



Meaning Reconstruction in Some Selected Nigerian Drama: Character Deconstruction as Panacea

Jibril Imam Mohammed-Kabir^{[a],*}; Lucy Ada Odusina-Onaivi^[a]

^[a]Department Theatre Arts, Alvan Ikoku Federal College of Education, Owerri, Imo State.

* Corresponding author.

Received 4 January 2022; accepted 14 February 2022

Published online 26 February 2022

Abstract

Young readers and interpreters often misinterpret and misjudge character construct in Nigerian playtexts. This is because African playwrights especially Nigeria's have been dominated and influenced by Western playwrights and writers with the styles of character construct in their playtexts. Thus the problem of this study centres on the Euro-American perceptions of character construct on the sensibilities of Nigerian playwrights. Hence, the study aims at evolving means of interpretation of Nigerian playtexts through character deconstruction and other artistic components and compositions from the point of view of the playwrights and interpreters. Objectives of the study include: to examine the object of character construct as foundation for analysis and interpretation. To deconstruct the selected plays through analyses and appraisal of character construct and characterization. The study is hinged on the theoretical premise of Ricoeur's theory of interpretation that made the researcher's meaning generation possible. The study adopts content analysis approach of the qualitative research method. The findings reveal that from the African deconstruction standpoint, character construction, reconstruction and deconstruction in Nigerian drama is aimed at effective generation and communication of meaning. The study recommends that character deconstruction should be key anchor for the interpretation of contemporary Nigerian playtexts. The study concludes that cultural elements add to the construct and impart of the dramatic products. Hence, deconstruction should be applied as analytical tool for character deconstruction in contemporary Nigerian drama.

Key words: Character; Nigerian drama; Reconstruction; Deconstruction and meaning making

Mohammed-Kabir, J. I., & Odusina-Onaivi, L. A. (2022). Meaning Reconstruction in Some Selected Nigerian Drama: Character Deconstruction as Panacea. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 24(1), 12-18. Available from: <http://www.cscanada.net/index.php/sll/article/view/12425>
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/12425>

INTRODUCTION

Character is seen as one of the people or persons that are used in movie, play or novel. Character is the instrument or medium used by the playwright, novelist or movie writer to pass his message. It is a vehicle that conveys the message of the play, movie or novel. The message passed through character is structured on the language the character speaks in the play, the action the character takes in the play, how the character relates with other characters in the play and the way he follows his goal in the play. The person called character in a play text is an embodiment of messages that needs to be deconstructed by the interpreter to make meaning out of what he reads. The character is a creation of the playwright through which he sends his message out to the reader/interpreter. In line with Yerima assertion that: "The budding playwright must know right from the beginning that character is a material from which plots are created. The idea remains the raw material from which characters emerge" (p.90).

Character according to Holman and Harmon, is, "A complicated term that includes the idea of a normal constitution of human personality..., the presence of moral uprightness, and the simpler notion of the presence of creatures in art that seem to be human beings of one sort or another" (p.81). Therefore, character is a brief descriptive sketch of a personage who typifies some definite quality. Character is describe not as an

individualized personality but as an example of some voice or virtue or type, such as an old man, a woman, a boy, a king, a prince or princess, a queen.

Deconstruction denotes the pursuing of the meaning of a text to the point of exposing the supposed contradictions and internal oppositions upon which it is founded. Supposedly showing that those foundations are irreducibly complex, unstable, or impossible. "It is an approach that may be deployed in philosophy, in literary analysis, and even in the analysis of scientific writings" (Royle, p.56). Deconstruction mostly tries to demonstrate that any text is not a distinct whole but contains several irreconcilable and contradictory meanings. Deconstruction opines that any text therefore has more than one interpretation and the text itself links these interpretations inseparably.

The oppositions challenged by deconstruction, which have been inherent in Western philosophy since the time of the ancient Greeks, are characteristically "binary" and "hierarchical," involving a pair of terms in which one member of the pair is assumed to be primary or fundamental, the other secondary or derivative. The point of the deconstructive analysis is to restructure, or "displace," the opposition, not simply to reverse it. This implies that in the process of character deconstruction, is to construct a different meaning out of the already constructed meaning or communication by the playwrights. As with the opposition between nature and culture, however, the point of the deconstructive analysis is not to show that the terms of the speech/writing opposition should be inverted; that writing is really prior to speech; nor is it to show that there are no differences between speech and writing. Rather, it is to displace the opposition so as to show that neither term is primary. In dramatic studies, deconstruction plays a major role in the transformation of literary studies by literary theory which was concerned with questions about the nature of character, the production of meaning, and the relationship between literature and the numerous discourses that structure human experience and its histories.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Paul Ricoeur's Theory of Interpretation

The theory of interpretation was propounded by Paul Ricoeur (1913-2005), a French philosopher who postulated the theory via what he calls the 'hermeneutic arc'. In order to understand the basis of hermeneutic-arc, it is appropriate to set the historical context of hermeneutics. Originally, the word "Hermeneutics" came from the Greek Mythological figure Hermes. As a messenger, Hermes was responsible for interpreting Zeus messages for the other gods and goddesses. In the words of Adogbo and Ojo:

Hermeneutics itself means science of interpretation, which seeks to bring to light the primordial nature of a phenomenon or the

very "essence" of the object under study. Its goal is to discover the essential structures of acts, and objects or entities that correspond to them. (p.10)

The hermeneutic arc is encapsulated in three stages; explanation, understanding and appropriation. Explanation: "In this first stage, the interpreter explores about this question 'What is this book about?'" And examines the texts inside nature thereby developing the quest to take an adventure into knowing what the play is all about on the part of the reader of a play" (Ricoeur, 1624).

Understanding: "In this second stage, the interpreter explores about this question 'What does this text talk about?'" In this level, the interpreter digs deep into the text for deeper understanding and seeks to bring out the hidden ingredients of the text" (Ricoeur, 1625). Here the reader of a play takes steps further to know what the playwright tries to communicate to the interpreter/reader.

Appropriation: In the third stage, "the gained understanding is used for expanding the text into a life world, here the interpreter seeks to achieve the writers thoughts and feelings but does this through (the interpreter's) understanding and meaning gained from the text" (Ricoeur, 1627). The reader/interpreter here in the quest to discover the 'dead' author appropriates meaning to the codes embedded by the playwright. Whether he interprets the playwright's intent or not, it is not a problem as he has the poetic license to appropriate his deduced meaning and adduced it in his own way.

CHARACTER DECONSTRUCTION IN MODERN DRAMA

Character deconstruction in a play involves taking an existing character and language in that play, deconstructing them straight and examining the likely/realistic consequences or implications of that character that tends to be ignored by straight examples of them. This character in the play does the same thing, but when he comes to deconstruction you see the character making different meaning like a fictional character archetypes. This is leaning on Langer's theory that: "Symbols are ... vehicles for the conception of objects" (Langer 70). That is, a symbol is, "an instrument of thought" (p.70). Hence, "The character may be entirely fictional or based on a real-life person, in which case the distinction of a 'fictional' versus 'real' character may be made" (Dibattista, p.20). To this end, Johnson posits that: "When a script has indispensable characters, characters who, without them, the drama cannot stand, then there is a beautiful creation" (p.87). As Nwabueze succinctly captures it that: "To Derrida, a document is replete with a multiplicity of meaning because there is no fixed system of knowledge and therefore, no definite, absolute meaning in a text" (p.56). According to Ricoeur, "the gained understanding

is used for expanding the text into a life world, here the interpreter seeks to achieve the writers thoughts and feelings but does this through (the interpreter's) understanding and meaning gained from the text" (Ricoeur, 1967). Corroborating this, Derrida asserts that: "The text (of a document) should be perceived as an entity within itself and its interpretation should not be encumbered by unnecessary intrusive meanings. It is the text that speaks and no prior or external presence ought to be considered in its analysis" (8). Because: "...the author is no longer the source of meaning in a text" (Nwabueze, p.57).

For instance, the interpreter of Osofisan's *Once Upon Four Robbers*, must have good knowledge of deconstruction. In deconstructing this play, the readers/interpreters may try to understand the characters of the four robbers, Alhaja, Angola, Hassan and Major. Osofisan empowers these four characters with language and weapons that would need to be deconstructed before deducing meaning. The reason behind their language, action and the use of weapons may be known to enable the interpreter deconstruct the play. The interpreter may try to understand why the robbers took to crime before deconstructing the characters. The characters of the soldiers in the play may be understood by the reader like what could have made Osofisan to bring in soldiers as characters in the play. For coherent interpretation, the interpreter may also know why the soldiers did what they did in the play. Or the characters of Titubi in Osofisan's *Morountodun* and her revolutionary aesthetics must be understood for adequate meaning generation and creation. Or the existentialist intent of Omodoko and Inikpi in Idegú's *Omodoko* and *The Legendary Inikpi* respectively and the Princess of Emepiri kingdom in Ododo's *Hard Choice* may be deconstructed in Nigerian Drama for meaning making. These characters may be understood from their sociological traits, psychological hegemony and physiological engagement.

The interpreter may want to say that it is the corrupt situation of the society that makes the robbers to take to robbery. Nwosu affirms that: "The robbers...are products of the corrupt society took to robbery because of hunger and unemployment..." (p.248). The reader/interpreter may try to understand this before creating his meaning of the play which is different from that of the playwright. Though the interpreter takes into cognizance the meaning of the playwright, he deconstruct the fused meaning by the playwright and come up with his meaning which may be entirely be different from the playwright's. A reader/interpreter may decide to say that why will the robbers take to robbery and terrorizing the society and they are not the only people in that society? This perspective influences the interpretative acumen of the reader thereby making a different meaning from that of the playwright.

It is interesting to note that every character in a play whether with speaking or non-speaking role is important.

That does not imply that there are no characters that are more conspicuous than the other. So, to undertake a critical discourse on the deconstruction of character in the selected plays of the selected Nigerian playwrights would be a herculean task to the reader/interpreter. Hence, in deconstructing the characters in the case studies, three aspects of character trait would be investigated, they are physiology, sociology and psychology. The reason may be that any character that does anything in a play is either influenced by this three traits or by one of the three. Once the characters have been influenced by any or all of the three, we see the result in what they say through their language and critics can do a meaningful deconstruction for comprehension of the selected playtexts.

MEANING RECONSTRUCTION AND CHARACTER DECONSTRUCTION IN SELECTED DRAMA

The study of Osofisan's *Twingle-Twangle...* and other plays prudently selected for the research shall be read beyond the playwrights' character construct. The constructs of the dramatists are mere windows through which the reader, decoder and interpreter can lean on to weave his/her meaning. For instance, Kehinde and Taye in Osofisan's *Twingle-Twangle...* and Edewede in Okoh's *Edewede*, are they strong, are they weak, are they tall and other physiological traits? The playwright may have given us a visual picture of them. But he does not just list their physical traits. The playwright tries to be inventive and creative with the way he describes them. Rather than saying Taye or Kehinde is fat, he could writes Taye or Kehinde substitutes exercise for eating and his waist-line shows it. Remember, the playwright's job is to entertain the reader as well. When he writes dull, dry sentences the reader will start to check out. So, the more interesting he can write a sentence the more engaged the dramatist's reader will be in deconstructing his characters and language. The reader/interpreter according to deconstruction has the license to interpret the play in his own way. That is why the case studies for this study was carefully selected because of character construct for communicative perspectives and tendencies in Nigerian drama.

This is possible as no one artistic, creative or literary work carries a static meaning. The meaning imbued by the writer is his conceived meaning, which is open to other meaning creation by the reader/interpreter. The Nigerian playwright only encodes his play with meaning through his characters from his preconceived idea/thought. As soon as the playwright as an encoder gives his play out, it is assumed that the writer is "dead". Any meaning that is made/ created out of such work is attributed to the reader/interpreter.

In the same vein, in Ukala's *Akpakaland* for instance, he developed his characters in the play to create meaning through what they say and the actions they carry out in the play. The physiological, sociological and psychological impetus that motivated the Fulama, Unata and other wives of Akpaka in *Akpakaland* may be well studied and understood for the reader/interpreter to deconstruct and make more meaning. Hence for an interpreter to make meaning from Nigerian drama, he painstakingly goes through the constructed characters in Nigerian drama to create his meaning. For example, a character starts a play without a tail suddenly developed one as the play progresses. This takes the artistic ingenuity of the playwright to achieve. This is done basically to encode meaning that would be decoded as the decoder picks up the play to translate/encode. Therefore, it requires the interpretative acumen of the interpreter to deconstruct these characters, as the reader fused them, the reader creates new meaning from the play.

Through what the characters say also helps in the deduction of meaning from the transfer of tail from Fulama and Unata. It takes the ingenuity of the reader/interpreter to make his meaning out of the play. Through deconstruction and semio-aesthetics, the reader adduces and deduces meaning other than that which the playwright imbued in the play. The transfer of tail, the action of the characters and what was said before the tail was transferred may be well understood before critical interpretation can take place, because it is also symbolic nature.

That is why the character created in any given play should be well studied for difference in meaning to be generated. Both the character form parts of the components of the instruments explored by the playwright to create his/her meaning in the play. Therefore, if such play (s) must be deconstructed, hence the mode through which built character and language applied in the play should be deconstructed. That is the position of this paper. In order to understand the meaning of any work it must be deconstructed through the study of semiotics and aesthetics for communicative enterprise. The writer/playwright is not there but his work opens the foreground for interpretation.

Again, "Since the end of the 18th century, the phrase 'character' has been used to describe an effective impersonation by an actor. Since the 19th century, the art of creating characters, as practiced by actors or writers, has been called characterization" (Bennett and Booth 160). For instance in *Akpakaland*, say the characters of Fulama and Unata may be seen in fictional or real through Langer's 'non-discursive symbolism'. Having tail and transferring the tail to another is a situation that calls for deconstruction. Thereby propagating Langer's theory thus: "Symbols are ... vehicles for the conception of objects" (Langer 70). We have the characters of Achema, Inikpi and Ame speaking from the ancestral world directly

in *Tough Man* calls for critical deconstruction for meaning construction.

Character as an important instrument used by the playwrights in their various plays to convey the messages of the playtexts can be seen clearly from their construct. The plays are well built around characters, who may be understood from their lines (language). The reader/interpreter may understand them more through what the playwright says about the characters, what the characters say about themselves and what other characters say about them. This can also be seen conspicuously from the conversation between Kehinde and Taye in *Twingle Twangle...* thus:

KEHINDE: Would you want to switch then?

TAYE: No. Digbaro does not respect me anyway-

KEHINDE: No, and Efundunke fears me. So it's a deal.

TAYE: Come, Efundunke. Come and say goodbye to my brother.

KEHINDE: And you Digbaro. Here's where we split up. Say goodbye to them. (*Twingle-Twangle...*p.13)

For the proper understanding of the play, Ricoeur's theory should be well understood and appropriated. The exchange above revealed the characters of both Taye and Kehinde. Thus, through character we were able to see both Taye and Kehinde from these lights. Their quest to choose the bags which Digbaro and Efundunke are carrying exposed both characters to the reader/interpreter of such plays. Meanings can be found in both non-discursive and discursive symbolism.

Taye in Osofisan's *Twingle Twangle...*, apart from been an epitome of peace and tranquillity, is also endowed with saturated wisdom. He equally borrowed a leaf from professor's words through language, when the Voices were commanding him to drink. The following dialogue exposes this:

VOICES: [*shouting.*] The stew! Drink the stew!

PROFESSOR: Patience, patience, *mes amis*, *Da mihi locum standi, et mundum movelos.* (*Twingle...*p.36)

Taye turning down the offer of marrying the princess threw everybody off balance. Through non-discursive symbolism, espouses on the character of Taye. But, the researcher observes through the interpretation of the play text that Taye has a mighty plan which was later revealed. Hinged on Ricoeur's: "the interpreter digs deep into the text for deeper understanding and seeks to bring out the hidden ingredients of the text" (1625). Taye insists on filling his stomach:

TAYE: NO! NO! I don't want her! [There is general consternation.]

ELENON: What insolence!

TAYE: Right now, all I can think about is my stomach. It's killing me. I think the stew only made the hunger worse. So please, if you could just ask them to lead me to the kitchen. (*Twingle Twangle...*p.41)

Taye's insistence that on his stomach in terms of hunger speaks volumes of the character of Taye.

Through Afro-semio-aesthetics analyses of character, the dialogue reveals Taye as a peace lover and reveals Kehinde as a war monger/war lover. Language and character as discursive and non-discursive symbolism can be deduced from *Akpakaland* thus:

FULAMA: I'm going nowhere. This is also an important state matter. When rubbish is too much in the soup, the blind notices it. I won't leave. (To AUDIENCE.) Everyone says, "the president is good. The president is imperial. The president is straightforward. The president is this. The president is that... You thought that would give her the heir to the throne? Men do not decide such things for the gods. I have just a daughter, but I'm not barren. The Beautiful One may have two children, but aren't they also girls? (*Hoots.*) Excessive beauty may not beget an heir.... (*Akpakaland*, pp.14-15)

The exchange did not only portray the symbolic representation of what it contained, hence, "The study of a character requires an analysis of its relations with all of the other characters in the work" (Aston and Savona, p.41). The principle of the theory is that every sign has meaning and the potential for multiple meanings (both inherent and non-inherent meaning), which can be adduced and deduced by the reader and critic. Glaring from *Akpakaland* thus:

AKPAKA: (*To UNATA.*) What do you say to that?
UNATA: What should I say? When one sees a weakling, does one not hunger for a fight? ...If my husband who slept with me a few nights ago, believes I have a tail because Fulama has said so, then I ha... ha... (*Begins to weep*)
IYEBI: (*Moves over to her.*) Don't cry! Don't cry because of this witch? Did she not say the same thing about me just now? If you or I have a tail, what is his business? Is she our husband? (p.17)

Fulama's character, language and emotional attachment to the issue of wife has a tail or no tail sets the conflict on the move. Iyebi's character can also be seen from her statement and action and what Akpaka says about her, as they try to clarify the issue of tail. These are textualities and languages that call for proper interpretation for semio-aesthetics to thrive. Textuality, character and language are parts of the core elements of African semiotics and aesthetics. The aforementioned lines espouse the characters of Fulama, Akpaka and Iyebi which of course, may be understood through deconstructive hegemony and Afro-semio-aesthetic analysis for meaning generation by the reader/interpreter. Fulama's action may be studied from envious perception and that of Akpaka may be studied from his physiological, sociological and psychological traits, which can be seen apparently from his action against Fulama above.

Hermeneutically, the process of extracting meaning from texts is called interpretation, but to succeed in this, the hidden part of the text must be discovered. Ododo's *Hard Choice* is explicit on this:

PRINCESS: Tonight I shall carry the burden of Emepiri kingdom to the gods so that war is averted and lives saved. Chinelo, what could be more honourable. Please, I'm in high

spirit today don't dampen it...

PRINCE: I know you're upset with me.

PRINCESS: I'm not, the prince of Igedu Kingdom.

PRINCE: I tried to reach you but the Queen's security network around you was impenetrable.

PRINCESS: I know, Chinelo told me everything.

PRINCE: My Princess, look we don't have much time. My people are getting set for the ritual slated for Oguguru shrine to recover the crown with your life. I've come to elope with you to far distance, far away from this entire weird atmosphere. Hurry...

PRINCESS: It's too late, Prince Oki. Can we really escape from our shadows? No. The life of your father, the King of Igedu Kingdom, and that of the entire people of Emepiri Kingdom are enmeshed in this weird atmosphere. It would only take a life, my life, to save them and you want me to walk away?

PRINCE: What then happens to me? (*Hard Choice*, pp.48-9)

The character of Princess was revealed as courageous fellow which must be deconstructed for meaning generation through Afro-semio-aesthetic elements. The meta-textual reflections of the play; this implies reading the play outside the playtext; Ricoeur's appropriation of course, the material for the play was picked or gotten from the society, hence, the play must have a link with the society; having a reflection on the society. Some critics believe that any literary work that does not have a reflection of the society in its thematic standpoint should be thrown away because it is the society that gave birth to such text. Which is: "the gained understanding is used for expanding the text into a life world, here the interpreter seeks to achieve the writers thoughts and feelings but does this through (the interpreter's) understanding and meaning gained from the text" (Ricoeur, 1967). Needless to ask whether, there may be any work of literature that will exist in a vacuum; without an iota of reflection on the society? This is one of the reasons why the play may be fused with textuality and language because the environment/society gave birth to it, as Emmy Idegu's *Tough Man* captures actions from both this world and the other world thus:

Inikpi: (*Sighing.*) Humnnnn. So what do we do? How do we help our people? Things cannot continue like this. (*To Ame*) What do you think?

Ame: There you come again. You sacrificed yourself for Igala people. Your death was never appreciated... (p.22)

The connect between the living and the dead was established by Inikpi as she tries to champion the way forward on how to ameliorate the problem of the people. What is most important is that, the relationship between the living and the dead should be well understood by the reader/interpreter through Afro-semio-aesthetic elements for proper interpretative purposes.

Afro-semio-aesthetics model is hinged on the environment of the play texts, therefore, textuality and language are central to Afro-semio-aesthetics analyses. Because for a reader/interpreter to understand the communication between the dead and the living, he should understand the cosmic order of the African world

of the living the dead and the unborn, which is naturally Africa's. This cosmic order of the world are reflected in some Nigerian dramas that require the concept of Afro-semio-aesthetics for proper interpretation and meaning generation.

Owing from that, the war Kehinde embraced the war Taye turned his back against. The peace Kehinde rejected that Taye accepted and his people are doing greatly well. The dancing that Kehinde abhors that Taye encouraged. This is purely opposite each other. Afro-semio-aesthetically, right when they parted ways and chose bags, both connote peace and war. Langer's Theory of symbol plays a vital role through symbol, object and person with signs and symbols of semiotics. Taye's subjects were scared of the impending war between Etido and Ereko; Kehinde and Taye's villages respectively. They nurse fear, they plan to run away as the citizens discuss it with Taye through language and character for meaning making.

For instance, as Kehinde was preparing for war, Taye was also preparing for feast unknowing to both brothers. Taye's prowess was later revealed to us in the play. Kehinde became the king of Etido village and Taye became the king of Ereko village. Both discursive and non-discursive symbolisms play out. Kehinde plans to invade Ereko with war, while Taye on the other hand, plans to welcome them in peace. Engaging binary oppositions which require deconstruction through African semio-aesthetic elements. To Kehinde's surprise, as they approach Ereko village what they saw was different from what they expected. Kehinde and Taye discovered their identities. There is a kind of double reunion here between Taye and Keyinde and between Efundunke and Digbaro their acolytes respectively. But the exchange between Taye and Kehinde caps it again in *Twingle Twangle*:

TAYE: Welcome then. I suppose I ought to have guessed.
KEHINDE: So should I. but you know of course that we have come to fight you.
TAYE: Yes, but it won't be necessary. We have no wish to resist.
KEHINDE: Perhaps you don't understand? There are terms which-
TAYE: Whatever the terms. We hate bloodshed. We hold life to be sacred.
KEHINDE; You will always be sissy, won't you? Perhaps it was inevitable, as I always told Digbaro, that such a day like this would come.

TAYE: I am not provoked. Only don't be too hasty to count your chickens before they are hatched. Tell us your terms. (p.86)

The construct of the characters of Taye and Kehinde in the play is symbolic that needs understanding of Afro-semio-aesthetic motif to enable the reader/interpreter do a deconstruction of the structured characters. The same way the meddled language in the play by Osofisan calls for creative and artistic understanding of the playwright's language to deconstruct the play semiotic and aesthetic wise. In this vein, Binebai and Olayiwola submit that:

Character in drama on the other hand is defined by Aristotle as the people represented in the play. A character is the representation of a person in a narrative or dramatic work of art. Characters guides [sic] readers through their stories, helping them to understand plots and ponder themes [sic]. (pp.36-37)

The character of Babalawo is very important to this study. The researcher upholds that Babalawo as he is called is a priest. In the African world-view the priests meditate between the people and the great beyond. For a reader to understand this character therefore, he must understand the elements of both African semiotics and aesthetics. These elements deal with the language, signs, symbols and environment/culture of the people. By extension, the reader/interpreter should equally be well-grounded in Derrida's deconstruction. The activities of the Babalawo may be viewed through sensual perception of African semiotics and aesthetics and philosophical binary oppositions of deconstruction. His character as Babalawo, if he does good or bad this may be seen from the point of view of semiotics and aesthetics because it deals with sensual perception. Babalawo communicates with signs and paraphernalia of divination.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Critic/interpreter should stimulate ideas and concept in their effort to interpret African/Nigerian playtexts. This should be done through the engagement of discursive and non-discursive symbolism in their interpretation to derive meaning for communication purposes.

Playwrights should endeavour to construct their plays with enough instruments of discursive and non-discursive symbolism, so as to provide avalanche of tools for the interpretation of such playtexts by the reader/interpreter in a multi-cultural society.

It is discovered that in this postmodern age, there is the threat of mono-culturalism to African art of playwriting. Thus, there is the need for multi-cultural theories that will engender in the playwright and critic, embrace of radical revival strategies that will rejuvenate the playtext interpretation in Africa/Nigeria.

CONCLUSION

The sociological traits of the characters in the plays fit into society. Like Achema, Inikpi and Ameh in Idegus' *Tough Man* and Princess in Ododo's *Hard Choice* call for cross examination and deconstruction if meaning must be generated. For example, are they kings and queens, are they beggars, are they royal Knights, teachers and others. This will go a long way in the study of deconstruction and interpretative purposes. The interpreter will be able to identify whether any of the character traits affect the action, language of a particular character and other characters in the play to enable him deconstruct them for meaning

generation and understanding of the messages therein. The psychology traits of Unata and Bulama in Ukala's *Akpakland* need to be appraised for concerted meaning creation. For instance, are they balance psychologically, or imbalance, are they bi-polar, are they calm, are they quick to temper, and is the hate or love around them and other psychological traits. All these affect the manner in which the character uses his language and they equally influence his actions and reactions to other characters in the play as will be seen in the analysis. The reader himself must be well grounded in the spirit of deconstruction through the aforementioned elements to permeate meaning generation in perspectives.

Taye and Kehinde even Baba Ibeji and Mama Ibeji must be well deconstructed psychologically, sociologically and physiologically before how and what they say influenced their action or how their characters were motivated to do what they did in *Twingle Twangle*.... Edewede as a character in the play should be studied sociologically, psychologically and physiologically for the reader/interpreter to know why she through her character and language waged a war against an age-long tradition. The princess of Emepiri kingdom who through the existentialist's eyes laid her life for peaceful co-existence may be well studied through her character for a proper deconstruction to permeate communicating effectively. The reason for selecting Achema, Ameh and Inikpi who are all dead must be viewed from the sociological, physiological and psychological strand and be identified and their characters before death must be well deconstructed for meaning creation. The reader/interpreter may go beyond the text to research historically to equally know their psychological, sociological and physiological positions when they were alive. Understanding all the above-mentioned qualities and elements would crave the easy way for deconstruction and meaning reconstruction in Nigerian drama.

REFERENCES

Adogbo, M. P., & Ojo Crowder E. (2003). *Research methods in the humanities*. Lagos: Malthouse Press Limited.

Ashton, E., & Savona, G. (1991). *Theatre as sign-system: A semiotics of text and performance*. London and New York: Routledge.

Bennett, L., & Booth, P. (2016). *Seeing fans: Representations of fandom in media and popular culture*. USA: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Binebai, B., & Olayiwola, A. (2011). Character-setting dissonance and Niger delta representation in Ahmed Yerima's *Little Drops*. *The Parnassus: A Journal of University of Uyo*, 35-47.

DiBattista, M. (2011). *Novel characters: A genealogy*. London: John Wiley & Sons.

Emeka, N. (2013). *Research methods an integrated approach*: Owerri. Abic Books and Equip Ltd.

Holman, H. C., & Harmon, W. (Eds.) (2006). *A handbook to literature*. New York: MacMillan Publishing.

Idegu, E. I. U. (2007). *Tough man*. Kaduna: TW Press & Publishers.

Iwuh, J. (2007). *The village lamb*. Ibadan: Kraft Books Limited.

Langer, S. K. (2011). *Encyclopædia Britannica. Encyclopædia Britannica ultimate reference suite*. Chicago: Encyclopædia Britannica.

Mohammed-Kabir, Jibril Imam (2019). *Language and character deconstruction in contemporary Nigerian drama: A semio-aesthetic analysis of selected playtexts*. A Ph.D Dissertation submitted to the Department of Theatre and Film Studies, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka.

Nwosu, C. C. (2014). *Postmodernism and paradigm shift in theory and practice of theatre*. Onitsha: Eagleman Books.

Ododo, S. (2011). *Hard choice*. Ibadan: Kraft Books Limited.

Okoh, J. (2000). *Edewede. (The Down of a New Day)*. Ibadan: Totan Publishers Limited.

Osofisan, F. (1993). *Twingle-Twangle A Twynning Tayle*. Ibadan: Longman Nigeria Plc.

Ricoeur, P. (1981). *Hermeneutics and human sciences* (pp.112-128) (Thompson, J. B., Ed.). UK: Cambridge University Press.

Royle, N. (2017). *Jacques Derrida (Reprint ed.)*. London: Routledge. Retrieved 8 September.

Soyinka, W. (1976). *Myth, literature and the African world*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Soyinka, W. (1977). *Death and the king's horseman*. New York: University Press.

Ukala, S. (2011). *Akpakland and other plays*. Ibadan: Kraft Books Limited.

Yerima, A. (2003). *Basic technique in playwriting*. Ibadan: Kraft Books.