

Ezeulu in the Binary Systems of Chinua Achebe's *Arrow of God*

Ngozi Chuma-Udeh
Anambra State University

Abstract

Binary opposition or binary system is the correlating of two opposites in a fictive character. It is the bringing together of a pair of adjacently related terms or concepts or behavioural patterns that are opposite in meaning to co-habit in one consciousness. Binary opposition is therefore the system by which, in language and thought, two theoretical opposites are strictly defined and set off against one another. G. Smith in *Binary Opposition and Sexual Power in Paradise Lost* refers to this strategy as an author's means of contrasting between two mutually exclusive terms, such as happiness and unhappiness, fire and ice, pride and humility, on and off, up and down, left and right, heroism and cowardice, loyalty and faithlessness, love gained and thwarted (383). The most common portrayal of this feature in a character is the sense of doubt. In structuralism such distinctions are held to be fundamental to all language and thought as well as in human philosophy and culture. This paper argues that Achebe imbued Ezeulu in *Arrow of God* with this unique quality to accentuate his characteristic traits in the midst of societal tumult. The author created an archetypal character heavily laden with an inner conflict that stems from the aura of mystery surrounding his spiritual life as a divine priest. This paper seeks to establish, too, that the working out of this internal conflict brought this character into direct confrontation with his people and his god and led to the eventual loss of his society's ethos.

Keywords: binary opposition, cataclysm, society, conflict, consciousness

Introduction

The theory of binary opposition is located in Saussurean theory. Ferdinand de Saussure posits that binary opposition is the means by which the units of language have value or meaning; each unit is defined in reciprocal determination with another term, as in binary code. According to him, its features are not a contradictory relation but a structural, complementary one. Saussure demonstrated that a sign's meaning is derived from the group (paradigm) to which it belongs. For example, one cannot conceive of 'good' if one does not understand 'evil'.

When it is zeroed down to literary works, binary opposition becomes the presence-absence dichotomy that primarily serve as prototypical means of explaining human behaviour and presenting ethical values. In much of literary studies, including structuralism, distinguishing between presence and absence essentially viewed as polar opposites, is a fundamental element of thought in many cultures. In addition, according to post-structuralist theory, *presence* occupies a position of dominance in literary thought over *absence*, because *absence* is traditionally seen as what you get when you take away *presence*. (Had *absence* been dominant, *presence* might have most naturally been seen as what you get when you take away an *absence*.)

In Chinua Achebe's *Arrow of God*, binary opposition is manifested in the colonial-colonized dichotomy. The emphasis here is on the political as well as the analytic or conceptual critique of binary oppositions. An attempt to view it through the lens of post-structuralism would mean that *colonization* can be seen, as injuriously dominant over the colonized because colonialism represents the presence of a stronger power; with colonization, there is a suppression of cultural identity.

Binary oppositions in *Arrow of God*

Binary opposition comes about in *Arrow of God* mainly by correlating politics and culture. At one end of the political impasse are the British government officials imposing imperial power on the natives and at the other end is the internal political conflict ravaging the colonized indigenous Igbo society. The culture confrontation is also perceived from two angles. At one end are the Christian missionaries encroaching and destroying the fabric of the indigenous religion; at the other end are the indigenous gods and their chief priests in stiff rivalry against each other in a context for supremacy. As the two cultures struggle for supremacy, the indigenous culture is weakened by contention and differences from within.

Achebe paradoxically did not just portray the binary of the disrupting effect of the colonial imposed power system on an internal African tradition and customs. He also portrayed the oppositions and conflicts within Igbo society which carved a ready niche for external invasion by both the colonial government and the Christian missionaries. In applying binary opposition to the character of Ezeulu, the author succinctly provided a *raison d'être* for the smooth incursion of colonialism.

Again, in view of the fact that structural theory of binary oppositions is not simply the reversal of the opposition, but its deconstruction, which is described as apolitical—that is, not intrinsically favouring one arm of a binary opposition over the other, the author balances the cataclysmic effect on the hero by creating in him contradictory flaws. Here, Ezeulu moves in tune with the principle of deconstruction as the 'event' or 'moment' at which a binary opposition is thought to contradict itself and undermine its own authority:

Arrow of God is set in a society undergoing change owing to the incursion of another more powerful culture. It mirrors a typical Igbo

community of people as they grapple with the intimidating tenets of colonialism. Ezeulu is the chief priest of the principal deity, Ulu, jointly instituted and worshipped by the six villages of Umuaro. At the beginning of the narrative there is a deep conflict tearing apart the six villages of Umuaro. Ezeulu watches helplessly as Umuaro gets involved in a war of 'blame' over a piece of land thought to belong to a neighbouring village. In the traditional Igbo society, land is a sacred and divine thing. Ownership of a sizable portion of land is the greatest achievement of a man; yet, tussle for land is the most volatile thing that could bring disaster and death to whole communities of people. It was believed that an elder or a Chief priest swearing falsely or bearing wrong testimony about the ownership of a portion of land may be struck dead instantly by the goddess of the land.

There is a binary setting in this struggle for land, heightened by Ezeulu witnessing against his own people before the white man, although he had warned them against going to war. His warning that, 'Ulu does not fight a war of blame,' had fallen on deaf ears and even when their emissary, Akukalia gets killed at Okperi because of his extreme rash actions, they still carry on with the war. In view of the fact that Ezeulu is the chief priest of Ulu, a god instituted in the ancient times when the six villages of Umuaro united to try and withstand the Abam slave raiders, he is by his office the custodian of the people's culture. This places on his shoulders the onerous responsibility of safeguarding the traditions and rituals of the people. Yet, in the conflict with Okperi, Umuaro refuses to listen to his voice of reason and rather sides the war thirsty Nwaka and Ezidemili. His narration of how Umuaro came to live beside Okperi is discarded with ignominy by the Nwaka led group:

My father said this to me that when our village first came here to live the land belonged to Okperi. It was Okperi who gave us a piece of their land to live in. They also gave us their deities – their Udo and their Ogwugwu. But they said to our fathers: We

give you our Udo and our Ogwugwu; but you must call the deity we give you not Udo but the son of Udo, and not Ogwugwu but the son of Ogwugwu. This is the story as I heard it from my father. If you choose to fight a man for a piece of farmland that belongs to him I shall have no hands in it (15).

But perhaps, the most oppositional factor raised by the land conflict is the fact that Umuaro is aware of the consequences of the Chief Priest of Ulu telling falsehood, yet they want him to tell a lie in their favour before the white man. His insistence on telling the truth brings deep conflicts in the town. The truth is supposed to set things right, rather it brings disaster; a disaster that set off an uncontrollable chain reaction. The Chief priest becomes so disgruntled with the people that he prays for them with bitterness and malice:

Every time he prayed for Umuaro bitterness rose into his mouth, a great smouldering anger for the division which has come to the six villages and which his enemies sought to lay on his head. And for what reason? Because he had spoken the truth before the white man. But how could a man who held the holy staff of Ulu know that a thing was a lie and speak it? How could he fail to tell the story as he heard it from his own father? Even the white man, Wintabota, understood, though he came from a land no one knew. He had called Ezeulu the only witness of truth. That was what riled his enemies – that the white man whose father or mother no one knew should come to tell them the truth they knew but hated to hear, it was an augury of the world's ruin (6-7).

A more serious case of binary opposition is seen in the office and personality of the Chief priest of Ulu. Ezeulu's personality is riddled with incongruities of strength and weaknesses. He is a full-bodied, respected personality, 'a most impressive figure of a man'; renowned, intelligent, well calculating priest who has at his fingertips the ceremonials of his god. He is portrayed as totally

devoted to the worship of his god. Yet in this absolute dedication, he is said to have carried the dignity of his status as the Chief Priest rather too far. It is on this absolute devotion to Ulu that various forces, which eventually bring about his isolation and monumental disaster hinges. Robert Serumaga, a Ugandan writer says of Achebe's Ezeulu:

He is an intellectual. He thinks about why things happen – he is a priest and his office requires this – so he goes to the roots of things and he's ready to accept change, intellectually. He sees the value of change and therefore his reaction to Europe is completely different from Okonkwo's. He is ready to come to terms with it – up to a point – except where his dignity is involved. This he could not accept; he's proud (26).

Ezeulu is presented as a noble man who would always stand aside from the crowd in his 'lonely' dignity as a Chief Priest. He is in fact different from other man in so many ways. A full insight is given of him as a private citizen, a polygamous head of a household, a village leader and elder, the isolated, lonely but dignified Chief Priest of Ulu. He is therefore a man divided in between two worlds – the world of the human and the world of the god, Ulu.

By casting Ezeulu as a man torn between two worlds, Achebe brings out effectively the inner conflict of a man in a society confronted with strange powers of change. The conflicts are all centred on him and around him. He stands at the centre of the conflict between Ulu and Idemili. He equally finds himself torn between his extreme self-pride which conflicts with the humiliation from his people. Finally, he finds himself torn between his spirit of revenge and of being abandoned by his god. All these conflicts culminate in turning Ezeulu into a sacrifice at the altar of the very god he served.

Still it seems to be the view of Achebe that Ezeulu is the major contributor to his colossal downfall by subtly introducing the society's unwritten code of retributive justice. This is manifested in

the binary opposition of Ezeulu, a priest of the principal deity in the town sending Oduche, his son to go and learn the ways of the white man. Ezeulu sends Oduche to study Christianity with the white missionaries led by Mr. Goodcountry. His initial motive is that Oduche learns the wisdom of the white men (42). Later, he realizes that if the white men take over the country, as it seems obvious they will, it would be sensible to have one of his own sons in that sphere. Even Ezeulu's bosom friend, Akuebue disapproves of Ezeulu's decision to send Oduche to the white man's school. 'When you spoke against the war with Okperi you were not alone . . . But if you send your son to join strangers in desecrating the land you will be alone' (134). His wanting a representative in the Whiteman's religion and worship means he is no longer sure of his own religion. The implication is that he becomes the first person to lose faith in the future of the god he is serving. He thus plants a seed of discord in his community that will in time germinate into an open hostility. His injunction to his son says it all:

I have sent you to be my eyes there. Do not listen to what people say – people who do not know their right from their left. No man speaks a lie to his son; I have told you that before. If anyone asks you why you should be sent to learn these new things tell him that a man must dance the dance prevalent in his time (189).

By sending his son to school – to dance the dance prevalent in his time, and by accepting the prevalence of that particular dance, Ezeulu has fully accepted the power of the white man as the dance of the moment. Through this act, he directly instigates others in the community to do so too. He as the Chief Priest of Ulu is supposed to be the role model.

When eventually Oduche brings him into conflict with Ezidemili by imprisoning the sacred python in his school box, Ezeulu does not see the imminent danger of such action causing a rebellion against other gods including Ulu. He knows that everyone in

Umuaro considers Oduche's action an abomination, desecration of a sacred symbol and a serious slight on another god yet he does not reprimand his son. He rather sees it as a triumph for himself and his god:

Why had Oduche imprisoned a python in his box? It had been blamed on the white man's religion; but was that the true cause? What if the boy was also an arrow in the hand of Ulu? (192).

What is more, Ezeulu in his awesome dignity could not douse the conflagration in his own home. He rather generates a crisis in his own household which makes Edogo, his oldest son to conclude that the old man is arranging to be succeeded by a favorite among his sons. He believes that Ezeulu has tried to influence Ulu's decision about which son will be the next priest. By sending Oduche to learn the religion of the white man, Ezeulu has essentially taken him out of the race. And Ezeulu has trained Nwafor in the ways of the priesthood, so he suspects that Nwafor is the one Ulu will choose. But Edogo begins to wonder what will happen if Ulu does not choose Nwafo and chooses instead Edogo or Obika. It will create conflict and division in the family and Edogo, as eldest son, will have to deal with it. He confides to Ezeulu's friend, Akuebue, and asks him to speak to Ezeulu.

Akuebue discovers that Ezeulu is also unwilling to listen to reports of divisions within his own household. He owns up to the fact that he has sacrificed Oduche, not so much to put him out of the running for the priesthood, but because he sees the threat to Umuaro and to the Igbo posed by Christianity. Such a situation requires the supreme sacrifice, that of a human being. This conflict is compounded by Ezeulu's initial witness against his own people in their case with the people of Okperi. The incident establishes him as a friend of the white man. The white man believes that Ezeulu is on his side. This mistaken view leads Administrator Clarke to develop more interest in him. This interest in turn breeds and

nurtures the element of distrust, arising from divisions in the community.

Ezeulu's enemies Nwaka and Ezidemili cash in on these loopholes seemingly created by him to attack him mercilessly. On Ezeulu's summons to Okperi, Nwaka unleashes his venom:

Ezeulu has told us that the white ruler has asked him to go to Okperi. Now, it is not clear to me whether it is wrong for a man to ask his friend to visit him. The white man is Ezeulu's friend and has sent for him. What is so strange about that? He did not send for me. He did not send for Udeozo; he did not send for the priest of Idemili; he did not send for the priest of Eru... he has asked Ezeulu. Why? Because they are friends. Or does Ezeulu think that friendship should stop short of entering each other's houses? ... Did not our elders tell us that as soon as we shake hands with a leper, he will want an embrace? It seems to me that Ezeulu has shaken hands with a man of white body. What I say is this, the man who brings ant-ridden faggots into his hut should expect the visit of lizards. If Ezeulu is now telling us that he is tired of the white man's friendship, our advice to him should be this: You tied the knot, you should also know how to undo it (162).

Ezeulu has indeed made himself susceptible to attack on two counts; for being on the side of the white man at the Okperi case and for sending Oduche to the white man's school. His vulnerability allows us to analyse fully the binary opposition in this traditional society. This society demands the loyalty of not only their chief priest, but that of their god too; a society with full rights and obligations demanding of course their franchise without compromise. This same society would refuse to listen to the voice of this same god represented by the chief priest. In the end, Ezeulu finds himself at the receiving end in the controversy between the god, Ulu, and the community not only because he had sold out to

the white man; but also because the society has little regard for injunctions of Ulu.

Apart from his relationship with the white man, he has his innate self-pride to contend with and this generates another binary opposition. Despite the tremendous influence and authority he wields on the fate of his people, he inwardly is not satisfied. He feels that his authority over the people is not absolute—he yearns for absolute authority! He is also not satisfied with his relationship to his god, which he views as ambiguous:

The festival of the Pumpkin Leaves would fall on the third *Nkwo* from that day. Tomorrow he would send for his assistants and tell them to announce the day to the six villages of Umuaro.

Whenever Ezeulu considered the immensity of his power over the year and the crops and, therefore, over the people he wondered if it was real. It was true he named the day for the feast of the Pumpkin Leaves and for the New Yam feast; but he did not choose the day. He was merely a watchman. His power was no more than the power of a child over a goat that was said to be his. As long as the goat was alive it was his; he would find it food and take care of it. But the day it was slaughtered he would know who the real owner was. No! The Chief Priest of Ulu was more than that, must be more than that. If he should refuse to name the day there would be no festival—no planting and no reaping. But could he refuse? No Chief Priest had ever refused.

So it could not be done. He would not dare.

Ezeulu was stung to anger by this as though his enemy had spoken it.

‘Take away that word dare,’ he replied to this enemy. ‘Yes I say take it away. No man in all Umuaro can stand up and say that I dare not. The woman who will bear the man who will say it has not yet been born.’

But this rebuke brought only momentary satisfaction. His mind still persisted in trying to look too closely at the nature of his power. What kind of power was it if everybody knew that it would never be used? Better to say that it was not there, that it was no more than the power in the anus of the proud dog who tried to put out a furnace with his puny fart (3-4).

The immensity of this power notwithstanding, he feels threatened by the fact that he is not given absolute power by his god. He is continually aware of the fact that both he and his god are creatures of the community and that the absolute power he yearns for belongs to the people. He knows it is only with their continued allegiance that he and his god would function effectively as guardians of the community.

Achebe thus highlights the human condition from the two count binary opposition between Ezeulu and his god Ulu and between Ezeulu and the people. These oppositions were Ezeulu's undoing and he is the strong hand knitting them against himself. He feels deeply unsatisfied with the limitations in his authority, which could not allow him to demonstrate the ultimacy of his power over Umuaro. The community on the other hand is extremely conscious of the supremacy of the power of the people and the total allegiance, which the Chief Priest and his god owe them. On two occasions, the fact of the peoples' power is thrown in his face. His friend Akuebue speaking on Oduche going to school says:

But you forget one thing: that no man however great can win judgement against a clan. You may think you did in that land dispute but you are wrong. Umuaro will always say that you betrayed them before the white man. And they will say that you are betraying them again today by sending your son to join in desecrating the land (147-148).

A more sinister viewpoint on the people's power over him and his god comes as a reminder by Ofoka, a man who is neither his

friend nor his enemy. Ofoka's speech strikes home, reminding him of his responsibility as a priest, leading to the priest's rumination as follows:

Yes, it was right that the Chief Priest should go ahead and confront danger before it reached his people. That was the responsibility of his priesthood. It had been like that from the first day when the six harassed villages got together and said to Ezeulu's ancestor: you will carry this deity for us. At first he was afraid. What power had he in his body to carry such potent danger? But his people sang their support behind him and the flute man turned his head. So he went down on both knees and they put the deity on his head. He rose up and was transformed into a spirit. His people kept up their song behind him and he stepped forward on his first decisive journey, compelling even the four days in the sky to give way to him (189).

The fact that the communities are aware of their power over him and Ulu makes Ezeulu feel the binary opposites crippling his job as the Chief Priest of Ulu because he is awesome in his ministry and at the same time extremely vulnerable. He feels insecure and his sense of insecurity becomes a major contributory factor to his psychological isolation. His insecurity heightens when Nwaka supported by Ezidemili makes reference to the fact that Ulu is not an ancient deity but was set up by the six villages of Umuaro for their protection. This means that his god could always be done away with if it no longer lived to expectation. More so, as Umuaro is no longer in danger of assault or harassment from their neighbours, Ulu's usefulness is already in question. There is a danger of the people not '*keeping up their song*' behind their present Chief Priest any longer. To emphasize this, their neighbouring village of Aninta already did away with their god Ogbe who must have outlived its usefulness. Though Ezeulu remains calm and unruffled; internally his heart is perpetually gnawed at by all the

rivalries around him. He is mostly bothered by the dwindling voices of support from his people and even his god:

As Chief Priest, he had often walked alone in front of Umuaro. But without looking back, he had often been able to hear their flute and song which shook the earth because it came from a multitude of voices and the stamping of countless feet. There had been moments when the voices were divided as in the land dispute with Okperi, but never until now had he known them to die altogether. Few people came to his hut now and those who came said nothing (218-219).

Ezeulu is disappointed by his people's lack of support as he is summoned to Okperi. He feels even more disappointed when 'no notice' is taken of his absence from duty and that of his starving god as he languishes in the white man's jail.

The Chief Priest is portrayed as a man caught in a vicious circle. As the Chief Priest of Ulu, he lives in solitude. In this solitary state, and all alone, he shoulders the enormous duty of carrying the guilt of his people during purification festival. He becomes so attuned to solitude that all through his crises with his people, few understand him. He is as he describes himself in his incantations '*known and at the same time unknowable*'. He suffers in silence:

Because no one came near enough to see his anguish – and if they had seen it they would not have understood – they imagined that he sat in his hut gloating over the distress of Umuaro. But although he would not for any reason now see the present trend reversed he carried more punishment and more suffering than all his fellows. What troubled him most – and he alone seemed to be aware of it at present – was that the punishment was not for now alone but for all time (219).

There was a real breakdown in communication – a huge breakdown which only fate could resolve; and it is indeed resolved through the colonial master's act. To a large extent, Achebe exposes the problems of indirect rule in Nigeria. He also points at some salient

factors, which hinder the policy in Nigeria in general and in Igbo communities in particular. The drama between Ezeulu and Clarke portrays how the fates of communities are destroyed by the colonial master's lack of knowledge of the people's culture.

At one end of the conflict is Ezeulu representing his people, at the other end is the impatient Clarke representing the Colonial Administration. Clarke could not understand why a 'fetish priest' could throw the goodwill of the Administration back on its face by refusing the Warrant Chieftaincy which he considers a great honour for the 'fetish priest'. Clarke's disappointment and anger at Ezeulu emphasises the lack of understanding on the part of the colonizers. In his confusion and anger at Ezeulu's rejection of an assumed honour, which would elevate him above his contemporaries, he throws him into detention.

His attitude and action reveals a great defect in the colonial practice of government. It not only widens the gulf between the Colonial Administration and the indigenes, it also shows the unnecessary feeling of superiority by the whites, which makes direct contact with the people impossible. This attitude is a contributory factor to the failure of effective implementation of the Indirect Rule System. Likewise, Ezeulu's reaction to his imprisonment presents yet another binary opposition. Ezeulu feels disappointed by his peoples' lack of interest in his ordeal at the hands of the white man. At the same time, he is aware of the enormity of the Whiteman's power over his people. His refusal to announce the beginning of the new Yam Festival and its attendant famine and suffering becomes his weapon against his people. He makes himself believe it is not his revenge as such, but Ulu's revenge – the revenge of the wronged and abandoned god who for three months is starved of sacrifices. Umuaro however sees it the other way round – the priest of Ulu is exerting his pound of flesh.

Ezeulu therefore becomes a ball to be tossed about between the god, the white man and his community. The game is a

dangerous one, which leads to the destruction of the god and his priest and at the same time spells the end of the community's togetherness. Umuaro would never be the same again. The traditional authority is destroyed and the thread holding them together has snapped. The epitome of the binary of opposition is that the god whom Ezeulu is so devoted to fails him woefully, and strikes him down mercilessly:

But why, he asked himself again and again, why Ulu had chosen to deal thus with him, to strike him down and cover him with mud. What was his offense? Had he not always divined the god's will and obeyed it? When was it ever heard that a child was scalded by a piece of yam its own mother put in its palm? Whoever sent his son up the palm to gather nuts and then took an axe and felled the tree? But today, such a thing has happened before the eyes of all (229).

This is further strengthened by the fact that the people ironically think that their god has sided with them against his priest and against himself. The same binary system is extended to the god who by destroying his priest also destroys himself.

The traditional unity and religious authority binding Umuaro together has been damaged by Ezeulu's ruin to the extent that it may never recover again. Another order has taken over society. The Christians win by a masterstroke of fate. They take advantage of the discord because 'When brothers fight to death a stranger inherits their father's estate.'

Conclusion

This paper has analysed Achebe's Ezeulu in *Arrow of God* as a character criss-crossed by binary opposition. Described as 'half man half spirit, known and at the same time unknowable', he propels his society to its doom. The central conflict of the novel is wedged in between continuity and change, in a presence-absence dichotomy. Ezeulu refuses to serve Winterbottom on the grounds that he will

be no other person's 'Chief' but the chief priest of Ulu; yet, he sends his son to learn the ways of another God. Then, in the controversy between the traditional villagers and his son, Oduche who studies Christianity, he stands solidly behind his son. John Updike asserts of Ezeulu's fate:

The events of the conclusion proved unexpected and, as I think about them, beautifully resonant, tragic and theological. That Ezeulu, whom we had seen stand up so invincibly to both Nwaka and Clarke, should be so suddenly vanquished by his own god Ulu and by something harsh and vengeful within himself, and his defeat in a page or two be the fulcrum of a Christian lever upon his people, is an ending few Western novelists would have contrived ('Letter from John Updike 56).

Achebe's point is that the Igbo people were in some way susceptible to the incursion of colonialism and assimilation by Western culture because they could not reconcile the internal discord within their own culture. Egejuru opines that 'the society itself was already heading toward destruction . . . [but] Europe has a lot of blame.... [T]here were internal problems that made it possible for the European to come in. Somebody showed them the way. A conflict between two brothers enables a stranger to reap their harvest' (125).

Perhaps, Achebe's masterstroke in *Arrow of God* lies in his ability to employ the theory of deconstruction as a constant straining to attain something that sounds profound by giving it the air of a paradox. Here, he seems to assume that all binary oppositions need to be fully delineated to get a perfect round character. This paper has analysed and criticized Ezeulu's manifestations of binary opposition. It has also attempted to look into the function of both logical and axiological oppositions in the hero as well as the author's attempt to provide meaning and values through this means.

Works Cited

- Achebe, Chinua. *A Man of the People*. London: Heinemann, 1966.
- . 'An Image of Africa: Racism in Conrad's Heart of Darkness.' *Hopes and Impediments: Selected Essays*. New York: Doubleday, 1988. 1-13.
- . *Anthills of the Savannah*. London: Heinemann, 1987.
- . *Arrow of God*. New York: Anchor Books, 1969.
- . The Novelist as Teacher. 'Hopes and Impediment: Selected Essays.' New York: Doubleday, 1988. 40-46.
- . 'Interview with Lewis Nkosi. *Africa Report*. July 1964.
- . Letter from John Updike. 'The Writer and his Community.' *Hopes and Impediments: Selected Essays*. New York: Doubleday, 1988. 47-61.
- . *Morning Yet on Creation Day: Essays*. London: Heinemann, 1975.
- . *No Longer at Ease*. London: Heinemann, 1960.
- . The Role of the Writer in the New Nation. *Nigeria Magazine*. 81 (June 1964): 158-79.
- . *Things Fall Apart*. London: Heinemann, 1958.
- Appiah, Anthony, Ryle, John and Jones, D.A.N. 'Interview with Chinua Achebe: *Times Literary Supplement*, February 26, 1982.
- Egejuru, Phanuel Akubueze, ed. *Towards African Literary Independence: A Dialogue with Contemporary African Writers*. Westport: Greenwood, 1980.
- Gikandi, Simon. *Reading Chinua Achebe*. London: James Currey, 1991.
- Goody, Jack. *The Domestication of the Savage Mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- Innes, C.L. *Chinua Achebe*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990.
- Lindfors, Bernth, ed. *Approaches to Teaching Achebe's Things Fall Apart*. New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1991.
- . *Conversations with Chinua Achebe*. Jackson: Uni. of Mississippi Press, 1997.



- Maja-Pearce, Adewale. *A Mask Dancing: Nigerian Novelists of the Eighties*. London: Hans Zell Pub., 1992.
- Menchu, Rigoberta. *I, Rigoberta Menchu. An Indian Woman in Guatemala*. New York: Verso, 1984.
- Moore, Gerald. 'Achebe's New Novel', *Transition*. 4 (May/June 1964): 52.
- Pieterse, Cosmo and Duerden, Dennis, eds. *African Writers Talking: A Collection of Radio Interviews*. London: Heinemann, 1972.
- Smith, G. 'Binary opposition and sexual power in Paradise Lost'. *Midwest Quarterly* 27 (4): 383, 1996.