

A Comparison of Video Interpretations of Athol Fugard and the Printed
Texts

by

OLUWASUJI OLUTOBA GBOYEGA

Submitted in accordance with the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

In the subject

English

at the

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AFRICA

Supervisor: Professor David Levey

November 2012

DECLARATION

I declare that A Comparison of Video Interpretations of Athol Fugard and the Printed Texts is my own work and that all the sources that I have used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by means of complete references.

SIGNATURE

DATE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My profound gratitude goes to almighty God; the giver of wisdom, knowledge and understanding. Also to my late parents Chief and Chief Mrs Ezekiel Adedara Oluwasuji for their upbringing, and to Engineer and Mrs Tope Oluwasuji, for their love towards my educational pursuits. I am also indebted to the Oluwasuji family especially Mr and Mrs Bayo Oluwasuji, Mr and Mrs Wole Oluwasuji, Mrs Olaniyi Toyin, Mr and Mrs Akodu, Mr and Mrs Oluwadare, and Oluwasuji Femi for their love, support, understanding, patience and willingness to give me the time I needed to complete this dissertation.

My supervisor, Professor David Levey has been a pillar to me: his encouragement, professional guidance, patience, constructive feedback, dedication, criticisms, suggestions, commendations and encouragements were of great value to me.

My life would not have taken any shape if not for the support of these special people that contributed greatly to my existence both in South Africa and from Nigeria; Bamgboye Ayodeji Adunni, Adebayo Tosin Temitope, Seun Ologunleko, Dipo Adu, Kofo Olayinka, Samuel Otenaika, Mrs Dupe Awenikeke, Lawal Musiliu, Tayo Obadofin, Egbon Kunle, Muyi Ajanaku, Ajewole Abimbola, Adebola Musa, Adeyanju Rayo, Adeyanju Tayo, Esan Omobayo, Reverend and Mrs Alawode, Alhaji, Fortune Zwane, Lindiwe, Folake, Bola Duduyemi, Mr Matthew and Dave Ovbiebo, Benjamin Izu, Olagunju Boye, Kayode Ayodele, RCCG Mount Zion Parish South Africa, Reverend and Mrs Agha Oti, Reverend and Mrs Ibiam, Mr and Mrs Kumandja, Curios Clique inc.

The UNISA library has been very resourceful during my research; especially Dawie Malan has been a research beacon linking me up with the likes of Anton Krueger, Crystal Warren, Andrew Martins and the entire National English Literary Museum (NELM), Grahamstown.

ABSTRACT

Without consciousness we become victims instead of actors– even if it is only a question of acting victims. And in the make belief of our lives, the audience is self (Fugard in Frank 2004: 53). The primary concern of this study is the comparison of video interpretations of Athol Fugard with their adaptations as visual texts. It has been argued that ‘the playwright’s creative labour ends with the completion of the script’ (Kidnie 2009: 15). Therefore, amongst other issues this dissertation will explore the politics of production at play during the adaptation from printed version to screenplays. My assumption is that a comparison between the printed texts and video versions will add to the understanding of the effectiveness of Fugard’s dramatic techniques and comprehension of literary texts; images are easy to decipher by inexperienced interpreters if guided. For the purpose of my presentation I adapt the reader response theoretical position of Stanley Fish based on a comparison that will be explored in terms of my own response to both the written text and the visual texts, and in line with other responses to the play.

Keywords: Athol Fugard; Playwright’s creative labour; Directors; Dramatic techniques; Reader response; Stanley Fish; Visual texts; Film Studies; South African literature.

TABLE OF CONTENTS	PAGE
PREFACE	vi
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2: STATEMENT PLAYS AND VIDEO/DVD VERSIONS: A COMPARISON	31
CHAPTER 3: PORT ELIZABETH PLAYS AND VIDEO/DVD VERSIONS: A COMPARISON	68
CHAPTER 4: DRAMATIC TECHNIQUES AND THEIR EFFECTIVENESS IN FUGARD’S PLAYS AND VIDEO VERSIONS	101
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION – OVERVIEW AND SUMMARY.....	111
LIST OF REFERENCES	119

PREFACE

'Fugard has mastered the art of seduction when it comes to captivating an audience'

- (Mfeka 2011 quoted in *Sunday Times*)

Doing a video study of Athol Fugard has given me the independence of reading my own meaning into his works and due to my background in previous studies I was able to engage with the printed and the visual texts. He is presently concerned with the level of corruption and decadence in South Africa. Fugard, quoted in an interview with *Theatre Voice UK* on the level of corruption in South Africa, points out, 'In a sense we have got to start again. It's a very fluid and a very volatile situation in South Africa. On my side there's a sense of betrayal. Men who I thought would stand up and speak out against the degree of corruption and everything that's going wrong... simply concern themselves with getting richer' (Peters 2011). This is evident in some of his recent plays, for example: *Captain Tiger*, *Bird Watcher*, *Train Driver* and *Blue Iris*. Nevertheless, in this study I consider Fugard as also according a voice to blacks and coloureds during the apartheid era among other playwrights, looking at works such as *Sizwe Bansi is Dead*, *The Island*, *Statements after an Arrest under the Immorality Act*, *Hello and Goodbye* etc. I learnt of Fugard in one of the courses I did at university during my first degree and from then I developed an interest in wanting to study more about Athol Fugard and Southern African literature as a whole.

My experiences during my undergraduate days are explained in the course of my research to avoid repetition. I took some literature courses that dealt with African literature especially the aspect that deals with oral literature; in such a way that I enjoy the performance aspect of literature which deals with studying how audience reacts to them. It is a truism that no author is an island: whatever he or she reads from a newspaper or other works of art will influence what he or she writes either positively or negatively (Ruthven 1979: 119). With this background knowledge, I was made to understand that I am dependent on, and influenced by, my assumptions about texts being read by me.

Moreover, it is possible to encounter both a similarity and difference in interpretation of a particular text as suggested by Stanley Fish in his view of an interpretive community, depending

on one's individual interpretive self. Fish argues that an interpretive community is a group of like-minded individuals who share similar assumptions about how a text should be read (Fish 1980: 14, Leitch 2001: 1970). The way I will read a text might be same as another person reads it but what s/he derives from the text might not be the same interpretation I will give to it. Hence, I crosschecked actual performances in the form of video versions with the printed texts.

The advantages of DVDs and VCRs allow the viewer to pause and analyse the chosen props, objects, gestures, relationships and so forth within the scene, many of which are visual strategies the filmmaker employs to communicate with the viewer. 'Film studies', as explained in the course of the dissertation, is evolving as different approaches and forms of literary criticism have been applied in its development. While most evidence shortcomings and variants, others still exert a strong influence on film study depending on the critic, such as Monaco (2000) and Dyer (2000). Some of these well-established theories include Marxism, psychoanalysis, feminism, auteurism, structuralism and the like. For example, psychoanalysis encompasses different schools of study such as the Jungian, Freudian and Lacanian psychoanalytic approaches. I am well informed about these approaches, but they are not the basis of my findings. I support my decision to go along with Fish's school of reader response by arguing that this school of thought gives me power of interpretation over any literary text.

Although my perceptions and experience of Apartheid are not first-hand, I have read about it in plays such as John Kani's *Nothing But the Truth* (2002), Athol Fugard's *My children! My Africa!* (1989) and such novels as Alex La Guma's *A Walk in the Night* (1962) and the like: these mediums broadened my knowledge about this system of government. I also held personal discussions with actors and literary experts on South Africa; actors such as Arthur Molepo and Omphile Molusi during the intimacy of my experience at the Market Theatre¹ and also Anton Krueger at the Drama department of Rhodes University. These interviews and email correspondence serve as part of my methodologies which function as a major resource in achieving some of the goals I targeted for the course of this dissertation. It is also strange that

¹ The Market Theatre is based in the vibrant inner-city suburb of Newtown in Johannesburg, South Africa, and was opened in 1976, operating as an independent, non-racial theatre during the country's apartheid regime (Fuchs 2002: 38). The particular performance of *Sizwe Bansi is Dead* which I attended was staged at the Laager theatre space in the Market Theatre on 24 July 2011.

there is no full video version of *The Island*; the exciting part of it is that both Dana Friedman and the BBC production make use of the part where John and Winston present *Antigone*.

Dr Chris Thurman's email correspondence also made me to understand that Athol Fugard is old and frail, though still relevant in the theatre world as he premiered a recent play in Grahamstown titled *Blue Iris*. I tried contacting his agent also who told me that Fugard is old to attend to any email correspondence but gave me some candid advice to visit the National English Literature Museum in Grahamstown, which I did, and met Mrs Crystal Warren and Mr Andrew Martin, who took their time to provide newspaper reviews and journal articles in the line of Athol Fugard's plays. These reviews (recent and old ones) are guidelines to responses from me.

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction: Film Studies, Performance and Reader Response

'Without consciousness² we become victims instead of actors – even if it is only question of acting victims. And in the make belief of our lives the audience is self.'

– Athol Fugard quoted in Frank 2004: 53

The audience is an integral part of the constitution of a text, which makes the audience self to his or her own interpretations. The audience incorporates individual experiences into the interpretation of a text, thus coming up with different interpretations. The primary concern of my study is the comparison of selected original published texts by Athol Fugard with their adaptations as visual texts/performance. In this dissertation, I will discuss the ways in which Fugard responds to life under the extreme circumstances in apartheid South Africa and as these have been interpreted on Video/ DVD by different directors who, in one way or the other, modify what is in the original text since 'the playwright's creative labour ends with the completion of the script' (Kidnie 2009: 15). Therefore, my research amongst other issues will explore the politics of production at play during the adaptation from printed version to screenplays. This chapter contains my assumption(s), literature review, theoretical framework and methodology. My hypothesis is that a comparison between the printed texts and video versions will add to the understanding of the effectiveness of Fugard's dramatic techniques. My intention is to become a member of the interpretive community that comprises readers and critics of South African literature. In what follows I discuss sources that have been positively or negatively reviewed by some of these critics.

This chapter constitutes my literature review and establishes the pattern of my discourse. In this chapter I contextualise Athol Fugard by describing South African literature, introduction to theatre and performance, concepts of reader response and various schools of theory. As said in the preface, no author is an island: whatever he or she reads from a newspaper or other works of art will influence what he or she writes either positively or negatively (Ruthven 1979: 119). My

² Owing to this, the audience may become emotionally attached to what is enacted on the stage or on screen (see chapter four).

argument follows that of Ruthven that we all bring critical assumptions with us to our interpretation of any text. I will thus make my interpretation more explicit in subsequent chapters. The introduction includes a short appraisal of Southern African literature of which the primary source for my research – Athol Fugard – is a pacesetter in the literary field in South Africa, as I shall argue below. This chapter, also, provides an overview of theories on theatre, film studies, performance, adaptation and reader response that I will employ in subsequent chapters of this study.

I will first justify my choice of Athol Fugard for this study. When the names of significant playwrights alive in the last decade of the twentieth century are mentioned – such as Arthur Miller, August Wilson, Harold Pinter, Tom Stoppard, Jim Allen, Wole Soyinka – the list will include him. In 1985, *Time Magazine* named Athol Fugard ‘the greatest active playwright in the English-speaking world’ (William Henry III, 1985). To date he has written over 30 plays. The playwright, who has been nominated six times but has never won a Tony award, was recently given a lifetime achievement award at the 65th annual Tony award ceremony (Swanepoel, 2011). Fugard thematises the effect of brutality and degradation on South Africans. He also focuses on the effect of apartheid on personal relationships and interactions. For example, *The Blood Knot* (1961) explores the story of two brothers joined together by blood: one is coloured and the other is black. Close to thirty years ago Fugard was best known for his fierce anti-apartheid activism and themes in his work.

His most celebrated works, according to April MacIntyre (2011), include ‘*Master Harold*’... *and the Boys* (1982), *Boesman and Lena* (1969) and *The Road to Mecca* (1984). In spite of the success of these works as MacIntyre posits, Fugard seems unsatisfied with the accomplishment of the works as written texts. This is indicated in an interview in 2000, as quoted by Andie Miller (2006): ‘Unfortunately theatre reaches such a small audience that it seems as if its impact on societies, particularly as they get larger and more complicated is not as great as that of television or film’. This declaration suggests that Fugard considers other forms of media like television and film as having more impact on audiences than the written text. This has encouraged me to study the video versions and the printed text together so that when the dissertation is completed, it will be a valuable source for students of literature and performance.

Fugard's notebooks have lent a hand in my research, although more recent ones have not been published. Fugard in his own words says something about the notebooks:

...my notebooks have been a complex reality in my life, serving many functions: private confessional, literary finger exercise, scrapbook, literary workshop where I jacked up my plays and examined the problems I was having in writing them ... (Fugard 1983:527, Shelley 2009: 9).

Hence, I will be cross checking actual performances in the form of video versions with the printed texts. Fugard's notebooks allow me to follow his plays and compare his challenges in producing them to the interpretations by others.

Different researchers such as Derek Attridge (1998), Lewis Nkosi (2007), D.B.Z. Ntuli, Michael Chapman (2003), Temple Hauptfleisch (1997) and others, have done impressive studies on the history of South African literature. In order to contextualise Athol Fugard's work, this chapter briefly examines South African literature before moving into the main concepts of the research.

South African literature as illustrated by the Questia online comprises 'the literary works written in South Africa or written by South Africans living in other countries. Populated by diverse ethnic and language groups, South Africa has a distinctive literature in many African languages as well as Afrikaans and English' (Columbia Encyclopedia 2008, Questia 2011, Gray 1979: 3, Chapman 1996: 1-4). As South African literature developed, a good number of literary works emerged. The Dutch language remained the official one even when that of Afrikaans emerged in the mid 18th century. Notable writers of the period were C.J. Langenhoven, Louis Leipoldt, Christiaan M. Van der Heever, Eugene Marais, Uys Krige and W.E.G. Louw to mention but a few. The English language literature materialised due to the spread of education, publishing industries and increasing population, thus causing a vital literary community to emerge in the mid 20th century. Examples of such writers are: Olive Schreiner, considered as the first great South African novelist, Sarah Gertrude Millin, William Plomer, Alan Paton, Roy Campbell and so on (Columbia Encyclopedia 2008, Questia 2011, Balseiro 2006: 140, Chapman 1996: 1-4).

As Stephen Gray puts it in his introductory note on *Approaches to a New Literature*, ‘the single most potent factor in the retardation of the development of South African English, and of its literature, is the fact that it has never generated its own publishing industry’. This is even evident in his book’s bibliography because most of the works that were cited were produced in London and New York, and imported into South Africa. In the book, references were made to two notable people, one being Olive Schreiner and the other Athol Fugard, who takes the option of providing a glossary of the South African English terms used in his Oxford University Press editions. The reason why authors, then, kept themselves from using the South African English terms might be due to reluctance to use local words, which might hinder their publication overseas.

According to Mary Alexander, written literature by black South Africans emerged in the 20th century. The first generation of mission-educated African writers sought to restore dignity to Africans by invoking and reconstructing a heroic African past. The first novel by a black South African was *Mhudi* (completed in 1920 but only published in 1930), by Solomon (Sol) Thekiso Plaatje. This epic story follows the trajectory of the Tswana people during and after their military encounter with the Zulus under Shaka, the Zulu conqueror of the 19th century, and it encompasses their earliest encounters with the white people moving into the interior (Gray 1979: 3, Chapman 1996: 1, Alexander 2011).

The 1940s saw the beginnings of a flowering of literature by black South Africans such as H.I.E. Dhlomo whose work preached a ‘return to the source’ –the wisdom of finding traditional ways of dealing with modern problems. His body of works includes several plays and the long poem ‘The Valley of a Thousand Hills’ (1941). Poets such as B.W. Vilakazi, who wrote in Zulu, gave new literary life to their indigenous languages. Peter Abrahams, a writer of mixed race descent, published his first novel *Mine Boy* in 1946, the same year a large miners' strike was violently suppressed by Smuts' government. *Mine Boy* depicts life in black urban areas of the time, and it dramatises the problems of rural people in a depressed urban environment – a theme that was referred to as the ‘Jim comes to Jo'burg’ phenomenon in South African literature (Alexander 2011, Gordimer 1967).

Another South African writer who emerged in the 1940s, Herman Charles Bosman, is best known for his tales, a portrait of Afrikaner storytelling skills and social attitudes. The first collection of stories was published in *Mafeking Road* in 1947. Among the most famous stories are 'Unto Dust' and 'In the Withaak's Shade'. Bosman, who was once jailed for the mysterious murder of his half-brother, also wrote poetry, novels, and much journalism; he is often satirical. One of his best works, *Cold Stone Jug* (1949), is a semi-fictionalised account of his time in jail. Other novels include: Alan Paton's *Cry, the Beloved Country* (1948) (Gray 1979: 1, Alexander 2011).

During the mid-twentieth century, theatre for white English speaking South Africans consisted almost entirely of local versions of plays being performed in England or America. In 1945, the national theatre was formed but it did not allow black creative participation. Although it performed some indigenous Afrikaans plays, only about five of more than forty plays in English were by South Africans. One of the few South African playwrights whose works were performed was Guy Butler, whose *The Dam* and *The Dove Returns* entered the company's repertoire in the 1950s (Thale 2011)

In 1950, as the apartheid system assumed its strong hold on South Africa, writers like Lewis Nkosi, Nat Nakasa, and Bloke Modisane, all names integrally entwined with that of Sophiatown, were barred from white theatres and entertainment and their potential contribution to South African theatre was lost. However, some attempts were made to provide an empowering environment for black talents based on European models of theatre in early 1950s when a member of an amateur white dramatic society, Ian Bernhardt, formed an all black drama group called the Baret Players. Ian Bernhardt was also one of the founders of the Union of South African Artists; its aim was to protect black artists from exploitation. Towards the end of 1950, a young and vibrant Port Elizabeth playwright named Athol Fugard made his first impression on the Johannesburg stage with his play, *No-Good Friday*. The success of the production of this play was a combined effort by a number of black intellectuals from Sophiatown, most of them being members of the Union of South African Artists (Thale 2011).

Formal theatre advanced steadily through the colonial tradition of presenting the Europeans and American classics, and the Afrikaner's romantic realism of the 1920s and 1930s,

amidst classics by Shakespeare, Ibsen, Tennessee Williams and others. Contact with Europe and America resulted in the production of plays, after about 1960, of symbolist, existentialist and Expressionist writers like Samuel Beckett and Bertolt Brecht and others in the 'poor theatre' tradition. South African theatre reflects the dramatic, oral elements of human contact. Theatrical efforts and collaboration spilled over the stage and into the work of writers such as Athol Fugard, Pieter-Dirk Uys and Zakes Mda. The conglomerate has resulted in the South African theatre today (Heywood 2004:178; Hauptfleisch 1997: 42-59; Chapman 1996: 18).

As the National Party government entrenched itself and its repressive system, theatre was used as a means of criticising the monolithic apartheid state. Plays by white playwrights such as Lewis Sowden (*The Kimberley Train*), Basil Warner (*Try for White*), David Herbert (*A Kakamas Greek*) and Athol Fugard (*The Blood Knot*) tackled aspects of the apartheid system. But few of them were seen in the areas in which the perpetrators lived (Alexander 2011, Thomas Thale 2011). The State of Emergency used by the apartheid state to crack down on dissidents and the banning of political organisations sent many black writers into exile in the early 1960s. Among them was Alex la Guma, a Marxist and ANC leader who saw the purpose of his work as the exposure of the dreadful conditions of South Africa's oppressed. His novella *A Walk in the Night* (1962) shows the life of crime to which slum inhabitants are driven; his *A Threefold Cord* (1967) contrasts the existence of a black worker in a white home with her employers' affluent life. The later novel, *In the Fog of the Season's End* (1972), possibly his best, shows the developing consciousness of a man dedicated to the underground struggle for freedom. As a 'listed person', little of La Guma's work was available in South Africa until 1990, when the liberation movements were unbanned (Gray 1979: 134, 192).

However, the different efforts by scholars, as partly mentioned above, some of whom had undertaken worthwhile research on Southern African literature, have attracted quite a number of literary critiques. Van Coller in his 'By whom and for whom is literary history written?' further asserts that, 'contemporary opinion holds that the all-encompassing literary history, especially written by one person (such as Knuvelder, Kannemeyer, Chapman, or Heywood), is obsolete' (157). The question that Van Coller tries to answer in his position on this is that it is now old fashioned for any author to singlehandedly write on a particular history, which includes a lot of obstacles like a single person searching through a large amount of information. Thus a frequent

criticism of this issue is that the effort is meaningless. The most interesting part of this debate is seen in the view of Schenkeveld during his review of Michael Chapman's book *Southern African Literature*; as far as he is concerned, 'any history of literature is unavoidably a story told from a certain perspective' (Schenkeveld-van der Dussen, 1993: v-vi).

On the other hand, Chapman in his attempt to discuss a possible South African literary history endeavours to give a direct and probable link between literature and its surrounding reality thereby bringing to the fore his assumption of evaluating literary works according to their intention to produce political change. Quoting from Chapman's *Southern African Literature*, Van Coller highlights the point from where the vigorous criticisms of scholars such as Crehan, de Kock and Van Vuuren on *Southern African Literature*, analyse the assumptions of Chapman such as the following:

... I have granted most value to content that is committed to what may generally be considered as democratic, non-elitist activity in southern Africa
(Chapman 1996: 9)

To this end, Van Vuuren asserts that Chapman's approach creates a caricature of Afrikaans literature 'as written by arch-conservatives, oppressors, pretentious producers of high art and imported concepts [who] seem as a group to collectively suffer from Calvinist guilt and agonizing soul-searching' (Van Vuuren *et al* 1997: 231, Ross 1995: 5). Many reviews and criticisms, as noted previously, dealt with the issue of South African Literature, particularly South Africa as being an ideal nation. Views ranging from Leon de Kock for instance, who quotes with approval the vigorous words of the critic Sikhumbuzo Mngadi that 'South Africa has never been a single, unified nation. The national liberation struggles might have promoted this illusion of a classless, sexless, ageless nation and promoted a practice of historical representation that reflected this myth' (de Kock 1997: 104) to Malvern van Wyk Smith, quoted in Van Vuuren (1994), who states outright that '[South African] literatures have grown up in isolation' (Van Vuuren 1994: 269). Van Vuuren also describes Schenkeveld-van der Dussen's advocacy of a possible history of South African literature as shallow and uninformed (1994: 269).

However, Chapman did not relent in his effort at writing a grounded Southern African literary history. He produced a second edition in 2003 with few or no changes; he maintains his views regardless of the several criticisms by different scholars as discussed above. The only

changing element in his 2003 edition is the preface as quoted in Van Coller (2008), which addresses several key issues in his argument concerning Southern African literary history. Chapman's additions in the preface to his 2003 edition include: stating that his main objective is to write a 'postcolonial' literary history that not only reconstructs the past, but also illuminates literary works (2003: x). He detects what he refers to as 'the tension between memory and amnesia' (2003: xi), and expresses the need to fill the silences of which he has become aware by bringing marginalised texts and authors to the fore. Furthermore, Chapman wants 'to step beyond categories of separation' (2003: xiv) by, he says, focusing on national themes and events as distinct from nationalist ones. In this 'integrative' literary history, the emphasis is on 'usable pasts': one story but different voices (2003: xv). Whilst 'traditional' literary aspects like 'aesthetics' and 'formal dimensions' still receive considerable attention, Chapman contends that he wants to 'ground imaginative works in moral conscience' (2003: xvii), which is closer to a sociological approach. Chapman, ostensibly, favours the model of society above that of the nation and surmises that the whole of Southern Africa shares the experience of colonialism, and that the theme of expression and liberation is a consequence thereof (2003, xviii). What South African drama texts had done in this regard is their effort in exposing to the people their way of life that can also be termed as their history since it expresses how they live their daily activities. An example is Athol Fugard's 'family' collection (see chapter three).

Van Coller (2008: 160) continues his review by describing the additions to the preface thus: 'Chapman explicitly states that he is strongly opposed to "balkanising" literature into discrete, ethnic units; he wishes to present literary history as a whole by uniting works and authors through comparison. He tries in effect to draw into one conceptual frame the varied reactions or interpretations that followed specific historical events' (2003: xix). Chapman's study 'acknowledges the contribution made to interpretation by the critical activity and by a community of readers. The implication is that we neither reduce the work of the past to its past condition nor read it today as if it were a product of our time, but think of the work as needing us for the realisation of its potential' (2003, xxi). In selecting bibliographical material, Chapman favoured material that 'best serves the construction of university courses on the literature of Southern African countries' and especially 'articles that raise key issues in the field... mainly in English, with studies in other languages identified in relevant end notes' (2003, xxi). So as not to

rely only on the work of Chapman though he is useful in such respects as his notion of the community of readers, I would like to point out that another source that attracted criticism is the work of Christopher Heywood, which I initially did consider briefly but rejected owing to its flaws.

These points mentioned above represent guidelines for my attempt to enter the interpretive community of South Africa. For the purpose of my research, I will utilise the reader response theoretical position of Stanley Fish because the comparisons will be explored in terms of my own response to both the written text and the visual texts, and in line with other responses to the plays. My strategies in the light of such a community will hinge on a framework comparing video versions of Fugard's selected plays with the printed texts. I will, furthermore, be in line to becoming a member of the interpretive community constituted by some South African critics such as Dennis Walder (1994), Albert Wertheim (2000), Allan Shelley (2009), and Frank Haïke (2004), who have undertaken a great deal of research on Fugard. One assumption of mine is that his plays do reflect social reality as well as Fugard's responses to his society, which I will discuss where relevant to the film and the printed texts.

In this light I argue that reader response theory is an appropriate theory to use as suggested by Gabriele Griffin (2005: 123), in view of the fact already mentioned that I, as a one-person audience, am involved. Stanley Fish's version of this theory will be discussed. This countered Wimsatt and Beardsley's declaration in 'The Affective Fallacy' that the audience of a literary work is irrelevant (Leitch 2010: 1246); this is the main concern of the New Criticism that Fish saw as fallacious. He focused on the effect of the text on the reader, who has the power of coming up with his or her own meaning, as I intend to do. I am also aware of the other main school of reader response theory such as that represented by Wolfgang Iser and Hans-Robert Jauss: I will be saying little about this other school of thought apart from some contextualisation below in order to focus on my adaptation of Stanley Fish's version of this school of thought.

In his essay 'Literature in the Reader', Fish stresses the nature of the reading experience as opposed to the autonomy of the author proposed by the new critics. According to him, ' . . . it [the opposing school] transforms a temporal experience into a spatial one; it steps back and in a single glance takes in a whole (sentence, page, work) which the reader knows (if at all) only bit by bit, moment by moment' (Fish 1980:44). Fish rebelled against the belief of the New Critics in

the autonomy of the text and its sole focus on literary form and language. According to Leitch, scholars who developed reader response theories argue from different perspectives on the reader and the text. For instance, Harold Bloom asserts the centrality of the author and the author's 'anxiety of influence' in face of the New Critical prohibition of the 'intentional Fallacy'; Stephen Greenblatt asserts the significance of historical context against the New Critical view of texts as self sufficient 'verbal icons'. Countering Wimsatt's and Beardsley's declaration in 'The Affective Fallacy' that the audience of a literary work is irrelevant, Fish declares this as a fallacy itself, since an abiding concern throughout Fish's work is the rhetorical force of texts and their effects on readers (Leitch 2010: 1972).

In consequence of an academic effort by some Anglo-American writers to focus critical attention on literature in the late 1920s and early 1930s, they founded a literary movement and called it New Criticism. As stated by Leroy Searle in Groden (2005: 691), 'New Critics developed speculative positions on techniques of reading that provide a vital complement to the literary and artistic emergence of modernism'. Further on in his account of New Criticism, Searle in Groden (2005: 692) sees the job of the New Critics as Practical Criticism or close reading, in which the poem or literary text is treated as a self sufficient verbal artifact. Given careful attention to language, the text is presumed to be a unique source of an experience available in no other way than the text.

The New Criticism, which bred such theories as the Affective Fallacy, according to Siegel in his short *Introduction to Modern Literary Theories*, is:

A literary movement that started in the late 1920s and 1930s and originated in reaction to traditional criticism that new critics saw as largely concerned with matters extraneous to the text, e.g., with the biography or psychology of the author or the work's relationship to literary history. New Criticism proposed that a work of literary art should be regarded as autonomous, and so should not be judged by reference to considerations beyond itself (Siegel 2006).

The Affective Fallacy is confusion between the poem and its results (what it is and what it does), a special case of epistemological scepticism, though usually advanced as if it had far stronger claims than the overall forms of scepticism. It begins by trying to derive the standard of

criticism from the psychological effects of the poem and ends in impressionism and relativism. The Intentional Fallacy is also referred to as the Affective Fallacy. Thus, the outcome of this fallacy is that the poem itself, as an object of specifically critical judgment, tends to disappear (Leitch 2010: 1246, Makaryk 1993: 120, Murfin 2009: 426). In the Affective Fallacy described by Wimsatt and Beardsley, a reader's emotional response to a text generally does not produce a reliable interpretation.

The Affective Fallacy was opposed to a reader having a deep emotional attachment to what s/he reads, while the New Critics dwell much more on the content of the text than the impact it has on its reader. The emotional effect will, in fact, supply the amount of information the reader needs to respond to what he or she reads (Leitch 2010: 1256 1257). What surprises me is that the Affective Fallacy attached more importance to the critics than to the reader. In the words of Wimsatt and Beardsley, 'the critic (reader) is not a contributor to statistically countable reports about the poem, but a teacher and explicator of meaning...' (ibid.1258). To them, the teacher has the authority to influence meaning in the reader, thereby causing the reader to be subjected to what the teacher is teaching and not his or her own independent meaning.

Thereafter, Stanley Fish's essay 'Interpreting the Variorium' (1976; revised 1980), introduces his seminal concept of 'interpretive communities', which, it is argued, radically services interpretive theory by locating meaning not in text but in readers, not in individual responses but in the protocols of communities (Leitch 2001: 1970; Groden 2005: 793). Fish believes that the interpretive activities of readers, rather than the author's intention or the text's structure, explain a text's significance and aesthetic value. This aims at recognising the social and institutional background or context of the reader as noted earlier in this paragraph (as regards interpretive communities). To simplify, a reader brings certain assumptions to a text based on the interpretive strategies he/she has learned in a particular community of this kind. For example, over the years during my undergraduate studies, I did very well in the performance aspects of literature. One of the courses that really helped me at that stage was ENG 123 (Theatre Workshop). The course introduced me to performance culture and the 'nitty-gritty' behind stage performance. My budding interpretive self concerning Fugard and South African

literature as a whole was sharpened by my background study in ENG 223 (Introduction to Oral Literature), and ENG 226 (African Drama).³

Reader response theory places the literary text at the centre of a triangle that has the reader and the author taking their place in the triangle. As discussed in *Understanding Literature* by Fidel Acosta (2001), more than two thousand years ago the Roman poet Horace claimed that literature is 'sweet' and useful. Since then, literature has been a medium of entertainment and education, thus having literary texts as a medium of transferring information, sources of pleasure and an object of beauty. Literary works often convey values and ideas which the reader, being either an informed reader or implied reader, who comes from a certain community (Acosta 2001), applies to what he or she reads in a text. Terry Eagleton argues that what distinguishes the literary language from other forms of discourse is the way it 'deforms' ordinary languages in various ways. Under the pressure of literary devices, ordinary language is intensified, condensed, twisted, telescoped, drawn out and turned on its head (Eagleton 1996: 3). This will be discussed with respect to how Fugard makes use of some dramatic techniques to drive home his points.

As said earlier, Ruthven's remark regarding assumptions, with which I agree, is that no author is an island: whatever he or she reads from a newspaper or other works of art will influence what he or she writes either positively or negatively (Ruthven 1979: 119). In this respect, '... the only way one can ever discover unity in texts or identity in selves is by creating them from one's own inner style' (Norman Holland quoted in Michael Groden (eds) 2005: 793). Since I will examine Fugard's influences as an author that causes his audiences to be active viewers, I shall also examine the role of the reader or audience. I recognise that there is no 'original' meaning, but only one that is based on my interpretation. My justification for coming from this point of view is that Fugard believes in the actuality of performance and relies on the power of live actors to move a live audience; the audience become part of his plays since what is enacted on the stage is what is happening in their daily lives. His plays place the audience in an active state, which is very different, for instance, from the New Critics who see the author as the originator of meaning and the reader or audience as passive. (I experienced this active involvement of the members of the audience in my visit to the Market Theatre on 24 July, 2011.)

³ Refer to chapter two; *Statement Plays*.

Also, video is very immediate, direct, close up, instantaneous and, possibly, easier to decode over repeated viewings. Fish's interpretive community gives power to the reader and the audience to respond from their own perspectives as Holland, quoted above, indicates.

As indicated, I am aware of the fact that there are different forms of reader response theory which vary from Louise Rosenblatt's and I.A. Richards's idea of a 'correct' reading which, though difficult to attain, was always the goal of the 'educated' reader or audience; this position is in consonance with Wolfgang Iser's argument that the reading process is always subjective. For Hans-Robert Jauss, a reader's aesthetic experience is always bound by time and historical determinants, according to Goldstein (2005: 793). I shall use Fish, however, for reasons I have discussed in the course of stating my point of entry. An important point to note is that Stanley Fish pursues a middle path in this regard: owing to his view of the interpretive community, he believes that we as readers come from a community that gives us authority to interpret a text the way we see it as an individual. This means that the reader is independent of the meaning he or she gives to any literary work.

Wolfgang Iser was a leading member of the Constance School and focuses particularly on the way in which texts are actively constructed by individual readers through the phenomenology of the reading process. Arriving at Constance in the year 1991, Iser joined a research group that included Hans Robert Jauss, and they successfully developed the theories of reader response (Leitch 2010: 1521). During 1970, in one of his early scholarly works *The Affective Structure of the Text*, Iser articulates his theory of the interactive nature of the reading experience. This would have led to Iser agreeing with Fish's interactive community, but the interactive nature of Iser's theory was not so much concerned about the reader and his contribution to the textual meaning. In his *The Implied Reader: Patterns of Communication in Prose Fictions from Bunyan to Beckett* (1972; translated 1974), Iser holds that literary texts provide the foundation for their interpretation, but they also imply the action of the reader (Leitch 2010: 1522). Iser further posits in his *Implied Reader* that 'reading is not passive but a process of discovery; a reader questions, negates, and revises the expectations that the text establishes, filling gaps and blanks in text and continually modifying his or her interpretation' (1523).

In describing what a virtual text implies, Iser in his *Act of Reading* argues that the text provides sets of instructions or a repertoire that the reader must assemble, so that interpretation depends on both the text and response, producing the virtual text. He emphasises that interpretation is neither objective nor subjective, but it is always a result of the dynamic interaction of text and reader. Iser sees the reader as a person who brings out an interpretation from what is not in the text, trying to fill a gap and modifying his or her viewpoints. Iser also postulates that a literary work has two poles: the Aesthetic and the Artistic (Bennet 1995: 20). According to him, the artistic pole is the author's text whereas the aesthetics is the realisation accomplished by the reader.

Furthermore, Peter Barry's *Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory*, on 'Theory before Theory', emphasises the idea of objectivity in the text. According to him, the literary text contains its own meaning within itself. 'The best way to study the text is to study the word on the page, without any predefined agenda for what one wants to find there ... the text will reveal constants, universal truth, about human nature, because human nature is constant and unchanging. People are pretty much the same everywhere, in all ages and in all cultures ... the text can speak to the inner truth of each of us because our individuality, our 'self' is something unique to each of us ... what critics do is interpret the text, so that reader can get more out of reading the text' (Barry 2008: 17). In the light of Barry's view, can a reader who possesses a subjective view respond to a text that is said to be objective? This, in my view, might be the basis of Stanley Fish's reaction to the effort of Wolfgang Iser.

Another view of reader response theory stems from the views of Hans Robert Jauss. Jauss is best known for his promotion of the importance of reception theory in literary interpretation. The view that the readers confront texts as self sufficient entities as 'verbal icons' in the terms of the New Critics, especially William Wimsatt, was countered by Hans Robert Jauss, stressing how the expectations that we bring to reading govern our response and aesthetic judgment. Robert Holub described reception theory as, '... a general shift in concern from the author and the work to the text and the reader' (Holub 1984: xii).

In the above extract, Holub believes that reception theory reflects a paradigm shift in the history of literature, and it is considered 'a reaction to social, intellectual, and literary

development in West Germany during the late 1960's' (Holub 1984: xiii, Groden 2005: 799). With this, one can infer that the theory aimed at a revolutionary approach to contemporary literary criticism. Reception theory, in other words, pays attention to the function of the reader in a process of literary experience (Leitch 2010: 1404). In 1969, Hans Robert Jauss, one of the leading contributors to reception theory, published an essay titled, 'The Change in the Paradigm Shift of Literary Scholarship'. He points out the main phase of the new paradigm which aims at emphasising the importance of the reader, replacing the models put forward by the New Critics. Jauss's contribution to reader response theory views literature from the perspective of the reader or consumer, and he treats literature as a dialectical process of production and reception (Holub 1984: 57, Groden 2005: 798, Leitch 2010: 1405). I find the following, Hans Robert Jauss's position, worthy of note, and it is my entrance to the adaptation of Stanley Fish:

...the relationship of work to work must now be brought into this interaction between work and mankind, and the historical coherence of works among themselves must be seen in the interrelations of production and reception. Put another way: literature and art only obtain a history that has the character of a process when the succession of works is mediated not only through the producing subject but also through the audience— through the interaction of author and public (Jauss 1982: 15, Sprinker 1982: 1208).

Jauss, in the above passage, presents the reader as a subject who is a consumer. Holub states further, in appreciation of Hans Robert Jauss's contribution, that, 'the literary work is neither completely text nor completely the subjectivity of the reader, but a combination or merger of the two' (Holub 1984: 84).

At the centre of the reader response theory is Stanley Fish's version which I am adapting in my research. In 1970, Fish came up with a phrase 'affective stylistics' in an essay titled 'Literature in the Reader: Affective Stylistics', which he later moved away from. This refers to the influence that the structure of a text exerts on the mind of individual readers as they read and, more generally, to a personal and private process of reading that Fish once believed everyone employs (Murfin 2009: 7). Furthermore regarding Fish's contribution to affective stylistics, Murfin sees his notable development of the ideas of reader-response critics, in his suggestion that 'meaning is an event that takes place in the mind of an individual reader during the act of

reading; that reading is a temporary process in which each succeeding word, sentence, paragraph, stanza and so forth provides additional information that readers must incorporate into their understanding; and therefore that meaning changes as the reader progresses through the work' (Murfin 2009: 7).

However, the above points to the fact that a reader after reading a piece ideally should improve his or her skill of interpretation, form new expectations, rejecting the old ones, identifying mistakes where they occur and making new interpretations of what s/he reads. The questions the reader response theory of Stanley Fish intends to answer are: firstly, whether our responses to a work are the same as its meaning(s); secondly, whether a work can have as many meaning as we have responses to it; thirdly, whether some responses are more valid than others (Murfin 2009: 425). These questions provide models that help in the reading process and understanding of the texts. Stanley Fish's work, however, is seen by some as marking the true beginning of a contemporary reader response criticism. Also, in the same essay, Fish argues that:

... any school of criticism that sees literary work as an object, claiming to describe what it is and never what it does, misconstrues the very essence of literature and reading... literature exists and signifies when it is read; that its force is an affective force; and that reading is a temporary process, not a special one, contrary to the formalist practice of surveying the literary work as if it were an object spread out before them (Murfin 2009: 426)

The above symbolises the views of the formalists where Fish took issues with their ethics. They might find shapes, aesthetics and patterns in the texts they examined, but they failed in determining that the work differs entirely in meaning for different readers in the reading process, who in the process turn the pages one after the other and infer different kinds of interpretation from them. Thus, literature is being redefined as something that exists in the mind of the reader and the literary work as a catalyst of mental events (Leitch 2010: 1971, Murfin 427). From this, the reader is concurrently defined and importance is being attached to him or her as to the judgment of a literary work. In Fish's book, *Self Consuming Artifacts: The Experience of Seventeenth Century Literature (1972)*, he argues that the informed reader is someone 'sufficiently experienced as a reader to have internalised the properties of literary

discourses, including everything from the most local of devices (figures of speech, etc.) to whole genres' (Fish 1980: 56).

Meanwhile, the concern of Stanley Fish in his later essay 'Interpreting the Variorium', confronts the question why different readers tend to read the same way. His view of the interpretive community will be the source from where I will be drawing my research methodology, as I have noted. He avers that multiple and diverse reading populations and the members of particular interpretive communities tend to share the same reading strategies, which exist prior to the act of reading and, therefore, determine the shape of what is read. Some questions in this light that Fish proposes to answer with his notion of the interpretive community are: First, why should regular, that is, habitual, differences in the career of a single reader ever occur? Second, what is the explanation on one hand of stability of interpretation (at least among certain groups at certain times) and, on the other hand, of the orderly variety of interpretation if it is not the stability and variety of texts? In his words, the answer to all these questions is to be found in his notion of the interpretive communities (Leitch 2010: 1990).

In my opinion, the reason why two or more readers may well agree is that the playwright or the director has a theme that he/she is driving at by means of a story that he or she writes about; even if the readers use different strategies to interpret the story, they might both come to the same agreement. The interpretive community which is the basis of the proposition of Stanley Fish determines the interpretive strategy of a reader or audience.

Also, Fish argues, according to Murfin, that 'the meaning given to a text may differ from group to group' (Murfin 2009: 248). In giving the example of college students and retirees, Murfin says that college students reading novels in academic courses form an interpretive community that is likely to read a famous work of detective fiction differently from the way it would be read by retirees living in adult communities (Murfin 2009: 248). From this it is evident that an interpretive community is a group of like-minded individuals who share similar conventions about how a text should be read.

In addition, Dorfman gives a further example of the interpretive community in expatiating on two groups of readers in the journal *Poetics*:⁴ one group was classified as ‘literary experts’ (postgraduate students in English Literature), and the other was classified as literary novices (undergraduate students in a technical field of study). Individuals in each of these communities were asked to read and respond to short stories derived from three literary traditions: science fiction, modern British fiction and postmodern fiction. Responses to each of the stories were assessed by a variety of measures that evaluated readers: understanding, enjoyment and appreciation of the texts (Dorfman 1996: 453). The result showed that experts and novices exhibit distinct patterns of response to the three traditions. In addition, Stanley Fish (1980) states that there are no literary texts, only ‘wilful interpreters’. Readers in their independent states of mind agree on the meaning of what they read, which leads to the individualistic act of interpretation (Dorfman 1996: 454). This is apparent among readers today, and I would like to pose the query ‘if readers have independence to interpret what they have read in their own way and pattern, then why do students fail?’ On another level, for instance, there are different video or stage interpretations of *Sizwe Bansi is Dead*.

Fish (1980) alludes to the fact that members of the same interpretive community are likely to use the same interpretive strategies. He further suggests that strategies exist prior to the act of reading, and exert a marked influence on the reader’s perception of the text (Fish 1980: 14, 171). Answers to several questions posed by Fish can be given in different ways. One of the questions is: ‘by what means is it possible to evaluate a reader’s response to text?’ Though the question is seemingly obvious and simple, it is not straightforward in my own view because the reader reasons along with the theory that suits him or her best. Just as I am adapting the reader response theory, so also a reader can think along the lines of the formalist or structuralist or postmodernists to come up with his or her own interpretation; also, the individual orientation of the theorist is to be taken into consideration when the reader tends to react or respond to a literary text. For instance, a reader who experienced the effect of colonialism will reason differently, when interpreting *A Walk in the Night* by Alex La Guma, from someone who experienced apartheid.

⁴ Dorfman, MH ‘Evaluating the Interpretive Community: Evidence from Expert and Novice Readers’. *Poetics* 23: 453-470.

Since this study aims at examining Fugard's influences as an author who causes his audiences to be active viewers, it will, also, examine the role of the reader, in this case myself as a reader and audience: active viewers in the sense that they are emotionally attached to what is being enacted. However, I wish to state again that I recognise the fact that there is no 'original' meaning, but one that is based on personal interpretation. My background in performance theory assists me in shaping my assumptions on the study of Fugard; also, my view of the work of Stanley Fish gives me the independence as a reader to create my own meaning in the study of the text. In the words of Fish:

The notion of interpretive community thus stands between an impossible ideal and the fear which lead so many to maintain it. The ideal is of perfect agreement and it would require texts to have a status independent of interpretation. The fear is of interpretive anarchy, but it would have been realized if interpretation (text making) were completely random. (Fish 1980: 172)

The above signifies that the reader must agree with his community before he or she can sharpen his interpretation from a text. In my own words, if a reader is taken from his community to another he or she must learn the norms and, also, feel free to be part of that community. Thus, the ability to interpret is not innate but learned. As Fish posits, what is acquired are the ways of interpreting and those same ways can be forgotten or supplanted by another (172). For me, reading and viewing is an adventure since one goes deeper each time the same text is being read or viewed. To arrive at more explicit connotations for a printed text, they have to be created into a visual text. According to Fish, 'meanings are not extracted but made and made not by encoded forms but by interpretive strategies that call forms into being' (173).

To Fish it is the reader who comes to realise the text, and since the reader now has authority over the text, he or she is no longer an isolated entity because he or she now resides in what he calls the interpretive community. The way in which the interpretive community views a text is due to the normal, the everyday and the individual thinking that cannot be taken for granted. The reader or audience is sustained by an act of interpretive will that is always subject to the decision of coming up with individual meaning. The reader's interpretive will is the innate

tendency of the reader that makes him or her want to know more or engage with the text emotionally or for the purpose of entertainment.

Although at the hands of critics like Culler, Goodheart, and Dorfman, Fish suffers much criticism, the truth is that as a member of an interpretive community I contend the meaning I give to a text depends on me, influenced by the community and my assumptions, and I have the right not to follow an author's interpretation of his work. On the other hand, if it is possible that the author and I are from the same interpretive community, as an independent reader I still have the right to my own critical assumptions. Goodheart posits that Fish thinks he gains all determinacy and even the stability that he needs from 'interpretive communities'; though, significantly, he does not tell us how these communities arise and gain authority. All he can tell us is that they exist (Goodheart 1983: 219, Culler 1980: 125). The questions that Goodheart asked in her essay on 'The text and the interpretive community' are: first, does this mean that people in the same interpretive community never disagree? Second, is it that the agreement is possible only within the same interpretive community? One must consider groups of people in a class or community that have different background and family foundations: factors such as age, gender, religion, ethnic background, class, sexual orientation, occupation, education, group membership, and countless other categories.

Some proffered criticism of the authority of the reader as an 'unclear entity', as avowed by Goodheart, suggests that Fish does not mention where the authority of the reader comes from. Goodheart argues that Stanley Fish has to provide a historical perspective that would yield, if not a general theory of the origin of authority, examples of how particular communities become authoritative (Goodheart 1983: 220). On this note, what informs Fish's thinking is a strong view of the social construction of reality; so also do the reader, the audience member and the writer all construct social realities. Fish believes that knowledge is not objective but always socially conditioned. All that one thinks and knows is an interpretation that is only made possible by the social context in which one lives (Fish 1980: 14).

The way a young generation will respond to a performance will be different from how an older generation will respond to it. A 30 year old and a 15 year old person who both see a production of *'Master Harold'... and the Boys* will probably react differently to how Hally spits

on the face of Sam, which might be due to their different experiences of apartheid in South Africa. Different generational responses became evident when they were mentioned in an interview with the actors in *Sizwe Bansi is Dead* (details in the following chapters).

Moreover, my understanding of the interpretation of texts and any literary work has depended on my knowledge in performance theory. Performance involves engagement, audience, emotion, experience and performance; therefore, it cannot be understood without its audience and social or religious context. The comparison of an adaptation of a play into a visual text offers some potential problems; these might be due to omission or insertion or interpretations by the director or different members of the same audience. One issue that interests me is that it is easier to read and interpret a picture, if one has been trained, than to read words in a book because the actual presentation is what is evident in the performance. It is also more straightforward to derive a direct meaning from watching a performance than from reading texts, which might contain nuances which the reader might not understand but will grasp in watching how the actors translate the text into performance. Instances will be discussed later.

Further, theatre as defined by the *Encyclopedia Britannica 2011* is the branch of performing art that focuses exclusively on live performers creating a self contained drama. A performance qualifies as dramatic by creating a representational illusion. ‘Theatre had existed since the dawn of man [sic], as a result of the human tendency for storytelling. Since its inception, theatre has come to take on many forms, utilising speech, gesture, music, dance, writing, and spectacle, combining the other performing arts, often as well as the visual art’ (Schipper 1982: 1; Kuritz 1988: 1-2).

As the above excerpt indicates, theatre is accomplished by employing a number of techniques that are used by the script writer, playwright or the director. So also are the video /DVD versions of plays, where the audience can pause and play to study a technique used by the director. In the case of Fugard, for example: his reference to *Antigone* (a tragedy by Sophocles written before or in 442 BC (Brunn 2012:36) is a technique employed in *The Island*. These elements will be discussed fully in chapter four. Effective use of these elements will aid a proficient presentation of subject matters by the playwright or director. The effect of this presentation on the audience may well provoke their desire to watch a performance over and

over again. Therefore, theatre might be regarded as a creator of social interaction.⁵ To this end, John Russell Brown (1997) opines that:

The next time you go to a theatre, arrive early and stand in the main lobby for five minutes watching people come in. Each of them has paid money and given his or her time to come and see the same play, but each one brings his or her own concern along with them... I forget the audience, their concern and my own concern, and wait for what is about to happen onstage, and everyone else responds in much the same way (Brown 1997:3).

The above extract shows that the experience of watching a visual text might be an isolating one, as in the case of Athol Fugard; each person has his or her own experience to share. People do come into the theatre with their different concerns, perhaps to see a play that relies on their day to day activities and what is happening in their present life. This might be due to an attempt to escape from stress or in order to enjoy something different from what they encounter daily. Performance gives rise to a shared experience that goes beyond what any person on stage or the audience could have imagined or experienced alone. Brown (1997) in his discussion about the power of theatre emphasises that theatre can be a social art form, a lively and powerful means of sharing ideas with thousands of people and, as a result, it has been subjected to severe political censorship in certain places and at certain times. Brown cites some examples in his book on Shakespeare's day in which several playwrights, including Ben Jonson (1572-1637) and George Chapman (*ca.* 1560-1634), were put in prison for writing a play that had escaped the official censors only to be judged unacceptable in performance. Even though it was a comedy, it still got its author and acting company into trouble (Brown 1997: 6-8, McDonald 2009). It is worthy of note that Fugard also was arrested and his passport was seized after the presentation of *The Blood Knot* in 1967 by the government, which began to watch his activities closely (Marino 2010: 3). This is evident in Merrill Brockway's production where emphasis is placed on the passbook rather than the 'book' mentioned by Fugard in the printed text (Brockway 1981).

⁵ For me, I meet new people each time I visit a cinema or theatre. An example was when I visited the Ster-Kinekor Theatre at Beatrix and Pretorius; I met a Master's student at the University of Johannesburg who is also doing a film study of Chimamanda Adichie. Thereby theatre (or movies) can become creators of social reality (director and playwright and audience create their version(s) of the societal reality surrounding them), where one can meet with other people to share ideas. Similarly, when a viewer finishes seeing a DVD, he or she can decide to consult a fellow researcher about how he or she reacts to the text adaptation.

Theatre also interprets reality where human life can be reflected on stage by a playwright who has experienced and watched the people closely; what happens on stage represents what takes place outside the theatre. Thus, the episode on the stage may reveal to the audience the truth about themselves and their entire daily lives,⁶ for example in *Boesman and Lena*: what occurs in some marital relationships. The stage reflects the real world so that it looks the same, but it is in fact different, more meaningful, more enjoyable, and more inspiring. As Brown (1997) puts it:

The mirror and its reflections work for an audience because what happens on stage may not only look real but also, in some respect, actually is real. A play uses the same elements as life itself: onstage there are real men, women, and children; there is talk, noise, and silence; light and darkness; movement and stillness. What is seen in the mirror may be unlikely or immediately existing, but it will always be made of the same materials as those found in reality, and it is experienced using the same kind of consciousness (Brown 1997:8).

Theatre revolves around the human being and all that surrounds him or her. No other form of art can make use of everything to present the human's life; admittedly, poetry can create an imaginary world and cause individuals to see their lives with the mind's eye. Arguably, the world that is shown onstage can never be quite so strange or pleasurable as that evoked by poetry (owing to the interplay with the audience as explored by Athol Fugard), but it will always be tangible, visible, audible, almost touchable (sensory). Theatre's imitation of life is also practicable: one element cannot be allowed to develop at the expense of the other, unlike poetry in which the concentration can vary in different spheres of life (Brown 1997: 10). Moreover, performances reproduce life because they communicate through more than words, or music, or visual signs: their expression revolves around the daily happenings in the life of human beings. This becomes even more evident when studying a visual text whose interpretation depends on the viewer who has in one time or the other internalised techniques to read such texts.

⁶ Sometimes I find presentations on the stage to be such an accurate representation of life (as if they have borrowed from what is happening around me) that I think the playwright has made some findings about me before putting his / her ideas on stage.

In terms of my experience during my undergraduate days, I learnt that performance and images can be studied, amongst other ways, in terms of the following categories: physiological, ethnographical and psychological (Monaco 2000). A physiological study of performance has to do with the bodily movement of actors on the stage and the way I, as a reader and audience of Fugard, imagine performances on the stage: it includes my perceptions and reactions in viewing the actual ones. I have seen for myself that he aligns his actors and actresses with everyday activities and the experiences of people in South Africa. Fugard writes his plays about human relationships that are put to the test by societal and personal forces.

Ethnography, according to the *Oxford Dictionaries Online*, is the scientific description of peoples and cultures together with their customs, habits, and mutual differences. Although Fugard is not a scientist he has been able, in his dramatic works, to develop identities based on the unique social and political features of his environment.

Psychologically, I will in later chapters explore the effect of Fugard's plays on his audience and how it affects the actors and actresses performing them, making use of reader response theory as remarked earlier. To achieve this I will be linking Fugard, actors, his plays and the observer, which includes me as a reader and audience; thus reinforcing my justification. My validation for coming from this point of view is that Fugard believes in the actuality of performance and relies on the power of live actors to move a live audience; the audience become part of his plays since what is enacted on the stage is what is happening in their daily lives. His plays place the audience in an active state, very different, for instance, from the New Critics who see the author as the originator of meaning and the reader or audience as passive. Video is also very immediate, direct, close up, instantaneous and possibly easier to decode over repeated viewings. Thus, bringing to mind Fish's interpretive community which gives power to the reader and the audience to respond from their own perspectives as Holland, quoted earlier, indicates.

Films can be read from the areas of movement, gesture, engagement with audience and the like; therefore, this study could have embraced some of the well-established film theories such as Marxism, psychoanalysis, feminism, auteurism and structuralism in its analysis but for the reason mentioned below. For example, psychoanalysis encompasses different schools of study such as the Jungian, Freudian and Lacanian psychoanalytic approaches (Groden 2005:

777). The point I would like to draw from this is that occasion might arise for making recourse to any of these, for the reason that at times they interpenetrate each other. However, for my research to be focused I have decided to limit myself to the concept of the interpretive community as found in the reader response theory of Stanley Fish.

Owing to the nature of my study, a comparison of video versions with printed texts, it is imperative for me to engage with certain aspects of film studies. In this regard the definition of 'film studies' will be considered. Dyer Richards (2000:6) defines it as an academic discipline that deals with various theoretical, historical, and critical approaches to films. It is sometimes subsumed under media studies and is often compared to television studies. Film studies is less concerned with advancing proficiency in film production than it is with exploring the narrative, artistic, cultural, economic, and political implications of the cinema. Therefore film studies includes textual analysis and analysis of the screenplays which come from the script or printed versions of plays, prose or poetry. To Thomas Corrigan, film studies is:

... a critical discipline that promotes serious reflection on the movies. It is part of a rich and complex history that overlaps with critical works in many fields, such as literary studies, philosophy, and art history (Corrigan 2009: 7).

From the above, Corrigan posits that films have been not just a mode of entertainment but also objects of serious study with important sociological and aesthetic values. The definition of film displays many variants, which means there is no single definition for film. According to Nelmes 2007, 'film is. Film is. Film is. Each apparent attempt to complete the sentence leaves us with an increasing sense that film evades any particular definition' (Nelmes 2007: 4). Another view is that of Gustav Deutsch 2011, who writes that:

Film cannot be defined, because its limitations are those of existence itself. The phrase which follows [film is], I realised, are not intended as even possible definitions, nor even as sub-categories of film's existence. Rather each articulates a perception, a facet, of film's continuous metamorphosis... thus the succession of film's affinities becomes multiple and transitory. No single term can occupy this space for long (Gustav Deutsch accessed 2011).

This illustrates that the definitions given to film cannot completely describe what film is. Thus, film studies take different shapes, ranging from a film's aesthetic value to its social values. Dyer (2000) posits that film matters for its artistic merits and shares a concern with newspaper and magazine film reviewing: even if this common cause is sometimes obscured by antagonism of both journalists and academics towards one another, at its best, journalism's readiness to mix a well expressed, honest response with a fine accurate, and evocative description of a film is of great methodological importance (Dyer 2000: 2). From these, it is evident that the response of a reviewer will aid the study of a film and will assist in the analysis of the film. He further states that there is freshness and immediacy of the reviewer's [reader's] response (2). The action on stage is immediate and does not give room for any playback; therefore the response of a reader is instant compared to DVD versions.

In consequence of the aesthetics of film, auteur theory was developed in the 1960 by Andrew Sarris. In his essay 'Notes on the Auteur theory, 1962', he attempts to redeem Hollywood cinema as worthy of study instead of European art cinema. The production line of Hollywood offers opportunities for the identification of themes, structures, narratives and aesthetics in films that in turn show the personality of the director (Butler 2005: 35, Dyer 2000: 3, Nelmes 2007: 99, Donald 2008: 21). The principal method by which the above was achieved by the earlier Auteur was the establishment of the hierarchical distinction between those directors labelled as mere 'metteurs-en-scene'⁷ and genuine auteurs. This theoretical form was a crucial movement for the establishment of film as a discipline; film is worth studying because art itself is worth studying and film is art (Dyer, 2000: 3). In his 1954 essay titled *A Certain Tendency in French Cinema*, Francois Truffaut claims that, 'film is a great medium for expressing the personal ideas of the director' (Hollows, 2000: 61). From this view one may interpret Fugard who acts, directs and invents his own stories. He acted in the Ross Devenish visual production of *Boesman and Lena* as Boesman.

The value of the auteur theory is that the director can use the commercial mechanism of film making the same way a writer will use his or her pen to communicate her or his ideas. The

⁷ French term for a film director. In the late 1950s and early '60s, the critics of French journal *Cahiers du Cinéma* used the term somewhat disparagingly to describe directors whose work was neither distinguished nor thematically consistent enough to make them worthy of being considered auteurs. Also available on: <http://www.screenonline.org.uk/education/glossary.html#auteurism>.

word auteur, which was the original name for the director, has its origin in the 1948 article by Alexandre Astruc in the French film magazine *Cashier du Cinema* (British Film Resource 2011, Donald 2008: 36, Bordwell 2010: 382). This observes that the director who is also the author of a particular film tries to convey information with what he includes in his production. Since it has been argued that the playwright's creative labour ends with the completion of the script, as said earlier in the introductory paragraph, this certainly will influence any adaptation.⁸

Any literary work, either a novel or a play, in the form of a film, has been adapted from the original text. Charlie Moritz states that 'many of screen dramas have been adapted from short stories, novellas and plays' (Moritz 2001: 141). A question that often arises from adaptation is: how faithful is the adaptation to the original text? Moritz argues, and I would also like to discuss this issue, that, '... many is the time writers (directors) of screen versions have been criticised for changing the original source material out of all recognition' (Moritz 2001: 141). This might be due to the way the director understands a work of art to be and the way he or she responds to the text.

Why does one study film, especially films of play texts? The advantage of DVD's and VCR's is that they allow the viewer to pause and analyse the chosen props, objects, gestures, relationships and so forth within the scene, many of which are visual strategies the filmmaker employs to communicate with the viewer. When a student watches a movie, this exposure escorts his or her thinking to the classroom where his or her knowledge can be built upon in a systematic way by the lecturer or mentor. Corrigan (2009) posits that 'the study of movies takes common knowledge and pleasure seriously while acknowledging that film culture is richer, more varied, and more challenging than most of us realise' (Corrigan 2009: 7).

In reality, studying films does not destroy our pleasure in watching them, it also increases the way we can enjoy them thoughtfully. Corrigan also avows that:

Another important reason for studying the movies is the undeniable prominence of film and media in the values and ideas that permeate our social and cultural lives. Even in the context of a classroom, film study makes clear that movies are

⁸ Athol Fugard is also a director of his own work, but in this context I am making a general note in agreeing with what Kidnie (2009) argues.

not simply a mechanical art but a practice of experience that centrally engages numerous aspects of our daily lives (Corrigan 2009: 9).

The above excerpt causes us to understand that taking film as a curricular item will also broaden our horizon to think widely and practically about our daily activities as we watch them on screen. The significance of studying film is not, primarily, about the way it is made but how we as an audience, as readers, viewers, respond to it.

Hence, studying film is to celebrate and give power to the audience member, who in turn brings out the positive, or the opposite, depending on how and what he or she sees on the screen. The film audience view actions and absorb them in an active state, and respond to them differently in terms of age, background, educational levels, and even geographical locations. For example, as noted earlier Athol Fugard places his audience in an active state, involving them in what is enacted on stage. All these factors, according to Fiske, make film viewing and film study a profound cultural experience (Fiske 2011: 62). He refers to the television as a primary social subject. Corrigan supports this view proposed by Fiske, when he argues that ‘while film viewers don’t make the movie, their varying cultural experiences of film bring it into a dynamic circulation that makes the film meaningful’ (Corrigan 2009: 11); thus making the film both a public and a private affair; it can be viewed at home or the cinema. These locations can shape our reactions to films in areas of intellectual, social, emotional interests that can be attached to the film.

Furthermore, the third edition of James Monaco’s book *How to Read a Film* outlines two different ways to which the tastes and responses of readers relate when watching a film. These are mentioned later as identification and cognition, explained below (Monaco 2000:154, Corrigan 2009: 19). The identification aspect of watching a movie deals with the way a viewer identifies with a character, action, place, setting (see chapter four). Conforming to what Aristotle discusses in his *Poetics*, as quoted by Moritz in his essay ‘Scripting Stories’, it is called the Rule of the three Unities – these being time, place and action (Moritz 2001:2). For instance, while watching a performance of *Blood Knot* by Athol Fugard, a viewer from any part of the world might shed a tear for Zachariah when he is denied a meeting with the white girl, ‘Ethel’. Cognition on the other hand deals with how rationally one thinks when studying or watching a

film. A reader or audience critically looks into aspects to which there are similarities or differences in the text, and engages with them employing lateral thinking. Explaining the relationship between identification and cognition, Corrigan argues thus:

Watching a movie is both an emotional experience that involves identifying through processes of participation and empathy and a cognitive process that involves the intellectual activities of comparison and comprehension (Corrigan 2009: 19).

Finally on this note, film criticism will be explored. Film criticism may be divided into two categories: journalistic criticism and academic criticism (Bywater 1989: xii). The former comprises newspaper, magazines and popular media reviews. Academic criticism deals with the all round literary criticism that has to do with film theory. Confusion may stem from the fact that journalistic critiques are also often referred to 'film reviews'. While film theory also varies from new criticism, structuralism, Marxism, feminism, gay and lesbian criticism to queer criticism, for instance, these approaches all display strong points and shortcomings as well as different shades of interpretation. For example, Marxism is often termed as totally political; a primary critique of Marx being that he did not look outside of economic forces to explain society (Milios 2000: 285).

Also, Fredric Jameson in *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism* commented on the strength of Marxism in discussing texts: he asserts that Marxism encompasses all other interpretive strategies, showing that its explanations of a text's meaning are only partial (Leitch 2010: 1818). However within Marxism, to take just one instance, there are different schools of thought. The same is true of other facets of literary criticism. I will not be going into details of these forms of literary criticism especially to the extent of giving their different nuances; owing to my choice of Stanley Fish's version of reader response in doing a comparative study of Fugard's texts and the video versions.

In conclusion, I trust my dissertation will make a valuable contribution to the field of film studies and impart useful knowledge to future researchers on reader response. In doing this I am adding something new to the interpretation of Athol Fugard, which is the comparison of the video/DVD interpretations with the printed texts. Though I realise there are many critiques of

Fugard's plays, I have stated my position and the school of criticism I will be adapting. For the purpose of this research I have chosen four early plays of Athol Fugard: *Boesman and Lena* (1969), *Sizwe Bansi is Dead* (1972), *The Island* (1972), and *Master Harold and the Boys* (1982). The reason for selecting them is their availability on DVD or as a filmed version of the performance.

CHAPTER TWO

Statement Plays and Video/DVD versions: A comparison

'However theatre for development comes to be employed in future texts in the late 80s, it will only be effective if it makes full use of the theatrical possibilities offered by the live medium for creating an engagement with the collective consciousness of its audience'

– (Prentki 2001: 123).

I will compare and contrast, in this chapter, the print versions of two of Fugard's Statement Plays – *The Island* and *Sizwe Bansi is Dead* – with their stage interpretations as recorded on DVD. I will be viewing more than one performance of these chosen plays in order for me to see how different directors and artists approached the same text. In doing this, some questions I will be asking are: What is in a shot when juxtaposed with the text? What is excluded? What is the exclusion or addition centred on? What are my responses to the changes effected by the directors, producers or the actors performing the plays?

Fugard's work ranges from stories inspired by real life and personal accounts to political theatre protesting South Africa's previously inhumane practices and laws: as observed, these have been his concerns for the past 50 years as a playwright. Irrespective of the subject matter of his works, Fugard's dramas can be summed up as powerful, honest and thought-provoking. The settings of his plays are, specifically, South African and his characters are aligned with several classes in the margins of the society in South Africa in such a manner that the audience encounters the poor Afrikaner, the maltreated coloured wife, the rejects, the underdog, the dispossessed and disinherited etcetera. His understanding of these classes may well affect the thinking and interpretation of the audience, so that what they experience in their day to day interaction with each other may be similar to what he presents in his texts.

Nonetheless, Fugard insists that his works are non-political. In his speech during the inaugural lecture of the annual Joe A. Callaway Distinguished Lecture Series in Drama at New York University on October 16, 1990, Fugard claims that 'The perception of myself as a political writer disturbs me. An attitude like that closes off an individual to an important thing I have tried to do. I've tried to celebrate the human spirit — its capacity to create, its capacity to endure, its

capacity to forgive, its capacity to love, even though every conceivable barrier is set up to thwart the act of loving' (Marino 2009: 1, Billington 2012). This reaction, in my view, may have been caused by the response his work attracted when his first play was shown on BBC TV in 1967: in SA he was treated like a citizen who was on the verge of destroying his country's image overseas. Fugard's passport was withdrawn, but it was later renewed for him in order for him to travel to the UK to direct *Boesman and Lena* at the Royal Court Theatre in London after about 4,000 South Africans signed the petition for his passport to be released (Marino 2010: 3).

According to Elsom (1974) quoted in Ferrer, 'Fugard is the sole dramatist now writing in English whose plays contain the necessary dualism of true tragedy. *The Island* and *Sizwe Bansi is Dead* may deal with particular situations, but implications are universal. They are unbearably moving, but they are also ennobling, hence joyful' (Ferrer 1977: 44, Goff 2007: 271). In reality, Fugard's work, especially the two Statement Plays discussed in this chapter, calls for political change, if not for outright revolutionary actions, bearing in mind that better political systems, ultimately, depend upon changes of heart. It is Elsom's view that Fugard's two plays provide the complete retort to Brecht's theory which argues if an audience is encouraged to identify with the suffering of tragic heroes it will lack the capacity to think calmly about the causes of these sufferings (Elsom 1974: 63). If this was Elsom's position with regard to Fugard's work, then there is the likelihood that such opinion was the vogue, which could have informed the belief that Fugard was the greatest active playwright in the English speaking world at the point when this statement was made.

Fugard was raised in the Karoo from the age of three. He is the son of an English speaking Irish/ Polish father and an Afrikaner mother (Marino 2010: 3). Before he realised his dream of becoming a playwright, a youthful and exuberant Fugard hitch hiked Africa working on a merchant ship with a fellow student and poet, Perseus Adams. However, in 1955 he returned to South Africa to begin his theatrical calling. Before this he served as a clerk, though, in the pass-law court where he witnessed first-hand the fringe of apartheid. In his words as quoted by Stephen Gray, 'it was like a factory. We sent an African to jail every two minutes. It was the ugliest thing I have ever been part of. I think my basic pessimism was born there...' (Gray 1982: 4). At this point he became friendly with people living in Sophiatown, which resulted in the

production of his first plays *No Good Friday* and *Nongogo*. In Sophiatown he managed the stage at the National Theatre Organisation (Gray 1982:4).

The Island is a two-character play which Athol Fugard devised with Kani and Ntshona. Stephen Holden asserts that ‘*The Island* is one of the more Beckettian⁹ works by an author for whom the South African tragedy symbolises metaphysical struggles that extend far beyond the horrors of apartheid’ (Holden, 1988). Martin Orkin describes this collaboration as imparting ‘a new impetus to South African theatre by showing how group improvisation and workshop brought together theatre practitioners and crossed the social and racial boundaries aimed at isolating them’ (Orkin 1991: 159). The ironical part was that John Kani and Ntshona had to disguise themselves as Fugard’s gardeners in order to travel and perform with him during the vicious regime of apartheid.

In the same vein, Christgau’s discourse around *Sizwe Bansi is Dead* as quoted in Ferrer (1977: 45) ignites a degree of curiosity in me to know more about South African history and people. According to Christgau, ‘the main reason [*Sizwe Bansi is Dead*] is satisfying is because it tells us things we don’t know, or haven’t bothered to imagine, about the epitome of our worst fears, the world’s most totalitarian state’ (Christgau in Ferrer 1977: 46). What this statement implies for a reader like me who was brought up to learn of colonialism is that watching or reading *Sizwe Bansi is Dead* would enlighten me about how matters were during the apartheid era and its passbook and other practices. Christgau further sheds some light on the emotional impact of watching the performance of *Sizwe Bansi is Dead*: ‘... the play has the kind of freshness that gave it its name... I gave my mother a ticket to this play and asked my mother how she liked it... my mother admired the play, even liked it, but she didn’t really enjoy it: “it was too real”, she told me’ (Christgau in Ferrer 1977: 46). To Christgau, his mother’s response to *Sizwe Bansi is Dead* is a proof of the play’s success; this would also apply to me if I were to be in the shoes of someone that was born outside an African setting. In addition, Christgau’s mother as

⁹ ‘Beckettian’ in the sense that, Fugard also writes in minimal characters, as he presents just two or three characters on stage (detail in chapter four).

part of the South African interpretive community¹⁰ sees how life during the apartheid system is presented on the stage and disapprovingly concludes that it looks so [i.e. too] real.

In Fugard's works, the playwright mostly deploys his major characters in twos or threes and they are always connected either by blood ties, love, friendship or common sufferings that may have been triggered by social, economic, political, or religious forces: The camaraderie between brothers like Morris and Zach, or between John and Winston, Sizwe Bansi and Buntu inter alia, points to the fact that Fugard is aware of how social and emotional problems or challenges can be solved via solidarity: was it not Buntu who helped Sizwe Bansi out of his identity difficulty? This suggests that with human beings showing love to one another (see Walder below), their problems can be solved. Also, worthy of note is the manner in which Fugard has been able to portray his characters struggling to survive in a world that seems uncertain and gloomy, when it seems as if there is no escape route.

In Dennis Walder's exposition on the characters of Fugard, he argues that they display strong emotions of anger and compassion, which express their opposition to the prevailing order (Walder 1984: 3). The characters on their own try to fashion out a way out of their present plight. For instance, Zach in *The Blood Knot* would have loved to meet Ethel but his dark skin is a deterrent; thus, he resolves to manipulate Morris in his favour. This would most likely also have applied to every race in the world if one holds, as Walder further states, that 'Fugard's plays make us aware not only of the South African dimension of man's inhumanity to man, but also of the secret pain we all inflict upon each other in the private recesses of our closest relationship' (Walder 1984: 3). Walder believes that the most important ingredient is awareness of the other's suffering, supplemented by responsibility, intimacy, compassion and love. This is obvious in the visual text by Brockway, that is, the gesture of Kani (Buntu) towards Ntshona (Sizwe) regarding how he can help him overcome his misery to leave Port Elizabeth and travel back to King William's Town.

For Fugard, being a regional writer aligns his view with that of Wertheim, seeing theatre as 'a place to enact both realities and dreams'. Wertheim, on Fugard's work, submits that: '... the

¹⁰ She would not have been an expert though if one follows the analysis of Dorfman (1996). But if she had not experienced apartheid, she would not have said the performance seemed so real.

word acting has at once a theatrical and a political meaning. Theatre is a place to enact both realities and dreams, and it is thus a microcosm and a possible model for the world beyond the playhouse doors. If the world is a stage, then the stage and the acting and performance it witnesses can also be played out in the world' (Wertheim 2000:3). For Fugard to have written plays that connote both political and theatrical meaning, he must have had it in mind to use his theatrical means to oppose the cruel system of government in his country.

Although the plots of Fugard's two collaborative plays, *Sizwe Bansi is Dead* and *The Island*, can be linked to the above discourse, yet it is of import to point out that certain significant issues led to his writing of these two plays. In this respect I here focus briefly on plot, discussing it more fully below: a literary term defined as 'the events that make up a story, particularly as they relate to one another in a pattern, in a sequence, through cause and effect, or by coincidence' (Cuddon 1999: 342). One difference between plot in a printed, and in a visual, text is that the director might want to emphasise material in his shots which the playwright regards as less significant. One is generally interested in how well this pattern of events accomplishes some artistic or emotional effect in such a way that each human being responds to situations differently according to how each person has experienced them. Fugard's discussion with John Berry about the Broadway production of *Boesman and Lena* in 1970 enlightened him when writing the script for the act which brings about the idea of Robben Island – six actors in space and silence. This was how the notion of writing *The Island* came into being.

Fugard describes his experience and what he knows of Robben Island thus: 'Seal Island' *The Island*: first image 'the eight prisoners thrown violently into their space, protecting themselves futilely, marked by violent outside; barefoot, bloodied noses, prison uniforms dishevelled; a groaning, self pitying heap of humanity: then the chain of sympathy, weather forecast and news bulletin' [italics in original] (Fugard 1983: 185). Fugard learnt certain information from some of the Serpent players that were imprisoned on Robben Island as he ends the paragraph subsequently, 'open with a man in a suit, alone on stage. After his release: I'll tell you' [italics in original] (185). In response to the above, Fugard himself reacts to his effort in these words: 'a reality which has got the two dimensions of an idea, of the intellect. The reality of a truly living moment in the theatre (actors in front of an audience) must involve the whole

actor, be a whole act in order to involve them wholly. Not just what we think, also what we feel' (186).

In 1971, Fugard commented on the suicide committed by Ahmed Timol, who jumped from the 10th floor of the police headquarters in Johannesburg: Timol was arrested at a road block in Coronationville, handcuffed and taken to the Newlands police station because the police had discovered pamphlets in the boot of the car that he was travelling in. According to the police, banned ANC literature, copies of secret correspondence, instructions from the SACP and material related to the 50th anniversary of the SACP were found in the car (Cajee 2005: 110). What Timol believed in was equality amongst his fellow countrymen, whether black, white or Indian. Through numerous reports about Timol on the internet and other databases, I learnt of Timol's dedication to tackling South African apartheid. This is evident as he sacrifices personal love and comfort, travelling to Moscow to further his knowledge of communism, with the aim of returning to his homeland to support the resistance (Cajee 2005: 110-135, Fugard 1983: 191). What was Fugard trying to depict of this event? As recorded in his Notebook it is one of those incidents that led to his writing.

The concept of *Sizwe Bansi is Dead* emanated after several weeks of doubts and the total involvement of Fugard with John Kani and Winston Ntshona, who were on the verge of starting their professional career as theatre practitioners. Fugard thought about giving them an already written play that could be performed by the duo. While trying to decide what to do with *The Coat* and *Friday's Bread on Monday*, which had already been completed, the idea of doing something new came to mind. According to his notebook, Fugard soon noticed that to make do with an already existing work would not help; thus, he decided to start something different and work along the lines of *Orestes* (Fugard 1983: 201, Shelley 2009: 127, Benson 1993: 458). Fugard was influenced by the Brechtian notion of a poor theatre which was versus the tenets of the rich theatre: he presented the concept of three or four chairs and tables representing the lounge of a local hotel with a type of arrogant and self-satisfied white student being served by two black waiters (John and Winston). Brecht wanted actors to strike a balance between being their character onstage and showing the audience that the character is being performed (Brecht 1974: 139). This is what the poor theatre is all about, rather making use of available

props to present its ideas. Using all these, the trio (Fugard, John and Winston) invented the act: their individual relationship to the customers, table and chair, these led to questions that were provoked in John's mind: who am I? Where am I? Who is where? (Fugard 1983: 202). To me, these thought provoking questions brought about my awareness of the issue of identity, which is at the core of *Sizwe Bansi is Dead*.

Also in an interview with *momentum*, Fugard mentioned another incident that led to the writing of *Sizwe Bansi is Dead*. Fugard saw a photograph in a little back-street studio, the image of a smiling man in an observably new suit, a pipe in one hand and a cigarette in the other. 'A bloody joyous man as he calls it, so celebratory in his testimony to something which cannot be broken in the spirit of people. I remembered it for years and when John and Winston said to me let's make a play; we want to be professional actors, we tried a few ideas out and all of them ground to a halt [to me, the attempt to improvise *Orestes* was referred to by Fugard as an attempt being halted]. And I told them about the photograph: the play is specifically based on it' (Daymond 1984: 25).

The Island on the other hand is a political protest play about the circumstances on the enigmatic South African prison, Robben Island, where Nelson Mandela and other anti-apartheid leaders were jailed. Combined with the collaborative efforts of John Kani and Winston Ntshona the play, following its opening in 1972, was widely acclaimed at home and abroad. Due to the fact that the play was performed outside South Africa, it helped to shape the knowledge of people about the apartheid system. I vividly remember that when it was presented at the Amphitheatre of the Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria in 2004, numerous people shed tears for the citizens of South Africa about their daily encounters as presented in this performance of *The Island*.

In 2000, 27 years after the first performance of *The Island*, John Kani reflected on the circumstances that led to the making of the play. In his words, while speaking to Esther Pan through a conference call:

... 27 years ago Winston and I and Athol were very angry, we took a lot of chances. Doing *The Island* then, we knew that the risk was real. We also were aware of the service we were providing to our country and the role we were playing

in that struggle for liberation. To go back to it, 27 years later, is like an actor crawling back into an old costume that fits him so well, and just enjoying the fact he still remembers the smell, the touch and certain flavours. But the work itself feels different. You are older in life, more experienced as an actor (Pan 2000).

This also depicts how different generations can respond to a literary text.

In addition, Fugard avows in his conversation with Pan that *The Island* is not just a story deriving from the imaginative impulse of the trio, but a plot that stems from the letters which were smuggled out from Robben Island, written by the inmates there. He concludes by calling *The Island* a piece of documentary theatre (Pan 2000). Through a series of overseas productions of *The Island*, the trio gained confidence and felt secure enough to initiate their first public performance in September 1974 at St. Stephen's Hall in New Brighton, South Africa (Shelley 2009: 143). Fugard responds thus to the production at New Brighton: 'I think to my dying day, the response of that jam-packed hall will remain the most memorable experience of my theatre going life. John and Winston had to stop the show a couple of times because direct audience participation was so strong that people wanted to come onto the stage and join the actors. For the first time they were watching theatre that was dealing with the daily, urgent issues of their lives' (Pan 2000). This was because the audience had been too intimidated to say things that would violate the apartheid law; they were being given a voice originating from what was being enacted of their daily encounters on stage. Another example of this active participation occurred during my visit to the Market Theatre.

Ntshona was not left out in the narration of the reaction to the performance. In his account, he indicated the emotions that overwhelmed him when he saw a white policeman enter the theatre; he thought the latter had come to arrest them. However, it turned out that the man had only come to enjoy the show. After some minutes, he left for the police station to call more officers to come and enjoy the play. Ntshona concludes by revealing how the law enforcement officers laughed themselves sick. To Fugard, 'That's the story of the way *Sizwe Bansi is Dead* and *The Island* opened the eyes of many white South Africans to the reality that the black men and women were living in the country' (Pan 2000). However, it is my view that *The Island* speaks to the situations of other countries; thus, its message could be argued to be universal.

The message would have been termed totally political by me, but when I read an interview by Fugard that was conducted when *The Blood Knot* was on Broadway, I found myself having second thoughts. According to Fugard, ‘nobody can take what I love away from me. I would like to believe that love is the only energy I’ve ever used as a writer. I’ve never written out of anger, although anger has informed love. When I return, that love will still be there, even if the South Africa I go back to in five months’ time is radically different from the one I left. I would like to believe that my absence from South Africa won’t affect my relationship to that country, which has been the source of my inspiration, the soul of my writing’ (Richards 1989: 8). The question that stems from a seeming crossroads is this: what would have become of Fugard if he had decided to face apartheid by direct opposition? The outcome may have been catastrophic or tragic. Thus, I am tempted to agree with Fugard by saying that nothing can be achieved with violence but only through love¹¹ as in the case of South Africa. For example, the love Angela Bassett as Lena shows to Glover as Boesman in *Boesman and Lena* causes her to return to him despite his maltreatment when she has the option of divorcing him (Berry 2000).

As stated by the *Oxford Dictionary Online*, the circumstances that form the setting for an event, statement, or idea, and in terms of which it can be fully understood are known as the context (*Oxford Dictionary* 2011). Obviously, the context in which Fugard wrote his statement plays is that of apartheid South Africa.¹² Alan Shelley tagged Fugard as having been regarded as a traitor to the South African society of whites (Shelley 2009:15), while Henry also quotes Fugard thus, ‘half of my descent, and maybe all of my soul, is Afrikaner. But I am also a traitor inside the laager’ (quoted in Shelley 2009: 15).

In the words of Marowski, ‘Fugard is a South African foremost dramatist. By combining social protest with universal concern for humanity, Fugard focuses on victims of apartheid

¹¹ This can also be seen in Fugard’s presentation of characters such as Buntu, Sam, Zach and others, all of whom showed a love to their fellows which causes them to discover their identity which does not come through violence but an understanding of where they come from.

¹² I explain this term for non-South African readers. Apartheid is an Afrikaans word meaning ‘separateness’ - it was a legal system whereby people were classified into racial groups - White, Black, Indian and Coloured - and separate geographic areas were demarcated for each racial group. Apartheid laws were part of South Africa’s legal framework from 1948 to 1994. Although racial segregation in South Africa began in colonial times, apartheid as an official policy was introduced following the general election of 1948. The new legislation classified inhabitants into four racial groups namely native, white, coloured, and Asian and residential areas were segregated, sometimes by means of forced removals (Laurel 1999: 18).

without overtly propagandising his political beliefs. His plays typically centre on a small number of characters drawn from the fringes of South African society and viewed as a microcosm of the country's poor and dispossessed' (Marowski 1986: 195, Zinman 2012). These elements are palpable to me in the visual texts chosen for this study: as a viewer I am made to understand through the performances by actors such as Zakes Mokae and Ving Rhames as Sam in both the Lindsay-Hogg and Price productions (see chapter three), that Fugard celebrates love and endurance in his works.

At this point, I would like to mention briefly dramatic structure as it applies to the plays and plots of Athol Fugard. For me, all drama texts must surely have a structure,¹³ so too must Fugard's plays. Do Fugard's play texts conform to the dramatic structure suggested by Gustav Freytag and originally by Aristotle? According to Freytag, the structure of a typical five act play consists of, exposition (introduction), inciting moment, rising action, climax, falling action, and catastrophe (Cuddon 1999: 335, Freytag 1968: 114-115). The exposition, as Freytag states, provides background information in understanding the play in the sense that 'at the beginning of a play text the dramatist is often committed to giving a certain amount of essential information about the plot and the events which are to come' (Cuddon 1999: 296). The expository part of the play, therefore, suggests materials to understand the themes, establishes the setting and introduces the major characters and, sometimes, it hints at coming conflicts. Rising action, on the other hand, refers to the basic internal conflict including various obstacles that frustrate the protagonist's attempt to reach his or her goal. According to Cuddon, it is 'the part of the play which precedes the climax' (755). In essence, the events that line the path between the exposition and the climax tend to create the point at which the suspense is created in the reader or the audience, which then takes the reader to the climax of the action whereby crisis is reached and resolution achieved (Cuddon 1999: 141). The climax is often the most interesting part of the play or film.

The next stage in the structure of a play as propounded by Freytag is what he calls the falling action. During the falling action or resolution, there is a moment of turnaround after the

¹³ Although experimental theatre alters traditional conventions of space, movement, mood, tension, language, symbolism, and other elements, it thus has a story and structure no matter how the playwright tries to fashion his or her skills.

climax, the conflict between the protagonist and the antagonist sorts out, with the protagonist winning or losing against the antagonist. The falling action might contain a moment of final suspense, during which the final outcome of the conflict is in doubt. The falling action, however, is that part of the story in which the main part has finished and the play is heading to the conclusion. The question that comes to the mind is that, how has the author or director of either the visual or the printed version, been able to maintain this structure in keeping the audience involved? The falling action is used as a metaphor to describe the effects of dramatic tragedy on the audience, by arousing empathy and terror through sympathetic identification with the tragic protagonist.

The denouement, catharsis, or resolution marks the end of the pyramidal structure proposed by Freytag. It is often the events between the falling action and the actual ending scene of the drama or narrative and thus serves as the conclusion of the work. Conflicts are resolved, creating normality for the characters and a sense of catharsis, or release of tension and anxiety, for the reader (Cuddon 1999: 335, Gray 1992: 85). Denouement, which is applicable to a comedy, is the sorting out or extrication of the complexities of a plot, while the tragedy ends with a catastrophe in which the protagonist is worse off than the beginning of the narrative (Gray 1992: 85). Athol Fugard in his plays balances the events with suggestions of reconciliation among two opposing parties such as ‘Hally and Sam’, ‘Lena and Boesman’, Sizwe and ‘the government’, in such a manner that the plays end in both parties involved settling their differences.

However I wish to question the pyramidal structure of Freytag by asking a question: is a director or playwright, who wishes to start his or her play with a war, continues the story with peace and ends it with another war, making use of such a structure? Is he or she still following the tenets of the dramatic structure proposed by Freytag? The structure of the two texts for this chapter vividly shows how Freytag’s suggestion of a play is not significant to modern day drama texts,¹⁴ where the director or the playwright has the right to begin his or her play or visual text by shuffling the techniques. For example, the director is able to start his or her text with the climax, while the play continues in its exposition of the characters. *Sizwe Bansi is Dead* is a one act play that runs from the beginning to the end non-stop. What makes the difference in how the play is

¹⁴ Some directors might start a production from the middle or the end of a printed text.

structured is the way Fugard links the various scenes to make a whole and how the director of any performance of *Sizwe Bansi is Dead* directs the light on the members of the casts, amongst other things. Also, the Brockway production switches scenes with several cuts and close up shots on Kani and Ntshona. After reading the play by Fugard, I wondered how this could be transferred onto the stage while I watched: seeing the way the lighting manager positioned the lamp on the different actors gave the play its meaning; it seemed as if the actors on stage were more in number than the two characters Fugard presents. Anyone viewing the play for the first time might well think Fugard has made use of five characters, while he uses only two all the way.

On the other hand, the structure of *The Island* is a more complex one, composed in four scenes. The first deals with the exposition and the introduction of Winston, John and Hodoshe; from this, one can see vividly what it is to be imprisoned and how different people live together when confined, according to Athol Fugard. The opening deals with the beating of the two major cast members under the real name of the dual collaborative entity of John Kani and Winston Ntshona; Hodoshe, the prison warder, and the pictures of two men struggling with transferring a quantity of sand. The second scene introduces the rehearsing of *Antigone* by John and Winston;¹⁵ from the stage directions given by Fugard in the opening of the scene it is clear that John and Winston are preparing themselves to make believe the role of Antigone: by means of the artificial breast and wig. Scene three forms the climax of the play after John had dropped the bombshell that he has just three months to leave the prison, while scene four depicts the anti-climax where *Antigone* is performed for the audience.

In reality, as previously commented, the structure of almost any drama or film would have followed a similar pattern to that of Freytag's pyramidal structure whether it is classical or not. Every director or playwright would much prefer his or her audience to be seated for an hour or more watching a play or movie than to see it half way, yawn, doze off, mutter in anger or walk out of the theatre or cinema. The director might not be thinking consciously of Freytag either.¹⁶

¹⁵ John Kani and Winston Ntshona used their real names in *The Island*. This might be owing to the fact that the story is inspired by an actual South African prison and may also increase audience involvement.

¹⁶ Juxtaposing Freytag with Fugard does not imply that in my view the latter consciously thinks of the dramatic structure before writing his plays.

Another significant point regarding the director or the playwright is their idiosyncratic way of presenting their interpretations. I earlier said in chapter one, quoting Jane Kidnie, that the creative labour of the playwright ends with the scripts; from there the director starts his or her own intellectual creativity. Fugard commences the scene of Styles and Robert Zwelinzima as Robert steps into the studio to take a photo to send to his wife. A director might decide to continue running the scene in a flash forward¹⁷ style, while (s)he pictures Sizwe Bansi struggling from King Williams Town carrying a load, and shows us how he came to assume the name Robert Zwelinzima who is now alive after the death of Sizwe Bansi. This will depend entirely on how the director or playwright intends to cause his or her audience to create meaning, a point which I elaborate on below; this may make the performance a whole depending on the goal of the director. For instance, in a movie, a director might decide first to show us a man that is dead: she or he might decide to rewind the camera to the events which led to his death and start the story from there. But the question arising here is, if the director changes the sequence or adds to the presentation of the play, why is this done? These questions will be answered later in this chapter.

In addition, what the directors have in mind while reading the script might be different from what the producer or the playwright has in mind while writing his script. Every plot has a goal, as suggested previously. Goals give definition to the overall story that unfolds moment-by-moment in scene. While a film projects the plot through images, it also has a goal. Basically, it is evident from various studies (Monaco 2000, Dyer 2000, James 2008, Nelmes 2007 etc.) that the key to creating a solid plot structure is the goal or problem that a narrative intends first to pose, and then to solve. For example, Athol Fugard's apartheid plays present someone struggling to exist in a white dominated environment in *Sizwe Bansi is Dead*, and dramatise how this person overcame his challenges with the help of his fellow brother. The goal, therefore, is the organising theme around which the entire play will be based. Without a plot a play is likely to become chaotic and may look meaningless to the audience whose members are probably expecting the play to have a sequential order (some exceptions might be that the play is a form of comedy or

¹⁷ The flash forward is a segment of film that breaks normal chronological order by shifting directly to a future time. Flash forward, like flashback, may be subjective (showing precognition or fears of what might happen) or objective (suggesting what will eventually happen and thus setting up relationships for an audience to perceive). Available on : http://www.psu.edu/dept/inart10_110/inart10/film.html.

experimental drama which sometimes does not follow a sequence). Plot is not just what happens in a story. Rather, plot is a pattern of cause and effect or conflicts upsetting the equilibrium of a situation. Plot is characters responding to those conflicts into some form of resolution, even if that resolution is incomplete, inconclusive, or unsatisfying to the reader. Similarly, the plot in a film is not just what happens. The plot is the series of conflicts or obstacles that the screenplay author and director introduce into the life of the characters onscreen. It allows the reader to become emotionally involved in the film.

Hence, no matter the way a director tries to approach the script of the playwright, both are after the goal of making meaning in an audience or helping the audience to make its own meaning. For instance, two students who intend to write the same examination may well read their books differently but with the goals of passing the exams; they might come to the same conclusion in deriving meaning from what they have read, but might follow a different reading process. This makes meaning idiosyncratic, in the same way as Stanley Fish posits that all readers are dependent on the meaning they give to texts. There is a possibility that the first reader could read a page twenty times before grasping what the author of the book is conveying, while the second might just scan through it and derive what he or she is reading perfectly. Moreover, students all read to pass; the only difference is the way they read and attach meaning to what they have read.

What is important to realise is the way Fugard's films have been presented earlier during the production of the text. Stephen Gray in his interview with Ross Devenish on 13 June 1980 exposes one to how Fugard's films have been shot and reacted to. Firstly, the question Gray asked refers to the problems of film making in South Africa. Separately from the financial constraints mentioned by Devenish, other problems confronted the production of films in South Africa at that time. Concisely, he mentioned two limitations: the government practices and the censorship of the audience by the government. Devenish recalls that it was difficult to find audiences in South Africa at that time. He distinguished between the theatre audience, the cinematic audience and the Hollywood film audience. Devenish in expressing his view proves how conscious some directors are of their targeted audience; the way a Bollywood¹⁸ film will

¹⁸ Bollywood is the name of the Indian film industry, while Nollywood is the name of the Nigerian one.

appeal to such a director's audience will be different from how a Nollywood director will encourage their response. In defining different audiences, Devenish responds thus: 'while theatre audiences have begun to appreciate and accept indigenous theatre that awareness hasn't passed yet into the cinema audience. The cinema audience has grown on a diet of Hollywood definition of film, so that any film that doesn't actually fit into that pattern is penalised' (Gray 1982: 130). Legal sanctions as discussed by Devenish were imposed on any film that violated apartheid laws as well as, socially speaking, on those films that violated the expectations of an audience influenced by Hollywood. Therefore, 'any film that tends to show some kind of indigenous reality faces the problem of censorship, consequently leading to the instituting of the censorship system by the National Party Government through the 1963 Publications and Entertainment Act called the literature police' (Macdonald 2009: 11).

In this respect, it would have been possible for all Fugard's plays produced during this time to be produced as visual texts: although they would probably also have been banned. But according to Fugard himself, 'I suppose it was really of decisive importance because, up till then (working with the Circle Players in Cape Town) my experience, my knowledge of theatre-particularly of the technical aspect of it was very limited. I am a representative of that period-like most South Africans I had seen very little theatre until the time I met Sheila...' (Gray 1982: 121-122). However, some directors during this period might have been afraid of being murdered or jailed for life. This is evident in how Devenish reacts to the production of *Boesman and Lena* (chapter three).¹⁹

Worthy of note are the various types of shot used by each of the directors in the visual text that will be analysed in this chapter. James Monaco discusses the choices of filmmakers and photographers as regards various shots and positions of cameras. According to him, 'the style of photography that strives for sharp focus over the whole range of action is called deep focus photography. While there are a number of exceptions, deep focus is generally closely associated

¹⁹ The question I would pose here is that, 'even in our present day 21st century, why is it difficult to obtain some of Athol Fugard's plays on film?' This posed a great challenge for me in the course of gathering visual materials for my research. Could it be due to the age of the author? Or is he not ready to give copyright to any director? I would implore upcoming researchers to go in depth into this. What I would say to these questions is that, a fear of the government also has a place to play in its production as film, since the topic of most of Fugard's plays is rooted in racial segregation. It might look as if the intended director is subverting the government.

with theories of realism in film, the shallow focus shot is used by the expressionist filmmakers, since it offers still several techniques that can be used to direct the viewer's attention' (Monaco 2000: 86). Realism is a distinct feature, though not the only one, in the plays of Athol Fugard: evident from the way he presents daily activities in his works, instead of romanticised, fictitious or stylised depictions of his characters. In line with this comment of Monaco, what comes to my mind is that, in the Market Theatre production that was staged where the camera was absent or hidden for instance, the researcher might be told he or she could not record the performance on a magnetic tape or video; therefore he or she would be obliged to perform the duty of a viewer and an analyst simultaneously. Monaco's comment is applicable to what Brockway employs in his production. The camera concentrates on the two actors on the stage in the form of a deep focus shot: the two actors remain permanently sharp but one can also see the environment and the activities continuing in it.

In the Brockway production, the dissolve/lap dissolve transition is used to switch between scenes, perhaps because the text of *Sizwe Bansi Is Dead* calls for continuing actions as an actor is intended to play two roles. 'The dissolve/ lap dissolve shots are used interchangeably to refer to a transition between two sequences or scenes' (Hayward 1996: 70). For example, in the visual text of Brockway this is evident in the transition from the narration of Styles about his experience in Ford to the photographic studio beside the funeral palace. There are more transitions in the visual text, especially from Sky's place to Buntu's house and in how the light fades on Robert while dictating the content of the letter to Nowetu his wife. To me Brockway would have used this kind of shot because it allows for a longer passage of time than a cut and is used to signal a forthcoming flashback. This would inform the audience of the reason for Sizwe's departure from King Williams Town to Port Elizabeth in order to look for a means of livelihood for his family, and of what led to his coming into Styles' photography studio. Similarly in *The Island* the scenes run from one scene to the other, which reflects the interweaving of reality and its dramatic interpretation.

The significance of a deep focus technique in film, especially with a text narrative which is realistic, such as in *Sizwe Bansi is Dead* and *The Island*, is that the viewer who intends to study the film finds it easier to read between scenes as it transits from a flashback into the

present. According to Hayward, ‘deep focus means that less cutting within a sequence is necessary so that the spectator is less manipulated, less stitched into the narratives and more free to read the sets of shots before her or him’ (Hayward 1996: 79). This type of shot allows for concentration on the subject of discourse by the director. For example, the scene from the prison cells flows into the acting of *Antigone* as John persuades Winston to act his part in the Dennis production; the director fades the light and brings it up again, contrasting with how Fugard might have wanted to run his script continuously without the light coming to a halt.

As a consequence, the study of Fugard instils in me the desire to go to any length in getting materials, since the visual texts of Fugard’s plays have become so hard to acquire. The Market Theatre trip was a worthwhile one, in which Arthur Molepo and Omphile Molusi co-starred in the Market Theatre production of *Sizwe Bansi is Dead*. Before the audience marched into the theatre I took a look at their faces; by doing so I could vividly observe that they were expecting to see something they had already experienced or heard of. As said earlier, Fugard tends to involve his audience in his plays. How I wished I had been at the front seat of the theatre; perhaps I would have been involved in the production by the way Buntu, as the pastor, collected the names of the church ‘members’ from the audience, although sitting further back gave me a chance to observe the audience as well as the actors. One other query that came to my mind was the way in which the director would bring the characters on stage: would it be different from how Fugard presented his casts in the text? In the text, Styles walks in with a newspaper, alert and smartly dressed in a white dustcoat and bowtie. He sits down at the table and starts to read (Fugard 1974: 6). In contrast, Molusi who starred as Styles at the Market Theatre was already seated before the light was directed on him, thereby giving him the cue to start reading the newspaper about the machines arriving from China while the audience laughed at Styles’ command of languages and his switching between topics in his monologue.

This, again, is different from the 1981 video of *Sizwe Bansi is Dead* in which Styles, in the person of John Kani himself, starts to recount his experiences at Ford as he mimics Baas Bradley who had asked him to translate what he says to his co-workers (Brockway 1981). The expression on Styles’ face in the Market Theatre production assisted me to decipher the anger in him as he recounts how the company spends much money on machines yet refuses to increase

their pay cheques. The manner in which Styles acted out the role of Bradley indicated that he was full of humour as if the stage was filled with cast members. I instantly remembered how we acted this scene out when I was at university. I was part of a group of 45 students tackling the challenge of a two man cast assigned to perform the play. It was the duty of the group leader to cast all group members, as it was made compulsory that all students must participate in the presentation. What I saw vividly in this performance was how the co-workers reacted to what Styles said in interpreting Bradley's speech.

The whole university exercise started with the group leader deciding to give out each and every role to each student. It was most enjoyable as the stage was filled up; I would credit this to how the group leader interpreted the play to suit his purpose. The speaking in the vernacular language posed a problem for the cast of the university play. However, interestingly, the group leader skipped the part where the South African local languages had been used in the text; he asked the rest of the cast members to speak the English interpretation. Unlike the undergraduate production, the way Molusi spoke the Zulu aroused laughter in the Market Theatre and I was aware that any Zulu speaking person in the audience in the auditorium would understand the humorous gesture of Molusi when he uttered the Zulu expressions. During the course of interpreting the words of Bradley, he spoke commandingly, instilling the protest spirit in his co-workers.

In contrast, Merrill Brockway begins his video production from page six of Fugard's text. This decision may have been informed by another reason, but I am of the opinion that Brockway decided to avoid the direct attack on the South African Government, which those previous pages embody (Brockway 1981). This ellipsis would not have been necessary if the film had been produced in another African state that was not subject to apartheid legislation, in which case it might have started from the beginning of the text. The whole shot is focused on Styles in Brockway's video as Styles enacts the role; a fascinating part of the sequence is that most of the words in Fugard's text were omitted in Brockway's production. Besides, there was much addition as well. Some words like 'gentlemen', 'America', 'tell the boys in your language', 'thank you sir I like it', 'today', 'already agreed' 'this Ford is an old bastard', were either omitted or included in the Brockway production (Brockway, 1981). Another interesting feature is evident

when the workers react to Styles' speech, 'someone shouted is he a bigger fool than Bradley?' The way this was improvised by Styles caused the audience to laugh during the Market Theatre production.

In this respect, improvisation, according to the *Encarta Dictionary* online deals with the making up of something on the spot: to perform or compose something, especially a sketch, play, song, or piece of music, without any preparation or set text to follow (*Encarta* 2010). John Kani as Styles in Brockway's production improvised several lines in demonstrating the arrival of Mr Ford at the Company. The same applied to Molusi in his enacting of Styles' role at the Market Theatre production: instead of speaking in Xhosa, he spoke in Zulu,²⁰ which might be due to his Zulu background. His speaking Zulu might not be a surprise for anyone who had not read the print text previously, but people like me in the audience, who are conversant with the print text, would have queried why he abandoned Xhosa for Zulu.

At the closing part of page six, in the video Bradley asks Styles to do him a favour which is not in the text. Quoting Styles in the Brockway production, 'today, I want the boys to do me a great favour, as soon as Mr Ford walks through that door I want you all boys to look happy. We slow the speed of the line down so that you have all the times to do your jobs properly' (Brockway 1981). This contrasts with what Fugard says in his text that, 'Styles, tell the boys that when Mr Henry Ford comes into the plant I want them all to look happy... slow down the speed of the line so that they can sing and smile while they are working' (Fugard 1974: 7). Kani in the visual text improvises to make it clear for the audience what happened when Bradley requested that the co-workers should pretend contentment at the entrance of Mr Ford. Furthermore, at the end of the translation by Styles one can see that he altered what Bradley said and even included 'old fool'. Style also indicated that the co-workers should hide their true feelings, thereby interpreting what Fugard means by 'wearing a mask of smile' (Brockway 1981, Fugard 1974: 7). What happens in this case is that the audience will clearly notice how the blacks who work for whites during the apartheid hide their feelings, and pretend as if they are not affected by the way they are treated by the dominant whites. The use of 'bloody monkeys', 'old fools standing next to me', 'strike and strike all the bloody time', all these are additions that might have been

²⁰ Another reason might be that Xhosa is spoken more in the Eastern Cape; Zulu is slightly more common in Johannesburg. It may be the language the director chooses so as to involve the latter audience.

suggested by the director or that Kani himself accumulated to amuse and also create eagerness in his audience that there be an immediate reaction to the oppression (Brockway 1981). Hence the additions of Kani to his words in the Brockway production to my mind serve as an authoritative translation of what Bradley says, in order to anger his (Kani's) co-workers.

Briefly, at the bottom of page 7, Fugard's text reads: 'gentlemen, he says we must remember when Mr Ford walks in, that we are South African monkeys, not American monkeys. South African Monkeys are better trained... (7)'. Alternatively, in Brockway's production, Kani as Styles states: '...prove to Mr Ford that we here in this country are better monkeys than our brothers the blacks in America, who all the times will stand up and fight for their rights ... understand of course that we don't have rights in this country, yes we must prove to Mr Ford that we are better trained monkeys' (Brockway 1981). This would have been due to the intention of Merrill Brockway to take the film to audiences especially outside South Africa, but the focus is obviously the United States audiences which Brockway had in mind. Additions like 'better monkey', 'rights', 'stand up' and others in the words of Kani were most likely also an attempt to make the members of the audience eager to fight for their rights (Fugard 1974: 7).

Subsequently, the gesture by Styles would have been misleading for Bradley who cannot in any way understand what the co-workers are saying in their local language. Styles in the Brockway production interprets what the person says as 'he is talking crap', as opposite to what is in the text: 'he is talking shit' (8). When Styles turns back to his boss, in the video what he says is different from what is printed in the text: 'he is just shouting, oh no they are just excited, when we are happy we like doing this [he raises his hands]' (Brockway 1981). Remarkably during the course of Styles' translation for Bradley, he dominates the whole discussion, stimulating his fellow workers to be revolutionary and politically conscious. For me, the addition of some emotive words is an attempt to urge his fellow workers to know what they want. For instance when he asserts that the white man is aware that they do not have rights in the country, this might well engender in his fellow workers eagerness to oppose this situation revolutionarily in their own way. One might ask: does this change the situation? To me Fugard uses these lines to support the oppressed class, the black co-workers, who work tirelessly to please the white boss

who comes, only takes some steps into the factory and walks away. The additions in the Brockway visual text extend this theme.

Brockway would have thought of a different way to convey the message to the audience as is evident in how Styles acts out the work in the factory. For instance in the visual text, the passage where Styles produces some sounds with his mouth in a click form to demonstrate the movements of the machines, is not recorded in Fugard's direction in the printed text which simply states vaguely that Styles should make sounds to exhibit these movements. The sound is as important as the visual images: if the audience is attracted by the sound they will want to know more about the story. The sound in the film indicates an upcoming event's imminence as in the case of action movies. Kani's addition of the machine sound is intended to emphasise how the workers at the industry worked tirelessly and mechanically to impress Mr Ford. The only point where it is mentioned in the printed text occurs when Fugard writes about the 'torque wrench out tightening the cylinder-head nut' (Fugard 1974: 8, Brockway 1981). This could have been interpreted by Kani or Molusi in his own analysis of the way Fugard tends to present the work force in the factory. Kani and Molusi, also, interpret the role as indicating how nobody cares about the workers: they concentrate only on describing the way the people they call 'big boss[es]' in the office had to work and dress differently that day, brushing their hair, straightening their ties and shining their shoes. Kani also adds what the old security guard asks that is not specified in the original text, 'boys are you happy today?' (Brockway 1981). This implies that the workers are not happy doing their work on other days, since they were told to hide their feelings during Mr Ford's visit. Molusi also made the addition at the Market Theatre production, since it adds to the emotional involvement in the performance. The way in which Molusi and Kani demonstrated the coming of Mr Ford is markedly different from what Fugard recounts in the text. The addition of 'looking through the big glass window', 'where I watched all the actions', 'black long Lincoln Continental cars', 'Mr Ford is around, remember please', 'I saw it all', '...16 of them, they all ran forward like a pack of big bull dogs', contrasts with what Fugard's text states: 'then through the window, I saw three long black galaxies zoom up, I passed the word down the line: he's come!' (Brockway 1981; Fugard 1974: 8). The Market Theatre audience dissolved in long lasting laughter because Styles made this part of the play more lively and humorous by means of his improvisational ability. These illustrations by Fugard, Kani and

Molusi portray the irony of trying to please someone who does not care about the plight of a fellow human being.

Further on, Styles also illustrates the section where Bradley introduces himself as the factory director and a scene where he takes Mr Ford round the factory showing him all its sections in the Brockway production and Market Theatre production (Brockway 1981). Contrariwise, Fugard, in the print version, presents Style soliloquising, but in the video and the theatre production, Styles is evoking audience reaction more clearly than in the printed text, making various gestures to the audience. As quoted in the text, ‘I looked and laughed! Yessus, Styles, they’re all playing your part today!’ (8); conversely in the video production, he says: ‘for the first time I saw them playing my role for life and I didn’t laugh’ (Brockway 1981). This might have been included by the director as part of his intention of making the medium a living medium, in the same way as Fugard intends to create a living moment with his casts, thus allowing for more engagement with the action on stage. Further in the video, Styles tends to present the way Mr Ford came into the factory, taking some steps, ignoring the factory management, not looking at anything in the factory and zooming off (Brockway 1981). Kani moves pompously up and down the screen to show how Mr Ford reacted to the preparation of the factory workers. I can vividly remember how the whole audience where I was sitting at the Market Theatre felt sympathy for Styles and his co-workers whose efforts in impressing Mr Ford and Bradley were rendered futile. Styles tells the audience how working and trying to please their boss made him and his co-workers tired (Brockway 1981).

The ellipsis on page 9 indicates Style wishes Mr Ford would never return to visiting the workers again, since his visit provides Mr Bradley the opportunity to subject them to stress. As Fugard presents this in the text, ‘it ended up with us working harder that bloody day than ever before. Just that big... [shakes his head], six years there. Six years a bloody fool...’ (9). Compared to what Brockway puts into the video, or as Kani interprets the text, possibly being responsible for the inclusions, ‘at the end of that day I was more tired than any other day in my whole life at Ford, I still wish that bloody fool Ford never came... six years... six years I worked at Ford... six years that bloody fool’ (Brockway 1981). As discussed earlier, the continued emphasis on Styles’ predicament might further draw the audience in.

Furthermore, it would be simple for a director to instruct the actors to improvise a script if he or she deduces that the best way to gratify an audience is not to follow word for word what is written in the printed text. This is not always true of a visual text where it is recorded permanently and is not subjected to any change unless improved on in latter versions. Another possibility arises if the director's script is not committed to what is in the text. As Kani continues his speech on how he derived his inspiration, there is a mistake in the video. Kani introduced Dlamini as his friend earlier, but later calls him his father: 'I went to see a friend of mine Dlamini... I still can't forget his wise words. You know what he said to me? He said Styles this is your chance "my son", don't let it pass grab it, grab it now before another man in your line put you in a long big black box, put the lid on and nail it for you' (Brockway 1981). It is feasible that this hint at greater intimacy would have attracted the audience.

In the video, Kani as Styles made reference to the 'Bantu Affairs Department of Administration and Developing Community and all some of the bloody address that would appear at the back of the address' (Brockway 1981). One may ask why Kani keeps adding 'bloody' to his statements. Is this in an attempt to satirise the government or to express anger in the character? This word might have been used in an attempt to arouse anger in the audience. However, when this statement was made by Molusi at the 2011 Market Theatre production about the Bantu commission, I could feel the sighing in the audience as some people breathed out with laughter. This might have also been due to Molusi's use of the word 'bloody', which may not have had connotations as serious as in the time Kani acted Styles. This shows that some parts of the audience were aware of what the Bantu commission dealt with during the apartheid era, knowing that the system was a backward and reactionary form of oppression (Horrell 1960: 12). If Kani had restricted himself to what is in the text, I am sure a number of the people in the audience would not have understood what the actor was saying since Fugard only mentions 'Administration officer' in the text. The use of 'Administration office' would have created ambiguity since it would not have been clear to the Market Theatre audience what organisation was being referred to.

Also, Kani in Brockway's production improvises when he states that the white men change their mind very quickly; this is not in Fugard's print text (Brockway 1981). Kani

whispered this additional sentence to the audience, while it is omitted in the printed text possibly owing to the nature of the censorship at the time the text was composed. This also might have been done deliberately by Kani or Molusi, and certainly does not mean that Fugard was afraid of the authorities. In this respect a useful point to make is the impact of a three dimensional space in the visual text and the position of the camera, compared to the printed text where there are numerous ellipses which are subjected to the director's decision or the actor's improvisation of his script. At the Market Theatre production, the light faded on Molusi who was drawing the audience in by recounting the permission granted by the commission; this contrasts with the way the camera shifted into Styles' studio in the Brockway production. Brockway did not dwell much on the granting of permission by the government but recounted a good deal of Kani's experience at Ford.

Kani, with a proud gesture, describes his studio and begins to share with the audience what the photographic shop is all about. In his introduction, he employs the text accurately, but when recounting what people come to do in the studio, he commences his improvisations again: 'tell me what you see? Another photographic studio like the ones you know downtown? When you lose your passport, you need a new one and you come to me for a little photograph and I say come in please' (Brockway 1981). Fugard's original text reads: 'When you look at this, what do you see? Just another photographic studio, where people come because they've lost their Reference Book and need a photo for the new one?' (Fugard 1974: 12). The passbook is unknown to people in the United States, hence the preference for passport, but for the South African audience it is more understandable if it is called the reference book, or the passbook (more recently the ID book). Fugard's original text did not mention the location of the executive arm of government in South Africa. 'Pretoria' is mentioned in the printed text only in the later part where Buntu cautions Sizwe to stay out of trouble. Molusi and Kani added this through improvisation: 'No expressions look dead unless they won't take it in Pretoria' (Brockway 1981). This creates greater involvement with the play, as the audience is made to realise how the people lived their lives during the inhumane system of apartheid. In the text there are a number of other ellipses which could allow the actors also to make additions by means of lateral thinking, owing to the different ways they interpret the directions of playwrights, not undermining the contribution of the director.

What is more obvious in the concluding part of that text, to my mind a very significant point, is the importance of the photographic studio to the black community that is repressed by apartheid. The photography studio is a means of discovering identity for the blacks, who have survived numerous challenges and would like to recount their experiences to their family back at home through photographs. A member of the South African interpretive community would have understood what Fugard meant by reading the last four lines on page 12 of the text; however, a different meaning probably would have been accorded to this passage by any reader other than a South African one. When I first read these lines, my interpretation was that Styles is referring to the customer who arrives to have a passport photograph taken, as suggested by the words: ‘come back tomorrow, please... wait for the next? It’s more than just that. This is a strong-room of dreams’ (Fugard 1974: 12). However, while watching the video, I had the opportunity to replay the scene several times, unlike the Market Theatre where I could not do so unless I were to return to see the performance again. I noticed that Kani speaks directly to the audience about what the studio represents. I also felt him talking to me directly with his addition, ‘here lies the dream of my people, here lies the history of my people that will never be found in your books, there are no statues erected for my people, no monument commemorating their great deeds...’ (Brockway 1981). Kani explains the relevance of the photographic studio by means of his addition in the Brockway production, as a place where someone can create and store memories that are not cherished by the dominant whites during apartheid. In this respect, some words that are either added or taken out or modified by Kani in the Brockway production in this scene are: ‘here lies’, ‘your books’, ‘statues erected for’, ‘these are the people’ and others, compared to what is in the text: ‘the simple people’, ‘history books’, ‘dreams and hopes’ and so forth (Fugard 1974: 12-13, Brockway 1981). The visual text explains these terms more fully to generate identification in the audience with the situation of the people. Kani’s addition is also a successful attempt to give ‘the people’, emphasised by repetition, a sense of identity.

While Kani and Molusi continue the engagement with the audience, what is noticeable is the way they both alter their moods from being angry and dejected to being proud whenever they both point out their achievements to the audience. Kani and Molusi acted out the scene of narrating the incident with the big family that came for the group photo very differently from how they both acted in recounting their experience in the Ford Company as discussed below.

Kani pointed to the picture on the wall, while Molusi carries the picture, showing it to the audience before he takes it back to hang on the wall.

In the Brockway production, Kani skipped numerous lines from page 13 of Fugard's text; to my mind this omission is due to a decision by Kani or Brockway not to bore the audience by depicting the incident of a young man who came to take a snapshot with his certificate from the Damelin Correspondence College (13). Kani omits this and, immediately, merges page 12 of the text with that on page 14 in a dramatic manner; he even quotes page 14 before stating what is on page 12. Quoting from what Kani says in the video, 'this one a family card [jumping to what is on page 14] is my favourite, it's got lots of people and each of them wants his own copy, I tell you they all came here. It was on a Saturday very early there was a knock on the door [Kani says what is on page 14 before continuing what is on page 13]. I must explain something...' (Brockway 1981). Conversely, what is in the text is, 'this one [a photograph] walked in one morning. I was just passing time. Midweek. Business is always slow then. Anyway, a knock on the door. Yes! I must explain something' (Fugard 1974: 13). In this line, Kani adds a number of remarks to make what is in the text more comprehensive and thought provoking; some of these include: 'wait', 'as you know', 'next door to me, my neighbour, is the funeral parlour', 'so if I sit here', 'lift my head up', 'that one is mine' etc (Brockway 1981). Kani makes these additions illustrative in such a way as to impress on the viewer that the studio is a place where positive memories are stored, whereas the funeral parlour is a space where people cry when they come to claim the bodies of their loved ones. In other words, in the photography studio people repress their challenges and store their memories in a visual form, while in the funeral parlour the opposite is the case. After this entire conversation with the audience, Kani continues with the story of the 'family card'.

In the presentation during my undergraduate days, as mentioned earlier, the manner in which this part of the play was interpreted by the group leader to suit the purpose of performance made it easier for participation by other course mates who were under obligation to take up a role in order to be graded for the course. In addition to this, each student was given the roles as mentioned by Styles in the printed text; also included in the students' presentation were the onlookers who from the outside shouted 'cheese, cheese, cheese'. The group leader made these

additions to exercise the authority of the director over the script, which is also similar to how Kani positions the family by improvising what is in the printed text (Brockway 1981). Kani uses these words to attract the attentions of the younger ones that came for the snapshot. He also adds to his lines in the visual text by introducing words like, 'outside the door' instead of 'outside in the street', 'raid... no they don't raid so late', 'before I could solve my problem', 'all the children ran in' in place of 'and in they came', 'don't touch it just play around it' (Brockway 1981, Fugard 1974: 14). The audience expects to see how Styles manages to cope with the presence of the kids without damaging his equipment; both Kani and Molusi fashion a comic way of making the family settle for the snapshot.

In the visual text, Styles mentions the people who arrived for the photograph, whereas Fugard never mentions anyone's name in the text. Kani calls the mother of the children by her name, gesturing with laughter: 'his elder son said to me, excuse me Mr Styles, this is my father, yes Mr Styles this is my mother, that is my wife, Ketrol... these are my brothers and sister Mr Styles with their wives and husbands, these are my other brothers and sisters some of them have children here but are not married yet... and these are all our children and grand children, we have come for a family card, my father always wanted it' (Brockway 1981). Kani humorously personalised the family card to contrast with the words in the printed text on page 15, where Fugard does not mention names and does not suggest that the eldest son has a wife and that the children were born out of wedlock (Fugard 1974: 15). Kani is more personal, while Fugard is more universal in his presentation of the family. This section in the Brockway production helps to prolong the tension while the play approaches its peak, but in the print version, Fugard might not have intended to bring about this effect before the climax of the play, the discovery of Robert Zwelinzima that leads to Sizwe's change of name.

Although Fugard includes the graphical re-enactment in the text, the interpretation Kani, or the director, gives to it makes it easier to interpret how the family is arranged. Kani demonstrates with his hands and poses in any position he describes. For example, where he mentions the old man, he bends his back and walks as if he has no strength in him. He sits on the floor acting like little children playing with studio equipment, while he simultaneously also asks them to stop playing with the implements and focus on the snap shot. This is achieved by several

additions. For instance, the use of words like 'look at me', 'no no no', 'family planning', 'don't move', 'alright everybody stay together', 'I love you' etc, encouraged me to visualise imaginary characters that are a part of the performance. In addition, as I watched the performance by Molusi at the Market Theatre I could not but help remember my times as an undergraduate. In reality, Styles' photographic studio (a place of dreams), to me is an instrument of empowerment designed to give hope to the victims of the system, by instilling a form of catharsis in the collective inner self of the audience as they watch their lives acted on stage or in the visual text. This is evident in the production at the Market Theatre where everybody in the audience, including myself, wanted to say along with Kani the old trick of making people to smile while taking photos: 'cheese'. The visual text might not produce this effect, but the viewer may well laugh and remember those old times when his or her mother would entice him or her to pose for a photograph.

The light faded on Styles at the Market Theatre production as a man was introduced into the studio. When the light beamed fully on both Styles and the man, Styles whispered to the audience, 'dreams'. What Styles meant becomes clear in the latter part of the play where he helps Sizwe to delight his wife by the letter and the handsome pose in the picture. On the contrary, in the Brockway production, the event that leads to the climax is the arrival of Sizwe in the studio, who intends taking a snapshot to send to his wife Nowetu. Also in the visual text a deep focus shot is placed on Kani who occupies the screen, laughing and holding one of his fingers. The deep focus is used to project the seriousness on Kani's face as he lays stress on the word 'dreams'. The dreams of Sizwe become reality when Buntu returns with a dead man's passbook. A very significant scene in the visual text occurs when Buntu and Sizwe are returning from Sky's place, both drunk; the scene of a dead man exhumed while Buntu leaves Sizwe to urinate. Buntu enters the back of the stage at the Market Theatre production, running back, urging Sizwe to quickly leave the scene. Buntu had found a book in the dead man's possession: this book becomes the article that takes the actions in the play to their climax as both men debate the found item. Buntu is quite aware that keeping out of trouble is also a means of not exposing oneself to apartheid restrictions, but after the realisation that the discovery of the dead man's passbook is a process of gaining freedom for Sizwe, he decides to help Sizwe out of the problem of his identity.

‘The dark’ as Fugard describes it might mean different things. In addition, the manner in which each director will interpret it will be different and furthermore each audience might well decode it differently. To me the dark in *Sizwe Bansi is Dead* could signify the back of the stage where the actor exits and comes to the stage for continuity. Brockway chooses what he uses in his production to be a roll of corrugated iron sheet, while at the Market Theatre Molusi enters the toilet at the back stage, due to the two directors’ choice of props. The two directors explore their environment and make different use of it.

Another omission in the Brockway production, which is a form of improvisation, comes into view on page 34 of the text. Here, Buntu and Sizwe discuss the dead man’s passbook. In the book, as remarked previously in this chapter, Fugard might have left the ellipses in the text for any actor who would take up the role to interpret what he writes in his or her own style. For instance, ‘you know where he is staying now? Single Men’s Quarters! If you think I’m going there this time of the night you got another guess coming’ (Fugard 1974: 34), contrasts with what Kani says in the visual text: ‘look where the dead man stays, Single Men’s quarters [that is it] listen I stay at 50 Mapija Street... that Single Men’s Quarters is a hell of a big... with a string of houses... (Brockway 1981). Some inclusions such as ‘50 Mapija Street’, ‘knock another’, ‘twelve doors six men’ as opposed to ‘six men six doors’ in the film, ‘knock at this thousand doors’, ‘am taking this book back’ as against ‘I’m putting this book back and we are going home’ (Fugard 1974: 34, Brockway 1981) as well as the omissions increase the suspense that led to Sizwe’s ironical death. The description of Robert’s environment makes it clear that some parts of the country were no-go areas for blacks during the apartheid era, to such an extent that it becomes frightening for Sizwe to venture into searching for Zwelinzima’s relatives.

Ntshona, in the later part of the scene while coming back from Sky’s place, creates certain improvisations. He says, ‘... will you just piss me wet and leave me there Buntu, your own friend Buntu, I wish I was dead Buntu because no one cares about me, what is happening in this world? Who cares for whom in this world? What is wrong with me?... I have got ears, am I not a human being, I have got hands am strong... am I not a man...’ (Brockway 1981). These counter what is in the text, as follows: ‘good people’, ‘who wants who?’, ‘who wants me, friend?’, ‘... to listen when people talk’. These additions effect empathy in the audience who can

experience how it feels when relegated to being an underdog in the community. These questions are rhetorical; it may seem obvious that, if an actor or actress poses a rhetorical question or says something that sets members of an audience wondering or anticipating what is coming next, he or she is likely to increase their attentiveness and involvement. This is what Ntshona does by asking the audience about his identity. And this might possibly cause them to think about their identity.

The next scene at the Market Theatre moves into Buntu's house as the light fades on both Buntu and Sizwe. Fugard in the text indicates that Sizwe says the lines as the light falls on him on his way back to Buntu's house. While in the visual text, the reason why Merrill Brockway puts this speech after the scene is best known to him, making Sizwe sit, to observe Buntu exchange the photo in the passbook. This piece of dramatic irony causes Sizwe to die and, metaphorically, became alive under the name 'Robert Zwelinzima'. In the closing lines of page 36, Buntu and Sizwe, as acted out by Kani and Ntshona, improvise some passages in the visual text. They also use slightly different words, such as, 'right to stay and work in Port Elizabeth', 'what do you mean? You don't want to lose this book, you like this bloody book' (Brockway 1981), in contrast to what is in the original text, for instance, '... has the right to be employed and stay in this town', you mean you don't want to lose your bloody passbook! You love it, hey?' (Fugard 1974: 36). These minor alterations in the production call to the mind of the audience how the blacks were forced to carry passbooks everywhere they went in order to enjoy the basics of life such as: any work, any health care, any schools and so on. The original text and the Brockway production both project Kani and Ntshona's dislike for the law that enjoins the carrying of passbooks.

Furthermore, Kani's (Buntu's) inclusion of what he says when telling Ntshona (Sizwe) to leave King William's Town shows how words can be played upon when someone is angry or happy. Earlier in this chapter it became evident that, whenever Kani wants to make the audience laugh, he emphasises certain words and also plays on some to give the audience a sense of belonging by providing local flavour to his lines. On page 37 Fugard writes only that, 'as Sizwe Bansi...? Start walking, friend. King William's Town. Hundred and fifty miles. And don't waste my time' (Fugard 1974: 36-37). Contrariwise, in the Brockway production there are a few

inclusions such as, ‘I say I can’t lose my name Buntu... I have got my book and I stay in Port Elizabeth, now listen Robert Zwelinzima takes this book goes to Fel and Textile gets the job and stays in Port Elizabeth, Sizwe Bansi picks up this one, he walks... you better start walking and you walk bloody fast you have got to be there yesterday, now walk.. you want to walk... you see the whole country, go join your wife and children, the whole Sizwe Bansi family on leave for life, sit on your bottom, watch all the cars pass up and down like you say...’ (Brockway 1981). At this point I discovered that identity stemming from one’s name does not matter in acquiring the basics of life but emerges from what we human beings can make out of our daily events. During a closer look at the gestures of Kani (Buntu) while I was watching the video, I could perceive that there is more to acting that role than in the visual text (see chapter four); almost certainly he was emotionally involved with the play, owing to his experience of the apartheid era.²¹

What is more, as Sizwe takes on the identity of Robert Zwelinzima to give him a new life, the play’s tension dies down as Buntu, and now Robert Zwelinzima, act out the new man. Ntshona’s gesture towards Kani in the visual text reflects how he rejects Kani’s bid to make him assume the identity of the dead man. Buntu teaches Sizwe, now Robert Zwelinzima, how to master his NI [ID] number; to me this symbolises the effort of all black human beings who regarded themselves as brothers and sisters during apartheid to help their fellows overcome every challenge posed by the government. There is a stress on Sizwe’s learning how to become another man in both visual and printed text, which shows that generally the road to success is hard and long. On explaining this to the audience, Buntu pictures Robert in the church. In the Brockway production a number of words are incorporated in the lines of Buntu (Kani), for instance, ‘Sunday morning, man in his white suit from the sales house, he looks smart so he must go to church, picks up the bible and the hymn book right under his arms [Styles picks up his hat in an attempt to join to join Buntu in his new act] ... down to Rattle Street into Dora down Agric Road... inside the church’ (Brockway 1981), whereas in the text, no names of streets are mentioned. Humorously, Robert (Ntshona) utters the word ‘abracadabra’ (a magician’s stage patter), as he kneels down to command sober reflections for Sizwe, now Robert. This also perhaps adds to the sense of the unreality of the ‘real’ (apartheid) environment of the people in the play and of ‘pretend’ existence.

²¹ See chapter four on dramatic techniques.

This embodies what Fugard calls the ‘living moment in theatre’, where the audience is active rather than passive. Furthermore, in the Brockway production, the passbook is thrown down after the police checked Robert subsequent to his returning from the church, which depicts Ntshona’s rejection of the forced identity of carrying a passbook around the community. What Fugard directs in the printed text is that the police hand over the book to Robert after checking it. Fugard might have done so to raise the tension again in the audience, but calms it down after Sizwe takes his book and sits down (Fugard 1974: 42). Finally, as long as Robert Zwelinzima who is alive stays out of trouble, Sizwe Bansi will be dead and the new man can continue his life. The photo of Robert Zwelinzima, the erstwhile Sizwe, is displayed again in the Brockway production as he dictates the letter to his wife Nowetu. The similarity in the text, video and the Market Theatre is to be found in the way the lights blaze on Sizwe during this process: a resurrection of Robert Zwelinzima, who is now alive in the body of another man. Also, the final part of the text narrates how Sizwe returns for the photo shot in the Styles Photographic Studio; this element is emphasised in the three texts of *Sizwe Bansi is Dead* (Fugard 1974, the Market Theatre production and the Brockway one). The significance of the return in the printed text and both visual texts portrays Sizwe’s dream come true, of reaching his wife through the snapshot.

I now turn to *The Island*, the second of the collaborative efforts of Athol Fugard, Winston Ntshona and John Kani that resulted in the Statement plays. As stated earlier, it is strange there is no full video version of the play, but only an extract of John and Winston presentation of the *Antigone* by the BBC production and Dana Friedman. As mentioned, it follows the daily lives of two South African prisoners who have been sentenced to life in a prison on an ‘Island’. *The Island* opens with a lengthy mimed sequence in which John and Winston perform their normal daily duty as the warders try to break the spirit of the political prisoners. Set against South African apartheid in the 70’s, as already noted, the play connects a thread from the struggles of Ancient Greece to the modern day, and offers a great deal of insight into the apartheid system. Any reader, any audience, would have perceived the text as a protest play. Winston has been sentenced to prison for life because he burned his passbook in front of a police station, while John has been imprisoned for belonging to a banned organisation. The story hinges on the relationship of these two men. Winston is the energetic rebel, whereas John, the intellectual, is trying to persuade him to enact *Antigone* in a condensed two-character version of Sophocles’

play. This is set to be performed in a concert aimed at entertaining fellow prisoners and their guards. However, Winston rebels at playing Antigone. He does not want the other prisoners to mock him: ‘When you get in front of them, sure they’ll laugh...Nyah! nyah!... But just remember this brother, nobody laughs forever! There’ll come a time when they’ll stop laughing, and that will be the time when our Antigone hits them with her words’ (Fugard 1974: 61).

The climax occurs when, as mentioned, one discovers he will shortly be released; the other is a lifer (life imprisonment), so there is a meeting of hope and despair. This camaraderie can be likened to that of Morris and Zach in *The Blood Knot*, sired by different fathers but still enjoying the spirit of brotherhood, collaborating to face the challenges the government system of the day might pose to them. The premiere took place in the Space Theatre in Cape Town with Fugard directing Kani and Ntshona. The title was given as *Die Hodoshe Span* since any references to the Robben Island prison camp would have been unacceptable to the government (Walder 1984: 77, BBC Video Production). The play was revived in London in February 2000 with Kani and Ntshona acting and Fugard directing. It played to full houses in the Royal National Theatre with both actors demonstrating their towering acting abilities (Fisher 2012).

In the BBC production of *The Island*, which is recorded in the form of an interview while only a few scenes in *The Island* are shown to make reference to how the play came into existence as this background pertains to Robben Island, *the Island* is evidently regarded as a direct attack on the government; producing a full length movie might have been interpreted as subversion of the latter. Therefore South African directors might have kept away from producing a film of it in order to avoid prison or exile. In the words of Kani in the video, ‘we were aware that we are going to be dealing with something dangerous because it is a taboo for anyone to talk about the Robben Island or any of the South African prisons’ (BBC Production). *The Island* presents the two men continuing to act as humans by using drama as the means for sustaining their humanity; this is achieved by the way both of them improvise their role to depict their personal experiences. The audience might therefore perceive these two as the mind of the masses when they act the role of Antigone and speak directly to the people in the theatre. Regarding this Albert Wertheim says, ‘acting, moreover becomes both shield and sword to the two prisoners: a means for self protection, for protection of the self, and a means for taking action or acting against their captors,

against the state' (Wertheim 1986: 245), thus bringing to mind Athol Fugard's idea of the audience being self.

The play opens with more than ten minutes' miming where the two actors engage themselves in the digging of sand and relentless labour to please the warder in charge of the prison in order to avoid torture. These opening actions of *The Island* provide the bedrock of all actions that follow them. The extended mime of John and Winston's Sisyphean lines, labouring with wheelbarrow and sand, causes the reader or audience to empathise with them. The opening segment is followed immediately by John and Winston's being tied up, joined at the ankles and forced to run in towards the cell door. Fugard describes the scene and its stage directions on page 47 of the printed text in such a direct manner that a reader can easily interpret the implications. For instance, 'They start to run... John mumbling a prayer, Winston muttering a rhythm for their three-legged run' (Fugard 1974: 47). Where Sophocles provides one Antigone figure alone in her cell, Fugard presents the interplay of John and Winston, linked through the bonds of brotherhood as they both battle existence together. The visual text likewise projects the camaraderie of John and Winston as they both strive to overcome the cruel nature of their existence in the cell.

According to Wertheim, 'similarly, the two prisoners have in the past produced recreations, have re-created their spirits by taking each other to the bioscope, creating cinema without film or screen but through the combination of imagination, narration and physical gesture' (Wertheim 1986: 247). The survival of the two prison inmates depends solely on how they can both manage their conditions and sort out their isolation. When they both began with the acting of *Antigone* numerous dramatic elements aid the portrayal of the information Fugard is conveying (chapter four will deal with the dramatic techniques). Making use of all they could find in their environment, Winston appears in fake breast and necklace, while John emerges in wool sacked cloth depicting the female character of Antigone; he comes forward to address the audience, who reciprocates with laughter (Dana Friedman 2010). This laughter evoked by John makes everything more ironical, as the audience both laughs and empathises with the actor on stage.

Moreover, the effect of this final part is also evident in the words of John in the text, when he makes mention of the targeted audience (the prison warders and, by extension, the

government) thus, ‘You think those bastards out there won't know it's you? Yes, they'll laugh. But who cares about that as long as they laugh at the beginning and listen at the end. That's all we want them to do . . . listen at the end!’ (Fugard 1974: 62). The costuming of Winston and John²² was sure to gain the audiences’ attention. It also demonstrates Ntshona’s (Winston’s) anger concerning the inhumane nature of the apartheid era. For instance in the BBC production, Winston dressed as a woman, wearing a mop for a wig, false ‘titties,’ and a necklace made of salvaged nails, protests, ‘I’m a man, not a bloody woman ... Shit man, you want me to go out there tomorrow night and make a bloody fool of myself?’ (BBC Production). Ntshona says this line with empathy in the visual text as it questions the audience about their identity. This response has an effect on me as a one man audience: I remember a version of the play I watched at the Amphitheatre in OAU Ile-Ife, Nigeria, where I identified with Ntshona’s role as Antigone. Ntshona’s stress on not being ‘a bloody woman’ portrays the damage the apartheid system caused to the male identity.

In this way, I argue, Fugard attempts to make his characters, reader cum audience develop from one stage to another. The members of the latter grow in their understanding of the play and sharpen their response to the text. For instance in the Friedman production, while John gains his anticipated freedom and Winston talks about his life incarceration, the (actual) audience sometimes laughs at the improvisation of the cast members on stage and forgets about the situation on Robben Island, owing to the amusing yet ironical performance of *Antigone* (Dana Friedman 2010). This is evident in the Dana production and the BBC, where in the background people laughed but suddenly stop as Ntshona continues his lines. While watching the performance something surfaces in me; I can vividly perceive how people in the theatre fit themselves into what is going on stage; they are silent, anticipating what will emerge next as the two actors share their experience of suffering.

Subsequently, in the last scene Fugard tends to talk directly to his audience, thereby causing Winston and John to act *Antigone* as a kind of political propaganda play. Again the

²² Sometimes in the theatre, an unusual costume worn by an actor or actress will captivate the attention of the audience, who might be expecting to see what the sudden change in costume will add to or subtract from the ongoing performance. For example, an actor performing the role of an old man who suddenly changes into a different costume will leave the audience thinking of what the director is trying to bring out from the change in costume. The director can decide to use this as a description of an unusual event approaching, as Dana Friedman’s production does.

play's tension rises as the trial of Antigone over the burial of her brother resumes. This commands empathy from me as an audience member, so much so that Winston's words hit me as a reader with tears rolling down my face. According to the printed text, 'I go now unto my last journey. I must leave the light of the day forever, for the island strange and cold, to be lost between life and death. So to my grave, my everlasting prison, condemned alive to solitary death' (Fugard 1974: 77). The visual text presents this as Ntshona gesturing with tears in a manner that commands compassion from the audience concerning Antigone's (Winston's) plight before her death.

The Island, as I have indicated, is clearly a metaphorical play that directly attacks any form of mental and physical imprisonment; Fugard could have effected this in another way, but with his striking presentation in the play within a play he speaks to the mind of both the government and its citizens. John addresses the audience on page 73, the long prologue to the performance of Antigone during the concert: 'Captain Prinsloo, Hodoshe, Warders and Gentlemen! Two brothers of the House of Labdacus found themselves on opposite sides in battle, the one defending the State, the other attacking it. They both died on the battlefield... But Antigone, their sister, defied the law and buried the body of her brother Polynices. She was caught and arrested. That is why tonight the Hodoshe Span, Cell Forty-two, presents for your entertainment: The Trial and Punishment of Antigone' (Fugard 1974: 73). From this extract, it is clear that Fugard draws a connection between the story of apartheid in South Africa and Antigone. And as the play ends in tragedy and soberness for the characters, the play returns to its beginning, John and Winston struggling with the chains bonded to their legs and hands as the warden forces them to pass through an experience of suffering. This is not in the visual text due to its incomplete recording. By means of the whole scene of the play within a play, the reader or viewer's mind will be concentrated on the claustrophobia of the dramatic techniques, affecting his or her thinking and also the minds of the government, the warders and the prisoners. According to Fugard's stage directions for the play, John and Winston are chained together and a siren is wailing (Fugard 1974: 75), which indicates that after the presentation by the duo, their plight in the prison continues.

In the words of Stephen Gray, 'regardless of its purpose, medium or style, every work of art has a multiple nature as a reflection of the culture from which it grew. Like the real world,

works of art are simultaneously religious, political, economic, sociological and historical with their aesthetics' (Gray 1982: 190). This reminds one that plays may well be reflections of what is happening in human history as illustrated in the pre-credits of the BBC production. Human life is usually the basis from which the playwright or director draws his or her narrative. For instance, Fugard commented in an interview with Lloyd Richards, 'That one little corner of South Africa, Port Elizabeth and its immediate surroundings, is a region that I know like the back of the hand that holds my pen as I write about it. I can stand on a street corner in Port Elizabeth, look at anybody and put together some sort of biography' (Richards 1989).

Thus far, Fugard has been able to present the plight of a black man searching for identity and political prisoners fighting for freedom on stage in the form of a Greek tragedy. Another interesting collection of Fugard's plays is the volume of Port Elizabeth plays that contains the so-called family plays, because they deal with family matters other than the camaraderie presented in the statement plays.

CHAPTER THREE

Port Elizabeth Plays and Video/DVD versions: A comparison

'At this time I made my first black friends and began to visit them in the ghetto townships. Out of this life I wrote my first full length play, No-Good Friday which described the lives of black people in the townships, threatened as always by white laws and black gangsters. Port Elizabeth Plays: The voice to which I speak from the heart'.

– Athol Fugard quoted in Wertheim 2000: 17

The above represents human beings as social objects (Fiske 2011: 62); the playwright or writer can consequently create a living moment from the daily experiences of people. For example, the Port Elizabeth plays depict life in typical township settings. This collection by Fugard dramatises the existence of people living together, collaborating in such a way that they have developed a real camaraderie. The question again arises: how do the visual texts interpret the printed ones?

This chapter will therefore contain a comparison of the print version of two of Fugard's Port Elizabeth Plays– *Boesman and Lena* and *'Master Harold'... and the Boys* – with their visual interpretations as recorded on DVD, using similar methods to those in chapter two. I will be viewing more than one visual text of these selected plays in order to establish how different directors and artists approached the same text in employing what Stanley Fish calls the interpretive self.

Athol Fugard in *Port Elizabeth Plays* features works that speak about families torn apart by poverty and apartheid. Also in these plays, Fugard portrays his childhood, family life and also a society that suffers from the dark grip of apartheid. In these plays one can vividly observe how people strive for survival during the apartheid era through their cherished or ambivalent relationships with one another.

Jean Branford in Stephen Gray reflects on *Boesman and Lena* during its world premiere at the Rhodes University Theatre as follows, 'a stunning revelation and powerful play with a sustained flow of wit and joy shining off its surface of misery and desolation' (Gray 1982: 80).

This illustrates how one member of the audiences at the premiere of *Boesman and Lena* responds to the play in the theatre. For Branford to have responded thus, she may well have been reflecting how the audience experienced the display on the stage. Moreover, Branford further comments on *Boesman and Lena*, 'this play in which the title roles are superbly portrayed by Fugard himself and Yvonne Bryceland, deals with the always poignant theme of the dispossessed' (80). This is evident in the way Boesman and his wife Lena move from one place to the other, such as 'Swartkops, Missionvale, Redhouse, Korsten, Veeplaas... etc' (Gray 1982: 81), which Fugard himself terms to be 'resale of empties', and a 'sackful smashed [bottles]' which Boesman collected from the white suburbs before the couple's dispossession by the government (Fugard 1983: 146). All these symbolise hardship and the means by which the couple survive their poverty stricken life.

What makes *Boesman and Lena* successful across the world according to Stephen Gray is that, 'the play appeals strongly to audiences unfamiliar with its South African settings' (Gray 1982: 82). This also applies to me as a non South African: as said in chapter one, while I might not have a South African background reading and studying about Athol Fugard helps me become part of the interpretive community of South African literary scholars. Sometimes while reading and watching certain adaptations of Fugard's plays such as *Blood Knot*, *My Children My Africa*, *My Life* etc, I feel for myself what another black man in a country like South Africa would have felt under the apartheid system. In 1986, Marowski termed *Boesman and Lena* as Fugard's finest play. In his words, 'Boesman and Lena is an eloquent reminder that the ultimate value of a work of art is the depth and passion of its conviction: that when its structure and style have ceased to elude or interest us we are compelled to recall what transfixes us and thus keeps the work alive at its very centre is its emotional truth' (Marowski 1986: 197, similarly argued by Newman 2012).

Likewise in '*Master Harold*'... and the Boys, the issue of skin colour is also addressed but in the form of autobiography. To me, of all Athol Fugard's plays, none is more personal than '*Master Harold*'... and the Boys; because it relates a boyhood incident which involved himself and which haunted him for years until he tried to atone for it by writing this play. First produced at the Yale Repertory Theatre in 1982, '*Master Harold*'... and the Boys is based on the playwright's early life in South Africa. I would also argue that the play itself is not a simple retelling of an incident

from Athol Fugard's past but presents a personal experience that extends to universal humanity and sharing of youthful experience to the world. This is achieved by Fugard's effective use of dramatic techniques in inviting the audience to be part of his creations, to be further investigated in chapter four.

'Master Harold'... and the Boys concerns two black waiters and the teenage son of a restaurant owner, where the two black 'boys' work. The play represents life in different aspects, likewise presenting human beings in several dimensions. The beginning focuses on two men in a restaurant exchanging pleasantries with a white boy called Hally. These two, Sam and Willie, are also depicted in two dimensions; to my mind Willie is a follower of anything Sam says, a humble and easy to manipulate person, while Sam, who looks much older, is also humble and cuts a dominant figure but one that is less than that of a white, even and especially Hally. This is evident when Hally reacts to what Sam and Willie demonstrate what white policemen do to prisoners: Hally is moved to say to Sam, 'I have heard enough, Sam! Jesus! It's a bloody awful world when you come to think of it' (Fugard 1993: 12).

The two Port Elizabeth Plays in this chapter possess another significant attribute of being written in a locality which Fugard himself knows well; the visual texts bring this out effectively. *Boesman and Lena* is part of a collection Fugard himself calls 'the family' (Fugard 1983: 173), which is written for two generations, parents and children. The first of the trilogy, *The Blood Knot*, as has been indicated, concerns brother and brother (Zach and Morris). The second, *Hello and Goodbye*, concerns children and parents who are not residing with each other (Hester and Johnnie with their father). Finally, *Boesman and Lena* refers to two parents (174). Fugard continues his explanation of family ties, and of the way in which all in the circle are knitted together by blood and habit, in later works, for example: *Captain Tiger*, *Train Driver* and *Exit and Entrances*. Fugard also focuses on the impact a stranger will contribute to the intrusion of a relationship between these generational groups, in writing of *Boesman and Lena*. According to him, 'Lena's involvement with the old man affects her relationship with Boesman, and until the Outa's demise their relationship gets sourer' (173). Fugard comments further on how relationships can be affected: in his words, 'it is an idea I've had almost from the moment I started writing – but as a discovery as I wrote my way deeper into the situation' (173).

Although ‘*Master Harold*’... and *the Boys* (*Master Harold*, hereafter) is not recorded in *The Notebooks* but simply mentioned it is regarded as a masterpiece of his boyhood background and as reflecting the guilt he carried into his middle age. Unfortunately, Athol Fugard has not published any notebook record after 1977 as mentioned, which nevertheless marks eighteen years of keeping records concerning how he arrived at his writings. According to Wertheim, Fugard recognises that *Master Harold* stems in some way from his relationship with Sam Semela, a Basuto [i.e. Basotho] family servant employed for fifteen years by Fugard’s mother in her various attempts to earn the family living by running a Port Elizabeth rooming house and later a snack bar in that city’s centrally located St George’s Park (Wertheim 2000: 135, Fugard 1983: 25-26). Wertheim acknowledges a great deal of criticism on the autobiographical content of the play; he also alludes to the writing of autobiography by Fugard (Wertheim 2000: 136). He thus avows in the same paragraph that the autobiographical inflection of *Master Harold* is strong, and certainly, too, that the feelings in the play have their origin in the depth of Fugard’s personal and painful remembrance (136). To Wertheim, this will add to the knowledge a reader will need in understanding the text and enhance academic reaction to the text. Perhaps the visual texts are even stronger in this regard. For instance, I would argue that the visual text will be more intimate as the life of the young Fugard can be seen on screen.

The settings for these two Port Elizabeth plays are deeply rooted in the apartheid era and treat subjects that have been mentioned earlier in the course of introducing this chapter. *Master Harold* is set in the St George’s tea room on a wet windy day; this is more obvious in the visual text as some scenes are enacted in the rain. Although some parts are acted in a ball room dance hall, and others in Sam and Willie’s room respectively, the tea room and the dance hall symbolise a microcosm of South African society as a whole (Gale 2002: 286). The metaphor of the dance floor used by Fugard presents a world without collisions, where everyone would be happy and there would be less conflict in the world. For example, Sam helps Willie to learn the dance steps in order to be successful in his exhibition with his partner, teaching him to be patient and forgive any mistakes made by her. *Boesman and Lena* has its setting in the same general area as that of *Master Harold*, also in Port Elizabeth but located in small places, mostly farms like the ones mentioned above (Gray 1982: 81).

It will be recalled that most plays have a plot which gives the story its shape. According to Freytag as discussed in chapter two, the structure of a typical five act play consists of exposition (introduction), inciting moment, rising action, climax, falling action, and catastrophe (Cuddon 1999: 335, Freytag 1968: 114-115). In this chapter I will again start my analysis by asking the same questions I did in chapter two, noting that the playwright has the right to divert from the popular view and follow his or her own principles as in the case of *Master Harold* and *Boesman and Lena*.

A reader on Amazon regarding the emotional effect of the play responds: ‘The way the author has described the events of a whole day and the way he has highlighted the life of Hally and the South African culture is heart touching. To do all this in 160 pages looks impossible, but Fugard has done this’ (Uzair Qadeer, 2001). *Master Harold* is a one act play that runs from the beginning to the end with no specific division in scene, leaving a director with choices as to how he or she could link a scene with another; thereby bringing to mind again the view of Kidnie that the creative labour of the playwright ends with the script, while that of the director commences from where the playwright ends (Kidnie 2009: 15).

As intimated, *Boesman and Lena* is a two act play about an itinerant couple that have been forced to relocate. Fugard introduces them after the demolition of their settlement by the government. One here does observe conformity of *Boesman and Lena* and *Master Harold* with the first stage in the pyramid, the exposition of characters. As indicated earlier, Fugard recognises the intrusion of a third party, which could cause a break in the cord that holds the family, as in the *Blood Knot*.

Interestingly, *Master Harold* has numerous rising actions in it. For example, when Hally received a call from his mother that his father was returning from the hospital, Hally changed his disposition immediately so that his relationship with Sam and Willie altered. Also, when there was an argument between Sam and Hally, Sam tried controlling himself by asking Willie to join in continuing the work; but Hally called him back and spat in his face (Fugard 1983, Price 2010). This incident is recorded in Fugard’s *Notebook* as follows, ‘...one day there was a rare quarrel between Sam and myself. In a truculent silence we closed the cafe, Sam set off home to New

Brighton on foot and I followed a few minutes later on my bike. I saw him walking ahead of me and, coming out of a spasm of acute loneliness, as I rode up behind him I called his name, he turned in mid-stride to look back and, as I cycled past, I spat in his face. Don't suppose I will ever deal with the shame that overwhelmed me the second after I had done that' (Fugard 1983: 26). Fugard lived with this feeling for years before transferring it into a play, which was brought to the screen by Lonny Price in 2010.

After the climax comes the falling action. During the action, which is the moment of turning around after the climax, the conflict between the protagonist and the antagonist is resolved, with the protagonist winning or losing against the antagonist. While Hally admits his wrongs in *Master Harold*, Sam forgives Hally and acts as if nothing ever happened. So also in *Boesman and Lena*, Lena is still married to Boesman and never leaves him despite the usual quarrel that stems from the relationship between them throughout the play. The falling action paves a way for the denouement or the catharsis; it shows that the play is nearing its end while during this action some aspect of the play tends to balance and make up for the suffering of the protagonist or worsen it in the case of a tragedy. This final stage, the denouement, where crisis and conflicts are resolved between the antagonist and protagonist, is reached after the climax. An instance in the Price visual text occurs when Sam accepts that he should call Hally 'Master Harold'.

As discussed earlier, Athol Fugard's contribution to making readers and audience active tends to present them as social subjects, which according to John Fiske is a reaction to perceiving the audience as literary subjects. Fiske sees the viewer 'as a social subject who has a history, lives in a particular social formation (a mix of class, gender, age, region, religion, etc) and is constituted by a complex cultural history that is both social and textual' (Fiske 2011: 62). Hence, Fiske adds that the viewer is a product of social experience and adequate textual experience. In keeping with Stanley Fish, the social subjectivity which Fiske posits is more influential in the construction of meanings than the textually produced subjectivity which only exists at the moment of reading, as the New Critics argued (Fiske 2011: 62).

Especially important in this dissertation is how the director and the playwright present their ideas. As discussed in chapter two, one director might decide to follow what the playwright has in his printed version, while another might change the direction of events and incorporate what happens in the middle of the printed version into the beginning of the visual text. *Boesman and Lena* was first produced as a film in 1974 by Ross Devenish starring Fugard himself, Yvonne Bryceland and Glynn Day. In 2000 another production was created by John Berry, starring Angela Bassett, Danny Glover and Willie Jonah. The following comparison will be undertaken in line with changes from the apartheid era when the first film was premiered and the 2000 production by Berry, six years after the apartheid system of government was called off.

The 1974 Ross Devenish production takes us to the starting line of the story in what Freytag calls the expository section. Through the opening scene of the visual text a viewer will understand the event that led to the dispossession of Boesman and his wife Lena. In the 2000 Berry production many changes were made to the opening part, especially the introduction of the pre-credit sequence to make the visual text look like some of the action movies in Hollywood. Such a sequence is a sort of prologue preceding the credits. According to Bernard Dick, in this kind of sequence, the title does not appear until after the sequence is over, which often takes place after the logo of the producing company has been showed and after some scenes appear before the title (Dick 2005: 25). As stated by Hayward, ‘a sequence is normally composed of scenes, all relating to the same logical units of meaning... traditionally the opening sequence of a film is composed of establishing shots to orientate the spectator safely’ (Hayward 2000: 324). In a few words, the initiation of each sequence functions to orientate the audience in a fade in fade out shot such as Berry employs during the onset of his production by showing how Boesman feels and in another shot how Lena feels.

In my own perception, Berry might have decided on this after looking at the previous visual text of 1974, where Fugard himself starred, by introducing briefly what happened during the dispossession before following what Fugard has in the printed text. In the stage direction Fugard starts thus, ‘*an empty stage. A Coloured man — Boesman — walks on...*’ (Fugard 1996: 3), while Devenish commences his choice of scene by a lengthy display of how the white men arrive to bulldoze the dwellings of people living in the settlement. In the Devenish text, Boesman

joins the white men in bulldozing the houses constructed from corrugated iron, putting on a number plate demonstrating as if he is driving a tractor too. Boesman in the production even takes a cigarette from the man who was doing the demolishing as fellow inhabitants observe this action in desperation, while Lena begs for more time to pack their belongings (Devenish 1974). All these antecedent events are absent from the printed version but presented in a pre-credit sequence with sound effects in the Berry production (Devenish 1974, Fugard 1996: 3, Berry 2000). This technique utilised by Berry and Devenish is an attempt to acquaint the audience with the preceding factors that led to Boesman and Lena's dispossession.

In addition, the differences in interpretation could also be due to some factors I think influenced the presentation of the two directors and Fugard himself. Firstly, the background of the cast may well influence their interpretation of the lines. Danny Glover is a native of San Francisco in America; Angela Bassett hails from Harlem, New York. The manner in which Bassett handled some of the Afrikaans words in the printed version shows her approach to interpreting her lines as she substitutes word like 'spell' for 'skof' (Fugard 1996:4, Berry 2004). Glover in his interpretation is so harsh on Lena that one can vividly see how a black man could interpret how Fugard cast Boesman to be a coloured (Fugard 1996: 3). Bryceland conversely is a South African stage actress; her pronunciation of words causes one to realise she is from a locality in South Africa, for example, her pronunciation of 'Boesman' to resemble 'Bushman' and also 'Swartkops' as similar to 'Swartakops'. In my opinion, to maintain originality and authenticity, Berry should have used South Africans in his interpretation of roles.

Secondly, the way in which Devenish presents his Boesman at the beginning causes one to notice the impact of Fugard who, as an actor, might interpret the role to suit the production or to throw more light on the behaviour of Boesman. Boesman in this production is seen lurching during the demolition. His shock sobers him up immediately he notices people relocating in different directions. Boesman is also observed entering the bottle store; this part is not in the printed text or in Berry. Despite the differences, but significant to the two visual texts, is the introductory section, whether short or lengthy, before the main title of the play is shown. The sequences before the main title might be the reason the theatre and movie goers are supposed to be seated (these sequences are sometimes presented as a link to the rising action in the visual text

by the director) before the action starts so as not to miss the expository part of the visual text. In the words of Dick, ‘the main reason for being seated when a movie begins is to know exactly how a movie will begin... the opening sequences can be quite creative and even witty [in the form of suspense as said above]’ (Dick 2005: 23). In other words, the introductory part of the text will contain some information about the characters and hints with respect to the plot.

In Berry’s production the action starts in the daylight as a fierce Lena is presented while a sober Boesman looks extremely tired, resting, looking at Lena and the sky intertwined. On the other hand the Devenish production commences at night while Boesman and Lena sit beside a fire made by Lena who is more eager to settle down at the Swartkops than the former. Lena chides Boesman for his cheerful gestures during the demolition (Devenish 1974, Berry 2000). The printed text presents an empty stage, as a coloured man walks on while a coloured woman later appears; thus justifying the choice of the time by both directors.

How faithful are the casts in both video versions to their lines in the printed version? In the opening speech by Lena in the Berry production certain lines are missing from what is in the latter. For instance, passages like, ‘so slowly...! Must be a feeling hey. Even your shadow so heavy you leave it on the ground’, are omitted in the printed version (Fugard 1996: 4). Likewise in the Devenish production, Yvonne Bryceland starts her lines from the last four lines on page 4 of the printed version. Some lines are missing from Lena’s conversation on page 5 of the printed version; Bryceland might have improvised her lines to make the situation appeal to the audience in an empathised manner that calls for identification with her character. Bassett in the Berry production even skips most of what Bryceland utters on page 4 of the printed version and jumps to page 5, to start from – this time more emphatic than the last – ‘you were happier this morning(4)... you had a good laugh... here we sit... look at us! Boesman and Lena with the sky for a roof again.’ (Devenish 1974, Fugard 1996: 5, Berry 2000). Bassett’s emphasis on Glover’s humorous gesture showcases how Boesman had been trying to make life unbearable for Lena. This exclusion might have been designed by Berry to bring to mind Fugard’s presentation of Boesman as a brute force reinforcing Lena’s unhappiness.

Further, some of Bryceland's lines which are present in the Berry production are missing in the Devenish one. The effect of these is noticeable in the visual text as they make a way for the emergence of Boesman's harsh behaviour towards Lena. For example on page 5, in the Berry production Boesman and Lena quarrel about Boesman's disposition in the morning during the demolition but place less stress on the couple's movement than Fugard did in the Devenish production (as discussed above). Sentences were omitted to maintain the flow of action and gestures by the casts in the Berry production and also to portray more of Boesman's behaviour to Lena to the viewer; where Boesman stands up to confront Lena in Lena's words: 'Big joke because I cried?... sitting there in the dust... because that is what it felt like... thinking of somewhere else again' (Berry 2000, Fugard 1996: 6). Bassett and Glover left out some of the Afrikaans words like 'Hotnot', 'kaalgat', 'brak' etc.²³ (Fugard 1996: 6). Some of the lines missing in this part, in the Berry production, are included in the Devenish one.

Moreover, there are some scenes in the print version which Devenish decides to act out. An example of these is the way in which Boesman and Lena walked down to the Swartkops. In the Devenish production, some white kids arrive, staring at Lena as Boesman goes into the bottle store to sell his used bottles. This is only mentioned briefly in the conversation of Lena in the Berry production: 'I was still sore where you hit me. Two children came and looked while I count the bruises. There's a big one here, hey...' (Devenish 1974, Fugard 1996: 8, Berry 2000). Fugard – and his visual text interpreters – may well be alluding to his own background as a heavy drinker who later gave it up for the love of writing about his people (Richards 1989). Alternatively, during a medium close-up shot in the Berry production, Lena frowns at Boesman who in turn accepts defeat. As indicated by Hayward, a medium close-up shot focuses on one or two (sometimes three) characters, generally framing the shoulders or chest and the head. Such a shot of two or three characters can indicate a coming together, an intimacy, a certain solidarity (Hayward 2000: 328). The close-up shot in Berry's production brings closer the look on Boesman's face, who reacts to what Lena said as if he is concerned about her present condition.

A remarkable element shared between the two visual texts of *Boesman and Lena* is the use of flashback which is also common in Fugard (to be discussed in chapter four). In the

²³ These words are also pejorative, even vulgar.

Devenish production, the couple walked to a river in the Swartkops, whereas in the Berry production there is a form of flashback in a long shot where the couple are seen after a heavy downpour swimming in the river. A long shot, according to Hayward, is one where the subject or characters are very much to the background of the shot so that the surroundings now gain much, if not more, importance (Hayward 2000: 329). The audience in this kind of shot become acquainted with the environment, which in turn hints at the events during the courtship, marriage and co-habiting of Boesman and Lena on the mudflats: for example, the small box which signifies another still birth experienced by her. Another difference in the visual text is evident when Lena talks about the Modderspruit. In the Berry production, Bassett calls the river 'Modersriver', while Bryceland calls it the Island which refers to Robben Island (Devenish 1974, Fugard 1996: 9, Berry 2000). The Island to Bryceland more strongly implies the severe political oppression of her people, than it would have for Bassett who would not have experienced it herself. Also, '*a little laugh*' [italics in original] as Fugard puts it on page 9 means different things to the two directors. John Berry portrays the couple laughing together, while in Devenish's production only Lena is laughing as Boesman looks at her (Devenish 1974, Fugard 1996: 3, Berry 2000). As a viewer I regard this as a significant inclusion by Berry, where a human being laughs over a situation although he or she does not mean it. This might be puzzling to the viewer who, if he or she misses the irony, might want to know why the actor or actress laughs at a situation that calls for contemplation. Again, Bassett and Glover improvised a number of lines, laughing together, and omitted the use of some Afrikaans words such as 'pap nat', 'skrik', 'oppas' and 'blourokkie' (Fugard 1996: 3, Berry 2000). As I suggested earlier, this might have been due to the background of these two cast members who are not South Africans. In addition, they are targeting an audience that is not South African, therefore causing the Afrikaans word to be irrelevant. Furthermore they are also non-native speakers of Afrikaans; another reason might be that the director wants to universalise the film while Athol Fugard writes for a South African audience. This also aids understanding of some of the Afrikaans words that were interpreted by Bassett, though some are more strongly clarified than in the printed text.

There are several interplays in the Devenish production in the form of additions, such as that the locality of the play was extended to another store where Boesman went to sell prawn that the couple had intended to eat (Devenish 1974). This demonstrates that Boesman had found a

means of livelihood on the Swartkops, as well as that he is also desperate to survive in the face of all odds. On the contrary in the Berry production, the director is faithful to the script: he follows the lines but omits certain sentences in the course of the action. For example, Glover added; ‘don’t touch that wine’, ‘make the fire’ while Lena skips some lines and ignores a number of Afrikaans words such as; ‘kondens melk’, ‘soetrigheid’, ‘bedonnerd’ (Fugard 1996: 13), though still faithful to her lines, using many facial expressions that portray her happiness each time Boesman is not with her on the screen (Berry 2000). Glover tries to measure up to the heat of Bassett’s opposition to his brute force, by using commanding tones representing male dominance. Bassett in the Berry production makes numerous changes to the text. This might not have been her decision; directors are acutely aware of their audience. As commented previously about Bassett and Glover, John Berry might not have consulted Fugard or any Southern African citizens when drawing up his script to ask for the pronunciation of the Afrikaans words. This is evident also in the song Lena sang to lampoon Boesman for their coming a long way to Swartkops: an Afrikaans lyric that she interprets to mean: ‘taste of condensed milk, makes our life sweet, Boesman is a bushman, he is a dog meat...’ (Berry 2000). On the contrary in the print version the song is written in Afrikaans (Fugard 1996: 13). Bassett’s translation of the Afrikaans song is more extremely insulting than in the original text; the result is that some words which are translated might actually not depict what the playwright had in mind.

In contrast to the Berry production, Bryceland sings in Afrikaans as Fugard has stipulated in the text. Bryceland’s Afrikaans for me grounds the visual text in the authentic context of South Africa compared to Bassett’s interpretation of the words. Another addition to Lena’s line in the Berry production on page 14 is noticeable where she challenges Boesman on how they arrived in the Swartkops; instead of being faithful to what is in the text she says, ‘it won’t work Boesman, I know what you are trying, it is not going to work this time, now look at yourself’ instead of ‘it’s no good, Boesman. I know what you’re trying. You’re not going to do it this time. Go laugh at yourself’ (Fugard 1996: 14, Berry 2000). Bassett immerses herself entirely into the role of Lena and therefore acts this role as if it was happening in real life; her seriousness makes it appear as if she is angered by what Glover is doing in the visual text.

In the Devenish production, Bryceland asks Fugard a question and he answers her. This contrasts with Berry's where the two characters are faithful to the text. Glover gestures at Lena pretending he does not hear what Lena has said, as the production continues according to the printed text. Devenish's production balances the relationship of both Boesman and Lena, but in the Berry production, Bassett is so dominant in her performance that Danny Glover becomes an unexciting auxiliary presence who drinks most of the time.

Another addition follows in the Berry production where Boesman holds up one of his fists and Lena responds to this threat thus: 'you better watch it, one day you go too far and dead is I' while conversely in the printed text she exclaims, '*oppas!* You'll go too far one day. Death penalty' (Fugard 1996: 17, Berry 2000). Glover in the Berry production more fully explains the word 'death penalty', as 'dead is I', telling Lena not to go too far with her nagging (Berry 2000). This illustrates that, if Lena does not stop, she may die from a beating. Notable in the Devenish and Berry production is the manner in which Bryceland and Bassett act this part; Bryceland is calm in her role, sitting down without confronting Boesman as if she is reading the lines with little emotion, whereas Bassett acts in fury reacting to the fist of Boesman, confronting him as if she is up to the task. In my opinion, Berry's presentation of women stems from the confrontational aspect of the second wave of feminism. This, as described by Martha Rampton, is one 'which began in the 1960s and continued into the 90's. This wave unfolded in the context of the anti-war and civil rights movements and the growing self-consciousness of a variety of minority groups around the world, which gave voice to the women' (Martha Rampton 2008). This is evident in the actions of Bassett as presented by Berry in his production. These emphasise equality among genders, and shun all forms of oppression towards women in society.

Afterward, Berry, again using a flashback technique (a flutelike sound is employed in the Devenish production), takes the action in the printed text to another scene. In the Berry production, the couples are seen in their youth enjoying the joy of matrimony as Fugard indicates in the printed text, 'it wasn't always like this. There were better times' (Fugard 1996: 18). The Berry and Devenish productions present this in two different forms. While the cloud darkens in the Devenish production, the day begins to brighten as the couple are taken years back in a flashback manner during Lena's pregnancy in the Berry production (Devenish 1974, Berry

2000). Hence, a close-up shot on Bassett and Glover who are seen again arguing about Lena leaving. There is a sharp resonance of a classic flute like sound in the Devenish production while Lena leaves Boesman to walk: as Fugard puts it in the printed version, '*Lena takes a few steps away from the fire then stops. Boesman watches her*' [italics in original] (Fugard 1996: 19, Devenish 1974). Berry presents his scene in the broad daylight as the Outa appears during the day, to contrast with the arrival of the Outa at night in the Devenish production, as Fugard stipulates in the printed version quoted above.

In addition, the omission of 'dark' on page 21 of the printed text by Glover in the Berry production might be an attempt by Berry to defend his choice of an afternoon scene. In this visual text, Boesman said, 'Lena calls out for someone and what does she get? [Laughing] hey, look at it' (Berry 2000). Bryceland in the Devenish production in a cool manner engages in a long conversation with the Outa and hands over a small book in the form of a passbook. While Bassett communicates with Outa furiously, this might be due to her daily encounter with Glover that angers her in the visual text. The significance of this aspect derives from Devenish's production being rooted in the apartheid system; the passbook would be of no import in the 2000 production by Berry because apartheid is over and the passbook is no longer relevant. Conversely, Berry uses a flashback to explain all that is recorded in page 26 of the printed text: Lena is engrossed in a dialogue with Outa, imagining his comprehension of her own language. In an attempt to share her mind with the Outa, Berry in an extreme long shot presents Lena and her dog in the form of a flashback together with Boesman selling the bottle of hard drink (Berry 2000). As indicated, this shot is used in films when the surroundings or objects in the shot become significant to the interpretation of meaning in the text by the audience (Hayward 2000: 329). The dog in the production is depicted as a companion to Lena each time she suffers loneliness, but Boesman counts it as an intruder to his relationship with Lena, because she spends much time caring for the dog, and does not want to see it at all. Differently in Devenish's production, the scene of the dog is omitted and shifted to the later end of page 26 to continue the action (Fugard 1996: 26, Devenish 1974, Berry 2000). The audience at this point may wonder why the dog that is considered by society as a means of security is regarded by Lena as a companion but as an intruder by Boesman. From the inclusion or omission of the word 'passbook' in the two visual texts, it is clear that time and situations can also determine the style

of production of visual adaptations of classic texts. Berry's production came six years after the apartheid era, while the *Devenish* was produced during this period.

Interesting about the Berry production is his interpretation as a director, which causes the play of 1969 to look like a modern play of early 2000, compared to now that technology improves daily. The Berry production makes this evident in his use of sound, picture quality and camera positions for instance; also in various presentations of scenes as flashbacks bringing to mind Fugard's love of the technique (see chapter four). For instance, on page 27 while Lena talks of the old days, Fugard writes this in ellipsis as follows, '...but in the old days...', whereas Berry takes us to a beautiful mountain view, where Boesman and Lena sit in a voiceless gesture laughing, until again Lena is seen with the Outa once more narrating her ordeals in the lonely mountain with Boesman (Fugard 1996: 27, Berry 2000). This part is absent from the *Devenish* production where the scene skips to where Boesman returns from his fishing spree. Techniques such as sounds, film tricks, several types of shots and others cause films to be interesting and emotionally gripping. For example, sounds introduce and conclude actions. They also serve as an indicator of forthcoming events in visual texts. Sometimes in the background of the performer's speech, sounds often hint at a particular tone or an emotional attitude toward the story and/or the characters portrayed. In addition, background music often foreshadows a change in mood. For example, dissonant music may be used in film to indicate an approaching menace or disaster, providing a form of suspense. An example would be Berry's use of sound to lay stress on the couple's past each time a flashback is used to project Boesman and Lena's past, which is played to show that the couple had experienced good times before their displacement.

The Berry production, in my view, can be likened to a present day Hollywood movie with his presentation of two Lenas on the same screen, in interpreting what Fugard writes as, 'I meet the memory of myself on the old roads' (Fugard 1996: 29), using a soundtrack that makes it look as if something is about to happen owing to the display on the screen (Berry 2000). The technique used by Berry here is called surrealism, 'a movement which is influenced by Freud, [and which] strove to embody in art and poetry the irrational forces of dreams and the unconscious' (Hayward 2000: 378). Most of these aspects that are shot to resemble the modern day Hollywood visual texts are omitted from the *Devenish* production. These features in the

Berry production constitute the only technique that presents the flashback as if it is taking place along with the actions.

Another flashback, again in the text as interpreted by Berry, occurs where Lena recounts her stillbirth and childlessness. In the printed text, it is recorded that Lena stands up and sits beside Outa while in the Berry production Lena approaches Outa in a medium close-up shot. Also in the flashback, Boesman and Lena are captured in an extreme long shot where they are very much to the background. This kind of shot enables the audience to see the boxed placard that contains the dead babies, as Boesman attacks Lena regarding her near barrenness. When Lena is shown on the ground suffering from the pains of the still birth, one can observe the environment as Lena cries from the memory. This agrees with Fugard's script in the printed version, 'it's a long story... one, Outa, that lived. For six months. The others were born dead. That is all? *Ja*. Only a few words I know but a long story if you lived it' (Fugard 1996: 29, Devenish 1974, Berry 2000). The shots and the different techniques by Berry captivate the audience's attention and create a medium of engagement with the text to a greater degree than when it is shot as a stage performance. This contrasts with the Devenish production which omits most of the interesting parts as presented in the former production. This part in the Berry production evokes sadness in me as a viewer.

Subsequently, in the Devenish production as the soft mood of Lena continues, in order to maintain the rising and falling actions, Devenish portrays the couple in a cheerful frame of mind. This is evident in the play where Lena tells Boesman that Outa has a job and he will buy them plenty of wine when he gets over his condition. The couples both laugh, in contrast to the Berry production where the tension increases. This is omitted in the Berry production which continues to where Boesman commands Lena to ask the Outa to leave (Fugard 1996: 32, Devenish 1974, Berry 2000). Devenish presents Lena as a sign of hope to the marginalised, who believes that the Outa has a future to fulfil, rather than being deprived of their companion. In the printed text, the incident of Boesman asking Outa to leave takes place after Lena enquired if she could break the bread into three pieces. On the other hand, the Berry production intertwines the scenes bringing the later one to the former (Fugard 1996: 31-35, Berry 2000). Berry's production, in my opinion,

maintains the occurrence of his dominant use of flashback to balance every scene with what has happened in the past of the couple, as discussed earlier.

Moreover, there is an addition in the beginning of act two in the Berry production since Lena starts the conversation, versus what Fugard puts in the printed version where Boesman begins it. Bassett commences the conversation in act two with an additional sentence, ‘if you don’t want your bread and tea pass it this way man’ (Berry 2000). The Devenish production initiates the second act by recounting what happens in act one, perfectly fitting into the occurrence that commences act two (Devenish 1974). This is demonstrable in the Berry production: in the sections where Fugard writes about a ‘big world’, ‘new ways’, new places’ etc, Berry decides to show a metropolitan city where skyscrapers are projected (these are also used as pre-credits in the Berry production). This scene suggests to the audience that the events in the 1969 play also take place in our present world. This may be Berry’s attempt to depict Boesman and Lena’s dispossession as a deprivation of the basic needs of urban dwellers that led them to becoming inhabitants of the mudflats.

Although the Devenish production follows what is in the text, there is a slight contrast in page 46 of the printed version where Berry offers his presentation of Boesman’s character as someone whose physique alone can infuriate Lena whenever he is drunk. While Boesman laughs to his response to Lena, Bassett presents an addition to her lines: ‘mother fucker’ (Fugard 1996: 47, Devenish 1974, Berry 2000). Owing to this addition, the audience may well observe the influence of the American society on the director. This simply depicts where Bassett originates from, since it is an American vulgarity.²⁴ This scene in the two visual texts paves a way for the anti-climax; the tension in the play lessens because Outa passes away, leaving the couple to face their affairs. In my view, the introduction of Outa in the visual and printed text is an element to heighten the tension so that his death means reconciling the two parties. For example in the Devenish production, Boesman decides to help Lena dispose of the dead man. Nonetheless in the Berry production the tension still continues as Boesman continues his masculine dominance

²⁴ It means a despicable or very unpleasant person or thing. Available:

<http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/motherfucker>

(Devenish 1974, Berry 2000). Boesman in the Devenish production grabs a stick to hit at Lena. On the contrary in the Berry production Boesman grabs a bottle, as Fugard prescribes in the printed version (Fugard 1996: 52, Devenish 1974, Berry 2000). During the reconciliation of Boesman and Lena in the visual texts, as the audience I feel a kind of relief and I perceive that there is possibly hope in broken relationships. Fugard suggests reconciliation and dialogue, rather than staging a protest or confrontation, as a means of overcoming the apartheid situation.

It is essential to note how both directors end their production: the audience are eager to know what will happen next as the couple are reconciled after the death of Outa. The Berry production contrasts with the Devenish when Lena questions Boesman on what led to Outa's demise in the 1974 production. Berry's technique, causing everything to stand still, and incorporating rain to wash away the rancour between the couple, also differs from its omission in the Devenish and printed texts. Another significant difference is the manner in which Boesman leaves Lena in the Swartkops; in Devenish's production Boesman departs without saying a word, while Berry's presents Boesman leaving in the rain whilst Lena says her lines. However in the printed text, Fugard directs, '*Lena turns her back on him violently and walks away. Boesman stands motionlessly. She ends up beside the old man*', [italics in original] telling us it was Lena who left Boesman, while in the two visual texts Boesman leaves Lena alone in the Mudflats (Fugard 1996: 56, Devenish 1974, Berry 2000). Fugard and the directors play on their audiences' expectations as they all reconcile the couple. Berry brings out a flashback from the incident on page 56, showing Boesman and Lena's life before they arrived on the mudflats. This is absent in the Devenish production where Boesman is seen lying by the roadside while Lena meets him to continue their journey (Devenish 1974, Berry 2000). This will impact on the audience's knowledge of the pre-occurrences in the lives of Boesman and Lena, in the Berry production to a greater extent than in Devenish. Also, Berry's presentation of Lena's memory of good times with Boesman makes her decide to reconcile him. As the curtains fade in the printed version, Boesman and Lena walk hand in hand in the Berry and Devenish productions, illustrating agreement between the final scenes of the three texts. Athol Fugard therefore emphasises the relevance of reconciling the couples when he writes that Lena leaves with Boesman to continue on their trip, while they both look for the next settlement. Fugard also portrays reconciliation in '*Master Harold*', which is evident in how Sam, Hally and Willie relate with one another.

The two visual texts in this chapter help in undertaking an in-depth analysis of the differences, similarities in production and ideology between the directors. The choice made by the director does not change the theme of the printed text. Turning to the second text, the Lindsay-Hogg production is the first attempt to adapt '*Master Harold' ... and the Boys* to a visual text in 1986: it starred Zakes Mokae as Sam, John Kani as Willie and Matthew Broderick as Hally, while the latter production was directed by Lonny Price in 2010 featuring Ving Rhames, Patrick Mofokeng and Freddie Highmore as Sam, Willie and Hally respectively.

The St George's Park Tea Room on a wet windy Port Elizabeth afternoon that introduces the print version of '*Master Harold' and the Boys* ('*Master Harold*' hereafter) contrasts with the beautiful plain shown in the Lonny Price production at the beginning of the text. The Lindsay-Hogg production differs from the Lonny Price presentation: it commences the action from inside the tea room as described in the printed text by Fugard when Willie sings the song written at the beginning of the printed text, 'she was scandalizin' my name, she took my money, she called me honey... a game' (Fugard 2000:3, Lindsay-Hogg 1986). As observed earlier the director of a visual text has the right to choose how to start his or her text, perhaps with the help of pre-credits, or to follow what the playwright does. The Price production is initiated by an announcement from the Springbok Radio station, heard in Sam's room with his wife lying on the bed. This addition at the beginning depicts a difference in the choice of settings and greater freedom of choice for the director. This causes it to be different from a videoed stage performance, if the visual text starts in the tea room as the Lindsay-Hogg production does. The Lindsay-Hogg production is similar to the Merrill Brockway in its presentation of shots, camera position, picture quality and sound system. In addition, the audience is being given a hint as to how Sam and Willie are living their lives before they discuss this during the latter part of the play, in both the Lindsay-Hogg production and the printed text. For example, Sam and Willie's wives were being mentioned in some parts of their discussion in the tea room in the Lindsay-Hogg production, but are projected in a kind of flashback by Price. Furthermore, this section in the Price production constitutes the expository aspect which aims at introducing the cast in their order of appearance, thereby familiarising the audience with the cast members before the play starts. Some additional phrases and sentences in the Price production include, 'do you really like it', 'it is beautiful', 'I think is going to be better than last year', 'I want to finish it today so that I

can be practiced in it', and 'good idea'. These dramatise to the audience the importance of the dance lessons Sam gives to Willie. A deep focus shot is used at the beginning so that the audience can easily see the room and some significant objects in it (Price 2010). These objects, such as, 'the dancing robe', 'the passbook', 'the wall of the room that symbolises poverty' and so on, became relevant during the course of the performance in the Price visual text.

Furthermore, the beautiful Xhosa song at the beginning of the Price production depicts a typical but perhaps idealised rustic existence in Port Elizabeth as Sam walks down to his work. The Lonny Price production commences with introducing Sam and his wife as discussed above and later Hally, who is seen combing his hair and preparing for school as his mother beckons him. Price uses an extreme long shot to present Hally's room where one can see books scattered on the floor. This depicts Hally's educational background: the visual text presents him to be a brilliant boy who wins awards several times in his high school. In this kind of shot, Hally is very much to the background in a shallow focus where his image becomes blurry but the room, significantly, becomes clearer. This presents Hally as a person from an average white family who is better educated than Sam and Willie. Sam is also being encouraged by his friends to bring the dancing award home to their community; all these details are absent from the text. In this expository part, there is a great deal of addition to what is in the printed text, as Sam travels from his home to his work. Some incidents that are not recorded in the text are talked over at the bus stop; such as the discussion on Bantu Education and the scheme of the government to make the boys 'kitchen boys and street sweepers' (Price 2010). These are added by Price to cause viewers to become familiar with and probably also to anger them regarding the evil caused by the system of government during apartheid. This part sets the mood as the audience are primed about what will happen in the play.

Furthermore, after a number of omissions of what is in the printed text and the Lindsay-Hogg production, Sam and Willie launch their conversation on the street while they wait for the bus to convey them to the shop. Conversely, the Lindsay-Hogg visual text and printed text commence this discussion in the shop where most of the actions in the expository part of the Price production are revealed.²⁵ The quotations listed below are uttered by Willie in the Price

²⁵ The Lindsay-Hogg production might have faced the same problem the Devenish production encountered.

production while walking to the shop but are rendered as taking place in the tea room in the printed text and also in the Lindsay-Hogg production: ‘don’t worry about those ones, Willie just remember what I told you, the secret is to make it look easy, ball room must look happy like, like romance’, ‘ I have got no more romance left for Hilda anymore’, ‘then pretend, imagine Hilda is Ginger Rogers’, ‘with nothing you try’ (Fugard 2000: 4, Lindsay-Hogg 1986, Price 2010). Price also introduces Hally’s mother, incorporating lines that are not in the printed text as heard in the conversation between Hally and his mother: ‘Hally, you are going to be late again’, ‘am going ma’, ‘okay... where is my kiss’, ‘you are not even dressed’, ‘bye Hally have you got your lunch’ (Price 2010). This depicts the ordinariness of Hally’s family, an emphasis not present in the printed text and the Lindsay-Hogg production (Lindsay-Hogg 1986).

The choice of settings and props in the Price production to my mind is worthwhile as one can plainly see what apartheid looks like watching the visual text, evoking much empathy for those who experienced it, unlike the Lindsay-Hogg production that begins as in the printed text by Fugard. In the Price visual text, from the point the bus occupants descend one can see the effects of apartheid as it is inscribed on the bus: ‘non-whites only’. Price also effected the addition of policemen asking people for their passes. Here, Sam and Willie were made to present their passbooks. This scene brings to remembrance the beginning where Sam prepares for work; the camera angle focuses on some significant objects as mentioned above, bringing to mind the symbolism of enforced identity in the shot (Price 2010). An addition, also in the Price production, is an incident in Hally’s school, where Hally’s friend mocks him, reminding him of how his father shouted ‘that is my boy’ during an award presentation, for his outstanding exposition on ‘the Greatest Adventure Show on earth, a Drop of Water under the Microscope’. Price presents Hally’s thoughts in a flashback, taking us to the award ceremony that is also absent from the printed text and Lindsay-Hogg.

Moreover, as the expository part carries on, unlike the Lindsay production Willie improvises his lines on page 3 and 4 to tell the audience about the preceding events in the play, as both Sam and Willie enter the tea room (Fugard 2000: 3-4, Price 2010). The extra material continues where Price depicts the tea room with Hally’s mother ‘Mrs Ballard’ preparing the sales counter, while Sam and Willie arrive greeting Hally’s mother. This is not in the printed text;

certain words and actions are incorporated into the performance, such as ‘good morning madam’, ‘do you over sleep again Willie, or you are going to blame the bus this time’, ‘the buses were late madam and police were checking the passes’, ‘yeah, everyday a new excuse’, ‘hurry up now the water is not even boiling’, ‘Willie I want a clean table’ etc. (Price 2010). These additions by Price emphasise Hally’s mother’s dominance over the black workers. The Lindsay-Hogg production differs from the Price: Willie is shown cleaning the floor, singing the song at the beginning of the printed text as Sam arranges the bar (which serves as a pre-credit to the actions in the text), humming alongside Willie, before the two begin their lines (Lindsay-Hogg 1986). As a one-person audience I wondered why Price decided to incorporate the role of Mrs Ballard and her choice of speech into the visual text, but I discovered that it also informs the play and allows for closer engagement with the text. The presence of Mr and Mrs Ballard symbolises apartheid itself, because their attitude becomes harder as it continues to raise the tension in the visual text.

Furthermore, the importance of a three dimensional act coupled with the director’s choice of scene and characters is explored by the Price production. In reality, if Price had followed the prescription of three cast members (Sam, Willie and Hally), the play would have still retained its plot, as in the Lindsay-Hogg production. Price’s intention is most likely to increase the sense of verisimilitude and cause the visual text to represent the background of Athol Fugard as Hally.

The presence of Hally’s mother in the Price production prevents the ‘boys’ from sharing their minds and continuing their discussion, but as soon as she leaves the actions commence, as Sam happily beckons Willie to inaugurate the dance (Price 2010). The Price production harks back to the beginning of the printed text when Willie practices his steps. This time Ving Rhames and Patrick Mofokeng are faithful to their lines. The action resumes on page 5 of the printed text because most of the actions on page 1 to 6 have been shown in the expository part of the visual text, in order to acquaint the viewer with the primary aim of the play (Fugard 2000: 1-4, Price 2010). The opposite takes place in the Lindsay-Hogg production where the scenes continue as they were in the printed version with slight additions by Zakes Mokae and John Kani. These additional words like ‘come on’, ‘too stiff’, ‘I am not working nineteen months’, are absent from the printed text and Price (Lindsay-Hogg 1986, Fugard 2000: 4-5). Mokae and Kani presumably

added some of these phrases to emphasise the dance steps as a simple task, not a hard exercise. The rain continues to fall in all three texts, as Hally enters into the tea room clapping to commend the efforts of Willie and Sam practicing the ballroom dance, in accordance with Fugard's presentation of a wet windy day. The scene is accompanied with much improvisation by the three characters in the Price production, whereas they are faithful to their lines in the Lindsay-Hogg one. Some improvised sentences in this scene include, 'do you want your lunch', 'just soup', 'am not sure Hally, the hospital phoned may be he is coming home', 'what makes you say that' etc, while some sentences found in the printed text but omitted here are: 'it's coming down cats and dogs out there', 'you can speak loud your mom's not here', 'sounds like it. In fact, I think he's going home' (Fugard 2000: 8, Lindsay-Hogg 1986, Price 2010). In view of this, the reason for this inclusion and omission is that, as indicated, most of what is supposed to be said had been depicted in the expository section of the Price production. It also increases the sense of domesticity, thereby causing the audience to feel a sense of intimacy with the family.

Another inclusion to draw attention to in the text is the display between Sam and Willie in the Price production, where the two characters chase themselves around in a kind of gun play to lessen the tension of Hally's father's return, which is not in the Lindsay-Hogg production (Lindsay-Hogg 1986, Price 2010). As a viewer, I notice the intimacy between Hally and the boys in the absence of either Hally's father or mother. In the Price visual text, the climax is introduced little by little as Hally's mother is shown in the hospital looking for her husband in the ward; he, unknown to her, had been referred for discharge due to a personal appeal by him. Sam and Hally are shown debating a drawing by Hally; he recounts his teacher's displeasure about his intelligence. Sam and Willie demonstrate how punishments are being meted out to offenders in jail. While acting this Hally thinks of his father behind the shop's bar, which infuriated him (Price 2010). The scene shifts immediately to how Price technically, in a shallow shot, shows Hally's father behind the Tea Room Bar, reminding him that associating with blacks will not do him any good. The effect of the shallow shot is to suggest how the intrusion of Hally's father will affect the relationship the boys have with Hally. Again, Price in his presentation of this part might have felt the viewer would not be interested in a shift to Hally's opinion about people of magnitude as it is expressed in the printed version. The three pages are represented in a form of flashback having Sam's voice in the background, while the action is taken back to the hospital

for Mr Ballard's discharge (Fugard 2000: 14-16, Price 2010). To my mind, there are some aspects I would not have understood while reading the text, but which became clearer in the visual one due to the improvisations of Sam, Hally and Willie that assisted in the understanding of certain events in the printed version: thereby causing an identification with the characters of Sam and Hally who found a way to be free, despite the dominant influence of the white characters who surround them. A viewer might picture himself or herself as a young Hally who is expecting an intruder on the relationship he or she has built with an older and experienced companion who is not of his or her race. This is evident in Price's input to the visual text.

As the Price production continues, depicting some parts mentioned in the printed text as flashbacks and additional scenes, the Lindsay-Hogg production continues its being faithful to the printed text. A case in point is the manner in which Kani laughs to attract the attention of Hally. It is obvious in the said production that Willie plays only a small part in the relationship of Sam and Hally. As Mokae and Broderick act out their lines, Kani is shown in the background laughing and making signs to Mokae, questioning whether he has the intelligence to cope with Broderick's brilliance. I interpret this as a means of Willie submitting to the superiority of Hally, who always laughs at all Hally says (Lindsay-Hogg 1986). Another basic feature in the 1986 production is the way Zakes Mokae drags words out in a rising and falling tune, perhaps due to the influence of Mokae's mother tongue: Sepedi and Sesotho are both tonal languages (Demuth 2007: 530). In my view, this might have been done deliberately by Mokae, or perhaps Lindsay-Hogg suggested it so as to imply that Sam had attained a level higher than Willie in education; words like 'l-a-m-e', 'l-e-g-s', 'r-e-l-a-x', 's-t-i-f-f', that end a sentence are often drawled by Mokae (Lindsay-Hogg 1986).

Another addition in the Price production is evident when Hally and Sam discuss their definition of man of magnitude, unlike what is in the printed text and the Lindsay-Hogg production. There are some words in the discussion of Sam and Hally in Lindsay visual text that also symbolise the dominance of whites over blacks. Examples used by Hally are; 'I showed it to you in black and white', 'the picture I showed you', 'Tolstoy may have educated his peasant, but I have educated you', 'my book', 'my picture' etc.; these were undoubtedly used to present Hally as a person superior to Sam.

The Price visual text's dominant use of flashback to narrate the stories offers the opportunity to see how Sam lives his life with his wife and also pictures Hally's childhood and his closeness to Sam. Furthermore, the actions on page 18 to 20 of the printed text where Willie and Sam pretend to imitate a boy's and a woman's voice are presented in a flashback in the visual text by Price but uttered by both Kani and Mokae in the Lindsay-Hogg production (Lindsay Hogg 1986, Price 2010). In the printed text, for example, the stage direction reads, '*knocking on the table and trying to imitate a woman's voice*' [italics in original] (Fugard 2000: 19) which is translated to an action in Sam's room where there are some additions such as Hally's mother entering to ask Sam and Willie about Hally, while, Willie wakes Hally up to say, 'hi man Hally, it is too late for school'. Other additional words in this scene are, 'okay now once more from the beginning', 'Hally are you in there', 'will you come out there at once' etc (Price 2010). These words are those of Sam and Willie in the printed text, enacted by Kani and Mokae, but are said by Hally's mother 'Mrs Ballard' in the Price visual text. This is noteworthy because having Kani and Mokae to recite those lines did not add much about Sam and Willie's relationship with Hally and his family in the Lindsay-Hogg production but by means of the additional characters and choice of settings, as a one man audience I could grasp Hally's background. The concepts of cognition and identification come to mind since one can see Mrs Ballard as a figure who represents the white dominance and the men (Sam and Willie) as the relegated blacks who work as kitchen 'boys'.

Moreover, in the production a close-up shot is used on Hally where he recounts his experiences in Sam's room in a type of flashback. What appears on the screen is the young Hally telling us how Sam arrives at the idea of the kite. The kite is fashioned by Sam for Hally in an attempt to help him rise above his shame. The process of creating and flying the kite seems to Hally like the miracle of being alive and free. This scene is absent in the Lindsay-Hogg production since it only makes use of the tea shop with Mokae and Broderick reciting the lines (Lindsay-Hogg 1986, Price 2010, Fugard 2000: 24). In the Lonny Price production, Sam and Hally are shown flying a kite on a hill. On the hill, two black men in a shallow shot are seen sitting on the floor very close to the only bench on the hill with the inscription 'whites only' (Price 2010). The shallow shot is used to project the symbol of apartheid, division, hatred and racism in the park. The mood changes as Price switches the action from page 25 to 27: suspense

stems from Hally and his mother's telephone conversation when she calls from the hospital to inform Hally about his father's insisting to be discharged. Price interprets this scene as a two way dialogue between Hally and his mother, translating the ellipses in Hally's conversation on page 26 as a two way conversation. A deep focus camera position is evident when Hally's father is seen in the background preparing himself for his discharge, while Hally keeps seeing his father smiling at him in a surrealistic scene (Price 2010). This shot projects Hally's father's influence on him as he signals to him; it also makes his expression obvious while he complains of his father's health.

The telephone conversation alters the mood in the play: Hally exhibits his dominance over Willie and Sam by using an additional sentence in the visual text, 'my mum said when you are through with the floor, you clean the windows' as opposed to its absence in the play text (Fugard 2000: 27, Price 2010). This distant-sounding command makes it obvious that Hally's skin colour is affecting his relationship with the boys. The telephone conversation in the Lindsay-Hogg production is one-way; it is only Broderick talking to himself, remaining faithful to his lines without any omission. But in the Price production is depicted a conversation between Hally and Mrs Ballard (Lindsay-Hogg 1986, Fugard 2000: 26, Price 2010). The return of Hally's father modifies the mood of the play; the audience can perceive the effect of Mr Ballard's intrusion into the relationship of Hally and the boys. Also in the Lindsay-Hogg production, the viewer could simply infer from the words of Hally that he is displeased with his father's return, as well as from the way he suddenly becomes harsh to Sam and Willie. Every attempt for Hally to convince his mother not to allow his father back home has proved abortive.

The value of flashback is clear in the visual text since one can identify one of the climaxes of the play from the actions by Sam, Hally, Mrs Ballard, Willie and Mr Ballard. Another feature of the Price visual text is the inclusion of certain additional scenes; for instance, Hally's discussion with his mother on his father's return is not present in the printed text nor in the Lindsay-Hogg production while the scene moves to the dance floor in the Price visual text. A further addition is the scene where Hally and his father walk home after seeing a movie, and pass by a show glass displaying pictures of people who fought in the Hitler war. His father narrates how he lost his leg on the ship, and what led to his non-enlistment in the army (Price 2010).

Quoting Hally's father, 'I didn't lose my leg in the war chap, I fell down from the ship gangway on the trip down from Southampton, I never got to the war Hally' (Price 2010). These inclusions serve as hints of the event that led to Mr Ballard's ill health, and also suggest that he had been lying about the incident. The printed text does not dwell much on what led to the crippling of Mr Ballard but it is occasionally mentioned, for instance in the telephone conversation; 'yes! How am I expected to be fresh for school when I spent half the night massaging his gammy leg?' (Fugard 2000: 26).

The scene of the dance floor follows immediately in a kind of flash forward in the Price production, whereas it is thus recorded in the words of Sam and Willie in the printed text, 'your imagination left out the excitement, [the dance floor is being shown in the Price visual text while Sam's voice continues in the background] oh! yes. The finalists are not going out there just to have a good time. One of those couples will be the 1950 Eastern Province Champions... [Willie again introduces the stage while the tempo increases] Mr Elijah Gladman Guzana and his Orchestral Jazzonions' (Fugard 2000: 33, Price 2010). The actions tend to be presented as more significant in the Price production, as Fugard himself incorporates in the play's stage directions that there is going to be a dance hall where couples dance in a free world. Therefore, Sam and Willie find respite in practising their dancing. As observed by Jordan, '... a welcome relief from their work but also of transforming the enforced posture of subordination into a mode of creative and liberating movement [dance]' (Jordan 1993: 465). Jordan continues his appraisal of the introduction of dance into *Master Harold*, commenting accordingly, 'dancing is thus much more than sentimental metaphor for social and political harmony, the 'world without collision' of Hally's homework assignment. It is also a form of disciplined social practice that has specific cultural meaning within the black community' (Jordan 1993: 466, Fugard 2000: 36-37). This is a reflection of a particular social construction of reality. One should note that all the texts studied for the purpose of this research reflect this, but differently. The dance as Sam discusses it in the printed text and as illustrated in the visual text explains how harmonious it would be if there were to be a world without racism and segregation.

Another addition in the Price production occurs when the Master of Ceremonies (MC) introduces the winner by means of certain additional words such as, 'yah ne... we know how to

make a noise ne, that is okay it means we know how to enjoy our self, and is that not what we are here for?... ladies and gentlemen, my... my... my... aren't they looking beautiful... no am not talking about our judges, am talking about our finalists [drum rolls and crowd cheering and laughing]' (Price 2010). Price adds this to create humour and to lessen the climax of highlighting the effect of discrimination as the audience in turn laugh and scream at what the Master of Ceremonies says. In contrast, in the Lindsay-Hogg visual text this scene is enacted by Mokae with Kani as the audience; clapping, whistling, shouting, babbling and so on. Furthermore, the sounds made by Willie add vitality to what Mokae enacts to make the scene as lively as if it is a dance hall (Lindsay-Hogg 1986). Both visual texts remain faithful to the directions on the printed text where Sam climbs on a chair to act out the MC, but the Price production exhibits a reverse angle shot, where the camera switches between the St George's Park Tea Room and the dance competition scene (Lindsay-Hogg 1986, Price 2010). The given shot is used to show how significant the dance practice is to the boys' freedom. This scene becomes more dramatic in the Price production; when the names of Willie and Hilda are announced in the Price visual text, Willie grabs toothless Hilda's hand as they resume dancing with other competitors. Suddenly, the action resumes in a reverse camera angle to the tea room (Fugard 2000: 35, Price 2010). The dance floor is also for Sam and Willie, as I have noted, a mode of escape from the force of apartheid they both experience every day. In my own observation, this distinction is projected both in the Lindsay-Hogg production which follows the play text and that of the 2010 production which makes use of every word to tell its story.

A shallow focus shot follows as Rhames explains to Highmore in the Price visual text what happens on the dance floor of a world without collisions, where some dancers are seen dancing in the background in a fuzzy vision. This shot is the opposite of the deep focus shot in which one of the images is in focus while the rest are out of focus but are sometimes relevant to the topic being discussed (Monaco 2000: 89). As a one-person audience I was captivated with the performance, as I was made to anticipate what would happen next in the text. The scene grows clearer as Sam and Willie are seen on a round table at the centre of the stage, and the phone rings to return the action into the tea room. Price uses this as a recall to action in the text. This technique is aimed at causing the audience to be curious about the incoming call. An additional scene is used to reflect this in the Price production; Mrs Ballard phones to inform

Hally of his father's return. This conversation in the visual text between Hally and his mother explains the ellipsis on page 38 of the printed text (Fugard 2000: 38-39, Price 2010). Conversely, the Lindsay-Hogg production presents its own telephone conversation scene with Broderick improvising as if he had someone over the phone communicating with him. The action in both the Price and Lindsay-Hogg versions heats up as Hally builds up his rage towards Sam and Willie, while they try to prevent him from making negative comments about his father. The audience at this stage may well feel the impact of an elder on a young person, indicating that Sam wants Hally to be respectful and not turn into the bully that the apartheid system will make him.

Moreover, the printed and the visual texts agree in the presentation of the climax of the play. In the printed text, Hally goes to the counter, picks up a bottle and smashes it on the wall. In the Price visual text, Hally also does the same but the only difference there is that he breaks it on a poster of a coloured man and a white woman playing on a beach, while in the Lindsay-Hogg visual text the bottle smashes on the bare wall and is not shown further (Fugard 2000: 40-41, Lindsay-Hogg 1986, Price 2010). Hally's breaking the bottle on this particular poster affords a reminder that legislation forbade mixed colour relationships in South Africa at that time. Certain elements in the visual texts help to suggest the climax to the audience, such as: the long pause, the heart beat, the background sound, Sam's reaction, the raising of his voice, the position of the camera, Willie's silence, Hally's voice pitch and mocking laughter (Lindsay-Hogg 1986, Price 2010). These elements assist me as an audience member to fully comprehend Fugard's emphasis on page 43 in the conversation between Sam and Willie: 'you are only a servant here don't forget it... is that he is your boss [Sam] No, he isn't. I get paid by your [Hally's] mother don't argue with me Sam!... he is a white man and that's good enough for you' (Fugard 2000: 42-43). I identify with the character of Sam regarding how it feels being relegated to an inferior position in accordance with the nature of one's skin, as Price emphasises in the visual text employing the elements mentioned above (Price 2010). These responses could also be experienced in watching the play, if someone in the audience exercises his or her imagination as Fugard mentions on page 33 while exploring the ballroom dance and its symbolism.

As the mood shifts in the play, so also in the visual texts does the tension rise; at the point where Hally commands Sam to call him 'Master Harold'. This is demonstrated with a number of additional words and actions in the Lonny Price version to depict what frequently occurs when racial discrimination becomes the order of the day. A single action in both visual editions that illustrates this, for example, takes place when Sam opens his arse to Hally; the latter's reaction connotes his guilt about what he has said to Sam (Lindsay-Hogg 1986, Fugard 2000: 44-45, Price 2010). This scene is faithful to what is in the printed text. Price includes some words of Willie and repeatedly foregrounds him to the audience during Sam and Hally's conversation. An instance occurs where Willie repeatedly comments, 'it's okay Sam', as opposed to what is in the printed text where Willie says this just once (Fugard 2000: 44, Price 2010). Also, after Hally spits on Sam's face it is not recorded in the printed text that Willie says anything to Sam before he reacts to what Hally did (Fugard 2000: 45, Price 2010). Again in the Lindsay-Hogg and the printed text, Sam wiped his face with a handkerchief after Hally spits on his face, '*Taking out a handkerchief and wiping his face*'. Conversely, Sam wipes his face with his hand in the Price visual text while he agrees to call Hally 'Master Harold' (Fugard 2000: 45, Lindsay-Hogg 1986, Price 2010). Price might have intended not to place Sam on a level that is equal to Hally in polite manners by omitting the scene where Sam wipes his face with a handkerchief. Likewise, when I put myself in the place of Sam, anger arises in me, seeing a young Hally spitting on Sam, as a result of my cultural background. Hally is understandably conflicted emotionally because society condones humiliating behaviour towards black men like Sam, yet the latter has been the only positive male role model in Hally's life.

Moreover, in the printed text Sam pauses, violently looking towards Hally and asks Willie if he could hit him, but in the visual text while saying his lines he kicks the table and a threatening sound is heard in the background. The passage where he asks Willie if he could strike Hally is omitted with a long pause (commented on below), moving into his addressing Hally again. On the other hand, the Lindsay-Hogg version lays emphasis on Willie (Lindsay-Hogg 1986, Fugard 2000: 45, Price 2010). This is exciting because Willie in the Price visual text is a more peripheral figure. Sentences in the conversation between Willie and Sam in the printed text and Lindsay-Hogg production, '[Sam] should I hit him [Willie] No, *Boet* Sam [Sam] why not [Willie] it won't help, *Boet* Sam [Sam] I don't want to help! I want to hurt him [Willie] you

also hurt yourself [Sam] and what if he had done it to you, Willie? [Willie] me? Spit at me like I was a dog... then I want to hit him. I want to hit him hard!...' (Lindsay-Hogg 1986, Fugard 2000: 45) are omitted in the Price visual text. Price may have wanted to balance the actions between anger and reconciliation, making use of the lengthy pause that signifies the moment when Sam controls his rage. This might mean more to an audience member who had learnt or taken an interest to know about the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa (TRC).²⁶

Furthermore, there is another additional flashback scene in the Price visual text reflecting what Fugard records on page 46, where Sam reminds Hally of the day he came into his room to help Hally with carrying his drunken father. A shallow focus shot is placed on Sam whilst he narrates the story in the visual text, where Hally's image turns fuzzy and only Sam can be seen on the screen. This camera position aims at emphasising the action by Sam, who wishes the good relationship between Hally and him could continue; an audience at this point would have hoped to see Hally remember the good old times and apologise to Sam. The action moves to the Central Hotel Bar where Hally is obliged to go inside to ask for permission to let Sam come in to carry his inebriated father; everybody in the bar glares at Sam in his black skin. And while Hally walks behind Sam, he has his head bowed at the disgrace of what had happened, reinforcing that he is ashamed of his alcoholic father (Fugard 2000: 46, Price 2010). This scene is enacted with certain additional sentences and actions such as, 'give me some water from the basement, we have to clean him up', 'promise me Hally that you won't allow them to take my other leg' (Price 2010). These inclusions are intended to emphasise how Sam cares for Hally as he rightly claims on page 46 of the printed text and also to exhibit how drunk 'Mr Ballard' Hally's father is when he requests Hally to promise that his second leg will not be taken. This scene explores the level of tension between whites and blacks during the apartheid era. Mr Ballard's attitude to blacks, especially to Sam, engenders arrogance in Hally who refuses to apologise to Sam despite the latter's attempt to remind Hally of the pleasant times they shared together.

The sadness in both visual texts is evident because Willie cries all through while Sam utters his lines. The soundtrack in the visual text becomes louder while another additional

²⁶ The South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) was set up by the Government of National Unity to help deal with what happened under apartheid. The conflict during this period resulted in violence and human rights abuses from all sides. Available on <http://www.suffolk.edu/research/6953.html>.

flashback scene is shown where Hally sits on a 'whites only bench', too young to know what it means. The rise in the volume of the soundtrack signals the significance of the upcoming action. The shallow focus shot in this scene makes the whole environment significant as only Sam's leg is put on view while he walks away from Hally who remains sitting on the bench (Price 2010). This reinforces Sam's submission to the request of Hally to call him master. The final scene in the Price visual text is accompanied with a circular movement of the camera; the shallow focus continues to agree with what is written in the play text thus, '*to the retreating back of the boy*' [italics in original] (Fugard 2000: 47). The circular movement of the camera projects a world without disharmony as Fugard posits it in some of his plays. Here Sam is presented in an indistinct image telling Hally to 'stop' while he tries to make peace with him, while a close-up shot is used as Sam requests another chance to fly the kite. Also in the Lindsay-Hogg production a deep focus shot is placed on Mokoena's hand whilst he is begging Hally to come and settle differences with him (Lindsay-Hogg 1986, Price 2010). This shot is a convincing representation of the environment where Sam and Hally built their relationship and where the former helped the latter to overcome his inferiority complex towards his school mates. The camera in the Price version shifts to a shallow focus when Hally rides away feeling guilty owing to all that had happened, while the action transfers to the tea room where Sam and Willie continue their dance steps in Hally's absence (Price 2010). The said shot is used to portray the disappointment in the behaviour of Hally to Sam. This scene is intended by Fugard to highlight the importance of dance to his primary theme in *Master Harold* (Fugard 2000: 48). The concluding part of the text is emphasised in both visual texts, where Sam and Willie brace their arms to dance Sarah Vaughan's 'Little Man': a significant contribution by Fugard and the directors, connoting sympathy for those discriminated against. It also refers to Hally, a 'little man' who relegates the older 'boys' to calling him 'master'. The gentle nature of the music implies that Sam and Willie hold no grudge against Hally, and that in the absence of those who represent apartheid (Mr and Mrs Ballard and Hally), there is peace between the two black men (Lindsay-Hogg 1986, Fugard 2000: 48, Price 2010). At the end of the play, when Hally realises the implications of how he has damaged his relationship with Sam, it is not only his pride, but also society's voice in his ear and that of his father which keeps haunting him, that will not allow the boy to apologise to Sam, his mentor and friend. Emotionally, the audience would have valued seeing both Hally and Sam

come back together in brotherly love again. This is certainly how I respond whenever I read or view *'Master Harold'* and the question comes to mind: will this be possible?

Interestingly, the Price visual text makes use of several shots that have been mentioned above which were appropriate to the technology of the time. And by means of this expository presentation, the audience would be able to anticipate some events that precede the happenings in the play. The ballet like sounds in the visual texts also remind one that soundtrack similarly determines the mood. Sounds likewise serve as indications of imminent events in visual texts. For instance when Sam and Willie are travelling down to their work place and Hally rides on his bike to the school and tea room, the soundtrack sounds soft in the beginning but moves to an up tempo jazz like music during Hally's introduction in the visual text, to reinforce the rise in tension in the visual text. More extensive also is the use of minimal character in the printed text and Lindsay-Hogg production, while Price interprets his production using the five major characters with dancers and orchestral bands so that the play revolves round them.

As already noted, Fugard writes plays about human relationships that are put to the test by societal and personal forces. This is achieved by his effective use of dramatic techniques in inviting the audience and directors to be part of his creations. These are subjects of the next chapter.

CHAPTER FOUR

Dramatic Techniques and their Effectiveness in Fugard's Plays and Video Versions

'Space is what the actor fills with his [sic] body, or with the movement or with stillness, and silence is something he fills with the words given him, the noises he makes, or with the silence itself, and I suppose it's just the inevitable thing that must happen to any artist as he progressively comes more to terms with the elements of his medium...'

– Athol Fugard in Jonathan Mark 1971: 45

Fugard in the above speaks about the living moment in the theatre, inviting the reader cum audience to consider the importance of certain techniques to the production of his plays. The directors explore their camera, placing it in different positions on the characters as discussed in chapter three to manage space and incorporate additional sentences to their roles. This chapter will concern the effectiveness of Fugard and, notably, the director's use of dramatic techniques and their effect on the audience, keeping in mind the focus of the research. The techniques that will be discussed in this chapter include: the use of *Antigone*, various means of emphasis and so forth. Effective use of these dramatic elements will lead to a memorable conveying of 'ideas', 'thought', 'experiences' by the playwright or director. These techniques will be discussed together with the influence of Brecht in order to avoid repeating other scholars' discussion of other early theatre practitioners' influence on Fugard as regards the effectiveness of some dramatic techniques used in his plays.

As indicated previously, Fugard is influenced by twentieth century theatre practitioners such as Bertolt Brecht, Peter Brook and Jerzy Grotowski (I refer only to Brecht). As mentioned earlier, Fugard believes in the actuality of performance and relies on the power of a live actor to move a live audience (Frank 2004:53). He does not place his audience in the role of passive viewers but makes them part of his work and incorporates them into his scenes, where the members of the audience can see themselves identifying with actors on stage. To Fugard the audience should be placed in the middle of the triangle where the actor acts out the happenings in the lives of the audience and the playwright presents the challenges of the audience on stage, in this way causing the events to revolve round the audience.

Performance (visual text or stage performance) may be seen as one creator of a social occasion as earlier mentioned, in terms of the observation of Brown concerning how different members of the audience perceive the action, while the director or playwright uses the medium as an expression of their mind to the outside world.

In the previous chapters *Antigone* has been discussed as a play within a play in *The Island*, which is one of the techniques Fugard uses to drive home his point while writing against apartheid. Wertheim develops his discussion on the imprisonment of John and Winston and their attempt to discover themselves in the four walls of the prison as portrayed in the BBC production, by positing, 'their humanities however remain intact, even amid a situation designed to be death in life or living death' (Wertheim 2000: 89). Likewise the audience may well realise at this point the essence of a camaraderie between people that can assist them to overcome their circumstances.

A critique I offer of Wertheim's comment is, 'how can someone use drama as self 'protection' or 'protection of the self'?' In my opinion, if drama is perceived as a weapon to protect one's self then it should be able to achieve what a gun can do and the playwright should not be arrested or his passport seized by the government as in the case of Athol Fugard.

As pointed out earlier, *The Island* is concerned with the plan of John to encourage Winston in acting *Antigone* to entertain an audience of prison guards and prisoners during a prison variety night. Moreover, this technique in *The Island* is used by Athol Fugard as a protest tactic in the form of a grieving woman forbidden to give her brother an honourable burial. The Sophocles' version of *Antigone* has sometimes resonated with political dissidents. For instance, Antigone's choice to sacrifice her life in a challenge to the unjust laws of Thebes, such as in Fugard's *The Island*, operates in three different directions that build up to the climax both in the printed version and the BBC visual text. These are as follows: Antigone's burial of her brother defies the repressive state, just as the characters in *The Island* denounce apartheid by performing *Antigone* for their guards and fellow inmates on Robben Island, while at the same time Kani, Ntshona and Fugard were risking arrest by staging a play that challenged the government. In the words of Fugard according to Jenkins, 'Now that apartheid no longer exists in South Africa, *The Island* has become a much more general statement about the question of political prisoners... The

press made the point that the play had not dated because it was about political prisoners and, God knows, there are enough of them in the world at this time.’ (Jenkins 2003). In reality, what Fugard writes, according to Jenkins obtains in most parts of the world as prisoners become victims of circumstances and may be killed at will.

While watching the BBC production of *The Island* I ask myself, why is it that only the scene where Kani and Ntshona acted *Antigone* was shown while the other parts of the documentary took the form of interviews? In my opinion, this emphasises the centrality of the given scene. Furthermore, highly effective is the concluding part of the visual text where Yvonne Bryceland summons the audience with a freedom song while the said text runs to its end. This must have paved the way for the audiences’ fellow-feeling for the victims of oppression during the apartheid system. Being a member of the audience in the Nigerian presentation of *The Island* in the Amphitheatre in Nigeria as earlier said, I experienced a compassion for the black citizens of South Africa during this era. In addition, contained in the Dana Friedman version of *The Island* on YouTube, her only extract from its presentation in the Carnegie Mellon University for the same reason as the BBC production discussed above, is the scene where Kani and Ntshona act *Antigone* (BBC Production, Dana Friedman 2010). These illustrations from the visual texts reinforce the relevance of *Antigone* to the discussion in *The Island*.

Another technique Fugard uses in driving home his point home is gesture. This becomes more obvious in the visual texts studied in the course of this research, as the actions are intimately portrayed and the video/DVD allows for a pause and replaying of actions, which allows me as a reader of the visual text to go back to a previous scene to grasp the idea being conveyed over a period. Significantly, the director informs the kind of gesture used and to be used in the further enactment of the story. The director reads his or her audience and character and knows when exactly he or she should use a gesture or not. She or he must also be versed in other aspects of theatre production, for instance stage management, props, costume choice and so forth. This leads me to considering stagecraft.

Stagecraft is a generic term referring to the technical aspects of theatrical, film, and video production. It includes, but is not limited to, constructing and rigging scenery, hanging and focusing of lighting, design and procurement of costumes, makeup, and procurement of props,

stage management, and recording and mixing of sound (Oxford Online Dictionary 2011). Anyone who has been involved in theatre or film for a while will know what it takes to bring out the best in a theatrical production.

Athol Fugard achieved success in directing by his construction of social reality; studying his people and writing on their daily challenges. This can be gathered from Barbera's interview with the cast of *Boesman and Lena* since they respond to the directing of Fugard in these words, '[Mokone] Because he writes about real people, he requires that you put yourself into the role of the person and be the person, without any symbols and stuff like that. He says "Just go ahead and be a person, because it is people I've written about..." [David] 'I've worked with very few directors who have as much respect for actors as I think Athol has. Being an actor himself, he has a profound respect for what you do...' [Williams] "Athol understands actors because he also acts"' (Barbera 1993: 430). This extract illustrates that before the director of a stage drama or film dictates mood or gesture he or she should have understood his characters and studied his audience. For example, when Kani in Brockway's production of *Sizwe Bansi is Dead* puts himself into acting out the monologue while he narrates his challenges at Ford, the way he carries his body, demonstrates with his hands and makes sounds in imitation of the machines means that the audience engages with the text differently from when the lines are being read without any body movement.

Moreover, an audience may query if Fugard or any of the characters used in the visual text are emotionally attached to their roles. Any audiences will probably realise that Fugard acts in his own plays (Devenish 1974); Kani and Ntshona collaborated with him in *The Island* and *Sizwe Bansi is Dead* and also perform in them. Do Devenish, Berry and Price choose the right casts for the presentation of their roles? Fugard also acted in the Devenish production but his interpretation is different from that of Danny Glover in the manner they both approach their roles. Glover is always ready to contradict anything Lena does, while in the Devenish production Fugard looks more tolerant of Lena's behaviour than Glover does. Moreover, in the same visual text Bryceland looks less aggressive than the way which the role is being interpreted by Bassett. The audience may well suspect Fugard, Kani and Ntshona have become emotionally attached to the production from their interpretation of their roles (this is discussed in subsequent paragraphs).

Likewise, the gestures in the visual texts become clearer than in the printed text as the directors narrate their versions using the camera. For instance, when Kani interprets for Bradley in the Brockway production: the camera shifts to the face of Kani as he switches between happy, confused, angry, serious moods in this text. While he is talking to his colleagues he will look stern in an attempt to encourage them to action, whereas whenever he faces Bradley he acts seriously; however when Bradley requests him to say something positive such as telling his colleagues to look happy, Kani will utter the negative words with a confused look and laugh at his colleagues, trying to mimic Bradley and Mr Ford. This is obvious also in the Berry production where Bassett will look relaxed whenever Glover is away but when he returns, the mood changes, thereby increasing tension in the play. In the Devenish production, Bryceland remains faithful to her lines and appears gentler than the way in which Bassett interprets her role.

Furthermore, I would like to elaborate on the presence or absence of the alienation technique or effect in the plays of Fugard and the visual texts, also called the a-effect or distancing effect. It is an idea central to the dramatic theory of the German dramatist-director Bertolt Brecht and involves the use of techniques designed to distance the audience from emotional involvement in the play through jolting reminders of the artificiality of the theatrical performance (Cuddon 1999: 38). As a result the view of Brecht is that the audience and actor should not be emotionally involved with the play. From this the question arises, is this applicable in the visual texts or the staged ones? From the actions of John Kani, Winston Ntshona, Ving Rhames, Zakes Mokae, Matthew Broderick, Patrick Mofokeng, Yvonne Bryceland and others, can one deduce they acted their roles without emotional attachment or without any other engagement? I have already partly answered this question. Fugard acts in and directs his plays, an example being his role in *Boesman and Lena* as mentioned. Does this mean that he was involved emotionally or not while acting that role? In reality, Fugard in his plays fashions ways in which the audience can be part of the play, thereby making them active viewers, and not utilising the a-effect.

The Brockway production of *Sizwe Bansi is Dead* starred Kani alongside Ntshona; since they are black South African actors, could I contend that they both display vested interests in

interpreting their role? The two actors have an apartheid background, whereas if I was in Kani or Ntshona's place I would have acted without putting any extra gestures or other additions into the interpretation of the role. This is evident in the manner with which Danny Glover acts his own part of Boesman, in an aggressive fashion compared to the Devenish production where Fugard starred as Boesman. Fugard's acting slightly less emphatically may represent his intention to suggest dialogue instead of confrontation, or possibly he is not quite as deeply involved emotionally with his role as Boesman. Another instance is the incident that heightened the tension in *'Master Harold'* where Hally spat on Sam's face: Ving Rhames as Sam evidences submissiveness in reaction to what Hally did immediately the deed was done, as opposed to the open-ended instruction in the printed text's directions: *'Sam stops and looks expectantly at the boy. Hally spits in his face. A long heartfelt groan from Willie. For a few seconds Sam doesn't move'*. [italics in original] (Fugard 2000: 45) Patrick Mofokeng in his acting of the less significant Willie, and also with his South African background, relates closely to Ving Rhames. In contrast to Kani and Zakes Mokae's combination, Kani is invariably enthusiastic whenever Mokae makes a statement, nodding at him encouragingly (Lindsay-Hogg 1986). Lindsay-Hogg presents Mokae as being on a higher level than Willie in education, while Price depicts Mofokeng and Rhames as having the same educational background.

Another observation I would like to draw from this is that since Kani and Ntshona form part of the collaboration that gave birth to *Sizwe Bansi is Dead*, there would have been a strong possibility that they were emotionally attached to their roles in *Sizwe Bansi*. An instance is to be found in the Brockway visual text; when Kani discovers the passbook in the dead man's pocket and runs back to Ntshona, emotion appears in the gesture by Ntshona when he is handed the passbook by Kani (Brockway 1981). The situation is quite unlike the performance I watched at the Market Theatre which starred Arthur Molepo and Omphile Molusi: though both men would have experienced apartheid, their greater humour in presenting their interpretation causes the subject matter to be approached differently from that in the Brockway production. In reality, as intimated earlier, background, age and location would have influenced the interpretation of the roles by these characters. A further example comprises the roles of Bryceland and Angela Bassett in the Devenish and Berry production of *Boesman and Lena* respectively; the use of Afrikaans words by Bryceland accompanied her more down to earth interpretation of the South

African community, as Fugard suggests, than that by Bassett, who in some instances omits or sometimes substitutes them for English words as remarked earlier.

Moreover, I wish to add that the way a play or visual text is being presented or acted can dictate one's involvement with a play, in such a fashion that an audience member may see himself or herself on stage and in return react to it due to his or her experiences. As a result of this, an audience member can be drawn into, moved by, a presentation (owing to its emotional effects) rather than simply enjoy it for the purpose of entertainment. If this is the case, then he or she may well have been manipulated, so that the staged play or visual text becomes a piece of propaganda. To me it still maintains its artistic value but shifts its focus from entertaining or educating to being the latter.

Significantly, the flashback has been and is a recurrent technique used by Fugard in his works, especially those that are discussed in this research. They serve as an indicator of past events and a hint towards the present. This technique is also used effectively in certain videos that have been studied during this project; scenes from the Price production of '*Master Harold*' and John Berry's production of *Boesman and Lena*, illustrate the effectiveness of flashbacks in the plays. The producers probably take their cue from the use of this technique in the printed version by Fugard himself. A flashback according to Murfins is a 'scene that interrupts the present action of a narrative work to depict some earlier events – often that occurred before the opening scene of the work via reverie, remembrance, dreaming, or some other mechanism' (Murfins 2009: 179). The significance of flashback in the visual texts in this discourse is evident from how it provides detailed information about characters such as Bassett as Lena in John Berry *BL*, Rhames as Sam in Lonny Price *MH*, Mofokeng as Willie in Lonny Price *MH*, Glover as Boesman in John Berry *BL* etc (Berry 2000, Price 2010). This is important because the technique acquaints the viewer with the preceding events in the lives of the performers better than in the printed text.

In short, the purpose of flashbacks in a visual text is partly to give the audience information that is needed to move the story forward and to clarify the actions of the characters. How does this affect the audiences? The flashbacks provide them with clues about the character's motivation, thereby alluding to what took place before the character appears on

stage. The audience is called back to the present by the actions or words of the character. For instance, Berry uses flashback to explain all that is recorded on page 26 of the printed text when Lena becomes engrossed in a dialogue with Outa imagining his comprehension of her own language (Fugard 1993: 26, Berry 2000). Owing to these instances the audience becomes alert to what occurred in the past of Boesman and Lena.

Notably, the Berry and Price productions made use of memory in their presentation; an example in the Berry production is the manner in which he employed memory alongside flashback in what I termed as surrealism in chapter three. Why did Berry choose to project this scene that was omitted in the Devenish production? I asserted, ‘The Berry production, in my view, can be likened to a present day Hollywood movie with his presentation of two Lenas on the same screen, in interpreting what Fugard writes as, “I meet the memory of myself on the old roads”’ (Fugard 1996: 29), using a soundtrack that together with the display on the screen makes it look as if something is about to happen (Berry 2000). The use of this memory technique coupled with a flashback while Lena sees her past self pass in front of her present self as she walks down the pathway with Boesman creates a sense of identity and discovery in the audience as discussed in chapter one.

Additional to this, one may mention the issue of the passbook and Robert Zwelinzima in *Sizwe Bansi is Dead* because this affects me as a member of the audience at the Market Theatre. Although I do not have a Southern African origin, a constant recourse to how a human lives as a stranger in his or her own land affects my thoughts regarding how people will cope in those kinds of conditions. In reality, a director who produced this play in the 70s or 80s would probably have placed much emphasis on the passbook, as this would have interested and influenced the audience to an extent. This is not limited to the Brockway production of *Sizwe Bansi is Dead* alone, but also includes the Price production of ‘*Master Harold*’, as one can see at the beginning of the visual text where a close-up shot focuses on Sam’s passbook and the medal he achieved from a dance competition. The audience is thus carried along with the action in the Price visual text as these items, passbook, trophy, Sam’s coat and so on, become relevant in the course of the visual text as the winners are announced. The appeal to memory by Price and Fugard is an element that specifies the background events that are not in the printed text. It is

evident from the use of memory and flashback in plays that they bridge time, place and action to reveal a past emotional event or physical conflict that affects the character. Sometimes, this gives insight and understanding into a character's behaviour or solves a past mystery as in *Boesman and Lena*.

Another distinctive technique used by Fugard is the use of humour, also presented in the visual texts. This refers to any message – transmitted in action, speech, writing, images or music – intended to produce a smile or a laugh (Mawter 2005: 2). Humour may be satirical while it could also convey its own significance in a text depending on how the director or the playwright uses it.

In both printed and visual texts, Fugard's presentation of humour represents cases where people see the reality yet laugh over it. For example, the monologue at the beginning of *Sizwe Bansi is Dead* where Kani narrates his ordeals at the Ford engineering company in a humorous manner; he mimics Baas Bradley who had asked him to translate what he says to his co-workers (Brockway 1981). The expression on Styles' face in the Market Theatre production forces me to interpret the anger in him as he recounts how the firm spends much money on machines yet refuses to increase their pay cheques. However, when Styles acts out the role of Bradley, he is full of humour, making the audience members including myself laugh as if the stage was filled with people acting as co-workers.

A further technique Fugard uses in his plays is minimal numbers of characters in contrast to the additional characters and scenes brought in by Berry and Lonny Price. In most of Fugard's plays he uses two or three cast members while presenting roles that several, perhaps even ten or more, actors could act out on stage. As earlier indicated, Fugard was able to manage his casts and settings owing to the way in which he was obliged to select the former, therefore making use of minimalist sets and props improvised from whatever materials were available; as mentioned earlier, according to his *Notebooks*, his plays were often staged in black areas for a night.

According to Loren Kruger, the Serpent Players used Brecht's elucidation of gestic acting, dis-illusion, and social critique, as well as their own experience of the satiric comic routines of urban African vaudeville, to explore the theatrical force of Brecht's techniques, as

well as the immediate political relevance of a play about land distribution (Kruger 2004: 217-218). The audience identifies with the character on stage or in the visuals, thereby allowing them to analyse the situations of the characters in Brechtian fashion. However, did Fugard use this technique significantly in his plays compared to the interpretations of Berry and Price in their visual texts? In the Price production, he imports additional characters such as Sam's wife, Mr and Mrs Ballard, the nurses at the hospital, the Master of Ceremonies, the dancers, men in the bar and so forth. And also in the Devenish production, the viewer can see a large group of people at the demolition at the beginning of the text, the sellers at the bottle store, the children that came to Lena while she awaits Boesman and so on. In addition, the Berry production uses some additional characters, similar to the technique of the Devenish production.

In my conclusion I will briefly revisit some of these points and make a few suggestions for further research.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION – OVERVIEW AND SUMMARY

This conclusion will reinforce the point already made, that film studies comprises an important addition to the South African study of drama texts especially those written by Athol Fugard, particularly in this case by applying Fish's version of reader response theory. The dissertation has examined the essence of DVD's and VHS's in allowing the viewer to gain more intimate knowledge of the text being studied by pausing and analysing the chosen props and objects; to analyse the various techniques such as gesture, body language and so on, used by the director or producer within the scene, many of which are visual strategies the filmmaker employs to communicate with the viewer or audience. Conclusions regarding the comparison between the chosen plays of Fugard and the video DVD versions will be included in this chapter and his present concerns briefly considered.

During the course of the research, Fish's version of reader response theory, which allows me as a reader the authority to offer my own interpretation of Fugard's texts, was applied, in order to read my own meaning into what is contained in the printed version compared to what the director puts on screen. I have thus far compared selected original written texts by Athol Fugard with their adaptations as visual texts/performance by directors such as Ross Devenish, John Berry, Michael Lindsay-Hogg, Merrill Brockway and Lonny Price. I have adduced the intimacy of my experience at the Market Theatre in Johannesburg. While writing the dissertation, I discussed the ways in which Fugard responds to life under the extreme circumstances in apartheid South Africa as they have been interpreted on Video/ DVD by different directors who, in one way or the other, modify what is in the original text. Quoting Jane Kidnie I averred that since 'the playwright's creative labour ends with the completion of the script' (Kidnie 2009: 15), practically this is where the duty of the director emerges. Therefore, my research has explored the differences in interpretation by directors of Fugard's printed texts.

The first chapter which contains my assumption(s), literature review, theoretical framework and methodology, explains my entry into Stanley Fish's version of reader response. I stated my intention to be a comparison between the printed texts and video versions, which

added to my own understanding of the effectiveness of Fugard's dramatic techniques as also explained in the visual text. My hypothesis was that reader response theory in Fish's version is helpful in understanding and tackling the printed text and the visual materials produced by the different directors. With the aid of Fugard's notebooks I was able to follow the situations and circumstances that led to the creation of his plays; this aided my arguments in chapter two and three regarding the comparison of two selected *Statement Plays* and *Port Elizabeth Plays* with their video interpretations by Merrill Brockway, the Market Theatre experience, John Berry and Ross Devenish. In chapter two I asked a number of questions which I also posed in chapter three such as: What is in a shot when juxtaposed with the text? What is excluded? What is the exclusion or addition centred on? What are my responses to the changes effected by the directors, producers or the actors performing the plays?

Although some inclusions and exclusions may be due to the director's intention of making the play text more commercially successful by being emotionally appealing, which is usually done with the visual text being faithful to or the opposite of what is in the play text, others are not deliberate; they might also be due to the time factor (to cut the film to a minimum meaningful unit). The director might also want to emphasise material in his shots which the playwright regards as less significant or omit material from the printed text. The audiences might react to the omission as the employment of a deliberate style by the director (if they are conversant with the play text and with the director); while some will regard the inclusion as part of the adaptation others will not be aware of the director or playwright's technique. The power of adaptation lies with the director, but sometimes the casts improvise the script of the director. The director either cuts-in or out what the actor or actress is acting, depending on his or her satisfaction with the improvised material. What may well keep the audience attentive at this point is also the technique the director has employed in interpreting the original text by the playwright. These issues are discussed in chapter four, where a consideration of Fugard's effective use of dramatic techniques is coupled with some notes on the directors who adapt his play texts to screen.

Chapter four also explored the effectiveness of Fugard's, and the directors of the visual texts', use of dramatic techniques to draw in the audience, while keeping in mind the focus of the

research. The techniques that were discussed in this chapter include: the use of *Antigone*, emphasis (actions and movements by actors), gesture, flashbacks and the like. The effective use of these dramatic elements aids the directors in their interpretations. Whether the interpretations are faithful or not, a film study viewer knows that the visual version is an adaptation of the printed text. In the course of writing the chapter I also looked at the effect of this technique on the characters in the form of the alienation technique. These techniques were also discussed along with the influence of some early writers and theatre practitioners on Fugard with relation to the effectiveness of certain dramatic techniques used in his plays.

I also found it important to mention the influence of some black, white and coloured theatre practitioners such as Zakes Mokae, Mannie Manim, Yvonne Bryceland, John Kani and Winston Ntshona on Athol Fugard.

I have examined the influences on Fugard as an author who causes his audiences to be active viewers, and also analysed the role of the reader; which is the cause of my recognition that there is no 'original' meaning, but only one that is based on my interpretation. This, coupled with my justification as mentioned in chapter one, is in line with the proposition of Ruthven that we all bring critical assumptions with us to our interpretation of any text (Ruthven 1979: 119). This is where the issue of the interpretive community and interpretive self emerges, thus shaping my response to the visual texts as a one person audience.

While members of the same interpretive community might use the same interpretive strategy, a member of another interpretive society might not read the same meaning into a text. For example, my reading of *Kongi's Harvest* by Wole Soyinka will be different from that of someone who comes from Swaziland. Having applied the reader response theory of Stanley Fish to the comparison of the DVD and printed texts of Athol Fugard, my response to the work as an audience and reader exposed me to some issues in performance theory which applies to the adaptation of play texts to visual texts.

In addition, the impact of the director on adaptation and his effort in taking the script on screen was explored in my comparison of video versions to the play text. The director narrates the plot with his shots: the long, deep focus, shallow focus, close-ups, extreme long shots, middle

shots and others, all make significant contributions in analysing the texts, such as establishment of and further information on the film settings, and so on. In addition, a playwright undertakes interpretations with words, while the director does so employing images, sounds, music and actors; with the aid of techniques such as preparation of scenes, master shots, coverage and camera angles, matching actions, continuity, cuts, entrances and exits, crossing the line, working with actors and many other aspects that I did not mention in my discussion. Knowing the basics of directing a play as discussed in the camera movement and types of shot used by the directors assists in logical reading of a film and its interpretation as an educated audience. As I stated previously, every plot may be regarded as having a goal; while a film reinterprets a plot through images, the audiences are affected by the way in which the story is being projected on screen.

Film criticism is the device used by scholars when making responses to visual or printed texts. Having discovered that there are numerous film theories that can be applied to the study of film and also having learnt of various shortcomings to each, I defined my approach in chapter one as stemming from the version of reader response advocated by Stanley Fish and did not delve much into other film theories.

As earlier mentioned, does this mean that people in the same interpretive community never disagree? Second, is it the case that the agreement is possible only within the same interpretive community? The answer to this depends on the individual's part in giving meaning to what he or she has read or seen in a text. An audience member might perceive a play from a perspective that is totally different from what a fellow reader or viewer saw. Their agreement is thus the point they drive at. Both members of the audience might technically pass through different routes in applying meaning to a work (if they are both literary experts), but will definitely exhibit a number of similarities in their conclusion. As remarked earlier, cognition deals with how rationally one thinks when studying or watching a film. For example, a film review of *'Master Harold'* in the United States of America will explore the text differently from one by a reviewer who resides in Botswana, but both will definitely tell us that the play looks like the autobiography of Athol Fugard.

Brown (1997) speculates that the mirror of the stage reflects the real world so that it looks the same, but it is in fact different, more meaningful, more enjoyable, and more inspiring. It thus

frequently become interesting when the viewer examines what happens as if the director or playwright had consulted or studied the actual situation, before coming up with the script. In this way, the viewer might exclaim (if watching a DVD, because it is impossible in the theatre), ‘that looks so real’. Furthermore, the presentation might be inspiring as in the case of *Sizwe Bansi is Dead*, where the spirit of brotherhood is being encouraged by Fugard. With brotherly camaraderie, Buntu was able to assist Sizwe to get over his trauma.

Thereafter, in chapter two and three, I compared and contrasted the print versions of two of Fugard’s *Statement Plays – The Island* and *Sizwe Bansi is Dead* and *The Port Elizabeth plays – Boesman and Lena* and ‘*Master Harold*’... *and the Boys*, with their stage interpretations as recorded on DVD. In some instances, I viewed more than one performance of these chosen plays and posed similar questions such as: What is in a shot when juxtaposed with the text? What are the exclusion or addition and responses centred on? These chapters answered the questions and also highlighted the contribution of actors and actresses to the exclusions from and additions to the visual texts. I combined this with Fugard’s choice of casts and presentation of his ideas compared to those of the directors who adapted his plays. In my discussion of the texts I highlighted some circumstances and conditions that surround the creation of the plays; looking at the plot, characterisation, context and settings. These were likewise explored while discussing the interpretation of the printed text on the screen.

I also pointed out that there are generational differences in interpretation, so that someone born during the apartheid era will respond differently to how someone born afterwards might respond. There are also different factors that can determine how someone will respond to texts: for example age, location and educational background may also influence interpretation. The identification aspect of watching a movie deals with the way a viewer identifies with a character, action, place, setting. My identification with Sam makes me empathise with what he might have possibly felt that would have created the guilt in Hally. As a viewer at this point, I felt that he had been relegated to inferiority more than he expected, when Hally spat in his face.

Moreover, in my argument I explored the conformity of Fugard’s plays and the DVDs to the dramatic structure suggested by Gustav Freytag, originally described by Aristotle. The structure of the four plays studied for this research is not divided into five acts but Fugard

constructs his plays with different structures; *Sizwe Bansi is Dead* is written as a single act, *The Island* in four scenes, *Boesman and Lena* in two acts, while '*Master Harold*' is also a one act play. The Devenish and Lindsay-Hogg productions divide scenes with fade in actions, while Berry and Price make use of flashbacks to do so.

Fugard in his work makes use of minimal characters to present his plays, which is in contrast with most of the visual versions whereby the directors make use of additional cast members in exploring the two dimensional nature of the screen. In '*Master Harold*' for instance, Price added such people as: Mr and Mrs Ballard, the competitors for the ball room dance, the bar scene, the bus stop, the police asking for pass books, the students mocking Hally and others (obviously the directors have the freedom to use larger numbers of characters based on their interpretation of the texts).

In chapter four, the effectiveness of some dramatic techniques of Fugard which are emphasised more in the visual texts was delved into. Fugard's aim of creating a live experience with live actors to communicate to living audiences, as discussed in chapter two and three, involves the audience in his production and makes them active, thereby causing the audience to be the mediator of his works. He therefore creates his characters from what is accessible in the lives of his audience, thus creating the desired effect in them, as explored in the visual texts by the directors. An example is the genesis of *Boesman and Lena*.

The cathartic value of playwriting is apparent in Fugard's words to Lloyd Richards: when asked the reasons for writing his plays, Fugard responds: 'Well, it's a convergence of two things. I can't think of a single one of my plays that does not represent a coincidence between an external and an internal event. Something outside of me, outside even my own life, something I read in a newspaper or witness on the street, something I see or hear, fascinates me. I see it for its dramatic potential. That external event affords me the opportunity to deal with what has been building up inside me' (Richards 1989). This statement confirms that writing for Fugard is therapeutic, as he pours out his feelings in his plays. This is in agreement with the view of Stanley Fish that one is a product of his or her own interpretive communities. In Fugard's words, 'it's the audience that occurs to me when I'm writing a play... I think of a South African

audience that will know, capture and enjoy the nuances that one brings into one's writing. I write for my fellows, South Africans. You know, white and black, we are dealing with the same issues, they haven't gone away' (Meersman 2010). This proves the point that Fugard is consciously a member of the South African interpretive community.

In this case, do actors' responses mean anything practically different from each other? In the case of *Sizwe Bansi is Dead*, the response may be due to emotional attachment by whoever is acting the role of Styles; for example Kani, who also worked at Ford, might have infused the role of Styles by what he experienced at Ford personally.

Furthermore, every audience responds differently to what is happening on stage or in the visual text. Some factors that influence this were mentioned above. A scene might lead to empathy in one audience while it is a source of entertainment to another. For example, for me the Lonny Price production of '*Master Harold*' would have taken the form of an entertainment movie, if it had not been for my study of South African literature.

The director is also a one-person audience, and there are possibilities that the meaning he or she derives from a text will be different from how another director sees the play text. This is made manifest in how Ross Devenish and John Berry interpret their own visual text as discussed in chapter three. The symbols in Fugard's plays, for example, the photography studio in *Sizwe Bansi is Dead*, the dance floor in '*Master Harold*'... *and the Boys*, the kite in '*Master Harold*'... *and the Boys*, the passbooks in the various visual texts and suchlike, all have significance in the lives of his casts and audience but are interpreted somewhat differently by different directors.

I enquired in chapter two, 'why is it difficult to get some of Athol Fugard's plays on film?' This posed a major challenge for me in the course of gathering visual materials for my research as discussed in chapter one. Fugard is ageing and frail. This is evident in an item of the email correspondence I conducted with Thurman on how to contact Fugard; below is an extract of a reply from him.

I'm sorry to say I've had this message back from my contact at the Fugard Theatre: Sadly we are not able to help. Athol is old and frail and now needs some time out. We are

grateful for how much he gave of himself for the media campaign for the play, but he is now waiving a little white flag (Email correspondence with Thurman 2011).

This is a major limitation I encountered in the course of my research.

Nonetheless, if more of Fugard's texts are interpreted on screen by directors this should encourage researchers to research into Fugard more deeply, perhaps using this new addition to the study of Fugard in the field of film studies. As indicated, I hope my dissertation will make a valuable contribution to the field of film studies and impart useful knowledge to future researchers especially as regards reader response and the study of Athol Fugard. My own reading might be different from scholars who are originally from South Africa, and I am therefore urging researchers in literature to venture into a reader response comparison of play texts at large together with their interpretations on screen. My recommendation to upcoming directors who are working on literary texts that pertain to the life of a certain group is to make use of actors from that geographical location, rather than using people who are not conversant with the basics of the people's language or culture.

Hence the essence of this comparison of Fugard's printed text with the visual interpretations by different directors both in South Africa and other parts of the world. I have also established that studying visual texts aids in understanding of printed texts and thus encourages more engagement with a text than restricting oneself to a printed text. The visual texts furthermore educate one more fully as to how the playwright uses techniques to drive home his points. Doing this, the director re-interprets the printed texts with motion pictures. Therefore, questions that arise when doing a film study of Fugard texts (both printed and visual) include: what can be done to encourage film producers to venture into putting African play texts on screen as is the case with the Shakespearean plays? Should playwrights be consulted or be included as a part of their texts' interpretation in visual form? What then is the present concern of Athol Fugard who dealt with apartheid with his early plays? What also is Athol Fugard contributing to the present world theatre that could make directors want to venture into producing his play texts as visual texts? These questions could be subjects of future research in the field of South African drama and film studies.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Primary Sources²⁷

Fugard, A 2001. *Athol Fugard: Sizwe Bansi is Dead (1 of 4)*_[Video Online]. Available: www.youtube.com/watch?v=zoTJUKt_HzU. Directed by Merrill Brockway [Accessed 13 June 2011].

Fugard, A 2001. *Athol Fugard: Sizwe Bansi is Dead (2 of 4)*_[Video Online]. Available: www.youtube.com/watch?v=HtVsbkb-pdg&feature=related. Directed by Merrill Brockway [Accessed 13 June 2011].

Fugard, A 2001. *Athol Fugard: Sizwe Bansi is Dead (3 of 4)*_[Video Online]. Available: www.youtube.com/watch?v=B8YGqgezaf8&feature=related. Directed by Merrill Brockway [Accessed 13 June 2011].

Fugard, A 2001. *Athol Fugard: Sizwe Bansi is Dead (4 of 4)*_[Video Online]. Available: www.youtube.com/watch?v=kocAhCfqcP0&feature=related. Directed by Merrill Brockway [Accessed 13 June 2011].

Fugard, A 1989. *Blood Knot and Other Plays*. New York: Theatre Communication Group.

Fugard, A 1974. *Boesman and Lena*. [DVD] Directed by Ross Devenish.

Fugard, A 2001. *Boesman and Lena*. [Video] Directed by John Berry. Fox Entertainment.

Fugard, A 1986. *'Master Harold' and The Boys*. [Video] Directed by Merlis Iris. Irvine, Calif: Karl-Lorimar Home Video.

Fugard, A 1993. *'Master Harold'... and the Boys*. New York: Oxford.

Fugard, A 2010. *'Master Harold'... and The Boys*. [DVD] Directed by Lonny Price. Image Entertainment.

Fugard, A 2000. *Port Elizabeth Plays*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

²⁷ For the convenience of the reader I have arranged these primary sources alphabetically, not chronologically.

Fugard, A 1981. *Sizwe Bansi is Dead*. [DVD]. Directed by Merrill Brockway. New York: CBS Cable.

Fugard, A 1974. *Statements: Two Workshop Productions / Devised by Athol Fugard; John Kani and Winston Ntshona*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fugard, A 2000. *The Island*. BBC production. Produced by Dennis Walder.

Fugard, A 1972. *The Island* [Video Online]. Available: www.youtube.com/watch?v=OE_7sJig_3g&feature=related. Uploaded by Dana Friedman. [Accessed 30 September 2011, 11h 25].

Secondary Sources

Acosta, FF 2001. 'Understanding Literature'. Available: www.fajardo-acosta.com/worldlit/understanding.htm [Accessed 20 October 2011, 11h 35].

Alexander, M 2011. 'South African Literature' Available: http://www.medioclubsouthafrica.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=107:literature&catid=35:culture_bg [Accessed 30 August 2011, 13h 00].

Attridge, D (eds). 1998. *Writing South Africa: Literature, Apartheid, and Democracy, 1970-1995*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Balseiro, I 2006. 'A History of South African Literature'. *International Journal of African Historical Studies* 39(1): 140-141.

Barbera, J 1993. 'Fugard as Director: An Interview with the Cast of *Boesman and Lena*'. *Twentieth Century Literature*, Winter 39(4): 430.

Barry, P 2008. *Beginning Theory: An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory. Third Edition*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Beck, E 2000. 'Fugard's *Master Harold and the Boys*.' *Explicator* 58: 109-12.

Bennet, A 1995 (ed). *Readers and Reading*. New York: Longman Publishing.

- Benson, M 1973. 'Athol Fugard and One Little Corner of the World'. *Yale Theatre Review* 4: 55-58.
- Benson, M 1997. *Athol Fugard and Barney Simon, Bare Stage, a Few Props, Great Theatre*. Randburg: Ravan Press.
- Benson, M 1993. 'Encounter with Fugard: Native of the Karoo'. *Twentieth Century Literature* 39(4): 455-460.
- Billington, M 2012. *Athol Fugard: A Man of Obstinacy and Courage*. Available: <http://www.mg.co.za/article/2012-06-04-athol-fugard-a-man-of-obstinacy-and-courage/> [Accessed 18 July 2012, 16h 45].
- Blumberg, M 1999. *South Africa Theatre and Intervention*. Amsterdam-Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Bordwell, D 2010 *Film History: An Introduction*. Third Edition. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Brecht, B 1974. *Brecht on Theatre: The Development of an Aesthetics*. Translated by Willet John. London: Eyre Methuen.
- Brems, H. 2006. *Altijd weer Vogels die Nesten Beginnen. Geschiedenis van de Nederlandse Literatuur 1945-2005*. Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Bert Bakker [cited in Van Coller, 2008].
- Brinkley, E 1988. 'Proustian Time and Modern Drama: Beckett, Brecht, and Fugard'. *Comparative Literature Studies* 25(4): 352-356.
- Brown, JR. 1997. *What is Theatre? An Introduction and Exploitation*. Butterworth: Heinemann.
- Brunn, V 2012. 'Revolutionizing *Antigone*: A Puerto Rican Adaptation of Sophocles' Tragedy'. *Romance Quarterly* 59(1): 36-47.
- Butler, A M 2005. *Film Studies*. Harpenden: Pocket Essentials.
- Bywater, T 1989. *An Introduction to Film Criticism: Major Critical Approaches to Narrative Film*. New York: Longman.
- Cajee, I 2005. *Timol: A Quest for Justice*. Parktown, Johannesburg: STE Publishers.

- Cartmell, D 2007 (ed). *The Cambridge Companion to Literature on Screen*. New York: Cambridge.
- Chapman, M. 1996, 2003. *Southern African Literatures*. London: Longman.
- Christgau, R 1975. 'Fugard, Athol 1932-'. In John Ferrers (eds). *Modern Commonwealth Literature*. New York: Fredrick Ungar Publishing Company.
- Corrigan, T 2009. *Film Experience: An Introduction*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's Press.
- Cuddon, J 1999. *An Introduction to Literary Terms and Literary Theory*. Third Edition. London: Penguin Books.
- Culler, J 1980. *Structuralist Poetics: Structuralism, Linguistics and the Study of Literature*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Davis, G 1996. *Theatre and Changes in South Africa*. Netherland: Harwood Academic Publishers.
- Daymond, MJ 1984. 'Athol Fugard'. In *Momentum: On South African Writing*. Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press.
- De Kock, L 1997. 'An Impossible History. Michael Chapman, *Southern African Literatures*.' *English in Africa* 24(1): 103-17.
- Demuth, K 2007. 'Sesotho Speech Acquisition'. *The International Guide to Speech Acquisition*. Available: <http://titan.cog.brown.edu:16080/~demuth/Articles/2007DemuthMcLeod.pdf> [Accessed 16 August 2012, 10h 30].
- Deutsch, G 2008. *Film ist. A Primer for a Visual World*. Available: <http://www.gustavdeutsch.net/index.php/en/shop/91-film-ist-eine-fibel-fuer-eine-sichtbare-welt.html> [Accessed 30 November 2011, 09h 30].
- Dick, B 2005. *Anatomy of Film*. Fifth Edition. Boston: Bedford St. Martins.
- Dobies, AB 2002. *Theory into Practice: An Introduction to Literary Criticism*. Boston: Thomson.

- Donald, J 2008. *The Sage Handbook of Film Studies*. London: SAGE.
- Dorfman, M H 1996. 'Evaluating the Interpretive Community: Evidence from Expert and Novice Readers'. *Poetics* 23: 453-470.
- Dyer, R 2000. 'Introduction to Film Studies'. In Hill John (eds). *Film Studies: Critical Approaches*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Eagleton, T 1996. *Literary Theory: An Introduction*. Second Edition. Cambridge: University of Minnesota Press.
- Elsom, J 1974. 'Fugard, Athol 1932- '. In John Ferrers (eds). *Modern Commonwealth Literature*. New York: Fredrick Ungar Publishing Company.
- Encarta Dictionary*. DVD Version. 2010. Microsoft Corporation.
- Encyclopedia Britannica* (2011). 'Alienation Effects'. Available <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/15423/alienation-effect> [Accessed 28 February 2011, 14h 59]
- Feldman, P 2011. 'Feldman @the flicks'. Available: www.artlinks.co.za/news_articles.htm [Accessed 25 June 2011, 11h 25].
- Fish, S E 1970. 'Literature in the Reader: Affective Stylistics.' *New Literary History* 2: 123-162.
- Fish, S E 1980. *Is There a Text in This Class?* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Fiske, J 2011. *Television Culture*. Second Edition. New York: Routledge.
- Frank, H 2004. *Role Play in South African Theatre*. Germany: Pia Thielmann & Eckhard Breitinger.
- Freytag, G 1968. *Techniques of Drama*. Translated by G. MacEwan. New York: Blom.
- Fuchs, A 2002. *Playing the Market: The Market Theatre, Johannesburg*. Amsterdam: Rodopi B.V.

- Fugard, A 1983. *Notebooks 1960-1977*. Mary Benson (ed). London: Faber & Faber.
- Fugard, A 1993. 'Some Problems of a Playwright from South Africa'. *Twentieth Century Literature* 39(4): 381-93.
- Goff, B 2007 (ed). *Crossroads in the Black Aegean: Oedipus, Antigone, and Dramas of the African Diaspora*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goldstein, P 2005. Reader-Response Theory and Criticism. In Michael Groden (eds), *The Johns Hopkins Guide to Literary Theory & Criticism*. Second Edition. Baltimore, Md. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Gontarski, SE 1999. 'Revising Himself: Performance as Text in Samuel Beckett's Theatre'. *Journal of Modern Literature* 21: 131-155.
- Goodheart, E 1983. 'The Text and the Interpretive Community'. *Daedalus* 112: 215-231.
- Gordimer, N 1967 (ed). *South African Writing Today*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin.
- Gray, M 1992. *A Dictionary of Literary Terms*. Beirut: York Press.
- Gray, S 1978 (ed). *Theatre One: New South African Drama*. Johannesburg: Ad Donker.
- Gray, S 1979. *Southern African Literature: An Introduction*. New York: Bames & Noble.
- Gray, S 1982. *Athol Fugard*. Johannesburg: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Griffin, G 2005 (ed). *Research Methods for English Studies*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Groden, M 2005 (ed). *The Johns Hopkins Guide to Literary Theory & Criticism*. Second Edition. Baltimore, Md. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hauptfleisch, T 1997. *Theatre and Society in South Africa: Some Reflections in a Fractured Mirror*. Hatfield, Pretoria: J.L. Van Schaik Academic.

- Hayward, S 2000. *Cinema Studies: The Key Concepts*. Second Edition. New York: Routledge.
- Henry, W 1985. *Theatre: Brothers the Blood Knot*. Available: www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,959974,00.html [Accessed on 13 June 2011, 13h 00].
- Heywood, C 2004. *A History of South African Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Holden, S 1988. Review/Theater: Fugard in Beckett Mode. Available: www.nytimes.com/1988/08/10/theater/review-theater-fugard-in-beckett-mode.html?src=pm [Accessed on 14 July 2011, 15h 00].
- Holland, NN 1975. 'Unity, Identity Text Self'. PMLA 90. In Tompkins, JP. (ed) (1980). *Reader-response Criticism: From Formalism to Post-structuralism*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hollows, J 2000 (ed). *The Film Studies Reader*. New York: Arnold.
- Holub, R C 1984. *Reception Theory: A Critical Introduction*. London and New York: Methuen.
- Horrell, M 1960. *A Survey of Race Relations in South Africa 1958-1959*. Available: <http://www.nelsonmandela.org/omalley/cis/omalley/OMalleyWeb/dat/SAIRR%20Survey%201958-59.pdf> [Accessed 23 August 2012, 11h 06].
- James, D 2008. *The Sage Handbook of Film Studies*. London: SAGE.
- Jauss, H R 1982. *Towards an Aesthetics of Reception*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.
- Jordan, J 1993. 'Life in the Theatre: Autobiography, Politics, and Romance in "Master Harold" ... and the Boys'. *Twentieth Century Literature* 39(4): 461-472.
- Kannemeyer, J. C. 2005. *Die Afrikaanse Literatuur 1652-2004*. Cape Town: Human & Rousseau [Cited in Van Coller 2008].

- Kidnie, J M 2009. *Shakespeare and the Problem of Adaptation*. New York: Routledge.
- Krueger, A 2010. *Experiment in Freedom: Explorations of Identity in New South African Drama*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Krueger, A 2011. Personal Discussions. 5 July 2011. Drama Department, Rhodes University, Grahamstown.
- Kruger, L 2004. *Post-Imperial Brecht Politics and Performance, East and South*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kuritz, P 1988. *The Making of Theatre History*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Laurel, BR 1999 (ed). *An Ambulance of the Wrong Colour: Health Professionals, Human Rights and Ethics in South Africa*. Juta and Company Limited.
- Leitch, B 2010. *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*. New York: Norton.
- MacIntyre, A 2011. *Playwrights Athol Fugard and Eve Ensler honored at Tony Awards*. Available: www.monstersandcritics.com/arts/news/article_1631201.php/Playwrights-Athol-Fugard-and-Eve-Ensler-honored-at-Tony-Awards [Accessed 23 June 2011, 16h 45].
- Makaryk, IR 1993. *Encyclopedia of Contemporary Literary Theory*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Marino, K 2009. 'Athol Fugard has Created Theater of Power, Glory, and Majestic Language'. *New York Times*. Available: www.courttheatre.org/season/article/athol_fugard_biography/ [Accessed 28 July 2012].
- Marino, K 2010. 'The Study Guide for "Master Harold"... and the Boys'. *Time Line Theatre* 1: 1-12.
- Marowski, DG 1986. *Athol Fugard 1932- . In Contemporary Literary Criticism*. Gale 40: 195-204.
- Mawter, J 2005. *Humour in Literature: Why Gross Works for Kids*. Available: <http://www.jenimawter.com/pdfs/Humour%20in%20Literature.pdf> [Accessed 19 June 2012, 18h 45].

- McDonald, P 2009. *The Literature Police: Apartheid Censorship and its Cultural Consequences*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mda, Z 1995. 'Theater and Reconciliation in South Africa'. *Theater* 25(3): 38-45.
- Meersman, B 2010. *Interview: Athol Fugard*. Available: <http://www.brentmeersman.book.co.za/blog> [Accessed 18 July 2012, 16h 35].
- Mfeka, Z 2011. *An Older, Wiser Fugard*. Available: <http://www.timeslive.co.za/entertainment/2011/05/22/an-older-wiser-fugard> [Accessed 29 May 2012, 01:21].
- Milios, J 2000. 'Social Classes in Classical and Marxist Political Economy'. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 59(2): 283-302.
- Miller, A 2006. *From Word into Pictures: in Conversation with Athol Fugard*. Available: www.electrica.org/vion4/miller.html [Accessed 20 June 2011, 10h 45].
- Molusi, O and A Molepo (2011). Interview with Actors. 24 July 2011. Johannesburg: Market Theatre.
- Monaco, J 2000a. *How to Read a Film*. Multimedia Edition. New York: Harbor Electronic Publishing.
- Monaco, J 2000b. *How to Read a Film: The World of Movies, Media, and Multimedia: Language, History, Theory*. Third Edition. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Moritz, C 2001. *Scriptwriting for the Screen*. New York: Routledge.
- Murfin, RC 2009. *The Bedford Glossary of Critical and Literary Terms*. Third Edition. Boston: Bedford Martins.
- Ndebele, N 1998. 'Memory, Metaphor, and The Triumph of Narrative.' In Sarah Nuttall and Carli Coetzee (eds). *Negotiating the Past: The Making of Memory in South Africa*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Nelmes, J 2007. *Introduction to Film Studies*. Second Edition. New York: Routledge.

- Newman, L 2012. 'Hardship and Tragedy hit the Road Again'. Available: www.iol.co.za/tonight/news/local/hardship-and-tragedy-hit-the-road-again-1.1250117. [Accessed 10 June 2012, 9h 50].
- Nkosi, L 2007. 'Postmodernism and Black Writing in South Africa'. In Tejumola Olaniyan and Ato Quayson (eds). *African Literature: an Anthology of Criticism and Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Orkin, M 1991. *Drama and the South African State*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Oxford Dictionary Online (2011). 'Context'. Available: www.english.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/context [Accessed 27 October 2011, 13h 00].
- Oxford Dictionary Online (2011). 'Ethnography'. Available: www.english.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/ethnography [Accessed 27 June 2011, 13h 00].
- Oxford Dictionary Online (2011). 'Lateral Thinking'. Available: www.english.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/lateralthinking [Accessed 27 October 2011, 13h 00].
- Pan, E 2000. 'On The Island'. *Newsweek* (Atlantic Edition). Vol. 135: 13.
- Peters, M 2011. 'Fugard feels Betrayed by his Country'. Available: www.iol.co.za/news/south-africa/western-cape/fugard-feels-betrayed-by-his-country-1.730930 [Accessed 30 June 2011, 10h 55].
- Pfister R. 2010 (ed). 'Women Need to Get Much More Self-Confident and Tough'. Available: <http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/0,1518,728175,00.html> [Accessed 22 July 2011].
- Prentki, T 2001. 'Somewhere over the Rainbow? Cultural Intervention and Self-Development in the New South Africa'. *South African Theatre Journal* 15: 119-134.

- Qadeer, U 2001. 'Emotional, Insightful and Emphatic'. Available: <http://www.amazon.com/Master-Harold-Boys-Penguin-Plays/dp/0140481877> [Accessed 15 January 2012].
- Questia Online 2011. 'South African Literature'. Available: www.questia.com/library/literature/literature-of-specific-countries/african-literature/south-african-literature.jsp [Accessed 22 October 2011, 13h 00].
- Rampton, M 2008. 'The Three Waves of Feminism'. *Pacific Journals*. 41. Available: www.pacific.edu/magazine_archives/2008/fall/echoes/feminism.cfm [Accessed 22 August 2011].
- Richards, L 1989. 'Athol Fugard, The Art of Theater No. 8'. *The Paris Review* 111. Available: <http://www.theparisreview.org/interviews/2416/the-art-of-theater-no-8-athol-fugard> [Accessed 10 January 2012].
- Rose, G 2005. 'Visual Methodologies.' In Griffin, G 2005 (ed). *Research Methods for English Studies*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Ross, H 1995. 'Assimilation and Transformation of African and European Literary Traditions in the Present Day South African Novel'. *Journal of Literary Studies* 11(2): 1-15.
- Ruthven, K 1979. *Critical Assumptions*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- SAFINDIT, 2011. 'A Tony for SA's Story-Teller' [online]. Available: www.safindit.co.za/blog/?p=1653 [accessed 2 August 2011, 11h 09].
- Schenkeveld-van der Dussen, M. A. 1993. 'Woord Vooraf' In Schenkeveld-van der Dussen, M. A. (main editor). *Nederlandse Literatuur, een Geschiedenis* [Dutch Literature. A History]. Groningen: Martinus Nijhoff. [Quoted in Van Coller 2008]
- Schipper, M 1982. *Theatre and Society in Africa*. Johannesburg: Ravan Press.
- Schipper, M 1990. *Beyond the Boundaries: Text and Context in African Literature*. Chicago: I.R. Dee.
- Shelley, A 2009. *Athol Fugard: His Plays, People and Politics*. London: Oberon Books.

- Siegel, K 2006. *Introduction to Modern Literary Theory*. Available: www.kristisiegel.com/theory.htm [Accessed 30 September 2011, 12h 45].
- Sprinker, M 1982. 'Picture of Reality: Aesthetics, Politics and Pleasure'. *Minnesota Review* 19(1): 154- 156.
- Steadman, IP 1985. 'Drama and Social Consciousness: Themes in Black Theatre on the Witwatersrand until 1985'. PhD Thesis. Johannesburg: University of the Witwatersrand.
- Sutton, B 2001. 'Fugard's *Master Harold and the Boys*'. *Explicator* 59(1): 109-111.
- Swanepoel, C 2011. *Fugard Finally Cracks Tony Nod*. Available: www.thenewage.co.za/20490-1022-53-Fugard_finally_cracks_Tony_nod [Accessed 24 June 2011, 14h 33].
- Thale, T 2011. *South African Literature*. Available: <http://www.southafrica.info/about/arts/literature.htm> [Accessed 30 September 2011, 11h 30].
- Theatre Voice*, 2010. 'Legendary South African Playwright Athol Fugard Interviewed'. [Podcast] October 2010. Available: www.theatrevoice.com/2585/legendary-south-african-playwright-athol-fugard-interviewed/ [Accessed 28 June 2011, 13h 45].
- Thompson, L 2001. *A History of South Africa*. Third Edition. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Thurman, C. Christopher.Thurman@wits.ac.za, 2011. Fw: contact with Athol Fugard? NOPE. [Email] message to O.G Oluwasuji (sujitoba@yahoo.com). Received Wednesday, May 11, 2011 12h31.
- Thurman, C 2011. 'Political Correctness Takes Away your Balls'. Available: www.mg.co.za/article/2011-05-13-political-correctness-takes-away-your-balls [Accessed 13 July 2011, 11h 33].
- Van Coller, H 2008. 'Recently Published South African Literary Histories'. *English in Africa* 35(1): 151-175.
- Vandenbroucke, R 1982. 'Robert Zwelinzima is Alive'. In Stephen Gray (ed) *Athol Fugard*. Johannesburg: McGraw Hill.

- Vandenbroucke, R 1986. *Truths the Hand can Touch: The Theatre of Athol Fugard*. Craighall: AD Donker.
- Van Vuuren, H. 1994. 'Introduction: Literary Historiography, with Specific Reference to the Problems of the South African Context'. *JLS/TLW* 10(3/4): 261-78.
- Walder, D 1984. *Athol Fugard*. London: Macmillan.
- Walder, D 1992. 'Resituating Fugard: South African Drama as Witness'. *New Theatre Quarterly* 8(32): 343-61.
- Walder, D 1994. 'South Africa Drama and Ideology: The Case of Athol Fugard'. In Boehmer, Elleke (eds) *Altered State? Writing and South Africa*. Sydney: Dangeroo Press.
- Wertheim, A 1986. 'Political Acting and Political Action: Athol Fugard's *The Island*'. *World Literature Writing in English* 26(2): 245-252.
- Wertheim, A 2000. *The Dramatic Art of Athol Fugard: From South Africa to the World*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Wood, D. 'High Definition for Europe': A Progressive Approach. *EBU Technical Review* 1: 1-11.
- Zinman, T 2012. *A Fugard Drama about a Cruel South African Prison*. Available: www.articles.philly.com/2012-05-25/news/31851473_1_creon-antigone-winston-ntshona [Accessed 26 August 2012].