

A DOCUMENTATION OF AGRICULTURAL TERMS IN ILAJE DIALECT

BY

Ewemikoku Benita Onyeka

ART1901349

v

DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS STUDIES

FACULTY OF ARTS

UNIVERSITY OF BENIN

BENIN CITY, NIGERIA

APRIL, 2024

A DOCUMENTATION OF AGRICULTURAL TERMS IN ILAJE DIALECT

BY

Ewemikoku Benita Onyeka

ART1901349

**SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FUFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
AWARD OF A BACHELOR OF ARTS DEGREE (BA) BY THE DEPARTMENT OF
LINGUISTICS STUDIES, UNIVERSITY OF BENIN**

APRIL, 2024

APPROVAL PAGE

I certify that this research was carried out by **EWEMIKOKU Benita Onyeka** with the matriculation number **ART1901349** in the Department of Linguistics Studies, Faculty of Arts, University of Benin, under my supervision.

Dr (Mrs) O. R. Osewa

Project Supervisor

Confirmed by

Prof. M.S. Agbo

Head of Department

PLAGIARISM CERTIFIATION

I **Ewemikoku Benita Onyeka** with the matriculation number **ART1901349** declare that this work Titled **A DOCUMENTATION OF AGRICULTURAL TERMS IN ILAJE DIALECT** has successfully passed the anti-plagiarism test and so does not violate any copyright regulation.

Sign: _____

Ewemikoku Benita Onyeka

Date: _____

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to the glory of the Almighty for his ever sufficient grace toward me and for the gift of life.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I am profoundly grateful to all those whose contributions and support were instrumental in the completion of this project. First and foremost, I extend my heartfelt appreciation to my supervisor, Dr (Mrs) O. R. Osewa whose invaluable guidance, insightful suggestions, and unwavering encouragement were indispensable throughout the fabrication process and the writing of this project. I am especially grateful for her dedicated efforts in proofreading and correcting my work, which significantly enhanced its quality.

My deepest gratitude goes to my mom Mrs Ewemikoku Christiana and my sister Ewemikoku stephany for their steadfast support and encouragement in my academic pursuits. Their constant belief in me, along with their words of motivation, has been a constant source of strength.

I would like to express my appreciation to the Head of the Linguistics Department, Professor M.S. Agbo, and all my lecturers for their valuable guidance and impartation of knowledge.

Furthermore, I am grateful to my friends, lajuwomi essential, anigboro gift, Clara, Lilian, Esther, Mr favour affia and Mr wike M.I for their camaraderie and support not only made my time at UNIBEN memorable but also provided invaluable assistance in navigating academic challenges.

To all those mentioned and the countless others who have supported me along this journey, I extend my sincere appreciation. Your belief in me and your encouragement have played a significant role in my academic accomplishments.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE PAGE	ii
APPROVAL PAGE	iii
PLAGIARISM CERTIFIATION	iv
DEDICATION	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
ABSTRACT	x
CHAPTER ONE	1
INTRODUCTION	1
1.0 Background	1
1.1 Statement of Problem	2
1.2 Aim and Objectives	2
1.3 Research Questions	3
1.4 Significance of the Study	4
1.5 Methodology	6

1.6 Language the People	7
CHAPTER TWO	9
LITERATURE REVIEW	9
2.0 Introduction	9
2.1 Conceptual Review of literature	9
2.1.1 Language	9
2.1.2 Sociolinguistics	11
2.1.3 Agriculture	11
2.2 Previous Studies	12
2.3 Concern of the Present Study	15
CHAPTER THREE	16
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	16
3.0 Introduction	16
3.1 The Basic Linguistic Theory	16
3.2 Relevance of the Basic Linguistic Theory to the Present Study	21
CHAPTER FOUR	23

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS	23
4.0 Introduction	23
4.1 Crop Terminologies	23
4.2 Cultivating/Tillage Terms	26
4.3 Processing Terms	31
4.4 Livestock Terminologies	35
4.5 Farming Equipment Terminologies	38
CHAPTER FIVE	40
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	40
5.0 Introduction	40
5.1 Summary	40
5.2 findings	42
5.3 Conclusion	44
REFERENCES	47

ABSTRACT

Language serves as a conduit for cultural expression, reflecting the culture and practices of a community. Among the diverse linguistic language of Nigeria, the Ilaje dialect emerges as a prominent language spoken in the western region, particularly in Ondo State. The Ilaje people, known for their agrarian lifestyle deeply rooted in farming and agriculture, possess a rich linguistic heritage intertwined with their farming practices. Despite the cultural significance of agricultural terms in the Ilaje community, scholarly exploration into this aspect of their language remains limited. This study aims to address this gap through a descriptive analysis of agricultural terms in the Ilaje dialect, delving into their categories, function, and semantic dimensions. The primary objectives of this research include compiling a comprehensive list of agricultural terms in Ilaje, investigating their functions, characteristics and exploring their semantic nuances in different agricultural contexts, and examining their cultural and sociolinguistic implications. The data for this study were collected utilizing a combination of qualitative methods, including interviews with native speakers, observations of farming activities, and analysis of written texts. The analysis, conducted reveals several significant findings. The Ilaje dialect exhibits a rich agricultural vocabulary encompassing various aspects of farming ranging from crop terms, cultivating/tillage term, processing terms, livestock terms, to equipment terms, reflecting the community's deep engagement with agricultural practices. Semantic specificity is observed in the precise categorization of different agricultural elements, highlighting the linguistic details of Ilaje farming terminology. The study uncovers instances of borrowing and adaptation from other languages, indicating the incorporation of modern scientific concepts into traditional agricultural lexicon.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Background

Linguistics as an interdisciplinary field that focuses on the scientific study of language has several areas one of which of particular interest is the study of agricultural terms in various languages. One language that has gained attention in recent years is the Ilaje language, spoken by the Ilaje people in Nigeria. As agriculture plays a crucial role in the Ilaje culture and economy, understanding the agricultural terminology in their language can provide valuable insights into their farming practices and their connection with the natural environment.

The study of agricultural terms in Ilaje language involves examining the lexical and semantic aspects of words related to agriculture ranging from, farming, crops, livestock, to other agricultural processes. This research not only helps linguists to document and preserve this unique aspect of the Ilaje culture but also contributes to the broader field of linguistics by expanding our knowledge of domain-specific vocabulary across different languages including different crop varieties, farming tools, planting and harvesting techniques, as well as names for various agricultural pests and diseases and how they are formed and their context of usage. This study also sheds light on the relationship between language and culture. Through this research,

linguists can investigate how the Ilaje people conceptualize and classify different agricultural concepts.

Language is an essential aspect of human culture, reflecting the values, traditions, and practices of a community. In the rich linguistic landscape of Nigeria, the Ilaje language stands as one of the prominent languages spoken in the western region. The Ilaje people predominantly reside in Ondo State, Nigeria, and are renowned for their agrarian lifestyle, deeply connected to farming and agriculture. Within this context, the study of agricultural verbs in the Ilaje language assumes significance as it offers valuable insights into the agricultural practices and the cultural significance attached to farming within the Ilaje linguistics community.

1.1 Statement of Problem

Despite the significance of agricultural terms in Ilaje culture, there has been limited scholarly exploration into this profound aspect of their language and its cultural implications. Therefore, this study seeks to carry out a descriptive study into the agricultural terms in Ilaje language to comprehensively document, understand, and analyze the various dimensions of this linguistic art form

1.2 Aim and Objectives

The primary aim of this research is to conduct an in-depth analysis of the agricultural terms in

the Ilaje language. To achieve this aim, the following objectives will be pursued:

1. To compile and categorize a comprehensive list of agricultural terms in the Ilaje language.
2. To document the agricultural terms in Ilaje.
3. To explore the semantic nuances and variations in the usage of Ilaje agricultural terms in different agricultural contexts.
4. To examine the cultural and sociolinguistic implications of agricultural terms in Ilaje, shedding light on the interplay between language, culture, and farming practices.

1.3 Research Questions

- 1 What are the different agricultural terms in the Ilaje language?
- 2 How can we document the agricultural terms in Ilaje?
- 3 What are the semantic variations in the usage of agricultural terms in different agricultural contexts?
- 4 What are the cultural and sociolinguistic implications of agricultural terms in Ilaje, shedding light on the interplay between languages, culture, and agricultural practices?

1.4 Significance of the Study

Understanding the agricultural terms in the Ilaje dialect has significant implications for various stakeholders:

Linguistic Scholars: This study contributes to the growing body of knowledge on African languages, specifically the Ilaje language. It helps to elucidate the structure and functioning of verbs in the language, enriching our understanding of its grammar and syntax.

Anthropologists and Sociolinguists: The analysis of farming verbs provides valuable insights into the cultural practices and social dynamics of the Ilaje community. It sheds light on their close relationship with the land, agriculture, and the environment.

Agricultural Practitioners and Development Agencies: By comprehending the semantic nuances of farming verbs, stakeholders involved in agriculture can gain a better understanding of traditional farming techniques and practices employed by the Ilaje people. This knowledge can lead to more effective and culturally appropriate agricultural development initiatives.

Preservation of Indigenous Knowledge: The documentation of farming verbs in the Ilaje language contributes to the preservation of indigenous knowledge systems. As societies undergo rapid modernization, there is a risk of losing traditional knowledge and practices. This research helps in safeguarding Ilaje cultural heritage related to farming.

The terms used in the Ilaje language provide insights into their traditional farming practices, indigenous knowledge about soil fertility, land management techniques, and their deep understanding of local flora and fauna. This linguistic analysis helps to uncover the intricate connections between language, culture, and agriculture, showcasing the Ilaje people's intimate connection with their natural environment.

Furthermore, studying agricultural terms in the Ilaje dialect can have practical implications for agricultural education and development programs. Linguists can collaborate with agronomists and agricultural experts to develop bilingual agricultural glossaries that can be used to improve communication and knowledge transfer between local farmers and extension workers. By understanding the Ilaje language's unique agricultural terminology, experts can have more effective conversations about land management practices, climate-resilient crops, sustainable farming techniques, and pest control methods. This interdisciplinary collaboration can ultimately contribute to the improved productivity and well-being of the Ilaje farming community.

Finally, the linguistic study of agricultural terms in the Ilaje dialect offers valuable insights into their farming practices, culture, and the relationship between language and agriculture. Through this research, linguists can broaden their understanding of domain-specific vocabulary and its cultural significance. Additionally, this knowledge can be applied to practical initiatives aimed at improving agricultural education and development in the Ilaje community. Overall, the study

of agricultural terms in the Ilaje dialect not only enriches our knowledge of language and culture but also has real-world implications for the sustainable development of agricultural practices

1.5 Methodology

The study will focus on investigating agricultural terms in the Ilaje dialect within the confines of Ondo State, Nigeria. The data collection will involve a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods. Primary sources will include interviews with native Ilaje speakers and observations of farming activities. Additionally, written texts, folklore, and existing linguistic resources will be consulted for a comprehensive data set.

The collected data will be analyzed using linguistic tools and methods, such as syntactic and semantic analysis, to identify patterns and variations in the use of farming verbs. Moreover, the study will be complemented by a sociolinguistic approach to understand the cultural significance of farming in the Urhobo community.

1.6 Language the People

The Ilaje people speak the Yoruba variety of language called the Ilaje language. This language is spoken in Ondo State. Ilaje people, a subgroup of the Yoruba people that speak the Ilaje dialect, a coastal dialect of the Yoruba language.

The Ilaje's are a distinguished, distinct linguistic group of the Yoruba stalk made up of four geopolitical entities namely Ugbomahin Etikan and Aheri

Ilajeland is bounded by the Ijebus to the West, the Ikale to the North, the Itsekiri to the East. The Apoi and Arogbo Ijaw to the North East, while the Atlantic ocean formed the southern boundary. No doubt, the Ilajes are one of the most dynamic and enterprising people in Nigeria. Their aquatic skill, coupled with their high adaptational ability enable them to conquer the harsh geographical environment and turn it to a big advantage.

Consequently, they were able to build large communities like Ugbonla, Aiyetoro, and Orioke. Aiyetoro and attracted visitors, tourists and researchers from all over the world especially Europe, Canada, and America.

Ilajes can also be found in cohesive diasporic communities in Douala (Cameroon), Sapele/Warri (Delta), Asejire (Oyo) and parts of Lagos State. According to the 2006 census statistics, we have a population of about 290,615 people.

Igbokoda, the Ilaje local government headquarters is fast becoming an international trade center as its popular market attracts traders not only from other parts of Nigeria, but, also from other African countries especially Togo, Benin, Ghana, Cameroon and Gabon.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

This chapter presents a comprehensive literature review on the topic Agricultural terms in Ilaje language. In this review, we explore previous research, theoretical frameworks, and empirical studies related to Agricultural terms in Ilaje language, hence this section is divided into four parts namely; conceptual review of literature, previous studies, concern of the present study and theoretical framework. The main aim is to gain insights into the patterns, functions, and underlying principles of Agricultural terms in this specific language.

2.1 Conceptual Review of literature

In this section, concepts related to the topic of study will be reviewed conceptually, these concepts include; Language, morphology, Sociolinguistics, Agriculture.

2.1.1 Language

Various scholars have provided diverse explanations and definitions of language based on their insights. Alshami I. (2019) posited in his work on language and linguistics that language serves

as a means of communication, facilitating the expression of thoughts, ideas, feelings, and emotions to others. Bihari Dash B. (2023) reviewed Noam Chomsky's definition, portraying language as "the inherent capacity of the native speaker to understand and form grammatical sentences." According to Chomsky, a language consists of sentences, each of finite length and constructed from finite elements. Bihari Dash B. (2023) summarized Chomsky's explanation into six features, emphasizing the innate ability of the mind, the significance of the environment, inter-relationships in languages, language acquisition device, universal grammar, and competence and performance. Hakeem A (2018), in an online article, reviewed several scholarly definitions of language, including Lyons (1981). Lyons defines language as the principal system of communication used by specific groups of human beings within a particular society. This definition explicitly states that language is the distinctive feature separating humans from animals as social beings. Language can manifest in various forms such as spoken, written, sign, and gesture, each effective in specific situations as needed.

Importance of language

- Language helps us to express our thoughts
- It is used to spell out the culture of a given peoples
- It is used to reveal the difference in people's race and tribe
- Language is used to build relationships

- It is used for governance and identity of a nation etc.

2.1.2 Sociolinguistics

Halliday (1989: 44) defines sociolinguistics as the specific lexical and grammatical choices made by speakers based on the situational context, the participants in the conversation, and the foundation of the language discourse. Labov (2009) demonstrated that sociolinguistic variation is widespread and highly structured, revealing consistent patterns of co-occurrence between language forms. Labov, often considered the father of the "variationist school of thought," asserts that sociolinguistic variation is not only normal but also essential for the linguistic development of languages. According to Crystal (1987), sociolinguistics is a discipline that explores the relationship between language and society. This implies a well-defined connection between the two, suggesting that language and society are interdependent just as language requires society, society also relies on language.

2.1.3 Agriculture

According to David H. and Dorian F. (2014) agriculture is the most comprehensive word used to denote the many ways in which crop plants and domestic animals sustain the global human population by providing food and other products. The English word agriculture derives from

the Latin *ager* (field) and *colo* (cultivate) signifying, when combined, the Latin *agricultura*: field or land tillage. But the word has come to subsume a very wide spectrum of activities that are integral to agriculture and have their own descriptive terms, such as cultivation, domestication, horticulture, arboriculture, and vegeculture, as well as forms of livestock management such as mixed crop-livestock farming, pastoralism, and transhumance. Also agriculture is frequently qualified by words such as incipient, proto, shifting, extensive, and intensive, the precise meaning of which is not self-evident. Many different attributes are used too to define particular forms of agriculture, such as soil type, frequency of cultivation, and principal crops or animals. The term agriculture is occasionally restricted to crop cultivation excluding the raising of domestic animals, although it usually implies both activities.

2.2 Previous Studies

Oluwafemi Bamigbade's (2020) research delved into the elaborate patterns of interaction between *Àpòì*, an isolated dialect of Ijaw, and *Ìlàjẹ*, an existing dialect of the Yorùbá language. Bamigbade focused on three key aspects: the extent of lexical borrowing, the influence of dialects, and the phenomenon of semantic narrowing observed in *Àpòì*, which heavily relies on Yorùbá elements. The data for this study was meticulously collected by Bamigbade, who selected one hundred items from the Ibadan 400-Wordlist of basic items. The participants in the study included five native speakers proficient in both *Àpòì* and *Ìlàjẹ*, who were also additive

bilinguals in either Ìlàjẹ/Àpọ̀ì or Standard Yorùbá (SY)/Àpọ̀ì. The findings of Bamigbade's research disclosed that Àpọ̀ì directly borrowed 42 items from Standard Yorùbá, 14 items from Ìlàjẹ, with some traces of influence from Standard Yorùbá, and 15 items from Ìlàjẹ without linguistic parallels in Standard Yorùbá. Additionally, Àpọ̀ì incorporated 9 items from Central Yoruba dialects of Ìjẹṣa/Mọ̀bà, and 3 items from Standard Yorùbá with narrowed semantic interpretations. In essence, the paper concludes that Àpọ̀ì is rapidly evolving into a hybrid linguistic form, embodying elements from both Ijaw and Ìlàjẹ. The borrowing of lexical items, the influence of dialects, and the narrowing of semantic interpretations collectively contribute to the dynamic evolution of Àpọ̀ì as it continues to assimilate and adapt linguistic features from various sources.

Akintoye Japhet (2012) undertook an examination of the pronouns in Ilaje, a Yoruba dialect located in the southeast, aiming to provide a formal account that would uncover the native speakers' intuitive understanding of the language structure. The theoretical framework guiding this investigation was the Minimalist Program, incorporating both phonology and syntax in the morphological analysis of pronouns. The study's data originated from the common usage of personal pronouns among Ilaje speakers. The phonological properties of the pronouns underwent analysis using autosegmental conventions, while the morphosyntactic properties were scrutinized through the feature-checking approach of the Minimalist Program. It was observed that, typically,

the pronouns in Ilaje present their Phonetic Form (PF) realizations rather than their basic forms. To reconstruct the fundamental form, the analysis involved separating each pronoun from its merger with any other syntactic element. This nuanced approach provides valuable insights into the interplay between phonology and syntax within the morphology of pronouns in the Ilaje dialect, elucidating the native speakers' intuitive grasp of the language's structural intricacies.

Olusanmi Babarinde (2013) analyzed the Yoruba counting system, aiming to explain the challenges in learning the language. The study used three main sources: lists of Yoruba numerals, the researcher's knowledge and linguistic training, and relevant literature. The paper highlighted the roles of affixes in forming odd numbers, multiples of twenty, centenary, etc. It explored the structure of numerals, revealing that Yoruba numbers are influenced by phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics. Elements like deletion, assimilation, tonal changes, and linguistic typology were identified as crucial aspects of numeral formation. The study also noted the difference in counting direction between Yoruba and English, with Yoruba counting from right-to-left. Yoruba's numeral structure involves counting in multiples of *ogún* (twenty), combining base five, decimal (base ten), and vigesimal systems.

2.3 Concern of the Present Study

This research primarily centers on analyzing agricultural terms in the Ilaje language. The analysis is conducted using the distributed morphology theory to examine the collected data. Unlike previous studies, this current research adopts the distributed morphology theory to explore the morphological and syntactic patterns, semantic functions, and linguistic significance of agricultural terms in the Ilaje language. The study reveals a consistent pattern observed in the agricultural terms of the Ilaje language.

CHAPTER THREE

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

3.0 Introduction

The previous chapter focused on the review of relevant literature and previous works on the subject of study. This chapter examines the research theory adopted for the present study; which is the Dixon (2010) basic linguistics theory

3.1 The Basic Linguistic Theory

The theoretical framework adopted in this work is the Basic Linguistic Theory by Dixon (2010). It provides a fundamental characterization of the nature of human languages and a comprehensive guide to their description and analysis. In crystal-clear prose, Dixon describes how to go about doing linguistics. The theory shows how grammatical structures and rules may be worked out on the basis of inductive generalizations, and explains the steps by which an attested grammar and lexicon can build up from observed utterances.

The theory also champions the course on how the grammars and vocabulary of one language may be compared to others of the same or different families. It also explains the methods

involved in cross-linguistic parametric analyses, and shows how to interpret the results. The expression “basic linguistic theory” refers to the theoretical framework that is most widely employed in language description, particularly grammatical descriptions of entire languages. It is also the framework assumed by most work in linguistic typology. Basic linguistic theory differs from many other theoretical frameworks in that it is not a formal theory but an informal theory. That is, many grammatical phenomena can generally be characterized with sufficient precision in without the use of formalism. As noted by Dixon (1997:128) "The term Basic Linguistic Theory has recently come into use for the fundamental theoretical concepts that underlie all work in language description and change, and the postulation of general properties of human languages."

Basic linguistics theory belongs to the class of Descriptive theories in linguistics. Descriptive theories are theories about what languages are like. They are theories about what tools we need in order to provide adequate descriptions of individual languages. Originally, the term descriptive was coined to express the distinction between historical or comparative linguistics, which dominated much of 19th century linguistics, and the emerging Structuralist paradigm with its emphasis on the notion of a synchronic system. Structuralist linguistics was also eager to emphasize the impartial and objective nature of its approach to language, refraining from taking a stand in matters of linguistic style and 'good usage. Descriptive is thus also opposed to the tradition of prescriptive grammars and dictionaries which emerged during the formative period

of the modern national languages in Europe. It was only in the sixties, during the rise of generative grammar, that descriptive was used in a third contrast pair, i.e. in contrast to generative, explanatory, or formal, the characterizing attributes of the Chomsky enterprise.

Dryer (2006:3) argues that....A single descriptive theoretical framework has emerged as the dominant theory assumed in descriptive grammars. Dixon (1997) refers to this theoretical framework as "basic linguistic theory. Basic linguistic theory differs most sharply from other contemporary theoretical frameworks in what might be described as its conservativeness: unlike many theoretical frameworks that assume previous ideas only to a limited extent and freely assume many novel concepts, basic linguistic theory takes as much as possible from earlier traditions and only as much as necessary from new traditions. It can thus be roughly described as traditional grammar, minus its bad features (such as a tendency to describe all languages in terms of concepts motivated for European languages), plus necessary concepts absent from traditional grammar. It has supplemented traditional grammar with a variety of ideas from structuralism, generative grammar (especially pre-1975 generative grammar and relational grammar), and typology. Basic linguistic theory differs from traditional grammar most strikingly in its attempt to describe each language in its own terms, rather than trying to force the language into a model based on European languages.

Conversely, the attempt to describe each language in its own terms reflects a major contribution of structuralism to basic linguistic theory. Another example of a major contribution of structuralism to basic linguistic theory is the notion of the phoneme. Various concepts from generative grammar, such as secondary predication, have made their way into basic linguistic theory. Such notions as ergativity, split intransitivity, internally-headed relative clauses, and evidentiality are notions that have become central to basic linguistic theory and which are referred to frequently in descriptive grammars. Recurrent phenomena that had not been explicitly observed before continue to come up in the literature, such as the notion of mirativity (DeLancey1997), and thus become added to the substantive concepts of basic linguistic theory.

Most descriptive grammars written within the past ten or fifteen years can be described as employing basic linguistic theory as their theoretical framework. Basic linguistic theory is traditional grammar modified in various ways by other theoretical traditions over the years, it is therefore an overall theoretical framework encompassing different points of view, and criticisms of specific practices within basic linguistic theory can often be constructed as theory-internal disagreements as easily as criticisms of basic linguistic theory itself. The improvements in basic linguistic theory over the past twenty-five years have not been prompted by specific attempts to improve it, since most linguists have failed to recognize its status as a theoretical framework. Developments have been the side effect of work in typology, and there is every reason to believe

that further developments will continue in coming decades, both because of work in typology and quite possibly from new ideas from some other quarter. However, further improvements might develop if more functional, typological, or descriptive linguists recognized the status of basic linguistic theory as a theory. The basic linguistic theory has emerged as the dominant theoretical framework for describing languages although there is a widespread failure of linguists to recognize its status as a theoretical framework. There are many ways, however, in which the field has suffered from this failure to recognize basic linguistic theory as a theoretical framework and to recognize the need for both descriptive theories and explanatory theories. Givón (2001: xv), in an apparent retreat from his position in some of his earlier work, emphasizes the need to recognize linguistic structure independent of function; if there are functional explanations for why languages are the way they are, we need to have some way of describing the things that are being explained. There is another negative consequence of the failure to distinguish descriptive theory from explanatory theory and to recognize basic linguistic theory as a theory. Because of the false contrast many linguists see between description and theory, and because of the higher prestige associated with what is called theory, work in basic linguistic theory is often dismissed as "merely" descriptive. Thus, if a linguist analyzes a set of data using some transient theory like Minimalism, or Optimality Theory, or Head-driven Phrase Structure Grammar, the analysis will be characterized as "theoretical", but if a linguist analyses a set of data using basic linguistic theory, the analysis will be characterized as descriptive. But this is simply confusing. The

analysis assuming basic linguistic theory is just as theoretical in the sense that it assumes a theoretical framework, just like the other analyses. And the analysis in the transient theory is also descriptive in that it provides a description of the data. Now, it is true that analyses in other theoretical frameworks often do more than describe the data, but make some additional theoretical point that the facts they are describing bear on. But this is usually because the transient theory is not only intended as a descriptive theory but as an explanatory theory as well, and the additional theoretical point being made is at least partly of significance to the explanatory goals of the theory. In addition, the theoretical point involves pointing to the need for some modification to the theory. But the analog happens with descriptions in basic linguistic theory: some theoretical significance is drawn from the facts being described.

3.2 Relevance of the Basic Linguistic Theory to the Present Study

The application of what Dixon (2010) refers to as "basic linguistic theory" is highly relevant to the current study. Dixon (2010) defines this theory as a descriptive framework, precisely suited to the needs of our research. Basic linguistic theory prioritizes describing each language on its own terms rather than attempting to force it into a model based on European languages.

The primary focus of our study is to document agricultural terms in the Ilaje dialect. This involves meticulously examining and discussing the collected data concerning various

agricultural processes and activities in Ilaje. The theory elucidates the structure and characteristics of these words in the language, enabling us to analyze the data to uncover patterns and regularities. Thus, the selection of basic linguistic theory is fitting due to its adaptable nature, allowing the researcher to closely align with empirical data. By embracing basic linguistic theory, our study can circumvent the pitfalls of imposing external structures onto the Ilaje dialect. Instead, it facilitates a more nuanced understanding of the unique nature of its agricultural terms. This approach ensures that our analysis remains faithful to the intricacies of the Ilaje dialect, thereby enhancing the quality and validity of our research findings.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

4.0 Introduction

This chapter contains the presentation and analysis of the study, focusing on the categorization, morphological structures, semantic roles, and cultural implications of agricultural terms in Ilaje language. The analysis aims to unravel the intricacies of how the language encapsulates the diverse aspects of agricultural activities within the Ilaje community.

4.1 Crop Terminologies

S/N	ENGLISH	ILAJE
1.	Fertilizer	Ajílẹ̀
2.	Chemicals(plural)	Àghan kẹ̀míkà
3.	rain	Òjò
4.	Manure	Ajílẹ̀
5.	Conservation	Ìkópamá
6.	Vegetables	Ewé (if edible Èfọ̀)
7.	Wheat	Àlikámà
8.	Crop Production	Okoipàrọ̀-èho

Analysis

1. Vegetables (Ewé) (if edible Èfó):

"Ewé" generally refers to plants cultivated for their edible parts, including leaves, stems, or roots, while "èfó" specifies leafy vegetables.

Example: Efo- efo yi gha n'oko mi ti gbo (the vegetables in my farm is ripe for harvest)

2. Fertilizer (Ajílẹ̀):

This term refers to a substance or material used to enrich the soil and promote plant growth.

3. Chemicals (Plural) (Àghan kẹ́míkà):

This term refers to chemical substances or compounds used in agriculture, such as pesticides, herbicides, or fertilizers.

4. Rain (Òjò):

This term denotes precipitation in the form of water falling from the sky, which is essential for crop irrigation and growth, in ilaje it could be rain or mist, but are considered to be called "Òjò"

5. Manure (Ajílẹ̀):

In this context, "ajílẹ̀" likely refers to organic matter derived from animal waste or decomposed plant material used to fertilize soil.

6. Conservation (Ìkópamá):

This term suggests the action or process of conserving natural resources or protecting the environment in agricultural practices.

7. Wheat (Àlikámà):

This term denotes a cereal grain crop commonly cultivated for its edible seeds, which are used in various food products.

8. Crop Production (Okoipàrò-èho):

This term refers to the process of cultivating, growing, and harvesting crops for human consumption or other purposes.

Observation

From the analysis it is observed from the data that Ilaje language crop agricultural terms encapsulate traditional farming practices, techniques, and knowledge passed down through generations. By preserving and using these terms, the language serves as a repository for indigenous agricultural wisdom, safeguarding valuable cultural heritage. Ilaje language crop

agricultural terms often comprise specialized vocabulary tailored to the unique agricultural environment, crops, and farming methods of the Ilaje people. This specialized lexicon enables precise communication among farmers, researchers, and agricultural practitioners, facilitating effective collaboration and knowledge exchange within the community.

4.2 Cultivating/Tillage Terms

S/N	ENGLISH	ILAJE
1.	Tear	Ya
2.	Push	Tì
3.	Swim (of Fish)	gwẹ̀
4.	Build	kọ́
5.	Cut	Gé
6.	Support	sèrànwọ́
7.	Tread (on something)	rẹ̀n
8.	climb	pọ̀n
9.	Mate	Gùn

10.	Spray (somebody with medicine by mouth)	fón
11.	Germinate	rà málè
12.	Transport (to-and-for)	lọyú-lọbò
13.	Differ, Differentiate	yàtò, Wànnón
14.	Split	pẹn
15.	Tie	Dì
16.	Cut (grass)	kọ
17.	Tighten	fón
18.	To Plant (seed and tuber)	Bò
19.	To plant (stem)	Bò
20.	To harvest (maize)	Ká
21.	To harvest (tubers and nuts like groundnut)	Yin
22.	To harvest (Pluck fruits)	Ká
23.	To peel (maize)	Bó
24.	To peel (tuber)	Bó

25.	Clearing the remains of a bush after burning	Pa oko òn
26.	Clearing of a virgin farm	Pa oko òn
27.	Pluck	Ká
28.	Pour	Dà
29.	Fence(noun)	Ìrògbà
30.	Lift	gbe nóòkè
31.	Peel	Bó
32.	Shake	Mímí
33.	Measure	Wàn
34.	Mould	Ma/sùn-ún mára
35.	Squeeze	Fọ́n
36.	Press (of fruit)	Fọ́n

Analysis

This term likely indicates the action of throwing seeds or materials onto the soil during planting or sowing.

9. Tear (Ya):

The term refers to the action of tearing or breaking apart soil during cultivation or tillage.

10. Push (Ti):

This term likely indicates the action of pushing or moving soil or vegetation during agricultural activities.

11. Swim (of Fish) (Gwè):

This term refers to the swimming motion of fish and may not be directly related to cultivating or tillage activities.

12. Build (Kó):

This term signifies the action of building or forming structures related to agriculture, such as mounds or raised beds.

Example: Ko- Mo ti mi ko ile eja (I am building a fish house)

13. Cut (Gé):

This term indicates the action of cutting, which may be relevant to clearing vegetation or harvesting crops.

14. Support (Sèránwọ́):

This term likely refers to providing support to plants or structures within the agricultural context.

15. Tread (on something) (Rẹ̀n):

This term denotes the action of treading or stepping on something, which may relate to compacting soil or walking on agricultural land.

16. Throw (Pọ̀n):

Observation

From the observation, these Ilaje agricultural terminology include cultivating; the production and tillage terms involves the care and management of soil for crop growth, tillage focuses on mechanical soil manipulation to prepare for planting, and production encompasses the entire agricultural process from cultivation to harvest and beyond. Together, these Ilaje agricultural terms play crucial roles in sustainable agriculture, ensuring the efficient and effective production of food and other agricultural products to support human populations and economies worldwide.

4.3 Processing Terms

S/N	ENGLISH	ILAJE
1.	Cut (with hands)	se(if hard) pen(if soft)
2.	Cutting	mí ge
3.	Pushing	mí tii
4.	Counting	mí kaa
5.	Carrying	mí gbé
6.	Bending(verb)	mí kakò
7.	Dividing	mí pen
8.	Planting	mí bò
9.	Packing	mí gbajọ
10.	Lifting	mí gbe nókè
11.	Grinding	mí lẹ̀
12.	Burning	mí jó
13.	Picking	mí sà

14.	Bending	mí kakò
15.	Wrapping	mí wé

Analysis

17. Cutting (Mí ge):

This term denotes the action or process of cutting, possibly with a tool or instrument.

18. Pushing (Mí tii):

This term signifies the action or process of pushing something, exerting force in a particular direction.

19. Counting (Mí kàá):

This term denotes the action or process of counting, determining the number of items or objects present.

20. Carrying (Mí gbé):

This term indicates the action or process of carrying or transporting something from one place to another.

21. Bending (Verb) (Mí kakò):

This term signifies the action or process of bending, flexing, or curving something.

22. Dividing (Mí pẹn):

This term denotes the action or process of dividing or splitting something into smaller parts.

23. Planting (Mí bọ̀):

This term indicates the action or process of planting seeds or seedlings into the soil for cultivation.

24. Packing (Mí gbajọ̀):

This term denotes the action or process of packing or packaging something for storage, transportation, or sale.

25. Lifting (Mí gbe nókè):

This term signifies the action or process of lifting or raising something upwards.

26. Grinding (Mí lọ̀):

This term denotes the action or process of grinding or crushing something into smaller particles or powder.

27. Burning (Mí jọ̀):

This term signifies the action or process of burning or incinerating something with fire.

28. Picking (Mí sà):

This term denotes the action or process of picking or harvesting something, such as fruits or crops.

29. Bending (Mí kakò): (Repeated term)

This term signifies the action or process of bending, flexing, or curving something.

30. Wrapping (Mí wé):

This term denotes the action or process of wrapping or enclosing something with a covering material.

Observation

From the observation the analysis provides insights into the function and meaning of processing agricultural terminologies in the Ilaje language, highlighting their relevance to various agricultural activities and practices, their relevance includes describing all the process that involves the tilling and cultivation of crops.

4.4 Livestock Terminologies

S/N	ENGLISH	ILAJE
1.	Sheep	Àgùntàn

2.	Poultry	ilé-ẹyẹ
3.	Livestock	Ẹran ọhèn
4.	Chicken	Ẹdiyẹ
5.	Chick	Ọma ẹyẹ
6.	Cattle	Igbo-ẹran

Analysis

31. Sheep: (Àgùntàn):

"àgùntàn" is sometimes used interchangeably with "àgbáwòn" in some ilaje dialects for "sheep".

This term signifies the characteristic or action associated with the sheep.

32. Poultry: (Ilé-ẹyẹ): This term is composed of "Ilé" and "ẹyẹ."

"Ilé": This agricultural term typically refers to a house or dwelling place. In this context, it denotes denote a place where the birds are kept while "Ẹyẹ" signifies birds or fowl.

33. Livestock: Eran òhèn: This term is formed by combining "Eran" and "òhèn." Which together means livestock cared for by humans

34. Chicken: Eḍiyẹ: This term signifies word for chicken. In Ilaje

Example: Ediye- ediye mi ti mi yen eghen (My chicken is laying eggs)

35. Chick: Oḡma ẹyẹ: This term consists of "Oḡma" and "ẹyẹ."

"Oḡma": This term refers to something small or young, fitting for describing a chick.

"Eḡyẹ": As mentioned earlier, this signifies birds or fowl.

36. Cattle: Igbo-ẹran: This term comprises "Igbo" and "ẹran."

"Igbo": This term denote a group or collection of animals, as "igbo" in Ilaje typically refers to a forest or a large group.

"Eran": As seen before, this term denotes animals or livestock.

Observation

This analysis offers insights into how terms function and what they signify in the Ilaje language concerning livestock agricultural terminologies.

4.5 Farming Equipment Terminologies

S/N	ENGLISH	ILAJE
1.	Filter	Ahẹ
2.	Pesticide	Apakòkòrò
3.	Nitrogen	Náítójìn
4.	Feed Grain	Èho óúnjẹ-ẹran
5.	Fertilizer	Ajílẹ
6.	Chemicals(plural)	Àghan kẹmíkà

Analysis

37. Filter: Ahẹ: This term refers to the equipment or function of filtering.

38. Pesticide: Apakòkòrò: This term refers to; "Apa": something that kills or eliminates pests and "Kòkòrò": which is pests or insects.

Example: Mo mi la ra apakokoro hun oko efo mi (I am going to buy pesticide for my vegetable farm)

39. Nitrogen: Náítójìn: This term seems to be borrowed directly from the English word "nitrogen".

40. Feed Grain Èho óúnjẹ-ẹran: This term consists of multiple terms in one.

"Èho": This denote something edible or consumable.

"Óúnjẹ": This signifies food or grain.

"Ẹran": As seen before, this refers to animals or livestock.

41. Fertilizer: Ajílẹ̀: This term explains what gives nutrient to the ground

42. Chemicals (plural): Àghan kẹ́míkà: This term consists of; "Àghan": indicates plurality or multiple instances. "Kẹ́míkà": This directly corresponds to the English term "chemicals", this it is a borrowed word

Observation

The terms for equipment in Ilaje dialect shows how some words are borrowed and modified from English language directly, example is the word Chemicals (plural): Àghan kẹ́míkà: This term consists of two morphemes which are borrowed

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

5.0 Introduction

This chapter talks about the summary, findings and conclusions of the study.

5.1 Summary

In this study, we embarked on a documentation of Ilaje agricultural verbs, delving into the intricate web of language, culture, and agricultural practices within the Ilaje community of Ondo State, Nigeria. By employing the lens of linguistics, particularly within the framework of Basic linguistics theory, we aimed to unravel the rich tapestry of agricultural terminology in the Ilaje language, shedding light on its categories, function, meaning, and sociocultural dimensions.

This investigation commenced with a comprehensive overview of linguistics as an interdisciplinary field, emphasizing its role in illuminating the significance of language and its intimate connection with culture. Within the diverse linguistic landscape of Nigeria, the Ilaje language emerged as a focal point of our inquiry due to its prominence in the western region,

intertwined with the agrarian lifestyle of the Ilaje people. The primary objectives guiding our research included compiling a comprehensive list of agricultural terms, exploring their morphological and syntactic characteristics, investigating semantic nuances, and elucidating cultural and sociolinguistic implications.

Methodologically, this study employed a combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches, drawing on interviews with native Ilaje speakers, observations of farming activities, written texts, folklore, and existing linguistic resources to construct a robust dataset. The adoption of the basic linguistics theory provided a theoretical framework for our analysis, which was complemented by linguistic tools and methods such as documentation and semantic analysis.

Through the analysis, several significant observations emerged. Firstly, we noted the richness of agricultural vocabulary in the Ilaje language, indicative of the community's deep engagement with farming practices and their reliance on agriculture for sustenance. Semantic specificity was also evident, with distinct terms delineating different aspects of farming activities, showcasing the precision in categorizing agricultural phenomena.

Furthermore, this analysis revealed instances of borrowing and adaptation, wherein modern scientific concepts were incorporated into the traditional agricultural lexicon, underscoring the adaptive capacity of the Ilaje people. Dual functionality of certain terms highlighted their

pragmatic approach towards agricultural resources, while environmental awareness was evidenced by terminology related to conservation, reflecting a holistic approach to agriculture.

Importantly, the agricultural terminologies in the Ilaje language served as repositories of traditional knowledge and cultural heritage, preserving centuries-old farming practices and wisdom. Their practicality and utility facilitated effective communication among farmers and ensured efficient management of agricultural resources.

5.2 findings

From the analysis of the Ilaje agricultural terminologies, several significant observations can be made:

Richness of Agricultural Vocabulary: The Ilaje language demonstrates a rich vocabulary related to agriculture, encompassing various aspects such as crops, equipment, techniques, and natural phenomena. This richness reflects the community's deep engagement with agricultural practices and their reliance on farming for sustenance and livelihood.

Semantic Specificity: Many agricultural terms in Ilaje exhibit semantic specificity, with distinct terms for different aspects of farming activities. For example, the distinction between "èfó" (leafy vegetables) and "èho" (grain) showcases the precision in categorizing different types of crops and produce.

Borrowing and Adaptation: Some agricultural terms in Ilaje appear to be borrowed or adapted from other languages, such as English. For instance, "kémikà" for chemicals and "Náítójìn" for nitrogen suggest the incorporation of modern scientific concepts into the traditional agricultural lexicon.

Dual Functionality: Certain terms, like "Ajílẹ̀" (used for both fertilizer and manure), highlight the pragmatic approach of the Ilaje people towards agricultural resources. This dual functionality underscores their efficient use of organic materials to enhance soil fertility.

Environmental Awareness: The presence of terms like "Ìkópamá" (conservation) indicates a level of environmental awareness and concern within the Ilaje community. This suggests a holistic approach to agriculture that considers the long-term sustainability of natural resources and ecosystems.

Cultural Heritage Preservation: The agricultural terminologies in the Ilaje language serve as repositories of traditional knowledge and cultural heritage. They reflect centuries-old farming practices, techniques, and wisdom passed down through generations, contributing to the preservation of the community's cultural identity.

Practicality and Utility: The agricultural terms in Ilaje demonstrate a focus on practicality and utility, with precise terminology tailored to specific agricultural activities and processes. This

facilitates effective communication among farmers and ensures the efficient management of agricultural resources.

Overall, the analysis reveals the depth of agricultural knowledge embedded within the Ilaje language, highlighting the community's intimate connection with the land and its resources, as well as their adaptive capacity in response to changing agricultural practices and environmental conditions.

5.3 Conclusion

In conclusion, this exploration of Ilaje agricultural verbs has not only provided a glimpse into the linguistic intricacies of the Ilaje language but also offered profound insights into the profound connection between language, culture, and agriculture within the Ilaje community. Through the lens of documentation, we have uncovered layers of meaning embedded within agricultural terminology, reflecting not only the practicalities of farming but also the values, traditions, and environmental consciousness of the Ilaje people.

The richness of the Ilaje agricultural vocabulary speaks volumes about the community's deep-rooted engagement with the land and its resources. Each term carries with it a wealth of knowledge passed down through generations, encapsulating centuries-old farming practices and indigenous wisdom. This linguistic heritage serves as a testament to the resilience and

adaptability of the Ilaje people in navigating the dynamic landscape of agriculture, while also contributing to the preservation of their cultural identity.

Furthermore, this analysis has highlighted the environmental consciousness inherent within the Ilaje agricultural lexicon. Terms related to conservation and sustainable practices underscore a holistic approach to farming that prioritizes the long-term health of the ecosystem. This reflects not only an awareness of environmental challenges but also a commitment to responsible stewardship of the land for future generations.

Looking ahead, further research in this area holds tremendous potential for advancing our understanding of the intricate interplay between language, culture, and agriculture on a global scale. By delving deeper into the linguistic nuances of agricultural terminology across diverse linguistic communities, we can gain deeper insights into the ways in which language shapes agricultural landscapes and vice versa. This interdisciplinary approach not only enriches our knowledge of linguistics but also informs sustainable agricultural practices and cultural preservation efforts worldwide.

In essence, this study underscores the significance of linguistic analysis in unraveling the multifaceted relationship between language, culture, and agriculture. By appreciating the nuances of agricultural terminology, we can gain a deeper appreciation for the rich tapestry of

human experience and the profound ways in which language reflects and shapes our interactions with the natural world.

REFERENCES

- Alshami, I. (2019) *Language and Linguistics*. Amarah: university of Misan press
- Babarinde, O., & Ahamefula, N. (2013). Morphophonological deviation in Yoruba: Its implication for communication. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 3, 14.
- Bamigbade, O. (2020). *Language Shift and Lexical Merger a Case Study of Ìlájẹ and Àpòí*. Obafemi Awolowo University.
- Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Reppen, R. (1998). *Corpus Linguistics: Investigating Language Structure and Use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bihari D (2023) Noam Chomsky's Language Structure and Language Use: A Critique. *Research Journal of English Language and Literature*. Vol. 11. Issue 1
- Chomsky, N. (1953). Systems of Syntactic Analysis. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 18(3), 242-256.
- Conrad, J. M. (1999). *Resource Economics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal D. (1987) *A Dictionary of linguistics*. Oxford: Network prints
- Crystal D. (2003) *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. (6th ed.). London: Black well.

- David, H. and Dorian, F. (2014). *Agriculture: Definition and Overview*. New York: Springer Printing Press. Pp 104-113. 10.1007/978-1-4419-0465-2_64.
- Dixon R. M.W. (1997) *The Rise and Fall of Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dixon, R. M. W. (2010) *Basic Linguistic Theory Volume1*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Dryer, M.S. (2006). Descriptive theories, explanatory theories, and basic linguistic theory. *Catching language: the standing challenge of grammar writing*. Ameka, F. ; Dench, A.; & Evans, N. Eds. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter 207 -234
- Hakeem A. (2018) *Definition of Language by Different Scholars and Linguists*, retrieved from <https://englishfinders.com/definition-of-language-by-scholars/>
- Halliday M.A.K(1989) *Spoken and written language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Japhet, A. (2012). *The morphosyntax of pronouns in the Ìlàjẹ dialect of Yorùbá* (Doctoral dissertation, MPhil Dissertation. University of Ibadan. Ibadan. xv+ 123pp).
- Labov, W. (2007) Sociolinguistics an interview with William Labov. *Revista virtual de Estuda da Linguagem, Revel* vol. 5, No. 9
- Lyons, J. (1981) *Language and Linguistics*: Cambridge University Press.

Schleicher, A. (2016). La teoría de Darwin y la Lingüística. Carta abierta al Dr. Ernst Haeckel, Profesor Extraordinario de Zoología y director del Museo Zoológico en la Universidad de Jena. *Revista argentina de historiografía lingüística*, 6(2), 123-134.

Sinclair, D. (1997). Self-regulation versus command and control? *Beyond false dichotomies. Law & Policy*, 19(4), 529-559.

Weidhaas, T., & Schmid, H. J. (2015). Diminutive verbs in German: semantic analysis and theoretical implications. *Morphology*, 25, 183-227.