

A Contrastive Lexicology of Greeting and Food Terms of English and Ogu Language: Its Pedagogical Implications

Taofeek Olanrewaju Alabi

Department of General Studies, The Federal Polytechnic, Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria
pthalab@yahoo.co.uk

Adewale Kazeem Ayeloja (Ph.D)

Department of English, Faculty of Arts, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria
adewaleloja@yahoo.co.uk

Babatope Joel Kehinde

Department of General Studies, The Federal Polytechnic, Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria.

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v4i1.859>

Received:

21/02/2022

Accepted:

25/03/2022

Keywords:

lexical variations, lexical difficulties, structural semantics, contrastive analysis, second language (L2).

Abstract

This paper is a contrastive study of two semantic fields of English and Ogu language namely greeting terms and food terms with the aim of identifying how lexical variations in the two semantic fields affect the learning of English by Ogu second language (L2) learner. The paper observed that the internal differentiation of human societies is reflected in the two languages, and responsible for some learning difficulties of Ogu English learner, especially in the lexis, which is considered as more culturally generated. The theoretical framework for the study is anchored on structural semantics, Sapir-whorf hypothesis and contrastive analysis principles. Twenty (20) subjects, who are Ogu/English bilinguals were purposively selected and interviewed with specific questions from the two semantic fields under study. The findings revealed that the socio-cultural and geographical realities of each speech community accounts for their vocabulary and naming of words. The paper thus recommended proper understanding of the learner's culture for proper translation of texts, design appropriate module for teaching and learning English, and a practical classroom approach to learning of second language vocabulary as some of the ways of resolving the learning problems confronted by Ogu learners of English.

1. INTRODUCTION

Language is a major index of man's culture as language and culture are closely related. Andah (1982) posits that "culture embraces all the material and non-material expressions of a people as well as the process with which the expressions are communicated". According to Sapir (1963:207), "language does not exist independent of culture: it is an important part of culture as well as a major vehicle for the expression of culture". Language does not exist in a vacuum... it is a means of expressing society's tradition and culture; so language exists as an aspect of people's culture (Akindele & Adegbite, 1993). Fishman, as cited in Adeyanju (2002) believes that "language and culture are inseparable. Language has a dual relationship with culture: it is an important part of culture as well as a major vehicle for the expression of culture. In fact, language is an expression of culture. According to Ogunsiji (2013), "our culture

influences the way we use language to express reality. There is, indeed, what can be termed cultural determinism as an alternative to linguistic determinism espoused in the strong form of Sapir-Whorf linguistic relativity hypothesis. Culture as the totality of the way we think and behave influences our language and the way we use it; it determines what we say and how we say it”.

Given this premise, therefore, lexical items of a particular language might be regarded as the carriers of the culture that produces the language. Banjo (1969) identifies cultural variations as the root of difficulty that one experiences in learning the vocabulary of another language. To him, the difficulty in learning the vocabulary of another language is in choosing the most apt member of a lexical set in a particular context, even in ones mother tongue. These cultural variations often result in divergent perceptions of what the worldview is in various societies.

Nigeria, as a multilingual nation, has many indigenous languages interacting with the English language. The English language and these indigenous languages, part of which is the Ogu language, shared some similarities and differences. These are obvious in the contrastive studies carried out by Banjo (1969), Maiyanga (1987), Lamidi (1996; 2004), Ojo (1996) and Igboanusi (2000). These differences account for varying degrees of proficiency among the Nigerian speakers of English. Moreover, one phenomenon that aptly illustrates the relationship between culture and language is the naming system, especially in the African culture”. According to Soyinka (1988)

Naming is a critical business in traditional African society....our names have meaning....they are intimations of hope, destiny, and affirmations of origin. They also have a history

Hence, this study focuses on contrastive lexicology of English and Ogu languages. It explores how speakers of both languages view the same lexemes semantically by employing a contrastive analytical tool to predict the likely areas of difficulty facing an Ogu speaker of English in the chosen semantic fields namely: greeting and food terminologies. The emphasis, however, is on the socio-cultural influences of the two worlds (English and Ogu) in the naming of objects, and on the Ogu speaker learning the target language (English). Thus, it becomes imperative to provide some basic information on the two languages as well as discuss certain concepts that are of relevance to this paper.

1.1.English and Ogu Language in Contact

The ‘Ogu’ language, also referred to as ‘Ogugbe’, is spoken by the Ogu people in Badagry, a town situated at the border point between Nigeria and the Republic of Benin. The Ogu people of Badagry and their language “Ogu” (shortening form of Ogugbe) have both been erroneously referred to as “Egun” (Avagnon, 1994). Our investigations revealed that this is probably as a result of the people’s contact with the Europeans who could neither pronounce the name of the people nor their language correctly. They resolved to merge the two terms into one bastardized term ‘Egun’. However, native speakers of the language call it “ogu”, which is adopted for this work.

According to Avoseh (1980), the Ogu people were said to have migrated from Porto-Novo to Badagry in the year 1925. The town is located in a coastal terrain, dominated by creeks and river estuaries. The mean monthly maximum temperatures fluctuate around 30⁰C, while the mean medium temperatures are rarely below 22⁰C. The relative humidity of the zone is

A Contrastive Lexicology of Greeting and Food Terms of English and Ogu Language: Its Pedagogical Implications

found to be lower to around 60%. Badagry area stretches south-westwards to include the coastal settlements of Gberefu, Gayingbo, Weshe, Kwemem, Gbaji, and eastwards to include the Ajara group of towns made of Topa, Aradagun, Ajido, Mowo, Vethol Doko, Agamaden, Ebute-Olofin, Ikoga, Igbaorosun, Topo, Pota, Tohun. Others include Gbanko, Daforo, Ogungbe, Akoko, Gedu, Moba, Ahanfe Kase, Pasi, Kweme, Ogo-Hausa and Grasinme. The Ogu people can also be found outside Badagry in places such as Ijanikin, Ojo, Iyana-Iba, Atan in large numbers.

Linguistically, the Ogu language is one of the “Kwa” languages spoken chiefly in Ghana, Cote d’Ivoire, Benin, Nigeria and Liberia. Other “Kwa” language family includes Ewe, Yoruba, Igbo, Nupe, Ashanti, Benin, etc. According to Greenberg classification of African language family, Kwa languages fall under the ‘Gur’ or Voltanic classification, which in turn comes under the Niger-Kordofanian language family. A major characteristic feature of this language family is the use of tones to indicate semantic or grammatical distinction. Ogu is said to have more than twenty dialects in the language family. They include Allada, Toli, Fon, Whegbe, Werrie, Savi, Eseto, Whla, Devi, Whydah, Jakin, etc. Out of these dialects, Allada is the only one that is spoken in the neighbouring towns and districts of both Badagry and Porto-Novo. It has a wider acceptability and usage within and outside Nigeria. It is a dialect used in translating the Holy Bible into Ogu language (Biblu Wiwe), produced over fifty years ago. This dialect of Ogu language is, therefore, the one adopted for this study.

The English language is one of the Germanic languages, which in turn descended from the Proto-Indo-Germanic languages. It is a language whose development was initially characterized by series of invasions (Medubi, 1999). Today, the English language has expanded to virtually the entire world (Yassin et al., 2020). The language has travelled all over the world, competed with other languages, and has taken root in lands and climates far and very different from its original base.

The language came into Nigeria in the 16th century as a result of adventure, gospel propagation, colonialism and commerce (Banjo, 1969). The Ogu speakers of Badagry were among the first set of Nigerians to come in contact with the English language by virtue of being a coastal area used for commercial activities by the British traders. According to Ogu (1992), the beginning of the missionary activities equally contributed to the spread of English in Nigeria, and Badagry in particular. Also, the abolition of Trans-Atlantic slave trade helped to entrench English in the West Coast. Ogu (1992), quoting Crowder (1968) says:

In the 1830s many freed slaves from Freetown came back to their original homes in Lagos, Badagry and Abeokuta. The arrival changed the linguistic typology of the West coast.

The influx of these people, and their contact with the Ogu people of Badagry, affected the linguistic terrain of the coastal area.

1.2. Contrastive Lexicology

Contrastive lexicology, as an aspect of contrastive linguistics, focuses upon the study of common and divergent features of lexicons of two or more languages, and finding out correspondences between the vocabulary units of the languages under investigation. Lexicology studies the lexis or vocabulary of a given language, and includes historical lexicology, comparative lexicology, contrastive lexicology, applied lexicology. Contrastive lexicology aims at establishing differences

and similarities between languages in the course of their systematic description. According to Borysenko (2005), Contrastive lexicology provides a theoretical foundation on which the vocabularies of different languages can be compared and described, the correlation between the vocabularies of two or more languages being the scientific priority.

Contrastive lexicology deals with *lexis in contrast* as manifested in the development of the two unrelated languages such as Ogu and English. Harouni (2004) claims that contrastive lexicology studies the morphological and semantic aspects of the lexical units or lexemes at the cross-language level. It compares and contrasts the various lexicalization processes, i.e. the form and meaning realizations at the word level without neglecting the syntactic environment which specifies the distribution of such realizations. The realizations at the level of the form constitute the object of study of what is referred to as lexical morphology and the realizations at the level of meaning are the object of concern of what is referred to as lexical semantics.

Contrastive typological investigations are carried out with the help of several methods. It could be an attempt to find out the derivational structure of a lexical unit, which makes use of Immediate Constituent analysis and transformational analysis. If the semantic structure of two correlated words is compared, the componential analysis will probably be applied. The distributional analysis in its various forms is commonly used nowadays by lexicologists of different schools of thought. By the term distribution we understand the occurrence of a lexical unit relative to other lexical units of the same level. It is readily observed that a certain component of the word meaning is described when the word is identified distributionally.

James (1980) claims that “the task of contrastive lexicology is “to compare linguistic accounts stated within the lexicological framework of the lexical competence possessed by speakers of two languages concerned”. Among the final tasks of any research in the field of Contrastive Lexicology are (a) to study lexical units of the languages compared (b) to investigate the problems of word-structure and word-formation in the languages under consideration (c) to study the problem of interrelation of a word and its meaning (d) to identify and classify the main isomorphic and allomorphic features characteristic of lexicons of the languages studied, and (e) to single out the isomorphic regularities and describe allomorphic singularities in the lexicons of the languages investigated.

1.3.Statement of the Problem

The pre-occupation of Contrastive Analysis rests on its ability to study the differences and similarities present in a pair of languages, with emphasis on dissimilarities. This points to the fact that two languages can rarely enjoy the same features at all linguistic levels. The Ogu speaker leaning English often face problems in the naming of some objects present in English but not in Ogu. The problem of lexical variation between the two languages due to cultural and geographical differences affects the learning of English vocabulary by an Ogu speaker, and consequently leads to a problem of transfer (positive or negative) from Ogu into the English language.

1.4.Research Questions

- a. How does an Ogu speaker view the same lexeme of English and Ogu in the two semantic fields under study?
- b. How do different world views and the socio-cultural realities in both worlds affect their lexical items?
- c. What are the likely problems that an Ogu L2 learner will face in the process of learning English?

- d. In what way (s) will an Ogu speaker give expression to English words not present in the Ogu language?
- e. How will the knowledge of some linguistic rules in the target language affect its learning process?

1.5. Aim and Objectives

The paper aims at examining the lexical variations between English and Ogu language due to cultural and geographical differences, which affects the learning of English vocabulary by an Ogu learner of English, and consequently leads to a problem of transfer (positive or negative) from Ogu into the target language. The objectives are

- a. to reveal how an Ogu speaker views the same lexeme of English and Ogu in the two semantic fields under study?
- b. to underscore the view that different world views and the socio-cultural realities in both worlds affect their lexical items.
- c. to assess the problems an Ogu L2 learner of English will likely be confronted in the process of learning English
- d. to examine the way (s) an Ogu speaker will give expression to those words not present in the mother tongue
- e. to describe how knowledge of some linguistic rules in a language affect its learning process?

2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The data for the study was obtained through an interview. The sampling method was a stratified random sampling technique in which a total of twenty (20) respondents were interviewed. The respondents are all English/Ogu bilinguals with high degree of proficiency in both languages. The respondents were asked to give the Ogu equivalents of the lexemes used in the two semantic fields of English. The data obtained in Ogu were then compared and contrasted with English to determine their areas of similarities and differences. Emphasis was, however, placed on the dissimilarities which is the major pre-occupation of CA and this work in order to discover the likely areas of difficulty for an Ogu speaker learning the English language (L2).

3. THEORETICAL ISSUES

As stated earlier, the theoretical foundation for this study is drawn from the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, structural semantics and contrastive analysis principles. The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis has been viewed from two perspectives: linguistic determinism (our thoughts and we are imprisoned by our language) and linguistic relativism (our language reflects only our world experiences). According to Whorf (1956), “the worlds in which different societies live are distinct worlds, not the same world with different labels attached”. This argument was later reshaped to read: “the world in which human beings live is the same and that it is only the labels of things that differ”. Corroborating this view, Leech (1974:30) says, “Languages have a tendency to impose structure on the real world by treating some distinctions as crucial and ignoring others”. The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis seems to have focused on language as being culture-bound. That accounts for Benjamin Lee Whorf’s position cited in Carroll (1964) that: “...we dissect nature along lines laid down by our native tongues. The categories and types that

we isolate from the world of phenomena we do not find there because they stare every observer in the face”.

The implication of Sapir-Whorf hypothesis for this study resides in the statement of Sapir (1929) as quoted by Chandler (1985) that “no two languages are ever sufficiently similar to be considered as representing the same reality”. This paper aligns with the position of linguistic relativism which states that our language reflects only our world experiences. The study pays attention, not only to the linguistic description, but to social and cultural factors which are fundamental in accounting for variations in the lexical structures of Ogu and English in the area of their vocabulary. The paper focuses on an Ogu/English bilingual, whose L1 is Ogu and the target language is English. By contrasting the lexemes present in the three semantic fields of study; we can extract difficult areas of the lexicon which an Ogu (L1) speaker may encounter in the process of learning the English (L2) vocabulary.

Structural semantics illuminates our knowledge of the nature of meaning, the concept of lexical relations and the semantic structure of the vocabulary. Some basic concepts constituting the structural semantics register are lexical relations, which can be described in terms of syntagmatic (the axis of chain) and paradigmatic (axis of choice) relations holding between lexical items in a system; synonyms (the semantic relation of similarity of meaning); antonyms (the semantic relations of oppositeness of meaning); hyponymy (a relation that holds between a general class and its sub-classes; polysemy (a semantic phenomenon of multiplicity of meaning); componential analysis (the view that every lexeme can be analysed in terms of a set of more general sense components, some or all of which will be common to several different lexemes in the lexicon); and hierarchical analysis (the hierarchical structure of the vocabulary in which the lexicographer works from the most general to the most specific).

The term “Contrastive Linguistics” or “Contrastive Analysis” is associated with applied contrastive studies advocated as a means of predicting an/or explaining difficulties faced by second language learners with a particular mother tongue in learning a particular target language. Lado (1957) as cited in James (1980:145) claims that:

The plan of CA rests on the assumption that we can predict and describe the Patterns which will cause difficulty in learning and those that will not cause difficulty.

This view is supported by Crystal (1992:28) who opines that contrastive analysis seeks to identify points of structural similarities and differences between two languages; to identify areas of potential difficulty i.e. interference or negative transfer in the learning of one or other of their languages. To linguists, the objective of comparison in CA may vary as pointed out by Johanson and Hofland (1994:25) that:

Language comparison is of great interest in a theoretical as well as an applied perspective. It reveals what is general and what is language specific and is therefore important both for the understanding of language in general and for the study of the individual languages.

Contrastive linguistics is concerned with linguistic issues such as transfer (positive or negative), interference, interlanguage study, translation study, etc. Within CA, it is assumed that learners will tend to transfer features of their mother tongue to their L2 utterances which often results to interference. The core of this hypothesis according to Larsen-Freeman and Long (1999), cited in Lamidi (2004:38) is that, “where two languages were similar, positive transfer would occur; where they were different, negative transfer or interference would occur”. Thus,

A Contrastive Lexicology of Greeting and Food Terms of English and Ogu Language: Its Pedagogical Implications

CA is regarded as an instrument for comparing languages and improving the methods and results of language teaching. The contrastive analysis hypothesis therefore refers to the belief that learning could be efficacious through the utilization of the similarities and differences between two systems: S1 and S2 (S1 being the first system acquired and S2, the second) (Lamidi, 2004). James (1980) identifies four approaches to the study of contrastive analysis. These are

- i. Structural and taxonomic model, which uses immediate constituent analysis in the comparison of structures or patterns of linguistic expressions without any reference to meaning.
- ii. Transformational generative grammar approach, which posits that deep structures and transformations are universal and the CA brings out points of departure in structures.
- iii. Contrastive generative grammar, where L1 and L2 structures are generated from a common base and are contrasted during this process of generation, and
- iv. Case grammar, which is based on a set of (largely semantic) linguistic universals.

In this paper, item (iv) shall be our reference point because it deals with the contrast of languages in the largely semantic fields.

4. DATA ANALYSIS

4.1.English and Ogu Greeting Terms

The greeting terms in English are basically for social interaction among members of the community. They are not as elaborate as that of the Ogu language. At this level of discourse, the English greeting terms are usually casual and make use of such terms as ‘hello’/‘hi’, congratulations, sorry, etc. In actual fact, an English man considers greeting as bothersome at times (Ojo, 1996). This accounts for the fewer terms existing in the English language. On the other hand, the Ogu greeting terms differ considerably from that of English. The Ogu culture accords greetings a great priority because it is through this cultural act that one demonstrates the concern for the well-being of others. It is one of the parameters used in measuring the proper conduct of a person in the Ogu society. The system of greetings on Ogu is observed via the production of a lengthy greeting in place of the casual greetings, which characterize the English discourse. The tables below show the contrast and similarities between the two languages.

Table I

WHÈNÈNÚ - SEASON/TABLE			
Ogu	English	Ogu	English
Mì kúdó aḥonú	Good morning	Mì kúdó àwéwéh (Happy harmattan period)	X
Mì kúdó whèmè	Good afternoon		
Mì kúdó whèjàyì	Good evening	Mì kúdó whènù (I hope you are enjoying the dry season)	X
Mì kúdózàn (Greeting for night, not in English ‘Goodnight’)	X	Mì kúdó whe	Compliments of the season
Èzúnkerè	Good night		

Mì kúdó àvivò (I hope you are enjoying the cold weather)	X	Mì kúdó gbòjè. {Happy holiday/happy resting day(s)}	X
--	---	---	---

Table II

ONODONU: CONGRATULATORY TERMS		VIVE: CONDOLENCE	
Ogu	English	Ogu	English
Mì kúdó tádagbè	Congratulations	Mí pàyídó	Sorry
Mì kúdó aloh sínmè (Congratulation on your new born baby)	X	Gothó ètòn na yòn	Accept my heartfelt sympathy
Jewhe na pòn ẹn (The baby will have younger ones)	X	Màwú nahdó arò múyíránká do tè. (God will prevent the re-occurrence of such death)	X
Yònú na bàsì tádagbè	Happy married life	Mi ma na mọ mọkọntón bà. (We won't witness such a terrible loss again)	X
Mì kúdó kwèzizań alowiwetòn. (All the money spent on the wedding will be fruitful)	X	Mawú nah yi devotho tẹntónmèh (God will replace the dead with another one (in the case of a baby)	X
Ásì naji bogbo (The wife will give birth to many children)	X	È wà lèbránú	What a pity!
Owhénámiyón (The new house will bring comfort)	X		
mi na so náa mọ mọ íkónà (You will not witness such occurrence again)	X		
Mì kúdó gbigbogaa na zán ẹ loo. (You will use what you bought by yourself)	X		
Màwú íná bàyí dèwú gán mọ lóo (May you be blessed with more promotions)	X		

Table III

ÀZÓN - WORK GREETING		DONÚDÓ - CASUAL	
Ogu	English	Ogu	English
Ena sẹ na wẹ	X	Nahweh	Hello/Hi

A Contrastive Lexicology of Greeting and Food Terms of English and Ogu Language: Its Pedagogical Implications

(It will be well with you)		Nah a bayido	How are you?
Mĩ kúdó àzán	Well done	Mi ku aze aton	Quite and age
Mĩ kúdó odah zan (Well done for the beauty work)	X	<u>E to dagbe ya</u> (I hope you are okay)	X
Àná sàà nú (May you sell and make a profit)	X	Mi ku avo lo	Welcome
Whèdàgbè wẹ mu na mọ May you have a good catch)	X	Mikudo jijohon (How are your people at home)	X
Mí nà yí dagbè bo sọ gọ dagbè	Safe journey	Whenu le lo	Bye
Mĩ kúdó máwù zón (well done in the work of God)	X	Ìbòwa	
Ána mọ hù (May you kill animals)	X		

The mark ‘X’ shows that there are no equivalents of the terms in the language.

4.2. Contrastive Statement

As observed from the tables above, the Ogu terms for greetings are multifarious and multi-dimensional. It is also noted that some greetings in Ogu are realised in prayers. What we have most times are the literal translations in which an Ogu/English bilingual transfers the system of greetings in Ogu into English. These forms of greetings are foreign to a native English speaker.

Furthermore, it is noted that the greeting terms in English that is expected to be casual such as “Hello” or “Hi” is more comprehensive in Ogu to include, “Mĩ kúdó jìjòhòn (I hope you are in good health), “Whenu le lo?” (How are your people at home?) and “Etó dàgbè yà” (I hope you are okay). This is attributed to the fact that greetings are taken very seriously in African in general and among the Ogu people in particular. Greetings in English are more of a casual or mere exchange of pleasantries without any strong cultural values attached to it.

The Ogu language also has a general term for greeting workers which is “Ena sè na wá” (It will be well with you). This form of greeting is foreign to a native speaker of English. There are also specific greeting terms for different groups of workers. For fishermen/women it is. “Whèdàghè whemu na mo” (May you have a good catch); traders will be greeted with, Ana san nu” (May you sell and make profit), the clergy will take. “Mĩ kúdó máwù zón” (Well done in the work of God). These and other forms of greetings are not realised in the English language.

Similarly, there is no T.E. for Ogu greeting terms such as, “Mi kudozan” (Greeting for late evening towards night but not the English Goodnight”). The Ogu speaker will likely substitute ‘Good evening’ for the night greeting term. Also, Ogu language has greeting terms for different seasons of the year, such as rainy season, dry season and harmattan. During the rainy season, the greeting is “Míkúdòàvívó (hope you are enjoying the cold weather), the dry season will attract, “Míkúdó whènù” (hope you are enjoying the dry season), while during the harmattan period, the greeting term in Ogu is, “Míkúdòàwéwéh” (happy harmattan period).

Finally, it is also to be noted that the Ogu language has more condolence greeting terms than English. The English language has the terms ‘Sorry’ and ‘accept my heartfelt sympathy or condolences’ for the expression of condolence. This is the way they share in the sorrow and

loss of the bereaved ones. But the Ogu language has more of the condolence greeting terms which is attributed to the communalistic nature of the Society.

4.3.English and Ogu Food Terms

According to Ernest and Helmer (1962) as presented in Ojo (1996), the English terms for food crops can be divided into four categories namely-cereal, root/tubers, vegetable and stimulant. This study will, however, treat fish as another category under food terms. The English fish terms are categorized into two classes due to their habitat. These are tropical saltwater fish and fresh water fish (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wik/fish>). As with English, the Ogu food terms can also be categorized into cereals, grains, vegetables, tuber/roots, stimulants and fish. A comparative analysis of food terminologies in Ogu and English would reveal the probable areas of conflicts. This is presented in the table below.

TABLE IV

TUBERS/ROOT		STIMULANTS	
Ogu	English	Ogu	English
Teví	Yam	Gbànja	Kola nitidia
Glèn	Cocoyam	Gbànja	Kola acuminate
Àzín	Groundnut	X	Tea
Welí	Sweet potato	Azomáh	Tobacco
Fènyèn	Cassava	Áhàn	Drinks
Òsúrú	Irish potato	Sìgáà	Cigarettes
		Gěé	Hemp

TABLE V

CEREALS		VEGETABLES	
Ogu	English	Ogu	English
X	Barley	Feví	Okro
X	Buckwheat	Lenu	X
X	Wheat	Somá	X
Gbathó	Maize	Jomakun	X
Likún	Millet	Mavèh	X
Àyíví	Beans	Gbomá	X
Gbokún	Guinea com	Gbádógbadò	X
Morikún	Rice	X	Spinack
X	Oats	X	Lettuce
X	Rhye	X	Cucumber
		X	Carrot
		X	Cabbage

TABLE VI

WHEVI		FISH	
Ogu	English	Ogu	English
Yányàn	Shark	Azovu	Lookdown fish
Awósó	Croaker	Fiayi	Permit fish
Pòkú	Mackerel	Àgàshà	X
Pàlí	Stockfish	Àsàn	X

A Contrastive Lexicology of Greeting and Food Terms of English and Ogu Language: Its Pedagogical Implications

Sikásikà	Goldfish	Àgbán	X
Zẹngbìn	Electric fish	Avọvẹh	X
Ọwẹ	Tilapia	Jádù	X
Salumó	Titus	Nukungodo	X
Zovú	Squid	Otùn	X
Dẹgòn	Crayfish	Megiden	X
Kaká	Slug	Apán	X
Gázá	Crab	Owẹh	X
Òsaṅ	Startfish	Dòdòkum	X
Pompoku	Jack fish	Gbogẹ	X
Akerémbà	Angel fish	Potoe	X
Kònkò	Puffer fish	Òwá	X
Tunví	Cat fish	Numbe	X
Wle	X	X	Bass fish
Ofan	X	X	Silver dollar fish
Ogùn	Whale	X	Sucker fish
Jenuvlẹ	X	X	Betta fish
Sósógliso	X	X	Butterfly fish
Àgbájá	X	X	Clown fish
Patámàjà	X	X	Banner fish
Afra	X	X	Blue Tang fish
Rufon	X	X	Trigger fish
Kwěntìn	X	X	Parrot fish
Ọrọmbo	X	X	Sea Horses
Anánòí	X	X	Sea dragons
Zokẹ	X	X	Yellow Tang fish
X	Highest fish	X	Hawk fish
X	File fish	X	Snapper fish
X	Jaw fish	X	Pork fish
X	Lion fish	X	Cuttle fish
X	Piranha fish		

4.4. Contrastive Statement

From the diagram above, it is noted that an Ogu learner of English may find it difficult to find Translation Equivalence (TE) for the differences observed especially in the areas of cereals, vegetables and fish. This is because cereals like barley, wheat, buckwheat, oat, rhye, and vegetables like spinach, lettuce and cabbage have no TE in Ogu due to the fact that these crops are foreign to the tropical region where Ogu exists. Also, since fish(es) have different distribution all over the world, some are foreign to Ogu speakers and so cannot be named. So also are some fish and their terms foreign to the English people. Therefore, the physical realities of English cereals, vegetables and fish, not known in the Ogu culture may be hard to capture. Their colour, shape and size would require great imaginative power to approximate. Though some lexemes such as cumber, carrot etc have found their way into the Ogu language via lexical borrowing and assimilation.

Moreover, the Ogu language has no equivalents for coffee, tea, chocolate which are most times differentiated in the English culture and language. As a result, an Ogu learner may use the word Tii, which is also a borrowed word from English to cover for all kind of beverages. Same goes for cigarettes referred to as Sigaa in Ogu. Kolanut, whatever the type, has just a name 'Gbanja' which may also pose a problem to a second language learner.

4.5. Pedagogical implications

As observed from the tables above, the various shade of differences that reflect in Ogu and English, due to cultural and geographical differences of the two language societies, will create learning problem to an Ogu learner of English, especially where there are no translation equivalences (T.E.) for those words in English. This may result to direct translation or negative transfer of the mother tongue to the target language. These shades of differences are of concern to the Ogu learner of English and the second language teacher.

5. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the lexical variations existing between Ogu and English in the two semantic fields of study have been attributed to their cultural differences. In fact, this study has revealed that of all the components of language, the lexis is more culturally generated and a good understanding of them, demand familiarity with the culture that produces them. It is the people's culture which serves as the key to opening their linguistic varieties, choice and usages.

Recommendations

- i. Since the concern of contrastive linguistics is how a monolingual becomes bilingual, text translation must be done by taking cognizance of the cultural context, lexical and communicative situation of the source language and its speakers. This will help to extract the intended meaning from the target language and then reconstruct this same meaning in the source language text and situation.
- ii. There is also the need for dynamism and innovativeness on the part of the L2 teacher as adequate incentives such as teaching/ learning materials, welfare package, conducive teaching and learning environment, motivation and opportunities for usage would go a long way in reducing, if not totally eliminating, the perceived difficulties of the Ogu speaker learning the second language (English).
- iii. Learning a language, therefore, is not only learning the alphabet, the meaning, the grammar rules and the arrangement of words, but it is also learning the behavior of the society and its cultural customs. Thus; language teaching should always contain some explicit reference to the culture, the whole from which the particular language is extracted.
- iv. Lastly, there is the need to design appropriate module for teaching and learning English with a practical classroom approach to learning of second language vocabulary.

References

- Adeyanju, D.S. (2002). Sociolinguistics: An introductory insight. In Babatunde, S.T. and Adeyanju, D.S. (Eds), *Language, meaning and society* (pp. 527-537). Haytee Press & Pub. Ltd.
- Akindele, F. & Adegbite, W. (1992). *The sociology and politics of English in Nigeria: An introduction*. OAU Press.
- Andah, B. (1982). *African Development in Cultural Perspective*. University of Ibadan Press

A Contrastive Lexicology of Greeting and Food Terms of English and Ogu Language: Its Pedagogical Implications

- Avognon, J.K. (1994). The degree of bilingualism of the Ogu speakers of Badagry. In Ogunremi, G.O., Opeloye, M & Oyeweso, S. (Eds) *Badagry: A study in history, culture and tradition of an ancient city*. (pp. 314-320). Rex Charles Pub.
- Avoseh, T.O. (1980). *A history of Badagry*. Adeolu Press.
- Avoseh, T.O. (1982). *Oruko Egun pelu itumo won ni ede Yoruba*. Adeolu Press.
- Avoseh, T.O. (1982). *Iwe "Ajara dabi Eko"*. Adeolu Press.
- Banjo, A. (1969). *A contrastive study of aspects of the syntax and lexical rules of English and Yoruba*. [Doctoral dissertation, University of Ibadan]. U.I. Library.
- Borysenko, O. (2005) Lecture notes on contrastive lexicology. <https://maup.com.ua/assets/files/lib/book/nw03.pdf>
- Crystal, D. (1992). Glossary. In Bright, W. (Ed), *International encyclopaedia of linguistics*. Oxford Univ. press. Vol. 4.
- Harouni, Z. (2004) Contrastive Lexicology, Bilingual Lexicography and Translation (pp.73-80). *Revue SCIENCES Humaines*.
- Igboanusi, H. (2000). Contrastive analysis: Some problem areas for the Igbo learner of English. In Babajide, A.O. (Ed) *Studies in English language* (pp. 188-196). Enicrownfit Pub.
- James, C. (1980). *Contrastive analysis*. Longman.
- Kramsch, C. (1995). The cultural component of language teaching. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*. 8(2), 83-92.
- Lamidi, M. T. (1996). Potholes in Grammar: A contrastive study of aspects of Empty Categories in English and Yoruba. [Masters degree dissertation, University of Ibadan], U.I. library.
- Lamidi, M. T. (2004). Agreement relations in English and Yoruba. *IBADAN Journal of English Studies*. Vol 1, 35-51.
- Maiyanga, M.A. (1987). A contrastive lexicology of six semantic fields of English and Igala. [Masters degree dissertation, University of Ibadan], U.I. library.
- Ogu, N. (1992). *A historical survey of English and the Nigerian situation*. Kraft Books Ltd.
- Ogunsiji, A. (2013). The power of language. In Ogunsiji, A., Kehinde, A., & Odebunmi, A. (Eds) *Language, Literature and Discourse*. (Pp 23-35), Stirling-Horden Publishers Ltd.
- Ojo, J.O. (1996). A contrastive lexicology of six semantic fields of English and Yoruba. [Masters degree dissertation, University of Ibadan], U.I. library.
- Sapir, E. (1963). *Language: An introduction to the study of speech*. Rupert Hart-Davis
- Schwimmer, B. (1996) "English Kin Terms" <http://www.umanitobaca/anthropology/tutor/kinterms/english.html>.
- Soyinka, W. (1988). Ethics, ideology and the critic. In Peterson, K. (Ed.) *Criticism and ideology*. Seminar proceedings No. 20. Scandinavian Institute of African Studies. Pp 26-54.
- Trudgil, P. (1974). *Sociolinguistics: An introduction to language and society*. Penguin.
- Yassin, A. A., Abdul Razak, N., Qasem, Y. A., & Saeed Mohammed, M. A. (2020). Intercultural learning challenges affecting international students' sustainable learning in Malaysian higher education institutions. *Sustainability*, 12(18), 7490.