Ifẹ̀ Journal of Languages and Literatures

Editorial Policy

Ifẹ̀ Journal of Linguistics and Literatures (IJLL) is published annually by the Department of Linguistics and African Languages, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria. It is a multi-disciplinary international refereed research journal of higher education on Linguistics, African Languages, Literature and Literary theories, Philosophy and Philology, Cultural Studies, Hypertext & Communication Studies, Folklore and Translation Studies. This Journal aims at disseminating and sharing knowledge globally. The views expressed in the articles are authors' own opinions for which the editor and or publisher will not be responsible at any stage. IJLL does not consider manuscripts that are under review elsewhere or that have been previously published. All correspondence and contributions should be sent to the Editor at the following e-mail addresses: ifejll@oauife.edu.ng, fabunmibm@yahoo.com

Ifẹ̀ Journal of Languages and Literatures

Volume 4 Number 1, June 2018

Ifẹ̀ Journal of Languages and Literatures

Some Yoruba Developmental Linguistic Errors and their Structural Imports

Fọlọrunṣọ Ilọri
Department of Linguistics, African & Asian Studies
University of Lagos, Akọka Yaba, Lagos Nigeria

_____

Abstract
Child language errors are not errors in the real sense of the term but manifestations of developmental stages of language acquisition of the child. Given the systematic and rule-governed nature of such errors in a manner comparable to those usually found in the performances of adult foreign/second language learners/users, such errors not only present interesting feedbacks on the linguistic development of the child (i.e. showing what the child has acquired successfully and what he is yet to acquire given his age and aptitude) but also provide useful insights on the linguistic structure of the language concerned and how such is acquired. This paper examines some linguistic developmental errors in the speech forms of a native-Yoruba child when he was between the ages of 4 and 6. As evident in the data, strings of Yoruba-English code-mixing were very minimal as the child's exposure to English prior to and during the study period was relatively minimal. However, the fact that the child had been exposed to more than two dialects of Yoruba namely Ọ̀yọ́-Ibadan Yoruba, Standard Yoruba, and Ọ̀kà/Ìkàrẹ́-Àkókó Yoruba is evident in the structural forms and types of errors manifested. Findings show a conglomeration of syntactic, semantic, and phonological errors some of which are actually traceable to influences from English and those other dialects of Yoruba to which the child had been exposed. The study concludes that the noted error types manifested (namely substitution, omission, and contradiction) are purely developmental in nature, which implies that the subject's brain as at the period of study was yet to develop the capability to handle the complexity of the constructions involved. The study has far reaching theoretical and practical implications and application for Yoruba as second/foreign language programmes in terms of material development and management of learner errors.

Keywords: language acquisition; syntax; semantics; phonology; dialects; error-analysis; Yoruba.

1. Introduction
Theoretical and descriptive discourses on developmental linguistics have continued to show that child language errors cannot really be considered as errors in the real sense of the term but developmental performance manifestations of stages of language acquisition of the child. This,

evidently, is corroborated by the systematic and consistent structural patterns found in such errors cross-linguistically. This paper examines the structural patterns of some developmental linguistic errors observed in the speech forms of a native-Yoruba child. It does not only explain them but equally account for what it considers to have induced/triggered them. The data employed for the study are audio recordings and orthographic transliterations of random but natural and uncontrolled spontaneous speeches of the subject covering the period between February 2012, when the subject was around 4 years and four months, and June 2013 when he was around 6 years old[1].The paper is organised in five sections. Sections two, three, and four are devoted to discussions on the various types and groupings of noted errors based on the levels of linguistic structure to which they belong namely syntax, semantics, and phonology, as identified in the data. Section five concludes the study.

2. Syntax Errors
The utterances examined in this section contain syntax-based errors as they manifest in the spontaneous speech of the subject. Each of the errors is first identified and classified on the basis of its general type before explanations on what triggers it is provided. The errors are syntactically grouped under the listed data sets, as presented by the subject.

Data Set I: Conjunction Errors

1a. Mọ́mì,   ó   yẹ   kí   n   ti   máa   brush funra-mi
    Mummy, HTS befit that PROG PERF should brush for-myself
    àti kí   n   ti   máa   wẹ̀   fúnra-mi.
    and that PROG PERF should bath for-myself
    'Mummy, I ought to have been brushing (my teeth)
    and bathing by myself.'

  b. Mọ́mì,   ó   yẹ   kí   n   ti   máa   brush
    Mummy, HTS befit that PROG PERF should brush
    kí   n   **sì**   ti   máa   wẹ̀   fúnra-mi.
    that PROG and PERF should bath for-myself
    'Mummy, I ought to have been brushing (my teeth) and
     bathing by myself.'

_____
[1.] The child was born in September 2007.

2a.*Dádì, èmi náà fẹ́   ẹ́ máa dá   fami   **àti** pọnmi.
   Daddy, 1SG too want to will alone draw-water and fetch-water
   'Daddy , I too want to be drawing and fetching water by myself.'

 b. Dádì, èmi náà fẹ́ ẹ́ máa dá   fami   kí n **sì** máa pọnmi.
   Daddy, 1SG too want to be alone draw-water that 1SG and be fetch-water
   'Daddy, I too want to be drawing and fetching water by myself.'

The form of the error in (1a) is such that the child uses the nominal conjunction **àti** 'and' to coordinate two clauses in a compound sentence. Adult Yoruba native speakers ordinarily will use **sì** in this context and will also not use the preposition phrase (PP) **fúnra-mi** 'by myself' twice in a single sentence as evident in the well-formed (1b) where the PP is preferably used once at the end of the sentence. The use of the PP in the first clause in (1a) is redundant and that explains why the whole sentence sounds tautological and childish.

Two questions readily beg in respect of these observations: one, what type of errors are these; and two, what induced them? The answer to the first question is not far-fetched. Since, the error has to do with the inappropriate use of the conjunction **àti** in a context where another conjunction **sì** is expected, that can be categorised as an error of substitution. On the other hand, the redundant repetition of the PP **fúnra-mi** 'by myself' can be roughly termed as an error of addition. To answer the second question, it is pertinent to mention that adult native-speakers of English who are foreign learners of Yoruba usually present with this particular type of substitution error noted in the speech of this child, as reported by Adewole (2007).

   Mo tẹ́ béẹ̀dì **àti** ya   irun. (Grammatical: Mo tẹ́ béẹ̀dì mo **sì** ya irun)
   1SG lay bed   and comb hair
   'I make my bed and combed my hair.'
                                                      (Adewọle 2007:25)

This particular error was induced by the wrong assumption that Yoruba **àti** has the same syntactic sub-categorization and scope as the English conjunction **and**. That may be one possible explanation as to why the boy went for **àti** instead of **sì** given the influence of English to which he was regularly exposed in school. On the other hand, it may be that the boy's syntactic competence was not as sophisticated to the level of him being aware of the preferred use of **sì** in such context. The disparity between the two conjunctions is that though **àti** is one of the likely translation equivalents of the English **and**, it only has the capability to coordinate

nominal phrases and not verb phrases or clauses in Yoruba. This is unlike **and** which has the syntactic ability to coordinate nominal phrases, verb phrases, and clauses in English. Considering the age and linguistic experience of the subject, the latter premise seems more plausible, as the first premise is more applicable to adult native-English foreign learners of Yoruba, as reported in Adewole (2007).

The error in (2a) is similar to the one in (1a) given the child's use of **àti** to coordinate two verb phrases, i.e. **fa omi** 'draw water' and **pọn omi** 'fetch water' instead of using **sì**. However, in addition to that, the child seems to differentiate between the semantic sense of **fa omi** '*draw* water (say from a deep well)' and **pọn omi** '*fetch* water' (maybe from the river or tap) in the construction. This is in order though such distinction may not necessarily be observed or taken for granted in adult speech of this kind for observable semantic reasons. The VP **fa omi** 'draw water' evidently entails **pọn omi** 'fetch water' as drawing water is one of the ways by which one can fetch water in the Yoruba world view. On the other hand, **pọn omi** 'fetch water' does not entail **fa omi** 'draw water' because one can **pọn omi** 'fetch water' by other means aside drawing, e.g. fetching from the river, spring, or tap. In the particular instance in question, one of the major sources of getting water for domestic use in the home and neighbourhood of the child is by drawing it from deep wells. That therefore explains the distinction he drew between **drawing** and **fetching** in the example.

Data Sets II& III: Verb Syntax Errors

3a.*Ṣé   ẹ **ṣẹ́kù**   ráìsì yẹn fún mi?
      INTER 2SG remain rice DEM for 1SG-ACC
      'Did you leave any leftover of that rice for me?'

 b. *Dádì, mo **ṣẹ́kù**   oúnjẹ mi.
      Daddy 1SG leave-over food   1SG-ACC
      'Daddy I left-over some portion of my food.'

 c. Dádì, mo **ṣẹ́**   oúnjẹ mi   **kù**.
    Daddy 1SG break food 1SG-ACC   remain
    'Daddy I left-over some portion of my food.'

 d.* Dádìí   **ṣẹ́kù**   oúnjẹ fún un-yín   ni ?
      Daddy-HTS leave-over food   for 2SG-HON FOC
      'Did Daddy left-over some portion of food for you?'

e. Dádìí   **ṣé**   óúnjẹ **kù**   fún un-yín   ni ?
Daddy-HTS leave-over food   remain for   2SG-HON FOC
'Did Daddy left-over some portion of food for you?'

   4a. *Dádì,   ẹ   **fihàn** mí owó   yẹn.
       Daddy, 2SG-HON show   1SG money DEM
       'Daddy, show me that money.'

    b. Dádì,   ẹ   **fi**   owó yẹn **hàn** mí.
      Daddy, 2SG-HON take money DEM show 1SG
      'Daddy, show me that money.'

The error in (3) & (4) is syntactic in nature. It has to do with the peculiar syntactic behaviour of the verbs **ṣékù** 'to leave-over' and **fihàn** 'to show (something)' in Yorùbá. Verbs of this nature are called splitting verbs in the literature simply because they split into two halves and sandwich their direct nominal object within the VP (cf. Awobuluyi 1978: 53-54). The structural lesson that could be drawn from the systematic nature of the errors in (3a, b, & d) and (4a) is that the subject at that level of his linguistic development knew the context where such verbs are used but was yet to learn or understood the splitting nature of their syntax. This made him treat them like every other verb that does not possess the splitting dynamics in the language. So, the error there is intralingua which appears to have been induced by inexperience rather than interference or negative influence from any other language.

      The next set of utterances (5a-b) raises some interference syntax-semantics issues between Standard Yoruba (SY henceforth) and the Akókó dialects to which the subject was exposed during the period of study when the data was elicited.

<u>Set III</u>

  5a.*Èwà té   ẹ **gbé** sínú   ráìsì yẹn, mi ò   like ẹ̀.
     Beans that 2SG carry LOC-inside rice DEM, 1SG NEG like it
     'The beans you put in that rice, I don't like it.'

   b. Èwà té   ẹ **bù/fi** sínú   ráìsì yẹn, mi ò   like ẹ̀.
     Beans that 2SG put   LOC-inside rice DEM, 1SG NEG like it
      'The beans you put in that rice, I don't like it.'

(5a) sounds odd in SY. The problem with it is the use of the verb **gbé** 'to carry' for **èwà** 'cooked beans' served on rice instead of the expected **bù/fi**

'to put' as used in the well-formed (5b). However, a careful look at the syntactic structure of Ọ̀kà/Ìkàrẹ́-Àkókó dialect of Yoruba to which the boy was exposed in school and the neighbourhood (through contacts/interactions with his age groups, mates, and friends) during the period clearly reveals that the error in (5a) is that of substitution induced by dialectal variation and interference on lexical choice coming from the influence of the Ọ̀kà/Ìkàrẹ́-Àkókó dialect. In the dialect, mass nominal words like money, food, etc. are constantly subcategorised and semantically selected by the verb **gbé** 'to carry'. This is in contrast to what obtains in SY where both the sub-categorization syntax and the semantic restriction of the V **gbé** will rule it out from selecting mass nominal items such as **ẹ̀wà (sísè)** 'cooked beans' as direct object.SY and many other dialects of Yoruba will prefer the V **bù/fi** in such context as used in (5b). The Ọ̀kà/Ìkàrẹ́-Àkókó dialect clause expressions in (6) corroborate this claim.

6a. Ó   dáa, lọ **gbé** owó   wá.
   HTS[2] good, go carry money come
   'Its okay, go and bring money.'

   b. Máà **gbé** ẹran ẹlẹ́dẹ̀ sínú   oúnjẹ wún ṃ   o !
      NEG carry meat pork LOC-inside food give 1SG-ACC Part
      'Hey, don't put pork meat in the food you are serving me!'

SY ordinarily uses **mú** 'take' or **kó** 'pack' in the context where **gbé** is used in (6a&b). These examples clearly corroborate our claim that the child's presentation in (5a) was a case of interference brought about by the influence of the Ọ̀kà/Ìkàrẹ́-Àkókó (ỌK/IK henceforth) dialect on the SY constructions of the subject.

Data Set IV: Quantification & DET/N Linear Order Errors

7a. [Ẹyọ̀ọ̀kan iṣu] ló   wà nínú pléètì mi, ẹyin mi-í   ṣì pọ̀.
   Piece-one yam FOC-HTS be inside plate my, egg my-HTS still much
   'Only a piece of yam remains in my plate, but my (fried) egg is still much.'

---

b. [Iṣu ẹyọọ̀kan] ló   wà nínú pléètì mi, ẹyin mi-í   ṣì   pọ̀.
   Yam piece-one FOC-HTS be inside plate my, egg my-HTS still much
   'Only a piece of yam remains in my plate, but my (fried) egg is still much.'

8a. ˀDádì, ṣé   ẹ   fẹ́   ẹ́ mú   [kékéré adìyẹ yẹn] ni?
    Daddy, INTER 2SG-HON want to catch small fowl DEM FOC
    'Daddy, do you want to catch the small-one of that fowl?'

  b. Dádì,   ṣé   ẹ   fẹ́   ẹ́ mú   [adìyẹ kékéré yẹn] ni?
     Daddy, INTER 2SG-HON want to catch fowl small   DEM FOC
     'Daddy, do you want to catch that small fowl?'

  c. Mọ́mì,   ẹyọ   kan adìyẹ la   ní.
     Mummy, single one hen   FOC-2PL have
     'Mummy, we have ONLY ONE HEN.'

  d. Dádì, ṣé   ẹ   mọ̀ pé ẹ   máa fún mi ní   méjì
     Daddy INTER 2SG-HON know that 2SG-HON FUT give 1SG FOC two
     chocolate? Mo máa mú ẹyọ kan biskit si.
     chocolate? 1SG FUT   take only one biscuit to-it
     'Daddy, do you know that you are going to give me two pieces of
      chocolate? I will add one biscuit to it.'

Interestingly however, unlike other northern Àkókó lects of Arigidi, Òkè-
àgbè, Ìgáshí, etc., the Òkà/Ìkàrẹ́-Àkókó dialect to which the subject was
fully exposed does not seem to have this [Det N] nominal structure feature
found in his expressions. What this suggests is that DP hypothesis' claim
that D selects N to project nominal phrases as DPs is not totally out of
place especially for Yoruba and related languages which are genetically
head-first. Claims made in certain quarters, e.g. Awobuluyi (2008),
Ajiboye (2007), and Ilori (2010) that SY and other related dialects in
which the nominal phrase has [N D] structure is simply a surface syntax
phenomenon derived through internal merge operation which raised N to
Spec-DP are therefore not misplaced. If this is anything to go by, then we
can say that the base form as claimed in those studies is what a child first
acquires before learning the internal merge rule that derives the surface [N
D] structure common in SY and related dialects.

Data Set V: Negation Errors
9ai. Qst: O   ò   jẹ **mọ́**   ni ?   (Mother)
         2SG NEG eat any-longer FOC
          'Are you not eating any longer?'

9aii. Answer: *Màá   jẹ **mọ́**   ọn.   (The Subject)
            1SG-FUT eat any-longer EMPH-part
            '*I will still eat any-longer!'

  b. Answer: Màá   jẹ (è).   / Màá   sì   jẹ.
            1SG-FUT eat EMPH-part   1SG-FUT still eat
            'I will (sure) eat.'   'I will still eat.'

10ai. Qst: Ṣé   ó   ti   wà ńbẹ̀?
          INTER HTS PERF be LOC-there
          'Is he/she/it already there?'

  aii. Ans: Rárá o!   *kò **wà** ńbẹ̀.
           No part! NEG be LOC-there
           'Not at all! He/She/It is not there.'

  b. Ans: Rárá o!   kò **sí** ńbẹ̀.
          No part! NEG be LOC-there
          'Not at all! He/she/it is not there.'

11a. Elder Brother: Mo fẹ́   fọbọ́   yìí.
                1SG want wash-plate DEM
                'I want to wash this plate.'

b. Boy (Subject): Ẹ   máà   fọ   abọ́.
              2SG-HON NEG wash plate
              'Don't wash the plate.'

c. Elder Brother: Mo gbọ́dọ̀ fọ̀   ọ́.
               1SG must wash 3SG-ACC
              'I must wash it.'

d. Boy (Subject): *Ẹ   **máà gbọ́dọ̀** fọ̀   ọ́.
             2SG-HON NEG must wash 3SG-ACC
            '*You do not must wash it.'

e. Well-formed: Ẹ   **kò gbọ́dọ̀** fọ̀   ọ́.
            2SG-HON NEG must   wash 3SG-ACC
           'You must not wash it.'

The error in the answer provided by the subject in (9aii) is connected with the misuse of the adverb **mọ́** 'again, any longer'. The adverb behaves like

a negative polarity item in Yoruba in that its occurrence is consistently licensed by a c-commanding negation marker. For instance, the negation marker **ò** licensed its occurrence in (9ai). By implication therefore, **mọ́** can only be used in negative clause constructions like (9ai) and not in the non-negative type of the answer provided by the subject in (9aii). The well-formed construction expected of him is (9b) which does not contain **mọ́**. It therefore appears plausible to conclude that the error was induced by the fact that the subject was yet to acquire the negation rule constraint on the use of the adverb **mọ́** as at the period of study.

The second negation related error noted in (10) bothers on the inability of the subject to make use of the appropriate form of the existential verb 'to be' in the language. Yoruba has a pair of allomorphic forms for this verb which are constantly in complementary distribution. The first, **wà**, is used in non-negative clauses while the second, **sí**, is employed in negative clause constructions. Therefore, the error in (10aii) contains in the use of **wà** (the non-negative form) in a negative clause construction projected by the negation marker **kò**. This on the surface at first may appear like an error of substitution. However a more careful observation suggests a situation in which the subject was yet to acquire the competence/knowledge that the language has two allomorphic forms of the verb 'to be'. Evidently, he was only aware of the non-negative form, **wà**, which he simply generalises; hence the error.

Similarly, the error in (11d) was triggered by the fact that the subject was yet to fully grasp or understand the constraint on the structural interaction that exists between negation and mood in the language. The imperative negation marked by **máà** does not occur with the mood item **gbọ́dọ̀** in the manner the subject used it. The appropriate negation word expected in that context, as rightly employed in the well-formed (11e), is (**k)ò** which is often referred to as the standard negation marker in the language. It should be noted that the error occurred, not because the subject did not know that **kò** exists as a negation marker, but rather because he was yet to understand that there are restrictions guiding the choice of the negation marker to be use in such context.

3. Semantic Errors
The errors noted in the following expressions in Data Set VI are semantic in nature. They show that the semantic knowledge of the child in SY was yet to develop to maturity. This observation is in order given his age. The mix-up in his speech in the data set presented reflects the seeming semantic confusion/misplacement of concepts by the subject.

Data Set VI: Contradiction Errors

12a. *Adúrú àmàlà té̩ e̩   fún mi yìí ti pò̩ jù, kò
      Much am   REL 2SG-HON give me DEM PERF much too, NEG
      lè tó   mi.
      can be-enough 1SG-ACC
      'This much amala which you served me is too much,
       it won't be enough for me.'

b. Adúrú àmàlà té̩ e̩   fún mi yìí ti pò̩ jù, mi ò
   Much am   REL 2SG-HON give me DEM PERF much too, 1SG NEG
   lè je̩ é̩ tán.
   can eat it finish
   'This much amala which you served me is too much, I cannot finish it.'

The problem with (12a) is that its first and second halves are contradictory. The boy in the first half of the sentence said the served food was too much but went on in the other half of the same sentence to say that the same piece of food was not going to be enough for him. Well, it is apparent that the information the boy intended to pass across in the second half of the sentence was that the said piece of food which was much would be too much for him but he erroneously said it would not be enough.

One possible explanation as to why this error shows up is to think of this blunder as some kind of slip. However, the fact that the boy was unable to correct himself but kept on repeating the statement until the mother reduced the heap of the *amala* morsel given to him evidently shows that it was a semantically induced error. Similar developmental blunders such as those in (13a) and (14a) committed by the subject corroborated this position.

13a. *Mó̩mì,   e̩   wá   bá   mi   bó̩ kádígàn,
      Mummy, 2SG-HON come meet 1SG-ACC off cardigan,
      òtútù ń   mú   mi.
      cold   PROG catch 1SG-ACC
      'Mummy, come and help me off my cardigan, I'm catching cold.'

b. Mó̩mì,   e̩   wá   bá   mi   bó̩ kádígàn, **oru** ń
   Mummy, 2SG-HON come meet 1SG-ACC off cardigan, heat   PROG
   mú   mi.
   catch 1SG-ACC
   'Mummy, come and help me off my cardigan, I'm feeling heat.'

60

14a. *Ẹ **yajú**   yín   dáadáa, ẹ máà **ri**   o!
　　2PL open-eyes 2PL-GEN well,   2PL NEG see-it EMPH
　　'Open your eyes well, donotsee it!'

　b. Ẹ **dijú**   yín   dáadáa, ẹ máà **wò** ó o!
　　2PL close-eyes 2PL-GEN well,   2PL NEG look it EMPH
　　'Close your eyes well, do not look at it.'

Again in (13a), the interpretation of the second half of the sentence contradicts the idea expressed in the first. Since the subject was asking for his cardigan to be removed, one would naturally expect that his reason for the request should be because he was feeling **ooru** 'heat' as indicated in the well-formed (13b) and not **otútù** 'cold'. So, evidently, one can conclude that the brain/mind of the subject at that age and time had not developed to the level of grasping the logic of encoding the right meaning structure in the language especially when using dual-part sentences like those in (12-14) such that he missed out on the right/appropriate combinations of expressions to be used. The semantic contrast between **ooru** 'heat' and the erroneously used **otútù** 'cold' in the second halves of (13a), on the one hand, and the one between **yajú** 'open eyes' and **dijú** 'close eyes' in (14a & b) on the other evidently confirm that the subject was involved in error of substitution in those contexts. This observation becomes more factual when one considers the verbal substitution in the second half of the construction in the ill-formed (14a). The subject used the verb **rí** 'found, see' in place of the appropriate V **wò** 'look' employed in the expected well-formed (14b).

4. Phonological Error
This is the last set of errors noticeable in the performance of the subject. The error itself is substitutional in nature as it involves the subject substituting some phonological form in SY with that of the ỌK/IK dialects to which he was constantly exposed during the period covered by the study. Only one error was noted in this instance as illustrated in (15) and (16).

　　15a. ˀDádì,   màá   tẹ̀lé **yin**
　　　　Daddy, 1SG-FUT follow 1SG-ACC-HON
　　　　'Daddy, I will follow you.'

　　　b. Dádì,   màá   tẹ̀lé **e-yín**
　　　　Daddy, 1SG-FUT follow 1SG-ACC-HON
　　　　'Daddy, I will follow you.'

The error in this speech form is phonological in nature and it is evidently triggered by a phonological difference between the Ọyọ́-Ibadan/Standard Yoruba dialect initial background of the child and ỌK/IK dialects to which the child was constantly exposed at school and in the neighbourhood during the period covered by the study. The nature of this error becomes clearer when one compares the form of (15) in SY with its equivalent in ỌK/IK dialect as presented in (16).

16a. Dádì, màá tẹ̀lé **e-yín**   (SY)
  Daddy, 1SG-FUT follow 1SG-ACC-HON
  'Daddy, I will follow you.'

 b. Dádì, màa tẹ̀lé **win**   (ỌK/IK)
   Daddy, 1SG-FUT follow 1SG-ACC-HON
   'Daddy, I will follow you.'

In ỌY/SY, the form of the 1SG honorific accusative pronoun **i-yín** which becomes **e-yín** in (16a) as a result of assimilation is phonologically different from the ỌK/IK form **win** in two fundamental ways: one, the final vowel of **i-yín** is high toned while that of **win** is mid-toned; and two, the forms of the central approximants used in the two words are different, /j/ is used in the ỌY/SY dialects while ỌK/IK dialects uses /w/. What happened in (15) therefore is a phonological situation in which the subject replaced ỌY/SY **i-yín** with ỌK/IK **win** but retained the consonant /j/. Interestingly, the form of the pronoun as rendered by the child is the exact form of the same pronoun used in Ìgbómìnà dialect (e.g. in Ìlá-Ọ̀ràngún, Òkè-Ìlá, etc. Therefore, only the tone of the front high nasal vowel **in** is affected in the substitution, as its high tone in SY was substituted with the mid-tone of **win** of the ỌK/IK dialects. This behaviour was equally noted in the performance of some other children with similar ỌY/SY background, which evidently confirms that the error is indeed systematic.

5. Conclusion
This paper has analysed and discussed the form, content, and nature of some developmental linguistic errors noticed in the spontaneous random speech of a native-Yoruba child. The observations on types and structural forms of the errors and their analyses supported the universal claim that errors, whether developmental or second/foreign language learning based, are truly systematic and rule-governed. The paper also revealed that the acquisition of the syntactic structure of Yoruba by monolinguals and relative bilinguals is observable and analysable, and that their developmental linguistic behaviour in terms of acquisition and the

attendant developmental errors are not far apart from what happens in the language faculty of the second/foreign language learner of the language. This presents far-reaching implications on the preparation of materials and development of teaching techniques for second/foreign language learners of the Yoruba language.

References

Abney, S. P. (1987) The English Noun Phrase in its Sentential Aspect. PhD Dissertation, MIT.

Adewole, L. O. (2007) Issues in Linguistics and Yoruba Language. Inaugural Lecture Series 202, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife: Obafemi Awolowo University Press Ltd.

Ajiboye, O. (2007) *The Syntax and Semantics of Yorùbá Nominal Expressions.* Port Harcourt: The Linguistic Association of Nigeria in Collaboration with M & J Grand Orbit Communications Ltd.

Awobuluyi, O. (1978) *Essentials of Yoruba Grammar.* Ibadan: University Press Limited.

Awobuluyi, O. (2016) *Èkọ́ Ìṣẹ̀dá-Ọ̀rọ̀ Yorùbá.* Ibadan: Kingdom Arts Publishing.

Awobuluyi, O. (1992) 'Aspects of Contemporary Standard Yoruba in Dialectological Perspective', Isola, A. (Ed.) *New Findings in Yorùbá Studies* pp. 1-76.

Awobuluyi, O. (1994) 'The Development of Standard Yoruba', István Fodor and Claude Hagège (Eds.) *Language Reform: History and Future,* Vol. VI, Helmut Buske Verlag, Hamburg, pp. 25 - 42.

Bamgboṣe, A. (Ed.) (1984) *Yoruba Metalangauage I.* Lagos: NERDC.

Bishop, D. V. M. (2003). *Test for reception of grammar (TROG-2).* Oxford, UK: Pearson.

Ellis, R. & G. Barkhuizen (2005) *Analysing Learner Language.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gardner, H., Froud, K., McClelland, A., & van der Lely, H. (2006). Development of the grammar and phonology screening (GAPS) test to assess key markers of specific language and literacy difficulties in young children. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*, *41*, 513–540.

Gruendel, J. M. (1977) 'Reference Extension in Early Language Development'. *Child Development 48 (4)* pp. 1567-1576.

Haris, M. (1993) 'Vocabulary Development'. *Language Experience and Early Language Development: From Input to Uptake.* Hove, UK: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 71.

Hartshorne, M. (2006). *The cost to the nation of children's poor communication*. London, England: I CAN.

Ilọri, J. F. 2010. Nominal Constructions in Igálà and Yorùbá. Akungba-Akoko: Doctoral Dissertation, Adekunle Ajasin University.

Jaeger, F. T. (2008). Categorical data analysis: Away from ANOVAs (transformation or not) and towards logit mixed models. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *59*, 434–446. doi:10.1016/j.jml.2007.11.007

Katsos, N. et al. (2016) Cross-Linguistic Patterns in the Acquisition of Quantifiers. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 113 (33) pp 9244-9249.

Lightbown, P. & Spada, N. (2013) *How Languages are Learned*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Maratos, M. (2000) 'More Overregularizations after All: New Data and Discussion on Marcus, Pinker, Ullman, Hollander, rosen, & Xu'. *Journal of Child Language 24 (1)* pp. 183-212.

Sauerland, U. et al. (2016) How do 5-year-olds understand questions? Differences in Languages across Europe. *First Language* 36 (3) pp. 169-202.

Schachter, J. (1976) An Error in Error Analysis. *Language Learning 24* pp. 205-214.