

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF LANGUAGE STUDIES, HUMANITIES,
JOURNALISM AND COMMUNICATION

DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE

**“Structural Analysis of the Evolutionary Motif, Portrait and Discourse
of National Identity in the Kebra Nagast, Tobbiya and Dertogada”**

Nebiyu G/Michael Mihretu

JUNE, 2012

**“Structural Analysis of the Evolutionary Motif, Portrait and Discourse
of National Identity in the Kebra Nagast, Tobbिया and Dertogada”**

Nebiyu G/Michael Mihretu

**A Thesis Submitted to
The Department of Foreign Languages and Literature**

**Presented in Partial Fulfillment for the Requirements for Degree of
Master of Arts in English Literature**

June, 2012

Addis Ababa University
School of Graduate Studies

This is to certify that the thesis prepared by Nebiyu G/Michael Mihretu, entitled: *Structural Analysis of the Evolutionary Motif, Portrait and Discourse of National Identity in the Kebra Nagast, Tobbiya and Dertogada*, and submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in English Literature complies 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 _____

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I should be grateful to my advisor—Dr. Melakneh Mengistu—for his motivated patience to tolerate me ‘til I reach at the decision to modify my initial research title, and his strong comments that made me into readings and contacting professionals in Addis Ababa University.

My special appreciation also goes to Dr. Sharma for his generosity to read and reflect on the conceptual framework, and for his ultra-meekness that helps trigger positive attitudes in my relation with people. I must thank my amigos and gurus: Yohannes Assfaw, Hadgu Teka and Tsedey Wondmu who gave me, unreservedly, their most precious intellectual treasures—in the PhD forums & elsewhere—which I could hardly attain from someone else.

Yewibdar Demissie, thank you very much for you were and will be always there to discuss & argue over all the academic matters, and thus, assist to actualize my “rebirths” into more adventures of scholarly quest. Wondimagegn, my good undeviating friend, thanks for your clean affection and help, and Nahom and Melkamu, thanks a lot for your memorable and humble friendship. My comrades of Tigrigna Department: Hayle, Haftay and Teklay, you deserve gratitude of special type for your supports.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	I
Table of Contents	II
Abstract	IV

Page No

CHAPTER ONE:

INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Background of the Study	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem	4
1.3. Objectives of the Study	6
Specific Objectives:	6
1.4. Significance of the Study	6
1.5. Scope of the Study	7
1.6. Method of data Collection	8

CHAPTER TWO:

A REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	9
--------------------------------------	---

CHAPTER THREE:

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORKS	14
3.1. Conceptual Issues of Structuralism	14
3.1.1. The Terminology of Structure and Structuralism.....	18
3.1.2. Structuralism & the Structuralist Investigation	29
3. 2. Structuralism in Linguistics	31
3. 3. Structuralism in Social Anthropology	38
3. 4. Structuralism in Literature	43
3. 5. Structuralism and Post Structuralism/ Mock-structuralism.....	46

CHAPTER FOUR:	
STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS OF THE EVOLUTIONARY MOTIF, PORTRAIT AND DISCOURSE OF NATIONAL IDENTITY IN THE KEBRA NAGAST, TOBBIYA, AND DERTOGADA.....	52
4.1. Introduction.....	52
4.2. Synopsis of the Narratives.....	53
4.2.1. <i>The Kebra Nagast</i>	53
4.2.2. <i>Tobbiya</i>	54
4.2.3. <i>Dertogada</i>	55
4.3. Literature and Human Belief: Pre-Archetypal Stage.....	56
4.4. The Bedrock/Archetypal Function of the <i>Kebra Nagast</i>.....	57
4.5. Displacement: the Undesirable and Desirable National Image of Ethiopia	59
4.6. The Grammar/ Parallelism of Mythos Architecture	64
4.7. The Mythos of Summer and Spring: Romance and Comedy	70
4.8. The Cyclical Sequence in Romantic Character’s Life.....	84
4.9. Dianoia/Thematic Parallelism and the Idea of Nation	93
4.10. Theory of Archetypal Imagery/Symbolism	96
4.10.1. Apocalyptic Imagery.....	97
4.10.2. Demonic Imagery	98
4.11. The Therapeutic Function of Literature: A Philosophical Theory	99
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS.....	104
REFERENCES.....	108

ABSTRACT

*Structuralism is a twentieth century approach or strategy which altered the conformist view of nature and reality as metaphysics and historicism do. Structuralism can be taken as a way, approach, method or philosophy of critical investigation of relationships among deep and surface levels of being and human culture in general; the modern structural world view emerged as prominent manner of study of universal rules and universality with the coming of Ferdinand de Saussure's book *Course in General Linguistics* in 1916. The Prague School that included Roman Jakobson and S. Troubetzkoy are responsible for the enrichment of structural linguistics and structuralism. Noam Chomsky and Levi-Strauss have also played an important role in the further development of the structural approach and able to successfully maintain its promising influence in the Western mode of thought from semiotics to cybernetics and general systems theory.*

Structuralism, hence, is attributed with the undented manifestation of things in their entirety and shared elemental constitution for an underlying principle is governing their existence and interactions. This unequivocal approach, however, had been mistaken as a study of static forms or refrigerated defunct even by some well-noted thinkers like J. Derrida and M. Foucault due to their deplorable fallacies and dubious insights about the concept; contrarily structuralism is a highly systematic and inclusive of the interconnectedness of things to form an relatively definable holistic entity of small constantly transformative as well as self-regulative structures. Thus, the structural insight situates itself somewhere in the middle, dispelling the inertially formalists and chaos theorists; and philosophizing that things are chaotic forms or formal chaos.

Thereof, the painstaking conceptual framework of structuralism has been discussed and analyzed in chapter three, following the introductory chapter and review of related literature respectively. In chapter three the concept of structuralism is discussed in detail fully understood to avoid the popular misconceptions including that of "post-structuralism". Chapter four lines up next to analyze the three focus materials' (the Kebra Nagast, Tobbiya and Dertogada) historical, social, political, and literary structural configurations, particularly accompanied with Northrop Frye's structural theory of recurrent formations. Thus, the analysis part of this research paper—synthesizing literature, philosophy and politics—discusses the selected materials' structural interconnection and similitude. And finally, the conclusion is rendered in chapter five to elicit the major points that have been constructed in the entire chapters, especially the fourth one.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study

The Ethiopian long and enigmatic literary tradition, which is competent of transpiring amazement with its profound depth of insights of socio-political structures and religious philosophies—and of course together with its dogmatic racial and religious favoritism and potential frictions, turns up to be devoid of serious scholarly attention for the popular misunderstanding of its content as sheer religious disposition. Substantially, the Ethiopian literary tradition contains many innovative productions, of high level of literary power of both aesthetics and political subject matter. Out of this literary heritage, three well-known and structuring materials or fictional productions are notable. These literary documents are entitled the *Kebra Nagast*, *Tobbiya*, and *Dertogada*, with their respective role of dexterously underlying, in the case *Kebra Nagast*, and discoursing, in the case of *Tobbiya* and *Dertogada*, the national identity and image of the Ethiopian nationhood.

Potentially and chronologically putting, the *Kebra Nagast* (*The Glory of Kings*) as precursory and influential avant-garde national epic, as Donald Levine (2000) also prefers to term, is responsible for the birth of the Ethiopian nationhood, political mentality and modernity by being an underlying structural principle. This concretely historical narrative argues about some of the top and controversial issues of the pre-Christ and pre-medieval periods of the world history, and sways the arguments to its own claim of the glories of its kings and peoples' highest status bequeathed by an assumed grandiose power-order in the universe. The second document is a well-taken legendary novel, with furtive historical references, and habitually regarded as the genesis of the Amharic novel; this novella is entitled *Tobbiya*. As the *Kebra Nagast* did, *Tobbiya* tried to define the Ethiopian national identity and statehood.

Last but not least, the third target material of this structural study is a latest and blockbusting Amharic novel called *Dertogada*. Seemingly, this work also discourses about the national issue in a mystical and pseudo-scientific approach and detective story-telling style—trying out for the infusion of a brand-new-blood into the political veins of Ethiopian history as well as her Shangri-la-like political futurity.

These three temporally diverse literary documents, having the role of deep and surface structural positions, have similar structuralist discourse of political agenda of building and reinstating national identity and image in the Ethiopian socio-political ethos. As pinpointed earlier, the *Kebra Nagast* is a deep structural principle for the subsequent two evolutionary productions under investigation, and also for other literary materials and chronicles in the annals and exegetic practice of the country. Concerning this substratal influence of the *Kebra Nagast*, Dr. Ambachew Kebede prefaces in *Ye atse Sertse Dingil zena mewael (1999 E.C.) (Chronicle of Emperor Sertse Dingil)*:

When we see the Kebra Nagast from a historical vantage point, it had played a vital role in serving as a model of ideology and technique of writing for the medieval historians. Many historical works, especially, the style of writing chronicles was directly copied from it. The initial, middle and ending parts of these materials are almost similar with its procedure. It can be said that the experience of adding religious and other quotations into the chronicles is taken from the Kebra Nagast's style. (p. 6)

Similar influential stature of the *Kebra Nagast* is also visible in the Ethiopian literary (in the general sense of the term) tradition; *Tobbiya* and, specially, *Dertogada* are distinguishable in spite of some sharp differences to have their own position as well. Thus, a due consideration of this preliminary narrative has been rendered in the structural study at hand, for a fullest comprehension of the evolutionary political endeavors of assorting, building and discoursing of the Ethiopian national image and identity made in the selected materials.

As many Ethiopianists agreed upon, the genesis of the Ethiopian nationhood is attributed to this aesthetically masterpiece and politically shrewd and astute literary document. The magnificence of the *Kebra Nagast* lies not only in its responsibility to the formation of the Ethiopian statehood as a *raison d'etat*, but also it functionally forges the structures of the *praxis* of the peoples' socio-political self-consciousness. The *Kebra Nagast* had been serving as a foundation of the political power that had been dominating and molding the Ethiopian society's elitism, in general, to believe and carry out their supremacy, as *New Israelites*—as a symbol of supremacy and privilege over other groups bestowed accordingly from the Christian God.

In the Ethiopian national ethos, the book, separately from local narratives of the legend, had been uplifted, especially in the imperial period, by many kings and people of the nation to the level of sanctification and symbolization of confidence and tranquility. Budge (2001) recorded a famous correspondence, dispatched by Emperor Yohannes IV in 1872, to Queen Victoria and The Foreign Secretary: “There is a book called the *Kebrā Nagast* which contains the laws of the whole Ethiopia; and the names of the chiefs, churches, and provinces are in this book. I pray you will find out who has got this book and send it to me, for in my country my people will not obey my orders with out it” (p. xv) [emphasis mine].

Seamus Deane (1990) explicates, “All nationalisms have a metaphysical dimension for they are all driven by an ambition to realize their intrinsic essence in some specific and tangible form. The form might be a political structure or a literary tradition” (p. 8). Yonas Admassu (1995), in his part, deals with the Ethiopian nationhood by “situating in particular the ‘nation’ as an object of the ‘narrative’ or ‘aesthetic enterprise’. Within this project, the ‘nation’ is primarily an ‘invented’ or ‘imaged’ category—a cultural ‘art fact’ so to speak, whose realization is conterminous with the moment of its narration” (p. 13). The *Kebrā Nagast*, as an ideological defining code, also has an international structural influence in the Caribbean world’s mentality as the “Divine-kingship” of an African monarch became the reason for a new socio-political order, and form of Christianity of the “I-and-I Consciousness” (Eriskine, 2004, p. 90-91).

When we say the *Kebrā Nagast* is an underlying principle or structure, its taken as a ‘structuring structure’ as in linguistics, the grammar is itself a structure that structures the surface utterances and discourses, and in philosophy, the human consciousness is a structure that structures the physical body and universe; Jean Piaget (1970) comments on how Levi-Strauss locates structures, “Levi-Strauss assigns his structures to a system of conceptual schemes somewhere between ‘infrastructure’ and conscious systems of conduct or ideology, because ethnology is first of all psychology.’ And he is quite right, for, as psychogenetic studies have shown, the mechanisms on which the individual subject’s acts of intelligence depend are not in any way contained by his consciousness, yet they can not be explained except in terms of ‘structures’ . . .” (p. 138). Therefore, here the *Kebrā Nagast* is a structuring factor though it has other factors responsible for its structuration and dynamism.

Hence, we are having a philosophical analysis on the question of ‘*how*’ it structurally influences, shapes and interweaves the later focus narratives—*Tobbiya* and *Dertogada*—and the polity of the nation, at least until the last period of the imperial era.

Thus, structuralism, as a philosophy and scientific method to the study of deep and surface structures of sign system, is deemed to be a great help in disclosing the structural matrix of the source of the country’s political philosophy and the evolutionary national portrait as reflected in the three relationally selected historico-political literary productions. The major elements, arguments, motifs, and achievements of the *Kebra Nagast* are structurally being transformed and regulated to reuse or sustain its influence regardless of historical temporality. And hence, the research adheres to the general aspects or characteristics of structuralism and structural analysis by considering the political agenda of the national portrait and state-image building as attempted in the target materials.

Therefore, the researcher believes that the structural analysis on these principal books, with the *Kebra Nagast*, serving as the “Grammar” of the Ethiopian general system of polity and successive texts of similar agenda, is worth-researching to understand the might of literature in fashioning and imposing ideologies and ‘reality’ in the mind of the mass and writers, both in its positive and negative results of the overall practice and consequence.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Oftentimes, in the Ethiopian literary and analytic conventions, the entity or existence of literary productions is barely measured by its component parts that built it; this means the influence of materials is not customarily scaled by its structural influences and connections with other similar narratives. On this reason, many analytic attempts use to frequent the investigation of the interior component parts prior to the effect or structural extensions of the material.

Basically and particularly, the *Kebra Nagast*, as master narrative of the issue at hand, though widely retained both among the people and different scholars, is also victim of superficial investigations and stigmatic criticism. And serious investigations on the book are rare in comparison to its fame and tremendous impact in the creation of the country’s nationhood, writers’ source of inspirations and literary model, as well as the peoples’ orientation of identity

and reality. Various books and research projects are inclined to content and source analysis though works like that of Donald Levine, Messay Kebede and Tadesse Tamirat are, more or less, substantially, worth-noting in the area; but still the specialists consent on more study on the book's literariness and role.

Among the above mentioned three recent studies, Levine's book, *Greater Ethiopia* (2000), which is the most recent one, notifies many other additional investigations, for the study on the *Kebrā Nagast* is still insufficient. Here is how Levine expresses the gap in his own words: "It is surprising, then, that the question of the role of the *Kebrā Nagast* in Ethiopian culture has not been taken very seriously. One reason for the neglect may be its literary quality: to many readers the *Kebrā Nagast* has seemed little more than a hodgepodge . . . (p. 93) . . . A new appreciation of the *Kebrā Nagast* may be reached by looking not at the diversity of its contents but at its overall structure. In its inner form, the *Kebrā Nagast* reveals a fully realized aesthetic unity" (p. 95).

Thus, this research—inducing a new insight of structural analysis with a focus on the analytic (slightly hermeneutic and narratological) evaluation of the influence of the *Kebrā Nagast's* major political motif, agenda, structural position and function as deep structure, structurally or comparatively with the similar political philosophy and attempt of *Tobbiya* and *Dertogada* to forge national identity, image and nationhood—is hoped to contend and alleviate the above problem/gap in some way.

Upon such conviction, the researcher decided to undertake an investigation on the *Kebrā Nagast's* structural *influence* and philosophical *pervasiveness* in the two later focus books, *Tobbiya* and *Dertogada*, through structural analysis; this accentuates on analyzing how the elements and agenda are distributed and affirmably referred to as standard of "truth" in the Ethiopian socio-political matrix as shared by the two target materials. As such, the research project includes granting the understanding to what degree the *Kebrā Nagast* literarily facilitates the consciousness or self-aggrandizement of the Ethiopian polity and literary tradition, and comparatively evaluate how the similar programs are formulated. Thus, the research diachronically deals with the structural role of the political program of the *Kebrā Nagast* (which the researcher prefers to call them "the *Kebrā Nagast* Consciousness") in political and mental fabrics as also later on manifested in *Tobbiya* and *Dertogada*.

1.3. Objectives of the Study

This research contains a couple of general objectives: firstly, it structurally systematizes the political motifs, discourses and programs in the *Kebrā Nagast*, *Tobbiya* and *Dertogada* to understand the constitutive or ontological principles of the Ethiopian polity and its evolutionary portrait of the national identity in the three eras when the materials had been produced; and secondly, it distinguishes the potentiality of literature to shape social or ideological structures, together with its therapeutic function of healing some ‘demonic imageries’ in the reminiscences of people. Moreover, the specific objectives of the research are the following:

Specific Objectives:

1. *Analyzing the influence of the political programming of the Kebrā Nagast in the Ethiopian polity and literature by measuring its reception as deep principle in the selected comparisons—Tobbiya and Dertogada*
2. *Evaluating the structural transformations of the political agenda of national identity and image building of the Kebrā Nagast later in Tobbiya and Dertogada*

1.4. Significance of the Study

The research is believed to have the following five significances: firstly, though the colossal influence of the *Kebrā Nagast* is sensibly considered and to some extent given a chance of thorough study, still many more holes are remaining exposed due to hasty generalization; thus, this research will contribute something via freshly systematizing *Tobbiya’s* and *Dertogada’s* referentialities to the major political programs of the *Kebrā Nagast*. So that, the influence of the book can be evaluated through the space allotted to its effect in subsequent literary materials. Secondly, the research is reckoned essential, to disclose the forceful interdisciplinary nature of literature, with the fields of political science, anthropology and philosophy, as it paves the way to observe how the strength of a certain preexisting ideology, propagated by literary piece(s), persists and lingers active in the political and literary arena of a society.

Thirdly, besides pinpointing the strength of the Ethiopic literature and scholarship, the research will draw the insight of the energy of literature for both didactic and aesthetic ends. Fourthly, the research project is deemed to be important as it studies the current status of the underlying

political principle of the *Kebra Nagast*, especially, as in case the of *Dertogada* for systems don't simply perish but evolve into the next possibility and/or necessity of its manifestation. Fifthly, methodologically, the research study is believed to bestow an analytic approach for its employment of structuralism as research method to analyze the Ethiopian history and literature or the novel. Hence, a highly systematic or scientific investigation of the target literature will come into the research scene. Lastly, the research, philosophically, will contribute some intensifying remarks about the conscious-human and his production and imposition of ideas to create and recreate his-*Self*—for Man is a *projected projector* or a *voiced voicer*.

1.5. Scope of the Study

The scope of the research is two-pronged; the one concerns the general conceptual framework—for structuralism is very vastly employed method both in the hard sciences and humanities, the research doesn't include the conceptions of structuralism other than related with the following fields: Structural Linguistics, Structural Anthropology, and Structuralism in Literature. The reasons for this selection and employment are the following: in case of Structural Linguistics, for it's groundwork and is frequently referred to as justifying epitome of the structural investigations; in case of Structural Anthropology, for the research also aims at assessing the Ethiopian socio-political system); and in case of Structuralism in Literature, for the three target books are literary pieces. Hence, only the three “branches of structuralism” are discussed as long as conceptual framework is concerned.

On the other hand, as the main part of the research is the analysis section, the project is scoped within structurally or comparatively searching and analyzing the political components and discourses of national identity of the *Kebra Nagast*, *Tobbiya* and *Dertogada*.

Concerning the focus materials, the first target book is the *Kebra Nagast*, the Kegan Paul edition of Budge's English translation, which is superficially re-titled as *The Queen of Sheba and her only son Meneyelik*; (Note that the 13th C is taken for the final redaction of the *Kebra Nagast* and considered in this research though many traditional narratives are folklorically available in the society long time before. Thus, any issue of the book's historical background has not been dealt here; or readers can simply refer to many Ethiopianists; for example Pankhurst (1967) and Baye Feleke (1996)); as the other two focus books are not prone to any doubt, no clarification is

demanded other than notifying the fact that Afwork G/Yesus' *Tobbiya* is the one that was published later on with no clear colophon; and in case of *Dertogada*, the Amharic version has been regarded for this investigation.

The reason why these three novels are selected, as also pinpointed earlier, is because technically a structural study/analysis can neither be altogether entangled in single structure nor artificially and detrimentally reduced to spoil the relative wholeness of the varieties of the structure or discourse; this means one has to consider the manifestations, as Levi-Strauss used in his study of myths, in relation to the whole; thus, the manifestations are 'infrastructural' contents of the previous form which will make up a systematic whole. Thus, the three fictions' are hoped to show us the transformative nature of the structure or political discourse of national identity and image across the gulf of time.

1.6. Method of data Collection

The data collection method of this research is entirely textual; the criterion of the selection is based on the issue of the role of literature in forging and propagating the socio-political "reality" or in other terms, how the nation is proposed to be and identified in the fictions. The productions of the selected materials have also matched with the time intervals of Ethiopian history, and thus, the temporal frameworks of the outlet of the materials is also methodologically relevant in revealing the political criticalities of the eras; furthermore, this is hoped to give us glimpse of the structural regulations or re-orderings. Therefore, the method of data collection is altogether text-wise.

CHAPTER TWO:

A REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In this section, the researcher overviewed some of the selected Ethiopianists' investigations on the three focus materials: the *Kebra Nagast*, *Tobbiya and Dertogada*. Starting with the *Kebra Nagast*, Prof. Donald Levine (2000) is one of the few scholars who gave a substantial attention to the book; though his study is not entirely dedicated to the study of the *Kebra Nagast* alone, enough is discoursed about its content and influence. Levine overviews, “[the *Kebra Nagast*] is described as the foremost creation of Ethiopic literature” (p. 92). He also underscores the “central narrative has held the imagination of northern Ethiopians for a thousand years” (Ibid, p. 93). The other scholar who seriously dealt with the *Kebra Nagast* is David Hubbard; Hubbard—in his Ph.D. dissertation, for the University of St. Andrews, Scotland—has investigated the sources of the content of the composition under the following categories—(1) Old Testament, (2) New Testament, (3) Rabbinical sources, (4) Apocryphal sources, (5) Patristic sources (6) the queen of Sheba-Menelik cycle, and (7) the composition of the *Kebra Nagast*—as the document is an integration of many materials that sufficiently shows, at least, the vastness of scholarship of the composers at the time, the 13th C, and their intensity of argumentations that we find later at the synthesis of the justifications in the *Kebra Nagast* for the international claims of superiority they proposed and succeeded to attain.

In addition to Hubbard's content-wise investigation, others like Karl Bezold, studying the literary unity; Rochet d'Hericourt, evaluating the central narrative of the book; and Cerulli had did similar study about the content while many other scholars, customarily, have made conclusory comments about the effect of the book; thus it's worth-noting, since it's impossible to overview all, that many generations' insights on the Ethiopian history—beginning from Rossi Contini, Job Ludolf, Francisco Alvarez, Enno Littmann, August Dilmann, Henery Salt, James Bruce, Edward Ullendorff and many other contemporary scholars—had been given.

The other scholar who has provided a magnificent investigation on the *Kebra Nagast* is Prof. Messay Kebede. In his paperback *Survival and Modernization: Ethiopia's Enigmatic Present (1999)*, he extensively discussed, with philosophical approaches, the diachronic structural effects and persistent potentialities of the *Kebra Nagast* to bring about modernity/rapid and sustainable

material and ideological developments to the country. Moreover, Messay's massive and magnificent analysis has anchored the question of achieving Ethiopia's nationhood, its survival, and modernization in the tradition, especially, in the concepts of the *Kebra Nagast*. Not only this, but he even put that its power is still active in the political arena of the country as it might also continue long after the present time. Here is what Prof. Messay (1999) expounds though discontentedly with the government's policy:

The harmfulness of the EPRDF's policy notwithstanding, restorationist elements do lie heavily on its vision. The Aksumite legacy has always inspired the Tigrean provincialism, fed on its rebellious attitude to the Amhara domination and state centralization. This same legacy defines the goal of the Tigrean uprising against Derg and sustained its combative mood. In other words, if we combine the Oromo seek for self-assertion and the Amhara longing for resurgence with the Tigrean restorationist drive, the picture of Ethiopia heading for an all-out revival of its cultural forces becomes patent. There remain the objective criteria for the validation of these aspirations (p. 398) . . . If the analysis of this study are correct—that is, if the failures and decline of Ethiopia are caused by its estrangement from tradition—then I see no other way to redress the mistakes and achieve a renaissance than through the resurrection of the dead. (p. 397)

Some other Ethiopian scholars have also studied the material in considerable degree; among these Prof. Baye Felleke, in his *Questions about the Kebra Nagast* (1996), comparatively studied the inconsistencies and contradictions in the Arabic version and the final redaction of the *Kebra Nagast* with concluding remark that the book (in its present form) has literary, pedagogical and political structuring role in the Ethiopian history. On the other hand, Gidena Mesfine in his MA thesis—titled *Makadda and Solomon in the eye of the Ethiopian traditional account (2010)*—comparatively studied some selected traditional narratives of the *Kebra Nagast*, including oral, Biblical and Koranic narratives; Gidena showed, despite the longevity of the account prior to the 13th C, the varieties or extensiveness, and thus indirectly, the influence of the account in the tradition and mentality of the people. Thus, though Prof. Baye's and Gidena's studies have similarities, Gidena's investigation is substantially vast and indicator of the durability and immensity of the account in the Ethiopian literary tradition.

Prof. Tadesse Tamirat (1972a&b) has also treated the political dramas and intricacies seen in the political practice of the *Kebrā Nagast* in Medieval Ethiopia. Tadesse emphasized on the political picture of the court under the *Kebrā Nagast* directions and philosophies; his two books aim at political history and show the seemingly chaotic situation of political struggle within the court as the *Kebrā Nagast* has a loose system, due to the literal meaning of the “blood”, to attain the rightful and fitting nominee for the throne.

Yonas Addmasu (1995), in his Ph.D. dissertation, titled—*Narrating Ethiopia: A panorama of the national imaginary*—for the University of California, Los Angeles, has also studied the book, comparatively with *Tobbiya*; the study primarily accentuates on the connection and role of the *Kebrā Nagast* and *Tobbiya* in determining the portrait of the nation and the effort of the Ethiopian society to define and assert themselves as a better group entity. Yonas pinpointed that the society’s self assertion depends in binary oppositions of the “We nice; They bad” dichotomy, like what Levi-Strauss outlined in his anthropological studies.

Though the two books are comparable for their similarities, for instance, in their insight of Christian monarchism, Yonas also showed the basic difference in their content and effect; the *Kebrā Nagast* is a “well invented” work of historical fiction with an immense foundational role while *Tobbiya* can be taken as a novella with a miniature subject matter of the *Kebrā Nagast*. Here is Yonas’ own expression:

Structurally, Tobbiya picks off where the Kebrā Nagast leaves us—with the glorification of the kingdom in terms of the military careers of its sovereigns as its “punch-line”—and proposes a scenario in which the past is cleansed of what the author seems to consider the worst blemish the country (historically speaking) had been suffering from until the moment of its inscription. (1995, p. 130)

But whatsoever the incongruities are, the composers of the books intentionally toiled to aggrandize the “Self” and create nationhood. Yonas conveys the point as follows:

Mindful of [Edward] Said’s observation about self-definition as one of the cultural activities common to all societies, and situating within this framework the narrative component as a specific form of articulation of the community’s self-defining activity—

for which it mainly draws upon inherited master codes coming in the form of authoritative texts. (Ibid. p. 30)

Finally, the Kegan Paul edition of Wallis Budge's English translation of the *Kebra Nagast* titled as *The Queen of Sheba and her only son Menyelek*—is considered in this research project.

So far the selected investigations on the *Kebra Nagast* have been discussed, let's hereafter consider the studies made on *Tobbiya* and *Dertogada*; however what have been reviewed about these books aren't as many as that of the *Kebra Nagast*, and even the four studies considered hereafter, excluding Dr. Yonas' reevaluation, aren't directly vital or imperative to the current research study, but their consideration might be demanding in some way to show the research gap. Thus, in addition to Yonas' dissertation discussed above, three studies about *Tobbiya* are available: similarly, Yonas Addmasu, in an anthology entitled *Silence is not golden (1995)*, edited by Tadesse Adera and Jimale Ahmed, has analyzed *Tobbiya* under the title "*The first-born of Amharic fiction: A re-evaluation of Afework Gabraysus' T'obbiya*". In this critical reevaluation, he states the significance and role of the work as follows:

[Tobbiya's] primary significance lies in its successful capturing, and fictionally representing, the rather elusive and controversial of the founding of an empire, very much echoing the mythical allusion in the Bible to Ethiopia, later laboriously woven into a legitimizing semi-religious legend in the Kebra Nagast . . . Afework Gabraysus' work can be safely considered a contemporary fictional interpretation of the myth of the founding of a unified community and its subsequent legitimation as "the chosen of God", to mention but one of the most recurrent themes in such foundational narratives. (p. 93-94)

The second study is Taye Assefa's "*Form in the Amharic fiction*" (1986); Taye has investigated ten Amharic fictions including *Tobbiya* and remarked that the form of the fictions is more or less similar. The other study is Mohammed Ali's thesis "*Islimina ina muslimoch be amarigna sine tsihuf wist ke 1307 eske 1966/ Islam and Muslims in Amharic literature from 1307 to 1966 E.C.*" (1998 E.C.); Mohammed probed how the Muslim part of the population is portrayed in the various fictional, including *Tobbiya*, and other religious texts.

His study concludes that in each text the representation of Muslims is harshly stigmatized and biased; generally speaking, thus, the portrait appears to be derogatory and apolitical.

As long as *Dertogada* is concerned, two studies are taken into account: the first is a seminar paper presented by Dr. Taye Assefa at the commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the Ethiopian writers association. His analysis is titled “*Pseudo-Science/Technology and politics in Dertogada and Ramatohara*”. Taye abstracts that “These two works mould pseudo-science/technology and politics to promote a vision of a “new” Ethiopia” (International conference of African writers, 2011, p. 51). The other is a thesis by Shiferaw Ejigu (2011) titled “*Narrative instance in the novels of Yismake Worku*”; Siferaw included the first two books of the author, *Dertogada* and *Ramatohara* and discussed their narratological aspects.

Having discussed the previous studies in the three focus materials, it can be apprehended how this investigation differs from the above. To make a long way short, the sole nearest study to the current one is Yonas Addmasu’s dissertation; as mentioned earlier, Yonas’ study considers the *Kebra Nagast* and *Tobbiya* from a dimension of the ontology of the Ethiopian national concept and image. Hence, the current study is peculiar in two terms: (1) It employs a scientific and philosophical “methodology” or “way”, called structuralism as a general framework. (2) It includes another material, *Dertogada*, to have the chance to observe the evolutionary portraits and discourse of the contemporary consciousness of similar agenda. Thereof, the use of structuralism and the addition of the third focus material are the two reasons that distinguish this research, particularly from Dr. Yonas’ study, and generally from the others, and emerge it as original and worth-researching.

CHAPTER THREE: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

3.1. Conceptual Issues of Structuralism

Roland Barthes (as cited in Culler, 1973), defines structuralism “as a method for the study of human artifacts” (p. 21). Jean-Marie Benoist (1978) also contends “structuralism is a method, not a doctrine” (p. 2). As such, in a relatively broader methodological and philosophical essence, structuralism or structuralist investigation is an ontological attempt that aims at two aspects: one is at scientifically analyzing the more or less systemic integrity or bondage of both the physical *world*, as we generate and experience it—for “the world around us came to be regarded as a mere outward projection of the mind” (Riegel & Rosenwald, 1975, p. 21); and the second is at the human *praxis* that enables us to deal with the seemingly *chaos* or *void* cosmos or space, with which the human mind falls short to interact. Thus, consequently, the surface phenomenon, which is “the outward, direct expression of essence, the form in which it is manifested” (Afanasyev, cited in Riegel & Rosenwald, 1975, p. 36), whose creation is traditionally entitled to the generative consciousness of humanity, becomes the object of probation. This indicates that any human culture and artifact is an endeavor to methodically and necessarily crystallize things so as to communicate with them through transformative designs.

Though this methodical nature of structuralism seems to have a very deep historical background, beginning from the Platonic theory of Form, Kant’s brand of formalism, Leibniz’s philosophy of harmony, congruency and self-regulating systems, and Husserlian essences, the issue wasn’t as such similar since structuralism, in spite of some common grounds, is more sophisticated than the various empirical and non-empirical formalisms. R. Habib (2005) expresses “much of Plato’s philosophy is generated by a desire to impose order on chaos, to enclose change and temporality within a scheme of permanence, and to ground our thinking about morality, politics, and religion on timeless and universal truths that are independent of human cognition” (p. 16). Concerning this connection of structuralism to the attempt of theorizing about the human mind’s structural interaction with chaos, (Spivak, in Derrida 1997) suggests with reference to Friedrich Nietzsche’s view:

The human being has nothing more to go on than a collection of nerve stimuli. And, because he or she must be secure in the knowledge of, and therefore power over, the "world" . . . These explanations and descriptions are "interpretations" and reflect a human inability to tolerate undescribed chaos—that the collective character of the world . . . is in all eternity chaos—in the sense not of a lack of necessity but of a lack of order, arrangement, form, beauty, wisdom, and whatever other names there are for our aesthetic anthropomorphisms [human weaknesses]. As Nietzsche suggests, this need for power through anthropomorphic defining compels humanity to create an unending proliferation of interpretations whose only 'origin', that shudder in the nerve strings, being a direct sign of nothing, leads to no primary signified. (p. xxiii)

Structuralism, oftentimes, is mistaken as a doctrinarian centralization of particular narrative and/or view point and so is devoid of the perception that what is signified is an endless game of signification, with no 'primary' or 'right' interpretation as Nietzsche points out above. What structuralism proposes for this chaotic reality of things and meaning is to *concentrate* on the relative structural aspect of the *chaos* so that we can alleviate the utter confusion to relatively lessened and shared confusion or interpretable illusion. Levi-Strauss, as cited in Tyson (2006), argues, in relation to mythological investigations, "that there is no "true" or "original" version of any myth. Each version of a given myth is equally valid because each embodies the attempt of all structures to make sense out of an otherwise chaotic world" (p. 216).

Lois Tyson further expounds that structuralism views the world as we know it having two fundamental facets—visible and invisible; "The visible world consists of what might be called *surface phenomena*: all the countless objects, activities, and behaviors we observe, participate in, and interact with every day. The invisible world consists of the structures that underlie and organize all of these phenomena so that we can make sense of them" (2006, p. 210). Hence, Tyson conclusively observes:

For structuralism sees itself as a human science whose effort is to understand, in a systematic way, the fundamental structures that underlie all human experience and, therefore, all human behavior and production. For this reason, structuralism shouldn't be thought of as a field of study. Rather, it's a method of systematizing human experience

that is used in many different fields of study: for example, linguistics, anthropology, sociology, psychology, and literary studies. (2006, p. 9–10)

Before persevering in the methodological issue of structuralism and structural investigation, let's add some points on the scientific change it has brought as it opened a relatively 'new front' at least in the tradition of Western scholarship; structuralism alters the metaphysical—"Derrida uses the word 'metaphysics' very simply as shorthand for any science of presence" (Spivak, in Derrida 1997, p. xxi) and "This type of philosophy—in short, all Western philosophy—Derrida calls *logocentric* because it places at the center (*centric*) of its understanding of the world a concept (*logos*) that organizes and explains the world for us while remaining outside of the world it organizes and explains.

But for Derrida, this is Western philosophy's greatest illusion" (Tyson, 2006, p. 256)—view of reality with cybernetic and transformational approach even though its theories succumbed to some irreducible problematic aspects that are seemingly complimentary for any concept is subject to challenge and amendment; "If the theory of cybernetics is by itself to oust metaphysical concepts," Spivak argues, "including the concepts of soul, of life, of value, of choice, of memory which until recently served to separate the machine from man, it must conserve the notion of writing, trace, gramme [written mark], or grapheme, until its own historico-metaphysical character is also exposed" (p. 9); when the "historico-metaphysics", if any, are exposed, if they can be so, we come to know that reason and existence, thus, are not directly *subject* to reason but to the structures that are both empirico-transcendental and fashioned by the human consciousness as to understand the *chaos*—the utterly disordered form of 'matter' before the universe comes to have its, probably, illusionary structure—and interact with it; thus reason itself is subject to transformation while the human mind is the organized—organizer of both the human organism and the physical world that we know as *reality*.

Manfred Frank (1989) explicates, "Structuralism stands outside metaphysics insofar as it no longer shares a specific basic assumption with it, namely, that the sensual world is a mirror image, a form of expression, or, for that matter, an area of application of the transsensual world. The expression "transsensual world" probably seems overcharged in this context.

Yet indeed, the world of "facts and figures" is transsensual, or to put it more simply, nonsensual in the sense of not corresponding to anything in the visible world" (p. 24). Jean Piaget (1970) on his part advocates the point, [with inclination of human's possession of the structures though the case is not only so]:

man can transform himself by transforming the world and can structure himself by constructing structures; and these structures are his own, for they are not eternally predestined either from within or from without. So, then, the history of intelligence is not simply an 'inventory of elements'; it is a bundle of transformations, not to be confused with transformation of culture or those symbolic activity, but antedating and giving rise to both of these. Granting that reason doesn't evolve without reason, that it develops by virtue of its internal necessity. . . (p. 119)

Piaget, in his discussion about structuralism and dialectic, furthermore, explains the conflict of structural and, the previously popular, metaphysical modes of thought as structuralism threatening the very existence of metaphysical concepts like *subject, genesis and history*; but the threatening is not as alarming as some thinkers thought; for instance, Marie Rosenau (1992) referring to Levi-Strauss, states, "The subject was a 'missing person' in the structuralist tradition. Lévi-Strauss, for example, suggested that the ultimate goal of his own research was not 'to constitute man but to dissolve him' (Lévi-Strauss 1966: 247-55) and post-modernists agree" (p. 46). Here, Levi-Strauss is only dealing with the "ultimate goal" of structuralism.

Other specific instances in which structuralism is a method of analysis that substitutes the atomistic investigation in the Western intellectual tradition are numerous; for example, "In psychology, structuralism has long combated the atomistic tendency to reduce wholes to their prior elements. And in current philosophical discussions we find structuralism tackling historicism, functionalism, sometimes even all theories that have recourse to human subject" (Ibid. p. 4). Troubetzkoy (cited in Robey, 1973) also avows, "The age in which we live is characterized by the tendency of all scientific disciplines to replace atomism with structuralism, and individualism with universalism" (p. 2). The methodological identification of structuralism shows its role of changing human insight about the universe and existence;

however, this change is fundamentally vast but to simply characterize the change, it's as radical as what Nicolaus Copernicus' theory had found out about the spherical shape of our planet and the universe.

Now, if the methodological and philosophical stature of structuralism, of illustrating its insights of the world and life as governed by underlying—conscious or unconscious—principles, and the cybernetically differential temperaments of these structures, what, let's once call to attention, is meant by structural analysis. Benoist (1978) tells us conclusively that “an analysis is structural if, and only if, it displays the content as a model, i.e., if it can isolate a formal set of elements and relation on terms of which it is possible to argue without entering upon the significance of the given content” (p. 8). Claude Levi-Strauss (cited in Overton, 1975), also purports, “The term ‘social structure’ has nothing to do with empirical reality but with models which are built after it . . . social relation consist of the raw materials out of which the models making up the social structure are built . . .” (p. 62). Moreover, Overton suggests and argues:

If ‘structuralism’ is to have any distinct meaning, it can not merely be in the sense of method . . . I suggest that the concept does have a distinct meaning or distinct meanings but that these meanings have to do with the ‘assumed’ or ‘postulated’ status or nature of ‘structures’ rather than whether or not they are introduced in the scientific enterprise.
(p. 63)

Thus, generally, “structuralism sees itself as a human science whose effort is to understand, in a systematic way, the fundamental structures that underlie all human experience and, therefore, all human behavior and production” (Tyson, 2006, p. 209-210). Having this as commencement—as more specific field-based explanations of the issue at hand are due in the coming few pages—let's proceed to the next fundamental points of the discussion:

3.1.1. The Terminology of Structure and Structuralism

In this section of the conceptual frameworks, the attempt of tracing the nominal sprite or connotation of the terms structure and structuralism has been hosted. The need for this section emanates out of two necessities: (1) to excavate more about this highly systematic and abstract idea that structuralism is all about, and (2) to rectify the inattentive view of structure that most of

the poststructuralist or deconstructionist, including the giants like Jacques Derrida and Roland Barthes, had misinterpreted, if not worse, the dispositions of structure and structuralism, and thus, negatively affected people's understanding of the concept of structure. This fallacy was convincingly demanded by the poststructuralists to develop their 'new' thesis, conceiving structures as static while Ferdinand de Saussure had pinpointed the arbitrary nature of the linguistic sign and pluri-signification of both the 'unbridled signifier and signified', had it not been harnessed by cultural conventions.

So let's first specify what structure is by considering Jean Piaget's understandings of structure and structuralism, with an inclusion of some poststructuralists' view to visualize the scholarly perplexity. (please see Section 3.5 for thorough discussion)

Essentially, Piaget's basic book, *Structuralism*, was originally published in French as *Le Structuralisme* in 1968, a year later after the publication of J. Derrida's *De la Grammatologie* and *L'écriture et la différence*; the book appears to be a ground clearing attempt for it emphasized on the very term, *structure*, which had been either the source or target of confusion before 1968, as in the case of J. Derrida, and after in the case of M. Foucault. Piaget appears to critically observe this confusion or, may be tactical ignorance, of the dynamism of structures; his book starts with this need to put emphasis on clarifying the term which later on becomes famously quoted in many critical books on the issue; but before Piaget's thesis, let's see Derrida's and Foucault's conclusive insights of the term structure; Derrida (1978) strongly states:

within structure there is not only form, relation, and configuration. There is also interdependency and a totality which is always concrete . . . Thus it is in no way paradoxical that the structuralist consciousness is a catastrophic consciousness, simultaneously destroyed and destructive, destructuring, as is all consciousness, or at least the moment of decadence, which is the period proper to all movement of consciousness. Structure is perceived through the incidence of menace, at the moment when imminent danger concentrates our vision on the keystone of an institution, the stone which encapsulates both the possibility and the fragility of its existence. (p. 4)

Derrida further concludes his insight frustratingly as follows:

Now the idea or the project which animates and unifies every determined historical structure, every Weltanschauung, is finite: on the basis of the structural description of a vision of the world one can account for everything except the infinite opening to truth, that is, philosophy. Moreover, it is always something like an opening which will frustrate the structuralist project. What I can never understand, in a structure, is that by means of which it is not closed. (Ibid. p. 201)

As Michel Foucault first published his *The Archaeology of knowledge* as *L'Archeologie du savoir* in 1969, a year after Piaget's *Le Structuralisme*, he at least considered some of the key terms that Piaget emphatically used to define the word structure; but Foucault kept on opposing structuralism—referring as 'history of idea'— for it threatens the historicism of human civilization by theorizing and seeking “more and more discontinuities, whereas history itself appears to be abandoning the irruption of events in favour of stable structures” (1972, p. 6) while his “archaeology is much more willing than the history of ideas to speak of discontinuities, ruptures, gaps, entirely new forms of positivity, and of sudden redistributions” (Ibid. p. 187). Here is how Foucault defensively and inequitably stands on the cases:

That is why, if we must tolerate all these structuralisms, whether we like it or not, we will not allow any taint to that history of thought that is our own history; we will not allow the unravelling of those transcendental threads that have hound it since the nineteenth century to the problem of origin and subjectivity. (Ibid. p. 223)

What is that fear which makes you reply in terms of consciousness when someone talks to you about a practice, its conditions, its rules, and its historical transformations? What is that fear which makes you seek, beyond all boundaries, ruptures, shifts, and divisions, the great historico-transcendental destiny of the Occident? (Ibid. p. 231)

To sum up the points, Derrida's understanding, which is worse than Foucault's, and objection of structuralism lies mainly on his view of structures as closed, misconceiving them as non-transformational thus, as perilous detention cells; Benoist (1978) remarks, “the dilemma between static structuralism and a dynamics that structuralism has supposedly left to one side is thus a false dilemma” (p. 212); similarly, for Foucault, who is better informed, the term wholeness or relational continuity of human history to the level of borderless fluidity or commonality is highly

improbable and even ideologically dangerous, for human history is categorizable into sectional entities. Thus, the term structure is synonymous to “fetter” for Derrida and “perpetuity” for Foucault. Generally, Roymond Boudon (1971) has extensively shown the difficulty of defining the term structure; in spite of the hardship, he has come up with “two types of contexts of the concept of structure”:

In the first type of context, the word structure is used either to underline the systematic nature of an object—to indicate, on other words, that one is dealing with a group of interdependent variables—or to stress that a certain method is applied in order to describe an object as a system . . . this will be described as its use in the context of an intentional definition. . . the second type of context is characterized by the incorporation of the concept of structure within a theory attempting to account for the systematic nature of an object. In this case the word structure is used in the context of an operative definition. (p. 16)

Considering the above serious confrontations or mistaking of the poststructuralists on the term structure, let’s proceed to what is exactly meant by the term as proposed by Piaget as also shared in this particular investigation: Jean Piaget, in his *Structuralism* (1970), titled his opening chapter as ‘*introduction and location of problems*’ to intentionally and ardently deal with the misapprehension or delusion visible in the French scholarship. Piaget starts with the confession that the various structuralists have invoked many significations of the term; and he slips into sharply and attackingly portraying that these meanings have been developed in areas of “science and unfortunately in cocktail parties” (p. 3) and underlines the need for synthesis. But instead of making the synthesis merely transcendental, slightly as Foucault needed to categorically mystify it, Piaget doubles the conditions of the problems in which both are distinct but linked together; Piaget enumerated the two problems with the hope to inevitably achieve an answer for the first one:

The first of these problems is to make out the nature of the affirmative ideal that goes with the very idea of structure, the ideal manifested in the conquests and hopes of every varieties of structuralism. The second is to describe and analyze the critical intentions attendant on the birth and development of any particular variety of structuralism. (Ibid. p. 3-4)

Upon the first problem, Piaget states two aspects that embrace the various structuralist insights or theories; these are (1) structures are self-sufficient, that we can even understand them by considering some parts of the whole; (2) all structures, though are diverse, have common properties. As Piaget observes the above delusion on the angle of viewing structuralism and expresses it this way: “current logical theory only rarely takes account of ‘structures’, for in many ways it has remained subservient to a rather stubborn atomistic tendency and is only beginning to open up to structuralism” (Ibid. p. 6). Other preliminary move to be considered before stating the aspects of structure is clarifying the terms ‘*structure*’ and ‘*form*’; a certain structure might be conceived as a form which is crystallized and thus, functions like a stamp and its possible imprint. The form of the stamp is directly responsible to the figure that we acquire as it is, thus it’s autonomously static in its own internal law. But a structure is a lively interaction without interiority and exteriority, for these positioning can exchange sides any moment, or never had such positioning;

The discovery of structure may, either immediately or at a much later stage, give rise to formalization. Such formalization is, however, always the creature of the theoretician, whereas structure itself exists apart from him. Formalization sometimes proceed by direct translation into logical or mathematical equations, sometimes pass through the immediate stage of constructing a cybernetic model the level of formalization depending upon the choice of the theoretician. But, it is worth repeating, the mode of existence of the structure he earlier discovered must be determined separately for each particular area of investigation. (Ibid. p. 5)

Noting the fact that the insight of many critics of structuralism is anchored at the formalization of structures and bound to “stubborn atomistic tendency” (Ibid. p. 6), Piaget conceptualizes the three key aspects or defining properties of the term structure; these are: (1) *wholeness* (2) *transformation* (3) *self-regulation*. Starting with the first aspect or characteristic of structure, i.e., *wholeness*, Piaget tells us that wholeness is a fundamental element in defining structure; this element implies the systemic working of the component parts as unit; the parts are unified, according to the underlying principle, to produce the system in un-reducible level of composition to its constituent parts.

Piaget further elucidates the point by comparing the term *structure* with *aggregate*; here, Piaget explains an aggregate is accumulation and existence of elements without forming systemic integration among themselves; thus, the constitutive elements fail to formulate a system which is irreducible to the component elements. But, on the other hand, structure has constituent parts but is capable of entering into a systemic integration, independent of the parts. Thus, the entrance of the elements into a holistic systemic functioning is determined by the law that is responsible to the union and operation as such.

“Moreover, the laws governing a structure’s composition are not reducible to cumulative one-by-one association of its elements. They confer to the whole as such over all properties distinct from the properties of its elements” (Ibid. p. 7).

On the plane of this property, Piaget raises an ontological problem often observed in the discussions of ‘history of ideas’; this essential question is concerning the genesis of these structures; two theses are submitted to the answer: one is that structures are *preformed*, meaning they are the products of internal necessity of nature. Thus, the innateness or un-generative prevalence of structures since time immemorial seemed underscored in this stand if the metaphysics of the structures is required (as the Western mind best functions in this way) and if it’s achievable as well. Such stand, the *preformation*, somewhat resembles the Platonic idea of absolute forms, Husserlian essence, Kantian a priori forms, and Chomskian innate structures. The other thesis is that structures *call for formation*. This thesis inquires an answer that if structures aren’t *preformed*, who’s responsible for their production. Though both theses are applicable, Piaget temporarily inclined—confessedly it might not be the answer—to the first as follows:

As is to be expected, it is of this problem that opinion is most divided, some going so far as to contend that the problem of the genesis of structure cannot so much as be formulated because structure is of its very nature nontemporal (as if this were not in its own way a solution of the problem, namely, the choice of a preformational view of the origin of structures). (Ibid. p. 9)

The second aspect or attribute of structure is *transformation*; this aspect needs a special mention for two reasons: first, for it kindles the very question of formation of structure that we have

raised in the first aspect above; we the know when did the transformation happen but we might not for its formation; thus, the problem of origin of structures emanates mainly from this aspect of structure. And second, apart from the genesis-related doubts that Piaget somewhat left open for argument, it's the most confusing aspect for the poststructuralists as it's at this vantage point they depart to forge their deconstructionist movement obviously as the result of this inconsideration.

Leaving the discussion about the case of origin or formation of structures momentarily, the very idea of transformation is anchored in the dynamism of structures; as such they are not fixed forms that are used to mold copy of designs. The structures are not merely crystallized rather they constantly flow and change their nature and function; therefore, they are in constant disequilibria. This can be epitomized and compared with a river's various flowing scenes created to meet the features of the landscapes of the catchment area; or when one crosses a river many a time at different points of the river, he/she doesn't cross the same river at each of the time but, generally, all the crossings happened on one river. This paradoxical expression can show the fluidity of possible structures made by the journey of the river. Piaget on his part explains the transformative nature of structures as follows:

If the character of structured wholes depends on their laws of compositions, these laws must of their very nature be 'structuring': it is the constant duality, or bipolarity, of always being simultaneously 'structuring' and 'structured' that accounts for success of the notion of laws or rule employed by structuralists. (Ibid. p. 10)

Apart from the affirmation that is seen in Chomskian transformational grammar and Gestaltian psychology of structures as somewhat static and transcendental structure, or what Barthes called 'structuration'—because of their theory of innateness of structures, as means of settling the problem of origin of structure—the history of this transformative nature of structures at least traced back to Saussurean insight (cited in Piaget, 1970) of “system to cover both laws of synchronic opposition and laws of synchronic equilibration” (Ibid. p. 10-11). Concerning the temporality and atemporality of structures, Piaget goes on explaining:

Indeed, all the known structures—from mathematical groups to kinship systems—are, without exception, systems of transformation. But transformation need not be a temporal

process: 1+1 'make' 2; 3 'follows hard on' 2; clearly, the 'making' and 'following' here meant are not temporal processes. On the other hand, transformation can be a temporal process: getting married 'takes time'. Were it not for the idea of transformation, structures would lose all explanation import, since they would collapse into static forms. (Ibid. p. 11-12)

As we have so far discussed, the aspect of transformation of structures is situated in the kernel of concept of structure and structuralism as the 'form' of the structure is neither stagnantly crystallized, that need merely superficial observation to explain, nor chaotically baffling and anthropomorphically insurmountable.

So that, the transformative property is correspondent with the property of wholeness in sustaining the component parts as systemic integration, with no stoppage of transformative interaction of the structure, i.e., the readjustments of the structure is never disrupted for structure, comparatively, is not *form*, though any matter in the universe is in constant *change* whether it's visible or otherwise to the human eye. Henceforth, the aspect of transformation brings us into the structural characteristics that can be put paradoxically as a resultant structure(s) of the dynamic play of transformation which is neither chaos nor static form, or which is series of disequilibria of equilibria.

The third aspect or property of structure Piaget listed out is *self-regulation*; this aspect shall be taken unruffled with the aspect of transformation because self-regulation is a property that attributes the properties of conservation of the 'transformative boundaries' of the 'dynamic wholeness' of the structure or system. A good example of this regulatory property (then we will proceed to the *SELF-regulatory* one) can be honeycomb or the Ethiopian staple food—*Injera*. The honeycomb is a hexagonal cell where bees process their honey production; the six-sided cells are intricately extended as far as the breadth of the beehive allows to, but finally the cells form one spacious structure that contains the cells; and if the need to add more cells is met, the supplementary cells will be joined as per the requirement or principle of apportion of the system, i.e., the shape is hexagonal thus, the new entries will form the prevailing intricacy among the hexagonal substructures and the overall structure that contain the entire cells as foundationally

single structure; hence, the regulation is undertaken as per the structuring principle of the structural system.

The case is similar in the structure of the Injera; the irregular openings on the surface of the Injera are traditionally called the “eyes”. Each eye is a structure belonging to a single entity of whole structure clearly observable in the back side of the Injera; the point is that if there is need to broaden the Injera on the traditional baking sheet, the synthesized dough will make similar structure of “eyes” of the rest. These two examples show that when a structure is said to be *regulatory* (by an external force as in case of the honeycomb) or *self-regulatory* (by internal necessity of the system), it is the sustainment of structure in spite of the possible transformations that occur to the system without the incidence of creation of neither gap nor stagnation.

For this matter, the structure is attributed with “open-closure”. Dealing with this property of structure, Piaget points out the following:

In adding or subtracting any two whole numbers, another whole number is obtained, and one which satisfies the laws of the ‘additive group’ of the whole numbers. It is in this sense that a structure is ‘closed’, a notion perfectly compatible with structure’s being considered a substructure of larger one; but in being treated as substructure, a structure does not lose its own boundaries; the larger structure does not ‘annex’ the substructures; if anything, we have a confederation, so that the laws of the substructure are not altered but conserved and the intervening change is an enrichment rather than an impoverishment. These properties of conservation along with stability of boundaries despite the construction of indefinitely many new elements presuppose that structures are self-regulating. (Ibid. p. 14)

The one critical point that should be considered in Piaget’s *self-regulation* is that the structuring agent can not only be the “*self*” of the system of the structure or the internal necessity for regulation in the strict cybernetic sense of operation; this is because the structuring agent might also be an external agent as the case is so in grammatical as well as anthropological structures. Whosoever might be the agent, the regulation depends on the laws of the structure, as the laws, as Piaget notifies are of two sorts: logically perfect or reversible laws, and those logically not

perfect. Piaget concludes his discernment as follows, with partial accreditation to Plato's ideology of form and the question of genesis:

Rhythm, regulation, operation—these are the three basic mechanisms of self-regulation and self-maintenance. One may, if one so desires, view them as the 'real' stages of a structure's 'construction', or, reversing the sequence, one may use operational mechanisms of a quasi-Platonic and non-temporal sort as a 'basis' from which the others are then in some manner 'derived'. (Ibid. p. 16)

All these doubts of origin of structure bring us forth to the most basic question whether structure is reality or else. There are two camps for the answer: the first states that structures are epistemologically posited for the sake of scientific investigation and systematic categorization, thus they aren't real; and the second camp, including famous psychologists like Piaget and Martinet, whom Riegel and Rosenwald (1975) call "structural realists", argues for the reality of structures. "Human agents act in a world constituted by large scale social structures that are not the products of anyone's plan or intention" (Ball, as cited in Marie Rosenau, 1992, p. 46); and Levi-Strauss (in Piaget, 1970) "assigns his structures to a system of conceptual schemes somewhere midway between 'infrastructures' and conscious systems of conduct or ideology, because 'ethnology is first of all psychology'" (p. 138). But a few thinkers argue the opposite; Althusser, for example, cited in Rosenau (1992) suggests, "Structuralism and systems analysis, then, deny the possibility of a subject with any personal capacity to maintain or change social relations" (p. 46).

To sum up, structures are not static for there is transformation and entirely fluid transformative boundary to define its structure and wholeness; this takes us to the conclusion that structures are never and can't be in equilibrium; rather they incessantly and transformationally (self)-regulate their boundaries compatibly with the property of wholeness; thus "structuralism is analogous to Sartre's view of consciousness—it's what it's not, and it's not what it's" (Benoist, 1978, p. 1). Having discussed what Jean Piaget outlined about the aspects or basic properties of a structure, which are hoped to settle the prevalent confusion about the characteristics of a structure, let's consider insights of other scholars with some sort of specific considerations of the case. For instance, in the history of social and behavioral sciences, the term and concept of structure,

transformation and interaction were introduced into the dictionary of their everyday use. Riegel & Rosenwald (1975) disclose:

The term structure, as distinguished from function, was applied by Titchener (1898) to characterize one of two major approaches in psychology. Titchener's use of these terms reflects the distinction between anatomy and physiology in medicine. (p. ix)

structures are relational organizations found both within and outside of the organism. They are the properties that remain partially stable under transformation. The continuous interactions among inner and outer structures but, especially, between inner and outer structures lead to changes. Changes represent transformations of structures. Transformations can be short-termed, as in interactive dialogues, or long-term, as in the progression of the child through different forms of grammars or logics . . . (Ibid. p. xiii)

Benoist (1970) refers to Gueroult and his insight of structuralism as “an attempt to consider a work in itself as a *relatively* closed and self-referring system which the analyst wishes to comprehend as such” (p. 9). Riegel and Rosenwald, asserting the aim of their study of structuralism as “structural transformation” or “transforming structures”, explain that the interaction or condition that is responsible to the dynamism of the structure can be both internal and external to the structure.

Rafey Habib (2005) on his part refers to the Saussurean influence or contribution to the idea of structure: “Claude Lévi-Strauss and others took from Saussure was an emphasis on linguistic features described as structures; they also stressed the deep structures underlying various phenomena and sometimes referred these structures to basic characteristics of the human mind” (p. 632). As the idea of structure is also prevalent in semiology, Roland Barthes points out that the structure of myth repeats the tridimensional pattern of the Saussurean discovery of sign containing signifier and signified and takes myth as a second-order semiological system within the sign, i.e., that the sign in the first system is a mere signifier (only one part of the sign) in the second system sign. This also shows the fluidity of positioning or transformative nature of the “Trinity of Sign System”: *Sign, Signifier and Signified*.

3.1.2. Structuralism and the Structuralist Investigation

Despite the above discussions of the various insights, arguments, doubts and dilemmas concerning the term structure and its double-edged importance of reference to structuralism and structuralist investigation, henceforward, we shall further intensify the discussion about structuralism and structuralist activity with some concrete penetrations. As we have pointed out on the onset of this chapter, structuralism is basically methodological and philosophical epistemic endeavor that scientifically approaches humanity and its existence as systemic and transformational entirety; this means apart from the methodological nature of structuralism and its wide application in the social and natural sciences and humanities, there is a unique quality of it because the methodology is not as strict or hard to modify as other methods applied in other fields of studies; this is to say that structuralism dynamically studies, to meet specific situations, the dynamics of structures as they are attributed with wholeness, transformability and self-maintenance.

This modificatory demeanor or changeability of structures has objectively determined the dynamism of structuralist study to appropriate the method timely to the target analysis tended to be undertaken. Marie Rosenau (1992) critically shows the objectivity of structuralism as follows (though the ‘*subject*’ shan’t be marginalized, for the *subject* can be an agent of structures):

Structuralists initiated the trend away from the author/subject by deemphasizing the individual and focusing on larger structures, on the formal laws of a system's functioning, on the linguistic construction of these structures, on the symbolic meaning they carry, and/or on change as manifest in structural transformations. (p. 46)

Roland Barthes (cited in Benoist, 1978) remarks “the aim of all structuralist activity, in the fields of both thought and poetry, is to reconstitute an object, and, by this process, to make known the rules of ‘functioning’, or ‘functions’ of the object” (p. 2). Referring to the durability and scope of this episteme, specifically in psychology, Looft and Svobodo (in Riegel & Rosenwald, 1975, p. 49) stated that they choose to regard structuralism as ‘*mentality*’. Observing the difficulty to define structuralism, Willis Overton (in Riegel & Rosenwald, 1975) mentions, “If ‘structuralism’ is to have any distinct meaning it can not merely be in the sense of method . . .” (p. 63);

On the methodological issue, Raymond Boudon (1971) raises a critical question about the very existence of structuralist method; he proclaims:

The answer to this question depends on the meaning attributed to the term 'method'. If by 'structural method' or 'structuralist method' is meant the very general approach which consists in envisaging the analyzed object as a whole, as a set of interdependent elements whose coherence must be shown, then such a method does exist . . . But if 'structural method' designates a set of procedures for the construction of a theory about any object, with as high a level of verification as possible and permitting one to account for the interdependence of constitutive elements—then we can say that such a method does not exist. (p. 139)

Benoist (1978) in his part further accentuates on the wholeness of analysis of structuralism: “Structuralism is not and cannot be reductionist, as it has been accused of being. It is, on the contrary, the most productive means for delivering us from what may without exaggeration be called the positivist hallucination” (p. 210).

Barthes (in Benoist, 1978) said, “It [structuralism] is not a school of thought, or even a movement, for most of the authors habitually associated with word do not feel in anyway bound together by a common doctrine or cause” (p. 1); thus, “Structuralism’s,” Benoist continues, “ambition is not, in fact, to reach a point where all meaning has been exhausted, which would mean falling into the substantialist trap once more; on the contrary, a structural approach, whether its object be a literary text, the organization of kinship system or the arrangements of the signifiers in a dream, remains a strategy that freely admits that its uncoding principle is local and not global” (Ibid. p. 211).

To wind up, let’s presume Piaget’s conclusive statements; Piaget, focusing on the comparatively long history of structuralism, which shows its methodological positioning rather than being a particular doctrine or philosophy, has come to conclude that the study of [structuralism] “can not be exclusive” (p. 137). This tells that the study correlates the connections among the various disciplines of the human sciences and other, like, general system theories in the technological sciences. Thus, the interdisciplinary integration of the study of structuralism shows the vastness of the domain.

Because of this, other insights shall be hosted with a certain disciplinary scope so as to have a relatively sectional concentration to finally draw an inclusive understanding about structuralism.

3. 2. Structuralism in Linguistics

This subsection focuses on the rudimentary insights of the Saussurean and Modern Structural Linguistics and their conceptions of structuralism and contribution to the over all structural study. Though the history of linguistic study can be traced as back “as the 4thC BC, to the Indian Grammarians” (Blumstein, in Riegel & Rosenwald, 1975, p. 153), the earlier background of structural linguistic study, as Benoist also states, can be crudely traced to the Platonic tradition, and it’s no wonder to have Saussure’s thesis of the arbitrariness of sign in early 20th C. John Lyons (in Robey, 1973) outlines two distinct senses of the term structuralism in current linguistics: the first sense Lyons outlined is the Saussurean linguistics; and the second is the Post-Bloomfieldian School, a school which dominated American Linguistics in the 1940s and ‘50s; “This was the school in which Noam Chomsky was trained and against which, in due course, he reacted” (Ibid. p. 5).

Spivak (1997) mentions structuralism was affirmed as a prominent method in the field of linguistics with the advent of “Ferdinand de Saussure and N. S. Troubetzkoy” (p. Lv). But Ferdinand de Saussure “is generally regarded as the founder of modern structural linguistics” (Lyons, in Robey, 1973, p. 6). The Prague School, legitimized specially in the sense of European linguistics, and containing Roman Jakobson and N. S. Troubetzkoy, is also entitled to be the chief promoter of this Saussurean thesis, which latter Chomsky criticized as methodologically and theoretically deficient though, as Lyons pointed out, there is no distinction in principle between the Saussurean structural linguistics and Chomskian transformational grammar. The initiation of de Saussure, with the latter contribution played by the Prague school, had changed the western epistemological consciousness to a great deal; stating the problem of the pre-twentieth century of language study as unsystematic, S. Blumstein (in Riegel & Rosenwald, 1975) reviews:

It was not until 1916 with the appearance of Saussure’s Cours de Linguistique Generale that the first truly structuralist approach to language was elaborated. Saussure applied the rigorous scientific methodology of historical linguistics to the study of language

system independent of its history, that is, synchronic description. As a result, the conception of language as a coherent and orderly system susceptible to analysis and understanding became a tenable notion. It was due largely to a group of scholars called the Prague school linguists that Saussure's views on structuralism in language were further elaborated and developed. (p. 155)

Before discussing what the Prague School linguists, a group where Roman Jakobson has a founding role, have added to the point at issue, let's generally overview what the Saussurean or structural linguistics theorizes. Jean Piaget (1970) outlines "Language is the bearer of multi-millennial traditions; and it is everyman's indispensable instruments of thought. As such, it appears to be the privileged domain of human reality, so it is only natural that it should sometimes be regarded as the source of structure . . ." (p. 75); and John Lyons (in Robey, 1973) summarizes the Saussurean insight of language as following:

Linguistic units derive both their existence and their essence from their interrelations. Every distinct language is a unique relational structure; and the units which we identify in describing a particular language—sounds, words, meanings, etc.—are but points in the structure, or network, of relations. (p. 6)

But this relation is basically arbitrary in its nature though a transformative system is created and functions as per the underlying principle of the language that governs the surface utterances and discourses. Thus, as the core point of structural linguistics is that the *signifier* or the *sound-image* is only arbitrarily linked to the *signified* object or things in the mind of the speaker. Saussure (1974) states "The linguistic sign unites, not a thing and a name, but a concept and a sound-image. The latter is not the material sound, a purely physical thing, but the psychological imprint of the sound, the impression that it makes on our senses" (p. 66).

Based on this, Saussure came up with two principles of sign, which he called primordial characteristics: the first is the arbitrariness of sign; Saussure expresses it, "The bond between the signifier and the signified is arbitrary. Since I mean by sign the whole that results from the associating of the signifier with the signified, I can simply say: *the linguistic sign is arbitrary* . . . (Ibid. p. 67) . . . "I mean that it is unmotivated, i.e., arbitrary in that it actually has no natural connection with the signified" (Ibid. p. 69).

The second principle is the linearity of signifier; “The signifier, being auditory, is unfolded solely in time from which it gets the following characteristics: (a) it represents a span, and (b) the span is measurable in a single dimension; it is a line” (Ibid. p. 70). Piaget (1970) discusses the issue:

In addition to its historical aspect language has a ‘systematic’ aspect (Saussure did not use the term ‘structure’); it embodies laws of equilibrium which operate on its elements and which, at any given point in its history, yield a synchronic system. Since the basic relation in language is that between the sign and its meaning, and since the meanings are relative to one another, the system is one of oppositions and differences; while it is synchronic because the meaning –relations are interdependent. (p. 76)

Or in Saussure’s own words: “A language constitutes a system. In this one respect (as we shall see later) language is not completely arbitrary but is ruled to some extent by logic; it is here also, however, that the inability of the masses to transform it becomes apparent.

The system is a complex mechanism that can be grasped only through reflection; the very ones who use it daily are ignorant of it” (1974, p. 73). To be more specific, let’s focus on the phonological and grammatical aspects of language in order to understand what structural linguistics claims structuralism as a method and theory is like to be. In phonology what we call a word is a group of sounds or phonemes; when we take the word “fit”, starting from the human capacity to produce sounds and to synthesis the form word and expressions, two phenomena can be observed: one is that the three phonemes are sequential arrangement of consonant-vowel-consonant, are yield to the “CVC” common rule of the English morphology; and second the word has a certain meaning by means of differential relationship to other similar words like *hit*, *bit*, *lit* and so forth and other similar groups like *beat*, *beast*, *bear* and others—the relation goes on to broader structures.

Lyons (in Robey, 1973) states, “They [the relational words or sounds] might legitimately be regarded as alternative, positionally determined, realizations of the same phoneme: i.e., as instantiations of the same linguistic unit” (p. 8). Therefore, a word is governed by the phonological and semantic relational patterns that what we call grammatical law of the overall language.

Lyons concluded: “Phonemes are postulated, in the description of the language, as the terminals of these relations of functional contrast; they have no prior and independent existence” (Ibid. p. 8). Broadly, including phonology, in grammar, for the sounds and words to have a certain minimum signified meaning, a rule is demanded for their arrangement; for instance one can’t say “She do it” for it’s grammatically wrong in English language usage. Here is what Lyons explicates:

By the grammatical structure of language is meant the network, or pattern, of functional relationships which hold between the grammatical categories and word classes—on the one hand, relationships of functional contrast and, on the other hand, combinatorial relationships. And once again it must be emphasized that the units of grammatical description (what we are, for simplicity, calling categories and word classes) derive their linguistic validity from the place they occupy in this relational network and cannot be investigated or even identified independently of it. (Ibid. p. 9)

Still related to the relational nature of linguistic components to sort out a system of communication through generating a minimal contractual meaning, let’s assume what Lyons discussed, what he called “the four Saussurean dichotomies that have been of great importance in the development of structural linguistics” (Ibid. p. 11). The first dichotomy is what Saussure termed *substance* and *form*; in the Saussurean sense “substance is the substratum of variation and individuality. It has no existence, or actuality, independently of form” (Ibid. p. 11). Lyons explains by epitomizing that a block of marble, which is worked on by a sculptor to have a certain shape, doesn’t initially have a single definite shape, view or meaning rather it’s potentially many things worth of view, and meaning worth of understanding. Saussure argues so is the case in language; the substances of the language are *sound* and *thought*; the form, or the rules and regulations, of the language plays the role of the sculptor (seemingly in this case, the sculptor himself is a structure of these components: his carving ability + carving equipments+ will/necessity to carve).

Thus, language basically meant anything or nothing at all (what meaning can you generate from a certain mass of cloud? Does it look like a clumsy elephant or a huge rat, or nothing at all?) because the substance (sound and thought) potentially means anything, or nothing, but if a

particular shape is intentionally or necessarily imposed, or the block of marble is carved, say, to denote the countenance of Ahura Mazda or Buddha, the marble is relatively reduced or sterilized to give certain meaning(s) (as the countenance of Buddha in the sculpture may resemble somebody else's look—may be to the figure of St. Benedict of Nursia or Derrida); if one needs and can see as many faces as possible, he shall not call the sculptor; on the other hand if the marble is not giving any meaning at all, ask the help of the sculptor; thus, this shows us the shape or form dredges up the human mind from a *confusing chaos* to *comprehensible chaos*. Let's conclude the point with what Lyons states:

Saussure's distinction of substance and form is crucial in what one may think of as mainstream structuralism. Not all structuralists, however, have employed the same terms as he did. The term 'structure' itself has generally been used in place of 'form'; and it is indeed a more appropriate term in view of the many other senses that 'form' has in linguistics and other disciplines. And many scholars have described meaning in language in terms of categorization of 'reality' or of 'the world' rather than in terms of imposition of form upon the substance of thought or conceptual content. Structuralism can be associated with either phenomenism or idealism, or indeed explicitly dissociated from both. (Ibid. p. 12)

The second Saussurean dichotomy is *syntagmatic and paradigmatic* pairs; this dichotomy “has to do with the relationship which hold between signs (and, at the level phonology, between the components of word-forms)” (Ibid. p. 12). Saussure (1974) expounds, “The elements are arranged in sequence on the chain of speaking. Combinations supported by linearity are *syntagms*; the syntagm is always composed of two or more consecutive units (e.g. French *re-lire*—reread, *contre toes*—against everyone . . .” (p. 123). Hence, it's a relation or linguistic sequence of things—sounds, words, phrases, sentences, and so on—that gives certain meaning(s). For example, the word ‘yes’ is ordered as y-e-s, not y-s-e, or if I say “The leopard is _____”, the following part can not be “eating-meat animal”. By the same token, the paradigm or paradigmatic relation is the occurrence of elements of the same level; for example “The squirrel death in the accident.” is incorrect for the word ‘death’ is not a fitting predicate, or the words: ‘shoot’, ‘is’, ‘apple’, & ‘handsome’ can not generate a sentence because there is no context or structure in the language to put these word-elements into a sentence.

Lyons (in Robey, 1973) figures out that “to describe a language is to specify both the membership of the paradigmatic sets and the possibilities of combination of one set with another in well-formed constructions. Looking at this point of view, languages can be seen, at each level of analysis, as having two dimensions, or axes, of structure; and every element has its place at one or more points in this two-dimensional structure” (p. 13).

The third Saussurean dichotomy is *langue* and *parole*; (this is similar to what Chomsky (1972) termed “*competence and performance*” (p. 115)) or what Lyons also prefers to alternatively use the terms “*language-system* and *language-behavior*”. Saussure states the *langue* is a system that underlies the surface utterances that the linguist studies; he explains the dichotomy in his own words:

But what is language [langue]? It is not to be confused with human speech [langage], of which it is only a definite part, though certainly an essential one. It is both a social product of the faculty of speech and a collection of necessary conventions that have been adopted by a social body to permit individuals to exercise that faculty. Taken as a whole, speech is many-sided and heterogeneous; straddling several areas simultaneously-physical, physiological, and psychological-it belongs both to the individual and to society; we cannot put it into any category of human facts, for we cannot discover its unity. (1974, p. 9)

But Lyons raised the doubt that the *language-system* or *langue* is also a human behavior; thus, the system is also a manifestation of another ‘*deep system*’. The matter shall be settled with dialogical interaction because a structure might inevitably have a structuring role to other structures. Saussure has understood if we enter into this metaphysical reduction, it will be inexhaustive and chaotic. He explains the difficulty, “As I see it there is only one solution to all the foregoing difficulties: *from the very outset we must put both feet on the ground of language and use language as the norm of all other manifestations of speech*. Actually, among so many dualities, language alone seems to lend itself to independent definition and provide a fulcrum that satisfies the mind” (Ibid. p. 9). Therefore, the structure of the *language-behavior* or *parole* is manifestation of the *language-system* or *langue*, but this doesn’t necessarily mean the *langue* is the final basement of structures, thus, the dichotomy may go ‘til the Platonic forms up to Chomskian innateness or what have you.

To wind up, “structuralism is based, in the first instance, on the realization that if human actions or productions have a meaning there must be an underlying system of conventions which makes this meaning possible” (Culler in Robey, 1973, p. 21-22).

The fourth Saussurean dichotomy is methodological, related with the approaches of language study: *synchronic* and *diachronic* investigation of language. The basic distinction of these two approaches is temporal scope of their investigation; the study of language at a particular stage of the language development is what Saussure called synchronic investigation. “The aim of general synchronic linguistics is to set up the fundamental principles of any idiosynchronic system, the constituents of any language-state” (Saussure, 1974, p. 101). But the diachronic investigation is a broader one to consider wide range of linguistic evolution so as to observe the change across the long range of time. Saussure comparatively explains the dichotomy:

In practice a language-state is not a point but rather a certain span of time during which the sum of the modifications that have supervened is minimal. The span may cover ten years, a generation, a century, or even more. It is possible for a language to change hardly at all over a long span and then to undergo radical transformations within a few years. Of two languages that exist side by side during a given period, one may evolve drastically and the other practically not at all; study would have to be diachronic in the former instance, synchronic in the latter. (Ibid. p. 101)

Lyons testifies the above discussed Saussurean ideas were taken up by many different schools of linguists [the Prague and Copenhagen Schools] in the years that followed upon the publication of his posthumous *Cours de linguistique generale*. These all characteristic dichotomies or binarisms (relational differences) are the reasons for the development of structural investigation of language; and this in turn paved the way the other structural investigations in many other disciplines. Generally speaking, the universality of human language can be manifested in its similarity of the underlying language system even including the arbitrary nature of sign systems of languages though there are some specific hindrances that challenge to the thesis of the universality of language, as for example, “there is no single word for the English *blue* in Russian; there is no single word for *brown* in French . . .” (Lyons, 1973, p. 16).

Jonathan Culler, in his article *The linguistic base of structuralism*, finally asserts the following with which we shall conclude our discussion:

The value of the linguistic model is to suggest that analogous tasks in other fields are theoretically possible, though difficult. One should at least attempt to make explicit the conventions which govern the production of meaning. In this sense a linguistically based structuralism is not simply the study of structures but the study of structures revealed by the analysis of systems of signs. (Ibid. p. 35)

3. 3. Structuralism in Social Anthropology

In social anthropology, structuralism, as a method and philosophy—or if structuralism is neither of these, it’s “essentially a way of looking at things” (Leach in Robey, 1973, p. 37)—has dominated the field after Claude Levi-Strauss in the late 1950s. Levi-Strauss, though he regarded Marcel Mauss “as the originator of authentic anthropological structuralism” (Piaget, 1970, p. 98), has introduced, to the Western world, the idea that the multiplicity of human behavior or culture is not actually separable entities, rather they emanate from similar ‘ground’ that is principally laid down as an ordering, systemic or cybernetic force labeled *structure*. Structural anthropology, especially of Levi-Strauss, is inspired by the structural linguistics of de Saussure. Anthony Wilden (1975) asserts that “originally, the common denominator in what came to be called structuralism was the reference to a supposedly scientific model of structure, drawn from linguistics and derived in part from the pioneering work of Ferdinand de Saussure” (p. 87). Derrida (1976) remarks, “Structural linguistics will certainly play the same renovating role with respect to the social sciences that nuclear physics, for example, has played for the physical sciences” (p. 103).

If structural anthropology is motivated by structural linguistics, and if structural linguistics shifts what Saussure, in his discussion of the nature of the linguistic sign, called the previous (pre-20thC) understanding of ‘motivated sign’ as “naïve approach” (1974, p. 65), is there any previous (which may not necessarily be called “naive” but “negligible”) approach that structural anthropology or simply Levi-Strauss has tended to shift? Though the question may not be fully answered identically, like the case in structural linguistics, structural anthropology had partially changed the atomistic and highly empiricist epistemological tradition;

the partiality occurred for there are two inclinations “Holistic and Elementaristic structuralisms” (Overton, 1975, p. 64), in which the latter resembles to the atomistic view. Overton states the holists, which include Piaget, Chomsky and Levi-Strauss, consider that structures are “primitive” not “derived”. Thus, “structure is a primitive construct in the sense that it is given as a basic explanatory construct” (Ibid., p. 66).

Ludwig von Bertalanffy, the generally acknowledge father of general system theory, (cited in Overton, 1975), endorses the holistic view, “The conception of the system as a whole as opposed to the analytical and summative point of view; the dynamic conception as opposed to the static and machine theoretical conception; the consideration of the organism as a primary active as opposed to the conception of its primary reactivity” (p. 74). “In this case activity precedes substance, though the vice versa is true in the elementaristic structuralism which takes structures as *generated*. Therefore, it can be considerably stated structural anthropology changed the static and atomistic approach of Western epistemology.

Noam Chomsky (1972) states that “Levi-Strauss models his investigations quite consciously on structural linguistics, particularly on the works of Troubetzkoy and Jakobson” (p. 74). Chomsky further criticized Levi-Strauss for his studies of primitive minds’ organizing role of physical world rather tracing to the mental acts which Chomsky calls “deep structure”. Similarly, the basic inspiration, as Anthony Wilden (in Riegel & Rosenwald, 1975) remarks of Levi-Strauss structuralist inquiry, did not only emanate from structural linguistics but also from “the beginning of formal systems, information, and cybernetic theory in the 1930s” (p. 87).

All these considerations take us to the inevitable connection of structural investigation, both in linguistics and the human sciences with ethnology but specially psychology.

But, even though what Chomsky has said is quite right and unavoidable, as structuralism is so vast to the extent of making the cosmos as an object of study, a scope is optionlessly demanded to concentrate on a certain area of the overall investigation; likewise Levi-Strauss seems to emphasize on the non-psychological aspect of his study of concrete models of the primitive societies. The opinions on the ‘first’ structure, its ‘entity’ and its ‘initial formation’ as structure or constructed varies according to Piaget’s notions that “there is no structure apart from construction” (1970, p. 140), and “the idea of structure of all structures is unrealizable”

(Ibid, p. 142). Therefore, the scope of the structuralist investigation, in any field, especially in anthropology, has only one criterion, i.e., the wholeness of the structure under study. It seems surrendering hope on the varieties of definitions that Leach (cited in Robey, 1973) tried to define anthropological structuralism as “essentially a way of looking at things” (p. 37).

Leach expounds that the Levi-Strausseau thesis of social structure is the synthesis of both Malinowski’s insight of the purpose of social institutions “satisfying the biological needs”, and Radcliffe-Brown’s “satisfying mechanical needs of the social system”. Leach states the change: “The Durkhiem—Radcliffe-Brown metaphor by which the articulation of society is seen as ‘like that of an organism is replaced in Levi-Strauss by the proposition that the articulated articulation of culture is ‘like that of a language’” (Ibid. p. 39). This insight is extended up to the point that roughly humans have universal physiological needs and responses like the grammar of language is universal. For the structural anthropologists, human culture is not only structured like language but is itself a language, a sign system.

Thus, the nature-culture dichotomy seems very much fluid or spontaneous. For example let’s take a certain cultural act, dressing or mythical description; if we take myth, here is how Roland Barthes (1972) explains it: “Myth is a system of communication, that it is a message” (p. 109). “Myth is a value, truth is no guarantee for it; nothing prevents it from being a perpetual alibi: it is enough that its signifier has two sides for it always to have an ‘elsewhere’ at its disposal. The meaning is always there to present the form; the form is always there to outdistance the meaning” (Ibid., p. 123). Accordingly, Barthes indirectly shows that if human culture is communication or sign system, it means it’s linguistic and this in turn demands the investigation of its fundamental principle that underlies the manifestation of the numerous human cultures.

Thus, like language, cultures have universal grammar which “anthropologists have been searching for such universals for over 100 years with little success [which] the structuralists think that they now have the key to the problem” (Leach in Robey, 1973, p. 40). Leach further states this unity of language and culture:

The interesting parts of cultural intercommunication do not depend upon stimulus-response mechanisms; they are linguistic in nature—generated within a context of grammatical rules—but the language involved is at least partly ‘non-verbal’. When two

individuals are in face-to-face communication 'the messages which are conveyed by words' and 'the messages which are conveyed by other means' are interwoven. (Ibid. p. 42)

So far, if enough has been said about the conceptual connectivity of Structural Linguistics and Anthropology that human culture is linguistic, how possibly structural anthropologists express the spontaneity of the various cultures to a holistic structure? Leach refers to Levi-Strauss's frequently used analogy to an orchestra:

The performers in an orchestra play different instruments; the musical score for each instrument is separate from that of any other instrument, so there is a sense in which each performer is providing a separate 'message'; but what is being communicated by the orchestra as a whole is a unity. The individual messages of the separate instruments only 'make sense' when they are combined as a whole. (Ibid. p. 44)

This analogy recalls the second Saussurean paradigm of *syntagmatic* and *paradigmatic* patterns; the core idea of the structuralist is that the diverse human culture or norms (marriage ceremonies, taboos, kinship, eating customs, sexual behavior, clothing style, mythical accounts, and so on) are spontaneous or coherent for the underlying principles are universal. But for this coherence of values to be visible, binary opposition of arbitrary or logical nature is essential (like there in linguistics we notice a word comparatively to other words or sound pattern linked arbitrarily or otherwise). Piaget (1970) explains:

In contrast to spontaneous values, social structures concerned with norms exhibit a strikingly 'operational' character. Thus, as is well known Hans Kelsen described the juridic structure as a pyramid of norms held together by a general relation of implication which he called 'imputation'. . . Kelsen replies that the 'ought' is not the 'is'; norms are not facts. The juridic structure is intrinsically and irreducibly normative . . ." (p. 105)

Here are (as Leach (1973) cited them) overview of some selected binary oppositions common to every culture:

1. *Left hand Vs Right hand*; this binary pair is a symbol of good and evil or correct and incorrect.
2. *Raw Vs Cooked*; the usage of fire is one of the distinct behaviors of human beings; thus eating raw foods is perceived as an act of animals or inhuman demeanor. “Levi-Strauss postulates that *Raw* versus *Cooked* is a universal metaphor of *Nature* versus *Culture*” (Ibid. p. 48).
3. *Spacial opposition*; this opposition is the most critical and influential one; this pair is like *This side of the river and That side of the river*; *Land and Sea*; *Us and Others*; *This world and Other world*; *Man and God*.
4. *Sister Vs Wife*; Leach explains this pair “if we accept the proposition that a sister can never be a wife, then x/y forms a binary dyad and the social relationship A/C (+) will always be in some sense opposite to B/C (—)” (Ibid. p. 48).

Therefore, social structures are results of binary-oppositional-relations similar to what characterizes structural linguistics or phonology. Accentuating on the society and social structure, Talcott Parsons (1969) defines society, “A society is a type of social system, in any universe of social systems, which attains the highest level of self-sufficiency as a system in relation to its environments” (p. 10). Piaget on his part defines, “A social group is evidently a whole; being dynamic, it is the seat of transformations; and since one of the basic facts about such groups is that they impose all sorts of constraints and norms (rules), they are self-regulating” (1970, p. 97).

Now the question comes up once again, who is responsible for this grouping or social structure? Is a social structure a holistic emergence? Or, it was itself subjected to a constructivist process to become structure? Piaget discusses and exemplifies that “Durkheim’s structuralism is merely global [holistic], because he treats totality as a primary concept explanatory as such” (Ibid. p. 98).

On the other hand, the analytical structuralism, like that of Levi-Strauss argues of ‘laws of composition’; or to put the question in other way: Is the grammar structured utterance or the opposite? And are people conscious of this structure? “Levi-Strauss points out repeatedly that the individual members of the group under study are unaware of the structural model in terms of

which the anthropologist interprets constellations of social relations” (Ibid. p. 98). But still another question raised, though the case might be different to the anthropologist, isn’t the members’ awareness of the structure inevitable after all? Do social structures ‘live’ outside the mind even though the mind itself is a structure? Thus, aren’t content and form indistinct? Here is Piaget’s remark:

there is no longer any need to choose between the primacy of the social or that of the intellect; the collective intellect is the social equilibrium resulting from the interplay of the operations that enter into all cooperation. Nor does intelligence precede mental life or the reverse; it is the equilibrated form of all cognitive functions. And the connections between intellect and organic life may be conceived of in the same way”. (Ibid. p. 114)

Therefore, the responsibility of formation of the structure is both ‘natural logic’, as Levi-Strauss claims it to be, and human mind as well; this means man has a meaningful inventory role in the construction of social structures with at least partial awareness of the process because even for Levi-Strauss, the primitive mind is an advanced logic. Thus, let’s conclude with what Piaget affirms about this problem:

man can transform himself by transforming the world and can structure himself by constructing structures; and these structures are his own, for they are not eternally predestined either from within or from without . . . Granting that reason doesn’t evolve without reason, that it develops by virtue of internal necessities which impose themselves in the course of its interactions with the external environment, nevertheless reason has evolved, from the level of the animal or the infant to the structural anthropology of Levi-Strauss. (Ibid. p. 119)

3. 4. Structuralism in Literature

Literature, like other sign systems: myth, fashion, wrestling, so on and so forth, is one aspect of human experience or culture that helps to deal with the chaos; this means through literature, the mind tries to structure itself in a conceivable time and space so as to interact or communicate with his world of imposition through the means of relational binary oppositions. “Structuralism believes that the structures we perceive in literature, as in everything else, are projections of the

structures of human consciousness” (Tyson, 2006, p. 220). Furthermore, as literature is a linguistic art, the structuralist approach won’t differ from linguistic and anthropological structuralism, or the mythological studies of Roland Barthes. Levi-Strauss (1966) states, “Mythical thought builds structured sets by means of a structured set namely, language. But it is not at the structural level that it makes use of it: it builds ideological castles out of the debris of what was once a social discourse” (p. 21). Graham Allen (2003) with reference to Barthes, and in relation to linguistics and literature, states:

The idea of structure enshrined in the name structuralism stems from this Saussurean differentiation between speech and language. When theorists such as Barthes refer to structure they are referring to the idea of a system (la langue) out of which utterances (parole) are generated. We might, therefore, refer to the structure of a literary text (out of which all the text’s meanings are generated), but we can equally refer to the structure of literature as a whole, or the structure of the realist novel out of which all particular realist novels are generated. (p. 40)

Shortly, structuralism in literature reveals that literary productions are governed with an underlying principle that actualizes their productions. Even if we take in a sense of narratological criticism, a single work’s structural entirety is determined by basic rules that regulate the flow of the story lines; holistically, literary productions are algebraic either in genre, style, canon, narration, theme, conspiracy, and so on. Thus, literature is a sign system that demands a structuralist investigation. Oftentimes, in literary studies, uncertainties occur in what is meant by “structural criticism” and “structural/ist analysis”; Tzvetan Todorov (1973), in his structuralist analysis of tales of Henry James, explains what structural analysis and structural criticism are meant:

‘Structuralist criticism’ is a contradiction in terms: criticism seeks to interpret a particular work, while Structuralism, for its part, is a scientific method implying an interest in impersonal laws and forms, of which, existing objects are only the realizations. The structural analysis of literature is nothing other than literary theory; however, the latter’s objective is not the interpretation of works, nor is there a ‘structuralist’ interpretation that is better as such than other methods—exegesis is to be assessed according to its coherence, not according to its truth in an absolute sense. The fact is,

then, that these two forms of activity, the hermeneutic and scientific, need as much to be distinguished as to be put into contact with each other. (p. 73)

For this reason, structuralism, apart from hermeneutics, “isn’t interested in *what* a text means, but in *how* a text means what it means” (Tyson, 2006, p. 220). For instance, Northrop Frye has made a structural study of what he calls “theory of myth”. Specifically in his “archetypal criticism”, Frye’s investigation is structural for what he dealt with was the recurrent patterns of the western literary tradition; thus, his investigation is not concerned with meaning rather with system of structuring model of the literary tradition or productions. Concerning this Levi-Strauss (1966) also comments:

*art lies half-way between scientific knowledge and mythical or magical thought. It is common the knowledge that the artist is both something of a scientist and of a ‘bricoleur’ [*the ‘bricoleur’ has no precise equivalent in English. He is a man who undertakes odd jobs . . . p. 17]. By his craftsmanship he constructs a material object which is also an object of the knowledge. We have already distinguished the scientist and the ‘bricoleur’ by the inverse functions which they assign to events and structures as ends and means, the scientist creating events (changing the world) by means of structures and the ‘bricoleur’ creating structures by means of events (p. 22).*

Here, Levi-Strauss asserts the structuring role of the human mind, or specifically of the artist’s, in which events and structures are both sources for his accomplishments. Thus, as grammar is the underlying law of utterances and discourses, literature is also governed by the human communicative behavior to order himself in the chaotic surroundings of his existence. If the way (man produces literature) is associated with the sign system of communication, the effect of this act is by itself structuring, i.e., literature has a structuring task by defining the individual or society as specifically this or that; but the big deal is that literary productions are further manifestations of linguistic function, and are governed by the ordering necessity of the human nature. Having said this, let’s conclude with Tyson (2006), explaining the importance of structuralism to literary studies:

For students of literature, structuralism has very important implications. After all, literature is a verbal art: it is composed of language. So its relation to the “master”

structure, language, is very direct. In addition, structuralists believe that the structuring mechanisms of the human mind are the means by which we make sense out of chaos, and literature is a fundamental means by which human beings explain the world to themselves, that is, make sense out of chaos. So there seems to be a rather powerful parallel between literature as a field of study and structuralism as a method of analysis.
(p. 216)

3. 5. Structuralism and Post-structuralism/ Mock-Structuralism

If a bottle of water contains half of the total content, two expressions of the situation are viable: one is that the bottle is *half-full* and the other is that it's *half-empty*. In this section I will discuss a theory obviously called 'Post-structuralism' and its relation to structuralism. Though some points of the issue have been discussed in the beginning of this chapter, a separate treatment seems imperative; thus, hereafter, the distinctions and similarities of these two methods will be discussed with due emphasis to the poststructuralist or deconstruction theory.

Howard Felperin (1985) quotes Franz Kafka, "Leopards break into the temple and drink to the dregs what is in the sacrificial pitchers; this is repeated over and over again; finally it can be calculated in advance, and it becomes a part of the ceremony" (p. 7). "Although deconstruction is no longer a new phenomenon on the academic scene—the theory was inaugurated by Jacques Derrida in the late 1960s and became a major influence on literary studies during the late 1970s" (Tyson, 1999, p. 249). In contemporary philosophy and social science, post structuralism denotes an adamantly naïve hermeneutic thesis in which language or text, appears to ceaselessly shift and complicate in meaning when it's read in light of the assumptions it suggests about and absences it reveals within themselves. However, despite the rigidity of the issue of 'deconstruction' for a congruent and formal discussion, we shall deal with the major conceptions for the sake of mental gymnastics.

In the first place, the term 'Post-structuralism' is undeserving as post structuralism does not emerge as an opponent theory to structuralism rather Modernism—in its Eurocentric political sense. The kernel of the poststructuralist view is that language and textuality are attributed with constantly *differential* and *deferential* nature, thus, meaning is differently infinite and slippery.

But when we look at what structuralism tries to *scientific*, esp., as Saussure's grand claim about the arbitrariness of the nature of the linguistic sign confirmed that the *signified* has no natural connection with the *signifier*, simply their relation is artificial to achieve a communicative atmosphere, we come to the light that structuralism is disclosing this human tussle to perceive the multi-signification of the chaotic universe of meaning. Accordingly, the signifier is potentially capable of signifying whatsoever thing the speech community wants to because there is no logical law to bind it with specific signified.

Initially, the determinant factor of the meaning of the sign is not linguistic but the speech community of the language. The unmotivated or chaotic nature of the sign is temporally settled with the preference of meaning of the human mind; if one needs to get married, everyone can be candidate but he/she shall prefer one or some to have a meaning of their life as married person. Saussure stated this situation: "The word *arbitrary* also calls for comment. The term should not imply that the choice of the signifier is left entirely to the speaker (we shall see below that the individual does not have the power to change a sign in any way once it has become established in the linguistic community); I mean that it is unmotivated, i.e., arbitrary in that it actually has no natural connection with the signified" (1974, p. 68-69). What Saussure claims is that it is the community who is seizing "power" to generate meaning, with no natural rule but inevitable necessity and choice to do so. Therefore, as poststructuralists are much concerned about the meaning of the text, here is the formula: *Sign = Signifier + Signified + Signified + Signified + Choice*.

Apart from what structural linguistics primarily underscores, about the unnatural connection between the signifier and signified, an 'instituted' or 'correct' signified or signifier is nothing but meaning generated in the meaning-laboratory of the community. This is why post-structuralism can't be a theory against structuralism, rather Modernism, for both structuralism and post-structuralism are on the same boat of the theory of arbitrariness of sign. Thus, structuralists, from the very beginning, stated human beings' inevitable move of coming out of the chaos of signification to a contractually shared institution of meaning.

But, on the other artificial hand, what is misconceived, if not cheated, by the poststructuralists, is their attempt of propagandizing as if they come up with a brand-new theory of multiple

signification of the sign system. Hence, structuralists study what the society bargained to harness the unbridled horse of sign, the deconstructionist prefer to roam in the old theory of chaos from which the relevance of the sign—an arbitrary or accredited delusionary signal—appeared as minimal ground for perception; but the poststructuralists are claiming ‘the old wine in its old wineskin’ as a new entry to the epistemology; basically, their move is more or less political rather than textual or hermeneutical; by political its meant that their target, esp. Derrida’s, was to challenge the bourgeois’ interpretation in the West. If so, what is the “post” about the Post-structuralism, rather it is “Mock-structuralism”.

As we have also seen earlier in our discussions of the concept of structure in the first subsection, the most critical confusion resides in the word “self-regulated system”; this doesn’t mean, and never has been meant, and never will mean, the system or structure is a kind of iron-cage in which the animal shouts to death for the entrances are welded once and for all. Structuralism has been victim of serious misconception, and deliberate tactical misfiring of deconstructionists to achieve their “cognitive atheism”; the case is sever in Derrida; Felperin (1985) shows this tactical misfire, “Both French and American deconstruction have demonstrated their capacity to undermine the extroverted structuration of semiotics with mole-like persistence, worrying away at its linguistic underpinnings until its Babel-like towers teetered vertiginously before collapsing into the groundlessness of their own pseudo-scientific discourse” (p. 110-111). Felperin critically attacks the practitioners of deconstruction as “hermeneutic mafia or the high priests of a new mystery cult” (Ibid. p. 112).

Similarly, Piaget (1970) evaluates the case in Foucault, and terms Foucault’s view of structuralism as “static structuralism” or “structuralism without structure” (p. 134), as it’s deemed to be barely size-evaluation of a certain static form, secluding the cybernetic nature of structures and structuralism. Once more, for the perplexed deconstructionists, the structure is more like the organization of the moving clouds thus a structure is not a confinement both in its Saussurean and Piagetian senses.

Upon observing the intimate connections (what I rather argue linguistically or semiologically identical) of structuralism and post-structuralism, Manfred Frank (1989), comes up with alternative nomenclature for post-structuralism as “Neo-structuralism”; he explains it as follows;

“neo-structuralism is not only, as the term "Post-structuralism" suggests, a school of thought that came to light *after* structuralism; it is also critically linked to structuralism and cannot be understood if one ignores this origin” (p. 22). Even though Manfred’s nomenclature is also compromising and what is more appropriate, as Howard Felperin also suggests, is to call it “Mock-structuralism”. Felperine teasingly expresses the misapprehension or theoretical cheating as, “deconstruction, in its French form at least, may be seen as a reaction to that reaction and an overcorrection to that overcorrection” (1985, p. 106). Baudrillard (cited in K. Green and J. LeBihan, 1996), describes deconstruction as “the ‘nihilist system’ which has the power to invert everything, even that which negates it, into indifference.

This constant indifference is what structuralism, both in the society and structuralist levels, had taken sufficient cognizance of, and finally found the necessity and inevitability of ‘institutionalization’ of the arbitrary sign to interact with the relatively comprehensible pluri-signification. Thus, the “anti-methodical methodology of deconstruction” (Felperin, 1985, p. 110) is merely operable in theory but not in practice; this anti-institutionalist theory, but not anti-theory for the sake of its survival, is not altogether reactionary though still it’s advisable to urge deconstruction either to ‘deconstruct’ or ‘reconstruct’ itself, if it has a “self”; Tyson suggests the general importance of deconstruction:

[deconstruction] can improve our ability to think critically and to see more readily the ways in which our experience is determined by ideologies of which we are unaware because they are ‘built into’ our language. And because deconstruction offers these advantages, it can be a very useful tool for Marxism, feminism and other theories that attempt to make us aware of the oppressive role ideology can play in our lives. (2006, p. 241)

To sum up, apart from deconstruction’s role in heightening the Schopenhauerean and Nietzschean nihilistic philosophy by ardently reconsidering and prefacing many philosophical questions of reality, essence, meaning, illusion, appearance, and so forth, the main achievement of deconstruction is registered in politics; it has contributed quite a lot in contesting and re-evaluating the hegemony of Western modern institutions and modes of reality; modernity has been challenged through the sharp razors, or “back-to-Bedlam” harangue, of deconstruction;

but the problem soon arrives as the blade is somewhat unsystematic and callous enough to even devastate its own discourse, i.e. as its anti-establishmentarianism of any sort of structure and system. Felperin (1985) explains:

Not only was deconstruction different from the critical and pedagogical practices in place in a sense of being alien and unfamiliar—but deconstruction appeared to be disturbingly different from itself, maddeningly elusive in the unpredictable repertoire of terms and procedures . . . not quite or yet a school or a movement, its reluctance or inability to routinize itself—as distinct from structuralism’s eagerness to do so—rendered it uniquely threatening to any institutional mentality. This potential enemy was doubly dangerous for being at once different and protean, not fully or clearly one thing or the other, indistinctly different. (p. 238)

This is why Felperin reveals deconstruction as “the most feared, and misprized” for it sees the text as ‘black marks on a white page’ or ‘the words on the page’. This denial clearly reveals that post structuralism doesn’t at all recognize language or the text as sign system and transformative entities worth of scientific investigation; the final destination of this chaotic and hazardous philosophy would have been nothingness had it ever claim due consideration in either of the disciplines. If this nihilist stand point negates the understanding of the differential nature of language and textuality, as a reactionary blast on all philosophies and systems, as a result, is there any institution after deconstruction? Felperin satirically answers:

deconstruction criticism is not to be confused with ‘destructive’ criticism, the relation between them being roughly that of the neutron bomb to the hydrogen bomb, both may devastate the texts on which they work . . . but the former, because it leaves all constituent parts undamaged, enables their reassembly on the more abstract plane of its own commentary, in the form of an ‘aftertext’ that survives the blast. So there may be life after deconstruction after all. (Ibid. p. 119)

Finally, what can be said about deconstruction is that its a means of making anything groundless while any discipline commences from hypothesis and even axioms and illusions. Thus, deconstruction seems in need of advice, which remind us the Saussurean theory of sign as arbitrary and the need to begin with it: here is one by Baudrillard (cited in Felperin, 1985):

for a thing to have a meaning, a stage is necessary, and in order for there to be a stage, there must be an illusion, a minimum of illusion, of imaginary movement, of a defiance of the real, which carries you away, which seduces you, which repulses you. Without this specificity aesthetic, mythical, playful dimension, there is not even political stage, where something might happen.

CHAPTER FOUR:

STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS OF THE EVOLUTIONARY MOTIF, PORTRAIT & DISCOURSE OF NATIONAL IDENTITY IN THE *KEBRA NAGAST*, *TOBBIYA*, AND *DERTOGADA*

4.1. Introduction

Hitherto, from the nearest chapter, the all-out conceptual framework have been laid down in its generic nature; likewise, the ongoing analytic part of the research is having similar procedure of treatment, both centrifugal (inferring from the focus materials to the broader philosophical insights) and centripetal (inferring from the broader philosophical insights to the focus materials), with prominent attention to the earlier. This is to mean that as the previous chapter was purportedly designed to be inclusive of the relatedly various fields' conceptions of structuralism, in its philosophical and methodological senses, this section is also necessarily made out to be focusing mutually on the three target fictions' structural connectivity—in terms of the conscious recursive political agenda of the books and their fundamentally subconscious precursory *Logos* for their composition—and resultantly applicable to the “universe of art” (Frye, 1957) and human nature.

As such, the present critical attempt has a premiere intent of scrutinizing the literary manifestation of humanity and its possible assessment using exceedingly fitting philosophical way of investigation, i.e., structuralism; thereof, the centripetal approach employed in here is matter-of-factly the product of the very facade of reality in its entirety. This viewpoint asserts any attempt of “sanctification” of certain thinker's or critic's conception of the case in point, in the name of specificity or narrow essence of conceptual framework is not granted much concentration to the research. More clearly putting, the analysis part is applicably free to empirically and philosophically draw insights and assertions, with further pertaining to the remaining human literary endeavor or holistically what human is all conscious about. Thus, *Man's* literary culture is inseparable with the theories of sign and the anthropomorphic apprehension of *reality*.

Having this in mind, this chapter develops in respect with emphasis on the target literary productions' content-like-manifestation in the universe of literature, and figuring out their

structural connection, principally with each other, and finally with their respective artistic forms. A question of how the interior elements are paid sectional concern might be raised; the issue of the elements of the novels are not altogether neglected but are meant to subserve the broader analytical insight of the overall structural investigation.

4.2. Synopsis of the Narratives

4.2.1. The *Kebra Nagast*

The legend of the *Kebra Nagast* narrates about a comely Queen, named Makeda, who had heard about a King called Solomon, who is extraordinarily gifted with divine wisdom. These block characters of the narrative are the Queen of Sheba, as in the Bible, and Queen Makeda in the story of the *Kebra Nagast*, and the biblical King Solomon. The narrative germinated from the Old Testament, Kings I, Chap. 10, account of the journey of the Queen of Sheba to visit/test the wisdom of Solomon. The *Kebra Nagast* discursively burgeons this small biblical narrative into longer masterpiece. Thus, the story goes that upon hearing the glory of Solomon from her chief merchant called Tamrin—who previously visited Solomon and his wisdom as Solomon informed the merchants of the world to bring him materials for the construction of the House of God—she was also marveled and coveted to quench her love of wisdom; and she decided to go and rectify what she heard with her own eyes.

Thereof, the Queen arrived in Jerusalem and King Solomon received her with pleasure and gifts. During her stay, she notified the splendor of the King and his kingdom; she watched all the reported magnificence of Solomon’s sagacious stature and his ruling through observation and personal discussions about wisdom and the God of Israel with him. Having spending six months of close conversational relations with the King, Makeda informed Solomon about her craving to leave to her country for the sake of her people though she wished to stay longer so as to learn more the “sweeter-than-honey” wisdom of Solomon, and administration and laws of the kingdom of Israel.

In the last supper, Solomon devised a little romantic game, a trick which threw the Queen into his arm. Solomon deliberately sent the Queen dishes with pepper and drink with vinegar that makes her thirsty after a time; upon taking her word of promise not to take anything from the house so that he won’t touch her for any sexual interaction.

In the night the Queen couldn't resist the thirst, thus, decided to "steal" water; this attempt deemed caused to break her oath, and granted the chance for Solomon to do his will.

Spending the night together, the Queen left for her country and finally gave birth to a male child on the way. The child, named Bayna Lehkem, was as handsome as his father; as he got 12, he started to ask to see his father; as a result, the Queen made Tamrin took him to Jerusalem. Upon staying some years with his father he asked to leave to his country. Though Solomon didn't want so, he finally consented to send his first-born son anointed as king, escorted with the first-born children of the senior officials of Israel. Like Solomon tricked the Queen in the first journey, the first-born children of Israel, some days before their departure, abducted or stole the Tabernacle of *Zion* by a well-prepared plan. The Tabernacle, symbolizing the highest power order next to God, deserted the Israelites and favored the Ethiopians as such the covenant of God to Israel was shifted. As a result, Ethiopians, affirmed by the Solomonic blood and the advent of *Zion*, became powerful nation on earth, and started pursuing their divine-mission to be evermore in the situation 'til the second coming.

4.2.2. *Tobbiya*

The story of this legendary narrative circumnavigates on hazy ethos, setting and characterization; the narrative tells about the episode of a family whose father, a Dejazmach or General of an army, was captured in battle with the "Muslims" and enslaved in the territory of the enemy. For the slave owner knew the "decency" of the man, he planed to let the slave's family pay ransom for his release. When the family, the twin male and female children—Tobbiya and Wahid—and the mother, heard the news, they rejoiced for the father is not dead yet, but they began worrying about how to get the ransom which is ordered in gold. The family soon toils to earn the money to buy the gold. Their life style deteriorates as the situation demands them to save much money, and the children involve in hard labors to get their father home again.

As Wahid tried to get job in a certain caravan, he encountered a wealthy owner to whom he told what happened. The merchant felt sorry upon the case and sent Wahid home with a sack of money, and just asked his father's name. The family hope got stronger on the steps they took so far, and as they were on such condition, their father all of a sudden came home and joined them.

The mystery happened for the merchant got the father released paying the ransom. The story continues as the father swore to find out this charitable merchant and thank him in person. Thus, the mission was given to Wahid but got lost during his searching and begun to encounter so many hardships.

As a year passed, the father and his daughter, disguised as a boy, set out in search of Wahid. During their searching, they entered into a critical moment of facing a very large enemy troop that destroyed whatsoever is in front of it. Though the father and daughter tried to escape, they fell into the hands of the enemy. Among the capturers, the young commander and king of the army was there who fortuitously saved them from being killed instantly. With the favor of the young king, they stayed in honor, and caused the king to know *Tobbiya* very closely to the extent of feeling sexual desire both by him and his cousin as well. As time pushed on, the father and daughter asked the king to do them just one more favor of getting Wahid—who is now facing slavery in a foreign land. The king did their will and informed the father about his decision to marry *Tobbiya*, for he knew her real gender somewhere in the story.

The case wasn't as such simple because the religious difference though finally the king declared his conversion to Christianity, together with his entire army, for he “understood” the teaching and faith of Christ, and for the sake of love. Thus, the marriage of the king with the Christian family and his happy life marks the end of the narrative.

4.2.3. *Dertogada*

This legendary, mystery, treasure-hunting and pseudo-science fiction narrates about some intelligentsia who planned to reform the Ethiopian socio-political situation. The members of this group—called themselves the *Dertogadas*—designed and facilitated a hidden program in an underground basement beneath one island-monastery among the group of islands of Lake Tana. The members of the group are chosen by two prominent monks named Abba Gimberu and Abba Didimos, and the “chosen ones” are communicated through codified tattoo which is put on their body a long time ago. These actors are selected for their high scientific knowledge and, almost all of them work for foreign countries like America, Israel, China, India, Russia and other powerful nations of the world.

So, the story aims at getting these skilled emigrant Ethiopians back home to reform the country with their knowledge; the story develops as various sophisticated missions are accomplished to collect the various selected scientists, engineers, doctors, intelligence agents and bomb technicians. Together with this flow, there is the code-breaking narrative that ushers the heroes to the treasure hunting and fulfillment of the underground project that is about to reform Ethiopia.

Finally, after a long journey of the characters' involvement and struggle to get together and attain the hidden treasure from the jaws of international enemies, the story ends with all fulfillments, including lovers reunion, and portrait of a better Ethiopia whose socio-political unity gets advanced than ever with modern bullet trains across all directions of the nation.

4.3. Literature and Human Belief: Pre-Archetypal Stage

As it has been settled in the introduction of the analysis part, the synthesis of philosophical and literary criticism is foregrounded so as to manage a worthwhile scholarly endeavor than value-judgment. Hence, a question often arises if literary productions aren't "new" in the sense of their production, but duplications of previous works and insights, what is the pre-archetypal stage that puts literature in such redundant or mimetic truck of human civilization.

Thus, before directly dashing into the structural analysis of the focus materials, let's drop the anchor here and get the elaboration of the underlying principles that regulate the literary culture (including writing, reading & criticism) of humanity. Frye (1957) states:

It is clear that criticism cannot be a systematic study unless there is a quality in literature which enables it to be so. We have to adopt the hypothesis, then, that just as there is an order of nature behind the natural sciences, so literature is not a piled aggregate of "works," but an order of words. A belief in an order of nature, however, is an inference from the intelligibility of the natural sciences; and if the natural sciences ever completely demonstrated the order of nature they would presumably exhaust their subject. Similarly, criticism, if a science, must be totally intelligible, but literature, as the order of words which makes the science possible, is, so far as we know, an inexhaustible source of new critical discoveries, and would be even if new works of literature ceased to be written.
(p. 17)

The arbitrary nature of any sign system, be it literature or nation or other wise, shall be recalled once again, for it has been discussed thoroughly in the previous chapter, not to obliterate the structural way of worldview, and thus, it can be easily comprehended the foundations of the human organism in its pre-discourse phase. In the above quote, what Frye communicates is that the arbitrariness of literature or its surging of surface utterances is “deeper” than the surface phenomena of natural sciences. Hence, criticism goes on for the linguistic sign system and literariness of literature never stopped due to the self-regulatory nature of structures. This understanding takes us to the notification of literature as order of signs, and for the sign to work, what man needs is, as Frye pointed out, “Belief”, and to add one more criterion, “Convention” upon its functionality.

Henceforth, the sign system, belief, and convention are what constitute the literary culture of human beings. But one more question must be hosted: what makes humanity urge to “create” and bargain with the sign system? Here comes the primordial grammar of human literary *praxis*; the human intellect does “understand” not only what it can understand but what it’s predestined to “understand” under the illusory entity of the cosmos or the totality of the sensual universal reality; for those who don’t make sense of this stand, the illusory entity of the cosmos can be illuminated as things that are varieties as well as opposite of themselves, or in some strong relation with the opposite nature of the things.

Whatsoever philosophy might tell about reality and human culture, no segmental and political investigation of literature revitalizes us to the higher comprehensions of literary productions and their interrelationships. Having believing settling the possible questions of the pre-archetypal stage, let’s lift the anchor we laid down previously and let the ship move substantially into the specific analytic wave.

4.4. The Bedrock/Archetypal Function of the *Kebra Nagast*

From the vantage point of the above insight of literature not as merely heap of individual works, but an order of words with interwoven system of codification and workability or structure, the individual artistic production belongs to the entity of content in the linguistic world; but as the focus reductively narrows down into the contents, the content-entity is no longer content but a form to the next becoming-content within the form.

Thus, bearing in mind the tumultuously topsy-turvy manifestations of the content-form delusion of reality, let's try to observe the role of a single book, the *Kebra Nagast* in case, in the literary system (on the other focus materials).

The book, though possibly signifying singularity of literary action, is not an isolated island from the other islands available in the formation of the literary or material world. Hence, the interconnection doesn't simply manifest only in terms of its belonging to the verbal world, but also in the very repeatability of the action and its outcomes. Frye asserts this, with a special reference to poetry—which we know as highly imaginative and subjective form or genre—as follows:

The central principle of the formal phase, that a poem is an imitation of nature, is, though a perfectly sound one, still a principle which isolates the individual poem. And it is clear that any poem may be examined, not only as an imitation of nature, but as an imitation of other poems. Virgil discovered, according to Pope, that following nature was ultimately the same thing as following Homer. Once we think of a poem in relation to other poems, as a unit of poetry, we can see that the study of genres has to be founded on the study of convention. The criticism which can deal with such matters will have to be based on that aspect of symbolism which relates poems to one another, and it will choose, as its main field of operations, the symbols that link poems together. Its ultimate object is to consider, not simply a poem as an imitation of nature, but the order of nature as a whole as imitated by a corresponding order of words. (Ibid. p. 95-96)

Likewise, the *Kebra Nagast* has this position of being substratum to later works with similar motifs and utopian projects of national portrait and image building. The style of the proposal of the political plan of the *Kebra Nagast* is more or less manifested in the other focus novels, *Tobbiya* and *Dertogada*. Generally put, as the detailed analysis is due the sooner possible, the substructural influence of the *Kebra Nagast* on the other materials is both verifiable through, empirically, the structural juxtapositions of the novels and their structure, agenda of socio-politico-historical and basic motivations for their advent, philosophically, the generic disposition of the human linguistic/literary reality—because “man's views of the world he wants to live in, of the world he doesn't want to live in, of this situation and destiny and heritage, of the world he

is trying to make and of the world that resists his efforts form in every age a huge mythological structure” (Frye, 1970, p. 18).

The bedrock model of the *Kebra Nagast* on similar patterns of narration, or more clearly the imitation of the two novels, is vividly reckoned in three aspects: the Mythos/plot architecture, Dianoia/theme, and Displacement or their background rational of displacing certain grudge in history. The similarity of the novels is not something mysterious for the theme or thought need to communicate is what governs the overall structure of the works. Concerning this Frye (1957) comments:

It is hardly possible to accept a critical view which confuses the original with the aboriginal, and imagines that a "creative" poet sits down with a pencil and some blank paper and eventually produces a new poem in a special act of creation ex nihilo. Human beings do not create in that way. Just as a new scientific discovery manifests something that was already latent in the order of nature, and at the same time is logically related to the total structure of the existing science, so the new poem manifests something that was already latent in the order of words . . . when Milton sat down to write a poem about Edward King, he did not ask himself: "What can I find to say about King?" but "How does poetry require that such a subject should be treated?" The notion that convention shows a lack of feeling, and that a poet attains "sincerity" (which usually means articulate emotion) by disregarding it, is opposed to all the facts of literary experience and history. (p. 97)

4.5.Displacement: the Undesirable and Desirable National Image of Ethiopia

It's obvious to hear some writers, for instance in the case of *Dertogada*, suggest that their characters are not their creation upon which they can do whatsoever they want; rather the characters have their own world and workings worth-following; thus the author, once notices them, follows their footsteps and observes their interactions and puts the story as witnessed. As such, as there is necessity for the characters to have free will to be themselves, there is similar necessity of creation available to the expression or the production. Frye explicates:

The true father or shaping spirit of the poem is the form of the poem itself, and this form is a manifestation of the universal spirit of poetry, the "on lie begetter" of Shakespeare's

sonnets who was not Shakespeare himself, much less that depressing ghost Mr. W. H., but Shakespeare's subject, the master-mistress of his passion. When a poet speaks of the internal spirit which shapes the poem, he is apt to drop the traditional appeal to female Muses and think of himself as in a feminine, or at least receptive, relation to some god or lord, whether Apollo, Dionysus, Eros, Christ, or (as in Milton) the Holy Spirit. (Ibid. p. 98)

Thus, the universe of art and the human desire to be “better”, and/or readjust or fix what he deemed is broken both actualize the birth of literary productions. Correspondingly, the *Kebra Nagast*, as master narrative, has this historical background of fixing the undesirable phenomena or reality.

The first is that the *Kebra Nagast* aims at counterattacking the biblical conception of the ancestry of black people is from the seed of Ham, the cursed one. The *Kebra Nagast* doesn't directly declare about the issue of race and blackness, but the case of being Ham's lineage is deliberately out casted by the discourse of the *Kebra Nagast* that the Ethiopians are the newly chosen people in front of the Almighty through the Queen of Sheba. Here is how the authors of the *Kebra Nagast* strategically put the issue in chapter 20, just before the beginning of the Queen's story, titled *Concerning the division of the earth*:

From the middle of Jerusalem, and from the north thereof to the south-east is the portion of the Emperor of Rom; and from the middle of Jerusalem from the north thereof to the south and to Western India is the portion of the Emperor of Ethiopia. For both of them are of the seed of Shem, the sons of Noah, the seed of Abraham, the seed of David, the children of Solomon. For God gave the seed of Shem glory because of the blessing of their father Noah. The Emperor of Rom is the son of Solomon, and the Emperor of Ethiopia is the firstborn and eldest son of Solomon. (p. 16)

The second possible background can be the hatred of Christians on the Jews, who are treated as traitors and crucifiers of the Messiah (which is a parallel phenomenon with *Dertogada* for political reasons). And the third historical reason for the preparation of this shrewd material is highly social and political; the authors of the book calculatingly brought forth this argument and socio-political structure to glorify the kingdom of Ethiopia.

Thus, the mission is purely building national identity and ideological reality that anchors on the mentality of the nation—the leaders and people—upon strong foundations of being the chosen children of God who can do their will beneath the supreme order of power of the universe.

Therefore, what is undesired is subordination in identity and world power share; the strong hold of the origin of the visit of the Queen of Sheba in the Bible makes the *Kebrā Nagast* believable and influential. The shrewdness of the narration, taking advantage of making the Queen an Ethiopian, arguing the fall of the Israelites for their disobedience, the lost of *Zion* with no trace, claims the position of being favored by God and thus, become the most powerful nation in the world. Nearer to the above achievements of the book, the narrative of document tried to clear off the hazy remote past of the nation. Hence, the *Kebrā Nagast* institutes the desired elements of image, consciousness, hope, and political power.

The above mentioned plans are structurally available in the other fictional narratives, *Tobbiya* and *Dertogada*. In *Tobbiya*, the undesirable phenomenon is the memory of the destructive invasion of Imam Gragn Ahmed from 1518-1526. In the Ethiopian history, the devastating campaign of Gragn Ahmed is recorded as a black spot on the Christian dynasty of the country. Thus, the memory of this powerful army that swept the whole nation is only celebrated by some Muslims as their notable military victory on the dominant Christian hegemony. Thus, the Muslim invasion is one of the most undesirably fatal memories of the Christian Ethiopia.

Hence, *Tobbiya* isn't just recording the history using literature, but injecting a small melody amidst the woe by Gragn's immense material and life casualty, including some humiliating facts like the disproportion of number of army (quarter million troops of the Christian king defeated by twelve thousand troops of Gragn).

Thus, like the *Kebrā Nagast*, *Tobbiya* is trying to lessen the historical anguish with the literary possibility. In the story, Cupid's single arrow accomplished the assignment that 250, 000 warrior's of a prominent Christian king failed to do. The wish thinking is a desire to rethink the episode in a new guise of literature, and see Ethiopia being secured Christian state again. This shows us the desire and mission of Christianization of the Ethiopian nationhood, which was founded in the narrative of the *Kebrā Nagast*, is here continued to the extent of paying special attention to the discontinuity of it, as we can ask why the Oromo invasion, for instance, that

positively and negatively affected the Christian monarchs and the people, having similar destructive moves, is not a big deal to the author of *Tobbiya*. The reason is that the consequence of the invasion of Gragn is much hazardous as the Imam declared to Islamize the country, in which the Oromo's agenda was not that uprooting. In this case the divine socio-political and mental arrangement set long ago by the narrative of the *Kebra Nagast* is actually threatened in history, and literarily inverted in *Tobbiya*.

Dr. Yonas Addmasu (1995) argues that the structural influence of the *Kebra Nagast* on *Tobbiya* is revealed as *Tobbiya* starts at what the *Kebra Nagast* terminated. But the story is not narrating about a Christian monarch pursuing his mission of conquering, or trying to do so, as what the tradition of the *Kebra Nagast* institutionalized with a sample of war in the new order, stated in chapter 94 of the *Kebra Nagast*. Thus, Yonas' insight is a little bit corrupted for what *Tobbiya* is structurally doing is generally reserving the “*The Kebra Nagast Consciousness*” by eradicating the undesirable memory of the nation, for energizing the system and securing the very make up of the system are neither similar nor continuous.

In the case of *Dertogada*, the historical backgrounds that have urged the writer to come up with such narrative are recent episodes of the country; for the author, the main concern of his production is not altogether historical as it bestows enough space for the literary exercise as well. The writer has tried to infuse pseudo-science and technology and quasi-detective narrations. This typifies the work from the previous masterpieces.

Dealing with the historical background of the book, two main historical and ongoing facts come to be undesirable in its concern, including some personal intent: the first undesirable element is the evacuation of the Ethiopian Jews by Mossad's operation called “the Operation of Solomon”, during the Derge regime—may be deliberately echoing the story of the operation made in the abduction of *Zion* in the *Kebra Nagast*; generally a structural reverberation occurs with the *Kebra Nagast* as the first-born children of the Jew officials have entered Ethiopia, accompanied Bayna Lehkem (King David II) with the missionary agenda of propagating the laws of the Old Testament among the Ethiopian society, though they begun entering Ethiopia long time before; thus, as the Jews' well-recorded entrance into the country is narrated in the *Kebra Nagast*, their major withdrawal is literarily recorded in *Dertogada*.

This historical phenomenon is bitter enough to drive the author into caricaturing the Jew characters of his novel, despite his first confession, in the introduction, how he freely molded them without his strict supervision; the writer's tone while hosting his look of the evacuation is so judgmentally harsh. Therefore, as the writers of the *Kebra Nagast* most clearly resented on and rebuked the Jews' "disobedience" or "denial" and crucifixion of Christ, similarly the author of *Dertogada* communicated his hatred for their evacuation of the country due to their historical resentments upon the Christian monarchs' mal-administration; to most Ethiopian black Jews, the return to Israel is desperately demanded like evacuating a land of misery. Whatsoever the detail, the structural linkage of the two ends of the history the Ethiopian Jews are dealt in both the *Kebra Nagast* and *Dertogada*.

What links the three materials on the issue at hand is their committal position to defend the Orthodox Christianity which is inextricably forged in the narratives of the *Kebra Nagast*. As we have seen how the *Kebra Nagast* and *Tobbiya* hosted the undesirable pimple on the historical face of the nation, let's see how *Dertogada* tried to get it rid off. The author initially opened crossfire of propaganda on the Jew's decision to leave the country, but finally the ideal love of Mirage, who is an Ethiopian and Sipara, Jew in blood but Ethiopian in faith and mentality (mind the name Sipara is taken to celebrate the reportedly Ethiopian woman who believed to be the wife of Moses) symbolizes the nostalgia and urge of the author to see the two people united. Thus, the narrative of the lovers tried to correct the historical act, and lessened the undesirability of the phenomenon; similar structure is visible in *Tobbiya*, in which the final marriage of the young Muslim King and Tobbiya after the king acknowledged and converted into the mainstream culture of the Ethiopian society; thus, the larger-than-Romeo-and-Juliet stature of Mirage and Sipara is portrayed as emblem of the Abyssinian Jew's belonging to the Ethiopian community. This tie is even mystified in the very story of the lovers' reunion after many years of separation. Thereof, structural connection of union of two separable entities are fused with the Ethiopian mainstream identity set in the earlier, as the *Kebra Nagast* is worth-noting.

The other undesirable historical reality of Ethiopia that *Dertogada* tried to mend is the backwardness of the country. This modern issue resounds the movement of the Japanizers—Ethiopian elites who proposed the Japanese way to the country's development.

The author has pinpointed some reasons for this which, of course, the reasons can be listed as undesirable elements though no thorough attention are attached to them; these are “negligence of the church and emigrant intelligentsias’ knowledge, disunity of the people (deemed as the result of the current government’s “wrong policy”), and “unfair foreign investment”. Having these socio-historical disturbing pictures of the Ethiopian nationhood, the author attempted to fix history by fantasizing, absurdly in many instances, to usher the country to his proposed apocalyptic readjustment.

The above analysis about the undesired historical happenings or portrait of the Ethiopian nationhood had been the seedbed principles of necessity for the “why” of the authors need of composition. As it’s explained earlier, the project of national image creating and building of *Tobbiya* and *Dertogada* are structurally attached to the political institutions and ideological discourses of the *Kebra Nagast*. Hence, the similarity of their regulative agenda to repair the cracks of the institutionalized national stature springs from the foundational “Grammar” of the *Kebra Nagast*. Thus, the final point is that the fictions have analogous historical purpose of being corrective fluids on the pages of the Ethiopian history.

4.6. The Grammar/ Parallelism of Mythos Architecture

Aristotle, as referred in Frye (1957), uses the word mythos to mean plot or narrative of a story. Functionally, Aristotle comprehends the plot as the “soul” or “shaping principle” of literary art (Ibid. p. 52). In his *Poetics*, he expounds the elements of tragedy (the Mythos of Autumn, according to Frye) and their level of importance, and arguing plot is the most pertinent element of all the other. He defines plot as arrangement of incidents which are imitations of an action. To further demystify his view, as literature is the reflection of *praxis*, human action, and tragic plot is also a reflection of the deeds or actions, but not the reflection of the characters. This is so because the action is the determinant factor for the personality of people.

Considering the plot development of the three focus fictional narratives—or their “souls”, the commonly rapid interactions of the characters in the plots describe the nature of the novels. Basically the *Dianoia*, thought or theme, is what determined the mythos of literary works.

Before proceeding into the *dianoia* of the novels, and let’s probe the structural interconnection of the focus materials’ mythoi. To begin with the *Kebra Nagast*, the stylization of composition is as

old as 14th C Ethiopia, the Golden age of Ethiopic literature yet to come during the regency of Zera Yacob. Because of the eminent influence of the Bible on the composers of the *Kebrā Nagast*, the narratives develop with the biblical style of writing and chapter-wise references to some selected narratives from the Old Testament; the whole book is compartmentalized into small 117 chapters, excluding the colophon in the end part of the book. The Kegan Paul edition (2001) of Budge's translation of the *Kebrā Nagast* contains 32 plats taken from the British museum, Ethiopic MMS, which might show the book had been prepared with such illustration in the original version (if so the plot is supported by another artistic accomplishment and as a result the narrative got stronger and readable).

Summarily, the plot of the *Kebrā Nagast*, having the motive of readjustment or transformation of the Ethiopian ethos is structured in the following formula:

1. *Traveling of the mother + importing law and lineage + returning home = Wisdom and Grace;*
2. *Traveling of the son + importing Solomonic regency and God's covenant + returning home = Glory and Divinity*

Having this picture, let's get down to the detailed analysis of mythos of the *Kebrā Nagast*. The first 19 chapters of the *Kebrā Nagast* previews some issues like the kingdom of Adam and his children, God's relationship with man, some selected principal narratives of the Old Testament, two chapters about the three hundred and eighteen Orthodox fathers, and human early corruption and so on and so forth. The first two chapters introduce the whole concern of the narrative; chapter 1 shrewdly quotes and elaborates dramatically how the Trinity agreed to create Adam and *Zion*, the House of Their Glory. This chapter alone has a magnificent initial power in the plot development; the chapter is freer in narration, making suspense, showing the miniatures of the prominent issues—like Creation, God, Man, *Zion*, Glory, David, Second *Zion* and Second Adam and so on—to come in the entire narrative. This particular plot development is what is in modern composition called prologue.

In the second chapter—*Concerning the Greatness of Kings*—the initial narrator rhetorically raises the main issue, the glory of kings, once again and introduces the hero-like narrator of the story called Gregory—“Gregory Lusavoritch, an Illuminator who flourished in the 4th C” (Wallis, 2001, p. 2); right after the first narrator introduced Gregory's majestic identity this way:

“Gregory, the worker of wonders and miracles, who was cast into a cave because of his love for the martyrdom of Christ and suffered tribulation for fifteen years, said . . .” (Ibid. p. 2), Gregory takes up the narration, orally addressing the group of church fathers, and continues:

When I was in the pit I pondered over this matter, and over the folly of the King of Armenia, and I said, in so far as I can conceive it, in what doth the greatness of kings consist? Is it in the multitude of soldiers or in the splendor of worldly possessions, or in the extent of rule over cities and towns? This was my thought each time [left] of my prayer, and my thought stirred me again and again to meditate upon the greatness of kings. And now I will begin. (Ibid. p. 2)

The first paragraph of the second chapter clearly set the motive of the discourse; “Come then, let us go back, and let us consider, and let us begin to state which of the kings of the earth, from the first even unto the last, in respect of the Law and the Ordinances and honour and greatness, we should magnify or decry” (p. 2). The story line didn’t start with the issue of the Queen (of Sheba), but with the review or framework about the greatness of kings of the world, starting from the “Supreme King and His shared kingdom of Adam” (chap. 3). The initial stage of the story line of the *Kebra Nagast* follows a strong procedure of argumentative writing; the 19 chapters of the book also signify some elements of dexterous academic work as the book starts with acknowledgment followed by the first chapter resembling abstract and the second chapter statement of problem and from chapter three to nineteen, a framework.

Thus, after raising the most important points, including the church father agreement and the discovery of the earliest version of the *Kebra Nagast*, which adds important implications to the main narrative of the book, chapter 19 foreshadows the new order of Solomonic line, which the rest of the chapters substantiate its occurrence. The *Kebra Nagast* narrates the journey of Queen Makeda and birth of her son from Solomon within chapter 19 and 32 as one full cycle of episode; the second cycle of the plot development revolves around the journey of her son, Bayna Lehkem, to Jerusalem to see his father, as his mother did in the first cycle, and this lasts from chapter 33 to 55, from the son’s departure up to his return; the second cycle is full of vivacious actions and heightened emotional complexities;

besides the picturesque and eventfulness attribute of this cycle—like the father-son reunion, coronation of the son as David II to reign in the kingdom of Ethiopia—the plot of the first-born children of Israel to abduct *Zion* puts the story line in its climatic stage and heightens the dramatic scenes.

The plot of the abduction starts in chapter 45, as the result of Bayna Lehkem's refusal to reign in Israel and Solomon's persuasion of the officials of Israel to send their first-born children as he is about to do; the first-born children, including Zadok's first-born Azaryas, decided to take *Zion* with them for they adore it very much and God consented to happen so for He had the plan to glorify the Ethiopian kingdom and people. The divine will is displayed through the patronage of an Angel of God in the plan and *Zion's* yielding to be moved or abducted. The consequence of the abduction brought a new power order in the religious sense of kingdoms of the world, i.e., the kingdom of Ethiopia rises at the expense of the kingdom of Israel for *Zion/Tabernacle* meant the might and abode of God's power and glory which the Israelites used to carry it with them during war times and use its power to defeat their enemies (similar custom used to be pervasive in the Ethiopian tradition).

It's for such reason that chapter 58 narrates the rise of Solomon himself to slay his son and the others sooner after Zadok learned what happened to the Tabernacle though the chasing failed for some miraculous space/time extensions experienced by the confederated. Thus, while the son got glorified, the father reduced into tragic hero (more detailed analysis shall be rendered together with the mythos of the other materials). The *Kebra Nagast* deliberately suspended the arrival of Bayna Lehkem (now King David II) and the celebration of his coronation to enhance the change by disclosing the inevitable series of catastrophes—like marrying a pagan Egyptian girl and trespassing the law of God—happened to a tragic hero sooner after he made the tragic flaw. Thirty three chapters away after the narration of his leave, King David II arrived in his land and many courtly events performed and declarations passed starting from chapter 84 to 95 up to when his authority is reportedly became universally known.

The narration continues analyzing the prophesies made about the first and second coming of Christ in which the author indirectly preaches about Christ and denounces the Jews for their failure to notice the case, and thus, convincing their tragedy, in the story, is fitting and worse is proposed to happen upon them.

Finally the story line terminates with the relationship between the kingdom of Ethiopia and Rom and their alliance, referring the historical fact of the alliance of Kaleb and Justine, and their share of the territory of the earth, half of the earth from Jerusalem, as stated earlier in chapter 19. The narration prophesizes the supreme power of the Ethiopian king, as the kings of Rom will adopt the title of the Ethiopian kings. Finally, the book concludes his argument followed by the colophon:

Thus hath God made for the King of Ethiopia more glory, and grace, and majesty than for all the other kings of the earth because of the greatness of Zion, the Tabernacle of the Law of God, the heavenly Zion. And may God make us perform His spiritual good pleasure, and deliver us from His wrath, and make us to share His kingdom. Amen. (Ibid. p. 227)

Proceeding into the next focus novel, *Tobbiya*, the plot architecture is to some extent similar to the *Kebra Nagast* as it can be summarized here after:

1. *Captivity of the Father + The Merchant's Altruism = Freedom;*
2. *Captivity of the Son + The King's Altruism = Freedom;*
3. *The Father and Daughter's Captivity + The King's Altruism = Freedom, Reunion, Thanks Giving and Marriage*

What we can understand structurally from the mythoi of the *Kebra Nagast* and *Tobbiya* is that the characters in the *Kebra Nagast* earned fortune from their journeys whereas the characters in *Tobbiya* also earned fortune but after slavery in all cases.

When we come to the plot structure of *Dertogada*, the initial stages and ending parts structurally resemble that of the *Kebra Nagast*; the preamble written by the author corresponds with what Gregory said in chapter 2 of the *Kebra Nagast*—both parts lay the very ground for their act of writing and concerns. The other contrast is the epilogue (the first 19 chapters in the *Kebra Nagast* and page 9-10 in *Dertogada*); and next part which the author titled “amekniyo/logic”, in which a real account—of the coincidence how Laureate Tsegaye G/Medhin came to compose his play Sokokawa Petros/ The agony of Peter and poem Petros Yachi Sa'at/Peter that moment—is technically fictionalized to heighten the effect through bridging the gap between fact and fiction.

For example, the first chapter of the *Kebra Nagast*, clarifies or fictionalizes, in comparison to the account in the Bible, the creation of Adam as follows:

For the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Sprit with good fellowship and right good will and cordial agreement together made the Heavenly Zion to be the place of habitation of their Glory. And then the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit said, 'Let us make man in Our similitude and likeness,' and with ready agreement and good will They were all of this opinion. And the Son said, 'I will put on the body of Adam,' and the Holy Sprit said, 'I will dwell in the heart [s] of the Prophets and Righteous'; and this common agreement and covenant was fulfilled in Zion, the City of their Glory. (Ibid. p. 1)

Thus, the fictionalization of “historical facts”, if the Bible is history, is characterized in the plots of the *Kebra Nagast* and *Dertogada*, having a principal contribution in the development of the storylines. Sticking to the plot of *Dertogada*, the architecture of the core narratives, divided into 30 chapters, can be summarized as following:

1. *Separation of lovers + strong hope to reunite = Reunion*
2. *Mission to get scientists + hurdle from enemies + victory over the enemy = Attainment*
3. *Treasure hunting + hurdle from an enemy + defeat of the enemy + code breaking = Attainment*

The plot ends with a motto that runs, “በከሱ ውስጥ የሞቱት በኛ ውስጥ ህያዋን ናቸው።” (ዴ.ሮ.ጋዳ፣ገጽ፣ 270) “Those who died in the story are alive in us” (*Dertogada*, p. 270). Structurally this ending part reverberates with the *Kebra Nagast*’s statement of how the composers toiled to show the glory of the Ethiopian kingdom, and plead the reader not to rebuke him for “his incorrect language” but pray for all of them. Generally speaking, the plot of *Dertogada* resembles to that of the *Kebra Nagast*; and to *Tobbiya* in its employment of suspense as a prominent technique.

The plots of the *Kebra Nagast*, *Tobbiya* and *Dertogada* are thus, similarly fashioned in *Search/Gain*, *Lose/Gain* and *Lose/Gain* approach respectively, noting that the *Kebra Nagast* has no narrative of “Lose” for its substratal position in the issues of the novels.

Accordingly, the kernel of the above analysis is structurally examining and proposing that the agenda tried to be addressed in the works are what governs, as underlying principle, literature, in the order of words and human vision, in the anthropomorphic world of senses. Thus, the keys to

the discourse of the agenda of glory of the nation—institutionalizing, fixing, and activating it through concrete proposition, in case of the *Kebra Nagast* and *Dertogada*, and romantic fantasy, in case of *Tobbiya*, are communicated through the plots. The three plots are inevitably categorized into what Frye called the rhythm of dreaming or innocence and waking into the life of experience. Hence, the *Kebra Nagast* and *Dertogada* are more or less dreaming while *Tobbiya* is waking that tries to find way to mend and continue the agenda, and the way is literary fantasy, which is still, as Plato puts, is a dream to the wake mind. Thus, *Tobbiya* too finally join the world of dream for the world of experience (as manifested in history or conventionalized as reality) is never sweeter than the world of dream, while even we are conscious about it.

Thereof, the narrative “grammar”, to use Tzvetan Todorov’s terminology, of the three plots is highly correlated with “*Searching*” and “*Wish-fulfillment*” of socio-political glorifications.

4.7. The Mythos of Summer and Spring: Romance and Comedy

On this sub-section of the analysis, Northrop Frye’s archetypal criticism or theory of mythos/generic plots is applied to observe and analyze the structural symmetry of the materials in focus. Frye (1957) theorizes that the all-out literary experience is categorizable into four structures and moods. These structures are: comedy (Mythos of Spring), Romance (Mythos of Summer), Tragedy (Mythos of Autumn) And Satire (Mythos of Winter). He expounds his point, the opposing and blending forces of structures working both in literature and human life:

If we think of our experience of these mythoi, we shall realize that they form two opposed pairs. Tragedy and comedy contrast rather than blend, and so do romance and irony, the champions respectively of the ideal and the actual. On the other hand, comedy blends insensibly into satire at one extreme and into romance at the other; romance may be comic or tragic; tragic extends from high romance to bitter and ironic realism. (p. 162)

Hereafter, the discussion about the mythos of summer or romance with slight touch of the mythos of spring or comedy is rendered, as the target narratives in this research project are structured with these two mythoi. Thus, before analyzing how the narrative grammar of the novels belong to similar repetitive patterns, let’s have a brief look at what Frye meant by his theory mythos of summer and spring.

The mythos of summer or romance is a plot structure that is used as one of the structures of literary culture of humanity manipulated in order to “achieve” fantastic dream-like arrangements as an ingratiating attempt with literary reality. This literary structure is pervasive since time immemorial and seemingly will continue functioning regardless of human “modernization”. This is so because existence is full of vacuums and the need to idealize and wish for something that is beyond the reach of human intellectual stretch is common across the gulf of life, specifically, to the anthropomorphic entity. Regarding this, Frye illustrates the aspect of the romantic structure:

The essential element of plot in romance is adventure, which means that romance is naturally a sequential and processional form, hence we the Kebra Nagast owe it better from fiction than from drama. At its most naive it is an endless form in which a central character who never develops or ages goes through one adventure after another until the author himself collapses. We see this form in comic strips, where the central characters persist for years in a state of refrigerated deathlessness. (Ibid. p. 186)

He tells us more about the adventurous actions of the heroes or heroines, by which a society's, a group's or an individual's wish or fantasy is carried and completed in three stages; these stages are: the “Agon/Conflict”, the “Pathos/death-struggle”, and the “Anagnorisis/discovery or recognition of the hero”. The phases of the story line of romance, thus, help the literary mentality picture both its very fundamental existence and its nostalgia or wish. Regarding the nostalgic aspect of the structure of romantic plot, we can consider the technique of magnifying the hero nearer to mythical hero of divinity. This shows man's desire to evolve his nature into his lust of becoming divine or highest power order or to activate it if it's deactivated within his nature. Frye exemplifies, for mythos of summer, the popular biblical quest-romance of St. George and his conflict with the dragon and his recognition of triumphant as reward.

The other mythos that is going to be considering here is the mythos of spring or comedy. The structure of this mythos narrates about an ordinary person or relatively a hero who needs to do or get something but hindered by certain problem, or opposition, and finally emerged as winner with certain change/consequence in the environment where the conflict or the story occurred; the consequence is most of the time supportive to the hero's trial of achievement. Frye simply portrays the organization of what he called the mythos of spring as follows:

What normally happens is that a young man wants a young woman, that his desire is resisted by some opposition, usually paternal, and that near the end of the play some twist in the plot enables the hero to have his will. In this simple pattern there are several complex elements. In the first place, the movement of comedy is usually a movement from one kind of society to another. At the beginning of the play the obstructing characters are in charge of the play's society, and the audience recognizes that they are usurpers. At the end of the play the device in the plot that brings hero and heroine together causes a new society to crystallize around the hero, and the moment when this crystallization occurs is the point of resolution in the action, the comic discovery, anagnorisis or cognitio. (Ibid. p. 163)

The action of the plot of comedy is anchored in the conflict happened when the hero moves to resolve his problem. And the action is not as serious as the action in romance for the reason of its principles to amuse the audience with comic interactions and speeches. In comedy, the comic hero/ordinary character is made to be successful at last with certain twist in the plot that ushers him into his comic destiny, and the society into some kind of understanding and acceptance of the need of the character's desire. Frye expresses this:

Thus the movement from pistis to gnosis, from a society controlled by habit, ritual bondage, arbitrary law and the older characters to a society controlled by youth and pragmatic freedom is fundamentally, as the Greek words suggest, a movement from illusion to reality. Illusion is whatever is fixed or definable, and reality is best understood as its negation: whatever reality is, it's not that. Hence the importance of the theme of creating and dispelling illusion in comedy: the illusions caused by disguise, obsession, hypocrisy, or unknown parentage. (Ibid. p. 169)

The comic action, therefore, appears moralistic and social; this means the comic hero's conflict is not only with certain enemies but also with the society of the environment who initially involved in some ways in discouraging the hero or supporting the opposing forces of the hero. Subsequently, the thematic aspect of the action resides in changing the society's attitude of the preexisting reality and preaches the idea of success. To make this picturesque, we take an example of a black and white characters who need to marry in the US setting, and the heroes encounter a problem for the preexisting reality of the US society in color orientation;

while the heroes are on the move to succeed their need, finally the plot gets twisted in some way and achieve their point with the society comprehending and supporting their union, or recreation of the society with new understanding or belief to reject color bars.

To sum up, the mythos of spring is characterized with success of the comic hero and promotion of the society into the need of the character that will be noticed in the festive mood created at the last moments of the story.

Having considering Frye's theory of the mythoi of summer and spring, let's advance into the focus materials' structural symmetry. As we have cited earlier, the target narratives have similar structure of mythos of summer/romance, and with their element of comic twists of action. In the *Kebra Nagast* and *Dertogada*, the romantic structure is principally foregrounded, with few comic insights, whereas in *Tobbiya*, the vice versa. Let's analyze these structures of the mythoi of the fictions in detail.

In the *Kebra Nagast*, the Queen is projected as an ideal hero who is smitten by love of wisdom, presented as the most precious thing to possess. Apart from the obvious tendency of granting high value of wisdom in any society, the Queen's lust of wisdom is persuasively connected with the biblical account of Solomon's request of wisdom from the Almighty and the following immense admiration and recognition for his unique and adorable demand. In the bible, Solomon requested wisdom for he is a leader and, he was young to assume such divinely royal position. Likewise, besides Sheba's queenly status, she is portrayed as heroine for her love of wisdom and her adventure to get it from the adventurous Solomon. Here is how the *Kebra Nagast* presents the queen's response after her merchant, Tamrin, told her about Solomon's wisdom:

And the Queen was struck dumb with wonder at the things that she heard from the merchant, her servant, and she sought in her heart that she would go to him; and she wept by reason of the greatness of her pleasure in those things that Tamrin had told her. And she was exceedingly anxious to go to him, but when she pondered upon the long journey she thought that it was too far and too difficult to undertake. And time after time she asked Tamrin questions about Solomon, and time after time, Tamrin told her about him, she became very wishful and most desirous to go that she might hear his wisdom, and see his face, and embrace him, and petition his royalty. And her heart inclined to go

to him, for God had made her heart inclined to go and had made her to desire it. (Kebra Nagast, 2001, p. 21)

Here what the story tells us is the main character is an extraordinary personality/romantic hero who is ready to make an adventure to a very far place to fulfill her dream. Moreover, her heroic character is elevated by her connection with the divine power as quoted above, though she is not lifted into being mythical hero. Another great characteristic that makes this hero romantic is the portrait that she, though so eager to visit a sagacious man in so remote place, is molded as amazingly wise woman in the present, before her journey. This extraordinary stature is displayed in the following speech she made in announcement or declaration of her journey to her people:

Hearken, O ye who are my people, give ye ear to my words. For I desire wisdom and my heart seeketh to find understanding. I am smitten with the love of wisdom, and I am constrained by the cords of understanding; for wisdom is far better than treasure of gold and silver, and wisdom is the best of everything that has been created on the earth. Now unto what under the heaven shall wisdom be compared? It is sweeter than honey, and it maketh one to rejoice more than wine, and it illumineth more than the sun, and it is to be loved more than precious stones . . . (Ibid. p, 21)

Thus, the Queen's personality and her adventurous quest and her double success or fulfillments (of getting wisdom and offspring) portrays her as heroic character in the mythos. At this point we shall refer to what Frye outlined as the three stages of romantic mythos though the Queen's journey is not an end to the story but to its own part; this means the adventure is continued by her son, whom she mothered from Solomon.

Thus, Frye's three stages of romantic mythos are manifested in the *Kebra Nagast* as follows: in the Queen's adventure, the lust for wisdom is the Agon or conflict, for she would be utterly depressed if she doesn't fulfill her wish.

The Pathos or death-struggle is the one that is made with nature, for the journey is so hard to take; and the Anagnonisis or discovery is her success to get what she dreams for. Thus, the characterization of the Queen is heroic in its romantic sense. Before proceeding into the son's portrait, here is a point worth-minding; the creation of the new society at the end of the Queen's journey, for the people of Ethiopia is converted into worshipping the God of Israel, is not actually,

according to Frye's theory, a comic one. This is so for the creation of new society at the end of comic plot occurs if the society has been participating in the conflict, opposing, directly or otherwise, what the comic hero sought or fought for. Thus, the new society is new in understanding, changing its attitude after a period of resistance. In this case, the new society created at this particular point is not comical in structure, though the case is so in the next adventure of the Queen's son.

In the second case, her son, Bayna Lehkem, is portrayed in similar picture as he also took the adventitious journey that his mother made 22 years before. The *Kebrā Nagast* tells us about the second hero first demand in his twelfth age, which is initially biological, to know his father; here is how he asked his friends:

'Who is my father?' And they said unto him, 'Solomon the King.' And he went to the Queen his mother, and said unto her, 'O Queen, make me to know who is my father.' And the Queen spake unto him angrily, wishing to frighten him so that he might not desire to go [to his father] saying, 'Why dost thou ask me about thy father? I am thy father and thy mother; seek not to know any more . . .' (Ibid. p. 38)

The child has asked his mother two times more though he was persuaded by the answer until he reached the age of 22 and requested to go and visit his father and did so. In the age of 22, the son is portrayed as hero for the story narrates: "And when he was two and twenty years old he was skilled in the whole art of war and of horsemanship, and in the hunting and trapping of wild beasts, and in everything that young men are wont to learn" (Ibid. p. 39). Thus, what we can understand is the son is so far grown into a heroic stature. The young prince made his heroic journey, met his father and kept on his growing in wisdom and finally ordained kingship and came back to Ethiopia, with an additional adventure of abducting the most precious thing in the whole world, the *Zion*, and escaping to their place. In their return, a time-space extension happened but that doesn't mean the character's human attributes are transferred into mythical hero; rather it adds another element of romance that is treasure hunting.

Therefore, Frye's three stages of romantic mythos works for the second hero in the *Kebrā Nagast* as follows: the Agon/conflict is the strong demand to visit his father, the Pathos/death-struggle is both the hardship of the journey and the escape from the chasers whose mission were to kill the

accomplice and get back the treasure (these situation creates a villain—hero contrasts which is the characteristics of romantic plot, and the contrast grows into Jews—villain/Ethiopians—heroes dichotomy); the Anagnonisis/ discovery is obviously manifested in the successful mission the hero accomplished.

Finally, in the mainstream romantic mythos there is a comic element in the narrative of the adventure of Bayna Lehkem; at the hero's arrival, long after his successful journey and the surprising plunder of *Zion*, a new society is emerged as understanding comes into the consciousness of the Jews that the abduction of *Zion* is demanding because the Ethiopians are the newly chosen people as children of God. This means the "God-sponsored" abduction of *Zion* was known later on, especially by the Jews, and admitted by everyone for the plan was something acceptable and agreeable. Let's see the reaction of in the Jew's or the opponent's part, in chapter 62 (Solomon's resignation to the will of God) and 63 (The elders accept Solomon's view and decide to keep the theft of *Zion* a secret):

And Solomon the King answered and said unto them, 'Hearken ye unto me and to what I shall say unto you, supposing He had taken me away whilst I was carrying Zion—what is impossible to God? And suppose He had taken you away whilst you where carrying her—what is impossible to God? And suppose He where to make them to inherit our city, and destroy us—what is impossible to God? For everything is His, and none can gainsay his Will, and there is none who can transgress His command in heaven above or in earth below. He is the King Whose kingdom shall never, never pass away, Amen. But now let us go and kneel in the House of God. ' (Ibid. p. 99)

And then the elders of Israel made answer and said unto him, 'May thy good pleasure be done, and the good pleasure of the Lord God! As for us, none of us will transgress thy word, and we will not inform any other people that Zion hath taken away from us.' And they established this covenant in the House of God—the elders of Israel with their King Solomon unto this day. (Ibid. p. 100)

The above quotes show us the acceptance and recognition, discarding their opposition of *Zion's* taking and their new understanding about the reality. Thus, it signifies that there is a new society

created by the situation or the hero's wish fulfillment. On the other side the winner enter into festivity at last as the following quote suggests:

And David the King came with great pomp unto his mother's city, and then he saw in the height the heavenly Zion sending forth light like the sun. And when the Queen saw this she gave thanks unto the God of Israel, and praised Him. And she bowed low, and smote her breast, and then threw up her head and gazed into the heaven, and thanked her Creator; and she clapped her hands together, and sent forth shouts of laughter from her mouth, and danced on the ground with her feet; and she adorned her whole body with joy and gladness with the fullest will of her inward mind. And what I shall say of the rejoicing which took place then in the country of Ethiopia, and of the joy of the people, both man and beast, from the least to the greatest, and of both women and men? And pavilions and tents were placed at the foot of Dabra Makeda on the flat plain by the side of good water, and they slaughter thirty-two thousand stalled oxen and bulls . . . (Ibid. p. 146)

To sum up, the romantic mythos of the *Kebra Nagast* is infused with comic element as the opposing forces created by the abduction of *Zion* are ushered into a new cognizance and acceptance of the new situation and the festive mood created in the land of the hero for their successful completion of the journey, the hero's ordinance as king of Ethiopia, and possession of *Zion* or God favor.

In the second focus material, *Tobbiya*, the structure of the plot, as we notice to some existent in the *Kebra Nagast*, is synthesis of comic and romantic structures; the romantic structures can be summarized as follows: first, the overall aim of the story is strongly attached to the wish-fulfillment element of romantic mythos; but this doesn't mean there is no wish-fulfillment in comedy, that we call success of the hero; in *Tobbiya* the wish-fulfillment is more of romance, and even the two characters, *Tobbiya* and *Wahid*, are not directly responsible for the new structure created in the society rather it is Love and the Young King who are the changing forces.

The twist that leads the story into wish-fulfillment is so romantic; here is how the narration twists as the mighty king of the Muslim army falls in an absolute love and his marriage proposal rejected for he isn't Christian, but the twist appears:

በጦቢያ አንጻር መንግሥቱም ዘውዱም አጀቡም ሠራዊቱም ከንቱ ሆነበት። ከዓለም አልቆጥርህ አለው። ሁሉም ቀርቶበት ለጦቢያ ባል መሆኑን ብቻ ወደደ። በአርሲ ነገር ልቡ ተሸበረ፤ ታመልጠኛለችን ሲያስብ ልቡ ባባ፤ ሆዱም ይቆርጠው ራሱንም ይፈልጠው ጀመር። ምን ያድርግ፤ ከሰው እንዳይነጋገር ታመምሁ ብሎ ተኛ። ከዋሕድ በቀር ከሌቱ ሰው እንዳይደርስ አደረገና ዝም ብሎ ያሰብ ጀመር፤ አሳቡ ግን በከንቱ ነው። ጦቢያ ክርስቲያን እንዳታገባ ማለች፤ ተከተተ ነገሩ። እርሱ ክርስቲያን ካልሆነ በቀር ሁሉም ቀረ ማለት ነው። አሳቡ በዚህ ቆመና፤ “ዋሕድን ሂድ ለእነትህ አይዘሽ ደስ ይበልሽ እንዳንቸው ክርስቲያን ሆኜ አገባሻለሁና የሚያጠምቀኝ ቄስ በሽሽግ አስፈልጋልኝ።” ብሎ ላከባት። ጦቢያም ከአሰዋ ግሥትነት ይልቅ በአርሲው ምክንያት ያን ያህል ትልቅ ያረመኔ ገጉም ክርስቲያን በመሆኑ ደስ አላትና። “ይኸማ ከሆነ አማረ።” አለች። እግዚአብሔርንም አመሰግኘች። (ጦቢያ፡ገጽ፣ 71)

His [the king's] mighty kingdom and army appears nonsense with out Tobbiya; he can't value it. He wishes to be just the husband of Tobbiya at the expense of his all possessions. He becomes desperate thinking about her and anxious about his lost and thus feels ill. He concealed his real situation from others and only contacts Wahid. Tobbiya has firmly decided that she will never marry a non-Christian unless he is converted; days pass, the king stops worrying, and says to Wahid, 'Go and congratulate your sister for I settled on marry her converting my faith to Christianity, and send me a priest, secretly, to baptize me.' Tobbiya rejoiced upon the news and situation, not for her queenly future, but upon the mighty king's, of the "infidels" [Muslims], conversion to Christianity for her sake. And she thanked her God. (Tobbiya, p. 71)

The other twist is also marked on the declaration or announcement of the king to his army about his conversion, after he secretly finished his course on the main doctrines of Christianity, the following of the army is so romantic that they accept the situation instantly; here is an extract of his speech:

... እኔም ከአያት ቅድመ አያቱ በቆየኝ ድንቁርና ለጣዖት ስሰግድ ኖርሁ። እሁን ግን ክርስቶስ ልብ ሰጠኝ፤ ከድንቁርና አወጣኝ፤ የእውነተኛውን ፈጣሪ እንዳውቅ አደረገኝ። የእውነተኛው ሃይማኖት የክርስቶስ ወገን መሆን ነውና የእኔ ሃይማኖት ነው፤ ዕውቀው። እኔን የወደድህ እንደእኔ ተጠመቅ። እኔን ያልወደድህ ተለይ። ክርስቲያን መሆን የወደድህ ወደቀኝ፤ እንደጥንትህ መኖር ያደላብህ ወደግራ ሥፈር።” አለና ጨረሰ።

ከዚህ አዋጅ ወዲያ ግራ ሠፋሪ ጠፋ፤ ሁሉም ወደመጠመቁ አደላ፤ ክርስቲያን መሆኑ ተረገጠ፤ ሁሉም አስቀድሞ እንዳወቀ ሆነና ረጋ። ገገሡ ደስ አለው። (ጦቢያ፡ገጽ፣ 73-74)

... ‘And I have been worshiping idols for my fathers and forefathers inherited me such ignorance. But now Christ gave me understanding and pulled me out of that unawareness. Thus, know that my faith is the true faith of Christ. If you love me, baptized as I did; if not, let me know.’ And he finished announcing, ‘if you are Christian line up on the right, if you want to live as in the older times, be in the left.’ After this announcement no one lined up on the left, and asserted, as if all was pre-informed, they are converted to Christianity, and the king rejoiced. (Ibid. p. 73-74)

Thus, the twist that brings the wish-fulfillment is altogether romantic rather than comic in structure. The other point that shows the romantic characteristics of *Tobbiya* are in its characterization; the three characters: the father, Tobbiya and Wahid are endowed with heroic stature for the father is a Fitawrari or General of army and the children are portrayed as heroes for their noble birth as well as commitment to share their father's misery. For example, Wahid though a youngster decided to free his father from slavery by replacing him, and later on see so many adventures during his lost; and Tobbiya, showed her heroic character, disguised as male, and followed her father to search Wahid.

Here is how the father asserted their heroic nature, by boldly responding to a soldier who teased upon their faith, when they fell in the hands of the enemy; the father gave a long discourse about the might of Christ and His saving power and concludes: “አሁን እኔና ልጄ እስትንሞት ድረስ አምላካችንን ከልብ እናምነዋለን። ብንሞት ብትገድሉንም አሁን ባበሳችን በኃጢአታች እንሞታለን እንጂ ለክርስቶስ ማዳን አቅቶት መስማት ተስኖት እንዳልሆነ እናውቃለን።” አለና ተናገረ።” (ጦቢያ፣ገጽ፣ 43) He said, ‘Now I and my child shall heartily worship our God ‘til our death; we know even if you kill us here, we die of our sin but not because God failed to save us’ (Ibid. p. 43). The young king as well played an important role in increasing the adventurous acts in the plot development.

The third reason to nominate *Tobbiya*'s mythos as romantic is its lack of humorous dialogues and incidents [though the narrator's comment in page 42 and 43 are the slightest comic touch in the whole story, we shall see these in the following discussion] and therefore, so far we have detected the structure of *Tobbiya* as mythos of summer.

On the other hand, as notified earlier, *Tobbiya* has some elements of mythos of spring or comedy; the creation of new society at the end of the story is quiet comic in many of its angles; when we see the mythos of *Tobbiya* from the king's perspective, we come to notice that his interaction molds him to be comic hero, as a character who falls in love and tries to get his wish fulfilled and finally successes.

Thus, the king actually becomes an additional hero in the story. The marriage at the end is a marriage among heroes followed by the festivity both to the ceremony and the creation of a new society; hence this creation of new society in ideology marks the second element to show the comic injection in the mythos of *Tobbiya* while the Christian-family didn't move to achieve so. The indirect success of the Christian-family their finding Wahid and the merchant who did them

favor. The marriage thus, is a surprise to the family and everyone else; and its success to the king with the instant recognition/enlightenment of the new order of belief.

The third element is the twist that brought the story to its end; the twist is the king's amazing decision to convert his religion which leads to the marriage and creation of the new society. Thus, this element makes the mythos comic. To sum up, the mythos of *Tobbiya* manifests the blend of both mythoi of summer and spring, almost half each in share, or we can say the mythos of spring is foregrounded, and this oppositely reverberates with the mythos of the *Kebra Nagast*, which is largely mythos of summer but also includes the mythos of spring as well.

Now let's proceed to Frye's three phases of romantic plot to analyze the structure of *Tobbiya*; generally the Agon/conflicts are shaped into triangle in the whole story line; the first that starts right in the initial stage is that a family is at trouble for their father is captured and enslaved as war booty. Thus, the family toiled to retain their father and his dignity. The second is the lost of the son while he tried to get the merchant who did them great favor in returning their father back home. And the third is the capture of the father and his daughter by the "infidels"/Muslim army.

The second phase of romantic mythos, of *Tobbiya*, is the Pathos/death-struggle; the death struggle is commonly critical in the triangular conflict of the plot. The family has hosted hard situations in their too-near-to-death adventures. The father's death was reported in the first conflict; Wahid almost died for thirsty in the second conflict; the father and daughter saved from the blood-thirsty troops of the "infidels" incidentally for the king was among the soldiers who captured them. Thus, the death-struggle is so natural and romantic. The third phase is Anagnorisis/discovery or the recognition of the hero. The three family members are asserted heroes finally in the plot for their survival of the hardships, with the most surprising double-win episode of marrying the king.

When we proceed to the third focus novel, *Dertogada*, we find almost identical structure of mythos with the *Kebra Nagast*. The highly fantasized wish-fulfillment is reflected all through the story line; based on Frye's theory, the characters in *Dertogada* are endowed with romantic heroism.

As noted earlier in this section, almost all the characters are scientists, engineers, intelligence agents, and intellectual monks. Their identity is not simply like we know or hear of in the actual

life, but are heightened with supra-power of mind and dexterity. The pseudo-detective stories in the plot surely brought complexity into the mythos and up graded the heroic characteristics of the characters.

For example, the major characters whom the plot gathered on pretty many time are Engineer Shagiz and Dr. Mirage; the engineer is fictionalized though he is actual personality—an Ethio-American scientist who used to work in the National aeronautics and space administration (NASA); he is novelized to be member of the *Dertogada* group beginning from his childhood, and grew into the status of being “a-number-one-scientist” whom the great nations of the world work day and night to kidnap him.

The heroic character doesn't only emerge as hero at the critical moment of the adventure but his growth to be so is portrayed as destiny in the story. The other hero, Mirage also grows into hero starting from his childhood; the author did this in order to create a circular flow in the narrative. Thus, the heroes are not presented as phenomena, like the quester-hero who kills a dragon in never-never-land by which most romance are traditionally identified, but showed their growth into it, and this adds the life-like feature of the heroes though later on they are fantasized into dream-like stature in the rest of the story line; the author, as politically oriented individual, has also the plan to sanctify the engineer and the community of monks mentioned.

Generally, the characters are exaggeratedly heroes of the modern ethos with fantasized moves and interactions. Their adventures are also extra-heroic, more sensible for Ethiopian readers, who might be deluded by the sense of belongingness otherwise the heroes appear sterilized mythical heroes. Thus, the adventures are presented not as such seemingly performed by the characters, but by the Rambo-like author, or as “God-sponsored” the abduction of *Zion* and their miraculous escape of the firstborn children of Israel in the *Kebra Nagast*;

here the sponsorship of the author is vividly and thus, ludicrously presented. In the plot architecture of *Dertogada*, the only comic element is the strange twists happen in so many action scenes of the story; the comical twists are even less justifiable in any standard of serious literary pieces.

For example, the omniscient narrator shows the most shocking happening of the destruction of the “most modern underground scientific laboratory in the world”, named after the title of the

book; the story line inclined into an utter tragedy, but out of blue one character tells the others about another sophisticated laboratory called “*Dertogada II*”; here is how it’s presented:

እኔ ደግሞ አንድ የምስራች ልንግራችሁ” አለ ጌራ ሁሉንም በፈካ ፊት አየቃኘ። “ከወደቀብን የሀዘን ጥላ ጀርባ ሌላ ብርሃን እንዳለ ልንግራችሁ ተዘጋጅቻለሁ። ከኢትዮጵያ ተራራዎች በአንዱ ውስጥ ቁጥር ሁለት ዴርቶጋዳ አለ። ቁጥር ሁለት ዴርቶጋዳ አየጠበቀን ነው። በዚያም በአሳት ከወደመብን ከቁጥር አንዱ ዴርቶጋዳ ውስጥ ይሰሩ ከነበሩ ሳይንቲስቶች በቁጥር የሚልቁ ሳይንቲስቶች ሥራቸውን እየሰሩ ነው። ወደዚያው በዴር 33 እንሄዳለን።”

“አትቀልድ!” ማራችሁ ሀዘኑ አንድ ልብስ ወልቆ ሲወድቅ ተሰማው። ተስፋው መልሶ ሲያቆጠቁጥ ታወቀው።

“ወደ ቁጥር ሁለት ዴርቶጋዳ ምናልባትም በዚህ ምሽት ስትገቡ የምታረጋግጡት ስለሆነ ያኔ ታምካኛላችሁ። ምናልባት ዛሬ ማታ። (ዴርቶጋዳ፣ገጽ፣ 270)

‘And let me tell you a good news, on my part,’ says Gera gazing them with bright face. ‘I am ready to tell you about the luminous fact that will chide our sorrow. There is Dertogada II in one of the mountains in Ethiopia. It is waiting for us. Many scientists, exceeding the number that was in the first station, are working in it. We will be heading there with Der-33 [an extraordinary multi-function aircraft made in Ethiopia by the Dertogada scientists].

‘Are you kidding? asks Mirage feeling his sorrow deserting him and feeling his hope flowering in him. ‘You will find out soon’. . . (Dertogada, p. 270)

Thus, the pervasive twists are the only features of comic mythos in *Dertogada*; the absence of creation of new society and the recognition of the heroes intensify the romantic attributes of the mythos. So, apart the hyperbole reflected in most of the heroes’ characterization and their unpersuasive but endearing adventure, their portrait is romantic which idealizes the wish-fulfillment characteristic of romantic mythos.

Now let’s consider Frye’s three phase of mythos of summer, the Agon/conflict, the Pathos/death-struggle, and the Anagnorisis/discovery or the recognition of the hero to analyze the mythos of *Dertogada*. Like the *Kebrā Nagast*, the Agon/conflict in this mythos resides on the abduction of a character that is called Engineer Shagiz, a chief scientist in the NASA, together with other international conflict, with an Italian gangster called Don Mormordino Buski and his right hand Diwolla, over a treasure with which the *Dertogada* heroes planed to transform Ethiopia. Hence, the conflict is two-pronged and international as the situation is so in both the *Kebrā Nagast* and *Tobbiya*, but its intensity and complexity is broader than the other contrast, as matter of fact it’s a modern fiction with modern dream to the country.

The second phase of mythos of summer in Frye's theory is the Pathos/death-struggle; most of the characters are Ethiopians who emigrate abroad and become elites and prominent figures; and they are in one way or another connected to the mission in Ethiopia, in the underground of the monastery. Chasing is the main feature of the pathos stage of *Dertogada*. The scientist-hunting and treasure-hunting made by the heroes produced many enemies across the globe giving the picture of Global war or reasonably Tom and Jerry's interesting warfare. As we have seen earlier, chasing characterized the other novels (like the chasing of the first born children of Israel including the son of the Queen, and the one done on the father and daughter in *Tobbiya*) but, this one is too sophisticated to the extent of lifting the heroes to the status of supra-heroes or mythical-heroes-minus-characters. The heroes' use of pseudo-science and technology and pseudo-reason to process their mission is so full of action and conspiracy that even tires the reader, especially at the end part.

Northrop Frye previously explained such tenacious and cyclical conflicts/adventures developed by some credulous authors: "The essential element of plot in romance is adventure, which means that romance is naturally a sequential and processional form, hence we know it better from fiction than from drama. At its most naive it is an endless form in which a central character who never develops or ages goes through one adventure after another until the author himself collapses" (1957, p. 186). Thus, the pathos or death-struggle is anchored in the abduction of people and treasure hunting in an international level as the *Kebra Nagast* and *Tobbiya* do.

The third phase of romantic mythos is the Anagnorisis or discovery or the recognition of the hero; the heroes of *Dertogada* finally more or less achieved and the utopian hope is surely pinpointed to be fulfilled shortly. This situation verifies the heroes—scientists and monks—are indeed heroes for they achieve the utopian aims, readers mustn't wait to know the actual recognition of the heroes; they are all known from the first begging; for example, the ideal lovers, Mirage and Sipara, were brought into the story line starting from their childhood, generally resembling the story of Bayna Lehkem in the *Kebra Nagast*, to some respect to the twins and the young king characters in *Tobbiya*. Hence, the heroes in *Dertogada* have been discovered as heroes all most in the entirety of the mythos.

4.8. The Cyclical Sequence in Romantic Character's Life

Frye has discussed the cyclical nature of things like moving from innocence to experience and back to the first, or from birth to death and vice versa. In his theory of mythos, he asserted that the four mythoi are part of the higher container, myth or literature. The unity is not just the result of the appearance of a higher container but, they are structurally entwined to each other. Frye elaborated the insight:

The four mythoi that we are dealing with, comedy, romance, tragedy, and irony, may now be seen as four aspects of a central unifying myth. Agon or conflict is the basis or archetypal theme of romance, the radical of romance being a sequence of marvelous adventures. Pathos or catastrophe, whether in triumph or in defeat, is the archetypal theme of tragedy. Sparagmos, or the sense that heroism and effective action are absent, disorganized or foredoomed to defeat, and that confusion and anarchy reign over the world, is the archetypal theme of irony and satire. Anagnorisis, or recognition of a newborn society rising in triumph around a still somewhat mysterious hero and his bride, is the archetypal theme of comedy. (Ibid. p. 192)

Frye listed six phases in the character of romantic hero; we shall construct our analytic focus onto the romantic hero for the mythoi of the focus novels in this research project are more or less romantic. Thus, with provision of brief Frye's theorization of the phases, their application into the novels will follow.

Phase 1: Frye associates the initial phase with the birth of the hero; oftentimes some kind of miraculous or amazing episode is attached to it. Frye exemplifies Moses and Beowulf. "Often, too, there is a search for the child, who has to be hidden away in a secret place.

The hero, being of mysterious origin, his true paternity is often concealed, and a false father appears who seeks the child's death" (Ibid. p. 199).

Phase 2: In the second phase the world of innocence depicts the hero in his youth surrounded by paradise like environment. This world is later to be compared with the world of experience which is harsh but suitable to the adventurous life of the hero. "In literature this phase presents a pastoral and Arcadian world, generally a pleasant wooded landscape, full of glades, shaded valleys, murmuring brooks, the moon, and other images closely linked with the female or maternal aspect of sexual imagery" (Ibid. p. 200). "Hence, though in later phases it is often

recalled as a lost happy time or Golden Age, the sense of being close to a moral taboo is very frequent, as it is of course in the Eden story itself” (Ibid. p. 200).

Phase 3: The third phase is simply the entrance of the hero into his adventurous life.

Phase 4: Frye explains the phase, “The fourth phase corresponds to the fourth phase of comedy, in which the happier society is more or less visible throughout the action instead of emerging only in the last few moments. In romance the central theme of this phase is that of the maintaining of the integrity of the innocent world against the assault of experience. It thus often takes the form of a moral allegory” (Ibid. p. 200-01).

Phase 5: This phase takes back the hero into his second phase of innocence with less action. The hero morally feels elevated in this phase and thus, the situation gets more contemplative. “Such an arrangement of characters is consistent with the detached and contemplative view of society taken in this phase” (Ibid. p. 202).

Phase 6: This phase takes the story into a deep contemplative view as Frye calls it “contemplative adventure”.

On a more popular and social level it takes in what might be called cuddle fiction: the romance that is physically associated with comfortable beds or chairs around fireplaces or warm and cosy spots generally. A characteristic feature of this phase is the tale in quotation marks, where we have an opening setting -with a small group of congenial people, and then the real story told by one of the members. (Ibid. p. 202)

Now having the conceptions of the phases of the hero in romantic mythos, let’s enter into the analysis of the three target materials.

🕒 **Phase One**

Though the queen is a hero, her birth isn’t narrated in the *Kebra Nagast*, but in many oral traditions, and its consideration takes us out of the scope. Thus, the son shall be considered. The birth of Bayna Lehkem marks a crucial moment in the story because the “Semitic blood” is injected into the veins of Hamites together with divine legitimacy; not only this, but the typical incidents of his gravidity, the narrative of Solomon’s shrewd plan and the birth of the child right at the arrival of the Queen in her kingdom exhibits the romantic nature of the hero. The heroic

nature of the two prominent heroes, Wahid and *Tobbiya*, is exposed in their interesting status of being identical twins that no one identifies them for sure. Their opposite sex is also an addition to their unique identification as romantic characters. In *Derogada*, as we can't consider all the cluster of heroes in the story, the two main-main characters are taken into account: Sipara and Mirage. Their birth is similarly striking for they are taken into the monastery reportedly they were separately forsaken, though the story got other facets later on. Thus, their advent in the story is quiet amazing or attributes heroic.

Ⓢ *Phase Two*

Bayna Lehkem reached the age of 12 and asked his mother three times about his father; the first notice he got about his father is while he was playing with his friends and classmates. Thus, at the time of 22, he was raised as a hero for he mastered every skill a young man can master, and then raised his demand to visit his father. In *Tobbiya*, though the slim book doesn't provide detailed information about the bearing or world of innocence of the heroes, the summery is found as they get ready for the adventures. It's reported that they can't get with the bad situation for they were raised in comfortable abode and condition for they are children of decent/noble man. The world of innocence of Sipara and Mirage is a typical example of phase two of the romantic hero; their world is paradise like place, in one of the islands of Tana Lake. Their friendship is so ideal and romantic in an ideal place, group of island monastery. The portrait even gets astonishing and innocent as the monks parted them because of the separating rule based on sex though their secretive contact booms their world of innocence, and finally became the cause for their entrance into the bitter adventures.

Ⓢ *Phase Three*

The adventurous part simply comprises the actions of the hero. Bayna Lehkem thus, set for his adventure to see his father, got his kingship, *Zion*, the source of Devin power, and safely returned home, leaving his father and his kingdom to misery. The adventurous life of the two twine appeared to be weaker for the traditional bombastic presentation of romantic heroes while setting for adventure. In *Tobbiya's*, the heroes are forced into the adventurous situation. Whatsoever the case they finally accomplished the adventures successfully. After the sudden end of the innocent life, the two heroes entered into the world of adventure and accomplished it for several years; whereas in *Derogada*, the entrance of the heroes into this phase is similar to *Tobbiya's* structure.

When they forcefully left their innocent world, they even had many difficulties in coping up the new situation. Thus, their heroic character is slowly developed 'till Mirage met a friend named Zangida, who influenced him a great deal, and Sipara taken to Israel and nominated for Mossad and grew into titanic heroes.

© *Phase Four*

The festive mood created at the end of Bayna Lehkem's accomplishment of his adventurous quest is so immense and typical in romantic mythos. The celebration and the society's gratification were so clamorous to the extent of the inclusion of beasts; chapter 84 goes. "And the King of Ethiopia returned to his country with great joy and gladness; and marching along with their songs, and their pipes, and their wagons, like an army of heavenly beings, the Ethiopians arrived from Jerusalem at the city of Wakerom in a single day" (*Kebra Nagast*, 2001, p. 145). The Queen's reaction, allegorizing the biblical David's reaction, is even far reposing and innocent, "And David the King came with great pomp unto his mother's city, and then he saw in the height the heavenly *Zion* sending forth light like the sun. And when the Queen saw this she gave thanks unto the God of Israel, and praised Him. And she bowed low, and smote her breast, and then threw up her head and gazed into the heavens, and thanked her Creator; and she clapped her hands together, and sent forth shouts of laughter from her mouth, and danced on the ground with her feet" (Ibid. p. 145-46).

Thus, as Frye theorizes, the plot comes into the relapse of the world of innocence as transitional phase to the deeper level of the world of innocence with the fuller emergence of the picture of the society in the story entering into the world of innocence through the actions taken to commemorate the hero's kingship and the counseling of and discussions made by the Queen and the firstborn of Israelities who accompanied the hero, and thus, the hero and the society are reposed from their adventures.

The forth phase in *Tobbiya* is marked in the story line when the king of the "infidels" consented to marry *Tobbiya* and brought the end of the adventure of the heroes. The ceremony that follows is the corridor that takes into the world of innocence. The actuality of the marriage (which is highly comic but common in romantic mythos as well as Frye theorizes) starts immediately at the spot where the adventure ends to the extent of forgetting the mother at all in the post-adventure narrative. The stage/ceremony is presented in detail, displaying the grace of the bride

and groom and their wedding place. The interaction or feeling of the society is blurred and unjustifiable. The author appears, as untrained storyteller, too hasty to see what he wants to happen to *Tobbiya* and *Wahid*, and ineptly ignored what the plot structure would possibly ushered him to. But the society is assumed to be entering into a totality of definable entity.

In *Dertogada*, this stage is quite magnified as the end of the adventure is an entrance into clarification of so many secrets, code-breakings and treasure hunting. So, as the story line approached to this stage the fuller picture of the happy society achieved its complete portrait, but the pictures have been slightly appearing throughout the narrative, best fitting Frye's theory though with slight openness and naivety of the portrait and predictable moral attitude of the author. Thus, after a lot of ups and downs and destructions and causalities of the heroes, a happy society relapsed to the relatively world of innocence.

© *Phase Five*

Frye's fifth stage of his theory falls short in considering the hero in the mythos of the *Kebra Nagast*; the main hero immediately entered into another adventure to energize his kingdom via the Solomonic blood, as ideal of supremacy divine prestige, and using *Zion* as a weapon to sincerely defeat the enemy. Hence, the adventure of *Bayna Lehkem* receded into the initial one as the achievements are means to other adventures for the hero equipped himself with the two most imminent powers in the whole world: the ideological principle of being member of the chosen people of God and holding the most powerful multipurpose "machine", *Zion*.

Thus, the relatively peaceful mood theorized to be created in the last phase, the post-adventure stage of the mythos of summer, fails to grow into deeper contemplative mood of the world of innocence. This shows us that the continuity of adventure often develops after the fourth stage as Frye pinpointed what the plot might appear if the adventure is ceaseless. But on the other hand, the next adventure starts after three months of integrity of the world of innocence and experience in the fourth phase. Thus, the hero and the society had the time and chance to enter into deep contemplative mood though it isn't narrated in the story. Even the conclusive remark why the book itself is written for in chapter 95 is not more of contemplative mood in the deep narrative of the *Kebra Nagast*. To sum up, it's more sensible to conclude the hero and society didn't proceed entering into the contemplative situation of the previous adventure or what Frye note as back into the second phase of the life of the hero.

The heroes in *Tobbiya* typically penetrate into this stage through an appealing continuation of the previous stage of entering into the integrity of the two worlds of innocence and experience and emergence of the happy society. In this stage the conclusive insights of the last pages of the narrative denotes the hero's summative dialogues of what actually happened in phase three. In the last part of the mythos of *Tobbiya*, the heroes entered into contemplative situation with low action as some expressions begun spouting: immediately after the king saw his new religion accepted, he declared, “ክርስቲያን ይግዛ እንጂ አይገዛ፣ ብሎ ደነገገ።” (ጠቢያ፡ገጽ፡ 74) ‘Let Christian rule, but not ruled’ (Tobbiya, p. 74). And the narrator comments (which is surely the contemplation of every one in the society), “ባንድ ነጋዴ ሰበብ ሁሉ ዳነ። ባንድ ሴት ምክንያት ሁሉ አመነ። ባንድ ንጉሥ ቃል አትዮጵያ ቆመ።” (ጠቢያ፡ገጽ፡ 74) ‘Because of one merchant, all saved; because of one lady, all believed; with one king’s word Ethiopia stood’ (Ibid. p. 74). And the king explains the meaning of the hero's, Wahid's name, “ዋሕድ ማለት አረመኔና አማራ አንድ ነሆ ማለት ነው. . .” (ጠቢያ፡ገጽ፡ 75) ‘Wahid means ‘infidels’ and Amharas get united’ (Ibid. p. 75). And the odd poems that finalize the narrative are full of such contemplative situations. Therefore, the heroes of the mythos of *Tobbiya* have entered into this phase of integration of innocence and experience.

In *Dertogada* the back-to-phase-two stage is fittingly situated in the plotline. As we were considering, the two main-main heroes, Sipara and Mirage, reunited where they departed several years ago and returned to their former status as they were looking for in their long period of separation.

The two characters have been abroad, Sipara in Israel working for the Mossad, and Mirage in USA working as medical doctor. The two lovers get back to where they raised together, but on their meeting they were amidst the adventures’ heated point. Thus, when the adventures terminated with the death of the protagonist Dewola, the story vividly emerged as the recurrent episode did in the fifth stage. Here are the heroes in phase two and phase five: In the second phase:

ሲጶራ በድቅድቁ ጨለማ ውስጥ አለቱ ላይ ቁጭ ብላ ማራኸፍን ስትጠብቅ መንፈቀ ሌሊት አለፈ። አለስቸል አላት። ልብሷን አወላልቃ ወደ ጣና ተወረወረች። ወደ ወንዶች ደሴት መሞኘት ጀመረች። እየመጣም ከሆነ እዛው ሃይቁ ውስጥ አገኘዋለሁ። ሊያጋጥማት የሚችለው ዓዛና ጉማሬ አለሰጩኑታትም። በሀፃንነቷ ስትሞኝ አትደከምም ነበር። አሁን ግን በፍርሃት የሚርድ ሰውነቷ አልንሳፈፍ አላት።

የሚሞኝ ሰው እየቀረባት መጣ። “ሲጶራ!” አላት የለሆሳስ ድምፅ። የምታውቀው ድምጽ። ራሷን ብቅ አድርጋ “ወይ” አለችው።

“ምነው?” አላት በድንጋጤ።

“ቆየህብኛ።”

“እኚ ተመለሽ ወደመጣሽበት ዋኚ”

“ደከሞኛል። አልቻልኩም።”

“አይዘሽ።”

“አይቃተኝ ነው ማራኝ” አይቃተኝ ነው ስትል ይበልጥ አቃታት። ተጠግቶ ደገፍ አደረጋት። ሰውነቷ ይፋጃል። ሰውነቱን ነዘረው። ትንፋሷ ለመጠጠው።

“አይዘሽ እየደረሰኝ ነው።” የልብ ምቹ ሲፈጥንበት ታወቀው። ውሃው ውስጥ ሆኖም አቃጠለችው። እሷንም አይቃጠላት ነው። ከሐይቁ ዳር ሲደርሱ አለቱ ላይ የጣለችውን ልብሷን ለበሰች። (ዴርቶጋዳ፣ገጽ፣ 41)

Sipara keeps on waiting Mirage in the dark, sitting on a rock, ‘til it gets midnight. She can’t hold on, and she jumped onto the lake, swimming to the monastery of male monks, thinking that she will meet him if he is swimming across opposite. She cared not about the crocodile or hippo that she might encounter on the way. She used to swim long way when she was a child, but now she can’t make it for her body is entangled with fear.

Someone came towards her swimming; and called her, ‘Sipara!’, with a stifled voice. She knows the voice. ‘Yeah’, she said.

‘What is wrong?’, he asked with terror.

‘You stayed long.’

‘Okey, now swim back.’

‘I am tired, I can’t do it.’

‘Come on.’

‘I can’t do it, Mirage.’ she gets more powerless as she pronounced it. He approached and held her.

Her body is too hot. He feels the warmth, and her breath.

‘We are getting along.’ he felt his heartbeat getting faster. She even burnt him with her body’s warmth in the water. She also felt his too. When they reached the bank, she put on her cloth.(Dertogada, p. 41)

In the fifth phase:

ማራኝ ተንገዳግዶ ሳጥኗን እንደያዘ ከሚፈሰው ውሃ በተቃራኒ ሸቅብ እየዋኘ ወደ ሲጅራ ገሠገሠ። እሱም እየዋኘ ወደ ማራኝ ፈጠነች። በውሃው የተኛው ፀጉሯን ከፈቷ ላይ ገልጦ በብዝ ቅዝብ ብሎ ተመለከታት። ፊቱ በደም እንደቀላ። እስከም ፍብዝ ብላ ተመለከተችው። ከከንፈሮቿ እንደድሮው ናቸው። የጎመራ የሮማን ፍሬ እንደመሰሉ ናቸው። ጎረሳቸው። (ዴርቶጋዳ፣ገጽ፣ 267)

Mirage, holding the box, swims opposite of the flow of the water towards Sipara; and she also swims hastily towards him and hold together. He looks at her with passionate eyes, pushing her hair from her face, gazing her with his bruised red face. She gazes back at

him. Her lips are as they used to be. They still look like palatable berries. He devoured them. (Ibid. p. 267)

Thus, the heroes get back to their paradise-like situation they use to have experienced several years earlier; but the contemplative situation is not widely presented in their interaction for the situation is so crowded with intense actions.

⊙ *Phase Six*

This stage is what Frye calls the stage of “contemplative adventure”; in the mythos of the *Kebra Nagast*, this contemplative situation is found not only at the end of the main narrative of the Queen and her son, but also at the very beginning of the narration, for the story is narrated in a flashback by Gregory. Thus, apart from the end contemplative adventure, the starting is situated in chapter 2, mainly, and echoed in chapters 11, 18 and 29, as the 318 church fathers witnessed the story narrated by Gregory. Thus, the whole story or book is stylistically contained in the attributes of this phase. Here is a quote from the ending part showing this phase:

Now through the Kebra Nagast we know and have learned that of a surety the King of Ethiopia is honorable, and that he is the King of Zion, and the firstborn of the seed of Shem, and that the habitation of God is in Zion, and that He there breaketh the might and power of all his enemies and foes. And after him the king of Rom was the anointed of the Lord because of the wood of the Cross. And concerning the kingdom of Israel. . . (Kebra Nagast, p. 166).

Similar contemplative adventure is noticed in *Tobbiya*’s mythos; the last odd poems uttered by the new couples, the King and the Queen, are manifestations of this stage. Here are two poems by each:

ዝናም እንዳጣ እህል፣
በበልግ የበቀለ፣
ባንቺው አፈጣጠር፣
ፍጥረት ነሆለለ። (ጦቢያ፣ገጽ፣ 76)

*O my love is like desert flower
That grows amidst parched lands;
And exceeds
All the other. (Tobbiya, p. 76)*

Here is the second poem uttered by *Tobbiya*, as Dr. Yonas Admassu (1995) translated:

አልፎ አላፍ አማራ ያስሸሸ የነበረ፤
 ራስ ደጃዝማቹን ይወር የነበረ፤
 ባለ ትልቁን ዘውድ ይሸር የነበረ፤
 አንኳን ጦርና ሰይፍ ምድፍ አይፈር የነበረ፤
 ወሬው ገና በሩቅ ያስረብድ የነበረ፤
 ጅቦና ሰንሰለት አይገታው የነበር፤
 እጅግ አስገረመ በማተብ ሲታሰር፡፡ (ጦቢያ፣ገጽ፣ 77)

*Millions of Amhara hosts dispersed before him;
 Rases and Dejazmatches were reduced by him:
 He disposed many powerful kings:
 No weapons of war overpowered him:
 People trembled at the news of his approach.
 He crushed oxen into pieces.
 No chain was strong enough to harness him.
 He was literally a lion, an uncontrollable lion
 But now he is tame, tied down by a Mateb. (p. 177)*

In *Dertogada*, such contemplative adventure is weakly presented as the action is extended into a dream yet to actualize. But the heroes’ hope or vision to transform Ethiopia with the treasure and scientists can be taken as such though its not concrete contemplative adventure.

4.9. Dianoia/Thematic Parallelism and the Idea of Nation

Whenever we make contact with fictional or literary piece, two things appear into our experience: the first is the story of the work, and the second is its implication or message that it imparts. This shows any work of fiction is two pronged in functioning as fictional production and as thematic or what Aristotle called “dianoia”. Frye (1957) explains the word, “We have cited Homer as the very type of impersonal fiction writer, but the main emphasis of Homeric criticism, down to about 1750 at least, has been overwhelmingly thematic, concerned with the dianoia or ideal of leadership implicit in the two epics” (p. 53).

He also argues humanity has a specific orientation towards the temporally good or desirable in their interaction; and this leads into a situation of fixing ideologies to guide his movement. He exemplifies, “For most poets of the Christian era who have used both the Bible and Classical literature, the latter has not stood on the same plane of authority as the former, although they are equally mythological as far as literary criticism is concerned” (Ibid. p. 54). Despite the theory of “death of the author”, the elements of fiction are, in the later stage of the rule of words, the

projections and digestions of the author and are through who the material is restructured and readjusted at least in content.

In short the elements are directly and indirectly interwove with each other and with the author's facilitation of the concerns of the work, taking the indispensability of pluri-signification of the signs into account; hence, the characters and the theme of the story quite belong to the author's own selection and stylization of narrative to finally delineate his messages and ideals, together with the situations that drive him to forge his literary work in a certain possible fashion. And for these reasons, and for the focus novels typify such thesis, the following analysis of the thematic insight of the target novels of this research project shall be rendered, correlating with the above analysis of mythos and character. So, the structural recurrent themes of the novels, which are utterly socio-political, will be displaying henceforward as an attempt of answering the question, "What are the novels all about?" and "What the role of theme in shaping the mythos?" Here are some selected ideals communicated in the three novels:

1. Nation

The ideal of nation (nation-building and nation-image building) is a recurrent motif in the focus literary materials; the three novels are primarily not interested in telling story about men and women rather try to define the Ethiopian nationhood. The *Kebra Nagast* obviously takes the lion's share in underlying the basic principles of the Ethiopian nationality, together with the clarification of the hazy and intruding episodes of her remote past. According to the *Kebra Nagast* the proposed pillar principles of the Ethiopian nationhood are the following: Solomonic monarchism and Orthodox faith.

In *Tobbiya*, the thematic principles are similar with the addition of the principle of ethnic dominance policy of Amharization, which is unspecified earlier in the *Kebra Nagast*; the nation is believed to use the current name starting from the 5th C AD, with the translation of the Bible into Ge'ez, and the 13th C reduction of the *Kebra Nagast* employs the name Ethiopia while its not used latter in *Tobbiya* for the ethnic policy mentioned. In *Dertogada*, the thematic principles are Orthodox faith, indigenous knowledge, science, and concealed Amharization. Thus, the concept of nation is structurally schematized in similar way of political point of view, with inevitably some developments, taking the *Kebra Nagast* as starting point of the issue at hand.

2. Self-Gratification

This theme is highly welded with the previous theme; the nation is romantically presented in ideally great, except in *Tobbiya* which directly related with the image building of the first theme cited above. The nation's greatness is discussed in an ideal manner fundamentally determining the romantic mythos of the novels; in the *Kebra Nagast* the gratification emanates from a divine favor, and thus, the nation is empowered with divine guidance and protection through *Zion*, where as in *Dertogada* it depends on the natural and human wealth the country possesses; and in *Tobbiya* the theme of gratification is displayed in the assimilation; the country actually experienced so many failures in her history though her survival was attained the sooner and even the enemies were blended into the Ethiopian ethos, like the king of the Muslims, in *Tobbiya*, adopted the main stream culture—thus “He Come, He Conquer; He See, He Conquered”. Hence, though the self-confidence to aggrandize the national image witnessed in the *Kebra Nagast* and *Dertogada* is not boldly available in *Tobbiya*, the three works toiled to gratify the country with the picture of unfaltering.

3. Faith

As pinpointed earlier, Orthodox Christianity is made as prominent element of subject matter due to its deep rootedness and pervasiveness in the socio-political spheres or mentality of the nation, both as defining theme and cultural hegemony. The theme of religion is strongly confirmed in all of the novels, with special reference to *Tobbiya*; thus, the novels structurally portrayed the nation as Orthodox Christian, and propose the need to secure it.

4. International relation

As we have seen, the romantic interactions of the novels are internationally located; the conflict or adventures of the heroes of the materials are scoped beyond the territory(s) of the land. This thematical affirmation corresponds with the second theme because the greatness of the forces representing Ethiopia and the failure of the opposing ones in the adventure idealizes the might of the nation under her ruling and people. In the *Kebra Nagast* and *Dertogada*, the international interaction is so exaggeratingly heightened, bringing the attributes of uniqueness with no equal in the entire world. This striking contrast of the *Kebra Nagast* and *Dertogada*, Ethiopia at war with the great nations of the earth, structurally and thematically exhibits the similarity of agenda that is romantically defining the stature of the nation in the world. The international interaction in

Tobbiya's adventurous quest also denotes Ethiopia's political treat is more of international than internal.

5. Journey

The theme of greatness brought forth adventurous plots in the novels, signifying diligence of the heroes and society in the story. The various journeys in the story are themes of life and its cyclical nature. As we have seen in the phases of characters in romantic heroism, the journey that the characters make is in order to accomplish their wishes, thus, it shows the situation of the world of experience and its demands to achieve desires and dreams. Generally, the novels communicated the ideal of journey with its consequence of attainment of something creditable. Thus, the theme of journey resembles the go-and-get-it advice.

6. Feminist motif

This theme is almost equally distributed in the novels; they all contained strong female characters signifying the power of women and their valuable contributions in the life of the society. As it's known, the female character in the *Kebra Nagast* is the Queen; she revealed a sturdy sense of potency for she desperately wished the wisdom of Solomon gifted from God; this portrait displayed the immense desire she manifested, even more than Solomon himself; thus, the theme shows the greatness of female. This theme is also pervasive in *Tobbiya* and *Dertogada*, considering the strength of Tobbiya, Sipara and Meroda is enough to observe the females' extraordinary and comprehensive power.

7. National feeling

This theme is strongly observed in most of the characters of the *Kebra Nagast* and *Dertogada*; the gratified national feeling showed by Tamrin, the chief merchant, when Joas, the general of Solomon's army, remarks about the betterment of the kingdom of Israel over Ethiopia, in the *Kebra Nagast*, is so fascinating and adorable; "Our country is better. The air (i.e., climate) of our country is good, for it is without burning heat and fire, and the water of our country is good, and sweet, and floweth in rivers, moreover the tops of mountains run with water. . ." (*Kebra Nagast*, p. 44). Bayna Lehkem's rejection of his father's request to be anointed as King of Israel also shows his national feeling, and this can be an example to many youth in Ethiopia. In *Dertogada* this feeling is so pervasive and strong, with slight coverage in *Tobbiya*.

8. Binary opposition

The romantic mythoi of the novels are suitable for such categorization of detecting reality and system of conceptions that make couplings of ideas or things. In the *Kebrā Nagast*, the We (Ethiopians) Vs They (Jews) binary opposition is noticed, while Muslims Vs Christian is the theme all over the story *Tobbiya*; and in *Dertogada* the opposition is multiple: Jews Vs Ethiopians, Intelligence agents Vs the *Dertogada* agents, and International mafias Vs the *Dertogada* members. Thus, the binary opposition helps in defining and securing the themes we list so far.

4. 10. Theory of Archetypal Imagery /Symbolism

Frye states the structure or organization of literature is primarily on what he called the undisplaced world of good and evil; this archetypal image is what religions represent as heaven and hell. Taking the popular tradition of literature of the West into account and its Biblical influence on its stylization, we come to distinguish the basic distinction of metaphysics—good and evil—are directly and archetypally coined by or symbolized with the narratives of the Bible. Thus, Frye theorizes the archetypal imageries in literature as follows:

We have, then, three organizations of myths and archetypal symbols in literature. First, there is undisplaced myth, generally concerned with gods or demons, and which takes the form of two contrasting worlds of total metaphorical identification, one desirable and the other undesirable. These worlds are often identified with the existential heavens and hells of the religions contemporary with such literature. These two forms of metaphorical organization we call the apocalyptic and the demonic respectively. Second, we have the general tendency we have called romantic, the tendency to suggest implicit mythical patterns in a world more closely associated with human experience. Third, we have the tendency of "realism" (my distaste for this inept term is reflected in the quotation marks) to throw the emphasis on content and representation rather than on the shape of the story. Ironic literature begins with realism and tends toward myth, its mythical patterns being as a rule more suggestive of the demonic than of the apocalyptic, though sometimes it simply continues the romantic tradition of stylization. (1957, p. 139-40)

4.10.1. Apocalyptic Imagery

The apocalyptic imagery comprises the anthropomorphic pictures of comfortable images of life represented, continually from the biblical references, vegetable world of gardens, farms, grooves and forests; animal world, like domesticated animal of any type; and mineral world like various building materials, cities or any consumable materials. “Apocalyptic symbolism presents the infinitely desirable, in which the lusts and ambitions of man are identified with, adapted to, or projected on the gods” (Ibid. p. 157). “In the apocalyptic conception of human life we found three kinds of fulfillment: individual, sexual, and social” (Ibid. p. 148).

In the focus materials, the apocalyptic imagery is highly oriented by the biblical images and discourses as Frye attributes to the western literary tradition. The heroes of the novels are the chief holders of this image, specifically of religious morality, invincibility, commitment, and compassionate, more than concentrating on the vegetable, animal, and material world of the apocalyptic imagery. When we see the heroes’ representation of apocalyptic imagery, for instance, in the *Kebra Nagast*, the beauty of the Queen is ideally represented, and is the reason, together with her wisdom, for Solomon’s attraction with no planned attempt from the queen to seduce him. Similar incident is in *Tobbiya*; the king of the “infidels” fell in love with the Ethiopian damsel, a situation that results in immense scarification; let’s recall how the narrator puts it, “ባንድ ነጋዴ ለባብ ሁሉ ዳነ። ባንድ ሴት ምክንያት ሁሉ አመነ። ባንድ ንጉሥ ቃል አትጥጽያ ቆመ።” (ጦቢያ፡ገጽ፡ 74) “Because of one merchant, all saved; because of one lady, all believed; with one king’s word Ethiopia stood” (*Tobbiya*, p. 74).

Thus, beauty is presented as image of power and changing force in the world of good. Other example from the vegetable apocalyptic world is vividly observed in the *Kebra Nagast*, in chapter 35, Tamrin conveys the country of Ethiopia’s vegetable and animal life: “Even at noon day we hunt wild animals, namely, the wild buffaloes, and gazelles, and birds, and small animals. And in the winter God taketh heed unto us from one year to the beginning to the course of the next. And in the spring time the people eat what they have trodden with the foot as in the land of Egypt, as for our trees they produce good crops of fruit, and the wheat, and the barley, and all our fruits, and cattle are good and wonderful” (*Kebra Nagast*, p. 44). Similarly, it’s pervasively displayed in *Dertogada*’s presentation of the paradise-like abode of the monks in the group of islands; and the treasure said to be sunk in the Tana Lake also depicts the mineral world

of the apocalyptic world. Generally, the world of the heroes is illustrated as apocalyptic/heavenly in the romantic mythoi of the materials.

4.10.2. Demonic Imagery

In Frye's theory, the demonic image is represented as an entity which is evil or contradictory to human existence and desire. It's the opposite of the apocalyptic image we observed earlier, or it's associated with the religious hell or inferno. "In the sinister human world one individual pole is the tyrant-leader, inscrutable, ruthless, melancholy, and with an insatiable will, who commands loyalty only if he is ego centric enough to represent the collective ego of his followers. The other pole is represented by the pharmdkos or sacrificed victim, who has to be killed to strengthen the others. In the most concentrated form of the demonic parody, the two become the same" (p. 148).

In the target materials, the demonic world is, on the other hand, the world of the opponents of the heroes. In *Dertogada* there is this description of the ugly, stinky, and eyesore character called Dewola; this character is depicted through out the narrative as an idealized repulsive, physically, and evil, behaviorally. His status is made to be slavery (he serves the chief mafia of Sicily Don Mormordino, and he is referred with offensive terms).

At the same plane, in *Tobbiya*, we got a character who among the "infidels" caricatured in alien and devilish manner, "ከነገሥታቱ ቤት ልማድ ነውና አንድ ደንክ ተቆመቱ አፍንጫው ላቅ ያለ፣ ተመደፉ ጆሮው ሰፋ ያለ፣ ተግባሩ ይልቅ አገጩ ለእንቅፋት የተመገፈ፣ ከተረከቱ ቀድሞ ቂጡን አቃቅማ የሚወጋው፣ ተመቆመና ተመቀመጠ፣ መለዮው ያልታወቀ፣ አብሮ ንጉሡን ይከተል ነበር።" (ጠቢያ፣ገጽ፣43) "There was this dwarf (among the "infidels", following the king) whose nose is longer than his height; his ear broader than his palm; whose chin stumbles first before his action; his buttock gashed by torn before his foot; who is unnoticeable whether he seats or otherwise" (*Tobbiya*, p. 43). Such depiction of imageries belongs to the aspects of the undesired world, and their presentation helps to structure the world anthropomorphically and pairing in binaries of good and evil. The miserable life of Solomon after the abduction of Zion is also typical of this world. To sum up, as the novels are romantic in mythos, the representation of good or beautiful is attached to the heroes and their environment while the opposite is to the opponents or enemies.

4.11. The Therapeutic Function of Literature: A Philosophical Theory

Pinpointing what Aristotle speaks, in the *Poetics*, Frye discussed his theory of modes, “the differences in works of fiction which are caused by the different elevations of the characters in them. In some fictions, he says, the characters are better than we are, in others worse, in still others on the same level. This passage has not received much attention from modern critics, as the importance Aristotle assigns to goodness and badness seems to indicate a somewhat narrowly moralistic view of literature” (Ibid. p. 33).

Thus, apart from the moral-oriented view of the case why humanity is wasting his time creating such and such characters and such and such environments, moreover, let’s face this grand question, why we write, read, and criticize literature? Why ideally romantic mythos? Why idyllic heroes? Why fetish images and symbolisms? This section, accordingly as transvaluation, tries to present the underlying principle that manages humanity to engage in literature, especially literature of fictional mode and romantic mythos, as to suit the focus novels’ basic drives, intensions and motifs. Or simply attempts to answer the question “Why”.

According to ancient Greek philosophy the “Word” or “Logos”, signifying reason, is the governing principle of the universe. Accordingly, one of the most fascinating expressions of the Bible, I presume, should be John’s first paragraph in his Gospel; “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made” (Bible: King James Version, John 1: 1-18).

The contribution of the “Word”, even symbolically, as to mean later Christ—meaning something substantially the product of arbitrary rule on the creation of “reality”, something that we think we know it is there or here, is principal. As the Word becomes Literature, as it becomes flesh in other views. This arbitrary principle, thus, happened to be the organizing grammar of meaning, existence and reality. This only means the reality we know is of this word that later will come to be something under its arbitrary rule; humanity’s view is hence sensually linguistic. Plato too remarks that “art is a dream for awaken minds”.

As such the reason why humanity is engaged in this activity called literature is to inescapably use it as mode to understand the “cosmos” and “himself” where he thinks belong. The basic reason, therefore, is to take any move of his being on the stepping stones of language, in which so far

humanity is not bothered for or is incompetent in finding other possibility of stepping stones. Thus, the first way, the linguistic perspective of taking reality, is the destiny of humanity to be enslaved in. Now within this scope, let's enter into what Frye called theory of mythos and try to build the transvaluation of the specific reasons upon the birth and function of the three novels that this research project is analyzing.

So far, observing the target materials' multifaceted sameness in their underlying principles, and hand in hand with the previously stated political reasons for their production, the second specific reason is therapy, i.e., literature does therapeutic function in human conscience and endeavor. The three romantic fictions do similar role and are from the beginning proposed to do so, as it's applicable to other works holistically. According to this thesis, what humanity is trying to do is fundamentally alleviating or healing the agony of his failures and structuring a couple of dreams, whose absence is injurious, especially to the eagerly striver; and these dreams are identification with and becoming powerful entity in both human and godly manifestations.

Particularly concentrating on the target materials, and as pinpointed early in this chapter as well, the authors of the *Kebra Nagast* were in bad situations of existence of their standard for things are uncomfortable or chaotic in their manifestations while other comfortable manifestations are available or are possibly be forged on other mythical layers, for greater advantage. The itching "facts", the biblical identifications of the Ethiopians with the cursed son of Noah is the first, and the lack of supremacy are the injurers of the authors and their need of the therapeutic function of literature emanates right here. Thus, the discourse of becoming the seed of Solomon through any possible way is one way to emancipate themselves and their society from the slavery of Christianity itself, as it puts the Black race are the descendants of the cursed son, or symbolically the demonic imagery while the "possessors" of the biblical narrative are made the sons of the apocalyptic imagery. Therefore, the question of supremacy germinates at this point.

The *Kebra Nagast* hence toils to change this bitter portrait via developing romantic literature in which it enables the achievement of the Semitic Green card. So the first treatment applied, through the story of the Queen who was desperate to get wisdom, and cured those who need to be so, and finally occupy the highest power on earth through divine favoritism.

The other is the need to be the highest order in the imagined cosmos for simply human desire is unstoppable; the extent which the authors of the *Kebra Nagast* cover show so for the narrative of race go beyond the first therapy and power readjustment; thus, as the first illness is known to be cured, the second and higher therapy will be in order; when we critically observe the procedures of the authors, they will surely go even for the claim of the topmost “ultimate” power, that is God’s power or position itself can be bargained had the authors pushed on their arguments.

The claim of the authors’ connection with the symbol of *Zion* is manifestation of this desire; according the *Kebra Nagast*, the *Zion* is fashioned in such aim to be too close to God, presenting it as the first thing to be created before Adam (see chapter 1 of the *Kebra Nagast*) and its role as the House of the Glory of God. The claim to possess such thing is thus to be the guard of the House of Glory of God. The divine favoritism is at the expense of others like Solomon and the mighty nations of the earth. The authors’ tendency to achieve this desire is special in comparison to other lay people. This special desire of the authors of the *Kebra Nagast* is also manifested in its treatment of the Almighty as accomplice when the characters abduct *Zion*.

The plunder was “heaven-sponsored”, and thus, the highest order is much like the authors or they need Him to be so for the fulfillment of their dreams. This feeling could be conscious or unconscious but in our case of the authors of the *Kebra Nagast*, it seems the later.

Anyways the authors have developed an ideal towards holding Solomonic blood in his veins and *Zion* that made him highest order (remember the king of Ethiopian is proposed to rule half of the earth while the other half belongs to the King of Rom, and already complaining on the Kings of Rom and hinted that they will change their titles for the King of Ethiopia is greater). Thus, the illness got alleviated by ordering themselves as favored by and be intimate to the ultimate power source; to sum up, if the authors shrewdly (in terms of literary and political caliber) reduce Solomon into tragic hero through his reported flaw in the Bible, to fulfill their desire to power, why not this works for God, who himself is a Word, an arbitrary entity after all.

In *Tobbiya* too, similar therapeutic function underlies its production; as the *Kebra Nagast* is more of legitimizing or power production from the cradle of apocalyptic order or divine order, *Tobbiya* is more of power production from human nature; thus, *Tobbiya*’s project is

anthropomorphic, or that understands human supremacy in itself as powerful enough to bring about the change desired, political power and national image building.

The sickness in *Tobbiya* is lined up in what the *Kebra Nagast* had cured as the Solomonic king is all powerful whose territory is by then half of the world but now the small country is even susceptible to invasion (power erosion and lost, which will be greater catastrophe, especially for the continued *Kebra Nagast* Consciousness). Thus, the dream of the *Kebra Nagast* of mighty Ethiopia under God's favor is disclosed as dream in history and activates the awakening in *Tobbiya*; and thus, the book looks for another way of sustaining the former dream, for awakening is disturbing, through human power, the energy of Love, accompanied by God's help.

Thus, the author of *Tobbiya* heals the historical wound of the invasion of the mighty troops of the "infidels" through literature; to put it clearly, the historical account of the story is demonic imagery, the world of failure and slavery, thus, undesirable, and it sickens the author and the society, and the novel cures the historical bitter episode via changing the demonic imagery into the apocalyptic world of joy and success.

Similarly, the same happened in *Dertogada*; the state of existence that the author got sick of or needed to be changed is the reason to compose his work; the assertion comes from the prime motive of *Dertogada*, exactly like the *Kebra Nagast* and *Tobbiya*, is not mere telling story; by a literary standard, *Dertogada* has no art for art sake stand. Thus, the book has an agenda, chiefly a political one and socio-economical as well. This ushers us into the disease that the author wanted to cure; the problem is national as the previous books, and specifically it's centrally economical but the factor takes to the political as well; thus the illness is economic and the cure is proposed as the author states the sick sleeps on the cure, someone there notices the case and removes the sick for awhile and picks out the cure. Therefore, the treasure is what finally and romantically proposed to save the country.

On other case, the author is in need of recreating some historical figures and condemns other groups. This is his private disease or few groups', for the nation is not represented in the historical plane but in his own one. This, anyway, shows us the current national economic illness or demonic world, and the author puts forward the path to the apocalyptic world.

To sum up, the authors of the target materials have activated the therapeutic function of literature and they firmly established themselves as therapists. The authors finally are emerged as doctors neither deactivated nor dead. What the “Post structuralists” claim the author to be nonexistent (to politically empower the reader as agent worth of having veto power in the “meaning-business”) is at least not applicable to the target materials under investigation. In the *Kebrā Nagast*, the author is a therapist or a specialist doctor; in *Tobbiya*, the author is a therapist as well as a comedian; in *Dertogada*, the author is a therapist, a butcher and a drug-dealer.

What we can notice from the above structural analysis of the underlying principle or motif or “*Wuqabi*” that exhorted the authors to come up with their productions is similarly therapeutic and political, and that is why their mythos is romantic, a structure of wish-fulfillment or the best way to the land of dream but existentially substantial.

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS

So far to this point of the theoretic and analytic endeavor carried out in this research project, a thorough scientific systematization and applicatory move of structural investigation has been executed and rendered to display the three selected fictional materials—the *Kebrā Nagast*, *Tobbiya* and *Dertogada*—structural interconnection of their elemental parts: motif, form, character and archetypal imageries, and their underlying stratum that governs their *logos* to manifest as such sort of literary production and their functionality.

In the history of the archaeology of human ideas, literature and literary criticism tends to be apprehended in various ways of analysis as well as numerous corrupted approaches to reach at the foundational structures that trigger their essence. The philosophy of the principal workings of literature and its role in human existence and discourse has shown a critical turn of insight with the advent of the Swiss thinker Ferdinand de Saussure into the critical scene. In 1916, Saussure’s exceedingly instrumental book—*Cours de Linguistique Generale*—published; what de Saussure changes in the Western mode of consciousness and critical tradition is so magnificent and

shocking as well. Saussure's thesis about the entity of the sign and its operation exerted a new vantage point to look into the basic way of how people conceive and interact with each other and the material world in their fluidity or dynamism and entirety.

Thereof, de Saussure's Structural Linguistics became the genesis of what we have been calling structuralism in its generic sense, in any field of study from semiotics up to general system theory. The previous conceptions of the sign, before Saussure had illuminated the outlook of reality that is deemed understood, used to be regarded as worth-leading into the very embodiment of things in themselves. But, later on, this notion was discovered to be the greatest flaw that reduced man into the state of tragic intellectual hero—for such angle merely presented the illusory arbitrary surface structure but not the reality people thought they actually grab its essential manifestation—and the last hundreds of years of man's intellectual adventures were abortive even though phenomenal philosophers like Plato discoursed many fine ideas in the earliest point of critical tradition which later philosophers rediscovered in their quest of the nature of reality and human perception.

Thus, the Saussurean vital conceptualization of language as arbitrary and its delusive manifestations which lead to the theory of meaning as utterly groundless and unearths human's futile discernment of the chaotic cosmic reality, regardless of the pretense of understanding by hard sciences, is a major step towards the elucidation of the inevitability of bargaining reality through convention because what gets through sensual and linguistic pipe is humanistic sole way to perception, at least up to the present times.

As stated utterly in chapter three of the conceptual framework, henceforth, structuralism as such springs to view the things and beings of the universe from their vantage point of being systematically and wholly governed by deep principles. These laws are termed structures or underlying principles that realistically, or whatever, manage the function of any operation in the physical world. Thereof, the structural view, being highly systematic and generic in nature to include the entire structure interwoven into singular entity of being, pulls our critical tradition from rotating to catch its tail. Thus, the understanding that puts things as separate from other entities—like Metaphysics and Modernity—came to be insufficient and unsystematic.

The structural approach attained a very good reception as in Linguistics and Anthropology that claim all languages are governed with underlying principle called grammar, and human cultures are universally recurrent across temporal and spacial “boundaries”. In our specific area of investigation, this situation is what enables researchers and critics employ structural analysis to take cognizance of the corporate laws or “souls” of literary productions as a result of which the deep structure the productions replicate in similar fashion reductively to resemble the law of its pattern. This further means the literary productions are surface utterances or manifestations of the profound substratum of regulation. The literary criticism that developed after the structural way of looking at deep and surface structures of things synthesizes all-inclusively literature and literary criticism with the human culture of literary practice, theory of meaning and reality.

Henceforth, the fundamental nature of things is no longer neither taken from history as essence nor treated discretely, but is human conventional construction which again is critically examined its motifs and background reasons for the construction of its parts in such a way.

The human reasons are extended up to the basic question of “why” and “how” in the first place literature comes to be part of the human culture and gets the considerable and prestigious position. At this particular vantage point, other offshoot insights, like Frye’s archetypal criticism also strongly supports the structural thesis of systematic analysis of undented entirety. This structural insight further sustains the views of structuralism and its theory of reality as it argues for the recurrence of literary works, and so they are byproducts of the foundational pattern of literature or what Frye calls “universe of words” for structures, as Piaget explicated, aren’t inertially deemed for they are in constant change or transformation of their shapes.

Thus, the relatively stagnantly appearing objects in our vision/perception are not so but illusion of the entity of the object in *Itself*. To sum up, as structuralism (not Modernity) philosophizes, the method by which we interact with the physical world is conventionalized and illusory, but there is a structure that enables the workability of this convention and thus, there is a real structure to finally assert illusion and reality are one—*the one is the other, and the other is the one, and both are both one and not!*

Therefore, this research project has been systematically theorizing and analytically investigating what constitutes the target fictional documents: the *Kebra Nagast*, *Tobbiya* and *Dertogada* in

relation to the universal principles that govern the literary endeavors; but specifically the focus materials manifested the substratum of their composition, and basic and shared motifs to discourse about the socio-political situations of the country. The structural analysis brought forth in practice what have been theorized and showed the integrity of the novels in many respects like thematic insights and plot architectures. The thematic treatments of national identity and national image building common to all the three are the fundamentally determinant factors for the narratives, formal elements and romantic characters in the story lines.

The structural approach to the investigation of the target works further emphasizes the human behavioral drives that sustain the authors to compose their literary pieces as a result of deeply excavating the human structural and existential lowest points of his being. Among the three fictions, the oldest and influential one, the *Kebrā Nagast*, situates as the master narrative comparing to the others because of its structural influence on the agenda and thus, narratives of the other focus novels (and this sectional treatment of the three materials is of course a part which will be incorporated into the universal working of the structures or literary reality) Taking this into account the materials are part of the universal human attempt that records the dreams and desires to achieve as individual or society;

this to say the authors tried to establish socio-political institutions through ideological productions and strived to quench their thirst of becoming better or supreme in the power order of the world.

On the other hand, the productions are the results of avoidance or suppression of previous disturbing feelings and experiences. This elevates the act of writing literature into the therapeutic functionality, besides other functions like amusement, subliminal experiences or didacticism. Therefore, the books under investigation in this research pointed their function of readjustment of historical happenings into some other suitable and energizing situation or corrected events to be consumed from the time onwards. Here, this flashes the above general theory of reality which we create and recreate belongs to the human conscience and behavior; as a result, literature, as the target novels verified to do, plays a vital role in the fabrication and readjustment of the sensual and linguistic reality, and helps relieve or discard our bad memories and agonies on one hand, and puts us into fantastic and idyllic world of our desires and dreams that we may not achieve in due time or never at all on the other hand.

The above conclusions, thus, can be further concisely summarized as follows:

- I. *The three literary materials are fundamentally similar in systematically readjusting the previous resentful national memories in the Ethiopian statehood.*
- II. *The works essentially attempt to romantically glorify the Ethiopian national image/portrait in their narratives.*
- III. *Thus, the above agenda of mending and gratifying the Ethiopian national identity result in determining the plot architecture, characterization and overall stylization of the productions to be altogether romantic, i.e., the narrative of adventure and wish-fulfillment.*
- IV. *As the creative works' prime motive is not telling story rather institutionalizing political agenda, they endeavor to functionally reconstitute the history and machineries of the Ethiopian polity. Thus, literature acts as re-fashioner of structures.*
- V. *Literature is a therapy—the author a therapist otherwise a butcher, never dead—that heals the supposed demonic imageries of the political life of the Ethiopian societies and restores the romanticized dwelling.*

References

- Allen, G. (2003). *Roland Barthes*. New York, NY. Routledge.
- Asmarom, L. (1973). *Gada: Three approaches to the study of African society*. New York, NY. Free Press.
- Barthes, R. (1972). *Mythologies*. (Annette Lavers, Trans.). USA. Jonathan Cape.
- Baye F. (1996). *Questions about the Kebra Negast*. Addis Ababa. Artistic printing enterprise. (published in 1975 by Bernard Grasset).
- Benoist, J. (1978). *The structural revolution*. (Trans.). London. Weidenfeld and Nicolson. (First published by Bertalanffy, L. (1968). *General system theory*. New York, NY. George Braziller, Inc.
- Boudon, R. (1971). *The uses of structuralism*. (Michalina Vaughan, Trans.). London. Heinemann Educational Books Ltd.
- Budge, W. (2001). *The Queen of Sheba and her only son Meneyelik*. K. Paul, (Ed.). USA. Columbia University.
- Chomsky, N. (1972). *Language and mind*. USA. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

- Dean, S. (1990). *Nationalism, colonialism and literature*. Minneapolis Minnesota. University of Minnesota Press.
- Derrida, J. (1978). *Writing and Difference*. (Allan Bass, Trans.). London. Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- _____. (1997). *Of Grammatology*. (Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Trans.). Baltimore and London. The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Eriskine, L. (2004). *From Garvey to Marley: Rastafari theology*. USA. University of Florida Press.
- Felperin, H. (1985). *Beyond deconstruction: the uses and abuses of literary theory*. New York. Oxford University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *Archaeology of knowledge*. Great Britain. Tavistock publications limited. (first published in 1969).
- Frank, M. (1989). *What is neostructuralism?: theory and history of literature*, vol. 45. (Wilke and Gray, Trans.). Minneapolis. University of Minnesota Press (first published in 1984 by Suhrkamp).
- Frye, N. (1957). *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays*. Princeton. Princeton University Press.
- _____. (1963). *Fables of identity: studies in poetic mythology*. USA. Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.
- Gidena, M. (2010). *Makadda and Solomon in the eyes of Ethiopian tradition: A developmental analysis*. USA: VDM Verlag Dr. Muller Aktiengesellschaft and co. KG.
- Green, K. & LeBihan. (1996). *Critical theory and practices: a course book*. London. Routledge.
- Habib, R. (2005). *Modern literary criticism and theory: A history*. United Kingdom. Blackwell publishing, Ltd.
- Hubbard, D. (1956). *The literary sources of the Kebra Nagast. (Ph.D dissertation)*. Scotland. University of St. Andrews.
- Levine, N. (2000). *Greater Ethiopia: The evolution of multiethnic society* (2nd Ed.). Chicago. University of Chicago.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. (1966). *The Savage Mind*. (Trans.). London. Weidenfield & Nicolson.
- Messay, K. (1999). *Survival and modernization: Ethiopia's enigmatic present*. Asmara. The Red Sea Press, Inc.

- Parsons, T. (1969). *Politics and social structure*. New York, NY. Free Press.
- Piaget, J. (1970). *Structuralism*. (Chaninah Maschler, Trans. (Ed.)). New York: Basic Books, Inc. (Originally published 1968 by Presses Universitaires de France)
- Riegel, F. & Rosenwald, C. (Ed.). (1975). *Structure and transformation*. USA. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Robey, D. (Ed.). (1973). *Structuralism: an introduction*. Great Britain. Oxford University Press.
- Rosenau, M. (1992). *Post-modernism and the social sciences*. New Jersey. Princeton University Press.
- Saussure, F. (1974). *Course in General Linguistics*. (Charles Bally, Albert Sechehaye in collaboration with Albert Reidlinger, Trans. (Ed.)). London. Fontana.
- Sheferaw, E. (2011). “*Narrative instance in the novels of Yismake Worku*.” MA thesis, unpublished. Addis Ababa University. Addis Ababa.
- Taddesse, A. & Ali, J. (eds). (1995). *Silence is not golden*. Asmara. Red Sea Press, Inc.
- Taddesse, T. (1972a). *Problems of royal succession in 15th C Ethiopia*. (for the fourth international studies) (unpublished)
- _____. (1972b). *Church and state in Ethiopia, 1270-1527*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Taye, A. (1986). “*Form in the Amharic Novel*.” University of London. School of Oriental and African Studies. PhD Dissertation.
- Tyson, L. (2006). *Critical theory today: A user-friendly guide (2nd Ed.)*. New York, NY. Routledge Tylor & Francis group.
- Yonas, A. (1995). *Narrative Ethiopia: A panorama of the national imaginary*. Michigan. UMI Dissertation Services.

ይስማዕከ ወርቁ :: 2001 ዓ.ም. :: ዴርቶጋዳ :: ኢትዮጵያ ማተሚያ :: አዲስ አበባ::

አፈ.ወርቅ ገብረ አየሱስ :: 1990 ዓ.ም. :: ጦቢያ

መሐመድ ዓሊ አድሪስ :: 1998 ዓ.ም. :: “እስልምና እና ሙስሊሞች በአማርኛ ስነ-ፅሁፍ ውስጥ፣ 1307 እስከ 1966::”

የሁለተኛ ዲግሪ ማሟያ ጽሁፍ አዲስ አበባ ዩኒቨርሲቲ::

ዓለሙ ሃይሌ :: 1999 ዓ.ም. :: የአፄ ሠርፀ ድንግል ዜና መዋዕል፣ ግዕዝና አማርኛ:: ብርሃንና ሰላም ማተሚያ ድርጅት አዲስ አበባ::

DECLARATION

I, the undersigned, declare that the thesis entitled “*Structural Analysis of the Evolutionary Motif, Portrait and Discourse in the Kebra Nagast, Tobiya and Dertogada*” is my original work and that all the sources used for the thesis have been duly acknowledged.

Name: NEBIYU G/MICHAEL MIHRETU

Signature: _____

Place: AAU (Foreign Languages and Literature)

Date of submission: June 20, 2012