AYEOMONI, Moses
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH
OBAFEMI UNIVERSITY, Nigeria

A Lexico-syntactic Analysis of Selected Dialects of Yoruba Language in Nigeria

Abstract

The study was on comparative study of Ondo and Ikale dialects of the Yoruba language with a view to finding the areas of convergences and divergences between the two dialects. The study was based on 50 sentences from each of the dialects, but only 25 of the sentences were presented. They were anaylsed from the perspective of Halliday Systemic Function Grammar (SFG) in order to identify the prominent lexemes and syntactic structures of the sentences. Simple statistics based on percentages was used to calculate the number of lexemes and structures that are similar and different. It was discovered that the two dialects have basically the same lexemes at both subject and predicator levels.

This shows that the speakers of the two dialects often make use of the same nominal and verbal items in their speeches. Besides, the two dialects share basically the same syntactic components – Subjects, Predicator, Complement and Adjunct in all the sentences examined, but the Adjunct is rarely used in the dialects. The dialects are however, found to be mainly different in the area of auxiliary verbs usage.

Most of the words or lexemes in the dialects are found in the standard Yoruba, hence the mutual intelligibility of the dialects to an average Yoruba language native speaker. It is thus envisaged that other dialects of Yoruba language that are geographically close may equally share similar linguistic features and cultural norms.

INTRODUCTION

No human language is fixed, uniform, or unvarying; all languages show internal variation. The actual usage varies from group to group and from speaker to speaker, in terms of pronunciation, choice of words, meanings or semantics, and syntactic constructions. So, this study looks at variations in Nigerian languages with respect to Yoruba, which is mainly spoken in the South West of Nigeria and some countries in the West African sub-region.

Languages all over the world are noted for variation pervasiveness. English for example, has so many variations which include British English, American English, Australian English, South-African English, Nigerian English etc. For instance, American English (*AME*) is noticeably different from that of the British, and the speeches of these two groups in turn are distinct from Australian English. When speakers of a particular language speak different versions of the language, they are said to be speaking different dialects of the language. The term 'register' first came into general currency in 1960s, Halliday et al; 1964:77 described register as a variety according to use in the sense that each speaker has a range varieties which he chooses from, at different times. The term is distinct from dialect, which is a variety according to user, in the sense that each speaker uses one variety and uses it all the time.

So, this concept of register is seen by Halliday (1976:22) and others as bound to a particular discourse situation. In general, register is considered as the linguistic structure of a text that relate to elements of context of situation of the text. Register is thus determined, by what is taking place, who is taking part and what part the language is playing (Halliday, 1978:31). Hence Halliday views it further as the configuration of semantic resources that the member of a culture typically associates with a situation type. So, register may be recognised by its formal (i.e linguistic) characteristics, while its structure is semantic. Other scholars like Greory and Caroll (1978:64) see register as a useful abstraction linking variations of language to variations of social context. And Ure and Ellis, (1977:252) say that a given language will be said to have a register distinction at a certain point, only if there are both linguistic and situational differences there.

The common factor in this definition of register is the view that both situational and linguistic variables should be essential part of the process of register characterization. It is these situational variables that specify register as a variety according to use. Hence, in Sociolinguistics, Ethnography of speaking and anthropological linguistics, it is argued that the knowledge of language includes the knowledge of its social and cultural use (Salami, 2010).

WHAT IS DIALECT OF A LANGUAGE?

A dialect is a distinct form or a variety of a language; it is associated with a recognizable regional, social or ethnic group, different from other forms of the language by specific linguistic features such as pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar or any combination of these. In any event, it must be kept in mind that from the linguistic point of view, a dialect is a theoretical concept; it is a variation of language, and variation is so pervasive that each language is actually a

continuum of languages and differs from speaker to speaker, and from group to group in such a way that an absolute lines can be drawn between different forms of or varieties of a language (See Labov, 1966, 1972; Akere, 1977; Milroy, 1987; Akmajian, 2004; Salami, 2006; Mesthrie, 2003; Gregory and Carol, 1978; Katzner, 1977)

HISTORICAL SURVERY OF DIALECT

The rise of the discipline of sociolinguistics has introduced the consideration of social and demographic factors into the description and analysis of languages and language varieties. This has made the study of dialects a significant area in the understanding of not only human behaviour, but also of the processes of language change. However, according to (Salami 2010), the study of the dialects of Yoruba (including the *koine*), so far, has followed largely the two frameworks of traditional dialectology and descriptive linguistics to the neglect of social dialectology and variation (see, for example, Adetugbo, 1967, 1973; 1982 Oyelaran, 1976; Awoyale, 1998, Awobuluyi, 1992; Fabunmi, 1998, 2001, 2003, 2006, 2009; Ajongolo, 2005 and Aboderin 2006; Akere, 1977; Akmajian, 2004; Awoyale, 1998).

The classical form of a dialect is the regional dialect, which is a distinct form of a language spoken in a certain geographical area. For instance, we have the Cockney-dialect, Yorkshire-dialect of English. Inhabitants of these regions have certain distinct linguistic features that differentiate them from speakers of other forms of English. Also, Tohomo O' odhan (formerly papago) and Akimel O' odhan (formely pima) are two native American languages spoken by members of some tribal groups living in the states of Arizona and Northern Mexico. The languages are close phonologically and grammatically with only minor linguistic differences in pronunciation and syntax (dialect variation). So, the phenomenon of dialect arose from the kind of language or the distinct form of a language spoken by members of a specific socio-economic class like the working class dialects in England or the ghetto languages in the United States. (Katzner, 1977; Mesthrie, 2003)

Examples below are taken from Labov (1963).

Working class (England)

Ghetto (United State)

(i) He is fast in everything he does   (i) He fast in everything he does

(ii) You are out of the game   (ii) You out the game

(iii)They are not caught   (iii) They not caught

(iv)He is going to try get up   (iv) He gon' try get up

(v) She is the first one, that started us off   (v) She the first one started us off.

THE ETHNIC DIALECTS

An Ethnic dialect can be described as the form of English sometimes referred to as 'Yiddish' English, historically associated with speakers of Eastern European Jewish ancestry. Language

variation does not end with dialect, as we have differences among speakers, and can also be linked to a particular region of the country or to a particular social class or ethnic group even individuals. Each recognizable dialect of a language is still equally subject to considerable internal variation, no two speakers of a language, even, if they are speakers of the same dialect produce and use their language in exactly the same way. It is in this sense that we are able to recognize different individuals by their distinct speech and language patterns, Indeed, a person's language pattern is one of the most fundamental features of self-identity. And the form of a language spoken by a single individual is referred to as an Idiolect, and every speaker of a language has a distinct idiolect. Once we realize that variation in language is pervasive, it becomes apparent that there is no such a thing as a single language used as at all times by all speakers. There is nothing like single English language, rather there are many English Languages (dialects and idiolects) depending on who is using the language and the context in which it is used, hence the terminology 'New Englishes'. For instance, the vocabulary differences between American and British English are often amusing. Indeed at a time, a pamphlet entitled, "Getting around the USA: Travel Tips for the British visitors", which contains a section labelled "How to say it" was printed and contains the following differences between British and American dialects of English

British Dialect	American Dialect
Car park	Parking lot
Coach	Bus
Garage	Service Station
Lift	Elevator
Lorry	Truck
Petrol	Gasoline
Call box	Telephone Booth
Minerals	Softdrinks
Vest	Undershirt
Lay by	Rest area.

These examples are typical of the sort of dialectal variations found in the vocabulary of British and American Englishes. Finally, there are two other kinds of variation of English languages which I would also want to touch briefly. They are PIDGIN AND CREOLE which developed during and after the slave Era of the 17th century. Now, under slavery, a large number of people were able neither to maintain their ancestral Languages nor to shift to the colonial language.

Instead, they created new languages (Pidgins and Creoles) that were partly based on the languages around them. To illustrate this, we have:

This small swine he been go for market

This small swine he been stay for house

This small swine he no been shop no nothing

And this small swine, he been go wee, wee sotei for house.

This version of 'This Little Piggy' recited by a speaker in Cameroon may seem highly unusual form from the view point of the convention of ordinary written English. Yet, sociolinguists who have spent their working career, studying such forms of speech, conclude that they are system in their own right, with their own linguistic norms. The technical term, for the language exemplified here is pidgin, and it is from Cameroon Pidgin English. There is also the Nigerian variety of Pidgin English which is widely spoken in the South-East and South-South part of Nigeria. In the South-West, where Yoruba race reside, it is equally but rarely spoken. Generally, the situation today is that Pidgin flourishes as a medium of inter-ethnic communication among less educated people in the southern part of Nigeria. The above Cameroon pidgin expressions could be rendered this way in Yoruba-Nigeria pidgin.

This small swine wey dey go market

This small swine wey dey stay for house

This small swine wey no dey shop anything

And this small swine, I dey go sotei for house.

The Nigerian Situation

Nigeria is a multilingua society with various kinds of languages (Indigenous and non-indigenous). The exact number of languages indigenous to Nigeria is still very controversial. Its estimates range from 200 to over 400 (see Jowitt, 2005 and Jones and Peccer, 2004). The problem of getting the accurate figure is a linguistic one, which has to do with differentiating language from dialect, and of deciding how to classify a particular speech-system that serves communication within a social group. However, dialectologists have been able to provide working definitions that have helped to explain the index for classification of the Nigeria languages and their dialects, which are variations by virtue of the fact that speakers live in different geographical locations, and belong to different social groups and networks, and are of different ages and genders (Salami, 2010). In addition to these, English Language is the language of official transaction which is the bane of the modern Nigerian culture that is highly influenced by western political, educational and technological cultures. We also have the Nigerian Pidgin, which is much wide spread, but still not a lingua franca in the national sense. It is neither an

elaborate code nor a restricted code. It is unlike the Tanzania Swahili, which is a language of broad social communication. It is also, totally different form the Standard English spoken in Britain and America. The three major Nigerian Languages are Yoruba language, Hausa language and Igbo language. These languages are different from one another in every respect.

THE YORUBA LANGUAGE AND ITS VARIOUS SPEAKERS

The Yoruba language is one of the three major languages recognized officially in Nigeria. It is spoken in the South-West of Nigeria and in two other West African Countries, which are Republic of Benin and Togo. In Nigeria alone, the native speakers of the language are over 15 million, while another 5 million speak it in addition to their mother tongue. The language is spoken in the South West and South Central parts of Nigeria, covering Oyo, Lagos, Ondo, Osun, Ekiti, Ogun, some part of Kwara states and a small portion of Edo State. Like other native languages, it is a tonal language, having three surface tones – High, Mid and Low tone.

The Language has seven oral vowels /a, i, ɛ, e, a, o, ɔ, u/ five nasal vowels /ĩ, ɛ̃, ã, c,□ũ/. The nasal vowels (ã) and (ɔ)□are found in different dialects. For instance, / ɔ /□ is found mainly in the dialect of Lagos, Egba, and Ijebu, while / ã / is mainly found in dialects of Ikalẹ, Ilajẹ, Ondo, ọwọ, e.t.c. while (ɔ)□ characterizes most of the south-west dialects that is, Lagos, Egba and Ijebu (ã) characterizes most of the other dialects.

The Yoruba language has several dialects such as Oyo, Ijẹsa, Ekiti , Owo, Akure, Ondo, Ife, Igbomina, Ilorin, Yagba, Ibunu, Egba Ilaje, Ikale, Egun, Akoko, Owe (Benin Rebublic), Sabee (Togo) and Popo (Togo). All these dialects vary slightly from one another, while some are totally different especially the Yourba spoken outside Nigeria. Now, let us consider the following Yoruba words spoken by different speakers of Yoruba Languages to confirm their similarities and differences:

	Yoruba Oyo	Yoruba Ikale	Yoruba Ijesa	Yoruba Ondo	Yoruba Ekiti	Meanings in English
I	wa□	bọ□ be□	ka□ri□ọra□h	bọ□ be□	Ia	Come
II	Isu	usu	Usu	Usu	usu	Yam
III	ile□	ule□	Ule	uli□	ule□	House
IV	ọmọ wa	ọmọ wa	ọmọria	ọmọ wa	ọmọ ra	Our child
V	I□ṣa□ẹ□	ẹri	odo□	Omi	odo□	Down/River
VI	I□ḷo□ko□	oti□ta	ujoko	a□ka□a□ba□	oti□ṭa□	Seat
VII	ewu□ṛe□	I□ke□gbe□	E□he□vegbe□	Ikegbe	ehu□ṛe□	Goat
VIII	adi□ỵe	ẹdi□ỵe	ẹdi□ỵe	adi□ẹ	ẹdi□ẹ	Fowl
IX	ilẹ□ku□h	Ilẹ□ku□h	a□ga□hdi□i□	ile□ku□h	a□ga□hra□hdi□	Door

In all the cases above, the meanings are the same but in (v) the words (I□ṣa□ẹ□) spoken by the I□je□ṣa□ as Odo□means a totally different thing from down which means (River). Each word of the dialects above is very similar to Oyo dialect on which the standard Yoruba is derived. This shows that a reasonable number of the words in the dialects of Yoruba language are closely related or similar in structure to those in Oyo dialect. For instance, on the table above, the Oyo dialect of Yoruba uses the word- Isu for yam, while other dialects, render it as –Usu /uʃu/. Also, the word 'fowl' in Oyo dialect is called Adi□y□while in other dialects considered above, it is called Ẹdi□y□except in Ondo dialect where it is rendered as Ad□□Then another word that has a similar rendition in all the dialects is Goat, which is called ewu□re□in Oyo dialect, but has a slightly different reference in all the other dialects (see the above table). However, the label for it in Ekiti dialect is ehu□r□□which is similar to that of Oyo dialect. Equally, the word 'house' in Oyo dialect is called Ile□, while the references to it in other dialects are Ule□ and Uli□which are the same and similar to that of Oyo dialect.

So, the words used in most of the dialects to refer to objects are not only close, but also similar to those found or used in Oyo dialect, where the standard Yoruba is derived. This thus accounts for mutual intelligibility of all the dialects of Yoruba language among the speakers of the language. All the dialects of Yoruba are almost similar to Oyo dialect. However, the details of this are not the foci of this paper. The paper is on comparative study of two dialects of the Yoruba language, which are Ondo and Ikale dialects.

Comparative study of Ondo and Ikale Dialects of Yoruba Language

This study is basically on the comparative study of Ondo and Ikale dialects of the Yoruba language. The study is informed by the relatedness of the dialects and the geographical proximity of the areas inhabited by the speakers of the two dialects to one another. Since the speakers of the dialects share geographical boundaries in the central and Southern senatorial districts of Ondo State of Nigeria; they also have a lot of cultural norms and activities in common. So, the study is out to find out the extent of the similarities and differences between the two dialects and the consequences of these on the traditions of the sub-tribes examined in this paper.

Data for the study

The study is based on fifty sentences that were tape recorded. However, since it has been discovered that direct tape recorded interviews often jeopardize the chance of gaining direct access to naturalness of language use, that is, the observer's paradox; as a result, the use of unstructured spontaneous recorded conversations becomes inevitable. Even Milroy (1980) confirms this, when he claims that recorded interviews render a speech unnatural and could mar the result of an investigation.

As of these deficiencies of the recorded interview system, then there is the recording of spontaneously surreptitious speeches of Ondo and Ikale origin. The respondents to these unstructured spontaneously recorded speeches are later made to be aware of the recording exercise. However, the investigation jealously guards against allowing the knowledge of the recording to mar and impede the chance of getting the speeches in their natural form and use. The recordings were played back to the respondents, for them to raise objections to any part of the recording if necessary, and this is immediately erased in order to avert suspicions. The sentences are later transcribed and written out for comparative analysis. The analysis is based on the orthographic comparison of the prominent lexemes in the sentences. In order to carry out a detailed and thorough analysis, only twenty five of the sentences could be presented. And we strongly believe that these will reflect the general forms and patterns of the two dialects. The sentences are analyzed from the perspective of Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistic (SFL). The Systemic Functional Linguistic (SFL), shows that language has a series of system, and each system is a set of options available to a speaker or writer in a given social environment. Grammar is a fractional part of form, which has four basic categories: Unit, Structure, Class and System. A unit is a kind of a stretch of language with a definite pattern. The relationship among them is such that each unit operates in the structure of the unit above it. The unit word, for instance, functions in the group, which is the unit above it, while the group operates in the clause, and the clause in the sentence. So, in this paper, the clause is the basic Unit of description, which is split into SPCA structure that is, the Subject, Predicator, Complement and Adjunct. Through this structure, it is possible to generate as many sentences as possible. It is a norm in Systemic Grammar to adopt statistical Procedures to analyse the observations of what people say and write in a particular social circumstance or situation, hence the adoption of this Grammar model for use in this paper.

	Ondo Dialect	Ikale Dialect	English Translation
1	We dà ti lọ in?	We ti lọ?	Haven't you gone?
2	La ba un.	La ba	Go and meet him
3	Ìwé ne saa?	Ìwé ni hánán?	Where is the book?
4	Wá jẹun	Wá jeun	Come and eat
5	Kí bi we lọ sí ?	Kí bo we lọ hí?	Where did you go?
6	ọkọ nẹ ti sa ju	ọkọ rè ti háré jù	The motor is over speeding
7	Móghó nì kò mí	Móghó ẹn mi	Give me the money
8	We ka sákò in	Wé ka hà un	You had better run away from him
9	Me la kàwé	Me la kàwé	I'm going to read
10	Ma ií ẹ nọla o	Ma ri ẹ nọla o	I will see you tomorrow
11	Odòwuọ́ ọ	Ódòwú ọ	Good night
12	Káárọ o	Káa rọ ò	Good morning
13	Kín tì ií kẹ?	Kí ngho ti gha kẹ?	How are things?
14	La jókò si bẹ in	Lajókò hi bèyìn	Go and sit down there
15	Kií gùwè bọ?	Kí gbo w obọ?	When did you come?

16	È lú wee tọ̀?	Ké lú we taa?	How much are you selling it?
17	La à sùn	La a hùn	Go and sleep
18	Èmí eé	Emì rée	Here I am
19	Dó ji mi nówuọ̀	Jẹ ji mi nó wúò	Wake me up in the morning
20	Mi dò ghó bé	Mo jẹ́, ghò bẹ	I say you should look here
21	Mu we nẹn kòmí	Múwé nẹn mi	Give me that book
22	È see sọkọ ẹ?	Nẹn sọkọ ẹ?	Who is your husband?
23	Aa mí yá	Arà mén yá	I am sick
24	Ó dà ti la sùn ín?	O ti la hùn?	Has he gone to bed?
25	Mẹní yẹn kò mí	Mẹ́ní yẹn mi	Give me that mat

Data Analysis

The analyses of the data are on two stages:

(i) Lexical Analysis
(ii) Syntactic Analysis

On Lexis: usage of the two dialects, the main lexical items in the sentences of the two dialects are focused, equally, at the syntactic level, attention is paid to the syntactic components of the sentences as follows:

SYNTACTIC ANALYSIS TABLE

S/N	Ondo					Ikale					Standard Yoruba Form
	S	Aux	P	C	A	S	Aux	P	C	A	
1	-	we da ti	lọ in	-		-	we ti	lọ	-	-	Se ẹ ti lọ.
2	-	-	la ba	un	-	-	la ba	-	-	-	ẹ lọ ba.
3	iwe nẹn	-	saa	-	-	iwe nẹn	-	hanan	-	-	Iwe naa da?
4	-	-	wa jẹun	-	-	-	-	wa jẹun	-	-	ẹ wá jẹun.
5	-	kii buwe	lọ	-	si	-	ki buwe	lọ	-	ni	Nibo le ń ḅ.
6	ọkọ̀ nẹn	-	ti sáré	-	jù	ọkọ̀ nẹn	-	ti háré	-	ju	ọkọ̀ re ti sá ré jù
7	mi	do mọ	gho nẹn	ko		mo	jẹ	mogho	nẹn	-	Mo in ki ẹ fun

				mi					mi		mi lowo naa.
8	-	We da ka	sako	un	-	-	We ka	ha	un	-	ẹ sin ma sa fun.
9	me	la	kàwé	-	-	me	la	kàwé	-	-	Mo fẹ lọ ǩ áwé
10	ma	-	ii	ẹ	nola	ma	-	rii	ẹ	nọla	Ma ri ẹ lọla.
11	O	-	dowurọ	-		O	-	dowurọ	o	-	O dà áọ o.
12	-	-	Kaarọ	o	-	-	-	Kaarọ	o	-	Kaarọ o.
13	-	Kẹn	ti i	-	Ke?	-	ki	ngho ti gha	-	ke	ba wo ni ń kan?
14	-	la	joko	-	Si be in	-	la	joko	-	hibe yin	Lọ jò kó si lẹ yẹn.
15	-	Kii gu we	bọ?	-	-	-	Kii gbo wo	bọ?	-	-	ìgbá wo lẹ de?
16	Eelu	we	tọ ọ	-	-	kelu	we	ta	-	-	È ló lẹ ǹ taạ?
17	-	laa	sun	-	-	-	la ka	hun	-	-	ẹ lọ sun
18	Emi	-	-	-	ee	emi	-	-	-	ree	È mi ni yi
19	me	-	gbọ	ẹ	-	me	-	gbọ	ẹ	-	Mi o gbọ yin.
20	-	-	do ji	mi	nowuọ	-	-	Jẹ ji	Mi	nowurọ	Ki ẹ jǐ mi laarọ
21	Mi	-	do bọ	-	bé	Mo	-	Je bọ	-	-	Mo ni ki ẹ bọ si bi.
22	-	-	mu	we	yen komí	-	-	mu	We	yẹn mi	ẹ mú ìwé yẹn wa.
23	aa	-	meya	-	-	ara	-	mẹn ya	-	-	ara mi ko dá.
24	O	dati la	sun	-	in	wo	ti la	hun	-	-	Se ẹ ti sun?
25	-	-	meni	yẹn	komi	-	-	meni	yẹn mi	-	ẹ fun mi ĺẹnǐ yẹn.

VOCABULARY TABLE

The Major Vocabularies of the Dialects in the Analysed Sentences.

S/N	Ondo	Ikale
1.	Lọ (v)	Lọ (v)
2.	Ba (v)	Ba (v)
3.	Ìwé (noun) saa (adv)	Ìwé (noun) han an (adv)
4.	Jẹun (v)	Jẹun (v)
5.	Ki bi (adv) lọ (v) sí(adv)	Kí bo (adv) họ (v) hí (adv)
6.	ọkọ̀ (n) sá(v)	ọkọ̀ (n), bá (v)
7.	Móghó (v) mi (pron)	Móghó (v) mi (pron)
8.	Sáàkó (v)	Háun (v)
9.	Kàwé (v)	Kàwé (v)
10.	Nọ́la (adv)	Nọla (adv)
11.	Òwúọ̀ (adv)	Òwúọ̀ (adv)
12.	Àárọ̀ (adv)	Àárọ̀ (adv)
13.	Ii (v)	Gba (v)
14.	Jòkó (v)	Jòkó (v)
15.	Wébọ̀ (v)	Wobọ̀ (v)
16.	Tọọ (v)	Taa (v)
17.	Sùn (v)	Hùn (v)
18.	Èmi (pron)	Èmi (pron)
19.	Ji (v)	Jí (v)
20.	Ghò (v)	Ghò (v)

21.	Mí (pron)	Mi (pron)
22.	ọkọ (n)	ọkọ (n)
23.	Aa (n)	Ara (n)
24.	Sùn (v)	Hùn (v)
25.	ẹní (n)	ẹní (n)

Key

N - noun
V - verb
Ad - adjective
Adv - adverb
Pron - pronoun

Results of the analysis for both Ondo and Ikale dialect.

1. The predicator – 'lọ' is the same for both dialects.
2. The lexeme at the predicator is the same 'bá '
3. The lexical items at the subject column is the same 'ì wé', differs slightly at predicator level.
4. The words are similar in auxiliary and adjunct, but same in predicator = jẹun
5. The same in main verb – predicator, but differs slightly in adjunct.
6. The words are similar in predicator but same in subject- ọkọ̀ and adjunct 'ju'
7. The words in the Subject, Predicator and complement are the same.
8. Similar word is used at the predicator level.
9. Both subjects and predicators have the same lexemes.
10. The same lexemes in S, P, C and A.
11. Same lexemes are found in S,P and C
12. Same lexemes found in P and C
13. The main lexical items are the same for P and A
14. The word in P is the same in both dialects
15. The main lexemes in P are the same in both dialects
16. The lexemes at S and P are slightly different but the auxiliaries are the same
17. The words are slightly different in P.
18. The S lexemes are the same in both dialects
19. All the lexemes in S,P and C are same
20. The main lexemes of P,C and A are same for both dialects
21. Both the main lexemes of P and A are the same in the dialects
22. Items in P, C and A are the same in both dialects
23. The items in P are the same in both dialects

24. The items in S are the same for both dialects
25. The items in P, C and A are same for both dialects

Findings from the Analysis

From the analysis of the 25 sentences got from the two dialects and examined above; it is discovered that the two dialects have basically the same lexemes at both subject and predicator levels; (see the vocabulary table above), meaning that the speakers often use the same nominals and verbals. For example, out of the 25 sentences examined, 16 of the sentences have the same lexemes at the predicator level for both dialects, and this represents 64% of the total lexemes at the predicator level.

In the same vein, at the subject level (the nominal) out of 25 sentences examined, 16 of the sentences of both dialects have the same words or lexemes at the subject level, and this represents 64%.

Granted that some of the sentences are imperative that do not have obvious subjects as found in sentences 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 12, 15, 17, 20, 22 and 25. They are however, treated as having the same subjects, since they appear so, in both dialects. The obvious point here is that the two dialects often share the same lexemes as shown in the data analyzed (see the table). This also extends to Adjunct position where some words/lexemes share the same forms in both dialects, as we have in sentences 6, 10, 21, 22, and 25 involving the words jù , nóla, nowùọ, yen and yen respectively. Even some words at the complement level, are also in the same form in both dialects, see sentences 7, 11, 20, 22 and 25. This further enhances the claim that the two dialects are very close in the area of lexical usage.

Syntax

At the syntactic level, the two dialects share basically the same syntactic components subject, predicator, complement and adjunct (SPCA). And in both dialects, it is found that adjuncts are rarely used in their sentences. For instance, out of 25 sentences examined, only 8 have adjuncts attached. (See sentences 5, 6, 10, 13, 14, 20, 21 and 22) on the syntactic table, this represents 32% of the total sentences analysed.

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THE FINDINGS

It is revealed from the findings that the two dialects examined in this work are closely related in the areas of lexical usage and syntactic structures. They have virtually the same lexical items in both the subject and verbal (predicator) positions. Even in the adjunct position, a reasonable number of the lexemes are the same in both dialects. This implies that the dialects have almost the same lexicon.

At the syntactic level, the two dialects have almost the same components at the syntactic level, as evident in the sentences below:

Sentence Number	ONDO Dialect			IKALE Dialect		
2	-	P	C	-	P	C
3	-	S	P	-	S	P
4		-	P		-	P
5	-	P	A	-	P	A
6	S	P	A	S	P	A

Most of the sentences of the dialects are imperatives; they are without subjects. However, the major difference between the two dialects at the level of syntax, is in the area of auxiliary verbs usage. The two dialects do not always make use of the same auxiliaries as shown in the sentences analyzed for this work. For example, in sentence 5, for Ondo dialect, the auxiliary is bù and Ikale has bo; in sentence 15, Ondo has gu, while Ikale uses gbo as auxiliaries, while Ikale has jẹ́, Ondo has do. In fact, these two auxiliaries (jẹ and do) are the major markers of differences in the use of verbals in the two dialects. This, however, does not mean, we do not have overlaps in the use of auxiliaries in the two dialects in some cases. The overlaps, for instance, are noticed in sentences 6, 8 9 14 , 16 and so on , where both dialects have the same auxiliaries of ti   , ka, la, la, wé respectively.

Orthographically too, the two dialects are similar in several respects, as they share the same orthographic form for most of the words or lexemes. They however, different in the use of the letters 's' and 'h', while Ondo often uses letter 's' for words that require it, Ikale uses letter 'h' as we have in sentence 17 and 24 as in sùn and hùn, and sentence 6 has sáré for Ondo, and háré for Ikale. This high degree of similarity of the two dialects has implication for traditions and norms (culture) in these dialectal communities, since language too, is an element of culture.

Then, it is also noticed that most of the words of these two dialects are similar to the words or vocabulary of the standard Yoruba, confirming this claim are words like lọ (v) in sentence 1, ìwé (n) in sentence 3, jẹun (v) in sentence 4, ọkọ̀ (n) in sentence 6, àárọ̀ (adv) in sentence 12 and so on, which are also found in the standard Yoruba language. This explains reasons for mutual intelligibility of the two dialects to an average Yoruba speaker. In the area of syntax, the major difference between the two dialects and the standard Yoruba is that, most of the sentences in the dialects are imperative, that is, without subject elements, while the standard Yoruba has always attracted subject elements (see sentences in the standard Yoruba). It should however, be emphasized that the two dialects differ significantly from the way they are produced or rendered phonologically. Their phonological productions are in several respects have to do with intonation,   stressing and so on. This area is not however, the focus of this paper, it will be taken up in the second version of this research later. As it is widely claimed that language is an element of culture, hence Peccei (2004:9), views that changes taking place in the socio-cultural, political and economic lies of human communities are not only expressed by language but are also

promoted through the use of language. So, language, which is part of culture, could be used not only to steer people's thought and beliefs but also to control those human and societal beliefs and thoughts. It is even argued by Salami (1993) that language variety could become an ideology at a stage when a variety of a language is rated as low status as a result of the class of its speakers, since the social structuring of the variety is based in the relations of social and economic power. In this respect, the two dialects examined in this paper, as a result of their relatedness as already proved, have endowed their speakers with similar cultural norms and practices such as eating similar foods, having similar mode of dressing, worshipping, festivals and so on.

CONCLUSION

It is envisaged that some of the dialects of Yoruba languages like the two examined in this paper, for reasons of proximity and historical factor, will equally share quite a lot of linguistic features. But quite a large number of them have vocabulary that are closely related to that of the standard Yoruba language as evident in Table I, hence the general mutual intelligibility of the dialects of Yoruba language to all the Yoruba speakers.

REFERENCES

Aboderin, A. O. (2006). Iyisodi ati Atupale ihun re ninu Eka-ede Awori. PhD. Thesis, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife.

Adetugbo, A. (1967). The Yoruba Language in Western Nigeria: its major dialect areas. PhD. Dissertation, Columbia University.

Adetugbo (1973). Yoruba Language in Yoruba History. In Biobaku, S: (ed.), Sources of Yoruba History. (Pp. 176-204). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Adetugbo (1982). 'Towards a Yoruba Dialectology.' In A.Afolayan (ed.) *Yoruba Language and Literature*. (Pp. 207-224). Ife and Ibadan: University Press.

Ajongbolo, P.O. (2005). Negation in AO dialect of Yoruba. PhD Thesis, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria.

Akere, F. (1977). *A Sociolinguistic Study of a Yoruba Speech Community in Nigeria: variation and change in Ijebu dialect speech of Ikorodu.* Unpublished PhD. Thesis, University of Edingburgh.

Akmajian, A. et al (2004). *Linguistics! An Introduction to Language and Communication*, India: Prentice-Hall of India.

Awobuluyi, O. (1992). "Aspects of Contemporary Standard Yoruba in Dialectological Perspective". In A. Isola (Ed.) *New Findings in Yoruba Studies. Ibadan: Odunjo Memorial Lectures*

Awoyale, Y. (1998) The Tense system of Yoruba: *Linguistics and Nigerian Languages*, Ilorin. Pp. 1-26.

Ellis, J (1966) 'On Contextual Meaning: in Bazell et al.

Ellis and J. Ure (1977) 'Language Varieties: Register in Meetham (1969), 251-258.

Ellis and J. Ure (1982) (eds.) 'Register Range and Change', International Journal of Sociology of Language, Special Issue, vol. 35.

Fabunmi, F. (1998) Tense, Aspect and Modal Systems in Ijesa Dialect of Yoruba. M.A. Thesis, Department of Linguistics and African Languages, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria.

Fabunmi, F. (2001) Notes on Ijesa Tense and Aspect Marking in *Studies in African Linguistics* 30 Pp. 113-114

Fabunmi, F. (2003) A GPSG Appraisal of Sequential Distributions of Auxiliary Verbs in Ijesa Dialect of Yoruba. Nordic Journal of African Studies, 12/3, pp. 355-371.

Fabunmi, F. (2006). Tense and Aspect in Mofoli Dialect of Yoruba. PhD Dissertation, Department of Linguistics ans African Languages, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife.

Gregory and Carol (1978) ' Aspects of Varieties Differentiation', *Journal of Linguistics*, 3/2, 177-98.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1966) "*Lexis as a Linguistic Level*" in Bazzel (ed.) In, memory of J.R. Firth, London: Longman. Pp. 77

Halliday, M.A.K. (1976) *Halliday: System and Function in Language, Selected Papers*. (ed. Gunther Kress). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1978) *Language and Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Meaning*. London: Edward Arnold.

Jones J. and Peccei, (2004). "Language and Politics" In L. Thomas, S. Waveing, I Singh et al. (Eds.) Language, Society and Power, London and New York: Routledge.

Jowitt, D. (2005) Nigerian English Usage: An Introductory Lagos Longman, Nigeria.

Pp. 9-10

Katzner, K. (1977) *The Languages of the World*, London. Pp. 10.

Labov, W. (1963) "the social Motivation of a sound change". Word, 19:225-309

Mesthrie, R. et. al (2003) *Introducing Socio Linguistics*, Edinburgh: University Press Edinburgh.

Milroy, L. (1987) Language and Social Networks, Oxford: Blackwell.

Salami L.O. (1993) "Language variation, Social diversity and social psychological explanations". Nigerian Journal of Sociolinguistics, Vol. 2, No 3, Pp. 40-58

Salami L.O. (2006a). Gender, Use and Attitude towards English Taboo Words among Young Adults in a Nigeria University. *The International Journal of Language, Culture and Society*, Issue 17. Pp. 320.

Salami L.O. (2010) "The Life and Times of Language" Unpublished Inaugural Lecture Series 229, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife. Pp 10.