

The Performer

**ILORIN JOURNAL OF THE
PERFORMING ARTS**



Vol. 22 (2020)

ISSN 1595-0972

**Published by the Department of the Performing Arts,
University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Kwara State, Nigeria**

EDITORIAL BOARD

Prof. AbdulRasheed A. Adeoye, Chairman

Prof. Solomon O. Ikibe, Assistant Editor
Mr. Felix A. Akinsipe, Member
Dr. Taiye S. Adeola, Secretary

EDITOR: Prof. AbdulRasheed A. Adeoye

EDITORIAL CONSULTANTS

Professor Olu Obafemi, Nigeria
Professor Mosun Omibiyi-Obidike, Nigeria
Professor Tunji Vidal, Nigeria
Professor Richard Okafor, Nigeria
Professor Anna Drews, Germany
Professor Grace Hampton, U.S.A
Professor Chris Ugolo, Nigeria Dr.
Ayo Oyeleye, U.K.

THE PERFORMER

The Performer is published by the Department of the Performing Arts, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria. The Editor welcomes articles in any area of performing arts and brief review of relevant publications. The journal is published once in a year. All correspondences, inquiries and articles should be addressed to the Editor, *The Performer*, Department of the Performing Arts, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Kwara State, Nigeria.

©DEPARTMENT OF THE PERFORMING ARTS, UNIVERSITY OF ILORIN

Logo: Adesina Adegbite
Cover Design: Sunday Ododo
First Published in **1999**

All Rights Reserved

**All interested subscribers should please send certified bank cheques,
bank drafts or cash to:**

The Editor
The Performer: Ilorin Journal of the Performing Arts
Department of the Performing Arts,
University of Ilorin,
P.M.B. 1515,
Ilorin, Nigeria

THE PERFORMER (VOLUME 22, 2020) TABLE OF CONTENTS **PAGE**

1.	Factors Responsible for the Occurrence of Themes of Illness and Healing in Selected Nigerian Gospel Songs - Taiye S. Adeola	1
2.	Interculturalism in the Music of Ayo Samuel - Morohunfolo Kayode	13
3.	Yorùbá Oral Artists and Cultural Symbolism: The Case of <i>Ìrèmòjé Eré Ìṣípà Ọdẹ</i> - Olúwólé T. Òkékándé	26
4.	Erotic Parody as a Religious Genre in Saint Janet's <i>Juju</i> Music - Adebayo Mosobalaje	45
5.	Assessing and Evaluating Theatre Management Approaches of Repertory Theatre Troupes in Nigeria - Kazeem Rufai-Ahmad	57
6.	Jimi Solanke's Creativity and Innovation in Theatre Praxis of Arts Entrepreneurship in Nigeria - Idris O. Bello and Taiwo O. Afolabi	65
7.	Breaking Barriers and Stimulating Dance Accompaniment to Contemporary Music in Nigeria - Olatunbosun S. Adekogbe	77
8.	Musical Aesthetics in Bakare's <i>Once Upon a Tower</i> and Ogunyemi's <i>Eniyan</i> - Hameed O. Lawal	87
9.	Language Interference and Polyglot Actors in Selected Yoruba Native Film - Adetoun A. Ademuyiwa & Eunice Uwadinma-Idemudia	98

10. Neo-Alienation Aesthetics in the Productions of Femi Osófisán's <i>Many Colours Make The Thunder-King</i> and Adébáyò Fálétí's <i>Basòrun Gáà</i> - Adewale Ademuyiwa	113
11. Classroom Drama for Civic Education: A Case Study of Oye Egbo High School Experience - Joseph A. Idogho and Timi H. Kayode	124
12. Politics of Place in the Design of the Nigerian National Theatre (NNT), Lagos, and its Corresponding Link to Contemporary Theatre Identity - Aminat T. Adebayo	134
13. Theatre in Education as a Tool for Teaching in Islamic Trust of Nigeria Secondary School Zaria - Abdulmalik Abubakar	149
Call for Papers.....	159

Yorùbá Oral Artists and Cultural Symbolism: The Case of *Ìrèmòjé Eré Ìṣípà Ọḍẹ*

By

Olúwólé T. Òkékándé, (Ph.D.).*

Abstract

This study examines the roles of the Yoruba cultural symbols in *Ìrèmòjé eré ìṣípà ọḍẹ*. On one hand, no work has examined *Ìrèmòjé aré/eré ìṣípà ọḍẹ* as an important Yorùbá oral genre or other hand, explored the relevance of the use of cultural symbols by the artists to the performance of *Ìrèmòjé eré ìṣípà ọḍẹ*. This gap is filled by this study. Cultural semiotics is adopted for this study; because, symbolism is better comprehended and understood through the cultural meaning associated with those symbols. *Ìrèmòjé eré ìṣípà ọḍẹ* written by Àjùwòn (1981) is used as a reference text; as the text majorly focuses on the hunters' cult- *awo ọḍẹ*. Cultural symbols are realised as tangible and intangible symbols. The use of some deceased hunter's materials in the text as symbols of hunters' guild are analysed against their cultural significance towards the success of their performance in particular and, among the Yorùbá people in general. It is found out that, the deployment of tangible cultural symbols take prominence over the use of the intangible cultural symbols. This is as a result of religious symbolism associated with it.

Keywords: *Ìjálá*, symbols, culture, hunters, performance, Artist, Oral Literature.

Introduction

Ìjálá, can simply be defined as hunters' entertainment songs. Like most of the other Yorùbá oral poetry, *Ìjálá* is associated with *Ògún*- the god of iron and war. Different scholars and authors have established some features that are peculiar with *Ìjálá* among other Yorùbá oral genres. The work of Babalolá (1966) is a pioneer work on *Ìjálá*. He demonstrates the contents and forms peculiar with *Ìjálá*. Àjàdí (1997) examines the stylistic features of *Ìjálá* poems of Ògúndáre Fọyánmú. He establishes that, *Ìjálá* poems generally and in particular, the *Ìjálá-Ìbà Olódùmarè* encapsulates the Yorùbá ideology, philosophy beliefs system and the God-*Olódùmarè* among others. Òkékándé (2010), (2014) and (2015) examined the stylistic features associated with *Ìjálá Orin Ọḍẹ Fún Àṣẹyẹ* written by Adébóyè

Babalolá. He focuses his stylistic analysis on prominence and coherence of *Ìjálá* poems. *Ìjálá*, like any other Yorùbá oral poems have *Oríkì* and *Orílẹ̀*

Olúwolé Tẹwógboyè Òkẹwándé, (Ph.D.), Department of Linguistics and Nigerian Languages, University of Ilorin, Ilorin.

of the *Olódùmarè*, the divinities, ancestors, supernatural agents, towns, families, and heroes, individual among others as prominent elements of *Ìjálá*. However, the existing works on *Ìjálá* as hunters' poems have neither examined *irèmòjé eré isípà ode* as a sub-text of *Ìjálá* poems nor examine the use of cultural symbols for the success of *irèmòjé eré isípà ode* performance. Therefore, the challenge of the use and, relevance of cultural symbols towards the success of *irèmòjé eré isípà ode* performance is open to research.

In this study, cultural symbols are realised in two forms- the tangible and intangible cultural symbols. That is, "Our cultural heritage has the tangible and the intangible component. The tangible heritage refers to those things that have physical form like carved wood and calabashes, statues, drums costumes, historical landscapes and sites, buildings, monuments and so on. The intangible components are those aspects that have no physical form, like our language, and literature, oral traditions, customs music, rituals, festivals and other special skills (Ìṣòlá, 2010, p. 68). On one hand, in this study, the tangible symbols are the cultural material symbols presented in the text as physical objects; mostly associated with the hunters or *Ògún*, the god of iron and war. On the other hand, the intangible cultural symbols are the use of verbal or oral arts as symbols. This is because; words are symbols, as words represent an idea, thing or somebody. In the text under study- *irèmòjé eré isípà ode*, the intangible cultural symbols are rendered in form of *Oriki* (panegyrics poems), *Orilẹ* (totemic poems) and *Ofò* (incantation).

Theoretical Framework

Cultural semiotics is employed for this study, because Yorùbá Oral Performers' can hardly perform successfully without the use of symbols. Cultural semiotics is concerned with all that is understood about different objects, symbols and signs in a given culture. That is, different meanings are associated with all that is embedded in a culture.

Semiotics can be traced to the pioneering works of Charles Sanders Peirce, the American philosopher (1931), and Ferdinand de Saussure, the Swiss linguist (1974). To Saussure, semiology is the study of signs as part of social life. Saussure made a distinction between '*langue*' (the internalized linguistic culture) and '*parole*' (the individual speech performance). He refers to the '*langue*' as the system of rules and conventions which is independent of and predates individual users. '*Parole*' refers to its use in particular instance (Saussure 1974).

Saussure focuses on the functions of social and cultural phenomena within semiotic system. He classifies signs into two entities: signified sign- vehicle and meaning. He refers to the signified as a 'concept', while signifier is the substance of the signified mostly in the form of material (objects, images, sounds and so on). For example, Yorùbá do say that, *bí a bá ñ fí àpárí isù han àlejò, òwe ilé tó lọ nìyẹn*. Literarily means that, if the topmost part of a yam is shown to a visitor, it a symbol to depart, in other words, there is no sufficient food at home any more. In this case, symbol is the 'the topmost part of yam' while signifier is, what it is interpreted to be, that is "to leave" is signified "concept." The association between form and meaning of a sign is fixed by conventions of language use. The link between the form and meaning are inseparable.

In the opinion of Peirce, the sign is an abstract entity. The sign is something which stands to somebody or something in some respects or capacity. This relation of ‘standing for’ is mediated by an interpretant. Peirce is of the view that, “a sign is anything which determines something else (its interpretant) to refer to an object to which itself refers (its object) in the same way the interpretant becoming in turn a sign” (1931, p. 35). That is, anything can be adopted as a sign. Peirce established three types of signs, the icon, the symbol and the index.

In this study, oral data evidence, especially from Yorùbá culture is explored to complement the written texts, or where the texts available are inadequate to account for the analysis of this study. The Yorùbá data are interpreted as possible; but, in some cases, are “left raw” (uninterpreted) so as to preserve the Yorùbá cultural flavor of such word or data. This is because, “African authors are themselves motivated by a desire to closely approximate the local flavor” (Oloruntimeba-Ojù, 1998, p. 4). However, where this is done, such will in no way jeopardise the content and intent of this study. In addition, the analysis of the symbols will be selective according to their signified. That is, few symbols from many that have the same meaning will be accommodated, so as to have spread over some of the cultural symbols employed by the text-*irèmòjé ipà ọdẹ*. This is done, so as to be able to explain in details, the import of the cultural symbols towards the *ipà ọdẹ* performance employed in the text.

Ìrèmòjé eré ipà ọdẹ belongs to the oral Yorùbá genre. “Orality was the means by which Africa made its existence, its history long before the colonial and imperial presence of the west manifested itself. In this sense, orality needs to be seen not simply as ‘the absence of literacy’ but as something self-constitutes *Sui generis*” (Gunner, 2007, p. 67). Oral genres are societal commodities. Therefore, their cultural values are guaranteed and more flavored in oral form. As a result of this, Orality is a communal and generational devoid of authorship or individuality “an utterance connotes anonymity, a collective voice, whereas a text implies individual authorship, a singular consciousness” (Ìrèlè, 2007, p. 80). Africans value their oral genres as dependable valuable historical facts.

Cultural Symbolism and Meaning

The use of traditional symbol connotes cultural expressions or an idea. Therefore, its use must be seen as a form or means of communication; especially in Africa, where “modern writing system” is new. In other words, Africans are from ancient time associated with symbols and oral media of expressions. Some of African objects, symbols and artifacts are ancient African system of writing.

Symbolism has been the topic of several studies. It is indeed of the utmost importance because these symbols are in close relation to speech: they are produced within the speech communities and demand interpretation by these communities. They fulfill one of the essential functions of writing: recording information and enabling its retrieval...Some objects elicit a verbal response and this encapsulates a text. The systemic use of objects can function like writing (Alain, 2009, p. 9).

One of the Yorùbá writing systems and oral performers are realised or seen in this study through the “semiotic lenses” of cultural symbolism. Some of the Yorùbá religious beliefs and writing systems is realised in the use of symbols. The symbolism of symbols’

codifications and significations as they relate to the African religion generally and Yorùbá beliefs system in particular have been subject of cultural scholarship for long. Therefore, the significance of cultural symbolism for the Yorùbá oral Artists is desirable. The value of an object is proportional to its use in cultural expressions— symbolism. That is, “the essence of an object is that which finds expression in the concept which the object embodies, the concept under which it must be identified if it is to be or remain what it is” (Olaide, 2017, p. 9).

Symbolism can be realised in different forms. For instance, the Yorùbá cultural believe that, ‘fish’ stands for negative and ‘crab’ for positive or to determine the ‘yes’ or ‘no’ of an interrogative statement such as *ẹja n bákàn?* (fish or crab?). It is culturally accepted that ‘fish’ symbolises (stand s for) ‘no’ or ‘negative’ and ‘crab’ symbolises (stands for) ‘yes’ or ‘positive.’ However, in *Ifá* divination context, *ibò* (lots cast) it is *egungun* (bone) that symbolises ‘no’ or negative and not *ẹjaas* in general cultural context.

Likewise, cowries shell symbolises ‘yes’, positive or affirmation in *Ifá* divination symbolism and not *akàn* (crab) as in general Yorùbá cultural belief (Abimbola, 1977a, p. 7). This means, cultural symbolism and meanings are culturally contextual. In other words, there is no constant or rigidity in associating meaning to cultural symbols. As a result of this, “it is only by ancient symbols, symbols that have numberless meanings besides the one or two the writer lays an emphasis upon” (Kennedy and Gioia, 2007, p. 250) that, one can account for their cultural values. This means, apart from the meaning of symbols in *irèmòjé eré ìsípà ọdẹ*, there are other meanings to such symbols in another Yorùbá cultural contexts.

The Yorùbá Artists may sometimes deliberately use symbols outside the cultural value or significance. In this case, there is Performers’ license or freedom. In other words, such is deliberately done to achieve a set goal or objective in the context of use of such “violation of cultural symbol.” This attempt is not restricted to the Yorùbá Artists alone but, to poets as well. When this happens, it must not be taken to be “cultural conflict, contradiction or collusion” but, as a “cultural extension”, because, the semiotic cultural signification of such cultural symbol remains unchanged.

Generally, it is unethical for any Yorùbá traditional artist to perform without being licensed, as the practice is in most cases, links with a religion. Therefore, there is a form of initiation for the apprentice artist before he can openly perform. One may reason behind this rule. For example, the sanctity and integrity of the divinities must be preserved. In other words, the misuse or misapplication of the religious/cultural symbols by the uninitiated traditional artist may spell doom for the artist or the community at large. This is as a result of the rage from the divinity resulted from the misuse of symbol. For example, a *Opón Ifá* (divination board) that is an immediate object (been worshipped), must not be faced to the sun (Òkèwándé, 2017). The *Ifá* priests are strict with the use of the *Opón Ifá* in this regards as it symbolizes *Ọ rúnmilà*- the divinity of wisdom. As a result of this, religious objects are regarded and respected at all cost and situations. In other words, the sacredness of religious objects is preserved.

Ìrèmòjé Eré Ìsípà Ọdẹ as a Form of Yorùbá Oral Performance

Ìrèmòjé ipà ọdẹ is an initiated hunters’ cult that belongs to male adherents. It is a hunters’ ceremony in memory and to pay homage to the deceased hunter. This is called

ṣíṣí ipà ọḍẹ. In other words, “ohun tí wọn ńpè ní ‘ṣíṣí ipà ọḍẹ’ ni kí wọn kó gbogbo ohun èlò ọḍẹ kan tí ó bá ti kú, kí wọn rù ú ló sí ẹyìn odi ilú pèlú ètùtù lati mú kí ọḍẹ tí ó kú fi iròrùn lọ sòrun” (Ilésanmí, 2004, p. 38). That is, what is called *ṣíṣí ipà ọḍẹ* is to gather all the belongings of the dead hunter and carry them to the outside town with associated sacrifices in order to pave way for the good or peaceful repose of the dead hunter. However, the presentation and the cultural implication (meaning) of the deceased hunter’s symbols/objects during the hunters’ performance are examined in this study.

The mode of *irèmòjé*, like all other Yorùbá oral genres, incorporates the speech, chants and song modes. It has been established that, “all the genres fall under the categories of recitation (speech mode) chant and song; but each category can be re-classified by their verbal difference of rendition, by their functions in the community, by the people who perform them and/or by their places of performance” (Ilésanmí, 2004, p. 68). Since, *irèmòjé ipà ọḍẹ* is performed in a “closed form.” For instance, not in the open or public; its function is also realised in “closed form.” The function performed by the *irèmòjé ipà ọḍẹ ṣíṣí* is exclusively confined to the *awo ọḍẹ*- hunters’ cult.

Since *ipà ọḍẹ* performance is in form of competitions, the manner or method of rendition is in form of turn taking. In this case, an artist takes the floor of the stage and performs. His turn may lapse by different factors such as poor performance, tiredness or completion of his performance. Change of turn of performer is done in a perfect way that the “novice” or “audience” may not notice any lapse or deficiency in the performances of the hunters. For example, an artist may end his turn by singing as a signal for another hunter(s) on queues to take a turn. An artist can as well be set off from the stage due to poor performance by a competent artist by singing as a link between the performance of one hunter and the other. The song may be rendered in lead and follow order; this is done to carry the “congregation” (the hunters and the audience) along as they all participate in the singing; sometimes with songs and dance. All these songs are coded as *orin ọḍẹ*- hunters’ songs.

The peculiar drum for *ipà ọḍẹ* occasion is *àgèrè* drum. However, *Gáangan* and *dùndún* are sometimes used as complement drums with *àgèrè*. Certainly, the associated dance with the drums, especially *àgèrè* in the course of hunter’s performance is not a “subtle” or “gentle-manly” one; but rather “hard” with all the body movement in action- jumping from one location to the other. Legs are the most active participatory parts of the body in *àgèrè* associated drum/dance. This is evinced from the Yorùbá discourse *tasè àgèrè*; used in relation with someone who is moving beyond his boundary or trespassing; as explained earlier. This indicates that the *àgèrè* drummer/dancer cannot be demarcated or confined to a boundary. The dance is performed without limit or restriction for the performers. In Yorùbá religious belief, some divinities have their associated drums. For instance,

Kósó l’a fi ń perí ọba/ King is called with *Kósó* drum. *Ìgbìn l’a ń lù f’óòsà/Ìgbìn* is drummed for divinity. *Bàtá l’a ń lù fún Kòso/ Bàtá* is drummed for *Kòso*

Ògún ní f’àgèrè lògbà/ Ògún is better appreciated with *àgèrè* drum (Ọ pádòtun, 1981, p. 61).

It should be noted in the above quotation that *Kòso* is an appellation for *Ẹ̀ṣàngó*, the divinity of thunder and light. This shows that *àgèrè* drum is the primary drum for

Ògún who is in charge of the *ìrèmòjé ipà ọ̀dẹ* performance. The drummers remind *ìrèmòjé* performers of relevant poems or aspects of poems and songs not remembered well by the performer(s).

Therefore, the *ìrèmòjé* drummers are “reminders” and “instructors.”

Ìrèmòjé ipà ọ̀dẹ performance is an obligatory art for the deceased hunter. The stage for the performance is set at the front of the house of the deceased hunter. It is usually a night till dawn performance, “*ni ọ̀jọ̀ ị́sípà yìi ni ẹgbẹ ọ̀dẹ yóó kó gbogbo ohun èlò ị̀dẹgbé àti Oògùn ọ̀dẹ tí ó kú pèlú nńkanorò yòókùjọ láti fì ị̀rèmòjé Ògún gbé e pàdẹ ọ̀dẹ tí ó kú náà lẹ̀yìn odi ilú*” (Àjùwọ̀n, 1981, p. 6). That is, on the *ị́sípà* day, all the hunters will gather the hunting equipments and medicines/charms of the deceased hunter with other associated cult-materials and use *ìrèmòjé* to hand them over to the deceased outside the outskirts of the town. Failure to do this hunters’ cult event- *ị́sípà ọ̀dẹ* may spell doom to both the living and the dead. This is because; the *ìrèmòjé ipà ọ̀dẹ* is majorly performed to pave way for the deceased to be admitted to the heavenly hunters’ folk. In other words, the *ìrèmòjé ipà ọ̀dẹ* is performed to exit the passed away hunter from the living or worldly hunters. It is after this the soul of the passed hunter can “rest in peace.” The family members are also at peace with their parted one, as they will receive the blessings of their parted one who has become a spirit being, powerful than them- the living being. In this way, “ancestors from previous generations, who have died, become spirits and yet who retain an interest in their families... They can influence living members of the family” (Robinson 2008, p. 2). To the Africans, the ancestors are regarded as ‘living-dead’ as their presence is felt in various aspects of the lives of the living family members.

Cultural Symbolism in *Ìrèmòjé Eré Ị́sípà Ọ̀dẹ*

As explained earlier in this study cultural symbols in the text- *ìrèmòjé eré ị́sípà ọ̀dẹ* are realized as intangible and tangible cultural symbols. The tangible cultural symbols of the deceased hunter are gathered in a basket and the necessary *orò/ipà ọ̀dẹ* (hunters’ cult) is carried out. It should however be noted that, non-initiated human being should not see these symbols along the way to the outskirts of the town as earlier explained. The *ìrèmòjé* performance involves “*ohun èlò ị̀dẹgbé láti lè jé kí ayé mọ iwúlò àwọn nńkan wọ̀nyí fún ọ̀dẹ nínú igbó níbi tí kò ti sí olùrànlọ̀wọ̀ kankan*” (Àjùwọ̀n, 1981, p. 15). That is, content of *ìrèmòjé* also include hunting instruments to let the uninitiated know their usefulness to the hunters where there is no presence of any helper. As a result of this, the intangible cultural symbols are used at *ị́sípà ọ̀dẹ* performance to educate the novice, uninitiated or general public about the cultural values the hunters associate with those symbols. These symbols comprise of the religious symbols of Ògún- the divinity of iron and war. Therefore, iron such as cutlass, hoe, bow, gun traps among others belong to this category. Some of these objects however exist in form of empowerment for the hunter; as the hunting work is mostly carried out in the bush and the hunters’ encounter with different animals and supernatural beings. As a result of this, *igbé nìgboro ọ̀dẹ*. That is, bush is the town for the hunters. These comprise of medicinal objects such as charms, armlets, “*ẹgbé, àfẹ̀rì, gbètugbètu, kánàkò, òòrùn-mákàn-tàrí, mágùn*” (Àjùwọ̀n, 1981, p. 6). These are medicines that are mostly possessed (empower) by all the hunters.

The intangible cultural symbols are used to complement invisible medicine that empowered the deceased hunter when he was alive. It also includes one of the contents of

ìrẹ̀mòjẹ̀ ipà ọ̀dẹ̀ and to other Yorùbá oral genres- *Oríkì* and *Orílẹ̀*, *Ọfọ̀*. *Oríkì* and *Orílẹ̀* have been described as the dominant elements in all the Yorùbá oral genres (Ọlájubù, 1981 and Òkẹwándé 2014). To the Africans in general and Yorùbá in particular, there are totemic objects and symbols which may be living or non-living things represented, regarded and respected to be the ancestral image and symbol. Generally, a totem “an animal, more rarely a plant, still more rarely a cosmic body or force like sun or wind, which gives its name to a clan and may be otherwise associated with it. A totem is, therefore significant, especially for the clan...disrespect towards the totemic object signifies disrespect to the forefathers and an injury to it indicates impairing of one’s own relatives” (Roy, 2003, p. 546). To this effect, totem is what represents and considered the first image of ancestors of every group.

There is no parallel line of difference between the two elements- *Oríkì* and *Orílẹ̀*. For example, before an oral Yorùbá artist can be proficient in his performance, s/he must learn and master *Oríkì* and *Orílẹ̀* including the history of individual, family or group. The Artist “has to learn the *Oríkì* (descriptive names) of various individuals, and things and the (*orílẹ̀*) descriptive poems of major lineages in the community in his immediate environment in which he practices his art” (Ọlájubù, 1981, p. 79). The knowledge of one of these elements is implied in the other. This means, there is no Yorùbá oral performance without these two elements under consideration. *Oríkì* (panegyrics) has to do with individuals, group, family or town historical collections of praise names and equally evince activities of individual wrongs and shortcoming among other things relating to an individual, group, family or town.

Totem can be seen as an accomplice of *Oríkì* because, like *Oríkì*, “totems are closely-tied up with relationship” (Káyòdé, 1984, p. 11). Totem, is a symbol that connects the present with the past. A loss of totemic symbol is a loss of identity. Furthermore, it is through shared *Oríkì/Orílẹ̀* (panegyrics or totems), that relationship between Yorùbá people is traced and identified. That is, “it is through their shared *Oríkì/Orílẹ̀* that these scattered groups recognise a relationship” (Barber, 1991, p. 135).

Oríkì is praise epithet of individual lineage and divinities, and are very important to the study of Yorùbá religion. It is a means by which someone is remembered “within the history of his family clan and tribe” (Odùyoyè, 1972, p. 72). This means that, the past is connected with the present by *Oríkì*. Barber asserts that *Oríkì* is based on history, and is concerned with “origin, custom, religion and taboos” (Barber, 1991, p. 25). *Oríkì* are essentially historical in the sense that they are one of the ways in which the relationship of the present with the past is constituted.

Ọfọ̀ (incantation) are the Yorùbá power of spoken words to make one’s desire comes to reality. It has a specific structural identification, “loaded with *ni-* and *kii-* constructions... We suggest that the link has to do with the exception less nature of the *ni-* and *kii-* constructions (Àjàyí, 2012, p. 102). *Ọfọ̀* is referred to as, “occultism in words... The Yorùbá incantation is used almost every sphere of human activity, be it social, political, economic or medical” (Dòpámú, 2009, p. 32). However, in *ìrẹ̀mòjẹ̀ eré iṣipà ọ̀dẹ̀*, these symbols are realised as *módàríkàn*, *gbètugbètu*, *àgbéro*, *àgbèti*, *egbé*, *aporo*, *àásán* among others. It is observed that, in this category, the spoken words must accompany physical symbols earlier mentioned under the tangible cultural symbols before

the accomplishment of wishes are carried out. This means, intangible cultural symbols are realized in complementary relation with the tangible cultural symbols before their cultural values are achieved. In other words, without verbal back-up of some tangible cultural symbols, they are seen or rendered as toothless dogs that cannot bite. It is observed that, the intangible symbolism or heritages are “under fire”, going towards the verge of extinction.

The degradation and disintegrations in the popularity and usefulness of this cultural wealth is alarming. This has demeaned this aspect of the Yorùbá heritage and value. As a result of this degradation, the significance and values and their cultural symbolism is being eroded. For instance, the recitation of *Orikì* (of different categories), *Orilẹ̀* and *Qfò* (incantation) are far-fetched in the Yorùbá society of today. This cultural defection is so discernible to the extent that, it has been brought to the public domain and debate. For instance, to salvage the intangible cultural heritage of the Yorùbá, Oba Lamidi Adeyemi III, suggested that, “there is the need for the legal protection of the intangible cultural heritage. Government must revive traditional and popular forms of a people’s expression; incorporate programmes relating to traditional cultures, heritage and folklores in education curricular at all levels (*The Nation*, August 23, 2017, p. 28).

One can describe *Orikì* as the micro-historical account of individual, group, thing or something; *Orilẹ̀* is macro-historical. This means that *Orilẹ̀* incorporates different *Orikì*. It encapsulates the origin or the root of somebody. *Orikì* is associated with almost everything that has a name; while *Orilẹ̀* is confined to towns in associated with human beings. The Yorùbá people trace their origin or relationship with one another through the use of *Orilẹ̀*.

Bí ó tilẹ̀ jẹ̀ pé púpò nínú àwọn ilú tí ójẹ orilẹ̀ Yorùbá—Ọ̀yọ̀ ti parẹ̀ lójọ̀ pípé, tí àwọn ẹ̀táhóró tó kù láàrin wọn kò fi bẹ̀ẹ̀ ní láárí dàbí aláà lóde-oní, àwọn Orikì orilẹ̀ ọ̀kọ̀ọ̀kan wọn ni kò jẹ̀ kí á gbàgbé àwọn orilẹ̀ tàbí ilú wònyí. Ósì jẹ̀ kí iran tàbí ẹ̀bí ọ̀kọ̀ọ̀kan lè mọ̀ orísun wọ̀, bí ó tilẹ̀ jẹ̀ pé wọn tan káàkiri orilẹ̀ ayé. Sẹ̀ okùn kò lè gùn gùn ká mọ̀ mọ̀ ibi tí a ti fà á wá. Ídì rẹ̀ tí kò fi ní yà wá lẹ̀nu tí a bá rí oríṣiríṣi ẹ̀yà tí wọn n fi Orikì Orilẹ̀ wọn kì wón bí ó tilẹ̀ jẹ̀ pé àwọn ilú tí irandíran wọn ti sẹ̀ ti parẹ̀ mọ̀ ayé lára ráúrúú tàbí pé wọn kò fi bẹ̀ẹ̀ ní láárí dàbí aláà mọ̀ lóde-oní. Orikì Orilẹ̀ wọn máa n sù yọ láàrin iran kan de ẹ̀kẹ̀jì àti bẹ̀ẹ̀bẹ̀ẹ̀ lọ (Ládélé, et. al, 1986, p. 178).

Eventhough, most of the towns of Yorùbá nations—Ọ̀yọ̀ are no more and the few that remains are no more relevant as such today, these towns are remembered today by their totems. It makes some clans and descendants know themselves. Eventhough, they relate with different nations of the world. There is no rope without the source, this is why there are associated with their totem despite the deserted towns of their origin today. Their totems surface at one time or the other between a nation and the other and so on.

Orikì, Orilẹ̀ and Qfò are most of the time expressed in metaphor in performance. This is because, “language comes closest to all the visual representation and especially when the vehicle is loaded with an emotional or spiritual significance, this reification makes a symbol. The commonest symbols carry a culturally validated, agreed-on meaning. (Matterson and Jones, 2000, p 43).

Intangible Cultural Symbolism of *Ìrèmòjé Eré Ìsípà Ọdẹ*

The intangible material in the oral performance has to do with using the appropriate verbal materials. Since the cultural value of *oríkì* in some instances links the present with the past. I had earlier pointed out that, *ìrèmòjé ipà ọdẹ* has to do with hunter's performance to exit the deceased hunter, from the earthly hunting expeditionson one hand and on the other hand, to be received or admitted to the heavenly hunters' cult.

Oríkì is prominent in *ìrèmòjé ipà ọdẹ*. Like any other Yorùbá oral genres, it forms the largest part of the text. That is, "*Oríkì*, including *Orílẹ̀* is in fact the essence, and the most dominant element of the content of all forms of Yorùbá oral poetry. The *Oríkì* is thus the greatest and largest store-house of the verbal materials for the composition of Yorùbá oral poetry. Therefore, its mastery is very essential for the success and reputation of the artists" (Ọlájubù, 1981, p. 78). For example, in the *ijálá ìrèmòjé* chant performed by Tóògùn says:

Omọ akínpejú/ Son of akínpejú
Omọ Ọ kájúà-àgbà-tí-sọra-rẹ dẹwe/Son of a greedy elder that turns himself
to kids.
E ẹ weyin t'Ọ gúnwọlé fí lẹ tí ọ dàkùkọ/Look at the little children
that Ọgúnwọlé left behind à bèẹ máa gbọọ/ don't you hear.
Ayí ni jó/ to turn is to dance
Eyébà wọn a lòkìtì/ The birds gather in broods
Tèèbó lare àşedọla/The Whites cherish night party till
dawn(Ajùwọn, 1981, p. 70)

The above *oríkì* symbolises that, as heroic Ọgúnwọlé was, he died too young. This is why it is painful that he left behind little children.

Different forms of *Oríkì* encode one form of background or the other about the deceased hunter. By the collection of *Oríkì* one can gather personal, community, town history. Therefore, *Oríkì* is an identity. On one hand, *Oríkì* has to do with profile or a biography relating to an individual family, thing, animal or place. If *Oríkì* is historical account that relates to the background of individual or thing, then, it gives way for continuity. That is, the past living or dead are brought together as an indivisible entity. On the other hand, *Orílẹ̀* of Ọgúnwọlé for whom *ìsípà ọdẹ* is being performed, is encapsulated in *ìrèmòjé eré ìsípà ọdẹ*. For instance,

Àkànjí Ọpó ti kan 'ra rẹ láábà/ Àkànjí of pillar or post that stands as
holder Ágbèdègbédé Ọpó, ti kan 'ra rẹ láábà ọdẹ/ Holder between two
posts

Ọpó ká jà, ká rỌ yọ/ Pillar or post related with
descendants of Ọ yọ

Nílẹ Ọgúnwọlé, Ọpó n rọşọ/In the house of Ọgúnwọlé, pillar or post
does have wrapping cloth. Pillar or post is decorated/ Ọpó n gbọn dudu (Ajùwọn, 1981,
*p. 22). By the above *Orílẹ̀* (totem), one is able to trace the origin of the deceased hunter*
to Ọpó (pillar or post) that have their origin with Ọ yọ descendants. As earlier explained,
totem serves as trace element of the origin of individual, group and town.

Another way by which intangible cultural symbol is used by *iremòjé ipà ọdẹ* performers is through *ọfọ* (incantation). There is nothing that has a name that the Yorùbá cannot call, invoke or conjure to answer them; either living or non-living things. This is done so as to rule their environment and to actualise their wishes or aspirations. Sometimes, the use of *Ọfọ* may be associated with some other tangible things (especially *ataare*- alligator pepper) working together before the realisation of their intentions. And sometimes, can work without such, that is, only by the use of verbal arts with any catalyst.

The use of *Ọfọ* (incantation) is an exploration into the third dimensional reality of the world in which primordial events are alluded to in order to re-enact an event which was primordially affected. Thus the past and the present are married together by special use of oratorically applied knowledge. It is like applying a tested true principle of science and effecting the same result year in year out (Ilésanmí, 2004, pp.38 -39).

The application of the tested Yorùbá power of the tongue- *Ọfọ* is sometimes applied by the hunters in their hunting expeditions.

Ò rọ náá a sì máa di iwàyá ijàkadì ní ọpọ igbà l'áàárín àwọn ẹranko àti àwọn ọdẹ...egbé àfẹ̀fẹ̀rí, àjàbọ̀ àti idíwọ̀: òògùn tí' wọn fí kí èèkanná ẹranko bí ẹkùn àti kinniún wólé...Sùgbọ̀n àwọn ọdẹ mǹràn tí kò bá tó gbangba í sùn lóyẹ, a máa sọdẹ nnkan kéékèèké kiri inú oko. Irú àwọn ọdẹ bèẹ̀ a máa lo èbìtì, ìrín, ọsọ, gbóró ẹ̀kú, ìgógó àtẹ̀ ajá àti ogi (Ògúnníran, 1978, p. 125).

The issue turns to a situation whereby the animal and the hunter engaged each other in wrestling. Charms to make the nails of wild animals such as lions enter in...But some hunters that are not famous engage in small-scale hunting in the areas like *ẹ̀bìtì, ìrín, ọsọ, gbóró ẹ̀kú, ìgógó àtẹ̀ ajá àti ogi*.

The practical experience of this is evinced in the encounter of a hunter with a wild animal in the bush. Adébímpé Ọ̀ jẹ̀dòkun in chanting mode of *Ọfọ* (incantation):

akiriboto kì í lójú awé/akiriboto has no lobes
È là ilẹ̀kẹ̀ kii lójú àtokùbò/ È là ilẹ̀kẹ̀ has no place to put thread
Àlérí-ìfọhùn nì tadárikọkọ/ No lizard crow by head nodding
Ó ní òkú tó tí kú kò gbọ̀dọ̀ mira/ He said the dead corpse must not shake body.
Àsùn-ì-para-dà nì tigi ajà/ the roofing rafters must not move
Lahón ẹ̀kùn bá sá wólé/ Then the tongue of the Lion begins to enter,
Lèékáná ẹ̀kùn bá wàkọ/ The nails as well enters in
Lehín ẹ̀kùn ba wà bọ̀ra wọn/ The teeth hook with one another
Sùgbọ̀n ìjà n lọ bèẹ̀ nì kòdúrò/ But the wrestling encounter continues.
Èkùn wá n ju ikúùkù bàlà/ Then the Lion was just punching anyhow
Bí adètẹ̀ gbìjà ara wọn-/ Like Lepers fighting for themselves
Ìkúùkù lásán lẹ̀kùn n jù/ Lion was just punching to the surface anyhow
 (Ọlátúnjí, 1978, p. 42).

This shows that, the power and security of the hunters is not limited to the tangible objects but, manifest in form of verbal power- power of the tongue. In *irèmòjé isípà ọdẹ*, this form of power is coded in discourse as:

*Boríborí kò le è bo segede/ No one that covers head can cover
segede segede ló lóri àrùn/ Segede has the head of disease (p. 101).*

However, since *irèmòjé ipà ọdẹ* is limited to the hunters' socioreligious event, the use of *Ọfọ* is minimal. This is because, they are not into hunting expeditions; whereby, the need for the use of *Ọfọ* in one form or the other may be applied. However, examination of intangible cultural symbols, especially with *ijálá* or *irèmòjé isípà ọdẹ* will be incomplete without making due reference and recognition to *Ọfọ*. **Tangible Cultural Symbolism in *Irèmòjé Eré Isípà Ọdẹ***

As explained earlier, tangible cultural symbols are associated with the use of physical objects with *irèmòjé isípà ọdẹ* performers. These objects and their symbolisms are related with *Ògún*- the divinity of iron and war. These objects are keenly related with professions such as,

ọdẹ (hunters), *ológún* (warriors), *alágbèdẹ* (blacksmiths), *olóólà* (human body artists/one who circumcises), *gbénàgbénà* (sculptors), and *onísòṇà* (leather artist including automobile mechanics and drivers in modern times)

...These symbols and other iron instruments, taken also as symbols of *Ògún*, are employed in oath taking, not only by members of the vocational guilds but also by the Yorùbá in general. All are under the suzerainty of *Ògún* inasmuch as they use one type of iron implement or the other, even domestically. Taking an oath or swearing using any of the emblems or iron instruments is considered swearing with or before *Ògún*, and it is believed that *Ògún* usually deals catastrophically with perjurers (*Ògúndèjì*, 2017, p. 270).

In the Yorùbá mythical belief, *Ògún*- the divinity of iron and warrior paves way for the other divinities to pass on their way to the surface of the earth; as some of the other divinities that attempted to do same failed because their equipment (symbols) could not withstand the thickness of the bush. *Ògún*, with his iron cutlass made way for other divinities to pass. This is why he is named *olúlàṇà* (the one that paves way). Till date, the role of *Ògún* is evinced in invocative discourse. For instance, the Yorùbá do say that, *òṇà kí í dí mólókó, òṇà kí í dí mọ aládàá*.

That is, one with cutlass and hoe always finds way to pass. It will be recalled that, *Ògún* is associated with iron equipment.

Ní isẹ̀dálẹ̀-ayé àwọn orìṣà wá sí ilẹ̀ ayé nibi nwọn ẹ̀e alábapádẹ̀ igbó dídí kíkíkí kan...Gbogbo àwọn orìṣà dúró nwọn kò le kọ́já l'aaarin igbó dídí yí...Lẹ́yìn èyí l'a gbọ́ pé Ògún bó sí igbó náà, o sì la òṇà gbẹ̀rẹ̀gẹ̀dẹ̀ gbẹ̀rẹ̀gẹ̀dẹ̀ fún àwọn orìṣà ẹ̀gbẹ̀ rẹ̀ nítorí pé irin àdà Ògún...

(Dáramólá and Jéjé, 1967, p. 292).

During the period of creation when the divinities were on their ways to the surface of the earth they met a very thick forest. All the divinities could

not find their ways forward. Afterwards we heard that Ògún with his iron cutlass came forward and cut the bush for other divinities to pass

In another context, the mythological account of the Ògún divinity in relation to the hunting profession with the use of some objects is evinced by Ògúnníran (1978) that:

Ògún láká-ayé Ọ̀ṣìnmọ̀lẹ̀ ni itàn atọ̀wọ̀dọ̀wọ̀ sọ pé ó dá iṣẹ́ Ọ̀ḍẹ́ síṣe sílẹ̀ – Ògún ni itàn pé ní ọ̀ḍẹ́ àkókò ọ̀un náà ni gbogbo ọ̀ḍẹ́ ilẹ̀ Yorùbá máa ń júbà di òní olóni yì kí iṣẹ́ ọ̀ḍẹ́ náà le jù wọ̀n í ẹ̀...Awọn nńkan tí ó nlò fún iṣẹ́ ọ̀ḍẹ́ ni irin, kùṁọ̀ àti Ọ̀kúta...Ní àkókò tí à ń wí yìi, kùṁọ̀ àti Ọ̀kúta ni wọ̀n nlò ẹ̀ḍẹ́ (p. 125).

The myth told us that *Ògún láká-ayé Ọ̀ṣìnmọ̀lẹ̀* is the founder of the hunting profession – Ògún is the one that all the hunters in Yorùbáland pay homage to till the present days. Those things he used for hunting are iron, club and stone. During this time club and stone are used for hunting profession.

Since the use of these objects in the text under study- *irẹ̀mọ̀jẹ́ eré iṣipà ọ̀ḍẹ́* make use of so many objects, few of these will however be referenced. The selected objects are observed in this study to be the basic ones- associated with Ògún and hunting profession. For example, the hunters performed that,

Apó ọ̀ḍẹ́/ These are the shelf

Ọ̀fà ọ̀ḍẹ́ náà rẹ̀e o/ The arrow of the hunter (p. 92 & 93). *È rúkọ ọ̀ḍẹ́*

náà rẹ̀e o/ This is hoe's handle (p. 93) *Ádà ni mọ̀gàjì ibọ̀n nínú*

ọ̀ḍẹ́ Ádà ọ̀ḍẹ́/ Cutlass is accomplice equipment for the gun in hunting expeditions. *Ádà ni máa gbádíí 'bọ̀n ni 'gbó ọ̀ḍẹ́/* Cutlass is used to tap the bottom of the gun in the bush

Ádà ọ̀ḍẹ́ náà rẹ̀e o/ This is the cutlass (p. 95)

Ìgbàborùn ọ̀ḍẹ́/ The head tie of the hunter

Oúndẹ́ ọ̀ḍẹ́ náà rẹ̀e o/ This is the charm of the hunter

Òògùn ọ̀ḍẹ́/ Medicine of the hunter

Kùṁọ̀ ọ̀ḍẹ́/ Club of the hunter

Oúndẹ́ ọ̀rùn ọ̀ḍẹ́ náà rẹ̀e o/ This is the neck-charm of the hunter (p. 96).

Ataare ọ̀ḍẹ́/ The alligator pepper, *Ataare ọ̀ḍẹ́/* The alligator pepper.

Obì ifin ọ̀ḍẹ́ náà rẹ̀e o/ This is the white cola of the hunter (p. 97).

Fitilà ọ̀ḍẹ́ náà rẹ̀e o/ This is the lamp of the hunter (p. 103)

As earlier explained, the tangible symbols (objects) are so many in the text, but the few mentioned are more prominent. However, I had earlier explained the cultural (religious) symbolism of Ògún's objects: cutlass, with the mythical role of the symbol during the journey of the divinities to the world. The cultural/religious symbolism of hoe and cutlass is relational to their use in *ọ̀fọ̀* discourse; which shows their significance, not only to the hunting profession alone, but, to humanity in general. It will be recalled that, Ògún, was referred to as Olùlànà to other divinities as earlier explained. To this end, many

bear Ògúnlàà among the Yorùbá people till today. However, this is connected with the symbolism of these objects.

The cultural/religious symbolism of *ibon* (gun) is referenced in some name as Ògúntókè (gun-Ògún can reach high place). Any of these objects (symbols) are used in oath taking or to swear. This can be in two forms:

Ò nà kìn-ní ni pé kí wọn to ibon sílẹ...Ènikòòkan yóò wá gbé ara rẹ ré bí ó bá ẹ n dá orí 'Ògún' yìi kọjá lókòòkan, bí wọn bá ẹ yí tán, kò sí ọnà láti ré e. Ó di dandan kí Ògún mú ẹni tí ó ẹ́ẹ́ ibi náà. Ikú Ògún ni irú ẹni náà yóò kú, láipẹ ojó...Ò nà kejì tí wọn tún fí máa n gbà ré Ògún ni nípa bíbu omi sínú ibon, wọn yóò sì gbé e fún ẹni tó bá fẹ búra yìi láti gbé e mu (Olofinsao, 2015, p. 79)

One way is to lay a gun on the floor...Each person will then curse himself or herself as he or she crosses the gun. After this it cannot be reversed. It is compulsory for Ògún to catch the person. That person will die an iron-related death without too long...The second way to swear by Ògún is to pour water inside a gun and pour it out for those involved to drink.

The cultural significance of some of these objects have been encoded in Yorùbá discourse beyond the stylistic domain of hunting profession. For instance,

Ò rò níi yobì lápò/ Words bring cola from the pocket

Ò rò níi yofà lápò/ Words bring arrow from the arrow shelf.

The use of these words and objects are culturally in collocation, in the sense that, cola nut can only be used or kept in the pocket; used as a metaphor for peace. Arrow is kept in shelf and when it is taken out, it is to kill. Therefore, while cola nut is a symbol of peace, arrow is a symbol of war. For instance, according to *Ìrètẹ̀ Méjì* contained in *Ọ̀dẹ̀gbọ́lá* (2015, p. 650),

Ohùn rere níi yọ obì nínú àpò/ Good voice brought cola nut from pocket

Ohùn búburú níi yọ ofà nínú apó/ Bad voice brought arrow from arrow shelf

The Yorùbá cultural symbolism of cola nut is peace and respect among humans and the divinities. This is extended to African belief generally, “the kola nut, so well known as the token of respect throughout the interior of Africa” (Clark, 1972, p. 246). In addition, the use of *kùnmò* (club) has earlier been explained in relation to its role in the early period of hunting profession. These symbols are culturally coded with meaning in Yorùbá in relation with the indigenous (religious/cultural) roles performed by the objects.

Conclusion

This work has demonstrated the indispensability of the cultural symbols for the indigenous Yorùbá oral Artists. The cultural symbols in the Yorùbá oral performance are categorised into two- tangible and intangible symbols. These two cultural symbols are observed in this study to be in complementary relation; as one complements the other in the course of oral Artist performance. It is equally realised that the cultural values and importance associated with cultural objects are of varying degree in meanings. In other words, some cultural objects are more indispensable than the other. The use of some of these objects most of the time have religious affinity or affiliations which make the

cultural object(s) to be associated with one Yorùbá indigenous divinity or another; as in this study, Ògún - the divinity of iron and war. The Yorùbá indigenous oral Artists recognise and give deserved cultural regard to the cultural objects in their performance because of their cultural symbolism.

References

- Abimbólá, W. (1977a). *Ifá divination poetry*. New York: Nok Publishers.
- Adeyemi, L. (2017). Alaafin decries negative impact of globalization, *The nation*, p. 28.
- Àjàyí, Y. (2012). The stylistic significant of focus construction in the ọfọ Corpus. In Adebayo, L. (Ed.) *Stylistics in theory and practice*, pp. 357-369. Ilorin: Paragon Books.
- Ajàdí, G. (1997). Ògúndáre Fáyánu's Ibà Olódùmarè: A stylo-rhetorical Analysis. In Adébáyò L. (Ed.) *Stylistics in theory and practice*, pp. 205-208. Ilorin: Paragon Books
- Àjùwón, B. (1981). *Ìrèmòjé eré ìṣipà ọdẹ*. Ìbàdàn: University Press Limited.
- Alain, R. (2009). Africa and writing. In Tejumola, O. and Quayson, A. (Eds.) *African literature: An anthology of criticisms and theory*, pp. 1-15. Australia: Blackwell Publishing.
- Babalolá, A. (1966). *The content and form of Yorùbá ìjálá*. Ìbàdàn: Clarendon Press.
- Barber, K. (1991). *I could speak until tomorrow*. Edinburgh: University Press.
- Clarke, W. (1972). *Travels & explorations in Yorùbáland* (1854 – 1858). Ìbàdàn: University Press.
- Dáramólá, O. and Jéjé, A. (1967). *Àwọn àṣà àti òrìṣà ilẹ̀ Yorùbá*. Ìbàdàn: Oníbòjé Book Industries.
- Dòpámú, A. (2009). *In the service of humanity*. Ilorin: Library and Publications Committee, University of Ilorin, Ilorin.
- Gunner, L. (2007). Africa and Orality. In Tejumola Oláníyan and Ato Quasyson (Eds.) *African literature: An anthology of criticism and theory*, pp. 67-71. Malden, US: Blackwell Publishing Limited.
- Geoffery, N. and Short, M. (1981). *Style in fiction: Linguistic introduction to fiction prose*. New York: Longman.
- Ìṣòlá, A. (2010). Harnessing, mobilising and deploying cultural heritage for development. In Oluṣegun, O. and Adéléké, D. (Eds) *Making culture memorable*, pp. 27-45. Ìbàdàn: Cultural Group Limited.
- Ilésanmí T. M. (2004). *Yorùbá orature and literature: Acultural analysis*. Ilé-Ifè: University Press.
- Ìrèlè, A. (2007). Orality, Literacy, and African Literature. In Oláníyan, T. and Quasyson, A. (Eds) *African literature: An anthology of criticism and theory*, pp. 74-82. Malden, US: Blackwell Publishing Limited.
- Káyòdé, J. O. (1984). *Understanding African traditional religion*. Ilé-Ifè: University Press.
- Kennedy, X. and Giogia, D. (2007). *An introduction to poetry*. New York: Longman.
- Ládélé T., Mustapha, O., Awórindé, I., Oyèrindé, O and Oládàpò, O. (1986). *Àkójopò iwádii ìjìnlẹ̀ àṣà Yorùbá*. Ìbàdàn: Macmillan Nigeria Publishers Limited.

- Mattersson, S. and Jones, D. (2000). *Studying poetry*. United Kingdom: Hodder Arnold.
- Odégbolá, I. (2015). *Ìwé mímó Ifá: È sìn àkódá Olódùmarè*. Ìbàdàn: Odégbolá Traditional Global Services.
- Odùyoyè, M. (1972). *Yorùbá names: Their structures and their meanings*. Ìbàdàn: Dayster Press.
- Ògúndèjì, P. A. (2017). Signs, symbols, and symbolism. In Fálolá, F. and Akinyemi, A. (Eds.) *Culture and custom of the Yorùbá*, pp. 269-280. Austin Texas: Pan African University Press.
- Ògúnníran, L. (1978). *Ìṣẹ́ tí àwọn Yorùbá nṣe*. In Olájubù, O. (Ed.) *Ìwé àṣà ibilẹ̀ Yorùbá*, pp. 120-143. Ìbàdàn: Longman Nig. Limited.
- Òkèwándé, O. T. (2017). A semiotic investigation of links between *Ifá*, *Ìbejì* and *Ayò Olópón*. A Ph.D. Thesis Submitted to the Department of Linguistics and Nigerian Languages, Ekiti State University, Ado-Ekiti.
- Òkèwándé, O. T. (2016). Memorial heritage as fountain of peace and justice in Africa: The case of *Ifá* in Nigeria. In Mawere, M. and Mubaya, T. (Eds.) *Colonial heritage, memory and sustainability in Africa: Challenges, opportunities and prospects*, pp. 105–37. Cameroon: Langaa Research & Publishing Common Initiative Group.
- Òkèwándé, O. T. (2015). Òdiwòn Itayọ́ Bí Fónrán Ìṣowólò-èdè Ìwé Orin Ode Fún Àṣeyẹ́ Tí Adébóyè Babalolá Kọ. *LÁÀNGBÀSÀ: Jónà ṣẹ́ akadá ní èdè Yorùbá*, 102 – 118.
- Òkèwándé, O. T. (2014). Àgbéyèwò Ìyípada Atóka Ajemówe Bí i Fónrán Ìṣowólò-èdèNínú *Réré rún*. *Àkùngbá journal of linguistics and literatures*, 15-21.
- Òkèwándé, O. T. (2010). Ìfojú Ìmò Ìṣowólò-èdè ẹ̀ Itupalẹ̀ orin ode fún àṣeyẹ̀. AnM.A. Dissertation submitted to the Department of Linguistics and Nigerian Languages, Ekiti State University, AdoEkiti.
- Olófinaso, M. (2015). Àṣà Ìbúra Nínú Àmójútó Àtí Ìyanjú Aáwò Láàrin Àwọn Yorùbá. *LÁÀNGBÀSÀ: Jónà ṣẹ́ akadá ní èdè Yorùbá*. Department of Linguistics, African and Asian Studies, University of Lagos, Akoka-Yaba, Lagos. 74-84.
- Olajide, F. (2017). In defence of the unborn and the limit of existential options. Inaugural Lecture Delivered on 6th June at Ekiti State University, Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria.
- Olájubù, O. (1981). Yorùbá oral poetry: Composition and performance. In Abalogu, U., Ashiwaju, G. and Amadi-Tshiwala, R. (Eds.) *Oral poetry in Nigeria*, pp. 71-85. Lagos: Emaconprint Limited.
- Olájubù, O. (1978). *Ìṣẹ́ tí àwọn Yorùbá nṣe*. In Olájubù, O. (Ed.) *Ìwé àṣà ibilẹ̀ Yorùbá*, pp. 120-143. Ìbàdàn: Longman Nig. Limited.
- Olóruntóba-Ójù, T. (1998). *Language and style in Nigerian drama and theatre*. Ìbàdàn: Ben-EL Books.
- Olátúnjì, O. (1978). *Ewì Adébáyò Fálétí. Ìwé kinní*. Ìbàdàn: Heinemann Educational Books (Nig). Limited.
- Ò pádòtun, T. (1981). *Ewì àsìkò*. Ìbàdàn: Abiprint Publishing Company Limited.
- Roy, I. B. (2003). *Anthropology: The study of man*. New Delhi: S. Chand & Company Limited.

- Peirce, S. (1931). Semiotics.
<http://www.singnosemio.can/peirce/semiotics.asp>.
- Robinson, B. A. (2008). *Ifa: the religion of the Yoruba people*. Retrieved from
<http://www.religioustolerance.org/Ifa.htm>.
- Saussure de F. (1974). *Course in general linguistics*. London: Collins.