

African Literature Criticism and the Post-colonial Curriculum

Bernth Lindfors

Summary

Who are the most important black authors in anglophone Africa and which are their most significant writings? One way of answering such questions is to examine which authors literary critics choose to write about and which texts teachers of literature choose to teach. Since those who are professionally engaged in interpreting African literatures discriminate when selecting what to comment on, a canon (or canons) can be said to exist. This paper seeks to identify canonical authors and canonical texts by employing statistical methods based on empirical research in Africa and the West. The results are presented comparatively and diachronically.

Opsomming

Wie is die belangrikste swart outeurs in Engelssprekende Afrika en watter is hulle betekenisvolste werke? Een manier waarop sulke vrae beantwoord kan word, is om te kyk welke outeurs literêre kritici kies om oor te skryf en welke tekste letterkundes kies vir hulle onderrig. Omdat diegene wat professioneel betrokke is by die interpretasie van Afrika-letterkundes diskrimineer wanneer hulle selekteer waarop hulle kommentaar wil lewer, kan daar gestel word dat 'n kanon (of kanons) bestaan. Hierdie artikel poog om kanonieke outeurs en kanonieke tekste te identifiseer met behulp van statistiese metodes wat op empiriese navorsing in Afrika en die Weste gebaseer is. Die resultate word vergelyk en diakronies voorgestel.

Teaching and researching African literatures are relatively new academic enterprises. Forty years ago hardly anyone was engaged in such activities, but today hundreds of teachers throughout the world are introducing thousands of students to the vigorous literatures that have emerged on the African continent. These educators are also writing numerous books and articles on what they teach, producing a voluminous literature on these literatures. Within a single generation they have transformed the study of African literatures into a young but respectable discipline, a distinct branch of scholarship with its own history, politics, rituals, and polemics. One could say without too much exaggeration that interpretation of African literatures has already become a recognized profession.

Africa itself has been the locus of most of this institutionalized activity. In schools and universities throughout the continent, literature curricula have been revamped to accommodate works by indigenous authors. Special libraries and research centers have been built, new journals founded, chairs and

professorships established, and national and regional scholarly bodies formed, all with the aim of promoting further research and teaching in this burgeoning field. African literature scholarship has become a major growth industry in the African academic world.

The same has happened elsewhere but at a slightly slower pace. African literatures were immediately accepted as legitimate subject matter in African, Black and ethnic studies programs at American universities, but they made their way more gradually into English, French, Portuguese, and comparative literature departments, where at first they tended to be regarded as exotic additions to a core syllabus consisting of classic Western texts. Today demands for a multi-cultural curriculum that is not totally dominated by books written by “dead white males” have led to the incorporation of more non-Western literature in required undergraduate courses, so one now sometimes finds African novels, plays and poems being read alongside American and European works. This kind of curricular innovation has occurred at the high school level too, especially in schools with a sizable minority enrollment. In this way texts that used to be at the outer periphery of literary studies in the United States have started to infiltrate the mainstream.

Teachers confronted with the challenge of teaching these new texts have turned to informed scholars and critics for guidance, so there has also been an ever-expanding market for books and articles on African masterworks. But part of the problem here has been to find a reliable way to identify the masterworks. Africa has produced hundreds of writers in recent years, and there are literally thousands of works to choose from. Who are the most important authors and which are their most significant writings? There has been considerable debate on such questions, and though not all of the dust stirred up by the debaters has settled yet, it could be said that a consensus of opinion can be discovered by examining which authors the critics choose to write about and which texts the teachers ultimately choose to teach. In other words, a canon does exist because those who are professionally engaged in interpreting African literatures do discriminate when selecting what to comment on. Writers who command attention are ipso facto more important than writers who are ignored. The biggest trees in any chosen forest are always clearly visible.

But more information is needed on the way the forest looks to those on the ground in Africa. Which authors and which books by those authors tend to get the lion’s share of attention in African university literature courses? Do African literary critics who write articles and books on African literature tend to be drawn to the same set of texts? Who in Africa decides which literary works are worthiest of sustained scrutiny? How is a canon of masterworks formed in a new literary culture? And are the same writers and the same texts taught and studied outside Africa, or is there a separate non-African canon of African literature? These are questions that I have been attempting to address by

constructing tools to measure the extent to which anglophone African authors have been taught in university classrooms and treated in books and articles on African literature. The first such instrument, called the Famous Authors' Reputation Test, recorded the frequency with which anglophone African authors and their works were discussed in print by literary scholars and critics. The second, called the Better Ultimate Rating Plan, sought hard data on pedagogical practices in literature and drama courses at anglophone African universities in the tropics; specifically, it examined patterns of text selection in these courses, recording the frequency with which works by anglophone African authors were assigned as required reading. A third such instrument extended the inquiry to pedagogical practices in English courses at universities in the Republic of South Africa, none of which had been surveyed in the Better Ultimate Rating Plan. And a fourth study sought to examine differences in critical practices between African and non-African commentators on African literature. All of these experiments in canonical measurement were attempts at quantifying qualitative discriminations, at putting into neat columns of round numbers the cumulated opinions reflected in the practical decisions made by literary critics and university teachers who deal with anglophone African literature.

Without going too deeply into the arithmetical procedures used in this kind of empirical research, let me present you with a few charts and graphs that illustrate what I found. But first a word about what counted and what did not. The Famous Authors' Reputation Test sought to record the frequency with which an author and his or her works had been discussed in detail in print by literary scholars and critics. A score was thus arrived at that could be compared to the scores achieved from the same data base by other authors. Those who scored highest could be said to have gained wider recognition than those who registered a lower number of substantive citations. The Famous Authors' Reputation Test ensured that an author's fame would be assessed not intuitively or ecstatically but purely mathematically. Plain numbers would determine the final ranking.

The data base from which statistical information was taken in this quest for objective analysis was the most comprehensive one I could lay my hands on – namely, my own bibliography, *Black African Literature in English: A Guide to Information Sources* (hereafter abbreviated as BALE), and its four five-year supplements – volumes which together attempted to list all the important critical books and articles (in whatever language) published on anglophone Black African literature from 1936 to 1996. The first volume, covering the earliest forty years of academic productivity, contained 3305 entries, the second 2831 entries, the third 5689 entries, the fourth 8772 entries, and the fifth a remarkable 13,652 entries – a proportional increase testifying to the tremendous growth of critical interest in this literature in recent times. The expanded data

base now consists of 34,386 books and articles produced over a 61-year period. This is not a small or inconsequential corpus of criticism. In devising a scoring system for the Famous Authors' Reputation Test, I decided to award three points for every discrete entry (i.e., every book or article devoted to a single author) and one point for every cross-reference (i.e., every significant discussion of an author in a survey of African writing). This weighted system seemed to me to reflect the balance between the two categories of commentary more accurately than did a straight one-for-one system that tended to inflate the scores of authors who were frequently cited but seldom examined with any care. An author who is known but never studied intensively may be a significant minor reference point in African literature, but it is unlikely that he or she commands the kind of respect that would earn him or her a measure of distinction. Literary critics and scholars tend to gravitate toward those writers whose works interest them the most. They do not waste too much time on second-rate talents.

What follows on Chart One is a list of the twenty writers who achieved a score of at least 600 on the Famous Authors' Reputation Test and then a list of eighteen others who achieved a score of at least 300.

According to statistics gleaned from more than six decades of critical commentary, these thirty-eight names are those most consistently chosen as worthy of serious attention, the figures on the left constituting what could be called a High Canon and the figures on the right a Low Canon. The choosers, incidentally, were both African and non-African critics, so this is an international index of literary reputation. It might look somewhat different if broken down geographically.

Nonetheless, what we have here is a clear indication that Soyinka and Achebe have a commanding lead over all the rest, that Ngugi is their only potential challenger at the moment, and that all the rest enjoy significantly less critical esteem. Of the 38 names on the list, 18 are Nigerians, 12 are South Africans, and the 8 others hail from Ghana, Kenya, Zimbabwe, Uganda and Somalia. More importantly, of the top 20 names, 11 are Nigerians and 5 are South Africans, testifying to the dominance of these two national literary cultures over all others in anglophone Africa. But since such a list may be biased toward older writers who have been on the scene a long time, it may be interesting to look at the figures derived from the latest volume alone in order to see who among the younger writers has emerged as important in the eyes of scholars and critics in more recent years. Chart Two thus gives the scores for 23 writers who gained more than 200 points between 1992 and 1996 and then lists 21 others who earned at least 135 points during the same period. Asterisks have been placed beside those names making the most striking short-term gains. These are evidently the most upwardly mobile celebrities at the moment, but it remains to be seen whether they will have the kind of staying power that some of their

numerically superior colleagues have already manifested. Since some reputations have waxed or waned over time, I am presenting in Chart Three a set of columns that may help us to see the diachronic patterns more clearly. The lists of names show the position held by each author included in the top fifteen in each of the five volumes as well as the position that the top twenty hold today in the rankings derived from the cumulated data in all five volumes. To give the chart more depth, and to show the great gains that have been made at various intervals by surging upstarts who had no visibility on the chart back in 1976, I have displayed places 16, 17 and 18 in BALE I as well, places occupied by Onuora Nzekwu, T.M. Aluko and Taban lo Liyong, all of whom have suffered a decline in relative standing in the past quarter century. I have also added to the columns the names of those who entered the lists late. An author's rise or fall in reputation can be gauged by the trajectory produced by linking his or her position in each of the five volumes, with the final 1996 ranking representing where in the grander scheme of things that author stands today in relation to all others past and present. It is clear, for example, that Soyinka and Achebe have always been at the very top, that Ngugi and Armah made impressive early gains and have more or less held their positions, that Saro-Wiwa has had a meteoric rise, that Head has also been getting ahead, that Emecheta, Osofisan, Rotimi and Aidoo have risen from obscurity to visibility, that Mphahlele, Brutus and La Guma have been creeping up, that Tutuola, Clark-Bekederemo, Ekwensi and Okot have been creeping down, that Abrahams, Okigbo and Okara have suffered steeper declines, and that Awoonor, Nzekwu, Aluko and Liyong have fallen off the chart.

A further diagram (Chart Four), which ignores the five-year fluctuations between 1976 and 1996 and charts individual trajectories from beginning to end of this entire period, may enable us to isolate dominant trends in these diachronic patterns more readily. On this simplified chart it is plain to see whose reputation has risen, whose has fallen, and whose has held steady. A word also needs to be said about gross numbers. More significant than a writer's relative rank in the Famous Author's Reputation Test is the total number of points he or she has accrued. Perhaps it would help to put this in visual terms, using the combined figures for all five volumes as the basis for the graph represented by Chart Five. The dramatic disparities between the front-running troika (Soyinka, Achebe, Ngugi) and the rest of the pack are now quite apparent. Indeed, it is unlikely that anyone will catch up with them in the near future, for at each five-year interval so far they have put greater distance between themselves and their followers. In any construction of a canon of anglophone African writing, works by these three writers would have to rank high. Their reputations are very great and growing. Their impressive statistics demonstrate that they are by far the three most important Black African writers.

This is not to say that there is no hope for younger writers whose names do

not yet appear on any of the charts. On the contrary, several of them have made striking gains, and one may expect a handful of them to continue rising in the ranks. But the only way that they and others can continue to ascend or to hold their own in future tabulations is by regularly being the subject of critical scrutiny – that is, by frequently being written about. The Famous Authors' Reputation Test shows no mercy on writers whose works or lives do not attract commentary. The unexamined literary career is not worth much in a noisy marketplace of ideas. To be famous, to be reputable, to be deemed worthy of serious and sustained consideration, an author needs as much criticism as possible, year after year after year. Only those who pass this test of time – the test of persistent published interest in their art – will stand a chance of earning literary immortality.

So much for the critics. What about the teachers of African literature? When they select writers to teach in the classroom, do they make the same choices as the critics? The Better Ultimate Rating Plan (Chart Six) sought to answer this question by collecting information on teaching practices in English and drama courses at universities in anglophone West, East and Central Africa. The data gathered included reading lists from 194 courses taught at 30 universities in 14 nations, a sample representing perhaps as much as 60 per cent of the total number of African literature courses taught in anglophone Africa in the mid-1980s. This averages out to more than six courses per campus, with several universities offering more than a dozen courses each and a few offering only one or two or three courses each. The sample embraces graduate as well as undergraduate curricula, courses that focus exclusively on African texts as well as those that treat African and non-African texts together, and courses that cover oral forms of literature as well as those concerned entirely with written literature.

It was found that in these 194 courses, works by 226 different authors were assigned, 97 of these authors being read in only one course (out of the 194), 31 in two courses, 24 in three courses, 19 in four courses, 22 in five to nine courses, and the remaining 34 in ten or more courses. The most popular assigned author was Wole Soyinka, whose works were used in 87 different courses, or around 47% of the total number of courses. He was followed closely by Ngugi wa Thiong'o, whose works were used in 77 different courses (about 42%), and then by Chinua Achebe, whose works featured in 57 courses (about 30%). So the three front-runners remain more or less the same for the teachers as for the critics, the only difference being that Ngugi's works are assigned more frequently by the teachers than Achebe's. Further back but still conspicuous by the frequency of their appearance were J.P. Clark-Bekederemo, Ayi Kwei Armah, Okot p'Bitek, and Alex La Guma, each of whom was represented in between 29 to 36 of the courses surveyed (roughly 15% to 19% of the total). Thereafter the percentages dropped off rather sharply. Some

variables in the data base had to be taken into account to determine the final ranking. Several authors, especially the top four – namely, Soyinka, Ngugi, Achebe, and Armah – occasionally had more than one book assigned in a single course. In addition, some authors were read in more institutions than others, though not necessarily in more courses. Some were also read in more nations than others, though not necessarily in more institutions or more courses. To give these variables the statistical significance they deserved, I devised a scheme that took into account not only an author's frequency of assignment but also his or her geographical and institutional spread. He or she achieved a numerical score in each of four categories: number of books assigned, number of courses prescribing these books, number of institutions offering these courses, and number of nations housing institutions offering courses that prescribe these books. The four individual sums were then dispassionately added together into one grand total for each writer and those compound sums became the final scores that enable us to sort out the somebodies from the nobodies in African literature studies and to place each writer with more precision on a hierarchical scale of relative importance. Chart Six summarizes the results achieved through the kind of objective quantification that the Better Ultimate Rating Plan makes possible.

When we analyze the data by text rather than by author, some interesting patterns emerge. We find that of the 452 different texts used in the 194 courses surveyed, 208 were assigned in only one course, 99 in two, 41 in three, 52 in four to six, and the remaining 52 in seven or more.

Relying on the same method of adding together the number of courses, institutions, and nations in which a text was used, Chart Seven offers a sliding scale of books that teachers of African literature at African universities evidently regard as worthiest of their students' attention.

Cumulatively, Ngugi now occupies the highest position, with three books in the top ten. Achebe and Soyinka come next with two each, followed by Okot, Armah, and Okigbo, in that order. Soyinka does not put in an appearance until *The Interpreters* ties for seventh and Kongi's *Harvest* takes the ninth spot, but this may not reflect the true position of his best dramatic work, for his *Collected Plays* turns up later on the list in a tie for thirty-sixth, and had the individual plays in those two volumes been identified by title, some of them no doubt would have stood higher in the final numerical ranking. But it is probably fair to conclude from the evidence now before us that while there appears to be widespread agreement about which are the most important works produced by Ngugi, Achebe, Okot, Armah, Okigbo, and Sembène, no such unanimity exists as far as Soyinka's output is concerned. The other great writers are identified with one or two masterpieces, but there is some confusion about what Soyinka's major contributions to African literature have been. He has no fewer than seven titles among the top three dozen, four of them dramatic pieces, yet his highest

ranking work is a novel and his third highest is a collection of poems. From this evidence we may be forced to conclude that while there is a clear consensus among African university teachers that Soyinka is Africa's most significant writer, there is still disagreement about which text or texts may be regarded as his most significant writings. He may be a master craftsman with no single universally accepted masterpiece to his name. Or another way of putting it would be to say that while he is a jack of all genres, he is a king or ace of none.

How do the results from the Famous Authors' Reputation Test stack up against those from the Better Ultimate Rating Plan? Are there writers who score higher with the critics than they do with the teachers, or vice versa? Where do the largest discrepancies lie? Chart Eight documents the relative standing of the major writers in each list and then, again through simple arithmetic, combines their standings in both lists to produce a final cumulation that reveals who are the top twenty-five writers in anglophone Africa today, at least according to teachers at African universities and literary critics worldwide. Since franco-phone, Arabic, and white African writers were not included in the Famous Authors' Reputation Test, I have omitted them from this version of the Better Ultimate Rating Plan to iron out a conspicuous new wrinkle in the data base and to ensure greater uniformity in the final results. However, I have been unable to delete the non-African critical input from the Famous Authors' Reputation Test, so the two data bases are not perfectly symmetrical racially. Nor are they symmetrical temporally, since the Famous Authors' Reputation Test is a diachronic measure covering literary criticism written over a sixty-one year span (1936-1996) and the Better Ultimate Rating Plan is a synchronic measure covering teaching practices in the mid-1980s only. Yet as crude measuring instruments, these two imperfect tools – used either individually or together – may still serve us well enough for large-scale calibrational and comparative purposes. We may not be able to make fine discriminations with them, but we should be able to discern dominant patterns and arrive at fairly accurate gross distinctions. Until someone devises a more sophisticated gauge using basically the same kinds of empirical data, this may be the closest we can ever come to discovering the principal fixtures in a truly double-barreled canon of African literature today.

And of course we have not yet considered another equally important set of figures – namely, sales figures. Which books do readers buy voluntarily simply to read for pleasure? If we subtract from consideration those books read primarily to win academic promotions (the critics' list) as well as those read solely to pass academic examinations (the teachers' list), what do we have left? Which books can hold their own in an open marketplace ruled not by captive readers but by captivated readers? In short, what is the popular canon? I have not yet devised a sophisticated econometric instrument equal to the task of making such measurements, but I believe it would be interesting to attempt to

do so, if only to observe toward what conclusions the quantification of commercial data would drive us.

Of course, the problem of determining popularity might be settled once and for all if we could only hit upon a sure-fire method of compiling an all-time Best Sellers' List. But this kind of high-stakes accounting work requires better book-keeping records than are currently available for public inspection in the African book trade. Most publishers have a natural inclination to exaggerate their successes; they tend to sing a different tune entirely when the day arrives for them to pay royalties to their authors. Firm, clean data might be hard to come by in so spongy a fiscal swamp.

But before we venture too far into such murky realms of pure speculation, let us return to our tidy columns of empirical data, adding to them teaching input from South Africa and the United States that complicates the scoring system by adding some new names to the lists. In 1992 I extended the geographical boundaries of the Better Ultimate Rating Plan by analyzing 139 course descriptions collected from English departments at 22 South African universities. At that time South Africa was in the middle of what Nadine Gordimer, following Gramsci, has called an interregnum – a transitional phase – in this case, two years after the release of Nelson Mandela from prolonged detention and the concomitant unbanning of the ANC and two years before the country's first truly democratic election. Some white universities had already started admitting black students in significant numbers a few years earlier, and there had been a great deal of public discussion about the need for curricular reform in a changing educational environment. Even before the interregnum several reforms had taken place. For instance, South African literature had gradually earned a niche for itself in an otherwise heavily British literature curriculum, but this had been due more to nationalistic pedagogical pioneering than to dramatic changes in the political climate in South Africa. Modifications of the old *Curricula Britannica* had already been introduced at every level of English teaching before the walls of apartheid had finally started crumbling, so that by 1992 there was no South African English program that did not offer some instruction in African literature.

That was the good news. The bad news was that the reforms had not gone far enough, that African literature on most campuses was still a marginalized step-daughter of traditional EngLit, which remained the queen mother of all its undernourished anglophone offspring. Moreover, in South Africa, the battle for official recognition of indigenous literary legitimacy had only been half won, for native sons and daughters had crowded out most of the interesting foreigners from parts further north, the result being a kind of geographical isolation in which Africa above the Limpopo was underrepresented in the pantheon of African letters. South African university students were now introduced to a sample of their own national literary heritage, but they were taught very little

about Nigerian, Ghanaian, Kenyan, Zimbabwean and other anglophone African national literatures.

This is quite apparent in Charts Nine and Ten which document the authors and texts taught most frequently in South African university English departments. As one can see, the overwhelming majority are South African, with only three authors from other parts of anglophone Africa (the Soyinka, Achebe, Ngugi triumvirate but in reverse order) making the list of preferred writers, and only four texts by Achebe and Ngugi, as well as two by Armah and Zimbabwean newcomer Tsitsi Dangarembga, managing to worm their way into the preferred list of readings. In all, only 38 writers from other parts of Africa had their books taught in 139 South African university English courses in 1992. Some big names – Awoonor, Clark-Bekederemo, Farah, Okot p'Bitek, Oyono, Senghor, Tutuola – were taught in only one course in one institution. Others equally important – most notably, Beti, Equiano, Okigbo, Rotimi – were not taught at all.

In addition, the South African curricula showed a pronounced bias toward white writers; Gordimer, Fugard and Coetzee being the big three, followed at some distance by Paton and Schreiner. As for favorite teaching texts, the lead was shared by Paton's *Cry, the Beloved Country*, Schreiner's *The Story of an African Farm*, and Fugard's *Boesman and Lena* (though one could not always be absolutely certain that this was the play assigned for reading when *Boesman and Lena and Other Plays* was the edition put on the book list for a course). Mphahlele's *Down Second Avenue*, Plaatje's *Mhudi*, Serote's *To Every Birth its Blood*, Coetzee's *Waiting for the Barbarians*, and Ndebele's *Fools and Other Stories* also scored high enough to be ranked among South Africa's canonical texts, but where was Nadine Gordimer's magnum opus? As with Soyinka, there seemed to be little agreement about which of her books was the most significant. *The Conservationist* earned a middling place on the list and so did *July's People* further on down, but none of her books had earned a commanding position in the pecking order.

Much the same could be said of Coetzee. Like Gordimer, he had two books on the list, the preferred title being *Waiting for the Barbarians*, but even that one did not fare as well as those by other authors who were best remembered for having produced a single masterpiece.

One might note in passing the near absence of books by exiled and formerly banned writers, Abrahams's *Mine Boy* being the exception that proves the rule. Maybe 1992 was still too early for some of these authors to have been fully rehabilitated and integrated into university syllabuses, but in the future one would hope to see more attention given to the best of them – Breytenbach, Brutus, Head, Kunene, La Guma and Nkosi, for starters.

One would also hope to see more books by writers from elsewhere in Africa being used in South African university classrooms. Achebe's *Things Fall Apart*,

followed at some distance by Ngugi wa Thiong'o's *A Grain of Wheat*, were the favorite selections now, and a handful of other novels by Achebe, Ngugi, Armah and Dangarembga were being read with some regularity, but why were not more than one or two campuses reading, say, Soyinka's *The Lion and the Jewel*, *The Road*, or *Death and the King's Horseman*, to name only a few works by Africa's first Nobel Prize winner in literature? And what about all the other African classics? Of the 35 non-South African African titles listed in the Better Ultimate Rating Plan as preferred texts in other anglophone African nations, in South Africa in 1992 only 5 were being taught in 6 or more courses, 5 in 3 to 5 courses, 7 in only 1 or 2 courses, and the following 18 were not taught at all:

Okigbo's *Labyrinths, with Path of Thunder*
Soyinka's *Idanre and Other Poems*, *A Shuttle in the Crypt*, and *Madmen and Specialists*
Ngugi wa Thiong'o and Ngugi wa Mirii's *I Will Marry When I Want*
Sutherland's *The Marriage of Anansewa*
Beti's *The Poor Christ of Bomba* and *Mission to Kala*
Armah's *Fragments* and *Two Thousand Seasons*
Sembène's *Xala*
Okara's *The Fisherman's Invocation*
Oyono's *The Old Man and the Medal* and *Houseboy*
Rotimi's *The Gods Are Not to Blame*
Achebe's *Morning Yet on Creation Day*
Clark-Bekederemo's *Song of a Goat*
Aidoo's *Anowa*

Of course, one could turn this around and ask why at universities in other African nations are so few books being read by South African authors who are widely taught in South Africa. West, East and Central African university teachers do prescribe a bit of Fugard and a slice of Abrahams, but why don't they assign Gordimer, Coetzee, Paton and Schreiner to their students? Is there a colorbar or boycott in operation here? Not a colorbar surely, because those same university teachers also do not have their students read much of Mphahlele, Ndebele, Serote, Plaatje or Dikobe either. Head has been making some headway in the tropics recently, but hers may be a special case, fueled as much by the growth of women's studies as by an increasing interest in feminist issues throughout sub-Saharan Africa. Perhaps greater reciprocity is needed on both sides of the geographical divide. The North needs to read more from the South, just as the South needs to read more from the North. Each nation or region may have its own hierarchy of educational priorities, but gaining a better understanding of neighboring peoples and cultures must certainly be near the top of the list everywhere. And what better way could there be to improve

mutual understanding in the entire continent than by reading masterworks of contemporary African literature?

I am attaching another chart (Chart Eleven) that sets the results of the tropical and southern African surveys side by side. This will enable us to see more clearly the adjustments that would be called for if we were to attempt to construct a Pan-African syllabus based on the teaching preferences of both North and South. Obviously there is not much overlap in these lists. With the exception of Fugard, white South African writers are not being read up North, but eight black South African writers are being studied, three of them – La Guma, Abrahams and Brutus – quite seriously. In the South, on the other hand, Ngugi wa Thiong’o, Achebe and Soyinka have been recognized as major talents, but only half a dozen other Northerners have been considered worthy of scrutiny. Southerners read Abrahams as attentively as Northerners do, tend to value Fugard, Head, and Mphahlele significantly higher and Armah, La Guma, Sembène, Okara and Laye significantly lower than Northerners do, and display very little regard for Brutus, Nkosi and Kunene, all of whose works were previously banned in South Africa. Lessing commands a modest measure of respect in each camp, but Mtshali is viewed by both as a minor talent. Several newcomers – particularly Ndebele, Dangarembga and Mda but also Kuzwayo and Wicomb – have made a favorable impression in the South but no conspicuous dent in the North, possibly because the data sample from up there is too old (having been gathered in 1986) for them to have evoked any response, positive or negative, since their books had not been published by then.

There may be a slight time warp as well as pronounced demographic differences skewing the comparison of these two canonical rosters.

It may never be possible to achieve a perfect consensus on what should and should not be taught in university English courses in the new South Africa, but a generous mixing and mingling of talented writers from different racial, social, temporal and national backgrounds appears to be the most satisfactory way to balance competing interests and produce a syllabus that is both representative of the best from the past and inclusive of the best from the present. One would hope that such a syllabus would also to some extent accommodate itself to wider continental circumstances and be capable of reflecting the remarkable heterogeneity of Africa itself, with its many diverse and complicated expressive cultures. University English literature teaching in South Africa – indeed, anywhere in Africa – should be a profoundly multicultural enterprise.

I have no comparable data from the United States to set beside the data collected on teaching practices in tropical and southern African universities, but a survey done twenty-five years ago by Zinta Konrad under the auspices of the African Literature Association should perhaps be mentioned in passing. Konrad sent a questionnaire to several hundred university professors teaching African literature in a variety of disciplines in the United States in an effort to elicit

information on their pedagogical practices and problems. The 112 respondents cited the works listed on Chart Twelve most frequently as their favorite text selections. As might be expected, Achebe and Ngugi scored highest in total number of citations among anglophone writers, but Tutuola and Armah also did quite well. A good number of works by francophone writers – Camara Laye polling the best numbers – were also being taught regularly back then.

Konrad claimed that the fifteen texts on her list, most of which were being used in fewer than two dozen courses in her sample, constituted the “classics” of African literature as taught in the United States in 1976. That may well have been so, for some of these same texts certainly have continued to appear on reading lists for American university literature courses. They clearly have passed the test of time, if we are willing to accept a notion of temporal stability measured only in decades rather than in centuries or millennia. They are contemporary classics if nothing else. A follow-up survey conducted ten years later by Konrad and Harold Waters did not give a statistical breakdown of assigned texts but did offer some information on favorite women writers, putting them into three categories: most frequently taught – Bâ, Head, and Emecheta; somewhat less frequently taught – Nwapa and Aidoo; and less frequently taught – Tlali and Sow Fall. No information appears to have been solicited on male writers.

So much for the teachers. Let us now return for a moment to the scholars and critics, looking a little more closely not at their preferences but at their practices. And let us do this on a comparative basis, pitting African critics against Western critics and attempting to discern significant polarities that distance the two groups from one another, for this may help us to isolate and understand certain problems of scholarly authority and intellectual production in African literature studies today, alerting us to some of the lingering geographical, political, racial and linguistic tensions that have produced peculiar distortions in postcolonial literary studies throughout the Third World. The complaint everywhere seems to be that there are still too many Western - Prosperos and Mirandas calling the critical shots, that the newly articulate Calibans are being crowded out of their own domain by uncouth invaders from outer imperial space, that careerist non-Africans with easier access to money, machines and magazines are monopolizing discussion of literary works by Africans, that First Worlders and Third Worlders are not engaged in any sort of productive dialogue – indeed, in most cases in no dialogue at all, but are speaking only to their own kind, the first Worlders through electronically amplified megaphones, the Third Worlders through baffles and mufflers. Furthermore, in the West the language of literary criticism has itself changed, moving toward higher and higher levels of abstraction and self-reflexivity, leaving many non-Westerners speaking in a quaint, old-fashioned hermeneutic dialect, if they are allowed to speak at all. In short, Africa, a silent partner in its

own intellectual marginalization, may be losing interpretive control of its own anglophone literature.

To test these explosive charges, it may be helpful to examine a representative statistical chart that reveals in plain, stark numbers where the greatest imbalances in African and non-African production of literary scholarship have existed and continue to exist today. The following data have been gleaned from the same bibliographical volumes we plundered before; *Black African Literature in English* and its sequels, which together cover six decades of scholarly productivity. To reduce these numbers to manageable proportions I have listed the relevant figures for only the top three writers in anglophone Africa: Wole Soyinka, Chinua Achebe and Ngugi wa Thiong'o. More has been written about these authors than about any others, so together they provide a sufficiently large sample for statistical analysis. But I have narrowed the data base a bit by concentrating exclusively on literary criticism and eliminating from the count all other forms of scholarship – e.g., bibliographies, biographical books and articles, and published interviews.

I have also excluded all works that deal with more than a single author, for they would have complicated the scoring system considerably. So the numbers on these tables represent only those scholarly studies that are devoted to one of the big three: Soyinka, Achebe, or Ngugi. In my original study I subdivided the data into six categories of scholarship – books, study guides, book chapters, articles, doctoral dissertations and master's theses – each of which told something different about the creative writers and scholars concerned. But since I fear you may be getting a little weary of charts and statistics by now, I am presenting only the final tabulation – the Mother of all Charts (Chart Thirteen) – which cumulates all the figures in each category into grand totals, super grand totals, and grand totals of super grand totals.

In order to get a sense of how the chart works, let us first translate the acronyms employed. BALE stands for *Black African Literature in English*, each volume of which is represented by a roman numeral. To bring the record further up to date, a fifth column covering book production in 1992-95 has been added. NI stands for Nigerian, OA for Other African, NA for Non-African, KE (under Ngugi) for Kenyan, IN (under Grand Totals) for Indigene, T for Total, SGT for Super Grand Total, and GTS/GT for Grand Total of Super Grand Totals. The horizontal plane represents the place of publication, and the vertical plane indicates the nationality of the scholar. If, for example, we look at the first combinations of figures listed under each of the authors, focusing on the fourth level of the fourth column beneath BALE I, we see that up to 1976 there were a total of 143 books, study guides, book chapters, articles, doctoral dissertations, and master's theses produced on Soyinka, 161 on Achebe, and 38 on Ngugi. Thirty of the studies on Soyinka were published in Nigeria, 29 in other parts of Africa, and 84 outside Africa. Also, 30 of the studies on Soyinka were by

Nigerians, 31 by other Africans, and 82 by non-Africans. Roughly two-thirds of the scholarship on Soyinka by Nigerians (21 out of 30 contributions) was published in Nigeria, about half of the scholarship on Soyinka by other Africans was published elsewhere in Africa (14 out of 29 contributions) and better than three-quarters of the scholarship on Soyinka by non-Africans (65 out of 84 contributions) was published outside Africa. By way of contrast, look at the figures for Ngugi under BALE IV, which records scholarship between 1987 and 1991, a period five years after Ngugi went into exile. During those years only 16 Kenyans ventured to write on Ngugi, more than two-thirds of them for non-African publications. Meanwhile 130 non-Africans wrote on Ngugi, all but seven of them (i.e., 95%) for non-African publications, and not one of them for a Kenyan publication.

If we look now at the final sets of figures – the Super Grand Totals (the sets of columns at the far right and the columns at the bottom) and the Grand Totals of the Super Grand Totals (the final set of columns at the bottom far right), some interesting patterns emerge. First, up to 1976, non-Africans had produced approximately 60% of the scholarship on Soyinka, Achebe and Ngugi. Nowadays their share of the total output has dropped to about 51%, so it is clear that African critics, particularly Nigerians, have been making gradual gains in the last twenty years. Non-African critics used to produce 59% of the commentary on Soyinka, but now they account for no more than 54% of the total. They also used to produce 63% of the scholarship on Achebe, but today their portion of the total critical corpus has dropped to only 46%. With Ngugi the picture is a little different, with non-Africans, formerly producers of 50% of the criticism, now weighing in slightly higher, at 52%. Yet the drift toward Africanization of the critical industry is unmistakable. Far from losing control of their own anglophone literature, African critics are slowly taking it back. If this trend continues, they may be able to claim more than 50% of the critical enterprise before the end of the twentieth century. This is real progress. Yet if one examines the bottom line, literally and figuratively – i.e., the places of publication – one finds that a majority of the studies of Soyinka, Achebe and Ngugi are still being published outside Africa. In 1976 the figure stood at roughly 61%; today it stands at almost 63%. But even here the news is not all bad, for 66% of all the Nigerians who have ever written on Soyinka, 70% of all the Nigerians who have ever written on Achebe, and 67% of all the Kenyans who have ever written about Ngugi have published their works at home. But offsetting this promising homeward-looking orientation among the Africans is a far more chauvinistic attitude among the Westerners. 90% of the non-African scholars who have ever written about Soyinka or Ngugi and 92% of the non-African scholars who have ever written about Achebe have published their works outside Africa. This is where the greatest inequity (not to mention iniquity) lies. Non-African scholars appear to have little desire to exchange

ideas with African scholars. They are eager to publish on African literature but not in African media. They are interested in African writers but not in African readers. These modern-day Prosperos and Mirandas would rather sit in armchairs at home making magisterial theoretical pronouncements in antiseptic isolation than risk getting their feet a little muddy on Caliban's island.

Unfortunately, they are not the only ones with this kind of phobia. A good number of African critics betray some of the same pathological symptoms. These reluctant travelers might be prepared to publish occasionally in Prospero and Miranda's distant kingdom, but they do not appear to be keen to address their own neighbors next door. Of the 321 books, study guides, essays, dissertations and theses that Nigerians have written about Soyinka, only 21 (6.5%) have seen print in other African nations. Of the 339 contributions Nigerians have made to the critical literature on Achebe, only 15 (4.4%) have been placed in non-Nigerian African media. Of the 55 scholarly works Kenyans have published on Ngugi, not one (0%) has been published elsewhere in Africa. And when scholars from other parts of Africa write about Soyinka, only 4.5% of what they write reaches print in Nigeria. When they write about Achebe, fewer than 1% of their books, booklets, articles, dissertations and theses get placed in Nigeria. And when they write about Ngugi, less than 1.8% of their scholarship sees the light of day in Kenya. So the absence of transnational, cross-cultural communication is a striking phenomenon within Africa too. Nigerians may talk to Nigerians, Kenyans may talk to Kenyans, and both Nigerians and Kenyans do talk to Westerners with some regularity, but there is hardly any intramural transcontinental dialogue going on among anglophone Africans. The little islanders do not mind mixing and mingling with big islanders far away, but they prefer to avoid having close contact with nearby little islanders like themselves. They appear to be suffering from an interiority complex.

The statistics on these charts suggest that scholars of anglophone African literature, wherever in the world they happen to be placed, need to broaden their cultural horizons by exposing themselves to more give and take with their African colleagues. They need to find ways to communicate more effectively with critics, teachers and readers all over the African continent, reaching out to make contact even with those in remote hinterlands who have been routinely cut off from the stimulation of literary debates. Only by thereby Africanizing their own intellectual production will they be able to achieve any measure of true scholarly authority. For if they continue to sail on, oblivious of indigenous conditions and deaf to local alarms, they will surely be blown off course, experience calamitous shipwrecks, and suffer greater insularity by marooning themselves forever on interpretive islands of their own making.

To rescue themselves from utter inconsequentiality on the African literary scene they must learn to exchange ideas with their African colleagues in

African media and in metalanguages that African scholars can read and speak. To refuse intercourse with Caliban, as Miranda did, would be a fatal mistake for Western scholars, for it would lead to sterility in precisely those communicative realms where hybridity or cultural cosmopolitanism is a decided advantage. In the emerging discipline of African literary studies one such realm is scholarship, another teaching. All of us who work in these realms must develop a lust for cross-fertilization, no matter the cost, for if we wish to survive and thrive in a multicultural literary universe, we must learn to transform ourselves into boundary-busting syncretists. We must learn to become, in the best sense of the term, real bastards.

References

- Konrad, Zinta
1978 African Literature in the American University Curriculum. *Research in African Literatures* 9: 259-281.
- Konrad, Zinta & Waters, Harold
1992 African Literature and Languages in the University Curriculum: A Decade Update. *African Literature Association Bulletin* 18(1): 42-54.
- Lindfors, Bernth
1979 *Black African Literature in English: A Guide to Information Sources*. Detroit: Gale.
1986 *Black African Literature in English, 1977-1981 Supplement*. New York: Africana.
1989 *Black African Literature in English, 1982-1986*. London: Zell.
1994 The Famous Authors' Reputation Test. *Comparative Approaches to African Literatures*. Amsterdam & Atlanta, GA: Rodopi, pp. 131-40.
1995a *Black African Literature in English, 1987-1991*. London: Zell.
1995b The Teaching of African Literature at Anglophone African Universities: An Instructive Canon. *Long Drums and Canons: Teaching and Researching African Literatures*. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press, pp. 45-59.
2000 *Black African Literature in English, 1992-1996*. Oxford: Zell. An Imprint of James Currey.

CHART ONE

1. Soyinka	7616	23. Ngema	541
2. Achebe	5597	24. Rive	537
3. Ngugi	3560	25. Awoonor	519
4. Saro-Wiwa	1494	26. Serote	470
5. Armah	1396	27. Osundare	449
6. Head	1244	28. Okri	432
7. Clark	1009	29. Amadi	424
8. Tutuola	986	30. Equiano	406
9. Mphahlele	949	31. Plaatje	400
10. Ekwensi	921	32. Marechera	390
11. Brutus	886	33. Omotso	386
12. Emecheta	877	34. Sutherland	350
13. La Guma	767	35. Ndebele	347
14. Okigbo	728	36. Sepamla Iyayi }	328
15. Okot	723	38. Mtshali	314
16. Abrahams Osofisan }	714		
18. Okara	668		
19. Rotimi	644		
20. Aidoo	616		
21. Nwapa	579		
22. Farah	571		

CHART 2

1. Soyinka	2 286		
2. Achebe	1 303	25. La Guma	189
* 3. Saro-Wiwa	1 123	26. Mhlophe	182
4. Ngugi	854	27. Equiano	171
5. Head	625	28. Clark	165
* 6. Ngema	448	29. Sofola	160
7. Emecheta	410	30. Kani	159
* 8. Osofisan	350	31. Dangaremba	157
9. Mphahlele	342	Tlali	}
10. Armah	316	33. Kente	155
11. Brutus	315	Marechera	}
* 12. Nwapa	314	35. Abrahams	151
* Rive }		36. Okot	149
* 14. Okri	310	37. Kuzwayo	146
* 15. Serote	262	Sepamla	}
16. Aidoo	250	39. Okigbo	142
* 17. Farah	230	40. Okara	138
* 18. Ndebele	229	Amadi	}
19. Osundare	214	42. Ekwensi	137
20. Tutuola	208	Mtshali	}
21. Sutherland	206	44. M. Kunene	135
22. Plaatje	201		
23. Rotimi	200		
24. Mbuli	198		

- 1976**
1. Achebe
 2. Soyinka
 3. Tutuola
 4. Clark
 5. Ngugi
 6. Ekwensi
 7. Okigbo
 8. Abrahams
 9. Okara
 10. Armah
 11. Mphahlele
 12. Okot
 13. Brutus
 14. Awoonor
 15. La Guma
 16. Nzekwu
 17. Aluko
 18. Liyong
 - 19.
 - 20.

- 1981**
- Achebe
 - Soyinka
 - Ngugi
 - Armah
 - Tutuola
 - Mphahlele
 - Ekwensi
 - Okot
 - Clark
 - Awoonor
 - Abrahams
 - Okigbo
 - Brutus
 - La Guma
 - Head
 - Okara
 - Emecheta

- 1986**
- Soyinka
 - Ngugi
 - Achebe
 - Armah
 - Clark
 - Okot
 - Head
 - Brutus
 - La Guma
 - Ekwensi
 - Rotimi
 - Tutuola
 - Emecheta
 - Okigbo
 - Mphahlele
 - Awoonor
 - Abrahams
 - Okara
 - Aidoo

- 1991**
- Soyinka
 - Achebe
 - Ngugi
 - Armah
 - Saro-Wiwa
 - Head
 - Ekwensi
 - Clark
 - Emecheta
 - Osofisan
 - La Guma
 - Osundare
 - Iyayi
 - Tutuola
 - Farah
 - Mphahlele
 - Rotimi
 - Brutus
 - Okara
 - Marechera
 22. Abrahams
 24. Aidoo
 27. Okigbo
 28. Okot
 48. Awoonor

1996

- Soyinka
- Achebe
- Saro-Wiwa
- Ngugi
- Head
- Ngema
- Emecheta
- Osofisan
- Mphahlele
- Armah
- Brutus
- Nwapa
- Rive }
- Okri
- Serote
- Aidoo
- Farah
- Ndebele
- Osundare
- Tutuola
23. Rotimi
25. La Guma
28. Clark
35. Abrahams
36. Okot
39. Okigbo
40. Okara
42. Ekwensi

1996

1. Soyinka
2. Achebe
3. Ngugi
4. Saro-Wiwa
5. Armah
6. Head
7. Clark
8. Tutuola
9. Mphahlele
10. Ekwensi
11. Brutus
12. Emecheta
13. La Guma
14. Okigbo
15. Okot
16. Abrahams
- Osofisan }
18. Okara
19. Rotimi
20. Aidoo

1976

- 1. Achebe
- 2. Soyinka
- 3. Tutuola
- 4. Clark
- 5. Ngugi
- 6. Ekwensi
- 7. Okigbo
- 8. Abrahams
- 9. Okara
- 10. Armah
- 11. Mphahlele
- 12. Okot
- 13. Brutus
- 14. Awoonor
- 15. La Guma
- 16. Nzekwu
- 17. Aluko
- 18. Liyong

Head
Emecheta

1976

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

Aidoo
Rotimi

1981

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

Osofisan
Osundare
Saro-Wiwa
Iyayi
1986

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

1991

1996

- * 1. Soyinka
- * 2. Achebe

- * 3. Ngugi
- * 4. Saro-Wiwa
- * 5. Armah
- * 6. Head
- * 7. Clark
- * 8. Tutuola
- * 9. Mphahlele
- * 10. Ekwensi
- * 11. Brutus
- * 12. Emecheta
- * 13. La Guma
- * 14. Okigbo
- * 15. Okot
- * 16. Abrahams
- Osofisan }
- * 18. Okara
- * 19. Rotimi
- * 20. Aidoo

1. Soyinka	=====
2. Achebe	=====
3. Ngugi	=====
4. Saro-Wiwa	=====
5. Armah	=====
6. Head	=====
7. Clark	=====
8. Tutuola	=====
9. Mphahlele	=====
10. Ekwensi	=====
11. Brutus	=====
12. Emecheta	=====
13. La Guma	=====

CHART FIVE (continued)

14. Okigbo	=====
15. Okot	=====
16. Abrahams	=====
Osofisan	=====
18. Okara	=====
19. Rotimi	=====
20. Aidoo	=====

CHART SEVEN

	Authors	Books	Courses	Institutions	Nations	Totals
1.	Soyinka	146	87	30	14	277
2.	Ngugi	110	77	28	13	228
3.	Achebe	71	57	27	12	167
4.	Armah	47	33	21	10	111
5.	Clark	44	36	20	9	109
6.	Okot	41	31	23	12	107
7.	La Guma	35	29	18	8	90
8.	Sembène	33	26	15	10	83
9.	Fugard	24	24	20	11	79
10.	Senghor	22	21	17	9	69
11.	Beti	24	20	16	8	68
12.	Abrahams	23	21	14	9	67
13.	Brutus	25	20	15	6	66
14.	Okigbo	21	21	15	8	65
15.	Aidoo	21	20	16	7	64
16.	Rotimi	20	20	13	6	59
17.	Okara	18	18	13	8	57
18.	Awoonor	17	16	13	6	52
19.	Oyono	15	15	11	7	48
20.	Githae- Mugo*	17	17	14	7	45
21.	Laye	12	12	11	7	42
	Mphahlele	13	13	10	6	42
	Sutherland	14	14	9	5	42
24.	Mwangi	12	11	9	5	37

CHART SEVEN

	Authors	Books	Courses	Institutions	Nations	Totals
25.	Lessing	13	11	6	8	35
	Ngugi wa Mirii*	10	10	8	7	35
	Osofisan	14	12	8	1	35
28.	D. Diop	10	10	8	6	34
29.	Al-Hakim	11	10	8	4	33
	Amadi	10	10	9	4	33
	Bâ	10	10	9	4	33
	Peters	12	9	9	3	33
33.	Okpewho	11	10	8	5	32
34.	Head	12	8	6	5	31
35.	Nkosi	8	8	7	4	27
36.	Kunene	7	7	7	5	26
	Mtshali	7	7	7	5	26
38.	Angira	8	8	6	9	25
	Marechera	10	7	4	4	25

* Co-author with Ngugi wa Thiong'o

CHART SEVEN (continued)

	Cour ses	Instit ution s	Natio ns	Total s	
Books by Author & Title					
1.	Achebe, <i>Arrow of God</i>	23	16	7	46
2.	Ngugi, <i>A Grain of Wheat</i>	22	15	7	44
3.	Ngugi, <i>Petals of Blood</i>	19	15	7	44
4.	Achebe, <i>A Man of the People</i>	19	14	8	41
5.	Okot, <i>Song of Lawino</i>	19	14	7	40
6.	Ngugi/G-M, <i>Trial of Dedan Kimathi</i>	18	14	7	39
7.	Armah, <i>Beautiful Ones...</i>	17	12	7	36
	Soyinka, <i>The Interpreters</i>	16	13	7	36
9.	Soyinka, <i>Kongi's Harvest</i>	13	1	8	33
10.	Okigbo, <i>Labyrinths</i>	15	11	6	32
11.	Sembène, <i>God's Bits of Wood</i>	13	10	7	30
12.	Achebe, <i>Things Fall Apart</i>	13	10	7	30
13.	Soyinka, <i>Idanre</i>	14	10	5	29
14.	Ngugi/N, <i>I Will Marry ...</i>	10	9	7	25
	La Guma, <i>Walk in the Night</i>	11	10	4	25
	Fugard, <i>Statements</i>	9	9	7	25
17.	Sutherland, <i>Marriage of Anansewa</i>	11	8	5	24
18.	Bâ, <i>So Long a Letter</i>	10	9	4	23
	Beti, <i>Poor Christ of Bomba</i>	9	8	6	23
20.	Armah, <i>Fragments</i>	10	8	4	22
21.	Sembène, <i>Xala</i>	9	7	5	21
	Armah, <i>2000 Seasons</i>	10	7	4	21
	La Guma, <i>In the Fog...</i>	10	7	4	21

CHART SEVEN (continued)

		Cour ses	Instit ution s	Natio ns	Total s
Books by Author & Title					
24.	Ngugi, <i>Devil on the Cross</i>	9	7	4	20
	Okara, <i>Fisherman's Invocation</i>	8	8	4	20
	Brutus, <i>Letters to Martha</i>	9	8	3	20
	Oyono, <i>Old Man and the Medal</i>	8	7	5	20
28.	Beti, <i>Mission to Kala</i>	8	7	4	19
29.	Ngugi, <i>The River Between</i>	8	8	3	19
	Soyinka, <i>Lion and the Jewel</i>	7	6	6	19
	Oyono, <i>Houseboy</i>	7	7	5	19
32.	Rotimi, <i>Gods are not to Blame</i>	8	6	4	18
	Achebe, <i>Morning Yet ...</i>	7	6	5	18
	Brutus, <i>A Simple Lust</i>	8	7	6	18
	Clark, <i>Song of a Goat</i>	7	7	4	18
36.	Soyinka, <i>Shuttle in the Crypt</i>	8	7	2	17
	La Guma, <i>Time of the Butcherbird</i>	6	6	5	17
	Soyinka, <i>Collected Plays</i>	6	6	5	17
	Okara, <i>The Voice</i>	7	5	5	17
	Soyinka, <i>Madmen and Specialists</i>	8	7	2	17
	Aidoo, <i>Anowa</i>	7	7	3	17

CHART SEVEN (continued)

Famous Authors' Reputation Test		Better Ultimate Rating Plan		Combined Rankings				
1.	Soyinka	5330	1.	Soyinka	277	1.	Soyinka	2
2.	Achebe	4294	2.	Ngugi	228	2.	Achebe	5
3.	Ngugi	2706	3.	Achebe	167		Ngugi	5
4.	Armah	1081	4.	Armah	111	4.	Armah	8
5.	Clark	844	5.	Clark	109	5.	Clark	10
6.	Ekwensi	784	6.	Okot	107	6.	La Guma	18
7.	Tutuola	778	7.	La Guma	90		Okot	18
8.	Head	619	8.	Abrahams	67	8.	Okigbo	20
9.	Mphahlele	607	9.	Brutus	66	9.	Abrahams	22
10.	Okigbo	586	10.	Okigbo	65		Brutus	22
11.	La Guma	578	11.	Aidoo	64	11.	Mphahlele	25
12.	Okot	575	12.	Rotimi	59	12.	Okara	28
13.	Brutus	571	13.	Okara	57	13.	Rotimi	29

CHART SEVEN (continued)

Famous Authors' Reputation Test		Better Ultimate Rating Plan		Combined Rankings				
14.	Abrahams	563	14.	Awoonor	52	14.	Aidoo	31
15.	Okara	530	15.	Githae-Mugo*	45	15.	Awoonor	32
16.	Emecheta	467	16.	Mphahlele	42		Head	32
17.	Rotimi	444		Sutherland	42	17.	Tutuola	37
18.	Awoonor	416	18.	Mwangi	37	18.	Ekwensi	39
19.	Saro-Wiwa	371	19.	Ngugi wa Mirii*	35	19.	Osofisan	40
20.	Aidoo	366		Osofisan	35	20.	Amadi	44
21.	Osofisan	364	21.	Amadi	33	21.	Emecheta	47
22.	Farah	341		Peters	33	22.	Marechera	55
23.	Amadi	286	23.	Okpewho	32	23.	Nkosi	62
24.	Omotoso	77	24.	Head	31		Okpewho	62
25.	Nwapa	275	25.	Nkosi	27	25.	Mtshali	65
26.	Liyong	237	26.	Mtshali	26			

CHART SEVEN (continued)

Famous Authors' Reputation Test		Better Ultimate Rating Plan		Combined Rankings
27.	Equiano	235	Kunene	26
	Marechera	235	28. Angira	25
	Osundare	235	Marechera	25
30.	Rive	223	30. Tutuola	23
31.	Aluko	211	31. Serumaga	21
32.	Chinweizu	208	Emecheta	21
	Iyayi	208	33. Nturu	17
	Serote	208	Ekwensi	17
35.	Plaatje	199		
36.	Mazrui	187		
37.	Nkosi	182		
38.	Ike	173		
39.	Mtshali			

CHART SEVEN (continued)

Famous Authors' Reputation Test

Okpewho 167

*Co-author with Ngugi wa Thiong'o

Better Ultimate Rating Plan

Combined Rankings

CHART NINE

Authors	Titles	Courses	Grades	Institutions	Totals
Fugard	12	36	4	17	69
Gordimer	11	39	5	13	68
Coetzee	6	37	5	15	63
Paton	9	17	5	13	38
Mphahlele	3	16	4	11	34
Head	5	15	4	9	33
Schreiner	1	13	4	12	30
Serote	2	14	4	10	30
Abrahams	4	11	5	8	28
La Guma	4	12	4	6	26
Plaatje	1	11	4	1	26
Ndebele	1	12	4	7	24
Ngugi	13	35	4	12	64
Achebe	6	31	4	15	56
Soyinka	11	17	4	11	43

CHART ELEVEN

TEXTS

Titles	Courses	Grades	Institutions	Totals
<i>Fugard, Boesman and Lena</i>	14	4	11	29
<i>Paton, Cry, the Beloved Country</i>	13	5	11	29
<i>Schreiner, Story of an African Farm</i>	13	4	12	29
<i>Mphahlele, Down Second Avenue</i>	14	4	10	28
<i>Plaatje, Mhudi</i>	11	4	10	25
<i>Serote, To Every Birth its Blood</i>	12	4	9	25
<i>Coetzee, Waiting for the Barbarians</i>	11	4	9	24
<i>Ndebele, Fools and Other Stories</i>	12	4	7	23
<i>Gordimer, The Conservationist</i>	10	3	7	20
<i>Abrahams, Mine Boy</i>	7	4	7	18
<i>Dikobe, The Marabi Dance</i>	8	3	7	18
<i>Coetzee, Life & Times of Michael K</i>	8	3	6	17
<i>Gordimer, July's People</i>	9	4	4	17
<i>Achebe, Things Fall Apart</i>	14	4	12	30
<i>Ngugi, A Grain of Wheat</i>	11	3	8	22
<i>Achebe, Anthills of the Savannah</i>	7	4	6	17
<i>Ngugi, Petals of Blood</i>	9	3	5	17
<i>Armah, The Beautiful Ones</i>	6	3	6	15
<i>Dangarembga, Nervous Conditions</i>	7	3	5	15

CHART TWELVE

Better Ultimate Rating Plan

1. Soyinka
2. Ngugi wa Thiong'o
3. Achebe
4. Armah
5. Clark-Bekederemo
6. Okot p'Bitek
7. La Guma
8. Sembène
9. Fugard
10. Senghor
11. Beti
12. Abrahams
13. Brutus
14. Okigbo
15. Aidoo
16. Rotimi
17. Okara
18. Awoonor
19. Oyono
20. Githae-Mugo*
21. Laye
Mphahlele
Sutherland
24. Mwangi
25. Lessing
Ngugi wa Mirii*
Osofisan
28. D.Diop
29. Al-Hakim
Amadi
Bâ
Peters
33. Okpewho
34. Head
35. Nkosi
36. Kunene
Mtshali
38. Angira
Marechera

South African Survey

1. Fugard
2. Gordimer
3. Ngugi wa Thiong'o
4. Coetzee
5. Achebe
6. Soyinka
7. Paton
8. Mphahlele
9. Head
10. Schreiner
Serote
12. Abrahams
13. La Guma
Plaatje
15. Ndebele
16. Armah
Dikobe
18. Smith
19. Dangarembga
Bosman
21. Mda
22. Mtwa/Ngema/Simon
Plomer
Tlali
25. Du Plessis
Essop
Lessing
28. Matshoba
29. Kuzwayo
Modisane
Sembène
32. Emecheta
Okara
Sepamla
35. Breytenbach
36. Mofolo
37. Laye
Mtshali
Wicomb

* co-author with Ngugi wa Thiong'o

CHART TWELVE

Books by Author & Title	Number of times cited
Achebe, <i>Things Fall Apart</i>	37
Laye, <i>Dark Child</i>	30
Oyono, <i>Boy!</i>	20
Tutuola, <i>Palm-Wine Drinkard</i>	20
Armah, <i>The Beautiful Ones Are Not Yet Born</i>	19
Kane, <i>Ambiguous Adventure</i>	15
Moore and Beier, <i>Modern Poetry from Africa</i>	14
Ngugi, <i>Weep not, Child</i>	13
Achebe, <i>Arrow of God</i>	13
Achebe, <i>No Longer at Ease</i>	12
Ngugi, <i>A Grain of Wheat</i>	12
Beti, <i>Mission to Kala</i>	11
Maran, <i>Batouala</i>	10
Laye, <i>The Radiance of the King</i>	10

CHART THIRTEEN (continued)

SOYINKA

	BALE I (1936-76)				BALE II (1977-81)				BALE III (1982-86)				BALE IV (1987-91)				(1992-1995)				SGT			
	NI	OA	NA	T	NI	OA	NA	T	NI	OA	NA	T	NI	OA	NA	T	NI	OA	NA	T	NI	OA	NA	T
NI	21	4	5	30	16	3	17	36	54	5	31	90	118	9	34	161	4			4	213	21	87	321
OA	3	14	12	29		5	9	14		19	11	30	2	21	15	38					5	59	46	110
NA	6	13	65	84	6	3	61	70	4	2	108	114	6	8	227	241	1	1	2	4	23	28	463	514
SGT	30	31	82	143	22	11	87	120	58	26	150	234	126	38	276	440	5	1	2	8	241	108	596	945

ACHEBE

	BALE I (1936-76)				BALE II (1977-81)				BALE III (1982-86)				BALE IV (1987-91)				(1992-1995)				SGT			
	NI	OA	NA	T	NI	OA	NA	T	NI	OA	NA	T	NI	OA	NA	T	NI	OA	NA	T	NI	OA	NA	T
NI	16	7	13	36	16	1	26	43	48	4	13	65	156	3	34	193			2	2	236	15	88	339
OA		15	9	24		12	19	31		14	14	28	1	19	16	36			1	1	1	60	59	120
NA	6	7	88	101	4		80	84	2		70	72	11		128	139			2	2	23	7	368	398
SGT	22	29	110	161	20	13	125	158	50	18	97	165	168	22	178	368			5	5	260	82	515	857

CHART THIRTEEN (continued)

NGUGI

	BALE I (1936-76)				BALE II (1977-81)				BALE III (1982-86)				BALE IV (1987-91)				(1992-1995)				SGT			
	KE	OA	NA	T	KE	OA	NA	T	KE	OA	NA	T	KE	OA	NA	T	KE	OA	NA	T	KE	OA	NA	T
KE	5			5	11		3	14	16		4	20	5		11	16					37		18	55
OA	2	11	1	14		11	8	19		33	26	59	1	39	34	74		1		1	3	95	69	167
NA	2	2	15	19	2	4	28	34	1	6.5	54.5	62		7	123	130			1	1	5	19.5	221.5	245
SGT	9	13	16	38	13	15	39	67	17	39.5	84.5	141	6	46	168	220		1	1	2	45	114.5	308.5	468

SUPER GRAND TOTALS

	BALE I (1936-76)				BALE II (1977-81)				BALE III (1982-86)				BALE IV (1987-91)				(1992-1995)				GTSGT			
	IN	OA	NA	T	IN	OA	NA	T	IN	OA	NA	T	IN	OA	NA	T	IN	OA	NA	T	IN	OA	NA	T
IN	41	11	18	71	43	4	46	93	118	9	48	175	279	12	79	370	4		2	6	486	36	193	715
OA	5	40	22	67		28	36	64		66	51	117	4	79	65	148		1	1	2	9	214	174	397
NA	14	22	168	204	12	7	169	188	7	8.5	232.5	248	17	15	478	510	1	1	5	7	51	54.5	1052.5	1158
GT SGT	61	73	208	342	55	39	251	345	125	83.5	331.5	540	300	106	622	1028	5	2	8	15	546	304.5	1419.5	2270