

LOCATING TRANSNATIONAL SPACES

Culture, Theatre and Cinema

ESSAYS IN HONOUR OF
Professor Emmanuel Samu Dandaura
fsonla, fitin, MNAL, MNIPR



*Sue Matheson, Stephen Ogheneruro Okpadah
and Prayer Elmo Raj*



Locating Transnational Spaces

Culture, Theatre and Cinema

A Special Publication of the International Association of Theatre Critics

And

***Faculty of the Arts, Business and Science, University College of the North,
The Pas, Manitoba, Canada***

IN HONOUR OF

Professor Emmanuel Samu Dandaura,

fsonta, fitin, MNAL, MNIPR

Edited by

Sue Matheson, Stephen Ogheneruro Okpadah

And

Prayer Elmo Raj

Published by the International Association of Theatre Critics and Faculty of the Arts, Business and Science, University College of the North, The Pas, Manitoba, Canada.

Copyright © 2020 Sue Matheson, Stephen Ogheneruro Okpadah and Prayer Elmo Raj.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form or by any electronic or mechanical means, including information storage and retrieval systems, without written permission from the publisher, except by a reviewer who may quote passages in a review.

First Published, 2020.

ISBN: 978-978-56857-7-0-X

email: okpadahstephen@gmail.com, smatheson@ucn.ca and pelmoraj@gmail.com

Dedication

This book is dedicated to Professor Emmanuel Samu Dandaura, fsona, fitin, MNAL, MNIPR

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title Page.....	i
Copyright Page.....	ii
Dedication.....	iii
Acknowledgements.....	iv
Biography of the Contributors.....	v
Foreword.....	ix
Table of Contents.....	xi

Section A

THEATRE, LITERATURE AND CINEMA IN TRANSNATIONAL SPACES

1. A Prognosis on Locating Transnational Spaces: Culture, Theatre and Cinema Stephen Ogheneruro Okpadah.....	2
2. Misleading Expressions in the Rendition of Subtitles: A Syntactic Analysis of Subtitles in Selected Yoruba Movies Joseph D. Atoyebi, Ph.D.....	6
3. Cultural Differences and Liminal Identities in Wole Soyinka's <i>The Lion and the Jewel</i> Prayer Elmo Raj, Ph.D.....	23
4. Film and Campaign against Gender-Based Violence in Africa: A Study of <i>Ije: The Journey</i> Taiwo Afolabi, Ph.D and Stephen Ogheneruro Okpadah.....	36
5. A Comparative Study of Heroism and Anti-heroism in two Selected Plays of Luigi Pirandello and Wole Soyinka AbdulRasheed A. Adeoye and Olayinka Magbagbeola.....	49
6. A Study of Language and the Dynamics of Merger in Genevieve Nnaji's <i>Lionheart</i> Sue Matheson, Ph.D.....	69
7. The Documentary Film Genre: Issues of Truth and Propaganda John Adakole Oklobia, Ph.D and Edmund Onwuliri.....	80
8. Official Apathy and Individual Suffering: Sharon Pollock's <i>One Tiger to a Hill</i> Papiya Lahiri, Ph.D.....	91

9. Communication of HIV/AIDS Through African Theatre Entertainment Education: The South Africa Experiments
Obi Nwagbo Pat.....99
10. Third World Cinema and the Committed Art of Sembene Ousmane
AbdulRasheed A. Adeoye, Ph.D and Stephen Ogheneruro Okpadah.....109
11. Women and their Choices of the *Other Room* in Zainabu Jallo's *Onions Make Us Cry*
Oluwakemi Emmanuel Olowonubi, Basiru Adebisi and Confidence Ozioyiza Daniel.....120
12. Cultural Realism in Nigerian Home Video Films: A Study of Kenneth Okonkwo's *Village Destroyer*
Kenneth Efakponana Eni Ph.D, AbdulMalik Adakole Amali Ph.D and Blessing Adjeketa.....132
13. The Role of the Arts in Community Development in Developing Countries
Oluwafemi Daniel Adebisi.....139

Section B

TRANSCULTURAL SPACES AND GLOBALISATION

14. The Marlian Empire: Exploring Celebrity Culture and Its Impact on Nigerian Youths
Effevotu Efetobor Stephanie, Biola O. Adumati and Elijah Oje Tosin.....148
15. Art Management and Alliance Francaise Du Lagos, Nigeria
Shadiat Olapeju Shuaib, Ph.D, Omolola Adewale Shukurat and Gabriel Oghenevwarho Ojakovo.....159
16. A Theoretical Analysis of Interculturalism
Giorgia Scribellito.....170
17. Some Notes on Ge'ez Literature: Medieval Hagiographies in Ethiopian Literature
Dawit Girma.....183

18. To Gag or not to Gag: A Psycho-Analytical Study of Selected Nigerian Popular Music Elijah Tosin Oje and Ayodele Obatomi O.....	195
---	-----

Section C

THE DRAMATURGY AND POLITICS OF EMMANUEL SAMU DANDAURA

19. Drama as a Panacea for Violence: A Study of Emmanuel Dandaura's <i>Venom for Venom</i> Babalola Olushola Hakeem.....	207
20. Ecoparadigmatism and Selected Themes in Emmanuel Dandaura's <i>Venom for Venom</i> Fanyam Joel Avangwa and Nkiruka Jacinta Akaenyi, Ph.D.....	218
21. Emmanuel Dandaura's <i>Venom for Venom</i> : A Review Samuel Ayedime Kafewo, Ph.D.....	226
Index.....	229

A Comparative Study of Heroism and Anti-heroism in two Selected Plays of Luigi Pirandello and Wole Soyinka

AbdulRasheed A. Adeoye Ph.D

And

Olayinka Magbagbeola

Introduction

In the artistic process of play construction, so many creative forces come to play. Conflict occupies the central position. Conflict helps to hold a play together so that it can have in-depth meaning. By extension, one of the means for creating conflict in a play is through the use of binary opposition which can be realised through the dialectics of synthesis and anti-thesis, objectivity and negation, communality and individuality, heroism and anti-heroism, amongst other artistic channels. The use of heroism and anti-heroism has not received much intertextual comparison of two different worlds in space and in time (i.e. the Western and African Worlds, and at two different timelines), especially from the perspectives of ideology, culture, dramaturgical style as well as attempt to document historical, philosophical and ardent sociological issues by Playwrights. Hence, this study examines the use of heroism and anti-heroism in Luigi Pirandello's *Six Characters in Search of an Author* and Wole Soyinka's *Death and the King's Horseman*.

It is worthy of note that, this study does not discountenance the supposed complexity of both playwrights as legislated by critics such as Brustein (1964), Chinweizu et al (1980), Lee (1993) and Oyegoke (2009). Certainly, one of the reasons that have accounted for the so-called difficulty or apparent phobia for the works of Wole Soyinka and Luigi Pirandello is, for example, the factor of 'obscurity' as some of these critics have argued. In a way that justifies obscurantism as a cardinal phalanx of postmodern literature, Oyegoke (2009) cited in Afolayan (2018, p. 149) explains that, "obscurity is scarcely a toxic aspect of literature and literary studies . . . the secondary order of discourse that is thrown up by the aesthetic exigencies of creativity".

Unequivocally, Soyinka, the man and Soyinka, the artist has been taxed with a lack of simplicity and has been described as a "eurocentrist, euromodernist, anti-African, cowboy sheriff, and obscurantist" (Chinweizu et al., 1980, pp. 196-211) in his writings. Nonetheless, these claims, as posited by Olaniyan (1995, p. 44), are due to what Soyinka identifies as, "an insidious colonialist discourse which hides its denial of the existence of an African world under the guise of sophistication". Interestingly, Obafemi (1996, p. 118) observes that, "critics of Soyinka's drama can be grouped into

three broad categories: the conventionalist, the materialist and the legislative". Musa (2007, p. 75) further expatiates that Oyin Ogunba, Eldred Jones, Michael Etherton and some other scholars belong to the 'conventionalist group', Femi Osofisan, Biodun Jeyifo, Andrew Gurr and many more belong to the 'materialist school', while Chinweizu, Jemie and Madubuike belong to the 'legislative school'. Quite naturally, the same convoluted charges have also been laid against the widely celebrated Italian dramatist, Luigi Pirandello, who is tagged as an "extreme theatricalist". This is buttressed by Lee (1993, p. 818), who surmises that, "His (Pirandello) relentless examination of the paradoxes of experience has given him a reputation for pessimism". Brustein (1964, p. 282) is also of the view that although, "Pirandello is one of the most subjective dramatists in the modern literature, and certainly the most self-conscious . . . he (Pirandello) often complains about being misunderstood and unappreciated . . . since his philosophy is pessimistic in the extreme, and based on the conviction that the problems of life are insoluble".

The fact, nevertheless, is that both playwrights' lack of simplicity as debated by some of the critics mentioned above, primarily derives from their quest to dramatise the unavoidable relationship between art and existence while also articulating their ideological and philosophical views. In so doing, heroism and anti-heroism has become a forte upon which their writings are premised. Two of such plays written by Luigi Pirandello and Wole Soyinka, in which heroism and anti-heroism have been substantially utilised remain *Six Characters in Search of an Author* (1922; which will simply be referred as *Six Characters* in this study) and *Death and the King's Horseman* (1975), which serve as the play-texts upon which the sub-textual and intertextual radar of juxtaposition are examined.

Theoretical Framework

This study adopts the theory of Intertextuality as modified by Mevlüde Zengin (2016) as its theoretical framework. First coined by Julia Kristeva in 1966, intertextuality is the shaping of a text's meaning by another text. Since every artistic object is assembled from bits and pieces of already existent art (Obafemi, 2010, p. 123), this study's adoption of the theory of intertextuality rests on the threshold that all literary texts are materials upon which readers and critics apply various literary canons. This study adopts the theory of intertextuality because the two playwrights in view, approve of "literary borrowings as long as they are thoroughly ingested, assimilated and given a new lease of life in original imaginative works" (Adekoya, 2006, p. 3).

Borrowing from the Swiss Linguist, Ferdinand de Saussure's (1974) argument on the concept of language as system of signs, to Roland Barthes' (1968) contribution to intertextuality that the author should be "eliminated" in the explication of a literary text, and then to Mikhail Bakhtin (1981) who argued that an author's existence should not interfere with the interpretation

of a text, the theory of intertextuality has been appraised by many post-structuralist theorists such as Paul de Mann, Hills Miller and Jacques Derrida.

According to Zengin (2016, p. 300), "intertextuality, in its broadest sense, is a poststructuralist, deconstructionist and postmodernist theory that changed the concept of text, recognising it as an intertext owing to the interrelations between texts and absorptions of other texts". Zengin's submission confirms that one cannot discuss intertextuality without mentioning its reciprocal relationship with the poetics of deconstruction, which is buttressed by Raji (1999, p. 223) that, "a central principle of deconstruction is the concept of intertextuality which directly refers to the way in which different texts exist in interdependent relationships to one another". The concept of deconstruction holds that literary text possesses a meaning that is constantly being re-assessed by literary criticism. The deconstructionist scholar, Jacques Derrida cited in Norris (1996, p.xii) elucidates that, "the structure preface-text becomes open at both ends. The text has no stable identity, stable origin . . . each act of reading "the text" is a preface to the next". Validating the presence of intertextuality within the African literary world, Obafemi (2010, p. 124) observes that, "some African writers have relied on intertextual borrowing: including aesthetic recasts of historical events to produce memorable texts". Reinforcing the strengths of this theory, a host of African dramatists such as Athol Fugard, Wole Soyinka, Tawfiq Al'hakim, Ola Rotimi, Ngugi wa Thiong'o, Femi Osofisan, Olu Obafemi, believe that, "the explication of African literature cannot be subjected solely to aesthetic appraisals" (Ngugi wa Thiong'o, 1993, p. 74).The following therefore, are the advantages of the theory of intertextuality:

- (i) it does not restrict readers to the organic world of a play-text alone;
- (ii) it gives credence to external factors that shape the meaning of a play-text;
- (iii) it places readers and writers in parallel interpretative positions that may contract or expand;
- (iv) it allows for borderless sub-textual and extra-textual deductions; and
- (v) it serves as a necessary background for textual discourses and counter-discourses within the literary and performative space of postcolonial theatre;

Despite the above-mentioned strengths of this theory, it should be noted that one of its major weaknesses is its dislodgement of the author's context of "originality". Therefore, relying on the intertextual mode, this study examines heroism and anti-heroism in Wole Soyinka's *Death and the king's horseman* and Luigi Pirandello's *Six Characters*. This study pays close attention to how both playwrights' dramaturgies have been shaped by this artistic modicum.

Literature Review

The fact that the spiral paradox of heroism and anti-heroism is a crucial dramatic style cannot be overemphasised. Heroism, according to Franco et. al. (2011, p. 99), "represents the ideal of citizens transforming civic virtue into the highest form of civic action, accepting either physical peril or social injustice". On the other hand, anti-heroism signifies a central character whose traits are traditionally regarded as unacceptable or antagonistic when compared to that of the hero. An anti-hero(ine), also referred to as the villain, antagonist, or a scoundrel, often switches position with the hero, in the process of which he/she becomes a character whose existence and essence turn out to be inconsequential to the world of the play. Interestingly, one major generic feature of most plays in which heroism and anti-heroism are dramatised is that they are tragedies, or that they have been built upon the tragic vision. This fact necessarily charts our discourse to the tragic arts. While this study does not disavow Aristotle's thesis on tragedy (as documented in his *Poetics*) which has served as the basis for the wide expanse of the definitions of tragedy, Barranger's (1995, p. 102) summation that, "tragic vision . . . conceives of people as both vulnerable and invincible, as capable of abject defeat and transcendent greatness" serves the brimstone of our notion of tragic heroism and anti-heroism for this study. Against Barranger's synthetic and dialectical backdrop, it should be mentioned that heroism and anti-heroism are surrounded by three apparent paradoxes:

The dueling impulse to elevate and negate heroic actors; the contrast between the public ascription of heroic status versus the interior decision to act heroically; and apparent similarities between altruism, bystander intervention and heroism that mask important differences between these phenomena (Franco et. al., 2011, p. 99).

Despite the ramifications stated above, most tragic heroes and anti-heroes, in an exercise of free will, "pitch themselves against forces represented by other characters, by their own inner drives, or by their physical environment . . . The trials of the hero (and anti-hero) give meaning to the pain and paradox of our humanity" (Barranger, 1995, p. 102). Within the dramatic spheres of Western and African writings therefore, plays such as Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex* (429 BC), Aristophanes' *Lysistrata* (411 BC.), Luigi Pirandello's *Six Characters in Search of an Author* (1922), Athol Fugard's *Sizwe Bansi is Dead* (1972), Ebrahim Hussein's *Kinjeketile* (1969), Ngugi wa Thiong'o and Githae Mugo's *The Trials of Dedan Kimathi* (1976), Ola Rotimi's *Kurunmi* (1971) and *Ovonramwen N'ogbaisi* (1983), Wole Soyinka's *The Strong Breed* (1963) and *Death and the King's Horseman* (1975), and a host of other plays, display the struggles and travails of heroic and anti-heroic characters within the textual and sub-textual boundaries of the plays' socio-historical, socio-cultural and socio-political realities. Heroic

and anti-heroic characters therefore, often characterise tragic dramas, and are most times symbolic or representational. While the anti-hero seemingly measures up to the hero's stallion gaze but falters beyond repairs within the acceptable norms of a play's organic and inorganic world, "the important thing is that the audience should not be indifferent to the protagonist" (Yerima, 2003, p. 38). The emphasis remains that, the dispersed complications of heroism and anti-heroism have received the pristine rhapsody of *necessity* in the dramaturgy of most playwrights.

With contextual precision, Ògún is unarguably the errant hero and anti-hero in Soyinka's artistic vision and dramaturgy. In his book titled, *The Writing of Wole Soyinka*, Jones (1983, p. 3) recounts that, "Soyinka has his roots in Yorùbá culture, as even a cursory reading of his works soon shows.". Soyinka's belief in the hero-god, Ògún, which he describes as the "protector of orphans", "roof over the homeless", "terrible guardian of the sacred oath", and "the creative urge and instinct, the essence of creativity", "terrible guardian of the sacred oath" (Soyinka, 1976, p.141), finds expression in most of his plays and has significantly defined his dramaturgy. This paradox has been mentioned by Peters (1975) cited in Musa (2007, p. 73), when he says that, "the importance of Ògún in his (Soyinka's) thinking shows the tragic vein which runs throughout his works". Musa however, disagrees with Peters because, "Soyinka has proved beyond reasonable doubt that he is not a scholar alone but also a satirist and a revolutionary of the left" (Musa, 2009, p. 73). Indeed, Soyinka's dramatisation of heroism and anti-heroism is not disconnected from his belief in Ògún's dialectical frame. Little wonder, Adekoya (2006, p. 2) affirms that:

Derived from the Ògún myth of creation which is also of destruction, the principle of paradox forms the bedrock of Soyinka's poetics. It is the secret behind the strength and vitality of all his writing. His profound understanding of the paradoxical creativeness-destructiveness principle emboldens him to place all cultures on the same levels.

Soyinka in his *locus classicus* titled, *Myth, Literature and the African World* (1976) argues that, "Ògún, for his part, is best understood in Hellenic values as a totality of the Dionysian, Apollonian and Promethean virtues ... Ògún stands for a transcendental, humane but rigidly restorative justice" (Soyinka, 1976, p. 141). Ògún's influence on Soyinka is further theorised in his *Fourth Stage* which, Olaniyan (1995, p. 46) argues is, "Soyinka's elaboration of a theory of tragic art rooted in an African sensibility, perhaps his finest musing on the philosophy of culture and inarguably his central document in the task of racial and cultural retrieval". It must also be mentioned that, one of Soyinka's major influences is his fraternity with Yorùbá travelling theatre troupes' practitioners which has made his plays to make extensive use of the setting in which this theatre movement grew

(Gibbs, 1986, pp. 23-24). Ready (1988, p. 712) in his article titled, "Through the Intricacies of *The Fourth Stage* to an Apprehension of *Death and the King's Horseman*" explains that:

Soyinka wishes to ensure that a play such as *Death and the King's Horseman* affirms the ritual origins of tragedy. In his essay "The Fourth Stage", on the tragic element in Yorùbá art, he seeks to demonstrate that in a tragic situation both the challenging figure the tragic hero-and the challenged order-nature, society-are equally to be respected and that each must play its role if man is to experience life as it should be experienced: integrally and wholly.

Ògún's heroic act thrives within his own dialectical poise of individual will and communal essence, and this perhaps, makes Soyinka to conclude that Yorùbá traditional drama is the "anguish of this severance, the fragmentation of essence from self" (Soyinka, 1976, p. 145). Using his famous quip on Negritude, Soyinka, as reckoned by Jeyifo (2004, p. 2.), likens a true hero to a tiger who must "not go about proclaiming its tigritude but merely lives and acts it". For the most part, Soyinka's creative universe is therefore, "multiverse, one of linkages, a concatenation of rings, each unique and all interdependent. One motivates and nourishes another and is in turn enriched" (Adekoya, 2006, p. 10). The nodal point that Soyinka elaborates is the rehabilitation of a ruptured continuum of self-apprehension. Conclusively, whether the deeds of the heroes oranti-heroes were worthwhile, Soyinka, through some of his plays has often shown that, "the hero's life is his people's life" (Iji, 1991, p. 95).

Pirandello is not left out of this dialectical medley. As observed by Lee (1993, p. 818), "Pirandello was not a popular writer in Italy, and much of his dramatic work were first performed abroad. But he did win the Nobel Prize for literature in 1934, an indication that his brand of modernism was indeed influential". Pirandello's mimesis of heroism and anti-heroism is surrounded by philosophical ideas such as the conflict between instinct and reason, the elastic gulf between reality and unreality, and the contrasting parallelism between art and life. In Pirandello's theatre, the artist is placed at an indicting position. Expanding upon this, Brustein (1964, p. 303) believes that:

the agony of the artist in Pirandello's drama is that, for all his ingenuity, he cannot really create life – to make an artistic form is to deaden and kill . . . when Pirandello's messianism is the ascendant, however, he argues the opposite point – that the artist's work is superior to God's, because art, unlike man, is immortal.

The paradoxes that permeate Pirandello's theatre cannot be disconnected from his unbelief of absolute reality. Certainly, his conception of heroism and anti-heroism can be applied to his decision to draw dispersion by juxtaposing the feelings generated by comedy and tragedy, as contained in his 1920 lecture titled, "On humour" in which he expressed in humorous terms his deep pessimism and pity for the confusion and suffering of the human condition. In light of this, Pirandello believes that:

Comedy and its opposite lie in the same disposition of feeling, and they are inside the process which results from it. In its abnormality, this disposition is bitterly comical, the condition of a man who is always out of time, of a man who is at the same time violin and bass; of a man for whom no thought can come to mind unless suddenly another one, its opposite and contrary intervenes (Duckore, 1974, p. 747).

Pirandello also indicts God for creating sentient beings and denying them a purpose in his image. In the final paragraph of his preface in *Six Characters*, he writes that:

Though the audience eventually understands that one does not create life by artifice and that the drama of the six characters cannot be presented without an author to give them value with his spirit, the Manager remains vulgarly anxious to know how the thing turned out, and the 'ending' is remembered by the son in its sequence of actual moments, but without any sense and therefore not needing a human voice for its expression (*Six Characters*, p. iv).

Crucial is the fact that Pirandello is also able to use all forms and indeed, every aspect of theatre to dramatise the unstable reality of life. Pirandello cited in Brustein (1964, pp. 302-303) explains his philosophy to art as:

Art is superior to life, because it has purpose, meaning and organisation – the illusion is deeper than reality. But art is inferior to life because it can never capture transitory, formless quality of existence . . . all that lives, by the fact of living, has a form and by the same token must die—except the work of art which lives forever in so far as it is form.

Contextually, Pirandello builds his drama on the conflict between life (which is always in transition) and form (which fixes it and which is immutable). These two culminate into "the inherent tragic conflict" between the hero and the anti-hero in Pirandello's theatre. Moreso, Pirandello's dramaturgical anthem is echoed by Lee (1993, p. 819) that, "what we think of as reality is totally subjective, something that each of us maintains independently of other people and that none of us can communicate".

Pirandello argues that human life would be formless and meaningless unless the individual can play a part he invents for himself and interpret the actions of others as supporting parts in the same play. In Olaniran's (1995, p. 48) words, Pirandello "casts an unhidden disdain" at the notion of absolute reality and questioned all thought of norms by bringing the very idea of reality under philosophical scrutiny. His philosophy revolves around the fact that specific actions are not right or wrong in themselves, but only in the way that humans regard them, and that an individual does not have one definite personality but many, depending on how that person appears to the people with whom he or she comes in contact.

The emphasis remains that the contradictions between the hero and the anti-hero multiply within the teatro-philosophical gulf of the Pirandellian paradoxes, and the conflict instigated by this philosophical leaning remains a recurring pattern in his theatre. Without doubt, the hero and anti-hero, although irretrievably at odds, represent life and form in his theatre. It is this 'reconciliation' that explains Pirandello's "attraction to the theatre, because of all the literary forms, only theatrical art combines the spontaneous and accidental with the ordered and predetermined" (Brustein, 1964, p. 304). Consequently this study examines the comely dais of heroism and anti-heroism in what are by far the most popular plays of both Luigi Pirandello and Wole Soyinka.

Synopsis of Wole Soyinka's *Death and the King's Horseman*

The action of the play, according to Wole Soyinka in the preface to the play-text is based on a real event that took place in Oyo, ancient Yorùbá city of Nigeria in the 1940s. The king has just died a month ago and is to be buried as tradition demands. According to the local law, his dog, his favourite horse and his horseman must accompany to the afterlife. Elesin is ready but just before his departure, the District Officer Pilkings learns about the prepared ritual suicide and orders Elesin's arrest. Meanwhile, Olunde, Elesin's son, who had previously left for England to study medicine returns home to bury his father. As Olunde prepares to leave, Pilkings and an enchained Elesin arrive on the scene, leading to a confrontation between father and son.

Elesin is imprisoned in a cell, watched by Pilkings, police officers, and his young wife, with whom he has recently shared connubial rites. Iyalaja, the matriarch of village women, visits him at the prison and scolds Elesin for failing to uphold his honour and fulfilling his duty. She announces the impending arrival of a "burden" brought on by Pilkings, which proves to be the corpse of Olunde, who has committed the ritual suicide in his father's place. When Pilkings uncovers the body, Elesin hangs himself in his cell.

Synopsis of Luigi Pirandello's *Six Characters in Search of an Author*

The play begins with an acting company preparing to rehearse a play written by Pirandello himself, titled *The Rules of the Game*. As the rehearsal is about to begin, the play is unexpectedly interrupted by the arrival of six strange

people who claim to be unfinished characters. The characters who appear are in a sense, types: a father, a mother, a stepdaughter, a son, two silent figures – the boy and the child, and finally, a milliner, Madame Pace. While he is not an author, the Director agrees to stage their story despite the disbelief amongst the jeering actors. After the Father and Stepdaughter act half of the scene, the Director stops them so that the Actors may act out what the 'characters' have just done. The Father begins an argument with the Director over the realism of the Actors compared to the Characters themselves. The line between reality and acting is blurred as the scene closes with the Director pleased with the first act. The final act of the play begins in the garden.

There is much argument amongst the family members as The Father sent for The Mother, The Stepdaughter, The Child, The Boy, and The Son to come back and stay with him. The Son reveals that he hates the family for sending him away and does not consider The Stepdaughter or the others a part of his family. The play climaxes with The Little Girl drowning in a fountain, The Boy committing suicide with a revolver and the Stepdaughter running out of the theatre with The Son, The Mother, and The Father left on stage. The play ends with The Director's confusion over whether everything is real or not.

A Comparative Study of Heroism and Anti-heroism in Luigi Pirandello's *Six Characters in Search of an Author* and Wole Soyinka's *Death and the King's Horseman*

The play, *Death and the King's Horseman* has sprouted a number of debates by critics such as Ogunba (1975), Gibbs (1986), Maduakor (1991) and Jeyifo (2004), especially with reference to the metaphysics of sacrifice and the dispersion between who is the actual hero of the play. It is then natural to begin our discourse from this metaphysical inquiry and to assume the position that Elesin's anti-heroic fate is not merely caused by the Yorùbá society itself and the colonial inference but also by himself. To begin from this point is therefore, to be armed with the key to unraveling this oeuvre. A part of Elesin's anti-heroic fate stems from the double background-the nation and the colonial government. Since Elesin's family inherits the status as the King's horseman, he must perform the ordained duty which is to accompany the King to the world beyond so that he earns the honour, something that is of great eminence in the community.

In the play, Soyinka suggests the importance of the collective social and psychic aspirations of Oyo community. Elesin is supposed to play the role of a ritual scapegoat who accedes to the world of the dead on behalf of the living and the unborn. His death is supposed to be a reflection of the communal will to ensure renewed harmony between the constitutive worlds of traditional Yorùbá cosmic order and the continuity of Oyo socio-spiritual harmony. The distinction of Elesin's lineage is buttressed by a woman who

says, "It is not he who calls himself Elesin Oba, it is his blood that says it. As it called out to his father before him and will to his son after him" (p. 35).

Our inferences of Elesin's anti-heroic lot draw credo from the beginning of the play, stemming from the playwright's description of Elesin's gargantuan will that, "... *He is a man of enormous vitality, speaks, dances and sings with that infectious enjoyment of life which accompanies all his actions*" (p. 9). In fact, our first contact with Elesin betrays his consumerist nature which is seen in his choice of the market as his last resort before entering the transitional realm. It is noteworthy that, the market does not only perform socio-economic functions within the gulf of the Yorùbá belief system. The market is the cryptic space of existence that serves as the "home of witches", the "dome" of luck and doom, the meeting point of the "mothers of the land" and so on.

Even though Elesin muses himself with the metaphor of the "Not-I-Bird" with the market women in order to re-assure and regain his already questioned stallion gaze, his statements from the beginning of the play reveal that he is aware of the imminence of the 'obstruction' in his path. In his definition and cosmic appraisal of honour, Elesin banters with the women:

Elesin: Life has an end. A life that will outlive fame and friendship begs another name. What an elder takes his tongue to his plate, licks it clean of every crumb? He will encounter silence when he calls on children to fulfill the smallest errand! Life is honour. It ends when honour ends (p. 15).

Women: Ah Elesin Oba, we knew you for a man of honour (p. 20).

From the foregoing, Elesin's anti-heroic outcome, as observed by Ready (1988, p. 719) is mere "self-destruction", the result of an "ego-inflation". While Elesin's drives and motives have been examined, our radar of analysis shifts to Olunde, his eldest son, who turns out to be the unprecedented hero of the play. Again, the playwright's description of Olunde, but now through Western characters, Pilkings and his wife, Jane, is worthy of scrutiny:

Jane: Oh now I remember. He was that very sensitive young man.

Pilkings: ... A most intelligent boy, really bright (p. 28).

Despite Olunde's Western orientation, he refuses to be nicked by integrationism. After seeing it all in the white man's land, he rather questions Jane that, "you forget that I have now spent four years among your people. I discovered that you have no respect for what you do not understand" (p. 50). Olunde's communal orientation even while studying abroad does not change, but becomes reinforced, which is seen in his explanation of the notion of self-sacrifice to Jane:

Olunde: ... I find it rather inspiring. It is an affirmative commentary on life.

Jane: What is?

Olunde: That captain's self-sacrifice.

Time: Nonsense. Life should never be thrown deliberately away (p. 51).

Olunde is presented by Soyinka, as a young man who understands the implication of the king's death as well as the demands of communal life. Having expressed great confidence in his father's will power, Olunde's display of heroism is expressed in his wounded but affirmative pride when he sees that his father, Elesin, for whose burial he has returned home, is still alive. This makes him deny his father's existence, concluding that, "I have no father, eater of left-overs" (pp. 60-61). Elesin has been thought of as the hero of the play, but a chord of ambiguation is struck, and the play's intermission begins. Soyinka uses as the point of intermission in the play. Elesin's dilemma calls for another who is worthier to take his place. He says to Pilkings, "Did you not see when the world reversed itself and the father fell before his son, asking for forgiveness?" (p. 63). It is this reversal that creates the spleen between Elesin, who becomes the anti-hero and Olunde, who becomes the hero.

Soyinka, in his use of heroism and anti-heroism, charts different courses for both the hero and anti-hero in the gulf of existence. Elesin watches his initial world of heroism as it collapses at the feet of his own son which makes him to commit suicide. This reversal is further eulogised by Iyaloja who says to Elesin, "... But first tell me, you who were once Elesin Oba, tell me, you who know so well the cycle of the plantain: is it the parent shoot which withers to give sap to the younger or, does your wisdom see it running the other way?" (pp. 69-70). Conclusively, Olunde's understanding of communal psyche, his non-conformity to the western culture, his decision to suspend his own will, and eventual resort to sacrifice himself in the stead of his father marks him out as the hero of the play. Only Olunde sufficiently understands the course of the Yorùbá world.

Here, Soyinka's analysis of heroism and anti-heroism is similar to that found in Luigi Pirandello's *Six Characters in Search of an Author* which begins with the metaphor of the author-function which often characterises Pirandello's plays. In the play, the figure of Pirandello appears as the deconstructionist/playwright who uses theatrical techniques to probe into the audience's psyche. The author is not only that which the characters search for in *Six Characters*, but as Pirandello laments in his preface to the play, the spectator as well. Though absent, the presence of the author permeates the stage. He assumes a promethean form and becomes a mask that is worn by the characters. He also becomes one whose voice is articulated by the thoughts, actions and inactions of the characters. Noteworthily, Pirandello's voice is affirmative in the character of the Father, who appears as the author's double, and who advocates for utmost truth and "absolute" heroism in the play. With this in mind, heroism and anti-heroism in *Six Characters* functions in two ways: on the level of the 'characters' versus the 'actors' and

throughout the "death harvest" of the Girl and the Boy. As Pirandello himself points out:

- *In any production of this play it is imperative that the Director should use every means possible to avoid any confusion between the SIX CHARACTERS and the ACTORS. The placing of the two groups, as they will be indicated in the stage-directions once the CHARACTERS are on the stage, will no doubt help . . . The CHARACTERS should not, in fact, appear as phantasms, but as created realities, unchangeable creations of the imagination and, therefore, more real and more consistent than the ever-changing naturalness of the ACTORS* (p. 680).

The excerpt above intensifies our examination of the 'characters' (who are regarded by the *actors* as 'escaped lunatics') as the heroes, while the 'actors' portend to be the anti-heroes of the play. The characters' argument of their authenticity and heroism is seen in Father's words that, "On the contrary, we are bringing you a terrible and grievous drama" (p. 681). Our second analysis is reinforced by the argument between the Director, who represents the camp of anti-heroes in the play, and the Father, who represents that of the heroes:

Director: . . . Oh yes? Do you think ours is a profession of lunatics, do you?

Father: Yes, making what isn't true seem's true . . . for fun.

Director: I should like you to know, my dear sir, that the actor's profession is a most noble one . . . we have given life, here on these very boards, to immortal works! (p. 681).

Pirandello's juxtaposition of heroism and anti-heroism is also drawn on the assumption that reality/truth is nothing like unreality/mimesis. It is therefore, not surprising to garner that, Pirandello uses his characters to comment on his philosophy and artistic vision, as established in our review of literature. Pirandello's philosophic writing and obscurantist charges are well-knit in his portrayal of heroism and anti-heroism, and this cannot be divorced from the context of his use of forms and theatrical paradoxes. This is seen in the words of the Director who largely represents him:

Director: And if you can understand *his* plays . . . you're a better man than I am! He deliberately goes out of his way to annoy people, so that by the time the play's through everybody's fed up . . . actors, critics, audience, everybody! (p. 680).

Pirandello's emphasis on forms is seen throughout the play, and this example is seen in the Father's tenacious position on the reality of the Characters; a reality that, as the stage direction indicates, is inhabited in their forms and expressions. While the Character's reality, according to the playwright is authentic, the Actors' reality is not. This is because man is subject to time, but a character's reality remains fixed for eternity. In other

words, time enables an opposition between reality and illusion for man, and this belief is the hallmark of Pirandello's philosophy. This reiterates the fact that characters are caught in what is best defined as the fixed world or eternal moment of being judged by a singular instance of being 'caught in the act'. According to the Father, the fixed world of the characters, "... doesn't change ... It can never be in any way different from what it is ... because it is already fixed ... For ever! For ever it is *this* reality ... This immutable reality" (p. 701).

The acceptance of the characters as heroes is not without support from the playwright's description with, "*The playing of this scene by the ACTORS will appear from the very first words as something completely different from what was played before, without its having, even in the slightest degree, the air of a parody*" (p. 696). The characters also detest the use of the term "illusion", and the goal of the Director to create a *perfect illusion of reality* in the theatre. They argue that no other reality exists outside of the world of illusion which the Director seeks to create. The Father laments thus, "A character, sir, may always ask a man who he is. Because a character has a life which is truly his, marked with his special characteristics ... And as a result he is always somebody! What a man ... man in general ... can quite well be nobody" (p. 700).

At the final moment when all actions of the characters are expected to wrap up in a climax, everything turns out to be an unimaginable tragedy seen in the deaths of the Boy and the Girl:

Other Actors: Make-believe? Pretence? Reality! Reality! ... No! Make-believe! It's all pretence! (*The stage and the auditorium are suddenly flooded with very bright light. The DIRECTOR breathes again as if freed from a tremendous burden ... a green flood light ... projects the silhouettes of the CHARACTERS [minus the BOY and the GIRL], clear-cut and huge, on to the backcloth. The DIRECTOR is terrified and leaps off the stage* (pp. 704-705).

As they squabbled about whether the entire action of the characters including the deaths is real, the confusion of the Director and other actors draws the curtain of our analysis. The heroes, represented by the character of the Boy and the Girl are archetypes of sacrifices that must occur in order for the story of the characters to be complete, while the confused, easily affected, mutable actors are the anti-heroes. Conclusively, Pirandello uses this play to demonstrate the frustration between the characters (heroes) and the actors (anti-heroes) has at its core an irreconcilable conflict between time and timelessness or life and form.

Although Soyinka and Pirandello lived and wrote in significantly different times, their dramatisations of heroism and anti-heroism share some similarities (and of course, some variance). First amongst the similarities both playwrights infuse is the *death motif* or *tragic situation* in their

dramatisations of heroism and anti-heroism. This clearly delineates their dramatisation of existence, human essence as well as individual and communal ethos. Like Olunde in *Death and the king's horseman*, the Boy and the Girl in Pirandello's *Six Characters* symbolically represent tragic heroes whose deaths are necessary in order to explain the characters' existence. Pirandello uses the two symbolic characters to comment on the impossibility of actors in totally achieving certain feats in character portrayal. Subsequently, this limitation bolsters Pirandello's dramaturgy, which is based on the hallmark that human life would be formless and meaningless unless the individual plays his meaningful part, supported by others' actions and representation.

One major difference in both playwrights' fusion of *death motif* in their plays however lies in the *raison d'être* or dramatic purpose for which the idiom has been used. Soyinka's use of the *death motif* is not disconnected from his quest to dramatise his notion of existence throughout the dialectical interplay of communal will and self-sacrifice. In fact, Soyinka 'purges' the emotions of readers by pitching the fate of father (Elesin—the anti-hero) and son (Olunde—the hero) against each other. It is this 'cathartic rebirth' that informs Soyinka's use of the death motif. Because he conceives himself as a "philosophical writer" that feels "a more profound spiritual need" to admit that "figures, affairs, landscapes have been soaked in a particular sense of life" (Brustein, 1964, p. 283), Pirandello, on the other hand, uses the metaphor as a representation of what should be widely regarded as total truth. Indeed, Pirandello uses the death motif to paddle the theatricalist and absurdist vision in his extremist theatre.

Another similarity between both playwrights' use of heroism and anti-heroism is their adoption of *mission* and *intermission* technique. This technique (which was a product of the Aristotelean categorisation) is characteristic of most plays that are written in Acts. The mission and intermission technique is used by playwrights to achieve several dramatic purposes, some of which include:

- (i) to allow relevant dramatic actions and points to sink into the mind of readers or the audience;
- (ii) to deliberately disconnect or isolate certain parts of the play from other parts;
- (iii) to permit flexibility or rigidity within the organic world of the play;
- (iv) to encourage the infusion of improvisation (when the play is being staged); and
- (v) to indicate the transitional moments of climax, peripeteia (reversal of actions), anagnorisis (recognition) and resolution.

Interestingly, both plays examined in this study have been written in Acts, although Soyinka's *Death and the King's Horseman* has five Acts,

while Pirandello's *Six Characters* has three Acts. Both playwrights converge in their use of the mission and intermission because, instead of using the technique to create a breakage in dramatic communication, they both use the idiom to aid the development of the plot up to the climax and eventual resolution of the entire conflict of both plays, leaving the audience to think out the various philosophical exigencies at character, dialogic and other symbol simulating levels. For example, the audience ponders whether Olunde's sacrificial death or Elesin's death will be acceptable in the perpetration of cosmic continuity in Wole Soyinka's *Death and the King's Horseman*, while not only the audience, but other characters in Pirandello's *Six Characters* find it difficult to accept the death of the Boy and the Girl as real.

There is, however, a major point of divergence between Soyinka's and Pirandello's use of the mission and intermission technique. Unlike Wole Soyinka, Luigi Pirandello makes the mission and intermission technique to be obvious, deliberately infusing it towards the end of each Act of *Six Characters*. This is seen in the Director's instruction that this is also seen in the Director's instruction that everyone should go on momentary "breaks" in the play. A typical example is seen towards the end of the first Act of the play when, "*The PRODUCER and the SIX CHARACTERS cross the stage and disappear . . . And talking among themselves in this way, the ACTORS leave the stage. Some go out through the door back, some go in the direction of the dressing-rooms*" (p. 690). Soyinka also uses the mission and intermission technique, which is seen at the moment when Olunde shockingly sees that his father is still alive, "*He (OLUNDE) walks slowly down the way his father had run. Light fades out on ELESIN, sobbing into the ground*" (p. 61).

At a resolute, yet necessary juncture, both Soyinka and Pirandello use the technique of *philosophical ending* in their deployment of heroism and anti-heroism. This is evident in the way that the conflicts of both plays are resolved, which is resplendent with unclear and miasmatic endings. In contrast, the philosophical ending in Soyinka's play is quite simplified, but Luigi Pirandello's extreme theatricalism leaves us with the conundrum of knowing what the actual resolution of the entire play is. However, both plays pay obeisance to the Marxist camp in which characters are pitched against each other in the guise of historical and dialectical materialism, and the aesthetics of open-ended deliberations in which the audience is expected to date and provide answers present a woven noose at the end of the play.

Although the two plays draw close parallels in *ideo-artistic reflection* of heroism and anti-heroism, both playwrights do this differently. Pirandello's obsession with absurdism and deconstruction is not just limited to the form or structure of his plays, but also to the organic content and dramatic purpose of his plays. Soyinka, on the other hand, pays obeisance to

the Classical school, which is seen throughout *Death and the King's Horseman*. While Soyinka seeks to document a historical event and, by extension, uses this to examine cultural and ideological issues raised in his discussion of heroism and anti-heroism, Pirandello uses the deconstructionist fauna (his characters and their situation) to reflect his ideology and to comment on the status and life of the theatre in the 1920s. Pirandello also instigates a series of speculations concerning the relationships of an audience seeing an actor on stage, of the characters which the actors portray, and the authors who create the characters.

Within these playwrights' silos, their unapologetic disposition towards the use of language cannot be overlooked. Generally, *lectalism* simply refers to the use of language in context. In this study, however, we use the term to refer to the playwrights' overall dialogic presentations of the heroes and anti-heroes in the plays examined. Generally, Soyinka's use of lectalism is very metaphoric, deeply cultural, tersely didactic, and widely functional. The banter of words between Olunde (the hero) and his father, Elesin (the anti-hero), places the duo in a dialogic contest in which the former triumphs. It is imperative to note that Elesin deeply understands the core and beauty of Yorùbá language, but Olunde's heroism makes the playwright-through the politics of subversion award him definitive, essential, and affirmative language that is more functional within the silos of sociolinguistic variations. In other words, Soyinka uses words to show the depth of Olunde's understanding of his functional role as the hero. Pirandello, on the other hand, elevates the language of the characters (heroes) with rich, deeply poetic, biting, grossly philosophical, and comico-satiric language to the amusement of the actors (anti-heroes) who operate on a lower linguistic pedestal.

Nonetheless, the following metaphors are shared by both playwrights in their uses of heroism and anti-heroism:

- (i) the death motif or tragic situation;
- (ii) the creative interlude of mission and intermission technique;
- (iii) the Marxist parody of philosophical/open ending;
- (iv) the poetics of ideo-artistic reflection; and
- (v) the sociolinguistic metaphor of lectalism.

It must be emphasised however that their uses of these dramatic metaphors vary at certain notable points and consequently define each playwrights' ideological leanings. Other findings in the study reveals that, amongst other functions, heroism and anti-heroism remains a veritable dual-metaphor for generating conflict, reinforcing the message(s) of a play and delineating the dramaturgy of playwrights. At a related but larger global level, the deployment of heroism and anti-heroism affirms the paradox of existence as well as the playwright's ideological views. Soyinka's

metaphysics of sacrifice and his poetics of 'iconoclasm' which involves satirising the society without it knowing, and Pirandello's treatment of 'transcendental aesthetics' (derived from Immanuel Kant's metaphysics of 'transcendentalism' as contained in his 1790 book titled, *The Critique of Judgement*, which examines the aesthetic distinction between *aposteriori* (experiential) and *apriori* (rational) forms of knowledge, are generically dramatised in their distillations of heroism and anti-heroism.

Furthermore, within the backdrop of deconstructionism and theatricalism, Pirandello's treatment of heroism and anti-heroism (represented by the characters and the actors in his play) comments on the gulf that lie between art and reality and uses the relationship that exists between the audience, the actors, and the characters to indict the author. With this, Pirandello indicts the function of the author by identifying the relationship that exists amongst the audience, actors and characters. These three pedestals can be likened to Soyinka's apotheosis of the worlds of the living, dead and the unborn. Conversely, Soyinka uses Olunde's heroism to sound the gong of metaphysics by placing him as the sacrificial lamb that must be slaughtered if sanity, order, and peace must be maintained in the Yorùbá communal world. His iconoclastic position is seen in his play's textual, sub-textual and extra-textual deductions.

Because Marxist aesthetics call upon the notion of collective heroism, this study reveals that there remains a close relationship between the playwright and the hero. Playwrights often approve of heroic characters' actions and speak through them while deliberately alienating the anti-hero as a necessary foible (in dramatic action) whose strength must falter to make extraordinary the weakness and helplessness of the hero. As seen in these two plays, this bias, which Green (1986) describes as "the politics of subversion" (p. 241), is reflected using the language, motives, and inactions of both symbolic characters. In Soyinka's play, Elesin's actions are repudiated and eventually become unacceptable, while Olunde's existence and ritual death is celebrated. Similarly, Pirandello celebrates the victory of the immutable world of the characters over the mutability of the actors, but in the process, emphasises the superiority of the actors' world.

It is also observed in this study that unlike Soyinka, Pirandello uses the dialectical cycle of heroism and anti-heroism in his *Six Characters* to interpret the multifaceted perspectives, which the play presents, as a means of self-criticism of actors (or theatre artists). The play also tries to point out the inauthenticity of the yardsticks that have often been used to measure character portrayal, and it is in this process that the actor is treated as a necessary anti-hero in opposition to the generic nature of the heroic characters in Pirandello's insoluble and highly experimental theatre.

Conclusion

This study examines how heroism and anti-heroism are used differently within Luigi Pirandello's and Wole Soyinka's writings. Despite their differences, Pirandello's and Soyinka's use of heroism and anti-heroism are the basis of their artistic enterprises. The metaphysics of self-sacrifice and the need to give dramatic colour to the African, and specifically Yorùbá conception of tragedy find expression in the dialectics between the hero and the anti-hero in Soyinka's theatre. For Pirandello, the questions of philosophical identity, themes, forms, and the audience, which the authors seek to address, are among the salient issues that are reflected in his dramaturgy. Indisputably, Wole Soyinka's *Death and the King's Horseman* captures the multiple dimensions of his legislation of African poetics through the creative style of heroism and anti-heroism. Pirandello adopts the dual metaphor to put the theatre and its processes on stage, as seen in *Six Characters*. His play is indeed an allegorical summation of the theatre, because it offers multiple frames of self-reference as well as the staging of a play-within-a-play, which is a convention that is borrowed from the Elizabethan dramaturgical conventions. The study concludes that both playwrights' unapologetic complexities in their distillations of heroism and anti-heroism in their plays cannot be over emphasised.

References

- Adekoya, S. (2006). *The inner eye: An oriel on Wole Soyinka's works*. Ile-Ife: Obafemi Awolowo University Press.
- Afolayan, K. (2018). Soyinka's poetry, the complex cult and freedom dialectics: Between Jeyifo and others. In: Osofisan, F. and Raji, W. (Eds.). *Ògún's errant warrior*, pp. 145-161. Ibadan: Kraft Books Limited.
- Allen, G. (2000). *Intertextuality: The new critical idiom*. London: Routledge.
- Asein, S. and Ashaolu, A. (1986). *Studies in the African novel*. Ibadan: Ibadan University Press.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*. (Trans. Emerson, C. and Holquist, M.) Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Barranger, M. S. (1995). *Theatre, a way of seeing*. 4th Ed. California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Barthes, R. (1967). *Elements of semiology*. Trans. Lavers, A. and Smith, C. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Brockett, O. and Ball, R. (2004). *The essential theatre*. USA: Wadsworth.
- Brustein, R. (1964). *The theatre of revolt*. Canada: Little, Brown & Company Ltd.
- Chinweizu, et. al. (1980). *Toward the decolonisation of African literature: African fiction and poetry and their critics*, Vol. 1. Ibadan: Fourth Dimension Publishers.
- De Man, P. (1979). *Allegories of reading: Figural language in Rousseau, Nietzsche, Rilke and Proust*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

- Derrida, J. (1980). *Writing and difference*. Trans. Bass, A. London: Rutledge.
- De Saussure, F. (1974). *Course in general linguistics*. Trans. Baskin, W. London: Fontana/Collins.
- Duckore, B. (1974). *Dramatic theories and criticism: Greeks to Grotowski*. USA: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc.
- Franco, Z., Blace, K., and Zimbardo, P. (2011). Heroism: A conceptual analysis and differentiation between heroic action and altruism. In: *Review of general psychology*. Vol. 5(2):99-113. American Psychological Association. Assessed on 8th August, 2018, from <https://scholar.google.com/scholar>.
- Gibbs, James. (1986). *Wole Soyinka*. London: Macmillan Publishers Ltd.
- Green, R. (1986). The politics of subversion. In: Asein, S. and Ashaolu, A. (Eds.). *Studies in the African novel*, pp. 241-251. Ibadan: Ibadan University Press.
- Iji, E. (1991). *Understanding Brecht and Soyinka*. Ibadan: Kraft Books Limited.
- Jeyifo, B. (2004). *Wole Soyinka: Politics, poetics and postcolonialism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jones, E. (1983). *The writing of Wole Soyinka*. USA: Heinemann.
- Kant, I. (1790). *Critique of judgement*. London: Macmillan.
- Maduakor, O. (1991). *Wole Soyinka: An introduction to his writing*. Ibadan: Heinemann Educational Books Nigeria Plc.
- Musa, R. A. (2007). Directing Wole Soyinka's comedies on Nigerian stage. An Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis Submitted to the Department of Theatre Arts, University of Ibadan, Ibadan.
- Musa, R.A. (2006). The drama and theatre of Wole Soyinka. In: Adeleke, F. (Ed.). *Anencyclopaedia of the arts*, II (3): 216-229. Lagos: Faculty of Arts, Lagos State University.
- Norris, C. (1996). *Deconstruction theory and practice*. London: Routledge.
- Obafemi, O. (2010). Intertextual aesthetics in Femi Osofisan's plays. In: Bodunde, C. (Ed.). *Texts and theories in transition: Black African literature and imagined tradition*, pp. 123-135. Bayreuth: African Studies Series.
- Obafemi, O. (1996). *Contemporary Nigerian theatre: Cultural heritage and social vision*. Germany: Bayreuth African Studies.
- Ògúnba, O. (1975). *The movement of transition*. Ibadan: Ibadan University Press.
- Olaniyan, T. (1995). *Scars of conquest/Masks of resistance: The invention of cultural identities in African and Caribbean drama*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Peter, J. (1975). A dance of masks: Senghor, Achebe, Soyinka and African cultural history. An Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis Submitted to the Department of English Arts, Faculty of Arts, University of Alberta.

- Pirandello, L. (1920). Onhumour. In: Duckore, B. (1974). *Dramatic theories and criticism: Greeks to Grotowski*, pp. 747-753. USA: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc.
- Pirandello, L. (1922). *Six characters in search of an author*. In: Lee, J. (1993). *The Bedford introduction to drama*, pp. 821-844. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Raji, W. (1999). Modern literary theories and criticism. In: Efuosibina, A. (Ed). *English language and literature in English: An introduction handbook*. Ilorin: Department of Modern European Language.
- Ready, N. (1988). Through the Intricacies of "The Fourth Stage" to an Apprehension of *Death and the King's Horseman*. *Black American literature forum*, Vol. 22 (4): 711-721.
- Soyinka, W. (1976). *Myth, literature and the African world*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Soyinka, W. (1975). *Death and the King's Horseman*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Limited.
- Wa Thiongo, N. (1993). *Moving the centre: The struggle for culture freedom*. London: Heineman books.
- Yerima, A. (2003). *Basic techniques of playwriting*. Ibadan: Kraft Books Limited.
- Zengin, M. (2016). An Introduction to intertextuality as a literary theory: Definitions, axioms and the originators". In: *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*. 25(1):299-326. Accessed on 27th November, 2018, from <http://dergipark.gov.tr/download/article-file/411869>.