

META DISCURSIVE REPRESENTATION OF MALE CHARACTERS IN AMAH DARKO'S FACELESS

Marius Eder BROU

Université Alassane Ouattara de Bouaké, Côte d'Ivoire
ederbrou@yahoo.fr

Kouadio Ange Michael N'GUESSAN

Université Alassane Ouattara, Côte d'Ivoire
angemicky2013@gmail.com

Abstract

Representation of a person involves a close examination of both the individual and his environment through the lens of his actions. Representation thus aims to provide information about the character traits or motivated behaviors of the person in relation to others in a given society. In this context, the representation of male characters in Amah Darko's "Faceless" reveals a reality in discourse, specifically the relationship between power and knowledge, and leads us into the realm of social discourse theory. It is noteworthy that the discursive practices of these male characters have an impact on social reality, revealing identities and attitudes of abuse and oppression whose motives can be summarized in terms of power, control and hierarchy.

Key words: *Attitudes, discourse, discursive, hierarchy, male, representation, power.*

Résumé

Représenter une personne, c'est mettre en évidence celle-ci et son environnement à la loupe de ses actes. La représentation œuvre donc à fournir des informations sur les traits de caractères ou comportements motivés de la personne dans sa relation avec les autres dans une société donnée. Dans cette optique, la représentation des personnages masculins dans Faceless de Amah Darko, révèle une réalité dans le discours à savoir les relations entre pouvoir et savoir ce qui nous introduit dans le champ de la théorie sociale du discours. L'on note que les pratiques discursives de ceux-ci impactent sur la réalité sociale et laissent transparaître des identités

et attitudes d'abus et d'oppression dont les motifs se résument en termes de pouvoir, de contrôle et de hiérarchie.

Mots-clés : *Attitudes, discours, discursif, hiérarchie, masculin, représentation, pouvoir.*

Introduction

Typically, representation ascribes to useful information regarding the entity being described. It aims at providing certain images of the entity being represented. In AMAH Darko's *Faceless*, the notion of male characters' representation is extensible. The novel unveils the lives of young girls who are victimized and exploited in a male-dominated world leading thus to a gender-based violence and oppression. As can be seen, male characters' representation does not only refer to a person's psychology trait but to his attitudes, behavior or actions that help associate it with social practices that in turn picture some knowledge about that individual. Male representation goes along with proper use of language that best fits the painting of male characters in the Novel. *Faceless* of AMAH Darko provides some speech patterns of male characters that showcase their backgrounds, personalities and relationships with other characters in the novel.

Thus, the theme: picturing male representation in discourse: case in Ama Darko's *faceless*. In other words, what linguistic features or artefacts are used in male representation? Does male portrayal manifestly mention covert ideas or insinuations?

As one can see, this work drives us straight to the study of social actors in their relationships. It offers an understanding of the unequal dynamics in the society in which male characters, through everything they do, demonstrate their hegemony and stranglehold on female ones. This work is therefore an appeal to positivism in social behavior for the sake of fairness, equity

and justice. Thus, in two divisions, will be displayed representation markers and semantic approximation first. In this first step, one will point out the linguistic tools that help comprehend how male characters are represented. Then, the social justifications of this representation.

1. Representation markers and semantic approximation

F. Boas (1930, p.1930) states that “Culture embraces all the manifestations of social habits of a community, the reactions of the individual as affected by the habits of the group in which he lives, and the product of human activities as determined by these habits”. For that reason, one can understand that culture shapes the habits and behavior of people and their actions partly reflect their culture. In this trend, the portrayal of male characters in the Ghanaian context shows to some extent their cultural and psychological background and this is obvious in the language use that reflects the way they are. The representation of male characters is observable through female’s characters use of language to talk about male characters. One can therefore notice nominalizations in female words when referring to male characters.

1.1. Referencing Male Characters with Nominalizations.

In AMAH Darko’s *Faceless*, male characters are referred to with nominalizations and this is purposeful on account of their violence against women. In fact, violence is a weapon that constrains and prevents the one who is assaulted from reacting or taking action for fear of the aggressor’s reprisals. Most of the time, in these circumstances, the victim of violence when talking about the aggressor or oppressor hardly refers to him /her literally. In fact, naming one’s aggressor is to expose oneself to the aggressor’s anger and reprisals or to expose the victim herself to shame as in the case of rape. The fear of the aggressor’s reaction leads people to use the many artefacts or

possibilities language offers in order to avoid naming people and be safe from any persecution. Among these covert techniques is nominalization. Concerning nominalization, one can press A. Partington (2004, p.5). A. Partington considers nominalization as “an information-impoverishment technique”. In other words, in a hostile environment made of violence as is the case of *Faceless*, the use of nominalization helps hide information so as not to expose the victim to the aggressor and avoid reprisals.

Nominalization is an internal censorship of protection against the evil when representing someone. AMAH Darko’s *Faceless* offers examples of such a representation process. In chapter I, when describing the visit of Macho to Fofo, one can grasp the psychology of Fofo and what she thinks and says of him in the following:

- (1) She stared into the face above her. Was her mind playing games with her? She looked again. It was *the nonsense street lord, poison of the streets*, a man who used to be the leader of the bullies. (*Faceless*, p. 3).

In this description, the ad hoc nominalization “*the nonsense street lord*” is more informative to the extent that it helps grasp the personality of the person being described. Macho is therefore seen as a man of violence who used to brutalize defenseless victims. This idea is more explicit when the author asserts:

- (2) *One muscular hand* came down hard upon her mouth and suppressed the sound from her throat. (*Faceless*, p.4).

The question is to know if “*One muscular hand*” refers to who and why describing that person with such a nominalization? Here, “*One muscular hand*” refers to Macho who is depicted as a violent individual who leaves no room for pity even if it is a woman.

Alike in (1) and (2), Fofu still cannot name her aggressor. She simply uses metaphorical language embedded in nominalizations.

(3) I am going to see my mother.

What are you going to see her about?

The big problem I told you about.

The big problem?

Yes, poison.

Poison? Poison? *The street lord?* (*Faceless*, p.4).

The type of language used in the above example is not simply frugal. First, it is a sign of protection; protecting oneself against someone who can do bad if he/she is covertly unveiled and secondly to reveal the nature of the individual at stake. M. Halliday (2004, p.656) already understood it when he considers nominalizations as “an information-packaging or encapsulation device”. Lexicalized constructions such as “*The big problem*”, “*The street lord*” in (3) Portray Macho’s personality. There is an absolute loathing for Macho, the person Fofu is referring to. In addition, nominals as used serve to avoid naming for personal reasons. It implies as suggested by C. Hagège (1985, p. 268), the avoidance of facing reality, that is to say “Le grand nombre de nominalisations permet d’esquiver par le discours l’affrontement”. In other words, the abundance of nominalizations makes it possible to use language to avoid confrontation and that is true. Fofu is afraid, she is unable to name the terror of the streets and even the wrath of the streets, known as Poison.

The nature of language use is intrinsically linked to psychological state and is “closely related to the social and personal needs that language is required to serve” (M. Halliday (1970, p.142). The fear of reprisals cannot help Fofu name her aggressor. Doing it is to expose herself to Poison’s fury and the possible outcomes. It can be paralleled that language

construction is determined by certain circumstances and the use of a specific language aims at serving and describing a specific situation. It cannot be otherwise in *Faceless*. Nominalizations are used to point to male characters' violence. They serve as indicators of information on the targeted people. Nominalizations give information and describe people. This goes from attitude information to mental one. They reveal the nature of individuals in discourse and in the present situation, it sheds light on male characters violence and this is perceptible in the content of the different male characters' propositions.

1.2. Speech Acts and Illocutionary oppression in male representation.

In their contribution on speech acts and social reality, Grewendorf and Meggle, (2002) state that in Searle's theory of language, "speaking in a language is a matter of performing illocutionary acts with certain intentions, according to constitutive rules." This parallel Searle (1979) ideas according to which speaking is to do something. Therefore, male characters' language use in the novel helps determine not only their character traits but also their intentions and the scope of their words. Thus, male characters' statements unveil their representation; and permit to identify their behaviors. These reveal that language can be used to perform actions such as to attack, humiliate, harm, force or intimidate others and it can be deciphered in the illocutionary force of the speech acts.

- (4) you want to live? Then no noise. (*Faceless*, p.4)
- (5) Better tell no one, he warned. I know what your new father Kpakpo did to you. Fofu told it all to me. Your mother loves him. I will tell it all if you tell anyone (*Faceless*, p 139).

The illocutionary force in (4) and (5) denotes illocutionary oppression. An illocutionary oppression is a verbal language whose effect constrains the hearer not to rejecting or resisting to

adversative propositions. It also implies as suggested by J. Austin (1962) things like ordering or warning. Could we say that excerpt (4) is a question or a request? Let's call for Groenendijk and Stokhof (1991) first. They contend that questions denote a set of propositions; that is to say, direct answers whereas in the view of Segeberg (1990), requests denote a relation between worlds and actions. Even if it is an indirect question, the second proposal seems to be more plausible and does not contradict Segeberg's (1990) view. In fact, this indirect question can be reworded as follows: "if you want to live, do not speak." the speaker makes a request in which he gives no alternative to the addressee through the threat embedded in it. The illocutionary force in this indirectness points out discursive violence traits and is characteristic of male characters' representation. In this trend, H. Nast, and S. Roberts's (1997) propose an explanation of "discursive violence" as follows:

We define discursivity as those processes and practices through which statements are made, recorded, and legitimated through linguistic and other means of circulation. Discursive violence, then, involves using these processes and practices to script groups or persons in places, and in ways that counter how they would define themselves. In the process, discursive violence obscures the socio-spatial relations through which a group is subordi-nated. The end effect is that groups or persons are cast into subaltern positions

(H. Nast and S. Roberts, 1997, p. 394)

Macho or Poison in speech (4), denotes physical and mental discursive oppressions that cannot misfire. These expressions characterize and determine the personality of Poison. Poison is considered as a bandit; and this status gives him the authority he needs to oppress with his words. The illocutionary oppression is a verbal expression of imposition or intimidation so that the

hearer conforms to one's will. In other words, illocutionary oppression only proposes one way out to the receiver; that is acceptance. The propositional content in (4) implies imposition on Fofo who cannot refuse if she wants to be alive. In (5) Onko wants a win-win compromise. He does not want his victim to reveal his bad action for, he blackmails Baby T. for silence. In fact, if Baby T loves her mother, she will not inform her or someone else about what Onko did to her to avoid Onko's reprisals which will only consist in revealing the secret between Baby T and her mother's husband about the sexual intercourse they had had. These instantiations recommend subordination and submission of the addressee to be safe and avoid humiliation as in (4) or disgrace in (5). Poison (4) and Onko (5)'actions are mental frustrations and are termed 'covert exercitive' by McGowan (2009). Following Austin (1975), an exercitive is a speech act that changes permissibility conditions.

The addressees have no more choice. They have to conform to their oppressors' desire. These reveal how oppressing, and violent male characters are.

Another bad practice of male characters is exploitation which is revealed in the following utterances.

- (6) I did beat the girl up, but I did not kill her. Why would I kill a girl who was making lots of money for me? You can talk to her if you like. I did beat her up but I left her crying, not dead. She wouldn't be crying if she was dead, would she? (*Faceless*, p 139)

In this instantiation, Poison as the name is, sexually exploits young ladies. He forces them to prostitute themselves and receive productivity bonuses in return. Moreover, exploitation is not the only imperfection of male characters, there is also negligence.

- (7) Three times he did it, and left her bleeding on his bed.
(*Faceless*, p 139)

After perpetrating the rape, Onko did not even assist the young lady who was ailing. This is a proof of his cruelty which can be qualify as I do not mind behavior. Moreover, male characters' representation also lies in the words used to describe their actions.

1.3. Semantic approach to male representation

The semantic field of male representation is related to men's actions that contradict social norms. It includes such concepts as debauchery and aggression that are noticeable in words used to describe males' actions. Focusing on the semantic representation of male is unavoidable because humans' actions are in words. It is through words one can judge, qualify or in short have an idea of people personalities. The following example describing what Onko did to Baby T will make it clear.

- (8) Three weeks since he had unexpectedly *locked the door* and *pushed* an unsuspecting and too trusting *Baby T onto his bed, pinned her down, forced a handkerchief inside her mouth* and. Three times he did it, and left her *bleeding on his bed*. P 139

In fact, Onko is raping Baby T as described with action verbs or performative verbs such as '*locked the door*', '*forced a handkerchief inside her mouth*' '*forced a handkerchief inside her mouth*' '*left her bleeding*' in the phrases. These action verbs convey actions that are being performed by the subject; therefore, they are indicative of the subject speaker's traits. They reveal the inner personality of male characters who are described as criminals who break social norms simply because raping is a crime that must be punished.

Male characters are identified as harmful. They fragilize social norms and see women as mere objects that can be used as they

please. But behind this relentless reality, is a problem of social positioning and self-esteem.

2. Social positioning in male representation

Male characters' discursive practices also show a social dimension in the painting of male characters with regards to their actions. Thus, one can easily guest that male characters are power-thirsty and intend to control any human being in their environment; namely women.

2.1. Power and Control

The representation of Male characters in Ama Darko's *Faceless* serves as evidence of the power dynamics and social hierarchy that permeate both Ghanaian and African societies. Through their linguistic expressions, interactions and behaviors. Male characters exercise power, control and domination over vulnerable female characters. The vulnerability of these female characters lies in the fact that they typically depend on men. According to S. Ademiluka (2018, p. 349), "this domination over women is reflected right from the process of contracting a marriage during which a man pays a bride price for his wife, which makes her the property of her husband". Through this statement, it is understandable that once the bride price is paid, men can possess women as they possess their cars. The subsequent reason that can be put forward is that, naturally, men have more physical strength than women.

The idea of power and control in *Faceless* is palpable through male characters like poison. The decision to attribute the name 'poison' to one of the main characters is indeed on purpose. The term 'Poison' itself represents power. The power to harm, the power to kill. He who does not want to die better not to play with it. As S. Tarlok et al., (2015, p. 2609) state, a

“poison is any substance that is harmful to the body when eaten, breathed, injected or absorbed through the skin”.

Poison’s use of power through language is noticeable in the excerpts (4) when he addressed Fofu: “you want to live?” he hissed. Fofu moaned and nodded under the gravity of his hands. Then no noise!” He warned” (*Faceless*, p. 4).

The conversation takes place in a context in which Poison ‘the street lord’ attempts to rape a vulnerable street girl named ‘Fofu’. Through this conversation, it is palpable that ‘Poison’ exercises power and dominance over his street subjects. The choice of the expressions of control in the illustration clearly shows that ‘poison’ has the power of life or death over the other street children, especially the girls. Another instance of power and control through language is perceptible in the following illustration:

(9) “*He got upset when he heard of Maami Broni’s visit to me. He knew she had come to tell me.*” “Tell you what? Are you saying Baby T is dead?” Maa Tsuru nodded. *He came here and turned me into a leper*” (*Faceless*, p. 24).

As if the death of her daughter was not sufficient enough, Maa Tsuru receives threats from the one who caused the death of her daughter. Not only does he show no compassion as any man would have done, but he also strongly threatens her. The use of the metaphor “*he came here and turned me into a leper*” (*Faceless*, p. 24) shows how poisonous and out of touch ‘poison’ is. Like lepers who are silenced and marginalized in society, poison prevented her from speaking out or taking action. This situation leaves Maa Tsuru feeling helpless and isolated. This is what made her tell her other daughter ‘Fofu’: (10) “And why you should also go away from here; he told me he would find you” (*Faceless*, p. 24). This ultimate threat from poison shows how dominant he is in society. In accordance with T. Van Dijk (2000, p. 84), “dominance is understood as a form of social power

abuse, that is, as legally or morally illegitimate exercise of control over others in one's own interests, often resulting in social inequality”.

Another form of power and dominance of men over women is discernible in the exploitative relationship between the male character ‘Poison’ and girls like Baby T, one of his sexual merchandises. As an illustration, one can quote ‘poison’ when he contends: (11) “You either agree to give him pleasure or I’ll remove you from here and put you to work at ‘Circle’”, he threatened Baby T.” (*Faceless*, p. 195). The use of threatening devices gives Baby T. no choice. Either she has sexual intercourse with her rapist ‘Onko’ or she accepts to work at ‘Circle’ where: (12) “there were the **catfights** between the girls themselves over clients. It was **risky** and **dangerous** at Circle” (*Faceless*, p. 195). Subsequently, power dynamics also can be observed in the conversation between Poison and Baby T.: (13) “*I won’t go to Circle,*” she cried at Poison. “*Then serve him!*” *Poison ordered.* In this utterance, the fear of facing a destructive and implacable reality likely leads to the loss of courage and submission. One can, therefore, notice that Poison uses dictatorship to impose his view and constrain his interlocutors to alignment because she is afraid of the ‘circle’.

Moreover, power dynamics in *Faceless* is also distinguishable through the enunciation of lie. As A. Farisha and K. Sakkeel (2015, p. 45) maintain, “lying is a part of communication and a form of social behavior which is involved in interacting with others. Lying means saying a statement that he knows themselves as false to others to whom he wants to perceive it as true”. Furthermore, Z. Toh (2021) states that a lie is a powerful tool in the hands of men. It helps them reach the ultimate goal which is the exercise of power. The manipulation of Maa Tsuru by Kwei and Kpapko through lies and emotional exploitation is a poignant example of the power dynamics and control exercised by individuals in vulnerable situations. Kwei

attracted Maa Tsuru into a relationship with the promise to marry her. He used this lie to gain her confidence and affection. This relationship led to the birth of their firstborn, Baby T. This promise is a means to control her emotionally and maintain total control over her. One of the obvious illustrations of Kwei's lies is when he pretends to come from a professional adventure. As the following excerpt clearly states: (14) "Then rumors grew rife that he actually got caught up in bad company that was into stealing building materials from construction sites in Accra" (*Faceless*, p. 120). Through this discourse of lie, Kwei wants people to perceive him as person who works hard to provide for his family, not as a thief.

Another form of enunciation of a lie is performed by Kpakpo. Kpakpo is an unemployed, lazy, drunkard and liar who played tricks with Maa Tsuru to have her as his wife and use her home as his dwelling place. A corroborative illustration of Kpakpo's lies can be found in this excerpt:

(15) "Her worst fears hit her straight in the face. Kpakpo was *no worker* in a factory at Tema. He had been out of work for so long a time *no one even remembered* any longer when he last worked. Or if indeed, he ever did. He had been *surviving through dubious means*" (*Faceless*, p. 131).

From this passage, it emerges that Kpakpo has been lying to Maa Tsuru all the time. The enunciation of lie is realized through expressions like: '*no worker*'; '*no one even remembered*'; and '*surviving through dubious means*. Through the enunciation of a lie, Kpakpo intends to deceive Maa Tsuru and exercise power and dominance over her. However, Maa Tsuru is not the only victim of his deceitful behavior. Indeed, being down and out, Kpakpo turned into a landlord by offering cheap accommodation. Once he has the money in his pockets, he reveals the bitter truth to his tenants: (16) "The landlord's right and privilege to 'perch' with the tenant throughout the period of

tenancy”. Unsurprisingly, (17) “None of the tenants who passed through his noose ever succeeded in collecting back what money they paid Kpakpo”.

As one explores how Kwei and Kpakpo influenced Maa Tsuru through manipulative language, it is clear that actions reflect a larger system where men hold more influence than women. As a result, it creates a sort of societal ladder.

2.2. *Hierarchization of the Society*

In Ama Darko’s *Faceless*, a vivid display of the organization of the society comes to light. Just like in real life, not everyone has the same degree of power and control. This creates a sort of ladder where men with more influence are at the top, while women often struggling to be heard. Some families, like that of Adade, follow the more traditional path, where the father provides and the mother takes care of the family. This structure seems to lead to stability and children who go to school. On the other hand, Maa Tsuru’s family does not have the same kind of stability. Her family’s hierarchy is disrupted, leading her children to the streets. Through these two families, the book shows how the hierarchization of the society, can shape the way people live and the opportunities they have.

In Adade’s family, linguistic cues and dynamics reflect a conventional and structured societal hierarchy where the father provides and the mother cares for the family. This hierarchy contributes to the stability and well-being of the family. As a result, their children receive an appropriate education and avoid street connections. The hierarchization of Adade’s family is summed up in the following excerpt:

(18) “*The mother, wife, worker and battered-car owner that she was, no day passed that Kabria didn’t wonder how come that good Lord created a day to be made up of only twenty four hours, because from dawn to dusk,*

domestic schedules gobbled her up; office duties ate her alive; her three children devoured her with their sometimes realistic and many times very unrealistic demands; while the icing on the cake, their father, needed do no more than simple be her regular husband, and she was in a perpetual quandary (Faceless, p. 10)

This excerpt globally highlights social roles and power dynamics the African society. It depicts Kabria's multiple roles as a *mother, wife, worker and battered-car* owner. The emphasis on these roles is an indication of the diversity of women's roles in the family and in society at large. The phrase 'domestic schedules goggled her up' suggests that Kabria's domestic responsibilities consume her time and energy. This reflects traditional gender role expectations for African women as caregivers. This idea is strengthened by E. Asuquo and P. Akpan-Idiok (2020, p. 1) when they maintain that "in Africa, women play an indispensable role in family life. The normative roles of women extend from reproductive role to the raising of children and caring for sick family members".

The hierarchy within Adade's family is evident in the division of duties. Kabria's description of the role of the father suggests that men have a less complex role in comparison to the multiple responsibilities of women. Her statement "needed do no more than simple be her regular husband" advocates that men's role is less demanding. Men's role in the family is described by the adjective 'simple'.

In *Faceless*, the patriarchal African society dictates that men hold authority over women. As a result, women are relegated to traditional roles. Indeed, patriarchy is a system of unequal power relations between women and men. In a patriarchal society, men have dominance over women. This patriarchal society can be seen in some of the linguistic devices used in the following passage: (19) "Mum, do you know that I

cut short your problems by coming as a boy and earned you respect? Kabria was so taken aback by it that she found herself asking, “What problems?” (*Faceless*, p. 13).

The statement of Kabria’s son ‘*I cut short your problems by coming as a boy*’ demonstrates an awareness of societal expectations regarding gender roles even in childhood. The term ‘cut short’ implies an acknowledgement of the assumed benefits that come with being male. The idea of gaining respect through masculinity highlights the perceived advantages of being a boy. Moreover, the reaction of her mother Kabria to his statement reflects the static beliefs of patriarchy. On top of that, this interaction shows how childhood experiences shape gender roles. It highlights how patriarchy affects how individuals view things and family relationships. Subsequently, the analysis of this passage suggests that patriarchy is transmitted across generations. As a result, gender dynamics will always be perpetuated. As M. Rached et al., (2021, p. 131) state, “the intergenerational transmission of patriarchal parental styles continues to influence perceptions of sexism and the perpetuation of gender inequality”.

The behavior of Adade throughout the narration serves as a lens through which the inherent patriarchy within African society is illuminated. As the head of his family, his actions and attitudes emphasize the traditional gender roles and power dynamics that permeate his interactions. Adade's role as the provider and decision-maker characterizes the patriarchal structure, where men often hold authoritative positions while women are relegated to supportive roles. The following excerpt can serve as an illustration to this idea:

(20) “Adade’s car horn sounded at the gate about an hour after Kabria and the children had all eaten and bathed and were settled behind the television. She managed a smile for him at the door after Abena had

opened the gate for him. But inside, she fumed as she reflected upon all that long and easy talk about how *if a woman wanted to keep her marriage always fresh and her husband all to herself, she had better make him feel good at home.* ‘Welcome him home with a smile,’ they say, ‘look good for him. Wear a mini skirt for him if he loves seeing you in one. Pamper him. Do him this. Do him that. Gosh! Who pampered her when she returned home tired from work, only to go and continue in the kitchen while trying to explain the word ‘abandon’ to their son?’ (Faceless, p. 57).

The imperative sentences from this passage effectively communicate duties and commands to Kabria. Besides, it emerges that it is Kabria’s duty to make her husband feel happy at home. She is the only one who has to keep her marriage safe. Adade only has to relax and feel happy at home. Out of question for him to make efforts to please his wife. He is the man. He is the chief of the family and just over the hill for doing that. Subsequently, the rhetorical question: “*who pampered her when she returned home tired from work?*” implies that she is not expecting any answer, but to make a point. The point that there is nobody to welcome her when she comes back from work. On top of that, this rhetorical question suggests that Kabria is desperate of affection. She would love someone to welcome her home and give her affection when she returns from work. Finally, this passage implies that Kabria is against this form of gender-based injustice. Therefore, by pointing out this power dynamics, it is an attempt to challenge this patriarchal hierarchization of the African society.

Conclusion

The way male characters are depicted in AMAH Darko's Faceless highlights social relationships. Through the use of

simple words and the analysis of their actions, it is evident that they tend to exploit, be violent towards, and neglect others, particularly women. This behavior is a result of the power they hold over women, which they use to control and enforce their own desires. Male characters demonstrate the self-centeredness of humanity and the disregard for those who differ from us. Ama Darko's "Faceless" portrays male characters as evidence of the power dynamics and social hierarchies found in Ghanaian and African societies. Through their use of language, interactions, and actions, male characters exert control, domination, and influence over vulnerable female characters. The women characters are vulnerable since they usually rely on men. For example, 'Poison' represents the exertion of dominance through speech, intimidation, and trickery, continuing to maintain his hold over individuals, especially women.

The way society is organized reinforces these power imbalances. Families like Adade's stick to traditional gender roles, where men provide for the family and women care for them. This structured hierarchy keeps the family stable and provides educational opportunities. But it's different for Maa Tsuru's family. The family has been torn apart, leaving her children vulnerable on the streets. It is obvious that the portrayal of male characters in Ama Darko's Faceless raises the issue of gender relationship in the society. This question embodies conflict as to who should have hegemony between men and women. Human beings are born equal therefore; power must not be disputed between both entities but equally shared for their own well-being. Male and women relationship must be a relationship of complementary but not dominance of one entity over another one.

Bibliography

Ademiluka O. (2018). Patriarchy and women abuse: perspectives from ancient Israel and Africa. *Old testam. essays*. vol.31, n.2, p.339-362. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17159/2312-3621/2018/v31n2a5>.

Asuquo F., Akpan P. (2020). The exceptional role of women as primary caregivers for people living with HIV/AIDS in Nigeria, west Africa. p. 1-14.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.93670>

Austin J. (1975). *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 178 p.

Farisha A., Sakkeel K. (2015). Psychology of Lying. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, Vol. 2, n.2, p. 45-57. <http://oaji.net->1170-1427635231>

Grewendorf G., Meggle G. (2002). *Speech acts, mind, and social reality: Discussions with John R. Searle*. Heidelberg. Germany: Springer Verlag. 327 p.

Groenendijk J., Stokhof M. (1991). Dynamic predicate logic. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, February 1991, Vol. 14, p. 39-100. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00628304>

Hagège C. (1985). *L'homme de paroles*. Contribution linguistique aux sciences humaines. Paris, Fayard. 314 p.

Halliday M. (1970). *Spoken and written language*, Oxford, Oxford University Press. 128 p.

Mcgowan K. (2004). Conversational exercitives: something else we do with our Words. *Linguist Philos*, Vol. 27, n.1, p. 93-111.

Nast H., Roberts S. (1997). *Thresholds in feminist geography: difference, methodology, representation*. Nebraska. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers. 400 p.

Partington A. (2004). Utterly content in each other's company: semantic prosody and semantic preference, *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, April 2004, vol. 9, n. 1, p. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ijcl.9.1.07par>

Rached M., Hankir A., Zaman R. (2021). Patriarchal upbringing in the 21st century: the impact emotional abuse related to parental styles has on the genesis of gender inequality and the development of unresolved trauma in children. *Psychiatria Danubina*, Vol. 33, n.11, p. 121-132. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:244872641>

Searle J. (1979). *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts*. Cambridge, London, New York, Melbourne. Cambridge University Press. 187 p.

Sumbria T., Sharma A., Prabhakar S. et al. (2015). Introduction to poisoning: a systematic review. *International Journal of Pharmacy Teaching & Practices*, Vol.6, n. 4, p. 2615-2619.

<https://doi.org/10.38022/ajhp.v2i1.4>

Toh P., (2021). *Aspects of Discourse Analysis*, Dakar, L' Harmattan. 270 p.