

**IDEOLOGY IN FOUR ETHIOPIAN NOVELS IN ENGLISH**

**BY**

**NEGUSSE AREGAWI ABRAHA**

**MAY 2019**

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY**

**ADDIS ABABA**

**Addis Ababa University**  
**College of Humanities, Language Studies, Journalism and**  
**Communication**  
**Department of Foreign Languages and Literature**

**Ideology in Four Ethiopian Novels in English**

**By:**

**Negusse Aregawi Abraha**

**Advisor:**

**Melakneh Mengistu (PhD)**

**May 2019**

**Addis Ababa University**

**Addis Ababa**

# **Ideology in Four Ethiopian Novels in English**

**By:**

**Negusse Aregawi Abraha**

**A Thesis Submitted to the Department of Foreign Languages and  
Literature in Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy in Literature**

**May 2019**

**Addis Ababa University**

**Addis Ababa**

**Addis Ababa University**

**College of Humanities, Language Studies, Journalism and Communication**

**Department of Foreign Languages and Literature**

This is to certify that the thesis prepared by Negusse Aregawi, entitled *Ideology in Four Ethiopian Novels in English* and submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Literature in English compiles with the regulations of the University and meets the accepted standards with respect to originality and quality.

Signed by the Examining Committee:

Examiner: \_\_\_\_\_ Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Examiner: \_\_\_\_\_ Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Advisor: \_\_\_\_\_ Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

## **DECLARATION**

I, the undersigned, declare that this thesis is my original work and has not been presented for a degree in any other university and that all sources of material used for the thesis have been duly acknowledged.

Name: Negusse Aregawi

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Place: College of Humanities, Language Studies, Journalism and Communication, Addis Ababa  
University

Date of submission: \_\_\_\_\_

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	v
DEFINITION OF KEY TERMS.....	v
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1 Background of the Study .....	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem .....	12
1.3 Objectives of the Study .....	14
1.3.1 General Objective.....	14
1.3.2 Specific Objectives.....	14
1.4 Significance of the Study .....	15
1.5 Research Methodology .....	15
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF PRVIOUS STUDIES ON THE NOVELS SELECTED AND IDEOLOGY.....	17
CHAPTER THREE: THEORTICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY .....	22
3.1 Ideology and Marxist Aesthetics .....	22
3.1.1 Literature and Ideology .....	24
3.1.2 Literature and Dominant Ideology of an Epoch.....	26
3.1.3 Content and Form in Marxist Criticism.....	28
3.1.4 Commitment and Realism .....	30
3.1.5 Realism in Literary Aesthetics.....	32
3.1.6 Lukacs on Realism.....	33
3.1.7 Realism, Modernism, and Postmodernism .....	36
3.1.8 Eagleton’s and Ngara’s Authorial and Aesthetic Ideologies .....	40
3.2 Ideology and Discourse.....	42
CHAPTER FOUR: ANALYSIS OF IDEOLOGY IN FOUR ETHIOPIAN NOVELS IN ENGLISH.....	44
4.1 Economic Condition and Feudal Social Formation .....	44
4.2 Reproduction of Dominant Ideologies .....	52
4.2.1 Religious Power and Power Relation and the Reproduction of Dominant Ideology .....	52

4.2.2 Discourses of Dominant Ideology in Family Social Relations and Media .....	65
4.2.3. Story of Previous Battles and the Discourse of Dominant Ideology in <i>The Thirteenth Sun</i> and <i>Firebrands</i> .....	69
4. 2.4 Satires of False Consciousnesses in <i>Beneath the Lion’s Gaze</i> and <i>The God who Begat a Jackal</i> .....	72
4.2.5 Repressive State Apparatus (RSA) and Coercion .....	76
4.3. Discourses of Resistance and Rebellion against the Dominant Ideology .....	85
4.3.1 Discourses of Resistance against the Dominant Ideology in <i>The Thirteenth Sun</i> and <i>The God who Begat a Jackal</i> .....	85
4.3.2. Public Disobedience and Rebellion in <i>The God who Begat a Jackal</i> .....	98
4.3.3 University Students’ Discourses of Resistance against the Monarchy in <i>Firebrands</i> and <i>Beneath the Lion’s Gaze</i> .....	105
4.3.4 Discourses of Resistance against the <i>Dergue</i> in <i>Beneath the Lion’s Gaze</i> .....	111
4.4 Patriarchal Ideology .....	112
4.5 Authorial and Aesthetic Ideologies.....	121
4.5.1 Reformation and Metaphoric Realism in <i>The Thirteenth Sun</i> .....	121
4.5.2 Radicalism and Socialist Realism in <i>Firebrands</i> .....	128
4.5.3 Marxism and Magical Realism in Nega’s <i>The God who Begat the Jackal</i> .....	135
4.5.4 Revolution and Realism in <i>Beneath the Lion’s Gaze</i> .....	141
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION .....	148
REFERENCES.....	164

## ABSTRACT

The objective of this study is to explore and analyse general, authorial and aesthetic ideologies as reflected in four Ethiopian novels in English - Dagnachew's *The Thirteenth Sun*, Sahles Silassie's *Firebrands*, Nega Mezlekia's *The God Who Begat a Jackal*, and Maaza Mengiste's *Beneath the Lion's Gaze*. Qualitative literary analysis based on mainly Marxist literary perspective has been used to analyze the ideologies in the novels. Althusser's Ideology and Ideological State apparatus, Gramsci's hegemony, and Foucault's idea of power, discourse and knowledge and van Dijk's concept of ideology and discourse have been used to approach the general ideologies and their reproduction as reflected in the novels selected. All the novels analyzed satirize the contradicting ideologies and their reproductions in different epochs. It was found out that religious, familial, academic social/power relations and media and cultural practices played a great role in the reproduction/discourses of the contradicting ideologies in the novels selected. All the novels under study are Marxist-oriented literary texts; and they reflect economic conditions, class formation and resistance done for social transformation. They satirize the base and superstructure; they reflect how the ruling feudal class used the land, exploited the society, and used both the ideological state apparatuses (ISAs) and repressive state apparatuses (RSAs) to reproduce its feudal class ideology. Maaza's novel, *Beneath the Lion's Gaze*, reflects also the reproduction of contradicting ideologies that existed during the reign of the Military Rule, *Dergue*, in addition to its reflection of the social realities in the reign of the monarchy. The novels analyzed also satirize organic intellectuals' discourses of resistance. It has been found out that all the novels analyzed are realist literary works though Daniachew's *The Thirteenth Sun* and Nega's *The God who Begat a Jackal* share some features of modernist and postmodernist modes of literary writings respectively in their form. All the novels have also been found committed to the cause of the organic intellectuals; and this is confirmed in the authorial ideology of each novel analyzed.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

Many people made this study realized. Above all, I would like to thank Dr. Melakneh Mengistu, my advisor, for his unreserved and constructive support in the course of this study. I am also indebted to Adigrat University, my working place, and Addis Ababa University, my hosting university, for sponsoring my study.

I would also like to thank colleagues and friends who had contributions to my study: Moges G/Mariam, Misrak Tenna who are both PhD candidates and Daniel Hagos (a friend and colleague in Addigrat University) for their help in search of books that are relevant to my study. Thanks to my friends and PhD candidates Baraki Haile, Hailay Tsigab, Bahre Araaya, Zerai Hailekiros, Fesseha Negasi, Molla Asmare and Berhe Taffere who facilitated my communication in Addis Ababa during the times of my absence. I am also indebted to Negusse Gidey, a staff of Addis Ababa University, for his encouragement and help during my study. I would also like to thank secretaries, in Department of Foreign Languages and literature of Addis Ababa University, Senait and others, and all the librarians in Addis Ababa University for their kind services.

My appreciation also goes to my colleagues and friends at Adigrat University: Teklay Haile, Teklit, Yared Negusse, Assefa Tesfay, Bereket Yeheyis, Araaya, Haftai Gebre and Micheale Gidey for facilitating communications in Adigrat University for me. My thanks also go to Mebrahtu Assefa and Firehiwot Teklay, friends and colleagues, both in Adigrat University and Abiyi Addi College of Teachers' Education, for their encouragement during my study.

I am also indebted to my brother Habtu Aragawi and his spouse Sheshait Abadi as well as their whole family, Habtu Hagos as well as his family, and all my relatives in Addis Ababa for making my stay in Addis Ababa easy. Finally, my appreciation goes to my family: Abeba Yohannes (my spouse), Hewan Berhe and my son Abel for your great contribution in the realization of this study.

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AI - Aesthetic Ideology

AUI - Authorial Ideology

EPRP- Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Party

GMP- General Mode of Production

ISA- Ideological State Apparatus

LMP- Literary Mode of Production

RSA- Repressive State Apparatus

## DEFINITION OF KEY TERMS

**Coercion:** exercising repressive actions, using certain force, to maintain or control certain social power

**Consent:** acceptance of certain ideology, or power.

**Discourse:** speech, text, and/or other means of communication that is done to influence and control people/society, maintain or resist certain social power, and/or transfer certain knowledge.

**False consciousness:** illusions created as a result of ideology and ideological discourses.

**Ideological State Apparatus (ISA):** According to Althusser (1969), ISAs are social and political institutions or cultural rituals where ideological reproductions (discourses) are carried out.

**Interpellation:** Hailing or making certain individuals, groups, societies submissive to certain ideologies.

**Hegemony:** An attempt done to get conscious and/or unconscious consent from subjects to maintain or resist certain social power.

**New consciousness:** a consciousness that is considered free of false consciousness of dominant classes; or it is a consciousness that is deviant from the dominant social consciousness.

**Organic intellectuals:** according to Gramsci (1971), organic intellectuals are the emergent social class who can come with counter hegemony against the hegemonies by dominant classes; organic intellectuals are those who come with revolutionary ideology and theories; they are considered as eye openers; they lead social transformation.

**Repressive State Apparatus (RSA):** According Althusser, RSAs are repressive machines, such as courts, police and armies that governments, states, or dominant classes use to maintain their power.

**Reproduction of ideology:** discourse of ideology; it is the discursive dimension of ideology.

**Traditional intellectuals:** according to Gramsci (1971), traditional intellectuals are those who have inter-class aura class position; they are the ones who conceal (hide) their attachment to various class formations.

# CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Background of the Study

David Hawkes (2003) states that there passed much argument, debates and refutations about human consciousness and its determinant factors. Hawkes also writes that, “History shows that all philosophical or ideological developments call forth their own refutation”. This shows us that different philosophies, refutations and social theories about the determinant factors of human consciousness predated and caused the coinage of “ideology” and its different concepts. This is to mean that the study of ideas did not begin only after the word *ideology* was coined in eighteenth century.

Raymond Williams (1977:56), Terry Eagleton (1991), and David Hawkes (2003) that noted that a French philosopher Destutt de Tracy coined the word ideology with the objective to look for and examine the origin of idea/human consciousness. The first French ideologues, like Tracy were influenced by the empiricists’ thought (like John Locke’s thought) that human consciousness/idea is not innate; rather, it is derived from sensation, i.e., from the external world. This led Tracy to coin the word ideology and study the source of human idea. The first ideologues assert that the source of our idea is nowhere but the history we passed through; they claim that our idea has a material base. Raymond Williams (1977) states how the study of idea with the word ideology began and writes, “It was indeed an assertion against the metaphysics that there are 'no ideas in the world but those of men’”. Terry Eagleton (1991) also states that the beginning of the word/concept of ideology has a deep root to the time of enlightenment and it had the objective of constructing rational society that is free of prejudice, superstition and obscurantism of the ancient regime.

Eagleton indicates also that it is difficult to come with a single and adequate definition of ideology not because people in the field have low intelligence but because “‘ideology’ has a whole range of useful meanings, not all of which are compatible with each other” (Eagleton (1991: 1). And the range of different meanings of ideology which are not compatible to each other oblige us to see the different ruptures and views of ideology that different thinkers stated about ideology.

## Early Marxists' View of Ideology

Early Marxists (like Marx and Engels) viewed ideology in relation to economy and the social formation. They argue that material production and its class formation determines man's consciousness. They contend also that those who control the material production control the reproduction of social consciousness; and they argue that the ideology of the dominant class who controls the material production becomes the dominant ideology of every epoch. Hence, they examine ideology and society at large under the notion of base and superstructure, where base is economic/material production and superstructure is politics and/or ideology (that can include ethical, religious and so on) that legitimates the power of the dominant class and an existing social formation, (Eagleton, 1976:5). Because of this notion, until the second part of the twenty century, the early Marxists considered ideology, as misleading, distorted, illusion or mystification that disguise the interest of the dominant class, (Eagleton, 1991:83; van Dijk 1998:3). In addition, Raymond Williams (1977:55) and Eagleton's (1991: 83-84) write the following summary of Marxist view of ideology:

1. *Ideology denotes as illusory belief system that distracts society from true understanding of their social conditions and which sustains the repressive political power. The opposite of this could be accurate, unbiased (scientific) knowledge of practical social conditions.*
2. *Ideology a system of beliefs characteristics of a particular class or group (here ideology is seen in relation to both dominant class and revolutionary forces in a class struggle).*
3. *The general process of the production of meanings and ideas.*

The first two Marxist notions of ideology can be seen in relation to class system and class struggle. They can also be used to analyze ideology of a society that experienced alienation, exploitation and oppression. The third view of ideology is about the general process of how meanings and ideas are produced.

Early Marxists claim that the working class, the proletariat, who are aware of the exploitative and oppressive nature of class ideology, can change dominative social order through aggressive movement, revolution. As indicated in Stoddart (2007), early Marxists favour revolution against oppressive social order: "All forms and products of consciousness cannot be dissolved by mental criticism . . . but only by the practical overthrow of the actual social relations which gave rise to

the idealistic humbug” (Marx and Engels 1989:258). According to early Marxists, action-oriented revolution is viable to avoid dominant ideology and repressive social order.

### **Gramsci’s Hegemony**

Gramsci (1971), in his concept of hegemony, writes that ideology is one means of winning consent to certain social power. He states that hegemony is controlling and exercising social power through two means\_\_ through consent and coercion. He asserts that people, especially political groups/classes can use ideology, i.e., diffusing one’s own world view, as one means of winning consent to their power (influence or domination) from certain society. In fact, ideology is not the only means that people use to win consent; people can use all other possible ways, like for example reducing taxes for tax payers, allowing self-government, practising parliamentary democracy etc. He states that civic societies have a great role in making certain society submissive of certain ideology. Coercion, on the other hand, involves using force to control and maintain social power. Hegemony is broader idea than ideology and the former includes the latter.

Gramsci declines the early Marxists’ pejorative meaning of the word “ideology”, ideology as only misleading thought. He, instead, asserts that there is also historically “organic” ideology, which is historically important for certain society. He notes that ideology plays a critical role in organizing people in a class struggle; it has the role of mobilizing men and women to fight for social transformation. Gramsci asserts also that there is no politically eternal ideology. Certain ideology is important for only particular historical period.

Gramsci notes also that two conflicting ideologies can co-exist in a society: ideology from the ruling class and ideology from the oppressed class. Based Gramsci’s assertion, Eagleton, (1991:118) writes, “Two conflicting conceptions of the world usually exist in such ideologies, the one drawn from the 'official' notions of the rulers, the other derived from an oppressed people's practical experience of social reality”. Gramsci discusses about the people who in the revolutionary forces can bring well articulated emancipator/ “organic” ideology (that he discusses is the ideology of revolutionary/working forces). He states that it is the task of “organic

intellectuals” in the revolutionary/working force that can come with emancipatory idea/organic ideology, ideology that can ensure social transformation.

### **Althusser’s Idea of Ideology and Ideological State Apparatus**

Althusser (1969), in his idea of *Ideology and Ideological Apparatus*, illustrates the role of ideology in the task of reproduction of the condition of production. He illustrates Marx’s notion of *base and superstructure* that he, Althusser, calls the edifice of every social formation. In other words, he illustrates how dominant classes use base and superstructure to maintain their power and dominance. Moreover, he illustrates how ideology in general functions; he states that ideology functions through interpellations, discourse, to make individuals or society submissive to certain ideology.

Althusser (ibid) asserts that every social formation arises from the dominant mode of production; and he states that in order to exist, every social formation reproduces the condition of its production. He states the reproduction of the condition of productions consists reproduction of the means of production, in general, reproduction of material (for instance, raw materials, machines, etc) and labour power. Althusser, in his illustration, concentrates on how the reproduction of labour power takes place. He states that the reproduction of labour power is done by offering wherewithal wage, (the material means with which to reproduce itself), upgrading the skill and making them (the labour) submissive to certain ideology.

Althusser (ibid.) states that the wage is reproduced itself in the services and goods that the capitalist presents. The services and the goods that the working class purchases are not defined by the working class but by the capitalist class. In other words, what the working class buys is not what he/she needs to have but what the capitalist class (or the proletariat class) defined him to have: “the historical minimum is not defined by the historical needs of the working class 'recognized' by the capitalist class, but by the historical needs imposed by the proletarian class” (Althusser, 1969: 131). He reminds that reproduction of labour skill is more practiced in a capitalist system. Althusser notes also that reproduction of human labour includes not only reproduction of their (the human labour’s) skill, but also their submission to the dominant ideology, the ideology of ruling class:

The reproduction of labour power requires not only a reproduction of its skills, but also, at the same time, a reproduction of its submission to the rules of the established order, i.e. a reproduction of submission to the ruling ideology for the Ideology and the State workers, and a reproduction of the ability to manipulate the ruling ideology correctly for the agents of exploitation and repression, so that they, too, will provide for the domination of the ruling class (Althusser, 1969: 132-133).

What is pertinent to the present paper is that reproduction of human labour that includes making the people submissive to the ideology of the ruling class. Althusser illustrates how the submission of people to the ruling classes in a class system is done using Marx's notion of base and superstructure which Althusser calls the edifice of every social formation.

Althusser states that dominating classes/groups use different apparatuses which rise out of the floor of the superstructure to reproduce their ideology and to reproduce the condition of production that includes submission of people to the ideology of the ruling class. He asserts that it is the ideological state apparatuses (ISAs) and repressive state apparatuses (RSAs) which rise out of the superstructure. He states the economic base determines the superstructure, out of which the ISAs and RSAs rise. He asserts also that there are functionaries (like priest, and other professionals) who carry out the submission of the people to the ideology of the ruling class. He further asserts that State Apparatuses (SA) for Marx are the government, the administration, the army, the police, the court, the prison, etc, which Althusser (ibid) added "Repressive" to it and becomes Repressive State Apparatus (RST). He has also the following lists of ISAs that ruling/dominating classes use in the reproduction of the condition of production, mainly in making people submissive to the ideology of ruling classes:

*the religious ISA (the system of the different Churches),*  
*the educational ISA (the system of the different public and private 'Schools'),*  
*the family ISA,*  
*the legal ISA,*  
*the political ISA (the political system, including the different Parties),*  
*the trade-union ISA,*  
*the communications ISA (press, radio and television, etc.),*  
*the cultural ISA (Literature, the Arts, sports, etc.).*

(Althusser, 1969:143)

Althusser (ibid) states that while the repressive state apparatus (RSA) belongs to the public (government) domain, Ideological State Apparatuses (ISA) belongs to the private. He asserts also

that while the ISAs function predominantly by ideology, the RSAs function massively by violence.

Althusser makes a clear distinction between state power and state apparatuses to clarify what class struggle is. And he asserts that class struggle is done to control the state power so as to control state apparatuses. He states that Marxists proposed the proletariat class must first control the state power to replace the bourgeois state apparatus by the working class (proletariat) state apparatus and eventually destroy the state power and state apparatuses. This shows that the early Marxists, until the poststructuralist come, considered state power and state apparatuses, power in general as only repressive. The poststructuralists, like Foucault, however, declined early Marxist's notion of power as repressive; they consider power as a relationship of forces. Foucault considers power, as a relationship of social forces, plays a crucial role for administration and knowledge transfer.

Althusser further asserts that ISAs in capitalist society are greater in number than ISAs in feudal system, yet they have same function in both political systems. Althusser has to say the following about ISA in pre-capitalism:

In the pre-capitalist historical period which I have examined extremely broadly, it is absolutely clear that there was one dominant Ideological State Apparatus, the Church, which concentrated within it not only religious functions, but also educational ones, and a large proportion of the functions of communications and 'culture'. It is no accident that all ideological struggle, from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century, starting with the first shocks of the reformation, was concentrated in an anti-clerical and anti-religious struggle ; rather this is a function precisely of the dominant position of the religious ideological State apparatus (Althusser, 1969: 151).

As it is evident in the extract, the church was the dominant ISA in pre-capitalist period. Althusser (ibid), in the above extract, indicated that people who were fighting against the dominant class were targeting religious institutions because they consider these institutions were serving the power interest of the dominant class of the time. Althusser (ibid) asserts that people's submission to a given ideology can be reflected in their material actions and their participation in the social practices and rituals which are defined by ISA's ideas to the subject:

Where only a single subject (such and such an individual) is concerned, the existence of the ideas of his belief is material in that his ideas are his material actions inserted into material practices governed by material rituals which are themselves defined by the material ideological apparatus from which derive the ideas of that subject (Althusser, 1969: 167).

People's submission to a certain ideology is confirmed in their actions and practices which are governed by material rituals defined by ideas that the ISA produces. Althusser (ibid. P. 170) asserts also that ideology functions by interpellation, i.e., by discourse. He indicated that people are made submissive to certain ideology through interpellation, as in: "Ideology interpellates individuals as subjects...There is no ideology except by the subject and for subjects" (Althusser 1969: 170). People use interpellation to make people submissive of certain ideology. He asserts that people's submissiveness to a certain ideology is done through hailing (through interpellation): "all ideology hails or interpellates concrete individuals as concrete subjects" (Althusser, 1969: 173). Interpellation makes subjects submissive to certain ideology by the reproduction of ideology. Althusser's concept of interpellation and reproduction of ideology has been replaced by "discourse" these days.

### **Ideology in the Frankfurt School of Critical Theory**

As we read in Mark C.J. Stoddart (2007), Frankfurt School of Critical Theorists such as Walter Benjamin (1968 [1936]), Max Horkheimer and Theodor W. Adorno (1950), Herbert and Marcuse (1964), who are among the founders of the school, expanded and deepened what the early Marxists discussed about ideology, mainly the superstructure, which dominant classes use to secure consent for their power (i.e. for domination) from the dominated. They examined why the working class, the proletariat, failed to transform the repressive social formation as Marx predicted. In doing so, they examined how undesirable social consciousness was created and cultured. They asserted that new technologies allowed dominant classes in the twentieth century to reproduce and disseminate their ideology and exercise their power. They asserted that the dominant classes used technological productions such as media, movies and music for mass dissemination. These theorists do not, like Marxists, merely cling to class and economic formation to see social consciousness. They, rather, concentrate on the superstructure that the dominant classes use to disseminate their ideology and exercise their domination.

Walter Benjamin (1968 [1936]) asserted that new technologies and media brought new chance for mass dissemination. And this gave also a new chance for dominant classes to reproduce their ideology and exercise their domination over others. Similarly, Horkheimer and Adorno (2002) described “cultural products”, that is, an ensemble of different media and films played role in transmitting ideological representations to the masses. According to these social theorists, the dominant classes used such technological changes and media to disseminate superficial democratization and false equality regardless of the economic difference and exploitation over the mass. Marcuse 1964 examined how mass deception in the “industrial advanced societies”/ “technological society” was created for consumerism purpose. The dominant classes, using media, make people ignore their “true needs” and toil for the “false needs” that the capitalist construct. The working class, the proletariat, who, by the wage it gets, relatively fulfils its needs, the standard, that the capitalists constructed. As a result, the working class ignores its revolutionary movement to transform the social condition, as the early Marxists predicted. Stoddart (2007) summarizes what Frankfurt school social theorists emphasized as follows:

In general, the Frankfurt School theorists emphasize the cultural realm and the growth of scientific rationality as important sites of domination, where dominant classes exercise power through ideology. They provide a useful corrective to Marx’s focus on economic production as the primary site of power, oppression and resistance. However, these theories tend to attribute a degree of homogeneity to the cultural sphere that is debatable (Stoddart, 2007:200).

This shows that theorists in this school used cultural realm and scientific rationality where dominant classes use to disseminate their ideology that helps to secure their interest and exercise their power. Critical Theory studies dominant ideology in every epoch, regardless of the class and economic formation in societies. Early Marxists consider economic condition and class as determinant factors for the dominant ideology. Class for Critical Theorists, however, is not considered as a decisive factor; they simply evaluate the desirability of dominant ideology that is found pervasively in a society. They identify dominant social consciousness/ideology, examine how it is disseminated and examine its undesirable effect in a society. Critical Theory embraces, deepens and interconnects different perspectives, such as Marxist and Freudian perspectives and

dialectical methods, etc and focuses on particular culture/practice that can cause undesirable social consciousness. To do so, it considers the political, cultural and historical contexts to analyse social consciousness/ideology;

Critical theorists consider ideology (both desirable and undesirable ideologies) as the product of culture/ social mobilizing factors. The aim of critical theory is to examine essentially undesirable social consciousness and its causes critically. Critical theorists examine social consciousness to look for potentialities that can liberate society from undesirable consciousness, like social inequality, domination and exploitations. It examines the effect of culture and technology in creating undesirable consciousness that in turn creates or sustains certain dominations among social classes.

### **Poststructuralists' View of Ideology: Foucault's View on Discourse, Power, and Knowledge**

Michel Foucault (2003[1976]) indicated that man's consciousness is the result of power/social relations and discourses. Poststructuralists and post-Marxists, in general, assert that discourses created in different webs of power/social relations are the bases of our knowledge, social consciousness (ideology). As stated in Mark C.J. Stoddart (2007), both these social theorists rejected the early notion of economic and class structure as the determinant factor of ideology. They, instead, posit the concept of discourse, as alternative to the early Marxist notion of ideology.

Foucault (ibid) considers discourse as system of thought and knowledge. He indicated that there can be different discourses, like for example, Marxist discourse, medical discourse, academic discourse and other scientific discourses (that employ some kind of methodological and technical approaches) and none-scientific discourses etc that are produced in multiple social relations. Foucault (2000[1994] and 2003[1976]) declines early Marxists' notion that considers economic and social structure as the main determinant factors of ideology and social consciousness. Foucault (ibid.), instead, considers discourses and power (power as relationship of forces in different social level) as the determinant factor of social consciousness. He contends knowledge/ social consciousness, "human subject, the subject of knowledge and forms of knowledge," (Ibid. 2) cannot be predetermined definitely by economic and socio-political conditions of existence.

He contends, however, that knowledge/truth is created out of social relations and social practices i.e., out of discourse in different social relations and practices. While Early Marxist claim that ideology as fake and deceiving that certain class use to perpetuate their power; and hence, they consider power as oppressive instrument. Foucault, however, focuses his assertion on how truth/knowledge is created out of certain social relations. Foucault (2000[1994]) argues that knowledge is not something nature endows as a gift. He, instead, asserts that we can get knowledge from discourses in different power/social relations: “Knowledge is simply the outcome of the interplay, the encounter, the junction, the struggle and the compromise between the instincts. Something is produced because the instinct meet, fight one another, and at the end of their battles finally reach a compromise. That something is knowledge” (Foucault: 2000[1994]: 8).

Social theorists, like the early Marxists, consider power is something that dominant classes/states use to perpetuate their economic manipulation and domination; they consider only those who have economic superiority have power. In contrast, Foucault considers power as a relationship of different forces in a society and he asserts, “Power is not primarily the perpetuation and renewal of economic relations, but that it is primarily, in itself, a relationship of force,” Foucault (2003[1976]: 15). He asserts also that power is not something that people control as commodity but it is something that people exercise: “power is not something that is given, exchanged, or taken back, that it is something that is exercised and that it exists only in action,” Foucault (2003[1976]: 15). Therefore, power is something that every person can exercise; it is not only those who have economic power can influence others. Foucault asserts that truth, knowldage (and discourse, in general) that comes out of certain social relations can be contested. Therefore, there is no eternal truth (knowledge). He notes also that every power can be challenged; and he says, “Where there is power, there is always resistance, and the two things are coextensive,” Foucault (2003[1976]: 280).

## **Ethiopian Literature in English**

Before we move to the history of Ethiopian literature in English, it is worth highlighting the history of writing in Ethiopia in general. Writing practice in Ethiopia goes back to the fourth

century A.D. Albert S. Gerard (1971:273) writes, “Epigraphic evidence demonstrates that indigenous alphabet of Semitic origin was in Axum as early as the fourth century A.D. Literary activities seem to have begun in the following century.” This helped Ethiopia to develop its own writing practices with its own indigenous alphabets that several languages of the country use.

Gerard (ibid) further states that writing activities in Ethiopia began by translating the Bible, some of the apocrypha and several theological treatises from Greek to Geez. Geez was a language of the century when these translations were done; the indigenous alphabets are also in Geez language. Gradually, Geez, which is reduced to a liturgical language these days, gave way to other Ethiopian languages. As a result, writing in other Ethiopian languages, like Amharic, began by adapting Geez alphabets.

The early sixties are marked as another phenomenon in the history of creative writing of the country: the emergence of creative writing in English. Gerard (ibid) regards a three verse play entitled *The Savage Girl* (1964) by Abbe Gubegna as the first creative writing in English. In fact, Abbe Gubegna is also known for his creative writings in Amharic language. Ashenafi Kebede who is known for his musical activities also appeared with a novel entitled *Confession* in English language in 1965.

Tsegaye Geberemedhin also is another Ethiopian writer who produced different literary works in English. Gerard (ibid) regards Tsegaye as the only Ethiopian writer who used English as his major literary medium. He started writing plays in Amharic. He also adapted and directed foreign plays, like plays by Shakespeare: *Othello*, *Macbeth* and *Hamlet*. He also wrote poetry in English. His first play in English was *Tewodros*. He also produced other plays like *Blood Harvest Azmari* and *The Oda Oak Oracle* in English.

Following the aforementioned pioneer creative writers, different Ethiopian writers produced numerous creative works in English. Among them are Abbe Gubegna’s *The Defiance*, Daniachew Worku’s *The Thirteenth Sun*, Sahle Silassie’s four novels (*Shinega’s Village*, *Afersta*, *Firebrands* and *The Warrior King*) etc. These writers are also known for their literary productions in their vernacular. Similarly, Ethiopian writers, mainly young adult writers, have produced different literary works in English by the help of Burt Award these days.

We read in Beer (1975) that Ethiopian literature in English includes novels (both originally written in English and translations from Ethiopian languages), short stories, plays, poetry, chronicles (translated from Geez) and oral literature. However, Ethiopian literary texts in English are limited in number as compared to other African contemporary literatures in English. Debebe (1980) writes two reasons for this. The first is that Ethiopian writers have strong literary background in their indigenous languages (i.e., Amharic, Tigrigna, and other languages) and this “disallows the writers to resort to or at least, give undivided attention to writing in English” (Debeb 1980:3). The second reason that Debebe gives is that English language had not been given much emphasis in the country until it was included in the Ethiopian curriculum in the late fifties.

Different factors, however, contributed later for Ethiopian writers to produce literature in English. One is the educational practice of the country. As stated in Beer (ibid), English language became the accepted second language of the country. Hence, English language has been given as a subject/course in different school levels. Moreover, English had been a medium of instruction beginning from the junior secondary school up to the university level. These factors might have had their own contributions to the production of literature in English.

Another factor that might have helped the aforementioned pioneer writers to produce literature in English is their exposure to foreign universities and literary traditions in English. We can understand from Molveare’s literary biography of Ethiopian writers (*Black Lions*, 1997), and Sahle Silassie’s autobiography *Finote Hiwot* (2008) that these pioneer writers got exposure to foreign universities and literary tradition. Such exposure might have helped Ethiopian writers to have mastery of the language and produce literature in English. Their writing experiences in their vernacular might also have helped greatly these pioneer writers to produce literature in English.

## **1.2 Statement of the Problem**

Literary theorists and critics, like George Lukacs (1964), Terry Eagleton (1975, 1976), and Emmanuel Ngara (1985) stated that novels can reflect ideologies of an epoch. Analysis of ideology in literature, as it is analysis of both content and form, can help us to better understand a given literature. It helps us to understand the general ideologies, the author and literary aesthetics. As to why we study ideology, Eagleton (1976: iii) asserts, “To understand an ideology is to understand the past and present more deeply; and such understanding contributes to our

liberation.” We study ideology and its nature, then, to understand our experiences both in the past and present and thereby make our future better.

Ethiopia, which has a long history in the world, has experienced many social phenomena\_\_ civilization, civil war and war against aggressors, and other social transformations (like the revolutions that caused the over throw of the monarchy and the military rule)\_\_ in its history. It is obvious that ideology played great role for those social transformations to happen. It is from this point of view that this study intends to explore ideologies as reflected in the Ethiopian novels in English. However, as to the knowledge of the present researcher a comprehensive analysis of ideologies that, as Terry Eagleton (1975, 1976) and Emmanuel Ngara (1985) stated, includes the inter-determinant factors of the ideology, the writer and the aesthetics he/she employed to project the contradicting ideologies of an epoch in Ethiopian novels in English have not been explored so far. In general, a comprehensive analysis of ideology that comprises of general ideologies (GI), the authorial ideology (AUI) and aesthetic ideology (AI) in Ethiopian novels in English have not been done so far. It is to fill this gap that the present study has been initiated. A comprehensive analysis of ideology that include the inter-determinant factors- such as the general ideologies, the authorial, and aesthetic ideologies- can help us to better understand a given literature.

As stated in section 2.1 of the present study, there are some researches done in some Ethiopian novels in English. Debebe (1980) in his unpublished MA paper analyzes themes and the different symbols used in *The Thirteenth Sun*. Taye (1994) analyzed imageries in same novel in relation to their thematic signification. Tadesse (1996), in his analysis of *Ideology in Sahle Selassie's Firebrands* draws the similarity between character and characterization in *Firebrands* and Ayi Kwei Armah's *The Beautiful Ones Are Not Yet Born*. He also compares the themes that center the corruption and injustices in both novels. All these studies, however, did not explore ideologies and their reproductions, the authorial ideologies and aesthetic ideologies. As Pierre Macherey states, analysis of ideology goes beyond what is given in a literary text though we rely on it: “it is in the significant silence of a text, in its gaps and absences, that the presence of ideology can be most positively felt, it is this silences which the critic must make ‘speak’” (Macherey cited in Eagleton, 1976:32).

Thus, the present study differs from the preceding researches on Ethiopian novels in English as described here. The present study, analyzes the general, and the authorial and aesthetic ideologies of each of the novels selected for this purpose. It analyzes the general ideologies that reflect power and power relations, domination, social struggle and group and/or class interest. It analyzes the general ideologies reflected in the novels in relation to Marxist Literary perspectives. Hence, the contradicting ideologies and their reproductions (discourse) in different power relations, Ideological State Apparatus (ISA), coercion and Repressive State Apparatus (RSA), and their effects, etc., which previous researchers who did their research on Ethiopian novels in English could not see in their analysis are part of the present study. Moreover, as aforementioned, this study includes the authorial, and the aesthetics ideologies which other researchers did not explore in line with the general ideologies in the novels are parts of this study.

### **1.3 Objectives of the Study**

#### **1.3.1 General Objective**

The general objective of this study is to explore and analyse the ideologies and ideological reproductions/discourses reflected in four Ethiopian novels in English.

#### **1.3.2 Specific Objectives**

The specific objectives of the study have been listed below:

1. To examine the general ideologies (political and other predominantly reflected ideologies) – ideologies that reflect social power in the novels have been emphasised.
2. To explore the reproduction of general ideologies in different social relations institutions, ideological state apparatuses (ISAs), and repressive state apparatuses (RSAs) and social movements in relation to social power.
3. To examine the discourses of different social forces and their role in creating social consciousness, perpetuating and/or resisting certain social power as reflected in the novels selected.
4. To investigate authorial and aesthetic ideologies of the novels- this includes investigating the biographical insertion of the writer into his/her work and his/her position in the conflicting ideologies. Attempt has also been made to investigate the internal formations of the texts selected. For this purpose, the dominant literary aspects

reflected in the novels selected have been investigated in relation to the general ideologies and discourses reflected.

#### **1.4 Significance of the Study**

This study has examined the ideologies and their reproduction (discourses) that existed in an epoch, the writer's ideology and the aesthetics that he/she used to reflect these ideologies. Generally, students of social sciences and humanities who want to carry out their research on ideology and ideological discourses can use this study as a reference material. To be more specific, students of literature can use this study as reference material in their literature learning and research. It will give them highlights about what ideology is and how ideological discourses take place. They can also learn about the content and form of some the Ethiopian literature in English. This study in general can allow student in literature to learn about the ideologies (the general, the authorial and the aesthetic ideologies) that the selected novels in the present study flesh out. Furthermore, this study will contribute to other social science students who do their studies on ideology related issues to learn about the ideologies and ideological reproductions (discourses) existed in an epoch of each novel selected for the present study.

#### **1.5 Research Methodology**

Analysis of ideology in literature is both analysis of content and form. It includes analysis of general ideology- the ideas/social consciousness and its reproduction- the authorial and aesthetic ideologies (the aesthetic form that a writer employed to inscribe the general ideologies). This study has explored the conflicting ideologies and their reproduction/discourse in the novels selected for this study. Qualitative literary analysis has been used to explore ideologies and the ideological discourses in an epoch in the novels. In this paper, ideologies that are predominantly reflected in the novels are emphasised. In other words, this paper does not address every social signified meaning in the novels selected; but it focuses on the major ideologies that the present writer considers as the manifestation of the novels.

As indicated in Ngara (1985), analysis of ideology in literature considers the dominant or competing ideologies of a society at a particular point in history, the ideological stance of a writer and the form, which Marxist aesthetics considers as a subordinate to content. Hence, ideologies which have relations to society, social power, social movement and struggle, and means of ideological reproduction have been emphasised in exploring the general ideologies and

ideological reproduction (discourse) based on different views of ideology, like views of ideology by early Marxists (Marx and Engels), Althusser's (1969), Gramsci's, (1971), Eagleton (1990), van Dijk (1998) and Michel Foucault's (2000 [1994]) to explore ideologies in the selected novels. Moreover, George Lukacs' (1964) views of realism and democratic revolutionary criticism and Eagleton (1976) and Ngara's (1985) view of Marxist/materialist literary approach have been used to explore mainly the general, the authorial and aesthetic ideologies in the novels.

Four novels have been taken for this study. The novels are: Dagnachew Worku's *The Thirteenth Sun*, Sahlessilassie Birhanemariam's *Firebrands* Nega Mezlekia's *The God who Begat the Jackal* and Maaza Mengiste's *Beneath the Lion's Gaze*. Availability of the novels was considered while selecting novels. As indicated in section 1.1 of this paper, Ethiopia owns its own indigenous alphabets that enabled Ethiopian writers to produce literature in their own language. For this reason, Ethiopian literature in English language (including in other foreign languages, in fact) are limited in number as compared to literature produced in Ethiopian languages. The present writer, as he joined department of Foreign Languages and Literature in Addis Ababa University for his PhD study, concentrates on analysis of ideology only on selected Ethiopian novels in English Language. This is to remind readers of this paper that Ethiopian writers are not limited to the ideologies analyzed on this paper for they produce numbers of literary works in their own local languages. Moreover, the novels selected are considered as literary canons in English. Their availability also is another criteria used for the selection of these novels.

## CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF PRVIOUS STUDIES ON THE NOVELS SELECTED AND IDEOLOGY

Albert S. Gerard (1971) in his study *Four African Literatures: Xhosa, Sotho, Zulu, Amharic*, included the period when Ethiopian literature in English emerged and gave a short summary of these literatures. One of these literary texts is *The Thirteenth Sun* which has been selected for the present study. Paul E. Huntsberger (1973) also, in his study *Highland Mosaic: Anthology of Ethiopian Literature in English*, presented in international studies, gave a nine lines long summary of thematic analysis of the novel mentioned. David F. Beer (1975) also included this novel in his study *Ethiopian Literature and Literary Criticism in English: An Annotated Bibliography*, a study whose main task was listing Ethiopian literature in English based on their genres.

Debebe Saifu (1980) in his unpublished MA thesis, “Ethiopian Literature in English”, carried out a thematic analysis on *The Thirteenth Sun* and concentrates on how Daniachew depicted the miseries that Ethiopia experienced in the last period of feudal social system. He writes that “the novelist depicts with remarkable gusto and verve the miseries and corruption that were prevalent in feudo-bourgeois Ethiopia” (Debebe, 1994: 609). He presents the themes of the novel in line with the role of the major characters and description of the scenes in the novel. As he indicated in his background of the study, though he employed theme analysis, it was inevitable for him to include the way how Daniachew depicted the miseries and scenes existed in the particular historical period in the novel. Debebe argues that the novel’s richness in form (imagery and other language usage, like using short and poetic language) obscures the themes in general and the revolutionary content of the novel in particular. He argues that the form of the novel is a hindrance to the full understanding of the themes. However, Taye (1994) opposes Debebe’s such argument.

Taye (ibid) in his critical article entitled, *The Imagery of Decadence in The Thirteenth Sun*, concentrates more on the imagery that Daniachew used to depict the social situations on the eve of the revolution. He states that different social groups in the novel are depicted in association with non-human things which are in turn “directly or indirectly related to rot and corruption, degeneration and death” (Taye, 1994:739). He states that the peasants in the novel are described

in relation to dusty colour of old decaying wood, the peasant who raped Woynitu also is described as having deep eyes, black and dreadful like the ooze of sucking swamp...similarly the beggars are described in association with drawn and haggard faces..., just to mention few. Taye further writes that the peasant's rape of Woynitu implies that the future destiny of the country lies upon the peasantry. Finally Taye agrees with Debebe that the novel, *The Thirteenth Sun*, is rich both in content and form. However, Taye disagrees with Debebe's perception of the form of the novel and argues that no one is justified to claim that the form of *The Thirteenth Sun* is a hindrance to the full realization of the content so long as the form is used to carry the theme. In general, As Beer (1975) and Taye accentuated, the novel *The Thirteenth Sun* is "a remarkable book by any standard" and hence remains center of study; yet these researches did not explore the ideologies, reproduction of the ideologies (ideological discourses), the authorial and aesthetic ideologies as reflected in the novel.

Taye (2012), in his other research, concentrated how Nega Mezlekia used magical realist mode of writing in his novel, *The God Who Begat a Jackal* (2002). He expounded Nega's deployment of magical realist mode of writing, dividing realist mode of writings into two big categories: *naturalization of the marvellous* and *defamiliarization of the ordinary*. Taye used the word *marvellous* which was coined by a Cuban novelist and critic Alejo Carpentier, having equivalent meaning with *magical*.

Under the theme *naturalization of the marvellous*, Taye explicated that Nega borrowed the two religious myths- myths of *Mawu-Liza* and *Amma* from West Africa: He writes, "the writer [Nega] borrowed [myths of *Mawu-Liza* and *Amma*] from West Africa coastline communities, namely, the Fon people of Dahomey and the Dogon in the present day Mali" (Taye, 2012: 69). While *Mawu-Liza* is the faith that legitimates the power interest of ruling class, *Amma*, homegrown and egalitarian faith, is considered as a faith of the lowlanders, who live in the fictional places *Kersa* and *Deder*. The *Amma* believers believe that *Amma* has the shape of an egg which comprises fire, air, earth and water. The first offspring of *Amma* from reunion with Earth is a jackal, who is considered as a rebellious and disobedient. *Amma* got another twins, both half-human and half-snake in its second union with Earth and the believers believe that descendants of these twins filled the earth.

Taye (ibid.) asserts that the thematic significance of the title of the novel, *The God that Begat a Jackal*, lies in the egalitarian nature of the Amma faith and the struggle done by serfs, slaves and nomads against the establishment of feudal class values. Taye further states that the writer used the myth Mawu-Liza and its practice to allegorically represent the Christianity and its practices that legitimated the power interest of Ethiopian imperial rulers. Moreover, he indicated that the writer used the different religious conflicts among the different religious groups to reflect the religious conflicts in the country.

The other theme of the *naturalization of the marvellous* that Taye (ibid) explored from the novel is *superstition as the marvellous* and *characters with extraordinary attributes*. He explored the superstition in the novel as follows:

dogs or dogs crossing travellers' paths; offerings, and sacrifices, to appease or solicit the aid of spirits; vulnerability of new born babies to attacks by spirits, or evil eyes; the attack of travellers by dust devils; and the use of 'markesha' or anti-dote to break an evil spell; or the burial of fetish in the compound of an adversary to cast a spell on him; or the use of an amulet to protect oneself against an evil spirit. Unlike the Mawu-Liza and Amma myths borrowed from West Africa, these superstitions are indigenous and form part of the Ethiopian local colour of the novel (Taye, 2012: p. 71).

The writer portrays the intrusion of spirits to different human characters and activities. There are also elements, the *markesha* and other fetish that people use to avoid evil spirits from people. We see the spirits have the power to transform skin colour of persons, like the colour of Aster, the main character. There are also characters, like the diviner who spell words to avoid evil spirits.

Finally, Taye (ibid) demonstrated aspects of intertextuality in Nega's novel, *The God who Begat a Jackal*. He notes that this novel has the influence of Haddis Alemayehu's *Fiqir Iske Meqabir* and Gabriel Garcia Marquez's *One Hundred Years of Solitude*. He reflected that Nega intertextualizes socio-cultural affairs, the love between two couple from different classes in feudal class system, from Haddis's novel and magical realist mode of writing from Gabriel Garcia Marquez. The novel, however, has more ideology and ideological discourses other than the love affair that Taye concentrated.

As it is seen in his analyses of both novels, Taye concentrates mainly in exploring specific literary form of each novel (we can see the titles of his articles: "The Imagery of Decadence in *The Thirteenth Sun*" and "Magical Realism in *The God who Begat a Jackal*"). He analysed the

imagery used in *The Thirteenth Sun*. He also analysed reflections of magical realism in Nega's novel, *The God who Begat the Jackal*. Hence, the present paper differs from Taye's study in that the present paper focuses on the analysis of content, mainly the general ideology (GI) authorial ideology (AuI) and the forms stated under the category of aesthetic ideology (AI).

Tadesse Adera (1996) in his article, "Ideology in Sahle Selassie's *Firebrands*", compares the novel with Ayi Kwei Armah's novel, *The Beautiful Ones Are Not Yet Born*. He draws the similarity of characters and characterizations in both the novels. He relates, for example, "Bezuneh" in *Firebrands* with "The Man" in *The Beautiful Ones Are Not Yet Born*. Similarly he relates Dr. Mandefrot in *Firebrands* with "the teacher"; Kofi, Billy, Manna and their friends in *The Beautiful Ones Are Not Yet Born* with Worku, Tokari, and students' movement in *Firebrands*. In addition to the characterization, he concentrates on themes which centres on corruption, injustice made against a character in the novel and the fight against them. However, Tadesse did not see ideology in relation to exercise of power, mainly political power and power relations and the response from the people/students governed. The two countries (Ethiopia and Ghana) being compared in Tadesse's analysis were under total different social order, different power relations and different mode of productions and hence they practiced different ideology and ideological discourses as reflected in the novels. It is to fill this gap that the novel, *Firebrands*, is included in the current study to examine the ideologies and their reproductions (the ideological discourse) and authorial and aesthetic ideology as a whole.

Fisseha (2009), in his unpublished PhD dissertation, assessed postcolonial ideology in four East African Anglophone novels based on colonial and post-colonial experiences. For this purpose, he selected novels from East African Anglophone countries\_\_ Kenya, Uganda and Somalia. Those novels are Ngugi's novel *Petals of Blood*, Mwangi's *Kill Me Quick*, Serumaga's *Return to the Shadows* and Farah's *First Trilogy*. He concentrated on analyzing post-colonial ideologies as reflected in the novels mentioned; he explored the dominant ideologies and forms of dominations by the European colonizers over the African people. The Ethiopian novels selected for the present study project different ideologies and ideological discourses because of the different socio-historical factors in the country, Ethiopia, than those of the Anglophone novels that Fisseha (ibid) selected for his study.

In general, the present study differs from the preceding researches on Ethiopian Novels in English in that it, the present study, concentrates on analysis of general/contradicting ideologies and ideological discourses, authorial and aesthetic ideologies; hence it analyzes both content and form based on mainly Marxist literary perspectives.

## **CHAPTER THREE: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY**

### **3.1 Ideology and Marxist Aesthetics**

We can understand from Ngara (1985) that analysis of ideology in literature includes analysis of dominant ideology, or competing ideologies of a society who lived at a particular point in history and the ideological stance of a writer. This can take us to explore how society in general and ideologies and reproduction of ideologies are represented in literature. Ngara (1985: iii) notes, “Marxists aesthetics offers more profound of the relation between ideology and literature than any other aesthetics in vague today”. The present writer agrees with Ngara that we approach works of Marxist literary theorists like the works by George Lukacs (1964), Terry Eagleton (1975, 1976), Raymond Williams (1977) and Ngara (1985) to explore ideologies in literature because we get better and coherent approaches that can help us to explore ideologies in literature.

Lukacs (1964) explains the critical advantages of Marxism, as in: “Marxism searches for the material roots of each phenomenon, regards them in their historical connections and movement, ascertains the laws of such movement and demonstrates their development from root to flower, and in so doing lifts every phenomenon out of a merely emotional, irrational, mystic fog and brings it to the bright light of understanding” (Lukacs 1964: 1). He further notes that Marxism examines the main lines of human development and recognizes its laws. We also read in Eagleton (1976) that Marxism is a scientific study of human sciences and the practices of transforming them; Marxism studies the struggle that men and women do to free themselves from certain forms of exploitation and oppression. Both Lukacs and Eagleton affirm the connection of Marxism to literary aesthetics. Lukacs writes that the material cause of history can be confirmed in literary aesthetics:

It is not by chance that the great Marxists were jealous guardians of our classical heritage in their aesthetics as well as in other spheres...Respect for the classical heritage of humanity in aesthetics means that the great Marxists look for the true highroad of history, the true direction of its development, the true course of the historical curve, the formula of which they know (Lukacs, 1964: 4-5).

Eagleton on his part asserts that Marxist Literary Criticism analyzes literature in terms of the historical condition that produced it. He states how literature projects Marxist philosophy; and then he adds that Marxist literary criticism focuses on understanding of ideologies of an epoch:

Marxist criticism is part of a larger body of theoretical analysis which aims to understand ideologies—the ideas, values, and feelings by which men experience their societies at various times. And certain of those ideas, values and meanings are available to us only in literature. To understand ideologies is to understand both the past and the present more deeply; and such understanding contributes to our liberation. (Eagleton, 1976 xii).

As we can understand from the extract, Marxist literary criticism is an approach that studies ideology in literature. It studies ideology that a society experienced in an epoch. Eagleton, as stated in the extract, noted that we can get ideology of an epoch in literature. He also included that the reason as to why we study ideology: we study ideology from literature to learn from the past and the present to liberate ourselves.

A historical study of literature began by many thinkers before Marxism. One of those thinkers is the idealist philosopher Hegel who studied literature in terms of the historical account which produced them. Eagleton writes, “Hegel has a profound influence on Marx’s own aesthetic thought. The originality of Marxism, then lies not in its historical approach to literature, but in its revolutionary understanding of history itself” (Eagleton, 1976:3). Marxist criticism then studies literature in terms of the organization of the society, class and conflict, power and power relation and ideological discourses of the historical event that shaped a particular creative writing. What makes Marxist literary criticism different from previous criticisms that focused on historical approach to literature is that Marxist literary criticism emphasizes on understanding of history in its revolutionary aspect.

Marxism involves divergent critical approaches and literary theories and the reason for this is explained by Forgas, as in: “Marxism is a living body of thought and a set of real political practices. It is both influenced by changes in the world and aims to intervene to change the world” (1982). However, there is a premise that all Marxist literary theorists share in common: literature should be studied in relation to society and history.

It follows from the above stated literary theoretical-critical principle that Marxist aesthetics opposes formalist approaches art and literature. Ngara (1985) considers Yergeny Base's (1979) idea to reflect as to how the literary critics (both Marxist and non-Marxist critics) who focus on reflections of social conditions in literature and art, in general, criticize formalist approaches to literature. Ngara summarizes the following four points from what Base rises in his strong criticism against the formalists:

Firstly, it [formalism] reduces scientific information to information received by means of exact, quantitative methods; secondly, it absolutizes the role of scientific theories; thirdly, it declares the scientific attitude to be the only legitimate attitude to the world; and fourthly, it illuminates philosophy from the components of man's world view and metaphysical problems from scientific issues (Base, 1979, as cited in Ngara, 1985:2-3).

Base, though he is non-Marxist critic, accuses formalist approach to literature for ignoring the content of literature, which is a similar criticism that Marxists have against the Formalists. Similarly, he criticizes New Criticism of North America for divorcing itself from content and considering art as "autonomous, closed structure, unconnected to the real world around it" (Base *ibid.* as cited in Ngara 1985: 3). Base, in general, argues that critical analysis of art should consider the fact that communication has social and historical dimensions. Ngara (*ibid.*) summarizes that while the formalist literary criticism subordinates content to form, the Marxist literary criticism subordinates form to content.

### **3.1.1 Literature and Ideology**

Pierre Macherey (1966) writes that ideology is a raw material for a writer. He notes that we, as readers, encounter ideology in literary productions as the writer encountered it in his/her life. In explaining how the writer gives form for the ideology he gets in his life, Macherey writes, "It would be said that the work has an ideological content, but it endows this content with specific form," (Macherey 1966: 133). As cited in Eagleton (1976), Goldman (1964) also asserts that literary works are not simply a creation of individual writers; rather, they are the embodiment of social world view.

Althusser (1966) states that real, authentic art (which he says is a work of not average or mediocre level) is not ideology but does have particular and specific relation with ideology. He writes that art conveys ideology in the form of *seeing, perceiving and feeling* (*ibid.* p. 222). He

further asserts that art and science convey same object (lived experience (ideology/knowledge) in quite different ways, and he writes, “The real difference between art and science lies in the specific form in which they give us the same object in quite different ways: art in the form of 'seeing' and 'perceiving' or 'feeling', science in the form of knowledge (in the strict sense, by concepts” (Althusser, 1966: 223). While science informs us (makes us know) about the lived experience/the truth/knowledge, art makes us see and perceive or feel ideology that the art disguises. This means the different theories that we read in the works of Marx, Althusser, Gramsci, etc., are scientific analysis of ideology that a certain society experiences. However, the writer of a novel (what Althusser calls the real art) does not tell us the ideology directly; rather, he makes us sense the ideology in a certain society by ourselves, from the writer’s work. Hence, the writer distances him/herself from the work by letting us see, perceive and feel the ideology that existed in a society and is reflected in his/her literary production. Eagleton (1975) asserts that it is the role of literary critics to translate the ideology that we were made to see into scientific knowledge. Eagleton (ibid) writes the following concerning history, and ideology in literature and the role of literary critics:

History, then, certainly ‘enters’ the text, not only least the ‘historical’ text: but it enters it precisely as **ideology**, as a presence determined and distorted by its measurable absences. This is not to say that real history is present in the text but in disguised form, so that the task of the critic is then to wrench the mask from its face (Eagleton 1975:72).

As we can understand in the extract, history of an epoch is represented by its ideologies in literature. This means literature conveys ideology of an epoch in a disguised form of history. The task of literary critics, as indicated in the extract, is to unmask the ideology from the pseudo-history. Ngara (1985) notes that literature enables us to see ideology of particular historical period because it is a socially conditioned material, and he writes, “thought they [literary texts] have an autonomous existence and are produced by individuals who may hold divergent views about life, they have a more or less direct relationship with historical development” (Ngara, 1985: 21). Ngara further notes that we can consider ideologies or conflicting ideologies of a society that existed at a particular period of history and the ideological stance of the writer in his/her literary text.

### **3.1.2 Literature and Dominant Ideology of an Epoch**

If literature is a socially and historically conditioned material because according to Ngara (1985) stated it enables us to see the nature of the ideology of an epoch. The question then is “what kind of relation does literature have with the dominant ideology of an epoch?” As to Ngara (1985:108), dominant ideology is “beliefs, assumptions and set of values that inform the thoughts and actions of a people in a particular historical moment”. Dominant ideology can also be the prevailing ideology of dominant classes that control both the means of production and intellectual life. Class here can include the different classes such as the classes between man and woman, the ruling and the ruled, etc. On the other hand, Eagleton (1976) implicated that there are two extreme, opposite ideas concerning the relation that literature has with the dominant ideology. The first is the idea by the ‘Vulgar Marxists’ who claim that works of literature are mere reflections of dominant ideologies of their time. They claim that works of literature are prisoners of false consciousness, unable to reach beyond it (the false consciousness) to arrive at the truth. The opposite group contend that literature challenges ideological assumptions, ideological limits, of its time, yielding us insight into the realities which ideology hides from sight” (Eagleton, 1976: 16).

Likewise, concerning the different relationships that literature has with dominant ideologies, Ngara (1985:21) writes, “relations between literature and the dominant ideology are sometimes harmonious, sometimes in conflict with each other”. Ngara further explains that in traditional communities, art served to the common interest (preoccupations, beliefs, assumptions and struggles) of whole society. Hence, arts like folktales and praise poems which are the creations of the community, not individuals, serve communities as a whole. Folktales are used to sustain socially accepted values, goodness, virtue and bravery. Praise poems also are used to accomplish activities like threshing, dancing, funeral services and religious ceremonies. In advanced societies where states, nations and class structures were created art that associated itself with ruling classes who controlled both the economic base and the intellectual life began to emerge. Songs that praise kings, emperors, and slave owners began to emerge. Ngara (ibid) indicated that arts that favoured ruling classes were seen in Africa, Europe and other places. He used ancient Egyptian poetry songs that praise the dynasties and the Pharaohs and *Sundiata*, a West African

epic that praises the ancient empire in Mali in his explanation about the emergence of arts that favour people in power.

Similarly, Ngara (ibid) stated that art in medieval Europe and Elizabethan period in Europe was in harmony with the dominant ideology that the Catholic Church and clergies, an elite of the period, an elite that was in alliance with the ruling class, constituted. He notes that art and language (i.e. Latin) during this period in Europe served to sustain the power of the ruling class until the church was challenged by Protestantism which came with emphasis on nationalism and national language. Ngara (ibid) writes the following concerning Shakespeare's works and their relation with dominant ideology of the Elizabethan period:

The great Elizabethan dramatist, William Shakespeare, produced works that were capable of appealing to all social classes in different ages and different lands. However, Shakespeare was a child of his time, influenced by the prevailing ideology of his epoch, an epoch that held dear notions well-ordered and stratified social system as well as the doctrine of the divine right of kings. History plays, tragedies and Roman plays were about events which took place in times previous to Elizabethan England, but they were designed to illustrate the accepted dogmas of Shakespeare's own age. The doctrine of the divine right of kings held that a subject should not rise against his ruler. To do so was to disturb the natural and divinely-instituted order and could only result in chaos. (Ngara, 1985: 23)

As we read in the above quotation, some literary works have the tendency to serve the interest of the ruling class of their epoch. Though they are appealing to all sections of the society, Shakespeare's plays were loyal to the dominant ideology of his time. Ngara further maintains that early English novels emerged, as a new artistic form, having new content that served the interest of bourgeoisie, a new and middle class, characterised by its spirit of adventure, individualism, and acquisition and accumulation of wealth, conquest of foreign lands, acquisition of raw materials, promotion of trade and industry. Since drama, which was the dominant form in the Medieval and Renaissance period, could not embody such social content, novel, as new genre, came into being to reflect the new ideology and the new economic system that came following the fall of feudalism. As Shakespeare's plays used generally members of the ruling aristocratic class – kings and princes- as heroes, novels used member of the middle class as their typical heroes when they, the novels, came into being as a new genre.

Ngara (ibid) points out that by the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century a new relationship of novels and dominant ideology began to emerge: novels that contradict the dominant ideology began to emerge. Tolstoy, regardless of his class position, produced literary works that question and expose the problems of the dominant ideology, the ideology of the Russian ruling feudal class, known as Tsarist Russia. AS Ngara (ibid) elaborates, peasants in Russia were revolting against feudal lords, new ideologies such as nihilism that questions the dominant ideology in the country were emerging and the country in general was beginning to see some social and economic changes (urbanization and industrialization) during the time when Tolstoy produced his literary works. In general, a new literary form i.e. realist works, like works by Tolstoy, Charles Dickens, and Bronte, that incorporated new social consciousness that was hostile to the dominant ideology of their time, hostile to the feudal class ideology and bourgeois capitalism, began to emerge. Partisan literary works, like Maxim Gorky's novel *Mother* which was destined to reflect proletariat struggle against the feudal ruling class and shape the new social psychology in his country, Russia, appeared. According to Ngara (ibid. p.24), "Gorky's works present a complete break between literature and the [dominant ideology] ideology of the ruling classes". This shows literature, mainly open partisan literature, can stand against the dominant ideology of its time.

The maximum level that literature confronts the prevailing ideologies is by creating social consciousness that enables people to have certain disillusionment about certain reality. In the words of Eagleton (1976:9), "The materialist theory of history denies that art can in itself change the course of history; but it insists that art can be an active element in such change". Therefore, literature can challenge the dominant ideology, in addition to its role in reflecting the ideology of an epoch. Three things, in general, are possible in relation to the relationship between literature and the dominant ideology: literature can remain neutral by only reflecting the ideology of its time, support or oppose the dominant ideology of an epoch.

### **3.1.3 Content and Form in Marxist Criticism**

Literary critics debated about what literature and literary criticism should include: whether it should include form or content or both. As we can read in Trotsky (2005 [1925]), Eagleton (1976) and Ngara (1985), content in Marxist aesthetics is the social reality while form is the way how these ideologies are reflected in literature. Formalism, which, according to Leo Trotsky (2005 [1925]), was "the first scientific school of art", focused on analysis of form in literature.

According to Eagleton (ibid), “Marxist criticism has traditionally opposed all kinds of literary formalism, attacking that inbred attention to sheerly technical properties which robs literature of historical significance and reduces it to an aesthetic game,” (Eagleton, 1976: 19). He explains further that Marxist literary criticism, at first, paid scant attention to artistic form, giving attention to political content, i.e., the ideologies reflected in literature. Both Eagleton and Ngara (ibid) supported this with evidences from Marxist literary analysis by the Russian revolutionary democratic critics and Lenin who wrote literary analysis entitled *Leo Tolstoy as the Mirror of the Russian Revolution*. Trotsky (2005 [1925]), George Lukacs (1964)), Eagleton (1976), George Lukacs (1964) indicated that early Marxist literary critics, like the Russian revolutionary democratic critics and Lenin concentrated on the social content of the novel and ignored the aesthetic form of the texts. Eagleton writes, “These men [Russian revolutionary democratic critics: Belinsky, Chernyshevsky and Dobrolyubov] considered literature as social criticism, and analysis, and the artist as social enlightener; and literature should disdain elaborate aesthetic techniques and become an instrument of social development” (Eagleton, 1976: 40). These critics demanded writers to emphasize reflections of social content in their literary writings. Considering this, Plekhanov (1953) criticized Chernyshevsky, one of the Russian revolutionary democratic critics, for his propagandist demand of art and opposed open-partisanship in art in general. Plekhanov distinguished between the social function and the aesthetic effect of literature and claimed that art should reflect the harmony of social facts and artistic quality though he did not deny that art that gives emphasis to history rather than immediate pleasure is more valuable. He notes that art has its own characteristics and claimed that a writer should translate social fact into literary ones. He then asserts that it is the literary critic’s task to decode the social facts from literary works back into reality.

Later Marxist literary critics, such as Eagleton (1976) and Ngara (1985), combined both content and form in their Marxist literary criticism and analysis of ideology in literature. As stated in section 3.1.8 of the present paper, Eagleton (1975) and Ngara (1985) accentuated that analysis of ideology in literature can include all the determinant factors: general mode of production (GMP), literary mode of production (LMP), general ideology (GI) and aesthetic ideology (AI). Moreover, Ngara (ibid) states that Marxist literary criticism subordinates form to content. In fact, later Marxists, like Ngara (ibid), criticized early Marxist literary critics for ignoring form in literature and focusing only on content of a given work of art. Ngara writes:

If it is a combination of the ‘what’ and the ‘how’ that makes great art, then the how should receive due attention in any theory of criticism that has a claim to comprehensiveness and adequacy. It is a major criticism of Marxist criticism that it does not pay sufficient attention to the ‘how’ of particular works of art. This weakness has its source in Marxist-Leninist philosophy itself because of its emphasis on the primacy of the economic base over the superstructure and of labour over language.... in a work of art, content corresponds to the economic base and form to the superstructure (Ngara, 1985: 4-5).

We can understand from the extract that Ngara appreciates literature that reflects excellent harmony of content and form. We can understand also that early early Marxist literary critics gave more and primary emphasis to economic base over the superstructure. Negar indicated also how content and form is related to the base and superstructure: content corresponds to the economic base, while form corresponds to superstructure. Marxist critics assert that as the economic base determines the superstructure, content determines form as in the case of the emergence of novel in the eighteenth century. They assert also that like the superstructure, form can grow in itself. Leo Trotsky (2005 [1925]) noted that literary form has a high degree of autonomy; and hence, it evolves partly in accordance with its own internal pressures, and does not merely bend to every ideological wind that blows. Eagleton also reflects his view on this matter and writes, “Form, I would suggest, is always a complex unity of at least three elements: It is partly shaped, by a *relatively autonomous* literary history of forms; it crystallizes out of certain dominant ideological structures; and it embodies a specific set of relations between author and audience” (Eagleton, 1976:23). Concerning autonomy of the form and the relationship of the author in determining the form of his/her work, Eagleton elaborates as follows: An author can use and modify forms available; or else, he/she can use new forms based on the condition of audience as in the case of the emergence of the novel as a genre in eighteenth century. Eagleton used Walter Benjamin’s idea of ‘author as producer’ to explain the specific set of relations between author and audience. That is to say, Benjamin, a Marxist critic, noted that an author can revolutionize the form of a given art in such away that it reaches the audiences easily.

### **3.1.4 Commitment and Realism**

Eagleton includes author’s commitment in his category of Marxist literary criticism. Then he writes that “Even those only slightly acquainted with Marxist criticism know that it calls the writer to commit his art to the cause of the proletariat” (Eagleton, 1976: 35). Marxists critics, however, had differences on how a writer could make his literature committed to the cause of the

proletariat. Proletariat, according to the early Marxists, are the working class, or according to Gramsci (1971), “the organic intellectuals”, who are aware of the oppressive nature of certain social ideology. Marxists claim that proletariats (or organic intellectuals, according to Gramsci (1971) can come with certain revolutionary/enlightening ideology that can challenge the oppressive social order. While some Marxist critics called for open-partisan literature that uses socialist realism, other Marxist critics called for non-open but partisan literature that uses critical realism; in other words, while some appreciate socialist art, art that shows the path for socialism, others appreciate critical realist art, art that reflects a balanced and unbiased representation of social forces, ideological contradictions. (Realism in literature has been discussed in the subsequent three sections). Both these critics, however, have no difference on the idea that literature should reflect social conditions, history and class struggle. Both agree on the idea that both critical and socialist realist writers should have the awareness of history and class struggle, the struggle that a human being does for living. Their difference lies in their reflection of reality: while critical realist works reflect reality objectively, socialist realist art presents reality by including subjective attitude (to the reality presented).

As we read in Eagleton (1976) and Ngara (1985), Marx and Engels reflect their support to critical realist works. They do not support open-partisanship in literature because, they claim, open partisanship reduces aesthetic value of a given work. It is stated in both Eagleton (ibid) and Ngara (ibid) that both Marx and Engels suggested socialist novelist does not have to openly reflect his ideological position, does not have to provide solutions to the problems of his days. Writer’s open ideological position, open-partisanship, can make literature, as Plekhanov (1953) points out, overt propaganda; and this can reduce the aesthetic value of the work. To use the more emphatic words of Engels, “The more the opinions of the author remains hidden, the better for the work of art” (Engels, as cited in Ngara, 1985:10). Both Eagleton and Ngara remind us the fact that Marx and Engels opposed not partisanship at all, but open-partisanship. Both Marx and Engels claim that an author’s commitment to certain social class, the proletariat, should be hidden so as to maintain the artistic value of a given realistic work. Eagleton (ibid) notes that commitment in realist works in general is inherent.

Both Eagleton and Ngara (ibid.) stated that Lenin, as a political party leader, called for an open class-partisan literature. In his party literature, *party organization and party literature*, he said,

“Literature must become a cog and a screw of one single great social democratic machine” (Lenin, cited in Eagleton, 1976:38). Lenin called writers to commit their work to the cause of the proletariat. He claims there was a need for a broad, multiform and various literatures inseparably linked with the working-class movement. Lenin and Trotsky (ibid) indicated the importance of the harmony of content and form. Trotsky is the one who thinks artistic form is the product of social content; he asserts also that literary form has a high degree of autonomy; he argues that a work of art should be judged by its own law. He, thus, shares the concern of formalists in terms of form though he condemns them for ignoring social content in literature.

### **3.1.5 Realism in Literary Aesthetics**

When we talk of realism in literature, we can say it is the depiction of social conditions, social realities. And when we talk of ideology in literature, we talk of realism, as realism is all about the reflection of social conditions, of which ideology is one. Realism is all about social conditions and social psychology, not individuals’ psychology. Marxist critics, like George Lukacs (1964), Eagleton (1976) Ngara (1985) drew on Engels’s view of realism in literature. Engels in his letter to Margaret Harkness, about her book *City Girl* wrote, “Realism, to my mind, implies, besides truth of detail, the truthful reproduction of typical characters under typical circumstances,” (Engels, cited in both Eagleton, 1976: 43 and Ngara, 1985:14). Ngara (ibid.) illustrates what this means and writes, “Realism, therefore, consists of three components: telling the story truthfully and plainly, presenting typical characters, and reproducing these characters under typical circumstances”. He further indicates Harkness fulfilled the first two criteria of realism: she used true story and typical characters in her work. But, she missed the third, i.e., to reproduce these characters under typical circumstances; she missed to reflect the historical role of these characters in the social order of the time. Eagleton (1976: 43) has to say this about what Harkness missed in her book: “Harkness neglects true typicality because she fails to integrate into her depiction of the actual working class any sense of their historical role and potential development; in this sense she has produced a *naturalist* rather than a *realist* work”. We, therefore, consider realism, in Marxist aesthetics, needs the awareness of history and class struggles; this is what makes realism different from naturalism in literature.

### 3.1.6 Lukacs on Realism

According to Ngara (1985), Lukacs (1964) gives more detailed explanation about realism in literature. Ngara affirms, “Engel’s definition of realism is most elaborately explained in the work of the major exponents of Marxist aesthetics, the Hungarian critics”. Lukacs states that realism is recapturing of the totality of both individual and social life. He argues that greatest artists are those who recapture and recreate a harmonious totality of human life; and he asserts, “True great realism thus depicts man and society as complete entities, instead of showing merely one or the other of their aspects” (Lukacs, 1964: 6). He asserts that great realist works flashes out the complex totality of society in an epoch. And Lukacs calls for an art/fiction that projects a rich and many sided-images of human wholeness (realism). We can understand from Lukacs that great realist fiction projects the social consciousness and its determinant factors, social forces, social struggle, and overall the complex relations between man, nature and history. He writes, “Thus realism means three-dimensionality, an all-roundedness that endows with independent life characters and human relationships. It by no means involves a rejection of the emotional and intellectual dynamism which necessarily develops together with the modern world” (Lukacs, 1964: 6). Realist writers treat individual characters in relation to the society in which they are in; it also includes emotional and intellectual dynamism in the way it reflects the determinant factors of a certain society.

Lukacs accentuates that realism is characterized by its reflection of *typicality*, *totality* (*typicality* of characters, situations treated under *typical* circumstances) and *totality of life*. Lukacs used both Hegelian and Marxist concept of *typicality* and *totality* in his view of realist literature. He used Hegel’s idea of *totality of object* in literature (i.e., epic literature in particular). He also used the idea by Engels who noted that typical characters under typical circumstances are prerequisite of realism in literature. Read Engels’s point on typicality in his concept of realism in the above section. He states that *typicality* in realism refers to the writer’s usage of *typical* character, *typical* situation reflected under *typical* circumstances. He notes that great realist writers use typical characters that represent historical social forces to reflect the social conditions and social contradictions of an epoch. And the typicality of characters and situations are treated in such away that they reflect the socially determinant factors of a given society:

The central category and criterion of realist literature is the type, a peculiar synthesis, which organically binds together the general and the particular both in characters and situations...what makes it a type is that in it all the humanly and socially essential determinants are present on their highest level of development, in the ultimate unfolding of the possibilities latent in them, in extreme presentation of their extremes, rendering concrete the peaks and limits of men and epochs (Lukacs, 1964:6).

Realist writers use typical characters and situations to reflect social conditions and their determinant factors. Great realist writers center on social reality to project the determinant factors\_\_social contradictions, power struggles, social practices and ideology in general\_\_ that determine the individuals' thoughts, actions and destiny. To do so, realist writers adopt typical characters and situations to reflect the driving social forces of an epoch. The typicality of the characters is linked to the ideological contradictions and their effects on the social conditions and evolution in a society. Lukacs also writes about what *totality* is as follows:

The true artistic totality of a literary work depends on the completeness of the picture it presents of the essential social factors that determine the world depicted. Hence it can be based only on the author's own intensive experience of the social process. Only such experience can uncover the essential social factors and make the artistic presentation centre round them freely and naturally. The hallmark of the great realist masterpiece is precisely that its intensive totality of essential social factors does not require, does not even tolerate, a meticulously accurate or pedantically encyclopedic inclusion of all the threads making up the social tangle; in such a masterpiece the most essential social factors can find total expression in the apparently accidental conjunction of a few human destinies (George Lukacs, 1968: 147-148).

Lukacs notes also that *totality*, the inclusion of *totality of life*, is another feature of realist works. He writes that the *totality of life* is "the presentation of the externals of life, the epic-poetic transformation of the most important objects making up some sphere of human life and most typical events necessarily occurring in such a sphere.," (Lukacs 1964: 151). *Typicality of life*, therefore, refers to the overall life and practices of one society and the important objects which can reflect the social realities in an epoch. Lukacs writes also that the *totality of object* in realism refers to the inclusion of "spheres of life belonging to the theme" (Lukacs, 1964: 151-152); that is to say every description and presentation is linked to the fate of the characters, to the history and struggle, which makes realism different from naturalism in literature. The totality of life reflected in literature goes in line with its themes. The totality of object depends on the writer's artistic quality of descriptions of life, places, and social events, "*the surrounding world*" and

their linkage to *the individual destinies of the characters* (Lukacs, 1964: 152) of a given literary work.

Lukacs implicated that authorial ideology can also be reflected in realist works, and he says, “Reactionary traits in the world-view of great realist writers do not prevent them from depicting social reality in a comprehensive, correct and objective way” (Lukacs, 1964: 139). Their authorial ideology cannot prevent great realist writers from reflecting “illusions motivated by the social movement depicted” (Lukacs, 1964: 139). The cause of democratic revolutionary writer/critics can be humanism. Lukacs implicates that realist writers do not isolate psychological problems from social problems. Great realist writers treat an individuals’ state of mind in relation to the social condition. This means realist writers consider social condition as the determinant factor. “The great realist artists always regard society from the viewpoint of a living and moving centre and this centre is present, visibly or invisibly, in every phenomenon” (Lukacs, 1968:145). As Lukacs maintains democratic revolutionary critics uncover also “the connection between political action and all other phenomena of social life. Lukacs” 1968: 121). This idea takes us to Foucault’s view of power and power relations. According to this view, individuals’ world view is the result of the various power relations in a society. The political action can be the power, power relation and power interest (people’s view to women can, for example, be determined by the view they get from the different power and power relations in society and social institutions).

Lukacs (1964) discusses not only reflections of social conditions in literature but also focuses of literary criticism: that is, whether literary criticism focuses on the social condition of a society represented in a given literature. He asserts that literature can be evaluated in terms of reflection of social condition and struggle. He strongly opposes the notion of “art for the sake of art” which he thinks denies the condition of the society and its struggle for social transformation. Hence, he appreciates the Russian revolutionary democratic critics, whom he considers as the first literary critics who focused on criticisms of social aspects in literature. Lukacs opposes literary critics and historians of literature who thought democratic revolutionary criticism as a work against aesthetics and the decline of art; and thereby he challenges their opinion psychologises and mystifies the subjective school of aesthetics.

Until he was criticised by Bertolt Brecht (1973), Lukacs argues that the greatness of literature is measured by its reflection of social reality. As stated in Eagleton (1976), Bertolt Brecht, however, criticised Lukacs for fetishizing one historical literary form (nineteenth century realist artistic form) and dogmatically demanding all other arts to conform to this paradigm. Brecht does not reject the concept of realism but implied that there can be different kinds of realism other than the nineteenth century realism; he asserts, “our Marxism and literary criticism concept of realism must be wide and political, sovereign over all conventions . . . we must not derive realism as such from particular existing works, but we shall use every means, old and new, tried and untried, derived from art and derived elsewhere, to render reality to men in a form they can master” (Brecht, cited in Eagleton, 1976:66-67). As stated in the above subsection, different Marxist literary critics identified different kinds of realism and then, as discussed in the following subsection, they have also distinguished how realism is different from modernism.

### **3.1.7 Realism, Modernism, and Postmodernism**

M.A.R. Habib (2005) writes that *Realism* as a literary movement emerged in the nineteenth century as a reaction to romanticism which is characterized by its idealization and imagination and refused other fairy-tale, highly stylized, symbolic, abstract and more decorative works. He notes that realism centres on truthful, accurate, and objective representation of the real world, both the external world and the human self. Realism requires true understanding of social and historical conditions.

Ngara (1985) notes that a realist writer gives less emphasis to form and conveys his/her meaning in a direct and non-prosaic manner. He indicates also that a linear plot formation is another characteristic of realism. Ngara further writes that the early African writers, like Achebe, use classical realist mode of writing because of two reasons: because they were exposed to the nineteenth century European realist writings and/or because of the linear structure of the classical realist writing is similar to the chronological order of African folk tales.

Literary critics have identified different means of representation of realities: notably, critical realism (and also called classical/nineteenth century realism), social realism, metaphoric realism, magical realism and mythic realism. Ngara (1985) states that critical realism refers to an

unbiased and balanced representation of reality; he reflects that critical realism is characterized by truthful and balanced account of reality that captures the mode of a given historical period. He also writes that it was the Soviet literary criticism that made a distinction between socialist realism and critical realism, considering European and Russian critical realist works (such as the works by Balzac and Tolstoy) and the socialist realist work by Maxim Gorky, *Mother*, which is considered as the first social realist work. Ngara writes that socialist art depicts reality from Marxist point of view; socialist art reflects class structure, social struggle and promotes the ideals of socialism. Socialist art is oriented towards the future, towards a building of a happy, successful and socialist society. Ngara notes also that metaphoric realism involves greater artistic representation of reality.

Ngara (1985) writes that realism was a popular mode of literary writing in nineteenth century until it was challenged by modernist literary writings in the twentieth century. Ngara draws the distinction between realist and modernist literature as follows: “whereas realist writers are concerned with depicting social reality and social factors which influence man’s life, modernist fiction is concerned with exploring states of mind, man’s consciousness and sub-consciousness” Ngara (1985: 109). While realist literary texts are concerned with society, modernist writings are concerned with individual’s consciousness. In fact, Ngara draws additional features of modernism which can help us to understand the distinction between realist and modernist literary texts which include these:

- 1) Modernist fiction is concerned with the inner man and explores the working of the mind through a process of introspection.
- 2) As the writer focuses on this internal reality, external reality and social issues are given minimum attention or are almost completely ignored.
- 3) The importance of plot is highly reduced in the writer’s ordering of events and he conveys his meaning largely through complicated system paralinguistic affective devices such as allusion, images, and symbolism\_\_hence, modernist fiction tends to be highly metaphorical.
- 4) The linear plot is dispensed with and time is collapsed in the present or the novel moves backward and forth in time perspective (Ngara, 1985:109).

As it is evident in the extract, while modernist fiction is concerned with state of mind of individuals, realist fiction is concerned with social reality and social factors. Modernist writers give no/or less emphasis to social issues (social reality). Though realism, mainly metaphoric

realism, uses metaphors for representing social reality, modernist writers are characterized in their conveying their meaning mostly through paralinguistic affective devices such as allusion, images, and symbolism. While realist writers use mostly linear and chronological plot formation, modernist writings move backward and forth in time perspective.

Habib (2011) writes that while the nineteenth century is known for literary movements such as realism, symbolism and aestheticism, the twentieth century is known for the emergence of different literary criticisms (formalism and other socially conscious criticisms such as Marxist, feminist, post-colonial, psychoanalytic, deconstructive, etc theories and criticism) despite the long period practice of literary criticism from the classical period to the present days. Twentieth century can also be seen in terms of the emergence of modernism and postmodernism. As a result of the advent of modernism following the vast devastation, psychological demoralization and economic depression by World War I (1914-1918), modernist writers emphasised on the world perceived as fragmented, a world that lacked cohesion and unity. Modernist writers (artists in general) were alienated from the social and political world; and so their literature and art in general was marginalised from the social and political world. Modernist writers considered individuals' loneliness and isolation as inevitable part of human life and searched for the meaning of human existence. Habib writes the following about what the world looked like of the time modernist writers lived:

The modernist writer occupied a world that was often perceived as fragmented, where the old bourgeois ideologies of rationality, science, progress, civilization, and imperialism had been somewhat discredited; where the artist was alienated from the social and political world; and where art and literature were marginalized; where populations had been subjected to processes of mass standardization; where philosophy could no longer offer visions of unity; and where language itself was perceived to be an inadequate instrument for expression and understanding (Habib, 2011:247).

Following world war I (1914-1918) that resulted in the vast devastation, and psychological demoralization and economic depression in the society, modernist writers occupied the world that the society (and the writers) perceived fragmented, questioned rationality, science, progress, civilization, imperialism by the old bourgeois ideologies. The society was subjected to mass standardization and language was perceived as inadequate instrument for expression and

understanding in modernism. Habib writes also the following with regard to historical development of postmodernism:

In the register of historical development, postmodernity designates society and culture that has evolved beyond the phases of industrial and finance capitalism. This society is often called consumer capitalism, a phase characterized by the global extension of capitalist markets, mass migration of labor, the predominating role of mass media and images, unprecedented economic and cultural interaction between various parts of the world, and an unprecedented pluralism and diversity at all levels of culture, (Habib, 2011:247).

All the factors that characterize postmodernism in the extract are related to the idea of globalization; there is high level of social interaction, cultural diversity, mass migration of labour, economic and cultural interaction among different societies around the globe, creating social consciousness and reproduction of certain ideology through mass media. Postmodernist society is viewed as ideologically constructed society. The role of mass media, various technologies and other institutions is considered high in creating ideologically constructed society. Postmodernist literary texts project such global phenomena: cultural diversity, flow of capital, migration of labour, social interaction, mass dissemination of ideologies and social interaction among the world's societies.

In terms of style, both modernist and postmodernist literary texts may not be abided by previous literary conventions, structures and poetic forms; they both show fragmentariness in their narratives and character construction. Habib (ibid) draws the following differences between modernist and postmodernist literary texts: First, unlike modernist, postmodernist writings recognize ethnic, sexual, and cultural diversity. Second, postmodernism does not categorize culture and art in terms of popularity: "postmodernis. . . deliberately extends into the domain of popular culture, abrogating distinctions between high and low art, and indeed often attempting to expose the structures of cultural coercion and domination" (Habib, 2011:249). Postmodernism avoids cultural relativism. Third, postmodernist writing exhibits difference, diversity and incoherence without linking these to identity. In other words, postmodernism considers differences, diversity and incoherence as natural phenomena. In modernism, however, difference is seen in relation to identity.

As they concentrate inner state of mind, modernist writers use more stream-of-consciousness as mode of literary writing in depicting what a character thinks of. Literary techniques such as intertextuality, magical realism and meta-fictional mode of literary writings are also more practiced in postmodernist literary texts.

### **3.1.8 Eagleton's and Ngara's Authorial and Aesthetic Ideologies**

Eagleton (1976:46) notes that materialist (Marxist) literary criticism should consider these determinant factors: (i) general mode of production (GMP), (ii) literary mode of production (LMP), (iii) general ideology (GI), (iv) authorial ideology (AuI), (v) aesthetic ideology (AI) and (vi) text (the product itself). He indicated that materialist criticism of ideology can reflect the inter-determinations of these factors.

Under the category of general mode of production (GMP), Eagleton considers the dominant economic forces and the social formation. GMP refers to a dominant economic system upon which social relation is formed. Eagleton asserts that general mode of production (GMP) can play a role in the production of literary mode of production (LMP) and general ideology (GI). He implicated also that there is inter-determination between GI and LMP. LMP can be the use of oral or written mode of literary production that is used dominantly at a given historical period. But what is important here is that LMP refers to the history of literary production in general. We can also see LMP and its relation with GI in terms of the language used to produce literary text. General Ideology (GI) refers to the dominant ideologies in any social formation. Eagleton writes about the relation between GI and LMP as follows:

GI typically contains certain general elements or structures, all or some of which may at a particular historical stage bear significantly on the character of the LMP. These general structures can be distinguished in the main as the linguistic, the political, and the 'cultural'. A set of complex interdeterminations will normally hold between them, which demand historical specification. A literary text is related to GI not only by how it deploys language but by the particular language it deploys (Eagleton, 1976:54).

A literary text is related to GI and LMP and their inter-determination in terms of linguistic, the political and cultural factors. We can analyze certain literature in terms of the language it uses and how it is used to represent the political and cultural conditions.

Eagleton(1975) states that there is possibility that an author can reflect his/her stance in homology, partial disjunction or in severe contradiction to the dominant ideology (to the ideology of the ruling class in a class system) and ideology of other social classes (such as sex/gender, region/ ethnicity, race, religion, etc where power relations or struggles are seen. Eagleton (ibid.) states authorial ideology is then the insertion and reflection of writer's stance to the effect of power relations reflected in a society. We can further read what Eagleton states about authorial ideology (AUI) from the following extract:

[Authorial ideology] is the effect of the author's specific mode of biographical insertion into GI, a mode of insertion over\_\_determined by a series of distinct factors: social class, sex, nationality, religion, geographical region and so on. This formation is never to be treated in isolation from GI, but must be studied in its articulation with it" Eagleton, 1976: 59).

Similarly, Emmanuel Ngara (1985:108) writes, "In a situation where there are competing ideologies, a writer will project his own ideological stance which may or may not be homologous with the dominant ideology". A writer can, therefore, reflect his/her ideological position in support of or against certain ideology in situations when conflicting ideologies coexist. It is the ideological stance of a writer that we call authorial ideology. Ngugi Wa Thiong'o (1981:7) implies how a writer can influence his/her recipients as follows:

The product of a writer's pen both reflects reality and also attempts to persuade us to take a certain attitude to that reality. The persuasion can be a direct appeal on behalf of a writer's open doctrine or it can be an indirect appeal through 'influencing the imagination, feelings and actions of the recipient" in a certain way toward certain goals and a set of values, consciously or unconsciously held by him.

We see in the extract that literature reflects reality and persuade readers to have certain understanding concerning realities. More pertinent to the present writing, however, is the fact that a creative writer incorporates his stance concerning certain ideology to his/her reader in direct or indirect means. The writer may present his ideology or his stance on certain ideology (authorial ideology in general) in a direct appeal (what open-partisan writers do), or through influencing the imagination, feelings and actions of the reader. Ngara (1985) also indicates that authorial ideologies can be described in political terms as conservatism, liberalism, humanism, nationalism, radicalism, or revolutionary democracy, Marxism, etc.

Eagleton (1976) and Ngara (1985) elaborate that Aesthetic Ideology (AI) refers to the complex internal formation of a literary production that can include a number of levels such as theories of literature, critical practices, literary traditions, genres, conventions, devices, and discourses and literary movements like romanticism, symbolism, expressionism, realism, formalism, etc. Eagleton further states also that AI can be seen in relation to the significance of social formations in the society in particular and the general ideology (GI) in general.

### **3.2 Ideology and Discourse**

As stated in section 1.1 of this present paper, Althusser (1969) asserts that certain classes or social forces use interpellations (i.e. discourses) to hail and make people submissive to certain ideology. He states that these classes or social forces, in general, use different social institutions (i.e. ideological state apparatuses (ISAs)) in their interpellations. As stated in same section of the present paper, Michel Foucault (2003[2000]) considers discourse as a system of thought and knowledge. As stated in Stoddart (2007) post-Marxists, like Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe (1985) assert that it is through discourse that people exercise or resist certain social power. Similarly, Foucault (ibid) explains discourse plays critical role in the creation of social consciousness and knowledge.

Van Dijk (1998), in his explanation of ideology, confirms that ideology is a combination of three dimensions\_\_cognitive, discursive and social dimensions-. First of all, Van Dijk defines ideologies are ideas, social shared belief systems though every shared belief are not ideologies; he writes ideologies are fundamental and axiomatic. Regarding ideology and discourse, Van Dijk writes, “ideologies are largely expressed and acquired by discourse, that is, by spoken or written communicative interaction” (Van Dijk 1998: 121). He further states that discourse includes language use (verbal and written discourses i.e. speech and text) and other semiotic messages (images, photos, movies, etc). Ideology refers not only to the ideas, socially shared ideas/beliefs, but also their reproductions. Therefore, it is difficult to separate ideology from discourse as discourse plays great role in the reproduction of certain ideology. Van Dijk states also that ideology involves certain discourse structures such as problem/solution and polarization when it is mapped into discourse. He illustrates problem/solution as a discourse structure of ideology as follows:

Do ideologies have a problem/solution structure? Many ideologies indeed seem to have something like that. Thus, whereas racism typically defines immigrants, foreigners, minorities or others as the reason for most social and economic problems, and withholding 'our' scarce resources (residence, citizenship, housing, employment, equal rights, etc.) as the solution, similar simple analyses may be made for anti-racism (problem: racism; solution: equality, diversity, etc.), feminism (problem: male chauvinism; solution: equal rights, etc.), and environmentalism (problem: pollution; solution: stop polluting)...., (van Dijk 1998:67).

We can understand from the extract that many ideologies have categories of problem/solution discourse structure. Racism is an ideology. Those who are racist perspective supplement their idea with certain category of problem/solution discourse structure. Those who oppose contend that racism is problem and the solution is equality, diversity etc. Similarly, in feminist ideology, involves discourse of structure of male domination as problem, and discourse of equality as solution. Dijk (ibid) identified also, another discourse structure which he called "group/ideological polarization which can be used to analyze certain ideology. He writes that group/ideological polarization involves discourses of positive self representation and negative representation of others.

## CHAPTER FOUR: ANALYSIS OF IDEOLOGY IN FOUR ETHIOPIAN NOVELS IN ENGLISH

### 4.1 Economic Condition and Feudal Social Formation

Althusser (1969: 128) writes, “Every social formation arises from a dominant mode of production”. We encounter feudal mode of production and feudal social formation in the Ethiopian novels in English under study— *The Thirteenth Sun*, *Firebrands*, *The God Who Begat a Jackal*, and *Beneath the Lion’s Gaze*. All these novels reflect ideology of the society who lived in the feudal system of Ethiopia. The society was divided into classes: the feudal ruling class and the ruled (mainly the peasantry) in the feudal class system of the country. There are different satires that reflect feudal class stratifications and their contribution to social consciousness and social power in the novels. In fact, unlike the others, *Beneath the Lion’s Gaze* reflects also the contradicting ideologies that existed in the Ethiopian society that lived under *Dergue* Junta, the Military Rule (1974 – 1991).

In *The Thirteenth Sun*, Daniachew uses different representations to symbolize the feudal class system of Ethiopia. He satirizes the class stratification through the communication between Fitawrary Woldu, member of the ruling feudal class, and the peasant, member of the ruled; the communication between these people in the novel is a communication between two people from different classes: the upper and the lower class of feudal class system. Fitawrary feels proud of his class he inherited by his blood relation, not by other personal achievements. The degenerated poor peasant rents his single bed to people who come for pilgrimage. Fitawrari is proud of introducing his class and tells the peasant that he is the real Fitawrary of Menelik. He introduces himself to the peasant as follows:

“You have heard of the name Fitawriry Woldu, I presume.”  
“so many Fitawraries nowadays...hard to catch up with their names”  
“The real Fitawraries am talking about- those of Menelik not men of Italians,”  
(Daniachew 1973:12)

Class, as indicated in the above extract, is used as a means of maintaining social power. Fitawrary uses class as a means of pride and economically privileged. No matter how the country is socially, economically and politically trapped, Fitawrary believes he is of the respected blood; hence, he himself and his class believe they are superior by their class they obtained from their

blood relation, not by their achievements. Fitawrary, in his dialogue, wants the peasant to consent to his class superiority as indicated in the following extract:

[Fitawrary] “**Your language smells very much of the soil.** Did you not have by chance a master who could teach you **how to talk to your superiors?**”

[The peasant] “Oh, lots and lots of them. Why, anybody with money is master for that matter”

[Fitawrary] “I mean **men of blood**; men who could teach you how to conduct yourself in **decent society**” (Daniachew, 1973:13)

Fitawrary never worries about the miserable life in the peasant’s family which shocked both Fitawrary’s own children, Goytom and Woynitu. Instead, he wants to see the peasant consent to his class superiority in his, the peasant’s language usage that gives due respect to people of superior class. The peasant consents to Fitawrary’s class superiority and he, in his monologue, says, “A rich Fitawrary and a man of blood, a gentleman who knows how to talk with his big men” (Daniachew, 1973:65). And we understand from the peasant’s monologue that the class ideology became effective, for the peasant admitted the class illusion is something natural. Through such satire, Daniachew portrayed how the society was made naturalize feudal social power. And this means, *The Thirteenth Sun* revealed that people who are made subject of class ideology forget that class is politics. Social and political thinkers, like Althusser (1969), Gramsci (1971), Foucault (2000 [1994]) and Fairclough (1989) state that power and power relations can be maintained through two means: through consent and/or coercion. As indicated in the extract, teaching subordinates how to communicate with their masters/superiors can be taken as one means that can help to attain consent to a certain power relation. That is why Fitawrary asks the peasant, in the extract, “Did you not have by chance a master who could teach you how to talk to your superiors?” In fact, the word superior, in the extract, shows itself the power imbalance between the two people and class: Fitawrary and the peasant. Source of the power relation as indicated in the extract is social class.

The response of the peasant shows that he, the peasant, sensed that economic difference is the cause for the superiority and subordination: “...Why, anybody with money is master for that matter.” And this takes us to the early Marxists notion that economic condition determines the social condition/structure which in turn determines man’s consciousness. Fitawrary, however,

solidifies his power that the economic difference and his superiority in the class system is linked to his blood-based class relation. In doing so, he intended naturalize his class superiority.

Language, beyond its communicative purpose, carries ideology of an epoch. It can also be used to persuade people through skilful use of rhetoric. Fitawarary's word, "Your language smells very much of the soil" poses a question, "*Does language really smell?*" In a class system, like feudal class system, language plays a key role in consolidating the dominant ideology, the ideology of ruling classes, of an epoch. Foucault (1978: 25) asserts that power functions in the feudal class system through signs and levies. Societies may have ways of using their language when they talk to people of the upper class in a class system. Hence, as it is evident in the extract, societies are taught how they should talk to their superiors. The family or any other social relations can play the role of teaching this kind of language as indicated in the extract (how to talk to superiors or a language that does not smell very much of soil) to the society.

Daniachew used the phrase "Men of blood", in the extract, to signify people in the upper class inherited by blood relation in a feudal class society. Hence, blood, in the extract, represents people's class in a class system. Hence, men of blood are men of the upper class inherited by blood relation. Similarly, Daniachew used the phrase *decent society*, in the dialogue between Fitawrary and the peasant, in relation to the feudal class system; and it has the meaning of respecting the superiors in the class system. For instance, as we read it in the dialogue, one means of decency is measured by the society's especial usage of the language which gives due respect to the class superiors in a feudal class system of Ethiopia.

Daniachew further represents the class stratification in the society through the peasants' categorizing the meat of a sacrificial sheep that a conjuring woman prescribed to be slaughtered to cure Fitawrarary. The conjure-woman, a priest and the peasant performed the sacrificial sheep to cure Fitawrarry alongside the holy water he takes. The peasant takes the task of slaughtering the sacrificial sheep which other people refused to do. After washing Fitwarary with the mixture of blood and all content of entrails, they moved from the place to their home leaving the sacrificial sheep there for devils. The peasant, however, returned to the sacrificial sheep, hiding himself from the sight of the people to consume the meat of the sheep. In his monologue, he divides the meat based on the classes in the society. He allocates the meat that he thinks is

delicious is to the *master* and *the rest to the servants*, (Daniachew, 1973:69-70). The servants are the peasants (because the peasant says *us*), entertainer, the cooks who provide service to the masters. The peasant further says, “But, now, everything is mine. I’m master and servant. I’m not full master yet,” (Daniachew, 1973: 70). Daniachew used such satire in the monologue to signify the class system in the country.

As Daniachew used men of blood that signifies class in the feudal class system, Sahle Silassie in his novel, *Firebrands*, used the phrase “noble and non-noble kin” discourse to signify the class system in the country. Buzineh, a major character in *Firebrands*, attacks the political appointee who unfairly expelled him from work. When the judge, another character in the novel, asked him why he did not appeal to the higher authorities instead of fighting, Bezuneh admits, “Having being born of a humble family, I had no noble kin to give me a push or to bring my appeal to the attention of higher authorities” (Sahle Selassie, 1979: 90). “Noble and non noble kin” is the discourse that the writer used to signify the feudal class system, in addition to expressions such as *majesty* (Sahle Selassie, 1979: 87), *insulting crown and emperor* (Sahle Selassie, 1979: 90) that reflect class stratification and the monarchy. *Weizero* Debitu asks her son, Worku, to stop his movement against the imperial government and she says, “You are not the son of nobleman” (Sahle Selassie, 1979: 125). *Weizero* Debitu admits that her family is not from the higher class, from the noble men, and hence she believed her class lacked power.

Unlike the other novels analysed in the present study, Nega’s novel *The God who Begat a Jackal* (2002), reflects servitude in a society, in addition to the feudal class system it reflects. The power hierarchies reflected dominantly in Nega’s novel are the following: At the top of all the power relations are the Emperor who rarely appears in the novel and Count Ashenafi, a nobleman and administrator of a fictional territory that includes fictional places called Deder, Kersa and Harar. Following the Emperor and Count Ashenafi, we get the people with the extraordinary/magical powers: soothsayers, spirit charmers, devil tamers, diviners, fortune tellers and rain makers. At the bottom of the power hierarchy are the tenants, serfs, vassals (slaves and servants) and the nomads (the Ammas in the novel). Moreover, there is familial (parent-children) relationship reflected in the novel.

The dominant mode of production or the political system reflected in the novel *The God who Begat a Jackal* is a feudal class system. And the class strata is the class between people in the

upper class, who controlled the mode of production (i.e., the land and human labour) and power and people in the lower class who are under total control of the upper class. People in the upper class of the feudal class system in the novel are Count Ashenafi (the feudal lord) and the Emperor. Count Ashenafi is one of the main characters, but the emperor rarely appears in the novel. The people in the lower class are the tenants, serfs and vassals (slaves and servants).

Nega used different stories to signify class stratifications of the class system reflected in the novel. The narrator narrates that *The Areru Twins*, characters in the novel, are “the only slaves and servants” (Nega, 2002:23) who Count Ashenafi chose from among other slaves to guard Aster, the Count’s only daughter. Gudu, a main character in the novel also is another person who was born from a bondwoman, Enquan, who serves in the Count’s home. The bridesmaids who accompanied Aster, the only daughter of Count Ashenafi, and forced her to marry a man of not her preference, were selected because of their social class: “The bride emerged accompanied by a select band of brides-maids, chosen not only for their ravishing good looks and youthful grace, but also for social standing” (Nega, 2002:132). Aster was forced not only to marry a man of not her preference but also to be accompanied by brides-maids selected for their beauty and social class. And this class system is created as a result of class ideology. Aster’s preference was to marry Gudu, the son of the bondwoman named Enquan. The Count and Gudu did not know that they are father and son until Enquan reveals their connection after the rebellion led by Gudu ended.

The Oral Historian, whom Aster visited to learn about the condition in different places before she elopes from her confined life, narrates her class-related ideology and the wars that took place between different nobles as follows:

The Oral Historian, whose old age could only be approximated from the number of wars he had lived through, was a breathing archive, more versed in what went on in his domain than the library of a reputable monastery. His knowledge had been passed on to him through the word of mouth and spanned fifty generations. It covered all battles concluded in the province, all slaves bought and sold, marriages ordained, annulled, prayers answered and celebrated, criminals sent to the gallows, and fugitives of justice, (Nega, 2002:90).

The novel is much about class ideology. And we see the narration in the extract is also related to the class ideology. We also read about the existence of wars among nobles and slavery that reflect the class formation.

Aster was finally forced to marry a man of not her preference. And the maids who accompanied her were selected because of their class: “The bride emerged accompanied by a select band of brides-maids, chosen not only for their ravishing good looks and youthful grace, but also for social standing,” (Nega, 2002:132). Aster was forced not only to marry a man of not her preference but also to be accompanied by brides-maids selected for their beauty and social class because of the class system in the society. Nega used such narrations in his novel to satirize the feudal class system.. And this class system is created as a result of class ideology. Finally, the man, the bridegroom, was slain by the Amma warriors who hosted Gudu during his eloping from the social confinements that forbid him to love Aster because of the class system.

Reading Maaza’s *Beneath the Lion’s Gaze*, we can see that the land is the base of the feudal class system and it became the centre of political conflict between the students rallying and the imperial government. It is indicated few feudal gentry control the land and take large share from the tillers’ production. And the myth of blood relation, which is part of the superstructure, strengthens the feudal gentry’s ownership of the land, as narrated by Mickey, the character in the novel:

The farmer ploughs land that isn’t his, that was never his father’s, which was never his grandfather’s, and will never be his son’s. He works as hard as his animals day after day to pay a landowner’s taxes and to glean enough crops to his family has enough grains for food after they’ve given the land owner his share. The Landowner’s share is always large... We live in a class system... our emperor has built by the myth of this land on the blood of those who have been too tired to voice their own truth, (Maaza, 2010:28-29).

We can get the base and superstructure in the extract. While the land is the base of the feudal class system, the myth of blood relation is part of superstructure. The emperor use the myth mentioned in the novel to consolidate his power. The myth consolidates the monopoly of the base and the power. According to Louis Althusser (1966), superstructure can contain two pillars: ideological state apparatus (ISA) and repressive state apparatus (RSA). In this respect, the myth of the blood relation which consolidates the control of the base is under the category of ISA.

All these novels, *The Thirteenth Sun*, *Firebrands*, *Beneath the Lion's Gaze* and *The God who Begat a Jackal*, reflect early Marxist view of ideology; they are, in general, Marxist-oriented novels. They relate the social formation and the social consciousness to the economy, the land, as the cause for the social formation and dominant social consciousness. All these novels reveal the land, which became later the centre of the political conflict of two opposing forces (the ruling feudal class and the revolutionaries) in the novels is, the deriving force of mode of production. We encounter that the land is under total control of the feudal gentry. They dramatize also the resistance and revolution done against the feudal class system.

The peasant, the one who is communicating with Fitawarary in *The Thirteenth Sun*, lives in a land of not his own. The owner of the land where he lives is a landlady who is a minister's wife and lives in Addis Ababa. He mutters the problem he has to his God at Church Abo and he says, "You know very well that I am too cramped, my hedge is too small and I don't have my own land to widen it," (Daniachew, 1973:78). He further confesses to his God that he takes bribery when he takes his cases to the district court. And eventually, he pleads to his God, "Oh, God, remember me in Your Holy Country [heaven], for as You know, it's my own land that I sow, my own hay that I reap, my own cabbage that I cut, my own firewood that I gather, and my own cattle that I graze" (Daniachew, 1973:79).

The novelist used the peasant's condition as one means to reflect the social consciousness of the epoch of the society depicted in the novel. The novel has already reflected that land is the mode of production of the feudal class system of the country. The peasant, a character and representative of the Ethiopian peasants of the epoch in the novel, does not own land. He tills land of not his own. He tills a land of The Land Lady who comes to the place from Addis Ababa and prepares a *grand memorial feast* for her late husband, a minister, every year. As it is seen in the extract, the peasant begs his God to offer him source of economy, the land he is denied here, on the earth, in the heaven.

The land, as the source of the economy and social formation, becomes also the centre of the conflict between the two major forces (the university students rallying and the imperial government) in both *Firebrands* and *Beneath the Lion's Gaze*. Both these novels revealed that the land is under total control of the feudal gentry.

*Firebrands* reflects that the source of economy of the feudal class system of Ethiopia is the land which is under full control of the ruling classes. The state controls the society by controlling the means of production. The land, as one and the main mains of the economic production of the time, is under total control of the feudal gentry. In other words, the land was the economic base of the feudal class system and its ideologies in the country. When Dejazmach Azbte, a member of the imperial government, asks a police officer about the content in leaflets that the students distribute under the cover of the night, the officer replies “*The land reform*” is among their demands.

As stated in the following extract, *Firebrands* exposes that people are politically appointed to government offices based on the loyalty, religion and tribal origin to maintain the political power of the monarchy. And the people who are loyal to the feudal class system are awarded land as means of income. Lidji Kebret, however, indicated that there is public opposition against the feudal class system’s control of the mode of production:

People are making a lot of noise about those who own large tracts of land these days. Several land owners are actually selling out their lands and investing their money in the urban areas. Don’t you think it’s because of the loud noises made by certain people? (Sahle Selassie, 1979: 18).

As indicated in the extract, people started opposing the monarchy’s full control of the mode of production to free society from economic exploitation and domination. However, the state refused to free the land and share it equally to the society. Instead, the feudal land owners have an intention to sell the land and shift themselves into semi-capital class. However, riot, that Sahlesilassie, the writer, used to as one means to reflect the class struggle, has erupted (as indicated in section 4.3.3) before they shifted to semi-capital class. The full control of the land (mode of production in general) by the feudal class enabled the dominating class to exploit the man power so that enrich itself economically and eventually maintain its political power.

Similarly, *The God who Begat a Jackal* reveals that the mode of production, source of economy, is the land and human labour (serfs, tenants and vassals), in addition to the class struggle. And this mode of production is under total control of the people in the upper class. As indicated in the following section (section 4.2 of this paper), the ruling class claims that the divine power

(Mawu-Lisa,) granted them the power to control the mode of production because of their blood line to the divinity. Count Ashenafi controlled the mode of production and the power. The people in the lower class are the tenants, like the tenants in the fictional place of Kersa, who are obliged to pay due to Count Ashenafi, who owned the mode of production.

## **4.2 Reproduction of Dominant Ideologies**

We can understand from both early Marxists and post-Marxists, Althusser (1966), Gramsci (1971) and poststructuralists that ideology refers not only to the idea that people live by but also its reproduction (discourses) done to create social consciousness and control and maintain certain social power. Dominant ideology refers to the ideology of ruling class (groups) who controlled certain social power. Under this section, we will see the different power relations and discourses used to consolidate the dominant ideology and the power of the dominant classes/groups in the novels selected.

### **4.2.1 Religious Power and Power Relation and the Reproduction of Dominant Ideology**

This subsection reflects how the feudal class ideology in the novel is reproduced. We analyse, here, how social institutions function in relation to certain social power. We can analyse such functions in relation to Althusser's ideology and ideological state apparatuses and Gramsci's Hegemony. Althusser (1970) illustrates how dominant classes/ ruling powers can use ideological state apparatuses (ISA), such as media, educational institutions, religious institutions, and family, etc, and repressive state apparatuses (RSA) such as institutions of security to maintain state power. He further asserts that ideology functions through interpellations, making individuals subject to certain ideology or social power. Similarly Gramsci illustrates how social power is exercised. He asserts that social power is exercised through hegemony, i.e., through consent and coercion. Post-Marxists also assert that social power and resistance against certain power (in general, power struggle) functions through discourses (read more about discourses of resistance in the novels in section 4.3)

In his novel, *The Thirteenth Sun*, Daniachew satirizes not only the society's religious complacency but also the Monarchy's use of religious power and power relation (or according to Althusser, religious ideological state apparatus (ISA)) in its interpellation or discourse to maintain its power and feudal class ideology. Daniachew dramatizes the Monarchy's alliance

with the church as ISA, through the power relation between the preacher and the pilgrims. The monarchy uses the preacher's power relation with the society, the pilgrimages, to disseminate the feudal class ideology and maintain the power of the monarchy in the novel. We encounter in the novel, *The Thirteenth Sun*, a secretly assigned fake preacher whose duty is to inculcate the power interest of the Emperor in his religious preaching to the subjects/pilgrims gathered to celebrate the annual anniversary of the allegorical Church of Abbo. The preacher described as stout looking with newly matted hair and satirized as trying his best to show the path to *the salvation*, appears in two sections in the novel: *The Sermon at the Lake* and *The Salvation*. Landlady tells a Little Lady who is both attending the annual anniversary of the church that she knew the preacher was assigned at church, to expiate his past crime of participating in a coup waged against the emperor and the monarchy. He is secretly assigned to fuse the power interest of the emperor and the religious lessons at Church Abbo to get pardon from the authorities and return to his former job as a captain. No one, except the Land Lady, knew this secret. Before we see how the preacher fuses the power interest of the emperor in his religious lesson, let us see who the pilgrims (crowds) are:

Pilgrims had already gathered by the lake side. A collection of lovers, gallants, profiteers, state embezzlers who had drunk away their consciences and forgotten the traditions of their fathers, of people of the basest scum, drunkards, thieves, prostitutes, hawkers of every kind of rotten provisions, and ragged, hungry and destitute peasants-the human beings, on each of whose faces were written laziness, slovenliness, weariness, boredom, disenchantment, hate and crime, were here to be cured of their various ailments and to pray that God save them from the current famine, diseases and social problems, (Daniachew, 1973:34).

As we can read it in the extract, the people who attend the preaching are from different social sections and backgrounds that the writer used the Ethiopian people who lived under the monarchy. And looking at the background of all these people, we can sense the degenerating life of the society and the decadence of the country. The writer, in his statement "state embezzlers who had drunk away their consciences and forgotten the traditions of their fathers" implies that the country was in a better condition before the kind of society depicted in the story. In other words, the country was in a better condition before feudal system appeared. The social condition in the extract would have provoked some kind of political awakening in the time. However, as the writer implied, the church as ISA plays a significant role for such awakening not to come.

And this role is reflected in the preacher's blending of the power interest of the emperor and the religious teachings. The preacher preaches the following to the pilgrims who are attending the procession of the *tabot* that refused to enter to its tabernacle:

“Some of you give shelter to thieves and criminals instead of handing them over to the law. Sometimes, even that those betrayed their Emperor and country. Some of you listen with ready ears to vagabonds and vagrants who revile and defame your superiors, instead of reporting them immediately. You eat animals which have teeth in the upper jaw, (Daniachew, 1973:147).

As we can read it in the above extract, the preacher coats the power interest of the ruling class of his time in his religious lessons. He relates the indisputability of the power of the monarchy, which is political, with eating animals which have teeth in the upper jaw, which is religious. He implied in his preaching that betraying and defaming the emperor and his political system also is crime. In doing so, he implies to the crowds gathered that the power of the ruling class is indisputable. He indicates that it is not right for the people or groups in a society to criticize or blame the superiors in the feudal class system. Hence, he calls up on the society to respect the power of the emperor. The preacher further bonds the power interest of the ruling class with his religious ideology, as follows:

“And now, you shout “Oh Amlak, oh Christ!” How come you forgot the eighth millennium is on you. The time when servants shall rise against their masters, children against their parents. The time when children bite the hand that feeds them. Rising against their Emperor. Against the Emperor who feeds them with milk and honey. Who educates them. Who picks them from the mire and makes them ministers and generals...” (Daniachew, 1973:).

The preacher associates opposition against the ruling class to the Eighth Millennium, the time when, according to the bible, the great tribulation appears. He indicates that it is not right for servants to stand against their masters and oppressors. By preaching so, the preacher implied to the congregations that the power of the ruling class should be respected. He condemns and asks others to condemn educated youngsters who demand new political system. Daniachew satirizes how the monarchy used religious ISA, or church, to maintain its power. The preacher in the novel fuses the power interest of the monarchy into his religious preaching as follows:

‘We have sinned against our God, we have sinned against our Emperor, against our country, against our brothers, against our society, against ourselves, and

great, great indeed is the price we have to pay for all of these...' (Daniachew, 1973:149)

The preacher strengthens the ideology of the ruling class by associating it with supernatural power; he associates disobedience to the emperor and his power with disobeying God and His will. Moreover, he, in his preaching, is asking the society to attribute any social problem to sin of society, not the political ideology: "Even our everyday life- our everyday life is being affected and slowly destroyed by our sins and crimes" (Daniachew, 1973:150). And the crime, as we see in the extract above, includes opposing political ideologies: "we have sinned against our Emperor". By doing so, the preacher makes his followers not to ascribe every individual and social problem to the political system and its ideology, rather attribute it to their individual and group sins. The preacher uses also religious pictures (icons) in his strengthening the power interest of the emperor.

A deacon carrying a picture of one of the scenes of hell was now standing near the conjure-woman. The devils had tied down a naked man and were butchering him, the blood flowing from every part of the body, shown with dull yellow. At the right hand section of the same picture, the remains of the unfortunate man were being pounded with mortar and pestle.  
'Oh, yes, you should pay for it! You need only look at the picture to imagine what it would be like in hell, though I admit, what you see in the picture is very, very insignificant as compared to what awaits you (Daniachew, 1973: 148).

Daniachew's presentation of religious icons and religious preaching in the story of the novel is not to reflect religious beliefs and practices of the society; rather it is to show the connection of the society's religious complacency and the power interest monarchy. In fact, such presentation enriches the totality of life and totality of the object that in turn reflects the writer's ability of describing scenes. The preacher uses the power relation between the devil and the man on the picture to warn the people who in case would intend to oppose the emperor and his rule. The preacher used to imply that to oppose the emperor is to commit a sin and to commit a sin is to face not only earthly but also heavenly punishments. Daniachew, the novelist, implied not only how the society was tied by religious complacency but also how the political power used such complacency, i.e., the alliance of the church, in maintain its power interest. The preacher requests the pilgrims, by implication the society, to legitimate the coercive action that the imperial government takes against people who oppose the monarchy as follows:

‘Yes my children, it’s time for repentance. It’s the time to save ourselves from everlasting hell-fire. Yes, my children. And let those who have sinned against their Emperor confess their crime and take their punishment- for it’s written, it’s better to lose the kingdom of this world than to lose the kingdom of heaven. Better it is to receive the punishment of an earthly king than that of God. And that is better to suffer an earthly prison than the prison of hell where the devil’s teeth are sharper than the sharpest cutter on earth...’ (Daniachew, 1973:150).

The writer, through the interpellations by the preacher, in the extract, showed the Monarchy and its feudal class ideology fusion with religious teachings; he showed the monarchy’s usage of church as ISA in consolidating and maintaining its political power. Such interpellations in the extract enable ruling class to get consent from the society for the coercive action it takes against those who oppose the monarchy to exercise its power. As it is evident in the extract, the preacher hails citizens to approve the coercion that the governing body can take against people who oppose the feudal class ideology. The ruling class owns RSA (repressive state apparatuses), like prison and other security forces, another means of exercise power, as reflected in the extract. The preacher calls the citizens to contrast the earthly punishment with punishments in hell: “Better it is to receive the punishment of an earthly king than that of God. And that is better to suffer an earthly prison than the prison of hell...” The preacher makes such interpellation to let citizens approve the coercion that the ruling body takes against people who oppose the dominant ideology, the ideology of the ruling class.

Daniachew satirize also the effect of the alliance of the monarchy and the church i.e. the monarchy’s usage of church as ideological state apparatus (ISA). Fitawrary, even though he was in *the sermon at the lake*, does not give attention to the religious preaching by the preacher. He, as member of the ruling class, knew the intention of the preacher. He ignored the preaching and talks to his son, Goytom, about a man with his mule, about the peasant who Fitawary calls beast who rented them his house, about the conjure woman, about the administration of the prescription of the blood of the sacrificial sheep and about the effect of the *kosso* water the conjure woman prescribed for him. On the contrary, a woman portrayed “bony and weather beaten of skin” was very much engrossed by the interpellations by the preacher. The writer

exposes, in such story, the religious complacency of the ruled ones, like the woman, who tries to seek religious gratifications from the interpellations by the preacher.

The writer reveals also the society's religious complacency and ignorance of the political manipulation of the church as ISA. The society could not realize the preacher's fusion of the power interest of the emperor and religious lessons; they, rather, mystify the origin of the preacher. Some say the preacher fell from heaven because it couldn't grow wing, and some others say God sent him to earth until he calls him back. Still others mystify that he is son of a devil born of a woman. Using such stories in the novel, the writer criticises the religious complacency that made the society ignorant of earthly forces.

The preacher's coating of feudal class ideology into religious ideology in general shows that Daniachew, the writer's, consciousness about the role of religion ISA, in maintaining the power interest of certain groups/classes. We can also see the power relations reflected among the monarchy, the preacher, and the pilgrims at Church Abbo in the novel. The monarchy is superior to the preacher who is in turn superior to the Pilgrims. The monarchy, using his power relation, assigned the preacher to Church Abbo to coat the power interest of the monarchy into his religious preaching as a penance for his move against the monarchy in a coup.

Over all, the writer's inclusion of religious ideology in the novel is to unmask how the feudal class ideology was intermingled with religious ideology. For this purpose, he included the story about Fitawrari's preoccupation of religious matters, like his announcement about his inheritance that would go to the cause of church constructions, handing over his *gold cross* (Daniachew, 1973:63-64) to Woynitu to symbolize the only thing that the monarchy could transfer to the next generation, and the preaching by the preacher in *The Sermon at the Lake* and *The Salvation* in the novel.

As Foucault (2000 [1994]) said the effect of power relation is more important than the power and power relation. He asserts that power should not be perceived as a negative social factor for it plays positive role not only in transferring knowledge but also in managing the growing society. What is important to analyse, rather, is the effect of power relation in a class struggle/ social

confrontation. The preacher's knowledge of religious lesson which according to Foucault is the truth/knowledge and his task as a preacher given to him by the monarchy enabled him to have the power relation with the people gathered and impose his truth/knowledge /ideology which strengthen the power of the monarchy. And this takes us to see the other side, the positive side, of the fusion of the political ideology into religious teachings in the novel. It perhaps enabled the monarchy to have power and create a cohesive society. As it had negative consequence that made society ignorant of earthly forces and mystify things, this fusion had also a positive side in creating a cohesive society.

Sahle Silassie's *Firebrands* also reflects how the ruling feudal class associated itself with sacred things (how it used the power of religion) to maintain its power. It is indicated in the novel that the emperor was considered as "the occupant of the legendary 'throne of David and Solomon' (Sahle Selassie, 1979: 11). The narrator narrates that Kebret was "motionless, his eyes cast down" when he was taken to the emperor to hear about his appointment to a high government office. It is narrated also Kibret was intentionally made "his pride squeezed to appear before the emperor", who is close to David and Solomon a biblical men of power. Through such story, Sahle Silassie magnifies the monarchy's association of itself to such biblical story to get consent to its power from the society and maintain its class ideology.

The writer dramatizes the monarchy's association of itself to the *Loin of Judah*, a biblical narrative. The monarchy in Ethiopia symbolizes itself with the Lion of Judah on a monument to attach its power to a biblical narrative though the monument was erected in memory of the victory that the country achieved over foreign aggressors:

Dejazmach Azbete had a special attachment to the monument, an ornamented pillar rising out of a circular structure suspended by four huge legs. On the flat top of the pillar stands the proud lion of Judah carrying the tri-coloured Ethiopian flag.

Dejazmach Azbete had a special attachment to the monument not only because the lion of Judah was the symbol of the imperial government; the monument was also the symbol of the heroic fight of Ethiopia patriots during the fascist occupation. And Dejazmach Azbete was one of the foremost patriots, (Sahle Selassie, 1979: 107).

The writer satirizes how of the monarchy connects its power interest with the sacrifice that the societies did in securing their independence. And this connection is manifested in the monument erected in memorial of the martyrs who paid their life to maintain their country's sovereignty. The monument then signifies both the scarification that the society paid to defeat foreign aggressors and the power of the monarchy. The writer implied in the story in the extract that the monarchy links itself to the myth of *Lion of Judah*, a biblical narrative, to signify the indisputability of its power and get consent its power from the society. Dejazmach Azbete is angry by the students protest against the feudal system because he claims that he deserves to stay in power for he was one of the patriots who paid scarification for liberation. (Read more how the imperial government connected itself to previous patriotic deeds in the following section (section 4.2.3).

There is similar connection of feudal class power to a religious myth in Maaza's *Beneath the Lion's Gaze*. The emperor connects his power to the religious myth so that it, his power, would remain indisputable. It is narrated how the emperor and his men were considered in the society: "They were mere men instructing God-chosen, the monarch with blood that could be traced to wise King Solomon of the Bible" (Maaza, 2010:42). The emperor instructs his servant to write instructions to the soldiers who are conspiring against his, the emperor's, power and brags, "Write so they [the soldiers] are reminded, so that they know the Conquering Lion of Judah still sits on his throne" (Maaza, 2010: 43).

*Beneath the Lion's Gaze* not only exposes the monarchy's usage of religious power and power relation (its association to the religious myth to get consent to its feudal class ideology and maintain its power) but also satirizes the effect (i.e. false-consciousness) of the hegemony created by such power relation, church as ISA. One of the subjects affected by the monarchy's usage of church as ISA is Mickey, member of the soldiers in the novel. Mickey could not believe the news of the overthrow of the emperor for he believed removing the emperor from his power is violating the divine law and experience heavenly tribulations:

The emperor was God's chosen, that the blood of King Solomon and King Dawit flowed in his vein, and Mickey imagined that anyone who dared to corner and trap one of God's own, who dared to defile that divine blood, was committing a blasphemous act for which there would be no forgiveness (Maaza, 2010:62).

As we can see it in the extract, Mickey believed to remove the emperor from his power is to defile the divine blood (the blood of King Solomon and King Dawit flowing in the blood of the emperor) and so face the immediate punishment from the divine power. We can see Mickey was subject of the false consciousness that he could not disillusion it easily. The base of Mickey's such illusion is the discourse that links the emperor to the divine power. Later, when he, Mickey, was appointed to inspect the emperor in his room by Major Guddu, the head of the Military Junta, he feared the emperor would curse him and says, "If he looks into my eyes, I'll be cursed. He is the emperor. *Janhoy*. Who am I?," (Maaza, 2010: 62). Mickey fears the emperor's curse because of his illusion that connects the emperor's blood relation to the kings, King Solomon and King Dawit. The writer came with such story to show how society are made subject of certain illusions for certain power interest. As implied in Althusser (1970), dominant classes in a class system can use religious ISA to create myths or legends, like the legend of Solomonic Dynasty in Ethiopia, that fuse people's power interest within religious lessons.

Similarly, Nega's *The God who Begat a Jackal*, mirrors religion as ideological state apparatus (ISA) that the class at the top uses for hegemony. Nega shows how a ruling feudal class associates itself to religious myth so that it, the ruling feudal class, controls the base and superstructure to reinforce its power. The ruling feudal class in the novel claims that their blood line to the divine power (the allegorical religious myth Mawu-Lisa in the novel) granted them the earthly power that enables them to control the land, and the people, the mode of production in general. The ruling feudal class in the novel use the religion (Mawu-Lisa) as ideological state apparatus (ISA) to prolong its feudal class ideology. The writer did so to allegorically represent the feudal class system in Ethiopia known as Solomonic Dynasty that used Christianity as religious ISA in claiming the political power in the country. The narrator narrates that his father, a descendant of the aforementioned allegorical religious myth Mawu-Lisa), roams over a territory ruled by count Ashenafi, the nobleman, to crash lowly status people and common vassals.

The narrator further recounts the extreme poverty that the society in a fictional place *Kersa*, experienced because of the prolonged drought. He witnessed such condition when he, at seven years of age, had accompanied his father to the place. He recounts, "the emaciated shadows of the vassals and the bloated stomachs of their children betrayed that they had barely enough food

to feed even their own family” (Nega 2002: 11). In doing so, the narrator highlighted the extreme poverty in the society. The tenants were totally unhappy when they saw the narrator’s father, who is in duty of collecting due for the Count. The narrator’s father uses the religious myth to convince the residents, tenants, while collecting due for the count from them. He preaches to them that Mawu-Lisa, the religious myth, permitted him (the narrator’s father) and his descendants to own the land. The narrator recounts what his father preached about the ruling feudal class’s possession of the land to the tenants, as follows:

A meeting was hastily called, and, standing before a gathering, of angry tenants, Dad made a fiery speech. He began with the vassal-feudal lord relationship, highlighting the fact that such a partnership was initiated when Mawu-Lisa delegated one of the first children, Legba, to oversee the activities of his siblings. It was a divine wish, Dad maintained, that the mere 10 percent of the multitude, those who could trace their bloodline to Legba, should own all the arable land in the kingdom, engaging the landless masses to toil from dawn till dusk for the rare privilege of going to bed with a full stomach; it was in the stars, he said, that the landless masses should be called upon to spill blood in a battle field in order to defend this sacred partnership (Nega, 2002: 10)

As it is evident in the above extract, the ruling feudal class in the novel uses the religion *Mawu-Lisa*, which yet allegorically represents the Christianity, to mystify its possession of the arable land and exercise its feudal class power. Hence, the writer adopted the Mawu- Lisa, religious myth, in his novel to show how ruling feudal class used religion as Ideological State Apparatus (ISA) to control power and rule society. As explained by Althusser (1966) religion, as one of the ISAs, served more in the feudal class system. And this is evident in Nega’s novel, a novel about the feudal class system that Ethiopia had. The narrator’s father mystifies that Ligba (fictional religious myth in the novel) granted the ruling feudal class the arable land because of their bloodline to it (Legba). He further tells the attendants that the landless masses are destined by the religious myth to toil on the arable land from dawn till dusk for the ruling feudal class. He further tells them that such agreement was made in the stars by the divine, metaphysical power. Through such story the writer reflected how the ruling feudal class controlled the society with such illusions.

We see in the novel that the priests are collaborators in reinforcing the interest of the feudal ruling class. The narrator recounts the tenants' response to his father who arrived to collect due for Count Ashenafi and the role of the high priest as follows:

Insults were heaped upon Dad. Fists shot up high in the air. And when I thought that dad and I were doomed, that we would be trampled to death like a snake found defiling a temple, the high priest of Kersa stepped in. The priest unveiled a rare and refined breeding in his person when he reminded the tenants that one should never send a visitor home empty-handed. Though the vassals had gone above and beyond their legal obligations to Count Ashenafi when they delivered four cows a bull three months before and a herd of sheep six months before that, the animals in question had all been destined for religious sacrifice. 'Is there even one among you who would not stand to benefit from that selfless act?' the priest argued. The holy man made further reference to the Scriptures, before passing the judgements.

Alas, the high priest blundered when he recommended that the leftovers of salted beef and mutton stashed away by the farmers be sent to their lord (Nega, 2002:)

The tenants were angry at the narrator's father who came to collect due in the time they had prolonged draught, but the high priest of their place forced them not to send the man empty hand. The high priest further tells the tenants that they would benefit from the Count's religious sacrifice. In doing so, the high priest, using his power relation with the residents is consolidating the power of the Count, who is exercising feudal class ideology. The gift in the extract, however, was considered by the Count as inappropriate, disrespectful and ill-fitted that eventually caused war against the tenants.

Similarly, there is a Monk, Revered Yimam, who was appointed as a legate by the Supreme Pontiff of the Shrine of Mawu-Lisa to protect the religion (Mawu-Lisa) from the Ammas (followers of Amma, a belief of nomads in the fictional story). He moved from place to place to raise money, enlist warriors and declared crusade over people who call them heretics and infidels and the Ammas.

The Monk using his power relation (being a religious leader) with the people preaches that master-slave relationship is God-given phenomenon and warns that to abuse such relationship is to violate God's order; "...the holy man [the Monk] chose to expound on master-slave relationships, arguing that human bondage had been sanctioned in the Holy Scriptures and that

relationship was to impugn God's words" (Nega, 2002:65). As it is evident in the extract, the religion (Mawu-Lisa) being ISA consolidates the power of the feudal ruling class. The writer, using such stories in the novel, reflected the fusion of the religious ideology with the feudal class ideology and showed how such fusion enabled the ruling class to consolidate its power of controlling and having cohesive society.

We see that religion as ISA is being used to motivate people for war against groups who rebel against the established social order, feudal class formation. A Supreme Pontiff promises salvation to the people who join the Inquisition/crusade, a war against the Ammas and other people, who are considered as infidels and heretics. And such practice, like the congregations' joining of the war, is the manifestation of the effect of the ideology disseminated. And such promise results in the residents' joining of the Inquisition launched to punish the Ammas who hosted Gudu and resisted the religion Mawu-Lisa. The Ammas hosted Gudu in his elopement from Count Ashenafi for he fell in love with Aster the Count's daughter. Reverend Yimam, a leader of the Inquisition, criticizes also the emperor for being reckless to control the Ammas and other people who revolt against the class ideology:

Reverend Yimam made it known, in his first public address, that the monarchy had lost its sight of reality; that, left in the hands of the reckless emperor, the nation was bound to race down the slippery slope that it found itself on, and into the waiting hands of the infidels. The kingdom had been besieged by false deities. On all sides; the emperor not only failed to see the threat posed to the true faith, but had conspired with the enemy when he issued grazing rights to the infidels' herd in return for taxes. The Mawu-Lisa clergy had stepped in at the eleventh hours to rescue not just the spiritual lives of the mortals and the tattered image of the kingdom, but also to stitch the country back together (Nega, 2002:139).

The monk, Reverend Yimam, criticizes the monarchy in general for leaving the nation in the hand of reckless emperor who he thinks was failing to control and punish the Ammas who were moving against the monarchy itself. He announces that his movement, the Inquisition, is to fill the gap that the monarchy couldn't fill; the aim of the Inquisition is to punish people who move against the monarchy and its class system ideology. In doing so, the Inquisition works as ISA to strengthen the monarchy's power of controlling the society.

The Inquisition, without abusing the class system, performs its tasks of suppressing people who move against the ruling class. It did not allow, for example, slaves to accuse 'freeman', but other

slaves for their infidelity against both the religion and the class system as narrated in the following extract:

Slaves couldn't make accusations against a freeman or bear witness in case involving one, but they were encouraged to come forward with damning evidence against one of their kind. Beza was promised a speedy entry into the Heaven of the underling when she revealed that Enquan, Gudu's mother, had fed her boy a meal of mutton and onions on a Wednesday, after the manner of the infidel Amma (Nega, 2002:414).

As shown in the extract, the Inquisition works as ISA for the class ideology. The Inquisition encourages slaves to condemn not "freeman" but other slaves who in case oppose the established social order. It promises the slaves would enter Heaven if they expose a slave who in case joins the disobedience against the class system. Beza, a bondswoman, exposes Enquan, another bondswoman, for feeding her son, who opposes the class system, a meal of mutton.

Because of the false consciousness, the slaves, like Beza and Enquan never dared to accuse freeman for his/her wrong doings; rather, they accuse to each other. They never question as to why they are not allowed to accuse the freeman as they accuse slaves. Beza exposes Gudu's secret visiting of Aster, his love, to Revered Yimam, the leader of the Inquisition. As a result, war broke out between the crusaders, army of the Inquisition, and Gudu's guards, the rebels, and armed people from both sides passed away. Beza, the bondswoman has totally submitted herself to class ideology because the illusion she has about it. Hence, she exposes Gudu, a leader of rebel group that fights against the established class system.

The monk announces practices called *a feast day* and *high mass* that strengthens the residents' submission to both the religious and feudal class ideologies. He makes the residents put their hands on the Holy Book and swear to support the Inquisition. He also declares a program called *Edict of Grace* during which people who think sinned against Mawu-Lisa and the established class system come and confess openly. As a result, there are people who questioned the validity of Mawu-Lisa and conspire with the Ammas against the feudal class system confessed openly. People who are thought sinned against Mawu-Lisa and the class system also are punished for imprisonment, number of lashes, and their homes were ransacked and sealed.

In addition to the religion, we see the ruling class uses individuals with extra-ordinary power (superhuman power) in consolidating and exercising its political power. The emperor, who

controlled the throne, surrounded himself with people who have special talents. People with special talents in the novel include fortune tellers, rainmakers, spirit charmers and devil tamers. The emperor of the fictional kingdom assigns Aster as his consultant because of her extraordinary power, like the power to communicate with departed spirits and knowing people's hidden thoughts (read for more in section magical realism). As a result, she exposed a visiting diplomat's hidden agenda against the emperor's power and the interest of the country. She also uncovered the plot organized by a brother against the emperor's throne. Though these special talents are related to magical realism that the writer used as a mode of writing (i.e., as postmodernist mode of literary writing), we can see their direct relevance to the ideology reflected in the novel. Eventually, Aster was sexually harassed by the emperor in a grand party that he prepared for her thirtieth birthday and acknowledgment of the service she offered to the monarchy.

#### **4.2.2 Discourses of Dominant Ideology in Family Social Relations and Media**

In addition to the religious power and power relations, there are other power relations like the family and media that produce discourses that both can create social consciousness and exercise and resist certain social power. We can understand from the works of both the early Marxists and post-Marxists, Althusser, Gramsci, Frankfurt School of critical theorists and Poststructuralists (mainly Foucault) that different social institutions and power relations, like the religious institutions, familial social relations and media play a great role in both creating social consciousness and in exercising and resisting certain forms of social power. Based on this, the present subsection contains the analysis of the role of family and media power and power relations and discourses in reinforcing the dominant ideology, the ideology of the ruling class of the society portrayed in the novels under study. In other words, we would see how social institutions (ideological state apparatus (ISA) for Althusser and civil society for Gramsci) were used for interpellation during the reign of monarchy and the Dergue junta in Ethiopia as attempted to illustrate in the following pages of the subsection.

To begin with, *Beneath the Lion's Gaze* by Maaza reflects the role of family power relation in reproducing the discourse that can reinforce the monarchy's power and its dominant ideology, the feudal class ideology. Dr. Hailu and his family ask his son Dawit to stop joining the rebellion waged by the students against the imperial government not only because they feared Dawit

would be harmed by the security forces but also because they think it is impossible to remove the imperial government. Sara, Dawit's sister-in-law laughs, at Dawit's idea of the students' rally to force the emperor to have meeting with them to discuss reforms. She shrugs arrogantly and mocks at the students' call for the Emperor to meet them and she says, "The emperor meeting with students?" (Maaza, 2010:21); and this shows that she implies the power of emperor is indisputable. The writer, through such conversational scenes between characters, the novelist is able to comment on the family's consciousness and its role in consolidating the power of the emperor.

Similarly, Dr. Hailu, the character in the same novel, thinks that it is impossible for the students revolting to remove the monarchy and says, "Do these children [the university students] think they can take down a monarchy of three thousand years.... that their ideas can stop bullets?" (Maaza, 2010: 37). Dr. Hailu is expressing the might of the monarchy in the country. Such ideas can have their role in either fortifying or weakening certain ideologies, during the period conflicting ideologies coexist. In fact, Dr. Hailu treated, in his hospital, a young boy who was bitterly damaged in the demonstrations by the security forces and hence he does not like his son, Dawit, to join the demonstrations and riots staged by the university students against the monarchy. His claim it is impossible to remove a government/dynasty of "three thousand", however, can reflect the role of the family as ISA in strengthening the indisputability and might of the power of the monarchy in the country.

Though it is not effective *Weizero* Debitu, in the *Firebrands* by Sahle Selassie also tries to stop her sons not to join the revolts by the university students against the monarchy. *Weizero* Debitu asks her son, Worku, not to take part in the riot, because she says he is not the son of a nobleman. She admits her family is too weak to fight, in addition to her maternal love to her son. Considering the students' riots against the monarchy, *Dejasmach* and the police officer blame the families and schools failure to discipline their children. They blame, "students' agitation, teachers' collaboration, parents woes for their failure to discipline their children..." (Sahle Selassie, 1979: 122). "To discipline their children" in this case, includes making them obedient of the rule the imperial government and its power. *Dejasmach* considered that the education was not functioning in the interest of the monarchy because the social consciousness created by the

education was out of its, the monarchy's, control. (Read the role of education in creating social consciousness and exercising and resisting certain social power in section 4.3.3).

Nega in his novel *The God who Begat a Jackal* also dramatizes family ISA that plays its role in prolonging the dominant ideology, class ideology. Though Gudu, a revolutionary character in the novel, has a seditious sense against the class system and questions what servitude is, his mother, however, attempts to repress his sense of rebelliousness, as is evident in the extract below:

For nothing Gudu made question servitude, the plight of his people, more than the sight of half-witted men and women, dressed up in exotic attire, patronizing him. Each night after his court performance, he brought his unanswered queries to his mother, but Enquan [Gudu's mother], knowledgeable about the fate of his bondwomen who exhibited freedom of spirit, did her best to repress his seditious thoughts (Nega, 2002:44).

We clearly see the role of family as ISA in prolonging the established social order and its ideology (social formation) by looking at the role of Enquan (Gudu's mother) in the extract. Gudu, as a working class, opposing the dominant class, is well aware of the difficult situation of the people under servitude and asks his mother, Enquan, to tell him the cause for it. His mother does not tell the cause for it; instead, she tries to suppress his seditious feeling against the class system. She does so because of her submissiveness to class illusion as stated in section 4.2.4.

*The Thirteenth Sun* reflects that family power relations as ISA (mainly those who have organic intellectuals as members of the families) were challenged by a new discourse by the new generations, mainly the organic intellectuals of the time, the university students, who are aware of the problems of feudal class system. This shows the society in general and the families, including families of the ruling class, in particular (who have organic intellectuals as family members) of the last period of the monarchy were influenced by the discourses of the organic intellectuals in universities. We encounter such challenge in the novel in the argument between Fitawrary Woldu and his son, Goytom.

*Firebrands* by Sahle Selassie reveals how the imperial government used media for hegemony (i.e. to get unconscious consent from the society to its power). It is implied in the following extract from the novel that Woizero Debritu, a character in the novel, gives unconscious consent to the imperial government because of its hegemony on media:

Although her son, Bezuneh, was one of the victims of what Worku was trying to enumerate, Woizero Debritu could not make sense of such general terms as corruption, feudalism, oppression, and misery. Her ears were rather more used to such soothing phrases as Ethiopia being ‘the bread basket of the Middle East’, ‘pregnant with minerals’, ‘untapped of her natural resources’ and the like. Day in day out the media poured out words and phrases that sounded big and meaningful and yet were hollow (Sahle Selassie, 1979: 124).

As it is indicated in the extract, the writer satirises that *Woizero* Deberitu is unaware of the bad governance by the imperial government because of the hegemony on media. She gives unconscious consent to the power of the imperial government. Her son, Bezuneh, is sentenced for ten years imprisonment because he prevented a government official from corrupting a bid. The cause of his imprisonment is his fight against corruption. The official expelled Bezuneh because he refused to cooperate in the corruption. The writer included such story to justify the revolution by the students. *Woizero* Debritu, Bizuneh’s mother, however, does not make sense of what her sons (member the university students rallying) mention-*corruption, feudalism, oppression, and misery*- because of the hegemony on media by the government as implied in the extract.

We can also see that media ISA used during the conflicting ideologies reflected in Maaza’s *Beneath the Lion’s Gaze*. The university students who were rebelling against the monarchy use pamphlets to disseminate their ideology to the public. Similarly, the military junta, the Dergue, used leaflets that it dropped from air, radio and television in their propaganda against the imperial government it, Dergue, removed from power. We can also see the different mechanisms that Dergue used for interpellations from what Dr. Hailu senses, during the military rule from the following extract:

He [Dr. Hailu] had grown weary in those months of jeeps and uniforms, marches and forced assemblies; his patience worn thin from the constant pressure to mold his everyday activities around a midnight curfew. He had to contend with identity cards and new currency, a new anthem and even a new flag. He had come to detest Radio Addis Ababa and Ethiopian Television and the announcements of the arrests and even executions of intellectuals and city leaders, and increasingly, students. His daily commute was punctuated by a constant stream of propaganda posters with star-and-sickles emblems and large-fisted, determined works. Pictures of Guddu, [head of the military rule] were everywhere. Communism had couched itself comfortably in a country that once boasted of a Solomonic Dynasty ( Maaza, 2010: 115)

The writer tries to show how the Dergue's reign was tight using the RSA, such as jeeps and uniforms (of the soldiers), *marches and forced assemblies*. She shows the military rule was so intense and repressive to control and maintain its power (Read more about RSA by *Dergue* in section 4.2.5.2). We can also see the power relations and different interpellations that Dergue used to control public mind and get public consent to its rule. Maaza satirizes the discursive and non-discursive means such as the national anthem, propagandas on radio and television, posters, photos of the leader of the military rule, Major Guddu, posted everywhere etc mentioned in the extract that Dergue, the military rule, used for interpellations to control public mind. Dr. Hailu, an intellectual who could understand the role of propaganda, however, says he was fed up by such propagandas because he realised from his experience that both rules (the monarchy and the military rules) use different propagandas and interpellations to get public consent to their power. He realised that as the monarchy boasted for Solomonic Dynasties, the Military Rule also uses different discursive and non-discursive interpellations listed in the extract to control the mind of the people and consolidate its power.

#### **4.2.3. Story of Previous Battles and the Discourse of Dominant Ideology in *The Thirteenth Sun and Firebrands***

Both Daniachew and Sahle Selassie satirize how the monarchy narrates Ethiopia's military resistance against foreign aggressors in the way it, such narration, prolongs its, the monarchy's, power. Both the novels reflected that the imperial government use story of previous battles to mask the prevalent decadence in the country and disguise its power. Goytom, being portrayed as progressive in *the Thirteenth Sun*, criticizes his father, Fitawrary Woldu, who ignores the decadence but always tells stories of previous battles. Goytom, in his monologue, narrates the following, concerning his father's narration of previous battles:

And haven't I seen that picture of a battle scene he [Fitawrary] hangs on the wall above his head. All that rubbish in one picture: cavalry, charge, mounted infantry and phalanx, all in action\_\_shooting, spearing, shielding, hand-to-hand fighting\_\_and hundreds of the white men dead and not even one Ethiopian. What an outrageous lie and how ridiculous! And he tells me that he has this and that medallion, as if I care a dot about it. Medallions given to people for telling the greatest lies or for being the greatest of cowards! He expects me to take him as a hero. Why should I tell him that heroes are dead and buried? Why should I tell him that bravado is his wrong word for fear? And that he sometimes succeeded by sheer accident. Why should I tell him that

medallions are used most of the time disguise a cowardly heart, (Daniachew, 1973:76).

Goytom, representative of new generation in the novel, is fade up with his father's story of previous patriotic deeds and recognizes that the ruling class is using such story to mask the decadence and the miserable life of the society happened as the result of the feudal class system. Daniachew recognized, perhaps, that people are made to live in previous glories of the country forgetting their existing situation that he came with such story. Goytom, asks himself concerning his father's narrations of story of previous patriotic deeds, "why should I tell him that medallions most of the time disguise a cowardly heart." He opposes his father's such story because he, his father, (by implication the monarchy), uses such story to cover its failure to ensure changes in the country. This indicates also that the new generation's demanded for social change while the old generation was too much nostalgic to previous achievements. By including such story, the writer implied that the monarchy used such stories of battles to cover its failure to ensure social transformation and maintain its power.

The writer has also included the story of children's mock battle of war to indicate how people were made marred by stories of battles to forget their existing miserable life caused by the feudal class system. Goytom narrates that children gathered in a memorial feast playing war, grouping themselves into two groups. He observed them having a mock battle between the two groups. He observes what the children were pretending "patriotism, respect for the dead mercy for the prisoners of war, triumph for the victories," (Daniachew, 1973:105). The writer included such events by the children to indicate that the monarchy used to tell the society about previous patriotic deeds to mask the decadence happened as a result of the feudal system.

Fitawrary hands over his gold cross to his daughter, Woynitu, and *omega* watch he received from the emperor for his participation in battles, to his son, Goytom. The writer, through such gift by Fitawrary, showed the monarchy's connection to religious myth, religious complacency of the society and stories of battles that it, the monarchy, used to mask the decadence in the country and maintain its political power.

What Woynitu narrates about Fitawrary's concern about the watch, title and land can be seen in relation to Marx's base and superstructure. Woynitu narrates that her father, Fitawrary, was concerned with his *watch, title and land* (Daniachew, 1973:161) that the emperor gave him. According to a Marxist notion of ideology, the land is the base, the mode of production upon which the superstructure, such as the titles, the medallion, the watch (expressions of patriotism), religious complacency and the feudal class ideology rise. The superstructure, comprised of both ISA and RSA, is used to keep the power interest of the feudal class system. Daniachew reflects that the Monarchy used stories of previous battles, title, and religion as superstructure in the novel. The superstructure helped the ruling class of the feudal system to control the mode of production: (the land and labour) and the political power.

Similarly, Sahle Silassies, in his novel, *Firebrands*, trivializes the monarchy's and old generation's attempt of disguising power through stories of patriotic deeds and refusal of new social change. Patriotism is done to defend once independence and sustain socio-economic development. However, we see Dejazmach Azbete, member of the imperial government in the novel, uses stories of previous patriotic deeds to disguise his power interest and condemn the students' opposition against the feudal class system:

'I have almost been pounded to death at Arat Killo [by the students protesting against the feudal class system], around the liberty monument, the monument for which I have made a sacrifice of my blood, a monument for which I was ready to give my entire life!' He looked up at a group of pictures on the wall. The man in the centre, the man with three rounds of a cartridge belt, carrying a gun on his shoulder was Dejazmach Azbete himself...' (Sahle Selassie, 1979: 109-110).

The novelist used such stories in the novel to show how the Imperial government used previous patriotic deeds of the nation to cover its existing feudal class ideology. Dejazmach Azbete refuses the students' call for the removal of the imperial government and associates his power interest with the nation's previous patriotic deeds. He uses his photo, taken being armed to influence people and remain in power. He and his imperial government claim to remain in power because "he had made a sacrifice of his blood in the wild forest" (Sahle Selassie, 1979: 110).

Dejazmach further associates the students' opposition against feudal class system with oppositions against the society who fought for independence, by saying, "I know that they [the

students in the riot] stand against the very people who fought gallantly in the forest, and retrieved the honour of our mother land” (Sahle Selassie, 1979: 120). He uses previous patriotic deeds to cover his power interest and the social problems caused by the feudal class system. By associating in such manner, Dejazmach attacks the students’ demand for political change and land reform.

#### **4. 2.4 Satires of False Consciousnesses in *Beneath the Lion’s Gaze* and *The God who Begat a Jackal***

We have seen Mickey, a character in Maaza’s *Beneath the Lion’s Gaze*, was the subject of the monarchy’s association of itself with religious myths. Mickey could not believe the removal of the emperor from his power. He, rather, expected the divine power would send tribulation to the country, Ethiopia, because of the removal of the emperor, who is considered the occupant of the Lion of Judah and the descendant of King Solomon and King David. Nega, the novelist, also satirizes the false consciousness (illusion) of the ruled in his novel, *The God who Begat a Jackal*. False consciousness here refers to subjects’ spontaneous consent and submissiveness to the class illusion that made people committed to certain ideology, like the feudal class ideology. We can consider the false consciousness as example of the cognitive aspect/dimension of ideology. *The God who Begat a Jackal*, as it is a Marxist oriented novel, satirizes the effect of the dominant ideology, the feudal class ideology, that ruling classes use to deceive the ruled and maintain their power. It is a Marxist oriented novel for it dominantly dramatizes how ruling classes in a class system manipulate base and superstructure, where base is the economy (the land in the novel) and superstructure is the reproduction of the ideology. The novel further reflects the early Marxist notion that the working class (represented by Gudu in the novel) who are aware of the oppressive and exploitative nature of the class system revolutionize against feudal social order. This section reflects mainly false consciousness, as social consciousness, which can be considered as the effect of the dominant ideology in the novel.

Nega reflects the false consciousness of the oppressed class and its role in strengthening the feudal class system. We see Beza, a bondwoman in the novel, is a prisoner of false consciousness that made her submissive to the feudal class ideology. It is narrated, “Whatever thought of her appearance and temperament, Beza’s dedication to her master was exemplary”

(Nega, 2002:42). As it is evident in the following extract, the narrator tells us also that Beza, as family ISA, made her family dedicated to the cause of feudal class ideology:

When Count Ashenafi was struggling to emerge from under his father's towering shadows and make a name for himself, often at the risk of financial and personal ruin, Beza was there to share his burden. Five of her children were sold to pay up blood money that he owed; her brother lost his life while defending her master's honor. Now that count Ashenafi was assured of his position in society, Beza assumed that he would look kindly on her and her children (Nega, 2002:42)

Beza's submissiveness and commitment to the class ideology, that made her a bondswoman, is reflected in her unreserved support to her master, count Ashenafi. Blinded by the class illusion, Beza as family ISA made her whole family dedicated to the cause of feudal class ideology. In return, she assumes kind look from her master. As compensation to her dedication, the Master made her two of her sons (the Areru twins in the novel) to escort his daughter for leftovers in his home.

Beza's illusion of the class ideology is also reflected in her envy and disappointment against Enquan, her fellow bondswoman, for her cheap service in the master's home:

...She [Beza] felt betrayed when he [the master] chose Gudu over her twins. But, above all, she was confirmed in her suspicion that Enquan, Gudu's mother, had eclipsed in her master's good grace.

Enquan was presented to Count Ashenafi by a thoughtful cousin on his acquisition of a title, and soon she was looking after the personal affairs of the lord of the manor whether he was at home or far afield. Joining his entourage during expeditions, she cooked for him and attended to his sundry needs. Like most cultured men in the kingdom of Hararghe, Count Ashenafi was never without a lap maid whenever he was away from home on an extended trip...Beza was not like most people; she saw a threat in the way that the count looked at his shapely attendant, and she decided to quash the danger when she saw it escalate along with Gudu's status (Nega, 2002:43).

Beza's competition is with Enquan, her fellow bondswoman, who is destined to carry out socially low works for the master. She does not recognize the oppressive nature of the class ideology; she, rather, envies and plots over Enquan's works which consolidates her enslavement to the master. Hence, Beza intends to quash Gudu, Enquan's son, for the position that the master

appointed him as court entertainer and that she thinks he is privileged. She plots to attack Gudu by using magical power, like burying fetishes in spots where she thinks Gudu frequents.

Beza, together with other scholars of the time did not like Gudu's appointment as the count's court entertainer. The count appointed Gudu for his attractive presentation of fables, anecdotes, poems and riddles that he gathers from far and wide places to him and other audiences. Gudu, however, does not see his position, the count's court entertainer, as a special privilege. And this shows Gudu, unlike his mother, Enquan, and Beza, is free of false consciousness created by the feudal class system:

Gudu rarely regarded the role of court entertainer as a privileged position. Others did not share his views. Fellow bondsmen envied him, while monks and scholars expressed anger that count Ashenafi should appoint someone of servile origins for a task that the Good Book clearly allotted to the freeborn and the enlightened. But perhaps the most bitter opponent of all was the mother of the Areru twins Beza (Nega, 2002:42).

Being prisoners of false consciousness (class ideology), Beza and other bondmen opposed Gudu's position as court entertainer. And through such story the writer showed that people who are blinded by the class illusion can conspire against their oppressed fellows. Beza, as a result of false consciousness, conspires not against the repressive class ideology but against Gudu, a bondman. As the idea in Frantz Fanon (1952), a slave becomes prisoner of class ideology when he/she compares him/herself with fellow class members, not a member of the oppressive class. And this shows the consequence of class ideology. Gudu, however, did not consider his position awarded by the count as a special privilege and this makes him revolutionary person for he is free of false consciousness. (Gudu's sense of rebelliousness is discussed in subsection).

There are also other slaves who serve the continuity of the class ideology because of the false consciousness which prevents them from understanding the true social formation. Among the members of the posse who were given the duty of apprehending Gudu, a bondman, who was accused of loving a girl of higher class were slaves. This phenomenon is narrated as follows:

Duke Ashenafi did invoke a posse, as Gudu suspected. A reward of one hundred birr was placed on the fugitive's head. Over two hundred men saddled their horses to join in the manhunt. And though many of them were puzzled at the incongruity of the mathematics – why one would pay the price of six slaves to locate one of his own\_\_none vocalized their bafflement (Nega: 2002:128).

False consciousness makes the six men in the extract sacrifice their life to hunt their fellow slave who was accused of nothing but loving a girl of upper class in a class system. When Aster professed her love for Gudu loudly to her father, her father consulted soothsayers to determine what was ailing her. The soothsayers prophesied that Gudu, by his spell, made Aster love him. Moreover, searches for fetishes that Gudu in case buried in Aster's backyard was carried out. But nothing was found. Duke Ashenafi ordered the posse to apprehend Gudu from the place where he eloped to because of his love with Aster that defames the count's name.

We see the villagers of Kersa where Gudu settled himself during his fighting against the class system also are prisoners of false consciousness. It was not easy for Gudu to convince the villagers in general and the clergy in particular that all human being is equal and that class among societies is politics. We can understand that it is hard for people who remained subject of false consciousness for a long period of time to evade the false consciousness that formed certain social formation. Because of his false consciousness, the clergy and the people who were ardent supporters of the rebellion against the class system resisted marriage between couples of different classes fearing that "the Almighty, who in wrathful vengeance, might send them to their days of hunger and destitution" (Nega, 2002:164). Hence, the clergy fail to accept Gudu's understanding of class formation, that the feudal class formation is politics. Similarly, the villagers were reluctant to accept Gudu's proposal of mixing freeman and a slave and creating sense of equality among the society:

Neither was Gudu's proposal for a slave and a freeman to pray under the same roof welcomed with open arms, at first. Many villagers were edgy, fearing that their pleas would remain unanswered, as those of bondmen; worst yet, that they would be mistaken for members of a lower caste and bestowed the wrong largesse" (Nega: 2002: 164).

We can see in the extract that false consciousness can exist for certain period of time even after the fall of the political power that established the class ideology. We also see in the extract that though the villagers were freed from the bondage of feudal class system, they were reluctant to accept the marriage between a "freeman" and a "slave" and to pray under the same roof because they feared God would punish them.

Still, the clergy doubted Gudu's opening of a school where both children of bondmen and freemen attend equally. The villagers insisted opening of the school when unfortunately dust

devils destroyed thatched roofs and a completed school, levelled, corn field, de-feathered a flock of chickens and emptied ponds of water. It is narrated that Gudu had already handed the torch to new generation though he was obliged to abandon opening the school because the fierce resistance of the villagers; “Not until many years had passed would the issue of integrated schools be brought up again, but by then Gudu would have already passed the torch to a new hand” (Nega: 2002: 164). And this shows that it is not a simple matter to help people avoid their previous illusions. And using such stories, the writer showed how certain illusion persists. The people were reluctant to disillusion their previous illusions even though they overthrew the feudal class system from their territory.

Similarly, the writer satirizes other class illusions in his novel. The villagers and the clergy whose places had been liberated from the government that exercised class system did not expect a normal person/baby would be born from a marriage of freewoman and a bondman. Only the nomads (the Ammas) and Gudu were free of such fear. Gudu and the Amma, believers of home-grown belief, believed a normal baby would come from the two couples. The clergy and the other villagers, however, expected, “ a child, with a small tail between its legs, a baby girl with a third arm sticking out of her chest, an infant of indeterminate sex, and a baboon with a jackal’s head” (Nega, 2002:165). And we can understand that this false consciousness has direct relevance to the general ideology, class ideology, reflected in the novel, *The God who Begat a Jackal*.

## **4.2.5 Repressive State Apparatus (RSA) and Coercion**

### **4.2.5.1 The Imperial Government’s Use of Force as RSA in *Firebrands* and *Beneath the Lion’s Gaze***

Althusser and Gramsci write that a given state/government can use repressive state apparatuses (RSAs) and coercion when the discourse in its ideological state apparatuses (ISAs) or the ideological means of hegemony fails to function in exercising its power. We encounter RSAs such as the court, police force, the army, the imperial body guard and Territorial Army that the imperial government, in the two novels, uses to exercise its power, in addition to some ISAs mentioned in the above sections. These are the RSAs which the feudal class system in the novels *Firebrands* and *Beneath the Lion’s Gaze* used to sustain its political system. The monarchy uses

such RSAs in taking coercive actions against the social movement, mainly against the university students, who are revolting against the feudal class ideology.

The imperial government in *Firebrands* uses certain forms of repressive state apparatuses to punish university students who are demanding new social order. For this purpose, there are police officers who are described as “joro tebi/ ear suckers” to silence conspiracies against the monarchy. The prosecutor accuses Bezuneh of not respecting Kebret, a political appointee regardless of the corruption he, Lidji Kibret, commits. The cause of the fight between Buzineh and Kibret is corruption; however, the prosecutor accuses Buzneuh who prevented Kebret from corruption (taking bribe, for attacking the imperial government and dismantling the frame) which embraced the emperor’s photo. Here is the charge that Bezuneh is accused of:

Bezuneh stood silent as the written charges were read out to him. The major charges were two: attempted murder in cold blood, and the tearing of the emperor’s picture which was given a high tone of treason. In fact, the small, wiry prosecutor with deep-set eyes implied in the written charges he presented to the judges that the attempted murder was not a simple attempt to kill Kebret, but indirectly an attempt to kill the ‘far-sighted and beloved’ emperor himself, for Kebret was a political appointee, a representative of the august emperor in the corporation, and such any attempt on his life was an attempt on the emperor’s life, albeit indirect (Sahle Selassie, 1979: 84).

As indicated in the extract repressive state apparatuses can serve to silence any movement which oppose the political power of their time. Bezuneh is charged for attacking political appointee which the official considered as attacking the whole political system. Eventually, Bezuneh is sentenced for ten years imprisonment though the cause of all these charges is Kebret’s, (the political appointee’s) temptation to corrupt. The writer has come with such story to reflect the repressive political system and its repressive institutions to justify the revolution by the students against the imperial government.

The ruling party suppresses the students’ movement against the feudal class system. Dejezmach asks the police officer about the action taken against the students who are revolting:

‘Couple of students have been shot at and wounded, Dejazmach. They have been carried away to hospital for treatment. And then...’  
‘They should have been shot dead, the ruffians,’ [interrupted Dejazmach]

‘And a few truck loads of them have been taken away where they will be taught discipline. Others are still at large, and are being hunted’ (Sahle Selassie, 1979: 120).

The students were shot and wounded for their riot against the feudal class system. Dejazmach, member of the imperial government in the novel, also approved the action by the police. The imperial government is unable to make the students revolting submissive to its ideology and hence, uses repressive machine to silence their rally against the monarchy.

*Beneath the Lion’s Gaze* also reflects repressive state apparatuses (RSAs) that the imperial government and the *Dergue*, the Military junta, used to suppress any resistance against their power. There are the police and soldiers who are repressing the university students’ demonstrations and riots against the imperial government and its feudal class ideology: “Police and soldiers were overwhelmed and racing through streets packed with frenzied protesters in all directions” (Maaza, 2010: 6). The Imperial government conducts close surveillance against any movement against the government. It stops cars at night. There are also rumble and rattle of trucks and cars whose mission is to stop the rally by the students. There are also patrol cars and police who work to stop people who burn buses and carry out lootings following the violence and rebellion by the students.

Eventually, after the intensive pressure between the feudal class ideology and the revolutionary got crystallised, revolution takes place. The military of the country denied its loyalty to the monarchy, carried out a coup and seized state power. Both *Firebrands* and *Beneath the Lion’s Gaze* reflect that the RSAs that had been working to repress the students’ revolt against the imperial government turned to be repressive machine for *Dergue*, the military junta, that controlled the state power. Mainly *Beneath the Lion’s Gaze* narrates that the military rule, after it removes the emperor and his imperial government, imposes restrictions on demonstration and free speech to consolidate its power. The military junta arrests also former (imperial government officials), civil workers and member of the royal family. It is narrated in the novel that the officials were eventually executed, without trial and charge, by *Dergue*, the military rule.

Mickey, the character, tells Dawit, another character in the novel, about the elimination of the officials. Mickey, together with Daniel, are the ones who major Guddu, head of the military rule in the novel, ordered to shoot the officials. Mickey tells Dawit about how they (Mickey, together

with Daniel) took and shot the officials, and he narrates, “He [Major Guddu] ordered us to tie them [the officials] up and drive them away and shoot them.” “They kept asking me not to do it,...Major Guddu ordered everything. He was standing next to me the whole time. They all died” (Maaza, 2010: 86 and 87).

The writer used such story to reflect Dergue’s irresponsible usage of RSA. And the story makes the man, the leader of the military junta, is responsible for such usages. Mickey witnesses the officials who were ordered to be shot: “The emperor’s grandson, Lij Iskinder Desta, Prime Minister Aklilu, Prime Minister Endalkachew, the other officials. Even...Even other people,” (ibid. 87). These are real people in the novel. and this can show us that the writer wants her reader learn a lesson from real history, mainly about irresponsible usage of RSA.

#### **4.2.5.2 The Dergue’s Use of Repressive State Apparatuses (RSAs) and Fascism in *Beneath the Lion’s Gaze***

Maaza’s novel, *Beneath the Lion’s Gaze*, is a historical novel that comprises real and allusive stories and real and fictional characters. This novel contains bigger portion that reflects Dergue’s cruelty and fascism\_\_torture, interrogations and executions of people in general. The novel is an open-partisan literature that calls up on the readers to curse the Degue for its cruelty and fascism. And the present writer dares to say its open-partisanship reduced artistic quality of the novel. (This has been discussed in section 4.6.4 under authorial and aesthetic ideologies of the novel).

The novelist used different stories that she thinks represents the interrogations, torture and execution of people by the Dergue in Ethiopia. As it is a historical novel, *Benath the Lion’s Gaze*, recounts also the overthrow of the imperial government and the coming of the Military Rule. There is a story that narrates how Dergue arrested and executed sixty officials of the imperial government without trial. There is also an account that talks about the removal of the Emperor from his power and interrogation that Dergue did against him in the novel.

With regard of the story about how Dergue came to power, the novel narrates that some select groups from the soldiers crept into a meeting at the *Fourth Division headquarters* and settled themselves around a table without the knowledge of the Emperor. It is narrated that the group of military removed the new cabinet created by Endalkachew and appointed another person as a substitute:

“This Defiance brought Endalkachew’s already dwindling cabinet to stunned paralysis. Endalkachew, stripped of all semblance of power, most of his ministers jailed, was forced to resign, and then was arrested himself, these low-level officers selected another one of his men, Mikeal Imru, as prime minister” (Maaza, 2010:41).

As indicated in the extract, the novel narrates the historical account of an epoch, the coming of the *Dergue* into power and continues what took place during this time. The writer used different stories that reflect the Military Rule’s fascism in the country. The stories that reflect Dergue’s fascism in the novel are: a story about elimination of the officials of imperial government, the story about the fictional character Birehane, a little boy and his family whose father was made disappear by the Military Rule, the story about Dr. Hailu and his family, different stories of fascism that includes execution of people who opposed the military rule by Dergue, and different stories about the dead bodies that Dergue dumps on streets and other places in Addis Ababa.

Birhane’s family do not know that his father was murdered; they, rather, expect he would comeback. Sara asks Sofia to leave the rent house and live with them in same compound. Sofia, however, refused Sara’s idea and says Daniel would miss them when he comes: “If we have moved back, how he will find us when he comes back?” Birhane, a little child, always talks of his father. He tells to a soldier he met in Hailu’s family that his father also is a soldier: “My dad is a soldier. But we can’t find him,” (ibid p. 59). He teases also to Sara and Emamma Seble that he has a magic that brings his father back.140.

Sofia, Birhane and Robel were destined to live a miserable life because of the disappearance of their father, Daniel, who was responsible to generate income for his family. The difficulty of life forced the two boys to work and generate income to their family. As the twelve years boy, Robel, works as shoeshine, seven years child, Birhane, sells newspaper around cafes and streets in Arat Killo near his brother. Birhane, after his return to his home, tells his mother that he sees dead body around the street he works. The body was dumped on street by Derg to send a message to the public who in case oppose its military rule. The writer used such horrible stories in the novel to reflect Derg’s cruelty.

One day, Birhane, while he was moving between cars stopped around the cafe to sell his newspapers, a man who is a member of the resistance group sitting in his car enticed Birhane to hand a piece of paper to an official of the military rule sitting in his car. Birhane, the boy, did not

know the message on paper; he simply submitted it to the official who was having tea in his car. The official hurried to get off his car soon after he read the message, “The essence of our existence is the destruction of Derg,” (ibid. p. 218), but he was immediately shot. Birhane got confused by the incident and soldiers swarmed the place. The death of the man caused Birhane’s arrest. Birhane’s mother and brother did not know what happened until another boy who sells newspaper with Birhane tells them a soldier took him in a military track.

Birhanes’s older brother, Robel, and Sofia, his mother spent days and nights to search of Birhane in different police stations in the city. Robel asked a policeman in a police station if there was a boy named after Birhane in the prison. The policeman replied, “No boys today, we just brought in those women from a funeral for an anarchist,” (ibid. p. 230). Anarchist is a polarizing word Derg used to polarize those who opposed its rule. (Read polarization as reflected in the novel in section 8.5). Moreover, we can see the fascism that the writer wanted to reflect in her novel using the idea in the policeman’s response: people who attended funeral of a person who is killed by the military rule were punished for imprisonment.

Birhane was severely tortured, interrogated by the soldiers in the prison. The soldiers “slapped him hard, imprisoned and whipped Birhane with a long stick repeatedly and asked him to tell them the name of the person who gave him the paper he submitted to the official murdered.

Soldiers made Birhane and other prisoners march on street and shout slogans such as “Long live Marxism! Viva proletariat Ethiopia! Viva Guddu! [The leader of the military rule], Victory for the masses! And Death to imperialism!” (p. 259 and 260). Soldiers order the prisoners to louder and raise their fist higher. Poor Birhane faced trouble that his short sags down his waist when he raises his fist as ordered because he had no belt; yet, the soldiers ask the prisoners to louder and raise their signs higher. Birhane wears a short that his mother prepared it from his father’s trouser. A soldier fired at Birhane when he saw him limped off to the side and stopped to tighten his short. Finally, Birhane was shot by the soldier.

Yonas, Dr. Hailu’s older son, was suddenly around and took Birhanes body to his family for burial. A Kebel official, however, did not allow the burial of the body; rather, he ordered the family to take the body and leave it on the street according to the practice by Dergue. Yonas begs the official to allow them to bury the body. The official refuses their request and said that his

superiors would jail him if he permits the burial. Yonas paid bribe and the family carried out the burial secretly. Birhane's story is among the different stories in the novel that the writer used to reflect the agony that society during the reign of Dergue experienced. It is also among stories that reflect how Dergue exercised its political power.

Another story that reflects Dergue's fascism in the novel is the story about Dr. Hailu and the girl he offered medical treatment. Both Dr. Hailu and the girl are among the people who are victim of the military rule. Two soldiers brought a girl who member of the military rule had burned in a plastic bag for she was suspected of supporting the resistance group who opposed the military rule. The narrator witnesses the condition of the girl when the soldiers brought her to Dr. Hailu for medical treatment as follows:

The girl was too weak to survive another round of interrogation. Even if she lived, she'd bear the scars for life. There would always be deep gashes on her thighs, her feet would never wear delicate heels. She would always with limp. She had been raped, violently, (ibid p. 154).

The interrogators, members of the military rule, tortured the girl severely. The writer used such stories in the novel to expose Dergue's fascism. We see in the novel that Dergue used fascism as one means of exercising its power. And though such stories, the writer teaches the history that the society passed to the generations of every period.

The narrator further narrates what Dr. Hailu observed on the girl's severely tortured body: "He [Dr. Hailu] counted the number of lacerations on her chest, the severity of the burns on her legs, the depth of the wounds on the bottoms of her feet," (ibid, p. 155). The girl had been burned by electricity until her flesh gets nauseating stench and she was soaked in her blood. The narrator further narrates that clumps of the girl's hair had been pulled out, and a smell of excrement and burnt flesh was coming of out her when the two soldiers brought her to the hospital. The writer still uses this story to expose the severity of the torture and interrogations by Derg.

Dr. Hailu explains to the soldiers that the electric shocks damaged the girl internally. Almaze, a nurse in the hospital, also confirms that the damage that the girl received from the interrogators caused "too much infection," (ibid p. 166) on her, the girl's, body. Dr. Hailu attempts to treat the girl and save her life, but because of the extreme damage she received from the interrogators she

died before the two soldiers, who brought her to the hospital. The death of the girl caused Dr. Hailu to be arrested, severely tortured and interrogated.

Dr. Hailu was imprisoned in a room where no light enters. It is narrated that because of the room is dark, Dr. Hailu couldn't differentiate days and nights, so he couldn't know the number of days he stayed in the prison. Dr. Hailu faced very hard torture and interrogations from an officer in the prison for a crime of not his own. As a result, Dr. Hailu got his arm damaged, his vision blurred, his bone bruised, his teeth smashed, and his flesh swollen. Moreover, he lost his hearing ability, and he got his ankles shoved and cuffed, and he felt his bones slid out of their socket. He also got his neck and head damaged because of the torture he faced from the officer in the prison. The officer transferred Dr. Hailu to another interrogator, to the colonel in the novel.

Dr. Hailu faces severe torture and interrogations from the colonel: electric wires were clamped to his ears; he was pounded with fist and hit again and again on his jaw. As result, Hailu's eardrum was damaged, his jaw was fractured, his teeth damaged and blood rolled out of his mouth. The colonel still asks Dr. Hailu about how the girl, who was a special prisoner died. Dr. Hailu responds he couldn't save the life of the girl because she had been dead by the severe torture she received from the interrogators, member of the military rule. He tells to the colonel that the girl was brought in a plastic bag to the hospital. When the colonel heard the girl was tortured in a plastic bag, he could realize that she was tortured by a cruel interrogator, Girma, known as a butcher, without his knowledge that she was taken to this man, Girma. The writer used such stories of cruelty to represent the social condition during the military rule, Dergue.

Before the story in the above paragraph, Dr. Hailu, a medical doctor, is portrayed as a dedicated person who gives more time to treat his patients. Moreover, he is religious person who always prays with his prayer beads in his pocket. The writer came with such portrayal of Dr. Hailu to expose the unjustifiable imprisonment, torture and interrogations by Dergue, against an innocent people.

There is also other reflection of Dergue's fascism in the novel. There are people who Dergue suspects oppose the military rule killed without trial and dumped on streets to send warning for others. The narrator narrates that there are bodies dumped from truck at night. Dawit and Sara, characters in the novel, encountered a body of a boy not more than fifteen years old. A note, "I

am an enemy of the people. Mother, don't weep for me, I deserved to die," (ibid. p. 240) was pinned to the boy's torn t-shirt. Some other days, both Dawit and Sara saw a body of a man dumped on a road around their home. Soldiers do not allow people to remove the bodies off the road. They say the bodies are left there for warnings to others who in case oppose the military rule and call for the establishment of civilian rule. A soldier warned Dawit when he, Dawit, tried to remove a body of a girl he knew off a square and take to her family for burial. Another soldier warned Dawit when he, Dwait, was trying to remove the body of a man off the road and bury it. The soldiers call the people killed and dumped are "anarchist," (ibid. 180) and "traitors to the revolution [by the military rule]," (ibid. 242).

Emama Seble, another character in the novel, tells to Sara that Derg killed an eight months pregnant woman who was suspected of counterrevolutionary. It is narrated that Derg calls people who oppose its military rule with a polarizing word, counterrevolutionary. (Read more about polarization in this novel in section 8.5). There is a story of a student who was found headshot and left for public view because he was suspected of distributing pamphlets that opposes the military rule, Derg. Dawit and Solomon said no one was allowed to move the student's body not even his mother. There is also a forest that Derg uses as "execution ground," (ibid. 206) near Dawit's house.

The bodies piled in a room that a mortician opens for Yonas who was in search of his brother also is another reflection of Derg's fascism in the novel. Dawit joined a rebellious group without announcing his family and left home. Yonas, Dawit's older brother was in search of him in the city. He went to one police station in the city and asked if there is a person named Dawit. The mortician opens the room and asks Yonas if his brother had a scar to search him easily from among the bodies piled. The mortician tells to Yonas that it is policy to pay fee for bullet if his brother was found in the room. Dawit unfortunately was not there and the mortician asks Yonas to check the roads around his home. The police, soldiers and jails are among repressive state apparatuses that *Derg* uses to maintain its power. (Read more about the RSA in this novel in section 8.7).

The writer used such stories that show reflections of Dergue's cruelty – the arrest of people, severe torture and interrogations, killing of youngsters, mainly intellectuals and throwing their

bodies on streets for public view and preventing their families not to take bodies off the streets without paying fee for the bullets used for the executions and pay for burial of the bodies etc - is to teach her readers to sense the agonies that this country, Ethiopia, experienced. She came with such stories in the novel in general to teach her readers the history that the country had in both the imperial and Dergue's reigns.

### **4.3. Discourses of Resistance and Rebellion against the Dominant Ideology**

The discourses by Goytom (in *The thirteenth Sun*), the university students (in both *Firebrands* and *Beneath the Lion's Gaze*) and Guddu (in *The God Who Begat a Jackal*), the people who are, in general, portrayed as the revolutionaries in the novels mentioned can be considered as the discourses of resistance, a resistance against the dominant ideology and dominant social powers.

#### **4.3.1 Discourses of Resistance against the Dominant Ideology in *The Thirteenth Sun* and *The God who Begat a Jackal***

Early Marxists (like Marx and Engels), Gramsci (1971) and Foucault (2000 [1994]) indicate that there can be individuals/groups who can come with ideas and discourse that can enlighten society about the oppressive nature of certain ideology. And these individuals are called *working class* or *proletariat* by Marx, *organic intellectuals* by Gramsci and generally *intellectuals* by Foucault. These individuals/groups can be considered social transformers because of their *universal truth* according to Marx, because of *cohesive move for social change* according to Gramsci, and because of *specific achievement* that is good for society in their specific field they work in, according to Foucault. In fact, mainly Marx and Gramsci consider class position and function in a society in categorizing the individuals/groups mentioned.

Both Goytom, the character in *The thirteenth Sun*, and Gudu, the character in *The God Who Begat a Jackal*, are characterised as having a new/deviant consciousness, a consciousness that is free of the illusion or false consciousness in the novels. It is indicated that the base of the university students' discourse of resistance against the imperial government and feudal class ideology in *Firebrands* and *Beneath the Lion's Gaze* is academic discourses, like Marxist discourses in the universities. (The discourses of resistance by the university students, as organic intellectuals in *Firebrands* and *Beneath the Lion's Gaze*, have been explained under under section 4.3.3).

Daniachew reflects the new consciousness and discourse of resistance against the feudal class system through Goytom and Woynitu. He used Goytom and Woynitu, characterized as having new consciousness which is deviant of the social consciousness established by feudal class system in *the Thirteenth Sun* to reflect the emerging/new consciousness and discourses of resistance against the monarchy in the country. Both of them are children of the feudal ruling class. The source of their new consciousness, a consciousness against feudal class could be academic discourses, like Marxist discourses that explain about the nature of class systems by the time. In other words, education (academic discourses in schools in general) is the cause of the new consciousness by the new generations. And their new consciousness is attributed to the consciousness of Daniachew, the writer, who was member of the students, and later university instructor, in the time when students had hot sentiment against the monarchy and its feudal class ideology. In any case, both Goytom and Woynitu who were introduced to modern education detested the feudal class system and its values in the novel. Goytom opposes his father (Fitawrary Woldu) who is representative of the ruling class of the feudal class system in many ways. Fitawrary in his part opposes any new idea by the emerging intellectuals whom he calls “*intelligentsia*” (Daniachew, 1973:76). (Read section 4.4 of this chapter). In general, *The Thirteenth Sun* reflects the emergence of new consciousness that recognizes and resists the class system. As mentioned elsewhere in this paper, *Firebrands*, *The Thirteenth Sun* and *Beneath the Lion’s Gaze* in general reflect discourses of resistance and revolution against feudal social power in Ethiopia.

Daniachew makes these two characters live with the society, sense the social condition and have new consciousness which is free of the false consciousness established by the feudal social order. That is to mean Goytom and Woynitu developed new consciousness about the social condition through close examination of the society. The novel, in general, is a study about the social condition of the society in the feudal class system of the country. We see the source of Goytom and Woynitu’s new consciousness is the social condition and culture that they examine it critically. In other words, their close living with the society enabled them to have the new consciousness about the condition of the country and the means how to transform it. They compared the life of the society in the village they visited and compared it critically with the modern life they know in their class and education they accessed. In fact, as mentioned above, their progressive new consciousness is attributed to Daniachew, the writer.

Goytom and Woynitu's close examination of the study begins when they set off accompanying their father (i.e. Fitawrary Woldu ) from Addis Ababa to a village in the country. Fitawrary's objective of the journey is to seek cure for himself from holy water of Abbo situated in a village called Zekuala: his journey was not to see the social condition of the society. In doing so, the writer highlights the concern of the new class and the ruling class. His children, Goytom and Woynitu, however, carried a close examination of the socio-economic condition of the society. Goytom and Woynitu who are among main character of the novel narrate social condition of the society separately, having their own sections in the novel. While Goytom narrates socio economic and culture of the society, Woynitu covers mainly women's condition in the society. Both these characters realize that the country is under total state of decadence.

In their journey to the holy water, Fitawrary talks about "the Anti-Christ who will rise before the Day of Judgement" (Daniachew, 1973:3) to his son, Goytom. Goytom, however, maintained his close observation about the social and environmental condition. By doing so, the writer implied the monarchy is preoccupied more by religion rather than the decaying social condition of the society. The ruling class of the feudal system in the novel used religion as ISA to sustain its power because, as indicated in the novel, the power interest of the ruling class was linked with the religious ideologies (read more about how the ruling class used religion as ideological state apparatus to maintain its power in *The Thirteenth Sun* in section 4.2.1). And the writer gave significant portion about the fusion of political power interest of the ruling class with the religious ideology in his novel, '*The Thirteenth Sun*'.

Goytom recognizes that the society in the feudal class system experienced degenerating life. His recognition of the existence of miserable life of the society and the decadence of the country is a new and emerging consciousness reflected in the novel. Goytom realizes that the politics of the time was unable not only to rescue the miserable condition of the society but also the political system itself (i.e. feudalism). Goytom, in his close examination of the society, realizes that the society suffers from lack of justice, corruption and other ills of society. Innocent people are flogged, bribery is common and women are subject in the misuse of political power. And such misuse of political power is a sign that Goytom considers the political system itself is decaying.

Goytom, in his monologue, states that the country was experiencing state of decadence not because it exhausted all its resources but because of the political power, the feudal class system

exercised in it. Goytom examines that the country is endowed with immense economic potential. He, in his interior monologue, states that the country owns sixty-five percent of fertile land. It also owns different weather conditions which would enable the country to produce different kind of crops indifferent places. He also examines the country can benefit much from animal products. He mentions also that the country owns “Watersheds running along the razor backed mountains” (Daniachew, 1973:42) which could be used for different purpose. He further asserts that the country has hard working people though they waste their time and energy in unproductive activities, like using traditional mill and thread production. He vehemently expresses that though the country owns all the listed resources, the society live under extreme poverty.

Goytom ascribes the extreme poverty and decadence in the country to the socio- politics, earthly force, which is, in fact, new and emerging consciousness in the novel; He examines things from the materialistic point of view. He accuses the political system of the time for its reluctance to modernize the country. His accusation of the politics begins when he argues with his father, Fitawrary (representative of the ruling class) about where to spend their inheritance. While Goytom wants to spend the inheritance to build schools, Fitwarary wants to spend it for church constructions and services in his salvation. Goytom recognized the country lacked modernization as follows:

Sad, you can't drive automobiles over these hills. There aren't even loose gravel roads. Only cow paths, got paths, rabbit path and foot paths. I don't really know when we are going to build real roads-down by the deep valleys and round the rocky-walled hills and over mountains (Daniachew, 1973:113).

He is conscious that the country lacked modernization. He indicates political system of the epoch failed to introduce modernization by blaming his father's power interest, “Hoping to live longer to fight against new- modern way of talking, modern dancing modern dress, modern hair cut, and tobacco” (Daniachew, 1973:41). He disproves the advertisement about the new era of civilization in the country he read on billboards around Addis Ababa. Goytom indicates the country, with all its resources, is denied all sort of modernization by the feudal class system. In other words, Goytom attributes the cause of the decadence in the country is the political ideology.

Goytom perceives that the country is “a potential tourist paradise” (Daniachew, 1973:30) with all its tourist attractions like birds and their songs “doves and wild pigeons calling, cranes, herons, duck, geese and ibises saluting the coming day...” (Daniachew, 1973:30). He indicates also that the country has not progressed, “as it used to be hounds of years ago” Daniachew, 1973: 30. He perceives the country could have benefited from tourism, education by educating women like *Woynitu*, and increase foreign currency and modernizing the country. But he realizes also that political power and commitment is critical for such achievement. He says, “But then who am I to decide on that. I’m not one of those people on the top” (Daniachew, 1973:32). He knows change in the country was possible if the political power wills.

Goitom, therefore, indicated that the country is bestowed with resources that the society could not use it. The society has suffered much from severe poverty and ignorance because of lack of political commitment like failing to build modern roads and educating the society. He attributed the society’s social and economic problems in general to the politics in the country.

Goytom believes the society is unaware of the extreme poverty and its cause because of the religious complacency in the society. He asserts the society’s mind is marred with religious complacency in such a way that it prevents the society from understanding the reality; religious complacency, as a type of ideology, prevented the society from understanding that the feudal political system is the cause of the decadence in the country. After considering the difficulty of the journey for the holy water of Abbo at Mountain ZeKwala, Goytom, complains about the cause of the religious complacency of the society as follows:

And then something began to rumble and gurgle in the sick man’s chest. You [the readers] began to think, listening to him, that he must be a wizard, and master of these remote cliffs, ranges of hills, buttresses and the table mountain- that he it was who originally planted the church in this killing ruggedness, and wantonly dotted the hills with those rotten hovels- that it was he who had poisoned men’s brains with complacency- that it was he who devoured their hearts with stagnancy and decadence- that it was he who was responsible for this deadly existence (Daniachew, 1973: 8-9).

The man in the above extract is Fitawrari Woldu and he represents the ruling class of the country. Goytom, the character and narrator, bluntly placed the cause of the decadence and deadly existence of the society in the country is the political system (i.e. feudalism). He criticizes the man i.e. Fitawrari (in other words the politics) for poisoning the society in religious

complacency and makes him responsible for the society's stagnancy and decadence. Goytom, the narrator, involves readers to think of the negative effect of the feudal class system and the religious complacency it imposed on the society by addressing us 'you'. Goytom's criticism of fusion of feudal class ideology with religious ideology is a new consciousness, by implication, the writer's new consciousness for raising such issue which remained untouchable in society.

Goytom examines that the society is predominantly overwhelmed by religious and other social illusions. Goytom's new consciousness indicates that religious complacencies in the society made the country fail to utilize its immense potentials: both human and natural potentials. Goytom repeatedly mentions, "God's way of putting an end to things" and "begging manna from Heaven" (Daniachew, 1973:41-44) in his different statements of his long monologue. Goytom's repetition of such statements in his long monologue shows that he believes such religious illusions made the society of the time ignorant of earthly forces\_\_economic, political and social conditions. In the monologue he lists enormous natural resources, livestock, different landscapes, biodiversities, people who can make deference etc that could have benefited the society. He realizes also that the society was made remain hand-tied to utilize all these resources and modernize the country. The following preaching by a preacher in *The Sermon in the Lake* consolidates Goytom's new consciousness as to why people remained hand tied:

“...Ethiopia is the only country in the world, you may not believe it perhaps, but it is true, the only country in the world that has different patron saints for each of the thirty days of the month. Any man and woman can have the patron saint of his or her liking, and as many as one wishes. Of course, the more saints you have the more time you spend to pay your respects to them and the more bounty they bestow on you...” (Daniachew, 1973:38).

There is a religious days allotted almost for each day in a month. And the congregations are asked to allot the dates for the patron saints. They are asked to spend the date commemorating the patron saint of the day. The writer indicates how the society is overwhelmed by the religious complacency. And these kind of religious interpellations made the society remain ignorant of their earthly affairs i.e. social, political, economic affairs, in general and modernization in particular. As a result, the politics and the society ascribe social and economic problems to God's will. Fitawrari (member of the ruling class) says the poverty in the country is, “a punishment inflicted upon them by God for the sinful life they have lived working on saints' day and holidays” (Daniachew, 1973:48). The society also believes the poverty in the society

happens because God willed. A conjure-woman says this in a conversation about the poverty in the society “Things are not what they look, sir. The people are poor because God has willed that way” (Daniachew, 1973:60). We can say Goytom has new consciousness because he has differences about the decadence, its causes and the way to reverse the situation. He attributes the decadence in the country to the politics (the feudal class system) while others attribute it to God’s will. The politics attribute the extreme poverty and miserable life of the society to God’s will to remain in power. The religious complacency in the society helped the politics to remain in power. Goytom is aware that the politics of the time is responsible for the fusion of political power with religious illusion.

Goytom, in his monologue, criticizes traditional intellectuals, who, according Gramsci (1971), have no association to either of the classes in the class struggle. Goytom wants to be different from such intellectuals. He satirizes the role of traditional intellectuals as follows:

And me a young man. An educated young man ... Oh, yes, at least I have learnt to spit into gaudy handkerchief. To use fork and knife. To knot my ties and put on my shoes. An educated man- an oddling by any standard. ... And I’m supposed to save Ethiopia. ... Save her from home? From myself, I guess? By prayers of mourning; by indolence and strong drink; by the pleasure of the body; by submission and humbleness, and by ignorance... Yes, I’m going to save Ethiopia. No, not by work; not by pride in what I have; not by dignity as human being; not by becoming hard and strong; not by building strength for our real true purpose of building a nation. No these are not for me. They are for those wandering out into the darkness beyond tomorrow... what is to me that these people live in hovels with far less attention to needs than fences than animals. For animals are more valuable in this country than men. At least we have started to export some... (Daniachew, 1973:113- 114).

Goytom, like Gramsci (1971) categorizes intellectuals based on their function in the class struggle. According to Gramsci the kind of intellectuals that Daniachew talks about in the extract are traditional intellectuals who have no social role in transforming the feudal social order. Daniachew criticizes the kinds of intellectuals in the extract exercise trivial personal values, like using forks and knotting ties etc rather than work for social transformation. He also calls up on such intellectuals who exercise feudal personal values to join to those other intellectuals, i.e., the organic intellectuals, who work to improve the life of the society i.e. ...*those wandering out into*

*the darkness beyond tomorrow*. He is indicating that the ultimate goal of education is to work hard with what you have and build a nation beyond personal gains.

Goytom's satire in the extract indicates that improving the society's life was ignored by concerned bodies, including by intellectuals. He observed that those people (governing bodies and the kind of intellectuals in the extract) ignore the miserable life of the society. The novel has already reflected that as there are organic intellectuals who feel the agony in society and work accordingly, there are also traditional intellectuals who only manifest their personal values. These values are the values mentioned in the extract.

After Goytom recognized the oppressive, exploitive and non-progressive nature of the feudal class ideology and the religious complacency of the society, he challenges the discourse of the ruling class with his discourses of resistance against the feudal class system and its class ideology.

There is polarization between the new and educated generation, represented by Goytom, demanding for political change and the ruling class of the monarchy, represented by Fitawrary, in the novel. Goytom opposes his father's feudal class value. His father, Fitawrary Weldu, in his part, does not accept any change that the new generation demands. In his conversation with his son, Goytom, Fitawrary polarizes the educated citizens who demand social change in their discourses of resistance against the monarchy as follows:

“Some of your [Goytom's] lot, the so-called intelligentsia, know nothing but how to kill themselves. Food is not good, they go out and kill themselves ... no work to do, they go out and kill themselves... no beautiful girl, no automobile, no villa, they go out and kill themselves. You [Goytom] and your kind are good-for-nothing. I tell you. No body of my generation would have done such silly things (Daniachew, 1973:76).

As it is evident in the above extract, the old generation, mainly the people who they think they are beneficiaries of the feudal class system rejected the new demands by the new generation. Fitawrary opposes any new idea from new generations whom he calls “the so-called intelligentsia”. He polarizes the educated citizens who have new consciousness are “good-for-nothing”. Moreover, he calls the students' movement for transformation is “silly things”.

Fitawrary further polarizes the new educated generation who is demanding for social transformation. He tells the following to his son:

When I was your age [Goytom's], I used to walk ninety kilometres a day...when I was your age, I used to kill a sheep by myself with every part of the meat cut from its proper place...I used to saddle a horse, load a donkey, eat like a man, drink like a man, fight like a man, love like a man...and look at you" (Daniachew, 1973:75).

Fitawrary polarizes that the organic intellectuals, who resist the feudal class system and initiate a new social order in their discourse, are incompetent. The writer used such story to show the monarchy's negative response to the organic intellectuals' demand for social transformation. Hence, the new consciousness (recognition of the social problems and the need for social transformation) by the intellectuals faced discourses of polarization from the monarchy represented by Ftawrary in the novel. Goytom, representing the organic intellectuals, on his part, polarizes the political system of the time by criticizing his father, in the following manner:

To imagine that he [Fitawrary] has lived at all! A man who has never loved for love's sake, who hasn't worked for work's sake, a man who hasn't fought for humanity, who hasn't stood for some universal truth in life, except\_\_ land, wealth, title, patriotism and that sort of rubbish (Daniachew, 1973:77).

The novelist makes his character Goytom to polarize the political system of his time. And he criticizes that people in the power have no love for their people and he accuses them that they do not work for the sake of society's progress. Goytom criticizes that the people in power do not fight to improve the life the society. He calls them people who lack "universal truth" in life. He criticizes them that they live for *land, wealth, title, and patriotism*. And all these (*land, wealth, title, and patriotism*) are the means that people in power use to sustain their political interest in the time. Land is the source of the economy, i.e., the base in the feudal system. Title, patriotism, etc, also are ideologies (superstructure) which ruling class in the novel use to maintain their power. Hence, Goytom, depicted as progressive in the novel, polarizes the monarchy's control of the base (the economy) and using the feudal ideologies such as wealth, patriotism, etc, are "rubbish" things. In doing so, Goytom targets all the sources of power of the ruling class in his polarization against the feudal class system of the country.

The novel trivializes the monarchy's concern to religious causes and criticizes the society's religious complacency. Goytom opposes his father for his decision to give his inheritance to the cause of religion instead of giving it for buildings school. Fitawrary wants his inheritance, after his death to the cause of church buildings and to the people who take part in the prayer for his salvation. When Goytom reflects his opinion that if the inheritance could be used for school buildings, Fitwarari is annoyed and said, "You know well enough that I do not go for that kind of rubbish" (Daniachew, 1973:). Fitawrari is bold enough to say introduction and building schools is rubbish thing. Daniachew, the novelist, used such argument by Fitawrary to expose how the monarchy used church as ideological state apparatus (ISA) in perpetuating the feudal class system.

Like Daniachew, Nega reflects people's new consciousness and discourse of resistance that oppose dominant class ideologies in his novel, *The God Who Begat a Jackal*. New consciousness refers to a consciousness that is free of the false consciousness of the dominant ideology. The new political consciousness that is deviant to the dominant class ideology can be considered as new consciousness in the novel. There are individuals, in the novel, who oppose existing social order (feudal class system), propose solutions for the problems and act accordingly.

Though she is reared well in her family because of her family's class (upper class), Aster opposes her father's oppressive nature to imply her hatred against the oppressive nature of the feudal class system. Aster's interest to prepare books together with a bondman, Gudu, whom she trains him herself is a new consciousness that opposes the class system in the novel. Aster wants to be a pioneer to produce books prepared by female and Gudu, the bondman:

Though she was inspired by the idea of committing to paper Gudu's treasure of oral knowledge, Aster soon set in motion plans to incorporate, in a book, her own catalogue of wisdom, wisdom long relegated to the deep recesses of her mind. She envisioned an army of monks in some distant monastery hunched over manuscript, reproducing every word for mass consumption. And, as it dawned on her that she was pioneering the first book in the nation ever to be written not just by a female author but also by a man in bondage, Aster's determination sprouted formidable teeth and claws (Nega, 2002:72).

In the extract, we get a new consciousness that opposes both the established oppressive class (social and gender system) system. Previously, only books prepared by men were used in the

monasteries. Aster was initiated to surprise monks in monasteries to get book prepared not by a female but also by a man in bondage. Learning how to read and write also was restricted to people in the higher class. Aster's teaching of a bondman and making him prepare a book with her is a new consciousness that breaks previous practices. Aster could see Gudu's intelligence when he was appointed as a guard for her and decided to teach him how to read and write to prepare a book. Gudu mastered the entire alphabets in six weeks and was able to prepare manuscripts of poems, riddles and fables in three volumes. However, her father, Count Ashenafi was angry when he found her sitting with Gudu shoulder to shoulder; "The sight of his highborn daughter sitting shoulder to shoulder with the family slave gave count Ashenafi a visible shudder" Nega, 2002: 74). As a result, he expelled Gudu from his duty of guarding Aster. Gudu's mother, Enquan, did not like Gudu's close relation to Aster because she had known a man who is a bondman lose his manhood and his life for he was suspected of falling in love with a girl of higher class. Hence, Enquan, as family ISA, pleads Gudu to stay away from Aster for he is a bondman and the secret she privately held. (Gudu is fathered by Count Ashenafi).

Aster decides to leave her family and their feudal class system and join Gudu in his eloping from the Count. Her realization of the oppressive nature of the class system that abided her not to love Gudu, a bondman, is a new consciousness that deviates from the established social formation and practice.

We can also see the narrator's position on the class struggle in the novel. He also has sense of rebelliousness against the established social formation. And one of his manifestations of his new consciousness and sense of rebelliousness is reflected in his favour to Aster's plan to elope. We sense the narrator's revolutionary understanding in the following extract:

Escaping from her [Aster's] prison like mansion had never been an option, but she could escape from her honeymoon bungalow. All she needed was a powerful sedative to throw the old decrepit [an old man who was recruited by the Count to look after Aster] into a sound sleep, and then dart out of her bedroom window and into freedom. What a brilliant thought! (Nega: 2002:131).

We see, in the extract, the narrator's sense of rebelliousness against the class ideology. He supports Aster's plan of departure from the established social order/ class ideology. He considers Aster's departure from the social formation is a *freedom*, and applauds her plan of eloping

saying, “What a brilliant thought!” Overall, we sense Gudu, Aster and the narrator have new consciousness, consciousness that recognizes the problems in the established social formation and its class ideology differently from the other characters who are prisoners of false consciousness in the novel. In fact, we do not see clear account how these revolutionaries raised their new consciousness that oppose the oppressive class systems (both social and sexual classes) in the novel. We can simply say they developed the new consciousness from the extreme life differences between the classes and the oppression and exploitation that the ruling feudal class impose on the subjugated.

The narrator narrates the event at which the Emperor gets into the wedding ceremony that Duke Ashenafi prepared for his daughter, Aster, as follows:

The high point of the event was when the royal carriage pulled in and the Emperor disembarked, flanked by princes and princesses. If Mawu-Lisa had come down to earth, the effect wouldn't have been more impressive. It took the entourage a good hour to walk the hundred paces to the shrine hall, weaving their way through a shrieking crowd, a crowd that fought to kiss the feet, the hands, and even the carpet the emperor walked on (Nega,2002:132).

The narrator satirizes the attendants' move *to kiss the feet, the hands and even the carpet the Emperor walked on*. As stated in the aforementioned, the narrator's such satirizing the event shows his new consciousness that understands the class ideology differently; the society considers the emperor as uniquely God created person. And such illusion strengthens the power of the emperor in controlling the society.

The narrator's father also was running a new consciousness by questioning the justness of Mawu-Lisa, which favours the class system and he was punished for two years imprisonment for it during the Inquisition launched to suppress people who disobeyed Mawu-Lisa and the class system.

Dad was summoned before an Inquisition tribunal consisting of the supreme legate [Revered Yimam] and two legal priests. He was confronted by the hunchback monk for heresy committed not very long ago in the reverend's hearing. Father had questioned the justness of the Holy Scriptures when they excluded the vast number of men and women of bondage from a normal life. He had even gone so far as to collude with the teachings of Ammas by advocating marriage among slaves (Nega, 2002:141).

As we can see it in the extract, the narrator's father had a new consciousness that questions the fairness of the teachings of the Mawu-Lisa, which advocates class system in the novel. And he tends to support the teachings of the Ammas, the religion by Ammas that is not in favour of social class. The Ammas are portrayed to have liberal mind. The Inquisition that was launched to punish people, who have deviant thoughts that oppose the class system, punished the narrator's father for two years imprisonment and ordered his home to be sealed. His family took other people's shelter until he was released from the imprisonment.

Gudu was among the men who set off to fight against the tenants who disobeyed to pay tribute to count Ashenafi in the second campaign. His duty in the fight was to present his entertainment to the men (called crusaders/raider/besiegers), who are made ready by the Count to destroy the rebellion by the tenants in the fictional place of Harar. Gudu, though he is member of the count's army, realized that the attack by the army against the tenants, who refused to pay due because of elongated drought, is an attack by an oppressive ruling class against poor people. And his cognition of such reality (the attack by the ruling class against the tenants and other residents of the place) can be considered as a new political consciousness opposing class system in the novel. Unlike the other members of the army (the bondmen, slaves and tenants), Gudu recognizes that the war by the count is taking place to silence the resistance by the oppressed class. Gudu's understanding of the war by count Ashenafi and his men against the tenants of the place is narrated as follows:

What Gudu couldn't comprehend, what no one could explain to him, was, however, why anyone would even begin to contemplate showering a village full of children, women, and elders with blind arrows, when their only crime was boycotting the payment of tributes. He was repulsed by the men of God – priests, deacons, and monks- who applauded the excesses of the murderers, looters, and war crazed; these men of God hadn't paused for a moment to reflect on the plight of those at the receiving end of Count Ashenafi's wrath. It was, perhaps, this particular episode more than anything else that cultivated Gudu's rebelliousness (Nega, 2002:105).

Individuals, being free of false consciousness, can recognize the oppressive nature of certain oppressive ideology and develop sense of rebelliousness to change it. Unlike the other men of the count who joined the army to attack the tenants in the fictional place of Harar in the second campaign, Gudu questions the significance of the war; he recognizes that the war is a war against poor and innocent people. Gudu realizes how the religious institutions are functioning as ISAs

for interest of the ruling feudal class. He could understand that the priests, deacons, and monks, using their power relation are making the society subjects of the feudal class system. And Gudu's such recognition can be considered as a new consciousness that the other people in the novel fail to realize.

#### **4.3.2. Public Disobedience and Rebellion in *The God who Begat a Jackal***

Nega's *The God who Begat a jackal* is an account of class struggle. According to Marxists, revolution can be considered as resolution used to avoid repressive class ideologies. And this is what we experience in *Firebrands*, *Beneath the Lion's Gaze*, and *The God Who Begat a Jackal*. The discourses of resistance and the rally by the university students against the monarchy and its feudal class system is explained in section 4.3.3 and 4.3.4. We will see the dramatised disobedience and rebellion in *The God Who Begat a Jackal* in this section. This novel is a Marxist oriented material; and it reflects what class struggle is, in general. Unlike the other novels analysed here, in this paper, Negas's *The God Who Begat a Jackal* satirizes the fight between two classes: The oppressive feudal ruling class and the oppressed- mainly the peasants. The other novels, however, reflect the fight between the ruling feudal class, mainly the monarchy, and the organic intellectuals, the ones who initiate the revolution in both their discourse and rally against the ruling feudal classes in the novels.

Nega dramatizes the disobedience and rebellion of oppressed classes against the rulers in a class struggle through the struggle that the peasants in the fictional place of Harar and the rebel groups do against the feudal ruling class in the novel. The tenants in the fictional place of Harar, in *The God Who Begat a Jackal*, began their rebellion against their rulers by refusing paying taxes and tributes to central government before this place was granted to Count Ashenafi. This place was granted to count Ashenafi as a dominion in compensation to his daughter's sexual harassment by the Emperor.

Count Ashenafi ordered men in his place, Karsa, to get prepared to crush the rebellion, punish the tenants, and make the fictional place of Harar obedient to his rule. His men were successful in their first campaign to crush the tenants and caused much misery to the Harar residents. Only three men from count Ashenafi's side were wounded and one of these men was Areru the Taller, a bondman. Areru the taller's wound in the campaign against the tenant's who refused to pay tributes to the Count shows the confrontation was between two oppressed groups the tenants and

the bondmen for the interest of ruling feudal class. Similarly, the people who fought on the side of the Count against the tenants' disobedience in the second campaign were member of oppressed class, as narrated in the following:

Some two hundred men showed up to lend out Ashenafi a hand. More than half were friends, and relations, the rest, chanting foot soldiers. Count Ashenafi had never asked for any help other than that of his usual army of bondmen, feudal tenants, and the overseer (Nega, 2002:100)

The novelist is politically conscious that false consciousness makes oppressed group fight against another oppressed group. (Read more about false consciousness reflected in this novel in section 4.2.4). The people who fought on the side of the Count against the tenants who disobeyed to the rule of the feudal class system are army recruited from bondmen, feudal tenants, and the overseer. This shows the confrontation is done between two oppressed social classes. Tyson 2006, in her Marxist analysis of ideology, asserts that ideology can make two poor/oppressed groups fight each other when either of them considers itself as a member of the ruling class. We can see the rebellion and the consciousness of the people who take part in a class struggle in the novel. By including such story, the writer reflects how two oppressed groups fight each other and sustain dominance imposed over them.

Nega dramatizes the role of organic intellectuals in initiating revolution for social transformation. Individuals/groups who Gramsci calls organic intellectuals have great role in cognizing existing social conditions and aspiring social transformation. Gudu, who according to the narrator, had seditious nature and wry outlook, used to disclose treacherous acts of respected diviners and monks using different kinds of tricks. The narrator recounts the tricks he learned as a playmate with Gudu. Gudu, then, developed spirit of rebelliousness against the feudal class system in general and the treacherous activities of the so-called diviners and monks in particular before founding his own rebel group. He, for example, tricked and disclosed the treacherous act of a monk who was a slave runner.

The monk claimed that he is a slave runner for salvation, not for money earning. We can also understand the claim by the monk is an attempt to fuse slavery with a religious myth as ISA. And all these made Gudu to develop sense of rebelliousness. Gudu was assigned as the count's court entertainer by the count though the assignment to the post evoked envy by fellow bondmen and disappointment by scholars who consider the assignment as transgression of the law of the Good

Book (Book of Mawu-Lisa) which favours the class ideology. Gudu, however, does not consider his assignment as court entertainer by the master's as special privilege. (Reading more about the feeling of Gudu and other bondmen and women to the position he was assigned in section 6.3, False Consciousness).

The cause that evoked Gudu's sense of rebelliousness can be the huge life difference that he observed between classes in the feudal class system. We can confirm this in the following extract, as accounted by the narrator-character:

I spent in the company of Gudu, peering into a larger world that I was not yet able to occupy comfortably. Gudu's account of the glided life of noblemen inflated my ambition, while his stories of the downtrodden slaves left me with slumped shoulders (Nega, 2002:42).

As we can see it in the extract, the narrator witnessed that Gudu had observed the life difference of the two classes in general and the miserable life of the slaves in particular. This could make Gudu develop sense of rebelliousness against the social order of his time. And the narrator, who joined the rebel group, admits that Gudu had influenced him to see the social order (larger world) and develop sense of rebelliousness too; "As I grew older, Gudu's seditious nature and wry outlook on life in the valley appealed to my rebelliousness," (Nega, 2002:39). And from this we can understand both the narrator and Gudu oppose the feudal class ideology. In fact, they carried out later a rebellion against the established social formation. The benefit of the uprising led by Gudu is narrated as follows:

Though the uprising had freed the vassals from any obligations that might have had to their former masters, it had yet to profit them. In fact, as the villagers had to man their new boarders, build their own prisons, police their markets, and look after the judges they appointed, the amount of money that went to communal use steadily increased. Many ended up paying out more this way than they ever had under the deposed system. But the uprising was never undertaken for riches; it was about basic human dignity. Nor was it for revenge, but self-determination; not for shedding blood, but ending bloodshed. Above all, it was about realising fair access to natural resources (Nega, 2002:168).

We can see the narrator is taking the side of the uprising against the established social order. *Realizing fair access for natural resource* indicates that controlling the mode of production is the means that is to tackle against oppressive class systems. If the mode of production falls on the

hand of the society, they, the society, will get chance to resist/reduce oppressions by their rulers. The fight against oppressive rule includes seizing the mode of production which is the source of its, the ruler's, power. And hence, we see the benefit obtained from controlling the mode of production initiated the fighters to pursue their fighting against their rulers who resided in the far fictional place of Deder in the novel.

The novel is divided into five books/chapters having their own different sections. The last book/chapter, i.e., Book Four is entitled '*uprising*' which consists five sections. As the title of the book/chapter indicated, this chapter is more about the rebellion done against the class system. Though this novel comprises different episodes, the major episode that constitutes the plot of the story lays on two conflicting ideologies: class ideology and revolutionary ideology.

The alignment of forces can also be seen in relation to the conflicting ideologies. The count, emperor, and Revered Yimam and the monarchy in general represent the class ideology while Gudu, the leader of a rebel group, the Ammas, and the villagers of fictional place of Kersa and Harar take side of the revolutionary ideology. The Ammas in the novel are considered as group of society, mainly nomads, who believe in their home grown faith and they are sole supporters of the rebellion. The bases of the conflicting ideologies also are different.

The class, mainly feudal class, ideology, bases itself on mystification i.e. religious myth (e.g. Mawu-Lisa in the novel). Through this myth, the people in the higher class sustain their control of the mode of production, source of economy, and power. The revolutionary ideology, ideology that opposes the dominant ideology (i.e. the ideology of the people in power,) bases itself up on ideology of equality, self determination and equal access to the source of economy, mode of production which can be considered by Marx as universal truth/ideology. Bases of the revolutionary ideology in the novel will be stated later, after the base of the feudal class ideology is stated in the following paragraphs.

It is narrated that Revered Yimam, a leader of the Inquisition that works to safeguard the monarchy from the fierce resistance of the society, attributes the creation of master-slave to a divine power; "Since the start of the revolt, Revered Yimam hadn't let a single sermon pass without touching upon the divine laws that governed the relation of master and slave, of sovereign and subjects, of body and soul" (Nega, 2002: 181). And such attribution has been

used to disguise the power interest that enabled the monarchy both the mode of production and ideological sphere. The religious myth in the novel, upon which the feudal system bases, also is used in the recruitment and motivating of the army of the monarch, as it is narrated in the following:

Reverend Yimam earned the goodwill of new recruits with the promise of plenary absolution of all sins committed from the day of their birth to that of their death, and of any obligations they might have to their landlords, including the payment of interest on their loans. Above all, he abandoned to them all the confiscated household properties of the heretics they had slain, and a share of the bountiful harvest that everyone talked about\_\_ he made sure, however, that no one got the wrong idea about the land possessions due Duke Ashenafi, which he intended for higher purposes (Nega, 2002:190).

As we can see in the extract, a divine power is used as the disguising means of political power of the feudal class system. The base of the ideological preservation of the feudal class system is religious myth. And feudal class ideology uses such myths even in recruiting armies. The new recruits are promised that their sins from birth to death would be eliminated and they would enjoy heavenly gratification. They are also promised they would inherit the properties of people who disobeyed the monarchy and became heretics. However, the new recruits are not allowed to raise the issue of land which is the main economic base of the feudal class ideology. (Read more how religious myth as ISA is used to disguised power interest of the feudal class system in section 6.2 of the present paper). And such mystification brought another conclusion in the novel. Reverend concludes that the rebellion by the rebel group would not win. He mystifies that nature created the classes as narrated in the following:

Even before the botched attempt to kidnap Gudu, Revered Yimam had never lost track of the development in Kersa, but he chose to keep his army on a short leash, convinced that a disorderly uprising of slaves and serfs was bound to fail. It was his belief that a bondsman lacked not only the capacity for self-government but also for the higher pursuit of civic virtues and culture, that a slave might hold a true belief but was unable to know the truth of his belief (Nega, 2002:181).

Having failed to know the base of the revolutionary ideology, ideology of equality, self-determination, and above all attainment of access for the mode of production, Revered Yimam clung himself to the deceiving ideology, mystification, to inspire his army to punish the rebelling people. It is true classes who are denied access to all economic bases and power are denied

access to all kind of development, such as access to learn and understand the base of the social formation and reality at all. Revered Yimam attributes slaves' and serfs' inabilities, however, to some sort of mystification instead of to the politics. Gudu, a bondman and later a leader of the rebellion could develop a new consciousness that understands the nature of oppressive class and proposed what Marxist call universal truth that relied on politics, earthly forces.

Gudu learned how to read and write in his own effort and developed a new consciousness opposes the nature of the feudal class ideology. He could learn a lot about the society and nature of the feudal class system when he was appointed as court entertainer. He could also learn the nature of the feudal class ideology when he was employed as a guard to Count Ashenafi's daughter, Aster. He could also sense the oppressions that people of the fictional place of Kersa and Harar experienced when he went to these places as entertainer during the expedition of army of the Count to punish the serfs and peasants who disobeyed the monarchy. Above all, he learned the excellent nature of these societies and their religion, the Amma, which abhors oppressive class in society. And all his observation of the condition and the good behaviour of these societies enabled Gudu to elope from Count Ashenafi to these societies and establish a rebel group with a revolutionary ideology.

The novelist, in his plot development, presents the oppressive nature of the feudal class system on one side and the classless nature of the fictional society of Amma and the progressive rebel group on the other. He presents the oppressive nature of the feudal class system by showing destructions caused by the crusaders, and the count's army who raided the fictional place Harar, using religious myth to hide the power interest and by the misery that society in the system mentioned, in general, experience. Let's consider the following extract to show how the society was suffered by the crusaders that work in safeguarding the class system:

Anticipating a more raucous departure of the crusaders than the one visited on the valley two years before, the townspeople were wisely staying indoors. The night before, many of them had witnessed a dress rehearsal for the performance in Kersa, as drunken men pillaged the shrine, yet again; raped women, young and old; set ablaze three barns, and laid waste a newly built school- all in full view of the supreme legate and his curates. And that was not for lack of adequate support from the locals. In fact, the week before, the townspeople had devoted much more of their time to the crusaders than to their own families (Nega, 2002: 189).

We read, in the extract, that the crusaders ransacked the residents of fictional place of Deder. The writer came with such damages happened by the crusaders to develop ideological conflicts in his plot and justify the victory of the revolutionaries who fought against the feudal class system. We can also see how religious myth is used as ISA considering the base and recruitment motives of the crusaders and the Inquisition in general. We can also consider religious ideological conflicts considering the act of the inquisition in the novel. The following extract can also show us how the writer foregrounded the act of the crusaders to justify the victory of the revolutionaries over the crusaders:

As they saddled their horse, the crusaders couldn't help but suspect that their departure was being celebrated by the townspeople. It was, perhaps, pent-up anxiety that prompted some of the pilgrims to poison the town's water hole before they decamped (Nega, 2002:189).

The townspeople hated the crusaders. The crusaders know that they are hated and as a result they poisoned the townspeople. The writer includes such story to reflect how the society hated the feudal class system that caused rebellion and the removal of the monarchy, the resolution of the plot of the novel.

Let's see now the base of the revolutionary ideology. The following extract can show us the revolutionary ideology that contributed a lot for the uprising against the feudal class system to win:

Though the uprising had freed the vassals from any obligations they might have had to their former masters, it had yet to profit them. In fact, as the villagers [the villagers under the territory of the rebel group] had to man their new borders, build their own prisons, police their own markets, and look after the judges they appointed, the amount of money that went to communal use steadily increased. Many ended up paying out more this way than they ever had under the deposed system. But the uprising was never undertaken for riches; it was about basic human dignity. Nor was it for revenge, but self-determination; not for shedding blood, but ending bloodshed. Above all, it was about realizing fair access to natural resources (Nega, 2002: 168).

The writer makes the uprising against the feudal class system is justifiable. And this can show us also the authorial ideology (AUI) of the novel. Read more about AUI of the novel (in section 9.3). We see the vassals in the territory of the rebel group leading the uprising are free of bondage. And therefore, equality is ensured in the territory. Their freedom from their

enslavement made the vassals fully support the uprising. Moreover, the villagers (people in the territory of the rebel group) began to sense the ecstasy as a result of equally benefiting from the social and political institutions. They have also equal participation in their social and political affairs and ensured self determination. And above all, all member of the society have equal access to the economic base, which had been limited to upper class in the class system. The writer strengthens the justifications for the uprising in the conflicting ideologies in the plot of the story by indicating the ecstasy that society experienced in the new system adopted by the rebel groups in the liberated territory as narrated in the following:

Two years after discarding the old shackles, as they kissed their wives and children good-bye and headed for the trenches, many of the village men would look back at the distances they had travelled and shake their heads in disbelief. Indeed, what an exhilarating feeling it must have been for someone who had never made a decision for himself to have, finally, his destiny firmly in his grasp: to grow the crop of his choice, to paint his home the colour he fancied, to marry his daughter to the man he favoured, and to be able to send his children o school, all without fear of repercussions from a feudal master... (Nega, 2002: 168).

We can see in the extract that the residents who removed the power of the feudal class system from their territory sensed ecstasy that encouraged them to continue their fight to overthrow the whole feudal system from the whole country. The writer included such story to justify the fairness of the fight by the rebel groups and the people against the feudal class system. And this in turn can also show us the Authorial Ideology (AUI) that the writer is in favour of the revolution against the feudal class system. (Read more about authorial ideology of the novel the following section 5.3). Therefore, the bases of the two conflicting ideologies in the novel are different and this results revolution, a resolution in the plot of the novel.

### **4.3.3 University Students' Discourses of Resistance against the Monarchy in *Firebrands* and *Beneath the Lion's Gaze***

Early Marxists say the working class who are aware of the oppressive and exploitative nature of dominant ideology can revolutionize against oppressive social order. Gramsci (1971) asserts that working classes win over oppressive ruling classes through counter hegemony by organic intellectuals who aware of the nature of certain ideology. The working class in the feudal class system is mainly the peasant; however, we do not see the peasants, the oppressed working class in the movement against the feudal class in *Thirteenth Sun*, *Firebrands* and *Beneath the Lion's*

*Gaze* except in *the God who Begat a Jackal*. Gramsci made it clear that it is the organic intellectuals, social actors, who can play active role in transforming oppressive and exploitative social order. And we find this is evident mainly in *Firebrands* and *Beneath the Lion's Gaze*, as illustrated in the subsequent paragraphs.

Both *Firebrands* and *Beneath the Lion's Gaze* dramatize the discourse of resistance mainly by the university students against the imperial government. The university students, as social actors, or according to Gramsci (1971), the organic intellectuals, who are aware of the oppressive nature of the feudal class system came with discourses that can enlighten the mass but undermine the monarchy. They challenged the dominant class ideology through discourses such as *land to the tiller*.

Sahle Selassie's novel, *Firebrands*, dramatizes the discourses of resistance that includes the rally against the Monarchy and its ideology in Ethiopia. The students in the *Firebrands* called for the removal of the imperial government, land reform, adoption of regional autonomy and the end of cultural domination among others. The characters whom the narrator calls *firebrands* discuss that a culture of one tribe is highly favoured by the ruling class, while the other cultures are systematically suppressed. Two characters in the novel (Tokari and Worku) raise the following concerning cultural domination in their political discussion.

'Let's take as a concrete example the question of culture,' Tokari went on. 'After the ruthless Amhara Gunners conquered the other tribes in the late nineteenth century, annexed their regions to Abesha land proper, they not only robbed them of their land, they not only imposed their feudal, politico-economic system on them, but they imposed their feudal, tribal culture on them as well. This is a fact of history....The systematic imposition of the Amhara culture resulted in the systematic destruction of the other culture (Sahle Selassie, 1979: 46).

Ethiopia has more than eighty five ethnic groups who have different cultures. The writer through such story, in the extract, reflects domination of one culture over others causes political instabilities in the country. As indicated in the political discussion of the people in the extract, culture of one ethnic group was deliberately made dominant over other cultures to maintain political power. The revolutionary students in *Firebrands* accuse the monarchy that it uses religion, tribal origin and loyalty to the imperial government as criteria to appoint individuals for government posts to maintain its power.

The criteria for appointment to such posts in the imperial government were not so much qualifications and capabilities as other factors. Though qualifications and capabilities were not totally ignored, other matters counted for more- the nominee's tribal origin, his religion, his past record, and most of all his loyalty to the established order, to the crown and to the emperor (Sahle Selassie, 1979: 10).

As it is indicated in the extract, Sahle Selassie stresses the students, characterized as organic intellectuals, state, in their discourse, that the imperial government of the country considers tribal origin, religion and loyalty to the government while appointing individuals for government duties. In other words, the novel narrates that the imperial government used these criteria to maintain its political power because these criteria enable the monarchy to get consent from the people who think their tribal origin and religion is favoured to its power.

Governments of every time can use different means that can help them to exercise and maintain their power. Foucault (1978) declines previous notion that considers power as only repressive and dominating machine. He says power is also important to transfer knowledge, manipulate society (especially a vast society) and carry out development. The importance of certain power is measured by its merit to a society. The university students/revolutionaries, including the writer of this novel, claim the means that the imperial government uses to strengthen its power has no/less contribution to the society's progress. Hence, they continued their rally against the imperial government.

The revolutionaries raise other additional discourses that enable them to oppose the monarchy. Worku, the revolutionist, ran to home escaping from policeman during the rally. His mother, *Weizero* Debitu, asks him why he was panting:

'They are killing us!' he cried  
'Who'  
'The policemen, the pigs'  
'Why should they do that?'  
'Because we say no.'  
'No to what?'  
'To corruption, feudalism, oppression, misery... we say no to everything the rotten government stands for,' (Sahle Selassie, 1979: 124)

The revolutionaries call for the removal of the imperial government and its feudal class ideology that they claim resulted misery, corruption and oppression. And the revolutionaries use polarizing words that call the policemen *pigs* and the monarchy as *rotten government*.

Worku, a revolutionary, member of the university students who are opposing the monarchy and its feudal class ideology in *Firebrands*, calls the graduates who are loyal to the feudal political system of the country “stone-age graduates” (Sahle Selassie, 1979: 7), “cowards!” who do not “act” (Sahle Selassie, 1979: 8). Similarly, the students used polarizing words such “the rotten government”, “inefficient” and “corrupt” (Sahle Selassie, 1979: 7) in their discourse against the imperial government. They say also that the monarchy is full of “nepotism” and “favouritism” (Sahle Selassie, 1979: 8). Worku tells to his mother, Weizero Debitu, “We say no to corruption, feudalism, oppression, misery... we say no to everything the rotten government stands for” (Sahle Selassie, 1979: 124).

Sahle Selassie presents also the response (counter discourse) of the monarchy to the discourses of resistance by university students in the novel, *Firebrands*. The imperial government in *Firebrands* undermines the students protest against the government system. *Dejazmach Azsbte*, who is high official of the imperial government calls the students who were protesting against government system around Arat Kilo, “an army of stone throwing hooligans, over fed, over clad, pampered, and let loose” (Sahle Selassie, 1979: 110) and “criminals everywhere, criminals in the street” (Sahle Selassie, 1979: 117). He also calls them “ruffians” (Sahle Selassie, 1979: 120). He, *Dejazmach*, disputes with Dr. Mandefrot about the meaning of “students” past and present, as follows:

“In our days what we called students were youngsters who respected their elders, who washed the feet of their teachers, who went around begging for their daily food, and travelled for miles on foot to get proper education. Those were students, my friend, and not hooligans ready to stone innocent people in the streets” (Sahle Selassie, 1979: 110-111).

*Dejazmach* denied at first that people can have new consciousness through time using education or other means. He says students of his time were cool and they did not oppose of the feudal class system perhaps because education was allowed only to children of *children of the Mequanent, and Messafnt*, (Sahle Selassie, 1979: 111). The students in the novel, however,

protested against the monarchy perhaps because they developed new consciousness for example, as it can be seen in the debate between Worku and Tokari about evolution of classes and class system stated in the novel, by reading Marxist works. We can understand of the cause of their consciousness and discourse against the monarchy and its feudal class ideology is Marxist discourses. The writer implies that students protest against the political system in the country not because they are overfed, as Dejazmach claimed, but because of the new consciousness they develop about the oppressive nature of the feudal class system. Dejazmach, however, polarizes the students who are calling for the removal of the imperial government and land reform '*hooligans*'. He also polarizes the educational institutions '*institutions that breed street boys*' because the students from those institutions protested the feudal class ideology.

Dejazmach does not agree to what Dr. Mandefrot tells him. Dr. Mandefrot tells him that the students are protesting against the political system in the country, like corruption, lack of justice, the existence of drought and famine and land reform. Dejazmah, however, believes the students are protesting against government because they are overfed and given education access that is inclusive to children of the classes in the feudal class system. Hence, he regrets educational access that is inclusive to all children of the upper and lower classes as follows:

the wise men of the past advised the government to restrict learning to the children of the Mequanent, and Messafnt, and not to spread education to the masses, to the children of the clerks, cashiers, peasants, craftsmen, and the rest of the scum (Sahle selassie, 1979: 111).

He asserted that education helped students to have new consciousness that enabled to realize the nature of the feudal class ideology they are opposing. At first education was restricted only to the people of the upper class, *to the children of the Mequanent, and Messafnt,*' and served as Ideological State Apparatus (ISA) to sustain the feudal class system. The police officer in the novel warns Dejazmach that the students' protest is fierce that can plunge the country into anarchy and create chaos that can damage the country's fragile economy (Sahle Selassie, 1979: 119).

Similarly, we encounter university students who stage demonstrations and rallies against the imperial political power in *Beneath the Lion's Gaze*. The university students, who are thus organic intellectuals in the novel, demand for actions that can address the country's poverty and lack of progress. They also demanded "for a new constitution and freedom of expression, for

land reform that gives the farmer ownership of what he tilled, for the removal of an old, tired monarch,” Maaza, 2010: 16).

The students read Marxist discourses, like a book by Mao and hold meetings that raise their political consciousness. And such readings and meetings helped the university students, like Dawit, Dr. Hailu’s son and a Law student in Addis Ababa University to have “ a new kind of confidence” (Maaza, 2010:22) in his opposition against the feudal class system. The university students used pamphlets, as media, to reach the public and disseminate their discourses against the oppressive nature of the feudal class system in general and the monarchy in particular. Different social groups joined the students’ opposition against the imperial government. Solomon, a university student tells to his friend Dawit, while gathering for protest at Meskel Square that “Everyone wants the emperor out” (Maaza. p. 34) and tells that soldiers in the north also rebelled and hundreds of Muslims marched for their right. The students, during their march voiced, “Land for the Tiller”, and “People’s government for all” (ibid.).

Social groups, such as the soldiers and the taxi drivers presented their demands to the imperial government. Prime Minister Aklilu Habtewold reports that there are problems in Neghele and Soldiers are rebelling. Debre Zeit Air force demanded for salary increment. The entire division in Asmara took control of radio stations and demanded a higher minimum salary increment, a free medical treatment and timely pay. Taxi drivers also demanded for lower petrol prices. The emperor was raged by the closure of the airport, the roads and the rebellions taking place by different social groups which eventually made prime minister tenders his letter of resignation to the Emperor. The rally against the imperial government couldn’t stop though “the emperor dissolved his prior cabinet and created a new one” (Maaza, 2010:37).

Eventually, *Firebrands* and *Beneath the Lion’s Gaze* reflect the revolution that removed the imperial government from its power and the coming of the Dergue, the military rule. The military rule in *Beneath the Lion’s Gaze* announced the arrest of the imperial government officials. It declared that it, the military junta, was in charge of state power and announced the officials of the imperial government were responsible for corruption and famine in the country. The university students who had been protesting the monarchy in *Beneath the Lion’s Gaze* continued their opposition against the military rule and demanded for civilian government in their discourse as analysed in the following section.

#### **4.3.4 Discourses of Resistance against the *Dergue* in *Beneath the Lion's Gaze***

The university students who had been protesting against the monarchy in *Beneath the Lion's Gaze* continued their opposition against the military rule and demanded for civilian government in their discourse. They use pamphlets to reach the public and disseminate their ideology/discourses of resistance against the military rule. Dawit, one of the university students protesting both the monarchy and the military rule, prepares and distributes pamphlets to hail the public for opposition against the military rule: "Like so many [students], he [Dawit] hadn't returned to his classes once schools reopened, choosing to spend his time protesting the *Derg*" ((Maaza, 2010: 117). The students, who are yet the organic intellectuals, protested the military rule and used a discourse that the Dergue declined its promise to make bloodless coup and establish civilian government. The protesting intellectuals concluded that Derg "continued its own viciousness and murderous spirit" (Maaza, 2010: 117) to consolidate its power. The novelist reflected also that the university students demanded in their pamphlet the end of the war in Eritrea.

We can understand from what the word *Dergue* means in the novel. Dr. Hailu tells what Dergue means to his friend, Kifle, and says it means 'committee' in Geez, a liturgical language. Though the Military Rule, Dergue, had announced the public that civilian government would be established, it later declined its promise and consolidated its own power. And Dawit, one of the university students who were rallying against the imperial government, asks Mickey, who was loyal to the military Junta and has to say, "We turned in a timetable for a transition to civilian government after the emperor's gone, but the Dergue hasn't responded," (ibid. p.46). Mickey couldn't, however, give to Dawit any hope about Dergue's plan to form civilian government. Mickey, rather, tells to Dawit that people should support the measurement that Dergue takes against the former officials, officials of the imperial government.

Because the Military Rule refused to establish civilian government, group of people, mainly intellectuals, formed a resistance force, represented in the novel as "Revolutionary Lion Resistance". This resistance group represents mainly EPRP (Ethiopian People Revolutionary Party) that declared "white terror" campaign against Dergue in the country. This resistance group carries out political radicalism against the Dergue in Addis Ababa. The resistance group declared a campaign called "white terror" to fight against the military rule. Dawit joins this group and he

was given a code name Mokennen. Members of the resistance group fire suddenly at member of the military rule. In response to the attack carried out by the member of the resistance group, the military rule, mainly Major Gudu, head of the military rule in the novel, declares a campaign called *Red Terror* against people who oppose its rule. The narrator narrates how the head of the military rule declares the campaign, Red Terror, as follows:

“The Red Terror!” The still breathing Guddu declared in Revolutionary Square. “The Red Terror will break the backs of these enemies of the state!”... ... “They have tried to kill me once again! And again, they failed!” “We have recently eliminated the Traitor Chairman Teferi Bante for his treasonous acts against the state”... “From Nakfa to Assab, we will destroy every Eritrean rebel! All those who want to stop Ethiopia’s progress will be eliminated. We will not stop until the gutters flow with the blood of all our enemies! ... “We will fight bourgeois White Terror with Red Terror”... “Death to our enemies! Death to our enemies!” He raised the bottle higher and sent it crashing to the ground... (Maaza, 2010:290).

The writer reflects the fighting between the resistance group in urban areas and other rebel groups fighting against the military rule and beyond for self determination. We encounter both the opposing forces: the resistance group and the military rule in the novel. We can also see how the military rule, Dergue, was fighting against the resistance group. Dergue declared *Red Terror* campaign against the resistance group represented as *Revolutionary Lion Resistance* that fights Dergue in Addis Ababa. This resistance group eventual goes to a distant area for liberation struggle which is the end of the story in the novel.

The people represented by Solomon and Dawit use pamphlets in their fight against Derg, (p. 98). These fighters communicate with their comrades using code name. Dawit is known later in his code name, Mekonnen. These people discuss about strategies that they can use to fight against Dergue, the military rule.

#### **4.4 Patriarchal Ideology**

Another ideology that reflects social power in the society reflected in the novels analysed is patriarchal ideology. Early Marxists focus mainly on the economy and the social formation; post Marxists and poststructuralists concentrate on discourses power, social relations and s; and other social theorists like the Frankfurt School of critical theorists focus on cultural realms that include

art, technological and cultural productions to examine certain social power and social inequalities.

Both Daniachew and Nega in their novels, *The Thirteenth Sun* and *The God Who Begat a Jackal* considered economic condition, the social formation and the cultural realm to reflect patriarchal ideology and its effect in the society in their novel. Woyniyu, that Melakneh (2005) considers symbolizes of Ethiopia in the *Thirteenth Sun*, also represents women who become subject of patriarchal ideology. She symbolizes the country which failed to experience progress in the feudal class system. Daniachew exposes women's sufferings mainly through Woynitu and her mother and the peasant's wife who becomes subject of both patriarchal and feudal class ideology. For these reason, Woynitu repeatedly mutters a statement, "I have become one with my mother, after all" (Daniachew, 1973:106). However, she is well aware that the society is experiencing miserable life which the society embraced it as something natural. In other words, she has deviant consciousness that recognizes the miserable life of the society. This is reflected in her observation of the woman of the family where she, together with her father and her brother, Goytom, lodged in. She narrates the following about the woman she found in a house:

What a woman! Littered as it with rubbish- the walls groaning with gourd and pumpkin utensils and the floor with wickerwork receptacles, earthenware, goat and sheepskins and the air close and stuffy-she still tries to make a home of it. she doesn't seem to care about herself-with her hair unbound and disarranged. An invisible cloud of death seems to enshroud everybody and everything in this hut. It may be this life that has intensified the scowl on her beautiful face. The suffering of the agonies of existence. The life with its stultifying lack of variety. I wish it were a dream. And her husband swallowing in a sense of self satisfaction. And yet she doesn't seem despondent and doesn't seem to complain. She goes on living like a scavenger sifting debris. And perhaps, she will die with a doxology on her lips and she will be buried in sanctified ground near the Abo Church (Daniachew, 1973:19).

Woynitu portrays the miserable condition of the woman and her surroundings. She portrays that the woman is no more different than the messy and rubbish things on the ground. The writer used pumpkin utensils, earthenware, goat skins to reflect the society lacked modernization because of the feudal class system. Woynitu depicts the miserable life of the woman, the peasant's wife, "The suffering of the agonies of existence" to reflect that death is looming upon the woman and her family. However, the woman and her husband never complain about the miserable life they are having. They do not know that there is better life so that they could improve their life. The

writer reflects that the society were unaware of the miserable condition of the society can be the result of earthly force, like the political ideology. He further satirizes the religious complacency of the society, in general, in the statement, “And perhaps, she will die with a doxology on her lips and she will be buried in sanctified ground near the Abo Church”.

There is a story that women were used as sexual objects to gain government services in the novel. Goytom narrates what he heard from a chat among groups of boys when they were talking about women who become subject of men’s sexual harassment. One of the boys was talking about what happened in his cousin’s life. He narrates that his cousin asked his wife to go to a government official to satisfy his sexual need and get a job for her husband in return. The wife, however, refused to go and eventually her husband turned to be outlaw. The boys entered into an argument whether the woman was right or not to refuse to go to the government official and get a job. The writer used such story to expose the patriarchal ideology that considers women as objects, objects of bribe, to overcome their, the women’s, economic problems.

Moreover, women are economical dependent and this caused them to suffer from different social problems. This is what Woynitu narrates about the economic and social problems that her mother experiences:

And my mother keeping a tavern! Perhaps she finds it easier to live that way. After all, what else is there that she can do? Disgusting as it is, this life of hers, yet she lives by it. Really disgusting- dealing as she does with all sorts of degenerates. She is kind-hearted, mother, but uneducated. She never cared, for example, about taking liquor when a customer came along and bought me a drink, taking me to be of the same calling as my mother. She thought it helped to add to our little income. She even sometimes left me with strangers and enumerated for me their qualities in advance- mostly about their being rich and men of status and influence (Daniachew, 1973:44).

Daniachew used the story in the novel to reflect problems that women face because of economic problems. As we read it in the extract, Woynitu narrates what she and her mother faced in the tavern where they work for income. Woynitu and her mother are sexually provoked by the men who drink in the tavern. The men verbally harass Woynitu and her mother. Woynitu expresses the agony she and her mother face, “the same calling as my mother”. Her mother does not consider the health and moral problems that her daughter, Woynitu, faces in the tavern. Both Woynitu and her mother overcome degenerating life in the tavern to solve their economic

problems. That's why Woynitu calls life of hers and her mother in the tavern "all sorts of degenerates". Daniachew used such story to reflect the socio- economic problem that women face because of patriarchal ideology.

As it is evident in the extract, the mother tells her daughter, Woynitu, men's domination, patriarchal ideology, by telling that the men who make Woynitu and her mother drink liquor are *rich, men of status and influence* which the writer used to imply both economic difference and class systems are among sources of dominant power relations between men and women. Woyniyu was repeatedly enticed by men to have sex with them. Surprisingly, the enticement was done by a woman who was enticing her to have sex with the man in the tavern. The woman entices Woynitu to have sex with a man who is married and already have a child because of his wealth. Daniachew used such story to show how women become co-operators of male domination because their low awareness about the male domination.

Moreover, the narrator in the novel narrates that the conjuring woman was once a concubine of feudal gentry. The peasant, the husband of the conjure-woman says about his wife, "She used to be the concubine of one of the poor Fitawraries of our district. She left him and married me" (Daniachew, 1973:97). Through such narration, Daniachew exposes women were subject of both feudal class value system and patriarchal ideology.

Finally, Woynitu is raped by a poor farmer who gave lodge to her family (i.e. her father and brother) while they were in their pilgrimage for holy water at Church Abbo in Ziquala. She was raped by the man whom she described him "deep eyes, black dreadful like the ooze of a sucking swamp.... his body reeking with the odour of smoke and mud" (Daniachew, 1973:19). She is raped by the man she hates much. The narrator narrates the following about the psychological and moral problems that Woynitu experienced after she was raped.

It was as if she were the only person on the mountain. She stopped suddenly. With the wild sounds hushed, the silence sent out ripples of fear throughout her body. She thought of Goitom [her brother]. She wondered what he would say if she told him what had happened to her or if he would still love her the way he used to. 'I have become one with my mother, after all,' dreamily she spoke aloud to herself (Daniachew, 1973:106).

Finally, Woynitu, like her mother, becomes subject of sexual harassment. Her mother was harassed (by both Fitawrari and the men in the liquor shop). Hence, Woynitu repeatedly matters,

“I have become the same with my mother”, a statement that Daniachew, the writer, used to imply the continuation of women’s oppression by men. The writer discloses women’s oppressions and their degenerating life to make the readers aware of women’s sufferings. Goytom, who is portrayed progressive and having positive attitude towards women, demands access of education for women. He narrates that Ethiopia can get economic benefit from educated women. Similarly, Goytom criticizes his father for getting married his mother with the intention to inherit her wealth.

Nega also uses different satires in his novel *The God Who Begat a Jackal* to expose socio-economic problems that women face because of the dominant patriarchal ideology in the society. Very little or rare influence of women in family and social affair is seen in the novel. It is narrated in the novel that Countess Fikre, the Count’s wife, had no influence not only in socio-political condition of the country but also in her own familial affairs. This is what is narrated when she was first introduced in the novel, “The Count’s wife was a young and blameless woman, a bundle of innocence, when she was burdened with responsibility of child bearing” (Nega, 2002: 12). This statement may tell us two things: she is blameless because her home is full because of her husband’s power or/and the dominant patriarchal ideology in the society made her blameless for all problems she faces. “Countess Fikre was the sort of woman any cultured man would like to have at his side. She never opened her mouth before checking her husband’s approval” (Nega, 2002: 49) is one among the different narrations that the writer used to reflect male dominance in the society.

Countess Fikre has no influence on how her single daughter should be brought up and married. Only the count passes his decision on the fate of their daughter. She says nothing about her daughter before her husband; instead, she talks about her daughter to a family diviner. She tells the family diviner that her daughter should approve the selection of the man to be her husband. She was opposed by the family diviner and head priest calling her thought was a pagan. The family diviner and the head priest, using their religious power and power relation he has with the family, suppresses the countess’s idea about her daughter’s selection of man. For this reason, Aster was not asked her idea whether to accept or refuse the number of suitors asking for her marriage.

Similarly, Aster was not asked to approve the man who her father chose to be her husband; “Aster was never consulted about her part in the affair, of course, because she would have no real role in the wedding until she was actually wed; likewise with the engagement” (Nega, 2002:120). The writer is conscious of feminist ideology that he produces ideas that reflect women’s oppression in the society. Let’s have a look at the following extract that reflects the writer’s consciousness of feminist ideology:

Duke Ashenefi might have reminded his daughter that not every girl is privileged enough to have her family choose a husband for her. In fact, in much of the country, the family of a young woman is no more master of her destiny than she herself is. The father of a peasant girl lives like a hen with a day old brood, in constant fear of a predator lurking in the shadows to snatch up her young, because marriage by abduction is the norm for the toiling majority (Nega, 2002:120)

Because of his consciousness in feminist ideology, the writer reflected the oppressions that women are destined to. We can also see both patriarchal and feudal class ideologies in the extract. We see in the extract that women in both classes (upper and lower classes) are subject of both the patriarchal and feudal class ideologies. Count Ashenafi makes Aster marry, without her consent to the man who was married five times. It is narrated also that the man married Aster not for her looks, health or youth, but for her family name and the wealth she is supposed to inherit from her family.<sup>131</sup> We also understand from the extract that girls, especially from peasant parents, are destined to be abducted.

Count Ashenafi did all his bests using his power to bring up his only daughter better than other children in his place. He permitted his daughter to learn how to read and write and compose a poem that was not permitted for females in the time. A diviner was assigned to carry out the task. Letting female to learn how to read and write was new and Aster was the first female to learn because of her father’s position in the political power. Forbidding of women for education is confirmed in the statement, “Traditionally, only boys were encouraged to pick up the skills of the pen,” (Nega, 2002: 18). Only boys were encouraged to learn how to read and write with locally produced inks obtained by producing mixtures, quill pens and carved wooden tablets to write on. Count Ashenafi did all these privileges to his only daughter not because he wanted to solve female’s oppression by patriarchal ideology but because he wanted his family benefit from his power.

Women were subject of both feudal class and the patriarchal ideologies. There are women destined to serve as maids in the family of “noblemen”: “maids served in uniform served beverage...” (Nega, 2002: 45). Two women were assigned to rear and serve Aster, the only daughter of Count Ashenafi. It also narrated that Enquan, a bondwoman travels with the Count for cooking, laundry and lap-maiden for him in his expedition to far places in his territory. The writer came with such stories in his novel to intentionally expose what females face because of male dominance in the society.

Exploiting women, mainly the bondwomen, by the men of the ruling feudal class for sexual need is another patriarchal ideology reflected in the novel. There are bondwomen who are destined to be the feudal lords’ lap maid. Enquan, an attractive bondwoman, is the count’s lap maid during his trips to different places. The Count’s sexual relation with her, however, remains hidden to hide his adultery and protect his class decency.

The narrator narrates how the Count sexually provoked Enquan unconsciously in a party where he was serving his invited guests, “Having let his guard down, he was seen pinching the rear end of his shapely attendant, Enquan, as she whisked by. The countess shook her head at her husband’s indiscretion. But who could blame the count for feeling librated” (Nega, 2002:83). We can understand from the extract that people do not blame men, mainly men of the ruling feudal class, who sexually provoke women before their wives. The writer is well aware of feminist ideology that the narrator whom the writer created narrates, “But who could blame the count for feeling librated”. People do not dare to blame the Count for his infidelity because of his power and the dominant patriarchal ideology in the society in the novel.

It is narrated the Count’s father-in-law also was known for having more maids. “The countess [Countess Fikre] was raised by a man [her father] who was cited, among other excesses, for the lap maids he keep in each of the six districts he governed...,” (Nega, 2002:48). It is further narrated that when the countess’s father noticed rowdiness from his family for his infidelity, he rounded up his wife and his four daughters and threw them to his private. Same thing encounters Countess Fikre from her husband; “...she [Count Fikre] overlooked her husband’s infidelity unless she is confronted by her arrival [another wife of her husband],” Nega, 2002:48). Because of the dominant patriarchal ideology in the community, Count Fikre does not blame her husband

for his infidelity. By presenting such story, the writer exposes the oppressive patriarchal ideology.

Aster, who possessed magical power and redeemed the emperor from arranged plots, eventually becomes subject of the emperor's sexual lust. She was made drunk in a grand party that the emperor had prepared for her thirteenth birthday and acknowledgment of her service. After she was sexually harassed by the emperor, Aster was turned mad for losing not only her chastity but also her extraordinary power that enabled her see the invisible and communicate departed spirits. Palace diviners, herbalists, spirit charmers attempted to treat her but were not successful. The narrator narrates that the holy men had treated two other women who became subject of the emperor's sexual lust. Finally, Aster was sent back to her family. And her father, Count Ashenafi, was granted dominion over the fictional town of Harar as compensation. Wanting self rule, however, the residents of fictional place of Harar do not welcome count Ashenafi. (The society's refusal to the order by the Count and their rebellion has been discussed in section 4.3.2).

The attitude of the society towards females who lose their virginity, as indicated in the following extract, also is another patriarchal ideology reflected in the novel:

Virginity is considered a yardstick of an unwed woman's upbringing, her values and social worthiness. A girl who has been deflowered while collecting firewood or water at the river, as is sometimes the case with peasant women, reminded of her wantonness long after she has settled into her marriage. Many marriages do not survive the second day after the wedding, when the best man traditionally announces the bride's praiseworthiness to a crowd that has gathered outside the groom's door from the crack of dawn. A bloodstained handkerchief dangling high above the head of the best man is proof of a bride's chastity, while a clean piece of cloth reveals her most private sin, (Nega, 2002: 32).

As it is seen in the extract, women are repressed for their personality by patriarchal ideology. Women who lose their chastity before marriage are physically tortured and get humiliated by both the men who married them and the society. The bloodstained piece of garment that men use to show whether certain girl is found virgin in her marriage to the society is among the stories that the writer used to reflect humiliations and repressive practices done against women.

Sahele Selassie, in his novel *Firebrands*, included women as wives of the officials of the imperial government. These women are portrayed as wives who entice and help their husbands to be corrupt. Kassech, Dejazmach Azbete, an official's wife motivates Tarikua, another wife of an official, to help her husband to use his power to rob and enrich himself as follows:

This is his [Kebret's] opportunity,' Azbete heard his wife saying to Tarikua, 'Sishome yalbella sishar yikochewal.' She was reminding her friend of the old Ethiopian adage that 'he who does not enrich himself while in office regrets when removed from office'. Appointment to a high post meant many different things to many different people, (Sahle Selassie, 1979: 13).

In fact, Sahlesilassie's inclusion of the adage is to reason out problems of the monarchy that caused revolution and change of government system in his plot of the story. He, however, did not include the role of women in the revolution that the university do against the feudal class system in the novel. He portrayed women as weak, like *Weizero* Debitu, who tries her son to stop him not join the revolution, and as wives who entice their husbands to corrupt. In general, Sahlesilassie did not include women in the revolutionaries, the university students, whom he calls the *Firebrands*. In reality, however, as indicated in Maaza's *Beneath the Lion's Gaze*, there were women who actively involved in the revolution that was done against the monarchy and Dergue, the military rule. There are women, like the lady who lost her life being treated in the hospital, who scarified their life to the cause of the public *Beneath the Lion's Gaze*. Sahlesilassie did not give much emphasis to feminist agenda, as the agenda that Daniachew and Nega included in their novels *The Thirteenth Sun* and *The God Who Begat a Jackal*, respectively.

Let's see more ideas about the adage in the above extract: '*Sishome yalbella sishar yikochewal.*' 'He who does not enrich himself while in office regrets when removed from office, it is not related to the topic of this section. Sahlesilassie included the adage to reflect the public perception of public power. This kind of adage makes society to have only the negative role of power. The adage seems it legitimates corruption by people who take government offices. Such social cognition might have emerged either from the politics who disseminated this idea to avoid accountability or/and from the society who observed corrupt people in power remained unaccountable. The adage ignores the positive role of power. Foucault, as indicated in section..., asserts that power is not only a factor that is used to dominate but also an important instrument to transfer knowledge, manipulate (administer) society and carry out development. Unless we

understand the negative and positive role of power and move accordingly, it can be difficult to have cohesive society.

## **4.5 Authorial and Aesthetic Ideologies**

### **4.5.1 Reformation and Metaphoric Realism in *The Thirteenth Sun***

Daniachew, in his novel *The Thirteenth Sun*, confirms that he is a reformist writer. He recognized that there was a need for the country, which was under the monarchy and feudal class system, to transform its socio-economic conditions. He explores the socio-economic condition that was under total state of decadence. He also exposes the miserable and degenerating life of the society in the epoch. He further explores the causes for the decadence in the country and degenerating life of the society. He reflected, in his novel, that the feudal class system and the idealist view of the social problems (i.e. religious complacency) are the major causes for the decadence in the country. As reflected in section 4.5 of the present paper, he exposes also the condition of women and the socio-economic problem they face from both the feudal class and patriarchal ideologies. Moreover, he realises that as there are organic intellectuals who take side of social classes and fight for the betterments of society, there are traditional intellectuals who care and remain faithful only to traditional/feudal values, “...To use fork and knife. To knot my ties and put on my shoes” (Daniachew, 1973:113- 114). He used such satire to reflect that intellectuality should be measured in terms of its contribution to the social transformation.

Daniachew recognizes that the country was experiencing state of decadence and miserable life not because of its limited resource and economic potentials but because of its ideologies: feudal class ideology and values, religious complacency, patriarchal ideology etc. Goytom, a character portrayed as an awakened intellectual, scrutinizes the life of the society, examines the economic potentials of the country and mumbles as to what should have been done to improve and modernize the country and improve the life of the society. It is indicated in the biography of Daniachew Worku by Molvear (1997) also that Daniachew is reformist. Daniachew, in his critical view of the social condition he reflected in his novel, *The Thirteenth Sun*, implied the need for social transformation.

Daniachew’s novel shares features of critical realism because of its presentation of objective social reality. Daniachew’s commitment to the economically and socially low class people as the

peasants, women and poor people in urban areas is reflected in his objective presentation of the social condition. His presentation of objective reality confirms Daniachew is non-open partisan writer in his novel, *The Thirteenth Sun*. And his presentation of objective reality and his special language usage (using different metaphors) enriched the artistic form of the novel.

Daniachew used metaphoric realism, as aesthetic ideology, to depict the social reality of the society in pre-revolution period in Ethiopia. And this made his novel, *The Thirteenth Sun*, to be rich in both its social content and aesthetic form. The novel is rich in its social content for its reflection of social realities, social consciousness and the contradicting ideologies in the society. Daniachew used metaphors, images and symbol the social condition and the mode of the epoch in this novel. Using metaphors is characteristics of most modernist writers; but we cannot say Daniachew's novel, *The Thirteenth Sun*, is modernist novel for its main concern is social condition, not individuals' state of mind. Daniachew blended techniques of modernist's literary writings (especially in his language usage and adoption of stream of consciousness) with the theme, i.e. social concern, of realist writings. *The Thirteenth Sun* has a linear plot formation which is one feature of realist works. Daniachew's usage of metaphoric realism, as aesthetic ideology, may imply his exposure to both critical realist writings, like 19<sup>th</sup> century critical realist works, and modernist writings. His linear plot formation in his novel can also be additional evidence to his exposure to classical critical realist writings.

Daniachew's novel, *The Thirteenth Sun*, is rich both in its typicality and totality of the object which in turn enriches the content of the novel. Typicality of the novel is reflected in the writer's usage of typical characters and typical events and typical culture, in general. Daniachew describes social events, rituals, ordinary family lives, the environment, the pilgrims, the beggars, a feudal gentry etc broadly and in detail that enriched the typicality of the novel. The novel is rich and complete also in its reflection of totality of life, totality of objects. We can see Fitawrari Woldu and his children's journey and the chat they have, the peasant and his family's life, the rituals at the church, the procession of the *tabot*, the monk and his preaching, the process of the conjuration, life in the tavern and the problems that women face there, the memorial feast and the scene there, and the priests and their conditions etc are examples that enriched totality of life and totality of objects of the novel. And all these typicality and totality of social life function in relation to the economic condition, social formation and the reproduction of the dominant

ideology and, in general, in relation to the class formation and power struggle which is one feature of realism in literature.

Let's now see how Daniachew used metaphors and other paralinguistic affective devices\_\_ symbolism, atmosphere, allusion, dramatizations and other devices\_\_ in general to reflect the social reality of the society in prerevolutionary period in Ethiopian. Daniachew uses different metaphors that allude state of decadence of the country during the monarchy. He entitled his novel *The Thirteenth Sun* that he took it from billboards that Goytom, the character in the novel, reads and used it as an irony to represent the degenerating life of the society and the decadence in the country. Goytom, the main character and narrator in the novel, narrates that he encountered billboards that read different announcements. The billboards carry announcements about beautiful animals, historical places and new civilizations such as, 'Smoke Gureza' 'Smoke Nyala', 'Smoke Walya', 'Smoke Elleni', 'Smoke Axum'- 'Filter American Blend' 'Smoke Marathon' – 'Little Cigars' and 'Fly Ethiopian Airlines- Thirteen Months of Sunshine'. Goytom reads these announcements on his way to Bishoftu while, together with his sister, Woynitu, accompanying his father, Fitawrary Woldu who was travelling from Addis Ababa to Church Abbo in Zkwala to seek cure from holy water.

Ethiopia's twelve months have thirty days while the last five days of the year are considered as the thirteenth month called Pagumen. Hence Ethiopia divides the year in thirteen months- the first twelve consecutive months (September up to October) have thirty days and the last month i.e. Pagumen that lies between August and September (the first month of Ethiopia's New Year) has five days. Thirteen months of sunshine has come from Ethiopia's unique calendar. The announcement *Thirteen Months of Sunshine* on the billboard has come from this calendar. And Daniachew has used *The Thirteenth Sun* that is to mean, thirteen months of sunshine, to entitle his novel. Daniachew reflects the socio-economic condition of the society is contrary to the announcement that Goytom reads on the billboards. Goytom, together with his sister Woynitu, examined that the country was under total decadence which is contrary to the announcement they read on the billboards. Daniachew entitled his novel, *The Thirteen Sun*, and used it as an irony to represent the degenerating life and deep ignorance of the society in Ethiopian's feudal system. Both Goytom and Woynitu who carried close examination of social condition confirmed that the country is denied all kind of modernization, (e.g. we can see the utensils in the peasant's home),

which is contrary to the announcement on the billboard. The society was in extreme poverty and was fighting for survival leave alone to enjoy the different kinds of cigarettes and flights being announced on the billboards.

Daniachew uses homes, faces of the people, places where social events take place as allusions to depict the state of decadence in the country during the monarchy. He describes the society's home "half rotten, hole-like doors, distained, dusty colour of old decaying wood" (Daniachew, 1973:6). Moreover, he depicts the inside condition of these homes whose "sorghum stalks plastered with mud walls ripped off, smoke sodden ceiling; they are homes with bed-bugs, fleas and a fat spider" (Daniachew, 1973:11 inside. Daniachew used all these words as similes to represent the country's state of decadence. He also used words/phrases such as: "horrible to look, you wished you could sink into the ground [considering the society's situation]" (Daniachew, 1973:6) "devoured hearts with stagnancy and decadence" (Daniachew, 1973: 8- 9) to portray the degenerating life of the society.

Daniachew's further portrayal of the miserable life and ignorance of the pilgrims, the beggars, the peasant's family and city dwellers consolidates depiction of the degenerating life of the society in the feudal class system. He portrays the beggars as follows:

And then among the pilgrims, the beggars, horrible to look at in the rags which covered their bodies, with sticks with their hands, and large sacks on their backs- some suffering from leprosy, some from consumption, some crippling rheumatism, and some from venereal and skin diseases. How they stared at you, surly and without restraint- now coughing and now hooting and now gesticulating and vociferating. You wished you could sink into the ground (Daniachew, 1973:6).

As it is evident in the above extract, Daniachew portrays the miserable condition of the beggars. We see beggars who suffer from different diseases. We hear painful voices from the beggars. Looking at the miserable condition of the beggars, Goytom, the narrator and character in the novel wished to sink to the ground. Daniachew further depicts the society in general as people who "devoured [their] hearts with stagnancy and decadence" (Daniachew, 1973:8- 9). Goytom further exposes the miserable condition that dehumanized the society by depicting the pilgrims (that include pilgrims from the surrounding villages and towns and beggars) in the church yards.

Some mending their clothing, some killing lice, some munching various types of injera collected at the doors of the villagers doors of the villagers' huts, some sleeping, and most of them, dirty, grimy, and misshapen, themselves like some unsightly lava freshly disgorged from the inflamed bowels of the earth.

Of all the pilgrims, the most pitiable were perhaps those chronic beggars who had taken upon themselves a disease of the body. Though they suffered by it and complained of it to the passer by, they nursed it lovingly and used it as a means of obtaining sympathy (Daniachew, 1973:16).

Daniachew, through Goytom's description, portrays the miserable condition of the society by depicting the horrible condition of the pilgrims and beggars. And he, in his simile, associates the pilgrims with lava disgorged from the inflamed bowls of the earth; he portrays them that they are motionless people. However, the pilgrims consider their living condition is something normal. They embraced their miserable living conditions as they are something normal and used it as a means of living. The writer reflects the life of the people in the urban areas is not better than the life of the people in the rural areas. Goytom, the character, depicts the life of the people of the urban areas in the feudal class system of Ethiopia as follows:

And I wonder if it is not just as easy to hear the summons from **Hell** in the towns: where everybody and everything is **civilized**- young men shouting to peddle their various articles; shoeshine boys running after your feet and almost forcing you to have your shoes shined; a record player blaring at a nearby tea-shop; and the beggars all over the sidewalks crying for alms. 'In the name of Mary, in the name of St. George, young man, young lady, don't pass me, don't pass me...' and the kids, 'father, father, I'm hungry. Even a five-cent -a five cent coin is enough for me.'..... and those young well dressed boys. They will approach you and try to speak in English to show you that they are as educated as you are. 'Brother, brother!' one of them will address you. Amazed and a bit frightened, you stop to inquire what the matter is. And he will come to you, 'Look, brother,' he will say, 'I have not eat yesterday, today also. I'm not ask you for much money; Just give fifty cent now....!' A civilized beggar who would determine for you how much to give him. You feel like running away from all this. .... You wish the earth would open up and swallow you. But the earth never opens. And you go on and on walking wherever the legs take you... all the same ... all the same...all the same....., (Daniachew, 1973:18).

Goytom is anguished by the poverty that all social sections all over the country are experiencing. He recognizes that the deep poverty is not limited to a particular place and particular social section and he emphasises this in his repetition of the phrase "all the same ..." (Daniachew, 1973:18). He personifies the earth to express his anguish to the misery and agony of the society

in the feudal class of the country “You wish the earth would open up and swallow you.” Goytom associates the miserable condition in the towns with “hell” and uses the word “civilized” as a paradox to express the condition. The writer used “a civilized beggar” as a paradox to reflect the miserable condition.

Daniachew’s depiction of the environment implies state of decadence of the country in the feudal class system. After describing the horrible condition of the pilgrims (gathered from towns and surrounding villages), beggars and city dwellers, Daniachew depicts the environment as follows:

The sun had started to sink beyond the horizon. Its heat and glare gave place to the coolness of the evening. The great bowl of water, hills and the trees assumed a vespertine stillness. The dampness, the smell of rotting grass and mud came more strongly from the bank. The skies got darker and the clouds heavier and the shadows began to take definite shape both on the land and on the dark green water, some of them assuming the fantastic shapes of strange monsters... The mosquitoes buzzed in your ears-and their persistent, shrill cry, resounded in your brain like an endless sorrowful groan, (Daniachew, 1973:18).

Dniachew’s portrayal of the environment goes in line with the state of decadence that the country experiences. His word choices such as “dampness, smell of rotting grass and mud” consolidates the presence of decadence in the country. He reflected death is looming upon the society because of their miserable life in his statement, “the skies got darker and the clouds heavier....” The last statement in the extract, “the mosquitoes buzzed in your ears-and their persistent, shrill cry, resounded in your brain like an endless sorrowful groan” is related to the writer’s statement about the beggars, “now coughing and now hooting and now gesticulating and vociferating” (Daniachew, 1973:6). In portrayal of the pilgrims and the environment, the writer reflected the decadence and the degenerating life of the society in the feudal class system.

The hovel and the place where the shade for the memorial feast erected is dirty. And Daniachew used the dirt in this place where the land lady prepares annual memorial feast for her late husband at Church Abbo to represent the decadence and the degenerating life in the country. Priests who attend the memorial feast got befuddled and are unaware of the dirt, heaps of cow dung, manure, damp that Daniachew used to depict social decadence and predicament of the country in a feudal class system:

Inside the hovel, there was another kind of commission. Some of the priests were growing more and more befuddled, their eyes staring unwinkingly at the opposite wall, with its lower part brown with cow-dung and its upper part plastered over with patches of dirt and mould. Some of them were clamouring and shouting without knowing either what they said themselves or what their companions were saying.... shouting amidst that stagnation, the walls reeking with manure, the earthen floor with damp, and the 'medebs'[seat made of soil and attached to a ground] with sweat and rags and sheep and goatskins. And yet none of them noticing it, none of them feeling it –completely befuddle...

Some of the beggars, realizing what was taking place inside the hovel, started elbowing each other, gluing their faces to the crevices in the wall. A priest who happened to see the intrusion got angry, and, trying to chase them away, walked through the heaps of cow dung and fell on his side, his threatening speech giving way to a string of curses and malediction, (Daniahew, 1973:83-84).

There are words in the above extract that Daniahew used to symbolize the decadence and degenerating life of the society. A wall covered by “cow dung, pitches of dirt and mould” the floor of the hovel and shade covered with “manure, damp, sweat and rags... heaps of cow dung” are words or phrases that Daniahew used to symbolize social decadence in the country. Daniahew portrays the priests who are there in the memorial feast are unaware of the stagnation and the dirt around them and by implication the society is unaware of the decadence in the country. Daniahew used the “stagnation” in the hovel to symbolize the stagnation in the country. The stagnation and decadence in the country resulted dehumanization. We see, in the novel, the horrible condition of beggars who the narrator calls people who lose their wits and conscience. They experience degenerating life as follows:

Late in the afternoon, a great pile of leftovers was collected in big baskets, and taken out for beggars...

“I’ll pull the skin over your ears for taking my share!” the two lepers were still picking quarrels.

Most of the beggars, however, had already gone up to the church and there only four or five around: One of them was gathering the crumbs of injera and bread from his cloth to his palm; another was rummaging and picking lice out of the folds of his shirt and trousers;... and the rest waited for additional left-over, (Daniahew, 1973: 84).

Daniachew used the fight among the beggars for leftovers to reflect the degenerating life of the society in the feudal class system of the country. In fact, he portrayed the miserable condition of the pilgrims, the farmer, and the beggars to expose what feudal class system resulted in the country. The feudal class system resulted decadence and degenerating life in the country.

Daniachew not only used special language (i.e. metaphors) and depicted the social condition of the society in the monarch system but also employed stream of consciousness as a narrative mode to let readers witness the objective reality of the social condition and its effect in the mental condition of the society. He borrowed stream of consciousness, a mode of modernist writing, and employed it to reflect the impact of social condition of the society in the feudal class system of Ethiopia. We can see the influence of feudal class system in mental work of the progressive Goytom and non-progressive the Peasant in the novel through their stream of consciousness. So, Daniachew not only depicted the physical social reality but also included the inner consciousness of individuals (individual characters) in the matrix of social context through stream of consciousness.

Daniachew employs different narrative modes first person narrative mode by letting Goytom and Woynitu narrate what they encountered during their pilgrimage with their father to church Abbo. Similarly, there is omniscient narrator who for example introduces Woynitu at first, before she came herself as first person narrator. The third mode of narration is streaming of consciousness through the characters, like Goytom, Woynitu and The Peasant. Over all, Daniachew gave greater emphasis to both content and form to the stories in his novel, the *Thirteenth Sun*.

#### **4.5.2 Radicalism and Socialist Realism in *Firebrands***

Title of the novel can easily show us authorial and aesthetic ideologies of Sahle Silassie's novel, *Firebrands*. Ngara (1985:112-113) illustrates that radicalism, as Authorial Ideology (AUI), is reflected in writers' usage of "vigorous, harsh, passionate and uncompromising terms," against social and political problems; writers with radicalist authorial ideology are not moderate. They praise and openly take side of revolutionary groups who fight against certain ideology. They claim that a certain group/class who they think create problems against certain interest should be removed aggressively. Ngara (ibid.) indicates that during two conflicting ideologies, a writer has a possibility of taking side of either of the conflicting ideologies or remaining neutral.

The novel *Firebrands* is all about the conflicting political ideologies during the imperial government in Ethiopia. The conflicting ideologies are the monarchy's feudal class ideology and university students' revolutionary ideology. Sahle Selassie is open-partisan writer in his novel *Firebrands*. His open-partisanship to the revolutionaries, university students rallying against the monarchy, is reflected in his titling the novel *Firebrands*; he calls the university students who were rallying against the monarchy *Firebrands*. He came with this novel, in general, to appreciate the university students who revolted against the feudal class system.

His open-partisanship to the movements against the feudal class system is reflected in his portrayal of characters, social situations and events. The characters that stand in favour of the feudal class system are portrayed highly oppressive and corrupt. They exercise feudal class values; they practice class, religion and ethnic-based favouritism and oppose the revolutionists' demand for land reform that makes land go to tillers. The revolutionaries, mainly university students, however, are portrayed committed people who work to remove the imperial government and its feudal class system and ensure equality. They are portrayed as people who expose corruption, oppose cultural domination and nepotism. The students are highly aware of not only the oppressive nature of feudal class system but also how class system is created in general. They call for land reform that they claim benefits all people equally.

His partisanship to the movements against the monarchy and sense of radicalism against the imperial government in the novel also is reflected in his autobiography *Finote Hiwot, a Journey of Life*, in which he mentioned some of the ideas in the novel. Sahle Sellassie writes in his autobiography that he was in France for further education (postgraduate study) when the first coup against the imperial government took place in Addis Ababa, He recounts about the news of the aborted coup against the monarchy as follows:

አንድ የምዕራብ አፍሪቃ ተማሪ (ከፈረንሳይ ቅኝ ግዛቶች ከአንዱ የመጣ) 'በአገርህኮ ከ ዴታ ተካሂደዋል። ንጉሣችሁ ወደ ላቲን አሜሪካ ለጉብኝት በሌዱበት ወቅት ወታደሮች አምጸው መፈንቅለ መንግስት አካሄደዋል' ሲለኝ ደንዝገፎ ቀርሁ። ከድንዛዜዬ ስንቃ ሌድ ብዬ አንድ የፈረንሳይ የዕለት ጋዜጣ (ለ ሞነድ ይመስለኛል) ገዛሁ። በእርግጥም መፈንቅለ መንግስት መካሄዱን ያወሳል። እንዲያውም በስዊድን የኢትዮጵያ አማባሳደር የነበሩት አቶ ተፈሪ ሻረው መፈንቅለ መንግስቱን በመደገፍ ጽዋቸውን አንስተው የተነሱት ፎቶግራፍ እዚያ ላይ አለ፤ ያውም እስከነሚያማምሩ ሴት ልጆቻቸው ጋር። የኢትዮጵያ ተማሪዎች በኤክስ አን ፐሮቫንስ ያለነው ብቻ ሳንሆን በግሮኖብል፣ በፓሪስ፣ እና በሌሎችም ፈረንሳይ ከተሞች ያሉት ጭምር ወዲያውኑ በስልክም በደብዳቤም

መፈላለግ ጀመርን። የብዙዎቻችን ፍላጎት ከአቶ ተፈሪ ሻረው ጋር ግኑኝነት ፈጥረን ለመፈንቅለ መንግስቱ የድጋፍ መልእክት ለመላክ ነበር።

I was surprised when a student from one of the francophone countries in Western Africa told me that there was coup in my country. He said the coup had taken place by the military force when the Emperor was on his visit to Latin America. Then I bought a French news paper and confirmed there was a coup. On the news paper, there was a photo of an Ethiopian Ambassador to Sweden, Ato Teferi Sharew, together with his two beautiful daughters supporting the coup. Soon we, Ethiopian students, in Aix-en-Provence, Grenoble, Paris and other French cities began to communicate with letters and phone **to** express our solidarity to the coup [Emphasis added].

The novelist's side to the aggressive movement (radicalism) of the revolutionaries against the monarchy, i.e. the authorial ideology of the novel, is reflected also in his autobiography as indicated in the extract. This means the writer produced his novel supporting the revolution and the students' radicalism against the monarchy.

One of the revolutionary ideologies by the university students is opposing cultural domination. The revolutionaries' opposition against cultural domination of one ethnic group over the others as reflected in the novel is also reflected in Sahle Selassie's autobiography. In a subtopic of his autobiography entitled "የባህል ግጭት" (cultural conflict), the writer narrates that he changed his name from ሳህለ አናንቃ (Sahle Ananka) into ሳህለ ስላሴ ብርሃነ ማርያም (Sale Selassie Birhane Mariam). He did this when he came to Addis Ababa for his secondary school; in his autobiography, the writer narrates that he is from the Gurage ethnic group. His authorial ideology of opposing cultural domination is also presented in the novel *Firebrands* in the following manner:

'The systematic imposition of the Amhara culture resulted in the systematic destruction of the other cultures. The net result of all this is that we do feel- as you my friend, Worku, said earlier\_\_we do feel an inferiority complex, not because our tribal culture is really inferior to the feudal Amhara culture but because constantly we have been made to think and to feel that way,' (Sahle Selassie 1979: 46).

As indicated in the extract, the writer opposes cultural domination that made him change his name. He could know from his further education that cultural domination makes certain groups (the dominated) feel inferior while the others (the dominating) feel superior. It seems he regrets changing his name. Similarly, he opposes class-and ethnicity-based favouritism both in the novel

and his autobiography. In the novel, the authorial ideology of opposition of class and ethnicity-based favouritism is presented in the political discussion between Worku and Tokari as follows:

‘You say this country is poor, and that little wealth that exists is in the hands of the few. But you rarely ask the question “Who are these few?” The fact is that the little wealth that exists is in the hands of aristocracy, the nobility, and the high clergy. And then...’

‘I have never denied that,’ Worku interrupted.

‘And then, there is another question which you never dare to raise. The question is “Who are these aristocrats, the nobles, and these high clergies.” In other words, who are the members of the present ruling class? Aren’t they all Amharas? Or at least the vast majority of them?’ (Sahle Selassie, 1979: 40).

First of all there is an assumption that the country is poor and its little wealth is owned by few people who belong to the ruling class of the feudal class system. And he thinks that a particular ethnic group, as indicated in the extract, is the dominant class. The writer reflects the domination of particular ethnic group in his novel as he reflected it in his autobiography. Similarly, Sahle Silassie reflects, in his autobiography, that he faced grudges while looking for job after his return from abroad because of class-based nepotism in the country:

**ከኛ በፊት በውጭ አገር ትምህርታቸውን ጨርሰው የሚመጡ የኢትዮጵያ ተማሪዎች እንደ አገሪቱ ብርቅዬ ልጆች ስለሚቀጠሩ (በተለይ የመሳፍንትና የመደንንትና ልጆች ከሆኑ) ገና ወደ ኢትዮጵያ ከመደረሳቸው በፊት በየሚኒስቴር መሥርያቤቶች የሥራ ቦታ ይያዝላቸዋል። (ማህለ ስላሴ፣ 2008፡ 145)**

Students who studied abroad were considered unique and jobs in higher government offices were reserved for them, essentially for those who are from higher class family, before they arrive in Ethiopia.

The class and ethnicity-based favouritism that is done politically in the novel is what the writer witnessed, as reflected in his autobiography. The authorial ideology of the novel is reflected in the dialogue between the characters Worku and Tokari who are among the key “firebrands” (revolutionaries) implied by the title of the novel. The novel is overtly political and partisan. It praises the university students’ rally and aggressive movement against the imperial government and strongly blames the imperial government.

The novelists open-partisanship influenced also his aesthetic ideology that shares features of both socialist and critical realist writings. His aesthetic ideology shares some features of socialist

work he openly exposes corruption, religious, ethnic and class-based favouritism and discriminations by the monarchy and its feudal class. While he openly condemns the monarchy, he openly praises the university students who aggressively fight against the monarchy. In fact, some Marxist critics assert that open-partisanship reduces artistic value of a given work; they claim that partisanship, though it is inherent in all realist works, should be hidden. *Firebrands* shares also features of classical realist writings in its linear plot formation and in its conveying meanings in direct and none-prosaic manner.

The novel is rich in its typicality than its totality, which both are characteristics of realist writings. The typicality of the novel is reflected in the writer's usage of typical characters, typical historical situations under typical circumstances. We can see university students rallying against the monarchy and its feudal class system. We can also see the Military Junta's use of the public resistance against the monarchy as an opportunity to seize state power. Another manifestation of the typicality of the novel is the political discussion that was held among the university students of the time. The students were debating about the nature of class society based on Marxist view.

We can say, however, that the totality of this novel is not as rich as its typicality. *Firebrands* does not flesh out all the historical forces, the peasants, as it is a realist work and reflecting the class struggle. Hence, it is limited in presenting totality of life and totality of object of the peasants, who are important historical force in the feudal class system. This means, social conditions that caused the revolution in the novel are not fully represented. In other words, the novel does not reflect what Lukacs (1968: 152) describes as the "sphere of life belonging to the theme and three dimensionality of life. *Firebrands*, does not show different dimensions of social life of the epoch in the novel.

Sahle Selassie simply gives clear historical account of university students' rally against the monarchy and its feudal class system and the military Junta's taking over of state power. His novel supports and promotes struggle against feudalism in Ethiopia. Though the novel was produced years after the fall of monarchy, it supports the fighting held against the feudal system and its long existing values. His novel shows the conflicting ideologies that resulted the revolution in the country. The writer showed how the then university students raised their political awareness using the political discussion that took place between Worku and Tokari, the

main characters. There is also a political discussion that university students and a professor hold. Dr. Mandefrot, portrayed as the organic intellectual, has active participation and supports the students' movement against the feudal class system; he is not neutral. In fact, he is very systematic in his move with the students against the monarchy. He pretends to be neutral to both the reactionaries and the revolutionaries, though he supports the students' revolution against the monarchy:

Dr. Mandefrot, a lecturer at the university, was a sort of fallen angel in the eyes of his noble relatives. He had very little to do with the older generation of the nobility. But he did keep in touch with those of his age and with the younger ones (Sahle Selassie, 1979: 15).

He wants to remain loved by the nobilities and at the same time he discusses political matters of the country with the revolutionaries. His movement is not as acute as those of other revolutionists because he will be beneficiary of both systems, the feudal and new political system that is supposed to come. Hence, his movement is hidden. Dr. Mandefro consoles Dejazmach Azbete, one of the high officials, for he was attacked in his car by the students who were revolting against the feudal system. He consoles him that the riot is not a personal attack and asks him to understand that time has changed. Dr. Mandefrot tries to convince him that the students have noble ideas, revolutionary ideology, pretending to be neutral of the conflicts:

'There are a number of problems, Dejazmach, if one can judge by the symptoms. Corruption is one. Lack of justice is another. And then...well, the students talk about the existence of some drought and famine, about land reform...'

Dejazmach Azbete suddenly leaned forward as though he had been pricked with a needle from behind. 'What is that you said last?' he bellowed out

I believed I said "land reform" (Sahle Selassie, 1979: 112).

Dr. Mandefrot tells the political problems of the imperial government to Dejazmach being close to the nobilities and the revolutionaries. He supports the students' revolution but does not involve in the confrontation.

We can understand from those political discussions in the story that the revolutionaries used Marxist discourses as instruments to raise awareness about nature of class and class systems in a

society. And this shows the political awareness of the writer. In fact, Sahle Selassie attended university during the monarchy and his novel flesh out all the political problems of the time. The university students in the novel rise political problems the monarchy such as the issue of land which was under the control of feudal gentry, cultural domination, and denial of regional autonomy, corruption and lack of justice. Eventually, revolution that caused the removal of the monarchy takes place and a military emerged as the owner of the revolution. The writer is in favour of the revolution but declines the military junta's taking over of the state power.

The novel *Firebrands* is all about politics that the country experienced during the final period of the monarchy. The plot of the novel is linear and. The ideological conflicts of the students and the monarchy, are pillars and dialectical in the plot formation of the novel.

The conflict arises when a corrupt government officer, Kebret, enters into a conflict with Bezuneh who accomplishes his duties in a responsible and transparent manner. Kebret is appointed as a manager to government office based on his loyalty to the imperial government, tribal origin and religion. He prepares a ceremony for his appointment to a government office. Bezuneh goes to Kebret's ceremony having a bottle of whisky to avoid grudge from him. Kebret becomes corrupt. Kebret planned to corrupt by distorting the procedure in the bid system. But Bezuneh, in his transparency, blocked the bribe that Kebret was tempted to take. Kebret forces Bezuneh to submit a letter of resignation for he was obstacle for Kebret's temptation to corrupt. The conflict between those two characters intensifies and causes physical fight. The writer used all possible ways to reflect the innocence of Buzineh, the representative of the oppressed class and the guiltiness of Kebret, the representative of the monarchy. The writer has come with this kind of plot development to magnify the decadence of the imperial government and its ideology that caused revolution.

Kebret and Bezuneh enter into a complete fight. Keberet, using his power in the corporation, expels Bezuneh from his work. Bezuneh is annoyed and grabbed Kebret on his throat. There is a symbolism that the writer has used to foreshadow the upcoming removal of the imperial government from its throne during the fight between Kebret and Bezuneh:

Like a wounded beast Bezuneh leapt forward and grabbed him by the throat. His hands were a pair of steel callipers. Swiftly he lifted Kebret off his feet, shook him several times and finally banged his head against the wall behind

him. The golden-framed portrait of the emperor in uniform came toppling down, and crashed on the floor; it must have been hanging loosely on the wall (Sahle Selassie, 1979: 72).

As we see it in the extract, the writer has indicated the removal of the imperial government from its power was foreshadowed. He showed the power of the monarchy in the eventual time was loose. His authorial ideology made the writer to use the symbolism of removal of the power as aesthetic ideology. Toppling down of framed portrait of the emperor and crashing it on the floor is an indication of the removal of the imperial government. The last sentence in the extract also is another symbolism that indicates the power of the imperial government was not strong. It is difficult to say the writer has used much adornment or allusions, except the symbolism mentioned here. He simply reflected social and political condition of Ethiopian society that the university students in the novel riase in their political discussion and revolution.

#### **4.5.3 Marxism and Magical Realism in Nega's *The God who Begat the Jackal***

Nega's novel *The God who Begat the Jackal* is a realist work as its concern is society and its historical materialism (i.e. history and class struggle). Nega has reflected his good awareness of class and class struggle, which is a Marxist concern, in this novel. As Trotsky (2005 [1925]) and Eagleton (1976) noted literary form has high degree of autonomy; hence, a writer may not abide by previous literary conventions. Unlike the other writers of the novels analysed in the present study, Nega Mezlekia used magical realist mode of writing, which is one feature of post-modernist writings, to reflect social reality, the class formation and social struggle in a society. This means he did not limit himself to classical or critical realism to reflect socio-political conditions of a society. He did not abide himself by the Marxist notion of realism that demands reflecting society truthfully and plainly with only typical characters. His novel has some features of socialist art as it talks about building a new and classless society that avoids domination and exploitation. He used post-modernist mode of writings to reflect socio-political conditions of particular society in his novel.

The novelist, through the stories, depiction of events, characterization showed that he opposes the oppressive class systems and patriarchal ideologies. He is politically conscious, conscious of class ideology and class struggle. We can understand that the novelist, as he is the creator of the narrator, is political conscious by the ideology that the narrator raises.

*The God who Begat a Jackal*, is Marxist oriented novel as it dramatises historical materialism; there is master-slave, feudal-tenant/peasant relations and the revolution done to reverse these relations in the novel. Ngara (1985: 112) has to say this about historical materialism: “According to Marxism, man passed through various stages of social development from primitive communalism through slave societies, feudalism, capitalism and socialism.” The novel by Nega fleshes out also the struggle and the revolution done to avoid the class formation (the master-slave and feudal –tenant relations) by a rebel group led by Gudu, a revolutionary character in the novel.

The novelist not only portrays Ethiopia’s condition under the feudal class system, but also emphasizes the oppressive nature of the feudal class ideology. He describes social structure in the feudal class system, depicts the life of the people in different classes, and shows the oppression that women in the feudal class system experience as a result of feudal class and patriarchal ideologies.

The novelist used the religious conflicts in his novel not only to reflect religious ISA (fusion of political ideology to religious ideology) but also to reflect his rejection of cultural relativism, which is one theme of postmodernist writings. We can see the issue of paganism among the religions reflected in the novel. The narrator, whom the writer characterized as curious and progressive, questions why pagans are called *irreligious* while having their indigenous religion, Amma. The narrator believes that the Amma too is a religion so long as it reflects the faith of its followers. And this shows the political consciousness (such as post-colonial political consciousness) of the writer.

Amma followers, who had practised egalitarian culture before the establishment of slaves and serfs, (class system, in general,) in the novel, believed that Amma is a god having a shape of egg that comprises four elements: Fire, air, earth, and water. Amma wanted his female earth, which was once barren, fertile and populated. Hence, he got down from sky under blanket and darkness and united himself with the female earth and impregnated her by a jackal. Amma felt regretted for having a jackal that became disobedient and mischievous. The title of the novel, *The God Who Begat a Jackal*, was taken from this myth. Angry by his first mistake to father a jackal, the god united with the female earth once again and fathered twins who have above their waist a human shape and their bottom half snake-like. By including such story in his novel, the writer

reflected Africans had their own belief, myth, which tries to give answers about the creation of things.

Gudu, a revolutionary/progressive character, in his campaign with the Count's army, realized that the Ammas/nomads he met are candid and friendly who do have their own religion. The Ammas, unlike the followers of Mawu-Lisa, do not exercise social class. And Gudu thinks that the Ammas are the society whom he, together his love, Aster, wants to elope to. He decides to do so because the class system he lived in did not allow him to love Aster because of his class position.

The novelist, through his adoption of the story of Amma, reflected and shared postcolonial ideology that the country exercised its own classless culture, beliefs and philosophies before the introduction of other culture, mainly "modern" culture that favoured class system. The narrator asks his mother why followers of other religion call the Ammas in the novel as society who practice their indigenous religion are irreligious. The revolutionaries who fight against the class system went to the Ammas and won a victory over their opponents in the class struggle. The Ammas helped the rebel groups, the revolutionaries, to unite, avoid class and eventually won the victory.

The novelist uses the army of the Inquisition, crusaders, for multiple purposes in the novel. He uses crusaders to show religious conflicts existed in the country. He uses them also to show how the power interest of the monarchy fused its class ideology to religious myth; the monarchy used religion as ISA to sustain its political ideology. The Inquisition was launched to suppress any movement that opposes the established class system.

Overall, Nega's novel dramatizes social struggle for social change. It, in general, fleshes out ideologies that show social evolution which can be traced through dialectical/historical materialism. Though Nega used magical realism, his novel is rich in its totality of life of an epoch. His novel shows social life, struggle and evolution of the society in the novel. The totality life in the novel is reflected in his wide and detail description of social life. Nega represents the ideological contradictions and social struggle and evolution through complete descriptions of battles; he describes the strategies and tactics used by the opposing forces and the inevitable

victory of revolutionary ideology over the feudal class ideology. In doing so, he reflected his support to the revolution that the society did against class ideologies.

Nega used magical realism, one of postmodernist literary writings, to represent class social formation). We encounter in the novel that there are people who have extra-ordinary (magical) powers that enable them perform extra-ordinary activities. There are also invisible forces, like *ergum*, that intrude into people's activities. There are also extraordinary incidents and things, like *markesha*, that have extra-ordinary (magical) power that avoids, for example, the invisible forces, in the novel.

The narrator narrates that he himself and his father were travelling to a fictional place, Kersa, to collect due from tenants for the Count. They, however, faced *ergum* because they had been crossed by a wild dog, which is a sign of a bad omen (falling to dust devil). *Ergum* is an invisible force revealed in the form of dust, called "dust devil", in the novel. *Ergum* is believed to live in both visible and non-visible worlds, and is suspended between the dead and the living. Because they encountered *ergum* on their way to Karsa, the narrator and his father lose their horse with their belongings. There is also fetish called *markesha* (apotriotic), prepared from different ingredients and sprayed to avoid the *ergum*. When it faces *merksha*, a fetish that people spray, the *ergum* is turned into a pile of dust and soon disappears.

We also get people who have possession of magical power that enables them to perform extraordinary activities in the novel. One of these people is Aster. She was taught "the Sage of Sages", the highest religious education mentioned in the novel. She was also kept away from social sight until she learns the highest level of education and possesses extraordinary power that could help her perform extraordinary activities. Eventually, she developed extraordinary power, *Third Eye*. Using her extraordinary power, Aster moves things without raising her hand and communicates with departed spirits. Moreover, using her magical power, Aster forecasts weather condition accurately, diagnoses the cause of diseases of patients with her quick glance at them and uncovers the secret behind people who were killed by their neighbour. She also locates treasure buried by late husband, knew people who borrowed money from him and notified this to a woman who lose her husband. In addition, she is mind reader (she knows what other individuals are thinking). Because of her possession of such extraordinary magical power, she was assigned as a consultant to the emperor in the fictional kingdom. Aster and her extraordinary

power played as ideological state apparatus (ISA); she could expose conspiracies by foreign diplomats against the emperor when she was assigned as his consultant. She, using her magical power, could also uncover a plot organized by a brother against the Emperor's power. The Monk (Revered Yimam) had also extra-ordinary (magical) power that enabled him to move objects without raising hand at the narrator's home.

The old diviner (Count Ashenafi's diviner) also has magical power that helped him to expose hidden secrets of deceptive people. He exposed a merchant who attempted to sell sacks of sorghum which he mixed with hey. He also exposed another trader (Arab trader) who had killed his partner in a wilderness to take his belongings. He exposed the crime of this trader by whispering to the trader's horse. He also has a special magical power that enables him to change himself into other forms of animals and invisible presence.

Count Ashenafi appointed the old diviner to guard Aster, his only daughter. The old diviner protected Aster from public contact. Gudu, son of a bondwoman, and Aster have secret love. Because of the old diviner, however, Gudu and Aster couldn't meet. Hence, Gudu and his friend, the narrator, visited an *ergum* charmer to get something that can avoid the magical power of the old diviner so that he meets Aster easily. The *ergum* charmer gave them ash-like ingredient that Gudu added to the diviner's snuffbox. The diviner took snuff that he did not know it had been contaminated and he was turned to be zombie. As a result, Gudu and Aster easily met and stayed together until the diviner awakened.

An abettor, self-appointed admiral, who is invited and sponsored by belligerent during tough wars, owns the ability to go without food and water for six months. It is also narrated that he has the following extra-ordinary power:

In ordinary year, he could expect to be stabbed to death twice. Once, an army of retreating archers shot him with ninety five arrows. On three different occasions, he was carved to hawks and storks; he was also known to have been buried alive. But, each time, the old man resurfaced in some remote corner of the kingdom in one piece, invigorated by his ordeal, ready to influence the outcome of another raging war (Nega, 2002:111).

As we read it in the above extract, the Abettor posses extra-ordinary magical power that enables him to resurrect from his death. The Count invites the Abettor to help him in the tough war

against the tenants of the fictional place of Harar. His political power enabled the count to sponsor the Abettor to silence the resistance of the tenants against the oppressions by the feudal class system.

The narrator narrates that he descended from Mawu-Lisa. Muwa-Lisa, God of the fictional people, is both man and woman. Mawu, the woman, is in charge of the night, while Liza is to the day. The narrator is the descendant of Ananu, the female child of Mawu-Lisa. Sagbata from whom the narrator descended is the most disobedient of Ananu's children. The disobedient nature of Sagbata's line develops in the course of life. Only changing the name and exorcising the person from this line can avoid their disobedience. The narrator narrates that he was renamed twice before a passing diviner read his signature in stars and was renamed at last "Teferi", "The Feared One".

Count Ashenafi's wife, Countess Fikre is pregnant for her first child. Her pregnancy, however, exceeds ninth month and reached tenth. This incident alarmed the neighbours and the sages, soothsayers and diviners as to why Count Ashenafi remained calm about his wife's unusually extended period of pregnancy. A passing sage pronounced that a child born of ten months can be a single-humped camel; in eleven months, cape buffaloes. Soothsayers were undivided as to why Count Ashenafi accepted and remained silent though his wife's ten full months of pregnancy; they all agreed that Count Ashenafi was struck by a spell of his wife's fetish. A renewed diviner argued that only a headless gecko buried under his seat can make a man blind of his wife's unruliness. For this reason the renewed diviner mobilized a group of six elders who would have a responsibility of "establishing the state of the Count's mind" (Nega, 2002:13). And the elders did what they were expected. They opened three bottles of highland *araki*, alcoholic drinks locally produced, at different places at the Count's home. And a bird was slaughtered in addition to a bottle of *araki* opened at the gate of the count's home. This was done to bring back the state of mind of the Count in case he was struck by fetishes that prevented and made him silent about his wife's ten month pofregnancy.

Considering his neighbours' worry, Count Ashenafi explained that his wife is late to give birth to wait escorts who would come with his expectant baby, for the widow spirit is bad for a newly born baby. We see coincidence that many infants of persons and animals were born during the time the Count's baby was born. One of the escorts, who emerged with Ashenaf's daughter, is

Enquan's son, whom Ashenafi named him Gudu, ("the surprise"). Ashenafi's newly born baby was sheltered from people's view because of the belief that it may be hunted by widow spirits "who live in wait to capture them [infants] and make their own" (Nega, 2002:14).

The relevance of magical realism to the ideologies can also be seen in relation to ISA and AUI. The novel reflects how the dominant class used myths as ISA to manipulate society. The writer used the magical stories to reflect how the society was trapped by the oppressive class ideology. The writer used also intertextuality to reflect the class ideologies in the novel. The writer used a love story (the love between two individuals from different classes which is similar to a love story that Haddis Alemayehu used in his novel *Fiqir Iske Meqabir*. He also used magical realism mode of literary writing that writers, like Gabriel Garcia Marquez, used to write their stories.

#### **4.5.4 Revolution and Realism in *Beneath the Lion's Gaze***

Maaza's *Beneath the Lion's Gaze* can be considered as historical novel, for it reflects the contradicting ideologies and their reproductions, revolution and social struggle done for social transformation in pre-and post-revolution periods in Ethiopia (i.e., during the imperial government and the Dergue junta). The novel is a blend of real history and fiction; it includes not only real historical events but also historical persons as characters.

Maaza, in her novel, dramatizes not only the oppressions, interrogations, tortures and executions done in Ethiopia but also the revolution done for freedom and democracy (like freedom of speech, establishment of people's government). The university students, as organic intellectuals, revolted against the feudal class system in the novel. Other social groups, such as taxi drivers and the soldiers (Debre Zait Air Force and the entire division in Asmara) joined the resistance against the monarchy and its feudal class system. For this purpose, Maaza used both real and typical characters, typical circumstances and both allusive and non-allusive stories to represent the oppressions, interrogations, tortures, executions and the social struggle and revolution in her novel.

There are real characters such as the Emperor and Prime Minister Aklilu Habtewold who tells the emperor about "the problems in Neghele" and the "soldiers rebelling" against the government and eventually tendered letter of resignation to the Emperor which are all real historical events

recreated in the novel. In fact, the novelist, at the endnote of the novel, noted that she used some typical characters, such as Emperor Haile Silassie, Prime Minister Aklilu Habtwoled etc., with their factitious portrayal in the novel. She noted also that Major Guddu in the novel remains a fictional character, though he was inspired by Mengistu Haile Mariam. The students' movement against the feudal class system, the soldier's rebellion and their different demands from the imperial government, the history of the "Neway Brothers" and the first coup attempt against the imperial government, The "taxi drivers' demands for lower petrol prices", the taking over of state power by the military, the Dergue junta, and its interrogations, torture and executions etc., also are among the reflections of the real historical events recreated in the novel.

The novel is a realist work as it fleshes out the social condition during the reign of the Imperial Government and the Dergue. The novel, *Beneath the Lion's Gaze*, touches on more social issues and practices in relation to the social struggle done for social change. It presents how the Military junta used the infamous Wollo famine for propaganda to get public consent to its removal of the emperor and the imperial government and to consolidate its power. The Military Junta announces on the radio to the public to watch the documentary film about the famine in Wollo to be aired on TV at night, on the eve of the New Year. The narrator recounts what was seen on the TV screen about the famine in Wollo, as follows:

Vultures cawed and screeched, greedy and vengeful. They beat their wings furiously and fast, sent feathers tumbling into the eyes of a camera. The steady glare of the sun shot balloons of light into the lens, forced shadows to skulk back into the sky. Under the vicious heat were flesh-covered skeletons that breathed. Covered in rags the colour of dust, children crawled on all fours. Grown women with bones for breasts clung to emaciated babies. Defeated men let ravenous flies feast on their eyes. Naked bodies lay crumbled on cracked earth, scattered like ash (Maaza, 2010:50).

The writer presents two realities, as we can understand from the extract: The first is that the imperial government hid Wollo famine from public to protect its political power. The second is that the Dergue used the history of Wollo famine for propaganda to get public consent to its coup against the imperial government. Dr. Hailu, a character in the novel, realises that the Dergue was using the documentary film about Wollo famine for "propaganda," (Maaza, 2010: 51). We read that the university students had been using similar propaganda in their discourse against the imperial government to provoke the society for protest:

He [Solomon, a member of the university students revolting against the imperial government] shoved a pamphlet in his hand. On one side of the pamphlet was a photo of starving child with painfully swollen limbs. On the other, Emperor Haile Silassie's fed his Chihuahua meat from a silver platter...soldiers rebelled in north because they don't have clean water to drink while the emperor's officers get beer and water (Maaza, 2010:34).

The writer shows also the effect the documentary film about Wollo famine that Dergue transmitted on his media. The documentary film helped Dergue to get public consent to its removal of the emperor from his power. The narrator narrates that the feeling and response of the society after watching the transmission of the documentary film was high: "No one would be locked in their homes that night. It seemed the entire city was slowly opening the door and windows, their surprise and stunned anger too volatile to be contained within four walls" (Maaza, 2010:52). As the Dergue anticipated, the documentary film provoked the feeling of the society who reflected their anger against the imperial government and its long established feudal class system. In other words, the society gave its consent to the removal of the imperial government for "the documentary had broken the flood of outrage against the monarchy" (Maaza, 2010:61).

We can also see other social realities reflected in the novel, *Beneath the Lion's Gaze*, The emperor's exile "during the terrible time of Mussolini" (Maaza, 2012: 43) is flashbaked in the story of the novel. How the emperor refers to himself is also reflected in his communication with people and his stream of consciousness; he refers himself 'we'.

Dergue's renaming of places also is another circumstance that enriches the totality and typicality of the novel. We can see also the ideological significance of such renaming of places. The new government's (military junta's), renaming of the Menelik/Jubilee as National Palace and Haile Silassie University as Addis Ababa University could create the feeling of the ownership of these institutions among the society in the fight against feudal class ideology. Similarly, the novel fleshes out propaganda and slogans, such as "Victory to our struggling masses! Heberetetesbawinet! The only true means of equality! Ethiopian Socialism!" (Maaza, 2010: 84) that the Dergue used to get public consent to its power.

The novel incorporates also stories that reflect Dergue's cruelty. The Dergue arrests people who ask for a civilian government under the pretext that they are "anti-revolutionary": "People who

are considered counter revolutionary were arrested for their intent to incite riots” (Maaza, 2010: 94). There are also stories in the novel that show painful tortures, interrogations and murders by Dergue. There are stories that flesh out Dergue murdered and dumped people on the streets to send message for those who in case resist its rule.

The novel raises other issues such as Ethiopia’s condition and its alliance to socialist group during Cold War era, the nationalization of private extra-homes, and the help from socialist countries, Russia, Cuba and North Korea, to the Ethiopian government of the time. According to the narrator, “Ethiopia had fallen victim to the Cold War scramble for the Horn of Africa” (Maaza, 2010: 117). The narrator narrates also that “Communism had couched itself comfortably in a country that once boasted of a Solomonic Dynasty” (Maaza, 2010: 115). Yonas tells his brother, Dawit, “He [Major Guddu, head of the military junta] closed Kagnew Station and ordered US military personnel out of the country” (Maaza, 2010: 134) that shows Dergue’s joining of socialism during the Cold War. In their dialogue, Yonas and Dawit (the two brothers) argue about what socialism is. In their argument they raise issues related to middle and upper classes and poor people. Dawit tells his brother, Yonas, how the Dergue’s socialism is different from other features of socialism, and he says, “The Dergue is a dictatorship clothed in socialist propaganda” (Maaza, 2010: 135). Dawit argues that the Dergue is using socialism as a disguise to cover its power interest.

The military rule tries to nationalise extra private homes, closes private shops and opens *kebele* (communal) stores to implement communism. The government obliges the people/families to buy only the ration based on their number of the families from the *kebel* stores. There are, however, people, including officials who sabotage the rule of communism. There are soldiers and some officers who use extra ration from the stores. Melaku, a store keeper, tells to Dawit, a customer, “A group soldiers took everything, didn’t even pay for the ones I tried to hide. They bought some of my rations, too, complaining that soldiers weren’t getting any more than any of us; it is all going to the officers. Imagine, like old times” (Maaza, 2010: 159). It is narrated also that There “many black-market vendors in the city. Through such stories in the novel, the writer tries to show how greedy people could sabotage the implementation of communism.

The novel satirised how Dergue attempted to implement communism in Ethiopia. A soldier introduces Shiferaw, who is appointed as Kebele officer to Dr. Hailu's family, and tells him the man, the new appointee, would give "class on socialism" (Maaza, 2010: 125). Moreover, the soldier tells Dr. Hailu that one room from his, Hailu's compound, would be nationalized and says, "Anyone with extra-house is now required to offer it to Dergue as part of our [the military rule's] effort to help all of Ethiopia's poor," (Maaza, 2010: 125). The novel mentions also Cuba's and Russia' military support to Ethiopia during the military rule.

The writer mentions also the politics and war that Dergue did mainly against Somalia invasion and Eritrean rebel groups. A taxi driver tells Sara the news about the death of General Amman and the sixty officials as follows:

"I can't believe it."... " Even General Amman. The great man helped us win the war with Somalia. He wanted to avoid a war with Eritrea,"  
"Why so many soldiers [soldiers on streets]?" she asked  
"You didn't hear?" "The Derg killed sixty officials last night. Just shot them like criminals....Even the prince and the prime ministers. Ex-prime ministers. No trial" (Maaza, 2010: 93).

One issue that the taxi driver mentions is the political issues with Eritrea, in addition to the murdering of the general and sixty officials by Derg. There is also a narration that says, "the capital Asmara and the Port Massawa were under siege" (Maaza, 2010: 123). The conversation that the two brothers, Yonas and Dawit, do indicates the war that Derg did against Somalia and rebel groups in Ethiopia. Dawit says Major Guddu, head of the military Junta, gets support from Soviet in his fight against Somalia and the rebel groups in Eritrea. The novel satirizes also that support that Dergue gets from Cuba: "Cubans were training new recruits of the Ethiopian army" (Maaza, 2010: 123). There is also radio announcement that tells about air raids against Eritrean town. All these stories reflect how the novel tried to represent realities in an epoch.

Let us see other literary techniques, as part of the aesthetic ideology that Maaza used to reflect the power/class struggle in the novel, *Beneath the Lion's Gaze*. The writer used omniscient narrator, as a literary technique, to imagine what the emperor was thinking about the terrible incidents happened against his reign. He/she narrates what the Emperor was thinking about his power while he, the Emperor, was sitting alone before the students' protest against his rule:

Mercy. This, we have prayed for, the emperor thought. This has been all we have wanted. When those treacherous sons of Niway fought our bravest of men and tried to steal our greatest place on this throne, we prayed not for justice but for mercy. Mercy on this throne and this humble one, your appointed. Didn't your own most blessed King Dawit beg to you in his darkest days, did he not sing your praises when you answered? Surely goodness and mercy shall follow us, he said. We ask only for mercy, not even for the blessing of rain (Maaza, 2010: 30).

The narrator is omniscient narrator that he/she tells us what the emperor thinks. The emperor pluralizes himself and says "we" when he refers himself. We can consider this as one manifestation of totality in the novel. The narrator implies that the emperor understands well that he is in power not because the people willed but he used certain illusion that disguises his power when he says "we prayed not for justice but for mercy", as indicated in the extract. The narrator in the extract, by implication the writer, is in favour of the revolution against the imperial government. And he indicates that the emperor's priority is the power, not justice and life of the society. When the Military Junta, Derg, appeared, they propagandized "justice", what the emperor does not want to be raised.

The narrator narrates also that the emperor "had felt small, sharp pain in the centre of his chest" as he read leaflets that announces about the arrest of the imperial officials who are "responsible for corruption and the famine" (Maaza, 2010: 32). The narrator narrates what the emperor felt when a group of soldiers asked him to leave the palace: "The emperor felt the heat of a thousand eyes fall on him... He remained seated, refusing to believe the end would be so undignified and without ceremony, announced by a man who carried traces of dirt under his finger" (Maaza, 2010: 54). The emperor felt this because he believed and made the society believe his power is God given, and hence indisputable. The emperor considers himself and tells the people that he is the one "conquering Lion of Judah... and kin to God's most blessed of kings" (Maaza, 2010: 43). It is narrated that the emperor believed and instructed the society that his kin was "God's chosen whose kin can be traced to wise King Solomon of the Bible" (Maaza, 2010: 42) that the emperor refused to believe he was instructed to leave his palace by a person who he thinks was undignified man.

The narrator tells us what the emperor thought and said when the group of military men asked him to leave his power, "We must not be anything other than who we are, he reminded himself.

We are and so we will be. We are here in these days of locust and noise, but it has been written that this shall pass, and so it will” (Maaza, 2010:42). Narrating this way, the narrator implicated how the emperor fused his power with the divine power.

The writer imagines how the Military Junta kept the emperor after it removed him, the emperor, from his power through her omniscient narrator. The omniscient narrator narrates what the emperor, in his imprisonment, faced and thought. A military official enters into the emperor’s room and asks him if there was money he, the emperor, deposited in banks like Swiss Bank in his name. The narrator narrates the dialogue that the military official and the emperor exchanged about the money that the Military Junta thinks the emperor hid as follows:

“You have it in a Swiss Bank account” the official insisted. “Where is the money? Where is it? You know. Give us the account number.”

The emperor thought to ask, “How much money?”

The military official scoffed, then replied, “Over a billion American dollars, His tone was triumphant. “It could have fed all those people you let starve” (Maaza: 2010:74).

The omniscient narrator narrates that the emperor, after the military official left his room, let his mind wander around his memories: “He [the emperor]... let his mind wander across decades to his victorious return from exile after the end of the Italian occupation in 1941,” (ibid, 74). Through her omniscient narrator, the writer flashbacks the history of the exile of the emperor, part of the historical moment reflected in the historical novel, *Beneath the Lion’s Gaze*.

The writer foreshadows the fate of the country under the Military Rule through the omniscient narrator’s depictions of the image, sub consciousness that Selam, the dying woman, sees: “Selam deeps into the service of a rolling cloud, sourness coating her tongue. A dry whirlpool threads dust through its hollow middle and a thousand startled crows flood flocked the sky. A sad owl cooks”. Whereas the crows that flood flocked the sky represents the coming of Degue, and the sad owl hooting represents Guddu, the head of the military rule in the novel. The writer used also some imageries, like the restless growls of the Emperor’s lion. The emperor considered the restless growls of his caged lions as a prophesy foreshadowing a danger against his reign.

## CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION

The objective of this study is to explore and analyse ideologies and their reproductions, discourses, as reflected in four Ethiopian novels in English - Dagnachew's *The Thirteenth Sun* (1973), Sahle Selassie's *Firebrands* (1979), Nega Mezlekia's *The God who Begat the Jackal* (2002), and Maaza Mengiste's *Beneath the Lion's Gaze* (2010). Qualitative literary analysis based on mainly Marxist Literary Criticism and Materialist Literary Approaches has been used. Moreover, different views of ideology such as the views by both early and post-Marxists, the Frankfurt School of critical theory Althusser, Gramsci, and poststructuralists have been used to approach the ideologies in the novels selected.

Ideology refers not only to the idea that people live by but also how certain social consciousness is created and reproduced/discoursed. All the novels flesh out the contradicting ideologies, mainly the feudal class ideology and the revolutionary ideology, or the ideology of the organic intellectuals of the time.

In *The Thirteenth Sun*, Daniachew used mainly the argument between the characters, Fitawrari Woldu and his son, Goytom, to mirror the contradicting ideologies\_\_ the feudal class ideology by Fitawrari and the revolutionary ideology by Goytom, an organic intellectual in the novel. Both Sahle Selassie and Maaza represented the conflicting ideologies-the feudal class ideology and revolutionary ideology\_\_ thorough conflicts between the conflicting forces, namely between the university students and the representatives of the monarchy. Maaza included also the conflicting ideologies during the Dergue junta. Similarly, in his novel, *The God who Begat a Jackal*, Nega dramatizes class struggle, mainly, the feudal class (and feudal class ideology) and the revolution waged to overthrow this old social order.

The novels are Marxist\_oriented texts that mirror the economic condition, social formation, social consciousness and the resistance done for social transformation. The novels flesh out also the contradiction of the conflicting ideologies; they representd different power relations and discourses used to reproduce these contradicting ideologies in an epoch.

In *The Thirteenth Sun*, Daniachew used different representations to represent the feudal class formation. He used the dialogue between Fitawrari Woldu and the peasant (a dialogue between two people from different classes to represent the feudal class system of Ethiopia. Fitawary, in

his dialogue with the peasant, implied not only he should receive special treatment but also the peasant's consent to his (Fitawrary's) class superiority. For this purpose, Fitawrary uses discourses, words and phrases, such as superiors [class superiors], men of blood, to consolidate his class superiority. The peasant, in his monologue, admitted that the class illusion is something natural and eternal, not political, as a result of the feudal class based ideological reproduction. He says, in his monologue, "A rich Fitawrary and a man of blood, a gentleman...." (Daniachew, 1973:65). Fitawrary wants also to confirm the peasant's consent to his (Fitawrary's) class superiority in his (the peasant's) language usage that gives due respect to class superiors. Fitawrary asks the peasant, "Your language smells very much of the soil. Did you not have by chance a master who could teach you how to talk to your superiors?" (Daniachew, 1973:65). .

Daniachew satires also the peasant's categorizing of the meat of a sacrificial sheep that a conjuring woman prescribed for Fitawrary's cure to represent the feudal class system in the country. After the conjuring woman, the priest and the peasant accomplished preparing the sacrificial sheep and washed Fitawrary with all the contents of entails, they moved back home leaving the sheep at a crossroad for devils. The peasant, however, returned to the crossroad to consume its meat the sacrificial sheep hiding himself from the sight of people. He, in his monologue, categorizes the meat of the sheep into parts based on the classes in the society and says the delicious part of the meat was to masters and the rest to the servants to represent the class in the society.

Sahlesilassie's novel, *Firebrands* too is all about the feudal class system and the revolution waged against it. The revolutionaries in the novel implied that class, the feudal class system, and tribe based oppressions are the political problems of the country. There is a debate among the revolutionaries whether the political problems of the country should be seen only from the Marxist view of social formation or not. Tokari, being portrayed as revolutionary character in the novel, argues that the political problems of the time should not be seen in terms of only the scientific point of view (i.e., from the Marxist view of history of social formation). He rather contends that the issue of tribalism should also be considered, in addition to the feudal class system, in understanding and solving the political problems of the country.

Moreover, the novels dramatize the economic reality of the feudal class system. They mirror that the land and the peasantry was the source of economy of the monarchy. It is narrated in the

novels that the landless masses, tenants, live in a lands of not their own. The unnamed character “the peasant” who talks with Fitawary in *The Thirteenth Sun* lives in a land of not his own. He tills a land of a widowed woman, a wife of the late minister. It is indicated in *Firebrands* that the little wealth of the country was found in the hands of aristocracy, nobility and high priests. Similarly, Mickey, a character in *Beneath the Lion’s Gaze* narrates about the cause of the Wollo Drought and claims that the peasants plough lands that are not theirs and work hard to pay shares to the feudal gentry. According to the narrator in *The God who Begat a Jacka*, only the feudal class, because of “their bloodline to the divine power”, control the arable land and exploit human labour (the landless masses in the novel). Through such story the novelist exposes also how the ruling feudal classes associated their power to a divine power in perpetuating their power.

The novels represent also different power relations or ideological state apparatuses (ISA) and discourses that were used to reproduce the dominant ideologies and creat social consciousness in the feudal class system. The dominant class/group in the novels uses religious social relations as the main ideological state apparatus, (religious ISA), to reproduce the feudal class ideology. The novels, in general, reflect the role of religious power relations in creating social consciousness and/or reproducing certain ideology. The dominant class of the feudal class system used church as the best means of ideological state apparatus (ISA) to reproduce the dominant ideologies in the novels. This can be because of two reasons: because the monarchy associated its power to a divine power and because church was the best ideological state apparatus, before other advanced state apparatuses (such as media ISA) came into being during the feudal class system, to meet public, reproduce the dominant ideology and perpetuate certain social power.

*The Thirteenth Sun* dramatizes the monatrchy’s usage of church as ISA and religious complacency of the society. There is a fake preacher who is secretly assigned to the allegorical Church Abbo with the duty to reproduce the dominant ideology and inculcate the power interest of the emperor to the subjects so that the power of the emperor should remain indisputable. Considering the power of religious ideology, the preacher, through his power relation with the subjects, the pilgrims gathered to celebrate the annual anniversary of the allegorical Church Abbo at Mountain Zekuala, condemns people who betray the Emperor, defame the “superiors”, and eat animals which have teeth in the upper jaw. The preacher, in this regard, blends betraying the emperor and defaming the “superiors”, which is political with eating religiously prohibited

animals, eating animals that have teeth in the upper jaw, which is religious. He further associates rising against the emperor and his rule with the biblical tribulations of the “Eighth Millennium”. He further preaches that to sin against the emperor is to sin against the God. He asks the pilgrims to condemn those who the emperor educates and feeds but protest against his rule. In other words, he asks the society to condemn the university students, organic intellectuals who opposed the feudal class system because, according to Gramsci (1971), organic intellectuals can easily understand the oppressive nature of certain ideology and produce counter hegemony. Through such preaching, the preacher calls also the society to be obedient to the emperor and his feudal class system. Through this story, Daniachew reflected the monarchy’s use of church as ISA to reproduce the dominant ideology and creating social consciousness in general.

Similarly, both Sahle Selassie’s *Firebrands* and Maaza’s *Beneath the Lion’s Gaze* satirize how the monarchy associated its power with a divine power. It is narrated in *Firebrands* that the emperor was considered as “the occupant of the legendary ‘throne of David and Solomon’” (Sahle selassie, 1979: 11). Sahlesilassie satirizes also how the monarchy in general and the emperor in particular was associated to the *Lion of Judah*, yet, a biblical narrative. Similarly, Maaza’s *Beneath the Lion’s Gaze* satirizes not only how the monarchy associated itself to religious myth to maintain its political power but also its effect (i.e. the false consciousness created as a result of such association). Micky, a character in the novel, could not believe the overthrow of the emperor because he had believed to remove the emperor is to disrespect the divine power and so to experience heavenly punishment.

Similarly, Nega’s *The God who Begat a Jackal* satirizes the feudal ruling class’s association of itself with a divine power in the novel. This means the ruling class in the novel uses religion as ideological state apparatus (ISA) to reproduce the dominant ideology and maintain its power. The ruling class in the novel, *The God who Begat a Jackal*, uses *Ligaba - Mawu-Lisa* as ISA to maintain its power. The writer came with such story to allegorically represent the monarchy in Ethiopia, known as Solomonic Dynasty, which used Christianity as religious ISA in claiming and maintaining the political power in the country. The ruling feudal class in the novel, *The God who Begat a Jackal*, claims that because of its blood line to it, *Ligaba* (a divine power in the novel) granted it, the ruling feudal class, to own the arable land, to engage the landless masses to toil from dawn till dusk.

A priest in the novel, *The God who Begat a Jackal*, also asks the society to be obedient to the feudal class rule. When the priest knows the tenants in a fictional place Deder refused to pay their share to a count's messenger because of prolonged draught in their place, he intervened and convinced them to pay their due. In this case, the priest, as social actor, is serving as religious ISA in interpellating, convincing, and making the tenants to be submissive and obedient of the feudal class rule. Similarly, Revered Yimam, a preacher in the novel, uses the allegorical *Mawu-Lisa* as religious ISA to mobilize people and fight against those who he calls are "heretics", "infidels", and the Ammas. The Ammas are portrayed as societies who practice their indigenous belief; they do not exercise classes among people in the novel.

The novel, *The God who Begat a Jackal*, reflects also that people can use different power relations and hierarchies maintaining and resisting certain social power. The emperor and the count in the novel use another power and power relation to maintain and exercise their power. They, because of their power, use people who have extraordinary/ magical power in maintaining their power. Nega, the writer, has used magical realism as a mode of literary writing and hence, the opposing forces in the novel use extraordinary/magical power in maintain or resisting certain social power. The ruling class use people, like, Aster, who have the power to communicate with departed spirits and know hidden thoughts of people to expose plots against its rule and interest of the country.

In addition to religious power and power relations, the novels reflect other power relations (ISAs), such as family, media and academic power relations that have roles not only in creating social consciousness but also in producing discourses that reinforce or resist certain social power. The organic intellectuals, those who fight for social transformation in the novels, face challenges from discourses that reinforce the dominant ideologies that are reproduced in family power relations, in addition to the challenges that they face from the ruling class itself. Dr. Hailu in Maaza's *Beneath the Lion's Gaze*, tells his sons, member of the university students rallying against the monarchy, that it impossible to take down a monarchy of three thousand years, and he says, "Do these children [the university students] think they can take down a monarchy of three thousand years.... that their ideas can stop bullets?" Maaza, (2010: 37). Similarly, Sara, in same family, undermines and mocks at the students' calling for the emperor for meeting. In doing so, she implies the indisputability of the emperor's power. Similarly Goytom, who opposes the

feudal class system and religious complacency, in *The Thirteenth Sun*, faces discourses of resistance against those who demand for social transformation from his father, Fitawrary Woldu.

Though she is not successful Weizero Debitu in Firebrands tries to stop her two sons who are among the firebrands in the novel from joining the rally against the monarchy; and she says, “You are not sons of the noble men”. A police officer and Dejazmach Azbte, a member of the monarchy, who could realize the importance of discourses in family power relation, accuse families and academic institutions for failing to discipline the students who rally against the monarchy. Dejazmach Azbte says, “Students’ agitation, teachers’ collaboration, parents woes for their failure to discipline their children...,” (Sahle selassie, 1979: 122). ‘To discipline their children’ in this case includes making the students, who are rallying against the monarchy in the novel, submissive and obedient to the imperial government.

*Nega’s The God who Begat a Jackal* satirizes the role of family power relations (family ISA), mainly of the ruled ones, in making members of their families submissive to the dominant ideology, mainly the class ideology in the novel. Enquan, a bondwoman and a character in the novel, tries to repress seditious sense of her son, Gudu, a revolutionary person in the novel, when he asks her about the cause of servitude in the society. It is narrated “...Each night after his court performance, he [Gudu] brought his unanswered queries to his mother, but Enquan [Gudu’s mother]... did her best to repress his seditious thoughts, (Nega, 2002:44). Gudu, however, could not stop his movement against the established social order that made him a bondman; he, rather, established a rebel group that overthrew the class social order, the feudal class system. Similarly, the narrator narrates that Beza, another bondwoman in the novel, makes herself and her whole family dedicated to the cause of the class system, which made her a bondwoman. And through such stories, the writer showed how people are made submitted to certain ideology through discourses done in different power relations, like family power relation.

In *The Thirteenth Sun*, however, the monarchy and the family ISA is challenged by the discourses of new generation represented by Goytom. Fitawrary Woldu, member of the Monarchy in *The Thirteenth Sun*, is challenged by Goytom. Goytom challenges the feudal class system and the religious complacency in the society. Goytom also accuses the society’s attributing of every economic and social problem to divine power, not to earthly force, politics.

The novels, *mainly Firebrands* and *Beneath the Lion's Gaz*, reflect also the role of media, such as radio, television and pamphlets, not only their role in creating social consciousness and transmitting information but also their role in consolidating or/and resisting certain social power i.e. reproduction of certain ideology. Salesilassie, in his novel *Firebrands*, satirizes the effect of media in making society submissive to certain ideology. The narrator in the novel narrates that Weizero Debritu never makes sense of the words *corruption, feudalism, oppression, and misery* that her sons, member of the students rallying against the monarchy, raise; she, rather, senses only what state owned media propagates about the country. It is narrated, "Her ears were rather more used to such soothing phrases as Ethiopia being 'the bread basket of the Middle East', 'pregnant with minerals', 'untapped of her natural resources' and the like," (Sahle selassie, 1979: 124). And through such satire, the writer implied how the ruling feudal class controlled the mind of the people using propagandas on media. He indicated that the propaganda on media prevented the society not to see the social ills caused as a result of earthly force, the feudal class system in the novel.

The students in both *Firebrands* and *Beneath the Lion's Gaze* also use pamphlets to reproduce/ disseminate their ideology and discourse against the monarchy to the public. Their discourse against the monarchy includes the call to remove the monarchy and "land to the tiller!". *Dergue*, the military rule, in *Beneath the Lion's Gaze*, uses different media such as leaflets dropped from air, radio and television (as ISA) in its propaganda against the monarchy it removed from power. It does such propaganda to secure public consent to the actions it takes against the monarchy. According to Gramsci (1971) ideology is used to get public consent to certain social power. Maaza satirizes the different discourses such as national anthem, the propagandas on radio and television, the posters and photos of the leader of the military rule that *Dergue* used for interpellations to get public consent to its power.

Moreover, *The Thirteenth Sun* and *Firebrands* satirize how the monarchy narrates Ethiopia's previous patriotic deeds in the way it prolongs its power. Both Daniachew and Sahlesilassie reflected that the monarchy uses previous patriotic deeds and stories of battles to cover its power interest. Goytom, characterized as a progressive in *The Thirteenth Sun*, criticizes his father, Fitawrari Woldu, who ignores the miserable life of the society but always tells stories of battles. He criticizes the monarchy for failing to ensure change and making the society live in

gratifications of previous patriotic deeds to maintain its power. Dejazmach Azbete, member of the imperial government in *Firebrands*, condemns the students' opposition against the feudal class system and their demand for the removal of the monarchy. He associates his power interest with the country's previous patriotic deeds. Dejazmach further associates the students' opposition against the feudal class system with oppositions against the society who fought for independence.

Both *Beneath the Lion's Gaze* and *The God who Begat a Jackal* satirize the false consciousness created as a result of class system and the ruling class's association of itself with religious ideology. We have seen in the above that Mickey, in *Beneath the lion's Gaze*, could not believe the removal of the emperor from his power because he, the emperor, was considered the occupant of the Lion of Judah and the descendant of biblical King Solomon and King David by the society; the society was made to believe so using religious power relations. Hence, Mickey expected God would send heavenly punishment to the country because of the forceful removal of the emperor from his power.

Similarly, Nega, in his novel, *The God who Begat a Jackal*, satirize the false consciousness of the ruled created as the result of the class system in general and the ruling feudal class's association of itself with religious myth. As stated above about the role of familial power relation, Baza, a bondwoman, is depicted to be a prisoner of the false consciousness, which made her submissive to the feudal class ideology and servitude in the society. She made herself and whole family dedicated to the cause of class ideology in the society. She made five of her children sold for the power struggle that count Ashenafi did to seize his father's throne. Her brother died in defending her master's (Count Ashenafi's) honour. The novel satirizes that she made her two sons, Areru twins, escort the Count's only daughter for leftovers in the count's home. In return, Beza assumes kind look from her master.

Beza's illusion on the class ideology (i.e. her submissiveness to the class ideology) also is reflected in her envy against Enquan, her fellow bondwoman. Beza thinks Enquan is privileged for she works as a slave servant in the Count's home (Enquan works as a lap-maiden, prepares food and gives laundry service for the Count in his trip to different places in his administration). As a result, Beza plots to quash Gudu, Enquan's only son, by burying fetishes on grounds that he frequents. There are also people from the ruled who, because of their class illusion, oppose the

count for appointing Gudu, a bondman as court entertainer. Moreover, six slaves lost their life in a conflict to hunt Gudu who was accused of falling in love with Aster, the Count's daughter, a daughter of higher class.

The novel, *The God who Begat a Jackal*, satirizes other false consciousness created as a result of the class system. The society in Kersa, a fictional place, could not avoid the class illusion even after the feudal class system was removed through revolution. The society that had been divided by classes refused to learn and to pray under same roof. They expected God would send them heavenly tribulations if they learn and pray under same roof. They expected also a pregnant woman who married a freeman would bear, "a child, with a small tail between its legs, a baby girl with a third arm sticking out of her chest, an infant of indeterminate sex, and a baboon with a jackal's head," Nega: 2002:165. Nega, the writer, used such story to satirize the false consciousness created as a result of the class ideology in the society.

Althusser (1969) and Gramsci (1971) indicated that ruling powers/states maintain their power through superstructure and hegemony- ideological state apparatus (ISA) and repressive state apparatuses (RSA), consent and coercion. Both *Firebrands* and *Beneath the Lion's Gaze* satirize the ruling classes/parties' use of repressive state apparatuses (RSA) to take coercive actions against the public oppositions. The imperial government in both *Firebrands* and *Beneath the Lions Gaze* use different power relations (or ISAs) to secure public consent and different RSAs such as the court, police officers, the army, the Imperial Body Guard, Territorial Army to exercise and maintain its power. The imperial government in both the novels mentioned uses the RSAs to take coercive actions against the university students, the organic intellectuals, who are aware of the oppressive feudal social order. The army suppresses the students' resistance against the monarchy until it, the army, denied its loyalty to the imperial government and seizes the state power. Dergue, the military rule, in Maaza's *Beneath the Lion's Geze*, too uses its repressive machine to suppress any opposition against its rule.

The novels analysed reflect not only how the dominant classes/ ruling bodies exercised and maintained their power but also satirize the discourses of resistance done against the oppressive social order. *The Thirteenth Sun* reflects the discourses of resistance by new generation, mainly the organic intellectuals, against monarchy and its feudal class ideology. Daniachew, through Goytom and Woynitu, who are portrayed as having progressive consciousness in the novel,

explore and examine the socio-economic realities in the country and propose ways of social transformation. Both Goytom and Woynitu hold close examination of the social condition and confirmed that the country is under total state of decadence.

Goytom employs the materialistic view of things while examining the social problems in the novel, *The Thirteenth Sun*. He realised that the root causes of the miserable life of the society and the decadence in the country in general are religious complacency in the society, inefficient use of the economic potentials (both natural and human resources), injustices, corruption and other feudal class values. Goytom attributes all the social stagnancy in the country to earthly forces, mainly to the political system, while the ruling class and society attribute problems to metaphysical power. When Goytom says, “God’s way of putting an end to things,” and “Begging manna from Heaven,” (Daniachew, 1973:41 – 44) in his long monologue, he is refusing the idealist view of examining things; he refusing ascribing things to metaphysical power. He, rather, ascribes socio-economic conditions to earthly forces, social forces.

*The Thirteenth Sun* exposes also the religious complacency that the writer believes had contribution to the decadence in the country. The society, because of its religious compliancy, attributes all the social problems and the decadence in the country to God’s work; they never attribute the socio-economic problems to earthly force. Hence, we do not see people complaining against the government rule or the feudal political system. There are, however, implications of protest against the monarchy by intellectuals in the polarization done between Fitawrari Woldu and his son, Goytom. Goyrtom opposes the feudal class system and calls the people on power “people who have no love to their people, people who do not work for sake of the society’s progress.” He also calls them “people who lack universal truth in life.” He criticizes the government officials for their failing to transform the country and polarizes them that they are people “who live for only land, wealth, and title” which play key role in maintain their power.

Goytom opposes his father for deciding to give his inheritance to the cause of church construction instead of offering it to the construction of schools in the country. He believes the religious complacency made the society attribute every problem to heavenly force instead of the earthly force. Hence, he thinks the society’s religious complacency and practice damaged civilization in Ethiopia. Fitawrari, in his turn, polarizes his son, Goytom, and other intellectuals

who oppose the monarchy, “good-for-nothing, weak, intelligentsia”, and their call for transformation, “silly things” and Goytom’s demand to build school, “rubbish”.

Gramsci (1971) indicated that organic intellectuals, social actors, who are aware of the oppressive nature of certain social order, can come with counterehegemony and lead society for social transformation. Goytom in *the Thirteenth Sun*, university students in *Firebrands* and *Beneath the Lion’s Gaze* are aware of the problem of the monarchy and its feudal class system. These novels dramatize the discourses of the university students, portrayed as organic intellectuals (i.e. the university students in *Firebrands* and *Beneath the Lion’s Gaze* and Goytom in *The Thirteenth Sun*). Though Goytom is not mentioned as university students, he is well aware of the decadence in the country and enlightens the society about the cause of the decadence in the country. In fact, his consciousness is attributed to the writer, Daniachew, who reached university level academy and took scholarship about creative writing in USA.

The university students expose the weakness of the monarchy through discourses such as land to the tiller. The university students in *Firebrands* call for land reform, adoption of regional autonomy and the end of cultural domination. They raise issues related to corruption, misery and oppressions happened as a result of the feudal class ideology in the country. Similarly, the university students, organic intellectuals, in *Beneath the Lions Gaze* demand for actions that can address the country’s poverty and lack of progress. They also call for new constitution, freedom of expression, land reform that gives the farmer to own what he tills and the removal of an “old and tired” monarchy.

The novels (mainly *Firebrands* and *Beneath the Lion’s Gaze*) reflect that academic discourses mainly Marxist discourses, determined the university students’ consciousness of resistance against the monarchy. Such such discourses evoked the the university students’ feeling resistance against the feudal class system in the country. The students hold discussions that can raise their consciousness about the nature of class system and this helped them to come with discourses that oppose the monarchy in the country. The university students in *Beneath the Lion’s Gaze* read Marxist materials like books by Mao and hold meetings that raise their political awareness. Such readings, as implied in the novel, gave the university students to have “a new kind of confidence,” (Maaza, 2010:22) in their opposition against the feudal class system in the country. Similarly, the revolutionary students in *Firebrand* argue about the nature of class system in their

political discussion. And these kind of power relations (the academic power relations and political discussions they hold), gave the students chance to have better consciousness and come with counter hegemony that ensured the social transformation. Alhusser (1969) illustrated that ideology functions by interpellations, i.e. hailing people/society and make them submissive to certain ideology.

*Beneath the Lion's Gaze* reflects also the discourses of resistance that the organic intellectuals did against Dergue, a military rule, that took over the monarchy. The intellectuals, mainly the university students, demanded for civilian government in their discourse. They, in their discourse, accused Dergue had declined its promise to make bloodless coup and form civilian government. The protesting intellectuals contend that Dergue “continued its own viciousness and murderous spirit,” (Maaza, 2010:117). The writer reflected also that there was a protest that demanded the end of the war in Eritrea. These intellectuals formed a resistance group called Revolutionary Lion Group that represents Ethiopian People Revolutionary Party (EPRP). The resistance group declared a campaign called *White Terror* in its fighting against Dergue. Major Gudde, the head of the military rule, Dergue, in the novel, in his turn declared a campaign called *Red Terror* to punish the resistance group who later moved their base from Addis Ababa to a distant rural area for liberation struggle which is the end of the story in the novel. This novel also dramatizes fascism by Dergue. The fascism includes severe torture and interrogations (in and out of the prisons) and executions of groups and individuals whose bodies are dumped on the street of Addis Ababa and other execution grounds. The university students in *Firebrands* and *Beneath the Lion's Gaze* use mainly pamphlets, as a power relation, for interpellation to reach the public and disseminate their ideology.

*The Thirteenth Sun* and *The God who Begat a Jackal* expose the socio-economic problems that women in the country face as a result of patriarchal ideology, that reflect another social power in the society. Woynitu is Fitawrari's daughter whom he got from one of his wives. Fitawrari Woldu, at first, refused his fatherhood until he becomes old and needs her treatment. Her mother, portrayed as uneducated, lives by selling liquor in a tavern. Customers come and oblige them to have liquor and date with them. Woynitu describes the life at the tavern “Disgusting” and “all sorts of degenerates”. She hates what the customers call them (verbal harassment), and says,

“The same calling as my mother” showing the continuity of women’s sufferings from the patriarchal ideology.

She joined her father, after he admitted his fatherhood to her, and accompanied him in his journey to search cure from holy water of Church Abbo in Mountain Zequala. She witnesses women’s sufferings in the village. Eventually, Woynitu was sexually harassed by the peasant who gave them lodge in their journey and says, “I have become one with my mother” indicating the continuity of women’s sufferings because of the dominant patriarchal ideology. The novel reflects also that men consider women as sexual objects. There is a story that reflects women are used as sexual objects to get jobs in government offices.

*The God who Begat a Jackal* also exposes patriarchal ideology. Nega dramatizes the problems that women face because of patriarchal ideology in the society. There is no or little women’s influence in the political affairs of the society in the novel. The narrator narrates that the count’s wife is blameless woman. The writer implied different meanings in the narrator’s idea. One is the Countess, Countess Fikre, is blameless because her home is full because of her husband’s power. The other is that the Countess is blameless for all the problems she face because of the patriarchal ideology that made women obedient to male domination. The narrator further narrates the countess, “never opens her mouth before checking her husband’s approval,” (Nega, 2002:49), and this reflects male domination. Similarly, Count Ashenafi forces his daughter to marry a man of not her preference. There is also marriage by abduction: “Marriage by abduction is the norm for the toiling majority,” (ibid. p. 120). The narrator narrates also that only boys were encouraged to learn how to read and write, though Count Ashenafi, because of his power, helped his only daughter, Aster, to learn and reach the highest level of learning, “the Sage of Sages” in the novel. The free men use the bondwomen as lap-maiden. As mentioned above, Count Ashenafi uses Enquan as lap-maid when he has trips around his territories. The narrator further narrates no one blames the count for his infidelity when provoking women for his sexual needs in big parties: “who could blame the count for feeling liberated” (ibid) because of his feudal class power and the dominant patriarchal ideology.

Aster who possessed a magical power from her high level learning and redeemed the emperor from numbers of plots is sexually harassed by the emperor himself. As a result, Aster loses not only her chastity but also her magical power that helped her uncover different plots and reveal

hidden thoughts. As compensation to her harm, the emperor granted additional dominion (a fictional place of Harar) to her father. The residents of this town did not welcome Count Ashenafi and hence, he opens war against them several times. There is also a story in the novel that women who are found lose their chastity are tortured by men who marry them and get humiliated by the society. Nega, the writer, used such story to reflect social problems that women face because of the patriarchal ideology, male domination, in the society.

When we come to the authorial ideology (AUI) and Aesthetic ideology (AI) of the novels analysed, we get reformation and metaphoric realism in Daniachew's *The Thirteenth Sun*. Daniachew examines the social condition and the decadence in the country that failed to utilize its resources he studied. He attributes the degenerating life and the decadence in the country to the feudal class ideology and society's religious complacency. Daniachew, in a biography of Ethiopian writers by Molvear (1997), confirms that he is reformist. He also implied the need for social transformation in his novel.

Daniachew used metaphoric realism to represent the social reality and the decadence in the country. We can say *The Thirteenth Sun* is rich in both content and form. And this is reflected in the typicality and totality of the work and the metaphoric realism that the writer used to develop this novel. Typicality of the novel is reflected in the writer's usage of typical characters and typical cultural events, activities, rituals, both rural and urban family lives. The writer covers also different cultural activities and lives, such as Fitawrari Woldu and his children's journey and the chat they have, the peasant and his family's life, the procedures at the church, the procession of the *tabot*, the monk and his preaching, the conjuration, life in the tavern and the problems that women face there, the memorial feast and the priests etc that enriched the totality of life.

Aforementioned, Daniachew uses different metaphors that allude the decadence and predicament in the country. He entitled the novel *The Thirteenth Sun* that Goytom, the character, reads from a billboard/ advertisement in his journey with his father to the holy water to allude ironically the degenerating life and the decadence in the country. Daniachew further used different metaphors, such as condition of the homes, the people's face, the utensils at the peasants home, the place where cultural event (like the Memorial Feast) is held, the condition of the beggars and pilgrims, etc to represent the degenerating life of the society and the decadence in the country under the monarchy in general. Moreover, Daniachew used stream of consciousness in portraying the

social condition. Characters, mainly Goytom and Woynitu narrate the social condition mainly through their interior monologue.

The authorial and aesthetic ideology in Sahle Silassie's, *Firebrands*, is radicalism and classical realism. Authorial ideology of the novel is implied in the title of the novel, *Firebrands*, that praises the university students' harsh resistance against the imperial government. Sahle Silassie, in his autobiography, *Finote Hiwot*, confirmed also that he supported the first coup done against the Emperor. *Firebrands* has a linear plot formation and less literary adornment which are both features of classical realism.

*Firebrands* is rich more in its typicality than its totality. The typicality of the novel is reflected in its typical characters under typical circumstance, like the university students who were rallying against the monarchy. The Military Junta, Dergue's seizure of the state power and the political discussion that the university students hold are other reflections of the typicality of the novel. The totality of the novel, however, is not as rich as its typicality. The novel does not cover what Lukacs says, "sphere of life belonging to the theme". Sahle Silassie does not show the social condition of the two classes that caused the revolution against the monarchy. The novel covers only a single event, i.e. the rally by the university students, organic intellectuals, against the monarchy.

The authorial and aesthetic ideology of Nega's *The God who Begat a Jackal* is Marxism and Magical Realism. The novel reflects historical materialism. Ngara (1985: 112) writes, "According Marxism, man passed through various stages of social development from primitive communalism through slave societies, feudalism, capitalism and socialism." *The Gog who Begat a Jackal* also reflects the struggle that the society do to avoid the oppression created by the class formation (the master-slave and feudal-tenant formation).

Nega used magical realism, one feature of post-modernist mode of writings, in representing the social formation, power relation and class struggle. We get people who have extraordinary/magical power, like the Abettors who disappear and resurrect and invisible forces, and the *ergum* that intrude into human's activities. The relevance of magical realism to the general ideology in the novel can be seen in relation to power relation, ideological state apparatus (ISA) and the authorial ideology (AUI). The novel reflects the power hierarchy of the people that

places the emperor and the count at the top, the people who have magical power next and the ruled (the tenants, slaves, and women) at the bottom. It also reflects how the dominant class used myths as ISA to manipulate the society and sustain its power.

The novel used also intertextuality, which is another feature of post modernist writings, to reflect the class ideology. The conflict created as a result of love between people from different classes is common story, like the story in *Fikir-eskemekabr* of Haddis Alemayoh. Considering the magical realism and intertextuality, we can also say Nega's novel, *The God who Begat a Jackal* is post-modernist writing.

The authorial and Aesthetic ideologies in Maaza's *Beneath the Lion's Gaze* also are revolution and realism. Maaza reflects the revolutionary movement done for freedom and democracy and social transformation, in general, in Ethiopia. For this purpose, she used both real and fictional but typical characters and both allusive and none allusive stories in her novel.

It is found that all the novels analysed are realist works; they reflect economic condition, social formation, and social struggle/revolution done for social transformation. This can be explained because the country experienced feudal class system for a long period of time and the social struggle/revolution done for social transformation. Moreover, all these novels, mainly, Daniachew's *The Thirteenth Sun*, Sahlesilassie's *Firebrands* and Maaza's *Beneath the Lion's Gaze* are committed to the cause of the organic intellectuals who organized and led the social struggles done for social transformation in the country. This can be because the authors of these novels were members of the organic intellectuals, the social forces, who fought for social transformation.

## REFERENCES

### Primary References

- Althusser, L. (1966). *A Letter on Art in Reply to Andre Daspre in Lenin and Philosophy and other Essays*. New York and London: Monthly Review Press
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1969). *Ideology and Ideological State Apparatus in Lenin and Philosophy and other Essays*. New York and London: Monthly Review Press.
- Beer, David F, (1975). *Ethiopian Literature and Criticism in English: Annotated Bibliography, Research in African Literature*. Indiana University Press Vol. VI, p. 44 – 57.
- Craig, D. (1975). *Marxists on Literature: An ontology*. London: Penguin books.
- Dagnachew, W. (1973). *The Thirteenth Sun*. London: Heinemann.
- Debebe, S. (1980). *Ethiopian Literature in English*. Unpublished MA thesis. Addis Aaba University
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1994). “*An Aerie of Society*”, in Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference of Ethiopian Studies. Institute of Ethiopian Studies. Addis Ababa University.
- Eagleton, T. (1976). *Marxist Literary Theories*. in Ann, J & David, R. Ed.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1978 [1975]). *Criticism and Ideology: A Study in Marxist Literary Theory*. London: Verso.
- \_\_\_\_\_ ( 1991). *Ideology: An Introduction*. London: verso.
- Foucault, M. (2000[1994]). *Truth and Power*. Pp. 111-133 in *Power: Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984*, edited by J. D. Faubion. New York: The New Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2000[1994]). *The Subject and Power*. Pp. 326-348 in *Power: Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984*, edited by J. D. Faubion. New York: The New Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (2000[1994]). *Truth and Juridical Forms*. Pp. 1-89 in *Power: Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984*, J. D. Faubion. New York: The New Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2003). “*Society Must be Defended*”: *Lectures at the College de France, 1975-1976*, edited by M. Bertani and A. Fontana. Translated by D. Macey. New York: Picador.

- Fanon F. (1952). *Black Skin, White Masks*. Translated by Charles Lam Markmann (1967).  
London: Pluto Press.
- Gerard, A. S. (1971). *Four African Literatures: Xhosa, Sotho, Zulu, Amharic*. Washington D.C:  
Three Continent Press.
- Gramsci, A. (1971), *Prison Notebooks*. Edited and translated by Quentin Hoare and Geoffrey  
Nowell Smith (1999). London: ElekBook.
- Habib, M. A. R. (2005). *Modern Literary Criticism and Theory: A History of Literary  
Criticism*. ASA: Blackwell publishing
- Huntsberger, Paul E., (1973). *Highland Mosaic: Anthology of Ethiopian Literature in English*,  
Papers in International Studies, Ohio University, Center for International  
Studies, Papers in International Studies Africa Series No. 19
- Lukacs, G. (1964). *Studies in European Realism*. New York; Grosset & Dunlap.
- Maaza, M. (2012). *Beneath the Lion's Gaze*. New York. W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- Macherey, P. (1966). *A theory of Literary Production*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Molvaer, R.K. (1997). *Black Lions: The Creative Lives of Modern Ethiopian's Literary Giants  
and Pioneers*. Asmara: Red Sea Press.
- Nega, M. (2002). *The God who Begat a Jackal*. Great Britain. Weildenfield and Nicoloson.
- Newton, K.M. (1997). *Twentieth-Century Literary Theory*, second edition. London:  
Macmillan Press Ltd
- Ngara, A. (1985). *Art and ideology in the African Novel: A study of the  
Influence of Marxism on African writing*. London: Heinemann.
- Ngugi, Wa Thiong'o (1981). *Writers in Politics. Essays*. Nairobi: Ibadan.
- Sahle Silassie, BM (1968). *Afersata*. London: Haineman
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1974). *Warrior King*. London: Haineman.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1979). *Firebrands*. Drumbeat: Longman.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2008). *ፍኖተ ኢይወጎ/ Finote Hiwot , A Journey of Life*, an autobiography, Boston:  
Daraku Publishing
- Sargent, L.T. (2009). *Contemporary Political Ideologies: A Comparative Analysis*, Fourteenth  
Edition: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

- Taye, A. (1994). *Imagery of Decadence of Society* in Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference of Ethiopian Studies. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa Universities.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2012). *Magical Realism in The God who Begat a Jackal* in Ethiopian Journal of Languages and Literature. Vol. XII, No. 11. Addis Ababa University. AAU Printing
- Trotsky, L. (2005 [1925]). *Literature and Revolution*. Chicago, Illinois: Haymarket Books.
- Tyson, L. (2006). *Critical Theory Today: A user-friendly Guide*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge Tylor & Francis Group.
- van Dijk, T.A. (1998). *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. London: S Age Publications
- Williams, R. (1977). *Marxism and Literature*. New York: Oxford University Press.

## Secondary Reference

- Base, Y. (1979). *Semantic Philosophy of Art*. Moscow: Progress Publishers, cited in Ngara, A. (1985). *Art and ideology in the African Novel: A study of the Influence of Marxism on African writing*. London: Heinemann.
- Forgacs, D. (1982). *Marxist Literary Theories*. in Ann, J & David, R. Ed. *Modern Literary Theory: A comparative: Introduction*. 2nd ed. London: B.T. Batsford Ltd.
- Gottlieb, R. S. (1989) *An Anthology of Western Marxism: From Lukacs and Gramsci to Socialist-Feminism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gramsci, A. (1971) in Eagleton T. (1990). *Ideology: An Introduction*. London: verso
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1971) in Roger S. Gottlieb (1989) *An Anthology of Western Marxism: From Lukacs and Gramsci to Socialist-Feminism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Laclau, E. and Mouffe, C. (1985.) *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London: Verso, in Stoddart, M. C.J. (2007), in *Social Thought and Research: A continuation of the Mid-American Review of sociology*, Vol. 28, 2007. USA: The University of Kansas.
- Lenin, V.I.(1971). *Articles on Tolstoy as the 'mirror of the Russian revolution'*. in Macherey, P. (1966). *A theory of Literary Production*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Liyong, T. (1969) in Ogude J. (1999). *Ngugi's Novels and African History*. London: Pluto Press.

Marx and Engels (1859), *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*. In Eagleton, T. (1976). *Marxism and Literary Criticism*. London: Methuen & Co LTD.

\_\_\_\_\_ (1989). "Excerpts from the German Ideology." in Stoddart, in M. C.J. (2007) In *Social Thought and Research: continuation of the Mid-American Review of sociology*, Vol. 28, 2007. USA: The University of Kansas.

Marx and Engels, *On Literature and Art*, Progress publishers. Moscow 1976 from in the work of George Lukacs (1964), Eagleton (1976), Ngara (1985) and website.

Plekhanov, G. (1953). *Art and Social Life*. A collection of Plekhanov's major essays on literature.

London. in Eagleton, T. (1976) *Marxist Literary Theories*. in Ann, J & David, R. Ed. Stoddart, M. C.J. (2007). In *Social Thought and Research: A continuation of the Mid-American Review of sociology*, Vol. 28, 2007. USA: The University of Kansas.