

# The Playwright as a Global Interpreter: An Examination of Femi Osofisan's Adaptation Techniques in *Wèsóo Hamlet*

---

Femi Adedina

Department of Theatre Arts,  
Adeniran Ogunsanya College of Education,  
Otto-Ijanikin, Lagos

---

## Abstract

Adaptation of literary works, most especially classic plays is a tricky business that tasks the writer. Adapting a well-known Shakespearean play like *Hamlet* to fit the Ijebu culture in Yorubaland, Western Nigeria, West Africa would have been an arduous task for a neophyte writer, but for a mature writer like Babafemi Osofisan, it is an opportunity to experiment. This paper explores the innovative techniques Osofisan used in transplanting a global tragic play into an African setting and soil. It also examines the various innovative themes and ideas introduced into the adaptation making it different from other adapted plays. The paper finally registers the challenges the playwright must have faced in localizing a play like *Hamlet* while exploring global issues like the impact of tobacco companies on less developed countries (LDC).

**Keywords:** Adaptation, Osofisan, *Wèsóo Hamlet*, *Hamlet*, playwriting, LDC

## Introduction

Adapting any work of literature to fit a new millieu, period and time is an arduous task. When the work is a classic piece well known in the world and well read it becomes a tricky business and a big task for the writer. To a prolific writer like Femi Osofisan however, it is an opportunity to experiment. An opportunity to explore his own cultural millieu and meld it with the features of the cultural millieu of the play he is adapting. We have seen this at play in all the plays he had adapted from the works of Gogol, Feydeau, Sophocles, Euripides and even Brecht. His dexterity in ever interpreting the stories he grabbed from other writers in a way we

cannot believe it is possible to interpret them serves as the kernel of this paper. In this paper we will be assessing the beauty of Osofisan's experimentation in *Wèsóo Hamlet!* and the impact his innovative experimentations have on the timeless Shakespearean's *Hamlet*.

### **What is Adaptation?**

Adaptation involves looking at an old literary work, an extant manuscript or a work in another genre of Literature and re-reading, re-creating or reworking it to create a new piece that though it is not totally new, it still have links with the script from which it is adapted. If the literary work is being adapted to fit a new medium like turning a novel into a film, the new work most times retains the basics of the old work. Why do writers adapt other works? How do they feel when they try to give a new look at an old work like Soyinka in recreating Euripides *Bacchae* to fit the Yoruba milieu, Ola Rotimi in transplanting Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex* to the land of Kutuje and even Osofisan re-reading Gogol's *The Government Inspector* as *Who's Afraid of Solarin* and Tunde Kelani recreating *Who's Afraid of Solarin* in the film medium as *Yeepa! Solarin mbo*. Osofisan in an interview gave an insight into the mind of the writer when he wants to adapt a work when he avers that:

when I do adaptations, really, I am not thinking in terms of... I mean... I see them as a separate line from my whole body of work and as I said earlier on, one is never completely free as a writer in making adaptations. You are more or less trapped by the original script. You are trapped within its structure and its message. So, it's not really your work, if I may say so. It's somebody else's work, which you are interpreting for a new time, a new climate, and maybe a new mode ... I have to agree, ideologically, with the authors before I begin any interpretation. (Olasope, 2013, p.75)

The feeling that the adapted work is not the writer's own work but one in which he is limited by structure and message does most times make the writer to try and break out of the mode through experimentation. In order

to achieve this, however, as Osofisan pointed out the writer adapting must 'agree ideologically with the author'.

### **Adaptation process and innovation in Wèsóo Hamlet!**

There have been many recreating, revisioning and adaptation of Hamlet as short story, novel, film or plays. They include: *James Joyce's Ulysses*, *Salman Rushdie's short story 'Yorrick'*, *Haig (2006) The Dead Fathers Club*, *Isler (1994) The Prince of Western Avenue*, *John Updike's Gertrude and Claudius*, *Tom Stoppard's Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead*, *Peter Elliot Weiss (1986), The Haunted House Hamlet*, *Michael O'Brien (1995), Mad Boy Chronicle*, *Iordanov's The Murder of Gonzago*, *The Klingon Hamlet*, *Michael Almeredya's (2010) film and Hamlet translated into Indian language (Das, 2005)* to mention a few. One basic but common characteristic of all these adaptations is the fact that, 'a revisionary author's reaction to a previous work leads to the creation of a new literary work'. This is why Bloom (1975) lays insistence on the existence of a state of intertextuality among literary works, arguing that every 'literary work is a response to another literary work'. (pg. 27); since revisioning to Bloom is a new poet's attempt to prove his "own distinctive existence" (Leitch et al. 2010, pg. 1649). Thus a revisioning of Hamlet might be interpreted as a way of protestation against, or, a depiction of certain contemporaneous trends or events. However, as Sanders (2001) argues, several terms such as adaptation, appropriation and revisioning have been utilized to explain the process of absorbing and transforming Shakespeare, yet there is no consensus among scholars as to the exact delineation of each of the terms. In adapting, recreating, revisioning or transforming there are four major types, namely:

absorption of *Hamlet* by a competent writer as a challenge to Shakespeare; rewriting of the play as a response to the questions unaddressed in the original text; revisioning of the play as a feminist struggle intent upon defending women against patriarchal readings of them; transforming *Hamlet* as a postcolonial urge to rewrite the past. Further, it is argued that varied types of revisioning, adapting, or transforming *Hamlet*, though

roughly different in their exact significations and delineations, are the consequence of two major factors: psychological reaction to Shakespeare, and, being situated within a socio-political context. (Safaei and Hashim, 2013, p. 21)

The two factors Safaei and Hashim talked about led to Jorgen's classification of film productions of Shakespeare into: presentation (in which a version close to the original play is produced by the artist), interpretation (where the production conveys a certain critical viewpoint of the director towards the original work) and adaptation (where the original play becomes an ingredient for a new production). *Wèsóo Hamlet* falls into the third category of Jorgen's classification. It also falls into the second category of Safaei and Hashim, that is, "rewriting of the play as a response to the questions unaddressed in original text". There are many questions unanswered in the original *Hamlet*. Some of the questions include: what are the motives of the major characters for the main characters in *Hamlet* to commit the crime they committed? What caused the young Hamlet's tardiness in carrying out action after finding out the truth about his father's death? Osofisan tried to give answers to some of the questions in the way he adapted Shakespeare's play. Therefore, assessing Osofisan's adaptation will be from the perspectives of structure, thematic concerns and characterisation. To do this effectively, we will highlight the new aspects Osofisan introduced to *Hamlet*; evaluate the impact of the additions and x-raying likely challenges Osofisan might have faced in adapting *Hamlet* to Ijebu culture in Yorubaland that is part of Western Nigeria in West Africa..

### **Osofisan's Experiment in Hamlet: Glocalising a concept**

In creating *Wèsóo Hamlet* from *Hamlet*, Osofisan went back to Yoruba culture and values to bring out concepts that are in contraindication to Western ideas about time concept, death, revenge, royalty, respect and love. He however, depicted how globalisation is battering the Yoruba cultural values in the areas of filial relationships, royalty, respect, love, truth and rulers' acquisitive tendencies. The new additions Osofisan made to *Hamlet* are discussed below.

The first is the introduction of a Prologue to the play where there is a lot of dance and music and the festival of the ancestral masks. In the original Shakespearean play there was no prologue. In this prologue scene, Òrúnmìlà the Yoruba god of wisdom detailed the ancestral masks of Claudius, Ophelia, and Hamlet to go to Yoruba land in order to intervene in the repeat of what happened to them in Denmark because:

Òrúnmìlà has decided that some of you  
Who were prominent in that earlier drama  
Should return now, to participate again,  
In its recurrence in Yorubaland, all in the hope that  
The tragedy that is about to break may be averted.  
(*Wèsóo Hamlet, p.8*)

Claudius, Hamlet and Ophelia's ancestral masks' visit confirms the differences between Western and Yoruba's time perception and orientation. The Western's concept of linear time perception is different from the African cyclical concept of time that time is always within time. This means that, the past is always in the present and will always be in the future. Hence the ancestral visit shows how the action in another part of the globe- Denmark- in the past is connected to an event in Ijebu area of Yorubaland and since according to Òrúnmìlà's messenger, there is no colour or race in the afterworld:

So, as I call you out now, you will go and prepare  
To regain your former human forms  
But – I warn you- this time as Africans,  
The same colour of skin as your hosts.  
(*Wèsóo Hamlet, p.8*)

The inability of the three ancestral spirits to avert the tragedy but even contributing to it through Claudius suggestions to Oba Ayibi seem to confirm the aphorism that, 'man does not learn from history'.

The use of dance and music as play opener in this adaptation instead of the guards' night watch and Hamlet's father's ghost visiting the watchmen in the original play is for a point. To the Yoruba mind, the return of a son from a sojourn in a foreign land is a thing of joy. An event worth celebrating, so for the townspeople, Ìyámódé and Asípa will not

allow Létò to slink into town like a criminal or a person without pedigree. This led to the dance and the merriment that opened Osofisan's *Wèsóo Hamlet* instead of the dialogue that opened Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. This further differentiates the Western 'logos-centric' drama from African drama with its combination of song, drum and dance. The invocation of Sayedero's ghost instead of the Senior Hamlet's ghost visiting his son in the night as depicted in the original *Hamlet* is meant to introduce traditional means- *Òkú Pípè*- through which the Yoruba contact and discuss with ancestors, ancestral spirits, forefathers and foremothers. The Yoruba believe that a ghost that keep roaming about did not die a good death and is not a good ghost. So, Osofisan in keeping to this cultural belief did not allow Létò's father's ghost to roam, as it was in the original *Hamlet* rather he fell back on a cultural practice- *Òkú Pípè*. The invocation of Létò's father's ghost in the *Bàrà* instead of the ghost wandering and visiting as in the original *Hamlet* reflects the Yoruba belief that the ghost that keeps wandering has not been allowed to rest with the ancestors hence, the saying and the wish that their dead will not become "*Aláámù tí n je l'èbà ògiri*" (*The lizard that plays and wanders on the wall*). However, an ancestor with offspring is never asleep, hence the saying, "*Òkú olómo kii sùn*".

The introduction of the evils of tobacco health and economic wise as a thematic concern into the play serves as a motive. In the original *Hamlet*, there was no motive ascribed to Claudius murder of his brother except royal and palace intrigue. In Osofisan's play however, a motive was added. Oba Ayibi's intentions to build a tobacco company which his brother the king, Oba Sayédèrò vehemently opposed. The conflict between the two brothers (which had undertones of sibling rivalry) over the appropriateness or inappropriateness of establishing a tobacco company in the town serves as the basis of fall out between them. This in turn led to the subsequent death of Oba Sayédèrò. As the exchange between them shows, Sayedero's death cannot be divorced from this conflict as reflected in the last exchange between them that:

Oba Sayédèrò: Go now. But just remember that it's going to be over my dead body, you hear. That factory will be built here only over my dead body!

Ayibi: All right. So be it then (*Wèsóo Hamlet*, 2012,p.31)

The sub theme of tobacco as a form of capitalist tool meant to deprive third world people of their health, wealth and a means of subjugating and oppressing under developing world inhabitants shows the effects of capitalism on Less Developed Countries (LDC) as Sayédèrò rightly pointed out that:

Tobacco is dangerous to human health. All over the world now, except in the non-Western and developing countries, smoking is being banned, because it leads to cancer. In the US, where your partners are coming from, major tobacco companies are closing down, because of the cost of litigation they are facing from tobacco victims. (*Wèsóo Hamlet*, 2012, pp.28-29)

Oba Ayibi's Machiavellian strategies and scheming, which surpasses Claudius own strategies in the original play is another addition. In Osofisan's version of *Hamlet*, Oba Ayibi's strategies and scheming include the bribing of his brother through gifts and money and when Sayédèrò stood against his interests, he killed him. His hidden motive of making money over the health of his townspeople is lacquered and painted in glittering colours he stated that he is starting a "*project that will bring employment to so many, attract modern amenities to the town and generally help improve the lives of the people*" pg.28. After killing his brother and Létò, the surviving son and the heir started digging and asking questions, Oba Ayibi went further than Claudius in *Hamlet* when he staged a scenario where Létò was set up as Ayibi's assassin and jailed for an attempt on the king's life and had his life on line. The Chiefs pleadings and explanation that Oba Ayibi could not kill the Prince and the king aligning with Claudius suggestions, offered the Aremo's position to Létò. All these were schemes and stratagems of the king to retain the throne. Ayibi in *Wèsóo Hamlet* went more than just sending a letter to another king to kill his foe. He went far to the point of setting Létò up and finally asking Ìyámòde to swap with him in the traditional mock battle between him and the Aremo while making plans to kill him.

Another of Osofisan's addition was the creation of a motive for the Queen (Olori) in order to justify her marriage to Ayibi, within a short time of her husband's death. The Queen's motive for marrying her husband's murderer- insecurity- is different from the original *Hamlet*. The fact that the Queen decided on most of her actions in Osofisan's *Wèsóo Hamlet* because of her son is patently African. There are other additions that made *Hamlet* authentically an African play in Osofisan's hand and they include, the use of flashbacks and play within play and masques more than the ones used in the original play. This is reflected in Létò using dance drama to confirm Ayibi's guilt as in the original *Hamlet* and the flashback on events leading to Oba Sayédèrò being killed. Others include, the Tobacco Procession Masque in the Bàrà after Tundun's death and the flashback of the maiden dance and Tundun's courtship by Létò in order to justify Tundun's actions in the play. All these reflect the African total theatre concept. The Masques and play-within-play also serve as commentary and expository tools in exploring some aspects of the play. In addition, they serve as motives for some characters. There are some play within play and masques. One of these is where Létò used dance drama to confirm Ayibi's guilt as in the original *Hamlet*. There was also flashback on events that led to Oba Sayédèrò being killed. This explained the motive for Oba Ayibi's murder of Létò's father. The flashback of the maiden dance and courtship scene and the meeting between Létò and Tùndùn before Létò's journey abroad, serve as justification for Tundun's actions later in the play. The doubts Tùndùn expressed and Létò's reassurance became explicit when Létò was unable to keep his words after learning about his father's death.

There are other additions Osofisan added to *Hamlet* in order to make the play fully an African play. They also include the following, Tundun's visitation of the Bara in order to see Létò, thereby breaking a taboo and putting a curse on herself thereby explaining her death rather than making her mad and drowning as in original *Hamlet*. The visit to see Létò could be explained as breaking a taboo so that Osofisan can have a reason for her death rather being depressed as it was in the original *Hamlet*. The taboo she broke placed a curse on her as Ìyámòde explained:

Tùndùn: I am sorry, Ìyámòde, please beg the dead for me!



Ìyámòde: As easy as that, eh? You fool! Because you couldn't wait anymore" you decided to contaminate yourself and put a curse on your head?

Túndùn: I'm really sorry—

Ìyámòde: Now you may never live long enough to be married, don't you know? Or if you marry, you 'll never have an offspring! Which do you choose? An early death or the pain of barrenness? (*Wèsóo Hamlet*, 2012,p.34)

Osofisan used this incident as a technique to explain Tundun's death later rather than making her mad and drowning as in the original *Hamlet* since as Túndùn explained to

Ophelia's ancestral mask:

Túndùn: This was where you drowned.

Ophelia: In a river, like this.

Túndùn: For the love of a man!

[Ophelia does not answer]

Túndùn: On our continent, we do not die because of heartbreak. We just weather the storm, till the climate changes.

Ophelia: On your continent, you are sure? (p.43)

Also, Tundun's action of burning down Oba Ayibi's tobacco company as a sign of her love for Létò and a means of reclaiming him is another addition. This action in Tundun's mind serves as a means of showing her love to Létò. Since in her mind, the burning of the factory will relieve Létò's pain arising from his father's death and at the same time show her love for Létò. This will in a way in her thinking help her reclaim his love. The burns she suffered and subsequent death through the tampering with Ìyámòde's herbs at the Bara caused Tundun's death and served as an alternative to Ophelia's death by drowning in the original *Hamlet*.

Like in all Osofisan's plays, *Wèsóo Hamlet* gave important roles to women. Women play important roles in Yorubaland setting and in Osofisan's plays and the ones in *Wèsóo Hamlet* are no exception. As Osofisan explained:

If you look at our culture very closely, at least, you know at a particular age, a woman was... is treated as a

male...once she attains a certain age, especially menopause. Besides, you'll find that in certain cults, females play certain roles, sometimes even superior to those of male members... (Olasope, 2013, p.62)

In *Wèsóo Hamlet*, Ìyámódè's roles as the go between ancestral spirits and the living, as Bara's caretaker where the departed kings bodies are kept and as an important chief in the palace showed the important role of women in Yoruba traditional society. The women in *Wèsóo Hamlet* were also stronger than men. While the men were busy scheming, dilly-dallying on actions to take, the women were making decisions and taking actions. Túndùn burnt down the tobacco company instead of complaining about it to Létò, the Olori took her life when she found out about Oba Ayibi's schemes and plots while Àdùkè avenged her friend's death by poisoning Létò. The women exploits in *Wèsóo Hamlet* were meant to show women's tenacity and strength.

Another of Osofisan's addition to *Hamlet* is the use of indigenous communication medium – Àrokò- as medium of message transfer to Oba Àyíbí. This represents the depth and semiotic qualities of messages in traditional Yoruba communities. As Oba Ayibi himself interprets each object sent to him after jailing Létò preparatory towards killing him.

**Oba Ayibi:** (Reads, as he unwinds the àroko): What 's this? Ah, burnt thatch. Snake skin. Bone of dog, meaning, "We do not set a fire to the home to catch a rat". I see! (Thinks) Snakes. "The snake dies because of the sins of his father, but it is the memory of his father's services that saves the dog" Hmm, what else? Two elephant carvings: "When the animals bow to a young elephant, it is not because of his exploits, but those of his forbears." Same thing. Thank you! This is what the elders sent to me? (*Wèsóo Hamlet*, 2012,p.62)

The combination and deeper meaning of the objects' symbolism shows the depth of Yoruba's philosophy and ideas. The weaving of Oba Ayibi's pursuit of money to the detriment of his subject with a parallel drawn between the unabashed capitalism of today and the ills of slavery in

Africa past within the play is also to comment on colonialism and neo-colonialism that seem to ravage present day African countries and leadership with the help of the West. This political examination of African's past and present differentiates Osofisan's *Hamlet* from the original *Hamlet*. This is not an innovation per se in Osofisan's works because one could make reference to how he treated the conflict between divine law and human law in his adaptation of Sophocles *Antigone* by referencing it with the activities of white colonialists in Yorubaland.

### **Likely Challenges Osofisan faced in adapting *Hamlet* for Yoruba Lord**

In creating a different *Hamlet* for Yorubaland, Osofisan must have faced some challenges. Some of these challenges will include setting, structure and the question of innovation when it comes to the new *Hamlet* as the additions above have shown; Osofisan circumvented these challenges in many creative ways. As to setting, he sets it in Ijebu land, whose traditional structure captures the intricacies; he would like to introduce into the new *Hamlet* he conceived. On the question of what to leave out and what to build on, Osofisan instead of taking out some aspects of the old *Hamlet* decided to extend and add deeper motives to the various characters than what their motives were in the old *Hamlet*. This is a way deepened the new *Wèsóo Hamlet* and also gave a good understanding of the characters. The additions of players in the old *Hamlet* in his own use of *Hamlet* also goes further to link the past with the present and bring out the universality of motives and nature. All these created a new *Hamlet* in all and made *Wèsóo Hamlet* different from Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. Osofisan's answers to above as seen in *Wèsóo Hamlet* come as a result of his own perception of adaptation process when he avers that:

...the adaptations I am inspired to write from the impulse of a powerful and mutual recognition, like the thrill of love or an unplanned re-union between long separated friends. That is, I read some work, and both the work and I come to what I call a delicious understanding, a glowing accord, immediate or slow but irresistible anyway. You know there are texts like that,

authors who speak like blood ancestors. (Olasope, 2013,p. 138)

This ability to take the old and remold it in a new manner with the old DNA reworded made Osofisan's adaptations a beauty to read from the African perspectives and distinctly create differences between Osofisan's adaptation and other African writers' adaptations. The dexterity in weaving wefts and warps of an old story into a new cloth in a way that the new cloth, that is story, while still carrying the patterns and texture of the old story differentiates Osofisan's adaptations. This is seen in most of his adaptations- *Tegonni* from Sophocles *Antigone*, *Women of Owu* from Euripides *The Trojan Women* and *Who's Afraid of Solarin?* from Gogol's *Government Inspector* to mention a few. The question, however, is, of what impact are Osofisan's innovative additions to Shakespeare's Hamlet in *Wèsóo Hamlet*?

### **Impact and effects of Osofisan's innovative additions to Hamlet**

The additions and innovations added to *Hamlet* by Osofisan are for a purpose. The questions however, are do these additions have an impact on our understanding of Hamlet as a play? Are these additions meant for African readers alone or for a universal audience? What impact or effects do the new additions have on readers?

As pointed out earlier in this essay, one of the differences between the original *Hamlet* and *Wèsóo Hamlet* is Osofisan's handling of the link between living and the dead which is reflected in the belief about spirits gone as the Egungun festival portrays in Yorubaland. The treatment and portrayal of Létò's father's ghost invocation and the visit of Claudius, Ophelia and Hamlet's ancestral visits only confirm the difference between African's time orientation and the Western world's – one linear, the other cyclic. A fact explained by (Adedina, 2013, p. 16) thus:

The handing of time by the westerners- Europeans and Americans differ greatly from the interpretation of time by the Easterners, Asians and the Orientals. The Africans and the Latin Americans perception of time also lean towards the Easterners rather than Westerners. The Western mind is linear and most of them have

punctualist perceptions. To them, time has a beginning and an end. It is divided into units that are exhausted and are no more. ... To the African, however, time cannot be split into units. It is cyclic and holistic. The past is part of the present time and the present exists in the future. There is the tendency for the African to be late and to strongly believe that those who have gone before are with him in the present; so also are those yet to be born...

A good reading of original *Hamlet* shows a perfunctory treatment of characters' motives. Motives however, are the backbone of stories and plays. As the character struts on the stage, his motives tend to explain why he took the actions he took. Osofisan with his Yoruba background brings to fore the Yoruba concept of cause and effect aptly reflected in their proverb that, *Lai ni idi obinrin ki je Kumolu* (There must be a reason why a woman is named Kumolu) meaning there is a reason for naming a daughter Death killed the first born) by giving his own character deeper reasons for their actions. A good example was the discussion between the Queen and Létò in which she tried to justify her action of marrying Ayibi.

**Létò:** You could not have waited for me?

**Olori:** What could you have done my poor son? What can you do? Besides, there was no time to wait. When the family met to decide, you were far way in England, your address unknown. I had to choose on the spot. Son, maybe I am not strong, but I opted to have a shelter on my head, to keep these clothes on my back, and to give you a home.

**Létò:** Still he made you his Olori, and you agreed!  
(*Wèsóo Hamlet*, 2012,p.40)

It is not only that this scene gave a motive to the Queen but also the scene confirmed the strong ties usually existing between mothers and their sons. The Queen had the need to justify her actions to her son. In addition to the above, there are other effects the innovations created such as

emphasizing women important roles in Yoruba land by making the women characters in Wèsóo Hamlet more powerful than their Shakespearean predecessors. Also the depiction of the inner workings of a capitalist mind through Claudius and Oba Ayibi's actions and plans added a modern twist to the *Hamlet's* story. The highlighting of the continuity of human existence – as reflected in Òrúnmìlà sending the ancestral masks/spirits of Claudius, Hamlet and Ophelia to Yoruba land in order to avert a re- occurrence of the tragedy in Denmark but which they did not achieve. (A case of human beings not learning from History?) As Hegel, opines that “ What experience history teaches is that people and governments have never learnt from history nor acted on the principles deduced from it” and collaborated by Coleridge that, “ if only men could learn from history, a lot of lessons would be taught to mankind”. Oba Ayibi, Túndùn and Létò's inability to learn from the ancestral spirits sent down to them by Òrúnmìlà bears these assertions out.

Finally, the reiteration of the power of love and sacrifice as shown by Túndùn, Olori and Ìyámóde show the power of women in Yoruba land and the length women can go when in love. All these additions to the old Hamlet and Osofisan's re- reading of the play goes a long way in positing that human experiences are the same and are not subjected to race clime or nations.

## **Conclusion**

Osofisan's version of *Hamlet* brings into existence a new version of the play that depicts our humanity in a deeper form than Shakespeare did and also reflected the depth of our Yoruba cultural values in the face of a rampaging globalisation. It also dialogues with us the need to search within our culture for the tools needed to counter the loss we are presently encountering when it comes to our African identity. The play, also as an adaptation is not only talking to the African mind but also interpreting a classical play from the African perspective to a global audience. This in a way affirms the universality of our humanity and is a good tool in combatting our rabid nationalism and belief that one race or people are different from others. It also questions our otherness syndrome

when it comes to culture, religion and belief systems. At the end of it all, we are all humans.

## **References**

- Adedina, F. (2013). *Learn to Communicate 2*. Lagos: Gazelleé Books.
- Braudy, L. "Afterword: Rethinking Remakes," in *Play It Again, Sam. Retakes on Remakes*, ed. Horton McDougal. Berkley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press.
- Bloom, H. (1994). *The Western Canon: The Books and Schools of the Ages*. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Bloom, H. (1998). *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human*. New York: Penguin.
- Das, S. K. (2005). "Shakespeare in Indian Languages." In P. Trivedi & D. Bartholomeusz, (Eds.). *India's Shakespeare: Translation, Interpretation, and Performance* (pp. 42-65). New Delhi: Pearson Education.
- Leitch, V. B., et al. (Eds.). (2010). *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*. New York: Norton.
- Olasope, O. (ed.), (2013) *Black Dionysos: Conversations with Femi Osofisan*. Ibadan: Kraft Books Ltd.
- O'Rourke, J. L. (2012). *Retheorizing Shakespeare Through Presentist Readings*. New York: Routledge.
- Osofisan, F. (2012). *Wèsóó Hamlet! Or The resurrection of Hamlet*. Lagos: Concept Publications
- Sanders J. (2001). *Novel Shakespeares: Twentieth-Century Women Novelists and Appropriations*. London: Bell & Bain.
- Shakespeare, W. (1982). *Hamlet*. Harold Jenkins (Ed.). New York: Routledge.