

Bibliotekarstudentens nettleksikon om litteratur og medier

Av Helge Ridderstrøm (førsteamanuensis ved OsloMet – storbyuniversitetet)

Sist oppdatert 20.04.26

Om leksikonet: https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no/gallery/om_leksikonet.pdf

Satire

(_litterær_praksis, _sjanger) Tekster og andre uttrykk med sterke, men humoristisk spottende og samfunnskritiske innslag (på tvers av medier og sjangergrenser), med angrep på fiender (mens ironi ofte kan oppfattes som angrep på venner). Det er kritiserende og refsende uttrykk på grunnlag av bestemte moralske normer, ofte med store overdrivelser.

Satiren rommer en fiendtlig eller aggressiv tendens; den er en komisk negativ framstilling av det negative (Kayser 1973 s. 381-383). Satirikeren framstår ofte som en person med sterk moralsk overbevisning, en person som kan skille mellom godt og ondt, sant og usant. Satiren er et våpen i sannhetens tjeneste, og brukes til å avsløre det usanne og onde (Zohra Rahmouni i <https://episteme.revues.org/953>; lesedato 02.06.16). Det brukes “overdrivelseskunst” f.eks. for å advare mot noe (Neuhaus og Holzner 2007 s. 462).

En satire er et stridslystent verk som vil tilbakevise noe gjennom et deformerende speil (Marc Angenot gjengitt fra <https://www.enssib.fr/bibliotheque-numerique/documents/61745-le-comique.pdf>; lesedato 23.01.26).

“An object is criticized because it falls short of some standard which the critic desires that it should reach. Inseparable from any definition of satire is its corrective purpose, expressed through a critical mode which ridicules or otherwise attacks those conditions needing reformation in the opinion of the satirist. I believe there is no satire without this corrective purpose. [...] A reasonable definition of satire, then, is “a literary manner which blends a critical attitude with humor and wit to the end that human institutions or humanity may be improved. The true satirist is conscious of the frailty of institutions of man’s devising and attempts through laughter not so much to tear them down as to inspire a remodeling” (Thrall, et al 436). [...] Far from being simply destructive, satire is implicitly constructive” (Robert Harris i <http://www.virtualsalt.com/satire.htm>; lesedato 24.10.04).

“Satire is the art of making someone or something look ridiculous, raising laughter in order to embarrass, humble, or discredit its targets. [...] Regardless of which type of satire is being deployed, it must take aim at a target that is larger or more

powerful than the author. Otherwise, instead of satire we have mere cruelty or bullying. So satire is very context-dependent.” (Evan Gottlieb i <https://liberalarts.oregonstate.edu/wlf/what-satire>; lesedato 08.08.22)

“The application of the satiric method can be quite broad because satire itself is more of an attitude or stance, than a genre or type of literature: “It is not bounded by form and structure but exists as an approach to a situation which can be present in any of the many literary forms” (Haas 2). There are several characteristics which distinguish satire, however [...] it must be ironic in tone to cope with the hypocritical situation of the reprobates in the world, and for the same reason it tends to be hyperbolic in form to force recognition of vice upon the guilty. (Hyperbole or irony alone does not constitute satire: a critical element must be involved.) Another characteristic of most satire is the use of wit to make the attack clever, or humor to make it funny. [...] The basic mood of attack and disapproval needs to be softened to some extent and made more palatable; wit and humor serve this end by making the criticism entertaining, and even attractive.” (Robert Harris i <http://www.virtualsalt.com/satire.htm>; lesedato 24.10.04)

Noen mener satire er en sjanger: “Satiren er beskrevet som en litterær sjanger som angriper noen for å latterliggjøre dem; en kritisk og bitende komisk framstilling av en mangel, løgn eller urettferdighet.” (Brigitte Bouquet og Jacques Riffault i <https://shs.cairn.info/revue-vie-sociale-2010-2-page-13>; lesedato 23.01.26) “Satire er en sjangerbetegnelse og ikke noen spesiell retorisk teknikk. I dagens språkbruk dekker begrepet diktning som angriper samtidas skrøpeligheter med spottende midler. Disse midlene kan være både ironi, parodi og sarkasme.” (Lindholm 1983 s. 47)

“It may be objected here that not all satire is meant to be corrective, because satirists occasionally attack foibles or failings basic to man’s nature which cannot be changed, or for which change is unlikely. But it can be argued in reply that such satire of inexpungible vices is still corrective, for it seeks to establish proper moral attitudes toward those vices. For example, if it be impossible to rid men of jealousy or egotism, the satirist will try to make men despise those feelings, resist them, and cease encouraging them. [...] Derived by implication from this corrective purpose, the theme of satire must be the maintenance of standards, the reaffirmation of values, and the necessity of reform. [...] The satirist does not need to state specific moral alternatives to replace the villainy he attacks because the morality is either already present in the lip service his target pays to virtue, or it is apparent by implication.” (Robert Harris i <http://www.virtualsalt.com/satire.htm>; lesedato 24.10.04)

“Satiren har til ulike tider hatt ulike formål, men sentrale kjennetegn er sjangerens latterliggjøring av et tydelig utpekt mål, omfattende bruk av ironi, humor og vidd, et ønske om å avsløre hykleri og dobbeltmoral, samt en ambisjon om å endre samfunnet til det bedre.” (Elise Dybvig i *Morgenbladet* 21.–27. juli 2007 s. 38)

“[S]atire is one of the means of relief necessary for us to go on facing problems of the highest import.” (Pollard 1970 s. 10)

Satire “impliserer forsvaret av et moralsk prinsipp [...] Den satiriske tonen består av to elementer: På den ene siden humoren eller vittigheten, på den andre siden et objekt som blir angrepet [...] satiren skal vekke motstridende følelser: opprørhet eller sinne på den ene siden og lystighet på den andre. Disse følelsene oppstår likevel ikke samtidig, men separat: Satirikerer ønsker nemlig å få mottakerne til å le av en moralsk urettferdig situasjon, som deretter blir oppfattet som nettopp en slik situasjon og dermed gjør mottakerne opprørt. Det komiske innslaget i satiren har dermed en relevant sosial funksjon. I sin avhandling om satiren peker Melville Clark (1975: 131) imidlertid på at “the general purpose of satire is not to cure anything or reform anybody, but to give to the reader a kind of astringent pleasure like an acid drop or a dash of bitters”.” (Simone L. Bue i <https://unipub.uni-graz.at/obvugrhs/content/titleinfo/1835162/full.pdf>; lesedato 27.10.21; oversatt av HR)

“Satire always has a victim, it always criticizes. Why does the satirist act in this way? His first task is to convince his audience of the worth – even more, of the necessity – of what he is doing. He must mean, or at any rate convince his readers that he means, what he says.” (Pollard 1970 s. 73) Det som kritiseres kan være avstanden mellom et ideal og virkeligheten.

“*Satire* (a.k.a. corrective humor; Ruch and Heintz, 2016b) shares with sarcasm and cynicism the detection of weaknesses and is aggressive. However, this is paired with attempts at goodness. This involves not only deprecating the bad and foolish, but also the intention of improving the world and correcting fellow humans. A satirist takes the ethical world as a measure of the real one and attempts to improve conditions by disclosing the true circumstances. The satirist is critical, often negative, tense and superior, but prefers the world to be moral and uses ridicule to better the world. Although the aggressive tendency is the common element, the mockery is not done on the basis of sheer pleasure, but it is grounded in a moral-based criticism. People with a critical mindset typically approve satire. The goodness of satire appeals to change inappropriate behaviors or mindsets without seriously damaging the interpersonal relations.” (Sonja Heintz m.fl. i <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/psychology/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00006/full>; lesedato 23.01.26)

“[G]eneral satire, aimed at many, is more common and more important than specific attacks on single persons, since the satirist’s ideal is the reformation or regeneration of a whole society. The general correction of vice is the primary aim because the satirist can live with a few very evil men more easily than he can with ten thousand somewhat less evil men who are pulling his world toward doom [...] In addition, the less evil are more likely to be corrigible than the totally corrupt.” (Robert Harris i <http://www.virtualsalt.com/satire.htm>; lesedato 24.10.04)

“Satiren kommer av latinske *satira* eller *satura* som betyr en sammensatt matrett, eller et fat med forskjellig slags frukt. Den litterære betydningen av satire er en miks av forskjellige former for litteratur, ofte en kritisk, latterliggjørende diktning av spottende karakter som blottlegger menneskelige svakheter og peker på skjevheter i samfunnet. Gjennom satiren forsøker forfatteren ved hjelp av humor og vidd å forbedre mennesket og samfunnet, og avkle hykleriet. Samtidig forsøker den å inspirere til modernisering eller omstrukturering. Tonen kan variere fra å være humoristisk og ertende til en sarkastisk og hånlig, bitende kritikk. (Lothe 1997: 226). Northrop Frye fremhever to viktige trekk ved satiren i *Anatomy of Criticism* (1957): Det ene er at humor ofte er forankret i fantasien, eller en følelse av det groteske og absurde. Den andre er at satiren alltid har et objekt for sin kritikk eller sitt angrep (Frye 2000: 224). Satirens angrep kan være humoristisk, men kan også komme i form av ren angivelse. Angrep på et individ, eller en gruppe bør være grunnlagt på en gjensidig mistillit eller forståelse av det uønskede i samfunnet. Dette medfører blant annet at satirens innhold ofte er grunnlagt på nasjonalt hat, snobberi, fordommer, personlig stolthet og fornærmelser, temaer som fort mister sin aktualitet. Den politiske satiren tar opp aktuelle tema, men den mister publikums interesse når dens tema ikke lenger er politisk eller samfunnsmessig aktuelt. Dette er en av årsakene til at mange i dag ikke kjenner til *Gulliver's Travels* som satire, men tror boken er et eventyr.” (Krog 2004)

Svært mange populære filmer, tv-programmer, tegneserier osv. driver satire.

“Buktaler-satire” (“ventriloquial satire”) går ut på “presenting a play in the voice of another poet whose purpose is to make fun of that individual and his comic practices [...] alert us to the possibility of a comic poet’s having written a play as though it were by another poet in order to attack that poet.” (Keith Sidwell i <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/25528418.pdf>; lesedato 22.12.22)

Satire “is a kind of humor that sides with humanism or the cause of the common man. It is a fictional type of writing that mocks or scorns its subjects (people, institutions, society in general) and points at the problem in order to attempt a change in the system. The motive is not so much to entertain as to make to a political or social statement. Satire uses recognizable elements from an original work to make fun of something else. It is a popular means to make a point, which is why irony, hyperbole, understatement, allegories are widely used in composing satires.” (<http://www.differencebetween.info/difference-between-spoof-parody-and-satire>; lesedato 06.04.18)

Den tyske forfatteren Kurt Tucholsky skrev: “Satirikerer er en krenket idealist: han vil ha en god verden, men den er dårlig, og nå angriper han det dårlige.” (sitert fra Neuhaus og Holzner 2007 s. 21) Satirikerer kan rette et etsende blikk mot anerkjente normer og verdier, og refse det som anses som “common sense”. Men satiriske verk springer ofte ut av såret kjærlighet til noe, og kjærligheten viser seg i verket på tross av forakt og andre negative følelser som kommer til uttrykk. For

satirikeren er verden er sted som har kommet ut av sitt rette spor, og både anklage og korrigering er derfor nødvendig (Zohra Rahmouni i <https://episteme.revues.org/953>; lesedato 02.06.16). “[T]he satirist is in theory a stern moralist castigating the vices of his time or place.” (T. S. Eliot sitert fra Pollard 1970 s. 50) “Satirikere er ikke drømmere, men leger.” (Enderle 1966 s. 8)

Noe i samfunnet eller ved en person “is in need of severe correction or has vices that need to be amended” (Price 1973 s. 43). “When man gets it out of proportion, the satirist must correct him. He restores us to sanity by making us laugh, sometimes generously, sometimes grimly. We should be able to enjoy even his anger. His correction may involve a compensating disproportion, but, provided that this is not extreme, we see its purpose and appreciate its effect.” (Pollard 1970 s. 21) “One function of satire is to confront us with a thing and to say ‘It is not what it seems. Look!’ ” (Pollard 1970 s. 19)

Satirikeren kan oppfattes som en “guardian of ideals. The best satire, that which is surest in tone, is that which is surest in its values. [...] Satire is always acutely conscious of the difference between what things are and what they ought to be. The satirist is often a minority figure; he cannot, however, afford to be a declared outcast. For him to be successful his society should at least pay lip-service to the ideals he upholds. If it does, he is placed in a more subtle and potentially more effective position than that of simple denouncer of vice. He is then able to exploit more fully the differences between appearance and reality and especially to expose hypocrisy. The hypocrite’s skin is notoriously more tender than that of the openly vicious. The one has nothing to conceal, the other everything. His whole reputation is at stake. Openly he subscribes to the ideals that secretly he ignores or defies. Such a man, we may feel, deserves exposure. To this extent the satirist is performing a socially and morally useful task of universal validity.” (Pollard 1970 s. 3)

“The satirist needs to know what he can convince his audience of as being important. If he gives too much rein to his own hobby-horse, as Juvenal does in his misogynistic sixth Satire, reaching a crescendo with the accusation that women had become so depraved that they had even taken to learning Greek, he is likely to find that his audience is laughing at him instead of at his intended victims. The satirist has to be careful, but in one respect he has extensive freedom. He does not labour under any formal restraint, for the variety of satire is almost infinite. This variety has never been better summarized than by A. Melville Clark, who, confining himself to what he calls regular verse satire, says: “It swings backwards and forwards, on an ellipse about the two foci of the satiric universe, the exposure of folly and the castigation of vice; it fluctuates between the flippant and the earnest, the completely trivial and the heavily didactic; it ranges from extremes of crudity and brutality to the utmost refinement and elegance; it employs singly or in conjunction monologue, dialogue, epistle, oration, narrative, manners-painting, character-drawing, allegory, fantasy, travesty, burlesque, parody, and any other

vehicle it chooses; and it presents a chameleon-like surface by using all the tones of the satiric spectrum, wit, ridicule, irony, sarcasm, cynicism, the sardonic and invective.” (*Studies in Literary Modes*, 1946, p. 32)” (Pollard 1970 s. 4-5)

Den russisk-amerikanske forfatteren Vladimir Nabokov ble i et intervju spurt om han “make a clear distinction between satire and parody”, og svarte: “Satire is a lesson, parody is a game.” (siteret fra Karrer 1977 s. 44-45)

“Even at its best, satire [...] exploits man’s fear of ridicule, and, although it can be argued that in a society in need of moral purgation, such a negative corrective is a product of lofty moral intentions or even that, as Lucian puts it in his defense of his own satirical writing, a hater of evil is implicitly a lover of good, it nonetheless remains true that in its destructive purpose and its engagement of destructive emotions, satire, even in its most intellectual forms, bears within itself as a possibility the spectacle of the “satire of blood,” the orgiastic indulgence of hatred” (Forcione 1982 s. 291-292).

“[S]atire turns out not to be a kind, but a whole group of genres, well characterized by [Gilbert] Highet himself, such as monologue, parodic satire, and narrative satire.” (Fowler 1982 s. 64) “Highet, who examines the use of denigratory names by Morier, Gogol, and others, goes so far as to say that “distorted or ridiculous names are always a sure sign of satire.” As we shall see, this is slightly overstated. Nevertheless, it is easy to think of other examples to put beside Gogol’s Hlopov (“Bedbug”) and Lyapkin-Tyapkin (“Bungle-Steal”). Joseph Heller’s satirical novel *Catch-22*, for example, has many such ridiculous names or nonnames: Mudd (“his name was Mudd”), Major Major Major Major, Scheisskopf, and Chief Halfoat.” (Fowler 1982 s. 75)

“Many dark, satirical novels came out of the US in the latter half of the 20th century, when the nation assumed leadership of the West after the shattering of Europe through two world wars, and the onset of the Cold War nuclear age. [...] *Catch-22*, the satirical novel by American Joseph Heller (1923-99), is set in World War II, although the book can be read as a commentary on the ongoing Vietnam War.” (Canton, Cleary m.fl. 2016 s. 276)

“As Melville Clark puts it, ‘the laughter of the cynic is edged with contempt, but sardonic laughter is blunted with chagrin and mortification’ (op. cit., p. 49). But the sardonic is on the edge of weeping because it is on the edge of uncontrollable anger. That is why its laugh is so bitter. [Jonathan] Swift has expressed this aspect of the sardonic position:

Like the ever-laughing Sage
In a Jest I spend my Rage
(Tho’ it must be understood
I would hang them if I cou’d:)

(‘Epistle to A Lady’, 171-4)”

(Pollard 1970 s. 70) “Melville Clark’s list is sufficiently comprehensive – ‘wit, ridicule, irony, sarcasm, cynicism, the sardonic and invective’. All these hurt, because satire aims to hurt” (Pollard 1970 s. 66).

En paskvill er et smedeskrift som kan virke direkte ondskapsfullt. “A pasquinade is a satire, usually done in writing and posted in public. A skit, flyer, or cartoon can be a pasquinade – as long as its intent is to mock or ridicule something or someone. You can find examples of modern pasquinades on late night television political sketches and in newspaper political cartoons that mercilessly make fun of public figures. Today, you’re probably more likely to use a synonym for pasquinade, such as lampoon or satire. But neither of those words can say they got their name from Pasquino, a 500 years-old statue in Rome where people posted lampoons and satirical poems.” (<https://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/pasquinade>; lesedato 22.12.22)

“Sarcasm is irony without the mystery and the refinement. It is essentially incidental and verbal. It is also cruder than irony, a much blunter instrument. It is lacking in generosity. It has been called, not without justice, the lowest form of wit.” (Pollard 1970 s. 68) Det har blitt hevdet at all satire driver “corrosive exposure and correction of abuses” (Forcione 1982 s. 306), og sarkasme er en slik “etsende” strategi.

“Cynicism and the sardonic are closely related. Both of them issue from a deep sense of disillusion, and the two often occur in close relationship.” (Pollard 1970 s. 69)

“The satirist is not an easy man to live with. He is more than usually conscious of the follies and vices of his fellows and he cannot stop himself from showing that he is. He is in a difficult position, for he can so easily lay himself open to the charge of moral superiority or even of hypocrisy if people think that they see in him the faults he condemns in others. If he escape these charges, he may still have to counter that of mere personal animosity against his victims, of being ‘a mean spiteful little wretch’, as Humbert Wolfe described Pope (*Notes on English Verse Satire*, 1929, p. 105). [...] the satirist seeks to persuade and convince [...] The satirist may seem to condemn too easily, even to enjoy doing it. [...] Satire as healer and corrective gives way to satire as punishment.” (Pollard 1970 s. 1-2)

“Satire is a literary technique of writing or art which principally ridicules its subject (individuals, organisations, states) often as an intended means of provoking or preventing change. The word satire derives from the Latin *satira*, meaning “medley” or a “dish filled with mixed fruits.” A satire, either in prose or in poetic form, holds prevailing vices or follies up to ridicule: it employs humor and wit to criticize human institutions or humanity itself, in order that they might be

remodeled or improved. Satire arouses laughter or scorn as a means of ridicule and derision, with the avowed intention of correcting human faults. Common targets of satire include individuals (“personal satire”), types of people, social groups, institutions, and human nature. Like tragedy and comedy, satire is often a mode of writing introduced into various literary forms; it is only a genre when it is the governing principle of a work. Satirists attempt through laughter not so much to tear down as to inspire a remodeling. If attackers simply abuse, they are writing invective; if they are personal and splenetic, they are writing sarcasm; if they are sad and morose over the state of society, they are writing irony.” (<http://www.deltasd.bc.ca/se/english12/eng1207satireparody.pdf>; lesedato 15.04.14)

“The satirist, like the orator, is entering a protest in public, addressing an audience with a view to changing its attitudes and disturbing its complacency. In satires with a strong framework of logic and argument, or in which the author offers an apologia for his muse and his career, elements of judicial oratory, especially techniques of proof and refutation, may be relevant. Besides *vituperatio*, the attack on wicked and unworthy individuals, satire will also adopt loftier rhetorical ends: dissuasion from vice and folly, and praise of those whose example deserves to be followed.” (Dixon 1971 s. 53-54)

“1) Hensikten med satire er samfunnskritikk, hensikten med sjikanen er å provosere/degradere sjikanens gjenstand evt. mottaker. 2) Senderintensjonen i satire er å erte, senderintensjonen for sjikanen er å være ondskapsfull. 3) Satiren er en kompleks retorisk ytring, ofte allegorisk og utpreget dannelsesforankret, den krever solid kulturell innsikt og erfaring for å forstås relevant. Sjikanen er rå, folkelig og umiddelbar og krever kun hverdagserfaring for å forstås relevant – når det er sagt: satire oppleves ofte som sjikanøs av den som lett lar seg krenke eller opplever sin tro/overbevisning/kunnskap som hellig.” (retorikk-professor Kjell Lars Berge i *Morgenbladet* 27. november–3. desember 2015 s. 7)

“In his mischievous private role the satirist must carry his reader by the virtuosity of his art, because he cannot rely on mere malice. He cannot even rely on a private dispute, however righteous he may think his own cause: ‘It is great vanity to think anyone will attend to a thing, because it is your quarrel’ (Steele, *Tatler*, No. 242). Indeed, in this essay Steele argues the need for good nature as an ‘essential quality in a satirist’, because ‘the ordinary subjects for satire are such as incite the greatest indignation in the best tempers’. Men of such make are also capable of the necessary detachment: ‘There is a certain impartiality necessary to make what a man says bear any weight with those he speaks to.’ The satirist may be abnormally sensitive, disillusioned, alienated, prejudiced, but, to have the best hope of success, he must appear detached, well-balanced, judicious and, did but the world allow it, capable of being better-natured than he seems. His aim is to move his readers to criticize and condemn and he will seek to do so by moving them to various emotions ranging from laughter through ridicule, contempt and anger to hate. The feelings evoked will depend on the seriousness of the faults attacked as well as on

the stance which the author himself adopts, the view he takes of the gap between the ideal and the reality.” (Pollard 1970 s. 74)

Det har blitt hevdet at det som angripes og forkastes i en satire, er det som satirikeren føler seg tiltrukket og nesten overveldet av, slik at det som satiren skal befri oss fra, samtidig er det som satirikeren ikke klarer å befri seg selv fra (Sigbert S. Prawer gjengitt fra Vietta 1983 s. 142).

Leseren av en satirisk tekst “is taking pleasure at another’s discomfort, but he is also tacitly assuming his own superiority or congratulating himself on his own escape. Such reactions are easier, the nearer we are to the circumstances in question. [Alexander] Pope’s readers could enjoy his victims’ discomforts, because they might know the victims and feel that they deserved their fate. For us that degree of engagement is impossible, and yet living satire must somehow be able to make us re-live the original experience. It does so [...] in one or both of two ways – by convincing us that the underlying attitudes have a permanent significance transcending the ephemeral circumstances or by the sheer artistry in the execution of the satire.” (Pollard 1970 s. 74-75)

“Alexander Pope definerte i sin imitation af den romerske lyriker Horats’ *First Satire of the Second Book* eksempelvis satire som det dydige kompromis mellem smiger og æreskrænkelser, der “heals with Morals what it hurts with Wit” (cit. i Maresca 1964, 367). Han insisterte på, at hans satirer var en anstændig reaktion på provokationer udefra, da de laster, han oplevede, var så skandaløse, at han måtte ytre sig imod dem (Maner 1980, 560).” (Møller 2013)

“Ein satiriskar er alltid bileststormar på eit vis. Satiren spring alltid ut av eit medvit om at dei fasttømra førestillingane vi har om verda og livet, er illusjonar og konstruksjonar tufta på makt, og at vegen til ei omkalfatring av maktforhold går gjennom ein kamp om språk og førestillingar. Satiriskaren er rasjonalist: han meiner å vite at det går ei grense mellom fornuft og ufornuft, sjølv om han ikkje alltid veit kvar denne grensa går.” (professor Atle Kittang i [http://arkiv.vinduet.no/tekst; lesedato 20.02.14](http://arkiv.vinduet.no/tekst;lesedato 20.02.14))

“This is the essence of successful satire – to get your victims ‘hopping mad’ and your audience ‘laughing their heads off’. [...] Thus we have [Robert] Burns’s unrestrained delight as he exposes the supplicant in ‘Holy Willie’s Prayer’, a petition mingled of secret candour, blind failure to recognize his sinfulness even though he confesses it, an unctuous sense of his own election and a vengeful desire against all who have crossed him. The wit derives from the simplicity, even the stupidity of a confession that does not recognize its own hypocrisy. [...] for a sustained and unrelenting sardonic exposure of religious hypocrisy Molière’s *Tartuffe* is unsurpassed.” (Pollard 1970 s. 12)

“An author may wish to outrage his audience, to ridicule, in fact, their seriousness. This is undoubtedly an element in Byron’s *The Vision of Judgment*. He may wish to expose a hollow seriousness, as with Samuel Butler’s *The Way of All Flesh*; or, as in the ages of faith he could do so easily, he may wish to inject some fun alongside, but without challenging, the seriousness.” (Pollard 1970 s. 10) “Samuel Butler was the grandson of Darwin’s old Shrewsbury headmaster. [...] Destined himself for the Church, Butler had read the *Origin* and become a devout Darwinian and an unbeliever. His anonymous novels, *Erewhon*, an anti-Christian satire, and *The Fair Haven*, a sly attack on the Resurrection, had won Darwin’s praise.” (Desmond og Moore 1991 s. 640)

“When we turn to the modes of satire we find that these are as various as its subjects. Few indeed are the literary forms that cannot accommodate at least a touch of satire, for satire is not only a chameleon adapting itself to its environment, it is capable of apparent metamorphosis, masquerading by parody in the very form it is criticizing.” (Pollard 1970 s. 22)

“Satirens spesialitet er å forstørre et lite flatterende karaktertrekk, en uheldig formulering eller en brist i et resonnement, for å frata avsenderen verdighet. Det mest ubehagelige i det offentlige ordsiftet er tilbøyeligheten til å lete etter og gnage på motstanderens svakeste punkt i stedet for å ta vedkommendes ytring på alvor som debattinnlegg.” (*Morgenbladet* 4.–10. desember 2015 s. 7)

Den såkalte “lyskasterteknikken” (Auerbach 1988 s. 378) går ut på å latterliggjøre gjennom å framheve en detalj (f.eks. britiske dommeres parykker) uten å ta med en forklaring på denne detaljen. Det er sant at denne detaljen finnes, men den fungerer absurd-komisk fordi den ikke settes inn i en større sammenheng eller forklares. (Når det gjelder parykkene, har det blitt hevdet at de gir dommerne en større, historisk forankret verdighet, markerer disse personene makt og dessuten gjør det vanskeligere for kriminelle å gjenkjenne dommere utenfor rettssalen.)

“The reader is surprised, comically shocked, by the unexpected collocation of ideas; yet though unexpected, he recognizes in them a certain truth or at any rate sufficient truth for the wit to be acceptable.” (Pollard 1970 s. 66)

En reiseberetning kan skildre satirisk hvordan skikker forandrer seg fra land til land, men kan også vise at mennesket i grunnen er seg selv lik overalt: Satirikeren “can work, that is, by either simple contrast, or apparent difference but basic similarity, or both.” (Pollard 1970 s. 36)

“There is also satiric comedy [...] Such comedy is kindly; it makes fun but accepts, it criticizes but appreciates; it laughs at but also laughs with its butt. Such is the comedy of Shakespeare’s Falstaff. Irony more serious than satire knows no bounds short of melancholia and madness. Its seriousness loses perspective; it is marked by ferocity and gloom. Such is the irony of Swift’s *Modest Proposal* to cure the

poverty and over-population of Ireland by the systematic rearing of its children as meat for the tables of the wealthy. Such is Hardy's fierce indictment of ironic disposition [...] his cryptic celebration of 'Christmas: 1924':

'Peace upon earth!' was said. We sing it,
And pay a million priests to bring it.
After two thousand years of mass
We've got as far as poison gas." (Pollard 1970 s. 5)

Karakter- og samfunnskomedier er vanligvis satiriske (Kayser 1973 s. 383). "Satire is irony with a victim, the literary derision of for instance persons or institutions, 'the attempt to diminish a subject by ridicule' (Abrams 2005, 276)." (Sørbo 2008 s. 38) "[T]he sharper the angle of the satirist's vision – in other words, the more closely his portraits resemble their real-life originals – the more likely it is that his victims may be shamed into mending their ways." (Howarth 1978 s. 6)

Den irske 1700-tallsforfatteren og presten Jonathan Swift skrev: "Satire is a sort of glass, wherein beholders do generally discover everybody's face but their own; which is the chief reason for that kind of reception it meets in the world, and that so very few are offended with it." Swift hevdet at "satire is not malice but medicine" (sitert fra <https://episteme.revues.org/953>; lesedato 02.06.16).

Satirikeren tar rollen som "a public benefactor. Thus Swift felt that things were so bad that he could write: 'The chief end I propose to my self in all my labours is to vex the world rather than divert it.' He also with his customary candour saw that there were "two ends that Men propose in writing Satyr, one of them less noble than the other, as regarding nothing further than the private Satisfaction, and Pleasure of the Writer ... The other is a publick Spirit, prompting men of genius, to mend the world as far as they are able." (*The Intelligencer*, Vol. III (1728)) (Pollard 1970 s. 73)

"In his "Verses on the Death of Dr. Swift," [1731] for example, Swift denies any malicious intent in his works, and affirms his purpose was correction:

As with a moral View design'd
To cure the Vices of Mankind:
His vein, ironically grave,
Expos'd the Fool, and lash'd the Knave.
.....
Yet, Malice never was his Aim;
He lash'd the Vice but spar'd the Name.
No Individual could resent,
Where Thousands equally were meant.
His Satyr points at no Defect,
But what all Mortals may correct. ...

(ll. 313-16, 459-64) [...]

In the *Intelligencer*, Number III, Swift also disclaims malice as a motive[:] “[...] my Design be to make mankind better; then I think it is my Duty; at least, I am sure it is the Interest of those very Courts and Ministers, whose Follies or Vices I ridicule, to reward me for my good Intentions.” [...] In his “Apology” prefixed to a *Tale of a Tub* in 1710, Swift says in discussing his purpose and method of this “useful and diverting” satire, “Why should any Clergyman of our Church be angry to see the Follies of Fanaticism and Superstition exposed, tho’ in the most ridiculous manner? since that is perhaps the most probable way to cure them, or at least to hinder them from further spreading”” (Robert Harris i <http://www.virtualsalt.com/satire.htm>; lesedato 24.10.04).

Noen satirer deler tydelig den kristne oppfatning om menneskets syndefall (Zohra Rahmouni i <https://episteme.revues.org/953>; lesedato 02.06.16).

Ian Johnston ved Malaspina University-College i British Columbia i Canada innsirkler fenomenet satire slik:

“Purpose of Satire”: “If we see someone or some group acting in a way we think is morally unacceptable and we wish to correct such behaviour, we have a number of options. We can try to force them to change their ways (through threats of punishment); we can deliver stern moral lectures, seeking to persuade them to change their ways; we can try the Socratic approach of engaging them in a conversation which probes the roots of their beliefs; or, alternatively, we can encourage everyone to see them as ridiculous, to laugh at them, to render them objects of scorn [...]. In doing so we will probably have at least two purposes in mind: first, to effect some changes in the behaviour of the target (so that he or she reforms) and, second, to encourage others not to behave in such a manner.”

“Morality of Satire”: “At the basis of every good traditional satire is a sense of moral outrage or indignation: This conduct is wrong and needs to be exposed. Hence, to adopt a satiric stance requires a sense of what is right, since the target of the satire can only be measured as deficient if one has a sense of what is necessary for a person to be truly moral.”

“Complications of Satire”: “One central challenge to the satirist is to be subtle and varied enough to keep the reader interested in the wit of the piece, while at the same time making it clear (but not obvious) that there is a satiric intent. ... Since most satires depend upon a certain awareness in the reader (awareness of events, of literary models being satirized, of irony working in the language), skillful satires tend to require a certain sophistication in the readers or viewers. A person insensitive to levels of irony in language will normally find satires difficult to follow (unless the irony is very obvious).” (Johnston her sitert fra <http://www.pkwy.k12.mo.us/west/teachers/gerding/satire.pdf>; lesedato 25.04.12)

“Techniques of Satire”:

Reduction	the degradation or devaluation of a victim by reducing his stature or dignity; belittling - a change in size - removal of signs of rank and status (usually clothes) - animal imagery which reduces man’s purposeful actions, the ambitious aims of which he is proud and the lusts of which he is ashamed, all to the level of brute instinct - vegetable or mineral imagery - caricature or parody - destruction of the symbol (a satirist who wants to show that an emblem is being used for unjust ends pretends not to understand its symbolic connotations; for example, the flag becomes just a piece of cloth. The person fails to see the symbolic values which society attaches to apparently trivial objects and actions.) The general idea of satire is to reduce everything to simple terms: the appeal is always to common sense, plain reason, simple logic.
Invective	open insult, used occasionally for shock effect According to Johnston, “It is the least inventive of the satirist's tools. A lengthy invective is sometimes called a diatribe. The danger of pure invective is that one can quickly get tired of it, since it offers limited opportunity for inventive wit.”
Irony	systematic use of double meaning; meaning of words is opposite of the literal or expected meaning
Caricature	“refers to the technique of exaggerating for comic and satiric effect one particular feature of the target, to achieve a grotesque or ridiculous effect. The term caricature generally refers more to drawing than it does to writing (e.g., the political cartoon). Almost all satire relies to some extent on the distortion of caricature. In that sense, satire is not concerned with psychological verisimilitude.” – Johnston
Burlesque	“refers to ridiculous exaggeration in language, usually one which makes the discrepancy between the words and the situation or the character silly. For example, to have a king speak like an idiot or a workman speak like a king (especially, say, in blank verse) is burlesque. Similarly, a very serious situation can be burlesqued by having the characters in it speak or behave in ridiculously inappropriate ways.” – Johnston
Reductio ad	“is a popular satiric technique (especially in Swift), whereby the

absurdum	author agrees enthusiastically with the basic attitudes or assumptions he wishes to satirize and, by pushing them to a logically ridiculous extreme, exposes the foolishness of the original attitudes and assumptions. Reductions are sometimes dangerous either because the reader does not recognize the satire at work or because the reader fails to identify the target clearly.”
----------	---

(tabellen er fra <http://www.pkwy.k12.mo.us/west/teachers/gerding/satire.pdf>; lesedato 25.04.12)

“Characteristics of Satire: 1. irony 2. paradox 3. antithesis 4. colloquialism 5. anticlimax 6. obscenity 7. violence 8. vividness 9. exaggeration” (<http://www.pkwy.k12.mo.us/west/teachers/gerding/satire.pdf>; lesedato 25.04.12).

“Satire is of two major types: formal (direct) satire, in which the satiric voice speaks either directly to the reader or to a character in the satire; and indirect satire, in which the satire is expressed through a narrative and the characters who are the butt are ridiculed by what they themselves say and do. In direct satire, a first-person speaker addresses either the reader or a character within the work (the adversarius) whose conversation helps further the speaker’s purposes, as in Alexander Pope’s “Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot” (1735). Indirect satire uses a fictional narrative in which characters who represent particular points of view are made ridiculous by their own behaviour and thoughts, and by the narrator’s usually ironic commentary. In Jonathan Swift’s *Gulliver’s Travels* (1726) the hero narrating his own adventures appears ridiculous in taking pride in his Lilliputian title of honour, “Nardac”; by making Gulliver look foolish in this way, Swift indirectly satirizes the pretensions of the English nobility, with its corresponding titles of “Duke” and “Marquess.” ” (<http://www.deltasd.bc.ca/se/english12/eng1207satireparody.pdf>; lesedato 15.04.14)

De som bruker satire, benytter seg ofte “av forstørrelse, forminskning eller forvrengning for å utfordre mottagerens meninger og fordommer. I dette ligger at satire godt kan inneholde utsagn som isolert sett kan tenkes å være uetiske, men som må aksepteres som en del av helheten. Ofte kan slike utsagn være nødvendige for budskapets kraft og retning.” (*Aftenposten* 27. februar 2009 s. 5)

“The essential attitude in satire is the desire to use precisely clear language to still an audience to protest. The satirist intends to describe painful or absurd situations or foolish or wicked persons or groups as vividly as possible. He believes that most people are blind, insensitive, and perhaps anesthetized by custom and resignation and dullness. The satirist wishes to make them see the truth – at least that part of the truth which they habitually ignore. [...] Satire is set apart from other literature by its fairly limited range of techniques. The essence of satire is wit, the power of giving pleasure by combining or contrasting ideas. Wit was originally defined as “mind,” then as “cleverness,” but now suggests the speech/writing that delights by

its unexpectedness.” (<http://www.pkwy.k12.mo.us/west/teachers/gerding/satire.pdf>; lesedato 25.04.12)

“Satiren skal utfordre vår tids vanetenkning. Men når utfordringen selv er ikledd de konvensjonelle gevantene til en tilnærmet rituell samfunnskritikk – “fridom er fridom til å velje i ein marknad” – kan man spørre om satiren ikke selv står i fare for å bli mer bekreftende enn utfordrende.” (fra Ane Farsethås’ anmeldelse av Frode Gryttens roman *Saganatt*, 2011; *Morgenbladet* 2.–8. september 2011 s. 37)

Satire kan inngå i litterære tekster, eller utgjøre en egen sjanger. Også bilder kan være satiriske (grafisk satire). Satire blir brukt som litterær sjangerbetegnelse i den tyske forfatteren Heinrich Bölls *Doktor Murkes samlede tausheter og andre satirer* (1958). Den israelske forfatteren Ephraim Kishon har publisert *Satire book I* (1981), *Satire book II* (1991), *Satire book III* (1992); på tysk er det utgitt utvalget *En perfekt ektemanns bekjennelser: Satirer*. “Ephraim Kishon (1924-2005) is one of the most popular writers and satirists of the world. In his satires Kishon tells the reader with a lot of love and irony about the “Israeli man in the street” and his fight against an all-powerful bureaucracy. But the most common victim of his satirical rage is his own family. Kishon was fighting a publicist war against the “modern art mafia” and the unhuman institution called marriage. But he wrote cynic political satires, too. Examples include satires about the Six Day War and the Yom Kippur War and Communism.” (<http://www.ephraimkishon.de/en/Kishon.htm>; lesedato 31.07.12)

Satire kan oppfattes som angrep på fiender eller på noe som fortjener å revolusjoneres eller utryddes, mens ironi tilsvarende er angrep på venner. Satirikeren vil ikke de han angriper vel. Staffan Bergsten opererer ikke med dette skillet mellom ironi og satire. For han er en satirisk tekst preget av “ironiskt kritiserande av olika missförhållanden” (Bergsten 1990 s. 96). Satire kan i noen tilfeller ha en viss grad av varme overfor sine “ofre”. Den engelske forfatteren Nancy Mitfords romaner “like those of Jane Austen, focus on the small social maneuverings of an exclusive family and their “set”; like Austen, she uses fond but mocking satire to gently send up the family, even while encouraging the reader to care about its fortunes” (Boxall 2006 s. 450). To av Mitfords romaner er *The Pursuit of Love* (1945) og *Love in a Cold Climate* (1949).

Det en utfordring for satirikere knyttet til “the very specific identification with the real world that the strict definition of satire seems to require” (Howarth 1978 s. 19). Dette er en grunn til at f.eks. mange av Molières skuespill fra 1600-tallet har mistet sin satiriske brodd. Hans angrep på bestemte av samtidens parisiske leger, som “even if they could once be so identified have long since lost their satirical point” (Howarth 1978 s. 19).

Homers framstilling av de greske gudene i eposene *Iliaden* og *Odysseen* kan oppfattes som satirisk. Gudene har menneskelige svakheter (sjalusi, oppfarehet,

sluhet osv.), og framstår som forstørrede mennesker med udødelighet som sin eneste suverene egenskap.

Den franske poeten Eustache Deschamps levde på overgangen mellom 1300- og 1400-tallet. “All but one of his poems are short, and some are very satirical, attacking the English, whom he regarded as the plunderers of his country, and railing against the wealthy oppressors of the poor. His satires were directed at corrupt officials and clergy but his sharp wit may have cost him his job as Bailli of Senlis.” (https://www.newworldencyclopedia.org/entry/Eustache_Deschamps; lesedato 26.02.21)

Sjangeren “sotie” var en type drama der de som opptrådte var narrer (Ligny og Rousselot 2016 s. 117). Det var et “short satirical play popular in France in the 15th and early 16th centuries, in which a company of *sots* (“fools”) exchanged badinage on contemporary persons and events. The sots, wearing the traditional short jacket, tights, bells, and dunce cap of the fool, also introduced acrobatics and farcical humour into the sketches. At first the sotie was used as an introductory piece to mystery and morality plays. Developing into an independent form, soties were created and staged by the Clercs de la Basoche, an association of law clerks; the Enfants sans Souci, a group of nobles; and other, more permanent companies. Pierre Gringore became the preeminent sotie dramatist. The sotie was openly satirical and was used as a weapon in political battles. It was forbidden in the 16th century and replaced by more general forms of satire.” (<https://www.britannica.com/art/sotie>; lesedato 11.08.25)

En bestemt satirisk sjanger kalles på tysk for “Grobianismus”. Sjangeren omfatter tekster skrevet på 1400- og 1500-tallet som handler om det ubehøvlede ved tidens sed og skikk, f.eks. folks oppførsel mens de sitter til bords. På 1500-tallet malte maleren Pieter Brueghel det satiriske bildet “Kampen mellom sparebøsser og pengekister” som kan oppfattes som et angrep på det nye kapitalistiske systemet.

“The Bishop’s Order was a strikingly panoramic instance of press censorship by Elizabeth’s government [i renessansen]. It occurred at the convergence of various political troubles, the succession crisis being at the fore. [...] the Order was mostly concerned with satire, which was becoming a vehicle for libellous attacks against individuals and religious mores. That English satire of the sixteenth century was steeped in a tradition of pseudonymity further heightened the threat.” (Jane Cooper i <https://www.athwart.org/speaking-freely-pseudonymity-satire/>; lesedato 15.11.22)

“The affinity of the censored satires for hallmarks of Cynicism is evident from many of the titles alone: take Thomas Middleton’s *Microcynicon: Six Snarling Satyres* (1597-1598), full of the doggish language pertaining to the Cynic school. (“Cynic” derives from the Greek κυνικός or “dog-like”, reflecting Diogenes’s self-association with the canine proclivities to bark at the truth and to bite their

neighbour.)” (Jane Cooper i <https://www.athwart.org/speaking-freely-pseudonym-ity-satire/>; lesedato 15.11.22)

Tyskeren Hans Jakob Grimmelshausens *Omsnudd verden* (1672) ble skrevet under psevdonymet Simon Leugfrisch von Hartenfels. Det satiriske ligger i at verket forteller om syndere som straffes og gode mennesker som belønnes, motsatt slik det oftest skjer i virkeligheten. Den reelle, virkelige verden er for fortelleren en omsnudd, bakvendt verden, full av urettferdighet. Jeg-fortelleren vandrer en aprildag rundt i fjellet for å samle urter til sitt husapotek. Under et voldsomt regn søker han ly i et hult tre, men bakken der inne åpner seg og han faller ned i helvete. Fordi han ikke er fordømt til helvetes pine selv, overlever han fallet, og flammene i helvete plager han ikke. Han ledsages av en skytsengel gjennom helvete og ser hvordan mennesker straffes der. I likhet med Dantes helvete framstiller Grimmelshausen såkalte “speilstraffer”, dvs. at straffen ligner den synden de gjorde på jorden. I samtale med en person i helvete kommer den satiriske skildringen av jorden som et paradys der rettferdigheten rår.

Den britiske dikteren Samuel Butlers dikt “The Elephant in the Moon” (ca. 1670) “must be one of the most wonderfully simple yet beautifully conceived satires of the seventeenth century. Essentially, Butler’s poem tells the story of a group of self-congratulatory Royal Society virtuosi gathered around a telescope. These gentlemen scientists take turns to examine the moon through the looking glass and discover the regaling sight of open warfare taking place on that celestial body, with two opposing armies in the heat of battle. Most astonishingly of all, an enormous elephant emerges from one of the lines of soldiers and rampages across the surface of the moon at a blistering pace, travelling from one side to the other in a matter of seconds. Amazed at the brilliance of their own discovery the virtuosi set about writing up their findings for publication, certain in the belief that this will finally put all questions about their lack of productivity to bed at last. Leaving the telescope unattended, a simple footman decides to experience the Royal Society life-style and steals a quick look through the eye-piece; he sees the truth of the situation immediately. Some gnats and flies have found a gap in the telescope and made a home on the lens; these are the virtuosi’s warring armies. And the elephant? A mouse has got trapped and squashed against the internal glass.” (Tom Colville i <https://blogs.kcl.ac.uk/kingshistory/2015/05/10/samuel-butlers-the-elephant-in-the-moon-c-1670/>; lesedato 02.06.16)

På 1600-tallet skrev spanjolen Francesco de Quevedo verket *Drømmer*, der fortelleren sovner og drømmer fantastiske scener som fungerer som satirer over samtidens Spania (Alexandrian 1974 s. 22).

Jonathan Swift er kjent for sine satirer. I Swifts *A Tale of a Tub* (1704) “[the] main targets are witless propagandists for Calvinism, but the flexibility of the genre, pushed to its limits by the invention of an insane “author,” sanctions free-wheeling assaults which threaten the viability of Swift’s own perspective – even satire itself

is satirized. The force of *A Tale of a Tub* is attributable to this almost autonomous ironic energy, capable of undermining anything with a power that even Swift's subsequent and more famous masterpieces rarely equalled." (Boxall 2006 s. 40) Swift mest berømte satire er *A Modest Proposal* (1729). Den engelske dikteren Alexander Popes satiriske helte-dikt *The Dunciad* (1728) "exploits the epic machinery and style almost solely to give force to his castigation of the corruptors by ironically exalting them." (Jump 1972 s. 44)

"Satire gives vent to malice but in a way which belittles its target, a diminishing which by defusing your aggression prevents it from taking a tragic turn. Satire is thus both an outlet for a potentially tragic pugnacity and a protection against it. It is a convenient device if you want to savage an opponent without granting him too much status. For a hard-headed, virulently anti-metaphysical pragmatist like Swift, whose satiric diminishments in *Gulliver's Travels* take a literal turn, and who grew up in a society to which tragedy was hardly a stranger, the tragic mode would be far too inward, profound and portentous; it is an art of the surface which he desires. *A Modest Proposal* needs its satirical obliquity partly as a defence against its Anglo-Irish author's own rancorous aggression as a second-class colonialist; partly because the horror of the Irish situation, if not scrupulously externalized, would risk overloading the text; and partly because as a colonial, which is where the text's political sympathies partly lie, one learns fairly quickly the perils of candour. In Pope's *Dunciad*, by contrast, satire is moving towards the grand tragic vision." (Eagleton 2003 s. 221)

Jonathan Swifts "A Satirical Elegy on the Death of a Late Famous General" (1722) "is indeed a poem so angry it sometimes forgets to be satirical: the moral castigation is paramount, and one admires the poet all the more for getting away with the naked simplicity of it. The target is John Churchill, the first Duke of Marlborough. [...] Marlborough's chief crime was not cowardice, however, but devotion to "his profit and his pride". Swift, a staunch Tory, considered the Whig general to be a war-profiteer, who had prolonged the war of the Spanish succession deliberately to enrich himself and his party. [...] The poem is grounded in Christian theology at its most punitive. Marlborough has wilfully created widows and orphans (that's why none follow his [funeral] procession) and when "the last trump" sounds, he will be summoned to eternal damnation. [...] Swift's repeated "Come hither" personally invites the damned into hell. These are the falsely elevated, the men made great by puffery, mere bubbles that are ultimately dirt." (Carol Rumens i <https://www.theguardian.com/books/booksblog/2014/sep/08/poem-of-the-week-jonathan-swift>; lesedato 05.11.18)

Daniel Defoes roman *Robinson Crusoe* ble utgitt i 1719. "Efteråret 1719 udkom også pamfletten *The Life and Strange Surprizing adventures of Mr. D- De F-*, en grovkornet og smudsig, men også ret morsom satire rettet direkte mod Defoes person. Ophavsmanden var dramatikeren og skribenten Charles Gildon, men pamfletten udkom anonymt. Den sidste del af pamfletten er opbygget som en

dialog. *Robinson Crusoes* to hovedpersoner, Crusoe og Fredag, opsøger i en drøm Defoe og holder ham over en længere samtale til ansvar for de mange stærkt angribelige træk ved hans værk. Rollefordelingen mellem de to hovedpersoner er relativt klar: Crusoe harmes især over bogens mangel på moral – ud fra strategiske overvejelser optræder han nemlig skiftevis som katolik og protestant i løbet af sit liv, og til slut belønnes han for sit indledende oprør mod sine forældre. Fredag raser over den utroværdige skildring af ham selv. “Have injure me, to make me such Blockhead, so much contradiction, as to be able to speak *English tolerably well* within a Month or two and not to speak it better in twelve Years after,” erklærer han således vredt, inden han prøver at skyde sin forfatter. “Defoes” svar viser sig at være stærkt selvudleverende – man har trods alt at gøre med en satire. Ikke blot udfolder Gildons “Defoe” bogens mangel på moralsk opbyggelighed (den dårlige søn får hele belønningen) som om det var en særlig kvalitet ved hans værk, også forklaringen på Fredags talevanskeligheder er suspect. [...] Alligevel er det værd at bemærke, at Gildons “Defoe” kalder *Robinson Crusoe* en løgn, og at det tydeligvis er en del af det satiriske angreb på bogen. Når det undervejs fremhæves, at Crusoe og Fredag er “airy Fantoms” skabt ud af Defoes tankespind, er det altså ikke fordi Gildon opfatter bogen som en mere eller mindre realistisk fiktion. Det er derimod del af hans satiriske demaskering: Bogen er en løgn, endda en umoralsk og irreligiøs af slagsen.” (Nexø 2007)

Under psevdonymet Pego Borewell ble det i 1763 utgitt et verk kalt *An Essay on Woman [...] With Notes by Rogerus Cunæus, Vigerus Mutoniatus &c. and a Commentary by the Rev. Dr. Warburton*. Forfatterne bak psevdonymet var John Wilkes og Thomas Potter, og hele teksten er en pornografisk parodi på Alexander Popes bok *Essay on Man* (1733-34). Wilkes og Potter parodierte også William Warburton (biskop i Gloucester) sine kommentarer til Popes tekst. Thomas Potter var en personlig fiende av Warburton og sannsynligvis var han bispefruens elsker (Coron 1998 s. 202).

Den skotske forfatteren Tobias Smolletts roman *The History and Adventures of an Atom* (1769) fortelles av et atom og har handling fra Japan. Britiske politikere er lett gjenkjennelige som de japanske karakterene. Atomet er vitne til hendelsene og forteller satirisk hva som skjer. Boka ble publisert anonymt.

Den russiske dikteren Vasilij Kapnists *Den merkelige rettssaken* (1798; fransk tittel *La Chicane*) behandler rettssystemet og korrupsjonen i Russland med skarp satire. Stykket ble forbudt etter å ha blitt framført fire ganger, men teksten sirkulerte i tallrike kopier, og teatergrupper langt fra Moskva framførte komedien til tross for sensuren (Gourfinkel 1956 s. 36).

Den franske dikteren Alfred de Mussets *Brev fra Dupuis og Cotonet* (1836) handler om to naive borgere på landsbygda som i årevis prøver å finne ut hva “romantisk” egentlig er: romantiske dikt, tragedier, landskaper, det groteske og sublime innen romantikken osv. osv. De blir mer og mer forvirret jo mer de leser og undersøker.

“Schnadahüpfel” er improviserte satiriske dikt, en slags sangbare spottedikt som det i Østerrike og i Bayern i Tyskland har vært populært å framføre (Boden og Müller 2009 s. 147).

Pingvinøya (1908) av den franske forfatteren Anatole France er en tydelig allegori (Suleiman 1983 s. 11). Romanen “details the history of the penguins and is written as a critique of human nature, and is also a satire on France’s political history, including the Dreyfus affair. Morals, customs and laws are satirised within the context of the fictional land of Penguinia, where the animals were baptised erroneously by the myopic Abbot Maël. The book is ultimately concerned with the perfectibility of mankind. As soon as the Penguins are transformed into humans, they begin robbing and murdering each other. By the end of the book, a thriving civilization is destroyed by terrorist bombs.” (https://www.goodreads.com/book/show/346024.Penguin_Island; lesedato 12.12.23)

Den østerrikske dadaisten Raoul Hausmann skrev satiriske tekster, publisert fra 1921 av, rettet mot småborgere og politikere som ikke hadde lært noe av 1. verdenskrig. Hans satirer har blitt samlet og gitt ut i en tysk bok med tittelen *Hurra! Hurra! Hurra!: 12 politiske satirer*.

I fortellingen “Den anarkistiske bankier” (1922; på norsk 1995) av den portugisiske dikteren Fernando Pessoa påstår det at kun en bankmann driver ekte anarkistisk virksomhet, fordi det han gjør leder kapitalismen til sin destruktive yttergrense og dermed virker mer ødeleggende enn å kaste bomber (Blask 1995 s. 138). Den portugisiske forfatteren José Saramagos “harrowing novel *Blindness* ([1995] originally published in Portuguese as *Ensaio Sobre a Cegueira*, “Essay on Blindness”) is an example of allegorical satire – a type of narrative that has, a parallel subtext that is often moral or political in nature. In allegorical satire, events are used explicitly or implicitly as metaphors to ridicule aspects of society, politics, or life. [...] American writer Suzanne Collins publishes *The Hunger Games* [2008-2020], using allegorical satire to indicate the power of media as a political tool in contemporary American society.” (Canton, Cleary m.fl. 2016 s. 320)

Eksempler på tekster og andre verk med mye satire:

Erasmus fra Rotterdam: *Dårskapens lovtale* (1511) – gudinnen Dumhet fører ordet om Erasmus’ samtid

Thomas Dekker: *Satiromastix, or The Untrussing of the Humorous Poet* (1602) – et skuespill

Ben Jonson: *Volpone* (1606) – et skuespill om griskhet

Jonathan Swift: *A Modest Proposal* (1729) – den fulle tittelen er *A Modest Proposal for Preventing the Children of the Poor People from Being a Burden to Their Parents, Or the Country, and for Making Them Beneficial to the Public*

Luise Adelgunde Victorie Gottsched: *Pietisteriet i fiskebein-frakker* (1736; utgitt anonymt) – denne tyske komedien er en satire over pietistene

Ludvig Holberg: *Niels Klims underjordiske reise* (1741)

Jane Collier: *An Essay on the Art of Ingeniously Tormenting* (1753)

Christopher Anstey: *The New Bath Guide* (1766) – vers om det “fashionable” i badebyen Bath, med gamblere, sosiale strebere osv.

Johann Karl August Musäus: *Fysionomiske reiser* (1778-79) – en satirisk roman rettet mot Johann Kaspar Lavaters teorier, overtro og genidyrkelsen innen Sturm und Drang (tysk førromantikk)

William Makepeace Thackerays *Vanity Fair* (1848)

Mikhail Saltykov-Shchedrin: *Historien om en by* (1869-70) – denne boka har blitt oppfattet som en satirisk allegori over russisk historie

Mark Twain og Charles Dudley: *The Gilded Age* (1873) og Mark Twains novelle “The Man That Corrupted Hadleyburg” (1898)

August Strindberg: *Röda rummet* (1880)

Sinclair Lewis: *Main Street* (1920) – en bitende sosial kommentar i romanform til livet i en amerikansk småby

Knut Hamsun: *Konerne ved Vandposten* (1920)

Johan Falkberget: *Bør Børson jr.* (1920) – miljøene i Trondheim og Kristiania er satirisk beskrevet, mens Olderdal-miljøet snarere er skildret med ironisk sympati

Buster Keaton og John G. Blystone: *Our Hospitality* (1923) – en stumfilm med satire over folkeskikken i sørstatene i USA

Giovanni Papini: *Gog* (1931)

George Orwell: *Animal Farm* (1945) – en dyrefabel med totalitaristisk ideologi som tema

Evelyn Waugh: *The Loved One: An Anglo-American Tragedy* (1948) – angrep på etterkrigstidens kommersialisering og materialisme

Robert Coover: *The Public Burning* (1976)

Gerd Brantenberg: *Egalias døtre* (1977) – roman om et kvinnestyrte land der kvinnene har makten også over språket (ord som “fedreland”, “brannmann”, “manne seg opp” osv. finnes ikke)

Axel Gottwald: *Daniel og dobbeltministeren* (1996) – satire over norsk “tidsånd” på 1990-tallet

Tom Wolfe: *A Man in Full* (1998) – om politisk spill, menneskelige forfengeligheit m.m. i 1990-tallets Atlanta, USA

Bret Easton Ellis: *Glamorama* (1998)

Axel Jensen: *Pasienten i periferien* (1998) – sakprosabok skrevet i sykesengen med polemisk og satirisk angrep på byråkratiet innen helsevesenet

Julian Barnes: *England, England* (1998) – en roman om planene med å bygge en temapark med kopi av blant annet Stonehenge

Lena Andersson: *Duck City* (2006) – roman fra Disneys Andeby der fedme har blitt et stort problem (f.eks. er nyfødtes gjennomsnittsvikt 6 kilo)

“Satiren har røtter tilbake til det antikke Hellas der man hadde satirisk diktning, *jambediktningen*, som hånede kjente personer og angrep maktforhold. *Diatriben* var et moraliserende foredrag som også kunne være satirisk. Aristofanes latterliggjør i sine komedier politikernes tomme løfter og filosofenes høyttravende prat. Den greske komediens *parabase* var en frittstående scene i skuespillet hvor skuespillerne tok av seg sine masker og henvendte seg til publikum. De kommenterte politiske og samfunnsmessige forhold og tok opp emner med skarpt satirisk innhold (Lothe 1997: 226). Som romersk genre på heksametersvers med emner fra dagliglivets mangfoldige situasjoner, er satiren et potpurri av forskjellige emner. Det finnes to ulike former for satire: verssatiren og prosasatiren. De to romerske poetene Horats og Juvenal skrev begge verssatirer, men tonen var forskjellig. Horats’ satirer var moralske læredikt, som var avsløpne og overbærende i formen, i motsetning til Juvenals satirer, som hadde en bitende ironi og spottende karakter. Juvenal går i langt større grad enn Horats til angrep på personer eller bestemte grupper og samfunnsforhold. Horatiske satirer er lystige, milde og urbane, mens juvenalske satirer er kritiske og bitre og ofte gir uttrykk for en rasende indignasjon. Den peker med forakt på menneskets moralske fordervelse og institusjonenes ødeleggende strukturer. Swifts *Gulliver’s Travels* tilhører den juvenalske satiretradisjonen, mens Addison er et eksempel på den horatiske satire (Harmon 2003: 454). Satiren kan henvende seg direkte til publikum (den formale direkte

satiren) eller iscenesette en hovedperson som blir gjort til latter gjennom sine egne uttalelser (den formale indirekte satiren).” (Krog 2004)

“Horatian satire tends to be good-natured and light-hearted, looking to raise laughter to encourage moral improvement. A famous example of Horatian satire is the eighteenth-century poet Alexander Pope’s poem *The Rape of the Lock*, which, despite its serious-sounding name, was an attempt to bring back together two real-life feuding families by humorously exaggerating the severity of the cause of their rift. [...] Juvenalian satire tends to be more bitter and dark, expressing anger and outrage at the state of the world. A famous example of Juvenalian satire is by another eighteenth-century writer, Jonathan Swift. *A Modest Proposal* is a prose pamphlet that initially appears to be a serious, well-intentioned attempt to suggest a solution to what was a major problem at the time: the impoverished state of Ireland, due in no small part to absentee English landlords who owned a lot of Irish land but re-invested very little of their profits back into the Irish economy. As the narrator begins to explain his plan to invigorate the Irish economy *and* make all the poor Irish families “useful” again, however, the reader slowly begins to see that the narrator’s proposal is actually for Irish women to sell their babies to be *eaten* by their Anglo-Irish landlords. *A Modest Proposal* is thus an angry denunciation, not just of the rapaciousness of the English landlords and their lack of care for their Irish tenants, but also of the kind of bureaucratic mindset that becomes so enamored with its own problem-solving that it forgets that real humans will be affected by its plans. A modern example of Juvenalian satire would be the parodies of contemporary advertising done by groups like Adbusters, in which they peel away the shiny veneer of advertising to show the heartless greed that lies underneath most corporate capitalism.” (Evan Gottlieb i <https://liberalarts.oregonstate.edu/wlf/what-satire>; lesedato 08.08.22)

“Juvenal writes a terrifying account, with evident truth underlying the satire, of a fight for religious reasons between two neighboring Egyptian villages, Ombi and Tentyra.” (Grant 1961 s. 75)

“Prosasatiren har sitt utspring hos tre klassiske forfattere: Menippos (gresk, 300 f. Kr.), Varro (romersk, 100 f. Kr.) og Lukian (gresk, 200 e. Kr.). Av Menippos selv og av Varro er lite bevart. Derfor er Lukians arbeid ansett som de viktigste overlevningene av de menippeiske satirene, flest tekster er bevart etter ham. [...] Disse genrene stod i motsetning til de mer seriøse genrene som monologen, tragedien og eposet. De seriøse genrene forutsetter blant annet et integrert stabilt univers, i motsetning til de dialogiske seriokomiske genrene som støtter seg på erfaring og fri innovasjon. Seriokomiske genrer har flere nivåer i teksten, og de blander det høye med det lave og det seriøse med det komiske. Den menippeiske satire er et eksempel på en seriokomisk genre. I motsetning til de seriøse genrene tror denne på menneskets manglende evne til å forstå sin skjebne (Bakhtin 1999: 107). [...] Menippeisk satire synliggjør det mennesket ikke ser. [...] Det viktigste trekket ved den menippeisk satire er dens modige og frie bruk av det fantastiske og

det eventyrlige, ifølge Bakhtin. Det fantastiske benyttes både for å søke, fremprovosere og teste filosofiske ideer og diskurser om sannhet. Det fantastiske tjener ikke legemliggjøring av sannhet, men er en metode å søke, provosere og teste sannhet på. Den menippeiske satires helter stiger opp til himmelen og senkes ned i underverdenen hvor de går gjennom ukjente land og havner i underlige livssituasjoner. [...] Satiren tester ikke først og fremst individets karakter eller sosiale type, men karakterens filosofiske posisjon i verden (Bakhtin 1999: 115).” (Krog 2004)

Lukian av Samosatas verk *Menippeiske satirer* (deler av teksten ble oversatt til norsk i 2010) gjør narr av “guder, filosofer og stormenn. Gjennom å vise frem det paradoksale i gudenes handlingsmønstre slik det er blitt gjenfortalt hos klassiske forfattere, avslører han hele gudelæren som tøv. [...] Gjennom sitater fra klassikerne driter Lukian ut den høystemte retorikken som omkranser gudene og deres gjøremål. Han driver myteknusing i stor stil, og fremtredende, historiske mennesker som Kroisos (Krøsus), Midas, Agamemnon og Mausolos blir kledd nakne. All slags spådomskunst og *mumbo jumbo* blir latterliggjort [...] den fantastiske “Sanne historier” – en sprut gæren og lynende klok beretning om en sjøreise som havner på månen og deretter er innom en serie fantastiske verdener. Den er en av litteraturhistoriens festligste løgner, med et raffinert spill rundt forfatterrollen og hele ideen om sannferdighet i litteraturen.” (*Morgenbladet* 30. juli–5. august 2010 s. 34-35; en anmeldelse av den norske oversettelsen).

Lukians “*Lovprisning af fluen* er skrevet i stil med samtidige lejlighedstaler, som havde til formål at hylde og lovprise en person, eksempelvis en olympiadevinder. Fællesnævneren for disse taler var et højt stilleje og et hav af rosende ord. Lukians værk har samme form og indhold, men talen er skrevet til en flue. Lukians sigte med *Lovprisning af fluen* har sandsynligvis været at demonstrere sine kunstneriske evner, idet han ganske fornemt gengiver kunstfærdighederne ved de store talere, men man kan jo heller ikke undgå at tænke på, at talen er dedikeret til en simpel flue – en ganske antiklimatisk dedikation, der tilføjer et satirisk element til talen.” (Lasse Evers Mikkelsen i <https://baggrund.com/2021/08/20/lukian-og-den-antikke-satire/>; lesedato 23.01.26)

“Menippean satire is reserved for prose works that still resemble the original connotation of satire as a miscellany, or containing multitudes. A canonical example of the Menippean satire is Laurence Sterne’s novel *Tristram Shandy*, published in 9 volumes between 1759-1767. While technically the life story of the eponymous narrator, the novel is far less interested in any kind of linear plot than in accumulating incidents, characters, and materials that gently mock and comment on the absurdities of what was then modern life and love. Menippean satires are relatively rare these days, but many so-called postmodern novels, with their encyclopedic range and fondness for esoteric digression, bear more than a passing relation to the form: from Thomas Pynchon’s massive *Gravity’s Rainbow* to Zadie

Smith's breakout *White Teeth*." (Evan Gottlieb i <https://liberalarts.oregonstate.edu/wlf/what-satire>; lesedato 08.08.22)

Anecdotes of the Learned Pig (1786) av James Boswell og Hester Piozzi "is a satirical work, likely written in the late 18th century. This unique text combines elements of humor and political commentary through the allegorical portrayal of a pig that possesses unusual talents and a penchant for rhetoric, reflecting the societal dynamics of its time. The book engages with themes of politics, celebrity, and the absurdity of public life. The narrative follows the eccentric life of a pig born under curious circumstances, who learns to speak and engages in various political musings. As the pig matures, it becomes involved in the tumultuous political atmosphere of the time, navigating between Tory and Whig sentiments. Throughout its journey, the pig develops relationships with notable figures and expresses disdain for political foes, all while humorously grappling with its own identity." (<https://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/51017>; lesedato 09.04.25)

Den såkalte Valborgsnatten, på tysk kalt "Walpurgisnacht", er natt til 1. mai, da heksene ifølge gammel folketro treffer hverandre på Bloksberg. Navnet betegner en slags hedensk vårfest og er avledet på en satirisk måte fra den angelsaksiske helgenen Walpurga (Valborg). Hun ble æret for din spesielt store dyd og hadde minnedag 1. mai (Eversberg 1985 s. 71).

Den amerikanske forfatteren Edgar Allan Poes novellesamling *Tales of the Folio Club* (1832-36) ble ikke publisert i hans levetid. "Dersom fortellingene fra Folioklubben hadde blitt utgitt, ville vi helt sikkert ha lest Poe med et annet blikk enn vi gjør i dag. [...] Poe, den ulykkelige alkoholikeren med nekrofile dragninger, har også en burlesk side, og det er den som slippes løs i fortellingene fra Folioklubben. Der samles en rekke karikerte forfattere én gang hver måned "til samfunnets oppdragelse og til fornøyelse for dem selv". På dagsorden står det middag med rikelig drikke og medbragt lesestoff: Hvert medlem må ha med seg en nyskrevet fortelling. [...] Filosofen i forsamlingen heter De Rerum Natura, om tingenes natur, etter tittelen på Lukrets' berømte læredikt. [...] Både navnene og de konsise beskrivelsene signaliserer forfatterens litterære preferanser. Fortellingen til mannen som beundrer Sir Walter Scott, åpner med et tilforlatelig historisk tablå, for så å utarte til et fylleslag hos Kong Pest i lokalene til et evakuert begravelsesbyrå. De Rerum Natura forteller historien om den hedonistiske filosofen Bon-Bon, som gjør et faustisk forsøk på å selge sjelen til djevelen. Djevelens sans for sjeler står i stil med Bon-Bons materialisme: Han spiser dem. Lukrets mente at også sjelen består av atomer; det er altså ingen grunn til at den ikke skulle være spiselig. Flertallet av fortellingene er elleville satirer. Poe parodier den presiøse stilen i "The Duc de l'Omelette": Hertugen dør av forferdelse fordi fuglen han serveres ikke er dandert på skikkelig vis, og i helvete havner han i en spirituell disputt med djevelen som formelig oser av franske gloser. I "A Decided Loss" sprenger Poe alle grenser for litterær usannsynlighet: Novellen åpner med at fortelleren mister pusten, bokstavelig talt, og rekken av umulige hendelser kulminerer med hans egen død

fortalt i første person. Slike outrerte scenarioer kan være både fornøyelige og lærerike. Men mest fascinerende er novellene der satiren er hakket mer sofistisert, og der vi aner at Poe også parodierer seg selv.” (*Klassekampen* 25. september 2013 s. 12)

“The satirist should also remember to poke fun at himself. His real virtue is that satire reveals not only the folly outside, but the folly within.” (Jane Cooper i <https://www.athwart.org/speaking-freely-pseudonymity-satire/>; lesedato 15.11.22)

“[G]enerally, the interior life of characters in satires is not available as it is in most novels; satires also tend to conclude inconclusively, without a change in the condition of the world that led to their composition [...]; finally, satires do not provide the same level of verisimilitude in the detailed depiction of objects (but may employ long and wildly heterogeneous lists instead). [...] William Makepeace Thackeray’s *Vanity Fair* (1848) is a novel with strong and sustained satiric implications, while Gustave Flaubert’s *Bouvard et Pécuchet* (1881) is a satiric narrative with some novelistic features.” (Frank Palmeri i <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/9781444337815.wbeotnp002>; lesedato 01.09.22)

Den britiske forfatteren William Makepeace Thackeray publiserte i 1847-48 romanen *Vanity Fair: Pen and Pencil Sketches of English Society*. Han “satirizes Vanity Fair but he also accepts it, and this alternation of satirical indignation and world-weary tolerance partly accounts for that shifting ambivalence of tone which is his distinctive ‘signature’.” (Gilmour 1982 s. 10) Den engelske presten og forfatter John Bunyan ga på slutten av 1600-tallet ut den kristne allegorien *The Pilgrim’s Progress*, der Vanity Fair er et sted for fristelser og synd.

“It is not that Thackeray lacked a firm grasp on his satirical targets, vanity and selfishness, but that he could not rest in an unequivocal moral position as his great rival Dickens tended to do; his ‘peculiar and characteristic scepticism’, in Bagehot’s phrase, led him on to question even the unworldliness he affirmed against the worldliness he satirized. This unrelenting scepticism is the motive-force of *Vanity Fair*, and gives rise to the variety of authorial tones and postures which prevent Thackeray achieving that ‘constant stance before the human spectacle’ which, on one view, is held to be necessary for the novelist. But it may be argued that Thackeray’s scepticism is no less an instrument of truth than the analysis of more consistent moralists – indeed that it helped him to see certain things more clearly than for example Dickens or George Eliot could, with their commitment to Victorian notions of moral nobility and self-sacrifice. He was alert to the other side of the moral coin from that represented by the Little Dorrits and Felix Holts of Victorian fiction – to the selfishness that lurks in Amelia’s self-sacrifice, the self-delusion in Dobbin’s devotion, the power of poverty to sour and corrupt Mrs Sedley. ‘I think I could be a good woman if I had five thousand a year’, Becky reflects in a famous passage. ‘And who knows but Rebecca was right in her speculations –’, is the narrator’s characteristic response, ‘and that it was only a

question of money and fortune which made the difference between her and an honest woman?" (ch. 41). It is questions like these, probing the bases of the reader's moral assumptions and judgments, which make Thackeray such an 'uncomfortable' writer. When critics accuse him of cynicism what they often seem to mean is that he does not flatter their moral idealism. [...] Thackeray could not forget those 'near facts' of ordinary human struggle and tried to make his art faithful to them that he was distrustful of moral absolutism." (Gilmour 1982 s. 52-53)

Bjørnstjerne Bjørnsons skuespill *Kongen* (1877) er "en satirisk tragedie som retter et voldsomt angrep ikke bare på monarkiet, men også på alle de institusjonene og skikkelsene som nøt godt av det. Det vil si hele samfunnseliten: bankfolk, grossererne, militærfolk, prester og politikere. Han visste at han kom til å møte motstand, men var ikke forberedt på aggresjonsnivået. Blant kritikerne i den konservative pressen (*Morgenbladet* og *Aftenposten*) ble det foreslått at hele opplaget ble makulert, og at forfatteren burde straffeforfølges. Bjørnson mottok også en masse personlig post med sjikane." (*Morgenbladet* 17.–23. juni 2022 s. 22)

Knut Hamsuns roman *Redaktør Lyng*e (1893) inneholder krass satire om den liberale redaktøren Alexander Lyng i avisen *Gazetten*. I begynnelsen av boka skildres hans arbeid og hans selvbevissthet slik: "Denne Mængde Trykt, denne Uorden overalt, disse dybe Sumpe af Blade og Bøger gav Indtryk af et stærkt og ustandseligt Arbejde. Ingensinde var der Ro, Telefonen ringed uafladelig, Folk kom og gik, Maskinerne sused ind fra Trykkeriet og Postbudet bragte nye Dyrer af Breve og Aviser. Det var som om denne Chef for et Blad var nær ved at begraves i et Hav af Arbejde og Vanskeligheder, som om en liden Alverden strømmed ind paa ham og ventede paa hans Afgørelser i alle Ting. Og midt i denne Travlhed sidder han selv med overlegen Ro og holder Traadene, skriver Overskrifter, modtager vigtige Meddelelser [...] Han har sine Garn ude allevegne, og over alles hoved blinker *Gazettens* Sværd; en Redaktør er en Statsmagt, og Lynges Magt er større end nogen andens. Han ser paa Klokken, rejser sig og raaber ud til Sekretæren: "Har ikke Ministeriet sendt os nogen Forklaring endnu?" "Nej." Og Lyng sætter sig rolig ned igen. Han ved, at Ministeriet maa bekvemme sig til at give ham den Forklaring, han har forlangt, ellers giver han den endnu et Stød, maaske Naadestødet. "Gud, hvor De er haard mod de stakkels Ministre!" siger den ene af Damerne; "De dræber dem jo." Men Lyng svarer alvorligt og varmt: "Saaledes gaar det hver Svigersjæl i Norge!" [...] Lyng forstod at lave lyse Luer af et Spørgsmaal, han skrev med Klør, med en Pen, der skar Tænder; hans epigramatiske Spidser var bleven en Svøbe, som aldrig fejlede og som alle frygtede. Hvilken Kraft og hvilken Smidighed! Og han havde visselig Brug for begge Dele, der var altfor mange mørke Ting, som gik i Svang overalt i Byen og paa Landet. Hvorfor skulde nu netop han være fordømt til at bringe Sandheden frem? [...] Med sin lykkelige Ævne til at bore sig ind allevegne og snuse i de trangeste Revner efter noget at sætte i Bladet, bragte Lyng bestandig noget nyt, bestandig noget raaddent frem for Dagens Lys; han drev en vældig Missionærs Gærning, opfyldt af Pressens store Kald, stræng, hvileløs, varm i sin Harm og i sin Tro. Og aldrig før havde hans Pen

gjort saa straalende Arbejde, det overgik alt, hvad Byen havde set af Journalistik. Han spared ingen og intet i sin Iver; ti for ham var der ingen Persons Anseelse.”

“I Hamsuns skrifter, både de polemiske og de skjønnlitterære, går det en dyp og konsekvent åre av samfunnskritikk i form av satire og latterliggjøring av og forakt for den moderne verden og dens representanter.” (Eirik Vassenden i *Morgenbladet* 30. mai–5. juni 2025 s. 48)

“*The Day of the Locust* [1939] by Nathanael West satirizes the grotesque vanity of Hollywood and its hangers-on during the Great Depression.” (Canton, Cleary m.fl. 2016 s. 276)

I Lost My Girlish Laughter (1938) er “a satirical novel about Hollywood by Jane Schor and Silvia Schulman (but published under the pseudonym Jane Allen)” (Rubery 2011 s. 51). Romanen fungerer som en “delicious satire of the film business, one is never very far from the truth of what makes Hollywood tick and why we all love it. [...] *I Lost My Girlish Laughter* is a must-read for any fan of classic Hollywood. The immense and hilarious insights about movie-making are ones that could have only been gleaned by someone who was ‘in the biz.’ And the way the story is told – through studio memos, telegrams, letters and diary entries – makes you feel as if you’ve been given a sneak peek into a secret world.” (<https://www.penguinrandomhouse.com/books/609618/i-lost-my-girlish-laughter-by-jane-allen-edited-and-with-an-introduction-by-je-smyth/>; lesedato 17.06.22)

I den amerikanske forfatteren Kurt Vonneguts novelle “Harrison Bergeron” (1961) “the pursuit of equality has led to a society that imposes handicaps on anyone with exceptional talents. The handsome, intelligent eponymous protagonist must among other handicaps wear eyeglasses that give him headaches; other brainiacs have radio transmitters implanted in their ears, which emit shrieking sounds two or three times every minute, interrupting their thoughts and preventing sustained concentration. The final satirical punch comes in framing the story from the perspective of Bergeron’s parents, Hazel and George, who see their son on TV when he proclaims his antihandicap manifesto (with fatal results for him), but, hampered by their own handicaps, they cannot concentrate enough to remember it.” (Hayles 2010) Dette er et eksempel på et dystopi som er satirisk.

“The search for meaning in increasingly fractured times is satirized in Kurt Vonnegut’s *Slaughterhouse-Five* [1969], inspired by the author’s experience of the firebombing of Dresden and the absurdity of war.” (Canton, Cleary m.fl. 2016 s. 276)

Den britiske forfatteren Fay Weldon “is a highly entertaining, inventive novelist with a mischievous sense of humor. Weldon’s satire focuses on human folly, avoiding sentimentalism, and relentlessly magnifying human error. Weldon does not suffer fools gladly, and in her fiction, fools abound. Yet the dark underside of

her humor is human suffering. Although we might laugh at the comic situation or the sardonic line, painful realities lie beneath the humorous surface of her fiction. Her ironic vision creates an amusing fictional milieu, but her social criticism is a serious matter. Marriage comes off as a comic, albeit flawed institution with husband and wife tied to each other by the basest of human emotions. Emotional dependency, economic necessity, and social urbanity keep many of Weldon's couples afloat, and infidelity and cruelty are commonplace between spouses. Her fiction acts as a corrective, amplifying the social wrongs that feed human conflict. In her novels men abuse women, women take advantage of men in retaliation, women are cruel to other women to gain power, and children remain victims of their elders. Social institutions and cultural thought unjustly favor men over women and children. Weldon relishes the mundane, exaggerating human circumstances and nuances, crystallizing our most intimate interactions so that we may look more closely at the daily act of living, in particular our relations with others. Out of these particulars, she proposes a larger social vision: the powerful lack compassion and victims will do anything to be empowered." (Faulks 1998 s. 3)

Weldons "satiric treatment of birth control and abortion depicts the arbitrary nature of pregnancy. Unplanned pregnancies create difficult situations for women trying to find a more advantageous place in a society that expects them to embrace motherhood. Responsible for birth control and bearing and raising children, women suffer not only the moral quandary of choosing to have or not have children but also society's subsequent judgment of their decisions. Weldon demonstrates through ludicrous scenarios the difficulties of such choices, while also showing that ethics are oftentimes based on a contingent set of biological forces. Men escape such decisions because of their social and biological positioning. Weldon accentuates the unfairness of this schema, suggesting that children would be better off if both father and mother shared decision making in regard to these issues and if women took less responsibility for reproduction and child rearing. Weldon's female characters are, nonetheless, also flawed. Some misguided ones are enmeshed in an illusory world of innocence, prey to the devious, sometimes evil control of others. Self-sacrifice causes some to give up their identities in order to fulfill social expectations." (Faulks 1998 s. 4)

Den fransk-kanadiske forfatteren Louky Bersianiks *Euguelionnen* (1976; på fransk) "is a wonderful attack on sexism in all its forms, past and present. It is written in chapter and verse form, parodying the Bible, and its parody of the Bible continues, starting with its mocking of the Adam and Eve [...] The Euguelionne of the title – the word comes from the Greek for *good news* or *gospel*, another dig at the Bible – is a creature from another planet. On her planet there are two species – the Legislators (who are, naturally, male) and the Pedalists, the females who, as on Earth, do the work. She has arrived on Earth looking for a positive planet and a male of her own species. Naturally, by the end of the book, she has found neither. She is black and beautiful (Bersianik will parody much of contemporary culture). She befriends a journalist called Exile, who has had her own problems with men,

and will take a tour around the planet with Exile, astounded at the sexism. Bersianik holds nothing back. From clandestine abortions to trophy wives, from urinating standing up to adverts, from male legislatures to the institution of marriage, it all comes under attack. As well as the Bible and the penis, psychology and language are key targets. Saint Siegfried, as she calls Freud, is, of course, a key target. Language, from professional titles that only have a masculine form (in French) – she gives a list – to all those vicious words used to criticize and attack women (she gives a long list), language is just one of the many ways men use to subjugate women. [...] a whole range of created myths, from the Euguelionne's planet to mock parables. The latter includes the story of the Fems and the Mascles, with the latter being particularly proud of their magic baton. Of course, the men try to destroy the Euguelionne and, of course, they do not succeed. [...] romp though what it means to be a woman and how men try to undermine that role.” (<https://www.themodernnovel.org/americas/other-americas/canada/bersianik/euguelionne/>; lesedato 04.04.23)

Den colombianske forfatteren Gabriel García Márquez' *Patriarkens høst* (1975, på norsk 1977) har blitt tolket som en satire over alle diktatur-regimer (Bujnowska 2011 s. 170).

I en scene i den kenyanske forfatteren Ngugi wa Thiong'o sin roman *Matigari ma Njiruungi* (1986) “dekorerer presidenten sine mest ærede undersåtter. På geledde står professorer i “papegøyologi” og redaktører i “Papegøyenytte”, eksperter på å formidle nøyaktig det de blir fortalt. I romanen er papegøyologene så servile at selv presidenten blir pinlig berørt. - Papegøyologien er en treffende metafor på den offentlige samtalen i et diktatur? - Den er basert på en virkelig hendelse. Etter et statsbesøk India sto president Moi på flyplassen og refset sine ministre. Han proklamerte høylytt at de skulle adlyde ham i ett og alt: “Sier jeg komma, skal dere si komma, sier jeg punktum, skal dere si punktum”. Så sier han, med sine egne ord: “Dere skal være som papegøyer”. Det var Moi selv som sa det! Du kunne ikke ha funnet et bedre satirisk bilde. Jeg tok bare ordene rett fra presidentens munn. Hvordan kan man bedrive satire over noen som er åpne om sine egne absurditeter og som selv gjør det absurde til norm? [...] På et tidspunkt forbød myndighetene rykter, det de kalte “rumour mongering”, eller “rumour crime”. Hvis du så mye som hvisket om regjeringen, kunne du bli arrestert, torturert eller drept. Retten til å organisere seg var også oppløst. Det er konteksten for romanen. Satiren slår ikke bare mot makthaverne, men også mot den altformenneskelige tendensen til å sette sin lit til at noen andre vil ordne opp.” (*Morgenbladet* 23.–29. oktober 2015 s. 51)

“Den skrevne Koranen regnes innenfor sunniteologien for å være en jordisk utgave av en evig og transcendent Koran, kjent som “umm al-kitāb” (bokens mor). [...] De annullerte åpenbaringene var tema for Salman Rushdies satire i hans *Sataniske vers*. Men han utbroderte feil-åpenbaringene, og gjorde dem til Satans verk, utøvet av en skriver som utnyttet Muhammeds manglende oppmerksomhet.” (*Morgenbladet* 20.–26. juli 2007 s. 30)

At manuset er sendt inn av en sekretær som egentlig skulle postlagt en helt annen bok, er lett å argumentere seg bort fra, i en retorikk der det å “bryte med sjangergrenser” bare er altfor gjenkjennelig til at satiren over jurybegrunnelser oppleves spesielt outrert. [...] Som flere har påpekt kan kokebokforfatteren leses som et ikke spesielt vennligsinnet vrengebilde av den indisk-amerikanske forfatteren Kiran Desai, som vant prisen det året mange mener St Aubyn burde ha fått den. [...] En interessant kritikk av *Lost for words* sto forfatteren John Banville for i en nylig anmeldelse i New York Review of Books. Banville ble for øvrig, da han i 2005 overraskende ble tildelt Booker-prisen for romanen *The Sea*, utpekt til “tidenes Booker-feilgrep” av den respekterte litteraturredaktøren i London-avisen Independent, noe forfatteren er raus nok til å minne om i anmeldelsen. Banville synes derimot blind for at romanens skildring av den tafatte, men trygge “litterære” kompromisskandidaten, Sam Blacks *The Frozen Torrent*, også kan leses som en karikatur av kritikken mot nettopp hans egen litterære stil [...] Vi ler fordi vi gjenkjenner en bredspektret karikatur gitt menneskelig, men ikke fullkomment gjennomlyst form. En dårlig vits er i en satire en langt større synd enn en overfladisk karaktertegning.” (Ane Farsethås i *Morgenbladet* 4.–10. juli 2014 s. 44)

Ingvar Ambjørnsens roman *Ut av ilden* (2014) handler om en forfatter som “har solgt sjelen sin og skriver nå lødig underholdningslitteratur. Det er én av hans synder. Han er i tillegg en aldrende kvinne-jeger, notorisk utro, fordrunken, mer opptatt av å pønse ut nye voldsmettede plott enn av menneskene rundt seg. Udelt sympatisk er han altså ikke, men han framstilles med nok varme, egenart og forsonende trekk til at jeg som leser bryr meg om hvordan det går med ham. Vi følger den aldrende forfatteren på reise fra sted til sted, på flukt fra spøkelser fra fortida. Etter et par turer til utlandet, er vi tilbake i Irgens’ fødeby Larvik, hvor han bader i hotellbassenget kledd i bermudashorts med Se & Hørs logo og drikker sjampanje på bladets regning. [...] romanen er mer enn en satire over norsk bok-bransje.” (<http://klassekampen.no/article/20140621/ARTICLE/140629993>; lesedato 18.12.14)

Nina Lykkes roman *Nei og atter nei* (2016) er en norsk samtidssatire med familietematikk. “Hun heter Ingrid og holder på å gå på veggene på Oslos aller beste østkant. Hun har ektemann, som hun elsker pliktskyldig med en gang i uken, samt to voksne sønner, som ikke har lært seg å tørke seg bak. Resultatet er møkkete underbukser, som Ingrid kokevasker, mens hun lurar på hvorfor sønnene bare snakker til henne når de trenger pengene hennes. [...] De møkkete underbuksene er en vellykket metafor for et norsk sosialdemokrati anno 2016, hvor foreldre feier foran de bortskjemte ungene sine, og statsråder tar med seg toåringene sine på kontoret. Romanen åpner med et sitat av den svenske statsministeren Tage Erlander fra 1956, hvor han advarer mot det han kaller “de store forventningenes misnøye”, som kort fortalt går ut på at tap av livsmening går hånd i hånd med stigende velstand. [...] Hos Solstad var det fortsatt muligheter til å finne mening i å lese verdenslitteraturen, men selv ikke her finner Nina Lykkes Ingrid noe fotfeste. Isteden blir hun sittende på lesesirkel med en debutroman skrevet på arkaisk

nynorsk om en mann som ender opp med å ligge med en dame som viser seg å være hans halvsøster i en mørk vestlandsfjord. [...] Nina Lykke skriver kjapt, treffende og gjenkjennelig. Desperasjonen virker ektefølt. Kanskje er hun den skarpeste satiriker i norsk litteratur i dag. [...] Kanskje er det ikke nok at romanen sier nei og atter nei. På et eller annet nivå må den også si ja. Men da blir det kanskje ikke en fullt så effektiv satire?” (Knut Hoem i https://www.nrk.no/kultur/bok/anmeldelse-av-_nei-og-atter-nei_-av-nina-lykke-1.13107609; lesedato 26.01.17)

“Debutboken til Frank Lade handler om Frank Lade og kloningen Frank Lade. - Jeg måtte kvitte meg med det selvbiografiske en gang for alle, sier forfatteren. Han har skrevet en satire på den romanen han mener norske forlag er ute etter. [...] Hans første roman kommer ut nå og er en satire hvor han har lagt inn alt det “riktige”. Slik er “Oppskriften for å bli publisert i Norge”, som blir gjengitt i romanen “Frank Lande” i en litt annen form: - Få med ditt eget navn i boken så ofte som mulig. - Klin så mange bilder som mulig av deg selv på omslaget (og finn en kunstnerisk forsvarlig grunn til å gjøre det). - Skriv med korte, helst litt søte setninger. - Gjentagelser er viktig, gjerne om nære og søte ting. [...] Romanen “Frank Lande” kan beskrives som en humoristisk utgave av tidsånd-filmen “Reprise” i bokform, inkludert en dose selvironi, med en tydelig touch av Erlend Loes stil. Og den er ikke bare en satire myntet på det litterære miljø. Det moderne kreativitetspresset blant unge er et sentralt tema. Romanfiguren Frank Lande er, i likhet med Frank som sitter foran oss, både musiker og blivende forfatter.” (Aftenposten 27. oktober 2006, kulturdelen s. 1 og 6-7)

Engelskmannen William Hogarth ble på 1700-tallet kjent for sine satiriske bilder, der han bl.a. kritiserte pengebegjæret hos de velstående i det britiske samfunnet.

Amanda Hiner og Elizabeth Davis har redigert antologien *British Women Satirists in the Long Eighteenth Century* (2022). “Listen på kvinner hvis verk de mener kan plasseres i satiresjangeren, er på 447 navn. [...] - Ofte var satiren verken moralsk eller velmenende i det hele tatt. I stedet ble den brukt til å ydmyke litterære fiender, latterliggjøre folk og avsløre skandaler, sier Davis. [...] “Da kvinnelige satirikere først begynte å skrive for scenen på 1690-tallet, ble det sterkt kritisert og attpåtil angrepet med egne satiriske meta-skuespill. *The Female Wits* fra 1696, signert av den anonyme forfatteren “Mr. W. M.”, er for eksempel en satire om kvinner som prøver å skrive skuespill – en av karakterene omtales som “en kvinne som later som om hun er klassisk skolert og beskriver seg selv som ‘kritiker’”. Ettersom det med satiriker-rollen følger en viss tyngde og autoritet, i den forstand at man må kunne heve seg over sine medmennesker for å identifisere deres svakheter og tåpeligheter, var dette ifølge Hiner og Davis en risikabel rolle for kvinner å gå inn i. - Det vi ser igjen og igjen, er at kvinner som skrev satire sier “nei, jeg skriver ikke satire!”. De var klar over at dette var en litterær form som var svært kraftfull, populær og provoserende, og visste også at den ble forbundet med maskulinitet og

aggressivitet. Derfor bruker de alle mulige strategier, både for å delta i formen og for å ivareta ryktet deres, sier Hiner.” (*Morgenbladet* 21.–27. juli 2023 s. 38 og 40)

Den amerikanske regissøren Howard Hawks’ film *The Big Sleep* (1946) har en relativt gåtefull handling og selv regissøren syntes den var vanskelig å forstå. Filmen har blitt tolket som en satire over filmproduksjon (Mai og Winter 2006 s. 88).

Den sovjetrussiske filmskaperen Lev Kuleshovs *Herr Wests uvanlige eventyr i bolsjevikenes land* (1924) er en satire over hvordan amerikanerne tenkte seg det sovjetiske “helvetet” (Ferro 1993 s. 198).

Gerd Brantenbergs science fiction-roman *Egalias døtre* (1977) dreier helt om på svært mange ord som har med mann/menn å gjøre, og skaper nye ord som f.eks. “matrark” (det motsatte av patriark), “kvinnskap” (ikke mannskap), “kvindat” (mandat), “jomherr” (jomfru), “herken” (frøken), “sangerann” (sangerinne) og “mone” (kone). “The ultimate effect of Brantenberg’s linguistic gender inversion is satire [...] The satiric humour inscribed in and through linguistic manipulation helps to both uncover and undermine the system that creates and maintains the abusive power structures that are in place – as Brantenberg so clearly shows in her reversal of these structures. [...] Brantenberg not only satirizes linguistic expressions of phallocentrism through the use of neologisms that invert and reveal gendered power imbalances, but also describes the effect such imbalances have on the group that is diminished by such language, thus creating an instance of recognition that is double: readers may recognize both how patriarchal language excludes women from the norm and the common reaction among feminists to this linguistic and sociopolitical phenomenon – “does our language *have* to be this way”? [...] the reader’s continuous translation of the book’s fictional matriarchal society into the patriarchal reality they know from real life contributes to the work’s satirical effect. By subverting the male as norm and creating lexical inventions by analogy with existing real-world Norwegian words and idioms, Brantenberg shows readers their world reflected as in a distorting mirror, and invites them to navigate between recognition and distortion – a well-known recipe for humour if the balance is right. [...] Although the patriarchal hierarchy and the authorities of the real world that benefit from this hierarchy are only seen and recognized through the reader’s translation of the reflection from the distorting mirror, there is no doubt that they constitute the target of the book’s satirical mockery.” (Flotow, Solberg og Lessinger 2021)

“[F]ilmkunstneren Trygve Luktavasslimos *Den veganske tannbørsten* fra 2019 [...] [er] en sylskarp satire over klimadebattens uthulede retorikk når den havner på avveie og profitteres på som markedsføringsredskap.” (*Morgenbladet* 29. oktober–4. november 2021 s. 32)

“*Man Bites Dog* (Remy Belvaux, André Bonzel, Benoit Poelvoorde, 1992, Bel.). This film is a mock-documentary, and is, in places, very funny. But it is a very dark, mordant satire on media journalists’ standards and ethics, which uses an accurate parody of a documentary team following a serial killer as the vehicle for its broader critical points.” (Ward 2005 s. 106-107)

I noen kapitler i tegneserien *Even a Monkey Can Draw Manga* (1990) “Takekuma and Aihara explain such basic techniques as drawing panel borders, facial expressions, and human figures, but in a unique, satirical way.” (Gravett 2011 s. 559)

Tong Enzheng var en kinesisk arkeolog, antropolog og forfatter som skrev science fiction. “During the Cultural Revolution (1966-1976), Tong became notorious in China for a paper criticizing the effect of cultural policies on the conduct of archaeology, effectively suggesting that “pure” science was being tainted by the interference of the Party. His refusal to be silent on this issue, and on many others, led to his branding as an “enemy of the people”, and to persecution of both him and his family. Many of his old stories were dragged out and pilloried, particularly “Guxia Miwu”, which was now claimed to be a veiled Satire in which the native Sichuanese state of Ba stood for the ousted Nationalists from the Chinese civil war, and the despoiling army of Qin was intended to represent the People’s Liberation Army. He spent much of the period working in a cowshed.” (http://www.sf-encyclopedia.com/entry/tong_enzheng; lesedato 14.05.21)

Amerikaneren Matt Groenings animasjonsfilmer om familien Simpson inneholder mye samfunnssatire. Det samme gjør Jason Reitmans film *Thank You for Smoking* (2005) og Michael Mores dokumentarfilmer. Politikere og andre maktpersoner latterliggjøres ofte. Larry Bishops film *Hell Ride* (2008) er en “motorsykkel-filmsatire”. Regissøren av filmen *Fight Club* (1999), David Fincher, “har ofte hevdet at filmen er en satire over machomannens behov for å markere og posere i et “feminisert” post-industrielt samfunn. Men filmen ble markedsført i pausene på amerikanske wrestlingkamper, og ble tidlig omfavnet av en generasjon menn som tok dette machoportrettet på stort alvor.” (*Aftenposten* 18. desember 2009 s. 14)

“Satire also depends on the audience recognizing it as such: for satire to be effective, it must be received as satire – there is always the risk that the satire will be read “straight” or superficially. This was the case, for example, with the reception of David Fincher’s 1999 film adaptation of Chuck Palahniuk’s novel *Fight Club* – which satirizes both consumerism and toxic masculinity. Many viewers of the movie apparently didn’t understand that it was a satire, however, since in its wake a number of real-life “fight clubs” sprang up across the country: something that shouldn’t have happened, had audiences fully understood that the film was *making fun* of the kind of masculinity that’s so desperate to prove itself that it will happily engage in underground, bare-knuckle fighting.” (Evan Gottlieb i <https://liberalarts.oregonstate.edu/wlf/what-satire>; lesedato 08.08.22)

Det har vært og finnes et enormt antall satire-programmer på TV og radio. “Politisk satire blant embetsmenn og pressetalspersoner er en britisk paradegren. “Ja vel, herr statsråd” var en øyeblikkelig klassiker tidlig på 80-tallet” (*Dagbladet* 12. november 2009 s. 65). Skotsk-italienske Armando Iannucci “begynte sin karriere i radio, men hadde sin første tv-suksess med nyhetssatiren “The Day Today” i 1994. Det var her den håpløse programlederen Alan Partridge ble introdusert for seerne i Steve Coogans skikkelse. [...] Armando Iannucci er mest berømt sine tv-serier. Han lagde sin første surrealistiske nyhetssatire i “The Day Today”, deretter talkshow-satire i “Knowing Me, Knowing You ... with Alan Partridge”, før Labour-regjeringen fikk gjennomgå i “The Thick of It”. I høst har han gitt ut sine bortimot samlede artikler i boka “The Audacity of Hype”. Tittelen spiller selvsagt på den kjente forfatteren Barack Obamas mer omtalte bok [med tittelen *The Audacity of Hope*], bortsett fra undertittelen, som lyder: “Bewilderment, Sleaze and Other Tales of the 21st Century”.” (*Dagbladet* 12. november 2009 s. 64-65) I 2008 hadde amerikaneren Jon Stewart stor suksess med satireprogrammet “The Daily Show” på amerikansk TV, og klarte i noen saker å “sette dagsordenen”, dvs. få en viss innflytelse på hva som ble diskutert i politikken i USA.

TV-serien *Insatiable* (2018-19; skapt av Lauren Gussis m.fl.) har blitt oppfattet som en satire over slankehysteri (Moritz Stock i <https://tvdiskurs.de/beitrag/jugend-in-serie/>; lesedato 07.06.22).

“Satire har lang tradisjon som virkemiddel for å påpeke politisk maktmisbruk og dårskap. Juvenalis (60-127 e.kr.) kritiserte i fem bøker Romas moralske forfall og latterliggjorde både grekere, romerske aristokrater og transvestitter. [...] Hvorfor lager ingen drama og satire av norsk politikk? Det kunne den sårt trengt. Det kunne skapt større interesse for beslutninger som styrer livene våre, men ikke minst utfordret politikerne der de ofte opererer i sin egen lille boble. Politisk humor avkler og avslører. Den splitter. Den er respektløs, farlig og sannferdig på sitt beste; en nødvendig ventil i diktaturer og en naturlig del av ethvert demokrati. [...] Det er mulig nettopp strid og konflikt må til for å få folk til å le. [...] “The Daily Show” er et satirisk amerikansk TV-show som blander humor med aktuelle nyhetssaker. Stewart gjør narr av både politikere og presse, men med en brodd som gjør at showet har gjennomslag som et seriøst aktualitetsprogram. Bare veldig morsomt.” (*Dagbladet* 21. april 2013 s. 50-51)

“Satire is becoming increasingly influential in shaping political debates today. To a growing number of people, satirical news presents a much-desired supplement to mainstream news and some people have even started to replace traditional media with satirical news as their primary source of information. This is not only an American or Western phenomenon but something that is happening all over the world (Baym and Jones 2013). Therefore, it is necessary to take satire seriously as a political force that is shaping our political discourses. Unfortunately, satire as a phenomenon is hard to pin down, as it makes use of numerous different modes of

expression, such as irony, sarcasm, hyperbole, profanity, and many more.” (Nielsen 2019)

Den franske forfatteren Jean Raspail roman *De helliges leir* (1973; på norsk i 2016) er kontroversiell på grunn av anklager om rasisme. I denne historien ankommer en enorm mengde illeluktende indiske flyktninger til Europa, og oppfører seg bestialsk. De dreper og voldtar. Den europeiske sivilisasjonen går under når de fremmede overtar, og romanen har derfor blitt oppfattet som et skremmebilde og en advarsel. Andre oppfatter boka som satirisk. “Raspails bok er satire – den er ikke faglitteratur eller politisk manifest. Det er en satire over selvforaktende idealister som slår dørene åpne for en flodbølge av båtmigranter.” (Asle Toje i *Morgenbladet* 21.–27. juli 2017 s. 28)

“Den danske forfatteren Jacob Skyggebjerg har spesialisert seg på satiriske romaner om landet sitt. I *Hvad mener du med vi* (2015) var det selve folkesjelen, det “til apatien bortskjemte” danske folk, som ble latterliggjort, og i *Hjælp* (2018) landets psykiatriske helsesystem. Flere av bøkene hans er blitt godt mottatt av både lesere og flere anmeldere, men de “er blitt dårlig anmeldt av litterater”, skrev Jyllands-Posten tidligere denne måneden: “Nå tar forfatteren hevn.” I hans nylig utgitte roman *Inderkredsen* er det nemlig litteraturmiljøet som får gjennomgå Skyggebjergs satire. Litteraturvitere og kritikere, profesjonelle lesere som “skubber vanlige mennesker bort fra bøkene”, og som tilnærmer seg litteraturen på en pervers måte, som forfatteren kunne konstatere i et intervju med avisen Politiken før utgivelsen: “Anmelderne er en vold av støy som ligger mellom forfatterne og leserne”, mente han, og la til at litteraturvitenskap hovedsakelig bare tjener litteraturvitenskapen selv. Og like raskt som romanen hadde ankommet bokhyllene, ble den slaktet av disse profesjonelle leserne – boken ble blant annet kalt for en konspiratorisk gimmick og en hateful full parodi. [...] Med romanen *Inderkredsen*, som kom ut i desember, gjør forfatteren satire på danske litteraturanmeldere – og beskriver et patriarkalsk og intellektuelt forfall.” (Maria Lokna i <https://www.morgenbladet.no/boker/2021/12/30/dansk-forfatter-til-frontalangrep-pa-litteratur-anmeldere/>; lesedato 18.01.22)

Romanen *Georg-komplekset* (2022) av den danske forfatteren Kirsten Hammann “er ein satire over seg sjølv, over middelklasseromanen som skildrar ein middelaldrande mannleg forfattar i (skrive)krise. Historia er òg ein diagnose av ei samtid der individualisme, sosial status og å bli sett er drivkrefter som for mange har gått heilt amok. [...] Ved å spele på og overspele krisen som praktisk, faktisk og eksistensielt plot, viser Hammann fram det patetiske, menneskelege og djupt humoristiske i korleis Georg tviheld på alle dei destruktive kjenslene som er blitt vekt i han etter at kona begynte på det for ham djupt fatale prosjektet med å skrive ein roman. Med eit godt blikk for struktur og status i den litterære sfæren og i litteraturen sjølv, som at mange mannlege forfattarar ofte vel seg ein professor i litteratur som hovudperson, går Kirsten Hammann heilt ublyg laus på både samtida

og skjønnlitteraturens vesen.” (Margunn Vikingstad i *Morgenbladet* 17.–23. mars 2023 s. 52)

Lars Mørch Finboruds roman *Tårnet. Fyrtårnet* (2025) er en “satire over det moderne kunstmuseet [...] Blant romanens høydepunkter er scenen der en avdød donator blir klattet inn i Tårnets grunnmur. [...] Flere av de fiktive utstillingskonseptene kunne antagelig glidd nokså ubemerket inn i sesongprogrammet til våre største visningssteder. Trender fra de store internasjonale biennalene får også gjennomgå – særlig er de infame beskrivelsene av en type installasjonskunst som roper fra taket, kostelig lesing. Mest urovekkende er likevel nedvurderingen av et vitalt fagmiljø. I *Tårnet* gir dette seg utslag i en lite tiltalende blanding av selvsikkert språk (“Tenk stort”) og et påfallende uambisiøst program.” (*Morgenbladet* 25.–31. juli 2025 s. 54) Romanen er “samtidsspiddende *new public management*-satire [...] - Denne boken er en gjenopplevd, faglig sorgprosess. Folk utenfor kunstverden har kommet til meg og sagt “for en fantasifull roman, rene galskapen”. Mens folk som jobber i museer bare sier: “Flott, du beskriver hverdagen min.” Arbeidshverdagen fortegner seg til tider som en fantastisk komedie.” (*Morgenbladet* 1.–7. august 2025 s. 39) Finborud er kunsthistoriker og kurator på Henie Onstad Kunstsenter.

Bilder kan i høy grad være satiriske. Et eksempel på en nazi-satire er ukraineren Boris Artzybasheffs underlige hakekors (tegnet i magasinet *Life* på 1940-tallet), med groteske figurer som danner det nazistiske hakekorset.

I noen blader, magasiner og tidsskrift er satire og annen humor gjennomgående – den såkalte “vittighetspressen”. Både verbale tekster og bilder er satiriske i disse bladene. Franske satiriske blader inneholdt midt på 1800-tallet mange såkalte “fysiologier” (“physiologies”), dvs. raske portretter av forskjellige mennesketyper og “sosiale typer” (Quinsat 1990 s. 381). Eksempler på gamle norske vittighetsblader er *Hvepsen*, *Krydseren*, *Vikingen*, *Korsaren*, *Tyrihans*, *Exlex* og *Karikaturen*. Eksempler på andre vittighetsblad er de britiske *Punch* (fra første halvdel av 1800-tallet) og *Private Eye*, det tyske *Simplicissimus* og det franske *Den lenkede and*. *Simplicissimus* ble utgitt i perioden 1896-1944.

“Satiren kan brukes og misbrukes, slik blant andre dansken Emil Jensen har skildret det i sitt mektige verk “*Karikaturalbum*” (1906-12). Oftest har satiren vært de svakes tilflukt mot overmakten – den har vært forstandens, rettferdighetens og sannhetens forsvar. Misbruket inntreffer når satirens virkemidler brukes av makthaverne til et bestemt propagandaformål, som da nazipressen i en endeløs strøm karikerte jødene og deres kultur. [...] I 1830 ble så den moderne vittighetspressen skapt med karikaturbladet *La Caricature*, grunnlagt av Charles Philipon. [...] Men den satiriske pressen fikk gradvis større suksess, den spredte seg som en vind utover Europa fra midten av 1800-tallet. Også Norge fikk en slik mediegenre – med blader som *Vikingen*, *Korsaren*, *Tyrihans* og *Karikaturen*. Dette nye mediet spilte en viktig rolle når det gjaldt å slå ned på blant annet fanatisme og

maktmisbruk, og fremmet utvilsomt demokratiseringen.” (Bredo Berntsen i *Dagbladet* 18. februar 2006 s. 58)

Det russiske vittighetsbladet *Krokodil* ble startet i 1922 og overlevde perioder med politisk ensretting og sterk sensur i Sovjetunionen. *Krokodil* støttet revolusjonen og kommunismen, men angrep samtidig – i både tekster og tegninger – uheldige utvekster i det russiske samfunnet: grådige apparatsjiks, byråkratiske rutiner, meningsløst politisk komitéarbeid, pompøse taler, krypende oppførsel overfor statslige ledere, korrupsjon og lignende “sykdommer” i samfunnet. Den russiske futuristen Vladimir Majakovskij var en kjent forfatter som av og til bidro til *Krokodil*.

“Report From Iron Mountain [1967]: In the form of a government think-tank report, this fabulous satire analyzed the “possibility and desirability of peace” and found that peace would be unhealthy to the American state for many reasons. The satire was aimed at the U.S. military-industrial complex from the American left-wing during the cold-war, but it has been revived by anti-government groups on the American right-wing in more recent years, some of whom take it to be evidence of an on-going conspiracy rather than just a finger pointing at the conspiracy.” (<https://sniggle.net/litforg.php>; lesedato 22.03.24)

Den amerikanske spilldesigneren Ian Bogost ville demonstrere den manglende kompleksiteten i spill som var populære på det sosiale nettstedet Facebook i 2010, og lagde derfor spillet *Cow Clicker* (2010). Spillet ble lagd som en satire (Rauscher 2012 s. 33). Det hele går ut på at spilleren hver sjuende time kan klikke på bildet av ei ku og få den til å raute. Ventetiden kan kortes ned ved å betale reelle penger. Spillet ble en kommersiell suksess, og bekreftet dermed Bogosts kritikk. Det ble Bogosts mest populære spill så langt i hans karriere, mer salgbart enn hans politisk engasjerte læringsspill.

“I den poengterte nye boka “Strange Bedfellows: How Late-Night Comedy Turns Democracy into a Joke” skiller engelskprofessoren Russell Peterson mellom det han kaller pseudosatire og ekte satire. Den tidligere stand up-komikeren hevder at samtlige av vertene for de store amerikanske fjernsynskanalenenes talkshow (Jay Leno, David Letterman, Conan O’Brian) bedriver det førstnevnte: vitsene angriper mannen ikke ballen. De gjør narr av politikernes karaktertrekk (stygg, dum osv.), men skyr unna selve politikken. Humoren preges av en kynisk ironisering uten politisk brodd og støter ikke andre enn politikeren selv. [...] Ekte satire, ifølge Peterson, preges derimot av en oppriktig indignasjon. Det er en måte å bruke humoristiske grep til å kritisere seriøse og høyst reelle problemer. [...] fenomenet EOO (equal-opportunity offenders), ifølge Peterson. For å unngå anklager om et politisk ståsted, sørger de alltid for å slå i alle retninger. [...] Satire er mest effektiv når den er røff, kvass og ubehagelig nær virkeligheten” (Ulrik Eriksen i *Dagbladet* 2. mai 2008 s. 39).

“Normal people without the gift of supernaturally fast mental reflexes are often left thinking of their *asteisms* a half-hour too late to use them. [...] An ingeniously polite insult. [...] Those that are quick-witted enough to deliver these wonderfully genteel mockeries, on the other hand, are often immortalized in quote books – if not in histories. For example:

“I’ve had a wonderful evening; but this wasn’t it.” – Groucho Marx

“Some cause happiness wherever they go; some whenever they go.” – Oscar Wilde

“She looks as if butter wouldn’t melt in her mouth.” – Jonathan Swift

“He has all of the virtues I dislike and none of the vices I admire.” – Winston Churchill

While these *asteisms* are funny to read, the majority of people would rather avoid insulting people. We carefully consider our words and usually try to say things that make others feel good. But some people have a harder time with this. Those on the autism spectrum have difficulty interpreting social cues and situations, which can often result in them saying things that others take to be deliberately insulting. *Asteisms*, on the other hand, require the speaker to have a keen understanding of the social environment, the cultural nuances of the chosen words, and must master their own social cues for perfect delivery.” (<https://blog.csoftintl.com/asteism-wacky-word-wednesday-blog/>; lesedato 27.04.24)

Swifts *Modest Proposal*

Jonathan Swifts “A Modest Proposal for preventing the Children of poor People in Ireland from being a Burden to their Parents or Country; and for making them beneficial to the Public” (1729) “begins with an account of the impoverished state of many in Ireland. The writer expresses sympathy and the need for a solution. [...] The writer calculates the number of infants born in Ireland and asks what should be done with them. He points out that they are unfit for any employment, being even too young to steal. Neither will merchants buy or sell children. Therefore, it seems like a good idea that the people of Ireland simply eat the infants when they reach the age of one year. The writer treats the weight of an infant, what kind of dish it will make, and how many people it will serve. He surmises the times of year when the infants will be most plentiful, based on the purported sexual patterns of the Irish. There might also be uses for the discarded skin of the infants, such as for ladies’ gloves.” (<https://www.gradesaver.com/a-modest-proposal-and-other-stories/study-guide/summary-a-modest-proposal>; lesedato 13.04.23) Essayet ble publisert anonymt.

Swift “blandt andet opfandt en økonom, der foreslog at sælge de fattiges mange børn som delikatesser til de riges bord og nøje beregnede de talrige fordele ved

dette columbusæg, som ikke bare skaffede de fattige af med deres belastende unger, men lod dem tjene en ærlig skilling, gav den kulinariske verden mulighed for at afprøve nye og inspirerende fødevarer og skænkede de rige endnu en chance for at tage socialt ansvar.” (Hans-Jørgen Birkmose i <https://baggrund.com/2017/11/29/jonathan-swifts-latter-en-meget-kort-introduktion-til-jonathan-swift-2/>; lesedato 27.11.25)

I sin satire anbefaler den anonyme skribenten institusjonalisert kannibalisme. Og babyene kan serveres på forskjellige måter: “a young healthy child well nursed, is, at a year old, a most delicious nourishing and wholesome food, whether stewed, roasted, baked, or boiled; and I make no doubt that it will equally serve in a fricasee, or a ragoust.” De engelske jordeierne i Irland vil nok sette pris på disse nye matrettene: “I grant this food will be somewhat dear, and therefore very proper for landlords, who, as they have already devoured most of the parents, seem to have the best title to the children.”

Forfatteren kalkulerer mye i teksten, og later som om han tror at leserne vil akseptere de matematiske kalkylene, som kan være en satire over vitenskapsmenn kjølige kalkuleringer. Tall og beregninger kan inngå i de mest sinnssyke måter å tenke på, fullstendig umoralsk tankeganger.

“The text was written as an imitation of a political pamphlet, in which Swift parodies the empirical, calculating and avaricious attitude of contemporary politicians. [...] As the text progresses, it seems there is nothing that this proposal will not fix. Swift even argues that this practice of selling babies for consumption will cause a decrease in domestic violence, as the men will be more careful with their wives during pregnancy, since they are now carrying something of actual value. [...] Swift uses the calculating logic of contemporary politicians and exaggerates it to a point where the complete lack of moral concern becomes unbearable. The parody, in this case, takes on a form very similar to an argument *ad absurdum*.” (Nielsen 2019)

“Swift pushes the instrumental rationality to a point where no one in their right mind would perceive it as rational anymore. This is what satirical parody can do by revealing the problematic contradictions inherent in terms like “the greater good”, “growth” and “value”. When Swift talks of the value of these children, he refers to their monetary value as a product to be sold and bought. This notion stands in direct contrast to the idea that most people might have of an inherent value of human life.” (Nielsen 2019)

“Stereotypes against Irish Catholics make it easier for Swift to use them as the subject of his satire. The stereotypes are present in both the reasons for the proposal and the language used. The narrator’s argument that something must be done with infants because they are too young to steal implies that this is a common employment of Irish Catholics, even while it is humorous apart from the stereotype.

The overall idea of overpopulation comes from the stereotype that Catholics tend to have a lot of children. The first reason Swift's narrator gives for adopting his proposal – that it will lessen the number of Catholics – is perhaps the best example of satire of religious prejudice in the piece. Furthermore, he uses the word “papists” in the offensive sense of anti-Catholic rejection of the Pope. In Protestant England, many people might share the stereotypes but would never go so far as the speaker suggests about eating children. The theme of prejudice against the lower classes is revealed in suggestions such as the idea that the carcasses of the poor children could be used for clothing, women's gloves. Swift suggests, with this extreme example, as well as his declaration that the landlords have already “devoured” the poor infants' parents, that the rich live at the expense of the poor. By referring next to another figure, “a very worthy person” (who is meant to represent a member of the upper, learned classes), Swift furthers his satire of the upper classes by implying that there are people so disconnected from the lower classes that they might agree with this outlandish proposal.” (<https://www.gradesaver.com/a-modest-proposal-and-other-stories/study-guide/summary-a-modest-proposal>; lesedato 13.04.23)

“Swift's attack on the British government's inability to solve the problem of poverty in Ireland is one of the literary canon's most famous examples of satire. It proposes that the most obvious solution to Ireland's economic crisis is for the Irish to sell their children as food: shockingly, it also suggests various ways in which they can be prepared and served. It was first published anonymously, in 1729, and the detached, serious tone of its narrator emphasises the horror of what Swift is actually recommending: only in its final paragraphs, when the essay turns to the realities of the Irish economic system and the problems caused by absentee landlords, does the author's view become clear. Despite its power as a piece of rhetoric, A Modest Proposal did not lead to any lasting changes for Ireland's rural poor; and just over a century later, thousands would perish in the Great Potato Famine.” (<https://www.bl.uk/learning/timeline/item126684.html>; lesedato 13.04.23)

“Written in the first person, the proposal outlines the problem of the children that Ireland was facing during the time of Jonathan Swift. The problem outlined was related to the women beggars filling the streets of the Irish cities. Some of them have no means to feed their young kids and the kids becoming beggars was another issue facing the country. During this time the Protestant minority English was ruling Ireland neglecting the poor Irish Catholics. Jonathan Swift has tried to invite the attention of the government toward this problem but it seems that after all of his efforts failed, he has chosen this selected and novel way to attract the attention of the authorities. [...] According to this proposal, there are 200,000 Irish parents actively giving birth to children by which means that if 30,000 of the couples can take care of them, 50,000 face miscarriages, leaving 120,000 parents having the inability to bring up their children in an appropriate way. His contention is how to deal with this explosion of the childbirth rate and what to do with this rising

number of children, for they cannot be used in agriculture, or cannot be made skillful workers. They are also too young to support themselves, he says, adding that they also cannot be sold as slaves, or else they would fetch a considerable amount of money. Therefore, he has suggested a comprehensive plan to deal with this increasing birth rate.” (<https://literarydevices.net/a-modest-proposal/>; lesedato 13.04.23)

“Exploitation: Although the essay seems a simple satire, the underlying theme is the exploitation of the landlords of Ireland and England who left people with nothing to eat. They were thronging the streets to beg for food. The laws were unfair and maltreated the poor in favor of the rich or the elite class. The rents charged from the tenants and farmers were very high which led to poverty and begging. Therefore, the essay highlights this exploitation [...]

Greed: The essay also shows the theme of greed lurking behind the lines. As it is not obvious, it is shown through the presence of beggars including women and children, who are “forced to employ their time in strolling to beg sustenance.” It shows that they have been forced by their landlords to go hungry or feed themselves and their children by begging. In other words, the greed of landlords brought the poor to the streets. Therefore, the proposal hints at the greed of the landlords.

Prejudice: The thematic idea, prejudice is not plainly noticeable but it makes up the background of the essay in that the British Protestants used to despise the Roman Catholics and have laws enacted to exploit their vulnerabilities, which left them to roam on the roads in search of food and security.

Irish Social Apathy: The essay also underlines the Irish social indifference as many people were begging in the streets with children and the government and social responses were almost non-existence as far as the essay shows. That was also a major reason behind his proposal of selling of the children to the gentry for meat and other purposes.

Poverty: The beginning of the essay shows that poverty was widespread in Ireland on account of the government’s lack of care, the indifference of the upper class and the landlords. The laws were enacted to crush the poor class, the reason that all women, children, and even men of this section of the society had been forced to come into the streets to beg for sustenance.

Colonialism: Although it is not modern colonialism, English rule on its adjoining lands and countries, unlike Asian and African countries, were for extraction of the sources by exploiting the local population making the situation of living worse in the British colonies. The Catholics were subjected to religious torture and legal exploitation, leaving a chunk of the Irish population to face starvation or beg in the streets.

Misanthropy: If read in literal terms, the essay shows extreme misanthropy of the author that he has discussed in his letter to Pope, yet when taken as a satire, it shows his love for humanity and his concern for the safety and security of the Irish children.” (<https://literarydevices.net/a-modest-proposal/>; lesedato 13.04.23)

Litteraturliste (for hele leksikonet): <https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no/gallery/litteraturliste.pdf>

Alle artiklene i leksikonet er tilgjengelig på <https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no>