
Orthographic Non Conformity to Kanuri Written Text: The Case of Babagana Wakil’s Book “Buskənyiya Fizako”

Yagana Grema

Department of Language and Liberal Studies. Ramat Polytechnic, Maiduguri, Borno State

Abstract: *This study is aimed at examining the role of idiomatic expression in improving selected higher institution students’ use of English Language by enhancing effective communication among the students and with the use of idiomatic expressions. The study adopts Noam Chomsky’s theory of Competence and Performance. The study covers thirty (30) students of three (3) selected higher institutions (Ramat Polytechnic, Borno State University and College of Agriculture) within Maiduguri. Ten (10) students are selected from each school with tables used to show their grades in oral and written tests. The study reveals that the students of the three schools exhibit good oral and written skills using idiomatic expressions with minimal amount of differences realised in terms of performance between the oral and written tests. It can be concluded that students are good in using idiomatic expressions regardless of the expressions being oral or written.*

Key words: *Idiomatic expression, Competence, Performance*

INTRODUCTION

Idiomatic Expression are expressions whose individual meaning are different from the meaning as a whole. They are often used to express feelings in an unusual way. These are used by students in higher institution either spoken or written

Abstract

The study was carried out on orthographic non conformity to Kanuri written text. A case study of Babagana Wakil Sbook “Buskənyiya Fizako” The study examined six different areas where this book failed to follow the rules of the Standard Kanuri Orthography, they are in the areas of Grammar, Spelling, Syllabification, Improper usage of sound, Word spacing, and some words that are unnecessarily prenasalized. Furthermore, researches on Kanuri language established variant pronunciations in the language due to various phonological operations that characterized the oral forms of Kanuri language use. Reducing the language into written form may result to nonconformity in its orthography. Therefore, the present study examined these nonconformities that can be found against the standard form of Kanuri Orthography in Written Text. Based on this study, it has been observed that some instances of ambiguity are caused by the non-conformity to the orthography of the language hence their need to be always written in any text based on the Standard Kanuri Orthography. In presenting language as a system of sound in print, it is necessary to create a clear, distinct and correct orthography that will present

the language as mark on paper or in print and it gives guide line to the speaker or writer to work in uniformity. This is where adequacy in orthography comes in, because the literature or text as being presented in the orthography may be read at far distance in space and time from its origin where the language is not familiar.

Keywords: Book, Kanuri, Non Conformity, Orthography, and Standard

1.0 Introduction

Development and expansion of the Kanuri language, it is closely related to the political history of the Kingdom of Kanem that was established in the 9th century AD, Alkali (1987:2) in Bulakarima (2001). As at that time, the North and the North-East of the Lake Chad were occupied by the Bulala, Kanembu and Zaghawa and it was being ruled by the Zaghawa, but later their power declined (Alkali, 1978) in Bulakarima (2001). Kanuri belongs to the Western Saharan sub-phylum of the Nilo-Saharan phylum alongside Kanembu, Teda-Daza and Berti-Zaghawa all in the same phylum, Greenberg (1966). The term Kanuri refers to all ethnic groups that make up the language and they are found in Nigeria in Borno and Yobe states and in Niger around Diffa Province (Bulakarima, 2001).

According to Bulakarima (2001), there are sixteen (16) ethnic groups that make up the Kanuri and they are: Manga, Bodai, Fada, Ngumati, Wuje, Koyam, Zarara, Suwurti, Karda, Kaama, Ngazar, Lare, Dagəra, Bilma, Təmagəri and Malama. The Yerwa dialect is the central dialect and is more widely used than any other dialects of Kanuri in both spoken and written works.

In Nigeria, it is most widely spoken by the people in Borno State which lies west of Lake-Chad. It is also spoken and understood by the neighbouring tribes in areas like North-east, west and southern parts of Borno. In the east, the Kotoko, Gamargu, Mowar, Bagirmi, Wula, Marghi, Bade, Ngizim, Kare-Kare, Duwui, Bolewa speak the language. In the west, the Mandara in the south, the Buduma of Lake-Chad region and Mandara Valley (Bulakarima, 1989).

The Kanuri native speakers are also found in Yobe State, and in some parts of, Dutse in Jigawa State, Azare and Misau in Bauchi State, Lafiyan Barebari and Bukuru in Nasarawa and Plateau States respectively (Bulakarima, 1987). In recent years, when an increased emphasis has been laid on mother-tongue in Nigeria, the role of the Kanuri Language in Nigerian society and education has been emphasized. For years, Kanuri has become a medium of instruction in primary education and consequently being offered as a course (B.A, M.A and PhD) at the University of Maiduguri and at Teachers Training Institutions in Borno.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

It is generally accepted that any language that is put into writing must to have its standard form in which every writer adhere to and this become known to all language writers. One of the problems in Kanuri orthography is that some of its writers fail to conform to the standard form hence makes the kanuri orthography to be inconsistent or even ambiguous. Researches on Kanuri language establish variant pronunciations in the language due to various phonological operations that characterized the oral forms of Kanuri language use. Reducing the language into written form may result to nonconformity in its orthography. The present study tents to find out these nonconformities that can be found against the standard form of Kanuri Orthography in Written Text.

2.0 Kanuri orthography

In recent years, when an increased emphasis has been laid on mother-tongue in Nigeria, the role of the Kanuri language in Nigerian society and education has been emphasized. For years, Kanuri has become a medium of instruction in primary education and consequently being offered as a subject at the University of Maiduguri and at Teacher's Training Institutions in Borno State.

The first known Kanuri text was written in the 17th century (Lange, 1972 in Cyffer and Geider, 1997:18). It was a short vocabulary which was converted to the present day form in the Standard Kanuri Orthography (SKO) as follows:

Present Kanuri

Cla	[kələ]
Chencafa	[shangāwa]
Dinar	[dinar]
Smou	[səmo]
Il n'y en appoint	
Qindga	[kənza]
Ary	[arè]
Chim	[shim]
Leny	[lenè]
Moscou	[músko]

In the 1850s, sources became increasingly reliable (Cyffer and Geider, 1997). In relation to the development of Kanuri text, Lohr (1997:79) observes:

.....the works of Sigmund Wilhelm Koelle (1854a, b) mark the beginning of scientific research on the Kanuri language. After the missionaries, and geographers like Heinrich Barth (1886), colonial officers pursued their philosophical interest in Kanuri alongside their official profession. Among them the works of Philip Benton (1911), P. Noel (1923 and Adolf Von Duisburg (1913) is outstanding.....

Afterwards, quite a number of comprehensive Kanuri write ups were published but with no homogenous spelling until 1975. Cyffer (1997:84) observes:

The Standard Kanuri Orthography (SKO) was developed in 1974 jointly by members of the Center for Nigerian Languages and the Kanuri Language Board. It was approved and introduced in 1974.

The issue of the Standard Kanuri Orthography was prompted since the inception of the Universal Free Education Programme (UPE) in 1976. It was introduced following the MacPherson Constitution of 1951 which granted democratic rights to the citizens to elect members to the regional Houses of Assembly of the then three Nigerian regions. It was decided that every child must know how to read and write the language he or she is familiar within the first year of primary school. Nine languages were introduced in which Kanuri was one of them, hence, the need to standardize the Kanuri writing (Cyffer and Hutchinson, 1977).

A seminar was organized in January, 1975 by the Nigerian Educational Research Council at the Bagauda Lake Hotel Kano to produce UPE Teachers Educational Material. It was decided that all the major languages of instruction should be standardized. On the part of Kanuri, special delegates were selected to study the language after due consultation and research; they were able to produce a satisfactory orthography which is now known as the SKO. It was agreed by all that anyone involved in the use of written Kanuri should follow the rules and conventions of the SKO.

There are twenty-four letters in the SKO in which six are vowels and eighteen are consonants. But there are two letters that are not added to the SKO which are written in combination as observed by Cyffer and Hutchinson (1977:8).

Every letter represents a specific sound of the Kanuri language. There are two additional sounds which are necessary in writing the language. These two sounds are therefore written as follows:

ng	NG
sh	SH

The vowels are: a e ə l o u which are represented as follows:

Letters	Examples	Phonetic Rep.	Gloss
a	am	[ãm]	“people”

e	nje	[ndʒè]	“pot”
ə	shəm	[ʃèm]	“eye”
i	tilo	[tílõ]	“one”
o	todə	[tódə]	“that one”
u	fowo	[fúwú]	“cloud”

The eighteen consonants are also presented as follows:

Letters	Examples	Phonetics Rep.	Gloss
b	bawa	[báwá]	“father”
c	cham	[tʃám]	“milk”
d	da	[dá]	“meat”
f	fato	[fátó]	“house”
g	goro	[góró]	“colanut”
h	hal	[há]	“character”
j	nje	[ndʒè]	“pot”
k	ka	[ká]	“stick”
l	lorusa	[lórúsá]	“bride”
m	maina	[máiná]	“prince”
n	na	[nà]	“place”
p	kororopchi	[kórórópci]	“type of gown”
r	ro	[ró]	“life”
s	suwa	[súwà]	“morning”
t	tada	[tádà]	“boy”
w	wadə	[wádə]	“promise”
y	ya	[yà]	“mother”
z	zawa	[zàwà]	“cap”

These are the letters which are adequately used to represent the language in print but precision is lacking when marched with the phonetic system of the language form in point. This is because, certain aspects in the speech sounds are not truly represented, thereby, causing orthographic ambiguity in the written form.

At the instance, there seems to be an obstacle with the Kanuri consonant chart of different phonetic shapes and their orthographic representations. The phonemic inventory presents some sounds in one form while the orthography presents it differently. For instance:

Phoneme	Orth
/j/	y
/tʃ/	c
/dʒ/	j
/ʃ/	sh
/f/	f
/ʔ/	-
/L/	l/r
/ʒ/	k/g
/ɲ/	ny
/ŋ/	ng/nk

Apart from the differences in phonetic symbol and that of orthography some letters can be produced in two different ways e.g. (f) and (l).

	Orth	Phonetic Rep	
f	[f]	findi	[findi] ‘twenty’

I	[ɸ]	fuwu	[fúwú]	‘front’
	[l]	lɛman	[lɛmán]	“wealth”
	(l)	liita	[Liítà]	“doctor”

The sounds [ɸ] and (L) are not reflected in the written form, but somehow it stipulates the use of [f] and [l] in the SKO. [ɸ] is produced midway between /b/ and /f/ but the letter (f) is used both for [f] and [ɸ] in the orthography. Related issue on this segment was illustrated by (Awwal, 2003), where she observes the [f] sound occur in string and used the following words as illustration:

Farai	[ɸaarai]	wooden trumpet
Kofa	[kwooɸaa]	door
Fam	[fam]	pound sterling
Laifi	[laifyii]	crime/fault

According to her, the orthography of Hausa has not imbibed certain vital principles for better understanding of the written discourse. In addition to that, the SKO does not draw any line of differences between the sound /l/ and /L/.

Furthermore, the sound /Y/ denotes ‘k’ or ‘g’ is weakly articulated. In the orthography the two sounds are in complimentary distribution, because their two pronunciations exclude each other in their respective sound environment but both being articulated as /Y/ thereby misinterpreting the sound. Cyffer (1991), E.g.

Base form	Phonetic	SKO	Gloss
Zəgərin	[zəYərin]	zəYərin	“he/she eats”
Səkarin	[SəYarin]	Səgərin	“carves”
Falkada	[falYada]	falgada	“they changed”

The combination letter (ng) in the SKO can be pronounced in two different ways:

1. As [ŋg] where ‘n’ has assimilated partially by changing to a velar nasal [ŋ] e.g.

SKO	Phonetic Rep.	Gloss
Ngawo	[ŋgáwo]	“back”
Lengo	[lɛŋgó]	“I went”
Ngəla	[ŋgəla]	“good”

2. As pronounced like velarized nasal [ŋ]

SKO	Phonetic Rep.	Gloss
Lengəna	[lɛŋəna]	“I have gone”
Gulŋin	[gulŋin]	“I will say”

In the SKO both articulation (ŋ) and (ŋg) are written as “ng”

The sound (?) is completely invisible in the orthography but predictable only to the native or fluent speaker of the language and it is likely to cause ambiguity in written text, E.g.

Orth	Phonetic Rep	Gloss
aa	[a?a]	“No”
kən indimi	[kən?indimi]	“Second one”
are	[?are]	“Come”
na am	[na?am]	“Yes”
am	[?am]	“people”

The sound is produced in the glottis by bringing the vocal cords together momentarily and then releasing them and when finally released a small click-like sound is heard, Bulakarima (2001).

Genitive construction – they are modifiers within a noun phrase, in which they modify a head noun by suffixing the genitive marker-be to the noun e.g.

Kulo kàm àdèbè “The farm of this man”

But the general rule of applying – be in all genetic and possessive link construction of the suffix – be may vary in various phonological environments though in SKO it is consistently –be Nelson (1979). It is pronounced as [ye] or [we] or “” is assimilated to the preceding consonant e.g.

SKO	Phonetic Rep.	Gloss
Karrabe	[kàraaye, karaae]	“of the bush”
Kàribe	“kàriye, kàriwe”	of the dog”
Fatkebe	[fatkee]	“of the trade”
Ngambe	[ngambe ngamye]	“of the cat”

The point here is that even though orthography may be an approximation of speech, but where phonemes and their corresponding letters are available employing such means to the fullest will enhance preserving the speech sounds in textbooks. By so doing, new traits and tendencies can be easily traced and explored. Where some relevant issues remain in the abstract, vulnerability (factors) about the language cannot be fully explored keeping in mind contact with other languages and the rate of spread. If the orthography imbibes, it only needs drill exercise for the learner to master them, both in speech and writing.

Beyond the segmental features there is also the supra-segmental feature on which the orthography is silent. It is one of the ways in which listeners work out the syntactic or grammatical structure of spoken sentences by using prosodic cues in form of tone, intonation and so on e.g.

“The old men and women sat on the bench”

The women may or may not be old. If the women are not old then the spoken duration of the word “men” will be relatively long and the stressed syllable in “women” will have a rise in pitch contour. Neither of these prosodic features will be present if the sentence means the women are old. Kanuri is a tone language and tone is said to be pitch of voice on which individual syllable of a word is uttered naturally so as to convey proper meaning of the word to the listener. It is primarily distinguished as high tone (´), low tone (˘) and falling tone (^) e.g.

Low	mbàl	alcohol
High	kámù	woman
Falling	njîm	hut

Each tone plays a vital role in distinguishing both lexical and grammatical meaning e.g.

Lexical meaning		
kərì	(falling tone)	hill
kərì	(low tone)	dog
lètə	(high tone)	touching
lètə	(low tone)	going
Grammatical meaning		
wàno	(low tone)	Jilted one
wáno	(high tone)	don't accept
leză	(falling tone)	they went
le^za	(falling tone)	they should go

More effort has been put to make the orthography of Kanuri standard but precision has yet to be achieved. Some sounds like /l/ are pronounced different from their written counterpart, while other sounds like /ʔ/ are completely invisible in the orthography.

2.1 Ambiguity

Ambiguity is a universal feature of all human languages, every utterance of natural languages may have more than one possible interpretation depending on the context of situation, and hence the need to highlight what ambiguity is.

Ambiguity is the presence of two or more possible meanings in a given expression. It is believed to be a phenomenon that has to do with feature of natural language. Lyons (1977) observes that many of

the acceptable utterances of a language are ambiguous as they can be interpreted in two or more possible ways. Thus, ambiguity is a phenomenon in all living languages. Some linguists like Nordquist (2014) defines ambiguity as the presence of two or more possible meanings in a single passage. He explains his definition with the following example, he observe from writers e.g.

“Brave men run in my family”

“I can’t tell you much I enjoyed meeting your husband”.

2.2 Lexical and Structural Ambiguity

Linguists such as Palmer (1976) and Abubakar (2000) accept that ambiguity is divided into lexical and structural ambiguities. Lexical ambiguity is the presence of two or more possible interpretation within a single word e.g. the word ‘box’ may mean ‘a container’ or ‘a punch’. Lexical ambiguity is a type of ambiguity that arises when a word has more than one generally accepted meaning as exemplified in:

“Child’s stool is great for use in garden”

The word “stool” in the above sentence is lexically ambiguous. According to the Oxford Concise Dictionary of Linguistics (1997:107) lexical ambiguity is the case of a single word having two or more related meanings. For instance, in Kanuri the word “kənza” which is lexically ambiguous may mean ‘to drink’ or ‘nose’.

Ambiguous words to Abba (2008), is a type of word that has multiple senses and he identifies polysemy and homophone as part of ambiguity. According to him, homophones are words that have phonological forms while polysemy has a shared meaning. To further explain his view these are some of the examples provided:

Homophones:	Words	gloss
	Súnó	form of oath made between especially hunters
	Súnó	shoe
	Súnó	advanced payment made to tradesmen
	Sùnó	(of meat) roasted
Polysemy	kóró	donkey
	Kòrò	score

Another relevant study is that of Isa (2012), ambiguous words in Kanuri, to him could either be homophone or polysemy and used some words in structure to illustrate each E.g.

kâmdə dardərongâjícína

The man gave the policeman granules (of grain)/bribe

Ba Isa gəməjekəlīsəmúnà

Ba Isa wore wet/green cloth

Ndúdágəldəgózə

Who carried the ladder/monkey?

cáridənamusufanjín

The old man feels cool/urge to urinate

Dalakamuzairosəragəna

Dala likes beautiful/young woman

Attention was given to the words ngaji, kəli, dagəldə, namusə and zairo to see the course of ambiguity.

Structural ambiguity is the presence of two or more possible meanings within a single sentence or sequence of words. It arises not from the range of meaning of a single word, but from the relationship between the words and the clauses of the sentence e.g.

- The professor said on Monday he would give an assignment
- Visiting relatives can be boring

In the first structure it can be interpreted as the professor made the statement on Monday or he will give an assignment on the coming Monday. The second structure may also mean paying visit to relatives is boring or the coming of relatives is boring.

In relation to structure ambiguity, Abubakar (1999-2001) identifies three areas of structural ambiguity in Hausa and they are:

- (a) Conjunct movement transformation, e.g. Np, da, Np, to Vp, if the Np and the conjunct da leave their initial place to the right part of the Vp then the transformed structure is going to be ambiguous as the following:

Sàmàríisùnzoo bukíi da ‘yanmàatàa.

Young men came to the party ceremony with young women.

The above structure may be interpreted as either:

Sàmàríisùn zoo bukíi, hàkàyanmàatàa

The young men attended the party so did the young women

OR

Zuwan sàmàríi ne yasaa ‘yanmàatàa suka zoo

The young men together with their girlfriends attended the party

- (b) Sentence containing gerund as part of Np, E.g.

Hàrbinsóojànnányáabáamútsòoróo

This structure also may have the following interpretations

“The shooting carried out by the soldier frightened us”

OR

“We were frightened when the soldier was shot”

- (c) Sentence containing one of the following” ‘yar, dan and ‘yan e.g.

Wanidanmaalaamiya zoo

“A certain unimportant teacher has come”

“A certain teacher’s son has come”

In terms of Kanuri structural ambiguity, Lukas (1937) cited in Hutchinson (1986) asserts that structural ambiguity occurs in Kanuri when the nominative and accusative suffixes (-ye and -ga) are omitted in some structures like:

- i. Musaye mintigacuwuna

MusaØmitiØcuwuna

Musa minticuwuna

Musa bought sweet

- ii. MintigaMusayecuwuna

MintoØMusaØcuwuna

Minti Musacuwuna

Musa bought sweet/sweet bought Musa

Both the two structures are grammatical, but the second one is ambiguous because it is not clear which noun is the subject and which one is the objects of the sentence.

In another separate study, Fannami (2007) reveals that the deletion of an object pronoun like (wúgà) in a complex structure that has non-object bearing verb from like (Yàdé) leads to structural ambiguity in Kanuri. He backs up his assertion with the following examples:

Nyikúngə̀nà̀nə̀mmà̀gà̀wù̀gà̀makka-royàdé

If you have the money take me to Mecca

Nyikúngə̀nà̀nə̀mmà̀gà̀ Ø makka-royàdé

According to Fannami (2007), the second sentence is ambiguous as a result of the deletion of the object pronoun (wuga) and the structure contains non-object bearing verb form (yàdé) changed to (sàdé) as below:

Nyikúngə̀nà̀nə̀mmà̀gà̀wù̀gà̀makka-rosàdé

If you have money take me to Mecca

These are the main types of ambiguity, the lexical and structural ambiguity. However, other types of ambiguities have also been identified by linguists. Linguist like Hoenrich (2004) identifies three types of ambiguity. Semantic, lexical and structural ambiguities. He gave examples as follows:

Semantic: Iraqi head seeks arm

The homograph “head” can be interpreted as a noun meaning either ‘chief’ or anatomical head of body, likewise the word ‘arm’ can be interpreted as plural noun meaning either weapon or body parts. It can easily be read as disembodied head searching for arms (body parts) or wanting to have them attached.

Lexical: Teacher strikes idle kids

‘Strikes’ can occur either as verb meaning to hit or noun meaning refusal to work. Meantime, ‘idle’ can occur as either verb or an adjective. It can easily be read as teacher ‘hit idle kids’ even though it was meant to mean that the walkout of teachers has left the pupils idle.

Structure: ‘stolen painting found by tree. The structure has two alternative syntactic representations which makes it structurally ambivalent.

- a) Tree found a stolen painting
- b) A person found a stolen painting near a tree

2.4 Orthographic Ambiguity

Orthography is the conventional spelling system of a language, it is the study of spelling and how letters are combined to represent sounds and form words. It is a standardized form of writing system for a particular language. On the other hand, ambiguity is a situation whereby a word or expression could be understood in two or more possible ways. Orthographic ambiguity is a way of reading word or expression that means one thing but interpreted as another.

Lohr (1997) when discussing the orthography of Kanuri points out some orthographically ambiguous sounds like the affricates used by Koelle (1854a:12). The affricate (ts) is constantly used by Koelle for both [dz] and [tʃ] e.g.

Koelle	SKO	Koelle	SKO	Gloss
<ts>	<s>	tsedi	sedi	ground
<ts>	<s>	tsanei	zane	wrapper
	<nz>	litsam	linzam	bridle
<ts>	<c>	tsim	cim	bitter
	<j>	keta	keji	sweet
	<z>	sobantsiye	sawanzøye	his/her friend

<ts> corresponds to SKO <s> and <z>, i.e. one sound stands for a voiced and voiceless consonant and it is ambiguous.

In addition, Benton & Frost (2012) in trying to process lexical decision on Hebrew consonants/sting affirm that the lexical decision for phonemically and semantically ambiguous Hebrew word occur as a result of the missing orthographic information such as the vowels. Vowels in Hebrew are identified with small diacritic dots and dashes and most of the time the vowel information are missing when writing articles, short stories, books etc and so processing lexical ambiguity is a routine procedure for the reader. Bentin& Frost (2012) compared unvoelled ambiguous consonant string to their vowelled disambiguated alternative as follows:

The unvoelled word:

Could be read as either:

Voweled alt.	Art	Gloss
	[daver]	“thing”
	[dever]	“pest”

From the studies reviewed above, it is clear that every written language has orthographic ambiguity both in word and structural levels. It shows that in written discourse, absence of some vital signs (special diacritics) causes constraints in communication leading to unnecessary ambiguity.

3.0 Research Methodology

Kanuri written text “Buskənyiya Fizako” by Babagana Wakil was used in collecting the data.

3.1 Model of Approach

The study adopts error analysis model of approach by Corder (1974). Error is the use of linguistic items in a way that a fluent or native speaker of a language regards it as showing faculty or incomplete learning. It occurs because the learner does not know what is correct and thus it cannot be self-corrected.

There is a difference between an error and a mistake Ellis (1977) suggests two ways of differentiating them. The first one is to check the consistency of learner’s performance. If he sometimes uses the correct form and sometimes the wrong one, it is a mistake. However if he always uses it incorrectly it is then an error. The second way is to ask learner to try to correct his own deviant utterance where he is unable to correct, the deviations are errors; where he is successful, and they are mistakes.

According to Corder, (1974) there are three stages of error analysis-recognition, description and explanation which are logically dependent on each other.

This is when one finds out the correct interpretation of the learner’s intended many while description is in what way the learner failed to realize his intended message then explanation is the psycho logistic problem; the reasons why he has broken, disregarded or ignore the rules of the target language.

Recognition of Error

In the process of recognizing an error Corder (1974) provided logically related decision which are expressed in form of an algorithm but it can be interpreted as thus:

The first stage is to know if a sentence is superficially well formed in forms of the grammar of the target language or not.

If “No” sentence is overtly erroneous and if “Yes” then one has to find out if the normal interpretation according to the rule of the target language make sense in context. If their normal interpretation is not apparently erroneous but many be right by chance and thus should hold for further investigation.

And also, if a term is overtly erroneous, one should consult the learner if available to obtain the interpretation and reconstruct the term, but if the learner is not available plausible interpretation does not put the context on, and then one should look at the mother tongue of the learner and if he does not know the mother tongue then hold sentence in store.

3.2 Description of Error

A number of different categories of error has been identified. Also Corder, (1973) classifies the error in terms of difference between the learner’s utterance and the reconstructed version. In this way error falls into four categories

- i. Omission of some required element
- ii. Addition of some unnecessary or incorrect element
- iii. Selection of an incorrect element
- iv. Misordering of the element

He also adds that his classification is not enough to describe errors that is why he includes the linguistic levels of the errors and the sub areas of morphology, syntax and lexicon. Ellis (1997) maintains that classifying error in this ways can help us to diagnose learner’s learning problem at any stage of their development and to plot patterns occur over time.

3.3 Primary Data

In carrying out this research a primary source of data collection was employed, which is the book “Buskənyiya Fizako” by Baba Gana Wakil which is written in Yerwa dialect.

3.4 Secondary Data

Textbooks, journals, thesis on Kanuri grammar, dictionaries etc are used to enable the researcher to get the linguistic structure of the language.

3.4 Data Collection

The data was collected from the Text; recognition is made to back up the data outcome. And analysis is being done by using percentage.

4.0 Data Presentation and Analysis

This section shows the analysis of the data collected for the research. As mentioned before it is the aim of the research to discuss the orthographic non conformity from the book “Buskənyiya Fizako” by Babagana Wakil. It has been observed that the non-compliance to the Standard Kanuri Orthography, caused drawbacks such as absence of tone marking, presentation of distinct sound as one in the text etc. Such constraints have made the orthography different from the spoken language.

4.1 Data Presentation and Analysis

In written discourse, communication solely depends on reader’s participation with the text hinges on speech sound presented. The research is carried out to observe the SKO in operation, meaning to observe how readers/writers use Kanuri text to produce what the orthography offers as a representation of the speech form. It has been also observed that there are other problems caused by the orthography in retaining the purest form of the language, problems such as absence of tone marking, representation of distinct sound as one in the text and others.

Such constraints have made the orthography different from the spoken language and it is the major factor that leads to what is known as ambiguity in written text

It is an undeniable fact that understanding language orthography, grammar spelling etc is essential even to the native speakers when writing to avoid the instance of ambiguity. Most of the Wakil’s words, phrases and statements become orthographically ambiguous because of non-conformity to the SKO. Some of the instances are:

- Grammar
- Spelling
- Syllabification
- Improper usage of sound
- Word spacing
- Non-conformity to SKO

All of the above were analyzed in four columns and the differences of the nonconformity will be shown in percentage for each column. Column 1 showed Wakil’s way of writing the word, Column 2 be the page number, column 3 is orthographic representation, and column 4 is the gloss. It is the focus of this research to bring out the words/structures that do not conform to the S.K.O. the total number of the words that do not conform to the SKO is 973. The formula of calculation applied is total number of error in domain multiplied by hundred divided by the total number of the words that does not conform to the SKO.

4.2 Grammar

Kanuri orthography has its own way of writing grammatical terms as whether to space a word, use hyphen or to affix it. Whichever one being altered will change the meaning of the word.

4.2.1 Misordering of elements

Here we discussed how the author misordered some words

4.2.1.1 The suffix “yé” of the additive adjunct

The suffix ‘yé’ of in Kanuri is used in two instances. As agent/subject marker, and as additive adjunct. The agent marker is affixed to the subject and usually has low tone while the additive adjunct has high tone and always placed at the end of a noun phrase. These are the differences among the two.

The additive adjunct is usually translated as ‘too’ or ‘also’ Cyffer, (1991). Contrary to this rule, Wakil suffixed the additive adjunct ‘ye’ to the noun and the readers may read it as an agent marker first but later after appealing to the context they will realize and read it as ‘also’ or ‘too’. Below shows the words

Wakil	Page no.	SKO	Gloss
<i>Kasumaye</i>	p.1	kásuma yé	also abusinessman
<i>Falye</i>	p.3	fál yé	one also
<i>nyidəye</i>	p.7	nyidə yé	you also
<i>adəye</i>	p.10	ádə yé	and that also
<i>sarsarye</i>	p.13	sarsar yé	also thin
<i>datəaye</i>	p.13	datāa yé	long also
<i>shiyē</i>	p.14	shi yé	he also

$$TM \text{ in "ye" } / TMT \times \frac{100}{1} = \frac{7}{973} \times \frac{100}{1} = \frac{700}{973} = 0.71\%$$

4.2.1.2 The indirect object marker –ro

The indirect object marker –ro is usually suffixed to the object in a sentence, it is never placed alone. For this reason when it is being preceded by additive adjunct it will be attached to the additive adjunct not to the head noun. E.g. ‘sandihero’ meaning “they also”.

But the book ‘BuskənyiyaFizako’ they are conjunct all as one word.

Wakil	Page no.	SKO	Gloss
<i>Niyayero</i>	p.13	nyiyayero	with you also
<i>Nyibayero</i>	p.13	nyibayero	without youalso
<i>Kalagnowoyero</i>	p.14	kalagnowoyero	and to turn it also
<i>lamarnzadəyero</i>	p.20	lamarnzadəyero	to their matter also
<i>kərmadəyero</i>	p.33	kərmadəyero	and now also

$$TM \text{ in } -ro / TMT \times \frac{100}{1} = \frac{5}{973} \times \frac{100}{1} = \frac{500}{973} = 0.51\%$$

4.2.1.3 The Focus Marker ‘ga’

When focus marker ‘ga’ is used in a structure with additive adjunct, the focus marker will be attached to the additive marker and will be written as one word ‘yega’.

Wakil’s use of focus marker is inconsistent, because sometime he will use ‘ga’ and sometime ‘a’.

Also the additive adjunct and the focus marker are submerged to the root word.

Wakil	Page no.	SKO	Gloss
<i>casaadəyega</i>	p.7	cesaadəyega	with sand also
<i>shiyeroga</i>	p.22	shiyeroga	to him also

$$\frac{TM \text{ in "ga"} / TMT \times 100 / 1 = 2}{973 \times 100 / 1} = \frac{200}{973} = 0.20\%$$

4.2.1.4 The Subordinating ‘yaye’

The subordinating ‘yaye’ is used to form concessive conditional clause, which usually precedes the major clause, see Cyffer, (1991) e.g. “kánocíntəyayelenyēn” “though Kano is far we will go there”.

It is usually not suffixed to a root word in the SKO but written apart. In Wakil’s book it is written as viz;

Wakil	Page no.	SKO	Gloss
<i>abinzənyaye</i>	p.5	abinzənyayé	In whichever
<i>abizəyaye</i>	p.15	abinzəyayé	whatever it is
<i>rumiyaye</i>	p.18	rumiyayé	even if you haven’t seen it

$$\frac{TM \text{ in "yaye"} / TMT \times 100 / 1 = 3}{973 \times 100 / 1} = \frac{300}{973} = 0.30\%$$

Writing the root word with the subordinator as one will make the word meaningless.

4.3 Spelling

It is the use of letters to form words. It usually implies that the letters of a language are used according to accepted conventions to avoid several spellings for only one word. For instance, when old English began to be written spellings varied widely but many of the words were changed after the Norman Conquest in (1066), e.g. the word “queen” was written as cwen and quat or hwact for “what”. The invention of the printing in 15th C proved to be a force in standardizing spellings, Microsoft Encarta (2009).

Thus every language must to have its standardized form of spelling when it is put into writing. Kanuri language also has its own standard spellings, but most the words in Wakil’s book do not obey to the SKO.

Wakil	Page no.	SKO	Gloss
<i>Cironya</i>	p.2	curunya	when he saw it
<i>Cironya</i>	p.2	curunya	when he saw it
<i>Kwaggabe</i>	p.3	kwangabe	of men
<i>Kashunya</i>	p.4	kashinya	when they came
<i>zəawu</i>	p.4	zaawu	answer
<i>arawu</i>	p.4	alewu	turban
<i>səbbarin</i>	p.4	səmbarin	he will be tired
<i>ciworo</i>	p.6	cuworo	he asked
<i>zopsə</i>	p.6	zapsə	scoop
<i>kənashim</i>	p.8	kənashin	dream
<i>waktə</i>	p.10	woktə	time
<i>hiljinnaro</i>	p.10	yiljinnaro	he is shouting
<i>dawartaiya</i>	p.10	dawartaiya	when we are ready
<i>bo</i>	p.11	bu	eating
<i>tusko</i>	p.12	toska	ferule
<i>dauwu</i>	p.12	dawù	neck

<i>gatdero</i>	p.13	<i>gadero</i>	hencforth
<i>gər̄la-gər̄lazən</i>	p.13	<i>gər̄la-gər̄lazain</i>	they were humping
<i>kursu</i>	p.15	<i>kurshu</i>	recitation in Qur an
<i>kilzənyi</i>	p.16	<i>gulzənyi</i>	he did not say
<i>nankono</i>	p.16	<i>namgono</i>	he sit down
<i>fajirzə</i>	p.16	<i>fajarzə</i>	at dawn
<i>daldal</i>	p.16	<i>del del</i>	so close
<i>ciluwo</i>	p.17	<i>culuwo</i>	he went out
<i>gabatse</i>	p.22	<i>gəwatsə</i>	he stepped
<i>afudolwuwo</i>	p.22	<i>afudaluwo</i>	would have been better
<i>asuzuguna</i>	p.22	<i>asuzəgəna</i>	made him understand
<i>huguwu</i>	p.23	<i>fuwu</i>	front
<i>nozəмага</i>	p.23	<i>nozənaga</i>	if he had known
<i>fomzenna</i>	p.23	<i>fomzainna</i>	they are roaming
<i>hariyabe</i>	p.23	<i>ariyabe</i>	deception

$$TMS/TMT \times 100/1 = 31/973 \times 100/1 = 3100/973 = 3.18$$

4.4 Syllabification

In Kanuri the only permissible syllable structures are CV and CVC otherwise it is as a result of historical weakening or intervocalic lenition of consonants over time. A single vowel in Kanuri occurs in word initial position only as a result of borrowing in another language Dikwa (2006).

Bulakarima and Abba (2012) believe that it is easy to predict the syllable of Kanuri language. To them all the lexicon of the language ends with either vowel final or with a sonorant obstruent or /a/ except idiophones. They also assert that no consonant clusters but phonological conditioned as a single.

The syllable structure of the words used is not properly maintained in the book 'BuskənyiyaFizako'. Some of the syllables are completely deleted while others are having more than the number of syllables they are supposed to have.

<i>Wakil</i>	Page No.	<i>SKO</i>	gloss
<i>Fidiun</i>	p.3	<i>fidegən</i>	forty
<i>CV\$CVVC</i>		<i>CV\$CV</i>	
<i>Sasen</i>	p.3	<i>sasain</i>	will repair
<i>CV\$CVC</i>		<i>CV\$CVVC</i>	
<i>Saiye</i>	p.3	<i>sandiye</i>	they also
<i>CVV\$V</i>		<i>CVC\$CV\$CV</i>	
<i>Walganoa</i>	p.10	<i>walganowa</i>	did it become
<i>CVC\$CV\$CVV</i>		<i>CV\$CV\$CV\$CV</i>	
<i>Maranti</i>	p.10	<i>maaranti</i>	school
<i>CV\$CVC\$CV</i>		<i>CVV\$CVC\$CV</i>	
<i>Siasa</i>	p.10	<i>siyasa</i>	politics
<i>CVV\$CV</i>		<i>CV\$CV\$CV</i>	
<i>lewosə</i>	p.12	<i>lenowosə</i>	said he is gone
<i>CV\$CV\$CV</i>		<i>CV\$CV\$CV\$CV</i>	
<i>Dauwu</i>	p.12	<i>dawu</i>	neck
<i>CVV\$CV</i>		<i>CV\$CV</i>	
<i>Kuwi</i>	p.14	<i>kuwui</i>	chicken
<i>CV\$CV</i>		<i>CV\$CVV</i>	
<i>Kərənzan</i>	p.15	<i>kərənzain</i>	they are listening
<i>CV\$CVC\$CVC\$</i>		<i>CV\$CVC\$CVVC</i>	
<i>kargədo</i>	p.15	<i>karəgəndo</i>	your hearts

CVC\$CV\$CV		CV\$CV\$CV\$CV	
<i>Siasa</i>	p.17	siyasa	politics
CVV\$CV		CV\$CV\$CV	
<i>Siasabe</i>	p.17	siyasabe	of politics
CVV\$CV\$CV		CV\$CV\$CV\$CV	
<i>Siasa</i>	p.17	siyasa	politics
CVV\$CV		CV\$CV\$CV	
<i>Raaka</i>	p.18	rakka	prayer
CVV\$CV		CVC\$CV	
<i>Kargə</i>	p.20	karəgə	heart
CVC\$CV		CV\$CV\$CV	
<i>Siasadərio</i>	p.20	siyasadərio	for the politis
CVV\$CV\$CV\$CV		CV\$CV\$CV\$CV\$CV	
<i>Kargawo</i>	p.20.	karawo	he entered
CVC\$CV\$CV		CV\$CV\$CV	
<i>Daube</i>	P22	dawube	of the middle
CVV\$CV		CV\$CV\$CV	
<i>Siranyi</i>	P22	səragənyi	he doesn't want
CV\$CV\$CV		CV\$CV\$CV\$CV	
$TM\text{ syll} / TMT \times 100 / 1 = 20 / 973 \times 100 / 1 = 2000 / 973 = 2.05\%$			

4.5 Selection of incorrect element

Some elements are incorrectly used in the text. Especially the sound /ə/ is used interchangeably with /u/ without considering their differences and sometimes being substituted with the sounds /e/ and /i/.

4.5.1 Inappropriate use of /ə/ Sound

The shwa /ə/ in Kanuri language is a mid-central vowel which is being produced when the tongue is not raised to the high position in the mouth and it is at the central. In Kanuri language /ə/ is just like the schwa in English. According to Bulakarima (2001), /ə/ never occurs at the world initial position but only in medial and final position.

In the book “*BuskənyiyaFizako*” there are some instances where the vowels /i/, /e/ and /u/ are being substituted for /ə/ as shown below:

4.5.2 Substitution of /ə/ with /u/

Contrary to /ə/, /u/ is a high back and rounded vowel. In the production of /u/ sound the tongue is raised to the high position in the mouth and dragged to the back position, the two lips become rounded.

Orthography

Wakil	Page	S.K.O.	Gloss
<i>Bune</i>	p.1	Bəne	Night
<i>Bune</i>	p.2	Bəne	Night
<i>Fugurtə</i>	p.3	fəfərtə	He rolled
<i>Furtənzən</i>	p.1	Fərtənzən	Under him/her
<i>Buləmzə</i>	p.1	Bələmzə	His pap

<i>Furazə</i>	p.1	Fərázə	His/she sweeps
<i>Mumurtə</i>	p.2	Məmərtə	She composed herself
<i>Fuləjinnaro</i>	p.6	Fəlejinnáro	As he is pointing it
<i>Buji</i>	p.7	Bəji	Mat
<i>Fulai</i>	p.8	Fəlai	raffia plate
<i>fulaidə</i>	p.8	Fəlaibédə	Of the plate
<i>Muradəzəna</i>	p.9	Məradəzəna	He desires it
<i>Furupne</i>	p.9	Fərəmné	Open it
<i>Bune</i>	p.12	Bəne	Night
<i>Kəmundə</i>	p.13	Kəməndə	This year
<i>Bune</i>	p.14	Bəne	Night
<i>Bunebe</i>	p.15	Bənebé	Of night
<i>Muradəgin</i>	p.15	Məradəzəna	Will need it
<i>Muradəzəna</i>	p.16	Məradəzəna	He desires it
<i>Zunum</i>	p.17	Zùnəm	You push
<i>Tawadduro</i>	p.17	Tawadəro	Certainly
<i>Furazə</i>	p.17	Fərazo	He sweeps
<i>Bundebe</i>	p.21	Bənebé	Of night
<i>Wadunzə</i>	p.22	Wadənzə	His promise
<i>Muradənzəwo</i>	p.22	Məradəzəwo	Of his desire
<i>Muradətəna</i>	p.24	Məradətəna	Is needed
<i>Furəmgata</i>	p.24	Fərəmgata	Is open
<i>Furətshinro</i>	p.27	Fərətshinro	That it will be loosen
<i>Burtindəro</i>	p.21	Bərtindəro	Because it will disperse
<i>Bullan</i>	p.32	Bəllan	In white

$$TM \text{ in } u / TMT \times 100 / 1 = 30 / 973 \times 100 / 1 = 3000 / 973 = 3.08\%$$

4.5.3 Substitution of /ə/ with /e/

The vowel /e/ is mid-front vowel while /ə/ is mid-central vowel, they differ in position. For this reason, substitution of one with the other will alter the pronunciation and also in some cases the meaning of a word. Below are the words

Wakil	Page	S.K.O.	Gloss
<i>Kela</i>	p.2	kəla	head
<i>Sekdin</i>	p.4	səgdin	in thatch fence
<i>Tere-terezai</i>	p.28	təre-tərezái	hanging around
<i>Kemabe</i>	p.30	kəmābe	The Lord's
<i>temanyidən</i>	p.30	təmanyidən	to my thinking

$$TM \text{ in } e /_{TMT} \times 100 /_1 = 5 /_{973} \times 100 /_1 = 500 /_{973} = 0.51\%$$

4.5.4 Substitution of /ə/ with /i/

The vowel /i/ is a front, high vowel and in the production of the sounds lips are spread. It is quite different with /ə/ sound both in position and height.

Wakil	Page	S.K.O.	Gloss
<i>Dirizanyi</i>	p.23	Dərizanyi	They have not gone around
<i>Fandimin</i>	p.27	Fándəmin	You will get it

$$TM \text{ in } i /_{TMT} \times 100 /_1 = 2 /_{973} \times 100 /_1 = 0.20$$

4.6 Word spacing

Word spacing affects the meaning of a word considerably in every language. If words are wrongly spaced, they may be read different from the intended meaning while others will be meaningless.

4.6.1 Inappropriate Use of the Conjunction marker –a

According to Cyffer (1979), the conjunction marker never appears alone or in single occurrence, it will be used when two or more constituents usually noun or pronouns are conjoined. Hyphen is required when in written text in order to make it clearly visible, e.g.

Ferowa-a tadawa-a
 “Boys and girls”

Wakil's use of conjunction marker is different from S.K.O. He uses without the use of hyphen which becomes associative.

Wakil	Page No.	Orthography	Gloss
<i>Daa</i>	p.2	dā-a	And meat
<i>Daa</i>	p.3	dā-a	And meat
<i>Modua</i>	p.9	Mòdu-a	And Modu
<i>Baa</i>	p.12	bā-a	And not
<i>Alimamia</i>	p.3	Álimamí-a	And Alimami
<i>Daadə</i>	p.3	dā-adə	And meat (the)

<i>Daabero</i>	p.6	dâ-abéro	And with meat
<i>Lawanna</i>	p.20	Lawan-a	And Lawan
<i>Alia</i>	p.6	Áli-a	And Ali
<i>Salamnzaa</i>	p.25	Sálamanzá-a	And their payment
<i>Kajirambea</i>	p.26	Kaájirambé-a	And with earthen incense burner

$$TM \text{ in } - a / TMT \times 100 / 1 = 11 / 973 \times 100 / 1 = 1100 / 973 = 1.13\%$$

The way Wakil writes his conjunction marker is just like associative marker where it is being attached to the word it describes, characterizes or indicates ownership e.g.

Ku kausua "It'shot today"
Kamunyisuroa "my wife is pregnant"

4.6.2 Suffixation of the "ba" (negation)

The negative suppression "ba" is usually detached with the word that is used to negate. In the Book "*BuskənyiyaFizako*", Wakil write as follows:

Wakil	Page No.	Orthography	Gloss
<i>Təngazəginmaba</i>	p.5	Təngazəngínmaba	No place to lean on
<i>Nyibayero</i>	p.13	Nyíbayéro	Also without you
<i>Falbagai</i>	p.1	Fálbagái	Like no one
<i>Nzəkkoyebaro</i>	p.10	Nzəkkoyebaro	No place to put
<i>Shəgənzəba</i>	p.12	Shəgənzəba	He has no doubt

$$TM \text{ in } - ba / TMT \times 100 / 1 = 5 / 973 \times 100 / 1 = 500 / 973 = 0.51\%$$

4.7 Non-Conformity to S.K.O. Spelling Words

Wakil	Page No.	Orthography	Gloss
<i>Cironya</i>	p.2	Curunya	When he saw it
<i>Cironya</i>	p.2	Curunya	When he saw it
<i>Fidium</i>	p.3	Fidegən	Forty
<i>Sasen</i>	p.3	Sasain	Will repair
<i>Sarawuna</i>	p	Səraana	He likes it

<i>Saiye</i>		Sandiye	They
<i>Kwaggabe</i>		Kwangabe	Men's
<i>Kashunya</i>	p.4	Kashinya	When they come
<i>Zəawu</i>	p.4	Zaawu	Answer
<i>Arawu</i>	p.4	Alewu	Turban
<i>Sebbari</i>	p.4	Səmbarin	He will be tired
<i>Wakazə</i>	p.6	Waazə	Happen
<i>Ciworo</i>	p.6	Cuworu	He asked
<i>Zopsə</i>	p.6	Zapsə	Take a handful
<i>Kənashim</i>	p.8	Kənashin	Dream
<i>Waktə</i>	p.10	Woktə	Time
<i>Walgonoa</i>	p.10	Walgonowa	Did it become?
<i>Maranti</i>	p.10	Maaranti	School
<i>Hiljinnaro</i>	p.10	Yiljinnaro	With shout
<i>Dowartaiya</i>	p.10	Dawarteiya	If we are ready
<i>Siasa</i>	p.10	Siyasa	Politics
<i>bo</i>	p.11	Bu	Eating
<i>lewosə</i>	p.12	Lewonosə	He said he is going
<i>tusko</i>	p.12	Toska	Ferule
<i>dauwu</i>	p.13	Dawu	Neck
<i>sanbaro</i>	p.13	Sainbaro	Without drinking
<i>gatdero</i>	p.13	Gadero	Forever/henceforth
<i>gər̄la-gər̄lazain</i>	p.13	Gər̄la-gər̄lazain	They are humping
<i>kuwi</i>	p.14	Kuwui	Chicken
<i>kursu</i>	p.15	Kurshu	Recitation of a portion of the Qur'an as prayer
<i>Kərəenzen</i>	p.15	Kərəenzain	They are listening
<i>Kargədo</i>	p.15	Karəgədo	Your hearts

<i>Kilzənyi</i>	p.16	Gulzənyi	He did not say it
<i>Namkono</i>	p.16	Namgono	He sat down
<i>Fajirzə</i>	p.16	Fajarzə	At dawn
<i>Daldal</i>	p.16	Del del	So close
<i>Cihuwo</i>	p.17	Culuwo	Went out
<i>Siasa</i>	p.17	Siyasa	Politics
<i>Siasabe</i>	p.17	Siyasabe	Of politics
<i>Zeancin</i>	p.17	Nzəgatain	He is chewing
<i>Siasa</i>	p.17	Siyasa	Politics
<i>Raaka</i>	p.18	Rakka	Prayer
<i>Kargə</i>	p.20	Karəgə	Heart
<i>Siasadvro</i>	p.20	Siyasadəro	For the politics
<i>Gabatsə</i>	p.21	Gəwatsə	He stepped on
<i>Kargawo</i>	p.21	Karawo	He entered
<i>Daube</i>	p.21	Dawube	Of the middle
<i>Afudolwuwo</i>	p.22	Afudaluwo	Would have been better
<i>Asuzuguna</i>	p.22	Asuzəgəna	Make him understand
<i>Huguwo</i>		Fuwu	front
<i>Nozəmagə</i>	p.23	Nozənamagə	If he had known
<i>Fomzenna</i>	p.23	Fomzain	They are roaming
<i>Hariyabe</i>	p.23	Ariyabe	Deception
<i>Siranyi</i>	p.24	Səragənyi	He/she does not like it

$$TM Nc/TMT \times 100/1 = 55/973 \times 100/1 = 5500/973 = 5.65\%$$

4.7.1 Addition of some unnecessary or incorrect elements

Elements which are not required are written in a word; some words are intentionally prenasalised throughout the text.

4.7.2 Prenasalization of Consonant Sounds

Apart from substitution of the /ə/ sound with other vowels, there are also some instances where Wakil prenasalized consonants. In the Standard Kanuri Orthography consonants are prenasalized at the word initial and medial positions, but not in the words Wakil used. The words are viz:

Wakil	Page	S.K.O.	Gloss
<i>Nyim</i>	P.1	yim	Day
<i>Nyim</i>	P.1	yim	Day
<i>Nyisəkin</i>	P.2	iskin	I will come
<i>Kazənyi</i>	P.4	kazəyi	Worries
<i>Sanyinna</i>	p.5	sayinna	Form of address to Islamic teacher
<i>Nyiskin</i>	p.2	iskin	I will come
<i>Nzəngu</i>	p.9	zungu	Sweat
<i>Ngədi</i>	p.10	gədi	Toilet/east
<i>Mbdudinyi</i>	p.6	bəđinyi	The rear part of head
<i>Nyim</i>	p.12	yim	Day
<i>Duwuli</i>	p.20	duli	Children
<i>Nyim</i>	p.22	yim	Day
<i>Ndəwulilo</i>	p.32	duliro	For children
<i>Ndulinyisodə</i>	p.32	dulinyisodə	My children
<i>Nyikiya</i>	p.32	yikiya	If I give it
<i>Nyikəko</i>	p.32	yikəko	I put it

$$TM \text{ in } PN/TMT \times 100/1 = 16/973 \times 100/1 = 1600/973 = 1.64\%$$

4.8 Omission of some required elements

With regards to this, Wakil omits nasal sound in the following words. Below are the words:

Wakil	Page	S.K.O.	Gloss
<i>Indi rozəna</i>	P.1	Indinrozəna	Hold with two hands
<i>Awazə</i>	p.1	Awanzə	His father
<i>Shiyelzə</i>	p.3	Shiyelnzə	His leg

<i>Lamarzə</i>	p.4	Lámarnzə	His affairs
<i>Tafakarye</i>	p.5	Tafakarnyé	We ponder
<i>Jeyem</i>	p.9	Jényen	Will recite
<i>Bejiro</i>	p.10	Mbejíro	There is
<i>Kədeoro</i>	p.13	Kəndoro	To act/to do
<i>Ashirzə</i>	p.13	Ashirnzə	His secret
<i>Dusoye</i>	p.15	Ndúsoye	Everyone
<i>Abizayaye</i>	p.15	Abinzəyayé	Whatever it is
<i>Guzuwu</i>	p.15	Nguzuwu	He stoop on it
<i>Kargədo</i>	p.16	Karəgəndo	Your hearts
<i>Njeg</i>	p.20	Njëng	Only (idiophone)
<i>Dalilzədə</i>	p.21	Dalilnzədə	The reason is
<i>Hangalzə</i>	p.21	Hángalnzə	Wisdom
<i>Yawalzə</i>	p.21	Yálwalnzə-a	And his family
<i>Gulge</i>	p.21	Gùlge	I will say
<i>Kolye</i>	p.21	Kolnye	We leave it
<i>Kjizəyiwa</i>	p.23	Kəjizənyi wa?	Is it not pleasant?
<i>Nəm-gənwu</i>	p.26	Nəmgəríwu	Immoral behaviour
<i>Banata</i>	p.26	Bannatə	To waste
<i>Dawarge</i>	p.27	Dawarngé	I put off
<i>Falzadə</i>	p.27	Falnzadə	One of them
<i>Gaiyaro</i>	p.30	Ngáiyaro	Not often
<i>Keshe</i>	p.30	Kənsħə	Coming
<i>dəmbərzə</i>	p.32	Dəmbərnzə	Under him

$$TM \text{ in } O/TMT \times 100/1 = 27/973 \times 100/1 = 2700/973 = 2.77\%$$

It has been observed that Wakil violates the use of possessive suffix +nzə as approved by the Standard Kanuri Orthography and continued writing +ze- as shown in the words (awazə for awanzə), (ashirzə for ashirnzə), (lararzə for lamarnzə) etc. Also, the possessive suffix +ndo which denotes “your/plural” is been written as +do by Wakil in the word: karəgə +do = karəgədo.

Quite often, the deletion of nasal sound in a syllable will change the meaning of a word, examples can be seen in the words below:

Wakil	Page	Literal meaning	Intended meaning
<i>Indi rozəna</i>	P.1	Holding = two	Holding in two hands
<i>Ashirzə</i>	p.13	Sequential congestion	secretly
<i>Hangalzə</i>	p.21	Sequential congestion	carefully
<i>Yawalə</i>	p.21	Sequential congestion	carelessly
<i>Banatə</i>	p.26	Sequential congestion	to be helped

Looking at the above words, it will be difficult for the learners of the language to make a decision as to what the words mean simply because they are not appropriately written as expected.

What should be observed from the above examples is that, the changing value of orthographic words listed solely depends on rightful spelling and application of tone; if appropriate tone is marked to a word the instance of ambiguity which is part and parcel of error will be resolved.

Summary and Conclusion

5.0 Introduction

This chapter discusses the summary of the findings of the whole work from chapter one to four. From the starting point it is the aim of the study to discover some minor lapses in the orthography of Kanuri language.

5.1 Summary of the Findings

Kanuri is one of the three major languages of Northern Nigeria (among Hausa and Fulani). It is spoken in Nigeria, Chad and Niger. Its development is associated to Kanem Bornu trading empire that ruled around Lake Chad from 9th to 19th century (Cyffer, 1991).

Some of the oldest and known documents of Kanuri text are as viz: In the 17th century 'a short vocabulary' was the first printed record and it is a list of Kanuri numerals, then the grammar of Bornu/Kanuri language by Sigismud Koelle in 1854. (www.languagesgulper.com)

There are lots of Kanuri writings nowadays, ranging from proverbs, folktales, fables, historical fragment, Dictionaries and proses. The researcher decided to choose the book Buskenyiya Fizako to check orthographic nonconformity in a written text. It is the aim of the researcher to bring out the areas that likely bring about the orthographic nonconformity such as omission and insertion of unnecessary elements and disordering.

It is a textual analysis where the researcher used her intuition with the help of relevant materials consulted to make the analysis of the work. The work was done successfully after reading the text several times so as to fish out the required words that cause the orthographic ambiguity.

The study examined six different areas where this book failed to follow the rules of the SKO, they are in the areas of Grammar, Spelling, Syllabification, Improper usage of sound, Word spacing, and some words that are unnecessarily prenasalized. The summary is as follows: the use of /ə/ sound, deletion of nasal in a syllable. prenasalization of consonants, the use of additive marker 'ye', unction marker '-a', conditional marker '+ga' with a total number of one hundred and sixty-three (163) instances. /ə/ sound were substituted with either /u/, /e/, or /i/. This could be seen in the words like, Bune, fufurtə, kela. kemabe. fandimin, e.t.c. the SKO the possessive maker is written at '+nz' which denotes his singular and are suffixed to a root word, but Wakil deleted the nasal alveolar "n" and write it as - z throughout the book. This example can be seen in the following words: az, lamarzə, shirze.

Also the possessive suffix +ndo which denotes 'yours plural is been written as +do. e.g *karagadofor karəgəndo* your hearts' Apart from that there are other words which are written in the S K O with nasal sound but, in the book "Busknyiya Fizako" it is written without the nasal sound. e.g. Ndusoye, Mbejiro, Nguzuwu.

The deletion of nasal in the possessive market will some time change the grammatical function of a word and thereby causes orthographic ambiguity to the structure. For example, the word *ashirzə* which is used in page (9) in paragraph (2) is intended to mean *his secret*. The meaning intended is different from the spelt word. Intended meaning *ashirnzə* 'his secret' while *ashirnzə* 'is sequential verb'

Other examples are the word *hanganze* is written as *hangaize* (which could be read as sequential verb).

Some consonants are prenasalized and in some areas nasals are deleted in a syllable. In the SKO there are prenasalized syllables like *nda, nyama, mbeji* etc but not in the words used by Wakil. He consistently use 'nyim' for the word yim (the day), mbudidyi' for 'bədinyi' (the rear part of the head). Some of the syllables where nasal sounds are deleted are as viz: Awazə, Tafakarye, Lejiro. e.t.c.

Wakil's usage of the adjective adjunct will make the reader confused, because it is suffixed to the noun phrase. The case will be seen in the words, Kasurnaye, Shiye, sarsarye, etc.

The conjunction maker (-a) is never hyphenated throughout the book, it is always written attached to the noun or the pronoun it conjure, e.g

Text		SKO	Gloss
da	for	da-a	"and meat"
Modua	for	Modu-a	"and Modu"
Lawanna	for	Lawan-a	"and Lawan" etc.

The negative "ba' contrary to the S K O rule is attached to the word that is used to negate, e.g *falbaga, sheganzaba, and nyibayero* which does not confirm to the Kanuri Standard Orthography e.t.c. and there are so many words which does not confirm to the SKO. Words like

Text	SKO	Gloss
------	-----	-------

siasa	siyasa	Politics
Sasen	sasain	will repair
Ciworo	cuworo	he ask

5.2 Conclusion

An over view of the relevant literature proved that there is development in the Kanuri written literature as prominent scholars abroad and at home are making lots of effort on Kanuri studies, yet there seemed to be defects in presenting the language as marks on paper. Based on this study, it has been observed that some instances of ambiguity is caused by the non-conformity to the orthography of the language hence their need to be always write any text based on the S K O.

Many people speak Kanuri language but find difficulty reading its text, and there is need to improve its writing in order to make the Kanuri written text easily read by many. To do so, there is need to reintroduce the Kanuri as a subject in both primary and secondary schools. In teaching the language the extra-linguistic features should not be ignored. By doing so the Kanuri written text would be easily read by many including the non-native speakers and that will enhance its prestige.

References

- Abubakar, A. (1983). "Generative Phonology and Dialect Variation: A case Study of Hausa Dialect," SOAS), London:
- Alkali, M.N. (1978). Kanem-Borno Under the Sayfawa: A Study of Origin, Growth and Collapse of a Dynasty Ph. D thesis, Ahmadu Bello University Zaria.
- Bulakarima, S. U. (1997). "Survey of Kanuri Dialects" in: *Advances in Kanuri Scholarship*, (Cd) Cyffer, N. & Geider. T. Koln, Rudiger. Koppe Verlag pp. 67-75.
- Bulakarima, S. U., Sheriff, B. and Abba, S. B. (2003). *A Kanuri-English Dictionary*. Desk-Top Publisher Co-operative Society Maiduguri.
- Cyffer and Geider. (1997). "A survey of the Kanuri Language". In: *Advances in Kanuri scholarship*, (PP 62-64). Rudder: Rudder Kopper VerlagKoIn.
- Cyffer, N. (1985). "The Story of Kanuri Language Study" *Annals of Borno*. Vol.2. pp. 237-251.
- Cyffer, N. and Hutchinson, J. P. (1979). *The Standard Kanuri Orthography*. Lagos:Thomas Nelson.
- Cyfler, N. & J. P. (1978). *Dictionary of Kanuri Language*. Fooris Publication Dardrecht
- CyIffer, N. (1998). 'A Sketch of Kanuri' KoIn.Rodiger.Vrlag.
- Dikwa, A. Khalifa (1988). "Arabic Loan Words in Kanuri" Unpublished M.A. Dissertation University of Maiduguri. Maiduguri.
- Fagge, U. U. (2004). "Semantic Analysis of Single Word with Different Sense" Department of Nigerian Languages, Series V. *Algaita Journal of Current Research in Hausa Studies*. No.3 Vol.1.
- Fannami, M. (2007). *Kanuri Syntax: A Government and Binding Approach to Kanuri Syntax*. Maiduguri: Desk-Top Publishers.
- Gazali, 8. A (2007). A Descriptive Analysis of Various Rules of the Postposition - ro in Kanuri. M. A. Dissertation, Department of Languages and Linguistics University of Maiduguri.
- Gazali, B. A. and Modu, M. A. (2010). "Element of Lexical Ambiguity and Vagueness in Kanuri" in *Maiduguri Journal of Linguistics and Library Studies (MAJOLLS)*. Department of Languages and Linguistics University of Maiduguri. Vol.xii: 1-8.
- Gender, T. (1996). "The Universe of Kanuri Oral Literature and Documentary Text" In Cyffer, N. and Gender, T. (eds) (1996) *Advances in Kanuri Scholarship*. Koln Germany Rudder Kopper Verlag. Pp. 1-24.
- Greenberg, J. II. (1963). *Languages of Africa*. Bloomington: Bloomington Indiana University Research Center in Anthropology, Folklore and linguistics Publication. No. 25.

- Greenberg, J. H. (1963). *Languages of Africa*. Bloomington: Bloomington Indiana University.
- Hockett, C. T. (1996). *A Course in Linguistics*. Macmillan New York
- Hockett, C. T. (1996). *A Course in Linguistics*. Macmillan New York
- Hutchinson, J. P. (1981). "Kanuri Word Formation and Structure of the Lexicon" In: Proceedings of the First Nilo-saharan Colloquium. Leiden University, Leiden.
- Hutchinson, J. P. (1981). "Kanuri Word Formation and Structure of the Lexicon" In: Proceedings of the First Nilo-saharan Colloquium. Leiden University, Leiden.
- Hutchinson, J. P. (1981). *The Kanuri Language; A Reference Grammar*. Boston University, African Studies Center, Boston.
- Hutchinson, J. P. (1981). *The Kanuri Language; A Reference Grammar*. Boston University, African Studies Center, Boston.
- Hutchinson, J. P. (1971). *Aspect of Kanuri Syntax*. Ph.D thesis Indiana University, Bloomington.
- Hutchinson, J. P. (1971). *Aspect of Kanuri Syntax*. Ph.D thesis Indiana University, Bloomington.
- Jarret, K. P. (1977). "Kanuri Phonology Reconsidered". Unpublished M.A. Dissertation, University of New York (U.K.).
- Kempson, R. M. (1977). *Semantic Theory*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- Kidda, M. and Fannarni, N. I. (1999). "Kanembu and Kanuri Lexical Relationship and Time Depth" *Maiduguri Journal of linguistics and Literary Studies, MA.JOLLS*. Vol.1, pp 71-80.
- Koelle, S. W. (1854). *Grammar of Borno or Kanuri Language*. London Church of Missionary Society.
- Ladefoged, P. et al (1975). *A course in Phonetics*.
- Leddy, P. D. (1989). *Practical Research: Planning and Design*. New York: Macmillan.
- Levenson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.
- Lorh, D. (1997). "Kanuri Orthographies from 1854 Until Present" in Cyffer, N. and Geider T. (eds) *Advances in Kanuri Scholarship*. Köln Rudiger Köpper pp. 68-77
- Lukas, J. (1936). "Linguistics Situation in Lake Chad Area in Central Africa" *Africa*, pp. 332-349.
- Lukas, J. (1937). *A Study of the Kanuri Grammar and Vocabulary*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Lyons, J. (1968). *An Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. London, Cambridge University
- Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*. Cambridge: University Press Cambridge.
- Lyons, J. (1981). *Language Meaning and Context*. Fontana Press, London
- Lyons, J. (2008). *Languages and Linguistics: An Introduction*. Cambridge University Cambridge.
- Modu, A. M. (2002). *Kanuri Wedding Songs: A Case Study of Hajja Ganaram*. Unpublished M. A. Dissertation Department of Languages and Linguistics University of Maiduguri, Maiduguri.
- Muhammed, I. (2014) *Study of Structural and Lexical Ambiguity in Kanuri*, Unpublished M. A. Dissertation Department of Languages and Linguistics University of Maiduguri.