tight-rope between the comic and tragic…a drama that made the surreal real, that went to the limit, then further, with no dead time…a drama glorifying differences, condemning hierarchies, that would rouse the dead to fight, always in the forefront of the struggle for the happiness of all mankind" (Barnes, *Plays I*, viii).

From this description, the carnivalesque quality of his theatre may easily be inferred, as his theatre is like a carnival without hierarchies and brings opposite things to the same level such as high and low as well as comic and tragic. In addition, Barnes employs almost every element of theatre such as music, spectacle, dance, heightened speech, sounds, modern slang, poetry, tragedy, comedy, ritual, farce, and slapstick, all of which exemplify a digressive narrative and the multi-styled nature of Menippean satire. From this perspective, Barnes presents a bounty of themes, characters, costumes, and ideas, unlike his contemporaries who mostly write realistic and naturalistic plays concentrating on the trivial details of the ordinary lives of ordinary characters.

In terms of themes, what Barnes' plays do is to expose the social evil, political abuses, and discrepancies in history in a carnivalesque atmosphere. Barnes uses the stage to protest and discuss English society's values and the institutions representing them. Although the system satirized in the play is shown as corrupted and ridiculous, it is still preserved at the end of his plays because Barnes does not provide any utopian vision or solution to the problems he presents in the same way as Menippus rejects any sort of dogma but does not propose any alternative to replace what he has rejected. The audience is left comparing their attitudes and beliefs with what is shown on stage. Barnes, therefore, is aiming to create a disturbance within the political consciousness of the audience in order to encourage discussion and to educate them to change.

Even though both in terms of form and content, Barnes has been observed to have dealt with similar themes in the form of Menippean satire because he thinks that it is essential to deal with these themes his late play, *Dreaming*, is not as comical as his early plays. *Dreaming* may be claimed to be more pessimistic and less playful than

his early plays. His style is also observed to be simpler than his early plays. As Barnes himself says explains he writes as easily as he breathes: “I think the clearer, the cleaner pattern of Dreaming- the pattern of a journey- requires this simplicity…Stylistically, I think I am writing in a simpler way. The dialogue is not so packed. I am not doing a James Joyce and packing five or more different layers of meaning into every sentence” (Rabey 258).

Barnes’s drama has been observed to be saturated by class hatred and by an abhorrence of the social, economic, and religious bastions of Western society. He uses the past to shed light on modern inequities such as class stratification, exploitation, capitalism and institutionalized religion. Barnes does not want to portray a slice of life in his plays. Instead, he wants to create skeptical, rational, critical, but not impressed or fooled people. The reason he wants to create such people is because he wants to make the world a little better and to be remembered as a playwright who had a responsibility towards his audience.

All features of Menippean satire in terms of form and content may be observed in Barnes’ plays *The Ruling Class*, *Leonardo’s Last Supper*, *Noonday Demons*, and *Dreaming* as they desire to reject any sort of absolutes regarding norms, cultural, religious or philosophical dogmas by creating a carnivalesque atmosphere. In order to oppose absolutes, the plays, as examples of Menippean satire, make use of parody, irony, intertextuality, juxtapositions of normally incompatible things, fantasticality, quest theme, any sort of psychological abnormalities such as madness and daydreaming, all of which enhance the carnivalesque quality of the plays at the same time. A resolution is not offered at the end of the plays because the genre does not favor any ideology over another but shows all of them as faulty and corrupted. Because all the features of Menippean satire may be found in Barnes’ selected four plays it is possible to classify his plays as modern examples of Menippean satire. Since all through his career Barnes used similar themes to the ones used in the analyzed four plays written in the form of Menippean satire he may be considered as a modern Menippean satirist.

ENDNOTES

[1] The Royal Society of St. George is a patriotic English society founded in 1894 to promote English traditions, customes and English way of life.

[2] He refers to French Revolution taking place in 1789 and to Russion Revolution taking place in 1917.

[3] He worked as Prime Minister from 1964 to 1970, and from 1974-1976.

[4] Nicholas Ridley (c. 1500- 16 October 1555) was an English Bishop of London. He was burned at the stake because of his support for Lady Jane Grey.

[5] The burning of a heretic

[6] Hugh Latimer (c. 1487-16 October 1555) was a Fellow of Clare College, Cambridge and Bishop of Worcester. He was burned at the stake and became one of the three Oxford Martyrs of Anglicanism.

[7] *Saul* is a dramatic work about the first king of Israel and his relationship with his successor David. The relationship is based on admiration at first but it turns into hatred and the downfall of the monarch later.

[8] Wedgwood is a company founded in 1759 by an English potter and entrepreneur called Josiah Wedgwood. It produces fine, china porcelain and luxury accessories.

[9] St. Francis (1881?-1226) was the founder of the Franciscan Order, and later became a Christian Saint. He was one of the most venerated religious figures in history.

[10] Socrates (c. 470-399 BC) was a classical Greek philosopher being one of the founders of Western philosophy. He was known the first moral philopsher of the Western ethical tradition of thought.

[11] General Gordon (1833-1885) was a British general who is seen as a national hero because of his courage in defending Khartoum against Sudanese nationalists.

[12] This person is not real person. He is made up by Barnes.

[13] Ludwig II (25 August 1845-13June 1886) was a king of Bavaria from 1864 till his death in 1886. He was called mad king because he did not have interest in daily state affairs and he spent all his royal revenues for extravagant artistic and architectural projects. He was a committed patron of the composer Richard Wagner.

[14] Ezekiel was the son of a priest and he was captured in 597 BC. While he was studying to be a priest. He was thirty years old when he was called a prophet during the exile in Babylon. He takes a sword, shaves his hair and divides it into three equal parts. His hair represents the people of Israel. In addition, Ezekiel "burns a pile in the middle of the city of Jerusalem, to show that it has been consumed by famine and pestilence during the siege. The second portion was to be struck with a sword; more literally, the Israelites were to die from warfare.The third remaining part was to be scattered on the wind. This literally meant that the Israelites were to disperse throughout the lands" (https://literaryloudmouth.wordpress.com/2013/10/30/what-is-the-significance-of-ezekiels-hairy-ways/).

[15] Lazarus' resurrection is told in the Gospel of John (John 11:1-44). According to the story, Jesus Christ brings Lazarus of Bethany back to life four days after his burial. This is considered as the last miracle before Christ's resurrection.

[16] In the story, a man called Armand falls in love with Marguerite Gautier who is a courtesan. He convinces her to leave her old life and to live with him. However, Armand's father prevents them from being together. Marguerite suffers from consumption. Until she dies Armand thinks that she has left him for another man. It is tragic love story.

[17] Ludovic Koch (1881-1974) was a broadcaster and an expert on recording animal sounds. He played an important role in enhancing the British people's admiration of wildlife.

[18] Judas Iscariot was one of the twelve disciples of Jesus Christ. He betrayed Jesus Christ to the religious authorities, which resulted in Jesus Christ's crucifixion.

[19] He is a fictional Japanese secret agent created by the American author John P. Marquand. He exists in six novels published between 1935 and 1957.

[20] He is a fictional character found in film, radio, television and comic book serious based on the fictional Western character created by O. Henry in his short story called 'Caballero's Way'.

[21] He is a character in a stage play called *The Tragedy of Bussay d'Ambois* (1603-1607) by George Chapman.

[22] A Polish-American social psychologist called Dr. Milton Rokeach (December 27, 1918-October 25, 1988) conducted an experiment in Ypsilanti, Michigan in 1959. He

brought together three men who claimed that they were messiahs to discover whether their behaviours or delusions would change when they were confronted with the contradiction of three people's claiming the same identity.

[23] He is a fictional villain character in a number of novels created by British author Sax Rohmer during the first half of the twentieth century. He has become an archetype of the evil criminal genius and mad scientist.

[24] Hear My Prayer is a Christian anthem composed by Felix Mendelsohn in Germany in 1844. The text is derived from Psalm 55. "...O for the wings, for the wings of a dove!/Far away, far away would I rove!/ In the wilderness build me a nest,/ and remain there for ever at rest".

[25] Palme Dutt (1896-1974) was a journalist and a theoritician in the Communist Party of Great Britain.

[26] This is an allusion to the movie *Animal Crackers* because the character named Harpo Marx drops silverware from his sleeve while police are arresting him.

[27] Divine Proportion or the golden ratio is described by Euclid, Greek Mathematician, "through the division of a line segment. A line segment whose length is *A* is divided into two smaller pieces, one of length *B* and the other of length *C*, such that the ratio of the original segment to the larger piece is equal to the ratio of the larger piece to the smaller piece" (http://eds.b.ebscohost.com/eds/detail/detail?vid=2&sid=dad4328a-a1dc-429c-b67e-b0c172652d09%40sessionmgr101&bdata=Jmxhbmc9dHImc2l0ZT1lZHMtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#AN=98697071&db=ers). In addition to math, divine proportion is used in art as well.

[28] Its full title is Miserere mei, Deus. It means "Have mercy on me, O God" in Latin. It was composed by Italian Gregorio Allegri during the 1630s. It is the setting of Psalm 51 which is used in many liturgical traditions thanks to its spirit of humility and repentance (https://miserere.askdefine.com/).

[29] The Black Mass is a ritual which is characterized by the inversion of the Traditional Latin Mass celebrated by the Roman Catholic Church. It became popular in French literature in the nineteenth century.

[30] Sigismondo Malatesta (19 June 1417-7 October 1468) is a noble Italian military leader.

[31] Federico da Montefeltro (7 June 1422-10 September 1482) is one of the most successfull Italian military leaders. He is also a renowned intellectual Humanist and the Lord of Urbino.

[32] According to Biblical narrative, God asks Abraham to sacrifice his son, Isaac. Although Abraham loves his son very much he obeys God. When he is about to sacrifice his son God sends a ram with an angel to be sacrificied instaed of Isaac.

[33] Jonathan is a heroic figure in the Hebrew Bible. He is the eldest son of King Saul. Jonathan eats honey without knowing that his father curses those who eat before evening but he is saved from death by his father.

[34] It is a Latin hymn. The poem describes the Last Judgement and states that the saved will be delivered and the unsaved will be burnt in eternal flames.

[35] According to a Medieval story called "A Runaway Horse", there was an old man named Rinuccio di Nello in Florence. He had an old and clumsy horse towards the end of his life. Rinuccio wants to take a ride and ties his horse up out in the street. Then, the horse hears a mare in the street and he breaks his strong bridle: He follows the mare in the street and causes some people to die (Appelbaum 83).

[36] It was a famous outdoor market in Florence.

[37] Samuel Jonson (1709-1784) was an English writer. He contributed to English literature as a poet, moralist, literary critic, biographer, lexicographer and an essayist.

[38] Michelangelo (1475-1564) was an Italian sculptor, painter, architect, and a poet of the High Renaissance, born in Florence.

[39] The apostle Paul turns from a persecutor to Jesus' follower during the Damascus Road experience. This experience is considered both as a conversion and as a call to new life. Paul himself cannot describe what has happened but he describes this conversion as a resurrection of Jesus (http://www.bbc.co.uk/religion/religions/christianity/history/paul_1.shtml).

[40] The doctrine of the Trinity is a Christian belief holding that there is one God, who is Father, Son, and Holy Spirit (http://www.bbc.co.uk/religion/religions/christianity/beliefs/trinity_1.shtml).

[41] 'The Last Supper' was painted by Leonardo Da Vinci in 1498 at the height of the Renaissance in Milan. This mural painting was done on the request of Ludovico Sforza, Duke of Milan. It depicts the last supper of Christ with his twelve disciples.

Leonardo read the Gospels before painting the Last Supper. The painting reflects the reactions of the disciples when Christ says one of them would betray him. Leonardo portrays Philip asking "Lord, is it I?". Christ answers: "He that dippeth his hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me" (Matthew 26). Judas and Christ are portrayed reaching simultaneously to the same plate although Judas retreats defensively. Judas is portrayed as holding a purse in his hand, which signals his betrayal because he takes silver to reveal Christ to the authorities after the meal. Peace may be observed in Christ's face while fear, indignation, grief, and treachery among others may be observed in the faces of the disciples. Thus, the painting combines the spiritual and the worldly. Another Biblical story depicted in the paining is that Christ is blessing the bread and the wine by stating: "Take, eat; this is my body. Drink from it all of you; for this is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for the forgiveness of sins" (Matthew 26). These words are important for the sacrament of the Eucharist. The painting has ideal geometric forms as Christ's body is like a equilateral triangle and he sits under an arching pediment that if completed traces a circle. The twelve disciples sit as four groups of three. There are also three windows. Number three refers to the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. Da Vinci renders a verdant landscape beyond the windows. This is interpreted as heaven and suggests that heaven is only achieved through Christ. The last thing about the painting is that the portraits on the painting are the portraits of people in Milan. (See https://tr.khanacademy.org/humanities/ap-art-history/early-europe-and-colonial-americas/renaissance-art-europe-ap/a/leonardo-last-supper).

[42] Mona Lisa is a popular song written by Ray Evans and Jay Livingston in 1950. It is popularized by Nat King Cole. Both the title and the lyrics of the song refer to the Renaissance portrait of Mona Lisa by Leonardo da Vinci.

[43] It is a feast that "commemorates Christ's resurrection and is observed with variations of date due to different calendars on the first Sunday after the paschal full moon" (https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/Easter).

[44] Saint Anthony (1195-1231) was born in Lisbon, Portugal. His real name was Fernando Martins. He was born into a rich family but he was asked to be sent to the Abbey of Santa Cruz in Coimbre by Franciscan friars. He studied theology and Latin there. Then, he changed his name to Anthony and left for Morocco to spread God's

truth. However, because of his bad health he returned to Portugal and he was assigned to the hermitage of San Paolo. The head of the Franciscan hermitage wanted Anthony to speak on whatever the Holy Spirit told him to speak of. (See https://www.catholic.org/saints/saint.php?saint_id=24).

[45] It refers to Bosch's *Saint Anthony Triptych* in which St. Anthony is painted in the centre of the central panel. In the four scenes illustrating St. Anthony, the Saint is being tempted in a *physical* way: "in the left interior panel, his body is attacked with violent actions; in the right interior panel, the weapon used by the devils is carnal lust; and the principal scene in the centre panel focuses on Christ, who is comforting the saint after he has been beaten. Anthony is absent from all the other scenes and yet it is obvious that these scenes are also meant to be understood as temptations" (DeBruyn 59).

[46] Hieronymus Bosch (c. 1450-August 9, 1516) is an Early Netherlandish painter of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Most of his works portray demons, sin and human moral failings (https://www.hieronymus-bosch.org/).

[47] These are the lyrics of a popular song written by Irving Berlin (1888-1989). He was born in Russia but moved to America.

[48] Alexander the Great (356 BC-323 BC), the king of Macedonia, is considered one of the greatest military geniuses of all times.

[49] Julius Caesar (100BC-44BC) was a Roman politician and a military general. He played an important role in the rise of the Roman Empire.

[50] George Michael Cohen (1878-1942) was an American actor, playwright, popular song writer and producer of musical comedies.

[51] "To be, or not to be, that is the question:

Whether 'tis nobler in the mind to suffer

The slings and arrows of outrageous fortune,

Or to take arms against a sea of troubles." (Shakespeare 63)

[52] Theodosius (347 CE-395) was a Roman Emperor of both East and West. He tried to bring religious unity to the country both with political and religious motives. Thus, only those who believed in the Holy Trinity were considered as Catholics. According to the Christians, Theodosius was emperor by the grace of God (https://www.britannica.com/biography/Theodosius-I).

[53] Gloria in Excelsis is a Christian hymn. It begins with angels informing the shepherds about the birth of Christ.

[54] Battle of Tewkesbury (May 4, 1471) is the Yorkist King Edward IV's final victory over his Lancastrian opponents during the English War of the Roses (https://www.britannica.com/event/Battle-of-Tewkesbury).

[55] The hill where Jesus was crucified according to the Gospels.

[56] Kibbutz means "a communal settlement in Israel, typically a farm" (https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/kibbutz).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

Barnes, Peter. *Peter Barnes Plays: 1, The Ruling Class*. London: Heinemann Educational Ltd., 1996.

---. *Leonardo's Last Supper*. London: Heinemann Educational Ltd., 1996.

---. *Noonday Demons*. London: Heinemann Educational Ltd., 1996.

---. *Dreaming*. London: Methuen, 1999.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Abrams, M. H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. Boston: Heinie&Heinie, 1999.

Akşehir, Mahinur. *John Fowles and Menippean Satire*. Deutschland: Lap Lambert Academic Publishing, 2012.

Albrecht, Michael von. *A History of Roman Literature: From Livius Andronicus to Boethius Vol. I*. New York: E.J.Brill, 1997.

Aytür, Ünal. "Humour and Satire in English Literature". Çankaya Üniversites Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi, Journal of Arts and Sciences Sayı: 3 /Mayıs 2005.

Bakhtin, M. M. *The Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Trans. Caryl Emerson. London: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.

---. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Ed. Michael Holquist. Austin: Texas UP, 1981.

---. *Rabelais and His World*. Trans. Helen Iswolsky. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1984.

Barker, Clive. "On Class , Christianity, and Questions of Comedy . Interview with Clive Barker. New Theatre Ouarterlv 6:SI (1990) 5-24.

Bartie, Angela. *The Edinburgh Festivals : Culture and Society in Postwar Britain*. Edinburgh University Press, 2013. EBSCOhost.

Blanchard,W. Scott. *Scholars' Bedlam: Menippean Satire in the Renaissance*. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 1995.

Brown, Judith M. *The Oxford History of British Empire: The Twentieth Century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Bly and Wager, "Theatre of the Extreme: An Interview with Peter Barnes." With Mark Bly and Doug Wager. Theater (Spring 1981): 43-48.

Carpenter, Humphrey. *A Great, Silly Grin: The British Satire Boom of the 1960s*. New York: PublicAffairs, 2000.

Childs, David. *Britain Since 1939, Progress and Decline*. London: Macmillan Press LTD, 1995.

Coffey, Michael. *Roman Satire*. London: Methuen&Co. Ltd., 1989.

Coles, Chris. *How to Study a Renaissance Play: Marlowe, Webster, Jonson*. London: Macmillan Publishers LTD., 1988.

Corinthians.https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=1+Corinthians+15%3A17-19&version=NIV

Defoe, Daniel. *The True-born Englishman and Other Satires*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2003.

Demastes, William W. *British Playwrights, 1956-1995: A Research and Production Sourcebook*. Greenwood Publishing Group, 1996. EBSCOhost.

DeBruyn, Eric. "The Iconography of the Lisbon Saint Anthony triptych: Bosch and the Vita Antonii".http://expert.jeroenboschplaza.com/ericdebruyn/wpcontent/uploads/sites/2/2017/02/DeBruyn_1.pdf. Web. 2 April, 2018.

Donnelly, Mark. *Sixties Britain: Culture, Society and Politics*. Pearson Education Limited, Edinburg: 2005.

Dryden, John. "A Discourse Concerning the Original and Progress of Satire". London: Clarendon Press, 1948.

Dukore, Bernard F. *The Theatre of Peter Barnes*. London: Heinemann Educational Publishers, 1981.

Dudley, Donald R.*A History of Cynicism: From Diogenes to 6th Century A.D.* London: Methuen, 1937.

Elliott, Robert C. Encyclopedia of Britannica. https://www.britannica.com/art/satire.

---. *The Power of Satire: Magic, Rituel, Art*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1960.

Evans, Lewis. *The Satires of Juvenal, Persius, Sulpicia and Lucilius*. London: John Childs and Son, 1910.

Everyman. http://geeks.astorialand.com/scripts/everyman.pdf.

Feinberg, Leonard. Introduction to Satire. Iowa: The Iowa State University Press, 1967.

Frye, Northrop. *Anatomy of Criticism*. London: Penguin Books, 1990.

Furlong, Norman. *English Satire: An Anthology*. London: George G. Harrap&Co. LTD., 1947.

Gardiner, Michael E. *The Dialogics of Critique: M. M. Bakhtin and the Theory of Ideology*. London: Routledge, 1992.

Gilbert, Highet. *The Anatomy of Satire.* Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1962.

Goldthwaite, Richard A. "The Medici Bank and the World of Florentine Capitalism". *Past & Present*, No. 114 (Feb., 1987), pp. 3-31. Web. 19 April, 2018.

Griffin, Dustin H. *Satire: A Critical Reintroduction*. The University Press of Kentucky, 1994. EBSCOhost.

Guilhamet, Leon. *Satire and the Transformation of Genre*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987.

Hennessy, Brendan. "Peter Barnes: Interviewed by BRENDAN HENNESSY". The Transatlantic Review, No. 37/38 (Autumn-Winter 1970-71), pp. 118-124.

Hodgart, Matthew. *Satire*. Italy: Officine Grafiche Arnoldo Mondadori, 1969.

Holman, Hugh C. *A Handbook to Literature*. London: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1992.

Juvenal. *The Satires*. Trans: A.S Kline, 2011. Electronic Source. Date of Access: 29.05.2017.

Johnson, Paul (Edt.). *Twentieth Century Britain: Economic, Social and Cultural Change*. London: Longman, 1994.

Jonson, Ben. *Everyman in His Humour*. Ed. Percy Simpson. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1919.

Kaplan, Carter. *Critical Synoptics: Menippea Satire and the Analysis of Intellectual Mythology*. London: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2000.

Kemp, Martin. *Leonardo Da Vinci: The Marvelous Works of Nature and Man*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Kirk, Eugene P.*Menippean Satire: An Annotated Catalogue of Texts and Criticism*. New York: Garland Publishing, 1980.

Kristeva, Julia.*Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1980.

Kernan, Alvin B. *The Plot of Satire*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1965.

Knight, Charles A. *The Literature of Satire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

---. "Satire, Speech, and Genre", Comparative Literature, Vol. 44, No. 1 (Winter, 1992), pp. 22-41.

Lomas, Charles W. "Sir Alec Doulas home: A Case Study in Rhetorical Failure". *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 2009, 56:3, 296-303. Web: 18 April, 2018.

Lowe, Norman. *Mastering Modern British History*. London: Macmillan Press LTD, 1989.

Milowicki, Edward J. and Robert Rawdon Wilson. "A Measure for Menippean Discourse: The Example of Shakespeare".*Poetics Today* 23:2 (Summer 2002) pp.291-326.

Murfin, Ross and Ray, Supryia. *The Bedford Glossary of Critical and Literary Terms*. Boston and New York: Macmillan Press LTD, 1998.

Musgrave, David. *Grotesque Anatomies: Menippean Satire Since the Renaissance*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014.

Nicholson, Steve. *The Censorship of British Drama 1900-1968: Volume One 1900-1932*. University of Exeter Press, 2014. The Censorship of British Drama, 1900-1968. EBSCOhost.

Ogborn J. and Peter Buckyord. *Satire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Persius, Flaccus. *The Satires of A. Persius Flaccus*. Trans. John Connington. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1893.

Pope, Alexander: "An Essay on Criticism". London: Dodo Press, 2007.

Rabey, David. "Peter Barnes: A Memorial in Correspondence". *Contemporary Theatre Review*, 15:2, 252-258, 2005.

Relihan, Joel. *Ancient Menippean Satire*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993.

Robinson, Christopher. *Lucian and His Influence in Europe*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1979.

Ruskin, John. *The Crown of Wild Olive*. London: Ballantyne, Hanson Co., 1907.

Shakespeare, William. *William Shakespeare The Complete Works*. London: Collins Clear-Type Press, 1960.

Sutherland, James. *English Satire*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1962.

Synder, John. *Prospects of Power: Tragedy, Satire, the Essay and the Theory of Genre*. Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky, 1991.

Swift, Jonathan. *The Intelligencer*. London: A Moor, 1730.

---. *Verses on the Death of Dr. Swift*. London: C. Bathrust, 1739.

Wagg, Stephen. "Comedy, politics and permissiveness: the 'satire boom' and its inheritance". *Contemporary Politics*, Volume 8, Number 4, 2002. Carfax Publishing, Taylor and Francis. 319-335.

Ward, Stuart (Edt.). *British culture and the end of empire*. "No Nation could be broker': the satire boom and the demise of Britain's world role". Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001.

Weinbrot, Howard D. "The Pattern of Formal Verse Satire in the Restoration and the Eighteenth Century". PMLA, Vol. 80, No. 4 (Sep., 1965), pp. 394-401.

Williams Glyn and John Ramsden. *Ruling Britannia: A Political History of Britain 1688-1988*. London: Longman, 1990.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Name and Surname: Sevcan IŞIK
Place and Date of Birth: Gaziantep, 10 February 1988

Education

Degree	Field	University	Year
Undergraduate	English Language and Literature	Atatürk University	2011
Graduate	English Culture and Literature	Atatürk University	2014

Work Experience

Bingöl Üniversity, English Language and Literature Department	Research Assistant	2012-2015
İnönü Üniversity, Western Languages and Literatures Department	Lecturer	2015- Present

Foreign Languages: English

E-mail: sevcanakcag@hotmail.com
Date: 28.05.2018