

## A SEMANTIC ANALYSIS OF POLYSEMY IN ỤMỤLỤMGBE DIALECT OF IGBO

Ude Ann Nnenna & Ngozi U. Emeka Nwobia

Department of Languages and Linguistics, Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki  
annnenna36@gmail.com

### Abstract

The objectives of this study are to investigate the Ụmụlụmgbẹ dialect of Igbo to find out if polysemous words exist in the dialect, to examine such polysemous words (if they are available in the dialect) to determine whether they have metaphorical meaning in addition to their literal meaning and to find out if their meanings are related to the prototype. As much as there are works done on polysemy in some parts of Igbo, there is no study on the polysemy of Ụmụlụmgbẹ dialect of Igbo. This study adopts a descriptive qualitative research design. Fifty polysemous words were collected through oral interview using purposive sampling technique. Data for this work were also collected using Ibadan Wordlist of 400 basic items. The selected words were only the ones that are polysemous. Twelve informants-six males and six females- (who are native speakers from the six villages in the town) were interviewed through an unstructured oral interview, using a tape-recorder. The data were analyzed using the theoretical framework of Cognitive Semantics as propounded by Geeraets (2010). The findings show that polysemous words exist in the dialect and only few polysemous words in Ụmụlụmgbẹ dialect of Igbo have both literal and metaphorical meanings. The findings also reveal that only a few of such words in the dialect are related to the prototype.

**Key words:** polysemy, metaphor, literal meaning and prototype

### Introduction

#### 1.1 Background to the study

Semantics is the field of linguistic study that is concerned with the study of meaning. Abdurrahman (2019) notes that linguistic semantics “deals with the conventional meaning conveyed by the use of words and sentences of a language”. The major interest of semantics as a field of study in linguistics is to examine the way in which lexical items, phrases and sentences portray meaning. Anyanwu (2008) expresses that semantics usually divides words into their sense and reference. He further explains that the reference of an expression is that entity which it refers to whereas the sense is the aspect of expression that helps to describe the entity it refers to. For Olmen (2018), relating a linguistic entity to something that lies outside of language is called reference.”

However, it has been difficult to determine what meaning is. Due to the controversies surrounding the meaning of meaning different theories of meaning have emerged. Another essence of the theories is to assign meaning to every word or sentence in a language. The theories include: The Referential Theory of meaning which was propounded by Ferdinand De Saussure. The theory claims that the meaning of a concept is the object to which such concept refers to. Mentalism is another theory that was propounded by Glucksberg. It claims that the meaning of a concept is the image which the speaker invokes in his mind when that concept is mentioned. Other theories are, Componential Analysis, Truth Condition Theory, Behaviorist Theory and the Use Theory.

In an attempt to describe the meaning of meaning, scholars identified different types of meaning. However, these meaning types discussed by different scholars do not pin-point the exact meaning of meaning. The types of meaning as discussed in Ndimele, (1997) include: Denotative/ Conceptual Meaning, Affective Meaning, Collocative Meaning, Associative Meaning, Affective Meaning, Collocative, Stylistic Meaning, Thematic Meaning, and Ostensive Meaning.

Semantics has its subfields as lexical semantics and sentential semantics. Lexical semantics/ sense relations is the subfield of semantics which studies the meaning of lexical items so as to determine how closely related the concepts are. Lexical field is one of the most important concepts in semantic relations. It is a grouping lexical items that have general conceptual association, either in terms of an area of knowledge or regular co-occurrence in real word situations, Stringer, (2019). Lexical semantics

is concerned with how meaning is encoded in words. The lexical relations that have been established in semantics are: Hyponymy, synonymy, polysemy, homonymy, homophones and semantic oppositions. The other subfield of semantics is the sentential semantics which studies the meaning of syntactic units larger than words (that is, phrases, clauses and sentences) and their meaning relationships. Some of the meaning relations at the sentence level are: paraphrase, ambiguity, anomaly, entailment, presupposition, redundancy, contradiction, tautology, meaninglessness, analyticity and proposition. The aspect of semantics which this study investigates is polysemy which is a semantic relation that occurs when a word has several meanings.

Polysemy is a sense relation which describes the characteristics of a word having several meanings. When a word is used in isolation, it may be difficult to determine the angle of meaning that it portrays. This is because some are ambiguous in nature. The meanings of ambiguous words are derived from the context in which they are used. This implies that polysemous words are lexical items having several meanings. Those meanings could be literal/direct or metaphorical meanings. Literal meanings of polysemous words are their original sense which usually comes to mind when the words are pronounced while metaphorical meanings are those extended meanings associated with the words. Metaphorical meanings are usually clear when they are used in context.

The meanings contained in polysemous words may share some relationship or may be totally different. The former aligns with the position of Augustine (2017) which views polysemous words as words having the properties of sense relatedness. However, some polysemous words are not related. For instance, the word 'bank' which can be used as a noun in the English Language and is also seen as 'a financial institution or the edge of a river.' The two meanings of the word do not have any sense relationship. However, some other meanings of bank in the dictionary may relate to the prototype. In support of the prototypicality effect of some polysemous words on one another, Rosch (1955) cited in Geereates (2010) notes that Polysemous words also have the feature of their meanings relating to the prototype. Crystal (1980: 247) cited in Essan (2008), sees polysemy as "a term" used in semantic analysis to refer to a lexical item which has a range of meanings. A polysemous word is known for having several related or unrelated meanings which could be literal or metaphorical. In some dialects and languages, polysemous words have literal meaning, see Ogwudile (2019:14). In English and Anaan Languages, polysemous words have both literal and metaphorical meanings, Urujzian (2015).

The study of polysemy is beneficial because it helps in word-economy. Some words extend their meanings to other words, everything in existence must not have a name. If all things are named, there will too many words which may not be remembered to be used. In line with the above point, Igwe (2002) notes that polysemy has the factors of economy and flexibility. For Akidi, (2014), "if everything is given a name, it will lead to forgetfulness thereby, rendering many words useless." Dictionaries have different ways of glossing polysemous words but most importantly, the meaning of all polysemous words are represented in all dictionaries.

Umulumgbe is a town located in Ojebe-Ogene in Udi Local Government Area of Enugu State, Nigeria. It is a town located at the north-western end of Enugu, Ude (2018). The town is made up of six villages which are Lett, Akpani, Amaabo, Amauwenu, Edem and Akpatoo. Umulumgbe town shares boundaries with Okpatu to the south, Ukehe to the north, Umuoka and Affa to the north-west, Egede to the south-west and Ogebe-Nike to the south-west (Ubaka 2005 and Odigbo 2012) cited in Onuegbu (2014).

The people of Umulumgbe town are known for their farming habits. The town has markets for different days in Igbo like Nkwọ Market which is located in Edem, Umulumgbe. The town also has Ori Market which holds on 'Ori' days and located in Amauwenu, Ngwuogbu Market that is held on 'Eke' and 'Afor' days. The market is located in Akpatoo village. People come from different towns to trade in the markets. Umulumgbe people are also known for producing quality palm wine and cashew nuts. There are lots of economic trees in the town which contribute to the sources of livelihood to the people of Umulumgbe.

Linguistically, Ụmụlụmgbẹ Igbo belongs to the Waawa Igbo dialects spoken in the northern part of Igbo land, Ikekonwu, (1987). Nwaozuzu (2008) notes that Ụmụlụmgbẹ is one of the dialects groups under the Northern Group of Dialects (NGD).

Some studies have been carried out on polysemous words in some dialects of Igbo, for instance, Ogwudile (2019) and Mbah (2012). Most of these works have centered on the literal meaning of polysemous words in the concerned dialects and the various meanings attached to the verb “se” in Igbo. However, it has not been established that the nature of polysemous words in Ụmụlụmgbẹ dialect of Igbo has been studied in terms of whether such words in the dialect have literal or metaphorical meanings.

For the above reason, this work studies polysemous words in Ụmụlụmgbẹ dialect of Igbo to find out if they have literal or metaphorical meaning or both. Also, the study seeks to examine some polysemous words in Ụmụlụmgbẹ dialect of Igbo to determine if the senses in them are related to the prototype.

## **Polysemy in semantic studies**

### **2.1 Conceptual review**

#### **2.1.1 Polysemy**

According to Crystal (1980: 274) cited in Essan (2008), “polysemy is a term used in semantic analysis to refer to a lexical item which has a range of meanings” Augustine (2017) describes polysemy as two or more words having several related meanings. Polysemous words have different meanings which could be related or not. A word which is polysemous in nature must have different meanings. There is always a meaning which usually comes to mind when a lexeme is pronounced, that is, the denotative aspect of sense. Other meanings associated with the word comes later and this is usually a meaning derived from the context in which the word is used. Urujzian (2015) refers to the meanings that are commonly used in languages to as “primary senses”. She notes that these senses are not dependent on the context and that they are the lexemes that appear first in dictionary entries. On the other hand, she calls the second kind of sense, “secondary” which are to be derived from the primary sense. These meanings are the contextual meanings.

According to Bejiont (2000) as quoted in Urujzian (2015), the different meanings of polysemous words must belong to the same semantic field. He illustrates this using the word “head” he opines that the word is polysemous because “all the different meanings of head” refers to the centre or starting point of anything. The argument of the above scholar is that all the different meanings of a polysemous word (primary and secondary meanings) must share relationship. In other words, the direct and metaphorical meanings of a polysemous word must belong to the same semantic field.

The work of Geeraerts (2010) aligns with the postulations of Bejiont (2000) as quoted in Urujzian (2015). He expresses that the senses in a polysemous word are related to the prototype adding that the similarity could be literal or figurative. He further explains this point using “fruit”, (“soft and sweet edible part of a tree or bush) which has other meanings that are related to the original meaning. For example:

- 1a. “fruits of nature”
- b. “the fruits of the ground”
- c. “the fruits of his labour”
- d. “the fruits of the womb”

His observation shows that the sense in each of the figurative expressions containing “fruit is related to the central meaning”. As the researcher had stated earlier in this work, the view of Geeraerts (2010) that the meanings of a polysemous word are related to the prototype and the opinion of Bejiont (2000) as stated in Urujzian (2015) that the meanings of a polysemous word belong to the same semantic field are related. Both studies argue that the other meanings of each polysemous word connect to its original meaning (prototype). However, this present research has a fairly different view on the meaning of polysemous words. One of the findings of this present work shows that it is not all polysemous words that are related to the original form.

### 2.1.2 Prototype

The concept of prototype was introduced in linguistics in 1980s by Rosch, see Greeraets (2010). It shows that there is grading in the semantics of natural languages. Members of a category have the most typical features, followed by the intermediate ones before the low ranked features, Rosch (1975) as shown in Greeraet (2010) illustrates the above point using the following examples:

2. bird, robin, sparrow, bluejay, bluebird, canary, blackbird, dove.

The relationship existing among the prototypicality scaling can be explained using the term hyponymy. Hyponymy is the semantic relationship which exists between words which one is an umbrella term and the others are words under the umbrella term. The umbrella term is called the prototype while words under it are called hyponyms. The term that typically represents the prototype is called super-ordinate term.

The words in example “2” above are the most typically represented for bird as explained by Rosch. The intermediate are ravens, goldfishes, pleasant, crows while at the lower end of the prototypicality scale are chickens, turkeys, ostriches, penguins, peacocks (Lemmen 2017:95). It's quite obvious that the super-ordinate term, the prototype and the hyponyms share semantic resemblance. They are called birds even though there are ones that are more typical than others. This kind of relationship may exist among some polysemous words in that they may have the feature of being semantically related. This means that some polysemous words are related to the prototype or the super ordinate term even though there may be words that are more typical to the prototype than the others. The less typical words are usually metaphorical. Lemmens (2017) further states that “some semantic substructure within that category are more salient than others and thus forms the semantic prototype...” He further states that “those senses form what Lakoff (1987) has called a “radial (polysemic) network”

Lackoff (1987) sees prototype as “cluster of features that define what an ideal typically member of the class should be”. The definition of prototype by Lakoff shows that it is the first version of an entity of member of a class that describes the other members.

### 2.1.3 Metaphor

Generative Grammar (GG) sees metaphor as a deviant language due to the fact that there are obvious boundaries between semantic categories. In GG, words that are combined must be compatible based on the feature specifications of the component forms. Selection restrictions are formalized in GG, so metaphor violates the formal rule of selection restrictions because semantics usually deal with literal meaning. However, Castello (1998) explains that cognitive semantics does not see metaphor as a speaker's violation rule of competence. He avers that “metaphor is a means whereby ever more abstract and intangible areas of experience can be conceptualized in terms of the familiar and the concrete.

The works of Lackoff (1993), Ferrando (1998) quoted in Castello (1998), portrays metaphor as the main conceptual mechanism through which we understand abstract concept and engage in abstract reasoning. They assert that metaphors are not mere figures of speech but are obligatory in every language. This aligns with Pye (2017) which postulates that metaphors occur in all languages. He goes further to explain that our basic vocabularies contain metaphors. For him, different people like poets, philosophers etc use metaphors. Pye believes that metaphors create a kind of analogue to digital conversion which helps language users to abandon superficial features of the world they are in order to avoid information overload. Pye is also of the opinion that all the things around us serve multiple functions and each new function provides a metaphorical extension. He points out that metaphors enable the mind to link sight to sound so as to connect an object showing light with the same object emitting sound. Pye's (2017) argument is based on the point that we use the same cognitive processes to understand metaphorical and literal statements.

Metaphors are those deviant expressions which help to add colour to expressions. On this point, Grey (2000) suggests that “if we want to express ourselves as rational thinkers, metaphors should be eschewed.” Grey (2000) also opines that metaphors help in generating new meaning from the old, (see also, Pye 2017). He illustrates this point with the word “run” which is usually used with animate objects

like human beings and animals. This verb-“run”-can also be used with an inanimate object like “river” in the phrase “the river runs”. The use of run with river is metaphorical. This study asserts that this is a good example of “frozen or dead” metaphor. A frozen or dead metaphor is that expression which has been suppressed. According to Grey, when this suppression takes place, the dead or frozen metaphor becomes an ordinary part of our literary vocabulary.

Urujzian (2015) notes that the meaning of a lexeme can be extended through the use of metaphor. For him, when this happens, there is a semantic shift or transfer. A semantic shift or transfer occurs when the central meaning of a lexeme is extended to accommodate other meanings. Every lexeme has a literal meaning and could also have associated meaning derived through the use of metaphors. The above researcher illustrates his point using the word “foot” as adopted in Lyons (1995:59) which refers to the lowest part of a leg and also means the terminal part of a hill or mountain. The opinion of this researcher is that a word could have different meanings. Part of the meaning may be literal whereas the other part may be associative. The contribution of the above scholar on metaphors is that when the meaning of a lexeme is extended, a semantic shift/transfer has taken place. This extension usually occurs from literal to metaphorical aspects of meaning. The researcher argues that metaphors contribute in making a word polysemous in nature.

#### **2.1.4 Literal meaning**

The literal meaning of a lexeme is the original sense of such lexeme. It is the ordinary meaning of a lexeme which first occurs in the mind of a speaker/hearer. This kind of meaning is devoid of semantic colourations. It is also called the denotative meaning of a lexeme. Literal meaning is the primary sense of a polysemous word which the other meanings of such word may depend on. Some associative meanings relate to the literal meaning. Abuarrah (2018) defines literal meaning as “a combination of the coded utterance and the micro-context”. He describes literal meaning as the first piece of evidence ready to the interpreter when he/she is speaking and the point where he forms his/her first assumption of the speaker’s meaning.

#### **2.1.5 Homonyms**

Homonyms are words that have the same spelling and pronunciation but different meanings and origins. Examples of homonymous words in English are:

bark (noun) “the tough outer covering of a tree”

bark (verb) “a loud noise from a dog”

The difference between homonymous words and polysemous words is that the former are different words but are spelt and pronounced alike whereas the latter is one word which has different meanings and could be related or not. According to Löbner (2002) as cited in (Essan: 2008), homonymy is an accidental, uncommon phenomenon while polysemy is independent of homonymy. This means that out of two words that make-up homonyms, each of them can be polysemous.

Homonyms can also be different from polysemy in the sense that in lexicography, they do not appear in the same style of entries. Words that are homonymous have different entries in dictionaries while polysemous words have one entry with different meanings. Homonymous words can also be polysemous. In the English language, the word ‘bank’ that could mean ‘a financial institution’ or ‘the edge of a river can be polysemous or homonymous.

#### **2.2 Empirical studies**

Ogwudile (2019) carried out a research on the meanings of polysemous lexemes in Oghe dialect of Igbo. His study aims to find out if polysemous lexemes are ambiguous or have extensional meaning. His illustration includes that “manə” in the dialect could mean “palm oil” or “pomade”. The word ‘elili’ may mean “rope” or ‘rope’ for wrapper. The study reveals that polysemy exists in Oghe dialect of Igbo without having idiomatic, metaphorical or ambiguous meanings. His findings also show that the meaning of polysemous words in the dialect are gotten through their use or context.

Urujzian (2015) examined polysemous words in English and Anaan Languages noting that the two languages require creativity and inventions just like other languages of the world. Going further, he reveals that the knowledge and mastery of polysemous words add up to the creativity and inventions

since much has not been done in such areas in language class. His analysis shows that polysemous words exist in both English and Anaan Languages. A part of his findings reveals that polysemous words have primary and secondary senses. He illustrated this using the word “head”. According to the study, “head” could mean “the part of the body or the starting point.” The study shows that “head as part of the body, has primary meaning while “head” as the leader of a group has secondary meaning. His further analysis reveals among others that polysemous words have both literal and transferred/metaphorical meanings. For instance, according to the data collected and analyzed in Anaan language, the word “ekpe” has its literal meaning as “tiger” (a large fierce animal) but metaphorically means “a powerful person” (see page 14).

Madueke and Umediaka (2021) conducted a research on polysemy and homonymy in the Igbo language. The study aims to find out the nature of polysemy and homonymy and to discover the polysemous and homonymous words in the Igbo language. It also aims to distinguish between polysemy and homonymy in addition to finding the similarities that are present in the both sense relations. Using descriptive method for the data analysis, the findings reveal that polysemy and homonymy are words that have the same spelling and pronunciation. It was further revealed that the meaning of polysemous words are related. The above study partly focuses on the similarities and differences between polysemous words and homonymous words in the Igbo language. The area of similarity of the study and this present work is that both are geared towards finding the nature of polysemous words but the areas of both studies differ. The concentration of this present study is only on the polysemous words in the Ụmụlụmgbẹ dialect of Igbo, the work did not investigate homonyms in the dialect. This present work also seeks to find out if the existing polysemous words in Ụmụlụmgbẹ dialect of Igbo have literal or metaphorical meaning and to find out if their meanings relate to the prototype.

Akidi (2014) made an enquiry on polysemy in Osina variety of Igbo. The objective was to find out if polysemy exists in the dialect without ambiguity. The study was based on the literal meaning of polysemous words. Adopting the theoretical framework of Use/Contextual of Wittgenstein for the analysis of the work, the finding reveals that polysemy is present in the dialect and that polysemous words occur there without ambiguity. Specifically, the work shows that polysemous words exist in the dialect without extensional meaning in the dialect. The above work is partly related to this present study in the sense that both seek to investigate polysemous words in both dialects. Contrarily, this present study uses the theoretical framework of Cognitive Semantics in the analysis of its data whereas the above study is based on Use/Contextual theory. Also, the above work concentrates on the literal meaning of polysemous words while this recent study extends its investigation to the metaphorical meaning of polysemous words in addition to finding out if the meanings are related to the prototype.

### **2.3 Theoretical framework**

The theoretical framework adopted for this research is the Cognitive Semantics Theory. Cognitive semantics came up in the 1980s as a subtitle of cognitive linguistics. The founding fathers of this theory are Leonard Talmy, George Lakoff and Ronald Langacher. Cognitive semantics is an aspect of cognitive linguistics which takes the description of language to the context of cognition. It is a theory studied within the domain of theoretical and descriptive linguistics not within the context of applied linguistics. Cognitivists opposed the independence of grammar and the secondary position of semantics in the generative theory of language conceptualization. One of the cognitive theories is that every human being has an innate predisposition that enables him to acquire language, see Lemmens (2017). The cognitivists argue that the environment and the mental endowment are necessary in language acquisition. Cognitive semantics which is a part of cognitive linguistics does not adopt a modular approach on language because morphemes, lexical items and syntactic forms are inherently meaningful. In cognitive semantics, meaning is considered conceptualization. Lemmens (2017) opines that our concepts are dependent on our cultural and physical experience. In other words, the concept that makes-up the meanings of expressions are gotten from our general world knowledge which constitute different patterns. According to Lemmens (2017), the patterns are called “image schemas”. Gibbs et. al (1994:223). Lakoff (1987) cited in Lemmens (2017) state that the image schemas “emerge throughout sensorimotor activity as we manipulate objects, orient ourselves spatially and temporally, and direct our perceptual focus for various purpose.” Mbah and Edeoga (2012) discuss the image

schema in Igbo semantics of the Igbo Verb-root ‘se’ under three image schemas, namely: CONTAINMENT, PATH and FORCE schemas. This study uses the theoretical framework of cognitive semantics as presented in Geeraets (2010). Geeraets presents four contributions of cognitive semantics to the study of word meaning.

- i. The prototype model of category structure
- ii. The conceptual theory of metaphor and metonymy
- iii. Idealized cognitive models and frame theory
- iv. The contributions of cognitive semantics to the study of meaning change.

He notes that the above four topics project three leading ideas of a cognitive linguistic conception of language. He states that “... a belief in the contextual, pragmatic flexibility of meaning, the conviction that phenomenon that exceeds the boundaries of the word and the principle that meaning involves perspectivization”. The topics used for this work are the prototype model of category structure and the conceptual theory of metaphor.

### 3.1 Methodology

The research design used for this study is descriptive research design. This type of research design is aimed at collecting data and describing them in a systematic manner. According to Fowler (1988), it is a study that does with gathering of facts rather than manipulating of variables to provide useful information on polysemy in Ụmụlụmgbẹ lect of Igbo.

This research took place in Ụmụlụmgbẹ which is a town located in Ojẹbe-Ogene. The town is in Udi Local Government Area of Enugu State. It is located along old Nsukka road and shares boundaries with Okpatu, Ukehe, Affa, and Umuoka. Ụmụlụmgbẹ town comprises six villages which are Lett, Akpani, Amaabọ, Amauwenu, Edem and Akpatọ. The dialect is an Inland dialect spoken in the northern part of Igbo land by the indigenes of the town. As the researcher had earlier noted, Ụmụlụmgbẹ belongs to the Waawa Igbo dialects as stated by Ikekonwu, (1987). It is one of the lects under the Northern Group of Dialects, Nwaozuzu, (2008).

Data for this research were collected through primary and secondary sources. The primary source of data collection was done using the Ibadan Word-list of 400 items (Trial English Version). The researcher also consulted some informants from the town. A total of twelve informants were interviewed, two from each village. Six of the informants were female while the other six were male. Some of them were elderly people not below the age of sixty-five years. Each of them was born in Ụmụlụmgbẹ town and had spent most of their years in the town. Among the informants were youths who were competent in speaking the dialect. Information was elicited through the use of a tape recorder. On the secondary source of data collection, the researcher made use of dictionaries, text books, articles in journals, theses and library information. The collated data were classified based on the list of polysemous words in the dialect. The classification of the data was also done highlighting the polysemeous words that contains literal and metaphorical meanings. The polysemous words that relate to their prototype were also indicated. The analysis of the data collected was done using the theoretical framework of Cognitive Semantics as propounded by Geeraets (2010). The analytical procedures used for the work are observational, descriptive and explanatory methods. The tone-marking convention used for this work is a system where all the tones are marked. Using this tone-marking convention, the high tone is marked with acute accent (´), the low tone with grave accent (`) and down-step tone with down-pointing arrow.

#### 4.1 Data Presentation

**Table 1. Polysemous words in Ụmụlụmgbè lect of Igbo showing their literal and metaphorical meanings.**

S/No	Polysemous Words In Umulumgbe	Gloss	Literal Meaning	Metaphorical Meaning	Related To Prototype Or Not
1	ìkèkè [ìkèkè]	a. air/wind b. fanning	Movement of air The act of fanning		Related
2	ògbágbó [ògbágbó]	(a) vomiting (b) barking	ejecting from the mouth. The sound of a dog	a loud utterance	Related
3	òmèmè [òmèmè]	(a) learning (b) reproduction	to get knowledge		Not related
4	Éká [Éká]	(a) hand (b) buoyancy	A part of the body	To be wealthy	Not related
5	í'↓sə [í'↓sə]	(a) to tell (b) to clear	To say something To clear a bush		Not related
6	énwùrè [énwùrè]	a. smoke b. snuff	Fine particles given off by burning Fine ground tobacco		Related
7	í'↓me [í'↓me]	a. inside b. pregnancy	The interior or inner part The condition of being pregnant being pregnant of something	being pregnant of something	Related
8	Mmépé [mmépé]	a. open b. development	Not closed The process of growth		Not related
9	Údwò [Údwò]	a. door b. route	An entry into a room A way for passing through		Related
10	í'↓kə [í'↓kə]	a. to plant b. to knock	To place a seed in a soil A sharp impact on an object		Not related



11	í'sə́ [í'sə́]	a. head b. life	Part of the body that contains the brain Being alive		Not related
12	ùdé [ùdé]	a. lotion /cream b.famous	A substance applied to the skin The state of being famous		Not related
13	Ègwà [ègwà]	a. bean b. character	A type of grain Traits that mark a person		Not related
14	í'↓nə́ [í'↓nə́]	a. to give b. to hear	To move something to someone To listen to		Not related
15	í'↓sə́ [í'↓sə́]	a. to cook b. to follow	The art of preparing food To follow a route		Not related
16	Éfwífwíá [éφíφiá]	a. weed b. Indian hemp	An un wanted plant A kind of drug		Related
17	ó'↓nə́ [ó'↓nə́]	a. mouth b. hole	opening through which food is eaten A hollow or a pit		Related

18	Ògbó [ògbọ]	a. age-grade b. public	A group of people within the same age A group of people		Not related
19	ùtə́ [ùtə́]	a. contribution b. powder	An amount of money given for something Dust		Not related
20	épətè [épətè]	a. mud b. cooked and wrapped Bambara nut	A mixture of water and soil cooked and wrapped Bambara nut		Related
21	Égwú	a. dance	A sequence of rhythmic steps		Not related

		b. song	A musical composition with lyrics		
--	--	---------	-----------------------------------	--	--

22.	Ímí [ímí]	a. nose b. mucus	organ for smell secretion from the nose		related
23.	Ódwù [ódwù]	a. tail b. last	The part of animal near the anus Last child of a person		Related

24.	Ípṣṣ [ípṣṣ]	a. face b. front	The front of the head The foremost of something		Related
25.	óló [óló]	a. neck b. voice	Part of the body Sound uttered by the mouth		Not related
26.	Éráá [éráá]	a. breast b. madness	The two organs on the front of a female		Not related

27.	Ọ́nṣá [ónṣá]	a. moon b. month	Natural satellite of a planet A period in which the year is divided		Not related
28.	ńtẹ́ [ntẹ́]	a. ash c. powder	The solid remains of fire Dust		Related
29.	Jí [dǒjì]	a. yam b. husband	The edible tuber of a plant The head of the family		Not related
30.	tẹ́ [tẹ́]	a dance b cook (soup)	A sequence of rhythmic steps performed to music To prepare soup		Not related
31.	ná [ná]	a. give b. hear	To move something To perceive sounds		Not related
32.	Ényá [éńyá]	a. eye b. bud	A organ for sight		
33.	Àgbà [àgbà]	a. Jaw b. Influence			Not related
34.	Íy'ṣi [íj'ṣi]	a. River b. Swear			Not related

35.	Mmà. [rímà]	a. Knife b. machete	A tool for cutting A sword-like tool used for cutting		Related
36.	Èkpà [èkpà]	a. handbag b. sack	small bag used by women a large bag with a strong coarse material		Related
37.	éj ↓a [éj↓a]	a. wall b. sand	A protective barrier A loose granular substance		Not related
38.	míí [míí]	a. water b. rain	A clear liquid Any matter falling		Related
39.	Ógwù	a. drug b. charm	Substance for treating illness An object believed to magic power		Not related
40.	Ézè [èzè]	a. king b. Wealthy person	A male monarch An influential person		Related

41.	Èkwà [èkwá]	a. Cloth b. Wrapper	A sewn fabric An outer garment		Related
42.	gó [gó]	a. Read b. Count	To look at and interpret To recite in sequence		Related
43.	pwé [phé]	a. see b. find	To detect To discover		Related
44.	egó [ég↓ə]	a. farm b. age group	A place for growing plant A group of people based on age		Not related
45.	Égwù [égwù]	a. fear b. danger	An unpleasant emotion Exposure to harm		Related
46.	ósásé [ósásə]	a. tree b. stick	A perennial woody plant A piece of wood		Related

### 5.1 Summary, conclusion and recommendation

Polysemous words in Ụmụlụmgbè lect of Igbo were examined in this work using the theoretical framework of Cognitive Semantics. The work was able to find out and enumerate the polysemous words in the dialect. This study also investigated polysemous words in Ụmụlụmgbè dialect of Igbo to find out if they have literal or metaphorical meaning. The work has also specified the polysemous words that relate to the prototype.

The evidence we have shows that polysemous words in the dialect may have literal and metaphorical meanings. It is only a few polysemous words in the dialect that have metaphorical aspect of meaning. This means that most words that are polysemous in the dialect have only literal meaning.

Finally, this study further reveals that few of the polysemous words are related to the prototype. The researcher recommends that Igbo lexicographers should give polysemous words serious attention by including them in Igbo dictionary compilation.

## References

- Abdurrahman, B. I. (2019). Semantics. English Department, College of Education for Women/ Tikrit University.
- Abuarrah S. (2018). Literal meaning. A first step to meaning interpretation 19 (2), PP.86-96.
- Akidi, F.C. (2014). Polysemy in Osina variety of Igbo. *International Journal of Igbo Scholars Forum*. Nigeria. Vol. 1. No 1.
- Anyanwu, O. (2008). Essentials of Semantics in History of Linguistics and Communication: Festschrift in Honour of Professor P.A. Nwachukwu. Nsukka: Paschal Communications.
- Castello, (1998). A Cognitive semantics analysis of the lexical units 'at'on' and 'in' in English.' A PhD Dissertation submitted in the Department of Filologia Anglesa, Romanica.
- Essan, M. T. (2008). *Polysemy as a lexical problem in translation*. "Adabal Rafidayn." Vol. (55).
- Fowler, F. J. (1998). *Survey research*. Longman: Sage publications.
- Geeraerts, D. (2010). *Theories of lexical semantics*. Oxford: University press.
- Grey, W. (2000). *Metaphor and meaning*. Minierva, Vol. 4.
- Igwe, B.A. (2002). A survey of polysemy as lexical ambiguity in Achi dialect of Igbo language. *In Unizik Journal of Arts and Humanities*.
- Ikekonwu, C. I. (1987). Igbo Dialect Cluster. Departmental seminar series. University of Nigeria Nsukka.
- Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, fire and dangerous thing: what categories reveal about the mind*. Chicago University Press.
- Lemmens, (2017). *Cognitive semantics Routledge handbook of semantics*. London & New York Routledge.
- Mbah, B (2012). "On the Igbo process verbs". *"Igbo language Studies"*. Vol. 1, pages 131-138.
- Mbah, B. M. & Edeoga P. N. (2012). Image schema of the verb "se" in Igbo semantics *"Research on Humanities and Social Sciences"*.
- Madueke, G. M. and Umeodinaka, A. (2021). Polysemy and homonymy in the Igbo language. *A Multi-disciplinary Journal of African Studies*. Vol 1, no 1.
- Ndimele, O. M. (1997). Semantics and the Frontiers of Communication. Port Harcourt: University of Port Harcourt Press.
- Nwaozuzu, G. I. (2008). Dialects of Igbo. Nsukka: University of Nigeria Press.
- Ogwudile C.E. (2018). Image schema of the verb "gba" in Igbo semantics *"Preorcjah"* Vol. 3 (1)
- Ogwudile C.E. (2019). Polysemy in Oghe variant of Igbo language. *Nigerian Journals Online*. Vol. 6 No 1.
- Olmen, D. V. (2018). Semantics. Department of Linguistics and English language. Lancaster University.
- Onuegbu, M. C. (2014). Numerals and measurement scales in Ụmụlụmgbẹ dialect of Igbo, Hausa and Yoruba. Ibadan: Ibadan Master Print.
- Pye, C. (2017). A metaphorical theory of meaning. *"Linguistic Society of Indonesia International Conference"*
- Stringer, D. (2019). Lexical semantics: Relativity and Transfer. Department of Second Language Studies. Indiana University Bloomington.
- Ude, A. N. (2018). Status and phonotactics of the schwa in Ụmụlụmgbẹ dialect of Igbo. A thesis submitted to the Department of Linguistics, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka.
- Urujzian, V. G. (2015). Creativity and inventions in the teaching/use of polysemous lexemes in English and literary studies, Akwa Ibom State University. *"Journal of Resourcefulness and distinctions"* Vol. 11, No. 1, ISSN.2276-9684.