The Villain Archetype in Adimora-Ezeigbo's *Trafficked* and *Roses and Bullets*

Osakue Stevenson Omoera[1,*] and Grace Itoro Ibanga[2]

[1]Department of English and Communication Studies,
Faculty of Humanities, Federal University Otuoke, Bayelsa State, Nigeria
[2]Department of English, Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago-Iwoye, Nigeria

[*]Corresponding author's e-mail: omoera@yahoo.com

Received: *January 29, 2021* ***Revised:*** *March 17, 2021* ***Accepted:*** *April 17, 2021*

Abstract

Employing the archetypal theory, this article uses historicocritical, literary, and descriptive methods to examine the issues associated with women being identified as their own common enemies of progress as depicted in Adimora-Ezeigbo's *Trafficked* (2008) and *Roses and Bullets* (2014). The paper analyses the daunting statures of villain archetypal figures – human-trafficked businesswomen, wicked husband-relation, the stepmother, and the mother-in-law – and the inherent complications such relationships have with minor women who are not equal to the so-called influential status-classified women (control women). It argues that there exist different individual types that characterise the contrastive characters to the point of equilibrium in all human relationships both in real life and in fiction. Furthermore, it demonstrates that in every culture or society where human beings exist there is always the good, the bad, and the ugly people who work for or against the socio-economic growth of humanity. Hence, the article submits that the villain archetype does not make for the progress of the human race, and so women should cut down on the perceived inherent wicked trait in their relationship with others.

Keywords: Control women, Minor women, Contrastive characters, Villain archetype, Human development, Individuation

Introduction

The *persona* is one of the several archetypes propagated by Jung. The *persona* according to Dobie (2009, p. 59) is the outward image an individual shows to others. It is an indication of how we project ourselves to the outside world. Cherry (2016, p. 3) registers that the term *persona* is taken from a Latin word which literally means "mask." It signifies the mask that we wear for the outside world to behold in answer to the needs of the social convention and tradition, which might not necessarily be all what we think about ourselves to be what we are inside. The *persona* is a "make-shift belief" of an individual falsehood or fake lifestyle. It is a kind of a butterfly appearance put up by a person to hide his or her evil or unpleasant true identity, or to conceal his or her own inner archetypal needs. The essence of

the fake public appearance or an outward image or mask is to make an exact impression upon others, to be able to keep secret the obnoxious attributes of his or her real human nature. Put simply, such falsehood is for the public personality, in contrast to the private personality. It is an appearance versus reality situation. A creative literary artist often adopts the concept of a *persona* in his or her works of art to display the human nature and the bitter realism of true life situations. In the *persona*, the *anima/animus* are seen as the two contrasting entities of a man's or woman's ego, his or her conscious personality. The former mediates between the egos and outside world, while the latter interacts between the ego and the inner one (Dobie, 2009, p. 60).

The term "individuation" according to de Paiva et al. (2015, p. 100) is a "psychological growing up or psychological follow up of an individual." It is also the process of discovering the peculiar features of self that distinguish an individual from the rest of the human species. Both the *anima* and the *animus* are major determinants of individuation, which Jung classifies as the aim of human development. The concept of individuation, as far as Jung is concerned, is a "process of differentiation having for its goal the development of the individual personality" (Jung, 1969, p. 155). Jung portrays that for individuation to occur, every person should discover and accept the different sides of himself or herself, most especially those negative tendencies he or she abhors and resists. If there are certain areas of our lives that we reject, it is possible that we unconsciously project such pejorative lifestyles to others, which in essence hinders us from admitting our wrong doings, mistakes, or guilt. This kind of attitude or behavioural pattern would always compel us to see other people's or institution's faults rather than admit to our own errors. It is within this cusp that this article uses Akachi Adimora-Ezeigbo's *Trafficked* (2008) and *Roses and Bullets* (2014) as textual referents to depict the overwhelming villain archetypal figures in human relationships.

Akachi Theodora Adimora-Ezeigbo

Akachi Theodora Adimora-Ezeigbo is a distinguished Professor of English at the University of Lagos (UNILAG), Nigeria. As a literary scholar, she has contributed immensely to global development of universities and humanities - University of London (1989 to 1990); University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg, South Africa (1999 to 2000); and Royal Holloway, University of London (2006 to 2007). She is a celebrated Nigerian/African writer who, within a period of two and a half decades, has had an impressive collection of over thirty-four titles, some of which include: *The Last of the Strong Ones* (1996), *House of Symbols* (2000), *and Children of the Eagle* (2002) which re-enacted the evolution of modern Nigeria from the era of colonial incursion to the present with priority on the role of women in the development of national history (Muo 2014:381). Adimora-Ezeigbo has other novels to her credit -*Trafficked* (2008), *Roses and Bullets* (2014), *Rhythm of Life* (1992), *Echoes in the Mind* (1994), *Rituals and Departures* (1996),and *Fractures and Fragments* (2006), among others.

As well, she ventured into other genres of creative literature such as the drama genre (*Hands that Crush Stone* (2010), *Barmaid and the Witches of Izunga* (2010)) and her poetry collection (S*inging in the Rain & Other Poems for Children* (2014), *The Eagle and Other Poems for Secondary Schools* (2014), *Dancing Masks* (2013), *Heart Songs* (2009), and *Waiting for Dawn* which emerged in 2013).Professor Adimora-Ezeigbo has won numerous awards including the following: Best Researcher in the Arts and Humanities in the University of Lagos;

British Council Fellow at the University of Cambridge, UK; Joint Winner of the NLNG Prize for Literature; ANA/Cadbury Poetry Prize; and the Most Admired Lecturer for the English Department, University of Lagos. She is a Fellow of the Nigerian Academy of Letters and Literary Society of Nigeria. She is a member of the African Literature Association and a chairperson of the Jalaa Writers' Collective. In addition, she has served as Chief Judge/Chief Examiner of literary prizes and essay competitions as well as Chief Judge/Chairperson, Panel of Judges, for the Nigeria Prize for Literature in 2011.

Trafficked

Akachi Adimora-Ezeigbo's *Trafficked* (2008) is a fictional depiction of the trauma of certain young women who are hoodwinked into the sex trade/sex industry. It depicts the attempt made by the traumatized young women - Nneoma, Efe, and other deportees - to free themselves and their families from such predicaments as economic and socio-political oppressions, injustices, poverty, and desperation in a heartless society that lacks genuine concern for the welfare of its young ones. *Trafficked* (2008) projects an in-depth analysis into the activities of sex trafficking - a modern form of slavery that employs women as sex commodities, seeking to better their lives in a wrong way. However, along the way, those youths fall victim into the hands of shrewd influential men and women that exploit them to their whims and caprices. In *Trafficked* (2008), Adimora-Ezeigbo recounts the deplorable conditions of poverty in the families of the young trafficked women, which forced them to look for alternative means to economic independence in order to obtain freedom. Yet, little do they know that they are enticed into prostitution. For example, the constant nagging and disgrace which Lebechi, Ogukwe Eke's brother's wife, subjects Nneoma's parents to by denying them accommodation into the main building, which the later sent to the brother when he was working at Enugu before his sudden retirement (*Trafficked,* pp. 69-71) that initially pushed her to seek a better life outside the home (*Trafficked,* pp. 80-83; pp. 116-119). Adimora-Ezeigbo exposes the untold sufferings which the young women go through in the hands of their oppressors before they manage to escape and are finally deported to Nigeria. The climax of the story is when the novelist allows the young women's total transcendence into empowerment by handing them over to a non-governmental organisation - Oasis Youth Centre for Skills Development (OYCSD) (*Trafficked,* p. 23) - to reform their damaged lives and to also give an essence for a new beginning. For instance, Efe graduated from the centre as a stylist (*Trafficked,* p. 138), while Nneoma gains admission into the university (*Trafficked*, p. 206).

Roses and Bullets

Roses and Bullets (2014) documents some of the events that occurred during the Nigerian Civil War through the character of Ginika. The novel is divided into four major parts to show the different events that led to the war and the war itself. Part One, "The Beginnings," covers chapters one to seven which indicate the beginnings of the war and the increasing number of the Igbos that left their various dwellings in the different parts of Nigeria to converge in the Eastern part of the country as a security measure from the killings and to participate in the war which had already started. Part Two, "Before the Beginning," shows the gradual tension and preparedness of hostilities for the war, the formation of Biafra, the uncertainty and

foreboding that filled the new country, and the disintegration of the familiar into scary pieces of the unknown. For example, Ginika and the other students of Elelenwa Girls' College, Port-Harcourt (a boarding school), were informed by their principal Miss Broomfield to vacate the school for their respective homes, as the new government of Biafra had instructed that the school be closed (*Roses and Bullets,* p. 171). The girls packed their luggages and departed into an uncertain future filled with the sound of guns and bombs.

Part Three is the "The Middle". This third part seems to be the largest in the novel – from chapters twelve to thirty-three. It portrays a full-fledged war and ingenuity, determination, patriotism, lack of sufficient sophisticated weapons, and the conscription of young boys into the ill-equipped Biafran Army. In the midst of the air raids and deaths, marriages were contracted and friendships were formed. It was at the climax of the war that Ginika met and married Eloka, the only son of Akunnaya Odunze. Her mother-in-law frustrated the life out of her because she assumed Ginika was not pregnant after being married for a period of about three months or there about (*Roses and Bullets,*p. 222). Here, her mother-in-law had forgotten to take into consideration that there was no way the young lady Ginika could have become pregnant since her husband Eloka had been conscripted into the army shortly after their marriage (*Roses and Bullets,* p. 210). This impromptu decision to marry crumbled Ginika's educational career for a length of time until Miss Taylor, her beloved teacher at Elelenwa Girls' College, fought for her and re-instituted her at a school to continue her education after the war had ended. However, she lost her marriage, her husband Eloka, and her only brother Nwakire. Part Four, "The End," highlights the grueling end of a phase of life, while the fifth and last part, "After the End," projects the possibility of yet another better life.

Theoretical Issues

Jung's theory of archetypes forms the basis of literary criticism known as "archetypal criticism," and it is chiefly influenced by Plato's concept of ideal forms. Jung (2010, p. 117) ascertains that:

> 'Archetype' far from being a modern term, was already in use before the time of St. Augustine and was synonymous with "idea" in the Platonic usage. When the Corpus Hermeticum, which probably dates from the third century, describes God as a … 'the archetypal light' it expresses the idea that he is the prototype of all light; that is to say, pre-existent and supraordinate to the phenomenon "light." Were one a philosopher, I could continue in the Platonic strain and say: somewhere, in "a place beyond the skies," there is a prototype or primordial image of the mother that is pre-existent and supraordinate to all phenomena in which the "maternal," in the broadest sense of the term, is manifest.

The concepts of archetypes according to Jung (1959, p. 288) are "universal archaic images which are inherent in humans" as the components of the collective unconscious. He argues further that archetype is an explanatory paraphrase of the platonic eidos. For our purposes, this term is opposite and helpful because it tells us that so far as the collective unconscious contents are concerned, we are dealing with archaic or primordial types, that is,

with universal images that have existed since the remotest times (Jung, 1959, p. 288). Accordingly, the collective unconscious supplies the impetus to explore archetypes in the literary works of arts. Brown (2011, p. 467) seems to believe Jung's position when he informs that Jung realises that people "need to experience the non-rational." This suggests that the unlearned knowledge that is derived from the collective unconscious is the psychic inheritance that we are born with. It is this unlearned knowledge that seems to control our entire experiences, attitudes, and behaviours as rational beings. More so, the unlearned knowledge shows itself through the images and characters in the collective unconscious (which is the second type of unconsciousness in the human experience) as approved of by human cultures. Gullman (2008, p. 5) insists on the use of a psychological theory to analyse literature rather than Jung's archetypal theory. He claims that, "as a psycho analyst learns about the working of the normal mind from the study of neurosis, so the literary critic learns about the literary imagination from the study of myths…".

Jung on his investigation on the theory of archetypes discovered that some themes are recurring in the dreams of human beings everywhere in the world - that is, archetypes are universal themes, feelings, symbols, and characters which are found in myths and legends and so on. Jung's observation indicates that the inward, innate, and inborn experiences are necessarily similar in all people. They involve sharing the same instincts, similar impulses, conflicts, or fears in all cultures and places. These universal themes, symbols, and characters are connoted in a single word "archetypes," and they are what Neustadt (2010, p. 7) calls "shortcuts to eternal truths." This is also summed up by Jung (1963):

> Personality is the supreme realization of the innate idiosyncrasy of a living being. It is an act of courage flung in the face of life, the absolute affirmation of all that constitutes the individual, the most successful adaptation to the universal conditions of existence, coupled with the greatest possible freedom of self-determination (Neustadt, 2010, p. 7).

This means that Jung's theory of archetypes has several approaches on the psychology of human behaviour. The second one is Jung's structural model which classifies the psyche into three dialectical levels of related areas: the id, the superego, and the ego. The ego, the primary conscious state of human mind, is concerned with identity and with what Gordon (1973, p. 28) regards as "boundary and personal achievements." Jung sees the personal unconscious as the subjects which can become conscious, like memories, including what Cherry (2016, p. 1) claims to be the concept of the *self* which has been structured to explain the "suppressed" experience of symbols of "completeness and totality." It also accounts for the feelings which Sigmund Freud describes as "oceanic" and for the living awareness which transcends one's personal self and reaches out to what Iris Murdoch calls the "un-self" (Gordon 1973, p. 28). Jung's model of an ego and a self assists an individual to determine the permanent state of tension between the inward demands for separateness and for union, and between the motif towards "differentiation" and the motif towards "non-differentiation."

Jung (1980) explains that "myths" are means by which archetypes, essentially unconscious forms, manifest and articulate to the conscious mind. Moreover, Jung observes

that archetypes project themselves in the dreams of individuals in order to convince them that their dreams are "personalised myths," while myths are "depersonalized dreams." What this means is that there is a close relationship among dreams, myths, and art (literature) because the three concepts provide the avenues through which archetypes become available to the conscious mind of human beings. Gullman (2008, p. 5) indicates that archetypes and mythologies can "carry the human spirit forward." Myth is also regarded as the answer to the human mind in different life's questions, and it seems to be a vital angle to confronting negative feelings of going astray in a chaotic society like ours.

The Jungian theory of archetypes brings to fore the archetypal or "shortcuts to eternal truths" (Neustadt, 2010, p. 7) of some actions of mythical female characters. The archetypal characters appear in different literary contexts, and they are not presented in similar manners. The power of language that they (characters) are using is different; they have separate habits or idiosyncrasies, different methods of expressing themselves in different cultural backgrounds or environments. Schermer (2010, p. 62), while considering why characters and gender distinctions motivate strong emotional attachments in individuals and the human race as a whole, comes up to assert that gender is an archetypal trait that informs primitive or rustic rituals of sex, aggression, and social or kinship status. Schermer also posits that gender (that is, a man and woman) is "a complex right-brain/left-brain experience and operates at both conscious and unconscious levels." The implication of this is that gender or character can be interpreted according to context. A close study of gender shows that it starts with the conscious level of experience which emerges in physical gestures and roles.

A superficial understanding of the conscious level brings about the deep unconscious and archetypal meanings that are situated in what Jung calls *numinous*; and the meanings are also gripped through mystery, dreams, legend, and metaphor. On the feminine level, Berke (1997) claims that the womb might represent inner madness with the meaning of the word *hysteria* bearing the same thing as the Greek term *uterus*; while on the other hand, the masculine side according to Lacan, the phallus - the (hotly contested) "privileged signife" (Schermer, 2010, p. 63) - may symbolise power and law. The critic Foulkes (1964) tags this archetypal level of the group matrix the *autocosmos*. Even though it is shown by the physical sex group members, the archetypes equally envelop the universal non-conscious components, many of which pose gender qualities. All these positions generally confirm what informs Frye's (2005, p. 203) decision to expand upon Jung's initial identification of archetypes "as patterns in the human psyche which originates in the past and continues to reside in human experience." Frye looks at archetypes as "an element in a work of literature, whether a character, an image, a narrative formula or an idea, which can be assimilated into a larger unifying category."

The feminist archetypal theory promotes the study of major female characters to re-inscribe the so called "weaknesses" which were originally attributed to women's works in the past. Catherin (1995-1996, p. 58) points out two common possible arguments that could stem up against employing Jungian archetypes in a feminist contest. First, she claims that it is "an *ad hominem* protest against Jung's social ideas about women," which tends to have illustrated "the general prejudices of his time, his views often being no different than those of any other

Swiss 'burgher'." The second assumption is that the archetypes are "essentialised, ahistorical, and apolitical," and are therefore not responsive to the cultural dictates of modern society.

Types of Archetypes

There are several archetypes identified by Carl Jung and other scholars such as Pearson (1986), Souris (2011), Campbell (1993), Coffey (2002), Jimenez (2012), Schermer (2010), and so on. To Jung the four major universal archetypes are: Mother, Rebirth, Spirit, and Trickster or Devil. Other significant ones are *Anima, Animus*, Shadow, and *Persona*. Jung insists that the number of existing archetypes are not static or fixed; others are discovered even in the course of dealing with the known ones, for example, Power, Magic, Unity, Child, Maiden/Damsel, Supreme Deity (GOD), Demons, Earth Mother, Wise Old Man or Woman, Innocent Youth, Anima, Scapegoat, Villain, Outcast, Temptress, Star-Crossed Lover, Creature of Nightmare, Loyal Retainer, Friendly Beast, and so on. Situation archetypes are also classified as the Quest, Task, Fall, Unhealable Wound, Magic Weapon, and Supernatural Intervention. Some archetypes are also categorised as symbolic archetypes: death and rebirth, light versus darkness, nature versus the mechanistic world, water versus desert, haven versus wilderness, innate wisdom versus educated stupidity, fire versus ice, and heaven versus hell (Jimenez, 2012, pp. 21-22). Whatever number, distinctions or categories of archetypes are stratified, and there are some essential ones that incorporate the elements of self and also govern the major female characters. These include the shadow, *anima/animus,persona*, mother figure, innocent youth, mentor, wanderer, and villain. This paper is narrowed down to only one archetypal trope amongst the multifarious types of Jung's archetypal tropes that exist in literature. The essence is to give the study a proper and deserving focus. The archetype in focus is the villain.

This villain archetype would be depicted and constructed in this manner showing qualitative features of each archetype, the primary motif of each, the defining characteristics (tasks), and of course, the purpose that each strives to avoid (fear) (Pearson xxiii).

The Villain:	Goes to any extent to contend or oppose the main character; exhibits evil to hinder the main character from succeeding.
Goal:	Destruction, wickedness, evil
Fear:	Divine intervention, failure

Adimora-Ezeigbo contributes immensely to the recounting of stories that affect the human soul and connect with typical female characters found across cultures over time. The form of storytelling is central to the study of archetypal characters. Looking at and also drawing from all the concepts, definitions, and explanations of archetype, we demonstrate that the villain archetype is recurrent in Adimora-Ezeigbo's creative writings.

The Villain Archetype in *Trafficked* and *Roses and Bullets*

The concept of the mother archetype is interpreted in two distinct categories - the great or good mother (that signifies fruitfulness and fertility) and what Jung (2010, p. 125; p. 145) refers to as, "The Negative Mother complex" (the terrible mother archetype connoting anything

secret, hidden, dark; abyss, deadly, devouring, seductive, poisonous, terrifying, inescapable, fate). The implications of the negative attributes implied by Jung's "Terrible Mother" are what this study analyses in this trope of the villain archetype as captured in Adimora-Ezeigbo's fiction. The villain archetype or the terrible mother is an enemy of "other" women's progress. She tries all she could to thwart progressive moves by other women. The issue of "other" signifies quite a variety of negative or pejorative attributes that are depicted in history over the periods by a patriarchal system, which have been fixed in place by the cultural sectors of what Egbung (2014, p. 100) describes as narrow boundaries "of cultural conceptions of female roles." In *Trafficked* (2008), Adimora-Ezeigbo projects woman injustice to woman. This happens when Efe runs away from her parents in Benin in response to the advertisement to travel to Europe in search for a greener pasture to better her and her parents' life. Efe does not know that the so-called job opportunity would lead her into sex work or the sex industry. She confesses to Nneoma in what she assumes, "…perhaps finding our voices will help us heal" (*Trafficked*, p. 97).

> We were taken to Italy and ended up in Palermo. It was terrible. I was sold to a woman called Madam Gold, a Nigerian. She was vicious. She used us shamelessly, made us walk the streets every night (*Trafficked*, p. 99).

Here Adimora-Ezeigbo is interrogating the involvement of the terrible mother or the villain archetype in luring the innocent girl(s) into sex work of parading the streets of Italy every night. Madam Gold is a villain because she lacks the cherishing and nourishing goodness that excludes her from the good mother archetype. She believes that money can take the place of the value of human life. According to Efe, "Madam Gold sold me to a pimp…" (*Trafficked*,p. 100). In Nneoma's case, Adimora-Ezeigbo projects Maria, the agent in Lagos who hands over (to Madam Dollar) "six young women between the ages of seventeen and twenty" as a villain (*Trafficked*,p. 127). She acts as an intermediary between the trafficked girls and Madam Dollar, the main woman in Italy who keeps Nneoma in servitude and raises money from her. Nneoma states:

> When I am difficult, the man beat me and threw me out of their cars or kick me out of wherever they have taken me …when this happens, I go home with little or no money, Madam raves at me, and Captain beats me up, but he makes sure he does not disfigure me, for this will mean loss of revenue for Madam Dollar "…the less money you bring me, the longer you will have to stay with me, you know." Madam dollar says, "you must pay me back every kobo I used to buy you" (*Trafficked*, pp. 129-130).

Madam Dollar does not possess the milk of human kindness in her relationship with Nneoma and the other trafficked young women. She seals her heart to the singular truth that the young women she charters into the sex industry could have been her own biological children. If that had been the case, would she have been happy to turn them into this shameful act?

Closely related to the incident and wicked act of Madam Dollar is Lebechi, Ogukwe Eke's late brother's wife. She is cruel and evil. She joins forces with her son Ezike and beats up Mma and afflicts bruises on her face and body as the elder, Ibeneme, summarises: "Is she yam that you should pound her like this?" (*Trafficked*,p. 82). The novelist documents such a horrible and ugly incident of human injustice against a relationship from the same extended family to demonstrate that Lebechi is a villain archetype. It is shocking to see a woman who is a representative of the mother figure turning out to be a terrible mother archetype. She denies accommodation, comfort, and peace to her late husband's brother and his family. What would it have taken Lebechi to resolve the issue of accommodation amicably when her husband was alive, to have shared some rooms in the building to Ogukwe Eke and his family? Since it is on record that Ogukwe is the main person that sent money to Ezeozo, his idle brother, before "his premature retirement" (*Trafficked,* p. 69).

Lebechi symbolises evil, a villain, and an enemy of human progress in her quest for wickedness. In the furtherance of her evil objective, she is seen to be resistant of the limiting effect of matriarchal dominance. She does this when the elders implore her to give peace a chance: "Listen to our decision on this case," declared Uchegbu, the oldest man in the extended family, "Ezike, you and your mother will settle the bill incurred in the treatment of Mma's wounds in hospital, Lebechi, you will kill a healthy chicken and prepare a meal which you will give Ogukwe to eat" (*Trafficked,* p. 83). The judgment given by the elders to settle the conflict between Ogukwe's and Lebechi's families should have lasted for eight days. After eight days (two market weeks) have passed, the elders contacted Ogukwe to find out whether Lebechi and her son had complied with the judgment passed on their quarrel (*Trafficked*,p. 112).

The implication of the whole exercise is that Lebechi and her son refuse to heed the decision of the elders. For that singular act of disobedience, the elders of *Umunma* pass their final judgment, "…Lebechi, from this moment, you and your children are excommunicated by the Umunma; you will remain in this condition until further notice" (*Trafficked,* p. 115). To this end, the author's invocation of "Igbo laws and tradition" on Lebechi and her children is a projection of the state of the terrible mother figure which Lebechi is. Normally, this final decision of the council of elders of *Umunma* to excommunicate Lebechi the villain is an explanation that both the people and the land have rejected her and her children from participation in the community. Lebechi is an embodiment of woman wickedness towards humanity. She does not signify the clarion call for female bonding to achieve the cause of women emancipation. Adimora-Ezeigbo demonstrates the consequences of traditional ex-communication on the erring woman. Lebechi starts to behave abnormally as one smitten by insanity. She takes to screaming insults and abuses on Ogukwe and Adaeze. A case in point is that evening when Adaeze and Mma return from the market late in the evening; she, Lebechi, bars them from entering their huts and utters obscenities upon Adaeze:

> So the champion trader is back with her apprentice daughter… You are the one wearing the trousers in your household, the bread winner. Am I wrong?... You will perish in your destitution, you and the vulture you call a husband. That weak good-for-nothing thinks he can drive me away from my house… Fools!

> You will leave this compound, feet first, when that hut you call a home collapses on you (*Trafficked*,pp. 118-119).

A close observation of the activities of Lebechi confirms Ogukwe's investigation into Lebechi's family background to discover "…his worry over Lebechi's aggression had increased considerably, since last week after a friend who knew Lebechi's family well told him that her grandmother had suffered mental illness" (*Trafficked*,p. 117). Adimora-Ezeigbo posits through this inhumane display of Lebechi that any woman who refuses friendship, sisterhood, and harmonious cooperation with another woman is as Adaeze captures: "she is already mad…what would you call her behaviour? What is the difference between her and a mad woman?" (*Trafficked*, p. 119).

This suspicion is quickly made manifest when Lebechi insults the family. Lebechi is a thorn in the flesh of Akukwe and his family. She taunts and despises them at every available opportunity (*Trafficked*,pp. 180-181). Indeed, it is one of her moments of inflicting mental trauma on Adaeze about her daughters, Hannah and Nneoma, that she said, "Ha, mother of tramps. Or should I call you mother of tramps? Where are your daughters? Who will marry them?" (*Trafficked*, pp. 180-181). It is this persistent taunting from Lebechi that leads Adaeze to forgive Hannah, her first daughter, and to accept her back into the family after Hannah takes a decision to return home after three years of a failed marriage to Prophet Elias (*Trafficked*, pp. 169-171). What would one do to a villain like Lebechi, who conceives or conspires mischief against her brother-in-law? Lebechi proceeds to excavate three big holes in the middle of the road in an anticipation that she wants to bury Ogukwe and his family alive (*Trafficked*,p. 227).

This terrible mother villain archetype is what Jung (2010, p. 138) describes as being "yet cruel-like fate." How could a mother, who is supposed to be a universal image, devise evil in her heart up to the point of wishing a fellow human premature death? Ogukwe Eke, being so shocked on seeing what Lebechi has done, ventures to ask, "What are you doing?" Aggressively she responds, "I am digging your grave…these two are for you and Adaeze, that one is for Hannah. The one I'm digging now is for Mma. You will all be buried today. You're too evil to live in this compound" (*Trafficked*, p. 227). Adimora-Ezeigbo projects a typical heart that is clouded with evil. This goes a long way to confirm what a biblical scripture says: "The heart of man is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked who can know it?" (Jeremiah, p. 17; pp. 9-10).

Lebechi is never tired of perpetrating havoc against Ogukwe and his family. When Lebechi is accusing Ogukwe of being "too evil to live in the compound," she does not reflect upon her own unwholesome practices. Adimora-Ezeigbo uses the character of Lebechi to portray the different characteristics of human beings - the good, the bad, and the ugly - that live in real life and fiction. The novelist also echoes to the reader the inside of Ogukwe's frustrated mind. He remembers when he had been working in Enugu some years back. He sent some money to Ezeozo, his brother, to build a kind of family house for them. However, at the time that he retired and came back home expecting without a doubt to live in the house he spent his life earnings on, he was met with disappointment. Nneoma reflects:

> The events of those days came clearly into her thoughts. The first serious quarrel between her father and her uncle, Ezeozo Eke, took place soon after father's premature retirement. Her mother had not taken it kindly to the idea of living in a hut that had once been her grandmother's quarters. It's only until I settle with my brother which rooms in the main building our family will move into… But we have told them we were arriving home today…Why have rooms not been set aside for us already? Now we're having to move into this tiny hut on a little patch of land. It's not even big enough for two people… (*Trafficked,* p. 69).

The main reason Adimora-Ezeigbo is depicting this scene is to confirm the act of Lebechi's wickedness as a villain. She has not just started showing evil inclination towards Nneoma's family, but it is an endemic trait in her (Lebechi). Despite all her atrocities towards this family, she still proceeds to wish Ogukwe's family dead. It should be stated, whether we understand human beings perfectly or not, that the normal man is a fiction, although certain generally valid laws do exist. Psychic life is a development that can easily be arrested on the lowest levels. The mind is not cultivated for its own sake but usually in its original condition, altogether primitive, unrelated, and ruthless; but also as true and sometimes as profound as Nature herself (Jung, 2010, p. 60; p. 133). Lebechi could not understand the fact that she belongs to the modern world of a social order, which cuts her off from the primordial behaviour or images of life. Adimora-Ezeigbo uses Lebechi to overturn the popular view that the good mother archetype is what Jung (2010, p. 125) claims is "often associated with things and places standing for fertility and fruitfulness." Lebechi does not possess the milk of kindness towards her relations. She possesses the typical nature of original mankind - cruel, wicked, and evil oriented; which caused the Creator initially to regret about making man: "… And it repented the Lord that He had made man on the earth it grieved Him at his heart" (Genesis, p. 6; pp. 5-6).

This suggests that Lebechi is working according to her "Adamic" nature, which, as observed by Ogukwe, was in her maternal grandmother. The maternal grandmother had suffered from mental illness once (*Trafficked,*p. 117). Adimora-Ezeigbo does not approve of the archetypal villain as a good example of the mother archetype. To portray that the villain archetype is not a welcomed development in the women community, she allows the extended family to come in a pick-up and take Lebechi away to the home of *Unenwakaibeya*, the renowned native doctor who treats mentally derailed persons (*Trafficked,* p. 128). It is also ideal to point out that the same mental illness that disturbs Lebechi could also have been on Madam Dollar (*Trafficked,* p. 128) and Madam Gold (*Trafficked,*p. 99). These women are vicious in their characters because they shamelessly allow the innocent girls to walk the streets of Italy every evening, raising money for them through prostitution. If Efe and Nneoma were their biological children, would they have encouraged their participation in rendezvous activities which profited little? It probably would have been the case because it is whatever a woman is inside that she shows/gives to her offspring.

In *Roses and Bullet* (2014), Adimora-Ezeigbo shows Auntie Lizzy as a villain because she takes delight in discouraging bonding between brothers and sisters. In the particular case of Ginika and her brother Nwakire, Auntie Lizzy seems to frustrate their efforts from showing

true love to one another. Auntie Lizzy exhibits an overwhelming negative influence on Ginika's father to forget his initial love he once had for his first wife who gave birth to his two children (*Roses and Bullet*,pp. 61-62). The question to ask at this point is: Who is the "other" woman? Auntie Lizzy is the protagonist's (Ginika's) stepmother. She is the "other" woman. Dr. Ubaka Ezeuko marries another wife after the death of his first wife, Ginika and Nwakire's mother, when Ginika was six and Nwakire nine years old. To confirm the concept of the "other," Adimora-Ezeigbo employs pejorative words and adjectives to present Auntie Lizzy as a villain archetype, which closely resembles a classic or average stepmother. The protagonist first introduces her on the day she came with her father Dr. Ubaka Ezeuko to Auntie Chitto's house to collect her (Ginika) from his brother Uncle Ray. She reflects:

> Ginika watched, detached. As her stepmother's rather large body pressed against her aunt's, Ginika thought she had gained more weight since she last set eyes on her during the holiday at home. She closely observed the three of them and thought how different they were. Auntie Chitto was cheerful and homely while her stepmother was sour and bad-tempered, distant and aloof. But her father was neither cheerful nor aloof… She could never understand why [she] made no effort to make people around [her] happy…. (*Roses and Bullet*, p. 7).

This portrays that the characteristics of Auntie Lizzy as a villain is indicated from the beginning of the story. Adimora-Ezeigbo builds up the hatred and dislike for Auntie Lizzy in the heart of Ginika, which from time to time triggers some comparison each time she meets kind-hearted women like Philo's Mama, Mrs. Ndefo. This thought provoking comparison is triggered in Ginika at Philomena's house because she comes in contact with the real woman Mama (Philo's mother) that exhibits true love towards her. She ponders, "Philo and her mother are quite close, Ginika thought, a wistful look entering her eyes, as she thought of her mother she lost too early, a mother she did not have long enough to feel or remember her warmth and affection" (*Roses and Bullet*, p. 61).

Adimora-Ezeigbo constructs the character of a villain archetype in the mind of the girl child. In the same vein, Nneoma and Efe relate to Madam Gold, Madam Dollar, and Lebechi as the terrible mother archetype. Ginika also describes her stepmother Auntie Lizzy as a wicked mother. She lacks love, care, and comfort for the people she knows - Ginika, Nwakire, and their father Ubaka (*Roses and Bullet*,pp. 61-62). Auntie Lizzy lacks natural wisdom in whatever she says or does to her stepdaughter Ginika. This could have perhaps explained why Ginika and her brother never really have or share any fondness for her. For instance, after the thanksgiving service at St. Mark's Anglican Church, Ama-Oyi, Ubaka thinks Ginika on the course of waiting for him to take her home has been talking with the "Skinny boy who was the cause of her ordeal." Her father asks, "Ginikanwa, who is that you are talking to?" Ginika has been trying to get over her father's wrong accusation when her stepmother Auntie Lizzy equally expresses her concern based on what her husband just pointed out. Lizzy posits:

> Ginika, you are now a woman, do you know that? With what happened to you today, you have become a complete woman… so you must take care of yourself

> and keep boys at bay. If you do anything with them, *afo ime achaala*, pregnancy will come (*Roses and Bullet*,p. 78).

Although Auntie Lizzy is seen by Ginika as a villain because she is a stepmother, a close observation of her in the above comment shows that she expresses her sincere heart-felt concern for her innocent girl stepdaughter, which is normal for a typical mother to do for her teenage girl. However, Ginika refutes Auntie Lizzy's comments vehemently: "Ginika squirmed in her seat, hating every word oozing from Auntie Lizzy's mouth, wondering why she and her father should pick on her in this cruel manner… if her mother were alive, would she treat her the way Auntie Lizzy did?" (*Roses and Bullet*, p. 28).

To understand Ginika's viewpoint on condemning Auntie Lizzy as a villain, Adimora-Ezeigbo explains that it is not in all cases that individuals could be right in judging a person's intention. What Auntie Lizzy has said, taking sides with Ubaka, Ginika's father, is not completely wrong. It is only done in good faith to encourage her innocent stepdaughter to be cautious of human beings, especially boys, as she is growing up. Ginika's youthful exuberance does not allow her to see the light in what her parent and guardian is saying to her. In this particular case, Adimora-Ezeigbo states that the representative role of Auntie Lizzy is a great one. She is imbued with the good attitude of rescuing the girl child, and not of a villain. When Ginika is lamenting about her late mother, Adimora-Ezeigbo on one hand hails Auntie Lizzy for following the path of a good mother figure and not a terrible mother figure. Hence, Adimora-Ezeigbo affirms Auntie Lizzy as a good mother with a clear conscience and right motive.

However, through Ginika's father's insight and confession in other spheres, Adimora-Ezeigbo classifies Auntie Lizzy more as a villain to her stepchildren, Nwakire and Ginika, than the mother figure. He laments, "When I married your stepmother she failed to play the role of a mother as I had dreamed and hoped she would. I cannot say if I succeeded or failed as a father, sometimes I have my doubts" (*Roses and Bullet*, p. 106). The negative attitude of Auntie Lizzy towards Ginika and Nwakire directly informs Ginika's attitude towards desiring to always stay away from home during holidays. She prefers to travel to Enugu to be with Auntie Chitto at the slightest opportunity. She boldly declares to a school friend who had asked to know why she prefers to spend her "holiday in Enugu instead of Mbano, where your family is?" Ginika states categorically, "I like being with my Aunt and her family and feel at home with her more than with my father or my step-mother" (*Roses and Bullet*, p. 103). This same cloudy emotion of forsaking her home occurs again when Miss Bloomfield, the Principal of Elelenwa Girls' College, informs the entire student population: "…'Goodbye girls.' After she has listened to the principal's announcement, she packs her things and decides to head for Enugu to be with Auntie Chitto and her family" (*Roses and Bullet*,p. 117).

A villain archetype is a nuisance to children and adults. Nobody feels safe staying or living with a villain. In *Trafficked*, Ogukwe Eke is always fidgeting and psychologically traumatised each time Lebechi starts trouble with him and his family. Madam Gold and Madam Dollar could not allow the young women (Efe, Nneoma, and other trafficked girls) to know peace because of their inhuman treatment shown on them. Auntie Lizzy has nothing good to offer Ginika and her brother. Little wonder, she becomes bored, tired, and unhappy each time

there is a reason to think about her family at Mbano. Adimora-Ezeigbo's portrayal of Auntie Lizzy's terrible mother figure and acts of wickedness is seen that particular morning she returns to Ama Oyi after the enemies have bombed Alaoma, where her husband Ubaka had been transferred to (*Roses and Bullet,* p. 139). Auntie Lizzy picks up a quarrel with Mrs. Ndefo and her children over what she claims, according to Mrs. Ndefo's report to Ubaka, "she was angry with the children and said they were wasting the water in the tank… She said from today, my children should go to the stream to fetch water… She said me and my children have no manners, that they dirty the house and make noise all the time…" (*Roses and Bullet,*p. 177).

A reasonable mother could have understood that all what Auntie Lizzy fumes about with Mrs. Ndefo are peculiarities which are common to boys who are just behaving like boys their age. She could have been patient with them. Even young Ginika observes that they are children and need to be corrected. It could also be because her womb does not carry children as Amaka, Mrs. Ndefo's only daughter, points out: "Please don't speak to my mom like that… is it because you don't have children of your own that you abuse us?" (*Roses and Bullet,*p. 177). Auntie Lizzy is shocked to hear such comments coming from a child. Why has the novelist allowed Amaka, a little innocent girl, to be the one to remind Auntie Lizzy of her predicament? It is a fictional technique to explain the psychological comprehension of a typical female character. If Adimora-Ezeigbo has revealed Auntie Lizzy's barrenness through another woman or mother figure, the reader would have condemned it as a deliberate attempt to run her down. However, being a child that condemns Auntie Lizzy shows the extent of Auntie Lizzy qualifying as a villain archetype.

Ginika's observation also goes a long way to ascertain that Auntie Lizzy is a villain. She concludes that she is piqued and disregarded by Mrs. Ndefo. Ginika concludes that she, Auntie Lizzy, "was hostile to the woman and her family." Ginika comes to this conclusion because of what Auntie Lizzy says when she realises that the Ndefos are moving out: "They did not even have the decency to let us know until this afternoon," Auntie Lizzy spat. "Let them run away to America and leave us to swim or sink here. When things were good they stayed, but now things are bad, they run away. Let them go, who cares?" (*Roses and Bullet,* p. 190). This illustrates that Auntie Lizzy is the type that does not forgive easily. She does not want the matter of having an issue with the Ndefos to rest. She still carries the hurt in her heart. Adimora-Ezeigbo explains that for the good mother figure, such an issue could have been thrown into the thrash can; she would have forgiven them and rejoice with the Ndefos when Auntie Lizzy finds out that Dr. Ndefos has obtained a visa to send his family back to America. However, because Auntie Lizzy is a villain, she refuses to heed the counsel of her husband, too:

> Lizzy what is it? … Let the matter rest. Does it matter when they told us? It is possible they did not even know when exactly they were to leave… Dr. Ndefo told me he had to wait for government to give him clearance (*Roses and Bullet,*p. 190).

The fact of Auntie Lizzy's refusal to forgive Mrs. Ndefo and her children indicates that "women are the enemies of themselves." Why should Auntie Lizzy be waiting for her husband,

a man, to be the one to tell her to forgive her sister, a fellow woman, to get along well with her? Is it patriarchy that is still the enemy or oppressor now? The implication of this is that women are still not mature enough to handle issues that concern themselves; they lack the confidence in themselves. They lack true love for their fellow women. They are not trustworthy; otherwise, Auntie Lizzy would not have waited for her husband, Dr. Ubaka, and her stepdaughter, Ginika, to intervene: "Auntie Lizzy, please calm down, Ginika clung to her" (*Roses and Bullet*, p. 177).

The state of mind put forth by Auntie Lizzy confirms what Koroye and Anyadike (2004, p. 16) explain: "when women do not trust themselves, they automatically transfer their trust and allegiance to the male folks." Another perspective of looking at Auntie Lizzy's truce with Mrs. Ndefo indicates that if they were co-wives, would Auntie Lizzy have spent all her strength, time, and life fighting Mrs. Ndefo? For instance, even though the quarrel between Auntie Lizzy and Mrs. Ndefo had taken long, the aftermath is still fatal in the hearts of both: "…Mrs. Ndefo and her children hovered at the entrance to their rooms, still cowed by Auntie Lizzy's attack…but when she saw Auntie Lizzy coming down the stairs, she withdrew into her room, like a snail that sensed the presence of its enemy..." (*Roses and Bullet*,p. 179). This further buttresses the notion that Auntie Lizzy is a villain archetype character or the terrible mother figure. This attitude condemns both women as victims of what Yakubu (2013, p. 9) claims to be "easy targets of machinations of patriarchy."

By still examining the concept of the "other" as explained in the villain archetype, Ginika acquaints the reader with the nature of information that Auntie Lizzy gives to "Nwakire and herself – to call her Auntie Lizzy after she had married their father and taken their mother's place" (*Roses and Bullet*,p. 12). The questions that are likely to generate discussion are: Why does Auntie Lizzy choose to distance herself from the children of the man whom she has accepted to marry? Is she planning that she will be able to separate Nwakire and Ginika from their father after her marriage? This now brings to fore Auntie Lizzy's lack of motherhood features for her stepchildren. She lacks love, care, and the capacity to shoulder responsibility that the mother figure archetype possesses. She chooses from the beginning to distance herself from that responsibility, and her stepchildren know that fully well. Again, by adopting the term "Auntie," which signifies the feature of one's father's sister or mother's sister or just any matured young woman, indicates that Auntie Lizzy would not be willing to relate with her stepchildren, Ginika and Nwakire, in the true sense of a good mother figure relationship.

Another concept of the "other" which qualifies the villain archetype as documented in *Roses and Bullets* is the mother-in-law and daughter-in-law relationship. Yakubu (2013) and Ezeigbo (1993) have considered the issue of cynicism and enmity with which women relate to one another in a mother-in-law and daughter-in-law syndrome, and this issue that introduces a villain archetype is associated with the matriarchal system that seems to introduce a rivalry syndrome in which women lack trust for one another. At certain quarters, women regard their fellow women as enemies of progress and tend to see nothing good coming out from their sex. It is shocking to see a fellow woman manifest a certain rivalry spirit of competing with her "sister" in marriage, politics, economics, and social spheres. Little wonder, some women consciously or unconsciously always present themselves as targets of patriarchal condemnation and gossip. Adimora-Ezeigbo projects Ginika's mother-in-law, Akunnaya Odunze, as a villain

archetype. She fails to regard and accept the wife (Ginika) of her son Eloka as a true member of her family. Ginika admits that sometimes she felt intimidated before her mother-in-law, especially when Eloka was not home. He had been a buffer between her and his family, making sure they treated her well. Not that she had anything to complain about really, but sometimes she felt Eloka's mother resented her (*Roses and Bullet,* p. 221).

Why does Ginika feel this way about her mother-in-law? The simple answer is, perhaps, Ginika is not the wife that Adaeze, Eloka's sister, had found for him which everyone was "so desperate… to get him married off." But they realise soon that Eloka might not be interested, as he confesses to Ginika, "I beat them to it by choosing a wife for myself; not that I would have succumbed to them even if I didn't have you" (*Roses and Bullet*,p. 221). It is from this note that the reader is aware why Akunnaya Odunze launches an immediate attack on Ginika as soon as she (mother-in-law) realises that her "buffer" Eloka is recruited into the army (*Roses and Bullet,* p. 222).

A close look at the bitter hatred that Ginika's mother-in-law presents explains that some women are not trustworthy. They lack the ability to believe in themselves. It is shocking to realise that Ginika's mother-in-law is making her to learn this injurious lesson so early in life. How could Akunnaya Odunze doubt the sincerity and innocence of the little young girl whom her son Eloka marries? The same little girl whom at the beginning Eloka compares with, "The red rose and white sheet," and then concludes that, "Both remind me of your beauty, your innocence and your purity" (*Roses and Bullet*,p. 161). Ginika's mother-in-law could have waited for her son to return before she accuses her of the inability to get pregnant. Ginika could not have been pregnant when her husband had been conscripted into the army. Besides, Ginika was angry and disappointed in her mother-in-law, but she tried not to show any such sign: "Eloka said he didn't want us to have a baby during the war that we should wait for it to end and finish our education" (*Roses and Bullet,* p. 222). There is no reason why Ginika's mother-in-law could not accept Ginika and Eloka's proposal concerning the raising of children after the war has ended, or maybe on the other hand wait for them to finish their education before having children. To Eloka's mother, that is unacceptable because Eloka is her only son. Her mother-in-law screams:

> "*Hei*! You quite agree, eh? *Lekwenu muo,* look at me - o! Why do people get married? Is it not to have children? Ginika, answer me now? So you married Eloka without intending to have children, to give him children and grandchildren to me and my husband? *Chie*! So we came to your father's house to marry you for you to come here and be staring us in the face? So you want to move about in the house empty, *ina ekpokoghari ebea*? God forbid a bad thing!" She snapped her fingers repeatedly (*Roses and Bullet,* p. 223).

Of course, there is little Ginika's mother-in-law could do when Eloka confesses it to her by himself during his visit home after his enrollment in the army. Eloka's mother intimates him with his sister (Ijeamasi), whose husband informs them has given birth to a male child. She (Akunnaya) inquires from her son, "*Nna,* when shall we see your own baby?" Eloka shocks his mother, 'After the war. Haven't I said this before?'… He did not want her to start on this

subject now, when he had just arrived home or she would get both of them upset" (*Roses and Bullet*, p. 246). Having heard from her son's mouth by herself, this was a confirmation of what Ginika earlier told her: "…his mother sighs and then hiss loudly in her frustration." This goes a long way to inform her that Ginika is not acting out of her own impulse, but acting based on agreement and plan. Unfortunately for Ginika, her mother-in-law, Akunnaya Odunze, is not a kind of woman that can be intimidated by a mere statement. She still carries out her intention of what is on her mind concerning the issue of child bearing with her daughter-in-law. Directly after her son Eloka returns to his battalion, she summons Ginika again:

> I'm sure you know why I called you?… I asked you this question before, and I want to ask you again because of Eloka's visit home. Are you pregnant? Did you do what I advised you to do when I talked to you on this matter? You are asking me why I bring it up, eh? My daughter-in-law asked me why I want to know if she is pregnant. *Aru*, abomination! Why do you think we married you - to come and stare at us in the face?… You have not tried to see things from my point of view, have you? You listen to Eloka and allow him to have his way in this matter. He is a man; what does a man know in matters like this? I am amazed at your lack of common sense - a woman who is not anxious to have a child for a husband who is a soldier! Do you know tomorrow? Do you know what can happen even in the next minute? And you allow Eloka to go away again without at least attempting to get you pregnant (*Roses and Bullet*,pp. 260-261).

Akunnaya Odunze's inordinate concern for her daughter-in-law getting pregnant and having a child is not an outright concern because she is a villain archetype. It is the most common practice among African women and their cultures. They believe that the essence of any marriage is for procreation, most especially when their sons happen to be the only child. Ginika's mother-in-law's desire is to have Eloka multiply himself through his children and her grandchildren, which according to her is the reason "…we married you" (*Roses and Bullet*,p. 260). When Ginika's mother-in-law harbours and executes such hate speech against Ginika, who is equally of the same age with her daughter Ozioma, what would she have done to a woman who is far older, which the prospect of giving birth is slim? She lampoons her anger the more at Ginika when she walks out on her:

> "You have no sense," her mother-in-law's angry voice pursued her. "You want to make me childless. I will show you, *anu-ohia*, bush animal. You will see something in this house…. I said it when I first saw you that your beauty is skin-deep, *ocha ka amaka*. If only Eloka had agreed to marry the girl Adaeze found for him, I would not have been put in this condition." Her mother-in-law began to sob (*Roses and Bullet*, p. 261).

Adimora-Ezeigbo sympathises with Ginika because of her naivety in understanding the cultural value system attached to marriage, pregnancy, and of course, child-bearing. Akunnaya Odunze, Ginika's mother-in-law, is acting in line with the African society and its value system.

African cultural patriarchy is unsympathetic with women who are barren, who cannot bear children because they are considered incapable of taking care of them. To Eloka's mother, the desire for her son to have children or for her to have grandchildren is borne out of what Yakubu (2013:14) describes as "self-esteem, as children are sites of power for these women. Women become obsessed with having children because of the feelings of pride, and joy, which come with it." A close assessment of this, perhaps, portrays why Akunnaya, Ginika's mother-in-law, reacts bitterly against her, most especially when she considers that three months have passed since Eloka left home for the battlefield, more so, coupled with the additional three-day holiday. Of course, no one should blame the young woman too much, since she has not known that kind of pressure could be mounted on a woman without child. Her father's wife, Auntie Lizzy, who has not given birth since her father married her, is not put under any pressure. So it looks irritating to young Ginika why her mother-in-law should be impatient on the whole issue, which to her is no issue since she is working with her husband's grand plan.

Adimora-Ezeigbo equally portrays Akunnaya Odunze as a villain archetype when she takes it upon herself to trail and to beat up Nwoyibo, her husband's concubine, residing in the refugee camp at Ama-Oyi. Janet a fellow worker at the refugee camp as well as Ginika's friend explains: "…just listen, *Nne di gi*, your mother-in-law was here with one man and they beat up Nwoyibo. It was terrible. They gave her a black eye and tore her dress. When some women heard her scream, went to investigate, they found her almost naked. Her blouse was torn and her *wrappa* wrenched off her waist and they left her with just panties" (*Roses and Bullet*, p. 239). Adimora-Ezeigbo uses Nwoyibo's case to show that the negative depiction of women (as prostitute, witches, etc.) by some literary works and certain historical accounts written by men are not mere portrayal of wantonness but what most women truly are in the physical world. It confirms the inferior presentation of women in male-authored texts over the decades. The novelist welds up strength in Akunnaya to disgrace Nwoyibo because she prostitutes with Odunze, her husband. She condemns Nwoyibo's unwholesome practice as being too primitive for a twenty-first century woman to get involved. Adimora-Ezeigbo laments that some women have refused to work on their image and attitudes to be able to save themselves from stereotypes. She solicits that such practices - extra-marital affairs and others - should not be the package of women empowerment.

In *Roses and Bullets*, Adimora-Ezeigbo registers that the positive attributes and virtues of noble women such as Ginika's late mother, Auntie Chitto, Udo's mother, Philomena's mother, even Nne - Ginika's grandmother, and Miss Miriam Taylor are "roses" with adorable qualities which people have come to identify with their kindness, lovely qualities, and compassionate virtues. These women unanimously work hard to dismiss the archetypal myths of depicting women as wicked, problematic, jealous, and unstable. In like manners, some terrible mother archetypes are automatically "bullets" which fall into the archetypal pattern stipulated for them by their society. Their negative influences destroy lives of other women just like bullets kill, turn into ruins, or even devastate the lives of many. Auntie Lizzy and Mrs. Akunnaya Odunze fall into this category. The novelist proscribes that the villain archetypes as bullets do not promote healthy human relationships, and so should be discouraged.

On the other hand, the description of the mother figure does not fit Auntie Lizzy because she has not had her own biological children. She does not even have any mother figure

characteristics for two reasons. First, on her initial introduction, Auntie Lizzy pressed it on Nwakire and Ginika that her name was Auntie Lizzy instead of Mummy, after she had married their father and taken their mother's place (*Roses and Bullets*, p. 12). This is indicative of the non-readiness of Auntie Lizzy to take up the motherhood of her stepchildren (showing unconditional love and care and taking additional responsibilities that the mother figure archetype possesses). She chooses from the beginning to distance herself from that responsibility, and her stepchildren know it fully well. Second, adopting the term "Auntie" (which is the name of one's father's sister or mother's sister) shows that Auntie Lizzy was not willing to relate with her stepchildren in the true sense of a mother figure.

Another thing that qualifies Auntie Lizzy as a villain archetype as documented is the concept of the "other" vis-à-vis mother-in-law and daughter-in-law relationship. This issue is associated with the matriarchal system that seems to introduce a rivalry syndrome in which women lack trust for one another. At certain quarters, women regard their fellow women as enemies of progress and tend to see nothing good coming out from their sex. It is shocking to see a fellow woman manifest a certain rivalry spirit of competing with her "sister" in marriage, politics, economics, and social issues. Little wonder, some women always present themselves as targets of patriarchal condemnation and gossip.

Conclusions

This article has demonstrated that women can be their own nastiest enemies in contemporary society. To do this, it used the literary works of Adimora-Ezeigbo, *Trafficked* and *Roses and Bullets*, to highlight and discuss the tropes of the villain archetypes among women. The paper analysed the daunting statures of villain archetypal figures - human-trafficked business women, wicked husband-relation, the stepmother, and the mother-in-law - and the inherent complications such relationships have with minor women who are not equal to the so-called influential status-classified women. It posited that there exist different individual types that characterise the contrastive characters to the point of equilibrium in all human relationships both in real life and in fiction.

References

Abrams, M.H. (1993).*Archetypal criticism in a glossary of literary terms*. Fort Worth: HBJ.

Adimora-Ezeigbo, A. (2008). *Trafficked*. Lagos: Literamed Publications (Nig.) Ltd.

--------. (2014). *Roses and Bullets*. Ibadan: University Press.

Berke, J.H. (1997).Womb envy. *Journal of Melanie Klein and Object Relations, 15*(3), 101.

Brown, I.M. (2011). We're taking back sexy girls bloggers SPARK a movement and create enabling conditions for healthy sexuality. *Girlhood Studies, 4*(2). 47-69.

Campbell, J. (1993). *The hero with a thousand faces.* London: Fontana Press.

Cautherin, C. (1996).Writing ritual and cultural unconscious: The great mother archetype in the composition classroom. *Journal for the Assembly for Expanded Perspectives on Learning, 1*, 58-65.

Cherry, K. (2016). What are the Jungian archetypes? Retrieved from http://www.verywell.com/what-are-jungs-4-major archetypes - 2795439

Coffey, A. L. (2014). *Six archetypes in selected novels of Ana Maria Matute Dissertation* (Doctoral dissertation). Texas Tech University: A & I, ProQuest.

de Paiva, S., Lima, C. S.,& Giglio, J. (2015). Individuation and feminine soul: Study of feminine archetypal images carried out on surgical patients. *Open Journal of Medical Psychology, 4,* 99-110.

Dobie, A. B. (2009). *Theory into practice: An introduction to literary criticism* (pp. 49-109). Wadsworth: Cenage Learning.

Egbung, I. E. (2014). *Reinventng the woman, Akachi, Adimora-Ezeigbo's*: *The last of the strong ones* (pp. 90-101).In Adedun, E. A.,& Nweke, O. B.(Eds.). New perspective on a literary enigma a Festschrift in Honour of Professor Theodora Akachi Adimora-Ezeigbo. Ibadan: University Press.

Ezeigbo, T. A. (1993).The enemy within: Women against women in novels by selected Nigerian female writers. *Ihafa-A Journal of African Studies, 1,* 7-13.

Foulkes, S.H. (1964). *Therapeutic group analysis*. New York: International Universities Press.

Frye, N. (2005). *Blakes treatment of archetypes II*. In Esterhammer, A. (Ed.).Northrop Frye on Milton and Blake. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Gordon, R. (1973).*Art: Mistress and servant of man and his culture* (pp. 14-53). In Field, D., & Newick, J. (Eds.).The Study of Education and Art. London: Routledge Kegan Paul.

Gullman, B. M. (2008).*A pure woman archetypally presented: Toward a Jungian of Hardy's Tess of The d'Urbevilles in Running Head* (Master's thesis). Liberty University.

Jimenez, M. (2012).*The girl who was on fire: A study of archetypes and mythology in the hunger games by Suzanne Collins (9th grade)*. Trinity University, Digital Commons @ Trinity, Understanding by Design: Complete collection.

Jung, C. G. (1959). *The basic writings.* Violet Staub De Laszlo, New York: The Modern Library Print.

Jung, C. G. (1963). *Mysterium coniunctions*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Koroye, S., & Anyadike, N. (2004). *Woman in the academy*. Festschrift in honour of Professor Helen Chukwuma. Port Harcourt: Pearl Publishers.

Lacan, J. (1996).*The subject* (pp. 123-125).In Rice, P., & Waugh, P. (Eds.). The mirror stage as formative of the function of the I as revealed in psychoanalytic experience. London: Arnold.

Muo, A. (2014).*Biographical citation and list of publications of Professor Akachi Adimora-Ezeigbo* (pp. 380-384). In Emmanuel, A. A., & Onuora, B. N. (Eds.). New Perspectives on a Literary Enigma a Festschrift inHonour of Professor Akachi Adimora-Ezeigbo. Ibadan: University Press.

Neustadt, W. (2010).*Designing brand personality using the power of archetypes*. Business consultancy international market and sales. Austria: University of Applied Sciences Wiener Neustadt.

Pearson, C. (1986). *The hero within: Six archetypes we live by.* San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Schermer, V. L. (2016). The complexity of gender. *Gender Issues in Group Therapy*, *32*(1), 57-70.

Souris, I. (2011). *The myth of Helen of Troy: Representing the archetypes of the myth in solo and collaborative forms of playwriting* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Exeter.

Trans, R.C.F. (1969).*The problem of types in poetry: Psychological Types*. Bollingen Series. Princeton: Princeton UP

Yakubu, A. M. (2014). Women as their own worst enemies: Rewriting the stepmother and mother-in-law archetypes in Adimora-Ezeigbo's *Roses and Bullets*. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 19*(1), 9-15.

Zhu, J., & Han, L. (2013). Analysis on the personality of Maggi by Jung's archetype theory. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 3*(2), 324-328.