

A CONTRASTIVE STUDY OF CULTURAL INFLUENCE ON FOOD TERMS IN ENGLISH AND OKPAMERI

Omolaiye, H. O

Department of General Studies,
The Federal Polytechnics, Ile-Oluji, Ondo State
happyomolaiyejo@gmail.com

Abstract

Language and culture are symbiotic in that they cannot be separated from each other in the linguistic event. Given this premise, therefore, it would not be out of place if lexical items of a particular language are regarded as carriers of the culture that produces the language. Hence, this paper contrasted food terms in English and Okpameri so as to investigate how English and Okpameri view the same lexemes semantically and also to see how English and Okpameri lexical items are affected by cultural influence. Predicating the study on Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis, Okpameri data were drawn from sources through the instrumentality of oral interview and test instrument of translation of some of the English food items to Okpameri language. The similarities may not cause much problems to the Okpameri ESL learners. This corresponds to Lado (1957) who claims that where the language patterns are similar in the two languages being compared, learners of the target language would find language relatively easy. However, areas of differences may pose problems to Okpameri ESL learners. The study revealed translation equivalents as the main problems Okpameri ESL learners might be confronted with in an attempt to translate some of the Okpameri words to English. The study therefore recommends that curriculum planners should include Okpameri language in our school system. By so doing, the problem of translation will be minimized.

Keywords: Culture, Food, English, Okpameri, Translation

Introduction

Culture plays a significant role in language structure. This is why Farinde and Omolaiye (2020) claim that language is built in the culture of the people. This implies that language and culture are integrated. The influence of culture on some lexical terms differs in languages. For instance, every speech community has a unique way of structuring its lexical items to reflect its socio-cultural realities. Lyons (1968) sees language as an integral part of its culture, in that the lexical items of each language tends to reflect the culturally important features of objects, institutions and activities in the society in which the language operates. So, the scholar views culture as a determiner of language and then language invariably determines our view of reality. In the same spirit, Trudgill (1983) sees the interrelationship that exists between language and society. According to this scholar, language may be seen on one hand as a factor of conditioning an individual's view of his environment and on the other hand, as reflecting the environment but conditioned by the society. This is why every speech community has a unique way of structuring its lexical items. Hence, language and culture usually determine the meaning of a particular item in the linguistic environment that holds such a lexical item.

It is important to make clarification on the words "food" employed in this paper so as to avoid ambiguity. The term "food" as used in this study to means anything which when eaten and digested can be used by the body to provide energy or substances that help in body building and repair or preserve our health. So, food includes things we eat and drink. Since this study is out to contrast food terms in English and Okpameri, it is important to shed light on histo-linguistic background of Okpameri as this will place this study on the right footing. Elugbe (1989, p.26) classifies Okpameri language as belonging to Edoid language family. According

to the scholar, all the Edoid languages (such as the Okpameri language) that have generic resemblance must have descended from a common proto-language as it were and of which each had later emerged as a distinct language over a long period of time. The linguistic affinity among the Okpameri is one of the greatest evidences of their oneness as a people. This why the word “Okpameri” simply means “we are one” (in language and history). Ekharo et al. (2007) classify the Okpameri as a community belonging to North-Western Edoid who had retained its language and speaks a fairly accented variety of Yoruba as second language. This singular act (speaking accented variety of Yoruba) has influence on some lexical borrowing from Yoruba to Okpameri linguistic system.

Okpameri is located in Akoko-Edo Local Government Area of Edo State, Nigeria. The communities that make up Okpameri are located in almost all the political constituencies in the local government. The following communities are in Akoko-Edo North constituency: Lampese, Bekuma, Ibillo, Imoga, Ekpesa, Ekor, the Ikirans, the Ugboshis, Aiyegunle, Ogugu and Somorika while communities like Ojirami, Dangbala, Ojah, Makeke, and Ekpe are in Akoko-Edo South constituency. Okpameri is a language widely spoken in the local government. It has a human population of about 62,000 (Omolaiye, 2013p. 15 citing 2006 population census in Edo State).

The natives are predominantly farmers. A sizable number of the female population are garri producers, while some trade with the nearby villages and towns of Ishua and Ikare (in Akoko, Ondo State) and Okene (in Kogi State). Communities like Ugboshi, Ikiran, Ibillo, Ekpesa, Lampese, Bekuma, Makeke and Ekpe fairly speaker Yoruba and Epira languages because of geographical boundaries. Okpameri practices religious secretion (the fusion of diverse religious beliefs and practices). However, two major religions (Christianity and traditional worship) dominate all the communities in Okpameri as these are reflected in the names given to humans and non-humans. In essence, Okpameri believes in its tradition and custom.

Conceptual Literature Review

Since this study is premised on cultural influence on food terms, it is, therefore, essential to briefly shed light on the notion of lexicology and some related concepts as they will serve as theoretical base of our discussion.

Lexicology

Leherer (1974) quoting Gleason (1962) says the American structuralists influenced by Bloomfield, intended to neglect the study of the lexicon, treating the vocabulary as more or less unstructured or at best very loose structured. This must have also influenced the apathetical stance of the early grammarians to the lexicon, which is regarded as part of grammar and hence does not deserve much attention. Snook (1971) opines that words of a language can be classified into sets which are related to conceptual fields with semantic space. To this end, semiological comparison of L₁ and L₂ lexicon is the key to the study of contrastive lexicology in contrastive analysis. Through this cross-linguistic comparison, the contents and meaning of words of both L₁ and L₂ are sought and structured. Therefore, the task of contrastive lexicology is to compare linguistic accounts stated within the same lexicological framework of lexical competence possessed by speaker of the two languages in question.

Bilingualism and Interference

Adegbite and Akindele (2005) view the concept of bilingualism from inter language perspective where they describe it as the use of two languages either by an individual or a community. This implies that bilingualism gives room for the existence of two languages in

the repertoire of an individual or a speech community. Bilingualism could, therefore, be seen as the ability which an individual has to produce meaningful utterance in the other language. This means that an individual can have the ability to speak two languages in a bilingual society. However, such an individual could be relatively deficient in either of the two languages. The resultant effect of this could be technically referred to as linguistic error. This is when a bilingual unconsciously transfers the structure of the language that he is more proficient in to the language that he is less proficient in. In view of this, Omolaiye (2017) identifies linguistic interference as those instances of deviation from the norms of either language which occurs in the speech of a linguist as a result of familiarity with more than one language. This explains why Weinreich (1953) describes linguistic interference as the rearrangement of patterns those results from the introduction of foreign elements into the more highly-structured domains of language. In a speech community, contrastive analysis could be carried out to reveal areas of similarities and differences. In the light of this, a linguistic analyst will predict the likely problem area(s) the natives could be confronted with while using the L₂.

Meaning in Context

Meaning and context are dependent on each other in linguistics. This is why Odebunmi (2006) claims that context is a determinant of meaning. Alo (2004) describes context, and of course, linguistic context as what is seen in terms of what immediately precedes and what follows in an expression in a text. According to the scholar, no word can be fully understood independent of other words in the same context, without recourse to placing it within a situational or cultural context in order to understand its meaning. Similarly, Malinowski (1923) claims that for adequate description of any linguistic event, the factor of cultural context and practice is important. This claim reveals the notions of the “context” and “culture”, and the “culture of situation” as they affect meaning within the theory of language. In a nutshell, linguistic context is how meaning is understood without relying on intent and assumptions while context of situation is the environment, time and place, etc. in which use of language occurs. Firth (1957) claims that every lexical item is actualized in a culturally determined context of situation and the meaning of a word is the totality of all the features in it that can be singled out as giving input to the maintenance of the pattern of life in the society in which the speaker lives. Firth, therefore, describes meaning as serial contextualization of our facts within contexts, each one being a function, an organ of the bigger context and all context finding a place in what may be called the context of culture. This implies that context serves as a veritable ground for meaning in a speech event. It is now clear that context and meaning are integrated in such that an attempt to separate them in the use of words may likely result in what could be termed as “linguistic ambiguity”. Context, and of course, cultural context therefore determines the meaning attached to lexical items used. So, languages differ much in the lexicon. This is because the lexis of every language is culture-bound. This is why Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis claims that each language creates its own world-view and therefore its own meaning.

Theoretical Framework

This paper is anchored on Sapir-Whorf's Hypothesis of (1921) and other scholars like (Lyons, 1968, Trudgill 1983, Ojo 1996, Farinde and Ogunsiyi, 2010 etc.) who have further expanded this hypothesis for the description of socio-cultural realities in a speech community. It is not out of place to say that no study on lexical items will be complete without a cursory look at the Sapir-Whorf's Hypothesis. This is because the proponent of this hypothesis was based on their assumptions on cultural relativity as they explore the interdependence between language and culture. Sapir (1921) studies the interrelatedness between language, culture and personality, while Whorf (1956) further expanded the hypothesis and then posits that language conditions

our world-view in which different speakers view the world along the different lines laid down by their respective languages.

Similarly, Trudgill (1983) sees the interrelationship between language and society where he examines differences in word-view. According to him, language is a factor that conditions an individual to view his environment different from others, thereby reflecting his environment that is conditioned by the society such an individual lives in. This means that language and culture usually determine the meaning of a particular item in the linguistic environment that holds such a lexical item. Lyons (1968) also claims that the language of a particular society is an integral part of its culture, in that the lexical distinction of each language usually reflects the culturally important features of objects institutions and activities in the society in which the language operates. Given this conviction, therefore, linguists tend to base their submissions on what brings language, though, and culture together.

The Hypothesis focuses on the effect of language on the society. Sapir (1974) corroborates this when he opines that the content of every culture is expressible in its language. According to this scholar, no linguistic materials whether content or form that are not felt symbolize actual meaning. The means that language is the property of society. Ojo (1996) premises the thrust of Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis on mental constrained by language, conceptualization of ideas through language, difference in language systematization and formation of ideas through language structures. This Hypothesis becomes relevant in a contrastive study of cultural influence on food terms in English and Okpameri because it opens up areas of similarities and differences in any two languages could be compared.

Data Base of Study

Two methods were adopted in gathering data for this study. The two methods are oral and written forms. As in the case of oral form, twenty informants, (comprising adult males and females) who are native speakers of Okpameri in Akoko-Edo Local Government Area, Edo State, Nigeria were interviewed. The rationale behind the selection is on the conviction that the Okpameri adult natives are proficient in Okpameri language. In written method, some lexical items in the semantic fields of food were written in English and distributed to twenty Okpameri speakers of English to translate the written items in Okpameri language. The researcher's intuitive knowledge in Okpameri and English was a great assistance in gathering the data. With regard to the English data, researcher made use of some home economics textbooks written in English where some English lexical items were drawn from.

Data Analysis

For the purpose of clarity of presentation, food terms are classified. For instance, food terms are classified under cereals/grains, vegetables, fruits, tubers/roots and stimulants. English, being the target language, was contrasted with Okpameri using samples of the data of the two languages collected. The analysis began with cereals/grain by placing them side by side and then contrasting them to establish their areas of similarities and differences. The mark "X" was used to signify the lexical item that does not exist in the lexicon of either of the two languages that were compared.

Food Terms

Olarewaju and Somoye (2007) describe food as anything which, when eaten and digested, can be used by the body to provide energy or substances that help in body building and repair or preserve our health. Food is one of the basic needs of man. This means that food is basic to life. Thus, human beings and animals cannot survive without food. This study, therefore,

classified food as carbohydrates, proteins, fat and oils, vitamins, minerals and water. However, focus shall be only on food crops. The food crops are further classified as cereals, root/tubers fruits, vegetables and stimulants.

A. **Cereals/Grains:** These are grain-bearing plants used as food. English and Okpameri Cereals/grains are compared below:

Table 1: Cereals/Grains

English	Okpameri
Barley	X
Buck wheat	X
Oats	X
Corn flakes	X
Rice crispies	X
Millet	X
Beans	X
Maize	Ateze
Rice	Ugbado
Guinea corn	Iresi
Cowpea	Ileshi
Soya beans	Izeze
X	X
X	Uzonoba (big seed beans)
X	Ukiniza (hard beans)
X	Avbele (clockwise beans)
X	Esinenichich (black beans)
X	Ezinke (ground beans)
X	Ezine (small seed beans)

Contrastive Statement

In table (1) English and Okpameri have lexical terms for cereal crops. While the English cereals include “wheat”, “millet”, “oats”, “rice”, “barley” etc., Okpameri cereals are *ugbado* (maize), *iresi* (rice), *ilesi* (guinea corn), *atezi* (beans) etc. It must be noted here that Okpameri language makes more distinctions on beans than English. The distinctions on beans in Okpameri are *egbatzeze* (white beans), *uzonoba* (big seed beans), *ezine* (small seed beans), *ezenenichichi* (black beans), *ezinke* (ground beans), *ukiniza* (hard beans) and *avbele* (clockwise beans). It would, however, be predicted that Okpameri speakers of English may find it difficult to find translation equivalents of some of the cereal/grain crops like *uzonoba* (big seed beans) *ukiniza* (hard beans), *avbele* (clockwise beans) in Okpameri into English because Okpameri makes more distinctions on beans than English. Also, the English cereal/grain items like millet, ryre, harley, buck wheat, oats and so on, have no translation equivalents in Okpameri language. It could be said that the diference in some of the cereal/grain items in English and Okpameri is due to cultural differences.

B. **Vegetables:** Vegetables are edify plants. The leaves and stakes of these plants are edible. English and Okpameri have terms for vegetables. The terms are presented in the table below:

Table 2: Vegetables

English	Okpameri
Spinach	X
Lettuce	X
Cucumber	X
Carrot	X
Cabbage	X
Okro	Ukuno
Tomatoes	Itomato
Onion	Alubasa
X	Ugbesu (thread leaf)
X	Ọyọyọ (umbrella leaf)
X	Esewhu (scent leaf)
X	Uha (bitter leaf)
X	Ẹmuẹ (cocoyam leaf)
X	Ẹfọ (soft leaf)

Contrastive Statement

As revealed in table (2), the English vegetables are “Spinachi”, “lettuce”, “cucumber”, “tomatoes”, “cabbage” etc. *Ukumo* (okro), *itomato*(tomatoes), *ẹfọ* (soft leaf), *alubasa* (onion) etc are Okpameri vegetables. The table has also revealed the areas of similarities and differences of vegetable items in English and Okpameri. It must be stated here that there is a name for every type of vegetable leaf in Okpameri. In essence, there is a name given to every edible leaf in Okpameri culture. English culture also has name for different types of vegetable leaf. Some of these are “lettuce”, “cucumber”, “spinach” etc. However, the data above show a contrast between English and Okpameri vegetable leaves because vegetable items like “cucumber”, “cabbage”, “spinach”, “lettuce” etc. are not in the Okpameri lexicon. This is because Okpameri culture does not see such food as vegetable. This explains why Lyons (1968) sees language as an integral part of its culture.

Vegetables like “spinach”, “lettuce”, “cucumber” etc. which are not part of the Okpameri culture may likely pose problems to Okpameri users of English because some of the English vegetables have no translation equivalents in Okpameri. Thus, they may not be easy to describe. Similarly, vegetables like *ugbesu* (thread leaf), *ọyọyọ* (umbrella leaf), *esewhu* (scent leaf) etc. are problems areas for an Okpameri speaker of English to appropriately translate these vegetables to English.

C. **Fruits:** These are plants that have one or more seeds that are eaten as food. Okpameri fruit items are *elakuti* (orange), *ogbi* (pawpaw), *ọgẹrẹ* (banana), *owhe* (cherry), *Okpaibo* (pineapple), *imagoro* (mango), *ikasụ* (cashew), *Iguava* (guava) etc. A contrastive study of fruits in English and Okpameri are, therefore, presented below:

Table 3: Fruits

English	Okpameri
Orange	Ẹlakuti
Pawpaw	Ogbi
Cherry	Owhe
Pineapple	Ọkpaibo
Mango	Imagoro
Cashew	Ikaşu
Pear	Ipiye

Guava	Iguava
Apple	Apu
Banana	Ogere

Contrastive Statement

In table (3), it is observed that orange, pawpaw, banana, cherry, pineapple and kolanut in English are also present in Okpameri lexicon. These are *elakuti* (orange), *owhe* (cherry), *ogere* (banana), and *okpaibo* (pineapple). It is also observed that fruits like mango, cashew, pear and apple are lexicalized into the Okpameri linguistic system through borrowing. The agents of the lexical borrowing are the early European traders who had contact with the Okpameri natives. So, the Okpameri now have *imagoro* (mango), *ikasu* (cashew), *ipiye* (pear), *iguava* (guava), and *apu* (apple) in its lexicon. As earlier mentioned, these words were borrowed from English to Okpameri language as a result of trade and commerce. According to the oral source, some of these fruits which are lexicalized into Okpameri linguistic system were not initially present in the Okpameri lexicon before they were brought to the Okpameri society either through trade. This implies that the resultant effect of language in contact can also bring about lexical nativization.

D. **Tuber/Roots:** Root or tuber crops are plants whose roots form tubers and balls that are edible. “Yam”, “cassava”, “groundnut”, “potatoes”, “cocoyam”, etc. are the tuber/root crops. These are shown in the table below:

Table 4 Tubers/Roots

English	Okpameri
Cassava	Unuta
Cocoyam	Ukare
Potato	Enema
Irish potato	X
Groundnut	Ukuzaje
Yam	Qvie
Yam	Qviodu (water yam)
Yam	Egbovie (white yam)
Yam	Ozilokpo (yellow yam)
Yam	Ozilo (trafolic yam)
Yam	Ilawhon (aeria yam)

Contrastive Statement

Table (4) shows that though both languages (English and Okpameri) have terminology for tuber/root crops. However, differences still exist. For instance, Okpameri makes distinction on yam by means of single words like *qviodu* (water yam), *egbovie* (white yam), *ozilopo* (yellow yam), *ozilo* (three-leafed yam) and *ilawhon* (aerial yam). However, such single words are not in English. This is so because the physical environment in which a society lives reflects in its language. On the other hand, Okpameri do not make distinction on potatoes whereas sweet and irish potatoes are in the English lexicon because such a crop type is in the English physical environment.

E. **Stimulants:** Stimulants are the kinds of foods that make one feel more awake and give one more energy. Tobacco, kolanut, coffee, wine etc. are examples of English stimulants while Okpameri stimulant include *awhu* (wine got from guinea corn). *Ilagbe*(kolanut), *oyili* (bitter kola), *ivbaraza* (home made gin), *ogoror* (wine got from raffia palm) *ebē* (Indian herm) *enyo* (palm wine) etc. A contrastive analysis of English and Okpameri stimulants are presented in a table below:

Table 5: Stimulants

English	Okpameri
Wine	Enyo
Gin	Ivharaze
Kolanut	Ilagbe
Tobacco	Etavba
Beer	X
Coffee	X
Tea	X
X	Enyoari (wine from palm tree)
X	Q̄q̄r̄q̄ (wine got raffia palm tree)
X	Awhu (wine got from guinea corn)
X	Oyili (bitter kola)
Concain	X
Marijuana	Ebe

Contrastive Statement

The table above shows a great difference between English and Okpameri alcoholic drinks. While English has “wine”, “gin”, and “beer”, as its types of alcohol, Okpameri makes much distinctions on alcoholic drinks. These are *enyo* (wine got from the palm tree), *Ivbaraza* (home made gin), *enyo* (palm wine), *q̄q̄r̄q̄* (wine got from raffia palm tree) and *awhu* (wine got from guinea corn). Stimulant like beer, coffee and tea are not in the Okpameri lexicon. Thus, some problems are expected to be manifested because Okpameri has no translation equivalents for coffee, tea, chocolate etc. As a result, Okpameri L₁ speaker may use the word “tea” to cover all beverages.

Discussion of the Findings

It is noted that the list provided for food crops is by no means exhaustive. However, we have predicted some of the problems an Okpameri learner of English will likely have in translating some of the Okpameri food terms into the English linguistic system. It is also a problem for an L₁ speaker of English to translate some of the English food terms into the Okpameri language. This problem of translation becomes difficult because the two languages (English and Okpameri) have different cultures and climatic regions.

It must be mentioned here that there are some food items that could be derived from other food crops in Okpameri. For instance, *ilar̄* (pounded yam) and *elivbo* (yam flour) are got from *ovī* (yam) while *igari* (garri) and *ifufu* (cassava flour) could also be derived from *onuta* (cassava). Some of the Okpameri food crops have pronunciation resemblance with Yoruba. The reason for the pronunciation sameness is predicated on Ekharo’s et al (2007) assertion that some of the Okpameri communities that made claim to both Benin and Ile-Ife origin must have be the cause of some lexical borrowing from Yoruba to Okpameri lexicon. For Okpameri natives to have remained in Ile-ife for several generations before they finally settled where they are today could be that the culture of Ile-Ife must have influenced them Okpameri way of life especially in the area of language (oral source revealed). So, it is not a surprise to find some of the Yoruba words like *agbado* (maize), *efo* (vegetable leaf) in the Okpameri linguistic system.

Similarly, words like *ir̄esi* (rice), *itomato* (tomatoes), *imagoro* (mango), *iguava* (guava), *ikasu* (cashew) and *ipiye* (pear) are borrowed from the English to the Okpameri lexicon. We were made to understand that the aforementioned food items were initially absent in the Okpameri lexicon before they were brought to the Okpameri society by the early European traders. As a

result, words used to refer to such food items in European culture are also used to refer to such food items in Okpameri. It was revealed that the word “*alubasa*” (onion) is a Hausa word. This implies that *alubasa* (onion) is also a word borrowed to the Okpameri linguistic system.

In the field of food terms, there is likely to be difficulties in the myriad of terms used for vegetables in English which are foreign to Okpameri. Similarly, the various types of vegetable leaf identified as edible leaf will constitute a problem of accurate translation to an Okpameri user of English. The distinction made on yam in Okpameri language is another problem to Okpameri ESL learners. Some of the English cereal/grain items have no translation equivalents in Okpameri language.

The study has revealed the prominent role of culture in the food items contrasted in English and Okpameri. Analysis shows that languages differ much in the lexicon. This is so because the lexis of every language is culture-bound. Trudgill (1997) corroborates this when he claims that physical environment in which a society lives is usually reflected in the language of a speaker, most specially in the structure of the lexicon. Lyons (1968) views culture as a determiner of language and then language invariably determines our view of reality. Thus, language and culture are the two basic tools for lexical structures.

Recommendations for linguistic studies

What is revealed in the contrastive study of the food terms in English and Okpameri has some implications for the teaching of English as a second language. As a result of language in contact, the teaching and the learning of the second language should be given due consideration. To this end, the following among others should be noted:

The learners should be exposed to the culture of the two languages being compared. This is because the lexical items of a particular language are regarded as carriers of the culture that produces the language. So, when the learners have the background knowledge of the cultures that produce the two languages being compared, translation problems will be minimal.

It is observed that there are variations in the way different language communities are caused by their language to engage with the world in distinctive perceptive manner. Of all the levels of language, lexis is more culture-bound, and a good understanding of them demands familiarity with the cultures that produce them. Therefore, lexis of the two languages should be well handled by the language experts. This would be of great help to the learners.

Conclusion

The following conclusions are drawn from the investigation. Predicating this study on Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis “linguistic determinism”, this study has come to observe that the lexical distinctions drawn in English and Okpameri have reflected the culturally important features of objects, institutions and activities in the societies in which the languages are found. It can, therefore, be deduced that despite the acknowledgement of universal semantic features, the meaning of words (sense and denotation) are internal to the languages which they belong. This is because each language is integrated in the culture in which it operates and its lexical structure reflects those distinctions that are important to its culture.

This study reveals the variations in the way different language communities are caused by their languages to engage with the world in a distinctive perceptive manner. Hence, language teachers should come out with practical demonstration of these lexical items in the second language being learnt. This will go a long way in reducing (if not totally eliminating) the

perceived difficulties of learning the English lexes and expressing the Okpameri terms in English.

References

- Adegbite, W. &Akindele, F. (2003). Sociology and politics of English in Nigeria: *An introduction*. Ife: O. A. U. Press.
- Alo, M. A. (2004). *Context and language variation*. Language and discourse in society. In Oyeleye, L. (ed). Ibadan: Hope publications. Pp. 79-80.
- Ekharo, T., Aliu, G. &Akanji, J. (2007). The history of Somorika. Lagos: Dee Honour Company.
- Elugbe, B. O. (1989). Comparative edoid: Phonology and lexicon. Deltal series. No 6. Port-HarcourtUniversity Press.
- Farinde, R. O. &Ojo, J. O. (2005). Introduction to sociolinguistics. Ibadan: Lektay Publishers.
- Farinde, R. O. &Ogunsiji, Y. (2010). Analytical linguistics. Ago-Iwoye: OlabisiOnabanjo University Press.
- Farinde, R. O. &Omolaiye, H. O. (2020). On cultural variation of greeting terms in English andOkpameri. In Dooga, J. T. (ed) *Jos Journal of the English language*. Faculty arts, University of Jos. Nigeria 3(1) Ya-Byangs Publications. Pp. 435-450.
- Firth, J. R. (1995). Papers in linguistics. Pp. 1934-51. London: Oxford University press.
- Lado, R. (1957). *Language teaching: A scientific approach*. New York: Mc Graw Hill.
- Leherer, A. (1974). *Semantic fields and lexical structures*. Amsterdam: Holland Publishers.
- Lyons, J. (1968). Introduction to theoretical linguistics. London: Cambridge University press.
- Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*. Cambridge: OUP.
- Malinoski, B. (1923). Context of situation.w.w.w.science-direct,com.pdf.
- Odebunmi, S. A. (2006). *Meaning in English: An introduction*. Ogbomoso: Critical Sphere publishers.
- Ojo, J. O. (1996). A contrastive lexicology of six semantics fields of English and Yoruba. *Unpublished M. A. dissertation*. Ibadan: University of Ibadan.
- Olarewaju, A. &Somoye, F. (2007). *Basic science: An integrated science course for junior secondary schools*. Lagos: Longman Publishers.
- Omolaiye, H. O. (2013). A contrastive lexicology of six semantic fields of English and Okpameri.*Unpublished M. A. dissertation*. Ibadan: University of Ibadan.
- Omolaiye, H. O. (2017). A comparative study of lexico-semantics of Standard British English and Nigerian English. In Ojo, J. O. et. al. (eds) *Journal of School of languages*, Adeyemi College of Education, Ondo. Pp. 71-97.
- Sapir, E. (1921). *Language*: New York: Brace World.
- Sapir, E. (1974). *Language*. In Blounts, G. (ed) *Language, culture and society*. Cambridge: Wirthop pp. 32-49.
- Snook, R. (1971). A stratification approach to contrastive analysis. Nickel G. (ed) papers in contrastive linguistics. London: Cambridge University Press. Pp. 45-52.
- Trudgill, P. (1997). *Sociolinguistics*.Hamondwoth: Pengun.
- Weireich, V. (1953). *Languages in contact*, The Hague: Mouton.
- Whorf, B. L. (1955). *Language, thought and reality: selected writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf*, in Carroll, J. (ed) Cambridge: MIT Press.