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Abstract
This article explores the Experiential Meaning in both Chinua Achebe's Arrow of God (1964) and Ngugi Wa Thiong’o’s Petals of Blood (1977). Indeed, two excerpts from each novel under study have been culled and thoroughly analysed on the basis of the Hallidayan Experiential Meaning theoretical framework. To descend to particulars, the scholarship has provided a summary of the findings from the transitivity analysis carried out, the distribution of the identified process-types per participants in the selected extracts, their interpretation, and ultimately offers a comparative study of both novels under study on the basis of the findings. At this point, the paper, in the light of the findings of the analysis, highlights to what extent Achebe’s fiction shares common features with Ngugi’s one while underlining striking differences between them. Likewise, following the Hallidayan Systemic Functional Linguistics theory applied here, limits to Ngugi’s stand that “literature written by Africans in a colonial language is not African literature, but “Afro-European literature” have been presented. Eventually, the study has interestingly uncovered, in the two novels at hand, such other relevant research fields as language nativization/indigenization, Pidginization, code-switching and pragmatic transfer to name but just these striking ones only.
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INTRODUCTION

There are many different languages in the world, yet none of them is without meaning. In fact, language has been a fascinating area of investigation for various linguists and other scholars such as philosopher, sociologists, literary critics and suchlike on account of its poignant social importance. Indeed, it is often viewed as a vehicle of thought, a system of expression that mediates the transfer of ideas from one person to another (Finegan, 2007). As such, language is typically a human feature. Consequently, the structuring of language as a functional system or code has first and foremost to be rule-governed. That is the reason why within the perspective of descriptive linguistics the
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structure of language has been the greatest concern of such earlier linguists as Ferdinand de Saussure (1870), Peter Trudgill (1982), MAK Halliday (1985), Ruqaiya Hasan (1985) Montgomery (1986), Suzanne Eggins (1994), to name just a few of them. Some of the current worthwhile questions about language are instead the following:

- Does the usage of language spring from a vacuum?
- How is language handled by its users to mean?

This trend of thoughts has given birth to new approaches to the study of language, Systemic Functional Linguistics being one of the most current instances. Actually, language use is functional. As a matter of fact, its function is to make meanings, which are influenced by the social and cultural context in which they are exchanged. One famous statement by Montgomery (1986) in this perspective is the following: “Language is sensitive to its context of situation” (P.101). Peter Trudgill (1982) also held a similar standpoint as he notices on the first page of his preface to Muriel Saville-Troike what follows: “The study of language removed from its social context has limitation… a community’s use of language is an integral part of its social fabric.” In a nutshell, language use is functional, semantic, contextual and semiotic. These functions of language can be summarised by describing the systemic approach as a functional semantic approach to language. Then it is quite plain that any full understanding of a literary text normally requires the application of some linguistic patterns. Given that a literary work can provide an in-depth depiction of the cultural, social, religious, economic and political outlook of a people more than history textbooks and anthropological records always do (Diamond, 1989), this article draws on the ideational metafunction as a theoretical lens to help dig into Chinua Achebe’s and Ngugi Wa Thiong’o’s prose fiction in order to contribute to their better understanding. More specifically, the study aims at applying the Experiential Meaning to two extracts culled from each of the two authors’ novels under scrutiny viz. Arrow of God and Petals of Blood. The other research objective is to end up comparing both authors’ examined pieces of writing basing on the findings. To this end, the following research questions have been drawn up to address the concerns of the study: First and foremost, how is the Experiential Metafunction realised in both Achebe’s Arrow of God and Ngugi’s Petals of Blood? Second, how far does it contribute to the understanding of those pinpointed novels? Finally, how common and/or different are their fiction in the light of the applied Systemic Functional linguistics theory?

The study is premised on three basic assumptions. First and foremost, it is assumed that the authors being scrutinized have in various ways used the resources of the English language to express their experience in their selected texts (Simpson, 2004). Second, in their creative process of writing, both authors have either consciously or subconsciously chosen certain linguistic items over others to represent an experience or event for stylistic effects. To be more specific, Achebe and Ngugi will associate or foreground particular transitivity patterns with particular characters for ideological, thematic and/or aesthetic effects. The third and final hypothesis is that both writers’ pieces of literary work are to some extent similar though largely different because they
were neither written nor published in the same period of time; and also because Ngugi stands that “literature written by Africans in a colonial language is not African literature, but “Afro-European literature.”

The study goes round six cruxes namely: the introduction, the theoretical background and methodology of the study, the transitivity analyses of the selected extracts, the critical discussion of the findings, the comparative study of Achebe’s *Arrow of God* and Ngugi’s *Petals of Blood*, and the conclusion.

**THEORETICAL BACKGROUND**

As stated by MAK Halliday, the Systemic Functional Linguistics Pioneer or Father as he is called today, language, is a social resource for making meanings and choices (Halliday 1973, 1978, 1985a, 2002, 2004). In the same stream of thought, Eggins (1994:2), one of his followers, advocates that the systemic-functional approach, viz. the metafunctional approach makes four theoretical claims about language, which unquestionably distinguish it from such other linguistic approaches as the Chomskyan one. These theoretical claims entail that: language use is functional; its function is to make meanings; these meanings are influenced by the social and cultural context in which they are exchanged; and that the process of using language is a semiotic process of making meanings by choosing. In fact, according to Halliday (1978), each utterance simultaneously expresses three metafunctions namely, the ideational, the interpersonal, and the textual meanings; making the language code tri-functionally organized. As a matter of fact, the focus of attention in this article is on the ideational metafunction. What is meant by ideational metafunction?

**The Ideational Metafunction**

Also referred to as experiential meaning in Eggins (1994), the ideational metafunction has to do with grammatical resources for constructing people’s theories of experience, and how people construct reality in ways that seem natural to them. According to Halliday (in Lyons, J. 1970, P.143) the ideational metafunction is the “Real World” meaning, the meaning about experiences and actions of the participants. It is important to highlight that the ideational metafunction is encoded in the system of transitivity. What is then transitivity?

**Transitivity**

Transitivity is the linguistic expression of processes, participants, and circumstances, simply referred to as a system of grammatical choice. Carrying out a transitivity analysis involves determining the process types, participants, and circumstances realized in any clause. In other words, it helps answer the following questions: what happens? Who makes what happens happen? To whom does it happen? And when / how / where / why / to what extent does it happen? Or who does what to whom / where / when / how / why...? (Hasan 1985/1989). From the Hallidayan perspective, the paramount function of transitivity is that of “representing processes or experiences like actions, events, processes of consciousness, and relations” (Halliday 1985:53). Actually, the term
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process is used here in an extended sense to cover “all phenomena... and anything that can be expressed by a verb: event, whether physical or not, state, or relations” (Halliday, 1976:159, cited in Cunanan 2011: 72).

In other respects, Eggins (1994), stands that in analyzing transitivity structure in a clause, we are concerned with describing three aspects of the clause:

- The selection of a process: the process choice will be realized in the verbal group of the clause,
- The selection of participants: participants will be realized in the nominal groups,
- The selection of circumstances: circumstantial meanings are expressed through adverbial groups or prepositional phrases (p. 229).

She further pointed out that difference in process types is what is meant by differences in transitivity. Alternatively put, the process type of a clause is its transitivity. Been defined as such, it is then of paramount importance to fully grasp the linguistic connotations of such pivotal components of the transitivity theory as process types, participants, and circumstances. Therefore, let’s take a look at the process-types.

**The Process Types**

The process types system is one major system to be taken into account when looking at a clause as an exchange. The processes are realized by a verbal group and are associated with different participant roles, occurring in different configurations. They specify the actions, events or relationships between implicated participants and they may be situated circumstantially. There are six (06) process types on aggregate. The sixth, that is to say the relational process type is subdivided in four (04) sub-types that is to say intensive attributive processes; intensive identifying processes; circumstantials and possessive relationals.

**The Participants**

In the transitivity system, participants represent experience in a particular way. In fact, participants are the nominal constituents functionally labeled in relation with the process involved. They are also aspects of the clause realized in the nominal groups. It is important to underscore that the participant may or may not be a conscious being. The following is a recapitulation table of the process types with their respective participants.

**Table 1.** Process types and Participants (adapted from Bloor and Bloor 2004:132) cited by Koussouhon and Dossoumou (2015: 130)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process Type</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Actor, Goal, Beneficiary, Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental</td>
<td>Senser, Phenomenon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>Sayer, receiver, Verbiage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural</td>
<td>Behaver, Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>Existent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational</td>
<td>Carrier/attribute, Token/Value, Possessor/Possessed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Circumstances

The circumstances stand for the meanings conveyed by the adverbial groups or prepositional phrases. They show manner, time, location, or cause etc realized in the clauses.

METHODOLOGY

To reach the dreamt attainment of this research, a methodology has been designed and adopted. As a matter of fact, the methodology drawn on in this research is that of sampling. More specifically, two excerpts from each of the two selected novels by the authors understudy are purposefully selected and submitted to a systemic functional linguistic analysis of the experiential meaning. The analysis carried out has allowed to collect data from Chinua Achebe’s and Ngugi Wa Thiong’o’s fictional works. These data have then linguistically been examined to bring out the novels’ experiential meaning. Further, statistical tables have been drawn up for a better visibility of the linguistic features displayed by the analysed extracts, and for a better interpretation of the findings.

TRANSITIVITY ANALYSES OF THE SELECTED EXTRACTS

Basing on the principles guiding the transitivity analysis, two excerpts from each of the authors’ novels understudy namely Arrow of God and Petals of Blood have been quantitatively and qualitatively analysed. More specifically, we have first devoted ourselves to identifying the number of process types in each of the selected excerpts with a view to discovering their respective field, and then went on to look at the distribution of each process type per participant in order to reveal the character of each human participant of the dominant process types. Indeed, the identified process types as distributed in the four extracts are counted, statistically summarized, and shown in Table 2 on the next page (see appendices).

In the light of the statistics, it is important to note that the most frequently occurring processes are not only the material processes, but also the mental, the verbal, and the intensive attributive processes. It is also vital to highlight that the least frequently occurring process types are the existential, the circumstantial and the Causative circumstantial processes. As a matter of fact, the material processes are noticeably predominant over the other processes in the overall excerpts. This is understandable in so far as most clauses in the texts are about doings. For example, out of the 208 processes recorded in the first excerpt, only 9 are passive. Furthermore, 90 of them involve a material process representing 43.26% of the overall process types enclosed in the excerpt. This suggests that the excerpt is centrally concerned with actions and events and the participants carrying them out. As for the mental processes, they are on aggregate 32 and rank second in the list representing 15.38%, which suggests that the excerpt is also concerned with matters related to thinking, feeling and conscious cognition. Besides, verbal processes rank third with a whole number of 26 representing 12.5%. This suggests that the excerpt involves doing as saying and that some discourses
have been spoken in it. The intensive Attributive processes rank third with a number of 20. This means that the excerpt deals with descriptive narration or event. Indeed, characters as well as things have been described and granted qualities. The Behaviorals are 13 in number unlike the Existentials, which are only 4 in number. Besides, one (0 1) circumstantial has been recorded. But the extract is devoid of causative processes.

Table 2. Account of the number of processes recorded in the selected excerpts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process types</th>
<th>Studied excerpts abstracted from:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achebe’s Arrow of God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ngugi’s Petals Of Blood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excerpt1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material processes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective/transitive</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle/intransitive</td>
<td>34[90] 43.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental processes</td>
<td>32[15.38%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural Processes</td>
<td>13[06.25%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Processes</td>
<td>26[12.5%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential Processes</td>
<td>04[01.92%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Being Processes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributive processes</td>
<td>20[09.61%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying processes</td>
<td>18[08.65%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circumstantial processes</td>
<td>01[0.48%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessive processes</td>
<td>04[01.92%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causative Circumstancials</td>
<td>00[00%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relational Processes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total of number of processes in each excerpt</td>
<td>208[100%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total of number of processes in each pair of excerpts from each novel under study:</td>
<td>439[52.38%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of overall processes in the excerpts</td>
<td>838[100%]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As far as the second excerpt is concerned, it is essential to highlight that here again material processes are overriding in number. To be specific, out of a total number of two hundred and thirty-one (231) processes recorded in the second extract, the material processes all alone represent an aggregate of a hundred and eight (108) viz. 46.75%. Once again, this state of affairs hints that the excerpt is about concrete actions and events. In contrast with the first excerpt, Verbal processes are those that rank second here with a global number of 53 that is 22.94% of the overall processes recorded in the excerpt. This, as said earlier, suggests that the passage deals largely with talking or verbal actions. Next, the mental processes come third, and the attributive processes fourth. The behavioral and the identifying processes are placed fifth equal. The causatives occupy the sixth position. The existentials, the possessives and the circumstancials are placed seventh equal with a number of two (02) processes per category. From all the details that have been provided so far, it appears that all the process types are depicted in the passage, which is a marvelous thing as it shows that the excerpt at hand yields to the research being carried out.
As for the third excerpt, it is to be noted that it contains all the process types. Here again, material processes prevail over the other process types with a global number of one hundred and twelve (112) that is 53.33% of the overall processes recorded in the excerpt. Indeed, of all the studied excerpts, this excerpt is the one that contains the largest number of material processes. The above presented statistical table accounts for this. That goes without saying that this excerpt, far from making any exception, is also fully about tangible and concrete actions and events. As a matter of fact, the mental processes rank second in this excerpt with a total number of thirty seven (37) i.e. 17.61% which, as in the first excerpt, suggests that the passage is also concerned with minding, sensing, thinking and feeling and chiefly that the participants’ feelings and thoughts are fully expressed. The Intensive attributives come third with a number of twenty-six (26) processes suggesting that participants, be they human or not are described and granted quality or attributes. Next come fourth, the verbal processes that count a whole number of fifteen (15) in the overall extract. The intensive identifying processes rank fifth and are only seven (07) in number. The circumstantial processes, sub category of the relational process type, follows ranking sixth and are five (05) in total. The behavioural processes are only three (03) in number and are seventh. The existential and the possessive processes tie for the eighth place and account for only two (02) processes each. The causative circumstantial processes rank the last with the lowest number of just one (01) process identified.

As far as the fourth excerpt is concerned, it is to be highlighted that material processes override the other process types just as it has been the case in the foregoing excerpts so far. As a matter of fact, they rank first with a remarkable number of a hundred and one (101). Curiously indeed, this excerpt is also about concrete and tangible action and events. As one could easily guess, whether in the first two excerpts from Achebe’s Arrow of God or in the last two excerpts from Ngugi’s Petals of Blood, the descriptive characteristics are roughly the same. Not only do the material processes rank first alongside the four excerpts, but they also include, at every single level, both subdivisions of their category which are: the transitive and intransitive material processes. Very impressively, just as in the first and third excerpts, mental processes rank second and are twenty one (21) in number. Verbal processes come in third position with a total number of eighteen (18). The intensive attributive processes on the other hand rank fourth with a number of seventeen (17) processes. Then, the possessive processes which are fifteen (15) in number, comes fifth. Next, the intensive identifying processes rank sixth but are only eight (08) in number. While the behavioural processes and the causative circumstantial processes tie for the seventh place with three (03) processes at each level, the circumstantial occupy the ninth place with a number of two (02) processes and the existential processes rank last with a total number of just one (01) process in the overall excerpt.

The comparison of the four excerpts from the two different novels under study basing on the above presented statistical table, allows us to state without being mistaken that all the process types, except for the causative circumstantial in the first excerpt, have been identified whether in the first two excerpts from Achebe’s Arrow of God or in the
last two excerpts from Ngugi's *Petals of Blood*. Another striking element coming up with this comparison is that the material processes are so largely overriding, in such an astonishing proportion in terms of number, in all the four studied excerpts, that it is quite difficult to believe that these latter ones (I mean the excerpts) are from two different novels or authors. This essentially implies that both authors, though involved in fiction work did not just write about fictitious things but, far beyond this, tried to point at, and indeed, called attention to the various problems, I would even say the real life situations, that were undermining their societies in their era.

In other respects, it is noticeable that the second excerpt from Achebe's *Arrow of God* encloses more process- types than the other excerpts. Actually, if they were to be classified or ordered in terms of number of processes that each excerpt encloses, the second excerpt would rank first with a total number of two hundred and thirty one (231) various process types identified; the third excerpt from Ngugi's *Petals of Blood* second with two- hundred and ten (210) processes; the first excerpt from Achebe's *Arrow of God* third with a number of two hundred and eighty (208) various processes recorded, and eventually the fourth excerpt from Ngugi's *Petals of Blood* fourth with one hundred and eighty nine (189) processes. It is vitally important to point out that the number of processes identified in the first two excerpts from Achebe's *Arrow of God* is to some extent greater than that recorded in the last two excerpts from Ngugi's *Petals of Blood*. More specifically, four hundred and thirty-nine (439) processes have been globally recorded in the excerpts from Chinua Achebe's novel under study while three hundred and ninety-nine (399) processes are enclosed in those from Ngugi Wa Thiongo's novel under scrutiny. To round off with our commentary on the statistical table, it is extremely vital to underline that the four excerpts, taken together, enclose an impressive number of eight hundred and thirty eight (838) processes all categories added up.

Besides, in order to carry out a scientifically more reliable analysis of the process types in the four excerpts, I am going to explore, more closely, each type of the processes I have been commenting on so far.

**Table 3.** Statistics of the recorded processes added up per category in the overall studied excerpts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Processes</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Mental</th>
<th>Behavioural</th>
<th>Verbal</th>
<th>Existential</th>
<th>Relational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excerpt №1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpt №2</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpt №3</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpt №4</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>49.04%</td>
<td>13.60%</td>
<td>03.34%</td>
<td>13.36%</td>
<td>01.07%</td>
<td>09.54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All in all, the four excerpts account for eight hundred and thirty-eight (838) processes. The material processes nearly half of the overall recorded processes are material. This in fact suggests that the
passages analysed are more about doings and actions than any other things. The
relational processes are the second most frequently occurring processes in the four
excerpts with a total number of one hundred and sixty-four (164) all sub-categories
taken together. The mental processes rank third with a global number of one hundred
and fourteen (114). As for the verbal processes, they rank fourth in the list and are one
hundred and twelve (112) on aggregate. Such processes as the behavioural and
existential processes are ones that occur with relatively low rates throughout the
excerpts under study. To descend to particulars, only twenty-eight (28) behavioural
processes and only nine (09) existential processes have been recorded in the extracts
representing respectively 03.34% and 1.07% of the eight hundred and thirty-eight
processes by and large. It is worth mentioning that the intensive relational processes
are, for the most, reduced to the process “to be” conjugated either in the simple past
tense or the simple present tense.

Besides, there are a large diversified number of participants involved in the described
processes. It must be highlighted that most of them are encoded in nominal groups
which are on the whole either human beings or inanimate things. Nevertheless, some
participants are encoded in pronouns which, again, are referents for either human
beings most frequently, or inanimate beings.

As for the circumstances, it is extremely curious to note that except for the Cause
circumstances, all the other types of circumstances are registered throughout the four
excerpts though both location and manner circumstances prevail over the others. In
fact, the dominance of these two circumstances is justified by the fact that the actions
performed by the participants take place in specified places and in some given ways. A
well made analysis of the transitivity patterns in the extracts from the two novels under
study helps discover that the transitivity description carried out in the present chapter
actually meets all the overall aspects of the transitivity theory displayed in the
theoretical framework. We can then state with conviction that the selected excerpts
from both Achebe’s *Arrow of God* and Ngugi’s *Petals of Blood* are very conducive to the
work at hand. This point of view is going to be more highlighted in the next coming up
sub part that deals with the discussion and interpretation of the findings.

**CRITICAL DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS**

Our objective here is to emphasize, through interpretation, all the essential linguistic
features that can help understand more deeply the message conveyed by Chinua Achebe
in the extracts selected from his third novel entitled *Arrow of God* on the one hand, and
those from Ngugi Wa Thiong’o’s fourth novel entitled *Petals of Blood* on the other hand.
Actually, we are not going to carry out a linear interpretation of the extracts all the more
as not all the linguistic features can be interpreted. In actual fact, we are going to focus
on common features shared by the extracts that encode deep meanings for the general
messages conveyed by both authors in their novels under study to carry out the
interpretation. But before tackling this, we want to call attention to the fact that we will
not take into account all the process types especially because of the imbalance that is
remarkably noticeable as far as the proportion of the number of each process type in
each studied excerpt is concerned. As a matter of fact, the discussion will revolve round the material, the mental and the verbal process types along with their participants and circumstances which are strongly predominant in the analyzed passages.

In fact, the predominance of the material processes over the other processes in the first two excerpts implies that Chinua Achebe’s world view in *Arrow of God* highlights more actions than any other things. Indeed, nearly all the actions are concrete and tangible in the processes be they transitive or intransitive. This state of affairs suggests that the author is writing about real and concrete matters of his time and not about abstract issues. Actually *Arrow of God* is written when colonization by British government officials and Christian missionaries was well underway.

In order to underscore the new changes that the new religion was bringing about at that time, Chinua Achebe makes use of some transitive material processes. Some of them are the following drawn from the first excerpt: “locked” in the 170th clause of the analysis carried out in the appendices of this article: “he locked the python inside”; “pushed” in the 155th clause “He (Oduche) pushed it (the python) down from the wall with his stick.” Oduche as the son of Umuaro people’s religious leader was not supposed to ill-treat the sacred python even less think of killing it. But his conversion into Christianity has allowed him to commit such abomination and sacrilege. From my perspective, Oduche is but the symbol or prototype of all the new converts of the new religion at that time. And this point of view is more shared when we take a good look at the following material process in the 63rd clause from the first extract: “clapped” in “many people clapped for him (Oduche).” This really means that Oduche is not the only person who supports that serpents should be killed no matter what their species is.

It is vitally important to note that not all the material processes encode concrete or tangible actions. As a matter of fact, some are “dematerialized.” In other words, some processes appear to be material but actually mean other process type. One example from the first extract is the following in clause 94 “led astray” in the clause “I (Moses Unachukwu) will not be led astray by outsiders...” Actually, the dematerialized process “led astray” could be replaced by the mental process “deceived” with the clause still remaining meaningful. That dematerialized process reveals a kind of deceiving appearance in the character of Moses Unachukwu. In effect, Moses as introduced in the first excerpt is the first and most famous Christian in Umuaro. In the ordinary way of things, he is the one that should promote the new religion. But alas! We find the contrast in him. He is to some extent against some of the white man’s religious dictations. This state of affairs suggests that Moses Unachukwu is hypocrite and deceitful. Besides, the dematerialized processes reveal that Chinua Achebe is not direct in his writing. Actually, while speaking of Moses Unachukwu, he (Achebe) means all the Africans who were not entirely favorable to all the changes that the new religion was instigating (or provoking). His indirectness also lies in the fact that instead of addressing himself directly to his contemporary people, he chose such characters like: “Oduche and Moses Unachukwu” to represent, on the one hand, all the converts of the period with their attitude towards the African traditional realities, and on the other hand, Moses
Unachukwu to represent the rest of the Africans that stuck to their guns, i.e. the Africans who did not share the new colonial system on the whole.

Some other Material processes do not encode concrete actions though denoting concrete actions at first sight. In the first excerpt, there are examples of this kind. The process “returned” in the clause “Obika returned to palm wine in full force” doesn’t actually denote tangible action. The same case is witnessed in clause 66 with the process “was not going to give” in the clause “Mr. Goodcountry was not going to give him another opportunity”. In fact, the compound verb “was not going to give” could be replaced by “would not allow/offer.” This deceiving appearance of the processes is subtly used by Chinua Achebe to convey the message that though colonization might be seen as something good or salutary at first sight, it is not to be ignored that it ushered into slavery.

As discussed in the analysis, most of the Actor roles are played by human subjects acting on things external to them. First and foremost, this state of affairs creates an atmosphere of physical activities. Moreover, it also suggests that people are the key actors that operate changes in the world created by the novel under study. In the second extract, the actions performed by the participants playing the Actor roles in the intransitive Material processes are limited to the Participants themselves. This, indeed, means that the Actors in the novel act not only on their world but also on themselves. We can understand through this that Chinua Achebe in these extracts from his novel has highlighted the diverse transformations that took place both in Africa as a whole and in the individual lives with the arrival of the British colonial government officials and Christian Missionaries in Africa. In effect, colonization has been so powerful as to bring about changes in the minds of some Africans who turned away from some of their cultures in aid of the white men’s ones. Vivid examples of such Africans are such people like: “Oduche, Mr. Goodcountry (the catechist) in our first extract who have made up their minds to side with the white man’s new religion and encroach upon the traditional one. That is why, to call his contemporaries attention to that ongoing terrible situation, Chinua Achebe has wisely chosen to foreground mental processes in his novel. In fact, the recurrence of these mental processes after the material ones is aimed at changing, on the one hand, the writer’s contemporaries’ ways of thinking, viewing, along with perceiving and their attitude towards colonization on the other hand. In fact, Achebe, through the prevailing mental Processes, wanted his contemporaries to understand that they shouldn’t, under any circumstances, allow that colonization be the means whereby African values are pushed into the background. Indeed, they should, in spite of the oppressing influence of colonization over their cultural realities, show great discernment to be able to withhold whatever is good and promoting in their culture in order not to fall victim to acculturation; since rejecting one’s culture in aid of another one’s own is denying oneself. Moreover, the fact that the Senser roles are exclusively played by human beings really emphasize that the responsible actors for this change, as viewed by the author, are the people themselves.
Furthermore, it is to be noticed that the intransitive material processes are fewer in number compared to the transitive ones in the first two excerpts from Achebe’s *Arrow of God*. As a matter of fact, this reveals, firstly, the limitations of the people’s own actions; secondly, a people’s worldview which in general cannot transcend these limitations but within which they may arise, and thirdly, a dim apprehension of the superior powers of the others represented by the rare intrusion of an intransitive clause.

In other respects, the features of the verbal processes encode deep meaning for a further understanding of the studied extracts in particular and of the novel by extension. Indeed, a large number of the verbal processes are in relationships of interdependence. This actually suggests that Africans along with Westerners should depend on one another for more harmonious and prosperous life conditions. Indeed, White men should not hold themselves in higher esteem to the point of destroying or down grading the Black in whatever ways and vice versa. Moreover, it also suggests, to a further dimension, that Africans have to live hand in hand i.e. unite in order to overcome the battle against the White who have come into Africa to crumble it away. In addition, most of the verbal processes in both excerpts are in projection relationship with such other process types as the intensive attributive processes. This state of affairs suggests that the author viz. Chinua Achebe is foreshadowing a brighter future for Africa but under the condition that Africans hold fast in the battle.

It is quite striking to note that the human beings are rarely “pronominalised.” The most frequently used pronoun is “He” having as referent either “Oduche, Obika, Ezeulu, or Edogo.” This gives the impression that the referents cited above are the major characters that perform the actions in the excerpts and that the author in his artistry work desires to achieve a goal through them. It is also curious enough to highlight that the first person pronoun doesn’t exist at all in any of the two selected extracts. This total absence of the first person pronoun suggests that the author is objectively writing about something he is already acutely aware of and now wants to call his people’s attention to it. Therefore, there is no need that he should refer to himself in the course of the delivery of his message.

The predominant or most frequently occurring circumstances in these first two excerpts are both *Location and Manner*, which suggests that the actions in the texts take place at a specific place and in a given way.

In the light of all that has been said so far in attempting to interpret the linguistic patterns we have come across in the analysis of the extracts from *Arrow of God*, we can say that Chinua Achebe has made use of the foregrounded material, mental and verbal processes in order to favor a better understanding of his *Arrow of God*. In fact, by making use of the material processes which are processes of actions and doings, Achebe wants to mean that Africans should stand up with concrete and tangible actions to block off the way to the white men who have come to crumble away the African traditional values and customs by superseding the African traditional religion by their own. The positive foregrounding of these process types through both excerpts is meant to
underline that there is no better way Africans can prevent the white from imperiling their communities than take actions against them and all their diplomatic techniques of colonization that are unfavorable to the survival of the African cultures and customs.

Turning to the last two excerpts from Ngugi’s *Petals of Blood*, a glance at their descriptive features reveals that the material processes are largely, and in a strikingly imbalanced way, prevailing over the other process types recorded in both excerpts taken all together. Indeed, more than half of the processes registered in these passages, viz. 53.38% of the overall processes enclosed in both excerpts are material. Moreover, almost all the transitive as well as the intransitive material processes depict concrete and tangible actions. This then clearly implies that the extracts from Ngugi’s novel under study are highly centered on specific real and concrete realities within the scope of the time when it was written. Furthermore, the fact that the transitive and intransitive material processes are nearly all about tangible actions suggests that the author has been pragmatic enough to go straight to the point and depict all the real or concrete problems or disgusting and overwhelming tangible situations that were undermining his epoch. Actually, far from being a mere entertaining literary work, Ngugi’s *Petals of Blood* is rather both a sarcastic and bitter indictment against the leaders of post-independence Kenya and how they betrayed the country. Indeed the studied extracts describe the inequality, hypocrisy, and betrayal of peasants and workers in post-independence Kenya. Verily, the following effective or transitive material processes in clause 05 viz.: “the beans could hardly fill up a sisal sack” and in clause 85: “I haven’t sold much beer” along with the intensive attributive process below i.e.: “the harvest of beans was nothing” highlight the betrayal the Kenyan peasants and workers were victim of during neocolonialism. Besides, the work is a damning denunciation of the corruption and greed of Kenya’s political, economic, and social elites who, after the struggle for freedom from the British rule, have not returned the wealth of the land to its people but rather perpetuate the social injustice and economic inequality that were a feature of colonial oppression. To emphasize the economic inequality, Ngugi has made use of some special transitive Material processes. An example would involve such process from the fourth excerpt as the one in clause 71: “He (a very important person in authority) charges a hundred shillings for this one room” while Abdulla the shopkeeper, representing, by his social status, all the Kenyan workers, was almost a homeless person since he lives in a mud-walled barrack of a house with several doors partitioning it into several separate rooms. This is illustrated by the middle or intransitive material process in clause 29: “Munira stopped by a mud-walled barrack of a house with several doors partitioning it into several separate rooms”. All these considerations taken together help understand the prevalence of the material processes over the other process types in the concerned excerpts and confirms the interpretation we drew earlier that the novel deals with concrete realities.

Furthermore, some of the prevailing material processes are “dematerialized” or alternatively said, appear to be material but in reality mean other process types. Examples of such dematerialized processes from the third excerpt are: “would go” in the clause: “Nothing would go wrong” and “had taken” in the clause: “Nyakinyua had taken
her to Mwathiwa Mugo. In fact, these dematerialized processes could be respectively replaced by the modalised intensive attributive process “would be” and the Circumstantial process “had accompanied”. Then the first clause would become: “nothing would be wrong” and the second one will become “Nyakinyua had accompanied her to Mwathiwa Mugo” and both clauses would still be fully meaningful. As a matter of fact, this “dematerialization” or “deverbalization” of some processes as illustrated above depict the indirectness of the author in the delivery of his messages through his novel. This is more vividly emphasized by the fact that the main action of the novel is not recounted chronologically, but is revealed in a series of flashbacks and confessions by various characters as well as by an omniscient narrator.

In other respects, the positive foregrounding of the mental processes in these last two excerpts from Ngugi’s *Petals of Blood* is not without meaning. Indeed, through the foregrounded mental processes, Ngugi Wa Thion’o is exhorting the corrupted, greedy political, economic and social Kenyan elites and surely, by this way, all the other African elites to repent from their wickedness and wrong-doings in order for African countries to prosper and get free from neocolonialism yoke or bondage. In fact Ngugi wants them to understand that they should put an end to neocolonialism and start viewing and perceiving things differently from the way they have been doing so far. More specifically, they (African leaders) have to abandon all practices that hamper African countries’ development to allow them to emerge from chronic poverty and misery. African leaders should stop thinking of their own happiness first and set forth the general interest ahead of everything. It is also of paramount importance to highlight that the fact that the Senser roles are exclusively played by conscious human beings clearly insinuates that the Kenyan problems, by that time, were no more from the outside but rather from the inside. People especially those in power are guilty of their own and their social group tribulation. Therefore, the author i.e. Ngugi is using these human being Sensers to call attention to the fact that if there would be any remarkable positive change, this would depend on the people themselves. Those who have lost consciousness in exercising their political, economic and social power should from then on become acutely aware of the jeopardy or chaos that their retrograde attitude are plunging both themselves and the people they were leading into. Additionally, it must also be pointed out that a large number of the mental processes analyzed in these last two excerpts either project other mental or, most often, material processes. This indeed suggests that Ngugi expects his contemporaries to become aware of their awkward attitudes and then take concrete and appropriate actions to remedy the death-defying situation.

The last positively foregrounded process type that requires attention is the verbal one. As a matter of fact, the foregrounding of verbal processes in these excerpts from Ngugi’s *Petals of Blood* is, beyond what one would think, of particular resource for a further understanding of the analyzed passages in particular and the novel in general. Actually, some verbal processes are in projection relationship with mental processes. This in fact suggests that Ngugi intends to affect positively the mind of his contemporaries through verbal sensitizing. Moreover, almost all the verbal processes in both excerpts are finites
expressing definite or specific actions. This, specifically, means that Ngugi did not use the verbal processes for the simple sake of using them. But indeed he was, by so doing, aiming at calling attention to the fact that in addition to criticizing neocolonialism, the novel under study is also a bitter critique of the economic system of capitalism and its destructive, alienating effects on traditional Kenyan society. To what extent are the writings under study similar or different from the point of view of their Transitivity meanings?

COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ACHEBE’S ARROW OF GOD AND NGUGI’S PETALS OF BLOOD

As it can be noticed from the description and the discussion of the findings, there is a tremendous similitude in the writing style of both authors in hand. Indeed, a look at the table presenting the number of processes recorded either in the excerpts from Achebe’s Arrow of God or in those from Ngugi’s Petals of Blood and the interpretation that has followed in the foregoing sub-section account for this. As a matter of fact, all the process types, except for the causative circumstantial missing especially in the first excerpt, are identified throughout the entire excerpts and at an approximate percentage. This indeed suggests that both authors dealt with serious matters in each of their novels in a very meticulous way. Actually, the approximation of the percentages also reveals that some of the problems that Chinua Achebe castigated in Arrow of God when colonization by the British government officials and Christian Missionaries was under way, were still prevailing even after colonization in such an austere way that Ngugi wa Thiong’o had to denounce them via his Petals of Blood (1977) with the same rigidity after independences especially in the era when neocolonialism was strongly established with its social and economic problems viz. the continued exploitation of peasants and workers for foreign business interests in East Africa. The approximate number of the processes occurring added to the foregrounding of the same such process types as the material, the mental and the verbal processes in each pair of excerpts from both novels under study evidence this reasoning. Furthermore, the interpretive linguistic features of the foregrounded material, mental, and verbal processes in any of the described excerpts as presented in the few preceding lines relating to the foregone sub-section are the same. Actually, the similarity in the handling of the various identified process types by both authors from different geographic locations, cumulatively with the circumstances, strikes so much that both the West African writer Chinua Achebe and the East African writer Ngugi Wa Thiong’o can be paired with each other from this point of view. In the same vein, a further analysis of the findings, in their approximation, shows that both novelists share, to a remarkable extent, the subject-matter of their writings in so far as they all write about their own people, culture and problems. This, indeed, is prominently illustrated in both novels under study by the authors’ constant use of some local languages or dialects throughout their novels.

In other respects, it is worth noting that the middle or intransitive processes in the studied excerpts are about tangible actions. But most of them encode motion verbs specifying location. It is of utmost importance to underline that the actor roles in both
the transitive and intransitive material processes are mostly played by human beings. This state of affairs suggests an atmosphere of effective activity. It further implies that the reforms dreamt of by the two authors in their novels are especially achievable through concrete actions to be taken.

As for the mental processes, it is essential to know that all of the three categories of their class as elaborated in Halliday's framework are found. However, it is worth stating precisely that they are curiously enough predominated over by the perception processes in the four excerpts altogether mostly encoded in such verbs as “see” and “hear”. This suggests that both Chinua Achebe and Ngugi Wa Thiong'o through their narratives in *Arrow of God and Petals of Blood* have dealt with actual problems which they had been eye-witnesses and/or heard of within their communities. Moreover, the analysis of the cognition processes that rank second out of the three categories of mental processes and encoded in "know" and “think” mostly with different characters playing the Senser roles, has made it possible to discover that both Chinua Achebe and Ngugi Wa Thiong'o, along with their compatriots, were acutely aware of the problems undermining their dear communities in the period of colonization and after independences. Therefore, they would like to set themselves free from the bondage of colonial authorities and socio-economic oppression.

The behavioural processes are also nearly ranking equally in each of the four excerpts. The particular detail of these processes is that they enhance the traditional values of Africa. Such values as brotherhood, unity and solidarity are recounted through those behavioural processes. Some of them depict the consequences that await those who encroach on African traditional principles. The following process withdrawn from the third paragraph of the first excerpt from Achebe's *Arrow of God* exemplifies that state of affairs quite well: “The brothers began to quarrel violently”.

The verbal processes, in all the four studied excerpts, are mostly encoded in such verbs as “say”, “tell”, “speak” and “ask. The Sayers are essentially conscious human beings like Ezeulu, the hero of Achebe’s *Arrow of God*, his close friend Akuebue on the one hand and Munira, Abdulla, Wanja, and Karega the four protagonists of Ngugi’s *Petals of Blood*. The Sayer’s functions in these processes show to what extent those main characters were concerned with the various problems they are facing through their different conversations.

Besides, it is vitally important to highlight that the analyses have revealed the circumstances of the Hallidayan SFL framework. But the most frequently occurring ones have been the location and manner circumstances. The latter ones state precisely the way in which the actions of the miscellaneous processes are performed and define not only the places at which they happen, but also the time.

Nevertheless, there is, to some extent, some dissimilarity to pinpoint. Indeed, the first person narration is absolutely absent in the first two excerpts from Achebe’s *Arrow of God* while in the last two excerpts from Ngugi’s *Petals of Blood*, it is heavily made use of by reference to his main characters such as Munira, Abdulla and Wanja. This in fact,
implies that Chinua Achebe is less direct in his writings than Ngugi Wa Thiong’o who appears quite more direct. No doubt, this striking directness in Ngugi’s fiction, mainly through his main characters, would have contributed, to a large extent, to his imprisonment in 1978 after the publication of his popular play “NGAAHIKA NDEENDA-I will marry when I want” - which he wrote with Ngugi Wa Mirii in 1977. Here again, the title: “I will marry when I want”, with the recurrent “I” referent personal pronoun, highlights his noticeable directness as said earlier. In the same vein, his directness also lies in the fact that after his imprisonment, Ngugi Wa Thiong’o decided to stop using English as the primary language of his work in favor of Gikuyu his native tongue in order to reach the largest African masses. Three years later and more specifically in 1980 Ngugi published the first modern novel written in his native language Gikuyu, CAITAANI MUTHARA-INI (Devil on the Cross). He argued that literature written by Africans in a colonial language is not African literature, but “Afro-European literature.” According to him, writers should make use of their indigenous, i.e. native languages, to give the African literature its own genealogy and grammar. Nonetheless, I personally don’t share Ngugi’s stand on this very issue because, although, by writing in their native languages African writers would promote African literature, it is true that only a tiny minority of the African masses would be able to write and read in their mother tongues. Therefore, it would be too restrictive even exclusive to consider things this way. Moreover, it would also be somehow egocentric for a writer to limit the influence scope of his literary work just to the boundaries of his/her community.

To round off, I must emphasize that both Achebe and Ngugi, in the extracts from their novels under study, have looked at Africa with the same perception even though they have different perspectives.

CONCLUSION

The focus of attention throughout this article has revolved around the question to know how the Experiential Metafunction is handled in both Achebe’s Arrow of God and Ngugi’s Petals of Blood for their better understanding. The detail of the findings, as far as the distinct process-types I have come across with are concerned, is as follows: it is noticeable that material processes are the most frequently occurring process types throughout the whole analysis carried out. Indeed, their classification into classes and sub-classes as it appears in the description is quite diversified. As a matter of fact, both the transitive or affective and the intransitive or middle material processes have been identified. But on the whole, most of the material processes are transitive and denote concrete and tangible actions that can be gathered in various categories: some of them specify movement whereas others denote bravery, determination, recklessness, and exploitation. The actor participants involved in these processes perform actions that are mostly extended to things external to them. The goal roles are played by either animate or inanimate things which the actors make use of. Those latter ones also make use of part of their body from time to time. Such other processes as the mental and the verbal processes along with their participants and circumstances which are strongly foregrounded through the analyzed excerpts have been closely looked at. Via these
positively foregrounded process-types, the meanings of both Chinua Achebe’s message in *Arrow of God* and Ngugi’s one in *Petals of Blood* have come over more impressively. As a matter of fact, it has enlightened me to understand, not only the depth of Chinua Achebe’s concern about the fate of the African traditional values during and even after colonization given that the settlers, especially the Christian missionaries, had come to supersede the traditional gods of Africa by their religion, but also how deeply worried Ngugi Wa Thiong’o was about the drastic consequences of Neocolonialism in East Africa, in particular, and in Africa, on the whole. We have shown how Chinua Achebe, in order to get his message across, has made use of foregrounding in material, mental and verbal processes to confront the differences of the European culture (represented by the British government officials; the Christian missionaries and the African converts) with the African culture (represented by such conservatives as Moses Unachukwu; Akuebue to name but just a few of them). In addition, the discussion and interpretation has also revealed Ngugi’s bitter and damning indictment against the hypocrite, deceitful, corrupt, and treacherous leaders of post-independence Kenya. Indeed, the foregrounding of material, mental as well as verbal processes in his *Petals of Blood* is an evidence of the necessity for a strategic and well-prepared plan or action to be taken against such leaders along with the perpetuated social injustice and economic inequality that were a feature of colonial oppression but which, unfortunately, was still prevailing even after colonization. From this perspective, our first two hypotheses that the two authors under scrutiny have in various ways used the resources of the English language to express their experience in their selected texts (Simpson, 2004); and that in their creative process of writing, both authors have either consciously or subconsciously chosen certain linguistic items over others to represent an experience or event for stylistic effects, are validated.

At the conclusions of the comparative study carried out, it is to be noticed that even though both authors, from the point of view of the interpretable linguistic features that their literary work display, share to a very large extent the same literary style, they differ from each other in the sense that Ngugi Wa Thiong’o shows more directness in his writings than Chinua Achebe does. Indeed, this partly confirms our third hypothesis since the differences as pinpointed in this study are neither due to the studied authors’ fiction timeline, nor to Ngugi’s stand concerning literature written in a colonial language. In a nutshell, the discussion of the findings has helped me to grasp all the contours of the messages conveyed by both authors in their novels under study.

It would be clumsy to set an end to this scholarship without mentioning that there are many other aspects of the Systemic Functional Linguistics that can be explored in both Achebe’s *Arrow of God* and Ngugi’s *Petals of Blood*. Indeed, investigation about the interpersonal meaning could also be applied to both novels for Systemicists argue that the clause’s experiential meaning is realized simultaneously with its interpersonal meaning so that the description of transitivity in the clause complements its simultaneous mood description. Additionally, further investigations about themes like: Language Nativization (indigenization), Pidginization, code switching and pragmatic transfer in both novels would not only help get to the core of their meanings more
deeply than ever, but it would also reveal other relevant dimensions of interest for future research projects.
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APPENDICES

Each of the four excerpts abstracted from the novels understudy is going to be analyzed according to the Hallidayan Transitiv Analysis of Chinua Achebe’s *Arrow of God* and *No Longer at Ease*. The texts have been divided into clauses, with embedded clauses [[shown within double brackets]]. Further, double slashed lines // indicate clause boundaries within embedded clauses.

Transitivity analysis key:

\[
P = \text{Process} \quad P_m = \text{Material Process} \quad P_e = \text{Eential Process} \\
P_s = \text{Intensive Attribute/Identifying Process} \\
P_p = \text{Possessive} \\
P_c = \text{Causesive Process} \\
A = \text{Actor} \\
G = \text{Goal} \\
B = \text{Beneficiary} \\
R = \text{Range} \\
S = \text{Senser} \\
P_h = \text{Phenomenon} \\
S_y = \text{Sayer} \quad R_v = \text{Receiver} \quad V_b = \text{Veriagi} \\
B_e = \text{Behaver} \quad B_h = \text{Behaviour} \\
X = \text{Existant} \\
T = \text{Token} \\
V = \text{Value} \quad C_r = \text{Carrier} \quad A_t = \text{Attribute} \\
I_d = \text{Identified} \\
I_r = \text{Identifier} \\
P_r = \text{Possessor} \\
P_d = \text{Possessed} \\
C = \text{Circumstance} \quad C_l = \text{location} \quad C_x = \text{extent} \quad C_m = \text{manner} \quad C_c = \text{cause} \quad C_a = \text{accompaniment} \\
C_r = \text{matter} \quad G_o = \text{role} \quad B_r = \text{recipient} \\
A_g = \text{Agent} \\
\]

Excerpt N°1: Chapter 04 (PP.48-51).

1. One day (Cl), six brothers of Umuama(A) killed (Pm) the python(G) // 2. and asked (Pv) one of their members, to cook (Pm) a piece of yam (G) and a bowl of water // 3. to Iweka(C). 4. When he (A) finished cooking (Pm) the yam (G) // 5. the men (A) came (Pm) one by one (Cl) // 6. and took (Pm) their pieces of yam (G). 7. Then they (A) began to fill (Pm) their bowls (G) // 8. to the mark (Ca) with the yam (Stw) // 9. But this time (Cl), only four of them (A) took (Pm) their measure (G) // 10. before the stew (A) got finished (Pm) // 11. Moses Unachukwu’s listeners (Be) smiled (Pb) // 12. except Mr. Goodcountry who (Be) sat (Pb) like a roost (Cm). 12. Odudebe (Be) smiled (Pb) // 13. because he (S) had heard (Pme) the story (Pb) as a little boy (Cl) // 14. and forgotten (Pme) it (Pb) until now (Cl). 15. The brothers (Sy) began to quarrel (Pv) violently (Cm) // 16. and then to fight (Pm) // 17. Very soon (Cl) the fight (A) spread (Pm) throughout Umuama (Cl) // 18. and so fierce (At) was (Pv) it (Cr) // 19. that the village (Cr) was (Pm) almost wiped out (At). 20. The few survivors (A) fled (Pm) their village // 21. across the great river to the land of Olu (Cl) // 22. 1. where they (G) are scattered (Pm) today (Cl). 22. The remaining six villages (S) seeing (Pme) what had happened (Pm) to Umuama (G) // 23. went (Pm) to a seer (Cl) // 24. to know (Pm) the reason (Ph) // 25. and be (Sy) told (Pv) them (G) // 26. that the royal python (Cr) was (Pm) sacred (At) to Idemili (Ca) // 27. it (T) was (Pv) his (Sy) deity (Vb) // 28. which had punished (Pm) Umuama (G). 29. From that day (Cl) the six villages (S) decreed (Pme) // 30. that henceforth, anyone who (A) killed (Pm) the python (G) // 31. would be regarded (Pme) // 32. as having killed (Pm) his kinsman (G) // 33. Moses (A) ended (Pm) // 34. by counting (Pm) on his fingers (Cl) the villages and clans (G) // 35. which (Sy) also forbade (Pv) the killing of them (Vb). 36. Then Mr. Goodcountry (Sy) spoke (Pv).

37. A story such as (Vb) you (Sy) have just told (Pv) us (Rv) // 38. Is (Pv) not fit (At) // 39. to be heard (Pme) in the house of God (Cl). 39. But if (A) allowed (Pm) you (G) // 40. to go on (G) // 41. so that all (S) may see (Pme) the foolishness of it (Ph). 42. There was (Pv) murmuring (X) from the congregation (Cl) // 43. which might have stood (Pme) either for agreement or disagreement (V).

44. If (A) shall leave (Pm) it (G) // 45. to your own people (Sy) to answer (Pv) you (Rv) // 46. Mr. Goodcountry (Be) looked round (Pb) the small congregation (Ph) // 47. but not one (Sy) spoke (Pv). 48. Is (Pv) there no one (X) here (Cl) // 49. who can speak up (Pv) for the lord (Ca)?

50. Odudebe who (S) had thus far (Cl) inclined (Pme) towards Unachukwu’s position (Cl) // 51. had (Pme) a sudden stab of insight (Pv). 52. He (A) raised (Pm) his hand (G) // 53. and was (Pv) about (Cl) // 54. to put (Pm) it (G) down again (Cl). 55. But Mr. Goodcountry had seen (Pm) him (Pv) // 56. Yes? (Vb)?

57. It (Cl) is not (Pv) true (At) // 58. that the Bible (Sy) does not ask (Pv) us (Rv) // 59. to kill (Pm) the serpent (G). 60. Did not God (Sy) tell (Pv) us // 61. to crush (Pm) his head (G) // 62. after it (S) had deceived (Pme) his wife (Ph)? 63. Many people (A) clapped (Pm) for him (Ca).

64. Do you (Sy) hear (Pv) that (Pm) that (Ph). Moses (Vb)?

65. Moses (Sy) made to answer (Pv) // 66. but Mr. Goodcountry (A) was not about to give (Pm) him (B) another opportunity (G).

67. ‘You (Sy) say (Pv) you (T) are (Pm) the first (Cl) Christian (V) in Umuaro (Cl) // 68. you (A) partake (Pm) of the Holy Meal (G) // 69. and yet whenever you (A) open (Pm) your mouth (G) // 70. nothing but heathen filth (A) pours out (Pm) // 71. Today (Cl), a child who (Be) sucks (Pb) his mother’s breast (Ph) // 72. has taught (Pm) you (Rv) the Scriptures (Vb) // 73. Is (Pv) it (T) not // 74. as our Lord himself (Sy) said (Pv) // 75. that the first (T) shall become (Pm) last (V) // 76. and the last (T) become (Pm) first (T). 77. The world (Cl) will then pass away (Pv) // 78. but not one single word of our lord (A) will be set (Pm) aside (Cl) // 79. he (A) turn (Pm) to Oduche (G) // 80. When the time (T) comes (Pp) for your baptism (G) // 81. you (Rv) will be called (Pv) (Pp) // 82. on this rock (Cl) // 83. All of us (A) build (Pm) my church (G).

83. This (T) caused (Pce) more clapping (V) from several of the congregation (Cl). 84. Moses (Sy) was (Pm) now (Cl) fully aroused (At). 85. Do I (Be) look (Pb) to you (Ca) like someone (S) // 86. you (A) can put (Pm) in your bag (Cl) // 87. and walk (Pm) on your way (Cl) // 88. He (Sy) asked (Pv) // 89. ‘I (Cl) have been (Pm) to the fountainhead of this new religion (Cl) // 90. and seen (Pme) with my own eyes (Cm) 91. the white people who (A) brought (Pm) it (G) // 92. So I (S) want (Pme) to tell (Pv) you (Rv) now (Cl) // 93. that (I) will not be led (Pm) astray (Cl) by outsiders (A) // 95. who (S) choose (Pm) // 96. to weep (Pb) louder than the owners of the corpse (Cm) // 97. You (T) are not the first (T) teacher (Pv) of my baptism (G) // 81. you (Rv) will be called (Pv) (Pp) // 82. on this rock (Cl) // 83. All of us (A) build (Pm) my church (G).
to Oduche(G). 121.As for you(Ph) they(s) may call(Ph) you(Ph) Peter(Vb) //122.or they(Ph) may call(Ph) you(Ph) Paul(Ph) or Barathas(Ph) //123. It(s) does not pull(Pme) a hair(Ph) from me(Ph). 124. If(Ph) have(Ph) no(Ph) thing(Ph) //125.to say(Ph) to a mere boy(Ph) //126. who(Ph) does(Ph) not(Ph) keep(Ph) any(Ph) palm nuts(G) for his(Ph) mother(Ph). 127. But since you(Ph) have(Ph) also become(Ph) our(Ph) teacher(Ph), //128.1 will be waiting(Ph) for the day(Ph) //129.when you(Ph) will have(Ph) the courage(Pd) //130.to kill(Pm) a python(G) in this Umunaro(CI). 131. A coward(Ph) may cover(Ph) the ground with his words(Ph) //132. but when the time(Ph) comes(Ph) //133.to fight(Pm) 134. he(A) runs(Pm) away(CI). 135. At that moment(Ph) Oduche(A) took(Pm) his(Ph) decision(G). 136. There were(Ph) two pythons- a big one and a small one -//137. which lived(Pm) almost entirely in his mother's hat, on top of the wall(Ph) //138. how(Ph) he(A) carried(Pm) the python(G) to his(Ph) mother(Ph) //139. and kept(Pm) the rats(Ph) away(CI) //140. only once(Ph) were(Ph) they(Ph) suspected(Ph) //141. of frightening(Pm) away(CI) a hen(Ph) //142. and swallowing(Ph) her eggs(G). 144. Oduche(s) decided(Ph) //145. that he(A) would(Ph) hit(Pm) one(Ph) of them(Ph) on the head(Ph) with a stick(Cl). 146. He(A) would do(Pm) it(G) so carefully and secretly(Ph) //147. that when he(Ph) finally(Ph) died(Pd) //148. the people(G) would think(Pme) //149. it(Ph) had died(Pb) of its own accord(Cm). 150. Six days(Ph) later(Ph) passed(Ph) //151. before(Ph) Oduche(Pm) found(Pm) a favourite cream(Ph) //152. and during this time(Ph) his(Ph) heart(T) lost(Ph) some of its strength(V). 153. He(s) decided(Ph) //154. to take(Pm) the smaller python(G). 155. He(A) pushed(Pm) it(G) down from the wall(Ph) with his(Cl) //156. but could not bring(Pb) himself(Pm) //157. to smash(Pm) its head(G). 158. Then he(Ph) thought(Pme) //159. he(Ph) heard(Pm) //160. people(Ph) coming(Ph) //161. and he had to act(Pm) quickly(Cl). 162. With lightning speed(Cl) he(A) picked(Pm) it(G) up(Ph) //163. as he(Ph) had seen(Ph) their(Ph) neighbors(Ph) //164. Anosi(A) did(Ph) many time(Ph). //165. and carried(Pm) it(G) into his sleeping-room(Ph). 166. A new and exciting(Ph) thought(Ph) came(Ph) to him(Ph) so(Ph) did(Ph) to his(Ph) friends(Ph) //167. He(A) opened(Pm) the box(Cl) //168. Moses(A) had built(Pm) for him(Cl) //161. took out(Pm) his singlet and towel(G) //170. and locked(Pm) the python(G) inside(Cl). 171. He(Ph) felt(Ph) quite(Ph) relieved(Ph) with(Ph) it(Cl). 172. The python(Ph) would die(Ph) for lack(Ph) of air(Ph) //173. and he would be(Ph) responsible(Ph) for(Ph) its death(Cl) //174. without being(Ph) guilty(Ph) of //175. killing(Pm) it(G). //176. which(T) seemed(Ph) to(Ph) him(Ph) a very(Ph) happy compromise(Ph). 177. Ezeulu's first son, Edogo(A) had left(Pm) home early that day(CI) //178. to finish(Pm) the mask(G) //179. he(A) was carving(Pm) for a new ancestral spirit(Cm). 180. In(T) was(Ph) now(Ph) only five days to the Festival of the Harvest Pumpkin leaves(V). //181. when this spirit(Ph) was expected(Ph) //182. to return(Ph) from the depth of the forest(Ph) to men(Ph) as a mask(Cl) and appearance(CI). 183. Those who(T) would not(Ph) want(Ph) as his(Ph) attendants(Ph) //185. were making(Pm) great plans(G) for his coming(Ca). 186. They(Ph) had learned(Ph) their dances(Ph) //187. and were(Ph) now(Ph) anxious(Ph) about(Ph) the mask(Ph) //188. Edo(Ph) was carving(Pm) for them(Ph). 189. There were(Ph) other(Ph) sacrifices(Ph) in the Umunaro(Pm) besides him; 190. some of them(Ph) were(Ph) even(Ph) better(Ph). 191. But Edogo(Ph) had(Ph) reputation(Pd) for finishing his work on time(Ca) //192. unlike Obiako the master carver, who(A) only took(Ph) up(Ph) his tool(G) //193. but saw(Pm) his compound(Cl) //194. coming(Ph) with his knife(Cl). 195. If(Ph) it(Ph) had been(Ph) so, any kind of carving(Ph) //196. Edo(Ph) would have(Ph) finished(Ph) it(G) long ago(Ph) //197. working(Ph) at(Ph) it(G) any moment(Ph) //198. hands(Ph) were(Ph) free(Ph). 199. But a mask(Ph) was(Ph) a different(Ph) AT //200. he(Ph) could not do(Ph) it(G) in the home under the profane gaze of women and children(Cl) //201. but had to retire(Ph) to the spirit house(Ph) 202. built(Pm) for such work(Ph) at a secluded corner of the newo marker place(Cl) //203. where no one(Ph) who(Ph) had(Ph) been(Ph) initiated(Ph) was(Ph) near(Ph) the secrets(Ph) //204. would dare(Ph) to approach(Pm).
Transitivity Analysis of Chinua Achebe's Arrow of God ...
Whom(//116. at seeing (A) the floor of the bar (A) 45. Abdulla(A) went away(A) with the three of them (A) and (A) raising(A) with Wanja's innovations and especially the professional seriousness (A) again.68. She(A) had not started (A) 42. Wanja (Sy) did not yield (Sy) at all. 46. that Abdulrah(A) repaired(Sy) a few of the shelves and also the table(Sy) in one of the back rooms in the shop(Sy) //44.that served(Sy) as a bar(Sy). 45. Abdulrah(Sy) said(Sy) //46.that he himself(Sy) would do(Sy) that(Sy) some day soon (Cl). 47. Wanja and Joseph (S) swept (S) the floor of the bar(S) and(S) and(S) smashed(S) water(S) on the dust(S). 49. Outside the building(S) she(S) had put up(S) a signboard(S): SHOP & BAR CLOSED THIS AFTERNOON- STOCKTAKING (G). 50. But there was(S) very(S) little(S) stock(X) //51. to take(S) //52 and customer(S) and(S) customer(S) especially in an afternoon(S), were(S) few(S) and(S) far between(A). 53. Nevertheless Abdulrah(S) was pleased(S) with Wanja's innovations and especially the professional seriousness //54 with which she(S) did(S) her job(S) //55. She(S) was in command(S) of(S) the situation //56 and(S) she(S) was(S) so involved in(S) //57 dusting up(S) here and(S) there(S) //58 and(S) writing up(S) things(S) in(S) an exercise book(S) //59. that she(S) forgot(S) the fatigue of the morning and(S) started(S) harvesting(S) //60. Abdulrah(S) could only marvel //61. so his shop and(S) bar(T) could(S) be(S) something(S) after all. 62. Toward the end of the afternoon (Cl) she(A) removed(S) the stocktaking sign(G) //63. and put up(S) another one: SHOPS OPEN //64. They(A) went(S) behind the counter(S) (A) //65 and waited(S) for(S) customers(S). But nobody(A) came(A) //67. She(Cr) was(Cr) up(Cr) again.68. She(A) put up(Cr) another sign: PERMANENT CLOSING DOWN SALE(G) //69. and on an impulsive(Cr) drew(S) sketches of a shop(Cr) //70. and people(A) running(S) toward(Cr) it in a hurry(S). 71. A few children(A) came(Cr) //72. to buy(S) sweets(G). 73. They(they) laughed(they) //74. and commented(they) on the little sketches of the men(Ph). 75. They(they) tried(they) //76. to sell out(they) the words(they) on the notice-board(Cl) //77. and recognizing(Pme) the word close and sale(Ph) //78. ran(Pme) to their parents(Cl) //79. to say(Pme) //80. that Abdulrah's(A) shop(A) was closed(A) before eight(A) and(A) he(A) was giving(A) away(A) something(A) to(A) children(A). 82. Within a few hours(Cl) the place(Cr) was(Cr) full(A) of(A) //83 customers(A) who(A) soon(A) found(A) out(A) the mistake(A) of(A) the children(A). 84. But(A) they(A) liked(A) the new look shop(Ph) //85 and a few(A) remained(S) //86. to gossip(Pme) //87 and sip(Cr) beer(G). 88. Wanja(A) took out(A) up(Pme) chairs(G) for them(Bg) //89. so they(A) could sit(Pme) outside on the verandah(Cl) //90. and while away the time(Cl) drinking(Pme) //91 and talking about(Pme) the harvest(Ph). 92. But even these later(A) went away(Pme) //93. and Wanja(A) sat Patiently(Cl) behind the counter(Cl) //94 looking for(Pme) a new lot(G). 95. Her mind(S) started wandering(Pme). 96. Tonight(Cr) the Big moon(A) would come out(Pme); //97 tonight(T) was(Pi) the day(V) //98 for which she(A) had been waiting(Pme) //99. since she(A) came(Cr) to Limorog(Cl) //100. and she(S) hoped(Pme) //101 that nothing(A) would go wrong(R). 102. Celebration of Joseph's impending return to school(T) was(Pi) only part of her scheme(V) --- a coincidence, 103. although it(T) was(Pi) one(V) //104. with which she(Cr) was(Pi) genuinely pleased(Cr).105. Suppose Munira(A) did not come --- but he would, he must(Pme).106. She(Cr) was(Pi) somehow sure of her power over men(At): 107 she(S) knew(Pme) //108 how(Cl) they(Cl) could be(Pi) very weak(At) before her body(At).109. Sometimes(At) she(Cr) was(Pi) afraid of this power(At) //110 and she(S) often(At) had(Cr) wanted(Pme) //111 to run away(At) from(A) her kingdom(At). 112. But(But) she(Cl) was not(Pi) really fit for much else(At) //113 and besides,(she she) thought(Pme) with a shuddering of pain(At) //114. she(A) had come(At) //115. to enjoy(Pme) the elation(Ph)/ //116. at seeing(Pme) a trick(Ph) --- a smile, a certain look, maybe even raising(Pr) his one's brow(R), or //117 a gesture like carelessly(Cl) brushing against(Pme) a custom(Cl) man(G) --- //118 turn(Pme) a man into a captive and a sighing fool(At).119. Still in her sober moments of reflection and self-appraisal(Cl), she had longed for(Pme) peace and harmony(Ph) within(Cl): 120 for those sometimes minutes of instant victory and glory(Ph) --- often(Cl) left(Pm) behind emptiness(Cl) //121 a void(G) that could only be filled(Pm) by yet more pilliatives of instant conquest(A) //122. Struggling(Pm) in the depths of such a void and emptiness(Cl) //123 she(Cr) would then suddenly(Cr) become(Pi) aware(At) //124 that in the long run(Cl) it(T) was(Pi) men(V) //125 who(Cr) triumphed(Pm) //126. and walked over(Pm) her body(G); 127. buying(Pm) insurance(G) against deep involvement with money and guilty smiles or in exaggerated fits of jealousy(At).128. She(A) would often(Cr) seek(Pm) somebody(G) in whom(Cl) //129. she(Cr) could be involved(Pme). Somebody(Ph) for whom(B) she(S) could care(Pme) //130. and be proud(At) //131. to carry(Pm) his child(G).132. For that reason(Cr) she(Cr) had somehow(Cr) avoided(Pm) direct
trading(G)/133. and that was(P) why(G)/34 she(A) had run away(Pm) from her cousin(C) //133 ولو(who(S) had wanted(Pm) her(Pm) straight in the market(Cl). 136. No, she(S) preferred (Pm) friendship (Pb), however temporary (Cm); //137 she(S) liked (Pm)/138. and enjoyed(Pm) the illusion(Pm)/139. of being wooed(Pm)/ //140. and fought(Pm) over(Pm)/ //141. and being bought(Pm) a dress or something(Pm)/ //142. without her(S) demanding(Pv) it (Vb) as a bargain(Co). 143. She(S) liked (Pm) it(Pb) best at the counter(Cl). 144. There(Cl), sitting (Pm) on a high stool away from the hustle and bustle(Cl)/145. she(A) could study(Pm) people(G)/146. so that soon(Cl) she(Ch) became(Pi) a good judge of men's faces(At). 147. She(S) could tell(Pv) the sympathetic, the sensitive, the rough, the cruel and the intelligent(Vb)//148. - those whose(Pb) conversation and words(A) gave(Pv) her(Rv) especial(ups) pleasure(Pd). 149. But she(A) had come(Pm)/150. to find out(Pm) //151. that behind most faces(Cl) was(Pi) deep loneliness, uncertainty and anxiety(At)//152. and this(As) would often(Cl) make(Pc) her(Ch) sad(At)// //153. or want(Pm) //154. to cry(Pb). 155. Otherwise she(S) did not often(Cl) brood(Pm) //156. and she(S) enjoyed(Pm) involvement in her work(Pm)/ //157. so that often(Cl) she(S) was much sought(Pm) by employers(A). 158. She(S) liked(Pm) dancing(Pm)/ //159. playing(Pm) records(R)/ //160. memorizing(Pm) the words of the latest(As) records(Pm)/ //161. on one or two occasions(Cl). 162. She(A) tried(Pm) composing(Pm)/ //163. but not for long(Pm). 164. She(S) always(Cl) wanted(Pm)/ //165. to do(Pm) something(Cm). 166. She(S) did not know(Pm) //167. what(At) if(At) she(S) was(Pi) //168. but she(S) felt(Pm) //169. she(S) Pr(Pm) had(Pp) the power(Pd)/ // to do(Pm) it(Ch). 170. When live music (G) was being played(Pm) - a guitar or a flute(R) - //171. she(Ch) thought(Pm) //172. she(Ch) could feel(Pm) this power(Pb) in her(Cl)/ //173. this power(A) to do(Pm) - what(Ch) //174. She(S) did not say(Pm) it(Pm). 175. The music(A) would often(Cl) take(Pm) the form of colours(Cm) - bold colours in motion //176. and she(A) would mix(Pm) them(G) up different patterns with eyes and faces of people(Cm)/ //177. - but only as long as the music(A) lasted(Pm). 178. She(A) wondered(Pm) from place to place(Ch) in search of it or for a man(Ch)/179. who(A) would show(Pm) her(Ch) it(Ch). 180. And then she(S) thought(Pb) //181. she(S) knew(Pm). 182. A child. 183. Yes. That(Ch) is(Ch) what(At) //185. her body(Ch) really(Cm) criied(Pb) for. 186. She(S) had learnt(Pm) //187. to take(Pm) precautions(G) because of her first experience(Cl). 188. But now(Cl) she(A) abandoned(Pm) all preventives(G) //189. and waited(Pm) 190. For a year or so(Cl) she(A) tried(Pm). 191. The more she(A) failed(Pm)/192. to see(Pm) a sign(Ch) //193. the more it(Ch) became(Pi) a need(At)//194. until in the end she(A) could not bear(Pm) the torture(G) //195. and came(Pm) //196. to seek(Pm) advice(G) - from(G) her(Ch) father(At). 197. Nwokoye(A) had taken(Ch) her(Ch) to Mwati wa Mugi(A) /198. and it(Ch) was(Pi) (Vb) //199. who - or rather his voice - who(A) had suggested(Pm) the night, the new moon(Ph). 200. But she(S) by no means(Pm) anything(Ch) about her first pregnancy(Cl). 201. No other customers(As) came(Pm) for the evening(As) Ca. 202. She(S) started to fret(Pm) 203. Even Munira(S) had refused(Pm) //204. to come(Ch). 205. Despite his promise. 206. It(Ph) paused(Pm) her(Ch) Be. 207. Something(Cr) was(Pi) wrong(At) with(towards(Gm) Ca). 208. Something(Cr) was(Pi) wrong(At). 209. Perhaps even(S) the moon(A) would come(Pm). 210. Perhaps - and who(T) was(Pi) it(Vb) with(Va) at the way(As) - ?

Excerpt 04: Chapter N°11 PP 281-284

1. What happened(As) to (Pi) Abdullah(A) and... and Wanjai(T) //2. karega(Sy) asked(Pr) //3. interrupting(Pm) Munira's catalogue of the changes(G)

2. At last... at last(Cl) the question(Ph) he(A) had searched(Pm) //5.is(Pm) this(T) //6.why(Gc) he(A) had returned(Pm) from a five-year exile and silence(Cl) ? Could it(Cr) be(Pr) //8. and that he(A) still retained(Pm) a spark of the memory of times past(G) ? Of her(G) ?

3. She(T)said(Pr) /10/ She(Pr) owns(Pp) houses - between here and Nairobi(Cl). 11. She(Pr) owns(Pp) a fleet of matusud(Pd). 12. She(Pr) owns(Pp) a fleet of big transport lorries(Pd). 13. She(Pr) is(T) that(V) bird(V) periodically(Cl) born(Ch) out(Pm) of the ashes(Ch) and dust(Cl).

4. Suddenly(Cm) Munisa(S) remembered(Pm) his shock and the humiliation of being a guinea-pig(Ph). 15. Bitterness(A) returned(Pm). 16. Why(Cc) should he(A) spare(Pm) him(G) ?

5. She(A) told(Pr) him(Ch) that her(Ch) was(Pm) a good judge of men's faces(As) //36 even those(Pm) falling away from women(Ch). The next day(Cl) 227. the harvest of beans(T) was(Pi) nothing(V) 228. Munira(A) didn't come(Pm). //229. I(A) haven't sold(Pm) much beef(G). 230. She(Ch) added(Pv) pensively(Cm).

6. Will the moon(A) really(Cm) show(Pm) in the sky(Cl)?
crue(bly)(Cm) illustrated(Pm) by what he saw with his eyes(A)/61. contained (Pp) familiar theme, a common theme(Pd)/62.shared(Pm) by the other places(A)/63.he(A) had been(Pm) to all over the Republic(Cl)/64. But it(Cr) was(Pi) no less depressing.At/65.Munira(G) abruptly(Cm) stopped(Pm) by a mud-walled barracks of a house(Cl)/66.with several doors(A) partitioning(Pm) it(G) into several separate rooms(G).

67. Here... Here(T) is(Ph) Abdulla’s place(V)/68.He(He)Sy) announced(Py)/69. As you(S) can see(Pme), 70.it(Cr)’s right at the centre of the New Jerusalem(Cl)/71. Do you(S) want(Pme)/72. to greet(Pm) him(R)/73. before we(A) proceed(Pm) to Wanjia’s place(Cl)?

74. Yes(‘Vb) Karega(Sy) said(Pv).

75. Munira(A) knocked(Pm) at the door(Cl)/76. calling out(Pm) aloud(Gm) hodi(G)/77. and Abdulla(Sy), from the inside(Cl) responded(Pp) in a drunken voice(Cm). 78.They(S) heard(Pp) the bolts creak(Ph). 79.Abdulla(A) threw(Pm) open(Cm) the door(Cl)/80. but instead of welcoming(Pm) them(G) with greetings of recognition(Cm)/81.he(A) went on(Pm) with complaints(Cm) against people//82. who(A) keep on walking up(Pm)/83. and disturbing(Pm) peaceful citizens(G)/84. Then he(S) saw(Pp) that(T) was(Pi) Munira(V).

86. Oh, if(T)’s(Pi) you... my friend(V)/... 87.come(Pm) in(Cl)/88.come(Pm) in(Cl)/89. I(Pr) have(Pp) a few five-shilling packets of Theng’eta(Pd)/90. Then’G a Thenga’s with Theng’eta. Haal! hai!(‘Vb)/91 100. Come(Pm) in(Cl).

101. He(A) sat(Pm) on the bed(Cl)/102. and invited(Pm) Munira(G)/103. to take(Pm) the folding chair, the only chair(G) in the place(Cl).

104. And don’t knock down(Pm) the hurricane lamp(G)/105.Abdulla(A) went on(Pm) 106. Then he(S) noticed(Pme) //107. that Munira(Cr) was not(Pi) alone(At).

108. Oh! Oh! And have brought(Pm) a visitor(G)/109. Let him(A) take(Pm) the chair(G)/110. You, Munira, my friend(A), come(Pm)/111. and sit(Pm) on the bed(Cl)/112. And be(Pi) careful(At)/113.Rubber straps(A) make up(Pm) the springs(G)/114. And you(S) know(Pme) some time ago(Cl)/115. I(A) sat(Pm) too heavily(Cm) on it(Cl)/116. and the straps(A) broke(Pm) 117. I(G) was really(Cr) sprung up(Pm)/118. and then brought(Pm) down on it(Cl)/119. And who(V) is(Ph) your(Ph) visitor(T)? 120. Does he(A) also take(Pm) Theng’eta? Mwalimu’s formula(R). 121. Drink(Pm) the drink of three letters(‘K)

122. Do you(S) not recognize(Pme) him(Ph)?//123. Munira(Sy) asked(Pv)/124. when they(A) all had sat down(Pm).

125. Where(‘V)? This silence(T)?

126. Karega... (‘V)

127. Karega(‘V)

128. Yes(‘Vb)

129. Karega. Nding’uri’s brother... (‘Vb)/130. But how... You(A) have really(Cm) grown(Pm)/131. A Mzee like myself from... (‘Vb)/132. you(A) only(Cm) need(Pp) a few tufts of grey(Pd)/133. But which corner of the world(Cl) did you(A) spring from(Pm)?//134.karega explained(Pp) briefly(Cm). 135. But he(S) saw(Pme) //136. that Abdulla(T) was not really(Cm) following(Ph) him(V). 137. He(Cr) had changed(Pi): hollow tired eyes(At) in hollow caves(At). 138. They(A) tried(Pm) this and that subject(G)/139. but nothing(Cr) seemed(Pp) //140. to flow(Ph) freely(Cm).

141. All the same(Cm) welcome(Ph) to this bachelor’s corner(Cl)/142. Abdulla(Sy) repeated(Pv). 143. A bit different from my old place(Pr)/144. but that(T) was(Pi) old Illorogv(V)/145. They(Ag) made(Pc) us(Cr) /146. demonstrated(Pm) the house(G).

147. And now(Ph) look at(Ph) the place(Cl)/148. they(A) have brought(Pm) us(G) to.

149. ’And whose house(Vis) it(Ph) this(T), then(Cl)?//150. karega(Sy) asked(Pv).

151. ’This... and a few others(Pd) belong to(Pp) a very important person in authority(Pr).

152. You(S) [mean(Pm) Him(Ph) /Ph] This?(R)/153. karega(Sy) asked(Pv).

154. YES(‘Vb). 155. He(A) charges(Pm) a hundred shillings(G) for this one room(Ca)/156. So from the block(Cl) he(A) makes(Pm) a thousand shillings(G) a month(Cl). 157. And he(Pr) owns(Pp) about ten blocks(Pd). 158. That(T)’s(Pi) ten thousand shillings(V)/159. Just for putting(Pp) up(Pm) a few poles(G) /160. and musting(Pm) them(G). 161. He(A) comes(Pm) in a Range Rover(Cm)/162. and he(A) parks(Pm) by the road(Cl). 163. He(A) sends(Pm) his driver bodyguard(G)/164. to collect(Pm) the rent(G).

165. But he(A) comes(Pm)... //166.he(A) earns(Pm) more than sixty thousand shillings(R) a day(Cl) //167.from transporting(Pm) sugar and hardware(G) for the Mcmillan sugar works(G)/168. And this, on top of his official government salary(Vb)/169.

169. Well(Vb). That(A) makes(Pm) it(G) sixty thousand plus ten thousand(R)/170. and that(A) comes(Pm) to seventy thousand and shillings(R)//171. Abdulla(Sy) said(Pv).

172. IT(T Islights) the way(V) of the world(Cl)/173. Munira(Sy) added(Pv). 174.He(He)Probably(Cm) owns(Pp) other slums(Pd) in other cities(Cl). 175. In our Kenya(Cr) you(A) can make(Pp) a living(G) out of everything even fear(Cm). 176. Look(at) the British company(Pb)/177. that owns(Pp)/178. and run(Pm) security guards(G) in this country(Cl). 179. Every house, every factory(Pr) has(Pp) a Security guard(Pd)/180. They(A) should set up(Pm) a Ministry of fear(G).

181. A Ministry for Administration and Proper Maintenance of slum Standards(Cr),would be(Pi) better(At)/182. Abdulla(Sy) added(Pv). 183. He(A) turned to(Pm) karega(G)/184. You(A) left(Pm) me(G) a shopkeeper(G). 185.(Cr) am(I) still one – an open-air shop-keeper(At)/186.I(A) sell(Pm) oranges(G) by the roadside(Cl).

187. Munira(Sy) told(Pr) me(Rv)/188. that Joseph(A) went(Pm) to Srrana(Cl)/189. karega(Sy) suddenly(Cm) said(Pv)/190. as if to brighten up(Pm) the conversation(G). 191. If(Cr) is(Ph) very good news(At). 192. He(Cr) was(Pp) a bright boy(At). 193. I(S) hope(Pme)//194. he(A) will not go(Pm) the way(Cl)/195. Munira and I(A) went(Pm).

196. ’All the same way(Gs) of going(Pm) for us(Cc) poor(At)/197. Abdulla(Sy) explained(Pv).

198. Ihr, I(S) forgot(Pme) /199. to give(Pm) you(Rv) something(G)/200. To drink(Pm). Theng’eta(G)/201. I(Pr) have(Pp) one or two packets(Pd).

202. He(A) leaned(Pm) over the bed(Cl)/203. and picked(Pm) a packet of Theng’eta(G)/204. ’Did you(Cr) ever(Cr) taste(Pi) it(A)? karega(‘Vb)."

205. ‘Yes(‘Vb). 206. In Mombasa(Cl) once(Cr). 207.I(Pr) was(Pp) surprised(At)/208. to see(Pme) it(Ph) on sale(Cl)/... 209. but it(Cr) did not taste(Pi) the same(At)/210. I(S) used to wonder(Pme) /211. how(If) it(A) came(Pm) into commercial use(Cl)

212. Then drink(Pm) it(G) again. 213. It(Ag) almost made(Pc) me(Pr)... well(At), almost made(Pc) us(Cr). 214. But it(A) ruined(Pm) us(G)."