

**BRICKS AND WOODS UNDER THE ROOF: AN EXAMINATION OF PERSONAL PRONOUNS AS A COHESIVE DEVICE IN OSOFISAN'S *MANY COLOURS MAKE THE THUNDER KING*.**

**ADE ADENIJI (PhD)**  
Ladoke Akintola University of Technology,  
P.M.B. 4000,  
Ogbomoso, Oyo State  
[adeolualakowe@gmail.com](mailto:adeolualakowe@gmail.com)

&

**OLAGUNJU SADE (PhD)**  
Ladoke Akintola University of Technology,  
P.M.B. 4000,  
Ogbomoso, Oyo State  
[boladeolagunju@gmail.com](mailto:boladeolagunju@gmail.com)

**Abstract**

*Cohesion is of significant relevance in the use of English Language given that it provides the platform for the relation between words to make it a unified whole. As much as works abound on cohesion in English Language, to the best of our knowledge, very little has been done in investigating its application in the successful production of literary texts. This study, therefore, sets out to examine personal pronouns as a literary principle that motivates literary text productions so as to determine their values in text productions and interpretations. The first in the series, personal pronouns, are examined in Ahmed Yerima's *Many Colours Make the Thunder King*. We found out that personal pronouns are employed to make anaphoric references which largely dominate the play as Osofisan builds the utterances as bricks are laid and woods structured under the roof. Notably, the first person singular personal pronouns "I", "me", second person singular personal pronouns "you", "your", and third person singular personal pronouns "he", "him", "her", and "his", are the bricks and woods used in the construction of utterances in the play. Apart from contributing to scholarship in this direction in linguistic scholarship, the study revealed a significant use that a no-content word class pronoun can be to achieve cohesion and meaning relation in text production. This template can be employed in the examination of cohesion in other African literary plays.*

**Key Words:** Personal pronouns, cohesion, literary principles, interactions and textual mechanism

**Introduction**

Cohesion in English Language has significant relevance in text productions and interpretations (Mey, 2000). Notable features that generate cohesion are textual mechanisms such as references, personal pronouns, deictics, and tenses. Cohesion is seen in this study as a discourse feature through which a text forms a unified whole. The general conception of personal pronoun is that they are class referring expressions used in place of nouns to avoid unnecessary repetitions. In such use, an already mentioned noun is replaced with an appropriate noun in what is tagged anaphoric reference that is

backward reference, and a link with an item to be mentioned later, known as anaphoric reference, that is forward reference.

Given the potency of personal lexical choices in texts, it is flexible for a writer to use the device to construct cohesive utterances towards achieving their goals in literary texts. More often than not, personal pronouns are treated as grammatical structures. This study however is a departure from these studies as we examine the use of personal pronouns in creating reasonable links in utterances thereby aiding successful construction of a text. This study, therefore, apart from contributing to existing knowledge in this direction in linguistic scholarship, will provide significant insight into how writers rely on the use of personal pronouns to project their perspectives, especially in African refracted universes.

### **Literary pragmatics**

Literary pragmatics is all about text production and interpretation. Hence, items such as; voice, characterization, point of view, reference, personal pronoun, tense, deixis, anaphora and readership are considered pivotal to literary pragmatics. Furthermore, Adebite (2005) observes that the category of context is central to literary pragmatics. According to Mey (200:12), literary pragmatics is the sort of effects that authors, as text producers, set out to achieve, using the resources of language in their efforts to establish a “working cooperation” with their audiences who are the consumer of texts. Literary pragmatics takes cognizance of the author, textual mechanisms and the audience, based on context (cf Lodge, 1996; Proust, 1980; Banfield 1982; Ehrlich 1990; Fludernik, 1993; and Fowler, 1996)

According to (Mey, 2001), context and perspectivization are two key central issues in literary pragmatics. According to Mey (ibid), context is the totality of the environment in which a word is used. Adebite (2000) emphasizes this is in his opinion of context as an abstract category employed by language scholars to provide a link between linguistic items and the social and situation factors of communication. Context thus “provides the background from which the meaning of a word springs (Odebunmi, 2006:22). Scholars have classified context into verbal context and context of situation (Malinowski, 1923 and Firth, 1962) which have been further broken into physical context, socio-cultural context, psychology context, linguistic context, context of utterance, context of culture and context of reference (Hymes, 1964; Fowler, 1996). Context is considered central to literary pragmatics because it enables us determine owners of voices in literary texts and enhances pragmatic interpretation of literary texts.

As said earlier, another significant aspect of literary pragmatic is perspectivization. It concerns communication in the texture universe, which Mey (2000:233) likened to Saussure’s “two talking heads”, a classical model of communication that was later adopted by Roman Jakobson and Sebeok respectively. Mey (2000) examines communication in literary texts through dialogic and pragmatic perspectives which are realized through vocalization and textual mechanisms.

The dialogic perspective concerns the voices in a text. It takes into consideration the voice of the author the voice of the character and the voice of the reader. The pragmatic perspective on the other hand, shows the author, point of view and the means he employs in projection the perspectives. For an author to be heard in a literary text therefore, he creates a world in which characters act out their parts and speak with the voice that reflects the views of the author. It is through this process that the thematic preoccupations and visions of the author are projected.

Scholars have studied literary pragmatics from formal and functional perspectives. Studying the linguistics of literary texts, Lodge (1996) observes that language is the medium through which the novelist expresses his perspectives. According to him, whatever the author does is ‘in’ and ‘through’ language. Consequently, he submits that the systematic level of language analysis should be employed in the study of literary discourse with semantics and pragmatics playing major roles.

Another linguistic study on literary pragmatics is Banfield (1982) which is premised on what she calls ‘unspeakable sentences’. Working within the ambits of the Chomskyan paradigm, she attempts an analysis of what is considered to be a strictly literary problem: ‘free indirect discourse’ (FID). She posits that since utterances naturally require a speaker, then, there must be a speaker for every sentence. This implies that the speaker (character) in a literary text vocalizes the author's point of view. Sound as her

analysis and findings are, Banfield should have given an in-depth expose on the structure of the “FID” such that through the composition of “FID”, a reader would be able to recognize the author's diction and a character's “FID” so as to be able to identify the speaker of a particular 'FID'

Ehrlich (1990) explores the interpretation of a sentence through the concept of point of view. Her work benefits a lot from Fillmore (1981) and Dry (1975, 1977, 1981). Ehrlich's view about the so called “understood dative” (when there is no understanding speaker in a sentence) reveals that there are lots of sentences in texts that consist of represented speech and thought (RST), whose interpretation cannot be explained by semantic content and/or semantic factors. Ehrlich therefore submits that the knowledge of literary pragmatics is a pre-requisite for textual interpretation. However, Ehrlich would have done better by identifying the aspects of literary pragmatics that are relevant to the interpretation of RSTs in literary texts.

Furthermore, Fludernik's (1993) work is a study on language and fiction undertaking a linguistic and literary analysis of literary texts, Fludernik proposes that 'the fictions of language are produced by the language of fiction'. That is, whatever literary and narrative effect that an author employs in a literary text (fiction of language), must derive from linguistic elements (language or fiction). This suggests that literary interpretation should be exclusively describable through linguistic means. Fludernik has been cautious to add that linguistic elements are polyvalent, that is, they function in various contexts depending on use. Their interpretation therefore goes beyond the scope of linguistics. Fowler (1996) gives an expose on the orienting devices of language and how readers and character's points of view are constructed. His study benefits a lot from the works of Boris Uspensky and Gerard Genets. Fowler is of the opinion that linguistic analysis can be very effective in demonstrating the presentation of themes and ideals in a narration. Ultimately, he submits that language is employed by writers to express their worldviews. This study, we can say, contributes immensely to knowledge, especially through focalization. Focalization makes us to distinguish between two alternative viewpoints from which a story might be told.

Also, Mey (2000) examines the credibility of a narration in literary texts the way the author narrates. He also attempts to determine the speak ability of utterances. According to him, this is located in the way that characters voices march up both with each other and with the conditions of existence that the author has laid down in the narrative universe of his/her creation. Mey assumes that the speaking voice in a narration should undeniably be ascribed to a character who has the wherewithal to explicitly express the points of view of the author. He therefore submits that voices and characterization assume central roles in the production and interpretation of literary texts.

In an all encompassing exploration of literary pragmatics, Mey (2001) discusses its scope and characteristic. He notes that author and narrator, voice and point of view, linguistic devices and readership and readership and some textual mechanism such as references, deixis, personal pronouns, tense and anaphora are elements of literary pragmatics. These according to him are responsible for the production and interpretation of literary texts. This study, therefore, is the first in the series to examine these textual mechanisms and we shall begin with personal pronouns.

Mey (2000:45) observes that a particular class referring expressions are located in personal pronoun such as 'I', 'you', 'we' etc. and their associated adjectival forms like 'my', 'your', 'our' which as revealed by Ogunsiyi and Olaniyan (2005: 167) are used to refer to person, for example, first person, second person and number (singular, plural). Citing example, of personal pronouns such as 'I' 'we', 'me' 'she', 'her', 'it', 'you', 'they', 'then', Ogunsiyi and Olaniyan also note that personal pronouns can be classified into three based on person and number, as reflected on the chart below:

Person	Number	Gender	Subject	Object
1st person	Singular		I	Me
	Plural		We	Us
2nd person	Singular		You	You
	Plural		You	You
3 <sup>rd</sup> person	Singular	-Masculine	He	Him
		-Feminine	She	Her
		-non-person	It	It
	Plural		They	Them

Table 1 Personal Pronouns (Adapted from Ogunsiyi and Olaiyan 2005:167).

Mey (2000) observes that the importance of personal pronouns is in their ability to determine a perspective, that is, a speaker's point of view. Knowledge of personal pronoun therefore enables us to determine the lexical choice that has been used to replace or substitute a noun. For example, first person (1st person) denotes the speaker's (narrator's voice, and the second person (2nd person) refers to the addressee, (the person being spoken to).

***Many Colours Make the Thunderking: A brief narrative***

The play opens with the setting of one of Yoruba's most valued culture; learnt that Shango had gone to Igunnu to seek advice on what he can do to be greater than Oranmiyan (his father). So great is Shango's insatiable appetite for power that without waiting to hear the consequence of the greatness went and marry a river. Afterwards, he also married the forest, all in a bid to be greater than his father. Along the line, there is treachery in Shango's palace, and Alagemo and a wife that loves him most, Osun, were sent away from the palace. This leads to the fall of Shango as his generals rose against and challenge him. In anger, the fire from Shango's mouth destroyed the palace and he had to flee for his life. With nowhere to go, Shango and Oya went back to the ostracized Osun for assistance. There, they met Alagemo. Once again, Alagemo was in Shango's service as he saved Oya's child from being sacrificed by Yeye Iroko, but Alagemo died in the end. Shango unable to continue with the struggle killed himself by hanging, but to save Shango's face, the news was dispelled and the saying "Oba Koso", that is "the King did not hang himself" was upheld instead. In the end, the people believed that Shango lives on and that he did not hang himself.

**Analysis**

We found out that the use of personal pronouns largely dominates the play. The uses and functions that they play are cursorily examined in the following examples:

**Ex: 1:**

Background: (Alagemo reveals the spiritual powers of Shango as an epilogue to the play)

**Alagemo:** Shango O! Whenever lightning strikes now in the world and thunder rumbles, men will recall your legend, and shout your name! Oba Koso O! You who gave birth to a terrible thunderstorm, and burnt a whole city! Whose wives became the source of rivers! Salute.

*(MCMTK pg 29)*

Example 1 above reveals that Osofisan largely employs personal pronouns to make the text cohesive. The pronouns here, second person singular pronoun "your", and "you" are anaphoric references to Shango, an already mentioned token at the beginning of the utterance. Through the personal pronoun your, Alagemo revert the powers of lightening striking, and the rumbling of thunder to Shango. With variation in the lexical choice, Osofisan opt for the use of the second person singular pronoun "you" to further emphasize the awesome spiritual powers possessed by the "you and your" that replaces the earlier mentioned Shango. A consideration of the use of the pronouns in the extract reveals that the first person

singular pronouns “your” and “you” tactically makes the text a unified whole, thus making the text cohesive.

Also, when Shango went to see Alagemo for consultation, the use of personal pronouns make the interaction cohesive. Witness 2 below:

- Ex. 2:**       **Shango:** The babalawo sent me to you  
                  **Igunnu:**        Yes, I know. I have been waiting  
                  **Shango:**        You mean the priest has told you about-!  
**Igunnu:** I am Igunnu: I was born and raised  
                          in the shrine of divination! Anytime anywhere  
                          that the nut clatters on a tray, the message echoes  
                          back in the chambers of my mind.  
                          That night, I looked in my calabash  
                          and I saw you by the tray.  
                          My king was burdened.  
**Shango:** I was, and shall continue to be  
                          until this obstacle is laid to dust!  
                          Stand up, my friend.  
                          Look at me and tell me who am i?  
**Igunnu:** What! When an elephant walks by,  
                          does one still ask-is that a passing breeze?  
                          The crocodile may leave his mouth open, but  
                          which animal will walk into it to have a nap?  
                          Shango Olukoso mi! why do people sing-  
                          (He signals the drummer to join him).  
                          “A feni ti kogilakolu,  
                          A feni Shango fe pa,  
                          Lole ko l’Eshu, lole ko lu Shango,  
                          A feni Esu fe pa!” –  
                          Total strangers who have never seen your face  
                          tremble at the sound of your name

(*MCMTK Pg. 17-18*)

The first person singular personal pronouns, “I”, “me”, the second person singular personal pronouns, “you”. “your”, and the third person singular pronoun “his” no doubt enhance the smooth flow of interaction between the characters here. The interaction opens with Shango’s contribution “the babalawo sent me to you”. The second person singular personal pronoun “you” automatically links with Igunnu’s response “yes, I know”, and on and on the chain continues to link. The first use of “you” by Shango refers to Igunnu, the second personal pronoun, “I” also refers to Igunnu.

A close look at the exchange reveals that Shango employs the personal pronoun “you” in the early part to refer to Igunnu, while the second person personal pronoun “I” by Igunnu refers to himself. However, with subsequent use of “you” by Igunnu to refer to Shango in the later part, it is obvious that personal pronouns are employed in the interactions in the play to sustain the link and sense of character’s utterances. This makes the exchange of words and turn taking in example 2 above to reflect Bhaktin’s (1992) assertion that interactions in drama texts are just like everyday conversations because it is close to reality. With our understanding of the use of pronouns in the extract here, we are able to associate the use of the pronoun “you” as making reference to the person being spoken to and “I” as a reference to the speaker.

This trend is maintained until the last contribution of Igunnu in the extract where he mentioned crocodile and subsequently anaphorically makes a backward reference to the same crocodile with the use of the third person singular personal pronoun “his”. A consideration of the use of pronouns in the extract above undoubtedly shows their usefulness in textual cohesion.

After Shango ordered Gbonka and Timi to fight so that they would kill each other so as to get rid of them, Gbonka came out victorious and after killing Timi, he challenges Shango and initiates moves to take over the political power from Shango. The use of personal pronouns comes in handy here to link the utterances and guarantee cohesion.

**Ex. 3: Gbonka:** There, Shango! I challenge you now, I Gbonka!

I have freed myself of your spell! Bring out the fire in  
your mouth now! And see if I will not quench it!  
I, Gbonka, I dare you in the open! I declare your reign  
ended today! You must leave the throne from now on!  
I give you seven days to surrender your crown! Or I,  
Gbonka, will come and take it from you! I Gbonka, I am  
second to none! Gidigbo Gidigbo

(*MCMTK* Pg. 81)

Example 3 reveals that Osofisan employs the first person singular personal pronoun in the extract above to knit the utterances together. Actually, there is no interaction here, Gbonka's contribution here is a challenge to Shango. In making the challenge, Osofisan makes use of the first person personal pronoun "I" to ascribe pride to Gbonka who boast of his spiritual powers in "I have freed myself of your spell", "see if I will not quench it", that is the fire in Shango's mouth, "I, Gbonka", "I dare". "I declare...", "I am second to none" and so on show how the first person personal pronoun "I" can be employed to express possession of spiritual power.

Also, we are made to understand here in example 3 that there is a referent to whom Gbonka's challenge is addressed. The referent here is Shango, as Gbonka mentioned his name in the early part of his contribution. Shango in this instance becomes an already mentioned token to which other second person singular personal pronouns such as "you" and "your" anaphorically refer. These manifest in such utterances as "I challenge you now", "I dare you in the open!", "I declare your reign ended today!", "you must leave the throne from now on!", "I give you seven days to surrender your crown!", aptly employed to achieve cohesion.

Osofisan also deals with the issue of predestination in *MCMTK* in terms of individual's choice of being in the world as ratified by God, marriage, and life sustenance. The issue of man's existence here predates the birth of various individuals. Characters that are affected by such situations in *MCMTK* are Oya, Shango, Alagemo and Osun. Let us consider the following examples:

**Ex.4 : Alagemo:**

It is what she herself chose as her destiny,  
when she was coming to the world. She chose  
opulence and beauty, and the children who  
could have accompanied her fled to other women,  
especially to the daughter of the forest. That  
is why our forefathers gave their warning. That  
whoever marries a river, will sooner or later  
wed a forest! But you didn't want to listen.

(*MCMTK* Pg. 29)

The whole of Alagemo's utterance above adequately points to predestination. The whole contribution is on Osun's destiny. Osofisan employs Alagemo, as a spiritual being, for us to take a peep into the Osun's request from God before coming to the world. The Yorubas' on which Osofisan's story is based belief that people chose their destiny stating how they will live on earth. Alagemo makes us to realize through the use of the second person singular personal pronoun "she" in making reference to Osun. Such utterances as "she herself", "when she was coming to the world", "she chose opulence and beauty..." are indicators.

Also, the third person singular personal pronoun is employed to refer to Osun and issues on her barrenness which Alagemo reveals as what she herself chose as "her destiny". This occurs as Osun decided to choose opulence and beauty, thus making the children who could have accompanied

“her” to the world to flee to other women. Without the use of the personal pronouns here, the cohesion achieved in making the utterance a coherent unified whole would have been impossible.

Osofisan further uses Alagemo to project the theme of predestination as the following example reveals:

**Ex. 5:**

**Alagemo:** (Alone). And so King Shango, with my help, accomplished his second ambition, and married a forest. The celebrations were just as wild and exuberant as those which marked the coming of Oya into the palace. Osun was the daughter of the forest and with her came the dwellers of that place to bless Shango’s kingdom. Food crops came in abundance, along with fruit trees. Gardens and orchards replaced bushes, and huge forests sprang up in once-arid savannahs. Along the ochre streets worn smooth and bald by the feet of soldiers, the miracle of flowers became a common sight! And Osun proved to be so fertile that, in no time, she earned a reputation as the daughter of the god of fertility, and needy women came praying to her court for help. King Shango had indeed surpassed his father. But what would happen next? One day the king left the palace, on his annual hunting expedition. In his absence, Oya and the generals summoned me.....

*(MCMTK Pg. 35)*

Our observation in the extract above is that in making use of the pronouns, Osofisan employs them to make direct reference, that is, in instances where the name of the referent has just been mentioned. For instance, “King Shango, with my help, accomplished “his” second ambition. The third person singular personal pronoun “his” is applied to make a direct reference to King Shango. In another instance Alagemo reveals that “Osun was the daughter of the forest and with “her” came the dwellers of that place to bless Shango’s kingdom”. Osofisan through Alagemo here also makes direct reference to Osun with the use of the third person singular personal pronoun. However, one would have expected the contribution to follow the trend such that the following pronoun, Shango ought to have been substituted with the third person singular personal pronoun “his”. This shows that it is not possible to make reference through substitution of the nouns for personal pronouns except in instances where there is direct reference.

This formation structure is further revealed in the extract when Alagemo further tells us about Osun and still makes an anaphoric reference to Osun through the use of the second person singular personal pronoun “she”. This is also followed with the mention of Shango’s name and a subsequent substitution with the third person singular personal pronoun “his”.

Pre-destination is also presented relative to marital issue when Shango wants to marry the hill as the third wife, Oya is against the move. Alagemo cautions Oya against this, telling her to remember that Shango’s destiny is to marry the river (Oya herself), the forest (Osun) and the hill, in order to be greater than his father, Oranmiyan. The conversation between Oya and Alagemo reflects this better.

**Ex. 6:** **Oya:** No, Osun don’t listen to his nonsense!

Why? Are we here, you and me?  
You the daughter of the forest, and me  
the princess of the river?

**Alagemo:** We are enough propitiation for mother earth!  
But Queen, you know yourself the importance  
of the mountain to your survival! Let Shango  
complete the circle. He will be greater than  
his father because men will say of him

he restored our link with mother earth  
we desecrated the forest and rivers,  
but he brought restoration!

*(MCMTK Pg. 39)*

Oya's contribution here would not have been cohesive without the use of personal pronouns. Notable here are the third person singular personal pronouns "his", "him", and "he", second person singular personal pronouns "you" and "your", first person personal pronoun "me", and first person plural pronouns "we" and "our" respectively.

In the first instance, the second person singular personal pronoun "you" is substituted for Osun, an earlier mentioned noun, thus creating an anaphoric reference whereby we identify the referent of the second person singular personal pronoun "you" in line 2 as Osun in line 1. Furthermore, the first person singular personal pronoun "me" in line 2 is a referent to Oya, the speaker. Although her name has not been mentioned earlier, we take the referent as anaphoric as it specifically makes a backward reference to Oya, the speaker herself. However, the flexibility and usefulness of the two above mentioned personal pronouns are revealed in lines 3 and 4 where the second person singular personal pronoun "you" is employed to refer to the later mentioned "daughter of the forest" and the first person singular personal pronoun, "me" also identifying a later mentioned "daughter of the river". Since these are not back references unlike in earlier mentioned instances above, the forward reference here to the "daughter of the forest" and "daughter of the river" are both cataphoric as they are employed to create a link with yet to be mentioned items, thus creating the needed cohesion to make the text a unified whole and acquire required cohesion. Also, the first person plural personal pronoun "we" in line 5 is an anaphoric reference to both the "daughter of the forest" and the "daughter of the river" earlier identified with the second person singular personal pronoun "you", and the first person singular personal pronoun "me" in lines 3 and 4 above.

Furthermore, Osofisan employs lots of personal pronouns to knit Alagemo's contribution together in 6 above. The second person singular personal pronoun "you" in the first line of Alagemo's contribution is an anaphoric reference to an already mentioned token Queen in line 1, as well as the second person singular personal pronoun in line 2 an anaphoric and backward reference to Queen earlier mentioned. The third person singular personal pronouns "he", "his", and "him" in lines 3, 4, and 5 of Alagemo's contribution are anaphoric references to Shango, an already mentioned token in line 2 of Alagemo's contribution here. The first person plural personal pronoun "we" is a combine anaphoric reference to all of Alagemo, Osun, and Oya, while the third person singular personal pronoun "he" in the last line is an anaphoric reference to already mentioned Shango. The foregoing reveals that without the use of the personal pronouns, the text would have lack cohesion.

Osofisan also employs the use of the personal pronouns to produce cohesive utterances in encouraging Oya that she can still conceive and give birth to a child. Let us consider example 7 below:

**Ex. 7: Osun:** No. let's not abandon hope yet you may still have this child, even sooner than you think! The god of children may visit your womb with a sudden roundness!

**Oya:** It won't Osun. That's a vain hope. What haven't I tried!  
Which of our gods have I not sacrificed to?  
Which herbalist have I not consulted?  
It's all been in vain. Shango has long forgotten the way to my bedstead!

**Osun:** Iyale mi, I'd wanted to suggest this to you long ago, but didn't know how you would take it.  
Back in the forest, there is an Iroko tree to whom barren women go. A goddess lives inside it, whose power is reputed to be infallible.  
Would you want to try her?

*(MCMTK Pg. 49)*



The second person singular personal pronouns “you” and “your” are employed in the extract above to make anaphoric references to Oya. These are observed in lines 1, 2, 3, 9, 10, and 14. The second person singular personal pronoun “you” in line 9 directly refers to Oya, identified as “Iyale mi “on the same line in an anaphoric reference. The first person singular personal pronouns “I” in lines 4, 5, and 6 are anaphoric references to Oya, while the one in line 9 is a backward reference to Osun. This shows that Osofisan employs the second person singular personal pronouns “you” and “your” to refer to the addressee, while he uses the first person singular personal pronoun “I” to refer to the speaker. Lastly, the first person singular personal pronoun “it” on line 12, and the third person singular personal pronoun “her” are employed to make anaphoric references to the “goddess” on line 11 in an anaphoric reference thus making the text a unified whole. A glean at the extract reveals that Osofisan relies largely on the use of personal pronouns in the construction of the majority of the utterances in the play in the bid to project his thematic preoccupations.

### Conclusion

We have examined the use of personal pronouns as lexical items to construct character’s utterances as bricks and woods are to construct houses in *Many Colours Make the Thunder King*. We found out that Osofisan largely employs personal pronouns especially to create a link in the text. Two types of references, anaphoric and cataphoric were found occasioned by the use of personal pronouns in the play. We found out that anaphoric reference largely dominates the play as Osofisan builds the utterances as bricks are laid and woods structured under the roof. First person singular personal pronouns “I”, “me”, second person singular personal pronouns “you”, “your”, third person singular personal pronouns “he”, “him”, “her”, “his”, are the personal pronouns that largely dominate the play. Apart from contributing to scholarship in this direction in linguistic scholarship, this has revealed a significant use that a no-content word class pronoun can be put to achieve cohesion. This template can be employed to examine cohesion in other African refracted textual universes.

### References

- Adegbite, W. 2000. “Pragmatics: Some Basic Principles and Procedures” *Studies in English Language*. Ed. Babajide, A.O. Ibadan: Enicrownfit pp 60-80.
- Adegbite, W. 2005 “Pragmatics Tactics in Diplomatic Communication: A Case Study of Ola Rotimi’s *Ovontamwen Nogbaisi*”. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37:1457-1480.
- Banfiled, A. 1982. *Unspeakable Sentences*, England: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Bartens, H. 2001. *Literary Theory: The Basics*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Barthes, R. 1972. *Mythologies*, New York: Hill and Wang.
- Barthes, R 1994. *Images – Music- Text*, New York: Hill and Wang.
- Bennett, T. 1979. *Formalism and Marxism*: London.
- Culler, J. 1997. *Literary Theory A very Short Introduction*, Oxford; Oxford University Press.
- Dasyilva, A.O. 2004. *Studies in Drama*, Ibadan: Sam Bookman Educational and Communication Services.
- Dobbie, A.B. 2002. *Theory into Practices: An Introduction to literary criticism*, Thompson London
- Eagleton, T. 1978. *Criticism and Ideology*, New York: Schocken.
- Eagleton, T. 1996. *Literary Theory*, Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Ehrlich, S. 1990. *Point of View: A linguistic Analysis of Literary Style*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Firth, J.R. 1962. “A Synopsis of Linguistic Theory “1930-1935””. *Studies in Linguistic Analysis*. London: Philosophical Society.
- Fludernik, M. 1993. *The Fiction of Language and the Languages of Fiction*. London: Routledge.
- Fowler, R. 1986. *Linguistic Criticism*. London: Oxford University Press.

- Grice, H.P. 1975, 'Logic and Conversation' *Syntax and Semantics*, Ed. Peter C. and Jerry M. 3: Speech Acts. New York: Academic Press 41-58.
- Halliday, M.A.K. and Hassan, R. 1976. *Ohesion in English*. London: Longman
- Halliday, M.A.K. 1978. *Language as Social Semiotic*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Hymes, D. 1962. 'The Ethnography of Speaking' in T. Gladwin and W.C. Sturvent (eds.) *Anthropology and Human Behaviour*. Anthropological Society of Washinton.
- Hymes, D. 1962. "Toward Ethnographies of Communication: The Analysis of Communicative Events" *Language and Social Context*. Ed. Gigioli P.P. Harmondsworth. Middx: Penguin Books. 21-44
- Iji, E 2001. *Background to Femi Osofisan's Philosophy on Drama and Theatre*, Calabar BAAJ International Company.
- Jay, M. 1935. *Marxism and Totality*, Berkeley: University of California Press
- Jefferson, A. and Robey, D. 1986. *Modern Literary Theory: A Comparative Introduction*, London: Batsford.
- Leech, G. 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics*, London: Longman
- Levinson, S. 1979. "Activity Types and Language" *Linguistics* 17 (516) 365-399.
- Lyons, J. 1977. *Theoretical Linguistics*, London: Cambridge University Pres.
- Magill, F.N. 1987. *Critical Survey of Literary Theory*, Pasadena: Salem Press.
- Makaryk, I.R 1993. Ed. *Encyclopedia of Contemporary Literary Theory: Approaches, Schools, Terms*. Toronto, University of Toronto Press.
- Malinowski, B. 1923. 'The Problems of Meaning in Primitive Languages'. *The Meaning of Meaning*. Eds. C.K. Ogden and I.A. Richards. New York: London. 296-336.
- Mey, Jacob, L. 2000. *When Voices Clash*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin: New York.
- Mey, Jacob, L. 2001. *Pragmatics: An Introduction*, )2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Blackwell, Malden, Mass and Oxford.
- Natoli, J. 1987. *Tracing Literary Theory*, Chicago University of Illinois Press.
- Odebunmi, A. 2001. *The English Word and Meaning: an Introductrroy Text*. Ogbomoso: Critical Sphere.
- Odebunmi, A. 2006 (a). a pragmatic Reading of Ahmed Yerman's Proverbs in Yemoja, Attahiru, and Dry Leaves on Ukan Trees *Intercultural Pragmatics* 3-2. 153-169.
- Odebunmi, A. 2006(b) *Meaning in English: An introduction*. Ogbomoso: Critical Sphere.
- Odebunmi, A. 2008. Pragmatics Functions of Crisis-Motivated Proverbs in Ola Rotimin's *The Osofisan, Femi* 1991. *Esu and the Vagabond Minstrels*. Ibadan: New Horn Press Ltd.
- Rivkin, J.R.M. 1998. *Literary Theory: An Anthology* Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell.