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Abstract: Conflicts occur between people, institutions, tribes and nations and cold be resolved when language and dialogue are effectively used. Peace linguistics and traditional ways of conflict resolutions in Terver T. Udu’s _Ikyav Saan Aga Saan_ and Sam Patrick Terngu’s _Adezungwen_ examines the causes of conflicts, explores the language of hate speech and states traditional ways of resolving conflicts in the select texts. This study adopts Coleman’s (2006) Human Relations Paradigm (HRP) for conflict resolution. The model emphasises the prominent roles that human social interactions play in resolving conflicts. The model uses mediation, integrative negotiation and constructive controversy as parameters for conflict resolution. Methodologically, this study used purposive sampling technique. The choice of the two select texts was deliberate hence the texts are laced with conflicts and how they were amicably resolved using traditional methods. The study used primary and documentary sources. The primary sources are Udu’s _Ikyav Saan Aga Saan_ and Terngu’s _Adezungwen_ while the documentary sources are journal articles, theses, glossary and textbooks. As data analysis, the select texts were read, data relating to causes, language of hate speech and resolution of conflicts were grouped and translated into English and then analysed. It was revealed that domestic conflicts could be resolved using human relation mechanism and nonviolent communication. This study has presented Tiv culture where the voices of the elders are respected and their decisions were unanimously accepted. Finally, peace repairs broken relationships and enhances progress. Traditional rulers should apply the solutions proffered by Terver Udu and Sam Paddy Terngu in their fictional texts to resolve conflicts in their domains.
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1. Introduction
Peace linguistics, peace studies, peace education and peace literature are relatively new academic disciplines. Disciplines relating to peace, principally, aim at using nonviolent language and dialogue in discourses so as to resolve conflicts. Peace linguistics as a branch of applied linguistics was birthed in 1990s, according to Crystal (2008) and it is still in its embryonic stage. Most studies on peace are done in the departments of Peace and Conflict Resolutions, Peace Studies, International Relations, Political Science and so on. Peace studies deserve attention in contemporary society because of the emergence of multitudinous conflicts, social unrests and insurgencies and how such crises could be combated or resolved using language and dialogue. In contemporary society, peace has become a scarce commodity as reflected in Udu’s (2014) _Ikyav Saan Aga Saan_ and Terngu’s _Adezungwen_ (2020) and these two authors used elders to traditionally resolve such conflicts in their fictional texts. In Udu’s _Ikyav Saan Aga Saan_, the author tells a story of Livinus who is posted to Ityulugh Primary Health Centre
and he befriends Beki Faasema and Dooshima. The two lovers meet in his apartment on one fateful day and a fight ensues. In the fight, Dooshima beats Beki mercilessly then Beki shamefully goes to her father’s house. Faasema comes to his in-laws and reports that he does not know his wife’s whereabouts. After listening to Beki and Faasema, the elders resolve that Beki should go and reunite with her husband and children. In Terngu’s Adezungwen, Agber Hueza and Abutu Jembe’s sour relationship starts when they are in army and the immediate cause of their enmity is that both vie for the post of the Tiv paramount office but none of them is crowned. Their conflict, too, is amicably resolved when Makir Dzakpe, the first-class king of Tiv people, admonishes and tells them to bury the hatchet. Both hug and forgive each other.

Though written in 2014 and 2020, the two texts reflect ancient ways of conflict resolution in the Tiv land. For instance, in the Tiv tribe of north-central geo-political area of Nigeria, orya (the head of the house), ye ingyôr or igyo (a group of families that is related by blood), ityô (kinsmen), igba (maternal kinsmen), ifyan i hamber (pouring of libation), ikyuryan (covenant) and ijir tamen (great judgement) are some traditional ways of conflict resolutions. Modern methods of conflict resolutions in Tiv include reporting the offenders to law enforcement agencies, apprehending the criminals, taking the case to courts of law, imprisoning the culprits, fining or executing perpetrators. Generally, there is a paucity of scholarly studies on peace linguistics and conflict resolutions in Udu’s Ikyav Saan Aga Saan and Terngu’s Adezungwen. This study therefore examines the causes of conflicts, explores the language of hate speech and states traditional ways of resolving conflicts in the select texts.

2. Literature review

The review of related literature is trichotomised into conceptual review, empirical review and theoretical framework. The conceptual review treats concepts of peace linguistics and conflict resolution, empirical studies reviewed and Coleman’s (2006) Human Relations Paradigm (HRP) for conflict resolution was adopted in this study.

2.1. Conceptual review

Linguistics, the scientific study of human languages, is compartmentalised into theoretical and applied linguistics. Theoretical linguistics deals with levels of language analysis such as graphology, morphology, phonology, phonetics, syntax and morphology. Applied linguistics is a branch of linguistics that deals with branches of linguistics such as peace linguistics, sociolinguistics, ecological linguistics, stylistics and so on (Crystal, 2008). Gomes de Matos (2005) affirmed that peace linguistics is an interdisciplinary approach which aids educational systems to bring about favourable conditions for preparing people to become peaceful language users. According to Crystal (2008), peace linguistics began 1990s and was spearheaded by linguists and language teachers. This branch of applied linguistics uses principles of linguistics, methods, findings and applications which aimed at promoting peace and human rights at a global level. Crystal further elaborates that peace linguistics stresses the importance of language diversity and multilingualism at national and international levels and emphasises the need to encourage language attitudes among individual speakers and speech communities. Gomes de Matos (2006) gives four pedagogical implications of peace linguistics to include: nonviolent communication, appreciative inquiry, powerful non-defensive communication and constructive communication. Gomes de Matos explains that nonviolent communication entails the use of peaceful, tender, decent, pleasant, polite, affectionate, cheerful, free, friendly dictions or vocabularies while speaking or writing.
Appreciative inquiry emphasises that language causes positive changes and a medium through which speech communities express themselves. Powerful non-defensive communication implies that the response is given to people based on how those people treat you, but you do not try to control or convince them to be different. Constructive communication involves communicating to humans in a peaceful way. According to Gomes de Matos, peace linguistics is seen as the branch of applied linguistics that is concerned with how inappropriate use of language causes conflict and how such conflicts are resolved.

Wallensteen (2002:8) defines conflict resolution as a situation where the conflicting parties enter into an agreement that solves their central incompatibilities, accept each other’s continued existence as parties and cease all violent action against each other. Miller (2005) defines conflict resolution as a variety of approaches that are geared towards finding lasting solutions to conflicts rather mitigating or managing them. Conflict largely occurs between two clashing parties. In conflict resolution, we must first of all identify the causative agents of the conflict and dialogue such conflicts through solutions that are unanimously acceptable and palatable by the conflicting parties. Taking arms to fight one’s enemy does not bring permanent solutions. Permanent solutions are employed when the disputants and the peace custodians come at a round table and dialogue. Effective manipulation of language helps in restoring broken relationships and ushers in rapid development as seen in Udu’s Ikyav San Aga Saan and Terngu’s Adezungwen.

2.2. Empirical review

Aluaigba (2009) observes that in Tiv tribe of Nigeria, kwav (age-grades) and the ityô (clansmen) can resolve intra-ethnic conflict while ijir tamen, Tiv apex court is capable of resolving inter-ethnic conflict. Ambe-Uva (2011) examines the role played by the Tiv people who live in the United States of America in resolving conflicts in Nigeria. Mezie-Okoye (2016) focuses on traditional mechanisms of managing conflict and methods used by local communities in Igbo tribe of eastern Nigeria to reduce and manage sometimes resolve conflicts at the sub-national level. The authorities saddled with peace resolution range from family heads, the council of elders, or chiefs, religious leaders, leaders of age-grades, local courts, kinship mechanisms, compensatory processes, and healing ceremonies. The family constitutes the lowest court in the traditional African system whereas the king and his council formed highest court of appeal. Agena (2018) identifies these traditional institutions of conflict resolutions by the Tiv elders of Tiv tribe of north-central Nigeria to include ya, compound council (elders) and the iye ingyôr (kindred council), ityô and tar elders’ council (clansmen and super-clan), age grades, igba (maternal kin), utor (chiefs) and ikyuryan (covenant making).

Kyoon-Achan (2013) compares Tiv and Inuit’s indigenous systems of conflict resolution in her study and affirmed that both Tiv and Inuit employed creative conflict resolution tools and methods within their communities. Kyoon-Achan maintains that, even in the contemporary times, the two ethnic groups still use their original cultural tenets for conflict resolution and peace-making. The foregoing review indicates that both intra- and inter-communal crises could be handled by the elders, covenant, paternal and maternal kinsmen, age-grades and apex court, ijir tamen. In the select texts, iye ingyôr or elders brought lasting solution to Faasema and Beki’s misunderstanding and His Royal Majesty Makir Dzakpe and his council of elders resolved the conflict between Agber Hueza and Abutu Jembe.

Chahur, Amende and Mohammed (2019) discuss problems associated with compounding in literary works. They identify Udu’s Ikyav San Aga Saan, Chia’s Adan-Wade Kohol Ga, Thaddaeus Kyegh’s Ambu Mgbegh sha
Vanger man a Yuhwa un ga and Wende Akasi’s Ankwaagh Vasha Swem as examples of texts that have defective compounding. Chahur, Amende and Mohammed observe that in Udu amalgamates or converts two words into one word in Ikyav Saan Aga Saan. Chahur, Amende and Mohammed cite the following instances: ãòndaîmêgh instead of ãòndo aimegh (dusk), ajimeavegh in place of ajime avegh (back of the hands), kwaghbo for kwagh bo (something bad), Wangbande for Wan Gbande (small drum, Beki’s mother), orgaav in lieu of or Gaav (somebody from Gaav) and kwaghyan instead of kwagh yan (food).

2.3. Theoretical framework
This study adopts Coleman’s (2006) Human Relations Paradigm (HRP) for conflict reconstruction, intervention, prevention and resolution. Coleman, director of the International Center for Cooperation and Conflict Resolution at Teachers College, Columbia University, identifies the realist paradigm, the human relations paradigm, the medical paradigm, the postmodern paradigm and the systems paradigm for conflict resolution. Human relations paradigm is adopted in this study because it provides a level ground for the disputants to resolve their differences amicably. This model emphasises the prominent role that human social interactions play in resolving conflict. This paradigm recognises the prominent role of ‘human contact and interaction between members of the various communities for both maintaining and transforming protracted conflicts’ (Coleman, 2006:543). Coleman lists human relations parameters for resolving conflict to include mediation, integrative negotiation, constructive controversy and models of different dispute resolution systems design. This approach is vitally important in resolving conflicts between two families as demonstrated in Udu’s Ikyav Saan Aga Saan and Terngu’s Adezungwen. In both texts, elders summoned the disputed parties together and used non-violent language to restore the families of Agber Hueza and Abutu Jembe and Faasema and Borogo, respectively.

3. Research methodology
This study used purposive sampling technique to select sample from the accessible population in this study. The choice of the two select texts is deliberate hence the texts are laced with conflicts and how they were amicably resolved using traditional methods. The study used primary and documentary sources. The primary sources are Udu’s Ikyav Saan Aga Saan and Terngu’s Adezungwen while the documentary sources are journal articles, theses, dictionary, glossary and textbooks. As for the data analysis, the select texts were read, data relating to causes, language of hate speech and resolution of conflicts were grouped and translated into English and then analysed.

4. Data presentation and discussion
This subheading explores the causes of conflict in Udu’s Ikyav Saan Aga Saan and Terngu’s Adezungwen, language of hate speech in Terver, T. Udu’s Ikyav Saan Aga Saan and Sam Patrick Terngu’s Adezungwen and traditional ways of resolving such conflicts.

4.1. Causes of Conflict in Udu’s Ikyav Saan Aga Saan and Terngu’s Adezungwen
Conflicts, generally, have different causes. In Africa generally and Nigeria in particular, most conflicts are caused because of land encroachment. However, in the select texts, there have been inter-group conflict between Agber Hueza and Abutu Jembe in Adezungwen and intra-group conflict between Faasema and Beki in Ikyav Saan Aga Saan. These conflicts have remote and immediate causes as herein critically examined.
4.1.1. Causes of Conflict in *Ikyav Saan Aga Saan*

In Udu’s *Ikyav Saan Aga Saan*, Livinus Torkwaor, medical personnel from Gaav who is posted to Ityulugh Primary Health Centre, has illicit affairs with Beki Faasema and Dooshima. One fateful day, the said lovers meet in Livinus’ apartment. The whole conflict begins when Beki enters into Livinus’ house without any permission, then, Dooshima who arrives before Beki asks Beki if she is the owner of the house. Before Beki arrives, Livinus tells Dooshima that he is on call and gives her a self-written letter claiming that it is Ortwer Asema that writes it to him. Angered by such deception, Dooshima wants to untie the towel that Livinus ties but Beki intervenes. As a result of Beki’s involvement, internal bickering and fighting commence. Dooshima then douses the entire content of Beki’s food flask on Beki and she begins to wail: ‘Ayoooo! Awei! I have been blinded ooo! Come ooo! She has killed me ooo! This prostitute killed me ooo. Ayoooo wu wu wu! Ayash! Ayash! Awandaful Awandaful (Wonderful! Wonderful!)’ (Udu, 2014: 8). Her weeping or crying has attracted audience to come to her rescue.

As the audience comes, they discover that it is Faasema’s legally married wife that is beaten by Dooshima in Livinus’ apartment. Out of shame, Beki runs to her house and tells her people cock and bull story. This is the bone of contention in Udu’s *Ikyav Saan Agan Saan*.

After a week of fruitless search for Beki’s whereabouts, Faasema goes to his in-laws’ house to officially report to them. The concocted report of why Beki goes to her house is vividly captured:

*M tent wan a nomom vilhi kpishi. Hanma shighe yô ka un a hiin kwagh a mo yö angbianev nas ve mough ve ta ikyar ker ana u chamber a mo er ka kpan yö. Hen ve yö m ngu kwase u lun a kwagh môm môm u dedoo ken amo ga.*

*Kwagh u a hembe vilhi hen orya wan yö, a soo u urugwan angereke sha iyol yam je zua ga. Zanzan yö nomom tuhum hanma shie er mo m ngu iswa. Cirin na yange tuhwan kwa gen la er mo m ngu kpkokofon u iti yam kpa mo m fe u ngeren ga kpa mo m gen m fe cihi yö. Orzy wanyangle ta a ta ken cirin na.*

*Kwagh u gen yö, iyange i tom ataan u kaa la m er kwaghyan u me za nenge kwase u Akaakighir sha iyucii. M ngur zan yö m kaa mer me yöoso a Ortwer vose. Nahan kwase na va her. Kwase la nengen a mo yö hen er Ortwer keren mo. Fele nahan kwase ne gham shu ikyondo er un a nongo num a mo. Kwagh ne lu eren kpa m hen mer ka kwagh u asenge. Ka er yange andem ikyondo vo yange ishima gham avambe ye* (Udu, 2014: 20-21).

This is translated as:

I have a strained relationship with my husband. Any time he had misunderstandings with me; his brother would support him and treat me like a slave. In their presence, I am a woman who has no single virtue. Something that is very bad about my husband is that he loved listening to gossips concerning me. My husband insults me every time that I am a bitch. His younger brother one day insulted me that I am uneducated that I did not know how to write my name but I am cheeky. My husband only supported him.

Another thing is, on Friday I prepared food to see Akaakighir’s wife in the hospital. As I was going, I passed to greet our ‘doctor’. His wife was around. As Livinus’ wife saw her, she thought he is befriending her. Without wasting time, she got hold of her waist and was ready
to fight. I thought it was a joke. It was when she tore my wrapper that my heart became bloody (Author’s translation).

Beki accuses her husband for not living a peaceful life, he and his bothers insulting her, saying that she is a stark illiterate and cheeky. The woman that fights her is Livinus lover, not his wife. She also claims that her costly wrapper is torn by Livinus’ wife. All these are invented to seal her promiscuous life. She claims that when her husband’s brothers get wind of the story, they do not verify it but threaten to machete her if she comes to their brother’s house. She concludes that out of fear, she goes to her father’s house.

After Beki’s reportage, Faasema is asked to explain why Beki leaves his house. Faasema tells Beki’s relations that Livinus Torkwaor, medical personnel, is befriending his wife, Beki. He explains that every evening Beki goes with food to the hospital. He often seeks to know if the patient still on admission. Beki replies that, ‘Hurugh pine ga. I tser u tsô. Tim daar a tav gelô gelô er ka Uwo u Binda nahan sha er u kuran mo yô ga’ (Udu, 2014: 23). This is translated thus: ‘Come and ask. It disturbs you so. Plant a high platform that is as high as Binda Mountain so that you will watch over me’. Faasema says that hence he has a swollen boil at his buttocks, has not gone anywhere to know the patient that Beki often visits in the hospital. He does not know why there is a fight and since that fight, he has not sighted his wife. Perhaps, as she fights with Livinus’ wife, she feels ashamed of coming to his house. ‘My father-in-law, you will kill me with my innocence’ (Udu, 2014: 23).

The two accounts are conflicting. However, it is clearly understood by Beki’s parents. Among the accusations levelled against Faasema, it is the encounter that Beki has with Livinus’ wife that appears to be true. However, Beki craftily retells her encounter with Dooshima in another way. She says so in order to conceal her promiscuous life-style so as to be exonerated from her parents’ blames. As the truth dawns, her parents do not maltreat their son-in-law as planned.

4.1.2. Causes of Conflict in Adezungwen

Basically, there are remote and immediate causes of conflict in Adezungwen. The remote cause of the conflict between Agber Hueza and Abutu Jembe began when they were in army. They fought World War II together. In the play, Agber Hueza lies down in his khaki when he is shot down on his leg when the attack becomes serious. Agber begs Abutu to rescue him but he refuses and leaves him (Terngu, 2020: 2). As their conflict persists, Emberga wishes to know the remote cause of the conflict between Agber Hueza and Abutu Jembe. Makir answers Emberga by saying that the feud between Agber and Abutu does not start today. He adds that ‘“kwagh la hii shie u se lu ken Boma la je’’ which is translated thus: ‘it started when we were in Burma’’ (Terngu, 2020: 15). The dramatist and Makir corroborate that their misunderstanding begins when they fight in Boma and that Abutu refuses to rescue Agber from the jaws of death. Furthermore, Abutu narrates to Bem, his son, why he has a misunderstanding with Agber. According to Abutu, he and Agber serve in army together. He maintains that they are tender by the time they serve in army. He further reveals that Agber brings two guns in a bag and keeps at Abutu’s backyard. The following day, they search for those guns and later find them at Abutu’s backyard and they beat him. If not because of his kinsmen, he would have been dismissed from army. Abutu also affirms that their fracas commences when they are in army but concludes that Abutu sets him up by hiding guns at his backyard to implicate him. The foregoing discussions hinge on the remote cause of the conflict in Adezungwen and subsequent write-up shows the immediate cause of conflict in Adezungwen.
The immediate cause of the conflict in Adezungwen is that both Agber and Abutu are contesting for the office of the Tor Tiv, the Tiv paramount ruler. Agber tells the audience that: “’Hegen m ngu kperan Tor u Tiv u Dio a soo u nan se Tiv ne. Abutu kpa ngu kperan. Er ne lan ga nan, kwagh gba Abutu a mo kpishi, kpa mo mngu or u wan ityogh, hiin iyongo ga, nahan Aôndo a er ishima na’” (Terngu, 2020: 18). Agber’s discourse is translated thus: “’Now I am vying for the office of the Tiv stool that the District Officer wants to give Tiv people. Abutu is contesting as well. As you all know, Abutu wants to have plenty issues with me but I am not somebody who will look for trouble, God should do his will’”. Agber further reveals that Abutu does not have intention of vying for the office of Tor Tiv but when he sees that his clansmen give him go ahead to contest for the post that is when Abutu starts causing commotion that he wants to contest. The remote issue that results in the conflict between Agber and Abutu is power tussle. Tiv people have a proverb that when people struggled over a bag, it must be torn. That means as the duo compete fiercely, none of them is elected but a neutral person, Makir Dzakpe.

4.2. Language of Hate Speech in Ikyav Saan Aga Saan and Adezungwen

Language could make or mar a given situation. Indiscriminate use of language can result in hate speech and conflict and proper deployment of language heals broken relationships. Every individual has freedom of speech but there are restrictions attached to it. We should know that where our freedom ends another person’s freedom begins. Freedom of speech does not warrant us insult or abuse people. Using stereotypical statements, libel, slander, insult means you are going beyond your freedom of speech. Hate speech, therefore, means using spoken, written, signed and surrogate language to incite, quarrel, ridicule, disparage, abuse, insult, backbite, debase, humiliates somebody, a group of people, communities, tribes, nations, continents, educational, political, religious, social institutions and so on. Hate speeches in Ikyav Saan Aga Saan and Adezungwen have been discussed.

4.2.1. Language of hate speech in Ikyav Saan Aga Saan

Actions and inactions of Livinus Torkwaor have given prominence to hate speech. His sexual relationships with Beki Faasema and Dooshima, lying against Ityulugh people, quarrelling and fighting between Beki and Dooshima, ill-report of Beki about husband, Ishua’s inciting pieces of advice are indices of hate speech in Udu’s Ikyav Saan Aga Saan. The fracas between Beki and Dooshima results in quarrelling and deployment of abusive words. Dooshima insults Beki, “’Bradiful. How can this little woman challenge me like this?’” (Udu, 2014: 6-7). ‘Bradiful’ is a corrupted spelling of bloody fool and it is a kind of invective used by Dooshima. The use of wrong spelling shows that Dooshima and Beki are illiterate or semi-literate. ‘This little woman’ and ‘ankwase ne’ are used diminutively as insults and ‘challenge’ implies verbal attack. Beki quickly replies Dooshima with an abusive word – ‘Anjôv’ – meaning ‘a sprite or fairy’. On seeing Beki’s condition, Ishua, one of the characters, tell Livinus that: “’I will tell you, Doctor Livinus, if you ‘don’t want to leave Ityulugh district then behave well. Conflict is not good in Ukpar. Do you think if Faasema sees his wife in this condition, will he leave you?’” (Udu, 2014: 10). Ishua’s statements are so inciting! Livinus is somebody from Gaav and if he wants to be safe in the hands of the host community, he must pipe low. A fight must ensue if Ishua reports this to Faasema. As Beki is thoroughly beaten, the audience say: “’Will men ever be satisfied? Women also do not sit in one place, Beki has got her reward. I covet one fish so as eat, ‘wa uka uka’, this night!’” (Udu, 2014: 10). The audience is alluding that Livinus is a casanova while Beki is a nymphomaniac. The ‘fish’ is a reference to the fish soup that Beki brings to
Livinus’ house. Livinus replies, “kaham ga vough er Orkan a caan [tsan] bua nahan” (Udu, 2014: 12), when greeted by Beki is a perfect example of hate speech. His response is an affront to the people of Ukan. To relate Livinus’ euphemistic proverb is to say that sleeping with a woman and a cow does not show any difference. The import of Livinus’ response is that there is no difference between yesterday and today. When Livinus asked why Beki has high blood pressure she says, ‘her husband troubles her like Year-seven’ (Udu, 2014: 15). Her answer shows that her husband is not allowing her to display her adulterous act.

Her escape from Faasema’s house is a panacea as her mother welcomes her warmly. Wangbande, (Beki’s mother) doesn’t want her daughter to go back that is while she gives Faasema a stringent condition of bringing her dowry items such as “basin, wheel barrow, ten gallons of oil, cloth and necklace, table and chair, measure for measuring salt, umbrella and mat” (Udu, 2014: 19). She demands those items so as to downgrade Faasema. Beki’s mother queries Faasema’s thus: “Alas! Why is it that my daughter will not rest? Everyday she is beaten. Everyday she is sent packing. As long as Beki doesn’t remain in her husband’s house, you will not succeed. I have finished telling you” (Udu, 2014: 19). It is clear that Wangbande doesn’t like her son-in-law. Wangbande catechizes Faasema thus: ‘Who told you that Doctor is befriending your wife? Yes? You don’t think anything good about your wife you only listen to gossips concerning her for you have plenty of them in you. Apart from that your brothers are at loggerheads with your wife for more than one time but you have shown no concern about it. What kind of husband are you? I ask, what type of husband are you, Faasema? (Udu, 2014: 23-24). Wangbande detests Faasema to the extent of denying allegations levelled against her daughter but accepts lies against him.

Through the use of hate speech, Ishua wants Faasema to deal with Livinus mercilessly because of his promiscuous life-style and being non-indigene. He tells Faasema that petitioning Livinus is not enough. He maintains that, “this Gaav man befriended your wife, humiliated you; humiliated the whole of Ityulugh but will you allow him to go scout-free?” (Udu, 2014: 28). The use of deictic ‘this’ before ‘Gaav man’ is emphatic and it implies he is a stranger that should be harshly treated. Humiliated and befriended are verbs that reinforce Livinus’ ill-treatment. The rhetorical question – “will you allow him to go scout-free?” – is effective hence it catapults Faasema to take immediate action. Now, it becomes a popular saying that, ‘I don’t covert black fish’ (Udu, 2014: 28). Black fish is an allusion to the fish soup that Beki brings to Livinus’ house that Dooshima later douses it on Beki’s head. People even nicknamed you and your wife ‘back fish’. He further advises and says, “if I were you, I would have done something to this Gaav man even if nobody asked him he would have said I will have nothing to do with Ityulugh people” (Udu, 2014: 29). Ishua further expatiates that this, Gaav man has completely scattered your home. Your mother-in-law wants your wife to remain in her house to be bringing food for her. He rhetorically asks Faasema – how many months did she stay in her house? -to let him know that Beki will not come back and that he should not procrastinate or else, ‘ikyav mbi asa u, aga kpa a saa u’ (Udu, 2014: 30). That proverb means Faasema will be humiliated and his wife will not come back and nothing will happen to Livinus. The misunderstanding between Faasema and Beki was resolved by the elders but she did not come back.

In a bid to escape the impending danger, Livinus craftily buys yams, a gallon of palm-oil and grass-cutter to see the Administrator in Gboko. His mission is to be transferred to another place after seeing the writing on the wall. He uses hate speech to scathe Ityulugh people when he says, Ityulugh is a hostile place indeed and “Ityulugh people are hard nuts to crack” (Udu, 2014: 33). He further adds that
Ityulugh people are generally hostile to visitors. They do not like visitors at all. As I have been posted there, I had four theft cases. My fowls, goats, yams in the farm had been totally stolen. They even stole even pants. After they stole my belongings, I would start afresh. Another thing is that things are exorbitant there like Lagos. There is a scarcity of water (Ude, 2014: 33).

Livinus reasons sound credible but they are not genuine. He does not know that Ityulugh people petitioned him but he has seen a bad sign. He lies that Ityulugh people are not welcoming, they are thieves, things are costly and there is a problem of water. All the above reasons are beautiful rubbish! After his lies, the Administrator hands him the petition that Faasema Nombagu, Zumgba Nombua, Atume Chado and Icaverkper Wuaindyar write against him which is captioned – PETITION AGAINST MR. LIVINUS TORKWAOR, HEALTH OFFICER I/C ITYULUGH PRIMARY HEALTH CENTRE (Ude, 2014: 33) and a letter inviting him to emergency meeting at “Board Room, Primary Health Services Board, Gboko” (Ude, 2014: 38). The foregoing hate speeches are aimed at downgrading humanities, exaggerating the truth, casting aspersions, promoting rivalries, bringing about disunity and confusion. Peace linguistics comes on board to address conflicts by using nonviolent expressions.

4.2.2. Language of hate speech in Adezungwen

A conflict which involves Agber and Abutu escalates to their family members. The two families are at loggerheads with each other and this misunderstanding lingers on for years. Ade asks Bem Abutu, what do you have to do with me? Your father hates my father, and why do you want to insult me? (Terngu, 2020: 6). The words, hates and insult, show acrimony and hatred that exist between the two families. Abutu tells Makir to see ‘pupuu mbaiorov’, worthless men that we have. You this ‘worthless’ man, if you prevent from being a king, will you be crowned king... (Terngu, 2020: 13). The phrase, ‘pupuu mbaiorov’, means worthless, poor, wretched, useless people. This indicates that Agber has nothing to offer or contribute even if he is given the mandate. Abutu also insults Abutu, ‘you this igyo toho, wild pig, do you think I forgot what you did to me?’ (Terngu, 2020: 13).

To call refer to somebody as ‘igyo toho’ means that he is not worthy to be a human being but an animal that ought to live in the jungle.

Ade tells Giddy that their parents have a ‘battle’ to fight. Your father and mine are at loggerheads. They quarrelled yesterday in the meeting. Bem, if you love me, be ready to fight a battle (Terngu, 2020: 18). The above words and a phrase further intensify the enmity that exists between the two families. Abutu also reports that Agber cursed him in the meeting. ‘Mbailuve, see if I die Agber should not stand on my grave...’ and ‘Bem never visit Agber Hueeza’s house and you should not have anything to do there (Terngu, 2020: 20). Abutu vows that Agber should have anything to do with his family even if he dies. This makes Agber’s wife and Bem to strengthen their animosity. Myer, Adezungwen’s friend, also says that Bem and your father have nothing to do in common. My friend, will you finish digging this hole? (Terngu, 2020: 29). She also advises them to be careful with their relationship for Ade’s father’s bad behaviour will not allow them to marry (Terngu, 2020: 29). Friends of Adezungwen and Bem are deeply involved in this feud. Myer even casts doubt about Bem and Adezungwen becoming husband and wife because of Adezungwen’s father’s cantankerous behaviour. Teseun and Doolumun express their displeasure when they see Adezungwen and Giddy together, the son of Abutu (Terngu, 2020: 29:33). The phrase, the son of Abutu, shows that Abutu is an arch-enemy that Adezungwen should not associate with.
The following excerpted dialogue shows how Abutu and Agber express their feelings:

**Agber**: You this fool give me access to the road let me pass, you walk with shoulder-high as if you threw down a white man (Terngu, 2020: 31).

**Abutu**: You this worthless man, if you see a king you should respect him. I do not let a fool pass on the way (Terngu, 2020: 31).

**Agber**: I do not allow foolish people to pass on the way. I see you are a dead person, I am avoiding you (Terngu, 2020: 31).

**Abutu**: You avoid me but why are you contesting for kingship stool with me? (Terngu, 2020).

**Agber**: The kingship is not yours. Do you fit to be called a king? (Terngu, 2020: 32).

**Abutu**: Moustache like a cat that carried a sponge (Terngu, 2020: 32).

The foregoing excerpt has vividly indicated that Agber and Abutu use invectives and foul words against each other. For instance, fool means Abutu is an ignoramus; worthless means Agber has no value or he is useless; foolish refers to senseless; dead person means powerless or lack of future and Moustache like a cat that carried a sponge is an invective simile that portrays an unkempt or dirty moustache.

Agber scolds Adezungwen and tells her to close her mouth there, Wan Baba, close your mouth. Ohoo...do you know what you are doing...for you are my enemy in my house... Wan Baba, you are supporting my enemy?” (Terngu, 202: 35). Adezungwen is a perceived enemy because she is in love with Abutu’s son, Bem. Doolumun tells Abutu to catch his dog that is called Giddy (Terngu, 2020). A dog is a metaphor that is called Bem. Doolumun further explains that “‘Abutu’s child is trying to spoil Agber’s only girl-child. We saw them in the bush today. Warn him, any time we catch him we will deal with him’” (Terngu, 2020: 36). Bem is purported to be seducing Adezungwen in the bush.

Abutu, too, strongly warns his family not to “‘have something in common with Agber’s family and says that that Baga has guts to challenge me, because of worthless person’s daughter”’ (Terngu, 2020: 37-38). Mbatimin further accentuates this hate speech when she exclaims: Kpei! Wan Baba! This mushroom grew on the grave, it cannot be plucked. Ade, see your father and Abutu are mortal enemies. Their enmity started before I married your father (Terngu, 2020: 39). Mbatimin observes that the coming of Bem may be to find a way of insulting their family (Terngu, 2020: 40). Mbatimin tells her daughter that crying alone will not stop anything that she should deny Abutu’s family. The underlined phrases and clause prove that that there is lack of peace in the families of Agber and Abutu.

Mbailuve says that Agber’s wife to try and tell her daughter to know that Bem is not for her, if she is looking for husbands, she should not come to Abutu’s house. Doolumun swiftly reacts that ‘You this foolish woman, do you know the woman you are talking to? I will tell you, catch your billy goat and tie, if we see him, we shall kill and Teseun adds that we shall cut off his scrotum that is not allowing girls to have any rest. Doolumun and Teseun will not hesitate to beat Mbatimin up on the way. Mbatimin asks, ‘What has the daughter of Mbatimin done to this mad woman?’ (Terngu, 2020: 63). When Makir is elected as the paramount ruler of the Tiv people, Agber says that ‘Zaki has plunged into water with his wound; flies should stay outside’ (Terngu, 2020: 76). It means Makir has been crowned a king, other contestants should step down. Abutu tells Agber, ‘You are a fly, you fool... are you the crowned king?’ (Terngu, 2020: 76). Foolish woman, billy goat, kill, cut off his scrotum, beat Mbatimin up, mad woman, flies should stay outside and you are a fly are all derogatory expressions or hate speech that deepened the conflict in Adezungwen.
4.3. Conflict Resolutions in Udu’s Ikyav Saan Aga Saan and Terngu’s Adezungwen

Faasema does not have any issue with his wife but comes and reports to Beki’s iye ingyôr – elders – that he has not seen his wife for one week. In a bid to resolve this internal bickering, the elders call Wangbande, Beki’s mother and Beki and they come. Without mincing words, Beki leaves for her parents’ home because of her promiscuous life-style. However, she tells her parents that Faasema does not take care of her, husband’s brothers insult her and they threaten to machete her if she comes to her Faasema’s house again. After listening attentively to their reports, the elders see no see reason why the conflict erupted and they only advise them how they will live happily.

Borogo, one of the elders says hence your husband doesn’t send you packing; I have nothing serious to say. It is indisputably clear that your husband has no misunderstanding with you. Tell us if you do not want to give us food so that we shall eat before our deaths come. He encourages her to exercise patience and stay in her husband’s house since she has three sons with him. Similarly, Ahula thanks Faasema for coming to Beki’s house to report on time. He does not see any offence that Faasema commits and encourages her to obey her husband and that her children will give her plenty food when they grow. Furthermore, Huanor, another elder, concurs with the decisions taken by Borogo and Ahula for “‘they are his backs’” (Udu, 2014: 25). Huanor asks Faasema, ‘Wonom, u ungwa er se kule kwagh ne kpa? This is translated as: “‘My in-law, did you hear how we have resolved this?’” Faasema answered: “‘Uter av, mo yô i beem ashen ashen kwagh shiin ga mò tsô kpa ngu ga. Ne kule vough’” – “‘My parents, I have forgotten about it since and nothing remained. You have rightly resolved it’” (Udu, 2014i: 26).

After their separate pieces of advice, Borogo tells Faasema to take her wife back. If your wife is stubborn please inform us. We have a covenant with you therefore we do not want any conflict. Come and talk to us so as to let you go (Udu, 2014: 26). The word talk is a euphemism for kickback or bribe. Faasema gives them gor, kola, and the family is extremely happy. Out of their euphoria, Ahula tells Beki that her parents have resolved their misunderstanding and she says, ‘I have heard’ (Udu, 2014: 26). He finally talks to his mother-in-law before going back to his house.

The continued love and deaths are instruments of conflict resolutions in Adezungwen. In the feuding families of Agber Hueza and Abutu Jembe, Adezungwen and Bem show agape love and this unalloyed love culminates into conflict resolution. Amidst hostility between the two families, their children persist in their unconditional love which elderly people lack. Giddy and Adezungwen do not consider the conflict that exists in their families and vow to love each other. Giddy tells Ade that even if I do not have chance to see you, “‘this ant-hill is my witness, my love for you is limitless. Any time I do not see you I will sit on this anthill to remember you’” (Terngu, 2020: 7).

Makir Dzakpe expresses happiness for being crowned a first indigenous Tor Tiv, first class chief. The office of the Tor Tiv, the Tiv paramount ruler came into existence during the colonial era. Makir Dzakpe, the first Tor Tiv, was officially installed on 3rd April, 1947. The playwright makes ‘true’ characters in his play. When Makir assumes his duty as the paramount ruler of the Tiv people, he pronounces that he will resolve the conflicts that his subjects have. He tells them that, “‘Nahan m ngu lôhôn Agber man Abutu hen ya wam, se lam nen’” which is translated as, “‘I am inviting Agber and Abutu to my house, we shall talk’” (Terngu, 2021: 76). Furthermore, Emberga advises the families of Agber Hueza and Abutu Jembeto bury the hatchet when he says, “‘nyian bee
nen a ibyume ihyom la hen atô wen kera, uma wen a mem, ga yô, ne mem ga’’’ –’’’reconcile your enmity between two of you today, so that you shall rest, if not, you shall not rest’’’ (Terngu, 2020: 85). After Emberga’s advice, he informs them that Tor Tiv and the rest will meet them in Abutu’s house in the morning. In human relation paradigm, according to Coleman (2006), human contact and interaction between members of the various communities help in conflict resolutions. It is bringing the families of Agber, Abutu and elders together that their perennial problem will be resolved.

Tiv people believe in gerontocracy, government of the aged. In those days, traditional rulers had a lot of influence in decision-making. They were respected for their wisdom and adjudication of justice. The first Tor Tiv, Makir Dzakpe, invites the feuding families and his subjects to meet in the house of Abutu so as to bring succour to the disputing families. Tor Tiv addresses his subjects using a proverb thus: ’’’Tiv people say that if you sold a dog because it squats and you bought a monkey, you will not cease seeing squatting in your house’’’ (Terngu, 2020: 86). The meaning of his proverb is to encourage the two ex-service men to forgive each other and become friends once again. Tor Tiv Makir Dzakpe further advises that, what happened to Abutu and Agber should be an example to others. He traces that the enmity of the duo started when they were in army. They could not reconcile it till today; you have seen how the world has taken that enmity to? Makir Dzakpe therefore calls for forgiveness and maintains that there is nothing more than forgiving one another. He states that ’’’enemies are not prosperous and if you are somebody’s enemy, you will retrogress. After series of advice and admonitions, he asks Abutu and Agber to embrace each other as a sign of peace and reconciliation so as to attract clansmen’s blessing’’’ (Terngu, 2020: 86-87).

In human relations paradigm, mediation and integrative negotiation are among the parameters that enhance conflict resolutions and the playwright did justice to that. After Makir’s admonition speech, without much ado, Abutu and Agber hug each other. Abutu says, ’’’my brother, Agber, I am guilty, but forgive me. Do not remember those bad things that I did to you’’’ (Terngu, 2020: 87). This shows that Abutu is remorseful and truly reconciles with Agber. Agber also truly reconciles with Agber when he says, ’’’No, my brother, Abutu Jembe, I am guilty. I will not frown at you anytime. I will show you my truthfulness; I have no misunderstanding with you. As our children died, I have accepted to be your father-in-law’’’ (Terngu, 2020: 87). In Adezungwen, Makir Dzakpe is a symbol of peace as he starts his reign by uniting the two feuding families.

As the two families resolved their differences amicably, the two dead children appeared to confirm the peace pact that they initiated while alive. Abutu, Agber and all the people become happy as Adezungwen and Giddy resurrect from death. To sustain the relationship between Abutu and Agber’s families, Makir Dzakpe tells his subjects that, ’’’the God of our ancestors turned mourning into happiness. Come to Agber’s house tomorrow so that we wed Adezungwen and Bem to become wife and husband’’’ (Terngu, 2020: 87). After the wedding of Adezungwen and Bem, the two families present the bride and groom to Makir Dzakpe who receives and advises his clansmen thus: ’’’Tiv say if you see your brother’s talking drum catches fire, you water your own’’’. This should serve as a good example. The love of these two children should show Tiv people wisdom. He goes ahead to say that ’’’reconciliation brings about good things and their tears turn into joy. My clansmen,know that if you forgive your brother, you will prosper in your life’’’ (Terngu, 2020: 90).

In peace linguistics, dialogue is a main medium through which conflicts are resolved. Human relations paradigm emphasises the role of mediation. The texts under review used traditional methods in resolving conflicts. In Udu’s Ikya Soo Agu Soo, the elders upon hearing from their son-in-law, called Wangbande, Beki’s
mother, and Beki to listen to Faasema. Both the disputants related what happened and the elders unanimously resolved the conflict between them. The elders’ decision was final despite Wangbande and Beki’s protests. The elders even said they “‘ya ikyur a Faasema’”, have a covenant with Faasema. In Adezungwen, Adezungwen and Giddy initiated peace-pact through their agape love which culminated into full conflict resolution after their deaths. After their deaths, Makir Dzakpe summoned a meeting where Abutu and Agber reconciled their differences by hugging and forgiving each other. Shortly after their reconciliation, their dead children resurrected and were wedded, thus ending their perennial conflict. Nonviolent communication and dialogue are effectively used when resolving conflicts as seen in the select texts.

5. Conclusion
This study deployed peace linguistics and a branch of applied linguistics to resolve conflicts in Udu’s Ikyav Saan Aga Saan and Terngu’s Adezungwen. This study has discovered that domestic conflicts could be resolved using human relation mechanism and non-violent communication. This study presented Tiv culture in the select texts where the voices of the elders are respected and their decisions are unanimously accepted. Peace repairs broken relationships and enhances progress. This study links linguistics with cultural studies and peace studies. This study foregrounds the importance of using peaceful diction in avoiding impending conflicts and at the same time using language to defuse tension if it eventually occurs. The solutions proffered by Terver Udu and Sam Paddy Terngu should be applied by traditional rulers in resolving conflicts among their subjects.
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