

## READERS OF WOLE SOYINKA'S POLITICAL DRAMA AND THEATRE

Adebayo Mosobalaje  
Obafemi Awolowo University

### Abstract

*The paper is a study of the readers of Wole Soyinka's political drama and theatre with a view to establishing the relationship between the author and his readers in terms of communication. To accomplish this, the paper employs the reader-oriented theory, using the critical perspectives of seasoned scholars in the field. We begin by examining the identity of Soyinka's readers in particular and readers of literature in general. Thereafter, we analyse the breakdown of communication between Soyinka and his readers, and his subsequent courtship of the popular readers.*

### Introduction

We should begin by asking some pertinent questions: "Who are the readers of Wole Soyinka? What social class do they belong in? And what is their attitude to his works?" To answer the above, we must note that the readers or audience of literature are without doubt members of the community. They are members of the society who, also like the writers, belong to a particular class and equally possess the critical criteria with which they perceive the world around them. Like writers, readers are also sensitive in society. They are also essentially involved in the process of composition and they are constantly in the creative imagination of writers. They sometime, depending on predilection, determine the success of a particular work or the reputation of a writer. That some writers become popular on the strength of the number of their readers shows that literary reputation is often determined by the audience and readers alike. Readers of Soyinka's works are also the elite class created by the colonial contact and who, like the writer, also received Western education in the colonial universities. These readers, according to the description of Jauss upheld by Selden and Widdowson (1993: 59-63) possess the necessary tools required to probe into literary works:

In his view a reader is someone who possesses a 'linguistic competence', has internalized the syntactic and semantic knowledge required for reading. The 'informed reader' of literary texts has also acquired a specifically 'literary competence' (knowledge of literary conventions). In order to read texts as literature we must possess a 'literary competence' just as we need a more general 'linguistic competence' to make sense of the ordinary linguistic utterances we encounter. We acquire this 'grammar' of literature in educational institutions.

Among the trained readers described above, there is a further classification into general and specialist readership. General readership consists of those who possess linguistic and literary competence that is adequate enough 'to make sense of the ordinary' meaning and sometimes deep meanings of literary works. People in this category may include competent Standard Six and secondary school leavers and of course college and university graduates. A worthy number of them cultivate robust literary taste, read and visit the theatre frequently. Specialist readership consists of college or university degree holders and professional scholars in language, literature and cultural studies. It therefore means that his readers belong in totality in the middle class. These readers are familiar with the worldview and the cultural

milieu that Soyinka usually explores in his works. Mostly, Africans share almost the same cultural and spiritual mode of apprehending reality. It is no surprise that we have similar or related deities in so many parts of Africa. Beyond the religious worldview, the African social and cultural views are also largely similar such that concepts of good behavior, citizenship, respect for elders and some other ethical values: the place of children, wealth and good health are held almost in the same vein by various nations and states in Africa. This goes to mean that most of the preoccupations of Soyinka's works are but a reflection of the Yoruba/African cultural milieu the products of which both the writers and the audience or readers are. The readers, according to Jauss, have a 'horizon of expectation' which informs their critical criteria with which they approach Soyinka's works. These readers are therefore not guests into the creative universe of Soyinka; they are a part and parcel of the milieu that produced the work. Soyinka's readers are familiar with the use of mask, with the *egungun* motif, with the tripartite world of Yoruba religious cosmology and with Ogun's paradox and its burden of mystery. Reading his works is thus a critical exercise in which case the readers move to and fro within their horizon of expectation in order to negotiate and mediate meanings. The relationship contained in this sort of reading is that of contestation of meanings between the readers and writers in which case one of them would have to make some condescension in terms of adjustments of perceptions of their shared socio-and ethno-cultural realities. The dyadic relationship of contestation between the readers and the text on the one hand and between the readers and the writer on the other hand is encapsulated in Selden's and Widdowson's (1993, 57) view:

It seems that while texts do set the terms on which the reader actualizes meanings, the reader's own 'store of experience' will take some part in the process. The reader's existing consciousness will have to make certain internal adjustments in order to receive and process the alien viewpoints which the text presents as reading takes place. This situation produces the possibility that the reader's own 'world-view' may be modified as a result of internalizing, negotiating and realizing the partially indeterminate elements of the text: to use Iser's words, reading 'gives us the chance to formulate the unformulated'.

In furtherance of the above, Griswold (1993: 457-8), following what Jauss termed as 'horizon of expectation', asserts that readers are not coming into the literary works as blank slates awaiting the inscription of the writers, instead he describes them as creative agents rather than passive recipients of the writer's gospel. According to him, "Readers collectively construct a set of aesthetic criteria, which they then use for literary evaluation". A Yoruba or an African reader of Wole Soyinka is surely involved in this process of contesting meaning and shifting grounds in places that are appropriate and could entirely disagree with the writer in various respects. Some readers may even in line with the practice of audience of traditional theatre in Africa disagree with a writer's use of language and forms. Readers are empowered to do the above because of their shared possession of the cultural and artistic milieu or what Jeremy Hawthorn (1992: 20) describes as code:

Writer and reader are linked by their common possession of a set of CONVENTIONS governing systematic transformations, an implication which appeals to many contemporary theorists interested in issues raised by the sociology of literature and by the concept of LITERARINESS. The term also, of course, suggests that the literary work contains that which is hidden to those not possessed of the right code-book.

According to him, there are various codes with which literary works are built. There are 'symbolic code', 'socio-ethnic code', and there are also 'literal and allegorical exegeses'. Depending on the code used to build up a work, the reader who belongs to the milieu would therefore unlock the texts. The codes are the constituents of what Jausse termed the 'horizon of expectations', and which Stanley Fish (1980: 14) termed the 'interpretive community'. The writer and the readers belong in this community as producers of cultural artifacts. The sociology of writing, that of the writer and the reader comes to the fore in the following by Fish as it reinforces the primacy of the social contexts:

It is interpretive communities, rather than either the text or the reader, that produce meanings and are responsible for the emergence of formal features. Interpretive communities are made up of those who share interpretive strategies not for reading but for writing texts, for constituting their properties. In other words these strategies exist prior to the act of reading and therefore determine the shape of what is read rather than, as is usually assumed, the other way round.

Both the writer and the reader are thus a product of the noetic formulae created by the social contexts. The primacy of the social contexts does not deny the writer any creative ingenuity. It however goes to establish that such creativity is also a product of the noetic conventions of the milieu or the interpretive community. The writer therefore has a duty either to the members of the community by exploring the multiple creative dimensions and potentials of their codes or to subvert their interest for a different end. Ultimately in the exploration of the potentials of the codes of the community, the writer must always carry the members along in order not to jeopardize his or her agency for the group. Umberto Eco (1981: 7) clearly establishes this:

To make his text communicative, the author has to assume that the ensemble of codes he relies upon is the same as that shared by his possible reader (hereafter Model Reader) supposedly able to deal interpretively with the expressions in the same way as the author deals generatively with them.

That the writer must be committed to its readers or audience in terms of communication implies that writers have no value outside readers and consumers who contribute, on the one hand, to writers' income and who, on the other, would transform the society through the gospel of the writer. According to Robert Escarpit (1971: 830) the foregoing value of literature can be attained only and only if there is "a convergence of intentions between author and reader or at the very least a compatibility of intentions". A work meant for a particular public must employ the noetic features of the idiom shared by the community so that communication can therefore be said to exist between the author and the reader. Escarpit claims that the successful book is that which is a medium of the public or that "which reveals the public to itself". Adedeji and Ekwuazi (1998: 69) opine that readers and audience can only identify with a work and regard it as their own if "both creator and the receiver are on the same wavelength". The centrality of readers thus affirms the meaninglessness and the valueless adventure of a work whose supposed interpretive community cannot link or converge with. For literature to be relevant it has to establish some simple and basic communion with its community for which it is produced in the first place.

### **Breakdown of Communicative Communion**

A number of Wole Soyinka's plays, particularly the early and the later comedies, enjoyed and still enjoy the patronage of their community while his canonical plays could not be deciphered by the university community, the original home of the English-language literature. The breakdown of communication between Soyinka's canonical works and his interpretive community has generated various responses. Nadine Gordimer (1992: 7) admonishes with a clarion call to the agency of African letters to endeavour to rescue itself from elitist disposition and speak to a great majority of Africans because, according to her, "a literary culture cannot be created by writers without readers". The extreme intellectualism of the canonical plays of Soyinka is obvious such that we would agree to reassert the view of other scholars that the university, being the original home of the middle-class literature, has prevented it to a certain extent from going to the people or condescending to popular readers. But a literature or drama of the people is supposed to break the shackles of embourgeoisement around it. Ngugi (1981: x) captures this when he declares that universities "have become the modern patrons for the artist". This is not to say that the middle class drama or theatre has never left the university but we are trying to, following Femi Euba (1981: 391), say that the English language drama and playwrights find their "warmest receptions" in the university. In spite of the university being the original and warmest home, Dunton (1992: 4) claims that the drama still has "a life off campus". Instances abound in relations to plays of Wale Ogunyemi, Ola Rotimi and the early comedies of Wole Soyinka.

Soyinka's canonical works alienate almost all semi-literates and a great deal of literates in the Nigerian society. What is alienating a great deal of literates and semi-literates from Soyinka's canonical works is not the use of English language as a medium of expression but the alleged "unattainable intellectualism" that he practices with the language. A number of English-language playwrights go to the above people without inhibition and that Soyinka's early comedies which are accessible such as *The Lion and the Jewel*, *The Trials of Brother Jero* and *Jero's Metamorphosis* belong to this group. The canonical plays such as *A Dance of the Forests*, *The Road* and *Madmen and Specialists* are dauntingly undecipherable (Biodun Jeyifo: 1988: 92-3) to a great majority of the Nigerian population and as such not popular and do not have some appreciable life both on and off campus. It must be reiterated that the three plays are also undecipherable to so many inhabitants of the university community. The claim of Biodun Jeyifo (2008: 12-13) that doctoral candidates and even holders of doctoral degree go through exceedingly difficult moments before they could gain access into the canonical plays of Soyinka is instructive in this regard. *A Dance of the Forests* was performed to an independence audience, "less than one percent" (Wali: 2007, 282) of whom could make any little of the play's message let alone have an inkling of Soyinka's jaundiced view of the 'gathering of the tribes' (Lewis Nkosi: 1981, 188) and of Africa's supposedly glorious past and the future of the country. As a commissioned play, the then newly adorned elite rulers of post-independence Nigeria could also make nothing of one of the profoundest literary minds on the continent let alone heed the warning and the probable guide contained in the play for the future. If audience could make nothing of the performance, how much of meaning would they make through reading which is supposed to be more complex than watching a performance.

Is Soyinka, therefore, a dramatist of the people and is his political drama a people's drama? We must take off from the point that traditional African drama is people-oriented and it is from this that we must assess any political drama that lays claim to championing the cause of the people. The acknowledgement of the communal commitment of art is expressed by Chinweizu (1980: 252):

Because in Africa we recognize that art is in the public domain, a sense of social commitment is mandatory upon the artist. That commitment demands that the writer pay attention to his craft, that he not burden his public with unfinished or indecipherable works.

The above does not stop the playwright from exploring, as said earlier, the artistic potentials that the form can yield, but it must ultimately be in such a way as to communicate to the community of readers for whom the play is meant in the first place. According to Ezeigbo (2008: 17), “a work of art becomes effective only when it is read”. By this, it means only when the readers can unlock the noetic codes, whether symbolic or socio-ethnic with which the work is locked. It is at this point that we can talk of communication and the potential influence(s) that the work may have on the readers. Jide Malomo (1993: 6) has rightly examined the problems of English-language drama from the audience attendance percentage in the Nigerian National Theatre:

An attempt has been made to account for the paucity of audience at performances in English Language Theater in comparison to the indigenous travelling theatres in Nigeria. This problem, which has only been studied through intelligent observation, has been attributed to the mode of production, the language, the aesthetics and the mores of the English-language theatre said to be “too intellectual and alienating” to the audience, while the indigenous theatres use simple language and choose themes that have direct relevance to the lives of the common people.

The above is replicated in the observation of Femi Euba (1981: 391). In this case, he made a particular reference to Wole Soyinka. Readers of Soyinka, going by his canonical plays such as *A Dance of the Forests*, *The Road* and *Madmen and Specialists* are treated to a hard recipe that no general readership the world over will ever wait to entertain:

Most Nigerian playwrights writing in English find it difficult to hold a substantial Nigerian audience or fill a theatre. A locality where these playwrights (English language writers) are most likely to have their warmest receptions – the university campus. Most of his (Soyinka’s) plays will not fill the theatre quite as well. And if they do, only a small percentage are his real audience, in the sense that they understand and acknowledge his theatre ... they usually come to the same conclusion – that he is too intellectual.

We must also agree, in spite of the too-intellectual aspect, that a Soyinka play is a multidimensional performance that could still thrill with music, action, games, dance, spectacle, costumes and ritual ceremonies even if the dialogue is intimidating. So many scholars seem to be impressively fascinated with the spectacle in the canonical plays and the robust effects it produces on readers and audience members even when they do not understand the plays (Nkosi: 1981, 188); the scholars are also united against the extreme intellectualism and the intimidating dialogues in the canonical plays. The plays therefore could thrill audience members who watch the performances but alienate and kill the almost non-existent reading public in Africa because the spectacle would be flat in reading. We, however, must note that our point of emphasis in the study is the communication of the message of the plays to readers. The spectacle would be more than important if it could break the linguistic wall the plays set against readers. Biodun Jefiyo (1985: 82) recounts the horror that many audience members often face during performances of Soyinka’s (and Osofisan’s)

plays. They often end up getting the more confused and raising posers such as “what is he saying? Or what does he propose as a way out of this mess?” What need be asked is the authenticity of the agency of Wole Soyinka as a political dramatist and satirist that is not popular with the people? Particularly focusing on a canonical play, Obiajunwa Wali (2007: 282) comments:

The ordinary local audience, with little or no education in the conventional European manner, and who constitute an overwhelming majority, has no chance of participating in this kind of literature. Less than one per cent of the Nigerian people have had access to, or ability to understand Wole Soyinka’s *A Dance of the Forests*. Yet, this was the play staged to celebrate their national independence, tagged on to the idiom and tradition of a foreign culture.

Beyond the general readership, the specialist readership equally is affected by Soyinka’s extreme elitism. It is the duty of the critical agency to assist readers whether general or specialist, who may find it difficult to understand a work, by carrying out an intensive exegetical work on such plays. Biodun Jeyifo (2008: 12-13) recounts the agency of the critical school in the cause of the people in search of a popular drama and theatre language:

Again this is more obvious in the essays on Soyinka and Okigbo: it was only after the publication of essays like those of Professor Izevbaye on these authors that people could begin to understand them, understand their worth and standing as extraordinarily talented authors who were not just perversely trying to be difficult and give their readers headache! By ‘readers’ here I am referring not just to high school or university students, but also, and quite significantly, critics and scholars with PhDs in English or Comparative Literature!

That readers hardly enjoy Soyinka is not in doubt. Femi Osofisan (1998: 25), a scholar, critic and a Marxist playwright expressed the same fear in his examination of the anti-people language that informed the work of the master playwright. He describes Soyinka’s language as that of the shrine, that is cultic and elitist and not of the public square. He dismisses the elitism as “linguistic insensitivity” to the nature and dimension of the political agency required of political dramatists. Granted the works affected in this regard are the canonical ones; they are sublime works that unfortunately do not speak to the people in defence of whom they are all about.

Writers alike respond to the anti-people canonical drama of Wole Soyinka. To them, he seems to be begging the question when he actually needs to speak in a language that will stimulate a collective consciousness. Chinweizu quotes Ama Ata Aidoo’s critique (2007: 224) while throwing a sardonic quip at Soyinka in the following:

We are waiting around for answers and praying that those who can see things will sometimes speak in accents which the few of us who read English can understand. For we are tired of betrayals, broken promises and forever remaining in the dark.

Ola Rotimi and Wale Ogunyemi are noted for striving energetically for a popular theatre language that would communicate not only to the few elite but also to the semi-

literate who are part of those who form the majority of our population. They are the ones needed for conscientization and mobilization. Obafemi quotes (1996: 89) Ola Rotimi with respect to the above concern:

I strive to temper the phraseology to the ear of both the dominant semi-literate classes, as well as the literate classes, ensuring that my dialogue reaches out to both groups with ease in assimilation and clarity in identification.

The above concern would be for the dramatists of the people and it is reflected in the advice that Chinweizu (1980: 246) gave to Soyinka to learn from one of the greatest Chinese poets, Po Chu-yi. The poet was said to have rewritten, correcting and simplifying his diction till the peasants could understand him. Soyinka is obviously aware of the elitist nature of his works which he acknowledges but challenges the hypocritical stance of critics who attack his “unattainable intellectualism”. According to Soyinka (1981: 134), the critics cannot escape from the fixed intellectual and linguistic situation of his art:

Unquestionably there is an intellectual cop-out in the career of any critic who covers reams of paper with unceasing lament on the failure of this or that writer to write for the masses of the people, when he himself assiduously engages, with a remorseless exclusivity, only the incestuous productivity of his own academic – that is bourgeois-situated-literature.

### **Courtship of Popular Readers**

That the post-Civil War popular political satires of Soyinka are clearly in response to the cries of the critical agency and of the readers thus debunks the earlier defence of “bourgeois situated literature” by Soyinka. In the political satires, Soyinka moves away from the extreme intellectual use of English language and intimidating dialogue to an accessible English and penetrable dialogue. The popularity of the satires is attested to by Wole Soyinka (1981: 138) in his description of the reactions of the Military Governor, the representative of the Visitor, to a performance of *Opera Wonyosi* that he thought was attacking the military, on the occasion of a Convocation ceremony of the University of Ife. Contained also in the account is the identification of the university cooks and staff of Parks and Gardens with the preoccupation of the play and the play itself. We also must note the reaction of General Sani Abacha to the play *The Beatification of Area Boy* and the declaration of Wole Soyinka as WANTED in Nigeria (Soyinka: 1999, 19) as attesting to the popularity of the play. Beyond this, there is a clear wall of difference between the canonical plays and the post-Civil War political drama in terms not only of language but also of plot structure, setting, figures and motifs from oral tradition and *mis en scene*. The only thing that audience members enjoy in the canonical plays is the spectacle and not the knowledge of the meaning. In the case of the post-Civil War plays, readers are now able to gain access into the primary level of meaning of the plays. In other words, they could make headway with the ordinary meaning of the texts without the service of the critics. With the understanding of the primary level of meaning of texts, they could on their own go about processing the deep and deeper connotative meanings as long as it can take.

Fundamental in the analysis of the extreme intellectualism of Soyinka is Olaniyan’s metaphor of the “Heroic Generals” and the “Absent Soldiers”. Master political dramatists such as Soyinka are referred to as heroic generals while the readers are the absent soldiers. The manuals of revolution are the literature and the revolutionary plays. Upon whistling by

the heroic generals to the soldiers to fire the revolutionary gun to upturn the repressive regimes as they have been so trained in the recipe detailed in the manuals, the absent soldiers instead begin to look like imbeciles. What ultimately accounts for the failure of the absent soldiers is that they do not understand the manuals as shown in the following by Olaniyan (2008: 55):

It turned out that many of the soldiers did not know that any manual existed, and many of those who knew guiltily mumbled with regret that they did not read or complete reading any of the manuals, or that they did read them completely but hardly understood what they were saying.

Once again, who are Soyinka's audience or readers? And can we regard his drama to be popular or not? Bob Leshoai (1965: 144) describes the two types of important audiences in Africa. The first "are the handful of intellectuals and the vast masses of the rustics of men, women and children in the street". Jeremy Hawthorn (1992: 135) defines popular drama as "for the people" and "of the people". Therefore popular drama is owned by the people and the drama also owns the people. To be popular or to be for and of the people means a lot. The following, according to Brecht, defines all the terms of the popular (1997: 81):

Popular means: intelligible to the broad masses, adopting and enriching their forms of expression/assuming their standpoint, confirming and correcting it/ representing the most progressive section of the people so that it can assume leadership, and therefore intelligible to other sections of the people as well/ relating to traditions and developing them/ communication to that portion of the people which strives for leadership the achievements of the section that at present rules the nation.

Looking at the classification of readers by Leshoai and at the attributes of the popular by Brecht, it is important at this juncture to make an appropriate account of the creative phases of Soyinka's works so as to establish which phase is popular and which is not. Jeyifo (1988: 92-6) summarizes the popular and the unpopular phases of Soyinka's creative output:

Soyinka's "minor" works ...are enormously popular and are regularly performed in the secondary schools and universities and by amateur companies. By contrast, the major plays, the "canonical" works...are generally considered unremittingly daunting and problematic; the potential of response and sympathy they could elicit are deemed an unknown, questionable quantity. Consequently these plays are very infrequently performed, either at home or abroad. (His minor works are more popularly acclaimed and patronized than those peaks of his literary corpus. The dream of all artists, except for a few aberrant types, is to elicit deep affective sympathies from the public, to achieve maximum impact, directly or subliminally, on the audience. One has in mind the generous and ambivalent tribute paid to Soyinka by the West Indian playwright, Derek Walcott: "his major plays are creations of great power and beauty but they are not staged in the Caribbean because of doubts as to whether the aesthetic, performance codes built into them can elicit appropriate responses".

Contained in the quote above is also a pointer to the fact that the problem of Soyinka's works in relation to the readers goes beyond the use of English language. That



some of the canonical plays are hardly performed abroad and in the Caribbean arising from the challenging aesthetic performance codes is a testimony to the above and to the identification of Soyinka's canonical oeuvre with the cultic and the shrine by various scholars. Soyinka is always, according to him in an interview with Anthony Appiah (1988: 779), worried when foreign readers claim they cannot gain access to his world. He laments this and erroneously refers to it as intellectual laziness since he could gain access to the works of Shakespeare, Ibsen and some other master playwrights. We observe that through this Soyinka should himself have noticed that many of the master playwrights have not been accused of his own sort of obscurantism. What Soyinka is short of saying is to declare in the manner of his poet friend Christopher Okigbo, quoted in Soyinka (1997: 416), who declared: "I only write my poetry for poets".

Soyinka, with reference to the canonical works, is not a dramatist of the people but a bourgeois dramatist speaking to a highly select segment of the specialist readership. We are of the opinion that the canonical works are driven primarily by sublime artistic experimentation and not primarily meant to be decipherable to the masses of rustic people. A *Dance of the Forest* is a classic example of sublime art that horrendously distances itself from the popular run of the people in the Nigerian society.

Side by side with Soyinka's art and time are the performances both theatrical and musical and stories that cultivate the people or the common masses of the Nigerian community. Cyprian Ekwensi is "better known perhaps by the general Nigerian public" (Chukwukere: 1965, 237). There are also the numerous Yoruba Travelling Theatre groups in Southwestern Nigeria with whose plays millions of Nigerians are familiar in the sense that the Theatre reflects them in terms of their aspirations and failings. Karin Barber (1982: 433) underscores the popularity of the theatre with the people in the following:

Within the Yoruba-speaking areas, this form of theatre is genuinely popular in both senses of the word: it attracts large audiences, and they are not elite but farmers, workers, petty traders, minor public servants, drivers, school-children, etcetera. That it is a non-elite form of entertainment is seen clearly in the background of the actors as well as in the composition of the audiences. In the group with which I am most familiar, the Oyin Adejobi Theatre Company of Osogbo, no member has more than three years of secondary education.

Akomolafe (2001: 144) posits that the Travelling Theatre gained the patronage of traditional rulers, women and children in primary and secondary schools. Fela Anikulapo-Kuti is another popular performer who is championing the cause of the people against the repressive Nigerian state. Unlike the creative artists and political dramatists who, given the nature of their medium, employ too private symbolism, metaphor and satirical portraits to lampoon the post-independence repressive and corrupt leaders, Fela in the manner of journalists frontally attacks the oppression and corrupt system (Ukpokodu: 1992, 42), using unambiguous symbols and language. Like Soyinka, Fela has equally been harassed times without number and jailed. Justin Labinjoh (1982: 131) establishes the popularity of Fela when he describes his "protest music, with its lower-class language and its toughness" as suitable to the need of those lower-class youths".

Finally we shall now examine the influences of the readers and the critical agency on the works of Wole Soyinka. As argued earlier, readers of literature, comprising the critics, are also members of the society from which the writer has come and as such have a sensitive role

to play in the creations of literary works. They too have imbibed the noetic traditions governing the artistic genres and equally are vital players in the nurturing and consolidation of societal values, religious ethics and spiritual codes of societies. They therefore are not stranger to the general pool from which the writers are drawing. With this in mind, the creative imagination of writers constantly imagines the readers as it produces knowing full well that readers in the process of reading mediate meaning making.

Regarding Wole Soyinka's works and the readers, we have seen that the bourgeois echelon which Soyinka self-consciously mounted in the republic of letters finally caved in through the efforts mainly of the critics, and of readers alike. Soyinka's "bourgeois-situated literature" as overtly exemplified in the canonical works received the deserved critical agency that turned it around. In works as obscure as those of Soyinka or such as required the artist to change a literary style, it is the duty of the critics as enunciated in the following by Charles Nnolim (2006: 7) to guide the writers in the interest of literature and readers as intermediaries:

Isn't the primary social function of the critic to make a text easier to understand for those who find it hard; to be a midwife between a difficult text and a non-understanding reader; to legislate taste and insist on decorum; to act as a guide to writers through suggestion, advice, demonstration; to explicate, analyze, interpret and in the process arouse enthusiasm for the work by showing that it has or lays definite claims to ultimate values... the good, the true, the beautiful? Finally, it is the function of the critic to discriminate among competing works of art and to defend the work of art against those who doubt its validity.

## Conclusion

It is established that Soyinka started his writing career using popular medium in works such as *Before the Blackout*, *The Lion and the Jewel* and *Trials of Brother Jero*. He, however, switched to high art, after the early plays, in the canonical works. It would be appropriate to argue that Soyinka covers the broad spectrum of popular and high art. It was the switch-over to the high art that generated the reactions of readers and the critical agency. In a triangular mode, Soyinka was made by the critics, readers and the need to address mass audience to retrace his step to the popular medium in the post-Civil War plays. It was after the critical agency of scholars such as Oyin Ogunba and Dan Izevbaye to mention a few that readers began to understand Wole Soyinka. Also, it was following the domineering attacks on Wole Soyinka by critics like Chinweizu along with the *bolekaja* critics and critics of the Left that Soyinka also considered the need to employ popular medium and idiom. One of such idioms is film-making that produced the satirical quip on the totalitarian government of Nkrumah, *Kongi's Harvest*, and *Blues for a Prodigal* against the Shagari regime. Another medium is popular music. One dominant piece in this regard is the long playing record entitled *Unlimited Liability Company*. The third idiom is Soyinka's return to the aesthetics of his satirical revues of the sixties. In other words, Soyinka comes back to the popular language typical of the early satirical plays that are mostly performed both at home and abroad. The argument is that Soyinka has rewritten his "bourgeois-situated literature" in a popular and people's lingo. The phase of rewriting comprises political plays such as *Opera Wonyosi*, *A Play of Giants*, *To Zia with Love*, *Beatification of Area Boy* and *King Baabu*. These plays are now well read, performed and enjoyed both within the country and outside. The return of Soyinka to the aesthetics of the satirical revues and that of the early popular comedies and

satires, upon the outcry of readers and critics, testifies to the identity, role and functions of readers of literature in their capacities as creative agents. We hope that the readership of his post-Civil war people's drama would expand such that his works would become like those of Charles Dickens "that help to remove some of the social abuses which he criticized and for his reward, the British postal stamp, adopted his emblem/image in 1992 to replace that of Nightingale" (Bamidele: 2000, 78).

## References

- Adedeji, J.A. & Ekwuazi, H. (1998). *Nigerian theatre: Dynamics of a movement*. Ibadan: Caltop Publications Limited.
- Akomolafe, O. (2001). In search of community theatre audience. *Issues in African theatre*. (ed.) Ola Rotimi. Ile-Ife: Humanities Publishers. pp. 114-121
- Appiah, A. (1988). An evening with Wole Soyinka. *Black American Literature Forum*, Vol. 22, No. 4, Wole Soyinka Issue. pp. 777-785.
- Bamidele, L. (2000). *Literature and sociology*. Ibadan: Stirling-Horden Publishers Limited.
- Barber, K. (1982). Popular reactions to the petro-naira. *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, Vol. 20, No. 3. pp. 431-450.
- Bloch, E. L, Brecht, B., Benjamin, W., & Adorno, T. (1977). *Aesthetics and politics*. London: New Left Books.
- Chinweizu, et al. (1980). *Toward the decolonization of African literature*. Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishing Co. Limited.
- Chinweizu, et al. (2007). Prodigals, come home! *African literature: An anthology of criticism and theory*. (ed.) Tejumola Olaniyan & Ato Quayson. Singapore: Blackwell Publishing. pp. 219-225.
- Chukwukere, B.I. (1965). African novelists and social change. *Phylon* (1960-), Vol. 26, No.3. pp. 228-239.
- Dunton, C. (1992). *Make man talk true: Nigerian drama in English since 1970*. London: Hans Zell Publishers.
- Eco, U. (1981). *The role of the reader: Explorations in the semiotics of texts*. London: Hutchinson.
- Escarpit, R. (1971). *Sociology of literature*. London: Frank Cass and Company Limited.
- Euba, F. (1981). The Nigerian theatre and the playwright. *Drama and theatre in Nigeria: A critical source book*. (ed.) Yemi Ogunbiyi. Lagos: Nigeria Magazine. pp. 381-398.
- Ezeigbo, A. (2008). *Artistic creativity: Literature in the service of society*. Lagos: University of Lagos Press.
- Fish, S. (1980). *Is there a text in this class? The authority of interpretive communities*. London: Harvard University Press.
- Gordimer, N. (1992). Turning the page: African writers on the threshold of the twenty-first century. *Transition*, No. 56. pp. 4-10.
- Griswold, W. (1993). Recent moves in the sociology of literature. *Annual Review of Sociology*. Vol. 19. pp. 455-467.
- Hawthorn, J. (1992). *A concise glossary of contemporary literary theory*. London: Rutledge Chapman and Hall, Inc.
- Jeyifo, B. (1985). *The truthful lie*. London: New Beacon Books Limited.
- Jeyifo, B. (1988). Wole Soyinka's theatre. *Perspectives on Nigerian literature: 1700 to the Present*. (ed.) Yemi Ogunbiyi. Lagos: Guardian Books Nigeria Limited. pp.

- 92-96.
- Jeyifo, B. (2008). For Dan Izevbaye: Literature and its 'others' in the developing world. *The postcolonial lamp: Essays in honour of Dan Izevbaye*. (ed.). Aderemi Raji-Oyelade & Oyeniyi Okunoye. Ibadan: Bookcraft. pp. 3-20.
- Labinjoh, J. (1982). Fela Anikulapo-Kuti: Protest music and social processes in Nigeria. *Journal of Black Studies*, Vol. 13, No. 1, Communication and Change in Sub-Saharan Africa. pp. 119-134
- Leshoai, B. (1965). Theatre and the common man in Africa. *Transition*, No. 19. pp. 44-47
- Malomo, J. (2002) *The theatre audience in Nigeria*. Ibadan: Stirling-Horden Publishers Limited.
- Ngugi, wa Thiong'o. (1981). *Decolonizing the mind*. Nairobi: East African Educational Publishers Limited.
- Nkosi, L. (1981). *Tasks and masks*. London: Longman Group Limited.
- Obafemi, O. (1996). *Contemporary Nigerian theatre*. Lagos: Centre for Black and African Arts and Civilization (CBAAC).
- Nnolim, C. (2006). African literature in the 21<sup>st</sup> century: Challenges for writers and critics. *African Literature Today*. Vol. 25, pp. 1-9.
- Olaniyan, T. (2008). The heroic generals and the absent soldiers: Notes on literature, development and governance in Africa since the Nobel Prize. *Reflections on African literature, governance and development*. (ed.) Gbemisola Adeoti and Mabel Ewrierhoma. Lagos: Kraft Books Limited. pp. 45-56.
- Osofisan, F. (1998). *Playing dangerously: Drama at the frontiers of terror in post-colonial state*. Ibadan: University Press.
- Selden, R., & Widdowson, P. (1993). *A reader's guide to contemporary literary theory*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Soyinka, W. (1981). The critic and society: Barthes, leftocracy, and other Mythologies. *Black American Literature Forum*, Vol. 15, No. 4, Black Textual Strategies, Volume 1: Theory. pp. 133-146.
- Soyinka, W. (1997). The writer in an African state. *Transition*, No. 75/76, The Anniversary Issue: Selections from Transition, 1961-1976. pp. 350-356.
- Ukpodoku, P. I. (1992). Plays, possession, and rock-and-roll: Political theatre in Africa. *TDR* (1988-), Vol. 36, No. 4. pp. 28-53.
- Wali, O. (2007). The dead end of African literature? *African literature: An anthology of criticism and theory*. (ed.). Tejumola Olaniyan & Ato Quayson. UK: Blackwell Publishing. pp. 281-284.

Adebayo Mosobalaje  
Department of English  
Obafemi Awolowo University  
Ile-Ife  
[eriohun\\_wura@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:eriohun_wura@yahoo.co.uk)