



CRITICAL INSIGHTS INTO LANGUAGE SHIFTS IN HELON HABILA'S WAITING FOR AN ANGEL THROUGH THE GRAMMAR OF CLAUSE AS EXCHANGE

INNOCENT SOUROU KOUTCHADÉ¹,
SERVAIS MARTIAL AKPACA²,
DIEU-DONNÉ AWOYODO³

^{1,2,3}Université d'Abomey-Calavi, BENIN



Article Received:31/11/2020

Article Accepted: 22/01/2021

Published online:28/01/2021

DOI: [10.33329/rjelal.9.1.53](https://doi.org/10.33329/rjelal.9.1.53)

Abstract

Human language is a versatile communicational tool opened to ever-moving contextual waves. To study this nature of language, this paper leans on mood, modality and adjuncts as operational tools of the interpersonal metafunction strand of the Hallidayan Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG). It aims to demonstrate the swinging feature and the pliability of language through *Waiting for an Angel*, a novel written by the Nigerian writer Helon Habila. Findings reveal that language shifts are vitally dependent on contextual waves in discourse.

Keywords: Interpersonal metafunction, mood, modality, deontic, epistemic, adjunct.

1- Introduction

Human language, according to Halliday & Webster (2009:8) is endowed with a "semogenic potential"; i.e. a meaning-making power. Moreover, it is a versatile communication tool. Meant to convey meanings, express our thoughts and feelings, it functions variably in tune with ad hoc discursive context. Montgomery (1986:101) argues that "language is sensitive to its context of situation." This claim is pretty well substantiated in daily linguistic trade and in the universe of literature. Helon Habila's language in *Waiting for an Angel* serves as a cogent testimony to this claim. Indeed, this paper aims to pinpoint manifestations of context-fed shifts in language in the course of human communication. The tools used to carry out this exploration involve *mood*, *modality* and *adjuncts*. These linguistic features are instrumental in highlighting a sharp relational imbalance between discourse participants.

2- Theoretical Background and Literature Review

The Hallidayan Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) is a tri-stratal mode of language study in relation to contextual features (Halliday, 1994, 2002, 2004; Eggins, 1994; Fowler, 1995). This involves three metafunctional meanings termed *Interpersonal*, *Experiential* and *Textual*. The first relates to how language in use either determines or is determined by the social features binding discourse participants. The second is about the message being conveyed or the subject matter of a communicative event. The third one deals with language configuration, i.e. how language is structured to mean what it means. By focusing specifically on the interpersonal strand of the Hallidayan linguistic metafunction, this research work leans on such operative toolkits as mood, modality and adjuncts. Mood generally refers to the clause structure reflecting role relations between discourse participants. Eggins (1994:192) contends that mood type correlates with the semantic category of speech functions of offer, command,

statement and question. Thus, mood types can be declarative, interrogative, exclamatory or imperative.

According to Halliday (1994), mood is “the grammar of the clause as exchange”. In Amoussou’s (2014:150) words, “mood is the linguistic expression of attitudes, judgments, points of view, social relationships...; etc.” Thence, it functions to monitor social interactions. Eggins (1994: 192-4) also views it as describing such variables as the types of clause structure or mood types, modality, the use of tags, vocatives, attitudinal words which are either

positively or negatively loaded, expressions of identification and politeness markers of various kinds. As a matter of fact, in the course of social conversation, speakers generally resort to typical mood types to perform specific speech functions. A good recapitulation of the marked correlations between mood types and speech functions is suggested by Amoussou (2014: 150). It is a clear synopsis of Halliday’s (1985), Eggins’s (1994), and Aitchison’s (2007) perspectives of Mood types and markedly connected speech functions. The mood-types and their related speech functions are summarized in the table below:

Table1: An Overview of Mood Types and Attached Speech Functions (Adapted from Amoussou, 2014: 150)

Mood types	Speech functions
Declarative Mood	Giving information by stating what is, or what happens
Interrogative Mood	Requesting information
Modulated Interrogative Mood	Indirect or tempered request of information
Imperative Mood	Getting someone to do something
Modulated imperative Mood	Getting indirectly/ in a tempered way somebody to do something by using polite modals
Exclamative Mood	Expressing wonder, surprise, bewilderment

As to modality, it refers to the “attitudinal features of language” (Simpson, 1973:47). It deals with how speakers voluntarily intrude on, and corrupt the message being conveyed. Modality features function to supplement the message with aspects of obligation, possibility, probability and inclination. Overall, two major modality forms can be identified: *Modalization* or *epistemic modality* and *Modulation* or *deontic modality* (Fowler, 1986; Eggins, 1994; Fontaine, 2013; Halliday & Metthiessen, 1999/ 2004). Glossed by some scholars as “Epistemic modality”, modalization functions to indicate a kind of connotative meaning relating to the degree of certainty the speaker/writer emphatically adds to his discourse or the estimation of probability or likelihood associated to what is being said (Fontaine, 2013: 121). One can say just like Eggins (1994: 179) that modalization is an area of mood analysis concerned with how speakers affect the truth condition of their speech acts through integrating attitudinal and judgmental clues of various types. In fact, it is the way the

speaker intrudes on the text by expressing a judgment about the probability, likelihood (perhaps, probably, maybe, certainly, possibly) or frequency of something happening or being done through such frequency adverbs as always, often, sometimes, usually, etc. Modalization can be implicitly realized either through a Finite modal operator or a mood adjunct of probability and certainty. It can also be realized explicitly with expressions like: “*I reckon*”, “*I guess*”, “*I think*”, “*I’m sure*”. Then, Halliday (1985: 334 – 40) refers to them as grammatical metaphors.

The second interface of modality is dubbed *Modulation* or “*deontic modality*.” It is meant to express obligation, permission, willingness and ability. It is the dimension of modality complementing modalization in propositions. With propositions, we do not just argue about what “*is*” or “*isn’t*” but also about the degrees of likelihood in between. Likewise, with proposals we do not just argue about “*do*” or “*don’t*”. There is also a scale in between, but this time around the scale is not a possibility or usuality, but rather an obligation and

inclination. Again, as is the case with modalization, we can also have degrees of modulation (high: must/required to; median: should/supposed to; low: may /allowed to). Thus, this pattern allows an interactant to avoid the dogmatic choices of “do” or “don’t” or “I’ll give you this” or “I won’t give you that”. Indeed, expressions of modulation allow speakers to avoid being strictly assertive. Definitely, Modulation avails to speakers/writers requisite resources to express their viewpoints about world events under depiction.

Regarding adjuncts, they can be defined as clausal elements which contribute some additional but non-essential information to the clause. They are not nominal but adverbial or prepositional elements and can appear in the MOOD and the RESIDUE boxes. According to whether they contribute to any of the three types of meaning, we distinguish circumstantial adjuncts, modal adjuncts, and textual adjuncts. As to Circumstantial adjuncts, they indicate circumstances attached to the process underway. They express time, place, manner, agent, accompaniment, reason/ cause and beneficiary. Concerning modal adjuncts, they are clause constituents which add interpersonal meaning to the clause. They are divided into four categories: *Mood Adjuncts, Polarity Adjuncts, Comment Adjuncts and Vocative Adjuncts*. Textual Adjuncts help in the organization of the message itself. They are of two types: conjunctive adjuncts and continuity adjuncts. Such tools have been applied by numerous scholars to get diversities of findings.

For instance, Koutchadé and Mèhouénou (2016) deal with gender and power relation in Akachi Ezigbo’s *The Last of the Strong Ones*. Basing on the tripartite exploration of mood, modality and tenor, their work has found that women are oppressed by patriarchy. It has also shown how women react to their condition. The importance of the work lies in the fact that it shows women’s activism and struggle to change their plight. It also reveals some useful contributions that language can make to improve human condition through enhancing gender justice and equity. This shows that to gain their autonomy and freedom, women folk have to be self-assertive and demand their rights

rather than remain coward and complacent with the males who dominate them.

Kousouhon and Dossoumou (2015) focus on an analysis of interpersonal metafunction through mood and modality systems in Kaine Agary’s *Yellow Yellow* from a critical discourse and womanist perspective. Their paper deals with a full insight into how the writer encodes her life experience through fictional depiction via the medium of interactional language. To this end, the scholars build on such operative toolkits as mood, epistemic and deontic modality patterns. The findings and their interpretation have contributed to revealing how instrumental interpersonal meaning description is to establishing consensus between people holding antagonistic relationships as to the development of an oil company in Nigeria. The work also highlights a revolutionary change in the traditional women’s status so as to build and foster a balanced gender relation in Africa. More importantly, the work reveals the usefulness of linguistic tools to *Critical Discourse Analysis* in the sense that they ensure good social relationship and happy female welfare.

In harbouring on meticulous explorations of lexico-grammar manifestations in Soyinka’s *The Lion and The Jewel* and Kongi’s *Harvest*, Guezohouèzon (2012) has underlined the manners in which *Tenor* relations bear diversely on the interpersonal linguistic metafunction. The work also reveals the writer’s unbalanced feminist trend as he continuously manages his plot to get most male characters emasculated while bestowing a sparkling primacy of privilege on their female counterparts. This strategy is indicative of the writer’s desideratum for a volte-face socio-cultural revolution as regards gender relations in African lands.

As for Allagbé (2015), his meticulous analysis of lexico-grammatical and cohesive properties has helped find out, in terms of Mood analysis for instance, the predominance of declaratives in his first three extracts culled from Adichie’s fiction. He infers, then, that the extracts are concerned with giving information. Likewise, the striking precedence of Modalization identified in the very extracts offers him good evidence to claim that the interpersonal relations displayed in the extracts are democratically

balanced. As regards textual property exploration, his final conclusion is that: "Cohesion is one aspect of discourse-semantic stratum that creates texture in text" (p.251). The other interesting interface worth exploring, but missing from his work is coherence analysis; that is, the contribution of extralinguistic manifestations to semiotic meaning modeling.

Dadjo (2014) has analysed Register Variables and Metafunctions in Flora Nwapa's fiction by using the theory of Systemic Functional Linguistics. He has described the linguistic features which connote experiential, interpersonal and textual meanings in Efurú, *One is Enough* and *Never Again*, three novels by Flora Nwapa. This description has consisted in carrying out the Transitivity analysis, the Mood analysis as well as the Theme analysis of six excerpts. Of course, these analyses are crowned with some overall interpretation of the message in the texts and, eventually, of the novels. He has found out that the essential message conveyed in Efurú and in *One is Enough* includes the role of women and the importance of [having] children –as far as women are concerned – in African societies. *Never Again*, he concludes, rather concentrates on the Nigerian civil war and the role of women during that war.

From the perspective of a systemic analysis, Tchibozo-Laine's (2014) interpretation has led to reveal the feminist ideology in three novels by Amma Darko. So, in *Beyond the Horizon*, the feminist ideology that can be deduced (mainly from the selected extract) is that Amma Darko exposes the ill-treatments, inhuman behaviors of men, women's inferiority in Ghana, in particular, and Africa, in general, and the different kinds of abuses women undergo under the oppression of men who are supposed to be their husbands. In *The Housemaid* (mainly through the selected extracts), the feminist ideology defended by Amma can be understood by her plea for women's empowerment and self-sufficiency. The women in this extract are the victims of their own plot or conspiracy. In fact, it is about a superstitious plan conspired by Efiá's people. Efiá's plan is to get pregnant and this can allow her to be part of Tika's family and become an heir. Amma Darko calls upon the consciousness of women (village women in particular) so that they can fend

for themselves. It is only by working hard that they can expect any reward. In *Faceless* (mainly in the selected extract), Amma Darko's only feminist commitment aims at discouraging men and giving a renewed face to women living in society where they are abused by men. Amma Darko stresses that sensitive and respectful men recognizing the place of the feminine gender may involve themselves in the struggle for women's social emancipation and economic development.

3- Descriptive and Analytical Overview of the Extract

This involves the identification and analysis of mood as well as modality, adjuncts and pronouns.

3-1 Identification of Mood, Modality and Adjunct Type in the Extract.

Identification of mood and modality is carried out according to the following keys below.

Keys:

S= Subject, F= Finite, Fn= negative, Fms= Modalized, Fml= Modulated, P= Predicator, PmL= Modulated Predicator, Pms= Modalized Predicator

F/P= fused Finite and Predicator, C= Complement, Ca= Attributive Complement, A= Adjunct, Ac= Circumstantial, Am= Mood, Ao= Comment, Ap= Polarity, Av= Vocative, Aj= Conjunctive, At= Continuity

Wh= wh element, wh/s, wh/c, wh Ac fused wh element, mn= minor clause.

The Mood identification in Extract1 runs as follows:

Superintendent: "1. Lomba(Av), step (P) forward (Ac) 2. So (Aj) Lomba(Ca) you(s) are (F).

Lomba: 3. Yes (Ap) I (S) am (F) Lomba (Ca)

Superintendent:4.Search (P) more (Ac) 5. A pencil (C) 6. Papers, and pencil (C) in prison! (Ac) 7. Can (Fms) you (S) believe (Pms) that? (C) 8. In my prison (Ac)! 9. I (S) will (Fml) ask (Pms) once (Ac). 10 Who (wh/S) gave (F/P) you (Ac) papers (C). 11.

Lomba:I (S) don't (Fn) know (P) 12.

Superintendent: Hmm (mn) 13. I (S) repeat (F/P) my question (C) 14. Who (wh/S) gave (F/P) the papers (C)?

Lomba: 15. I (S) have (F) forgotten (P).

Superintendent: 16. So (Aj) you (S) won't (Fn) talk (P) 17. You (S) think (F/P) 18. You (S) are (F) wrong (Ca). 19. That (S) is (F) how long (Ac) 20. I (S) have (F) been dealing (P) with miserable bastards (C) like you (Ac). 21. Let this (S) be (P) an example (C) for all of you (Ca). 22. Don't (Fn) think (P) 23. You (S) can (Fml) deceive (P) me (C). 24. We (S) have (F) our sources of information (C) 25. You (S) can't (Fml). 26. Don't (Fn) think (P) 27. You (S) are (F) political detainees (Ca) 28. You (S) are (F) untouchable (Ca). 29 Where (Ac) did (F) you (S) think (P) 30. You (S) can (Fms) go (Pms)? 31. These (mn) 32. These (S) are (F) your papers (C) 33. I (S) read (P/F) your file (C) 34. Also (Aj) you (S) are (F) journalist (Ca) 35. It (S) is (F) your second year (Ca) here (Ac) awaiting (P) trial (C) for organizing violent demonstration against the militaries legal government (Ac)].

Lomba: 36. It (S) is not (Fn) true (Ca).

Superintendent: 37. Eh! (mn) 38. You (S) deny (F/P).

Lomba: 39. I (S) didn't (Fn) organise (P) a demonstration (C) 40. I (S) went (F/P) as a reporter (Ca).

Superintendent: 41. This (S) is not (Fn) my business (Ca) 42. The truth (S) will (Fms) come out (Pms) at your trial (Ac).

Lomba: 43. But (Aj) when (WH/Ac) will (Fms) that (S) be (P)? 44. I (S) have (F) been forgotten (Pms)

Superintendent: 45. I (S) am not (Fn) a lawyer, or visitor (Ca).

Lomba: 46. I (S) have (F) been waiting (P) trial (C) for two years now (Ac).

Superintendent: 47. Do (F) you (S) complain (P)? 48. Look (P) 49. Twenty years (Ac) I (S) have (F) worked (P) in prison all over this country (Ac) 50. Can (Fms) you (S) win (P) a case (C) against government (Ac)? 51. Wait (P), 52 hope (P) 53. Maybe (Am) there (S) will (Fms) be (Pms) another coup (C)? 54. Maybe (Am) the leader (S) will (Fms) collapse (P) 55 and (Aj) did (F/P) 56. He (S) is (F) moral (Ca) after all (Am) 57.

Maybe (Am) a Politician government (S) will (Fms) come (Pms) 58. Then (Aj) there (S) will (Fms) be (P) amnesty (C) for all political prisoners (Ac) 59. Don't (Fn) worry (P), 60 enjoy (P) yourself (C). 61 I (S) read (F/P) all your poems (C) 62. I (S) burned (F/P) the illegal letters (C) 63. Prisoners (S) sometimes (Am) smuggle out (F/P) letters (C) to the press (Ac) [to make (P) us (C) look foolish (Ca)] (Ac) 64. But (Aj) the poems (S) are (F) harmless (Ca) 65. You (S) wrote (F/P) the poem (C) for your girl (Ac) 66. Isn't (Fn) it (S)? 67. Perhaps (Am), because (Aj) I (S) work (F/P) in prison (Ac) 68. I (S) wear (F/P) uniform (C) 69. You (S) think (F/P) 70. I (S) don't (Fn) know (P) poetry (C)? 71. I (S) write (F/P) poems (C) too (Ao) 72. Read (P).

Lomba: 73. Is (F) it (S) poetry (Ca)? 74. Not bad (Ca) 75. You (S) need to work (Pml) on it (C) some more (Ac)

Superintendent: 76. I (S) promised (F/P) my lady (Ac) a poem (C) 77. She (S) is (F) educated (Ca) 78. You (S) know (F/P) 79. A teacher (Ca) 80. You (S) will (Fms) write (P) for me (Ac) for my lady (Ac).

Lomba: 81. You (S) want (F/P) me (C) to write (P) a poem (C) for you (Ac)? 82. I (S) am (F) glad (Ca)

Superintendent: 83. You (S) understand (F/P). 84. Her name (S) is (F) Janice (Ca). 85. She (S) has (F) been (P) to the university (Ac). 86. She (S) has (F) class (C). 87. Not like other girls (Ac). 88- She (S) teaches (F/P) in my son's school (Ac). 89- That (S)'s (F) [how (Aj) we (S) met (F/p)] 90. Even (Aj) jailers (S) fall (F/p) in love (Ac). 91. I (S) thought (F/p) inanely (Ac). 92. 'At first (Ac) she (S) didn't (Fn) take (P) me (C) seriously (Ac) 93. She (S) thought (F/p) (Am) [I (S) only (Am) wanted (F/P) // to use (P) her (C) // and (Aj) dump (P) her (C)] 94. And (Aj) 95. Also (Am) 96. We (S) are (F) of different religion (Ca) 97. She (S) is (F) Christian (Ca), 98. I (S) am (F) Muslim (Ca) 99. But (Aj) no problem (C) 100. I (S) love (F/P) her (C) 101. But (Aj) she (S) still (Am) doubted (F/P) (Am) 102. I (S) did not (Fn) know (P) [what (Wh/c) to do (P)] 103. Then (Aj) I (S) saw (F/P) one of your poems (C) 104...yes (Ct), this one (C).'

Lomba: 105 he (S) handed (F/P) me (C) the poem (C).
Superintendent: 106 It (S) said (F/P) everything (C) 107. I (S) want (F/P) [to tell (P) her (C)].

Lomba: 108. It(S) was(F) one of my early poems(Ca), [rewriting(P) from memory(Ac)].

Superintendent: 109. "three words(mn) ",110. I(S) gave(F/P) it(C) to her(C)yesterday(Ac) 111. When(S) I(S) took(F/P) her(C) out(Ac)'.
Lomba :112. 'you(S) gave(F/P) her(C) my poems(C)?'

Superintendent: 113. 'Yes(Ap)'.
Lomba:114. 'you(S)... you (S)told(F/P) her (C) [you(S) wrote(F/P) it(C)?']

Superintendent :115. 'Yes(Ap), yes of course(Am) 116. I(S) wrote (F/P)it(C) again (Am)in my own hand(Ac),

Lomba:117. 'he(S) said(F/P), unabashed(Ac) 118. He(S) had (F) been speaking (P) in a rush(Ac);119. Now(Ac) he(S) drew(F/P) himself (C)together(Ac) 120.[and(Aj) , as though(Aj) to reassert (P) his authority(C)], began(F/P) to pace(P) the room(C), [speaking(P) in a subdued, measured tone(Ac)]

Superintendent:121. 'I(S) can(Fml) make(Pms) life(C) easy(Ac) for you (Ac/c)here (Ac)122. I(S) am(F) the prison superintendent (Ca)123. There(S) is(F) nothing(C) 124. I(S) cannot(Fml) do(Pml) , 125. If(Aj) I(S) want (F/p) 126. So(Aj) write(P) 127. The poems (C)128. For me (Ac/C)'.129. There(S) is(F) nothing(Ca) 130. I(S) cannot(Fml) do(Pml)

Lomba:131. You(S) can(Fms) get(Pms) me(C) cigarette(C),[I(S) am(F) sure(Ca)((Am)], and food(C).132 You(S) can(Fms) remove(Pms) me(C) from solitary(Ac)133. But(Aj) can(Fms) you(S) stand(Pms) me(C) outside these walls(Ac), free under the stars(Ac)?134. Can (Fms) you (S)connect(Pms) the tips of my upraised arms(C) to the stars(Ac) 135. so that(Aj) the surge of liberty(S) passes down(F/p) my body(Ac) to the soft downy grass(Ac) beneath my feet(Ac)?136. I(S)asked(F/p) for paper and pencil(C/Ac) 137. And(Aj) a book(C/Ac) to read(P).

Narrator:138. He(S) was(F) removed(P) from the solitary section(Ac) that day(Ac) 139. The pencil and paper(S) came(F/P), 140. the book (S) too(Am) 141. But(Aj) not the one(Ca) [he(S) had(F) asked for(P)]142. He(S) wanted(F/P) Wole Soyinka's prison's notes(C), The Man Died(C);143. But(Aj) when (Aj)it(S) came(F/P) 144. It(S) was(F) A Brief

History of West Africa(Ca)145.[While(Aj) writing(P) the poems(C) in the cells(Ac)], Lomba(S) would(Fms) sometimes(Am) let (Pms)his mind (C)wander (P);146. He(S)'d(Fms) picture(Pms) the superintendent and his lady (C) out on a date(Ac) , 147. How(Aj) he(S)'d(Fms) bring out(Pms) the poem(C) 148. And(Aj) unfold(P) it(C) 149. And(Aj) hand(P) it(C) to her(C) 150. And(Aj) said(F/P) boldly(Ac), ['I(S) wrote(F/P) it(C) for you (C)] 151. Myself(C)'. 152.they(S) sit(F/p) outside(Ac) on the verandah (Ac) at her suggestion(Ac) 153. The light from the banging (Ac), wind-swayed Chinese lanterns(S) falls (F/p) softly(Ac) on them (Ac)154. The breeze(S) [blowing (P) from the lagoon(Ac) below(Ac)] smells(F/p) fresh(Ac) to her nostrils(Ac);155. She(S) loves(F/p) its dampness(C) on her bare arms and face(Ac) 156. She(S) looks at(F/p) him(Ac) across the circular table(Ac),[with its vase(Ac) holding(P) a single rose (C)]157. He(S) appears(F) nervous (ca)158. A thin film of sweat(S) covers(F/p) his forehead(C)159. He(S) removes(F/p) his cap and dabs (C) at his forehead(Ac) with a white handkerchief(Ac).

Superintendent:160. 'Do(F) you(S) like(P) it(C), a Chinese restaurant(Av)? **Narrator:**161. He (S)asks(F/p),[like a father anxious(Ac) to please (P) his favourite child(C)] 162. It(S) is(F) their first outing(Ca) together (Ac)163. He(S) pestered(F/p) her(C) 164. Until(Aj) he(S) gave in(F/p) 165. Sometimes(Am) she(S) is(F) at a loss(Ac) [what(Wh/c) to make(P) his attentions(C)] 166. He(S) sighs(F/p) 167. She(S) turns(F/p) her plump(C) face to the deep, blue lagoon(Ac)168. A white boat(S) with dark stripes(Ac) on its sides(Ac) speeds(F/p) past(Ac);169. a figure(S) is(F) crouched(P) inside(Ac), almost invisible(Ac) 170. Her plight, flower-patterned gown(S) shivers(F/p) in the light breeze(Ac)171. She(S) watches(F/p) him(C) covertly(Ac) 172. He(S) handles(F/p) his chopsticks (C) awkwardly(Ac), but(Aj) determinedly(Ac).

Superintendent : 173. 'Waiter!(Mn)'

Narrator: 174. He(S) barks (F/p),[his mouth(S) full of fish(Ac), startling(P) her (C)].

Superintendent:175. 'Bring(P) her (C) another bottle of wine (C)!'

Janice: 176.No(Ap). 177 I(S) am(F) all right(Ac), really(Ao),'

Narrator: 178. She(S) says(F/p) firmly(Ac),[putting down(P) her chopsticks (C)].

179.after the meal (Ac), [which(Wh/c) has(F) been (P) quite delicious(Ca)/Ac)],180. He(S) lifts(F/p) the tiny, wine-filled porcelain cup(C) before him(Ac)181. And(Aj) says(F/p):

Superintendent:182 '[To you(C)]. And(Aj) me (C)'

Narrator: 183.She(S) sips(F/p) her drink(C), [avoiding(P) his eyes(C)].

Superintendent:184.I(S) love(F/p) you(C), Janice(Av).185 Very much(Ac).186 I(S) know(F/p) [you(S) think(F/p) I(S) am not(Fn) serious(Ca)].187 That(Aj) I(S) only(Am) want to suck(F/pml).188 The juice(C) and(Aj) throw away(P) the peel (C).189 No(Ct)).'

Narrator: 190 He(S) suddenly(Ac) dips(F/p) his hand(C) into the pocket of his well-ironed white kaftans(Ac) 191. And(Aj) brings out(F/p) a yellow paper(C).

Superintendent:192.Read(P) 193.and(Aj) see(P).'

Narrator: 194 He(S) pushes(F/p) the paper (C) across the table to her(Ac)

Superintendent :195. I wrote it.196 For you (C).197 A poem (C).

Narrator: 198.She(S) opens(F/p) the paper (C)199. It(S) smells(F/p) faintly(Ac) of sandalwood(C) 200. She(S) looks at(F/p) the title (C): [Three Words(C)] 201. She(S) reaches(F/p) past the vase(Ac) with its single, white rose(Ac), past the wine bottle, the wine glasses(Ac),202. And(Aj) covers(F/p) his hairy hand(C) with hers briefly(Ac)

Janice: 203. Thank you(Mn).'

Narrator: 204.She(S) reads(F/p) the poem (C), [shifting(P) in her seat(Ac) towards the swaying light of the lantern(Ac)]:

Superintendent : 205.Three words(C) 206.When (Aj)I (S) hear (F/p) the waterfall clarity of your laughter (C), 207.When(Aj) I(S) see(F/p) the twilight softness of your eyes(C), 208.I(S) feel(F/p) like

draping(P) you all over myself(Ac), like a cloak(Ac), 209.To be warmed(P) by your warmth(C).

210.Your flower-petal innocence, your perennial(C) 211.Sapling resilience(C)--212.your endless charms(C) 213.All these(S) set(F/p) my mind(C) on wild flights of fancy(Ac): 214.I(S) add(F/p) word (C) unto word(C/Ac), 215.I (S)compare(F/p) adjectives 216. and(Aj) coin exotic phrases(C) 217.But(Aj) they all(S) seem (Fms) jaded, corny, unworthy(Ca) 218.Of saying(P) [all(C) I(S) want to say(F/p) to you(C)]. 219. So(Aj) I(S) take(F/p) refuge(C) in these simple words(Ac), 220.Trusting(P) my tone(C), my hand in yours(Ac), 221.when(Aj) I(S) Whisper(F/p) them(C), [to add (P)depth and newTwists of meaning(C) to them(C)] 222. Three words(C): 223.I(S) love(F/p) you(C).

Narrator: 224. with his third or fourth poem for the superintendent(Ac), Lomba(S) began(F/p) to send(p) Janice(C) cryptic messages(C)225. She(S) seemed(F/P) to possess(P) an insatiable appetite(C) for love poems(C/Ac) 226. Every day(Ac) a warder(S) came(F/p) to the cell(Ac), in the evening(Ac), with the same request from the superintendent(Ac): ['The poem(C)'] 227. When(Aj) he(S) finally(Ac) ran out(F/p) of original poems(C),228. Lomba(S) began(F/p) to plagiarize(P) the masters(C) from memory(Ac) 229. Here(Ac) are(F) the opening lines of one(Ca):

Superintendent : 230.Janice(Av), your beauty(S) is (F)to me(Ca) 231.Like those treasures of gold(Ac)...

232.Another one(S) starts(F/p): 233.I (S)wonder(F/p), my heart, what you and I(C) 234.Did(F/p) till(Aj) we(S) loved(F/p)...

Narrator: 235.But(Aj) it(S) was(F) Lomba's bowdlerization of Sappho's'Ode'(Ca)236. That(Aj) brought(F/p) the superintendent(C) to the cell door(Ac):

Lomba: 237.A peer of goddesses(Ca) she(S) seems(F) to me(C) 238.The lady(S) who(Wh/S) sits(F/p) over against me(Ac) 239. Face to face(Ac), 240.Listening (P) to the sweet tones of my voice(C), 241.And(Aj) the loveliness of my laughing(C). 242.It(S) is(F) this(Ca) 243. That(Aj) sets(F/p) my heart(C) fluttering(P)

244.In my chest(Ac), 245.For if(Aj) I(S) gaze (F/p)on you(Ac) but(Aj) for a little while(Ac) 246. I(S) am(F) no longer master of my voice(Ca), 247.And(Aj) my tongue(S) lies(F/p) useless(Ca) 248.And(Aj) a delicate flame(S) runs over(F/p) my skin(C) 249.No more do(F) I(S) see(P) with my eyes(Ac); 250.The sweat(S) pours(F/p) down me(Ac) 251.I(S) am(F) all seized(P) with trembling(C) 252.And(Aj) I(S) grow(F) paler than the grass(Ca) 253.My strength(S) fails(F/p) me(C) 254. And(Aj) I(S) seem(F) [little short of dying(P/Ca)]. 255.HE(S) Came (F/p) To the cell door(Ac) less than twenty minutes(Ac) 256. After(Aj) the poem(S) had(F) reached(P) him(C/Ac), [waving(P) the paper(C) in the air(Ac),// a real smile (S)splitting(P) his granite face(C)].

Superintendent: 257. 'Lomba(Av), come out(P)!

Narrator: 258. He (S) hollered(F/p) through the iron bars(Ac) 259. Lomba(S) was(F) lying(P) on his wafer-thin mattress(Ac), on his back(Ac),[trying(P) to imagine(P) figures(C) out of the rain designs(Ac) on the ceiling(Ac)].260.The door officer(S) hastily(Ac) threw(F/p) open(P) the door(Ac). 261.The superintendent(S) threw(F/p) a friendly arm(C) over Lomba's shoulders(Ac) 262. He(S) was(F) unable to

stand(P) still(Ac) 263. He(S) walked(F/p) Lomba(C) up and down the grassy courtyard(Ac).

Superintendent: 264. 'This poem 265. Excellent(Ac) 266. With this poem(Ac).267 After(Aj).268 I(S)'ll(F) ask(Pml) her(C) for marriage(Ac)

Narrator: 269. He(S) was (F) incoherent in his excitement(Ac) 270. He(S) raised(F/p) the paper(C) 271.and(Aj) read(F/p) aloud the first line(Ac), [straining(P) his eyes(C) in the dying light(Ac)]

Superintendent: 272. "A peer of goddesses(Ca) she(S) seems (F)to me(C)" .273 Yes (Ct).

274.Excellent(Ac) 275. She(S) will(F) be(Pms) happy(Ca) 276. Do(F) you(S) think(P) [I(S) should(Fml) ask (Pml)her (C)for] marriage(Ac) today(Ac)?

3-2 Presentation and Analysis of the Findings

3-2-1 Mood Functions

3-2-1-1 Statistics of Mood Types in the Extract

A statistical overview of the mood varieties identified in the extract is tabulated as follows:

Table 2: Statistics of Mood Types in the Extract 1.

Mood types	Participants				Total
	Super- intendent	Lomba	Janice	Narrator	
Declaratives	108 (51.42%)	38(18.09%)	1(0.47%)	63(30%)	210(76.08%)
WH interrogatives	05(50%)	05(50%)	00(00%)	00(0%)	10(3.62%)
Polar interrogatives	06(54.54%)	05(45.45%)	00(00%)	00(0%)	11(03.98%)
Exclamatives	01(100%)	00(0%)	00(00%)	00(0%)	01(0.36%)
Imperatives	16(100%)	00(0%)	00(00%)	00(0%)	16(05.79%)
Modalized interrogatives	01(100%)	00(0%)	00(00%)	00(0%)	01(0.36%)
Minor clauses	14 (51.85%)	10(37.03%)	02(07.4%)	01(03.7%)	27(09.78%)
Total /participant	151(54.71%)	58(21.01%)	03(1.08%)	64(23.18)	276(100%)

3-2-1.2.Mood analysis

This stretches into both quantitative and qualitative aspects. As can be seen in the table above, participants have used a total set of 276 mood clauses. Declaratives occupy a large proportion with a total of 210 rounds representing 76.08%. Out of this total, the Superintendent has used 108 (51.42%) of them which involve clauses (2,

9, 13, 16, 23, 32, 33, 35 38, 41, 45, 108, 110, 121, 184, 195, 268) among others. As to Lomba, he has used 38 (18.09 %) declaratives. Some of them may be seen in clauses (3, 11, 15, 36, 39, 40, 44, 75, 82, 131) and in many others. As to the narrator, he has authored 63 (30%) involving clauses 138, 144, 161, 174, 178, 204, 269) among others. Janice has echoed only one declarative clause, (0.47%) in clause (177). We have also found out 11 polar interrogatives

(03.98%). Of these, the superintendent has echoed 6 (54.54%) which can be seen in clauses (47, 50, 68, 80, etc). Lomba authors 5 of them (45.45%), namely, in clause (73,81,112,114 and135). Participants also share 10 wh-interrogatives among which the Superintendent has used 05; say, 50% including such clauses as (10, 14, 29). 5 clauses (50%) are incumbent to Lomba: clauses like 43,. we have also noticed that the Superintendent has used 14 minor clauses representing 51.85%, out of this number, Lomba has used 10 (37.03%) of them. Janice has used 02 minor clauses involving clauses 176 and 203. The narrator used only one minor clause. There are 16 (05.79%) imperative clauses which are all used exclusively by the superintendent. We have also counted 1 modalized interrogative (01.25%) and 1 exclamative which are used by the Superintendent as can respectively be noticed in clause 7 and 173. Considering the predominant number of declaratives, i.e. 210 (76.08%) and that of interrogatives 11 (5 Wh; 5 polar and 1 modalized; say, 07.96%) as compared to the total number of clauses 276(100%); we can infer that this extract focuses on an exchange of information. As to imperative clauses, they number 16 and are exclusively used by the Superintendent. They involve such clauses as (1, 4, 21, 22, 26, 48, 51, 52, 59, 60, 72) . Having dealt with the statistics of Mood types and their analysis (Mood types), we now focus on the qualitative analysis of the very extract.

Overall, this Extract contains declarative, imperative and interrogative mood-types. They are essentially meant to provide information and establish typical interpersonal relations. For instance, they are manipulated to display a sharp imbalance in the relation holding between Lomba and the Superintendent. By way of instantiation, we may consider the following sequence, clauses 5-11:

Superintendent: A pencil. Papers and pencil in prison! Can you believe that? In my prison? I will ask you once. Who gave you papers?

Lomba: I don't know.

By this sequence, one can sense out two major social manifestations. The chained-up series of minor declaratives and both wh- and modulated questions echoed by the Superintendent function to

dump a crushing hegemony over Lomba. Conversely, the latter's minimalized reply as "I don't know" is indicative either of his reluctance to state out the person he got the paper from or his frightful psychology. In the same way, clause 15 is used by Lomba to answer the Superintendent's question. The conversational sequence used by Lomba at this level reads again as: "I have forgotten", as a reply to a persistent "Who gave you the paper?"—question from the Superintendent. Visibly, this reply sounds deviant from the intent of the Superintendent's question which rather requires Lomba to name the person he got the paper from. By this break in the adjacency pair, one can infer the psychology of inferiority characterizing Lomba. The deviant response proves the man to be subjugated by his speech partner. Even the incompleteness of the reply – lacking object constituent – is quite baffling because one still has to wonder what exactly he has forgotten: is it the source he got the paper from, or the existence of some forbiddance to write anything within the prison cell? Indeed, given the situational context of the conversation proving Lomba to be a new prisoner under the Superintendent's order, one can sense out his incapacity to tell out his actual mind. Here arises a serious issue of precluding human freedom and man-to-man domination. Although the Superintendent is also a prisoner –a former, albeit – he considers himself as a reigning king or the possessive or genitive load in his "in my prison" reveals his boastful feeling as an imposing and autocratic landlord, considering the person place to turn his own private regency.

Likewise, "Can you believe that?" (clause7) displays the Superintendent's authoritative status over Lomba. It subsumes that for him, writing one's mind on a sheet of paper within the prison cell is a quite unbelievable and outlandish deed. In fact, this modalized interrogative is uttered by the Superintendent to bring Lomba to know that he is breaking some serious and stringent regulation. Therefore, Lomba's act of writing poems in the prison is viewed as a substantial sin that deserves a severe sanction and merciless punishment.

Besides, imperative clauses are exclusively used by the Superintendent either to tease Lomba, or to cajole him. Indeed, the Superintendent has initially

used imperatives to give order to Lomba; which is demonstrative of his hegemony over the latter. Illustrative cases in this regard include: “Lomba, step forwards” (1), “Search more” (4) and “Let this be an example for all of you” (21). But by the end of the conversation, his imperative tone softens and is oriented towards giving brotherly, affective and soothing advice. Testimonial examples encompass the following: “Hope” (51) “Don’t worry, enjoy yourself” (59+60). Overall, the Mood exploration of the extract sets into the open a sharp relational

imbalance between both participants at stake, Lomba and the Superintendent. Our next focus of scrutiny relates to modality function.

3-2-2 Modality Analysis

3-2-2-1 Statistics of the Modality Types in the Extract

The statistics of modality-specific findings from the extract are encapsulated in the synoptic table 3 below.

Table 3: Statistics of the Use of Modality in the Extract

Modality	Participants				Total
	The Superintendent	Lomba	Janice	Narrator	
Modalisation	05(29.41%)	09(16.66%)	00(0%)	03(17.64%)	17(54.83%)
Modulation	14(100%)	00(0%)	00(0%)	00(00%)	14(45.16%)
Total / participant	19(92.85%)	09(29.03%)	00(0%)	03(09.67)	31(100%)

3-2-2-2 Critical Discourse Analysis of the findings

Through table 3, we have noticed that there are 31 uses of modality. There are 17 modalized forms. They involve clauses (30, 42, 43, 53, 54, 57, 124,133,134). As to the modulated ones, they number 14 and can be found in clauses (7, 9, 16, 23, 25, 42, 50, 80, 121, 124, 268, 276) among others. Anyway, both modality variants are predominantly authored by the Superintendent. Testimonial examples include the following: “Don’t think you **can** deceive me” (22-23) and “You **will** write (poems) for me for my lady” (80). The use of modalization evidences that the Superintendent has expressed a judgment or an attitude having to do with probability or possibility. The 08 modulated forms used by the Superintendent are meant to display judgments and attitudes showing relationship with obligation and imposition, with the Superintendent exerting a strict hegemony over Lomba.

Modalized clauses in this extract display specific social manifestations between the characters. In line with these findings, they set into the open unbalanced power relations between the Superintendent and Lomba. Indeed, related to probability though they are by nature, modalized

forms are patronizingly manipulated by the superintendent to substantiate his power advance over Lomba as well as his disaffection to the latter. As such, when he says “the truth will come out at your trial” (42), this is pretty well indicative of his inclination to see Lomba sentenced after trial. This clause is typically symbolical of his lack of confidence in Lomba’s claim as: “I didn’t organize a demonstration” (39). The whole trade proves him not to trust Lomba’s sincerity.

Besides, the evolution of modality functions in this extract also helps to identify the Superintendent’s behavioural shift. Once he has known about the creative muse inherent in Lomba’s poems, his initial despising attitude towards the latter has changed. Indeed, the Superintendent’s harsh tone has changed into a brotherly, sweet, soothing and sedating one. Supportive examples to this allegation read as follows: “Maybe there will be another coup” (53), “Maybe, the leader will collapse” (54), “Maybe a politician government will come. Then, there will be amnesty for all political prisoners” (58, 59). The attractive tone shown by these clauses proves the Superintendent’s inclination to sympathize with Lomba at last after he has discovered the latter’s poetic competence with

a view to enticing Lomba to write good poems for him to seduce his own wife. The same manifestation of tone shift in the Superintendent can also be seen in his manner of handling modulation. The following examples offer good evidence to the contention: “So, you won’t talk.” (16) and “You will write poems for me for my wife” (80). In fact, the *will*-modal in these clauses is purported to display the Superintendent’s bossy tone, showing his superiority over Lomba. Now, having dealt with the statistics and analysis of modality types, I have to

focus on the manifestations of adjunct types in the very extract.

3-2-3 Analysis of Adjunct Functions

3-2-3-1 Statistics of the Adjunct Types

Adjunct functions in the extract have also been analysed quantitatively and qualitatively. The statistics of the findings from the descriptive exploration has been displayed in table 4 below:

Table 4: Statistics of Adjuncts Types in the extract.

Adjunct types	Participants				Total
	superintendent	Lomba	Janice	Narrator	
Circumstantial	46 (36.22%)	19(14.96%)	00(00%)	62(48.81%)	127(62.87%)
Conjunctive	20(43.47%)	13(28.26%)	00(00%)	13(28.26)	46(22.77%)
Mood	11(78.57%)	01(07.14%)	00(00%)	02(14.28%)	14(06.93%)
Polarity	02(50%)	01 (25%)	01(25%)	00(00%)	04(1.98%)
Vocative	06(100%)	00(0%)	00(00%)	00(00%)	06(02.97%)
Continuity	04(100%)	00(0%)	00(00%)	00(00%)	04(01.98%)
Comment	01(100%)	00(0%)	00(00%)	00(00%)	01(0.49%)
Total/interactant	90(44.55%)	34(16.83%)	01(0.4%)	77(38.11%)	202(100%)

3-2-3-2 Critical Discourse Analysis of the Findings

From these tabulated data, it can be noted that there are 202 (100%) adjuncts used by the two participants. 127 circumstantial adjuncts are used in total and represent 62.87% of the total number of Adjuncts. Up to 46 of them are incumbent to the Superintendent. One can read them in such clauses as: (7, 10, 21, 29, 35, 46, 58, 63, 67, 80). As to narrator, he has used 62 encompassing clauses (165,172,174, etc.). The remaining 19 of them falling to Lomba show up in clauses 40, 75, 81; etc.

As regards conjunctive and mood adjuncts, they constitute the next dominant types, evenly numbering 46 for either of them; thus, scoring a 22.77% rate. Instances of conjunctives involve clauses (2, 16, 34, 43, 58, 64 and 67). They fall to the Superintendent 20, narrator 13 and Lomba 13. As to the mood adjuncts, the Superintendent authors 11

of them. They appear in clauses (53, 54, 56, 57, 63, 63, etc.). The only one echoed by Lomba is in clause (75) and two hail from narrator in clauses 140 and 165.

Vocative, continuity and comment Adjuncts respectively score equally 11 (5.44%). All of them are used by the Superintendent only. Vocatives are seen in clauses (1, 2, 184, 230,240, etc.) while continuity types show up in 12, 37, 104 and 273. There are 4 polarity Adjuncts. Of these superintendent has used 02 (50%), Lomba 1 (25%) and 1(25%). The polarity form is used by superintendent, Lomba and Janice whereas the comment one hails from superintendent.

Adjuncts also make substantial contributions to the overall meaning of the passage. In serving a helpful appendage to meaning making, they contribute to better highlighting the sharp

imbalance in the social relationship between the Superintendent and Lomba. Indeed, the predominance of circumstantial adjuncts helps add circumstantial precisions to the depiction of running events in the text in terms of place, manner, goal, time, beneficiary, etc. For example, the sequence “It is your second year *here* awaiting trial *for organizing violent demonstration against the militaries legal government*” (35) is replete with a good diversity of circumstantial specifications as follows: place (*here*), beneficiary (*against the militaries legal government*), and cause (*for organizing violent demonstration*).

As to conjunctive adjuncts, they function to tailor the passage into a unified semantic set. For example, in clause (16) “So you won’t talk”, the conjunction ‘*so*’ is meant to show a consequential continuation of some previous idea. Likewise, the conjunction “then” (clause 58) falls in the same vein. Reversely, the “but”, conjunction in (43) functions to establish a conflictual relation with some preceding idea. As far as mood adjuncts are concerned, they display the characters’ mood temper during the verbal trade. Examples include the following: “*Maybe*, there will be another coup” (53), “*Prisoners sometimes* smuggle out letters” (63), “*Perhaps* because I work in prison” (67) and “You need to work on them *some more*” (75). The adjuncts *maybe*, *perhaps* and *sometimes* are all meant to perform some flattering mission. They are planned by the Superintendent to please Lomba and induce him to accept to write poems for him. In order not to shock his superior in power as the Superintendent is, Lomba tries to give an adulating reply building on the sedating “some more”-adjunct in the clause “You need to work on it some more”. This adjunct bears a euphemistic dose which permits to avoid any otherwise full-frontal response likely to hurt his partner. This communicational alertness is quite symbolical of a cute body feint meant to elude any straight forward collusion with his superior in power partner.

Concerning polarity functions, they also come within the same token. For example, Clause 3 contains a polarity adjunct: “**yes**, I am Lomba”. Lomba has uttered this assertive *yes*-adjunct to certify that he is actually the person being looked

for. He doesn’t want to hide his identity. Not only does this reveal that there is no previous close relationship or acquaintance between Lomba and the Superintendent, but it is also revealing of the speaker’s sincerity in disclosing his identity without any hesitation or hedging.

3.2.3 Overall Tenor of the Discourse

The tenor of discourse has been based on mood, modality and adjunct analysis. In the Extract, the exploration about the participants reveals a boss-to-subaltern relation. The Superintendent who has been working in prison for more than twenty years stands quite bossy while Lomba, the new comer, is submissive. In the prison cell, Lomba has found ways and means to be writing poems, which puts the Superintendent on his nerves. This situation has worsened the master to servant, lord to slave relationship binding Lomba and the Superintendent. The Superintendent often uses minor exclamative clauses such as “A pencil!”, “humm!”, “Lomba”, “step forward!” to show his astonishment and his bitterness. The circumstantial adjunct “In my prison!” shows that the Superintendent is very powerful in this prison which he speaks of as a private property as testified by the *my*-genitive. There are a lot of minor imperative clauses such as “come here”, “out”, “follow me”, “talk”, “don’t think”, “step forward,” etc. in this extract which signal a strong command and the Superintendent’s position of authority over Lomba. The modalized interrogative clauses “can you win a case against the government?” and “can you believe that?” insinuate that Lomba, as a prisoner has no right, no possibility to express any personal stance. In a word, he is muzzled and subjugated by his falcon-natured speech partner, the Superintendent.

Definitely, there is unequal power between the Superintendent and Lomba because Lomba has uttered neither imperative nor interrogative clauses when speaking to the Superintendent. By way of illustration, he says “yes, I am Lomba”, “I don’t know”, “I have forgotten”, all of which are indicative of his total submission, his being doomed to show allegiance to an inmate prisoner. There is no frequent contact between the two participants

because Lomba often stays in his narrow cell and his boss stays in his office. There is also low affective involvement between the two participants due to the unfriendly relationship and unbearable atmosphere established to govern their relations. But surprisingly enough, the very Superintendent who has uttered bitter, harsh and severe words to patronize and torment Lomba has changed his linguistic items to sweet, milky and sedating words when he has read the poem and wanted to profit by Lomba's competence and ability. On the ground of the unequal power holding between these participants, their interactive language is proved formal.

Accordingly, imperative clauses have turned from strong command to encouragement and motivation. To illustrate this claim, the following clauses may be quoted: "Don't worry", "Enjoy yourself". The rationale behind this sudden tone shift is that he wants Lomba to write him poems to please his wife. In this vein, the atmosphere has turned convivial and Lomba has felt so good, so powerful and at ease. Through the following interrogative clauses "sir, is it poetry?" "You want me to write a poem for you?" Lomba has asked questions and has also shown respect to the Superintendent. The vocative "Sir" is utterly telling, indeed. It can be deduced that language has, indeed, a meaning potential which is variably activated in accordance with prevailing situations. At large, this sudden volte-face in their initial relational climate is exhibitiv of the Superintendent's opportunistic or go-getter sense, given that he just affords a makeshift freedom to his thus-far dominated partner

4- Conclusion

In a nutshell, findings from this study testify that there is a major gap in the social status of both participants at stake. Though a prisoner too, the Superintendent displays a crunching precedence over Lomba, his new mate. Odd enough, his long-fancied hegemony has happened to fade away and has dragged him back to a sudden cooperative humility once he has discovered Lomba's in-built writing muse. As he needs Lomba's sedating poems to allure his own wife, the Superintendent's tone has

rapidly suffered an opportunistic alteration. This substantiates Bolinger's (1968/1975:17) contention that "language changes to outwit change." In the same vein, Halliday (1973:20) also argues that "language is as it is because of what it has to do." However, the Superintendent's rapid change of attitude is symbolical of his loose personality. In displaying and alertly chastising the abrupt behavioural volte-face of the superintendent, Habila surely intends to promote human virtues of sincerity and probity. He is quite supportive of Ahmed (2004:6) warning against the increasing moral decay in Africa: "Our values are thrown into trash can. Bad models serve as role models for the young and the old. Morons are barons. Thieves are chiefs. Nonentities are personalities. Psychopaths are politicians."

References

- Ahmad, M. (2004). "The Degeneration of the Generation 2". Daily Independent. Lagos. July 16. P.E6.
- Allagbé, A. A. (2015). Lexicogrammatical and Cohesive Properties in Selected Extratcts From Chimamanda N. Adichie's Prose Fiction. Unpublished Phd Thesis, University of Abomey-Calavi.
- Amoussou, C.Y. (2014.) Discourse Tenor, Context and Character in the Lawyer's Monster Parable (*Petals of Blood*). *Particip'Action*, 6(1), 147-170.
- Bolinger, D. (1968/1975). *Aspects of Language (2nd Ed)*. USA : Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
- Dadjo, S. D. Y. (2014) Register Variables and Metafunctions in Flora Nwapa's Fiction Unpublished Phd Thesis, University of Abomey-Calavi.
- Eggs, S. (1994/2004). *Systemic Functional Linguistics : An Introduction*. London: Printer Publisher
- Fowler, R. (1986). *Linguistic Criticism*. Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- Helon, H. (2002). *Waiting for an Angel*. New York: Norton & Company, Inc.

- Halliday, M.A.K. (1973). *Exploration in the Functions of Language*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1975). *Learning How to Mean: Explorations in the Development of Language*. London: Edward Arnold Ltd.
- Halliday, M.A.K. & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London & New York: Longman Group Ltd.
- Halliday, M.A.K. & Hasan, R. (1978). *Language as a Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning*. London: Edward Arnold Ltd.
- Halliday, M.A.K. & Hasan, R. (1980). *Text and Context: Aspect of Language in a Social Semiotic Perspective*. Victoria: Deakin University, Geelong.
- Halliday, M.A.K. & Hasan, R. (1985/1989). *Language, Context and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective*. Oxford: Deakin University.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (2002). *Linguistic Studies of Text and Discourse*. London: The Tower Building.
- Halliday, M.A.K. & Matthiessen, M.I.M. (2004/ 2014). *Functional Grammar: An Introduction. (4th Ed)*. London & New York: Taylor and Francis Group
- Halliday, M.A.K (2007). *Language and Society*. Great Britain: MGP Books, Cornwall.
- Halliday, M.A.K. & Webster, J. J. (Eds) (2009). *Continuum Companion to Systemic Linguistics*. Great Britain: MGP Books Group.
- Koussouhon, A. L. & Dossoumou, M. A. (2015). Analyzing Interpersonal Metafunction through Mood and Modality in Kaine Agari's *Yellow Yellow* from Critical Discourse Analysis and Womanist Perspective. I *International Journal of English Linguistics*. C 5(6), 19-33.
- Koussouhon, A. L., Koutchadé, I. S. & Amousou, F. (2016). The System of Mood, Tenor and Context of Culture in Amma Darko's and Sefi Atta's Fictions: a Contrastive Socio-Semiotic Analysis. *Revue Internationale d' Ethnographie*. 13(6), 155-166.
- Koutchadé, I. S. and Mèhouénu, S. (2016). Male-Female Characters's Tenor of Discourse in AkachiEzigbo's *The Last of the Strong Ones*. *International Journal of Linguistics*. 8 (3), 167-182.
- Montgomery, M. (1986). *Language and Society: An Introduction*. Great Britain: Methuen and Co. Ltd, the Saucer Press.
- Tchibozo-Laine M.J.I. (2014). "Tenor and Interpersonal Meaning in AmmaDarko's Fiction: A Feminist Perspective". Unpublished DEA- Thesis: Université d'Abomey-Calavi.