

Ihafa: A Journal of African Studies 11: 1
June 2020, 125-153

Lexical Variation in Ìkàré and Arigidi Dialects of Àkókó: A Critique

Boluwaji Oshodi & Olusegun Owolèwa
Adekunle Ajasin University

Abstract

Bámìgbádé and Sanni (2018) examined lexical variation in Ìkàré and Arigidi, two speech forms spoken in Àkókó region of Ondo State, Nigeria, with focus on cognates. They observed that Ìkàré and Arigidi share striking similarities and concluded that they are both dialects of Àkókó language. This paper critiques this submission with the aim of correcting the erroneous claims in the work. Based on available evidence from existing literature and linguistic evidence from Àkókó region, the paper argues that there is no language known as Àkókó and by implication, therefore, Ìkàré and Arigidi cannot be its dialects. It also establishes that the comparison of Ìkàré and Arigidi lexical items which necessitated the search for cognates was vague since the basis for the comparison was neither established nor justified. Relying on data from adult native speakers of Ìkàré and Arigidi, the paper presents empirical

Boluwaji Oshodi, PhD.

Department of Linguistics and Languages

Adekunle Ajasin University, Akungba-Akoko, Ondo State, Nigeria

Phone: +234 Email: bolu_oshodi@yahoo.com

&

Olusegun Owolewa, PhD.

Department of Arts Education

Adekunle Ajasin University, Akungba-Akoko, Ondo State, Nigeria

Phone: +234 Email: Olusegun.owolewa@aaua.edu.ng

facts which invalidate the claims of Bámigbádé and Sanni (2018). It concludes that Bamigbade and Sanni's claims on the linguistic variation and relationship between Ìkàré and Arigidi are false and unreliable.

Keywords: Lexical variation, dialects, Ìkàré, Arigidi, Àkókó, Èdoid

1. Introduction

According to Olúmúyìwá and Oshodi (2012), Àkókó is a region of unusual linguistic diversity. This assertion is based on the many complex and unrelated languages, dialects, and speech forms found in the region. For example, in Òkè-àgbè (the headquarters of Àkókó North-West Local Government), there are four distinct speech forms (Àfá, Ìdò, Ògè and Àjè) spoken in the four distinct quarters which make up the town. From existing literature (e.g. Capo 1989, Hoffman 1994, Ohiri-Anichie 2006, Lorena - Ethnologue 2009, and Oshodi 2011), some speech forms spoken in Àkókó North-west Local Government Area have remained the most problematic for linguists in terms of classification. To date, the status of some of the speech forms still remain controversial. According to Oshodi (2011a), one of the biggest problems with their classification is the fact that most of the scholars who have attempted it have not physically visited the region while others have relied solely on data supplied by speakers of adulterated forms of the lects. These two factors have negatively affected most of the attempts to classify the speech forms, particularly the names given to some of them. Fábùnmi (2009) is a good example of such studies which examined the group and erroneously tagged them Yorùbá Àkókó¹. Another

¹This claim is false, as empirical fact in existing literature (Awóbùlúyì 1998; Adéníyì 2010) clearly show that the speech forms examined in the study are not part of established Yorùbá dialects spoken in Àkókó region. The author also did not justify his reasons for tagging them Yorùbá Àkókó. Considering

example is Adeníyì (2016) which claims that studies on the phonologies of the speech forms are rare. This claim is also not true because there are a good number of published works on the phonologies of Akoko speech forms: Awóbùlúyì (1972) examined the morphophonemics of Àfá; Oyètádé (1981) and Oshodi (2011b and 2011d) examined the phonology and phonetics/phonology of Arigidi; while Fádorò (2010) examined phonological and lexical variations of Akoko speech forms.

Àkókó is a region which covers some parts of Ondo and Èdó states. There are 63 towns in Àkókó part of Ondo state and all the 63 towns attach the word Àkókó to their names as evident in Arigidi-Àkókó, Ìkàré-Àkókó, Àkùngbá-Àkókó, Àjowá-Àkókó, Òkà-Àkókó, Òkèàgbè-Àkókó, Ìṣùà-Àkókó, Ìbòròpa-Àkókó etc. Some of the towns listed above are not in any way linguistically homogenous. For example, Àjowá-Àkókó is a community comprising eight different autonomous communities namely; Urò, Òjò, Dája, Èṣùkù, Èfifá, Ìlúdòtun, Oso, and Òrà. Each of these communities has its own recognized traditional ruler. Despite living in the same geographical space under a common name, most of the communities speak completely different speech forms which are, in some instances, not mutually intelligible. However as observed by Oyètádé (2007) Yorùbá remains the lingua franca in Àkókó region and most of the natives in addition to their indigenous tongues use Yorùbá as a “second native language” since both are acquired simultaneously.

According to Joseph (2015), the Àkókó part of Èdó state known as Àkókó-Èdó is made up of fifty-six towns and villages. These include Igarra, Dangbala, Makeke, Olloma, Ekpe, Bekuma, Okpe, Èkpè-Èdó, Oṣósò, Ojah, Lampese, Ikiran, Ibekuma, Uneme-Osu, Ewan, Ijaja, Ayegunle, Ojirami, Ibilo, Uneme-

the controversy surrounding the linguistic status of the speech forms, any name suggested for them must be justified.

nokhua, Ikpeshi and Ekpesa. Just as it is in Ondo state, there are different ethnic groups in Àkókó region of Èdó state. The Okpameri people constitute the major ethnic group there with towns/villages like Ibillo, Lampese, Ayegunle, Ugboshi, Imoga, Ekpesa, Ekor, Sómoríkà, Ikiran, Bekuma, Ogbe, Eshewa, Ojah, Onumu, Ojirami, Dangbala, Ekpe, Ogugu, Ebun, Makeke and Ayanzah. Others are the Uneme with towns/villages like Uneme-Erhurhu, Uneme-Akiosu, Uneme-Ekpedo, Uneme-Akpama and Uneme-Nokhua; and the Etuno comprising Okpe-Idesa-Oloma-Akukuku, Oṣósó, Sasaru-Ewan, Ikpeshi and Igbegere.

The major difference between Àkókó towns/vilages in Ondo state and their counterparts in Èdó is that unlike those in Ondo state the names of Àkókó-Èdó towns/villages do not have the word Àkókó attach to them. What they share in common are two: one, they are all grouped Àkókó-Èdó Local Government with the headquarters in Igarra; and two, all of them are jointly referred to as Àkókó-Èdó. However, the reality is, there is no language or dialect known as Àkókó spoken anywhere in Àkókó axis either in Ondo or Èdó state.

2. Linguistic Background and Situation in Àkókó Region

The Àkókó part of Ondo State is made up of four Local Government Areas: Àkókó North-East, Àkókó North-West, Àkókó South-East, and Àkókó South-West. According to Crozier and Blench (1992) and Lewis (Ethnologue 2009), there are five different language family groups of the Benue-Congo language family in the region. These are:

²**Yoruboid:** Ọkà, Ìkàré, Ìbòròpa, Àkùngbá, Ìfira, Ọbà, Ikún Šúpàrè, Ọgbàgì, Ìrùn, Àfín, Eṣé

²Oshodi (forthcoming) observed that this list is incomplete. Towns such as Ùgbè, Èrìtì, Oso and Ọrà are Yorùbá dialect speaking towns in Àkókó which

Arigidi Cluster: Arigidi Erúşú Àfá, Ògè, Ìdò, Àjè, Oyín, Eşé, Urò, Òjò, Ìgáşí

³**Akpes Cluster:** Àkpes (Àkùnnù), Àsè, Dája, Èşùkù, Gèdègèdè, Ìbaràmù Ìkàrààmù, Ìyàni

Ukan: (Ikani) Àúga (Ligau) Işè (Ishieu), Ìkákùmò-Àkókó (Ukaan), Anyánrán (Iyinno) (spoken in Èdó state)

Èdóid: Ehueun (Èkpinmi), Ùhàmi, (Ìşùà), Ukue

(Crozier and Blench 1992)

The Yoruboid group comprised of established Yorùbá dialects interestingly found across the four local government areas in the region: Òkà, Àkùngbá, Òbà, Ikún and Şúpàrè in Àkókó South-West; Ògbàgì, Ìrùn, and Àfìn in Àkókó North-West; Ìkàré and Ìbòròpa in Àkókó North-East. Ìfira, a member of Ào Yorùbá dialect predominantly spoken in Òsé local government area (Táiwò 2005) is the only one of the speech forms spoken in Àkókó South-East.

3. Genetic Classification and Linguistic Relationship of

Ìkàré and Arigidi

Arigidi and Ìkàré are neighbours whose boundaries are difficult to determine. However, facts from existing literature show that the two speech forms belong to different sub-language families. According to Lewis (2009), Ìkàré and Arigidi both belong to the Benue-Congo language family group. Awóbùlúyì (1988) and Adéníyì (2005, 2010) classified Ìkàré as a Yorùbá dialect. Awóbùlúyì (1998) further classified Ìkàré under Òbà-Ìkàré sub-group under South-East Yorùbá dialects. On his part, Adeníyì

were not captured. Also, we are of the view that Eşé, which was put under Arigidi Cluster, should be under Yoruboid.

³Agoyi (2008) suggested the name Àbèsàbèsì for this group and claimed it should be placed under Edoid.

(2010) classified the Yorùbá dialects spoken in Àkókó under Eastern Yorùbá dialects. As shown in the previous section, the linguistic status of Arigidi is still controversial. The consensus is that Arigidi and the other speech forms share a common ancestor with Yorùbá. However, there is no agreement among scholars regarding their actual sub-family group as different writers have classified them under different sub-families.

4. Lexical Variation in Ìkàré and Arigidi: A Synopsis of Bámigbádé and Sanni (2018)

Bámigbádé and Sanni (2018) carried out a lexicostatistic study on Ìkàré and Arigidi. The major goal of the study was:

to examine the extant relationship between Ìkàré and Arigidi dialects of the Àkókó languages, a member of the YEAI (Yoruboid, Èdoid, Akokoid and Igboïd) subgroups of the West Benue-Congo language family

Bámigbádé and Sanni (2018:43)

On the methodology adopted for the study, and some part of the findings, Bámigbádé and Sanni (2018:43) made the following claims:

A lexical count analysis of the data collected was done to determine the cognate percentage between the Ìkàré (sic) and Arigidi. The findings showed 45.0% of the items are identical, 40.0% are the same while 15.0% are different.

They summarized their findings on page 62 thus:

A careful look at the data above reveal a striking similarity between Arigidi and Ìkàré. This is as a

result of contact. Two major factors could be held accountable for this. First, the migration pattern of speakers of Akokoid reveals that they traced their ancestral home to both Ile-Ife and Benin. Second, their present geographical settlements pitch them between the speakers of Yorùbá and Èdoid languages. It is also noticed that Arigidi had a closer contact with Èdó than Ìkàré and Ìkàré on the other hand had a closer contact with Yorùbá than Arigidi. The lexical variants that are attested in our analysis above could be attributed to external influence as a result of contact with other languages which eventually led to borrowing or influence.

We shall now subject the focus, authenticity of the data supplied, method of data analysis as well as findings of Bámigbádé and Sanni (2018) to scrutiny.

4.1. Incorrect Data Presentation and Analysis

Lexical variation seeks to identify the differences between lexical items in two or more languages. The major goal usually is to establish similarities and differences by determining the level of cognates in the speech form being investigated. According to Romaine (2000), Lexicostatistics aims at establishing linguistic relations on the basis of a quantitative comparison of vocabulary; it is the statistical study of vocabulary to discover whether languages are historically related by counting the percentage of cognates.

A look at the data presented in Bámigbádé and Sanni (2018) reveals a lot of inaccuracies with regards to the forms ascribed to Arigidi words, especially in tone and phonemic representation. Table 1 contains examples of such misrepresentations and their correct forms, adapted from Oshodi (2011 and 2018).

Table 1. Lexical Items in Arigidi: Bámigbádé and Sanni (2018) versus Oshodi (2011b, 2018)

Gloss	Bamigbade & Sanni (2018)	Oshodi (2011b, 2018)
ashes	*ódon	ọ́dọ́n
axe	*ohó	ọ́họ́n
back	*òsan	ọ́sọ́n
bad	*a-sán	not a single word
belly	*ogo	ọ́gọ́
big	*don	dọ́n
bird	*oron	oorọ́n
bite	*ron	rọ́n
blood	*èjè	ẹ́jẹ́n
burn	*lejú	léyú
bush	*uron	èéfá
chin	*agbò	eetiò
child	*uworin	uwọ́n/àwọ́nrín
cloud	*súnmò	òfúrufú
day	*egen	ẹ́gẹ́n
die	*kú	kun
dirty	*sinrìn	dọ́tí
dog	*ófó	ofó
drink	*bo	bọ́
dry	*go	gho
dull (blunt)	*kún	not a single word
dust	*grukutu	erukutu
earth, world	*itfa	ẹ́ẹ̀kà
egg	*ejáha	ẹ́jaha
eye	*odù	oju
fall	*fɔ	lépo
feather	*eyíyo	ẹ́ẹ̀ka
few	*ikèngbè	yèyè

fight	*peje	kpeèje
fire	*itó	eeso
fish	*eso	eso
five	*itan	iton
fly (v)	*kòhò	hòhò
foot	*àtèlè òhú	òhò
forget	*bí	bin
four	*inee	ìnẹn
freeze	*dìyìnyùn	dì
give	*gbàyèn	not a single word
good	*idán	sọn
guts	*ègìrì eewòn	ègírìèwòn (chest)
hand	*ọwọ	ọwọ
hear	*şe	şe
head	*ègìrì	ègírì
heart	*ọkà	ọkàn
he	*okèrè	not a single word
how	*idaben (daji)	not a single word
in	*légo	ògo (in/inside)
kill	*kó	kpo
know	*rá	rọn
leg	*ùhò	òhò
lie	*oye	oye
louse	*osò leather	eeso
man/male	*òkòrè	ukọnřen (man) ọkọọrè (male)
mouth	*oru	òrun
name	*òdò	eyín
meat	*aran	ààrọn (goat/meat)
near	*yù-tìn	not a single word
neck	*ugó	ugọ
new	*tonton	tọtọtọ
night	*odúdú	òdudo

one	*ikan	ikón
other	*àjàfò	ìmòò
person	*èwé	ènen
play	*debò	deẹbo
rain	*èyìn	èjin /èdjin/
sand	*isá	ííša
salt	*owò	owo
short	*ikàgò	kúrú
sit	*sesin	şesin
sky	*sómò	sónmòn
sleep	*jen	şen
smoke	*újù	uyu
star	*iràwò	alawon èèjù
stand	*sisiyēn	şisiyēn
stick	*orupu	orùkpó (stick/cane)
stone	*eta	ęta
sun	*ùhò	ùhọ
straight	*tàarà	tààrà
that	*ìgòrò	igoro
there	*ihàrò	ìhanro
thin	*tere	not a single word
this	*igin rin	iginrin
three	*ída	ida
throw	*dèe	dé
tie	*pèe	pé
tongue	*èrè	ęerè
tooth	*eyín	eyin
vomit	*kpà	pà
walk	*džin	džen
wash (plate)	*bèe	bè
wash (cloth)	---	fọ
water	*èdži	èdjin
we	*ao	aò

wet	*rùn	no word
where	*ihen	ihêèn
when	*ifó ufoó	ùfọ̀
white	*efufo	èfúfò
woman	*èjèré	eşéere
firewood	*ohon	ọ̀họ̀n (tree/wood)
war	*olo	òòlò
wide	*kà	gbarà
weep	*go	gogò (weep/cry)
yellow	*ofefe	no word for it
year	*ebo	eebò

As evident in table 1, the examples given in Bámigbádé and Sanni (2018) were all asterisked to indicate their ill-representation in contrast to the well represented forms in Oshodi (2011b; 2018). Some of the errors are due to wrong substitution of vowels, e.g. /ẹ/ for /e/, /ọ/ for /o/, and /ọ̀n/ for /an/. Similarly, wrong assignment of tones by Bámigbádé and Sanni (2018) gave the Arigidi word for ‘white’ as /efufo/ with a mid-mid-mid tone sequence whereas the correct pronunciation is /èfúfò/ with a low-high-low sequence. Another example is the word for *tree* given as ‘ohon’ instead of ‘ọ̀họ̀n’. The difference was due to the use of vowel /o/ instead of /ọ/. Again, in Arigidi, the nasal vowels /an/ and /ọ̀n/ are two distinct vowels. Thus, the word for back rendered as ‘osan’ in Bámigbádé and Sanni (2018) is wrong. The correct word is “òsọ̀n”. Some examples were also given for certain words where no single word exists for such in Arigidi: the word for *bad* was tagged ‘a-san’, give ‘gbayen’, he ‘okére’ and yellow ‘ofefe’. For clarity, ‘Á à san’ is a full sentence which means ‘He/she/it is not good’. ‘gbà̀yọ̀n’ in Arigidi is an imperative sentence which means ‘Give it to him/her/it!’ There is no word for yellow in Arigidi. The discussion on the word for ‘he’ (the third person singular short subject pronoun) in Arigidi is beyond the scope of

this present study (see Oshodi 2013 for a comprehensive discussion). ‘Ọkọ̀ọ̀re’ in Arigidi means ‘male’ and not ‘he’.

Also, Bámigbádé and Sanni (2018; 61) gave examples of some Arigidi words which they claimed were influenced through contact with Yorùbá as well as those influenced by some neighbouring Èdoid languages. There are four issues with this claim. One, the link between Arigidi and Èdó is not new, Oshodi (2011b) made similar observations and justified it with lexical examples. Two, there is no direct neighbouring Èdo town around Arigidi which speaks a dialect of Èdó. Three, there are many languages and dialects under Èdoid, but the particular one referenced in Bámigbádé and Sanni (2018) was not mentioned. Four, if Arigidi is truly influenced by both Yorùbá and Èdó, it would have been more interesting if Bámigbádé and Sanni (2018) had made a categorical statement on the linguistic status of Arigidi, i.e. whether it should be considered an Èdó or a Yorùbá dialect.

A lot of wrong claims were also noticed in the Ìkàré data. It is very surprising that Bámigbádé and Sanni (2018) claimed that the only difference noticed between Ìkàré and Yorùbá is the replacement of sounds /w/ and /i/ with /h/ and /u/ respectively. The replacement of vowel /i/ with /u/ in Ìkàré is not a general rule as claimed by Bámigbádé and Sanni (2018). Words like iye ‘mother’, iba ‘father’, Ìsàkúnmi ‘a street’, ijèrí ‘food’, ilá ‘okra’, iden ‘maggot’, iyọ ‘salt’ and iije ‘yam’ still exist in Ìkàré where the vowel /i/ is not replaced with /u/ at the initial position. Besides, it is an established linguistic fact that some Yorùbá dialects like Ọwọ́, Èkìtì, Ìkàré and Ìjẹ̀sà normally use vowel /u/ in most cases in word initial position in contexts where Standard Yorùbá uses /i/. Furthermore, the claim that Ìkàré is closer to Yorùbá than Arigidi while Arigidi is closer to Èdoid than Ìkàré is confusing since the status of Ìkàré as a Yorùbá dialect has never

been in doubt and no linguistic literature has linked Ìkàré dialect to any Èdoid language.

There were also incorrect forms under the data for Ìkàré. Some examples of such misrepresentations are as presented below in table 2.

Table 2. Ìkàré (Bámigbádé and Sanni 2018) vs. Correct Form

Gloss	Bámigbádé and Sanni (2018)	Correct Form
belly	*úkù	ukùn
chin	*agbò	àgbòn
dig	*jèn	gbé
drink	*kè	ké
farm	*okó	oko
heart	*ókòn	ọkòn
name	*òdò	orúkọ
salt	*uyò	iyò
three	*éta	ẹta
wind	*aféré	atẹgùn
yellow	*pupa	no word

Some of the identified incorrect forms in table 2 from are significant for obvious reasons. For example, the Ìkàré words for ‘belly’, ‘heart’ and ‘three’ were given as ‘úkù, ókòn and éta’ respectively where they all began with a high tone. This is totally strange because the data portray Ìkàré as a dialect where a high tone can begin a word. This is incorrect because in Ìkàré just like Standard Yorùbá, the high tone never begins a word. Also, the word given for farm ‘okó’ actually means ‘penis’ in Ìkàré and not farm. Also, the word presented for yellow ‘pupa’ traditionally means ‘red’ while *yellow* as a colour does not exist in Ìkàré.

4.2. Unexplained Letters in the Data Analysis

Bámigbádé and Sanni (2018: 54-60), employed some letters under data presentation, which were not explained. These are presented below in table 3:

Table 3: Unexplained Letters by Bamigbade & Sanni (2018)

S/N	Gloss	Arigidi	*S/N	Ìkàré	Yorùbá
1	all	àkùkù	D	gbògbò	gbòngbò
9.	because	nítòrí	S	nítòrí	nítòrí
23.	cold	tún	I	tútù	tútù
72.	head	ègìrì	D	orí	orí
106.	name	òdò	S	òdò	orúko
169.	thick	gbúpon	I	nípon	nípon

Based on standard practices, S/N stands for serial number as shown in (1, 9, 23, 72, 106 and 169). However, another S/N (asterisked) is noticed in between Arigidi and Ìkàré. Instead of the usual numbers, letters D, S and I appeared under it. The function of these letters and the particular information they intended to convey in Bámigbádé and Sanni (2018) remains unclear because it was not explained.

4.3. Wrong Claims and Unusual Reference Patterns

Bámigbádé and Sanni (2018) contains some misleading claims and unusual reference patterns. These shall be highlighted, discussed and assessed in terms of their implications on the study of Àkókó speech forms and the overall quality of the work.

First and foremost, the goal of Bámigbádé and Sanni (2018) ‘to examine the extant relationship between Ìkàré and Arigidi dialects of the Àkókó languages’ (sic) was not justified. This assertion is based on two reasons. One, there has never been

any study on Ìkàré and Arigidi which examined their linguistic relationship and establish any fact on them, either negative or positive in terms of their relatedness. Thus, comparing their lexical items to examine and show the extant relationship between them is unjustifiable. Two, Ìkàré and Arigidi were referred to as dialects of Àkókó languages. This implies that there is a language or languages in the region known as Àkókó with Ìkàré and Arigidi as dialects of such language(s). This is also totally misleading. As shown in section two of this critique, there is no language known as Àkókó. The name Àkókó collectively refers to the region and all the inhabitants and does not represent any of their language, dialect or speech form.

Also, the methodology adopted by Bámigbádé and Sanni (2018) was faulty. The major goal of lexicostatistics is to determine cognates. Cognates refer to words that have the same meaning and descended from common ancestors. It is calculated by dividing the total number of items multiplied by 100 to obtain percentage cognates as follows:

$$\frac{\text{Cognates}}{\text{Total Number of Lexical Item}} \times 100$$

(Arókoyò & Lágúnjú 2019)

Gudschinsky (1956) identified three levels of cognate scores to determine relatedness:

- i. 0%–35% cognate means separate language family.
- ii. 36%–80% cognate means separate language, same family.
- iii. 80% and above cognate means it is the same language.

A look at the pattern of data analysis in Bámigbádé and Sanni (2018) revealed that it did not follow this well-established procedure of determining cognates. There was nowhere in the study where any form of division or multiplication was done to determine cognates. How Bámigbádé and Sanni (2018) arrived at the percentages used to determine cognates in the study remains unclear. Based on the levels of cognate scores to determine relatedness identified by Gudschisky (1956), one would have expected Bámigbádé and Sanni (2018) to choose a level among the three levels to explain and establish the degree of relatedness between Ìkàré and Arigidi, but nothing of such was done. The study did not make any categorical statement on the linguistic relationship between Ìkàré and Arigidi, but focused, instead, on its assumed linguistic link between Ìkàré and Yorùbá and Ìkàré and Èdoid on one hand; and the relationship between Arigidi and Yorùbá, and Arigidi and Èdoid on the other.

Bámigbádé and Sanni (2018) also claimed that Arigidi and Ìkàré both had contact with Yorùbá and possibly some Èdoid languages which are the closest neighbours to Arigidi in Àkókó-Èdó region. This claim is incorrect. Ìkàré is a dialect of Yorùbá, saying it had contact with Yorùbá is just surprising. Also, the claim that Ìkàré had contact with some Èdoid languages cannot be justified since the particular Èdoid language(s) in question were not mentioned. Furthermore, the claim that some Èdoid languages are the closest neighbours to Arigidi is geographically incorrect. The closest neighbours to Arigidi are mostly Yorùbá dialect speaking towns. Arigidi shares boundaries with Ìkàré, Ìbòròpa, Ògbàgì, Òkèàgbè and Erúşú. Apart from Òkèàgbè and Erúşú (which are not Èdoid speaking towns), the rest are Yorùbá dialect speaking towns. In fact, the proximity between Ìkàré and Arigidi is such that it is difficult to pinpoint the exact boundary between the two towns because houses have been built across the boundary by inhabitants of both towns. It is important to say that

historically, Arigidi has a link with Èdo. According to oral history (Oshodi 2005), the first settlers in Arigidi were claimed to have migrated from Ilé-Ifè but stopped over in Ùbíàjà (a town in Èdó State) where they spent a lot of time before moving to their present location. Their long stay in Èdó region is assumed to be responsible for some Èdó words found in Arigidi today. For example, the Arigidi word for money is ‘okùba’ which looks like a cognate of ‘ikìba’ and ‘úgùba’ in Ibillo and Ọsòsò in Àkókó-Èdó, respectively.

Furthermore, the claim credited to Oyétádé (2004) is a complete misrepresentation. The language families in Àkókó cited by Bámìgbádé and Sanni (2018) was from Crozier and Blench (1992) also cited in Oyétádé (2007). The section was titled “Languages spoken in Àkókó Region according to Group”; it is not “Variants of Àkókó Dialects” as claimed by Bámìgbádé and Sanni.

A look at the summary and findings of Bámìgbádé and Sanni (2018) revealed that their findings cannot be substantiated. From the data they presented, there is no striking similarity between Arigidi and Ìkàré contrary to their claim. In actual fact, with the distorted and incorrect data supplied and analyzed in the work, it is impossible to make any valid claim on the lexical relatedness of Ìkàré and Arigidi.

Also, in the latter part of the summary, Bámìgbádé and Sanni (2018) indirectly claimed that Ìkàré and Arigidi are variants of the same language presumably ‘Àkókó language’ and the variations attested in their lexical items could be attributed to external influence due to contact and borrowing from Yorùbá and some Èdoid languages. It also claimed that Ìkàré had a closer contact with Yorùbá than Arigidi. These claims are totally misleading. As established at least for Yorùbá, (Awóbùlúyì 1992), it is the Standard language (i.e. Yorùbá) that was shown to have borrowed from other various diverse dialects of the language.

On unusual citation and reference styles, one prominent unusual citation and reference issue in Bámigbádé and Sanni (2018) was the repeated citing of a single work by an author and making it appear as two different works by two different authors. Two instances of this are noted in the study.

The first was the in-text reference ‘Boluwaji (2012)’ on page 52 of the paper. Under references, the work titled “*The Sociolinguistics of Borrowing: The Impact of Yorùbá on Arigidi*” was credited to two authors namely, Boluwaji O (2012) and Oshodi B (2012) as follows;

1. *⁴Boluwaji O. (2012), “*The Sociolinguistics of Borrowing: The Impact of Yorùbá on Arigidi*” Unpublished B. A. Long Essay of Adekunle Ajasin University.
2. *Oshodi B. (2012), “*The Sociolinguistics of Borrowing: The Impact of Yorùbá on Arigidi*” Adekunle Ajasin University.

The second example was the in-text reference ‘Sophie (2013)’ on the same page 52. The work titled “*Tone in the Phonology, Lexicon and Grammar of Ìkàà̀n*” was credited to two authors as follows:

3. *Sophie, S. (2013), “*Tone in the Phonology, Lexicon and Grammar of Ikaan*”, Unpublished B.A. Long Essay of University of Benin
4. *Salffner, S. (2013), “*Tone in the Phonology, Lexicon and Grammar of Ikaan*.”

⁴The asterisk sign indicates that the citation was either incorrect or incorrectly cited.

One pattern for APA referencing is to have the surname first, written in full which would be followed by the first letter of the personal name in bold. It is surprising that the work of a single author was referenced and credited to two different authors by simply swapping the surname and the first name. In the first instance, the first name was written in full and made to appear as the surname and the surname was abbreviated and made to appear like the first name (wrong format); while in the second instance, the surname was written in full and the first name abbreviated (the correct format). For the first work “The Sociolinguistics of Borrowing: The Impact of Yorùbá on Arigidi”, the correct citation for the study should be:

5. Oshodi, B. (2011) “The Sociolinguistics of Borrowing: The Impact of Yorùbá on Arigidi”, *Studies in Language and Literature*, Vol. 2, 64-78, *University of Ado Ekiti*.

Example 5 reveals that the work was never an Undergraduate Long Essay of Adekunle Ajasin University neither was it published at Adekunle Ajasin University as claimed in Bámigbádé and Sanni (2018).

For the second work “Tone in the Phonology, Lexicon and Grammar of Ìkàà̀n”, the correct citation should be:

6. Salfner, S. (2009) *Tone in the Phonology, Lexicon and Grammar of Ikaan*. Doctoral Dissertation, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, London.

Example 6 reveals that the work was never an Undergraduate Long Essay of the University of Benin. The second citation (example 4) had neither a publisher nor a place of publication.

The work was actually a doctoral dissertation of SOAS, London, in (2009) and not (2013), as claimed by Bámigbádé and Sanni (2018).

These revelations confirm that the citations by Bámigbádé and Sanni (2018) in (1-4) were concocted and incorrectly cited. The most interesting thing about them is that the two authors to which the work were credited are the same person. *Boluwaji, O.* and *Oshodi, B.* is the same person. The full name is **Oshodi Boluwaji** and, so, the correct citation should be **Oshodi, B.** Similarly, *Sophie, S.* and *Salffner, S.* are the same person. The full name is **Salffner Sophie** and the correct citation should be **Salffner, S.** It is therefore clear that these double citations by Bámigbádé and Sanni (2018) were not mistakes. The convergence of the pattern used in both examples showed that they were purposely concocted.

Another issue in the paper involves the incorrect title of some cited works and the incomplete citation of some in the references. For example, Fábùnmi (2009) was cited as:

7. *Fabunmi (2009). Vigesimal Numerals on Ife (Togo) and Ifẹ̀ (Nigeria) Dialects of Yorùbá.

This citation is not only wrong but incomplete. Apart from the wrong title, the author's first name and the publisher (Journal information) were not included. The correct citation should be:

8. Fábùnmi, F. A. (2010). Vigesimal Numerals in Ifẹ̀ Dialects of Yorùbá in Nigeria and Togo. *New Findings in the Study of Nigerian Languages & Literatures: A festschrift in honour of Oladele Awobuluyi.* Oyebade, F., and T. Olúmúyìwa (eds.), pages 60-80, Department of Linguistics & Languages, Adekunle Ajasin University, Akungba-Akoko, Ondo State.

Another example is Ayéòmoni (2012) cited thus:

9. *Ayéòmoni, O. (2012). Comparative Study of Ondo and Ikale Dialects of Yoruba. O.A.U. Ile-Ife.

The title of the work was incorrectly cited; ditto the name of the publisher. The work was not published either by or at O.A.U Ile-Ife. The correct citation should be:

10. Ayéòmoni, O. (2012). A Lexico-Syntactic Comparative Analysis of Ondo and Ìkálẹ̀ Dialects of Yorùbá Language. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies* 2 (9), 1802-1810.

Our submission therefore is that, the various unusual citation cum reference styles in Bámigbádé and Sanni (2018) made the work appear more like a product of conjectures backed up with invalid claims and concocted citations and references which cannot be used to substantiate any claim made in any serious academic research.

5. Summary of Established Shortcomings in Bámigbádé and Sanni (2018)

Based on the issues identified and addressed above from Bámigbádé and Sanni (2018), it is evident that the study contained a lot of gaps. The quality of data presented and analyzed (most of which were incorrect and misleading), the invalid claims which were complete misrepresentations of established facts on Ìkàré and Arigidi and the unusual reference styles where non-existent authors and places of publications were concocted and cited have cast a shadow on the claims and findings of the study. The findings (i.e. incorrect claims and

submission in Bámigbádé and Sanni 2018) identified and established in this critique are summarized below:

1. The reason given for carrying out a lexical comparison of Ìkàré and Arigidi was not genuine enough to support the research. There has never been any controversy regarding either the linguistic relationship between them (i.e. Ìkàré and Arigidi) or their linguistic relationship with Èdoid languages. Considering the reference to Èdoid, Ìbòròpà would have been a better choice than Ìkàré for such a research. This is because Ìbòròpà is a Yorùbá dialect speaking town which shares a boundary with Arigidi and also with Èkpìnmi (an Èdó dialect speaking Àkókó town).
2. There is no language, dialect or speech form known as Àkókó. The various speech forms found in Àkókó region belong to five different language families. For example, Àkùngbá, Ìkàré, Òkà and Ìbòròpà are Yorùbá dialects, Ehueun (Èkpìnmi), Ùhàmì, (Ìṣùà) and Ukue (Ìkpè) are dialects of Èdó while Àúga (Ligau) Iṣè, (Ishieu) and Anyánrán (Iyinno) (spoken in Èdó state) are dialects of Ùkààn (Ìkààn). They are all spoken in Àkókó region.
3. Ìkàré and Arigidi are next door neighbours but they belong to different sub-language families. Ìkàré is an established Yorùbá dialect while the linguistic status of Arigidi still remains controversial. Thus, it is misleading to refer to them either as Àkókó dialects or dialects of the same language without providing compelling linguistic facts to back up the claim.
4. Most of the data presented and analyzed in Bámigbádé and Sanni (2018) especially for Arigidi were incorrect and misleading. The study contained a lot of distortions on phonological patterns of Ìkàré and Arigidi. For example, giving the Arigidi word for dust as “grukutu” presents

Arigidi as a speech form which allows consonant cluster. This is totally misleading. From previous studies on Arigidi e.g. Oyétáde (1981), Oshodi (2005, 2011a, 2011b, 2011c, 2011d, 2013, 2016, 2018) and Fádorò (2014), Arigidi operates an open syllable system and just like Yorùbá and its dialects, it does not allow consonant cluster or word consonant final.

5. The lexical comparison between Arigidi and Èdoid without reference to the particular Èdoid language was totally vague. The basis and justification for the comparison and reference was not established.
6. The claim of contact between Ìkàré and Èdó is confusing and unclear. There is no known study where any reference was made to any linguistic relationship between Ìkàré and Èdó or where there is a controversy over the status of Ìkàré as a Yorùbá dialect.
7. There was overgeneralization as well as distortion of established facts on Yorùbá dialects with reference to Ìkàré. For example, the use of vowel /u/ in positions of vowel /i/ at word initial position and the substitution of consonant /w/ for /h/ in Ìkàré as against what operates in Yorùbá is context specific and not a general rule as claimed in Bámigbádé and Sanni (2018).
8. A lot of false claims were credited to some authors. For example, the table of language classification credited to Oyétáde (2007:2) is a false credit. The classification was by Crozier and Blench (1992) and it was titled language families in Àkókó and NOT that of Àkókó dialects as claimed in Bámigbádé and Sanni (2018). Also, there is no known work on Arigidi by Boluwaji (2012) cited in Bámigbádé and Sanni (2018), same for Sophie (2013) on Ùkààn (Ikaan). The correct in-text citations for the works

cited should be Oshodi (2011) and Salfner (2010) respectively.

9. Some unusual reference styles were discovered in Bámigbádé and Sanni (2018). One, non-existing authors were cited. Two, a work with the same title was credited to two different authors where one of the two sources cited does not exist. Three, some works cited under references were incomplete. In some cases the places of publications were concocted while it was missing in others. Four, the titles of some works cited were either incomplete or wrong. Five, some works cited (in-text) were not referenced while some listed under references were not cited (in-text). The high number of this type of citations and references identified in Bámigbádé and Sanni (2018) shows they were not mistakes but deliberate

The above summary of findings (i.e. shortcomings of Bámigbádé and Sanni 2018) identified in this critique clearly show that they are vital issues that needed to be addressed. There are lots of linguistic misconceptions about the group of speech, tagged Arigidi Cluster Lewis (Ethnologue 2009). A number of studies have examined these speech forms and have come up with controversial, incorrect and misleading conclusions on them. Such conclusions have presented not only incorrect but misleading perception about their structure as well as their linguistic status. More so, considering the controversial issues surrounding the linguistic status of Arigidi and other related speech forms in Àkókó region, any study on any of them is always of interest to linguists and language scholars all over the world. It thus becomes imperative to always give not just correct but accurate and valid information about them particularly their grammatical structure.

6. Conclusion

Based on existing studies on Yorùbá dialects and the speech forms in Àkókó, this paper has shown that Ìkàré and Arigidi belong to different language sub-families. On this premise, it is therefore pertinent to establish a good basis and purpose before a lexical comparison can be carried out on them (see Arókoyò and Lágúnjú 2019). Unfortunately, Bámigbádé and Sanni (2018) did not establish any genuine basis for their comparison. From all indications, the comparison was based solely on the wrong assumption that the two speech forms are dialects of Àkókó language, whereas, there is no such thing as Àkókó language. Facts presented in this paper clearly showed that Bámigbádé and Sanni's research on the topic was not thorough. Serious issues ranging from citing wrong, incomplete and non-existent sources, false claims credited to some of the sources, among many others made their submission questionable. Bámigbádé and Sanni (2018) evidently was carried out with no pre-research data driven facts, as it actually presented the exact opposite of facts that have been established on Ìkàré and Arigidi. These obvious shortcomings cannot be overlooked because doing could lead to wrong perception about the linguistic structure of Ìkàré and Arigidi as well as the linguistic relatedness between them.

In conclusion, this paper has established that Bámigbádé and Sanni (2018) has no place in the dialectology of Àkókó speech forms because rather than contributing something new, it only succeeded in distorting existing and well established linguistic facts on Ìkàré and Arigidi.

References

- Adéníyì, H. 2005. Àwọ̀n ẹ̀ka èdè Yorùbá. Adeniyi, H. and Òjọ́, A. (eds.) *Ìlò èdè àti ẹ̀dá-èdè Yorùbá*. Africa World Press, Inc.
- Adéníyì, H. 2010. *The Yorùbá dialects in West Africa and beyond*. Paper presented at the Research Institute for World Languages. Osaka University, Japan.
- Adéníyì, K. 2016. An outline of Ìgá sí Tone System. *Ihafa: A Journal of African Studies* 8 (2), 17-35.
- Àgọ̀yì, T. 2008. *The phonology of vowel harmony in Àbèsàbèsì*. Doctoral Dissertation, Department of Linguistics and Languages, Adekunle Ajasin University, Akungba-Akoko, Ondo State.
- Arókoyò, B. E., & O. O. Lágúnjú 2019. A lexicostatistics comparison of Standard Yorùbá, Àkùré and Ìkàré Àkókó dialects. *Journal of Universal Language* 20 (2), 1-27.
- Awóbùlúyì, O. 1972. The morphophonemics of Òwọ̀n Àfá. *Research Notes* 5, 2:25-44, Department of Linguistics and Nigerian Languages, University of Ibadan.
- Awóbùlúyì, O. 1992. Aspects of Contemporary Standard Yorùbá in Dialectological Perspective. Isola, Akinwumi (ed.) *New Findings in Yorùbá Studies*, 1-79, Ibadan / Lagos: J. F. Odunjo Memorial Lecture Series 3.
- Awóbùlúyì, O. 1998. Àwọ̀n ẹ̀ka-èdè Yorùbá. Àpérò ẹ̀gbé-èdè Yorùbá, pages 10-15, Bodija, Ibadan: Pastoral Institute.
- Ayéòmọ̀ni, O. 2012. A lexico-syntactic comparative analysis of Ondo and Ìkálẹ̀ dialects of Yorùbá language. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies* 2 (9), 1802-1810.
- Bámìgbádé, O. E., and A. F. Sanni 2018. Lexical variation in Ìkàré and Arigidi dialects of Àkókó. *Ihafa: A Journal of African Studies* 9 (2), 43-64.

- Bennet, P. & J. P. Sterk 1977. South Central Niger-Congo: A reclassification. *Studies in African Linguistics* 8, 241–273.
- Capo, H. B. C. 1989. Defoid. J. T. Bendor-Samuel, & R. L. Hartell (eds.) *The Niger-Congo Languages: A Classification and Description of Africa's Largest Language Family*, 275-290, Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Crozier, D. H., and R.M. Blench. 1992. *An index of Nigerian languages*, Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Fábùnmi, A. 2009. A GPSG structure of aspect in Yorùbá Àkókó, *Nordic Journal of African Studies* 18(4), 258–285.
- Fábùnmi, F. A. 2010. Vigesimal numerals in Ifè dialects of Yorùbá in Nigeria and Togo. Oyebade, F. and T. Olumuyiwa (eds.) *New Findings in the Study of Nigerian Languages & Literatures: A festschrift in honour of Oladele Awobuluyi*, Akungba-Akoko Department of Linguistics & Languages, Adekunle Ajasin University, pages 60-80.
- Fádorò, J. O. 2014. Akokoid comparative wordlist. *Journal of Advances in Linguistics* 3(1), 156-169.
- Greenberg, J. 1963. The languages of Africa. *The Hague I.J.L.A.L. Publications 25 of the Indiana University Research Centre in Anthropology, Folklore Linguistics* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Gudschinsky, S. 1956. The ABC's of lexicostatistics (*Glottochronology*). *Word* 12 (2), 175-210.
- Hoffman, C. 1974. Nigerian languages by language families. *Mimeograph*, Ibadan.
- Joseph O. S. 2015. Àkókó-Èdó local government area: The oldest, largest, unaltered, untapped and unexplored

- L.G.A in Nigeria. *Afemaiconnect.com*. Retrieved on 20/01/2020.
- Lewis, T. 2009. Ethnologue: Languages of the world, *Summer Institute of Linguistics International*. Retrieved on September 28, 2011, from the Website temoa: Open Educational Resources (OER) Portal at <http://www.temoa.info/node/24358>
- Ohiri-Anichie, C. 2006. The place of Akokoid in Benue – Congo. O. M. Ndimele, C. I. Ikekeonwu, and B. M. Mba (eds.) *Language and Economic Reforms in Nigeria*, Port-Harcourt: M and J. Grand. Orbit Communications Ltd. and Emai Press.
- Olúmúyiwá, T., and B. Oshodi 2012. On the linguistic situation in Àkókó. *California Linguistics Notes* Vol. xxxvii, No 1, 1-8.
- Oshodi. B. 2005. *The internal structure of the determiner phrase in Arigidi*. Unpublished M. A. dissertation, Department of Linguistics and Languages, Adekunle Ajasin University, Akungba-Akoko, Nigeria.
- Oshodi, B. 2011a. The HTS (High Tone Syllable) in Arigidi: An introduction. *Nordic Journal of African Studies* 20 (4), 263–275.
- Oshodi, B. 2011b. *A reference grammar of Arigidi*. Akure: Montem Paperbacks.
- Oshodi, B. 2011c. The sociolinguistics of borrowing: The impact of Yorùbá on Arigidi. *Studies in Language and Literature* Vol. 2, 64-78, University of Ado Ekiti.
- Oshodi, B. 2011d. A comparative study of the phonological features of Arigidi and Standard Yorùbá: Implication for language classification. *Akungba Journal of Linguistics and Literatures* Vol. 3, 68-76.

- Oshodi, B. 2016. The epenthetic vowel and negation in Arigidi and Ọ̀wò: Another evidence of Arigidi-Yorùbá affinity. *Studies in Linguistics* 40, 423-450.
- Oshodi, B. 2018. The Arigidi speech form in words: A pictorial guide, Vol. 1. Àkùrẹ̀: Montem Paperbacks.
- Oshodi, B. in Press. Academic invention versus linguistic reality: on the validity of the so-called Ñjò-Kóo. *Yorùbá: A Journal of the Yorùbá Studies Association of Nigeria*.
- Oshodi, B. Forthcoming. *Yorùbá dialects in Akókó region of Ondo State: An internal classification*. Àkùrẹ̀: Montem Paperbacks.
- Oyètádé, S. O. 1981. *The phonology of Arigidi*. Unpublished undergraduate Long Essay, Department of Linguistics and African Studies, Ibadan: University of Ibadan.
- Oyètádé, S. O. 2004. Towards a study of linguistic variation in Yorùbá: A preliminary statement: Language endangerment in Nigeria: Perspectives with the Akpes Cluster of Akoko languages, Akinlabi, A. and Adesola, O. (eds.) *Proceedings of the 4th World Congress of African Linguistics*, New Brunswick, Cologne: Rudiger Koppe, 529-548.
- Oyètádé, S. O. 2007. Language endangerment and language preservation: Perspectives on Àkókó languages of the Southwest. Small languages and small language communities, 55. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 184, 169-184.
- Romaine, S. 2000. *Language in society: An introduction to sociolinguistics*, 2nd edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Salfner, S. 2009. *Tone in the phonology, lexicon and grammar of Ikaan*. Doctoral Dissertation, School of Oriental and African Studies, London: University of London.
- Táíwò, O. 2005. *Negation in Ào dialect of Yorùbá*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Linguistics and African Languages, Ibadan: University of Ibadan.