

## The System of Mood, Tenor and Context of Culture in Amma Darko's and Sefi Atta's prose fictions: a Contrastive Socio-semiotic Analysis

(1) Léonard Koussouhon, (2) Innocent, S. Koutchadé, (3) Franck Amoussou  
(Corresponding author)

(1) Professeur titulaire (CAMES) de la linguistique anglaise appliquée, FLASH, UAC. Coordonateur des Etudes Anglophones à l'Ecole Doctorale Pluridisciplinaire (EDP) de la Faculté des Lettres, Arts et Sciences Humaines (FLASH), Bénin. [koussouhon@yahoo.com](mailto:koussouhon@yahoo.com)

(2) Maître-assistant (comes) de la linguistique anglaise appliquée, FLASH, UAC, Bénin. [koutchade2@yahoo.fr](mailto:koutchade2@yahoo.fr)

(3) Doctorant à l'Ecole Doctorale Pluridisciplinaire de la FLASH/UAC (Bénin). [courawin@yahoo.fr](mailto:courawin@yahoo.fr)

### Résumé

*Cet article démontre que le contexte culturel dans lequel les multiples problèmes soulevés dans les œuvres de fiction de Amma Darko (Ghanéenne) et Sefi Atta (Nigériane) impacte significativement l'usage de la langue par les personnages, notamment les rôles de la teneur du discours adoptés par chacune de ces romancières. L'examen de la grammaire du sens interpersonnel (Mode) et la Teneur du discours exprimé dans les romans respectifs « Faceless » (2003) et « Everything Good Will Come » (2006) des deux écrivaines anglophones africaines, est basé sur la Linguistique Systémique Fonctionnelle développée par Halliday et d'autres chercheurs (Halliday, 1971; Halliday 1985; Hasan, 1985; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004; Halliday & Webster, 2009; Eggins, 1994, 2004; Fowler, 1986, Bloor & Bloor, 2004; Fontaine, 2013; etc.). Cette analyse a révélé, à partir d'une étude contrastive des éléments de la Mode, que les choix de mode et de modalité utilisés par les romancières à travers leurs personnages sont expressifs des dimensions de la teneur.*

**Mots-clés :** contexte culturel, modalité, mode, sens, teneur.

### Abstract

*This paper shows that the cultural context in which the multifaceted problems raised in the fictional works of Amma Darko (Ghanaian) and Sefi Atta (Nigerian) impacts significantly the use of language by the characters, especially the roles of tenor of discourse adopted by each of the two novelists. The study of the grammar of interpersonal meaning (Mood) and Tenor of Discourse expressed respectively in the novels "Faceless" (2003) and "Everything Good Will Come" (2006) by both Anglophone African female writers, is based on Systemic Functional Linguistics propounded by Halliday and other scholars (Halliday, 1971; Halliday 1985; Hasan, 1985; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004; Halliday & Webster, 2009; Eggins, 1994, 2004; Fowler, 1986, Bloor & Bloor, 2004; Fontaine, 2013; etc.). This study reveals, from a contrastive analysis of Mood patterns, that the mood and modality choices used by the novelists through their characters, are expressive of tenor dimensions.*

**Key words:** Cultural context, modality, mood, meaning, tenor.

### Resumen

*Este artículo demuestra que el contexto cultural en el cual los problemas multifaceted levantaron en los trabajos ficticios de Amma Darko (ghanés) y Sefi Atta (nigeriano) afecta perceptiblemente el uso de la lengua por los personajes, especialmente el papeles del tenor del discurso adoptado por cada uno de los dos novelistas. El estudio de la gramática del significado interpersonal (modo) y tenor*

del discurso expresado respectivamente en las novelas "Faceless" (2003) y "Everything Good Will Come" (2006) por ambos escritores femeninos africanos anglófonos, se basa en la lingüística funcional systemic inventada por Halliday y otros eruditos (Halliday, 1971; Halliday 1985; Hasan, 1985; Halliday y Matthiessen, 2004; Halliday y Webster, 2009; Eggins, 1994, 2004; Fowler, 1986, Bloor y Bloor, 2004; Fontaine, 2013; etc.). This estudio revela, de un análisis contrastivo de los patrones del modo, que las elecciones de modo y las opciones de la modalidad utilizados por los novelistas a través de sus personajes, son expresivas de dimensiones del tenor.

**Palabras claves :** Contexto cultural, modalidad, modo, significado, tenor.

## 1. Introduction

Linguists whose approaches have been influenced by Saussure are concerned with two fundamental relations, the paradigmatic and the syntagmatic relations. These are features from which linguistic signs get their meanings (Eggins 1994, 2004). Syntagmatic relations (what elements from what classes can go next to each other in structures) are given more priority by formal grammatical approaches. Such approaches, as Fawcett (2005) notes, direct attention too strongly to the forms of language at the expense of its functions. In that light, Graham (1996) observes that "a grammarian interested in this [formal] kind of description will often use for analysis sentences that have been made up to illustrate different grammatical rules rather than sentences from the real world" (p.1). Applied to a literary work, this formal/structuralist approach, seeks not to interpret literature, but to investigate 'the structure and devices of narrative' (Amoussou, 2011: 50). From the foregoing, one can agree with de Beaugrande & Dressler (1981) who argue that "the analysis of formal structures might well fail to uncover the nature and function of an entity in its wider context" (p.xiv). Hence, a thorough understanding of literature requires a meaning-oriented or functional semantic approach to language. More specifically, a satisfactory analysis of a literary work requires an approach which can disclose meanings that facilitate the understanding of the writer's style or linguistic features. Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) turns out to be the most suitable model for that attempt. Here, the theoretical approach drawn upon in the current study is social-semiotics, the functional approach developed by systemicists. It applies one of the three metafunctions, viz. the interpersonal meaning, to selected extracts from two contemporary novels, notably *Faceless* (2003) and *Everything Good Will Come* (2006) in order to point out the common point and difference between the two fictional works.

## 2- Theoretical foundations: Interpersonal meaning, Tenor of discourse, Mood Grammar and Context

Within the social-semiotic scope, the paradigmatic perspective motivates a view on language as a multi-dimensional semiotic space (Ochi, 2006: 765-6). From the perspective of metafunction, language is interpreted as a meaning potential diversified functionally into three simultaneous modes of meaning: ideational, interpersonal and textual (Halliday, 1985a; Halliday, 2002; Halliday & Hasan, 1985, 1989; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004; Eggins, 1994, 2004; Bloor & Bloor, 2004; Fontaine, 2013, Graham, 1996; Patpong, 2009).

According to Patpong (Op, cited), the interpersonal metafunction is concerned with the interaction between speaker and listener. It involves the grammatical resources for enacting social roles in general, and speech roles in particular, in dialogic interaction: for example, resources for establishing, changing, and maintaining interpersonal relations. For Halliday & Matthiessen (2004: 61), the interpersonal metafunction is “clause as exchange” that enacts social roles and relations. On his part, Matthiessen (1995: 17, cited in Patpong, 2009: 210) views the interpersonal meaning as a resource for enacting social roles and relationships between speaker/writer and listener/reader. From all those definitions, two assumptions arise: (i) an analysis of a text from the perspective of the interpersonal function involves a situation of “dialogic passages” (Egins & Slade, 1997, cited in Patpong, 2009: 198); (ii) the interpersonal meaning is related to the social roles interactants are playing once engaged in a dialogue.

The interpersonal meaning is realized in wordings through Mood and modality and is centrally influenced by tenor of discourse (Yulianti, 2013: 52). Formerly labeled ‘*style of discourse*’ (Hasan, 2009: 166), the concept of tenor of discourse is a contextual variable which is intimately related to the interpersonal meaning. Halliday defines tenor of discourse as “*the interactions between participants in terms of status and role relationship*” (Halliday, 1978: 62). Drawing on Halliday (1978, 1985, 1989), Martin (2009) argues that *tenor is concerned with social relations, as these are enacted through the dimensions of power and solidarity* (p.159). Based on these dimensions of power and solidarity, Egins (1994, 2004) whose definition of tenor is “*the social role relationships played by interactants*”, breaks (referring to Cate Poynton, 1985) this contextual variable into three continua which are ‘power’, ‘affective involvement’, and ‘contact’.

Moreover, most studies on tenor, Amoussou (2014a: 149) notes, focus on the analysis of the mood and modality types and of adjunct types. Halliday (1985a) contends that interpersonal meaning is the realization of Mood patterns of the clause. Mood is, according to Halliday & Hasan (1985, 1989), the grammar of the clause as exchange; it recognizes the speech function, the type of offer, command, statement, or question, the attitudes and judgments embodied in this clause, etc. Egins (1994, 2004) distinguishes five major mood types which are declarative, interrogative, imperative, modulated interrogative, and modulated imperative mood.

As for modality, it is viewed by Bloor & Bloor (2004: 55) as a component of interpersonal meaning whose function is to indicate some aspects of the speaker’s attitude to the message or his/her commitment on its relevance, reliability, interest and so on. Fowler (1986) claims that “modality is the grammar of explicit comment, the means by which people express their degree of commitment to the truth of the propositions they utter, and their views on the desirability or otherwise of the state of affairs referred to” (p.132). Palmer (1986), on his part, states that modality is “the grammaticalization of speaker’s (subjunctive) attitude and opinions” (p.16). Halliday & Matthiessen (2004: 147) emphasize the role of modality and posit that what the modality system does is to construe the region of uncertainty that lies between ‘yes’ and ‘no’. In addition, (Garcia, 2000) contends that modality is broken into two components: epistemic modality and deontic/root modality. Bybee & Fleischman (1995: 4) define epistemic modality as the *possibility or necessity of the truth of propositions*, while deontic modality is associated with the *social functions of permission and obligation*. Those two terms correspond, in Egins’s classification, to

modalisation and modulation respectively. As a matter of fact, modalisation is the way the speaker/writer/narrator gets into the text: expressing a judgement about the certainty, likelihood, or frequency of something happening or being (Eggins, 1994:180). It can be expressed through the choice of a modal operator like *can, may, might, will*; through the use of Mood Adjunct of probability like *perhaps, maybe, usually* like *sometimes, usually, still*, etc; through both modal operators and what Halliday (1985a: 334-40, cited in Eggins, 1994: 181) calls grammatical metaphor or metaphor of modality like *I'm sure, I think, I reckon, it's likely, it's possible*, etc. Modulation, on the other hand, is regarded as “the scales of obligation and inclination” (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004: 147). It can be expressed by (a) a finite modal operator (*should, must, need, ought to, have to, will, won't, cannot, etc.*) or (b) an expansion of the predicator typically by a passive verb (*you're supposed to*) or an adjective (*I'm anxious to*).

Apart from mood and modality, modal adjuncts are also components of mood patterns which help express interpersonal meaning. These include (a) mood adjuncts, (b) polarity adjunct (*yes* or *no*), (c) comment adjunct (*frankly, unfortunately*), and (d) vocatives (*Mum, darling, Amina, etc.*).

It is to be noted that meaning as a whole arises from the friction between text and context (Halliday & Hasan, 1985, 1989:47). This means, as Hasan (1985: 101) has put it, that “an understanding of the context of a text is important” to get the meaning of that text. Later on, (Hasan, 2009: 175) emphasizes that successful applications of linguistics would be impossible without a good modeling of language in its social context. Context in that perspective is viewed by Meiristiani (2011) as “the situation in which texts unfold and in which they are to be interpreted” (p.41). Drawing on Malinowski (1923), Firth (1958), Halliday (1985a), Eggins (1994, 2004), Fischer (1963) and Fowler (1986), Koussouhon (2013: 96) contends that meanings or metafunctions are influenced by the social, cultural, and ideological contexts in which they are exchanged. Consequently, he identifies three types of context which are: (i) context of culture: the whole network of social and economic conventions and institutions constituting a particular culture (ii) social or situational context: the ‘social element’ or the social context in which the work [of art] is written; (iii) context of ideology: the set of beliefs, values, perspectives and categories by reference to which a person comprehends the world. Our interpretation of the deep meaning conveyed in the novels under study will focus on what Fowler (1986) terms ‘contextualisation’ (cultural, social, ideological), with a particular focus on the cultural aspect. But, before embarking on such a task, we need first to focus on the study of the interpersonal features in the selected excerpts (texts), in terms of statistical data; hence, the next section dealing with the findings of the paper.

### **3. Practical Contrastive Analysis of Findings**

The analytic approach adopted in the frame of texts analysis within the SFL scope by some scholars and junior researchers (Amoussou & Anagonou, 2009; Koussouhon & Allagbe, 2013; Koussouhon & Dossoumou, 2014; Yokossi, 2006; etc.) consists in investigating the texts (in these cases, at least two texts are selected for analysis) at hand separately. That procedure, although detailed, is quite redundant and does not clearly bring to limelight the comparative features (in terms of similarities and differences) of the studied texts. In view of coming with valuable contrastive results plainly set up, we are going (following Eggins, 2004; Amoussou, 2014b) to conduct

the current analysis in one phase. To put it clearer, for every linguistic feature, the data obtained from the interpersonal perspective texts description will be systematically displayed and compared in both texts in the meantime. With this in view and on the basis of the clause-to-clause interpersonal analysis initially undertaken on the concerned texts, we obtained the results which follow.

### 3.1- Mood type analysis

The different Mood types in the two extracts have been identified through a clause-to-clause analysis. For space constraints and personal convenience, we decide to label the two texts from *Faceless* and *Everything Good Will Come* T<sub>1</sub> and T<sub>2</sub> respectively. Also does the notation C<sub>figure</sub> stand for the number of the clause concerned (for instance C<sub>1</sub>, T<sub>1</sub> stands for clause1 in Text1). The results obtained are summarized in the table below.

MOOD (ranking clauses only)					
Mood class		Text1 (T <sub>1</sub> )	Percentage	Text2 (T <sub>2</sub> )	Percentage
Declaratives	Full declarative	187	86.16%	168	78.99%
	Elliptical declarative	6		5	
Interrogatives	Full polar interrogative	2	5.80%	6	8.67%
	Elliptical polar interrogative	1		3	
	Full WH-interrogative	7		9	
	Elliptical WH-interrogative	3		1	
Imperative		12	5.35%	17	7.76%
Exclamative		3	1.33%	0	0%
Minor		3	1.33%	7	3.19%
Total ranking clauses		224	100%	219	100%

Table 3.1: Mood types in the extracts

The above table reveals four main types of Mood in T<sub>1</sub> (declaratives, interrogatives, imperative and exclamative), while T<sub>2</sub> contains three of them (the preceding mood types minus exclamative). Among them, declaratives come first with more than three-fourths of the total ranking clauses (86.16% and 78.99% for T<sub>1</sub> and T<sub>2</sub> in that order). Interrogatives rank second (5.80% and 8.67% respectively), whereas imperatives come third (5.35% and 7.76%). As for exclamatives, they are less predominant (1.33% in T<sub>1</sub> only). Of the declaratives, full declarative is the most predominant with a proportion of 187/224=83.48% in T<sub>1</sub> and 168/219=76.71% in T<sub>2</sub>. As for the interrogatives, full WH-interrogative is the highest one with a rate of 3.12% and 4.10% respectively.

To sum up, declaratives (especially full declarative), interrogatives (mainly full WH-interrogative) and imperatives are the most predominant moods in both texts. For the purpose of pertinence and logic, we chiefly base the interpretation of mood types on only those predominant mood types. For the time being, we now focus on the modality- types in the excerpts.

### 3.2- Modality Analysis

Modality properties are also noted in the texts under study. Table 3.2 below summarizes the occurrence of modality in the two texts:

MOOD (ranking clauses only)			
Modality		T <sub>1</sub>	T <sub>2</sub>
Modalisation	Modal operators (Fms)	10	18
Modulation	Modal operators (Fml)	4	2
Total (modalisation +modulation)		14	20
Total ranking clauses		224	219

Table 3.2: Modality distribution in the extracts

According to the statistics above, modality is expressed by modalization and modulation in both texts, with a very low proportion of modulation (4/14 and 2/20 respectively). Modalisation is indicated by modal operators used to convey the addresser's attitude and judgment ("Doom *would* befall them all" in C<sub>158</sub>, T<sub>1</sub>; and "You *won't* be sad" in C<sub>132i</sub>, T<sub>2</sub>). Mood adjuncts are also used as modalisation devices to signal the interactants certainty or probability about the propositions in the passages. Note, however, that the rates of modality in both texts are low as regards the total ranking clauses. Thus, in the first extract, it amounts to 14/224, i.e., 6.25%, whereas it slightly rises to 20/219, i.e., 9.13% in the second one.

### 3.3- Modal Adjuncts

The modal adjuncts used in the passages are counted and tabulated as follows:

Modal adjuncts	T <sub>1</sub>	T <sub>2</sub>
Mood adjuncts	7	5
Polarity	1	3
Comment adjuncts	8	-
Vocatives	1	5
Total	17	13

Table3.3: Distribution of modal adjuncts in the extracts

T<sub>1</sub> displays a total of 17 modal adjuncts, while T<sub>2</sub> contains 13 modal adjuncts in all. Of the overall number of such adjuncts in the first text, comment adjuncts rank first (8/17). They are followed by mood adjuncts which occupy the second position (7/17). Polarity and vocative have the same proportion (1/17 each). As for the second text, the order of those adjuncts is mood and vocative adjuncts (5/13 per adjunct type) and polarity (3/13). Comment adjuncts are non-existent in this text.

### 3.4- Tenor Analysis

On the basis of Poynton (1985, cited in Eggins 1994, 2004)'s tenor classification, the role relationship of the interactants of/in T<sub>1</sub> and T<sub>2</sub> is summarized in the following table:

<i>Referents</i>	<i>Contextual Description</i>			<i>Excerpts</i>	
	<b>Power</b>	<b>Contact</b>	<b>Affective involvement</b>	<b>T<sub>1</sub></b>	<b>T<sub>2</sub></b>
<b>Interactants' societal relationships</b>					
Ma Tsuru and Kwei (husband-wife)	Unequal	Frequent	High and haughty	X	
Kwei and Ma Tsuru's aunt (husband-mother-in-law)	Unequal	Infrequent	Low	X	
Kwei and his mother (child-mother)	Unequal	Frequent	High	X	
Enitan's parents (husband-wife)	Equal	Frequent	High and haughty		X
Enitan and her father (child-father)	Equal	Frequent	High and sweet		X
Enitan and Arin (child-mother)	Unequal	Frequent	High and haughty		X

Table 3.3: Tenor of Discourse in the extracts

It is obvious, from the table above, that the societal relationships displayed in the two texts are that of husband-wife (Ma Tsuru and Kwei in T<sub>1</sub>; Enitan's parents in T<sub>2</sub>); husband and mother-in-law (Kwei and Ma Tsuru's aunt in T<sub>1</sub>); child and parents (Kwei and his mother in T<sub>1</sub>; Enitan and her father, and Enitan and her mother in T<sub>2</sub>). The African cultural order in terms of power, contact and affective involvement continua is revealed in the extracts. Nevertheless, the case of Enitan and her father's power relationships on the other hand (equal instead of the commonly unequal set in all African societies), and Enitan's parents' relationships, on the other are an exception to that order. Here, contrary to the African practice, the wife and her husband's affective involvement is high and haughty. In the same way, though one is expecting to have a high and haughty affection between Enitan and her father, it is surprisingly a high and sweet relationship the reader is presented in T<sub>2</sub>. All this shows that Sefi Atta breaks the normal cultural way of human relationships in families to indicate that, under certain circumstances, tenor of discourse in African societies are to be questioned.

### 4- Interpretation of Findings and Conclusion

To begin with, it is important to remind that the current research centers around the study of Mood grammar (through mood types, modality and modal adjuncts) and tenor of discourse to reveal how the interpersonal meaning is expressed in the two texts under investigation.

The predominance of declaratives in both texts as revealed by the mood analysis statistics suggests that the two texts function as statements of information; i.e., in their interaction with one another, the interactants are more concerned with delivering information. And the information both texts are dealing with has to do

with family life. For instance, in the following full declaratives involving Kwei and Enitan, we notice that the addressers are given their listeners specific pieces of information: “after all, you are not my wife” (C<sub>18</sub>, T<sub>1</sub>), “I don’t like boys” (C<sub>154</sub>, T<sub>2</sub>). Indeed, in the first case, Kwei is clearly notifying to Maa Tsuru that he has never considered her as a wife in its full sense. In the same way, Enitan is trying to reassure her father that she’s not concerned with boys’ matters (restoring thus confidence in him that she will not get interested in boys at all once at school). The great number of declaratives, and precisely of full declarative (86.16% in T<sub>1</sub>, and 78.99% in T<sub>2</sub>), is also accounted for by the fact that the narrators are providing the reader with some information as regards the events being narrated. Actually, by writing for instance “Maa Tsuru returned home in shock” (C<sub>41</sub>, T<sub>1</sub>), “my mother pulled me to my feet by my ear” (C<sub>23i</sub>, T<sub>2</sub>), the narrators of the texts are respectively informing the readers about the state in which Maa Tsuru left Kwei’s room after her conversation with Melon-bosom, and the reaction of Enitan’s mother on hearing that the book her daughter was holding was Sheri’s. In a word, the great percentage of (full) declaratives in the two texts clearly confirms Hasan (1985)’s claim that “judged by its frequency, the declarative mood is the mood *par excellence* for [...] prose fiction” (p.42).

As unveiled by the analysis, interrogatives are also important in terms of frequency (5.50% in T<sub>1</sub>, and 8.67% in T<sub>2</sub>). This denotes that apart from giving information, the interactants are also concerned with seeking information. The predominance of full WH-interrogative (7/13=53.84% in T<sub>1</sub>, and 9/19=47.36% in T<sub>2</sub>) means that the information sought has to do with “specify[ing] the entity that the questioner wishes to have supplied” (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004). As a matter of fact, in asking for example “*why* did you let it happen?” (C<sub>11</sub>, T<sub>1</sub>) and “*what* are you doing here?” (C<sub>169</sub>, T<sub>2</sub>), Kwei and Enitan in that order wants to know the reason why Maa Tsuru has accepted to get pregnant, and what has urged Sheri to come to Enitan’s house at so dark a night. It is noteworthy that in T<sub>1</sub>, people pretending to have power over others are the ones asking the full WH-questions, like “since *when* did a fertile womb become a bad thing?” (Kwei to Maa Tsuru, C<sub>21</sub>), “*who* are you?”, “*who* told you?” (Maa Tsuru to Melon-besom, C<sub>31</sub>, 35). In T<sub>2</sub>, by contrast, we notice that both interactants, with low or equal position, ask such kinds of questions. This is the case with Enitan in: “*What* is that?” (to his father, in C<sub>143</sub>), “*what* are you doing here” (to Sheri, in C<sub>169</sub>). It follows from this that while Darko seems to abide by what is culturally admitted in our societies and hold by Eggins that “women are submissive” (Eggins, 1994, 2004), Atta happens to strengthen women, making them more ‘authoritative’ like men.

Imperatives clauses in the excerpts (12 in T<sub>1</sub> and 17 in T<sub>2</sub>) indicate that the two texts at stake do not consist of only information, but are also concerned with ‘exchanging goods and services’. In line with Halliday & Matthiessen (2004:139), the second person imperative (you...!) is the typical realization of a demand of goods and services, in the passages. As for imperative clauses, they are used in the texts to get an action carried out by somebody else, i.e., they function as command. In the following instances: “wait!”, “wait for me!” (C<sub>121</sub>, 122, T<sub>1</sub>); “beat them up!”, “tell me now”, Kwei and Enitan’s father are respectively ordering their vis-à-vis (Maa Tsuru and Enitan) not to budge, and to act (by beating bullies and to answer the question). Sometimes, imperative in the texts doesn’t respect the typical structure of such mood-types (Cf. Eggins 1994: 184-185). This is the case with “out!”, “one minute!”,



“another two tots!” (C<sub>49, 63, 73</sub>, T<sub>1</sub>) and “up” (C<sub>54, 55, 58</sub>, T<sub>2</sub>). Last but not least, T<sub>1</sub> is characterized by the use of one clause of the ‘you-and-me’ type, with ‘let’s’ realizing it (C<sub>78</sub>: “let’s play”). Such instance is, in Halliday & Matthiessen’s (2004: 139) terms, a suggestion, that is both a command and an offer. In fact, Enitan’s father is not only inviting his daughter to play, but he himself is included in the performance of that task. Imperative clauses have also been uttered in T<sub>1</sub> by those who have power such as Kwei’s mother over her son (“go!”, “go far away from here”; C<sub>138, 139</sub>), Kwei over Melon-besom (“out!”, C<sub>49</sub>), Kwei over Maa Tsuru or over the ‘akpeteshie’ seller (“one minute!”, “two tots!”, C<sub>63, 69</sub>). On the other hand, imperative in T<sub>2</sub> is used by interactants of high status or by those sharing the same status with their addressees. As illustration, Arin, Enitan’s mother, says to her daughter: “answer me now” (C<sub>16</sub>); Enitan’s father to his daughter: “sit”, “come on”, “and join the debating society, not the girl guides”; no chasing boys (C<sub>76, 141, 153i</sub>); Sheri to Enitan: “open up” (C<sub>167</sub>). Here, we can infer from these statements that both the Ghanaian and the Nigerian authors choose to conform to the traditional African cultural way of giving orders: people with low status are not allowed to give their superiors orders, but must receive orders that they may execute (or not).

As far as modality is concerned, its low proportion (6.25% in T<sub>1</sub> and 9.13% in T<sub>2</sub>) in the two texts confirms that the writers are, as suggested by Eggins (1994: 315), offering information and goods and services. However, the high number of modalisation in both texts is indicative of the authors’ propensity to give not cold information, but information associated with the narrators’ or the interactants’ attitudes and judgments’. As a matter of fact, modal operators like ‘*would*’/‘*wouldn’t*’, ‘*must*’, ‘*can*’/‘*can’t*’, ‘*will*’/‘*will not*’/‘*won’t*’, ‘*could*’/‘*couldn’t*’, ‘*shall not*’, are the grammatical items used to express epistemic modality. Examples are “it *could* happen”, “it *wouldn’t*”, “it *must* be some power...”, “I *shall not* allow you” (C<sub>3ii, 4iii, 103, 145i</sub>, T<sub>1</sub>) and “I *would* lose my fortune”, “there *will* be trouble in this house”, “she *can’t* make friends anymore?”, “you *won’t* be sad”, “I *couldn’t* get rid of her” (C<sub>4iv, 33iii, 40, 132i, 179</sub>, T<sub>2</sub>).

Apart from Mood and Modality, the two writers also make reference to modal adjuncts to add interpersonal meanings to their texts. Of the four modal adjuncts noticed, mood adjuncts are mostly used. They express modalisation and basically serve to express usuality about the propositions conveyed. In clauses such as “Maa Tsuru was *still* spending the nights with Kwei”, “*never* had something so singularly shaken Kwei to the core”, “this number ‘five’ has *always* been in conflict with the spirit of this family” (C<sub>1, 100, 141</sub>, T<sub>1</sub>) on the one hand, and “if I *ever* catch you”, “you’re *still* sulking?”, “he would *never* buy me another watch again”(C<sub>33i, 87, 120ii</sub>, T<sub>2</sub>) on the other hand, one can plainly perceive that the different mood adjuncts play the function of expressing the frequency of the actions stated. However, T<sub>1</sub> also displays some mood adjuncts of probability or intensification like “if *maybe* there wasn’t *really* something in the matter” (C<sub>22ii</sub>,) and “*really*?”(C<sub>116</sub>). In the first example, the narrator of *Faceless* is not sure of the information being delivered and prefers to add her judgment of likelihood to the proposition conveyed. In addition, the adjunct “really” is meant to intensify or put force on the proposition articulated. From the foregoing, one can assume that through the use of Mood adjuncts of usuality, both authors are reminding the readers of how frequent and long-lasting some African cultures are hypothecating the continent’s development. From this, Darko, although

not so sure to eradicate here and now such bad practices, calls a cast that people (and more precisely women) must intensify their fight against those evils.

Comment adjuncts are used solely in T<sub>1</sub> to signal the narrator's judgements about the information delivered as can be noticed in the following occurrences: "Maa Tsuru cried *foolishly*", "because he has *singlehandedly* and very cost *effectively* terminated an unwanted pregnancy", "and slept *soundly* there for the next five hours" (C<sub>26</sub>, 90iv, 96v). Those instances show that in her artifact, Darko uses such category of adjuncts to express, as Eggins (1994) states it, "assessment about the clause as a whole" (p.168).

As far as vocatives or terms of address are concerned, they are mostly employed by Sefi Ata to "mark the interpersonal relationship, sometimes, thereby claiming superior status or power" (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004: 134). In the following instances, "*Enitan?*", when I'm talking to you, *Enitan*" (C<sub>12</sub>, 52ii), it is Enitan's mother who is showing her superiority over her daughter through the use of her name. Moreover, the author of *Everything Good Will Come* intentionally makes her interactants use vocatives in case of equal power. This is displayed in the propositions like "thank you *Daddy*", "*Daddy*" "*Eni-Tan*" (C<sub>115</sub>, 158, 180 ) uttered by Enitan to her father on the one hand, and Sheri to Enitan on the other hand. Here all the personae consider themselves of equal status, no matter their age.

Finally, looking at Tenor variables, the analysis has unveiled that the two writers have conformed to the African cultural order as far as power, contact and affection continua are concerned. However, through the equal relationship set between Enitan and her father on the one hand, and that between the girl's parents, Sefi Atta has decided to make an incursion into the usual way in which role relationships are set in African cultural societies: husbands are not supposed to try to dominate their wives, neither should parents try to have an absolutely high authority over their children.

As a conclusion, the study of the salient Mood patterns used in the fictional works by Sefi Atta and Amma Darko have made it easy to point out, from a linguistic point of view, that the lexico-grammatical/interpersonal features in the two literary artifacts are culture-specific. They have also revealed that these two female African modern writers have manipulated the English language to keep to the African culture or to infringe 'the patriarchal practices' which displays some aspects of their ideological perspectives. They also intend to claim, in the way of Akung, that "the woman cannot continue in the space defined for her by the society; she must fight for her space... She must speak out because silence is no longer golden" (Akung, 2012: 114). Overall, the study has viewed language as a social semiotic resource people use to accomplish their purposes by expressing (interpersonal) meanings in context.

## References

- Akung, J. E. (2012). Feminist Dimensions in Sefi Atta's *Everything Good Will Come*. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 4, 114-122.
- Amoussou, C.Y. (2011). Characterisation, Focalisation and Discourse in Ngugi's Wa Thiong'o's Novels: A Functional Structuralist Approach. Unpublished PhD Thesis. UAC.
- (2014a). Discourse Tenor, Context and Character in The Lawyer's Monster Parable (*Petals of Blood*). *Particip'Action*, 6, 147-170.

- (2014b). Transitivity Analysis of Two Stretches of Narrated Mental Discourse from Ngugi's *Wizard of the Crow*. *Revue du CAMES/Lettres, Langues et Linguistique*, 2, 120-136.
- Amoussou, F., (2012). The lexico-grammar of *Tongue of Promise* by Nana Otua Owusua1: A Systemic Functional Linguistic Approach. Unpublished DEA Thesis. UAC.
- Amoussou, F., & Anagonou J. (2009). The Grammar of Interpersonal Meaning: Descriptive, Analysis and Interpretation of Mood patterns in George ELIOT's *The Mill on the Floss* (1860), Unpublished Maitrise thesis, Université d'Abomey-Calavi.
- Atta, S. (2006). *Everything Good Will Come*. Lagos: Farafina.
- de Baugrande, R., & Dressler, W.U. (1981). *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. New York: Longman Inc.
- Bloor, T., & Bloor, M. (2004). *The Functional Analysis of English: A Hallidayan Approach*, (Second Edition). London: Arnold.
- Bybee, J., & Fleischman, S. (1995). Modality in Grammar and Discourse. In J. Bybee, & S. Fleischman (Eds), *Modality in Grammar and Discourse* (1-14). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Darko, A. (2003). *Faceless*. Accra: Sub-Saharan Publishers.
- Eggins, S. (1994). *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*, London: Pinter Publishers.
- Eggins, S. (2004). *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*, (Second ed.). London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Fontaine, L. (2013). *Analysing English Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fowler, R. (1986). *Linguistic Criticism*, First Edition. UK: University Press.
- Graber, P. L. (2001). *Context in Text: A Systemic Functional Analysis of the Parable of the Sower*. Emory: Emory University.
- Garcia, F. G. (2000). Modulating Grammar Through Modality: A Discourse Approach. *Elia*, 1, 119-135.
- Graham, L. (1996) *Functional English Grammar: An Introduction for Second Language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1978). *Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning*. London: Edward Arnold.
- (1985a). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- (2002). *Linguistic Studies of Text and Discourse*. London: Continuum.
- Halliday, M.A. K., & Hasan, R. (1985, 1989). *Language, Context, and Text: aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M (2004). *Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 3rd edition. London: Edward Arnold.
- Haratyan, F. (2011). Halliday's SFL and the Social Meaning. *2<sup>nd</sup> International Conference on Humanities, Historical and Social Sciences IPEDR*, 17, 260-264.
- Hasan, R. (1985). *Linguistics, Language, and Verbal Art*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (2009). The place of context in a systemic functional model. In M.A.K. Halliday & J. J. Webster (Eds.), *Companion to Systemic Functional Linguistics* (pp.166-176). London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

- Koussouhon, L.A. (2013). Facets and Functions of Linguistic Displacement in Ngugi's *Petals of Blood*: A Functional Structuralist Perspective. *Humanités Gabonaises*, 4, 93-127.
- Koussouhon, A. L., & Allagbe, A., A. (2013). The Lexicogrammar of Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie's Fiction: A Systemic Functional Contribution. *Langage & Devenir*, 22, 19-44.
- Koussouhon, L., A., & Dossoumou, A., M. (2014). Lexico-grammatical Analysis of *Yellow-Yellow* by Kaine Agary with a Focus on Experiential and Textual Meanings. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 23, 2430-2438.
- Koussouhon, L., & Koutchade, I. (2011). A Social-Semiotic Approach to the Analysis of Wole Soyinka's *The Man Died*. *Actes du 3ème Colloque des Sciences et Technologies de l'UAC-Benin*, (pp. 205-253).
- Martin, J. R. (2009). Discourse studies. In M.A.K. Halliday & Webster (Eds.) *Companion to Systemic Functional Linguistics* (pp.154-165). London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Meiristiani, N. (2011). Understanding tenor in spoken texts in year XII English textbook to improve the appropriacy of the texts. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1, 39-55.
- Ochi, A. (2006). The Reporter's Voice in Hard News Reports in English and Japanese Views from Context, Semantics and Lexicogrammar. *33<sup>rd</sup> ISFO*. (pp. 763-774).
- Patpong, P. J. (2009). Thai Persuasive Discourse: A Systemic Functional Approach to an Analysis of Amulet Advertisements. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*, 22, 195-217.
- Palmer, F. R. (1986). *Mood and Modality*. Cambridge: C.U.P.
- Yuliati, S. (2013). Interpersonal meaning negotiation in the teacher-student verbal interaction. *The International Journal of Social Sciences*, 11, 52-60.
- Yokossi, D. T. (2011). Transitivity Analysis Of Chinua Achebe's *Arrow Of God* And Ngugi Wa Thiongo's *Petals Of Blood*: A Comparative Systemic Functional Approach, Unpublished DEA thesis, Université d'Abomey-Calavi.