

**A MORPHOSEMANTIC ANALYSIS OF YORUBA AGENTIVE
NOMINALIZATIONS**

BY

**ODUNUGA OLUWASEUN MOYINOLUWA
ART2100806**

**DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS STUDIES
FACULTY OF ARTS
UNIVERSITY OF BENIN
BENIN CITY**

OCTOBER, 2025

**A MORPHOSEMANTIC ANALYSIS OF YORUBA AGENTIVE
NOMINALIZATIONS**

BY

**ODUNUGA OLUWASEUN MOYINOLUWA
ART2100806**

**A PROJECT SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS
STUDIES, UNIVERSITY OF BENIN, BENIN CITY, EDO STATE. IN PARTIAL
FULFULMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF THE
DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF ARTS, LINGUISTICS STUDIES, UNIVERSITY
OF BENIN, BENIN CITY, EDO STATE.**

OCTOBER, 2025

APPROVAL PAGE

I certify that this project work was carried out by **ODUNUGA OLUWASEUN MOYINOLUWA (Matric No. ART2100806)** in the Department of Linguistics, Studies, University of Benin, Benin City, Edo State.

ODUNUGA OLUWASEUN MOYINOLUWA
(Author)

DATE

DR. P. USENBO
(Project Supervisor)

DATE

DR. (MRS.) P.O. SOLOMON- ETEFIA
(Head of Department)

DATE

PLAGARISM CERTIFICATION

I, **ODUNUGA OLUWASEUN MOYINOLUWA** with the matriculation number **ART2100806** declare that this work titled “**A MORPHOSEMANTIC ANALYSIS OF YORUBA AGENTIVE NOMINALIZATIONS**” has successfully passed the anti-plagiarism test (with a score of 5 %) and so does not violate any copyright regulations.

Signed: _____
ODUNUGA OLUWASEUN MOYINOLUWA

Date: _____

DEDICATION

I dedicated this project to God Almighty for seeing me through from starting of this journey in school and even to the end.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My gratitude goes firstly to God Almighty for holding my hands through the journey of this school. I also want to appreciate firstly my parents Mr Wale Odunuga and Miss Ladipo Oluwakemi for their financial, emotional and physical support; I wouldn't have made it this far without it. I also want to appreciate my sister Odunuga Oluwadamilola for her support in this journey; thank you for staying with me till the very end. To my grandma, Kehinde Sabina, thank you for your prayers and words of encouragements; it a lot meant to me. To my amiable supervisor, Dr. P. Usenbo, I want to appreciate for your corrections in the course of this research work; I wouldn't have made it here without your advices and corrections.

I sincerely appreciate the efforts of my lecturers who have helped to shaped my life academically: Prof. M. S. Agbo, Dr. (Mrs.) O. V. Evbayiro, Dr. (Mrs.) O. R. Osewa, Dr. (Mrs.) I. N. G. Essien, Dr. G. O. Agharuwa, Mr. F. Ajala. To my friend who turned brother, Ayokunle Modupe, thank you for the constant check-ups, support and love you have shown me; it always puts a smile on my face. Special thanks to Mr Olayemi for his support and care. I also want to appreciate my friend who stuck with me from 100 level even till now, Awele, thank you for your advices, love and care. To my family given to me by God in school, CASOR UNIBEN/UBTH, thank you for holding my hands through it all, your words of encouragements, prayers and care towards me is not taken for granted.

To my Pastor and friend, Ezeifeduba Ifeanyichukwu, thank you for coming into my life when I needed it the most, your sacrifices, love, care and words of encouragements always rings in my ears. To my new found friend, Etchie Temisanrenworitse, thank you for holding my hands through this final year journey; your presence means a lot to me. To my friend, Ndazhaga Namaba, thank you for the advices and always giving me a listening ear. To my first family in school, Uahomo Marvellous, Precious, Deborah, Promise, Aduragbemi and Ruth, thank you for sticking with me to the very end, I do not take our bond for granted. To my dearest friends, Momoh Emmanuella and Ezech Glory, thank you for every word of prayer and advices you gave me; it made my days better.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title Page	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	i
Approval Page-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	ii
Plagiarism Certification	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	iii
Dedication	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	iv
Acknowledgements	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	v
Table of Contents	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	viii
Abstract	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	xi

CHAPTER ONE: GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1.0 Background of the Study	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
1.1 Yoruba Language and the Speakers	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
1.2 Methodology	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
1.3 Statement of the Problem	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
1.4 Purpose of the Study	-	-	-	-	-	--	-	-	-	4
1.5 Research Questions	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5

1.6 Significance of the Study -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
1.7 Summary -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW									
2.0 Introduction	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
2.1 Conceptual Review	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
2.1.1 Concept of Nominalizations in Linguistics	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8
2.1.2 Agentive Nominalization	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9
2.1.3 The Function of Thematic Roles in Agentive Nominalization -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10
2.2 Morphological Processes in Yoruba Agentive Word Formation -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11
2.2.1 Prefixation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11
2.2.2 Reduplication	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12
2.3 Semantic Fields and Roles in Agentive Nouns -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12
2.4 Previous Studies -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13
2.5 Concern of the Study	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15
2.6 Summary -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16

CHAPTER THREE: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

3.0 Introduction	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17
3.1 Lexeme-Based Morphology	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17
3.2 Morphosemantic Analysis of Yoruba Agentive Nominalization: A Lexeme-Based Morphology	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	19
3.3 Summary	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	19

CHAPTER FOUR: DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

4.0 Introduction	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	21
4.1 Data Presentation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	21
4.2 Morphosemantics Analysis of Yoruba Agentive Nominalization-								-	27
4.3 Findings - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	72
4.4 Summary	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	73

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

5.0 Introduction	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	74
5.1 Summary of Findings-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	74
5.2 Conclusion	-	-	--	-	-	-	-	-	75
5.3 Recommendations-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	75
References	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	77

ABSTRACT

This work is centered on showing the morphosemantic relationship that exists in agentive nominalizations. It shows the interplay between semantics and morphology with the use of the Lexeme-Based Morphology framework in which the smallest unit of a word is a lexeme. This framework examines how base lexemes which can be nouns or verbs are transformed into agentive nominals which depicts an individual being the doer of an action. The data used for this research work were secondary sources which are from past works of this topic. The findings of this work indicated that most Yoruba agentive nominalizations are usually formed through prefixation and a few are formed through reduplication. The prefix “oni-” was used in the derivation of agentive nominals. The semantic interpretation of agentive nominals showed that these derived nouns are divided into occupational, status, habitual and legal roles as a semantic field. It was also noted that the thematic role for these derived forms are Agents which means that each of them are the ones who performs an action. The findings of this research work bring to limelight the morphosemantic relationship that exists in the derivation of agentive nominals

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.0 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Language is more than just a medium of communication, it also involves the way how new words are formed or derived. These words when formed, represents entities, individual roles and ideas. There are many ways words are being derived and one of them includes; nominalization. Nominalization defined by Lieber (2004), refers it to the morphological process of forming nouns from other parts of speech, especially verbs and adjectives; and it often reflects a shift in syntactic category and semantic interpretation. Nominalization, in other words can be defined as the forming of nouns that denote the agent or doer of an action. These nouns when derived, represents human professions, habitual actions and identities in any language.

Yoruba agentive nouns are usually formed through various morphological processes such as prefixation and reduplication. These morphological processes are governed by language internal rules; they are not arbitrary. Agentive nouns not only depict the actions behind the words but also show the social roles attached to them. Previous studies have investigated various aspect of Yoruba morphology and nominalization such as Owolabi (1995) who laid a foundational study of Yoruba

phonology and morphology, listing the key derivational processes. Owoeye (2013) who worked on *The Comparative Study of Morphological Constructed Agent Nouns in French and Yoruba*, shows the different morphological process used in the agent nominalizations of French and Yoruba and many more individuals has worked on this study.

The combination of morphology and semantics in this work is unique and has not yet been explored yet. Most who delved into this area treated both distinctively and not collectively; the semantic field of these agentive nominal lexemes were not accounted for. Yoruba agentive nominalizations are more than showing the morphological process involved but showing the nuances of these derived words which shows status, occupation or profession and even cultural meanings.

1.1 YORUBA LANGUAGE AND THE SPEAKERS

The Yoruba language is one of the major languages spoken in Nigeria. It belongs to the Niger-Congo language family. It is spoken in the southwestern part of Nigeria (Okebiorun, 2022). The Yoruba language is not only spoken in Nigeria, but in communities in Benin, Liberia and other parts of West Africa, Cuba, Puerto Rico, Dominican Republic, Trinidad and Togo (Adeoye, 2010). The number of Yoruba speakers, were estimated to be about 40 million (Unuabonah & Oyebola, 2021).

According to the *Ethnologue of World Languages*, there are about twenty-one dialects of the Yoruba language; these includes Ao, Aworo, Bunu (Bini), Ekiti, Ijebu,

Ondo, Wo, Iworo, Yagba, Gbedde, Egba, Oyo, Owe, Ila, Jumu, Igbonna, Akono, Ikale, Ilaje, Ijesha and Awori. The Oyo dialect is regarded as the standard Yoruba (Ajeigbe, 1977). The Yoruba language has seven oral vowels [a, e, ε, i, o, o, u] and five nasal vowels [ã, ε, i, ɔ, u] (Okebirorun, 2022). According to Bangbose (1965) in his work “A Grammar of Yoruba”, he identified consonants phonemes in the Yoruba language [p, b, t, d, k, g, f, s, s, g, m, n, n, l, r, y, w, gb]. There are three tones presents in the Yoruba language namely; high tone (´), low tone (˘) and the mid tone which is unmarked and only the vowels carry these tone marks.

1.2 METHODOLOGY

This research work adopts qualitative method of acquiring data by relying on secondary data existing from other linguistic works. The data used for this analysis includes previously documented examples of agentive nominalizations in the Yoruba language. This research will make use of data found in works such as Owoeye (2013) and Oyinloye (2021). These works contain a vast range of agentive nominalization in the Yoruba language which will be analyzed using the Lexeme-based Morphology. This work does not involve direct fieldwork whereby there was an informant to collect data but rather focuses only existing data from past works of different scholars.

1.3 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Agentive nominalization is basically a concept that depicts an individual being a doer of a particular action. In words like oníbatà which means “a person that sells

shoes”; “bàtà” which means “shoe” and “oní-” is a prefix that when added to a word gives an individual an agent role. Nominalization, according to Leech (2006) defined it as a process whereby a grammatical construction or lexical item that functions as verb or adjectives is converted into a noun or noun phrase. Though this field has been explored but under the emphasis of the morphological and phonological areas; leaving the semantic nuances of these words behind.

The semantic field or roles of these lexemes have been neglected such as habitual, social function, agency or cultural meanings. Yoruba agentive forms have been discussed but these works rely heavily on morpheme-based frameworks leaving a gap between the meanings embedded in these words and their morphological structure. This research seeks to address this gap by providing a comprehensive morphosemantic account of Yoruba agentive nominalizations using the Lexeme-based Morphology as a framework to show the relation between these words and their meaning.

1.4 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to show how morphology and semantics can be encoded in agentive nominalizations of the Yoruba language. It examines how morphological and semantic structures are incorporated together.

This work seeks to capture how root verbs are transformed into nouns that denote agents through the use of the Lexeme-based Morphology framework. It will

also include the examining of semantic content and thematic roles while categorizing these lexemes into their various semantic fields.

1.5 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This work seeks to answer the following questions;

1. What morphological processes are used in forming agentive nouns in Yoruba?
2. What semantics fields do these agentive nouns typically fall into?
3. How can these formations be classified and interpreted using Lexeme-based Morphology?

1.6 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The Yoruba language is one of the major languages in Nigeria and agentive nominalizations have not been fully explored. This work contributes to the documentation of the Yoruba language which helps in the continuous learning, richness and preservation of the language. This work also adds to the expansion of the theoretical understanding of how word-formation process relates to meaning by the usage of the Lexeme-based Morphology framework. It contributes to the thoughts patterns that word formation process not only includes the studying of their morphological or phonological structures but also includes the semantic approaches of each word. In essence, this study serves as an eye opener on Yoruba agentive

nominalizations by the incorporating of morphology and semantics thereby filling the linguistic gap.

1.7 SUMMARY

This chapter begins with laying the foundation of this study which includes the meaning and detailed information of agentive nominalizations in the Yoruba language. It then goes further to show the richness of the Yoruba language and their speakers which includes the listing of their sounds both vowels and consonants along with their tone marker and have twenty-one dialects. The statement of problem highlights the gap between the study seeks to cover which seeks to cover which is showing the morpho-semantic analysis of Yoruba agentive nominalization which has not been explored yet.

In the significance of the study, it showed the impact of this work on the preservation of the language and the theoretical expansion of the view of Yoruba agentive nominalizations. More so, this chapter laid the foundation of this research work by providing, outlining and justifying the relevance and importance of their study.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 INTRODUCTION

This chapter is divided into three sections. Section 2.1 discusses the overview of concepts related to this study which are nominalization, agentive nominalization and thematic role. Section 2.2 discusses the various morphological processes involved in Yoruba word formation such as prefixation and reduplication.

Section 2.3 entails information on the various semantic roles and fields in agentive nominalizations. Section 2.4 gives a detailed insight on previous works relating to this study. Section 2.5 provides the concern of this research work; what distinguishes it from others. Section 2.6 gives a summary of everything discussed in sections listed above.

2.1 CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

The overview of these concepts related to this study is very crucial and important as it lays the foundation of these terminologies that will be used throughout

the course of this study. The detailed discussion of these terms will help to provide a background knowledge for easy understanding and comprehension. This overview shows the intricacies of these concepts as well as their significance in the language and linguistics as a whole.

The following are the concepts involved in this research;

1. Concept of nominalization
2. Agentive nominalization
3. The function of thematic roles in agentive nominalization

2.1.1 CONCEPT OF NOMINALIZATIONS IN LINGUISTICS

Nominalization can be defined as the transformation of verb phrase into a noun phrase, often involving the addition of derivational affix and a change in syntactic category (Chomsky, 1970). Nominalization is an important process in the field of linguistics especially in areas such as morphology and syntax in the formation of words. Nominalization changes the syntactic category of word; it changes other grammatical categories to noun categories. Nominalization is one of the most productive processes in morphology, allowing verbs and adjectives to be turned into nouns that name actions, agents, results or states (Aronoff & Fudeman, 2011).

According to Geert Booij (2007) defined nominalization as a word formation process in which a base lexeme is assigned the category of a noun, allowing it to

function syntactically as a nominal element. In summary, nominalization is a crucial concept in the study of linguistics and different languages in which the Yoruba language is among. This process is very common in every language as it enriches a language's vocabulary.

2.1.2 AGENTIVE NOMINALIZATION

Many Yoruba scholars such as Bamgbose (1967), Oyelaran (1970) and Yusuf (1998) has defined agentive nominalizations as the morphological process through which verbs are derived into nouns that denote the agent; the person or entity responsible for performing the action expressed by the verb. According to Awoyale (1985), Yoruba agentive nouns “are primarily formed through the addition of a vowel prefix such as “a” or “o” to a verb root with accompanying tonal changes that marks the nominal status of the form”. For example, the word “akẹkọ̀ọ̀” which means “student” is from the verb “kọ̀” which means “to learn”. This example shows the relationship between the agency and verbal action.

Lieber (2004) said that agentive nominalization involves “a derivational process that forms a noun denoting the agent of an action from a verb base”. Oyelaran (1970), in his work emphasizes these agentive words represents habitual or occupational activity and nominalization process in Yoruba is semantically and

syntactically productive. He also noted that these derivations not only entail grammatical category change but also incorporates thematic roles.

In sum, agentive nominalizations as noted by these scholars are word formation processes that encodes in them semantic interpretation and morphological changes which denotes agency and action incorporated in a single lexical item.

2.1.3 THE FUNCTION OF THEMATIC ROLES IN AGENTIVE NOMINALIZATION

Thematic roles or theta roles according to Radford (2009) are semantic roles assigned by predicates (typically verbs) to their arguments to indicate the function each argument plays in the event described by the verb. Thematic roles are crucial concepts that enable a comprehensive understanding of how meaning is preserved and changed when verbs are being nominalized. These roles describe the semantic function that participants in events does; such as agent, experiencer, theme and many others.

In all of these thematic roles mentioned above the agent role is the most important to agentive nominalizations as it is the role that shows the entity that is responsible for performing the action expressed by the verb. Thematic roles such as agent, theme, experiencer; are general labels used to indicate the semantic relationship between the verb and the noun phrase in a sentence (Yule, 2010). The inclusion of

thematic roles in this study brings to limelight the meanings or semantic properties of a particular entity in a derived noun therefore bring a nuanced understanding of such concept.

Theta roles are assigned to syntactic constituents (typically NPs) and define their role with respect to the verb's argument structure (Haegeman, 1994).

2.2 MORPHOLOGICAL PROCESSES IN YORUBA AGENTIVE WORD FORMATION

Morphological processes can be defined as the set of operations that create new words or modify existing words, often by manipulating morphemes, that is, the smallest unit of meaning (Spencer, 1991). Morphological processes are basically a set of operations that changes or creates new words from existing lexemes. According to Aronoff and Fudeman (2011), they defined morphological processes as formal mechanisms that describe how words are built from roots and affixes and how meaning is added or changed through these structures.

There exist various morphological processes in the formation of Yoruba words such as affixation, reduplication, compounding, conversion, clipping and tone change.

In this study, the morphological processes to be discussed are those involved in the derivation of agentive nominalizations.

2.2.1 PREFIXATION

Katamba (1993) defined prefixation as a morphological process in which an affix is attached at the beginning of a root or base word to modify its meaning or grammatical function. Prefixation is a morphological process whereby a bound morpheme known as a prefix is attached to the beginning of a word to modify its meaning. Yoruba agentive nominalization makes use of this morphological process in the derivation of these lexemes with the use of “o-”, “a-” and others. Prefixation involves adding a bound morpheme to the start of a base to create a derived word (Bauer, 2003).

2.2.2 REDUPLICATION

Inkelas and Zoll (2005) described reduplication as the repetition of phonological base to fulfill a morphological requirement. In their work, they emphasized that reduplication is a linguistic process that is done with structural motivation which are both governed by morphological and phonological rules. In the Yoruba language, reduplication is used mostly to express a repeated action or to increase the intensity of a meaning of a word. It is a process that involves the copying of a word to express grammatical meaning (Moravesik, 1978).

2.3 SEMANTIC FIELDS AND ROLES IN AGENTIVE NOUNS

Semantic fields can be defined as a set of expressions that are related in meaning and covers a particular conceptual domain. In agentive nouns, semantic fields serve as an umbrella in which agents denote or operate. Semantic roles which can also be called thematic roles or theta roles are the in-built relationship that a noun has with the verb of a clause or sentence. In agentive nouns, the most important semantic role is the Agent which means an entity who initiates or performs an action.

These semantic roles and fields are important factors in a morpho-semantic analysis of agentive nominalizations as it shows the meaning of each of these lexemes and the categories they belong to.

2.4 PREVIOUS STUDIES

There exist empirical studies on agentive nominalization words yet little research has been done to capture the morphological and semantic properties of these agentive nouns. Many of the works either focuses on the morphological structures and phonological transformation that occurs in these derived nouns. The works which made an attempt to incorporate semantic did little research on it. Oyinloye (2021), in his study focused only on the agentive prefix “oní-” which had a constraint in its derivation. He focused on incorporating phonology and morphology in the study using the Optimality Theory as the theoretical framework.

In his work, he noted that there was an argument that the prefix “oní-” can be split into two separate morphemes where “o-” is treated as a prefix and “ní-” is a verb meaning “to have” (Adewole 1995; Awobuluyi 2008; Eleshin 2017). Though Oyinloye did not focus on whether the statement is true or not as that was not the basis of his study. Oyinloye used the Optimality theory propounded by Prince and Smolensky (1993) for his study as the rule-based methodology could not accurately account for the transformations that occurs in the addition of the prefix “oni-”. Optimality theory “does not have rewrite rules or anything that resembles them” (McCarthy, 2008:6).

Finally, Oyinloye’s work divided the surface realizations of /oni-/ belongs to three categories, that is, unmodified, slightly modified and radically modified. These examples represents them respectively; oní + fila onífilà; oní+ işu oníşu and oní + áta aláta. From these examples, it can be seen that the first word “Onifila” was not changed in the addition of the prefix “oní-” to the lexeme “fila” but for the rest the same cannot be said; there are modifications that occurred in the joining of the prefix to the words.

Another work on this phenomenon is A Comparative Study of Morphologically Constructed Agent Nouns in French and Yoruba by Owoeye (2013). In his work, he compared the agentive nominalizations of the French and Yoruba Language. He adapted the Lexeme-based Morphology framework as it is a multidimensional approach to word formation (Owoeye, 2013). Owoeye treated the prefix “oní-” as one

morpheme and cannot be spilt semantically into “o-” which means “someone” and “ní-” which means “to have” using the example “oníjà” which means “someone who fight” and not “someone who has fight”. He did not agree with Awobuluyi’s statement (2008:10) that the prefix “oní-” can be spilt.

Owoeye also identified the prefix “oní-” has allomorphs which are “alá-”, “ẹlẹ-”, “oló-”, and “ọlọ-” which can be used to produce agent nouns in Yoruba. He also discovered that the prefix “oní-” and its allomorphs (alá-, ẹlẹ-, oló-, ọlọ-) attaches exclusively to noun bases and the remaining prefixes (a-, à-, ì-, ò-, ọ-, and olù) attaches themselves to verb bases. Owoeye included semantics into his work in which he them into five categories; animate agent, inanimate agent, professional agent, instrument agent, partisan agent. These semantic categories were proposed by Owoeye (2009, 2011 and 2013).

2.5 CONCERN OF THE STUDY

The concern of this study is to fill the linguistic gap that exists between morphology and semantics in the aspect of agentive nominalization. Previous studies only focused on the morphological structure and phonological structure, giving little or no relevance on the morphosemantic structure of these agentive nominalizations. These nominalizations play the role of agents that is why this study incorporates thematic roles especially the role of an agent in it analysis. Though Owoeye (2013) incorporated semantics in his comparative study but it was categorized according to

his work; this study, the categorizing these agentive nouns in their respective semantic fields which includes religion, occupational, habitual, educational and many other semantic fields.

This work focuses on exploring the semantic properties embedded in these derived nouns with the lexeme-based morphology framework. It underscores the relationship between morphology and semantics in agentive nominalization. By categorizing these lexemes into semantic field, it shows the general meaning of where each of these words are placed in the society. This study brings to light and add to the linguistic research of agentive nominalizations by the fusion of the morphological structure and semantic properties. In conclusion, a morphosemantic analysis of this study shows and bridges the gap that exists in agentive nominalizations.

2.6 SUMMARY

This chapter gives detailed information about terms nominalization, agentive nominalization and thematic roles. It lays the foundational knowledge for each of these concepts for better understanding of the study. It goes further to explain the various morphological process used in the formation of agentive nominalization as well as the meaning of morphological processes according to different scholars. This chapter also entails an overview of semantic fields and roles of which these fields depict the embedded meaning agentive nominal carry. The previous works discussed in this study were of two different perspectives; one is a comparative study of the Yoruba agentive

nominalization and that of the French while the other studied the constraints of the “oni-” prefix and its modifications.

The concern of the present study is to bring to recognition the role of semantics in agentive nominalization. The inclusion of semantics in this study is what distinguishes it from others by categorizing these agentive nominals under each semantic field of umbrella that suits them.

CHAPTER THREE

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

3.0 INTRODUCTION

This chapter is divided into three sections. Section 3.1 provides an overview of the theoretical framework employed in this work. Section 3.2 gives an insight into the use of the Lexeme-based Morphology research study Yoruba agentive nominalization. Section 3.3 gives a summary of the above mentioned.

3.1 LEXEME-BASED MORPHOLOGY

The Lexeme-based Morphology was worked on several individuals; it was the contributions of many individuals that made the theory what is it today. The primary

individuals behind their framework are Charles F. Hockett and Robert Beard. Hockett (1954) introduced the “Word- and-Paradigm” approach in which he emphasized the lexeme as an abstract lexical unit that underlies different word forms.

Beard (1995) built on these principles and formalized them in his Lexeme-Morpheme Base Morphology which separated the processes of derivation and inflection while keeping the lexeme at the center of morphological analysis. The secondary contributors added to these ideas are Stephen Anderson, Mark Aronoff, Andrew Spencer and Arnold Zwicky. Together, these scholars treated a lexeme as the central unit of morphological analysis rather than a morpheme.

In Lexical-based Morphology, the lexeme is regarded as the smallest unit on which word formation rules operate before complex words are formed. Lexeme Formation Rules are taken to be processes through which complex lexemes are selected according to phonological, syntactic and semantic characteristics of base lexeme (Owoeye, 2013). This selection, which is a process of input and output, utilizes the phonological, syntactic and semantic properties of the base lexeme to produce another lexeme itself possessing its own phonological, syntactic and semantic properties (Owoeye, 2013).

One major characteristics of this framework is the distinction between derivations and inflections. The case of inflectional morphology is that it does not create new lexemes rather it modifies therefore adding to the richness of the lexical

item but in derivations, new words are created which gives them another semantic interpretation different from that of the base lexeme. For example, the base lexeme “ko” which means “to teach” becomes “oluko” which means “a teacher”. Though the meaning of the base lexeme may be embedded in the derived form but the meanings are not the same.

In conclusion, the Lexeme-based Morphology is a multidimensional approach to word formation due to its radical approach by treating the lexeme as the smallest unit of word formation and not a morpheme.

3.2 MORPHOSEMANTIC ANALYSIS OF YORUBA AGENTIVE NOMINALIZATION: A LEXEME-BASED MORPHOLOGY

The application of the framework in this study means that the analysis treats the base word as a lexeme from which these agentive nouns are derived. The framework places emphasis on the relationship between the base lexeme and the derived agentive noun. Agentive nominalization is how nouns are being derived from other parts of speech. For example, using their framework; the lexeme “kó” which means “to teach” creates a derived noun “olùkó” which means “teacher” by adding the prefix “olù-” to it. The LBM treats a lexeme as the smallest unit of word formation; the

lexeme formation rules show the phonological, syntactic and semantic properties of the base word (kó) which in turn produces another lexeme which has its phonological, syntactic and semantic properties (olúkó).

The use of this framework in this study shows how the base word lexeme has its own phonological, syntactic and semantic properties and how the derived noun has its own properties. It shows the relationship between the base word and the derived form; it accounts for every property a word carries. For example; oní + filà onífilà. The base word “filà” means “cap” and derived form means “someone who sells cap”

3.3 SUMMARY

This chapter focuses on the framework adopted in this study and how this framework relates to Yoruba agentive nominalization. The framework is regarded to be the most suitable for this research due to its tenets. The LBM framework accounts for the phonological, syntactic and most importantly the semantic aspect of these nominals which is the central focus of this research work. The smallest unit in the LBM is regarded as a lexeme which fits into the structure of agentive nominal as these words that they are derived from already exists as a lexeme in the vocabulary of such a language.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

4.0 INTRODUCTION

The previous chapters have laid the foundation of Yoruba Agentive Nominalization. This chapter serves as a morphosemantic analysis of agentive nominalizations; it includes a comprehensive and detailed study of agentive nominalization showing their morphological structure and semantic properties.

This chapter will give a detailed analysis of the morphological and semantic analysis of these agentive nominalizations.

4.1 DATA PRESENTATION

A total of eight nine words will be used in this analysis. The secondary data was collected from Owoeye (2013) and Oyinloye (2021). The data is represented below;

1. Onífilà “seller of cap”
2. Oníbàtà “seller of shoe”
3. Onígèlè “seller of headdress”
4. Onídòdò “seller of plantain”
5. Onímói-mói “seller of moi-moi”
6. Oníṣu “seller of yam”
7. Onígi “seller of firewood”
8. Oníke “seller of plastic”
9. Oníkòkò “seller of pot”
10. Onilèkùn “seller of door”
11. Aláta “seller of pepper”

12. Elépo “seller of palm oil”
13. Èlèran “seller of meat”
14. Olómi “seller of water”
15. Oloja “seller of goods”
16. Alájá “seller of dog”
17. Alágbàdo “seller of maize”
18. Aláṣo “seller of cloth”
19. Alákàrà “seller of bean-cake”
20. Aláàánú “a merciful person”
21. Alákòóso “manager”
22. Alágbára “a powerful person”
23. Eléwùré “seller of goat”
24. Elétò “a very organized person”
25. Elékèé “liar”
26. Eléré “one that is given to play or merriment”
27. Elébi “starved person”

28. Elégbò “one that is afflicted with sores”
29. Elépè “one who curses”
30. Èlèpà “seller of groundnut”
31. Èlèyìn “seller of egg”
32. Èlèsè “sinner”
33. Èlèja “seller of fish”
34. Èlètàn “deceiver”
35. Èlèkọ “seller of pap”
36. Olóyún “a pregnant woman”
37. Olókíkí “a famous person”
38. Olótiító “a truthful person”
39. Olóròóró “seller of groundnut oil”
40. Olóko “owner of farm”
41. Olóri “leader”
42. Olófòófó “a person who gossips”
43. Olópàá “a policeman”

44. Ọlọsàn “seller of orange”
45. Ọlọpọlo “a brainy person”
46. Ọlọlá “an honorable person”
47. Ọlọtí “a drunkard”
48. Ọlọta “seller of bullet”
49. Ọlọko “owner of husband”
50. Apànià “murderer”
51. Apeja “fisherman”
52. Akòwé “writer”
53. Akọrin “singer”
54. Aségità “wood seller”
55. Òsìsé “worker”
56. Òjìse “messenger”
57. Olùkọ “teacher”
58. Olùfẹ “lover”
59. Olùsọ “guardian”

60. Olùkòrè “harvester”
61. Jagunjagun “warrior”
62. Kólékólé “burglar”
63. Béríbèrí “executioner”
64. Òmùtí “drunkard”
65. Òkósé “apprentice”
66. Òmòlé “builder”
67. Gbanigbani “deliverer”
68. Fágifági “wood carver”
69. Ológèdè “banana seller”
70. Olóṛe “giver”
71. Olóṣe “soap seller”
72. Olówu “cotton dealer”
73. Olófin “lawmaker”
74. Ológùrò “seller of bamboo-wine”
75. Èlèbè “pleader”

76. Èlẹ̀rọ “engineer”
77. Èlẹ̀wà “beans seller”
78. Elékuro “seller of citrus”
79. Elélùbọ “yam flour seller”
80. Elédèméjì “prevaricator”
81. Aládiyẹ “seller of chicken”
82. Oníbàrà “beggar”
83. Oníjà “fighter”
84. Oníjọ “dancer”
85. Onísòwò “trader”
86. Onídirí “a person that plaits hair”
87. Gbomogbomo “kidnapper”
88. Oníwasu “preacher”
89. Dánàdánà ‘highway robber”

4.2 MORPHOSEMANTIC ANALYSIS OF YORUBA AGENTIVE NOMINALIZATION

1. Base Lexeme: Filà

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Onífilà

Meaning: Seller of cap

Formation Process: Prefixation (oni-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

2. Base Lexeme: Bàtà

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Oníbàtà

Meaning: Seller of shoe

Formation Process: Prefixation (oni-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

3. Base Lexeme: Gèlè

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Onígèlè

Meaning: Seller of headdress

Formation Process: Prefixation (oni-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

4. Base Lexeme: Dòdò

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Onídòdò

Meaning: Seller of plantain

Formation Process: Prefixation (oni-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

5. Base Lexeme: Mọ́í-mọ́í

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Onímóí-móí

Meaning: Seller of moi-moi

Formation Process: Prefixation (oni-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

6. Base Lexeme: íṣu

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Oníṣu

Meaning: Seller of yam

Formation Process: Prefixation (oni-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

7. Base Lexeme: Ígi

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Onígi

Meaning: Seller of firewood

Formation Process: Prefixation (oni-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

8. Base Lexeme: Íke

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Oníke

Meaning: Seller of plastic

Formation Process: Prefixation (oni-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

9. Base Lexeme: Íkòkò

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Oníkòkò

Meaning: Seller of pot

Formation Process: Prefixation (oni-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

10. Base Lexeme: Ílẹ̀kùn

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Onílẹ̀kùn

Meaning: Seller of door

Formation Process: Prefixation (oni-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

11. Base Lexeme: Áta

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Aláta

Meaning: Seller of pepper

Formation Process: Prefixation (ala-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

12. Base Lexeme: Épo

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Elépo

Meaning: Seller of palm oil

Formation Process: Prefixation (ele-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

13. Base Lexeme: Éran

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Èlèran

Meaning: Seller of meat

Formation Process: Prefixation (ele-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

14. Base Lexeme: Omi

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Olómi

Meaning: Seller of water

Formation Process: Prefixation (olo-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

15. Base Lexeme: oja

Word Class:Noun

Agentive Nominal: Ọlọja

Meaning: Seller of goods

Formation Process: Prefixation (olo-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

16. Base Lexeme: Ájá

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Alájá

Meaning: Seller of dog

Formation Process: Prefixation (ala-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

17. Base Lexeme: Ágbàdo

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Alágbàdo

Meaning: Seller of maize

Formation Process: Prefixation (ala-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

18. Base Lexeme: áşo

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Aláşo

Meaning: Seller of cloth

Formation Process: Prefixation (ala-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

19. Base Lexeme: Ákàrà

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Alákàrà

Meaning: Seller of bean cake

Formation Process: Prefixation (ala-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

20. Base Lexeme: Àánú

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Aláàánú

Meaning: A merciful person

Formation Process: Prefixation (ala-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Status

Thematic Role: Agent

21. Base Lexeme: Ákóso

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Alákòóso

Meaning: Manager

Formation Process: Prefixation (ala-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Status

Thematic Role: Agent

22. Base Lexeme: Ágbára

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Alágbára

Meaning: A powerful person

Formation Process: Prefixation (ala-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Status

Thematic Role: Agent

23. Base Lexeme: Éwúré

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Eléwúré

Meaning: Seller of goat

Formation Process: Prefixation (ele-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

24. Bas Lexeme: Étò

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Elétò

Meaning: An orderly person

Formation Process: Prefixation (ele-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Status

Thematic Role: Agent

25. Base Lexeme: Ékè

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Elékèé

Meaning: Liar

Formation Process: Prefixation (ele-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Habitual

Thematic Role: Agent

26. Base Lexeme: Éré

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Eléré

Meaning: One that is given to play

Formation Process: Prefixation (ele-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Habitual

Thematic Role: Agent

27. Base Lexeme: Ébi

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Elébi

Meaning: Starved person

Formation Process: Prefixation (ele-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Habitual

Thematic Role: Agent

28. Base Lexeme: Égbò

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Elégbò

Meaning: One afflicted with sores

Formation Process: Prefixation (ele-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Habitual

Thematic Role: Agent

29. Base Lexeme: Epe

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Elépè

Meaning: One who curses

Formation Process: Prefixation (ele-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Habitual

Thematic Role: Agent

30. Base Lexeme: Épà

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Èlépà

Meaning: Seller of groundnut

Formation Process: Prefixation (ele-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

31. Base Lexeme: Éyin

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Èlèyin

Meaning: Seller of egg

Formation Process: Prefixation (ele-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

32. Base Lexeme: Èsè

Word Class: Verb

Agentive Nominal: Èlèsè

Meaning: Sinner

Formation Process: Prefixation (ele-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+V \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Habitual

Thematic Role: Agent

33. Base Lexeme: Èja

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Èlèja

Meaning: Seller of fish

Formation Process: Prefixation (ele-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

34. Base Lexeme: Ètàn

Word Class: Verb

Agentive Nominal: Èlètàn

Meaning: Deceiver

Formation Process: Prefixation (ele-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+V \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Habitual

Thematic Role: Agent

35. Base Lexeme: ékọ

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Èlẹ̀kọ

Meaning: Seller of pap

Formation Process: Prefixation (ele-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

36. Base Lexeme: Óyún

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Olóyún

Meaning: A pregnant woman

Formation Process: Prefixation (olo-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Habitual

Thematic Role: Agent

37. Base Lexeme: Ókíkí

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Olókíkí

Meaning: A famous person

Formation Process: Prefixation (olo-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Status

Thematic Role: Agent

38. Base Lexeme: Otító

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Olótító

Meaning: A truthful person

Formation Process: Prefixation (olo-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Status

Thematic Role: Agent

39. Base Lexeme: Ororo

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Olóròóró

Meaning: Seller of groundnut oil

Formation Process: Prefixation (olo-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

40. Base Lexeme: Oko

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Olóko

Meaning: Owner of farm

Formation Process: Prefixation (olo-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

41. Base Lexeme: Órí

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Olóri

Meaning: Leader

Formation Process: Prefixation (olo-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Status

Thematic Role: Agent

42. Base Lexeme: Ofofo

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Olófòófó

Meaning: A person who gossips

Formation Process: Prefixation (olo-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Habitual

Thematic Role: Agent

43. Base Lexeme: Ópà

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Ọlọpàá

Meaning: A policeman

Formation Process: Prefixation (olo-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

44. Base Lexeme: Ọsàn

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Ọlọsàn

Meaning: Seller of orange

Formation Process: Prefixation (olo-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

45. Base Lexeme: ọ̀pọ̀lo

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Ọlọpọlo

Meaning: A brainy person

Formation Process: Prefixation (olo-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Status

Thematic Role: Agent

46. Base Lexeme: Ọlá

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Ọlọlá

Meaning: An honorable person

Formation Process: Prefixation (olo-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Status

Thematic Role: Agent

47. Base Lexeme: Ọtí

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Ọlọ́tí

Meaning: A drunkard

Formation Process: Prefixation (olo-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Habitual

Thematic Role: Agent

48. Base Lexeme: Ọ́ta

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Ọlọ́ta

Meaning: Seller of bullet

Formation Process: Prefixation (olo-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

49. Base Lexeme: Okọ

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Ọ̀lọ̀kọ

Meaning: Owner of husband

Formation Process: Prefixation (olo-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Habitual

Thematic Role: Agent

50. Base Lexeme: Pànià

Word Class: Verb

Agentive Nominal: Apànià

Meaning: Murderer

Formation Process: Prefixation (olo-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+V \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Habitual

Thematic Role: Agent

51. Base Lexeme: Peja

Word Class: Verb

Agentive Nominal: Apeja

Meaning: Fisherman

Formation Process: Prefixation (a-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+V \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

52. Base Lexeme: Kòwé

Word Class: Verb

Agentive Nominal: Akòwé

Meaning: Writer

Formation Process: Prefixation (a-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+V \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

53. Base Lexeme: Kòrin

Word Class: Verb

Agentive Nominal: Akorin

Meaning: Singer

Formation Process: Prefixation (a-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+V \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Habitual

Thematic Role: Agent

54. Base Lexeme: Ségità

Word Class: Verb

Agentive Nominal: Aségità

Meaning: Wood seller

Formation Process: Prefixation (a-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+V \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

55. Base Lexeme: Sisé

Word Class: Verb

Agentive Nominal: Òsìsé

Meaning: Worker

Formation Process: Prefixation (o-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+V \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

56. Base Lexeme: Jíse

Word Class: Verb

Agentive Nominal: Òjíse

Meaning: Messenger

Formation Process: Prefixation (o-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+V \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

57. Base Lexeme: Kọ

Word Class: Verb

Agentive Nominal: Olùkó

Meaning: Teacher

Formation Process: Prefixation (o-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+V \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

58. Base Lexeme: Lùfẹ́

Word Class: Verb

Agentive Nominal: Olùfẹ́

Meaning: Lover

Formation Process: Prefixation (o-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+V \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Habitual

Thematic Role: Agent

59. Base Lexeme: Lùsọ́

Word Class: Verb

Agentive Nominal: Olùsọ

Meaning: Guardian

Formation Process: Prefixation (o-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+V \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Status

Thematic Role: Agent

60. Base Lexeme: Kórè

Word Class: Verb

Agentive Nominal: Olùkórè

Meaning: Harvester

Formation Process: Prefixation (o-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+V \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

61. Base Lexeme: Jagun

Word Class: Verb

Agentive Nominal: Jagunjagun

Meaning: Warrior

Formation Process: Reduplication

Word Formation Rule: V reduplication → N

Semantic Field: Status

Thematic Role: Agent

62. Base Lexeme: Kólé

Word Class: Verb

Agentive Nominal: Kólékólé

Meaning: Burglar

Formation Process: Reduplication

Word Formation Rule: V reduplication → N

Semantic Field: Habitual

Thematic Role: Agent

63. Base Lexeme: Béri

Word Class: Verb

Agentive Nominal: Béríberí

Meaning: Executioner

Formation Process: Reduplication

Word Formation Rule: V reduplication \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

64. Base Lexeme: Mùtí

Word Class: Verb

Agentive Nominal: Òmùtí

Meaning: Drunkard

Formation Process: Prefixation (o-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+V \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Habitual

Thematic Role: Agent

65. Base Lexeme: Kòsẹ́

Word Class: Verb

Agentive Nominal: Òkósé

Meaning: Apprentice

Formation Process: Prefixation (o-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+V \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Habitual

Thematic Role: Agent

66. Base Lexeme: Mòlé

Word Class: Verb

Agentive Nominal: Òmòlé

Meaning: Builder

Formation Process: Prefixation (o-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+V \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

67. Base Lexeme: Gbani

Word Class: Verb

Agentive Nominal: Gbanigbani

Meaning: Deliverer

Formation Process: Reduplication

Word Formation Rule: V reduplication → N

Semantic Field: Habitual

Thematic Role: Agent

68. Base Lexeme: Fági

Word Class: Verb

Agentive Nominal: Fágifági

Meaning: Wood carver

Formation Process: Reduplication

Word Formation Rule: V reduplication → N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

69. Base Lexeme: Ogèdè

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Ọlógèdè

Meaning: Seller of plantain

Formation Process: Prefixation (olo-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

70. Base Lexeme: ọṛẹ

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Ọlọṛẹ

Meaning: Giver

Formation Process: Prefixation (olo-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Status

Thematic Role: Agent

71. Base Lexeme: ọṣẹ

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Ọlọsẹ

Meaning: Seller of soap

Formation Process: Prefixation (olo-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

72. Base Lexeme: Ówu

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Olówu

Meaning: Cotton dealer

Formation Process: Prefixation (olo-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

73. Base Lexeme: Ofin

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Olófin

Meaning: Law maker

Formation Process: Prefixation (olo-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Legal

Thematic Role: Agent

74. Base Lexeme: Ogùrò

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Ológùrò

Meaning: Bamboo wine seller

Formation Process: Prefixation (olo-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

75. Base Lexeme: Èbẹ̀

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Èlèbè

Meaning: Pleader

Formation Process: Prefixation (ele-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Habitual

Thematic Role: Agent

76. Base Lexeme: Erọ

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Èlẹ̀rọ

Meaning: Engineer

Formation Process: Prefixation (ele-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

77. Base Lexeme: Èwà

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Èlẹ̀wà

Meaning: Seller of beans

Formation Process: Prefixation (ele-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

78. Base Lexeme: Ekuro

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Elékuro

Meaning: Seller of citrus

Formation Process: Prefixation (ele-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

79. Base Lexeme: Elùbó

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Elélùbó

Meaning: Yam flour seller

Formation Process: Prefixation (ele-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

80. Base Lexeme: Edèméjì

Word Class: Verb

Agentive Nominal: Elédéméjì

Meaning: Prevaricator

Formation Process: Prefixation (ele-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+V \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Habitual

Thematic Role: Agent

81. Base Lexeme: Adiyẹ

Word Class: Noun

Agentive Nominal: Aládiyẹ

Meaning: Seller of chicken

Formation Process: Prefixation (ala-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+N \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

82. Base Lexeme: Bára

Word Class: Verb

Agentive Nominal: Oníbára

Meaning: Beggar

Formation Process: Prefixation (oni-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+V \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Habitual

Thematic Role: Agent

83. Base Lexeme: Íjà

Word Class: Verb

Agentive Nominal: Oníjà

Meaning: Fighter

Formation Process: Prefixation (oni-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+V \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Habitual

Thematic Role: Agent

84. Base Lexeme: Ijo

Word Class: Verb

Agentive Nominal: Oníjọ

Meaning: Dancer

Formation Process: Prefixation (oni-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+V \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Habitual

Thematic Role: Agent

85. Base Lexeme: Sòwò

Word Class: Verb

Agentive Nominal: Onísòwò

Meaning: Trader

Formation Process: Prefixation (oni-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+V \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

86. Base Lexeme: Dirí

Word Class: Verb

Agentive Nominal: Onídírí

Meaning: A person who plaits hair

Formation Process: Prefixation (oni-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni + V \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Occupational

Thematic Role: Agent

87. Base Lexeme: Gbomo

Word Class: Verb

Agentive Nominal: Gbomogbomo

Meaning: Kidnapper

Formation Process: Reduplication

Word Formation Rule: V reduplication \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Habitual

Thematic Role: Agent

88. Base Lexeme: Wasu

Word Class: Verb

Agentive Nominal: Oníwasu

Meaning: Preacher

Formation Process: Prefixation (oni-)

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+V \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Habitual

Thematic Role: Agent

89. Base Lexeme: Dánà

Word Class: Verb

Agentive Nominal: Dánàdánà

Meaning: Highway robber

Formation Process: Reduplication

Word Formation Rule: Oni-+V \longrightarrow N

Semantic Field: Habitual

Thematic Role: Agent

4.3 FINDINGS

Based on the observations, it can be identified that most of agentive nominalizations are placed under the occupational semantic fields because most of these derived nominals depicts the role of a job or source of livelihood. The other semantic fields present in the use of this data such as status, habitual and legal are not as common as the occupational field; therefore, it is then concluded that most agentive nominalization words are mostly given a function of an occupational role to play in the society.

The use of nouns as the base lexeme is common in the derivation of agentive nominalizations. Most of these words when derived stems from the noun class system which is why most of the word formation rule shows this rule; Oni- + N N; which means the prefix “Oní-” when added to a noun based word, it then gives rise to another noun.

Another notable distinction to point out is the use of the prefix “oní-” to represent these prefix “alá-”, “ẹlẹ-”, “oló-” and “ọlọ-”. The prefix “oní-” is used because from it these other variations stem from; the prefix “oní-” can be realized in those four different prefixes as mentioned above. The most common morphological process in derived nominal is prefixation; the number of reduplications according to the data used is not considered as many therefore prefixation exists to be the most common morphological process of deriving agentive nominals. Finally, as noted in the aspect of thematic roles each of these agentive nominals are considered to be Agents as they all fit into the category since it is the person who performs the action.

In summary, these distinctions are the facts pulled out from the data used to examine the morphosemantic analysis of agentive nominalizations in the Yoruba language.

4.4 SUMMARY

From the analysis above, it was observed that agentive nominalization processes are mostly achieved through prefixation and sometimes reduplication. Most of these nominal falls under the semantic category of occupational field due to it

depicting individual's profession. The habitual semantic field is the most common field after occupational as it shows a repeated action or activity which cannot be described as a profession.

This table shows the morphosemantic correlation of these agentive nominalizations by showing the morphological process involved, their meanings and semantic category of which they operate in.

CHAPTER FIVE

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

5.0 INTRODUCTION

The previous chapters have laid the knowledge for this research. In each of those chapters, emphasis was made in showing the semantic properties and morphological properties of agentive nominalizations. This chapter will provide the

facts which are based on linguistic findings. Each of the findings discussed in this chapter are based on observable traits that Chapter four showed by combining both semantic and phonological properties. In essence, this chapter will discuss the data presented in Chapter four as well as give as summary of this research work.

5.1 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Based on the analysis conducted in Chapter Four, there were several key findings that were observed; Firstly, the analysis showed that prefixation is the most productive morphological process used in the formation of Yoruba agentive nominalizations. Prefixes such as oni-, ala-, ele-, and olo- were used to derive agentive nouns from both noun and verb bases.

Secondly, reduplication was also found to be used as a morphological process in the formation of agentive nominals but it is a less frequent process. The reduplicated forms like, jagunjagun "warrior", kólékólé, "burglar" shows habitual actions . Thirdly, the analysis showed that Yoruba agentive nouns are mostly found within the occupational and few are not. Many of the derived nouns denote professions or sources of livelihood.

Furthermore, the study shows that all Yoruba agentive nominalizations share a single thematic role; the Agent since each derived noun refers to a person who performs an action. Finally, the findings indicates that Yoruba agentive nominalizations shows a strong relationship between morphology and semantics. The

morphological processes not only change the grammatical category of the base lexeme but also entails the rich semantic nuances that reflect occupation, personality traits, or social identity.

5.2 CONCLUSION

This research shows the relationship that exists between morphology and semantics on the basis of agentive nominalizations. Through this research, a conclusion was drawn that most morphological process, semantic field, types of speech and thematic role are prefixation, occupational, nouns and agents respectively.

The morphosemantic approach to this study brings to existence and relationships of agentive nominal.

5.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings of this research work, proves that there is still much work that can be done on agentive nominalizations in the Yoruba language. Further studies should do a cross-examination of these Yoruba agentive nominalizations with another language to show the areas whereby both languages show the same characteristics and where each characteristic is specific to a language thereby adding to the preservation and growth of the Yoruba language

REFERENCES

Adeoye, C. L. (2010). *Asa ati ise Yoruba*. Ibadan: University Press.

Adewole, S. M. (1995). *Yoruba word formation processes*. (Doctoral dissertation).
University of California, Los Angeles.

Ajeigbe, O. (1977). *A syntactic and semantic study of nominalization in Yoruba*.
(Doctoral dissertation). School of Oriented and African Studies, University of London.

Anderson, S.R. (1992). *A-morphus morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511586262>

Aronoff, M. (1994). *Morphology by itself: Stems and inflectional classes*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Aronoff, M. & Fudeman, K. (2011). *What is morphology?* (2nd ed.). Malden, MA: Wiley- Blackwell.

Awobuluyi, O. (2008). *Èkó ìṣèdà-òrò Yorùbá*(Studies in Yoruba word formation processes). Akure: Montem Paperbacks.

Awoyale, Y. (1985). Tonal specification in Yoruba nominal constructions. *Journal of Linguistic Analysis*, 15 (1), 47-63.

Bambgose, A. (1967). *A short Yoruba grammar*. Ibadan: Heinemann.

Bauer, L. (1983). *English word formation*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bauer, L. (2003). *Introducing linguistic morphology*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Beard, R. (1995). *Lexeme-morpheme base morphology: A general theory of inflection and word formation*. State University of New York Press.

Booij, G. (2007). *The grammar of words: An introduction to linguistic morphology*. (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chomsky, N. (1970). Remarks on nominalization. In R.A. Jacobs & P.S. Rosenbaum (Eds.), *Readings in English transformational grammar* (pp. 184–221). Waltham, MA: Ginn.

Eleshin, A. (2017). *A unified analysis of nominalization in Yoruba language* (Doctoral thesis). University of Lagos, Nigeria.

Haegeman, L. (1994). *Introduction to Government and Binding Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hockett, C. F. (1954). Two models of grammatical description. *Word*, 10(2-3), 210-234.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00437956.1954.1169524>

Huddleston, R., & Pullum, G. K. (2002). *The Cambridge grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Inkelas, S. & Zoll, C. (2005). *Reduplication: Doubling in morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Katamba, F. (1993). *Morphology*. London: Macmillan.

Leech, G. (2006). *A glossary of English grammar*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Lieber, R. (2004). *Morphology and lexical semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McCarthy, J. J. (2008). *Doing Optimality Theory: Applying theory to data*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Moravcsik, E.A. (1978). Reduplicative constructions. In J.H. Greenberg (Ed.), *Universals of human language* (Vol 3, pp. 297-334). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Okebiorun, F. (2022). On the pragmatics of interjections in Yoruba. In S. G. Obeng & K. Agyekum (Eds.), *Topics in West African discourse pragmatics* (pp. 111-129). Köln: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.

Owoeye, S. T. (2009). *ABUD of Journal of Humanities*.

Owoeye, S. T. (2011). La suffixation en –eur agentif: Peut-on mieux generer ses regles de construction des lexemes? [The agentive suffixation in –eur: Can its lexeme construction rules be better generated?]. *Eureka: A Journal of Humanistic Studies*, 2, 1-15.

Owoeye, S. T. (2013). A comparative study of morphologically constructed agent in French and Yoruba. *Acta Linguistica*, 7(2),15-27.

Owolabi, K. (1995). *A unified standard orthography for Yoruba*. Ibadan: University Press.

Oyelaran, O. (1970). Some aspects of Yoruba nominalizations. *Journal of West African languages*, 7(1), 45-53.

Oyinloye, M. (2021). A constraint-based account of the agentive prefix ‘oni-‘ in the standard Yoruba. *Journal of Linguistics. (Ghana)*.

Prince, A., & Smolensky, P. (1993). *Optimality theory: Constraint interaction in generative grammar*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Radford, A. (2009). *Analyzing English sentences: A minimalist approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Spencer, A. (1991). *Morphological theory: An introduction to word structure in generative grammar*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Unabonah, F. & Oyebola, U. (2021). “Abeg na! We write so our comments can be posted!” Borrowed Nigerian Pidgin pragmatic markers in Nigerian English. *Pragmatics*, 31(3),1-27 <https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.19038.unu>

Yule, G. (2010). *The study of language*. (4th ed). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yusuf, O. (1985). *Introduction to the linguistics of Yoruba*. Lagos: LECAPS Publishers.

Zwicky, A. M. (1989). Heads. *Journal of linguistics*, 25(1), 1-29. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226700012083>