

SENSE RELATIONS OF IDENTITY AND INCLUSION IN MWÁGHÁVÚL

KWARPO Mathew Sylvanus, MUSTAPHA Abdulhamid Baba, AKASE Tiav Thomas & Yakubu Jacob UMARU

Department of Languages and Linguistics,
Nasarawa State University, Keffi

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.4314/jolls.v14i4.10>

Abstract

Sense relations are the relationships existing between lexical items of a language. This study examined sense relations of identity and inclusion in Mwághávúl language. The study adopted a descriptive and analytical research design involving the description and analysis of qualitative data gathered through both primary and secondary sources, with oral interview as the main source of data collection from native speakers of Mwághávúl language from Mwághávúl speaking areas of Plateau State, Nigeria. The lexical pragmatic theory was adopted for the study. The data collected were analyzed descriptively. The findings from the study revealed that, the sense relations of identity and inclusion that exist in Mwághávúl language include synonymy, hyponymy, and metonymy. These sense relations perform the role of explaining the meaning of words or expressions in relation to other words or expressions in the language in order to avoid misinterpretation and misunderstanding by users of the language. The study concludes that competence and proficiency in the use of the language does not just depend on the knowledge of the vocabulary of the language, it also requires the understanding of the different sense relations between words and expressions in the language; as this enhances communication in the language. The study suggests that, to further advance the study of semantics in Mwághávúl language, researchers can delve deeper into the complexities of sense relations, exploring beyond the sense relations of identity and inclusion in Mwághávúl.

Keywords: Semantics, Meaning, Sense Relations and Mwághávúl.

Introduction

The study of a language is not complete until the way it comes about its meaning is studied. This is why semantics like all other aspects of language study is very important. Semantics is an area of language study which deals with the science of meaning. It is a deep and challenging subject such that for a very long time now, different scholars have been trying to understand how meaning works in their different areas or fields of study. Semantics has a lot of implications in communication; it is one thing for a speaker to talk, it is another thing for a listener to understand what exactly the speaker means. Thus, as an Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court, Felix Frank (1939 – 1962) cited in Denham (2010:287) rightly said, “all our work, our whole life is a matter of semantics, for the words are tools with which laws were made, out of which the constitution was written. Everything depends on

our understanding of them.” Therefore, our understanding of semantics is very important to overcome the communicative challenges that exist from different areas of human endeavour.

Pushpinder and Jindal (2010:141) consider semantics as “that level of linguistic analysis where meaning is analyzed.” It is very difficult to study the meaning of words comprehensively relying only on their referential or denotative properties. This is because a large number of words cannot be easily analyzed into meaning components. The meanings of such words can only be analyzed based on the relationship such words maintain with other words. The sense of a word therefore, reveals itself through the relationship that the word has with other words in the language. It is a semantic procedure of describing a language and characterizing the meaning of a word in terms of its relationship to other words but not in terms of

componential features (Tiav, 2020). Denham (2010) as cited in Tiav (2020) refers to sense relations as the ‘nyms’ which is part of knowing the meaning of a word, including knowing the semantic relations among words. This relationship is found across human languages. When words share certain semantic features, it means that they belong to a particular semantic field for they are the same. Sense relations however, refer to how the meanings of individual words are either different or similar.

Kreidler (1998: 303) sees sense relations as “the relationship of meaning between words, as expressed in synonymy, hyponymy and antonymy.” Thus, sense relation can be seen from the similarity of meaning as synonymy, the inclusion of meaning as in hyponymy, and the opposite of meaning as in antonymy. Whereas Cruse (2004: 148) classifies sense relations into two (2) classes: those that express identity and inclusion between word meanings, and those that expresses opposition and exclusion. The first class discusses the sense relation between words whose meanings are similar or included in other ones. The second class discusses the sense relation between words whose meanings are opposite or excluded from other words. Hence, this study is only concerned with sense relations of identity and inclusion in Mwághávúl language.

Mwághávúl is a West Chadic language under Bole Ngas group, generally spoken in Mangu Local Government Area of Plateau State, North Central, Nigeria (Blench, 2012). The name Mwághávúl refers to an ethnic and linguistic group found largely in Mangu Local Government Area of Plateau State, North Central Nigeria. It also refers to the language spoken by this ethnic group (Kwarpo, 2023). According to Babuje (n.d) as cited in Blench (2012), Mwághávúl refers to the people as well as their language and it means ‘*Mùn-ávúl* or *Mwán-vúl*’ (walk two or we are two). Babuje (n.d) further argues that an alternative spelling of Mwághávúl is ‘*Mwáhávúl*’ (Blench, 2012). The people are identified with the Mwághávúl language, which is spoken by the people in all Mwághávúl speaking areas and by those in the Diaspora. The Mwághávúl people now occupy a geographical setting called Mwághávúl

chiefdom in Mangu Local Government Area of Plateau state, North Central Nigeria. Mwághávúl inhabits nine (9) districts of the chiefdom. These districts include: Chakfem, Jipal, Kerang, Kombun, Mangu, Mangun, Ampang-West, Panyam and Pushit (Kwarpo, 2023). The headquarters of Mwághávúl chiefdom, Mangu, is about 77 kilometers from Jos, the Plateau State capital. Mwághávúl chiefdom falls between latitude 9°05’N and 9°43’N and longitude 8°40’E and 9°21’E. It has a total land mass of about 1,587km² and a total population of about 20,107 based on the 1933 census and 72,864 for the 1963 census (Gowon, 2011). The population increased to 250,000 in 1980 (Datok, 1983); 340,084 in 1991 census figures (NPC, Mangu, 1991); and 462,860 in 2006 census (NPC, Mangu, 2006). It is worthy of note that, although secondary migration has brought about Mwághávúl settlements in Shendam, Quanpan, Langtang South and Wase Local Government Areas of Plateau state; Lafia of Nasarawa state; and Samunaka, Pambeguwa, Dutsen Wai, Soba and Zaria in Kaduna state; these Mwághávúl speaking areas still owe their traditional allegiance and ancestry to their Mwághávúl home settlements. It is based on this that the Mwághávúl people are among the largest ethnic groups in the state with an estimated population of about 700,000 people including those settled outside Mwághávúl chiefdom (Gowon, 2011). According to Datok (1983) as cited in Kwarpo (2023), the Mwághávúl people share boundaries on the North with Botto and Lere of Bauchi State, North West is BarkinLadi Local Government Area, South West is Bokkos Local Government Area, South is Quanpan Local Government Area and on the East is Pankshin Local Government Area, all in Plateau State.

According to Zhuanglin, Runqing and Yanfu (1988:145), sense relates to “the complex system of relationships that hold between the linguistic elements themselves, mostly the words”. This is concerned only with intra-linguistic relations. Therefore, sense relations can exist between both words and sentences. It is pointed out that, although, sense relations encourage the economy of words in Mwághávúl language, it however, impede communication. This is in the

sense that, sense relations in the language consists of vocabularies that empower speakers of the language in attaining proficiency in the use of the language; but this is not always the case as when one listens to most communications in the language, users do not show good mastery and use of sense relations. It follows that, misapplication of sense relations by speakers renders the listeners confused as to what the right option of word or expression should be in a given scenario. This misapplication or use of the semantic relations would also result in wrong grammatical constructions in the language. Hence, the present study intends to provide insights into the sense relations in Mwághávúl. The study identifies the sense relations of identity and inclusion in Mwághávúl language and examines how the sense relations help meaning to work better in the language.

Semantics

Semantics is the study of meaning or the meaning contained in a language, code, or other sort of representation (Irawan, Fkip and Inggris, 2020). Stringer (2019) asserts that what is known as semantics is the study of how language is used to represent meaning. More specifically, the purpose of semantics is to explain how speakers and listeners encode and decode literal meanings through language. It is concerned with the relationship between signifiers, such as words, phrases, signs, and symbols, denotation, or what they represent. In fact, semantics can be known as the study that discusses about how to know meaning in language. Thus, the goal of semantic studies is to understand meaning objectively rather than subjectively. In other words, semantics is the scientific study of meaning.

Semantics as a field of linguistics studies meanings of words, phrases, clauses and sentences. However, there are differences and similarities that exist between words, phrases, clauses and sentences and these are studied in semantics under sense and reference, semantic fields, sense relations, among others. In sense relations, which are the focus of this study, therefore, the emphasis is on the study of how individual words or lexical items in a language are either similar or different (Ajim, Iorember & Iorfa,

2021).

Meaning

Meaning here is one associated with sense and sense refers to the linguistic meaning of a word or expression. Ogden & Richard (1923: 11) presents some definitions of meaning as follows:

- i. An intrinsic property of something.
- ii. The connotations of a word.
- iii. The thing to which the speaker of that word should refer.
- iv. Other words related to that word in a dictionary.
- v. The thing to which the speaker of that word refers.
- vi. The thing to which the hearer of that word believes is being referred to.
- vii. The thing which the speaker of that word believes himself being referred to.

These definitions show that, there are many ways through which meaning is understood. Gumperz & Hymes (1972) view meaning as 'a set of possible feelings, images, ideas, concepts, thought, and inference that a person might produce when a word is heard. This means that the meaning of an expression here is the mental image or idea formed on the mind as soon as an expression is uttered.

Sense Relations

The sense of a word is defined as the relations holding between words or lexemes and the objects and ideas in the world. Sense relations on the other hand are the relationship existing between lexical items of a language. They are concerned with meaning relations that words contract with each other in the meaning system of the vocabulary of that language (Lyons, 1977). In discussing sense relation, Tiav (2011:207) asserts that "in any human language, words do not only have meaning properties in isolation, they also bear some meaning relations with each other." He opines that "when words share certain semantic features, it means that they belong to a particular semantic field or they are the same." Tiav (2011) is of the view that sense relation has to do with how the meanings of individual words are either similar or different. Pushpinder and Jindal (2015) opine that meaning of a linguistic item can be explained by using other words and the relation of a word

with another word or sense relation. They assert that sense is a complex system of relationships that holds between the linguistic items themselves. To Pushpinder and Jindal (2015:145), “sense is concerned with the intra-linguistic relations, that is, relations within the system of the language itself, such as similarity between words, opposition, inclusion and presupposition.”

However, sense relation can also be defined as meaning relation between words (Jackson, 1988 cited in Munyaya, 2022). It is a complex system of relationships that exist between the linguistic elements. Sense relations are therefore the intra-linguistic realizations of lexical items making up the vocabulary of a language. Sense relations are important because every language is arranged in such a way that meaning is understood for purposes of communication. Thus, Cruse (2004:148) classifies sense relations in language into two (2) groups. Those that express identity and inclusion between word meanings and those that express opposition and exclusion. The first group or class discusses the sense relations between words whose meanings are similar or included in other ones (Similarity) such as synonymy, hyponymy, entailment, paraphrase, metonymy, anaphora, and presupposition; while the second class discusses the sense relations between words whose meaning are opposite or excluded from other words (Oppositeness) such as antonymy, anomaly, ambiguity, polysemy, homonymy, and contradiction. This study is therefore, only concerned with sense relations regarding to the sameness or similarity of meaning in Mwághávúl language.

Empirical Review

Empirical studies on sense relations of identity and inclusion and related works are reviewed to identify the gaps that exist in literature as well as establish the landmark contributions of the present study.

Chahur (2011) analysed “The Knowledge of Synonymy in Comprehension”. The study used the descriptive method of data analysis and defined synonymy as words with similarity of meaning. The study maintained that a synonym of a word is the one that has a similar sense with the word in

question and carries the same meaning as the word in a given sentence. Examples with the lexical items “small and little” which are synonymous to each other were given in the study. However, the study concluded that synonyms are best identified not in isolation but in context; and that sense relations is a fascinating aspect of the semantic study of the Tiv language as the understanding of the sense relation in Tiv not only enhance effective communication, but also, the knowledge of sense relation in Tiv is vital in effective use of Tiv language and thorough comprehension when the language is used.

Carbone (2018) examined “Lexical Sense Relations and Meaning as Context”. The study contributes to the understanding of meaning as inherently vague and indeterminate except when seen as the active process in which discourse sets up lexical sense relations. It argues that word meaning is made up of components which are activated by the context, where the context may help disambiguate the semantic composition of a word in use. Even though some components are activated by contextual triggers, discriminating which components are active is rarely straightforward. This is precisely the kind of task lexical relations effect in context. Thus, the contention in this study is that all sense relations are constructed in texts, not just antonymy. This view helps appreciate more accurately both the flexibility and the fuzziness of meaning, but it also contributes to understanding the processes of meaning disambiguation as instantiated by lexical relations in discourse.

Faidah (2018) did an “overview of language learning in sense relation: sameness and oppositeness”. The study aimed to know the sameness and oppositeness in sense relation of language learning. The method was based on library research. The study was about language, and so the study was about the meaning of language because language is a tool of communication to each other. It was pointed out that, semantics is about meaning, and the meaning of a language could be seen from its relationship between words, as the sense of one word is related to another sense. Thus, the result of the study was that there are two main groups of sense relations.

The first group is the sense relations with regard to the similarity or sameness (synonymy, hyponymy, entailment, paraphrase, metonymy, anaphora, presupposition). The second one is the sense relations of oppositeness (antonymy, anomaly, ambiguity, polysemy, homonymy, contradiction). The study concludes that, sense relations need to be known very well for studying about semantic because those are related to the study of language meaning. The sense of the word can be understood from its similarity with another word. On the other hand, it can also be learned from its oppositeness with other words. Therefore, by understanding sense relations, it can help us communicate with each other through language and avoid misunderstanding that can occur in a language.

However, the literature gap exposed from the reviews is in terms of the fact that, literature abounds on studies on sense relations as well as the various categories or types of sense relations in different languages; but none has been conducted in the area of sense relations or any category of sense relations in Mwaghavul language. Therefore, since sense relations is an important aspect of language which not only aids in effective communication and language learning but also serves as a means of language development; studies on sense relations and categories of sense relations is also relevant in Mwaghavul language. Hence, the present study examines sense relations in Mwaghavul language with the aim of conducting a descriptive analysis of categories or types of sense relations that exists in the language; for the purpose of aiding effective communication in the language, as well as for language learning and development.

Theoretical Framework

This study is carried out within the theoretical framework of the Lexical Pragmatics Theory proposed by Deirdre (2003). This theory has two components: lexical semantics and lexical pragmatics. The lexical semantic model has words treated as encoding concepts which denote categories of objects, events or properties in the world. The lexical pragmatic component of the theory explains how a hearer bridges the gap between the concept encoded by a word and the concept communicated by use of that word on a

particular occasion. Thus, the theory argues in favour of divisions of labor between lexical semantics and pragmatics; hence it combines the idea of semantics under specification in the lexicon, with a theory of pragmatics, that is, context. This invariably implies that a single lexical item or word once contextualized, on its own produces or gives rise to several different but related meanings. More so, in Lexical Pragmatics Theory, when words are put into contexts, they give rise to both grammatical forms and semantic (meaning) realizations, which exposed the meaning or sense relations. This therefore, makes the theory a better option for this study. Hence, the study is anchored on Lexical Pragmatics Theory as this study is guided by the Lexical Pragmatic Approach (LPA) as a tool for analysis. The theory of lexical pragmatics tackles issues on notions such as: lexical semantics, nature of concepts and their role in communication and cognition, acquisition of word meanings, word meanings and how they are processed, and about the development of lexical-pragmatics abilities. The theory has the relevant concepts and descriptive tools appropriate in the analysis of the data relevant for the study.

Research Methodology

This study is descriptive and the qualitative research design was adopted for the study. Data for this work were collected using both primary and secondary sources. The primary sources include the native speakers of Mwághávúl language from Mwághávúl speaking areas of Plateau State, Nigeria. Oral interviews were conducted with forty-five (45) elderly members from the nine (9) districts of Mwághávúl chiefdom of Mangu Local Government: Chakfen, Jipal, Mangun, Ampang West, Kerang, Panyam, Mangu, Pushit and Kombun districts; who were randomly selected as respondents based on their deep experience and knowledge of Mwághávúl sociolinguistics. The observations and intuition of the researcher as a native speaker were also very relevant for the work. The secondary sources on the other hand, include: internet, textbooks, and journals on sense relation in language as well as some published and unpublished materials on the Mwághávúl language. However, the data collected

were analyzed descriptively, based on the meanings of lexical items produced by the native speakers, as well as from secondary sources coupled with the researcher's intuitive knowledge as a native speaker of the language. These lexical items cut across different socio-cultural backgrounds of the Mwághávúl people as well as various sociolinguistic relations. The Lexical Pragmatic Approach (LPA) is the tool for analysis in this study. The theory centres on issues or notions such as: lexical semantics, nature of concepts and their role in communication and

cognition, acquisition of words meanings, word meanings and how they are processed, and about the development of lexical-pragmatics abilities. The theory therefore, has the relevant concepts and descriptive tools appropriate in the analysis of the data relevant for the study. This is in the sense that, with this theory, identification, presentation and interpretation of words meaning to identify their sense relations is arrived at from the sources and conclusion is drawn, descriptively, by pointing out how the sense relations affect communication.

Data Presentation and Analysis

This section present, categorize and analyzethe data gathered based on the sense relations of identity and inclusion identified in Mwághávúl; that is, synonymy, hyponymy and metonymy. The data are analyzed based on their lexical pragmatic contexts to show the sense relations of the lexical items in Mwághávúl, the roles sense relations perform in the language and how the sense relations affect communication and empower users of the language to attain proficiency in the use of the language.

Synonymy in Mwághávúl

This is a sense relation of inclusion. It comprises words or lexical items with the same or similar meanings depending on the context. Technically, for two words to be synonymous, they have to be similar and share all essential components, and thus capable of being used to substitute one another in all contexts without any noticeable difference in their meanings. This is what is termed as complete or absolute synonymy. In the Mwághávúl language, certain lexical items have completely same or similar meanings. These words in Mwághávúl include the following:

1. *mwén/nnōs* ‘stupid/foolish’

làà nī ā mwén/nnōs
boy the is stupid/foolish
'The boy is stupid/foolish'

2. *báán/bām* ‘to help/assist’

mó báán/bām ngù dāngdāng nī
they help/assist person begging The
'They helped/assisted the beggar'

There is another type of synonymy which occurs in languages, termed as partial synonymy. This type of synonymy indicates semantically similar lexical elements which differ by some dimensions or degrees of meaning and use. They are words/lexemes which share most of their necessary components or constituents with one another, but not all. In other words, they are synonymous in one context but not in the other one. Partial synonymy in Mwághávúl includes the following:

3. *pár/nkhōō* ‘dark/black’

nī Á pár/nkhōō
it Is dark/black
'It is dark/black'

4. *jéér/nfíí* ‘barren/empty

Mát dík nī rá á jéér/nfíí
woman married the she is barren/empty
'She is a barren/empty married woman'

The data above (1 - 4) shows that each pair of the words or lexical items in Mwághávúl are synonymous; but while some are absolute synonyms and can replace each other and the meaning of the sentence does not change but remains the same as in data (1 and 2); others are partial synonyms that cannot replace each other in the same or all contexts as in data (3 and 4). However, in the Mwághávúl language, nouns, adjectives, adverbs and verbs can all be synonyms; and based on the various situations involving synonyms that occur, it could be due to different dialects, registers, linguistic styles, colloquial and literary conditions. Another consideration is formality; that is, the case where the truth value of the synonym used in predictions with the same referring expression is the same. Hence, synonymy in Mwághávúl does exist due to stylistic, regional, dialectal, emotional and contextual differences that create different synonymous words. Thus, synonyms in Mwághávúl affect communication in the language and the understanding of synonyms would empower users of the language to achieve effective communication.

Hyponymy in Mwághávúl

Mwághávúl has words that have sense relations of inclusion in terms of hyponymy. Hyponymy is the relationship of enclosure of meaning where a specific word is included within or under a general word. The umbrella term is the generic, hyponymy, hypernym or superordinate term where the more specific is the hyponym or the subordinate term. Hypernyms and their co-hyponyms in Mwághávúl include the following:

5. *lēemiyēr* 'farm tools'
rī sò m.bóng kí lēē mìyēr
he go to farm with tools farm
'He went to the farm with farm tools'

The co-hyponyms could be:

i. *cáán* 'hoe'
rī sò m.bóng kí cáán
he go to farm with hoe
'He went to the farm with a hoe'

ii. *cùkngírók* 'sickle'
rī sò m.bóng kí cùkngírók
he go to farm with sickle
'He went to the farm with a sickle'

iii. *cùkgùùpòòdép* 'cutlass'
rī sò m.bóng kí cùkgùùpòòdép
he go to farm With cutlass
'He went to the farm with a cutlass'

6. *lōng* 'wild animals'
lōng dī mó ndighìn lìghít nī
wild animal there PL inside forest the
'There are wild animals in the forest'

The co-hyponyms could be:

i. *pààp* ‘duiker’
pààp dī ndīghìn lìghìt nī
duiker there inside forest the
‘There is a duiker in the forest’

ii. *ààk* ‘squirrel’
ààk dī ndīghìn lìghìt nī
squirrel there inside forest the
‘There is a squirrel in the forest’

iii. *mòsdòng* ‘grass-cutter’
mòsdòng dī ndīghìn lìghìt nī
grass-cutter there inside forest the
‘There is a grass-cutter in the forest’

7. *nyèr* ‘birds’
rā tù nī nyèr mó
she kill the bird **PL**
‘She killed the birds’

The co-hyponyms could be:

i. *mbūl* ‘pigeon’
rā tù mèè mbūl
she kill a pigeon
‘She killed a pigeon’

ii. *kushing* ‘firefinch’
rā tù mèè kushing
she kill a firefinch
‘She killed a firefinch’

iii. *ntaaseet* ‘cordon-bleu’
rā tù mèè ntaaseet
she kill a cordon-bleu
‘She killed a cordon-bleu’

8. *làà* ‘children’
rā kí làà mó
she have child **PL**
‘She has children’

The co-hyponyms are:

i. *lààdyèm* ‘son’
rā kí lààdyèm
she have son
‘She has a son’

ii. *lààrēēp* ‘daughter’
ră kí *lààrēēp*
she have daughter
‘She has a daughter’

From the above data (5 – 8), it is demonstrated that the hypernyms in Mwághávúl have the inclusion of the meanings of the co-hyponyms; as the class denoted by the superordinate term includes the class denoted by the hyponym as a sub-class. However, hyponymy is a crucial aspect of language, enabling effective communication. It helps convey meaning efficiently, striking a balance between precision and clarity. Whenever there is a challenge in finding the perfect word, hyponymy allows the use of more general or specific terms, providing just the right amount of information. This facilitates natural communication, avoiding unnecessary detail and promoting clarity. Thus, understanding of hyponymy is essential for effective communication in Mwághávúl language.

Metonymy in Mwághávúl

Metonymy is a sense relation of inclusion in which one word is used to describe a concept associated with the concept normally expressed by that word. Metonymy is the use of one word to substitute for another word that it is closely associated with. The word that replaces the original thing is called a metonym. Metonymy in Mwághávúl is shown in the following expressions:

9. *pùtūghūp* ‘heart’ as a substitute for *wál* ‘love’

i. *wál* ‘love’
án cín *wál* fīnā n.ghà
I give love my to you m. sg.
‘I gave you my love’

ii. **Metonym**

án cín *pùtūghūp* fīnā n.ghà
I give heart my to you m. sg.
‘I gave you my heart’

10. *làng-làng* ‘ride’ as a substitute for *ngūm* ‘car’

i. *ngūm* ‘car’
ngūm fīnā nī kí dár ātīlēng
car my the is stand outside
‘My car is parked outside’

ii. **Metonym**

làng-làng fīnā nī kí dár ātīlēng
ride my the is stand outside
My ride is parked outside.

11. *kícír* ‘grave’ as a substitute for *múút* ‘death’

i. *múút* ‘death’
Ā *múút* ā kyés kí sēēn
FOC death is end of life
‘Life ends in death’

ii. **Metonym**

ā *kícír* ā kyés kí sēēn
FOC grave is end of life
‘Life ends in the grave’

12. *pán*‘mind’ as a substitute for *dyēn*‘passion/energy/effort’

i. *dyēn* ‘passion/energy/effort’

án lè *dyēn* nkáā dák fīnā
I put **passion/energy/effort** on work my
'I put **passion** into my work'

ii. **Metonym**

án lè *pán* fīnā nkáā dák fīnā
I put **mind** my on work my
'I put my **mind** into my work'

Data 9 – 12 show metonyms exist in Mwághávúl. Metonym is not just limited to nouns; they can also be verbs or any other class of word, as long as there is a close association; for instance, as in data (10), my ride is parked outside. “Ride” is a metonym for car, and this works even though “ride” is a verb because there is a close association as in “my ride is parked outside”. Metonymy can also be used to refer to abstract concepts, ideas and emotions as in data (9) and (12). “Heart” can be used as a metonym for several things. The most obvious meaning is love, as in, “I gave you my heart”; we understand this as meaning, “I gave you my love”. Also, if you “put your mind” into something, it would mean that you have put passion, energy or effort into it. ‘Heart’ and ‘mind’ works as a metonym in both contexts, respectively. However, by substituting one thing for another, one can bring a whole bunch of vivid associations along with it as metonymy can add deeper meaning or complexity to a simple word choice. Metonymy also helps one cut down on wordy explanations by relying on a word’s associations and connotations. Therefore, metonymy affects communication in the language and can enhance writing and speaking in the language by creating new imagery, making words more powerful, and conveying a complex idea or emotion in a more concise way.

Discussion of Findings

The analysis explored the types of sense relations of identity and inclusion in the Mwághávúl language, how the sense relations in the language affects communication, positively or negatively, and how the knowledge and understanding of the sense relations enable the various users of the language including speakers and writers to effectively use the Mwághávúl language. It was discovered that, in the Mwághávúl language, there are semantic affinities between certain words and sentences as studied under sense relations. In other words, there is relatedness or similarity between words and sentences, often based on their meaning or context. This finding is in accordance with Carbone (2018) who argued that word meaning consists of components activated by the context, which may help disambiguate the semantic composition of a word in use. Hence, the sense relations of identity and inclusion identified in the

Mwághávúl language are synonymy (comprising complete or absolute and partial synonymy), hyponymy and metonymy.

This is in line with Faidah (2018) that identified sense relations of similarity or sameness, such as synonymy, hyponymy, entailment, paraphrase, metonymy, anaphora, and presupposition. The study found that these sense relations perform the role of explaining the meanings of words or expressions in relation to other words or expressions in the language. This is also indicated by Mukhalad (2017) that concludes that lexical relations are a subset of semantic relations that play a significant role in explaining, analysing, and applying word meanings within sentences. This role of sense relations can be seen in the various communicative events or situations as presented in the analysis, especially when the meaning of a word or expression is unclear and needs to be explained thoroughly, else, it may lead

to misinterpretation and misunderstanding between the parties in the communication. Therefore, in communication, sense or lexical relations are considered an effective way of explaining the meanings of words in various ways and thus, a better communication might be achieved. Hence, the study reveals that the knowledge and understanding of the sense relations of identity and inclusion identified in Mwághávúl can enhance effective communication. Faidah (2018) also agrees that grasping sense relations could facilitate better communication and help avoid misunderstandings in language. By understanding these sense relations, it can help users communicate effectively with each other through the language and avoid misunderstanding that can occur in the use of the language.

Conclusion

The study established that the knowledge of sense relations in Mwághávúl is vital in effective use of the Mwághávúl language and thorough comprehension when the language is used. This is in the sense of the fact that sense relations explain the meanings of words in terms of their relations to others at various levels and by doing so, there would be much exposure to language and much augmentation as far as the knowledge of the vocabulary used in the language is concerned. In fact, sense or lexical relations might be considered an efficient way in understanding the exact meaning of the word and how it is related to other words within sentences. Lastly, the study established that the tendency for wrong choice of words meant for one situation for another is almost inevitable due to lack of mastery of sense relations. Thus, a good understanding of sense relations in the Mwághávúl language is an

added advantage for effective communication in the language. This is because it will help users and speakers of the language to produce very intelligible and pragmatic sentences in the language, thereby contributing to the grammar of the language.

Recommendations

The study recommends that, to further advance the study of semantics in Mwaghavul language, researchers can delve deeper into the complexities of sense relations, exploring beyond the sense relations of identity and inclusion in Mwághávúl. This can involve analyzing how sense relations interact with other semantic phenomena, such as metaphor and metonymy and examining the role of context in shaping these relationships. Future studies should venture beyond the scope of this research, extensively examining particular sense relations identified in the language. Furthermore, researchers can investigate how Mwághávúl speakers use sense relations to convey meaning and achieve communicative goals, focusing on the languages' pragmatic dimensions. Additionally, exploring the relationship between sense relations and other areas of Mwaghavul grammar, such as syntax and morphology, can provide a deeper understanding of the language's overall semantic architecture. By pursuing these lines of inquiry, researchers can gain a more profound understanding of Mwaghavul semantics, ultimately contributing to a richer understanding and cognition of Mwághávúl language and human languages in general. This continued research can uncover new insights into the intricacies of Mwaghavul language, and further illuminating the complexities of human language and communication

References

Ajim, S.S., Iorember, M.N. & Iorfa, P.T. (2021). "Sense Relations in Tiv." *African Journal of Language Research*, 3(1 & 2): 36 – 43.

Blench, R. (2012). *Mwághávúl – English dictionary*. Cambridge: Kay Williamson Educational Foundation.

Carbone, A.V (2018). "Lexical Sense Relations and Meaning as Context." *Ideas*, IV (4): 1 – 9.

Chahur, A.A (2011). *The theory and practice of comprehension and summary (Revised edition)* Makurdi: SOHA Productions Ltd.

Cruse, D.A. (2004). *Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics (2nd edn.)*. Oxford:

Oxford University Press.

Datok, P.F. (1983). *A Short History of Sura (Panyam), 1700-1982*. Jos: Nigeria Bible Translation Trust.

Deirdre, W. (2003). "Relevance and Lexical Pragmatics." *Italian Journal of Linguistics*, 15(2): 273-291.

Denham, K. (2010). *Linguistics for everyone: An introduction*. Boston, MA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.

Faidah, Y. (2018). "Overview of language learning in sense relation: Sameness and oppositeness." *IDEAS: Journal of Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, 6(2): 49 – 57.

Gowon, R. (2011). "General introduction." In Lohor, S., Katu, B.A & Danfulani, U.H.D (ed.) *Towards a Mwághávúl History: An exploration*. United States of America: Xlibris Corporation.

Gumperz, J.J & Hymes, D. (1972). *Directions in sociolinguistics*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston.

Irawan, D., Fkip, D., & Inggris, B. (2020). "Semantic Analysis of the Meaning Sontoloyo Politician in the Mr. Joko Widodo Speech". *Faktor Jurnal Ilmiah Kependidikan*, 7(1): 33–36.

Jackson, H. (1988). *Words and their Meaning*. New York: Longman.

Kreidler, C.W. (1998). *Introducing English Semantics*. London: Routledge.

Kwarpó, M.S (2023). "Ethnopragmatic study of Mwághávúl Death Prevention Names in Plateau State, Nigeria." Unpublished M.A Dissertation submitted to the School of Postgraduate Studies, Nasarawa State University, Keffi.

Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Munyaya, E.J (2022). "Pragmatics of Sense Relations: A Description of the Kigiryama System of Meaning." *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science (IJRISS)*, 6(4): 523 – 529.

National Population Commission (NPC) (1991). *National Population Commission Census Figures for Plateau State, Nigeria*. Abuja: National Population Commission (NPC).

National Population Commission [NPC] (2006). "Nigeria National Census: Population Distribution by Sex, State, LGAs and Senatorial District: 2006 Census Priority Tables (Vol. 3)." *National Population Commission [NPC]*, <http://www.population.gov.ng/index.php/publication/140-popn-distri-by-sex-state-jgas-and-senatorial-distr-2006>.

Ogden, C.K. & Richard, I.A. (1923). *The meaning of meaning*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.

Pushpinder, S. & Jindal D.V. (2015). *An introduction to linguistics: language, grammar and semantics*. India: Prentice Hall of Indie private limited.

Pushpinder, S. & Jindal, D.Y. (2010). *Introduction to linguistics, language, grammar and semantics*. New Delhi: PH Learning Private Limited.

Stringer, D. (2019). "Lexical semantics: Relativity and transfer." In Erdogan, N. & Wei, M. (Eds.), *Applied Linguistics for Teachers of Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Learners (pp.180-203)*. Hershey, PA: IGI Global.

Tiav, T.A (2011). "Sense and meaning relations". In G.S. Omachonu (ed.) *NSUK texts in general linguistics, 1(1)*. Enugu: Rossen Publication Ltd.

Tiav, T.A. (2020). *Semantics (1st edition)*. Lagos: NIRPRI Publishing Press.

Zhuanglin, H., Runqing, L., & Yanfu, L. (1988). *Linguistics: A course book*. Beijing, China: Peking Univ. Press.