

## **Intellectuals as Sacrificial Heroes**

### **A Comparative Study of Bahram Beyzaie and Wole Soyinka**

Saeed Talajooy

#### Abstract

A study of Bahram Beyzaie and Wole Soyinka's works reveals how in two disparate cultural settings, traditional structures and themes appear in modern forms to renegotiate people's cultural identity. Both writers demythologize the ancient and modern superstitious beliefs that haunt their peoples, depict the fallacy of hybrid obsessions that distort everyday life in their countries, and mythologize the positive aspects of history to redefine cultural identity with the best their cultures offer. One aspect of this process is their depiction of creative intellectuals as sacrificial heroes. The form reveals their concern with the question of leadership and citizenship, the victimization of the educated people, and the resulting brain drain in their countries. In the paper that follows, I will compare Beyzaie and Soyinka's depictions of intellectuals as sacrificial heroes. I will first study the dramatic origins of their forms and their approach to tragedy, myth, history, and sacrificial heroism, and explore the sociopolitical and personal reasons for the development of their forms. My intention is to discover how these forms evolved and why they reflect similar paradigms. I will then compare Beyzaie's *Parchment of Master Sharzin* with Soyinka's *Madmen and Specialists* to provide textual examples of these similarities and differences.

Keywords: mythologize; demythologize; ritualize; sacrificial hero; scapegoat; victimization; intellectuals; creative artists; *ta'ziyeh* passion plays; *Mir-e Nowruzi*; spring rejuvenation rites; Yoruba human sacrifice.

Bahram Beyzaie (1938–), the Iranian playwright and filmmaker, and Wole Soyinka (1934–), the Nigerian poet, playwright, and novelist, use their creative works to reconstruct the indigenous rituals and myths of their cultures and highlight the failures that leave their people at the mercy of external colonial and internal tyrannical forces. Both demythologize the traditional and modern superstitions haunting their peoples, depict the fallacy of the artificial constructs that distort their people's lives, and mythologize the positive aspects of their cultures to redefine the narratives of nationhood produced to form collective identities for their peoples.

The most striking similarity between Beyzaie and Soyinka is their portrayal of ideal intellectuals as sacrificial heroes. In the context of the contemporary histories of Iran and Nigeria, this reveals their concern with the victimization of dissenting intellectuals and educated people and its resultant brain drain. The two countries' cultural and historical backgrounds and the outcomes of their peoples' struggles for liberation and justice diverge in fundamental ways. Yet during the last century, both countries experienced coups and revolutionary, anti-colonial struggles that dislocated millions and transformed their narratives of modernity, nationhood, and belonging. The recurrent patterns of hopes, struggles for liberation, and failures arising from these conflicts have also made Beyzaie and Soyinka concerned with the question of leadership and citizenship. At this level, both also use indigenous forms to project desired images of themselves and their ideal intellectuals in a light attuned to the cultural memory of their peoples. Their intellectuals are also put in situations similar to that of the authors, who have faced censorship, threats, and detention during their careers. Thus their depictions of intellectuals as sacrificial heroes also contain autobiographical aspects that suggest their own positions as Gramscian organic intellectuals caught between their peoples and the colonialist, liberalist, Marxist, Islamist, nationalist, and

nativist discourses used to transform their countries since the 1900s. For both, therefore, a major source of inspiration has been their relationship with their peoples, who, as their works sometimes imply, have failed them.

This suggests that it may well be this love/hate relationship with their peoples that has kept their creative impulse active during the last six decades. To determine the subjects of this love/hate relationship is difficult because Iran and Nigeria comprise different ethnic groups with diverging political interests. Yet both authors are concerned with the general conditions of human beings under tyranny, with some focus on those who share their ethnic and cultural roots. Thus for Beyzaie, this imaginary public includes all Iranians, particularly Persians; and for Soyinka all Nigerians or sub-Saharan Africans, especially the Yoruba.

In the article that follows, I trace these elements in Beyzaie's and Soyinka's works and focus on the mythologizing and demythologizing processes at work in their depiction of artists or creative intellectuals as sacrificial heroes. I will first explore their backgrounds and the ritual bases of their forms, and then compare the personal and political origins and the characteristics of their heroes and tragic forms. In the last section, I will compare Beyzaie's *Tumar-e Sheykh-e Sharzin* «طومارِ شيخِ شرزین» (*The Parchment of Master Sharzin*, SP1986) with Soyinka's *Madmen and Specialists* (P1973) to provide concrete examples of how these elements work in their plays.<sup>1</sup> I will then conclude with an overview of the position of Beyzaie's and Soyinka's intellectuals in the context of twentieth century's conceptions of intellectuality.

### **Contour in Time: Beyzaie and His Intellectual Hero**

Bahram Beyzaie was born in December 1938 and grew up during a period of anti-colonial conflicts when the collapse of Reza Shah's authoritarian rule (1925–1941) and the dominance

of foreign powers over the country shocked educated Iranians into attempting to promote a sense of nationhood in which the nation acquired its meaning from its people rather than a king. Punctuated by violent street demonstrations, fear of famine, rivalries among political parties and modernized feudal lords over parliamentary seats, the rise of religious terrorism, the struggle for the nationalization of oil, and the Anglo-American coup (August 1953) that ushered in Mohammad Reza Shah's dictatorship (1941–1979), this era of fledgling democracy challenged the people's views on citizenship, leadership, and the rule of law.

These conflicts carved into Beyzaie's memory the images of how dominant groups transform the accounts of history to marginalize unwanted narratives of belonging and nationhood and how internal failures help foreign powers to dominate a nation. As such when he began writing in 1959, his major concern was to reclaim marginalized cultural and artistic practices in plays that thematically undermined the grandiose, reductive narratives of nationhood, heroism, intellectualism, womanhood, and culture.

Beyzaie's career is thus characterized by his recurrent creation of alternative narratives on the cultural identity of Iranians. During the first decade of his career, Beyzaie wrote more than fifteen plays, directed four, and produced four research monographs on Iranian, Indian, Japanese, and Chinese performing traditions, which contributed to the rise of Iran's non-Western-style theater in the 1960s. In 1969 he expanded his vision to cinema and became a leading figure in the Iranian New Wave. Since then, he has directed twelve feature films and five plays and written more than one hundred plays and screenplays, which have been among the most widely read in Iran.

Beyzaie's subjects extend from myth and history in village, city, or court settings to contemporary city and family life in works that mix sociological, psychological, and philosophical analysis with film noir elements. His plots, however, recurrently depict the conditions of divergent thinkers in uncaring communities. Thus in his works early prototypes

of intellectuality and modern intellectuals appear to challenge distorted norms and be victimized or ostracized by corrupt religious or political leaders and their cohorts. This paradigm fulfills its objectives through templates originating in two indigenous forms which are at times combined. The first uses the figure of *Mir-e Nowruzi* (New Year Ruler) to depict an outcast who is temporarily glorified, and then ritually punished. The second uses elements from *ta'ziyeh* passion plays to create intellectuals that defy stagnant beliefs and suffer in ways similar to sacrificial heroes.

As a ritual, *Mir-e Nowruzi* bore similarities to the European “Lord of Misrule.” It was a New Year festival held from the twentieth of March until the first of April, the first two weeks of the Iranian calendar. Mohammad Qazvini’s paper on the subject contains a report provided by a physician about the festival as it was held in Bojnurd:

I saw a procession of people on foot and on horseback. One who was clad in an expensive costume and carried an umbrella rode on a splendid horse. People accompanied him, walking in front or behind, as if they were his entourage. Some had long sticks in hand with the shapes of animals’ heads on them [ . . . ] as if the king was returning from a conquest. People were following them, singing merrily [ . . . ]. People said that during the *Nowruz* festival, one becomes the clown governor of the town and is obeyed until deposed on the first day of April [ . . . ]. The job was kept in the family.<sup>2</sup>

The report describes the festival as performed in March 1923 by actors, but some of its elements suggest it is rooted in ancient rituals like *Kuseh bar Neshin* (The Ride of the Beardless One), *Haman Suz* (Burning Haman),<sup>3</sup> and *Dasteh-ye Surena* (Surena’s Procession).<sup>4</sup> In these violent carnival forms, a person or an effigy was made up to look like, and allowed to act as, a ruler, but was then beaten and banished. The process of selecting and obeying an ordinary man involved carnival aspects that emphasized the temporary nature of power. While echoing this function, Beyzaie also reformulates the structure to highlight the readiness of people to victimize outcasts.

Despite the importance of *Mir-e Nowruzi*, the greatest influence on Beyzaie's tragic form is *ta'ziyeh*. The term refers to the dramatic rituals associated with the annual commemoration of the martyrdom of the Shiite saint Imam Hussein (626–680) and the male members of his extended family in Karbala on a day known as 'Ashura in October 680. With the establishment of the Shiite faith as Iran's official religion in the sixteenth century, these rituals became a locus for the reinforcement of a religious national identity. During the seventeenth century, due to royal patronage, these rituals produced full dramatic forms with passion plays about sacred figures in the Judeo-Christian and Islamic historiography. *Ta'ziyeh* reached its highest status in the nineteenth century when it created a treasure house of dramatic techniques with about two thousand plays on 270 subjects, including secular and comic ones.<sup>5</sup>

The annual performances of these ceremonies evoke the timeless space of sacrificial heroism through reenactment so that the faithful are mobilized to redefine their political and cultural sympathies for uprooting evil. Since the early days of Shiite thought, this concept, which is properly stated in the motto "Kullu yawm 'Ashura, Kullu Arz Karbala" (All days are Ashura, all lands are Karbala), has often been used by activists to mobilize people for military encounters and uprisings.

The rituals' central paradigm, the commemoration of sacrificial heroes, has its archetypal origin in the myths of the dying god; but in its religious forms it has roots in Iran's pre-Islamic cosmology, and the annual performances reinforce these roots. Within the philosophical framework of this centrality, human beings are players in the battle of good and evil, and for those aspiring toward unity with God it is necessary at any given moment, including the moment they are threatened by death, to try to embody the attributes of God. However, though human beings can claim all God's attributes in their lesser forms, God is beyond having all human virtues. The temporary nature of human existence as beings made

of flesh and blood enables them to suffer and sacrifice their lives for the creation of good. Human beings are capable of suffering and self-sacrifice, God is not. Yet God experiences suffering and self-sacrifice through his sacrificial embodiments who are at the moments of their deaths so detached from desires of being and overflowing with God that they become divine. It is within this context that Hussein's blood was identified as *Sar Allah* (God's blood), or that Mansur al-Hallaj (858–922) claimed *Allah fi Jubbat* (God is in my cloak).<sup>6</sup> It was probably also in this context that the early Christians talked of Jesus as divine, before he was transferred by Constantine's priests into the Greco-Roman Jupiter template and became the Son of God or God himself.

This centrality has given sacrificial heroism a salient role in idealized self-projections in Iran, and people tend to aggrandize and adore those who fit the role. As Majid Tehranian argues, "this love of blameless saints and martyrs," "this martyrdom complex" also drags the best Iranian political figures into the vortex of idealism and "messianic purism," which "automatically cancels realistic reform."<sup>7</sup> This is thus a collective passion that makes 'Ashura the most influential ritual in Iran, important even to those who resent its role as a locus for the manifestation of religious zeal.

For Beyzaie, the technical and conceptual world of *ta'ziyeh* is the space in which Iranian popular imagination has preserved its values and performing traditions. As Negar Mottahedeh argues, Beyzaie's works, like *ta'ziyeh* plays, make voyages into the timeless, "imaginal" space of Iran's cultural archetypes to make them serve modern purposes.<sup>8</sup> Beyzaie reshapes the thematic assumptions and technical features of *ta'ziyeh* to allocate a space to the victims of creative thinking in Iran's cultural memory. Despite this ritual gaze, Beyzaie's characters and contexts, even when cloaked in historical or mythical attires, suggest contemporary relations. As he himself states, "rather than being in love with history," he is "disgusted by it."<sup>9</sup> His recourse to history, therefore, suggests a desire to examine the origins

of a modern selfhood that needs analysis before reform becomes possible. This contemporaneity, however, does not reduce the historical force of his works. As if responding to Walter Benjamin's assertion that "there is no document of civilization which is not at the same time a document of barbarism," Beyzaie explores the past to rewrite the history of victims of glorified rulers. Like Benjamin's model historian, he brushes "history against the grain" to give voice to the silenced who lost power in the present.<sup>10</sup>

Beyzaie's aim, therefore, as he himself states, is to discover why Iranians are where they are and to reveal the consequences of their failure to support those who attempt to improve their conditions.<sup>11</sup> As such Beyzaie's protagonists are in many cases thinkers, teachers, or artists whose attempts to steer people into reexamining their beliefs are impeded by the machinations of the political or religious establishments or unidentified forces that suffocate any divergent thinking.

A quick look at *Ragbar* « رگبار » (*The Downpour*, F1971) clarifies this point. Hekmati, a young teacher, arrives in a traditional neighborhood to teach at the local school and falls in love with Atefeh, who supports her little brother and their decrepit mother. After being beaten by a roughneck butcher who loves Atefeh, Hekmati begins a process of transformational self-discovery which involves working hard to prove his worth to Atefeh and the people around him. He refurbishes the dilapidated hall of the school, stages a play, and gives a taste of communal art and togetherness to the poor children. After the play, the headmaster tries to belittle Hekmati's work by boasting about his plans for the hall, and the rich butcher by donating a large sum to the school, but the children void their plans by applauding Hekmati. The film ends by the headmaster using his connections to send Hekmati away in a Kafkaesque scene in which an injured Hekmati and his belongings are taken away by a bespectacled cart man whose irritating gaze may represent fate at existential and political levels.

As in Hekmati's case, Beyzaie's heroes are usually put in situations that make them initiate a quest for knowing themselves and improving their world. This quest is punctuated by their feeling of being under incessant observation by a generalized "other" that deprives them of any privacy. The emphasis on this gaze is reminiscent of Foucault's interpretation of Bentham's "Panopticon" and suggests a surveillance society in which the "normalizing gaze" of unspecified "others" demands conformity with dominant sociopolitical discourses.<sup>12</sup> Yet it also suggests the author's meta-theatrical gaze which compares life under the all-seeing eyes of history, society, destiny, death, or God with an actor's life under the gaze of an audience or a camera. This gaze also imbues Beyzaie's works with a Kafkaesque ambience of sociopolitical and existential anxiety that makes the audience uneasy about their gaze.

For Beyzaie's heroes, the quest for self-discovery and the omnipresent gaze breeds a form of anxiety that tortures them until they rebel or achieve difficult feats to prove their qualities, yet most of his rebels finally surrender to death to avoid the agony. As if in dialogue with Heidegger's "I myself am in that I will die,"<sup>13</sup> Beyzaie depicts the looming presence of death as a force that may activate or paralyze our constructive curiosity about existence or distort it into greed.

The destiny of Beyzaie's heroines is rather different. They may win their battle or keep it undecided. They use their sensitivity to signs and codes to relate the past to the present and transcend or confront the judgmental gaze to reconstruct their suppressed sense of identity at personal or collective levels. This concern with women is the major difference between Beyzaie and Soyinka. Whereas in Soyinka women are to motivate or hurdle the growth of male protagonists, in Beyzaie female protagonists recur as frequently as male ones. Until recently, these women were often depicted as survivors, signifying that Beyzaie had hope for the multifaceted growth of women movements in Iran. Yet since the mid-2000s,

even this hope seems to have expired, and his female protagonists appear to be as victimized as his male sacrificial heroes.

### **Soyinka's Ogunian Intellectuals**

Born in 1934 to a Yoruba family in Abeokuta and educated at the universities of Ibadan and Leeds (1952–1959), Wole Soyinka is Nigeria's most eminent dramatist. As reflected in his biographical novel, *Aké: The Years of Childhood*, his father, a talented headmaster, gave him a Christian upbringing. Yet he was also exposed to the dramatic life of Yoruba markets, in which his feminist mother, "Wild Christian," had an active part, and to the entertaining *apidan* and ritualistic *egungun* masquerade performances, which flexibly integrated new materials and forms, and provided the psychological basis for Soyinka's syncretic style. Later when he studied Greek history, language, and drama, he rediscovered ritual as the root of drama and embarked on a career that produced more than thirty plays, memoirs, and novels and a series of critical studies that carved him a place as a cultural theorist in the English-speaking world.

During his teenage years, Soyinka's encounters with the Yoruba soldiers returning from the Second World War and his father's involvement in anti-colonial conflicts exposed him to the politics of national and international relations and the revolutionary discourses of Yoruba intellectuals. It was, however, his education in England and his involvement in creating the narratives of nation building in early 1960s Nigeria that pushed Soyinka into creating his peculiar dramatic forms.

Living in a colonially engineered country of about one hundred ethnicities, Soyinka gained firsthand experience of how political opportunists use people's conflicting interests and ethnocentric or religious obsessions to divide and rule or even instigate ethnic cleansing.

He also observed how those who thought divergently were silenced. Thus in his dramatic reconstructions of life in Nigeria, he focused on the link between deceit and leadership, the victimization of the elite and the poor, and the need for leaders who prioritize people's interests over their own. In his tragedies, this focus created a heroic dreamer who confronted opportunistic leaders, but had to suffer or even sacrifice his life to carry his message across.

Thus Soyinka's dreamer, like Jesus, is hanged, hoping his words may be scattered among people through his death, for those who think divergently may convey their ideas only when they sacrifice their lives for them. As he puts it in his poem, "Higher than trees a cryptic crown / Lord of the rebel three / Thorns lay on a sleep of down / And myrrh; a mesh / Of nails, of flesh / And words that flowered free."<sup>14</sup>

Yet in Soyinka's plays even this halfhearted hope remains vacant, for he persistently suggests that for him the recurrent pattern of human inanity results in similar vicious systems. Thus although Soyinka's templates suggest that Nigeria needs self-sacrificing leaders to prosper, his hope for such a future is frail. For him, human beings are flawed, and since they have free will even God cannot save them from their "fooleries." As Forest Head states in *Dance of the Forests* (P1960), he can only "torture awareness from their souls" and give them chances to "pierce the encrustations of soul-deadening habit, [ . . . ] knowing full well, it is all futility."<sup>15</sup>

Soyinka's sacrificial template suggests his desire to commemorate those exceptional individuals whom he admired, but it also reveals his attempt to forge a heroic identity for himself by projecting it on his protagonists. In *The Man Died* (M1972), he refers to Christopher Okigbo, Victor Banjo, and Francis Fajuyi, whose ideas promised a better Nigeria, and explains how ethnocentric warmongers silenced them before their views were understood. Yet as recorded in *The Man Died* and *You Must Set Forth at Dawn* (M2006), Soyinka himself has occasionally endangered his life to save people from the atrocities raging

around them.<sup>16</sup> This reveals his desire to promote forms of leadership that prioritize people's lives over the leaders' interests, but his use of Yoruba rituals to dramatize his ideal leaders and citizens also suggests that he aspires to create them in accordance with the indigenous cultural memory.

An example from *The Strong Breed* clarifies this. Eman, a man whose father was a respected professional carrier of evil in the New Year purification ritual at his village, becomes a teacher and medic in another village, in which the ritual is conducted by drugging a mentally disabled person or a stranger into the role. When Eman questions the use of a disabled boy for the ritual, the priests of the village challenge him to be the carrier in a ritual that proves much more violent than the one in his village. During the ritual, as Eman is escaping from his trackers, his hallucinatory flashbacks reveal his relationship with his father, his childhood sweetheart, and a distorted tutor whose treachery caused Eman to leave his village and ancestral role as a carrier.

The leadership question rises in the juxtaposition of the two approaches to the ritual, with Eman and his father contrasted with the priests of the second village. For Oyin Ogunba, Eman's predicament is that he is an individual with a universalized sense of morality trying to achieve altruistic aims by serving a society where the moral system is still local and communal.<sup>17</sup> Yet contrary to what Ogunba suggests, Soyinka's dreamers are not trapped by the people they try to help, but by those who control the people by keeping them ignorant. The tutor in Eman's village and the priests in the second village are arch-individualists whose presence shows that their communities are far from living with a sense of "we." The villagers become "we" only when following these individualists or having a "they" against which they can unite. The final scene even suggests that some observe the ritual only because they are afraid of their peers and leaders. Thus the battle in Soyinka's plays is between leaders who

sacrifice their interests to promote creative thinking and inclusive morality among people and leaders who use fear and deceit to preserve their prerogatives.

Using *The Strong Breed* to analyze Soyinka's tragic vision, James Gibbs enumerates several sources for Soyinka's sacrificial heroes. These include the "purification rites" of Yoruba New Year, the myth of Ogun's voluntary plunge into the abyss of nothingness, the account of Ogun's drunken slaughter of people, the annual festivals for Ogun, which may involve sacrificial rituals, the passion plays of Obatala, and the *egungun* and *apidan* mask performances. Among these, the rituals of Ogun, the god of creativity and ironwork in Yoruba mythology, are more important, particularly because Ogun was the one who made the contact between the gods and humans possible by his sacrificial act of plunging into nothingness to initiate the path for the new meaning of being. Obatala, the creator of human beings and the earth, is also significant, as his conflict with Oduduwa, who usurped his position, and his death and rebirth are the subjects of some Yoruba passion plays.<sup>18</sup>

Gibbs then identifies the New Year "purification rite" as the greatest influence on Soyinka and describes it as a ritual for purging the individual or community of "blood guilt" and "the evil accumulated over a period":

In some communities of the Niger Delta, the role of the carrier was inherited and the cleaning of the community, the "placing of the evil in a small boat which the carrier launched on the out-going tide," was conducted with dignity and a high degree of stylization. In [some related] celebrations . . . masquerades, such as Eyo Adimu, performed the function of the carrier. In others effigies were dragged through the streets . . . and beaten. In Abeokuta, these effigies had become known as "Judases," evidence of a mingling of religious traditions.<sup>19</sup>

For Gibbs, this "mingling" is significant, for it suggests a source for the depiction of the carrier in *The Strong Breed* where "Soyinka stresses the similarities between Yoruba concepts of self-sacrifice and Judaeo-Christian ideas."<sup>20</sup>

Ogunba provides the details of a similar “purification festival” among the Ijaw, who emphasize the role of “the carrier” as a “sacrificial lamb” and drug him for a humiliating, occasionally fatal ritual, during which he carries “to the river, just before midnight, all the sins and filth of the community during the past year.”<sup>21</sup>

Comparing these accounts with *The Strong Breed* reveals that Soyinka juxtaposes the two forms to glorify the one conducted by a volunteer in the Niger delta. He also charges it with political import to promote his claim that as “the language of the masses,” ritual is ideal for creating a drama of resistance.<sup>22</sup> Like Beyzaie, therefore, Soyinka contextualizes his adopted rituals to redefine their functions and to subject them to critical analysis or even “comic inspection.”<sup>23</sup> For Soyinka, as Jeyifo states, “drama’s renewal as a cultural medium,” capable of responding “to the crisis and contradictions of the present age,” depends on a “fusion of drama with ritual.” Yet this fusion does not entail “an unambiguous recuperation of rituals and ritualism” because “Soyinka subjects ritual to [ . . . ] anti-ritual.” Thus in his works, ritual “comes with layers of formalistic and thematic reconfigurations which considerably interrogate the legitimacy and value of the pristine ritual traditions,” and is “placed within a festival complex” in which it is “quite often parodied, subverted or deconstructed.”<sup>24</sup>

The descriptions of these rituals are also interesting in that they reveal their similarities with the Iranian *Mir-e Nowruzi*. Of course, these similarities should not be overrated because, as Frazer’s *The Scapegoat* (1919) demonstrates, these purification rites were universal. Yet for Soyinka and Beyzaie who have parallel tastes in rituals, it suggests similar points of departure, which they both reformulate to deconstruct their patriarchal, dogmatic, or ethnocentric content. They both seem to approach their subjects in the way Hamid Dabashi identifies in Beyzaie’s work: “He challenges the metaphysical elements by plunging deep into them” and juxtaposing them “in the realm of *mythos* [ . . . ] in the hope

that the echoes of his mythic battles will be reflected onto our contemporary realities.”<sup>25</sup> They portray the mythic and the comic in the metaphysical, yet, having dethroned the gods, display the godliness of the human to maintain the beauty of mythic existence. These restructured rituals no longer carry the cathartic impact of the original rituals which evoke “a renewed mythic awareness”<sup>26</sup> and give the viewer the chance to integrate with the community. Yet the archetypal images find their ways into the subconscious of the audience and arouse sympathy.

Another source of influence on Soyinka’s tragic form is the Yoruba ritual of human sacrifice, in which, the sacrificial individual “is treated with great deference” as “an ‘ambassador’ to the ‘country’ of the supernatural beings.”<sup>27</sup> If we compare *Death and the King’s Horseman* (P1975) with the historical report of the events it is based on,<sup>28</sup> we can see how Soyinka transforms the locus of the Elesin’s intended sacrifice into a Bakhtinian “chronotope,” the “spatio-temporal matrix” around which his depicted community, like his plot, is to renew its existential sense of unity.<sup>29</sup>

As the king’s horseman, the Elesin is to undergo self-annihilation after the king’s death, but the interference of the British governor and the Elesin’s momentary hesitation ruin the ritual, resulting in his son’s voluntary self-annihilation to reclaim his family’s honor. The roots of the ritual may have been in the community’s desire for renewal through a complete purging of the previous ruling elites who may have impeded the rise of the new generation. As Osofisan suggests, it may also have functioned to exorcise “the terror of the unknown,” with the Elesin as “the medium through whom the ritual is processed.”<sup>30</sup> But Soyinka enhances this philosophical aspect by presenting the ritual as the path to a new house of being, for which the sacrificial hero functions as an Ogunian pathfinder. He also depicts Olunde, the Elesin’s son, as a Western-educated intellectual to indicate the contemporary relevance of sacrificial leadership and the value of having cross-cultural perspectives. The

Elesin, who has been bound to his culture and enjoyed the prerogatives of his position all his life, fails the task; but his son, who has examined his culture with a creative intellectual gaze from outside, understands its significance and fulfills it.

### **Affinities and Differences in the Context of Political, Personal, and Aesthetic Origins**

As in Olunde's case, sometimes Soyinka's intellectual heroes seem morbid, particularly if we compare them with his trickster antiheroes, whose will and acumen charm the audience. This is partly because his tragic theory requires willing sacrificial heroes who readily plunge into nothingness as Ogun did. Like Beyzaie's heroes, these figures find themselves under life-changing gazes of their "others." Yet their willingness overrides their vigor. Beyzaie's sacrificial heroes, in contrast, have an immense desire for life and are normally as willing to confront injustice as to avoid conflict and save their lives. This approach juxtaposes the binaries of heroic self-sacrifice and oppressive victimization to accentuate the cruelty of their environments.

Despite this difference, their protagonists are similar in being sacrificial rather than tragic. Unlike Aristotle's tragic heroes, they are not noble individuals with tragic flaws that lead to their downfalls so that the community can uphold the ideal of the golden mean. Their predicaments also differentiate them from the Hegelian tragic individual who is caught between mutually exclusive systems of value.<sup>31</sup> Instead, they are either divergent thinkers who sacrifice themselves to save their communities or rebellious individuals who defy dominant sociopolitical discourses and are victimized by those whose prerogatives are guaranteed by these artificial constructs.

As a result, they also reflect the realities of the lives of the ideal, dissenting, organic intellectuals who, as Edward Said explains, may, like all human beings, have personal

problems and dreams, cultural dependencies, convictions, and moments of hesitation and failure, but fulfill their functions by “maintaining a state of constant alertness” that does not “let half-truths or received ideas steer” them along, an urge for highlighting the margins, which makes them voice the problems of the silenced, “speak truth to power,” and question the constructs imposed on people.<sup>32</sup>

To create these protagonists, both authors reformulate indigenous ritual forms to comment on contemporary life. From an artistic perspective, this suggests a conscious plan to create modern dramatic templates that are rooted in indigenous forms. From a cultural angle, however, it suggests their desire to communicate with their peoples at ritual levels. Thus they use the code systems of their cultures to fashion protagonists who resemble sacrificial gods/heroes and depict the consequences of people’s apathy toward the fate of those who challenge the status quo to improve people’s conditions.

At this level, Beyzaie’s and Soyinka’s works have been designed to communicate with common people as citizens and the educated as potential leaders. Both authors seem disillusioned with people, but have occasionally overlooked the ignorance or apathy they find in them to offer models of responsible and sympathetic citizenship. Soyinka’s *The Beatification of Area Boy* (P1995) and Beyzaie’s *Divan-e Balkh* « دیوان بلخ » (*The Court of Bactria*) (P1969), for instance, depict people who unite against tyranny, but Soyinka’s *King Baabu* (P2002) and Beyzaie’s *Pardeh-ye Ne’i* « پرده نئی » (*The Reed Panel*, SP1992) portray people whose apathy, cruelty, or greed aggravate their conditions. This ambivalent attitude reflects the love/hate relationship of the two with their peoples, but it also reveals the vicissitudes of their peoples’ reactions to their countries’ political conditions, which has, in turn, caused fluctuations in the two authors’ depictions of people.

As specified above, this bid for communication has involved Beyzaie’s and Soyinka’s attempts to address their peoples with the language of rituals and without resorting to

ideological prescriptions. Yet their attempts at communicating with “the masses” have not been as successful as one expects. Their works are among the most read or seen in their countries. To reach out to the diverse ethnicities of Nigeria, Soyinka has written in English rather than Yoruba, produced satiric plays and songs targeting street audiences, and turned some of his plays into films; and Beyzaie has made films that have reached wide spectatorship. Yet their formal plays, partly due to the medium, have remained favored by educated rather than everyday people. This suggests the partial failure of their ritualizing bid for changing the narratives of nationhood and cultural identity through the language of “the masses.” However, their experimental templates have urged other creative artists and scholars to reformulate the essential qualities of their works and find new ways to approach people.

At the personal level, Soyinka’s ritualized sacrificial trope may have evolved due to what Femi Osofisan describes as his “obsessive inquiry into the essence and the apparatus of the society’s self-rejuvenating process,” and reveals Soyinka’s “traditionalist belief” in the idea that “society seasonally accumulates a burden of guilt and sin dangerous to its health and sanity, which can only be purged through the shedding of blood.”<sup>33</sup> Though Osofisan misinterprets Soyinka’s ritually charged emphasis on self-sacrifice with a traditionalist belief in blood sacrifice, the link he makes between Soyinka’s conception of rejuvenation and the role of artists in society is perceptive, particularly because he notes that Soyinka sees the true artist as an Ogunian sacrificial hero. Set beside Jones’s assertion that “Soyinka sees society [ . . . ] in continual need of salvation from itself [ . . . ] through the [ . . . ] dedication of individuals who doggedly pursue their vision,” Osofisan’s explanations suggest that Soyinka’s artist–hero is there to demonstrate that “the salvation of society” depends on “the exercise of the individual will.”<sup>34</sup> Thus the members of the strong breed, artists and intellectuals, must be Ogunian in their creativity and will to action. This Ogunian facet is also manifest in that, as Awam Amkpa states, for Soyinka “crisis and chaos” are essential

“ingredients for social transformation,”<sup>35</sup> and thus some of his heroes, such as Old Man in *Madmen and Specialists*, examined below, use radical means.

Soyinka’s Ogun, however, as described in his essays, has qualities that merge the Greek gods Dionysus and Apollo. His revolutionary literary theory also suggests a form of rebellious neo-romanticism. Coleridge, for instance, insists that any act of creativity demands the destruction of previous norms and patterns and the reconciliation of their seemingly opposite elements.<sup>36</sup> In this context, Soyinka’s Ogun becomes like Nietzsche’s *Übermensch*, a rebel prototype who transcends good and evil and violates norms to reconstruct them. These affinities may be accidental, for elemental human faculties represented in gods or archetypal figures are similar in many cultures. Yet they also suggest that Soyinka’s voyage into Yoruba cosmology is that of a well-tuned mind back to its origin to reclaim its veiled potentials.

This rebelliousness endows Soyinka’s thinkers with Ogunian features that confront the stagnant aspects of the tradition, while celebrating their essence. In *The Swamp Dweller*, for instance, Igwezu, whose journey to the city has ended with the loss of his wife to his rich brother, returns to confront the village priest and prove that he uses people’s ignorance to exploit them. As Ogunba states, here Soyinka deconstructs the belief in sacrifice and questions the integrity of traditional priests.<sup>37</sup> Yet the same Soyinka later develops a philosophy of sacrificial heroism in which individuals transcend self-pity and ethnocentric beliefs to confront injustice and attain a status similar to that of Gramsci’s organic intellectual, intellectuality which involves devotion to improving people’s conditions. Likewise, in *A Dance of the Forests*, he ridicules “the whole idea of divination or ritual sacrifice” and sees his community as being enslaved by ancient rituals “whose chief point is the adoration of” “incompetent,” “self-centred” lesser “gods and spirits.”<sup>38</sup> Yet he presents a lofty image of the Forest Head and his associates, including Ogun, as being concerned about humanity. A more political instance is when Daodu, the rebellious prince of *Kongi’s Harvest*,

stops the royal music, or when he asks his uncle, the priest-king Danlola, to give the role of blessing the New Year's Yam to Kongi, the dictator.<sup>39</sup> Both acts are blasphemous, yet the audience knows that Daodu's vision is more important than the superficial aspects of the ritual.

Beyzaie's background reveals similar patterns, but rather than being concerned with the essence of rituals, he is preoccupied with secularizing the culture by using rituals in ways that demonstrate the humanity of the divine and the godliness of the human. As the origin of his tragic form, Beyzaie's research into the resources of Iran's cultural memory finds its real significance in his concern with reclaiming marginalized cultural practices and characters to create alternative narratives of modernity and nationhood and deconstruct dominant discourses on women, heroism, intellectuals, ethnic minorities, and so on. In the case of intellectuals, Beyzaie has fashioned a type that, like Soyinka's, challenges the norms or the tyrants and faces dire consequences. Yet rather than promoting a sacrificial will to action among creative intellectuals, Beyzaie focuses on raising awareness about the conditions of victimized artists and intellectuals, which remains marginal in Soyinka.

This is because Beyzaie's and Soyinka's ideal intellectuals project their creators' self-desired images and reveal their reactions to the discourses within which they have worked. In this regard, Soyinka's attempt to couch his theories in African terms or his instance on the homogeneity of an "African world" and a true African identity bear affinities with the reactionary nativism of the Negritude movement. Yet despite his quest for "authenticity," Soyinka avoids Negritudist limitations by transcending the binary opposition between European rationality and African intuition. His Ogun is not characterized by intuition, but by a form of creative reasoning that combines Apollonian instrumental reasoning with Dionysian reconciliation of opposites and Promethean rebelliousness. This is also reflected in his essays. For instance, in "And After the Narcissist" (1962) or "From a Common Back

Cloth” (1963), he denounces as superficial the Negritudist concept of authenticity, racial self-romanticism, and unqualified adulation of African cultural heritage. But in “The Fourth Stage” (1969) or “Cross Currents” (1982) he modifies this critique to integrate at a philosophically elaborate level some essentialist aspects of Negritude aesthetics.

Beyzaie’s hero also harbors his responses to the return-to-the-roots movements of 1960s Iran. His research on Asian dramatic forms was perhaps motivated by the nativists’ discourses for turning the intellectual horizons of the country east. Yet his studies on Western cinema and the qualities of his hero reveal that for him the expansion of Iran’s intellectual and artistic horizons was more essential than looking east. Beyzaie avoids the extremes of Iranian nativism, Ahamd Fardid’s call for “authenticity,” Jalal Al-e Ahmad’s polemics against “westoxification,” and their religious manifestations that aspired to make Iran post- or anti-modern when it was becoming modern.<sup>40</sup> His intellectuals expose their values to external judgment and may learn even from children. As Sharzin in *The Parchment of Master Sharzin*, discussed below, he may be a scholar who rejects obsession with received ideas and indigeneity and embraces cross-fertilization.<sup>41</sup> Or as Ferdowsi in *Dibacheh-ye Novin-e Shahnameh* «دیباجه نوین شاهنامه» (*The New Preface to the Shahnameh*, SP1986), he may dedicate his life to the creation of a monumental masterpiece that reformulates the cultural history of a suppressed people to give them a sense of unity and promote new perspectives on life. They work by persistent scrutiny, cataloging, and analysis, but their character is defined by compassion, clemency, and self-control. They may die for their ideas but have no convictions besides valuing humanity more than ideas. Thus, they promote a universalized form of Iranian ideal identity that transcends mimicking the West, which suggests an inferiority complex, or misinterpreting and rejecting it with reactionary nativism, which, to use Harold Bloom’s concept, betrays an “anxiety of influence.”<sup>42</sup>

Edward Said defines *Orientalism* as a “systematic discipline by which European culture was able to manage—and even produce—the Orient politically, sociologically, militarily, ideologically, scientifically, and imaginatively during the post-Enlightenment period,” a system of representation through which modern Europe created itself in contrast with its imagined, silent civilizational other.<sup>43</sup> But with the rise of reactionary nativism in the postcolonial world of the 1950s and 1960s came into being a form of “Orientalism in reverse” which used similar methods to confront the Occident. Rather than being concerned with the game of rejecting or accepting Western forms and concepts, Beyzaie has considered them as one among many. Thus, by engaging with Asian and Euro-American artistic forms, he has produced works that contain creative reformulations of Iranian and non-Iranian forms and concepts while leaving records of original thinking inspired by ideas from all over the world.

Soyinka also rejects the ideological straitjackets of thought and satirizes the proponents of dogmatic secular or religious ideologies. His protagonists are also far from any rigid intellectual attachments. Like Soyinka himself, they represent their universalized African intellectuality without any Marxist, existentialist, or Negritude badges. Whether an artist, a teacher, an educated farmer, a philosopher, or a physician, they display qualities similar to Beyzaie’s intellectuals. They support the outcasts and the weak, and are juxtaposed with opportunistic intellectuals as foil characters that highlight their qualities. Their divergent thinking, wide knowledge, and ability to reformulate cultural assumptions in unexpected situations also make them unique.

Despite these similarities, Beyzaie and Soyinka’s intellectuals have another major difference, which originates in Beyzaie’s resistance to the idea of intellectuals as saviors. This is significant because in Iran, in Ahmad Sadri’s terms, “the idea that intellectuals are agents of social change [ . . . ] has been red-hot throughout the twentieth century,” and

“Iranian intellectuals” have “acted as catalysts of cataclysmic revolutionary change” in “the Constitutional Revolution of 1905–1906 and the Islamic Revolution of 1978–1979.”<sup>44</sup> If we add to Sadri’s list the failed reform attempts of nationalist intellectuals, headed by Mohammad Mosaddeq in the early 1950s, and that of religious intellectuals in the 1990s and 2000s we realize why Beyzaie evades engaging with everyday politics or giving people glorious saviors.

Iranian creative intellectuals have traditionally been preoccupied with political liberation rather than aesthetic engagement with the resources of culture and language to increase awareness among people. This is to some extent inevitable because totalitarian systems punish social criticism as political acts, which rather than intimidating authors into becoming apolitical makes them too political. Consequently, as Javad Mojabi argues, in countries like Iran the roles of theoretical philosophers, creative artists, and reformist politicians, as the major types of intellectuals, merge to such an extent that the former two become obsessed with politics and cannot achieve the depth their works require.<sup>45</sup> Beyzaie, however, has been preoccupied with reformulating the aesthetics of Iranian drama and resisting dominant discourses by highlighting marginalized narratives and forms. Thus, although he embraces politics in its cultural sense, his priority is not politics but raising awareness about cultural failures, which, among other things, entails deconstructing the idea of heroic saviors.

For Soyinka, however, intellectuals must function as catalysts for change, engage with politics and be ready for self-sacrifice as their ultimate weapon. Thus, whereas Soyinka’s Olunde in *Death and the King’s Horseman* concludes that the only way to save the derailed train of his culture is to undergo self-sacrifice, Beyzaie’s Kashvad in *Arash* «آرش» (P1960) warns Arash, the archetypal sacrificial savior, about the outcomes of his sacrifice. People should face the consequences of their apathy and defeat, but Arash’s sacrifice will give them

the excuse to wait for saviors or blame their failures on individuals who failed to act as heroically as they wanted them to.<sup>46</sup>

### ***Madmen and Specialists versus The Parchment of Master Sharzin***

*Madmen and Specialists* is set in a world in which evil is not lurking behind stagnant rituals: it has surfaced and left millions of casualties. If the people in *The Strong Breed* sacrifice one stranger for their spring ritual, in September 1966 Hausa and Fulani people massacred thousands of Igbos due to ethnocentric conflicts. If the Court of Mata Kharibu in *A Dance of Forests* waged pointless wars that killed hundreds, the war over the secession of Biafra (1967–1970) led to the deaths of one million people.

The plot depicts the homecoming of a philosopher father, Old Man, and his physician son, Bero, from a war that has metamorphosed them. Bero is now an intelligence officer determined to subdue his father, who violated the rules by teaching the cripples of the war to think and tricking the military rulers to eat human flesh. The encounter of the two is punctuated by their interactions with a chorus of four mendicants, who were once rehabilitated by Old Man after being mentally and physically injured in the war. Representing the deformed soul of Nigeria in the early 1970s, these mendicants dangle between their attachment to Old Man and earning a living as Bero's instruments of tyranny. There are also two old sisters who represent the irreducible forces of nature, and Old Man's daughter, Si Bero, who symbolizes naive optimism. Though the sisters have trained and helped Si Bero to build her store of herbal medicines, when they realize Bero intends to misuse the herbs they burn the whole stock.

Soyinka's play depicts a distorted new world in which religion, science, and psychology are means of torture. Within this world, rather than sacrificing their interests to

save lives, people strive to victimize others to aggrandize themselves. In response to the cripple who dreams of being freed from his crutches through a miraculous operation by Bero, the other mendicant, Aaffaa, angrily explains:

You think the specialist has time for your petty inconvenience? [ . . . ] You are just the kind of people who make life impossible for professionals. Miracle, Miracle! That's all we ever get out of your smelly mouths. Because you blackmailed one Christ into showing off once in a while you think all others are suckers for that kind of showmanship. Well, you've met your match in this generation. Turn left, turn right, turn right about again, you'll find everyone you meet is more than a match for you.<sup>47</sup>

Unlike the previous generation, who engineered the independence and produced people of the Eman or Olunde type in *The Strong Breed* and *Death and the King's Horseman*, this generation defies all values. Nobody even considers helping others, "things have fallen apart," language has disintegrated, and people eat one another. Central to the plot, therefore, is Soyinka's sardonic subversion of self-sacrifice in a feast of human flesh engineered by Old Man, who sarcastically attempted to avoid wastage when he failed to stop the war. Using a language rich in twisted mythical and biblical allusions, Soyinka creates a feast of flesh in which, unlike the myth of Tantalus, the guests remorselessly enjoyed having human flesh, a sacrament in which the flesh and blood of Jesus were actually eaten, a second coming which heralds nothing but evil and a prodigal son who comes to kill his father and possess the land.

The relationship between fathers and sons is central to Soyinka's tragedies. In *Camwood on the Leaves* (P1960) the son accidentally kills his father; in *The Strong Breed* he emulates him; and in *Kongi's Harvest* and *Death and the King's Horseman* he shoulders his responsibilities. Soyinka thus reflects on individuation and the conflict of values between generations. In *Madmen and Specialists* this relationship takes the form of deliberate patricide. Two mad specialists, a father and a son, fight over the souls of four maimed mendicants to enable Soyinka to criticize the people of his own generation for their apathy

toward human suffering and to denounce humanity in a nihilistic overview of all manmade institutions, modern and traditional.

Summing up Nietzsche's critique of man's cruelty and triviality, Walter Kaufmann writes, "The weak, lacking the power for creation, would fain shroud their slave souls in royal cloak and, unable to gain mastery of themselves, seek to conquer others. Men dedicate their lives to the accumulation of riches; nations make wars to enslave other nations."<sup>48</sup> This flaw is Soyinka's launchpad. As in *A Dance of the Forests*, he reflects on the vicious circle of man's greed and destructiveness, but insists that modern technology has aggravated the situation. If people are to kill one another, it will be less evil to do it with arrows than with napalm and atomic bombs. Bero is an educated man, but he belongs to that category of Soyinka's intellectuals who have forsaken wisdom for instrumental reasoning. Obsessed with control, these figures treat human life like the nature they crave to subdue. Thus, like the professor in *The Road* (P1965) or Kongi in *Kongi's Harvest*, he is a man of distorted talents. He can heal, as Eman could, but engrossed by the power his skills generate in a malformed world he uses it to detect people's weak spots to torture and control them.

**Si Bero:** [ . . . ] But you have . . . you have given that up now. You are back to your real work. Your practice.

**Bero:** [ . . . ] Practice? Yes, I intend to maintain that side of my practice. A laboratory is important. Everything helps. Control, sister, control. Power comes from bending Nature to your will. The Specialist they called me, and a specialist is—well—a specialist. You analyse, you diagnose, you—(He aims an imaginary gun.)—prescribe. (31–32)

If Bero's madness lies in his mania for control, his father's is in his frustration with humanity, with those who demand soulless conformity and use human shields for their sterile victories. His attempts to influence other people, therefore, is an insane but altruistic bid to warn as many people as possible. He has reacted to the dehumanization of the people around him by

feeding the dead to the military rulers to show them the reality of their hunger for power. This daring action projects him as an Ogunian hero, one that plunges into a radical, sacrificial act to create a new sense of being or to bring sense to the universe. His language skills, his commitment to teach thinking to people, his stubborn self-denial and his Socratic approach to reasoning also make him an insane version of Soyinka's ideal intellectual. His intensely deconstructive intellect is particularly apparent in his AS philosophy, which analyzes the intentions behind all religions and ideological systems and identifies them as masks for mankind's insatiable greed for power.

In *The Strong Breed*, Eman fails his father's expectations to become a carrier, yet emulates him in a sacrificial choice intended to cleanse his environment of another form of evil. Bero is an Eman, contaminated by the evil he tried to exorcise, a monster of instrumental reasoning so obsessed with his skills that he commits patricide to silence his dissident father. The interactions between him and his father are striking not only for their philosophical descriptions of the history of the world and its recurrent patterns of disguised cruelty and deceit, "As,"<sup>49</sup> but also for their insight into megalomania, which is one of Soyinka's specialties:

**Old Man:** Why do you hesitate?

**Bero:** To do what?

**Old Man:** [ . . . ] Once you begin there is no stopping. You say, ah, this is the last step, the highest step, but there is always one more step. For those who want to step beyond, there is always one further step.

Bero: Nothing more is needed.

**Old Man:** Oh yes, there is. I am the last proof of the human in you. The last shadow. Shadows are tough things to be rid of. (He chuckles.) How does one prove he was not born of man? Of course you could kill me[ . . . ].

**Bero:** Or you might just die[ . . . ]. (49)

Soyinka shows how under totalitarian regimes people confuse the awe of power with love and the ability to deal out punishment with justice. Bero argues he has captured and tortured Old Man “for his own good,” diagnosing his ability to make people think to be an “infectious disease” (52). He insists that the official plan for making the handicapped accept their conditions without thinking was compassionate. As in Orwell’s *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, need and fear have turned people into informers, aptitude is forced to serve the state or is brutally suppressed, and words have lost their sense. Loyalty is selling your friends to the authorities; devotion worshipping the one with absolute power; and love molding people in the image the “Big Brother” prescribes for them.

Though “argumentative” and assertive, Old Man has been knowledgeable, original, noble, against “wastage,” and charitable (33–34). Yet, having observed the senseless cruelty of his time, he has concluded that the ultimate drive in man is obsession with power, reflected in a mania to have others at one’s mercy and possess more land, money, and women. He thus talks of a humanity that has “lost the gift of self-disgust” (55). Yet, despite his determination to fight the system, he willingly denies his pride to help others. He asks Bero for a cigarette to give it to the mendicants (48, 55). He plans to take the circus of the mendicants around the world to reveal the atrocities afflicting his people. Like Soyinka, he sets his pride aside to stage plays that reveal the dark comedy of Nigerian civil war to the world.

*The Parchment of Master Sharzin* depicts a similar situation in medieval Iran. Having gone through the experience of the 1979 revolution, Beyzaie reflects his disillusionment with humanity. Building on centuries of religious and military suppression of original thinking, he reformulates the past to criticize the contemporary persecution of dissenting intellectuals and highlight the cause of Iran’s failures in scientific and cultural development.

Abdi, a scribe assigned to burn old parchments, finds a court appeal written by his former master Sharzin-e Ruzbehan, which contains the details of Sharzin’s life and how he

was prosecuted by his dogmatic colleagues for writing a dissertation that argued for the priority of knowledge and reasoning over tradition and challenged patriarchal and absolutist beliefs. As Sharzin's life is projected in flashbacks, we find he escaped punishment by claiming the dissertation was by Avicenna (980–1037), reclaimed it when other scholars began to praise it, and was finally tortured and ostracized for "pretending that it is his." Abdi gradually pieces together the events leading to Sharzin's forced divorce from his wife, torture, blinding, and exile. Depicted in flashbacks, these events are arranged like a *ta'zīyeh* passion play that ends with Sharzin's murder in a scene reminiscent of *Mir-e Nowruzi*: though originally treating him with respect, the people of a village cut Sharzin into pieces when they see his power to spot their treacheries from their words and voices.

In *The Downpour*, Beyzaie's critical gaze highlights how unseen authorities attempt to derail and adopt the creative skills of resourceful intellectuals or to find ways to suppress or victimize these intellectuals to stop them from resisting sociopolitical dominant discourses. His local, organic intellectual, therefore, blames the failures of people on the absence of opportunities and learns to like and help them. In *The Parchment of Master Sharzin*, however, people are the instruments of tyranny, and religious hypocrites and military opportunists commit their atrocities through sycophants who persecute the learned. Thus they either hide their sympathies and survive or confront the evil and suffer.

Sharzin's character and his linguistic gift are similar to Old Man's. His *Tamsil-e Tary Khaneh* (*The Allegory of Dark House/History*) defines life as follows:

در دست راست رود جهالت است و در دست چپ دریای ظلمت و آن به این می ریزد. و دریا گذاران بر زورقهای تزویرند؛ که تاء آن تهمت است، و زاء آن زشت گردانیدن روی جهان، و واو آن ویل است که مر ایشان بساخته اند از بهر بینایان بر غرضهانشان، و یاء آن یاس است از بهر جهانیان، و راء آن ریاست است که می جویند در نهان.<sup>50</sup>

(On the right there is the river of ignorance, and on the left the sea of darkness and oppression, one flowing into the other. The seafarers are on the yachts of *tazvyr*

[hypocrisy and deception], in which “t” is *tohmat* [calumny], “z” is *zesht gardanidan-e* [the denigration] of the beauty of the world, “v” is *vayl* [the hellish dungeon] that they have built for those who can see their intentions, “y” is *ya’s* [the despair] they impose on the world, and the “r” is *riyasat* [the leadership] that they are furtively looking for . . . )

Like Soyinka’s, Beyzaie’s language reflects the distortion of life around him. The scene between Sharzin and his pupils in which he teaches them to see the souls of people and his description of all systems as disguises for man’s greed for “zar, zur va zan” (gold, power, and women) achieved through “tazvyr” (hypocrisy and deception) remind us of the scenes between Old Man and the mendicants and his indictment of all human institutions: “The pious pronouncements. Manifestos. Charades. At the bottom of it all humanity choking in silence” (70).

Soyinka’s universe is Huxley’s *Brave New World* deteriorated by a postcolonial self-hatred that makes its brutal twist explicit. People who think differently are considered faults in the patterns of predicted behaviors and are to be eliminated or recycled:

As Is, and the System is its mainstay though it wear a hundred masks and a thousand outward forms. And because you are within the System, the cyst in the System that irritates, the foul gurgle of the cistern, the expiring function of a faulty cistern and are part of the material for re-formulating the mind of a man into necessity of the moment’s political As, the moment’s scientific As, metaphysic As, sociologic As, economic, recreative ethical As, you-cannot-es-cape! (71–72)

Practice on the cyst in the system [ . . . ] you cyst, you cyst, you splint in the arrow of arrogance, the dog in dogma, tick of a heretic, the tick in politics, the mock of democracy, the mar of Marxism, a tic of the fanatic, the boo in Buddhism, the ham in Mohammed, the dash in the criss-cross of Christ, a dot on the I of ego and ass in the mass, the ash in ashram, a boot in kibbutz! (76)

In Beyzaie’s world similar forms of unleashed power distort life, history, and culture, and any attempt to reveal the defects of the system is brutally silenced. Working at both personal and political levels, these vicious forces also function as Beyzaie’s gates for subverting literary and cultural clichés. Sharzin’s encounter with Abnar Khatun, a femme fatale, is a good

example. Abnar, a powerful woman, uses her beauty and learning to enchant a homeless, lonely Sharzin after his downfall. But when he begins to feel the warmth of love and attention, she blinds him. Beyzaie, however, challenges the stereotype by giving her a voice and presenting her as a victim of patriarchal distortions, which ruined her talents by defining her as a sex toy. She enjoys punishing men for the sins of patriarchy:

آبنار خاتون: [ . . . ] مرا مار خوش خط وخال بخوان، جفت مکر روباهی، که تنها به کار بستر می آیم. بگو بگو، دشنامهای مردان کجاست؟  
شرزین: چه زخم جانگاهی در روح تست و من نمی دیدم. نه، هرگز خوبان را خوار نپنداشته ام. مادرم بی شک زنی بود، و چگونه از زنی سرافکنده مردی سربلند بزاید؟  
آبنار خاتون: مگر نه که زنان را هفده خفت است که عادت و مکر و کم خردی کمترین آنهاست؟ پس باش تا چنین باشد. حالا خود را چنان ساختم که شما می گوئید؛ مکار و نابخرد!  
شرزین: [ . . . ] در دارالکتاب همایونی دارنامه هست. فصلی را بخوانید که برای آن محکوم شدم. فصلی که می گوید مخلوق مرد و زن یکسانند [ . . . ] کینه ی تو این بار به خودت برمی گردد؛ تو از وارونی سپهر چشمانی را برکندی که در زنان به ستایش نگریسته بود! (51)

**(Abnar Khatun:** [ . . . ] Call me the pretty snake, the vixen in human form, good only for the bed. Speak up. Where are your manly curses?)

**Sharzin:** What an agonizing wound was in your soul and I did not see it. No, I never thought of the fair as worthless. My mother was a woman? How can a worthy man be born of a worthless woman?

**Abnar Khatun:** [ . . . ] Do they not say women have seventeen vices, the least of which are menopause, cunning, and lack of wisdom? So, let it be as it is. I made myself what you wanted me to be: cunning, cruel, and unwise.

**Sharzin:** In the library of the king, find my *Darnameh*. Read the chapter for which I was condemned, the one which says men and women are equal in creation. Your hate this time returns to yourself. The treacherous irony of life, you blinded the eyes that looked at women with respect.)

Working like a bricolage, Beyzaie mixes diverse elements to create scenes that echo the life stories of victimized Iranian thinkers, mystic sayings about life, or words from world literary masterpieces. This eclectic creativity is then used to imply the attitudes of religious hypocrites and philistines toward creative thinking in 1980s Iran, where officials equated

cross-cultural fertilization with “westoxification.” Thus Sharzin suffers like the philosopher Zakaria Razi (Rhazes) (914–987) or the mystics Eyn-al-Qozat Hamedani (1098–1131) and Shabeddin Sohrevardi (1155–1192) because he insists on observing, analyzing, and revealing, and “speaking of reason in a reasonless world” or “of love to loveless people” (51). Like Ibsen’s Dr. Stockman, once ostracized, he educates the “urchins” to see “society’s wolves.” Like Twain’s Huck Finn he steps onto “uncharted territories” (40). As in Wilde’s saying, he suffers because he holds a mirror to a world incapable of tolerating its ugliness (67–68).<sup>51</sup>

In “Truth and Power,” Michel Foucault speaks of “non-universal,” “specific intellectuals,” whose everyday struggles with the same sources of power that subjugate the masses, in fact bring them closer to the masses. For Foucault, such intellectuals are everywhere and may use universal evidence to analyze particular cases, but their actions are always meaningful in response to specific problems.<sup>52</sup> In Sharzin, Beyzaie depicts such an intellectual, a symbolic image of himself and the Iranian philosophical, literary, artistic and scientific traditions being punished for creativity. Having faced banishment from the court and seminary circles, Sharzin ends up teaching the masses, but instead of lecturing them with received knowledge he teaches them how to see, a task that Beyzaie himself has been trying to fulfill. By reconstructing the history of medieval martyrs of creativity in Sharzin and matching it to the images of modern creative intellectuals, Sharzin becomes the spirit of all thinkers sacrificed on the altar of military, political, and religious opportunism and bigotry. His physical death, therefore, is not the end of his journey. The final image, depicting Sharzin’s spirit walking with two long sticks, as if rowing in a sea of sand, suggests the continuation of his journey for holding up his mirror to the world.

These symbolic overtones reflect the continuity of thought and beauty despite dogmatic tyranny. Henry Corbin states that *ta’ziyeh* reflects the “imaginal” space that

“maintains the concrete spiritual world of archetype-figures” whose transcendent identities and actions are assumed to be ever present and recurring.<sup>53</sup> By depicting Sharzin like the archetypes of religious sacrificial heroism, Beyzaie reformulates the “imaginal” world of *ta'ziyeh* to include the victimized thinkers of Iran’s intellectual history. The scenes between Sharzin and Maskhareh (the Fool) are significant in this regard. The Fool functions like an angel warning him of what is to come, particularly regarding the femme fatale, Abnar Khatun. He scatters dust on his head when Sharzin is tortured (39) and helps Sharzin when, blinded and helpless, he is banished (61). Looking at the thoroughfare, Sharzin remembers how Mehrban Abkenari was skinned to death, describing it in details that echo the death of mystic saints. The same is true about the scene in which the executioner breaks Sharzin’s teeth, as he identifies himself with “Jesus” and “Mansur al-Hallaj” by calling their names in his cries of agony (38).

Sharzin’s ability to see the souls of people from their appearance, voice, or words, and his reappearance in their hallucinations after his death echo the supernatural powers attributed to sacrificial heroes. Beyzaie structures the events to suggest that Sharzin’s powers are the natural powers of a well-tuned, well-informed brain and that people’s hallucinations about him are the inevitable consequences of his tremendous presence and influence that make his absence unbelievable. Yet the similarity of these references with the accounts of sacrificial heroes cannot be missed.

In Soyinka’s play, this spiritual aspect is in the presence of the two sisters, who carry the knowledge of the earth. As specified above, they have helped Si Bero gather the herbs that can heal or kill, yet fearing that Bero may use this treasure for evil purposes they burn it. Their act condemns those who put their knowledge at the service of warmongers, but their failure to convey their experience to the next generation signifies the collapse of education in conflict-ridden countries. If, in the past, the suppression of free schools and the opportunism

of military, religious, and political establishments allowed little space for the transfer of knowledge, now the cruelties of upstart megalomaniacs scare knowledge away before it flourishes. Thus, as the symbolic fire suggests, both the old and the new worlds have to be burned before salvation becomes possible.

The presence of the sisters mythologizes the play, for their actions and words mark them as symbolic or supernatural elements. The stage directions enhance this dimension by specifying three levels of being. At the lowest level, there is “the surgery . . . down in a cellar,” where Bero and the mendicants operate, and Old Man is imprisoned. In the middle, there is the “drying space” of medicinal “barks and herbs,” where Si Bero weaves her future dreams. Finally, in “the higher structure” is the semi-open hut of the sisters, Iya Mate and Iya Agba, who represent nature in its gentility and harshness (2). This arrangement suggests a psychological reading in which the stage projects the collective consciousness of Nigeria during the civil war, with the surgery representing the space of the id, Si Bero’s storehouse that of the ego, and the open hut that of the superego. Thus the ego (Si Bero), who has long neglected the atrocities committed by its crazed id, fails to negotiate a healthy balance between the id and the superego, and the whole national identity collapses.

Despite this psychological proposal, Soyinka’s orchestration of allusions—to the Christian sacrament and the myth of Tantalus—and his emphasis on the philosophy of “As” makes philosophical mythologizing the main force of the play. This mythologizing primarily juxtaposes the wisdom, knowledge, and cures that Old Man and the sisters, the embodiments of human intellectuality and earthly/divine experience, give us with what our obsession with power and control imposes on life.

Old Man’s sacrificial feat distracts Bero to allow the sisters to burn Bero’s stock and deprive him of a new source for his destructive knowledge. His sacrifice also blocks Bero from understanding “As,” which shatters Bero’s illusions about breaking everybody and

controlling everything. Thus, like his mythical colleagues, the two sisters, Old Man upholds his position while depriving Bero of the knowledge he craves. The association between Old Man and the sisters is also reflected in Old Man's references to the fire and flood and the similarity between the sisters' pipe and Old Man's, which Bero tries to replace with a packet of imported cigarettes. Thus, as Beyzaie's Sharzin becomes the prototype of modern intellectuality and ancient sacrificial heroism, Old Man becomes a perfect Ogunian hero, one who plunges into nothingness to change the world. If the sisters are from the world of ancestors and gods, Old Man is the volunteer who opens a path to fulfill their plans. His powers are also reflected in the path he has taken to admonish the military rulers. Ogun is known for exercising his will in gory scenes, and Old Man for a "twisted humanistic logic" and an "immensely subversive will" that has dared to feed human flesh to those ruling by massacres.<sup>54</sup> Thus, as Swift's "A Modest Proposal" did in the eighteenth-century English-Irish context, Soyinka's play reveals the absurdity of using seemingly rational arguments to justify wars, massacres, and starving people to death.

## **Conclusion**

In 1927, when Julian Benda published his critique of those learned individuals who failed to analyze grandiose political and military endeavors such as nationalism and colonization dispassionately, the ideal of intellectuality he promoted was that of an objective, universal type immune from the pitfalls of politics and subjective fallacies of thought.<sup>55</sup> Since then, however, many have described intellectuality in non-universalist terms as the function of representing class or ethnic sympathies and promoting or resisting dominant discourses. Antonio Gramsci, for instance, suggested that though all human beings were intellectuals, intellectuality per se was a function seen in its "traditional" forms in priests and teachers and

in its “organic” forms in scientists, technicians, scholars, or politicians who theorize the moral and developmental trajectory of different social classes or fields of knowledge and represent them in the sociopolitical arena. He also emphasized the necessity of producing a particular type of organic intellectual that represents the proletariat and the common people in the realm of culture, knowledge, and politics.<sup>56</sup> Michel Foucault also spoke of “specific intellectuals” who were indispensable to the relations of “power/knowledge” and engaged in battles about the “specific effects of power attached to the true,” and the “status” and “the economic and political role” of truth as “the ensemble of rules according to which the true and the false are separated” or produced in institutions. The responsibility of such intellectuals was not to emancipate “truth from every system of power (which would be chimera, for truth is already power) but of detaching the power of truth from the forms of hegemony, social, economic and cultural, within which it operates at the present time.”<sup>57</sup>

Despite their differences, however, these authors, and others, such as Said, seem to suggest that besides those intellectuals who absorb the relations of power/knowledge and promote dominant discourses, there exists an intellectual type that relentlessly examines the hushed margins to challenge the reductive truth of received knowledge or dominant sociopolitical, economic, artistic, scientific, or cultural discourses.

As demonstrated in my study, the ideal intellectual types promoted by Beyzaie and Soyinka are of this dissenting type, who are often juxtaposed with opportunistic intellectual types that attempt to silence their voice. The challenges they face also reflect their positions as dissenting intellectuals in countries with a history of colonial and postcolonial conflicts and distortions, where they face the triple tasks of identifying effective and peaceful ways to build and critique modern institutions while facing the proponents of traditional received knowledge and resisting reductive colonial and postcolonial discourses.

Both Soyinka and Beyzaie portray their intellectuals in forms that contain ritual patterns. Beyzaie reconstructs the lives of Iranian sacrificial heroes and creative intellectuals in forms that make them similar while condemning the victimization of creativity for political gain. The process resists the Iranian state's attempts to depict dissenting intellectuals as puppets of the West. Yet it also proposes a more culturally rooted form of intellectuality that transcends the sense of belatedness which has trapped many intellectuals in pro- or anti-Western ideologies. Beyzaie's intellectual is an unwilling challenger who is pushed to hold a position against bigotry and tyranny. In his optimistic works, particularly those written during the revolutionary years (1977–1981) and those in which women are protagonists, these figures may be survivors; but in other cases, they are sacrificial. These intellectual figures are also present in Soyinka's, but they are always men. In Soyinka's plays of the 1960s this figure is an unwilling sacrifice, but he becomes a willing sacrifice in his post-civil-war plays of the 1970s, and then disappears in favor of a comic vision in the later plays.

These transformations suggest that in both cases the authors have been concerned about the roles or conditions of intellectuals in their societies, but whereas Soyinka has increasingly turned to satire to highlight the same issues, Beyzaie has intensified the tragic aspect in response to the aggravations of the conditions of intellectuals.

## Notes

---

<sup>1</sup> I have used the following abbreviations in the article: "F" for "Film," "M" for "Memoir," "N" for Novel, "P" for "Play," and "SP" for "Screenplay." The transliteration of Persian words is based on the style used by the *Journal of Iranian Studies*. For details, see <http://iranianstudies.com/journal/transliteration>.

- 
- <sup>2</sup>. Mohammad Ghazvini, “Mir-e Nowruzi” [New Year Ruler], *Yadegar* 1, no. 3 (1944): 14 (my translation).
- <sup>3</sup>. J. G. Frazer, *The Scapegoat (The Golden Bough*, vol. 6) (London: Macmillan, 1919), 364–70, 390–94, 402.
- <sup>4</sup>. Plutarch, *Lives*, vol. 3, trans. Bernadotte Perrin (London: William Heinemann, 1915), 417–19.
- <sup>5</sup>. Jamshid Malekpour, *The Islamic Drama* (London: Taylor & Francis, 2004), 57.
- <sup>6</sup>. Louis Massignon, *The Passion of Al-Hallaj: Mystic and Martyr of Islam*, trans. Herbert Mason (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994).
- <sup>7</sup>. Majid Tehranian, “Power and Purity: Iranian Political Culture, Communication and Identity,” in *Iran: Between Tradition and Modernity*, ed. Ramin Jahanbegloo (Lanham, MD: Lexington, 2004), 196.
- <sup>8</sup>. Negar Mottahedeh, *Displaced Allegories: Post-revolutionary Iranian Cinema* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2008), 15–30.
- <sup>9</sup>. Ali Talebi-Nejhad, “Goftogu ba Bahram Beyzaie” (interview with Bahram Beyzaie), *Film Va Cinema [Film and Cinema]* 2 (1998): 28.
- <sup>10</sup>. Walter Benjamin, “Theses on the Philosophy of History,” in *Illuminations*, trans. Harry Zohn (New York: Schocken Books, 1969), 256.
- <sup>11</sup>. Hamid Dabashi, *Close Up: Iranian Cinema, Past, Present, and Future* (New York: Verso, 2001), 83.

---

<sup>12</sup>2. Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of Prison*, trans. Alan Sheridan (New York: Pantheon Books, 1995), 33–34, 170–71, 195–230.

<sup>13</sup>3. Martin Heidegger, *The History of the Concept of Time*, trans. Albert Hofstadter (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992), 316–17.

<sup>14</sup>4. Wole Soyinka, *Idanre and Other Poems* (MA: Methuen Publishing, 1967), 17.

<sup>15</sup>5. Wole Soyinka, *Collected Plays 1* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1973), 71.

<sup>16</sup>6. Wole Soyinka, *The Man Died* (London: Africa Book Centre, 1972), 95, 155–59, 162–64, 173–74.

<sup>17</sup>7. Oyin Ogunba, *The Movement of Transition: A Study of the Plays of Wole Soyinka* (Ibadan: Ibadan University Press, 1975), 110; Eldred Durosimi Jones, *The Writing of Wole Soyinka* (London: Currey, 1988), 78, 153.

<sup>18</sup>8. See Kacke Götrick, *Apidan Theatre and Modern Drama* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1984); and Kola Abimbola, *Yoruba Culture: A Philosophical Account* (Iroko: Iroko Academics Publishers, 2005).

<sup>19</sup>9. James Gibbs, *Wole Soyinka* (Hong Kong: Macmillan, 1986), 18–21.

<sup>20</sup>0. *Ibid.*, 21.

<sup>21</sup>1. Robin Horton, “New Year in the Delta,” *Nigeria Magazine* (1960), 67: 256–96, in Ogunba, 103.

---

<sup>22</sup>2. Wole Soyinka, "Drama and the Revolutionary Ideal," in *In Person: Achebe, Awoonor, and Soyinka at the University of Washington*, ed. Karen Morell (Seattle: Washington University Press, 1975), 87.

<sup>23</sup>3. Philip Brockbank, "Blood and Wine: Tragic Ritual from Aeschylus to Soyinka," in *Shakespeare Survey 36: Shakespeare in the Twentieth Century*, ed. Stanley W. Wells (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 18.

<sup>24</sup>4. Biodun Jeyifo, *Wole Soyinka: Politics, Poetics and Postcolonialism* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 125, 127.

<sup>25</sup>5. Dabashi, 92.

<sup>26</sup>6. Ann B. Davis, "Dramatic Theory of Wole Soyinka," in *Critical Perspective on Wole Soyinka*, ed. James Gibbs (Washington, DC: Three Continents Press, 1981), 149.

<sup>27</sup>7. Ogunba, 103.

<sup>28</sup>8. Akinade Bello in Gibbs, 118.

<sup>29</sup>9. Katerina Clark and Michael Holquist, *Mikhail Bakhtin* (Cambridge, UK: Harvard University Press, 1984), 278–86.

<sup>30</sup>0. Femi Osofisan, "Tiger on Stage: Wole Soyinka and the Nigerian Theatre," in *Theatre in Africa*, ed. Oyin Ogunba and Abiola Irele (Ibadan: Ibadan University Press, 1978), 170.

<sup>31</sup>1. For Aristotle and Hegel's conceptions of tragedy, see Rebecca Bushnell, ed., *A Companion to Tragedy* (Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 2005), 39–67.

- 
- <sup>32</sup>2. Edward W. Said, *Representations of the Intellectual: The 1993 Reith Lectures* (London: Vintage Books, 1994), 17, 63–75.
- <sup>33</sup>3. Osofisan, 163.
- <sup>34</sup>4. Jones, 12.
- <sup>35</sup>5. Awam Amkpa, *Theatre and Post-colonial Desires* (London: Routledge, 2004), 21.
- <sup>36</sup>6. Samuel Taylor Coleridge, chapters 13 and 14 in *Biographia Literaria; or, Biographical Sketches of my Literary Life and Opinions* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1985).
- <sup>37</sup>7. Ogunba, 19.
- <sup>38</sup>8. *Ibid.*, 85.
- <sup>39</sup>9. Wole Soyinka, *Collected Plays 2* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1974), 111.
- <sup>40</sup>0. Mehrzad Boroujerdi, *Iranian Intellectuals and the West: The Tormented Triumph of Nativism* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1996), 63–77.
- <sup>41</sup>1. Bahram Beyzaie, *Tumar-e Sheikh-e Sharzin [The Parchment of Master Sharzin]* (Tehran: Roshangaran, 1986), 15
- <sup>42</sup>2. Harold Bloom, *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1973).
- <sup>43</sup>3. Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1978), 3.
- <sup>44</sup>4. Ahmad Sadri, “Varieties of Religious Reform in Iran: Politics, Culture and Society,” in Jahanbegloo, 117.

---

<sup>45</sup>5. Javad Mojabi, *Negah-e Kashef-e Gostakh [The Bold Probing Gaze]* (Tehran: Ofoq, 2004), 135.

<sup>46</sup>6. Bahram Beyzaie, “Arash” (1961), in *Divan-e Namayesh 1 [Collected Plays 1]* (Tehran: Roshangaran, 2001), 45.

<sup>47</sup>7. Wole Soyinka, *Madmen and Specialists* (Norfolk, UK: Cox & Wyman, 1971), 44-45.

Hereafter cited parenthetically by page number.

<sup>48</sup>8. Walter A. Kaufman, *Nietzsche: Philosopher, Psychologist, Antichrist* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1950), 224.

<sup>49</sup>9. Ketu H. Katarak, *Wole Soyinka and Modern Tragedy: A Study of Dramatic Theory and Practice* (London: Greenwood Press, 1986), 151–65.

<sup>50</sup>0. Beyzaie (1986), 56. Hereafter cited parenthetically by page number.

<sup>51</sup>1. See Henrik Ibsen, *An Enemy of the People* (New York: Dover, 2000), 81–82; Mark Twain, *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* (London: William Collins, 2009), 196; and Oscar Wilde, *The Picture of Dorian Gray* (New York: Vintage Books, 2011), 3.

<sup>52</sup>2. Michel Foucault, “Truth and Power,” in *Power/Knowledge*, ed. and trans. Colin Gordon (London: Random House, 1972), 109–33.

<sup>53</sup>3. Henry Corbin, *The Man of Light in Iranian Sufism*, trans. Nancy Pearson (New Lebanon, NY: 1994, Omega), 42.

<sup>54</sup>4. Jeyifo, 150.

---

<sup>55</sup>5. Julien Benda, *The Treason of the Intellectuals*, trans. Richard Aldington (New York: William Morrow & Company, 1928).

<sup>56</sup>6. Antonio Gramsci, *Prison Notebooks*, trans. Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith (London: ElecBook, 1999), 134–62.

<sup>57</sup>7. Foucault (1972), 132–33.