LINGUISTIC DEFAMILIARIZATION:
A REAPPRAISAL OF *THINGS FALL APART* THROUGH
THE STRUCTURALIST CHARACTER THEORY

Yémalo C. Amoussou[i]
FLLAC, University of Abomey-Calavi,
Bénin Republic

Abstract:

This paper applies the Structuralist Character Theory to 33 extracts of inner experience from Chinua Achebe's novel *Things Fall Apart* (1958) with the view to showing that some of the narratorial judgments about two central characters, namely Okonkwo and Obierika, seriously lack textual evidence and need revising. Not only does the paper succeed in proving, drawing on the statistics of mental and behavioural processes, that Okonkwo, the man said '*not to be a man of thought*' ends up being at least *23* times more so than the one said to be so. Though this injustice can be accounted for by the narrator's ideological clash or complicity with either character, the researcher invites language scientists to defamiliarize, to submit other works to similar analyses to avoid falling into the dangers of linguistic familiarization. He strongly believes, to quote a prominent linguist, that "*After the analysis, what seemed flat becomes rounded; what was rounded still has other dimensions added to it*" (Halliday, quoted in Cummings & Simmons, 1983: viii).

Keywords: structuralist character theory, defamiliarize, inner experience, processes, rewriteable discourse

Résumé :

Cet article applique la théorie structuraliste du personnage à 32 extraits de discours à processus interne tirés du roman *Le Monde S'effondre* de Chinua Achebe afin de démontrer que certains jugements portés par le narrateur sur deux personnages centraux, à savoir Okonkwo et Obierika, sont presque sans fondements linguistiques et devraient être revus. Le chercheur a non seulement réussi à prouver, en fonction des procès mentaux et comportementaux, que celui qui est dit '*ne pas être un homme de pensée*' se trouve l'être au moins 23 fois plus que celui qui était dit l'être. Bien que cette injustice puisse s'expliquer par l'opposition ou la compatibilité idéologique du narrateur à l'un ou l'autre des personnages, l'analyste, par ces résultats, invite les linguistes et critiques du discours littéraire à '*dé-familiariser*,' à entreprendre des études similaires sur d'autres œuvres pour

---

[i]Correspondence: email cayemal@yahoo.fr

éviter de prendre tout ce que les auteurs/narrateurs disent sur leurs personnages pour *'parole d'église'*. Il croit fermement, pour citer une figure emblématique de la linguistique systémique fonctionnelle, *"[qu'après l'analyse ce qui semblait plat devient rond et ce qui était rond a d'autres dimensions qui s'y ajoutent"* (Halliday, cité par Cummings & Simmons, 1983: VIII; *ma traduction*).

Mots clés : théorie structuraliste du personnage, dé-familiariser, expérience interne, procès, discours reformulable

1. Introduction

As fiction writers and narrators are regarded as the creators and painters of their characters, what they say of them is less likely to be doubted or questioned by readers, as doing so would be like asking God why He created a person short and the other tall. Structuralists refer to this kind of resigned reaction as *'habitualization' or 'familiarization'* (Fowler, 1986:8.). A discovery by Whorf (1956: 56) points to the dangers of this widespread attitude. In a fire insurance company where he worked as a risk assessor, Whorf noticed that employees' behaviour towards things dangerously correlate with what they call them. They refer to drums that have contained petrol, and then emptied, as *'empty drums'*, and thus regard them as such. As a result, they did not hesitate to smoke near them, ignoring that volatile petrol vapour still lingered inside (Fowler, 1986: 32). To avoid such risks, structuralists invite readers to find ways to check on writers' statements about their characters, to stimulate response to the possible extra information that may be conveyed behind apparently simple narratorial opinions about them. In short, they need to *defamiliarize* the text, to reconstruct/reassess it from a different perspective than it is familiarly known or viewed (Fowler, 1986: 8; 36). In other words, Fowler (1986:42) contends that a basic principle of defamiliarization is expressed by Tomashevsky's (1965: 85) claim that *"the old and habitual must be spoken of as if it were new and unusual. One must speak of the ordinary as if it were unfamiliar"*.

Indeed, even though there is hardly any other textual evidence to the narratorial statements that *'Okonkwo is not a man of thought'* (p.48) and *'Obierika is more of a man of thought than Okonkwo'* (p.87), almost all the 200 second-year students-respondents in a preliminary survey squarely agreed without any reservation, giving such reasons as *'it is written black on white on'* p.48 and on p.87' and *'that is what I know, that is what everybody knows: we saw and read it in the book.'* Many lecturers of the novel have had similar responses. Indeed, quantitative analysis of each character's involvement in *'processes of inner experience'* (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004: 170, 208) shows that that Okonkwo is the most mentally active character in the novel, he is about 23 times more so than Obierika *'the man of thought'*.

The work is divided into two main sections excluding the introduction and the conclusion. The first discusses the theoretical background and proposes a methodological

perspective. The second reports, analyzes and interprets the data findings with the view of showing the baselessness of the statements about the two characters.

2. Theoretical Background: Overview of the Structuralist Character Theory

Linguists of literature usually feel the need to provide relevant information about both the object and the method of analysis, which accounts for the length of some of their articles: "*Linguistic structure [analysis] is always related not only to the data of the corpus, but also to the grammatical theory which describes these data*" (Bach, 1964: 29). As a result, this section first briefs on the structuralist character theory and the data corpus.

Indeed, the structuralist character theory emerged as a reaction against the traditional author-centred approach to the study of literature, which created an image of an '*Author-God*', as if the reader did not exist at all. In his seminal essay '*The Death of the Author*,' Barthes (1967/77) wrote: "*The image of literature to be found in ordinary culture is tyrannically centred on the author, his person, his tastes, his passions...Literary criticism to great extent still seeks an explanation of a work...in the man or woman who produced it*" (p.143). Holding, rightly, the view that literature cannot fully exist without the activation of the text-reader relationship, structuralists go for a reader-centred approach: "*a text can only come to life when it is read, and if it is to be analysed, it must therefore be studied through the eyes of the reader*" (Iser, 1971: 2-3). Drawing on Saussurean linguistics, Barthes argued that language does not need the author as '*a person*' to operate but essentially as 'a *subject*':

> *Linguistics has recently provided the destruction of the Author with a valuable analytical tool by showing that the whole of the enunciation is an empty process, functioning perfectly without there being any need for it to be filled with the person of the interlocutors. Linguistically, the author is never more than the instance writing, just as **I** is nothing more than the instance saying **I**: language knows 'a subject,' not 'a person', and this subject, empty outside the very enunciation which defines it, suffices to make to make language 'hold together', suffices, that is to say, to exhaust it.* (pp. 144-45)

He insisted that the only way to make writing and reading useful is to '*remove*' the writer's all-pervasive presence and to reinstate the reader: "*We know that to give writing its future, it is necessary to overthrow the myth [that the writer is the only person in literature]. The birth of the reader must be at the death of the Author...* A text's unity lies not in *its origin* but in *its destination*" (p.148).

Not only have structuralists declared the death of the author but they have also initially rejected the concept '*character*' as presented by other clashing theories (Bathes, 1966:104; 1970: 95; Culler, 1975: 230). For instance, the realistic theorists insisted that that characters can be studied independently from the events and contexts in which they are involved, while the psychological ones mainly see character in term of a *Proper Noun* (Propp, ([1928]1968; Mudrick, 1961: 211, Rimmon-Kennan, 1983:31-32; Chatman, 1978: 73,

118; Culler, 1975: 230; Barthes 1970:95; 190-91). As for the relational theory, it is best put in this dictum by Henry James: "*What is character but the determination of incident? What is incident but the illustration of character? What is either a picture or a novel that is not of character? What else do we seek in it and find in it?*" (James, ([1884]1963:80; Rimmon-Kennan, 1983:35). While this view places character as a central concern of the novel, it reconciles the realistic and psychological theories and somehow paves the way toward the structuralist thesis. However, Todorov's (1969) propositional definition can be taken as the background of the structuralist character theory as a proposition is defined as a combination of *character* (*noun*) with an attribute (*adjective*) or an action (*verb*) (Hawkes, 1977: 95-99). This definition places character as the participant that performs various processes (relational, material, mental, etc) in given circumstances or contexts.

Drawing on this view of '*characters*' as '*participants*' (Robbe-Grillet, 1963: 28; Chatman, 1978: 118; Barthes, 1974: 190-91; Culler, 1975: 230; Rimmon-Kenan; 1983: 33, 58); Chatman ([1972]2009: 57) argues that 'Structuralists wish to base their analyses strictly on what characters **DO** in a story, not on what they **ARE** –by some outside psychological measure". As Barthes (1977: 106) notes, Structuralists reject the definition of human agents in terms of '*psychological essences*' and contend that participants are defined by analysts not in terms of '*what they are*' as characters' but in terms of '*what they do*'. While the clash between '*being*' and '*doing*' helps *to* theoretically distinguish between relational processes and such others as the material, mental, behavioural and verbal ones, the golden question –'*who does what to whom under what circumstances*?'–used as the guideline for the transitivity analysis, shows that in practice the distinction is disregarded.

The structuralist character theory is thus founded on the theory of language as experience/representation. As this domain is construed through the experiential meaning grammar (Eggins, 2004: 206, 213; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004: 170), which involves analysis of process-types, participant-functions and circumstances, this study draws on the process-type taxonomy proposed by Halliday and Matthiessen (2004:170-260) and Eggins (2004:215-248). They distinguish six major process-types (*PT*), some of which are broken into sub-types and initialized as follows:

1) material processes: transitive material processes (TMP) + middle material processes (MMP);
2) meteorological processes (MTP);
3) mental processes (MeP): perceptive (MeP-P) + cognitive (MeP-C) + emotive (MeP-E) + desiderative (MeP-D);
4) behavioural processes (BP);
5) relational processes (RP): attributive (ARP) + identifying (IRP) + circumstantial (CRP) + possessive (PRP) + existential (ERP), and
6) verbal processes (VP).

These are defined, exemplified and illustrated in the table below:

Table 1: Definitions, exemplifications and illustrations of process-types;
inspired from Halliday andMatthiessen (2004: 170, 171, 257, 258)

PT		Definitions and examples	Illustrations
MP	TMP	-a process of the external world with an actor impacting on a goal: to eat, to kill, to knock, etc	**e.g.: -**Paul **killed** the snake with a stick. **-**Nell **knocked** him on the first round**.**
	MMP	-a process of the outer world with an actor in a movement action: to go, to run, to jump, etc	**e.g.: -**Ben **ran** as fast as possible. - Tasso **played** very well yesterday**.**
MTP		-'a process that deals with the weather': to rain, to snow, to breeze	- **e.g.: -**The wind **blew** wildly. - It **was** very foggy yesterday**.**
MeP	(P)	-a process the inner world showing perception: to see, to hear, to feel, to taste, etc	- **e.g.: -**Bello **heard** the news on the radio. - Sarah **saw** the boy from a distance.
	(-C)	-a process of the inner world expressing cognition: to think, to know, to remember, etc.	- **e.g.: -**He **knew** the truth as usual. - She **understood** his various reasons.
	(-E)	-one of the inner world expressing emotion: 'like, fancy, love, hate, enjoy, relish, marvel, etc'	**e.g.: -**He **feared** his father-in-law - She **understood** his various reasons.
	(-D)	-one of the inner world expressing desideration: want, plan, decide, resolve, agree, comply, etc	**e.g.: -**She **loved** the boy as her son. - Satan **hates** fire as nobody's business.
(BP)		-'one that represents the outer manifestation an inner working/the acting out of a process of consciousness or a psychological state'	**e.g.:-**She **slept** a whole day after the surgery - He **breathes** heavily when he **sleeps.**
(RP)	(-A)	-one that expresses quality/class-membership: 'state verb' +adjective/+indefinite noun phrase'	- **e.g.: -**He **was** happy. - He **was** a happy man.
	(-I)	'one that identities: 'state verb'+ definite noun phrase	**-e.g.: -**Nell **was** the opposition leader.
	(-C)	-one that classifies/identifies in a circumstance	**-e.g.: -**Nell **is in** a bad mood today.
	(-P)	-one that expresses ownership/possession	**-e.g.: -**Nell **owns** two big cars.
	(-E)	-one by which an entity is recognized 'to exist': 'There + 'state verb' +location	**-e.g.: -There was a man in the garden**.
(VP)		'one expressing a symbolic relationship constructed in the consciousness and enacted in the form of language, like saying and meaning'	**-e.g.: -**Pascal **told** me the story of Diana. -They **reported** that he had been fired.

In addition, the sub-identification of *MePs* is inspired by a classification proposed by Matthiessen (1995: 263-70) and rechristened by Halliday and Matthiessen (1999: 137-144; 2004: 208-210). However, a few refinements are made. In earlier studies, these authors, and Amoussou (2014; 2017) have kept existential processes separate from other relational processes, while I here keep them together, for two reasons. First, as can be seen on the table above, they mainly have the same nucleus '*verb of state.*' Second, the '*there*' in existential processes is '*an apparent*' subject and thus has no function in the experiential

grammar (Eggins, 2004: 238; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004: 257). As a result, the so-called existential clause is a surface manifestation of the extraposition of a circumstance to the end of the clause: '*an elephant was in the garden*' is the deep-structure clause turned into '*there was an elephant in the garden.*' Many of these '*existential*' clauses thus function more or less as circumstantial relational ones.

In practice, the concept of '*thought*' in the domain of '*inner experience*' is generally used to encompass what systemic functional linguists call '*processes of inner experience*' or '*mental processes,*' which includes four aspects: perception, cognition, desideration and affection (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004: 170, 208; Amoussou, 2016: 249). To these, behavioural processes, which '*represent the outer manifestations of processes of consciousness and psychological states*' (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004:171), must be added, as such aspects as dreams, daydreams, visions, memories, internal voices, etc are vehicles of the stream of consciousness. Moreover, the difference between '*mental*' and '*behavioural*' processes is at times hard to grasp. For instance, in one classification, Halliday and Matthiessen (2004: 210) consider '*to dream*' as '*a cognitive mental process*' while in another the very authors see the same as '*a behavioural process*' (p.251), which blurs the line between cognition and behaviour. In addition, the process '*tofear*' is taken as '*a cognitive mental process*' and then as '*an emotive mental*' one on the same table (p. 210). More than that, most researchers, including myself, would promptly take, for instance, the verb '*to sing*' as a '*verbal process,*' but Halliday and Matthiessen (2004:251) view such verbs describing bodily postures and pastimes as '*to sing, to dance, to lie (down), to sit up, to sit down,…etc*' as behavioural processes. Some structurally relational processes function to express inner experience (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004: 212) and are thus taken as either mental or behavioural processes depending on their contextual semantic import (Amoussou, 2014: 122; 2017: 256).

Intriguingly, Rimmon-Kenan (1983: 81), drawing on Uspensky (1973:75), lists some experiential and interpersonal indicators of the inner experience mode: When the focalized is seen from within, especially by an external focaliser, indicators such as 'he **thought**', 'he **felt**', '**it seemed to him**', '**he knew**', '**he recognized**' often appear in the text. On the other hand, when the inner states of the focalized are left to be implied by **external behaviour**, modal expressions – suggesting the speculative status of such implication – often occur: '**apparently**', **evidently**, '**as if**', '**it seemed**', etc. Uspensky calls these 'words of estrangement' (1973:p.75) (my bolding & italics).

While the highlighted verbs above belong to the group known as '*mental processes,*' '*the external-behaviour-signals*' have to do with '*behavioural processes*' and the modal locutions are part of '*modalisers/estrangers.*' It thus comes out that the 'inner experience mode' or the 'internally-focalized discourse' (Barthes, 1975: 262) is most likely to rely on mental and behavioural processes with the intrusion of an observing narrator/character through the use of Uspensky's '*words of estrangement*'. Indeed, these are the major indicators of '*the internal monologue*' which Fowler (1986: 137) sees as a "*directly experienced mental process*". Thus, in compliance with Fowler's definition, sentences of interior monologue, whether direct or indirect, are taken as mental processes. The direct ones are

labelled (*MeP-I*) and the indirect/rewriteable ones are as (*MeP-R*). Barthes (1975) suggests a test to see whether a narrated discourse string is internally focalized or not: when a string that is not initially in the first person can be rewritten into that person without the need for "*any alteration of the discourse other than the change in grammatical pronouns (and tenses)*" (p.262), then it is internally focalized, when it cannot, then it is externally so. Some of the monologic strings are thus submitted to Barthes' rewrite-test (Barthes, 1975: 262; Genette, 1980:193; Amoussou, 2017: 249) to show their transformability and interiority (Table 3).

Thus though classification tables 5 (5); 5 (9); 5 (13); 5 (15); 5 (18); 5(20); 5(21); 5(24),5 (25) and 5 (27) proposed by Halliday and Matthiessen (2004: 187-89; 208-9; 210; 218; 225; 238; 243; 251, 255; 260) to a great extent serve as checklists for the identification and categorization of process-types, some contextual refinements have been necessary for some accuracy in the data identification. The next section applies these considerations for the experiential data-processing and analysis of the 32 extracts.

3. Methodology and Analysis

3.1. Data-Collection and Data-Processing

This research work is based on the contention, contrary to the narrator's statements, that Okonkwo can be proved to be the most mentally active character in the novel after a quantitative analysis of the inner processes for which he plays the participant-function. To solve that problem, it is deemed it necessary to read the novel at least thrice and to identify, delimitate and reproduce all sequences in which the two characters are involved in inner experience. About 32 such strings are identified, and even though such other characters as Ikemefuna, Nwoye and Ekwefi are also internally probed into, none of them seems to be so much so as Okonkwo. The 32 extracts are each broken into numbered clauses, the process in each clause is labelled and categorized for the quantification of each type in Table 2, which serve as the backbone of the analysis. For space constraints, the longer of the processed extracts are referred to with their boundaries (n^{0s} 3;4; 7; 8; 9; 10; 14; 18; 19; 20; 21; 22; 23; 24; 26; 28; 29; 30) while the shorter ones (n^{0s}1; 2; 5; 6; 11; 12; 13; 15; 16; 17; 25; 27; 31;32) are fully shown to show details of the data-processing.

3.2 The Extracts Taken to Pieces

1) "(1)[Okonkwo *had just blown out*(BP) his palm-oil lamp](2)[and *stretched* (BP) himself on his bamboo bed](3)[when he *heard*(MeP-P) the *ogene* of the town-crier(3.1)[*piercing* (VP)the still night air]: (4)[*Gome, gome, gome, gome boomed* (VP) the hollow metal]. (5)[Then the crier *gave*(VP) his message], (6)[and at the end of it he *beat* (TMP)his instrument again]. (8)[And this *was*(IRP) the message]: (8.1)[every man of Umuofia *was asked*(VP)](8.1.1)[*to gather* (IMP)at the market place tomorrow] (9)[Okonkwo *wondered* (MeP-C)](9.1)[what *was* (ARP) amiss, (10)[for he *knew*(MeP-C)certainly](10.1)[that something *was*(ARP) amiss]. (11)[He *had discerned* (MeP-C) a clear overtone of tragedy in the crier's

voice], (12)[and even now he *could still hear* (MeP-P) it](13)[as it *grew* (ARP) dimmer and dimmer in the distance]" (p.7)

2) "(14)[Okonkwo on his bamboo bed *tried to figure out*(MeP-C) the nature of the emergency] –(15)['*war with a neighbouring clan?*' (MeP-I)](16)[*That seemed the most likely reason]* (MeP-R), (17)[and *he was not afraid of war]* (MeP-R).(18)[*He was a man of action, a man of war]* (MeP-R). (20)[*Unlike his father he could stand the look of blood]* (MeP-R)" (p.7)

3) "(21)[*Perhaps* down in his heart Okonkwo *was not* (ARP)................ (36)[and another *was* (IRP) idleness]" (pp.9-10);

4) "(37)[Everybody *laughed*(BP)heartily..................(39)[Okonkwo *remembered* (MeP-C) his own father]" (p.15)

5) "(40)[*He knew*(MeP-C)](40.1)[that Nwakibie *would not refuse*(MeP-D) him], (41)[but *he had not expected*(MeP-C)] ((41.1)[[*he would be*(ARP) so generous]. (42)[*He had not hoped* (MeP-C)](42.1)[*to get*(TMP)more that four hundred seeds]. (43)[*He would now have to make a bigger farm*] (MeP-R). (44)[*He hoped* (MeP-C)](44.1)[*to get*(TMP) another four hundred yams from one of *his* father's friends at Isiuzo]" (p.16)

6) "(45)[Okonkwo *remembered* (MeP-C)that tragic year with a cold shiver throughout the rest of his life]. (46)[It always *surprised* (MeP-C) him](47)[when he *thought of* (MeP-C)it later](47.1)[that he *did not sink*(MeP-E)under the load of despair]. (48)[He *knew* (MeP-C)(48.1)[he *was*(ARP)a fierce fighter], (49)[but that year *had been* (ARP) enough](49.1)[*to break*(MeP-E)the heart of a lion]" (pp.17-18)

7) *(7)*"(50)[Only a week ago……………………………*to kill*(MeP-E) a man's spirit]" (p.19);

8) "(56)[Even Okonkwo himself.. *liked* (MeP-E) the boy]" (p.20);

9) "(64)[Inwardly Okonkwo *knew* (MeP-C)……………………… *saw*(MeP-P) in him]" (pp.23-4);

10) "(70)[Okonkwo *cleared*(BP) ....(75)[it *was*(CRP)like the desire for woman]" (p.30);

11) "(76)[Okonkwo *was specially fond of*(MeP-E) Ezinma]. (77)[She *looked*(CRP)very much like her mother](77.1)[who *was*(IRP) once the village beauty]. (78)[But his fondness *only showed* (MeP-E) on very rare occasions]" (p.32)

12) "(79)[Okonkwo *was inwardly pleased*(MeP-E).... he already *saw* (MeP-P) in him]" (pp.23-4);

13) "(94)[And then quite suddenly a shadow *fell*(CRP) on the world], (95)[and the sun *seemed* (ARP) *hidden* behind a thick cloud]. (96)[Okonkwo *looked up* (BP) from his work](97)[and *wondered*(MeP-C)](97.1)[if it *was going to rain*(IMP) at such an unlikely time of the year]" (p.39)

14) "(98)[He *did not sleep* (BP)......................................(108)[and *spread*(BP)down his body]" (p. 44);

15) *(15)*"'(109.1)['*She should have been a boy*'(MeP-I)]' (109)[he *thought*(MeP-C)(110)[as he *looked at*(BP) his ten-year-old girl]" (p.44)

16) "' *(111.1)*['She **should have been** a boy' *(MeP-I)*]*(111)*[Okonkwo **said to himself***(MeP-C)* again]. *(112)*[His mind **went back***(MeP-C)* to Ikemefuna]*(113)*[and he **shivered***(BP)*].*(114)*[If only **he** could find *some work to do***he** would be able to forget] *(MeP-R)*" […]:*(115.1)*['When did you become a shivering old woman?' *(MeP-I)*]*(115)*[Okonkwo **asked himself** *(MeP-C)*],'*(116)*['you are known in all the nine villages for your valour in war'*(MeP-I)*].*(117)*['How can a man who has killed five men in battle fall to pieces because he has added a boy to their number?' *(MeP-I)*]*(118)*['Okonkwo, you have become a woman indeed!' *(MeP-I)*]*(119)*[He **sprang***(BP)* to his feet], *(120)*[**hung***(TMP)* his goat-skin bag on his shoulder]*(121)*[and **went to visit***(IMP)* his friend, Obierika]" (p.45)

17) "*(122.1)* ['*Too much of his grandfather,' *(MeP-I)*]*(122)*[Obierika **thought***(MeP-C)*], *(123)*[but he **did not say***(VP)*it].*(124)*[The same thought also **came***(MeP-C)* to Okonkwo's mind]. *(125)*[But he **had** *long* **learnt***(MeP-C) (125.1)*[how **to lay***(MeP-D)* that ghost].*(126)*[Whenever the thought of his father's failure and weakness **troubled** *(MeP-E)* him]*(127)*[he **expelled***(MeP-D)* it]*(128)*[by **thinking about***(MeP-C)* his own strength and success]. *(129)*[And so he **did***(MeP-C)* now], *(130)*[his mind **went***(MeP-C)* to his latest show of manliness]" (p.46)

18) "*(131)*[Okonkwo **was beginning to feel** *(MeP-P)* .... **was***(IRP)* the next best]" (p.48);

19) "(*137*)[For the first time in three nights............................. *(153.7.1)*[he **was***(ARP)* still alive]" (p. 53);

20) "*(154)* [Okonkwo **was also feeling** *(MeP-P)* .... **had become** *gravely* **worried** *(MeP-E)*]" (p.78);

21) "*(175)* [A cold shiver **ran down***(BP)*...*no hand in his death*]" (p.84);

22) "*(178)* [Okonkwo **said yes** *(MeP-D)*.......................................*had been* *(ARP)* born]" (p.55.);

23) "*(180)* [Obierika **was***(ARP)*a man]*(180.1)* [who **thought about***(MeP-C)* things]................*(193)* [As the elders **said***(VP)*], *(194)* ['*if one finger brought oil, it soiled the others*'*(MeP-I)*]" (p.87)

24) "*(195)* [As Okonkwo **sat***(BP)* in his hut that night], ...*(227)* [And *suddenly* Okonkwo's eyes **were opened***(MeP-P)*]*(228)* [and he **saw***(MeP-P)* the whole matter clearly]:*(228.1)* ['*Living fire begets cold, impotent ash*'*(MeP-I)*]. *(229)* [He **sighed***(BP)* again, deeply]" (pp. 108-9)

25) "' *(230.1)* ['*This is a womanly clan,*' *(MeP-I)*]*(230)* [he **thought***(MeP-C)*]. *(231)* ['*Such a thing could never happen in **his** fatherland, Umuofia*' *(MeP-R)*]" (p.113)

26) "*(232)* [Okonkwo **knew***(MeP-C)*].... ....*in the way of the clan*' *(MeP-R)*]" (p.121);

27) "' *(256.1)* [*I wish she were a boy,*' *(MeP-I)*]*(256)* [Okonkwo **thought***(MeP-C)*within himself]. *(257)* [She **understood** *(MeP-C)* things so perfectly]. *(258)* ['*Who else among **his** children could have read **his** mind so well?*' *(MeP-R)*]*(259)* ['*With two beautiful grown-up daughters **his** return to Umuofia would attract considerable attention*' *(MeP-R)*]. *(260)* ['***His** future sons-in-law would be men of authority in the clan*'*(MeP-R)*]. *(261)* ['*The poor and unknown would not dare to come forth*' *(MeP-R)*]" (p.122)

28) "*(262)* [Okonkwo ***was deeply grieved****(MeP-E)*…………… ***become****(ARP)* soft *like women*]" (p.129);

29) "*(266)* [*For the first time in many years*……………...... ***was almost happy*** *(MeP-E)* *again*]" (p.136)

30) "*(278)* [Okonkwo ***slept*** *(BP)* *very little that night*]…………. *(321)* [Okonkwo ***turned*** *(BP)* from one side to another]*(322)* [and ***derived****(MeP-E)* a kind of pleasure from the pain]*(322.1)* [his back ***gave****(MeP-E)* him]. *(323)* [*'Let Egonwanne talk about a "war of blame" tomorrow'* *(MeP-I)*]*(324)* [*'and I will show him my back and head'**(MeP-I)*]. *(325)* [He ***ground*** *(BP)* his teeth]" (pp.141-2)

31) "*(326.1)* [*'I shall wait until he has spoken'**(MeP-I)*],' *(326)* [Okonkwo ***thought****(MeP-C)*],*(326.2)* [*then I shall speak'**(MeP-I)*]" (p.142)

32) "*(327)* [Okonkwo ***stood looking at*** *(BP)* the dead man]. *(328)* [He ***knew*** *(MeP-C)*]*(328.1)* [that Umuofia ***would not go****(IMP)* to war]. *(329)* [He ***knew*** *(MeP-C)*]*(329.1)* […(328.1)… *(IMP)*]*(330)* [because they ***had let*** *(TMP)* the other messengers escape]. *(331)* [They ***had broken*** *(IMP)* into tumult instead of action]. *(332)* [He ***discerned*** *(MeP-P)* fright in that tumult]. *(333)* [He ***heard*** *(MeP-P)*]*(333.1)* [voices ***asking****(VP)*: *'why did he do it?'*]" (pp.144-5)

3.3 Report and Analysis of the Data from the Process Identification

From the process-identification, this table is produced, drawing on the classification earlier adopted and the refinements brought to it, to summarize the major data. The first column shows the process-types and sub-types, the second the numbers of the clauses in which a typical process occurs in the extracts, and the last ones the quantities and rates.

Table 2: Distribution of process-types in the extracts

P. T.		Clauses of occurrence: n⁰s	Quant. (rate)	Quant. (rate)
MP	*TMP*	6; 33.3.1 ; 42.1 ; 44.1 ; 50.1 ; 67.1; 84.2.1 ; 105; 120; 133; 144; 144.1 ; 147 ; 148.1; 181; 188.1 ; 190.1; 191; 199.1 ; 199.3 ; 235.1 ; 244 ; 246.1 ; 249.1; 274.1; 274.2; 275.1 ; 276 ; 281 ; 281.1; 282; 295; 320; 330.	34 **(07.37)**	57 **(12.36)**
	IMP	8.1.1; 97.1; 103; 121; 153.6; 160; 163; 165; 166.1.1; 167; 170; 176.1; 199.2; 206.1; 209.1; 264.1.1; 264.1.2; 270; 310; 311; 328.1; 329.1; 331.	23 **(04.99)**	
MeP	*(-P)*	3; 12; 69.1.1; 86; 104; 106; 131; 140; 141.1; 154; 155; 173; 202; 208; 209; 209.3; 227; 228; 237.1; 245; 246; 248; 251; 264.1; 266; 303; 305; 332; 333.	29 **(06.29)**	246 **(53.36)**
	(-C)	9; 10; 11; 14; 29; 31; 33.1; 39; 40; 41; 42; 44; 45; 46; 47; 48; 55; 64; 64.1.1; 65; 65.1; 69.1; 80; 97; 99; 100; 101; 109; 111; 112; 115; 122; 124; 125; 128; 129; 130; 132.2; 135; 139; 141; 142.1; 148; 156; 161; 162; 163.1; 166; 168; 169; 169.1; 176; 179; 180.1; 185; 186; 187; 188; 197; 200; 204; 213; 230; 232; 233; 233.1; 234; 235; 239; 248.1; 256; 257; 268; 283; 284; 286; 290; 291; 297; 302; 312; 326; 328; 329.	84 **(18.22)**	
	(-E)	22; 23; 24; 25; 26; 27; 28; 30; 31.1; 34; 34.1; 34.2; 47.1; 49.1; 55.1; 56; 57; 58; 63.1; 69; 72; 73; 76; 78; 79; 85; 87.1; 89; 92; 126; 153.5; 158; 159; 174; 183; 192; 198; 245.1; 254; 262; 263; 264; 265; 266.1; 277; 279; 308; 322; 322.1.	49 **(10.63)**	

	(-D)	40.1; 50; 53.1; 68; 81; 84; 125.1; 127; 132.1; 166.1; 178; 199; 206.1; 209.2; 221; 237; 270.1; 274; 275; 287.	20 (04.33)	
	(-I)	15; 38.1; 109.1; 111.1; 115.1; 116; 117; 118; 122.1; 149; 184; 189; 194; 228.1; 230.1; 256.1; 284.1; 291.1; 296.1; 298; 299; 300; 301; 312.1; 313;314; 315;316; 318; 323; 324; 326.1; 326.2.	33 (07.16)	
	(-R)	16; 17; 18; 19; 43; 114; 201.1; 203; 207; 210; 214, 215; 216; 217; 218; 219; 222; 223; 224; 231; 238; 240; 241; 242; 243; 255; 258; 259; 260; 261; 288; 289.	32 (06.94)	
(BP)		1; 2; 37; 37.1; 51; 61; 62; 70; 71; 74; 86.1; 92.1; 96; 98; 102; 107; 108; 110; 113; 119; 137; 138; 143; 145; 146; 153.2; 157; 175; 182;195; 196;201; 206.1.1; 208.1; 212; 225; 226; 229; 271; 278; 280; 285; 286.1; 293; 293.1; 296; 304; 307; 309; 316; 321; 325; 327.	53 (11.50)	
(RP)	(-A)	9.1; 10.1; 13; 21; 41.1; 48.1; 49; 59; 64.1; 67; 68.1; 81.1; 82; 83; 84.1; 88; 90; 95; 132; 134; 142.2; 150; 152; 153.7.1; 171; 179.1; 179.2; 180; 200.1; 234.1; 236; 249; 252; 253; 265.1; 267.1; 268.1; 273; 292;294; 306; 319.	43 (09.26)	
	(-I)	8; 29.1; 32.1;33.2; 33.3; 35; 36; 54.1; 60; 66; 77.1; 87; 136; 206; 211; 220.1.	16 (03.47)	81 (17.57)
	(-C)	33; 54; 75; 77; 80.1; 91; 94; 142; 163.1.1; 164; 172;205; 220; 247; 267; 272.	17 (03. 69)	
	(-P)	53; 84.2; 91.1.	03 (0.07)	
	(-E)	63; 250.	02 (0.04)	
(VP)		3.1; 4; 5; 8.1; 32; 38; 50.1.1; 52; 93; 123; 151; 153; 153.1; 153.3; 153.4; 153.7; 177; 190; 193; 209.4; 234.4; 269; 333.1.	23 (04.99)	
Total		**461**	**100%**	

Figures on this table reveal that three major groups of process significantly occur in the extracts: *TMPs + IMPs*[(07.37%) + (04.99%) = **(12.36%)**];*MePs + BPs* [(53.36%) +(11.50%)= **(64. 86%)**];*RPs* [(**17.57%**)], with *VPs* ranking lowest of all [(**04.99%**)].First the sparse occurrence of *VPs* means at first sight that the participants are less involved in such aspects of speech as saying, telling, narrating, reporting and projecting. Despite their fewness, the *VPs'* distribution is most telling of Okonkwo's character. Though he is the most focalized character in these extracts, he authors only 3*VPs* (n[0s] 52; 93; 269) out of the *23* identified (**13.04%**) while non-focalized characters play the Sayer-function in 20[(**86.96%**)](n[0s]3.1; 4; 5; 8.1;32; 38; 50.1.1; 123; 151; 153; 153.1; 153.3; 153.4; 153.7; 177; 190; 193; 209.4; 234.2; 333.1).The small number of the Okonkwo-uttered *VPs* can in part account for his speech defect and the resulting anger and heavy-handedness – "*He had a light stammer and whenever he was angry and could not get his words quickly enough he would use his fists" (p.4)* –it also partly results from the double narrative function Okonkwo plays: he is both the central character and focaliser. Indeed, the other *VPs* are uttered in the hearing of Okonkwo, which turns him into the perceptual focaliser for them. Interestingly, about **43.48% *(10/23)*** of these VPs (3.1; 8.1; 50.1.1; 153.1; 153.3; 153.4; 153.7; 209.4; 234.4; 333.1) appear in rankshifted clauses, meaning that they stand for what the character-focaliser hears and remembers others saying.

The occurrence of material processes, be they transitive[*(07.37%)*] or intransitive [*(04.99 %)*], means that the participants in the extracts are relatively involved in concrete goal-oriented actions as they are in movements from one place to another (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004: 180). However, the fact that this group of process-types occurs at a relatively lower rate[*(12.36%)*] and comes in the third position shatters the assumptions that material processes always dominate in transitivity-oriented analyses (Amoussou, 2014: 120) and that Okonkwo is mainly '*a man of action, a man of war*' (p.7, p.48), while it confirms one of my conclusions that a writer's approach to character revelation (external or internal approach), and such narratological devices as mode of narration and focalisation do influence the distribution of processes and therefore must be taken into account for the application of SFL-theories to fiction (Amoussou, 2014: 132; 2017: 263).

There is a significant occurrence of relational processes *(17.57*%), which in general means that characters are involved the construction and maintenance of such abstract social relations as class-membership, relative definition, identity revelation, circumstantiation, possession and existentiality (Halliday &Matthiessen, 2004: 214; 220; 229-246). In this category, *ARPs* are dominant (43/81:*53.08%*), followed by *CRPs* (*17/81*: *20.98*%), then *IRPs* (16/81: *19.75*%), with *PRPs* and *ERPs* occurring only sparingly, *03.70%*) and *02.46%* respectively. This means that the most emphasized social relationship is that of class class-membership, as the rate of *ARPs* shows, either in terms of quality-specification or entity specification. Indeed, the main participant's concern over his elder son's inclination to resembling his grandfather in terms of such 'womanly qualities' as '*weakness, gentleness*' and his desire for him to be '*a great farmer*', '*a strong man*' account for the significant occurrence of these process-types.

The crashing majority of processes in the '*MePs + BPs*'-group [*(64. 86%)*] indicates that characters are primarily involved in such aspects of mental actions as perception, cognition, emotion, desideration and physiological or psychological behaviour. In this group, cognition and interior monologue stand out more significantly [*(18.22*%)&*(14.10*%)*], followed by psychological behaviour *(11.50 %)*, then emotion [*(10.63*%)], perception *(06.29*%), ending with desideration*(04.33*%).The last rate entails that the characters are in situations in which they have little power over their behaviors, perceptions, thoughts and emotions. Maybe, Okonkwo's personality clash with his father's or elder son's, his desire to make his son a man of action and his helpless fears that the son might resemble his failed grandfather account for the lower rating of this *MeP*-type.

The high ranking of *cognitive MePs*, with the most frequently occurring ones being '*thought*' *(n^{0s} 47; 65; 99; 100; 101; 109; 111; 124; 124; 128; 129; 130; 163.1; 169; 197; 204; 230; 256; 284; 290; 291; 302; 312);'knew'(n^{0s} 10; 33.1; 40; 55; 64; 141.1; 232; 233; 327; 328); 'remembered' (n^{0s} 39; 45, 176; 213; 297); 'wondered' (n^{0s} 9; 115; 141; 200) 'hoped' (n0s 42; 44; 148),* unarguably portrays Okonkwo as '*a man of thought*', a cognitive *MeP* being basically '*a process of thinking*' (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004: 172, 208, 210; Eggins & Slade, 1997: 228). Indeed, of all the *246 MePs* identified in these extracts, Obierika, the so-called '*man of thought*', plays the Senser for only *10* (*04.06%)* including *05* cognitive (n^{0s} 122; 180.1; 185;

186; 188); *04* direct internal processes (n^{0s} 122.1; 184; 189; 194) and *01* emotive (n^0 183). The tribesmen, including Okonkwo's daughter Ezinma, are also made to play the Senser function for *04 MePs (01.64%)* (n^{0s}237.1; 257; 268; 275). All in all, Okonkwo is Senser for *232 (94. 30%)* of the *MePs*. In addition, of the *53BPs* identified only *06* (n^{0s} 37; 86.1; 182; 226; 291; *293) or 11. 32%* are acted out by other characters while Okonkwo plays the Behaver function for all the remaining *47 (86.68%)*, which means that he is the character whose physiology and psyche is most exposed of all. This is solaced by this narratorial information on the link between his physique, physiology and psychology:

*(33) He **was** tall and huge, and his bushy eyes and wide nose **gave** him a severe look. He **breathed** heavily and it was said that when he **slept**, his wives and children in their out-houses **could hear him breathe**. When he **walked**, his heels hardly **touched** the ground and he **seemed to walk** on springs, **as if** he **was going to pounce** on somebody. And he **did pounce** on people quite often. He **had a light stammer** and whenever he **was angry** and **could not get** his words quickly enough he **would use** his fists. He **had no patience** with unsuccessful men. He **had no patience** with his father (p.3, my emphasis).*

In a nutshell, the intense use of behavioural processes helps to portray Okonkwo's moods in terms of anger, frustration, shame, disappointment about his father's failure and the replication of this failure in his elder son's femaleness. Indeed, many of Okonkwo's utterances are introduced by behavioural processes where truly verbal ones are normally expected. A scan through the novel has helped me to identify at least *18* cases of this: *'thundered'* (p.10); *'stammered'* (p.10); *'swore'* (p.24); *'burst'* (p.27); *'shouted at'* (p.32); *'growled'* (p. 53), *'roared'* (p.57); *'threatened'* (p.58); *'swore furiously'* (p.58); *'rumbling like thunder'* (p.58); *'roared at'* (p.60); *'roared'* (p.66); *'mocked'* (p.76), *'stammered'* (p.107); *'roared'* (p.107); *'roared again"* (p.107); *'warned'* (p.136), *'snarled'* (p.138). These add up to *07* in quote (*n^0* 33) above to make *25* additional *BPs* and reinforce Okonkwo's temperamentality. Though the estrangers –*'it was said that, seemed to, as if'* (*n^0* 33)– indicate a speculative or subjective external observation, on the whole, Okonkwo turns out to be the single character that is the most *perceptually, cognitively, emotively, desideratively and psychologically probed-into.*

Another distinctive feature is that these extracts are built around a few macro-*MePs* (Fowler, 1986: 137; Amoussou, 2014: 129; 2017: 255) which govern other process-types. Each of these macro-*MePs* is found to contain all the others within its range or coverage: *'knew'* (10): [10.1-13]; *'tried to figure out'* (14): [15-20]; *'remembered'* (31): [31.1-36]; *'remembered'* (39): [37-38.1]; *'knew'* (40): [40.1-44.1]; *'remembered'* (45): [46- 47.1]; *'knew'* (64): [64.1-64.1.1]; *'wanted'* (68): [68.1-69.1.1]; *'had begun to plan'* (239): [240-243]; *'thought'* (256): [256.1-261]; *'thought'* (291): [291.1-296.1]; *'remembered'* (297): [298-301]; *'thought'* (312): [312.1-318]. Indeed, most other process-types (material, relational, verbal) are included within these Macro-*MePs*. Like the down-ranked *VPs* discussed earlier, many material and relational processes are rankshifted: *19/34(55.88%) TMPs* – (n^{0s}33.3.1 ; 42.1 ; 44.1 ; 50.1 ; 67.1; 84.2.1 ; 144.1 ; 148.1; 188.1 ; 190.1; 199.1 ; 199.3 ; 235.1 ; 246.1 ; 249.1; 274.1; 274.2; 275.1 ; 281.1.); *12/23(52.17%) IMPs*–(n^{0s}8.1.1; 97.1; 153.6; 166.1.1; 176.1; 199.2; 206.1; 209.1; 264.1.1; 264.1.2; 327.1; 328.1); *17/44 ARPs (38.63%)* – (n^{0s}9.1; 10.1; 41.1; 48.1; 64.1; 68.1; 81.1;

84.1; 142.2; 153.7.1; 179.1; 179.2; 200.1; 234.1; 265.1; 267.1; 268.1) and **07**/16 *IRPs(**43.75**%)* – (n⁰ˢ 29.1; 32.1; 33.2; 33.3; 54.1; 77.1; 220.1), etc. This means that about half of the other outnumbered process-types are further downgraded as they are reported or projected to stand for the contents of the *perceptive, cognitive, emotive*and *desiderative* mental clauses, serving thus as '*idea clauses*' or as '*the representation of the contents of consciousness*' (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004: 206). That is why systemicists theorize that the four sub-classes of '*mental*' clauses stand for four types of sensing –'*perceptive*', '*cognitive*', '*desiderative*' and '*emotive*' –and they differ with respect to phenomenality, directionality, gradability, potentiality and ability to serve as metaphors of modality (Halliday &Matthiessen, 2004:208; Halliday & Matthiessen, 1999:137-44; Matthiessen, 1995b: 263-70).

Fortuitously, the extracts also contain *27* items of modality, namely modalisers or estrangers –'*certainly*' (10); '*seemed*' (16; 95; 267); '*it had occurred to him*' (166); '*might*' (166.1; 235.1; 248.1; 252) '*it seemed to him*' (248), '*perhaps*' (21; 216); '*as if*' (226; 251); '*appeared to/had appeared*' (142.2; 251; 268); '*should*' (29; 109.1; 111.1); '*no doubt*' (63); '*indeed*' (67; 118), '*must*' (163.1.1) and '*it was said that, seemed to, as if*' (extract*n⁰* 33). These indicate that though the main character is seen from within (first-level focaliser), he is also observed from outside by other characters (second-level focalisers: extract *n⁰* 33) just as he is as the second-level focaliser trying to subjectively observe and interpret events and other characters (Uspensky, 1973: 75; Rimmon-Kenan, 1983: 81; Fowler, 1986: 142; Amoussou, 2016: 245, 256; 2017: 255; 262). This inner presentation is justified by the occurrence of as many as **65** strings of internal monologue, whether direct or narrated. Oddly enough, the rate of direct internal monologue (*MeP-**I***) is almost equal to that of its indirect/narrated/rewriteable counterpart (*MeP-**R***), *that is '**07.16%'** vs. '**06.94%'**.*This near equality means that the narrator lends his/her reporting voice to the character for about *50%* of the interior monologue mode while the character thinks and internally speaks/thinks about 50% to himself. Barthes' (1975) rewrite-test is applied to some of the narrated monologue strings (n⁰ˢ*16; 17; 18; 19; 43; 114; 201.1; 203; 207; 210; 215; 216; 217; 218; 219; 222; 223; 224; 231; 238; 240; 241; 242; 243; 255; 258; 259; 260; 261; 288; 289)* to show the difference in their surface structure and deep structure configuration. *Table ₃*shows their narratorial versions *(a)* and rewritten ones *(b)*:

Table 3: Application of the rewrite-test to a few MeP-**R**s from the extracts

Clause n⁰ˢ	(a)*narratorial version/surface narrative structure*
	(b)*rewritten version/deep narrative structure*
(201.1)	*(a)*['*Why … should **he**, Okonkwo, of all people, be cursed with such a son?*']
	(b)['*Why … should **I**, Okonkwo, of all people, be cursed with such a son?*']
(203)	*(a)* ['*For how else could **he** explain **his** great misfortune and exile and now **his** despicable son's …?*']
	(b) ['*For how else **can I** explain **my** great misfortune and exile and now **my** despicable son's behaviour?*']
(207)	*(a)* ['*Suppose when **he** died all **his** male children decided to follow Nwoye's steps and abandon **their**…?*']
	(b) ['*Suppose when **I** die all **my** male children decide to follow Nwoye's steps and abandon **our**…. ?*']

(214-219)	*(a)*[He *was* a flaming fire]. [*How then could **he** have begotten a son like Nwoye....?*][*Perhaps he was not **his** son*]. [*No! he could not be!'*][***His** wife had played **him** false*]. [***He** would teach her!*]
	(b)[*I **am** a flaming fire*]. [*How then **can I** have begotten a son like Nwoye, degenerate and effeminate?*][*Perhaps he **is** not **my** son*]. [*No! he could not be!'*][***My** wife **has** played **me** false*]. [*I **will** teach her!*]
(222-223)	*(a)* [***He**, Okonkwo, was called a flaming fire*]. [*How could **he** have begotten a woman for a son?*]
	(b) [*I, Okonkwo, **am** called a flaming fire*]. [*How **can I** have begotten a woman for a son?*]
(240-243)	*(a)* [*The first thing **he** would do would be to rebuild **his** compound on a more magnificent scale*]. [***He** would build a bigger barn than **he** had before*]. [*And **he** would build huts for two new wives*]. [*Then **he** would show **his** wealth by initiating **his** sons in the ozo society*]
	(b) [*The first thing **I will** do **will** be to rebuild **my** compound on a more magnificent scale*]. [*I **will** build a bigger barn than **I have** before*]. [*And **I will** build huts for two new wives*]. [*Then **I will** show **my** wealth by initiating **my** sons in the ozo society*]
(258-261)	*(a)*[*Who else among **his** children could have read **his** mind so well?'*][*With two beautiful grown-up daughters **his** return to Umuofia would attract considerable attention*].[***His** future sons-in-law would be men of authority in the clan*]. [*The poor and unknown would not dare to come forth*]
	(b)[*Who else among **my** children **can** have read **my** mind so well?*][*With two beautiful grown-up daughters **my** return to Umuofia **will** attract considerable attention*]. [***My** future sons-in-law **will** be men of authority in the clan*]. [*The poor and unknown **will** not dare to come forth*]
(288-289)	*(a)* ['*If Umuofia decided on war, all would be well*']. ['*But if they chose to be cowards **he** would go out and avenge **himself**'*]
	(a) ['*If Umuofia **decide** on war, all **will** be well*']. ['*But if they **choose** to be cowards **I will** go out and avenge **myself***]

Overall, six or seven aspects of inner experience are exhibited in the texts: perceptive, cognitive, emotive, desiderative, direct mental, rewriteable mental and physiological-psychological processes. The occurrence of estrangers also helps to signal that the processes are presented from a subjective character-focaliser's perspective. If these should be seen as groundbreaking revelations about Okonkwo's character, then one cannot but agree with Barthes (1977) that the author must at times be removed to see the true features of literary texts: "*Once the Author is removed, the claim to decipher a text becomes quite futile. To give a text an Author is to impose a limit on that text to furnish it with a final signified, to close the writing*" (p.147).

4. Conclusion

The process-type distribution in the extracts shows that most of the commonly high-ranking process-types (material, relational and verbal) are outnumbered and down-ranked by mental and behavioural processes. In the main, the statistics of these processes in which Okonkwo and Obierika are involved show, contrary to narratorial pre-judgments about them, that the former is about 23times more a man of thought than Obierika: ['*94. 30%'vs. '4.06%'*]. These findings imply that Okonkwo is unarguably the most central character and the main focaliser in the novel. In the latter function, the participant is most likely to be the vehicle of innerness/focalisation, which involves intense involvement in various types of mental processes and behavioural ones. Indeed, when a character's consciousness is revealed, the discourse is likely to be dominated by

MePs-BPs, to contain macro-*MePs*, strings of direct or rewritable monologue and words of estrangements. In a nutshell, inner-focalised discourse is most likely to foreground aspects of mentality and behaviour while aspects of materiality, relationality and verbality are backgrounded or phagocytised by the former.

There is no denying that Okonkwo is a man of action/war as these outer signs – *'his fame as a great wrestler' (p.3; p.6)* and as *'a wealthy farmer/one of the greatest men in Umuofia' (p.6, p.10; p.19; p.147), 'his prowess as a warrior (p.6; p.8), 'his heavy handedness' (p.9; p.20; p.21; p.27) 'his hard work' (p.27), 'his love of war and violence' (p.38; p.141)*, etc –clearly show. However, these visible signs, which are part of *'outer experience'* (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004: 170) appear as the tip of the iceberg in the appraisal of character as they clearly overshadow the inner signs that play a more important part in character determination.

It can rightly be claimed that the narrator's views of these two characters illustrate his/her ideological stand to the *'violence'* vs. *'non-violence'* approaches adopted by either. Indeed, those judgments seem to rob Okonkwo of his humanity, as no normal person acts without first thinking, a wrong that is righted by these findings. Researchers are thus invited to resort to appropriate theories/approaches to investigate the linguistic foundations of narrators' statements about characters. Anyway, these findings highlight the need for linguistic defamiliarization: *"I try to teach my students how to practice criticism so that they become better equipped to resist habitualization and to question the structure of the society which benefit from its members' lack of critical consciousness"* (Fowler, 1986: 36). It thus becomes imperative that linguistics-oriented theories be applied to already-studied texts so as to look into them from different perspectives: *"Linguistics analysis becomes an integral part of the process of understanding literature, a means of formulating intuition, a means of objectifying it and rendering it susceptible to investigation, and in so doing, a means of feeling out and revising our initial interpretation* (Pearce, 1977: 18). A well-known character has this to say: *"The world is like a mask dancing: if you want to see it well, you do not stand in one place"* (Achebe, 1964: 46).

Conflict of Interest Statement
I do declare that there is no conflict of interests regarding this paper.

About the Author
Dr. Yémalo C. Amoussou is an Associate Professor of English Language Linguistics at the University of Abomey-Calavi (Bénin Republic, West Africa). His areas of interests include systemic functional linguistics (SFL), semiotics, pragmatics, narratology and ESP. To date, he has published a book and about thirty articles, with many in European, American and Asian journals. He is the current Editing Secretary of the Faculty's Journal *'Annales de la FLLAC'* and Deputy Coordinator of *'Anglophones Studies'* at the Doctoral School of the University. He has participated in many scientific conferences or colloquia as a research-paper presenter and as an organizer.

References

Achebe, Ch. (1958). *Things Fall Apart.* Heinemann: Heinemann Educational Books.

Amoussou, C. Y. (2017). 'Linguistic Features of Internally-Focalized Discourse in Ngũgĩ waThiong'o's *Matigari*,' *The Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, ISSN 2039-2117/ 2039-9349, Vol. 8, n °1, pp. 224-264, Jan. 2017; Rome, Italy.

Amoussou, C. Y. (2014). Transitivity Analysis of Two Stretches of Narrated Mental Discourse from Ngũgĩ's *Wizard of the Crow,Revue du CAMES*, nov.2014, Ouagadougou; pp.121-137.

Bach, E. (1964). *An Introduction to Transformational Grammars.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Barthes, R. (1975) (trs). 'An Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narrative', *NLH* 6, pp.237-72.

Barthes, R. (1977). 'The Death of the Author', *Image, Music, Text*. London: Fontana Press, pp.142-48.

Chatman, S. (1972/2009). On the Formalist-Structuralist Theory of Character; *Journal of Literary Semantics*; Vol.1, Issue1, pp. 57-79.

Chatman, S. (1978). *Story and Discourse*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

Cohn, D. (1966). Narrated Monologue: Definition of a Fictional Style, *Comparative Literature, XVIII* (1966), 97-112.

Culler, J. (1975). *Structuralist Poetics: Structuralism, Linguistics and the Study ofLiterature*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Cummings, M. & Simmons, R. (1989). *The Language of Literature: A Stylistic Introductionto the Study of Literature.*Oxford: Pergamon Publishers Ltd.

Eco, U. (1979). *The Role of the Reader: Explorations on the Semiotics of Texts*. Bloomington & London: Indiana University Press.

Eggins, S. (2004). *An Introduction to Systemic-Functional Linguistics*. London: Pinter Publishers Ltd.

Fowler, R. (1986*). Linguistic Criticism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Genette, G. (1980). *Narrative Discourse*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

Halliday, M. A. K. & Matthiessen, Ch. (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*(3rd ed.) London: Hodder Headline Group.

Halliday, M. A. K. & Matthiessen, Ch. (2006). *Construing Experience through Meaning: A Language-based Approach to Cognition*. London, New York: Continuum.

Iser, W. (1978). *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Iser, W. (1971b). Indeterminacy and the Reader's Response to Prose Fiction, in James, H. ([1884]1963). 'The Art of Fiction', Shapira, M. (ed.) *Henry James: Selected Literary Criticism*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Miller, J. H. (1971) (ed). *Aspects of Narrative*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (1995). *Lexico-grammatical Cartography:* English Systems. Tokyo: International Language Science Publishers.

Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (1998). 'Construing Processes of Consciousness: from the Commonsense Model to the Uncommonsense Model of Cognitive Science.' In Martin, J. R., Veel, R. (eds). *Reading Science: Critical and Functional Perspectives on Discourses of Science*. London: Routledge, pp. 327-57.

Mudrick, M. (1961). 'Character and Event in Fiction,' in *Yale Review 50*, pp.202-18.

Pearce, R. (1977). *Literary Texts: Discourse Analysis Monographs Nᵒ 3*. University of Birmingham: English Language Research.

Propp, V. ([1928] 1968). *Morphology of the Folktale* (trans. Laurence Scott, 2nd edn.). Austin; University of Texas Press.

Rimmon-Kenan, S. (1983). *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics*. London & New York: Methuen.

Tamashevsky, B. (1965). 'Thematics,' in Leman, L.T. & Reis, M.J. (trans.). *Russian Formalist Criticism: Four Essays*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, pp.79-92.

Todorov, T. (1969). *Grammaire de Décaméron*. The Hague : Mouton.

Uspensky, B. (1970, trs 1973). *A Poetics of Composition: The Structure of the Artistic Text and Typology of Compositional Form*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Whorf, B. L. (1956). *Language, Thought and Reality*. Cambridge, Mass. MIT Press.