

Towards a common Oshikwanyama official orthography for Namibia and Angola: The way forward on the conjunctive and disjunctive writing systems of Oshikwanyama

Edward T Shikesho¹
Ministry of Education, Arts, and Culture

Abstract

This paper emanates from a serious debate that took place at Okalongo, in Omusati Region, between the author of this salient paper, and some University of Namibia students, specialising in Oshikwanyama. This debate compelled the author of this study to explore further on the writing systems that prevail in Oshikwanyama. The disagreement was on the writing systems that are observed between Oshikwanyama used in Namibia and the Oshikwanyama used in Angola. Oshikwanyama, as a cross-border language, is one of the twelve dialects of Oshiwambo. Oshikwanyama's writing system is adapted differently. In Namibia, it is written disjunctively, while in Angola, it is officially written conjunctively, especially when it comes to the treatment of verbs (Although, there was an attempt established in a meeting that was held in 2014 at a cultural festival in Ondjiva in Angola, headed by Pedro Tongeni, where it was agreed for the Angolans to adopt to the Oshikwanyama writing system used in Namibia. However, it is not yet officially approved by these two nations.) This is a qualitative study influenced by purposive sampling and content analysis. This study's theoretical ideas are those of Cole (1975) who believes that Bantu languages should follow their writing system, instead of those of Indo-European languages. In this study's literature review, a short overview of these two writing systems is provided by various scholars in the linguistic discipline, with special focus on Bantu languages (Prinsloo & De Schryver, 2002; Taljard & Bosch, 2006). Adapting to a common writing system and perhaps coming up with a common official orthography, preferably Orthography 4 of Oshikwanyama, where the two countries will be following in writing future materials, is of paramount importance, and it is what this study recommends.

Keywords: *Orthography, disjunctive writing system, conjunctive writing system, translation equivalent, Oshikwanyama, cross-border languages, Bantu, lexicographers, prefix, suffix, radical, root, agglutination, consonantalisation, vowel elision, phonological process.*

Introduction

The debate between the author of this study and some University of Namibia students over the writing of verbs in Oshikwanyama compelled the author of this salient study to explore further on the two writing systems that are prevalent in Oshikwanyama. According to Brock-Utne (2000; Halme, 2004; Ngodji, 2004; Shikesho, 2019), Oshikwanyama is a dialect spoken in the two

¹ **Edward T. Shikesho** is a high school teacher in the Ministry of Education, Arts and Culture. He teaches English as a Second Language and Oshikwanyama as a First Language (Grade 8-12) at Nuuyoma Secondary School in Omusati Region, Namibia. He holds a Bachelor of Education (Honours) and a Master of Arts in African Languages (Oshiwambo studies) from the University of Namibia (UNAM) in 2015 and 2019 respectively. While he was an undergraduate student, he served as a writing tutor in the Writing Excellence Unit, at the UNAM's Language Centre. He is also a part-time lecturer at NAMCOL's Ongwediva Campus. His research interests include Oshikwanyama Lexicography, Linguistics, and Oshiwambo cultural practices. Email: eshikesho@yahoo.com

countries, Namibia and Angola. It is a cross border dialect (standardised language), of which its orthography or writing system is adapted differently. In Namibia, Oshikwanyama is written disjunctively, while in Angola, it is written conjunctively, especially when it comes to the treatment of verbs. This article then provides a brief overview of these writing systems, as discussed by various scholars in linguistics, with special reference to Bantu languages. Some examples are provided to contrast these two writing systems that prevail in Oshikwanyama. The preferred writing system is then suggested, although modification is needed to suit these two countries' orthographies. The challenges that are faced in adapting only to a common writing system between these two countries, as far as Oshikwanyama is concerned are also established in this study.

According to Halme (2004; Shifidi, 2014; Shikesho, 2019), Oshikwanyama is one of the two Oshiwambo standardised written languages in Namibia. It is primarily used in both Angolan and Namibian education systems. Apart from the education systems, it is also used in church activities, cultural activities, social activities, in media, and many other activities. More Oshikwanyama publications have been produced in Namibia than in Angola. Since Oshikwanyama is used in both countries, it is better than ever to share books, dictionaries and other learning materials with schools that have Oshikwanyama as a First Language in both Namibia and Angola. According to F. Hilifavali (Personal communication, June 28, 2020,) (presenter, Radio Kunene in Ondjiva), Oshikwanyama has not been active in schools in Angola, because the Angolan education system has not yet fully made provision to the teaching of local languages in all grades. It is only Portuguese that is used as a language of instruction in schools. Hilifavali (2020) further explains that preparations and arrangements have been put in place and in full swings in developing the curriculum for Oshikwanyama for primary education up to tertiary institutions. For these two countries to share all publications, from educational materials, church materials and others, a common writing system should be introduced. This is the only way the language will grow, not only academically and socially but also culturally.

There has been discussion to implement a uniform writing system for both countries, but to date, no conclusion has been reached yet in this regard (P. Hasheela, personal communication, April 14, 2020). A meeting that took place at Ondjiva during a cultural festival in 2014 suggested for Oshikwanyama in Angola to adapt to the disjunctive writing system used in Namibia. Although the agreement was reached between a few officials including one prominent pioneer of Oshikwanyama language and culture in Angola, Pedro Tongeni and a few officials from Namibia, the use of disjunctive spelling system has not been considered officially, especially in Angola. Several books in Angola have been published thereafter, including the 2016 publication entitled *Dicionário de nomes em Oshikwanyama (Oshikwanyama dictionary of names)* by Cecilia Ndanyakukwa which has used the conjunctive writing system. Attempts have also been established, especially in 2020, when the department of education in Angola decided to review and update the Oshikwanyama books that are used in schools, to adapt to the disjunctive writing system which is used in Namibia (F. Hilifavali, personal communication, August 8, 2020). Therefore, this study suggests for a common writing system (i.e. Oshikwanyama Orthography 4) be established officially by these two nations (Namibia and Angola).

Overview of the Oshikwanyama orthography

The writing system of Oshikwanyama became functional somewhere around the 1890s when the Finnish missionaries came to Namibia (Halme, 2004; Ngodji, 2004; Shikesho, 2019). These missionaries' prime purpose was not only to exploit the country's natural resources indirectly but also to introduce the local ordinary people to the Living God. Many of the local ordinary people were taught religion and demarcated from their traditional beliefs, customs as well as their way of living. When teaching and preaching the voice of God, the missionaries started to teach the local

ordinary people how to read and write. It was in the year 1891 when the German missionaries began to translate the Holy Bible into Oshikwanyama when they arrived in Oukwanyama. They did so by getting assistance from the local indigenous people. The leading missionary on this project was H. P. Brincker. Many people were struggling to write and read by then, but later after the translation of the bible into Oshikwanyama by Brincker in 1910, many Oshikwanyama speaking people started learning to read and write (Ngodji, 2004; Shikesho, 2019; Halme, 2004). The first print of the translated First Testament of the Holy Bible in Oshikwanyama was then completed in 1927 (Ngodji, 2004).

The first Oshikwanyama orthography was established by Brincker in the late 1880s and went through several editions and revisions (Halme, 2004). According to Brock-Utne (2000), the official Oshikwanyama orthography in these two countries is different, due to the different missionaries that came from different states. The missionaries that arrived in Namibia came from Germany and Finland, while the missionaries that went to Angola came from Portugal (This needs further investigation, as many missionaries that lived in Angola wrote Oshikwanyama, and they came from German and Finland as well). These missionaries then produced various Oshikwanyama orthographies.

It has been confirmed by Halme (2004) that the first edition of Oshikwanyama orthography was introduced and later adapted in Brincker's publication entitled *Lehrbuch des Osikuanjama*. This publication was released in 1891, and it was the first of the two publications that were published in Oshikwanyama in the same year. Although Oshikwanyama is used in both Angola and Namibia, it is of paramount importance to mention here that each country has its language policy (Halme, 2004). This was caused by the unstable political situation that dominated these countries by then. Therefore, cooperation in the field of language was limited until the 80s.

It is confirmed that many missionaries that wrote early in Oshikwanyama developed their orthographies. These orthographies were not official. Some orthographies have not been provided here, for instance, the orthography that was used at Engela, which is believed to be similar to the one used by Turvey and Tobias (the Anglican missionaries who stayed at Onamunama and Odibo respectively in Oukwanyama) in their *English-Kwanyama Dictionary* (1954). There was also an Oshikwanyama orthography which was used at Oniipa somewhere around 1962.

In South West Africa (Namibia today) under South African administration, all Oshikwanyama reference materials were published in support of the Bantu education system, which was also dominating in Namibia by then. The first Oshikwanyama official orthography was produced in 1966. A few years later (in 1973), under the department of Bantu education of South Africa, the Oshikwanyama orthography number 2 was introduced and produced (Rosburgh, 1980). According to P. Hasheela (personal communication, April 14, 2020), Orthography 2 had many revisions, before Oshikwanyama Orthography 3, was produced. Furthermore, Halme (2004) confirms that the official Oshikwanyama orthography's latest version (Orthography 3) was introduced in 1985. There are no major changes that have been made to this official orthography since then. Although it was introduced, this Orthography 3 came into being when it was approved in 2004.

In Angola, the *Instituto de Linguas Nacionais*, an institute that was responsible for conducting research that has to do with national languages in Angola introduced Oshikwanyama orthography as part of a UNDP funded project. This institute's prime purpose was to establish six national languages' alphabets. The official Oshikwanyama orthography was then introduced by the team that was chosen by this institute (*Instituto de Linguas Nacionais*) in 1979, at Ondjiva, Cunene's

Province. The leading SWAPO of Namibia then represented Namibia. According to Halme (2004), the official orthography of Oshikwanyama in Angola was accepted at both national and international levels.

Oshikwanyama is used in different domains in Namibia in comparison with Angola. Therefore, it was of a great idea for these two countries (Angola and Namibia) to cooperate, so that the language issues could be clarified and discussed. It was then in 1996 at Okahandja in Namibia, when a workshop on cross-border languages was held. A common orthography for Oshikwanyama between these two countries was one of the major issues discussed in that workshop. It was an unfortunate workshop, as there was no agreement for using the same orthography. In other words, the members of the delegate, both from Angola and Namibia, did not reach an agreement at all in adapting to a common orthography of Oshikwanyama that would be used officially by these two countries (Legere, 1998).

One of the major problems the members of the workshop discussed was the Oshikwanyama writing system which was (and perhaps still is) not the same in these two countries, namely the disjunctive writing system as well as conjunctive writing system of the verbs. The Oshikwanyama in Namibia uses the disjunctive writing system while the Oshikwanyama in Angola uses the conjunctive writing system. According to F. Hilifavali (personal communication, June 28, 2020), due to the lack of publications in Angola, many books that are used in churches, especially the Holy Bible, are written disjunctively (as they are primarily imported from Namibia), therefore some churches use disjunctive writing. Even up to today, the issue of adapting to a common official orthography in these two countries remains officially unsolved.

The present official orthography in Namibia, as far as Oshikwanyama is concerned, is the way verbs are written disjunctively. This makes one write and read with some difficulties, especially when a particular someone did not study the language formally. It is argued by Halme (2004) that although the disjunctive writing system is very complicated, it is now well-established, in comparison with the conjunctive writing system which is used in Angola. Halme (2004) points out that a lot of mistakes are made by learners in Namibian schools due to the use of the disjunctive writing system. Halme (2004) provides one feature of the disjunctive writing of verbs. She articulates that the verb is not cut into pieces randomly. "The most closely related components are kept together, while the morphemes with looser ties to the stem are kept apart. For example, the derivational extensions are written conjunctively with the stem, whereas most inflectional morphemes preceding the stem are written disjunctively" (Halme, 2004, p. 9).

It is now 45 years ago when Cole (1975) argued against the foreign preconceptions in handling their official orthography. Cole (1975) discourages most Bantu languages from following the foreigners' writing systems and articulates that if Bantu languages aim to have a proper and satisfying analysis, all foreign preconceptions of following the foreign writing system should be discarded.

The foreign preconceptions are those of adopting the foreign writing system, which is the disjunctive writing system. The following sentence is written disjunctively "Eliaser ota li" ≈ Eliaser is eating. It is further suggested by Cole (1975) for Bantu languages to be examined by following a point of view of Bantu word structure. Therefore, it is discouraged to use a disjunctively writing system. The most preferred system for Bantu languages is the conjunctively writing system. This system requires all prefixal and suffixal formatives to be attached to the stem or roots, especially the verbal stem (Cole, 1975). The following sentence is written conjunctively, "Eliaser otali" ≈ Eliaser is eating. It can be seen that the verb *otali* consists of a pre-stem *ota-*, the radical *l-* and the suffix *-i*.

The conjunctive system has also been supported and adapted already by Rosburgh (1980). In his comprehensive study on Oshikwanyama, Rosburgh (1980, p. 132) presents the following examples:

Example 1: The conjunctive writing

Ohanditumifa meme omunyasha.
 "I asked (cause) mother to send the young man"
Okwevapitififa mo meumbo.
 "He makes them go out of the house"
Okwevakefifa po omuti.
 "He makes them chop down the tree"

It can be seen that the sentences provided in the example above are written conjunctively, as far as verbs are concerned. The verbs are written as *ohanditumififa*, *okwevapitififa*, and *okwevakefififa*. Disjunctively the verbs would have been written as follows: *ohandi tumififa*, *okwe va pitififa*, and *okwe va kefififa*. According to Rosburgh (1980), verbs do perform a predicative function in the sentence. They must incorporate at least a radical and a tense suffix, and may also have conjugational prefixes, concordial affixes, pre-suffixal extensions, and post-suffixal enclitics.

Literature review

This section deals with the two writing systems that are used in Bantu languages, namely conjunctive and disjunctive writing systems.

The disjunctive and conjunctive writing system of Bantu languages

Poulos and Louwrens (1994, p. 4) argue that "There are [the] numerous similarities that can be seen in the structure (i.e. morphology) as well as the syntax of words and word categories, in the various languages of this family." This simply means that the Bantu languages are naturally agglutinating because their prefixes, as well as suffixes, are used extensively in the formations of words.

In their articles, Taljard and Bosch (2006) have presented two languages in South Africa that use the two writing systems. These languages are the Northern Sotho, which uses the disjunctive writing system, and Zulu, which uses the conjunctive writing system. These languages are presented in the following example, as in Taljard and Bosch (2006, p. 433).

Example 2: The disjunctive and conjunctive writing systems of Northern Sotho and Zulu

	Orthographical representation	Morphological analysis				
N.S	ke a ba rata	ke	a	ba	rat-	-a
Z	ngiyabathanda	ngi-	-ya-	-ba-	-thand-	-a
	"I like them"	s.c. 1p.sg	PRES	o.c. cl 2	verb root	inflectional ending

With regard to Example 2, on orthography representation, the two languages have provided sentences that mean the same. Northern Sotho presents “Ke a ba rata” and Zulu presents “Ngiyabathanda”. These sentences are then given their translation equivalents in English as “I like them”. Three orthographic words in this English sentence “I like them” are observable. Each of these words is classified as a linguistic word and belongs to a different word category. This translation equivalent consists of three orthographic words, each of which is also a linguistic word, belonging to a different word category.

It can be observed that the Zulu language follows a conjunctive writing system. One orthographic word that corresponds to one linguistic word is observed in the Zulu language, and this word is “Ngiyabathanda.” In Zulu, the word “ngiyabathanda” is classified as a verb. Therefore, the orthographic item “ngiyabathanda” is a linguistic word that belongs to a particular word category. It is then worth pointing out that this correspondence between orthographic and linguistic words is a characteristic feature of Zulu, which then differentiates it from Northern Sotho (Taljard & Bosch, 2006).

When it comes to the Northern Sotho which writes disjunctively, just like the Oshikwanyama that is used in Namibia, one can see four separate orthographic words that make up one linguistic word, which is a verb. These orthographic words are: *ke*, *a*, *ba* and *rata*. Although one can call these morphemes as words, this study believes that these are not words at all, but they are just morphemes. It seems like there is a misunderstanding of the term “word”, because for the word to qualify as a word it should follow the following structure: it should make sense when it stands on its own, and it can change its position in a sentence, and the sentence can still make sense (Mbenzi, n.d.). Therefore, this study believes that the sentence “*ke a ba rata*” does not consist of four words, but rather four morphemes. It can be concluded here that the Northern Sotho in South Africa, regards morphemes as words as seen in English. What can also be concluded here is that there is no way for English to be compared to Northern Sotho, as they are not from the same family of languages. English is an Indo-European Language, while Northern Sotho is a Niger-Congo family. Therefore, these two languages have different language features.

According to Taljard and Bosch (2006), there are various reasons for following these two different writing systems by these two languages. One of the main reasons is presented below:

The reason is based partly on historical and partly on phonological considerations. When Northern Sotho and Zulu were first put to writing, mainly by missionaries in the second half of the nineteenth century, they intuitively opted for disjunctivism when writing Northern Sotho and conjunctivism when writing Zulu. Thus, an orthographic tradition was initiated that prevails even today (p. 433).

This simply means that these languages use a different writing system, because of the missionaries that started writing first in these languages. The missionaries that first wrote in the Northern Sotho wrote disjunctively. As a result, this system is still maintained today. This is the same as Zulu. The conjunctive writing system was adhered to due to the missionaries who wrote first in this language.

In addition, Taljard and Bosch (2006,) comment as follows:

... the decision to adopt either a conjunctive or a disjunctive writing system was probably guided by an underlying realisation that the phonological systems of the two languages necessitated different orthographical systems (p. 434).

Taljard and Bosch (2006) add that phonological processes presence such as, among others, vowel elision, vowel coalescence and consonantalization in Zulu makes a disjunctive writing system practically impossible and linguistically implausible. The sentence *Wayesezofika ekhaya* is a good example.

The disjunctive representation of the sentence *Wayesezofika ekhaya* ≈ 'He would have arrived at home' as *W a ye s' e zo fika ekhaya* is quite not possible to either read or pronounce. In the case of Northern Sotho, it is confirmed that these processes of phonology are much less prevalent, and in addition to that, the majority of morphemes are syllabic and therefore do not pose any problems for disjunctive writing (Taljard & Bosch, 2006).

In their article entitled "Towards an 11 x 11 Array for the Degree of Conjunctivism/Disjunctivism of the South African Languages", Prinsloo and De Schryver (2002) support the disjunctive way of writing when it comes to some Bantu languages, including the Sotho languages such as Sepedi. This way of writing these languages pose a few problems because most formatives constitute syllables, and they can be written disjunctively. Another reason why the languages are in favour of the disjunctive writing system is that the Sotho languages do lack some semi-vowels between the syllables, which are made up of the vowel only. Therefore, if these languages could follow the conjunctive writing system, the reading and the pronunciation of words would have been a problem.

In their final say on the disjunctive and conjunctive writing systems that are adopted differently in South African languages, Prinsloo and De Schryver (2002) give the following judgement:

...It was first indicated that these two opposite writing traditions are primarily a matter of convention and that one should not be considered more scientific than the other. Examples clearly illustrated that it is possible to simulate a conjunctive way of writing for disjunctively-written languages and vice versa... (p. 263)

The conclusion made by Prinsloo and De Schryver (2002) focuses only on the languages that are spoken within South Africa. In this context, Prinsloo and De Schryver's conclusions cannot justify the situation that prevails in Oshikwanyama, because it (Oshikwanyama) is spoken in two countries, and these two countries have adapted it differently when it comes to writing, especially the writing of verbs. For language development purposes of this cross-border language, an agreement should be arrived at, by either following only the disjunctively writing method or conjunctively writing method, although linguists such as Cole (1975) and Halme (2004) are in favour of the conjunctive writing method, it can also be agreed for the disjunctive writing system be accepted with some modifications, provided that both countries can be satisfied with the agreed modifications. Numerous publications have already been written disjunctively. Therefore, it is best if the two nations agree to adopt to the disjunctive system, although it does not follow the Bantu writing system as Cole (1975) establish.

Methodology

This study employed a qualitative research approach in nature and adapts philological methods in analysing the sources that were written by different scholars on the writing systems of Bantu languages. Particular attention is given to Oshikwanyama writing systems. Cell phone conversations were also conducted to get information from relevant people from both Namibia and Angola about the statuses of disjunctive and conjunctive writing systems in both countries. The population is all the sources that deal with the Bantu writing systems. Purposive sampling was used in this study, to sample only the relevant sources for a thorough analysis and scrutiny.

Examples from Oshikwanyama

The following examples are written disjunctively, in terms of the verb. The italicised sentences are in Oshikwanyama and the translation equivalents are in English.

- (a) *Ohatu ka teya mongula.* ≈ We will harvest tomorrow.
- (b) *Hano ove oto ka lilila shike ngeenge oto ka kala wa wanifa?* ≈ Why would you be crying if you will be satisfied?
- (c) *Efeni ounona ve uye kuame.* ≈ Let the children come to me.
- (d) *Kanana naNghikongwa otava yoo.* ≈ Kanana and Nghikongwa are swimming.
- (e) *Onda penduka ongula handi limemsha.* ≈ I woke up smiling in the morning.

Example 3: The Oshikwanyama disjunctive writing system

In the examples provided in Example 3, it can be seen that the verbs are written disjunctively from their prestems, a case which is adapted by the Namibian Oshikwanyama. This means that all the morphemes are not attached, the idea that was copied from English. In sentence (a), the concord *ohatu* (*o* = positive marker, *ha* = habitual tense and *tu* = subject marker) is separated from the future tense marker *ka*, and the future tense marker is separated from the verbal stem *teya* (*tey-* radical, *-a*= suffix). In the conjunctive writing, these morphemes would have been written together, as they all form parts of the verb. The only word that should have been written separately in Sentence (a) is the adverb *mongula*, because it belongs to another class or word category.

In (b) the adverb *hano* is presented correctly. The second word *ove* is also presented correctly, because it is a personal pronoun, *oto* which is the concord (*o*= positive marker, *to* = subject concord), which has a pronominal function, referring to the deleted subject, *ka* as the future tense marker, and *lilila* as the verbal root, should have been written together, but all these morphemes have been split. *Shike* and *ngeenge* are correctly presented, but again *oto*, *ka*, *kala*, *wa* and *wanifa* are written disjunctively. This is due to the reason that the whole sentence is written disjunctively.

Let's have a look at the following sentence. But, emphasis is given to the presentation of the verb which is written conjunctively (Rosburgh, 1980, p. 107):

Example 4: Morphological analysis of the verb written conjunctively

Ohandikutalele oinima ei	"I am minding these things for you"
o-	: tense prefix
ha-	: present tense prefix
ndi-	: subject prefix
ku-	: object prefix
-tal-	: verb radical "watch"
-el	: pre-suffixal extension (applied)
-e	: present tense suffix

Although Rosburgh (1980) has used archaic terms, his analysis on the verb parts is still applicable today. The sentence *Ohandikutalele oinima ei* with its translation equivalents in English "I am minding these things for you" has a verb *ohandikutalele*, in which all the verb prefixes are attached to the verb root or radical as provided in the sentence. The verb and its prefixes and suffixes are then analysed morphologically, as provided in *Example 4*. It can be observed that the first *o-* is a positive tense marker, *ha-* as a present tense marker, *ndi-* as a subject marker, *ku-* as an object

marker, *-tal-* as a verbal root or verb radical marker, *-el* as a pre-suffixal extension marker, which is called an applied extension, and *-e*, the present tense suffix marker.

Scholars such as Cole (1975), Shikesho (2019), and P. Mbenzi (personal communication, April 28, 2020) are in favour of the conjunctive writing system and suggest the Bantu languages to follow their structure of writing verbs. Regarding Example 4 above, the verbs are written conjunctively in all the three remaining sentences. Therefore, the above sentences should have been written conjunctively as follows, following the Bantu rule of writing verbs:

Example 5: The conjunctive writing of verbs in Oshikwanyama

- (a) *Ohatukateya mongula*. ≈ We will harvest tomorrow.
- (b) *Hano ove otokalilila shike ngeenge otokakala wawanifa?* ≈ Why would you be crying if you will be satisfied?
- (c) *Efeni ounona veuye kuame*. ≈ Let the children come to me.
- (d) *Kanana naNghikongwa otavayoo*. ≈ Kanana and Nghikongwa are swimming.
- (e) *Ondapenduka ongula handilimemesha*. ≈ I woke up in the morning smiling.

If one takes a closer look at the sentences in Example 5, it can be seen that the morphemes that form up the verb are attached. In sentence (a), two parts of speech are observed. The verb, *ohatukateya*, and the adverb, *mongula*. This is how the verb is presented in the remaining four sentences. So this way of writing verbs does not only make it easier for learners and students in school, but also to someone who has not studied the language in detail.

Both conjunctive and disjunctive the writing systems are not completely different; there is an overlap between these two. The only difference that prevails here is on the writing of verbs. The other forms of words such as nouns, adjectives, demonstratives, adverbs, etc., are written the same. Rosburgh (1980) writes the following:

In the official orthography, the substantive form classes are written conjunctively, whereas distinctive word division is applied to predicatives where various prefixal elements are considered to be separate words. Thus, there appears to be an element of arbitrariness in the separation of prefixal elements in the latter case (p. 249).

In his statement, Rosburgh (1980) was referring to official Orthography 2 which was published under Bantu Education in 1973. In this orthography, many forms of words are written conjunctively, while disjunctive writing system is applied to predicates in which verbs are also included, as they are part of predicates. In this case, different morphemes are written separately and are regarded as separate words.

The way forward, recommendations and challenges

Since Oshikwanyama is used in public schools in both countries, Namibia and Angola, learning materials such as textbooks, lexicographical works (for instance, dictionaries), and many others need to be shared. Numerous public activities are conducted in Oshikwanyama in these two countries; therefore, a common orthography needs to be established and used by both countries. This study then suggests all lawmakers, language committees, examination officials, curriculum developers and designers, lectures at universities, selected learners' parents, senior education officials, teachers, members of the media, teachers, and education ministers in these two countries should meet and discuss seriously the issue of adapting to a common Oshikwanyama orthography.

Furthermore, the common orthography should then consist of the conjunctive writing system of verbs, because it follows the correct Bantu languages structure as adopted by many Bantu languages. This system does not follow many Indo-European languages structure, particularly English, which follows the disjunctive writing system. Since numerous publications have already been written disjunctively, it can be accepted, provided that modifications have been established to suit both two countries. This writing can also be modified as the language is growing every day. So, it will be at the stakeholders' discretion in agreeing to what should be included and be ignored in the proposed Oshikwanyama official Orthography 4.

This study suggests for Oshikwanyama to adapt to the common orthography between these two countries. Workshops and meetings should be re-organised between these two nations so that this long-term issue of adapting to a common orthography can be adequately canvassed for finality. Oshikwanyama needs to be developed further, not only by one country but by both countries.

Implementing a disjunctive system with modifications is not an easy task. In arriving at this stage, serious work needs to be done. Let's make Oshikwanyama a well-developed (cross-border) language, and perhaps in the near future to come it will be one of the official languages in both Namibia and Angola. A good example is taken from South Africa, Namibia's neighbouring country. South Africa consists of eleven official languages. How did it happen? If South Africans made it happen, why can't we do the same? This also reminds the readers of this salient study the idea of promoting multilingualism. One does not only need to learn one or two languages, but he or she can learn more than two languages. Let us have our Oshikwanyama a known and learnt language, not only by people in Namibia and Angola, but by everyone from all the other parts of the globe. By this way, Oshikwanyama will never extinct, and future generations will appreciate it.

Conclusion

This study discussed the two writing systems that are adhered to in Oshikwanyama in the two countries, Namibia and Angola. Particular attention was given to the writing of verbs. The issues that prevail between these two writing systems and in Oshikwanyama, in general, have been discussed. It has been found that if Oshikwanyama language is to be developed further by these two countries, then there should only be a common writing system to be adhered to, in terms of writing verbs. This study then suggests the disjunctively writing system (with some modifications that would be agreed to by the two countries) as it has been adopted and frequently used in the past 40 years, and it has been used in many Oshikwanyama publications. By using a common writing system, Oshikwanyama in these two countries will be developed further, and learning materials will be shared unreservedly. Oshikwanyama lexicographers from Namibia and Angola will also be able to work together in compiling dictionaries of higher quality, and plenty of resources, such as books, newspapers, and many others will be shared among the Oshikwanyama speaking people of these two countries.

References

- Brincker, P. M. (1891). *Lehrbuch des Oshikuanjama*. Berlin: W. Spemann.
- Brock-Utne, B. (2000). *Whose education for all?: The recolonization of African mind*. New York: Falmer Press.
- Cole, D. T. (1975). *An introduction to Tswana grammar*. Cape Town: Longman Penguin.
- Department of Education. (1973). *Kwanyama orthography no. 2*. Windhoek: John Meinert.
- Halme, R. (2004). *A tonal grammar of Kwanyama*. Cologne: Rudiger Koppe Verlag.
- Legere, K. (1998) (ed.). Crossborder languages. Reports and Studies. *Regional Workshop*. Cross Border Languages, NIED, Okahandja. 23–27 September 1996.

- Ndanyakukwa, C. (2016). *Dicionário de nomes em Oshikwanyama*. Luanda: Mayamba Editora.
- Ngodji, M. (2004). *The history of the bible among Ovakwanyama: The agency of Indigenous Translators* (Unpublished Master's Thesis). University of KwaZul-Natal, Pietermaritzburg, South Africa.
- Poulos, G., & Louwrens, L. J. (1994). *A linguistic analysis of northern Sotho*. Pretoria: Via Afrika Limited.
- Prinsloo, D. J., & De Schryver, D. (2002). Towards an 11 x 11 Array for the Degree of Conjunctivism/Disjunctivism of the South African Languages. *Nordic Journal of African Studies*, 11(2), 249–265.
- Roxburgh, J. A. (1980). *Segmental phonology and morphology in Kwanyama* (Unpublished Master's thesis). University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa.
- Shifidi, L. N. (2014). *Integration of translanguaging in lessons: An approach to teaching and learning in Namibian junior secondary schools* (Unpublished Master's Thesis), Hedmark University College, Norway.
- Shikesho, E. (2019). *A critical evaluation of English-Kwanyama Dictionary* (Unpublished Master's Thesis). University of Namibia, Windhoek, Namibia.
- Taljard, E., & Bosch, S. E. (2006). A Comparison of approaches to word class tagging: disjunctively vs. conjunctively written Bantu languages. *Nordic Journal of African Studies*, 15(4), 428–442.
- Tobias, G. W. R., & Turvey, B. H. C. (1954). *English-Kwanyama dictionary*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.