

Authority in Language:
The Role of the Chichewa Board (1972–1995)
in Prescription and Standardization of Chichewa

KISHINDO, Pascal J.
University of Malawi

Language prescription has had a long tradition in the West especially France. In medieval Europe institutions were set up to legislate the ‘correct’ usage of language and codify these legislations in handbooks. This task was not the preserve of institutions alone, individuals also set themselves up as self-styled experts in this domain. These individuals usually plied their trade in newspapers and magazines. The urge to prescribe was not peculiar to Western countries. African countries have also seen the need to prescribe the correct usage of their languages. This has been more urgent in those countries where African languages have been given official status, for example, use in education. The need to prescribe has been seriously felt in the domain of orthography. The desire to standardize the orthography has, therefore, been paramount. This paper discusses the attempts made by the Chichewa Board to prescribe the correct usage of Chichewa and to standardize its orthography. Chichewa is the national language of Malawi but it is also spoken in Zambia, Zimbabwe and Mozambique where it is known as Chinyanja. The paper examines the dominant role played by Dr. Hastings Kamuzu Banda, Malawi’s first President and founder of the Chichewa Board, in its affairs. The strategies that the Board employed to ensure that standardization is achieved are discussed. Finally the Board’s achievements are assessed.

Introduction
Historical Precedence
Dr. H. Kamuzu Banda and Chichewa
The Chichewa Board: a Synopsis
Functions of the Board
Prescription in Practice
Modernization of Chichewa
Evaluation
Conclusion

Keywords: Language prescription, language planning, lexicography, orthography, standardization

It has come to our notice that the public at large regards the Board as a superior Body in matters concerning Chichewa as a national language. They therefore, expect to get answers to their questions about Chichewa written or spoken from the Board.

Secretary, Chichewa Board.

Introduction

Prescription, according to Milroy and Milroy (1984, p.1), depends on ideology (or a set of beliefs) regarding language which requires that language use as in other matters such as car driving things shall be done in the right way. However, language unlike car driving is a much more complex phenomenon. Besides it is a much more fundamental aspect of human experience. Whereas driving rules are codified in highway codes, "correct" use of language is codified in handbooks of usage. It is likely that all speakers of Chichewa and possibly speakers of most languages have a number of definite opinions as to what is "correct" or "incorrect" in the language they use. Nevertheless, they may often look to 'expert' opinions rather than to their own knowledge of language, or in Chomskyan terms, competence, to make a decision. In the English tradition there are individuals who set themselves up as experts on English language usage. These individuals usually write for newspapers or magazines. These language amateur/enthusiasts have rather unflatteringly been called language shamans (Bolinger 1980) or language mavens (Pinker 1994). As regards Chichewa, the national language of Malawi, people looked up to the shamans at the Chichewa Board for guidance on language usage.

Language being such a complex phenomenon, it is not easy to separate the nature of language prescription (i.e. imposition of norms of usage by authority) from a number of related issues, such as standardization of language. These are ordinarily interwoven. In this paper I shall explore the role of the Chichewa Board, the then language authority in Malawi, in imposing norms of usage and standardization of Chichewa. The paper will, among other things, discuss the influence of Dr. Hastings Kamuzu Banda on the Board's affairs and the strategies the Board employed to ensure standardization of Chichewa. Finally the Board's successes and failures will be assessed.

Historical Precedence

The sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were remarkable for a concern with language standards. Closely connected to the efforts of individual philologists, both amateur and professional, were those of formal institutions. The Italian experience set the scene for others. The first body devoted to language was the Academia Della Crusca of Florence, founded in 1572. Its first major task was the purification and codification of the Italian grammar and dictionary. The first never appeared, but the dictionary was published in Venice in 1612 (Edwards 1994, p.156).

The academia continues to work on lexicography to the present.

Similar interest groups existed in France, one of which was the Pleiade in the Sixteenth century, and another led by Marie de Gournay in the Seventeenth century. Since officialdom regarded such groupings as potentially troublesome, it moved to control them by bestowing recognition. Thus, for example cardinal Richelieu converted the gathering of Valentin Conrart (1603–75) into the Academie Francaise. The main concern of the Academie was to reinforce its conception of “clarity”, “simplicity” and “good taste”. The so-called forty “immortals” of the Academy were given “absolute power over language and literature”, although only two men trained in lexicography have ever been members (Edwards 1994, p.156). Most members of the Academie were drawn from the church, nobility or military. These institutions would at least historically, have been inheritors of the best of French and the obvious arbiters of linguistic taste. In modern times, the Academie is best known for its attempts of trying to keep the French language free of foreign loans especially English ones. And also to create, where necessary, French terms for the products and processes of science and technology. The Academie has thus acquired a modernization function to supplement the original purifying objective.

With the same objectives as the Academie Francaise and much influenced by it, was the Real Academia Espanola founded in 1713 by the Bourbon king Philip V. Its royal motto, *Limpia, fija y da esplendor* emphasizes once more the desire to clarify, purify and glorify language. The Spanish academy produced a dictionary in 1730 and a grammar in 1771. The work of the Spanish academy is generally considered better than that of the Italian Academy and Academy Francaise.

In the English speaking world there hasn't been anything similar to the European tradition in terms of formal institutions. Quirk (1982, pp.67–68) has ascribed this to the Englishman's aversion to “linguistic engineering” of any sort. This, however, does not mean that the prescriptive urge is not there. The job of prescription has been left to teachers, publishers and individuals (See Milroy and Milroy 1985; Pinker 1994 and Edwards 1994).

Although the Chichewa Board had inherited the idea of its role in society from these European institutions, it looked up to the Kiswahili Institute of Research set up at the University College, Dar-es-salaam in Tanzania in 1964 as its model. The Institute was a metamorphosis of the East African Swahili Committee which had been established in 1930. This body, despite current efforts to play down its achievements, contributed greatly to the fact that by independence Swahili had had a standard orthography for more than a quarter of a century, had a fair number of grammars and dictionaries, and by African standards, a substantial body of written texts of one kind or another (Whiteley 1973). Similarly, the Association for the Advancement of Swahili (Jumiya ya Kustawisha Kiswahili) though re-founded in 1963, was in effect a continuation of a society set up in Tanga during the nineteen fifties with the aim, essentially, of rehabilitating Swahili from the rather inferior position it occupied to English.

The Kiswahili Institute of Research has continued work on new Swahili dictionaries, and periodically produces lists of words for official use. Other organizations, such as Radio Tanzania, have been appointed as an "observer" to keep an eye open for misuse and make corrections wherever and whenever possible. The Ministry of National Education, too, has an Inspector of Swahili who not only supervises work in the schools but initiates projects in the preparations of school texts (Whiteley 1973).

In a nutshell one may say that purification from English influences is one of the major objectives here, e.g. reducing code-switching, excessive use of loans and what are held to be Anglicisms in syntax and colloquialism (Whiteley 1973, p.19). More positively the use of words from other Bantu languages is encouraged. A model of written Swahili was provided by the journal of *Lugha Yetu* (Our Language) which was intended to serve as "good example of correct Swahili usage" (Whiteley 1973, p.20).

Dr. H. Kamuzu Banda and Chichewa

One cannot truly appreciate the workings of the Chichewa Board without understanding the towering authoritarian figure of Dr Hastings Kamuzu Banda, the first president of Malawi, the so-called Life President and the founder of the Chichewa Board. The story of Chichewa Board is the story of Dr Banda's interest in language. Dr Banda's interest in Chichewa can be traced back to his student days at the University of Chicago where he acted as an informant to Mark Hanna Watkins, an African-American scholar who was preparing a thesis on Chichewa, Banda's own mother tongue. At this stage Banda was an up-coming scholar who enjoyed the patronage and support of Professor Edward Sapir, a leading anthropological linguist who had an abiding interest in the development of African studies (Phiri 1995, p.2). In regard to his association with Dr Banda, Watkins (1937, p.7) observes:

All the information was obtained from Kamuzu Banda, a native Chewa, while he was in attendance at the University of Chicago, from 1930-1932. Some of it, however, consists of letters which he received from home and kindly permitted me to study. He read the letters and aided with the translation. A portion of the material utilised in the revision was also obtained from him during 'spare moments' since 1932. Mr. Banda was a very excellent informant and without his cooperation this study would contain more defects than it does.

On the eve of the outbreak of the Second World War, Dr. Banda found himself in the company of his relation, Native Authority S. C. Mwase of Kasungu who the School of Oriental Studies (now School of Oriental and African Studies) of the University of London had invited to act as a Chichewa informant. With regard to this visit, a Dr. Bargery and a Cullen Young had previously arranged with the Colonial Office that Dr.

Banda should live with the Chief during the early days of his stay in England and show him around in return for a grant offered him for his medical studies. But beyond showing Chief Mwase around:

(...) during the early part of the research Dr. Banda often accompanied the Chief and helped me explain the various phonetic and grammatical points I wished to investigate.¹⁾

It could be argued that the period that Banda was a student was quite instrumental in the development of his views on language. One can discern the origins of his passion, at a later date, for the correct usage of Chichewa, and its development.

It was not surprising that when he became the President of Malawi, the party he led, the Malawi Congress Party, at its annual convention in 1968 endorsed his views of making Chichewa the national language in the interest of national unity. The delegates recommended that:

- i. Malawi adopt Chinyanja as a national language;
- ii. That the name Chinyanja (should) henceforth be known as Chichewa;
- iii. That Chichewa and English (should) be the official languages of the state of Malawi and that all other languages would continue to be used in private life in their respective homes.²⁾

The reason for change of name from Chinyanja to Chichewa have been discussed in a number of works (Kishindo 1990, 1998; Mchombo nd). A number of scholars have been critical of the move to nationalize Chichewa because it apparently was done without adequate consultation and it suppressed “smaller” languages such as Chitumbuka and Chiyao (See Kishindo 1996, 1998; Phiri 1997 among others). The point these scholars seem to miss is that language planning is far from straightforward. The work of linguists is certainly important requiring a great deal of skill, but they should not delude themselves that they are the prime movers in this exercise. The job of selecting languages for use at the national level does not occur in isolation, it is part of social engineering. Scholars should acknowledge the radically different magnitude between their contribution and that of the real planners — politicians, administrators and above all rulers. Also, it is abundantly clear that language planning, especially selection and implementation is not value-free; it is, in fact, a heavily value-laden exercise. It is subservient to the demands of non-academic interests with social and political agendas. Certainly any disinterested theorizing becomes compromised in practice. Language planning in 1968 in Malawi, just as elsewhere, was inevitably coloured by ideological imperatives — and the driving imperative was nation building.

1) See Guy Atkins, “Chinyanja Linguistic Research, General Report of Chief S.C. Mwase’s visit to England,” August 15, 1939 to February 10, 1940, Malawi National Archives File No.526/8/1/1.

2) See Malawi Congress Party, Annual Convention Resolutions 1965–1985, p.6.

So, what may have appeared as progress to some was seen as persecution to others. Language planning after all is prescriptivism.

It is common knowledge that the Banda years (1964–1994) were in linguistic matters and otherwise years of authoritarianism and prescriptivism.³⁾ During that period much of the work of codifying and standardizing Chichewa was carried out by the Chichewa Board. It was the engine that drove the standardization process of Chichewa. It is, however, doubtful whether without Dr. Banda language planning would follow the path it did between 1968 and 1995 as the Board acknowledges:

The Board noted with keen interest and profound gratitude that the return of His Excellency the Life President, Ngwazi Dr. Banda, in 1958 marked the start of the real concern with the development of Chichewa leading to the establishment of the Chichewa Board in 1972, as well as the Chichewa Working Group.⁴⁾ [Emphasis in original]

It was not surprising therefore that he was believed to be the ultimate authority on Chichewa matters. Hence unofficially he was referred to as the “Honorary Professor of Chichewa.”

The Chichewa Board: a Synopsis

The Chichewa Board was established early 1972 when the then President, Dr. Banda directed its formation. But before the Board was formed there was a Chichewa Research Committee appointed and financed by the President which began work in 1970. The Committee which consisted of three members⁵⁾ was concerned with collecting Chichewa words from every Chichewa speaking district in preparation for compilation of a National Dictionary of the Chichewa Language. It was based in Lilongwe and operated under the auspices of the Ministry of Education. Every month the committee produced a list of words with their meanings, a copy of which was always submitted to the President.⁶⁾

With fervent desire to get the Dictionary produced in a reasonable short span of time Dr. Banda stepped in personally and appointed a special group known as the Chichewa Working Group⁷⁾ under his own chairmanship to tackle the more difficult tasks connected with the preparations for the Dictionary compilation. The Research Committee was eventually absorbed by the Working Group. The Chichewa Working

3) The more glaring ones were legislations on dress, expression and censorship of the Arts.

4) See Minute 6/80 of the Meeting of the Chichewa Board held in the Conference Room of the MCE Board in Zomba on the 7th August, 1980. Ref. No.BM/2/2/5.

5) The committee members were S.J. Nthara, B. Mbuka Banda, (both retired teachers) and W. Chakwera (politician).

6) See “A Brief History of the Chichewa Board (1970–1977).” Circular Ref No.ADM/1/40.

7) See “A Brief History of the Chichewa Board (1970–1977).” Circular Ref No.ADM/1/40.

Group, as the name implies, was a working force and as such it had to serve under the supervision of a Board hence the Chichewa Board⁸⁾ was also appointed by Dr. Banda. The Board began its work in 1972.

The Board, however, found itself confronted with two immediate problems: (a) lack of universally acceptable grammatical terminology and (b) [lack] of universally acceptable orthography of Chichewa.⁹⁾ The latter was quickly resolved. A number of consultations were held on orthographic matters and a draft orthography was produced. The draft Orthography Rules were approved by Dr. Banda as New Chichewa Orthography Rules (1973).

In the same year 1973, Dr. Banda ordered that the Chichewa Working Group should take over Chichewa coordination from the Malawi Broadcasting Corporation (MBC).

In 1977 the Board was declared a statutory Board. Throughout its life the Board was very conscious of the overwhelming presence of its founder as it will become clear subsequently.

Functions of the Board

The stated functions of the Board were:

- i. to provide the national dictionary of the Chichewa language,
- ii. to provide Chichewa orthography rules, and
- iii. develop the Chichewa language.¹⁰⁾

In addition to the above named functions, the Chichewa Working Group was responsible for coordination of Chichewa in the country. Although this function was not very well defined, the coordination of Chichewa included:

- i. checking Chichewa language and spelling in newspapers and magazines and other publications;
- ii. advising the MBC on Chichewa usage and
- iii. interpreting the Chichewa orthography.¹¹⁾

And as part of the standardizing efforts, the Board

- i. answer[ed] letters on “Tiphunzitsane Chichewa” on MBC;
- ii. correcte[d] spoken Chichewa on “Tiphunzitsane Chichewa” on MBC;
- iii. vet[ted] Chichewa materials e.g. books, papers and pamphlets; and

8) The first Board comprised politicians who were also Members of Parliament as well as cabinet ministers: J.D. Msonthi (Chairman), A.E. Gadama, P.L. Makhumula Nkhoma and A.M. Nyasulu.

9) See “Brief History...” The second claim though is rather curious because orthographic rules existed and they were published as the Publication Circular No.3. The Chairman of the Board acknowledges the existence of these rules in the Introduction to the 1973 Rules.

10) See “Chichewa Board 1984 Malawi Convention Exhibition Flier”, Ref No.CD/4/25/104.

11) See “Chichewa Board 1984 Malawi Convention Exhibition Flier”, Ref No.CD/4/25/104.

iv. translate[d] English materials into Chichewa.¹²⁾

From the functions of the Board mentioned above, it is clear that it was a prescriptive institution in the tradition of the medieval academies of Italy, France and Spain. In the following sections we examine the strategies the Board adopted to achieve its goals of standardization and Chichewa.

Prescription in Practice

Orthography

Although it is not acknowledged anywhere in the records of the Chichewa Board, their work in orthography was just a continuation of similar work done during the colonial period (Kishindo 1990). For example, a colonial orthographic committee was formed and two meetings were held: one in 1931, and the other in 1932. At the 1931 meeting, members of the orthography committee made several recommendations that were submitted to the language Board of that time. In 1945 the committee's proceedings were taken over by the Phelps-Stoke Commission.¹³⁾ The committee reconvened two years later at the invitation of the Central African Publications Bureau. The meeting involved members from Northern and Southern Rhodesia and Nyasaland bureaux. In 1953 the Federal Government (of the Rhodesias and Nyasaland) decreed that all languages with substantial number of speakers should be standardized. This decree led to a number of languages being broadcast on the radio. However, due to the state of emergency declared in 1959, which precipitated the disintegration of the Federal government, the activities of the orthography committee were interrupted. In 1963, the Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland Publications Bureaux split. Subsequently, the Nyasaland Bureau was absorbed into the Ministry of Education.

It is not surprising, therefore, that when Dr. Banda initiated the Chichewa Research Committee it operated under the aegis of the Ministry of Education. Vernacular language matters had always been the concern of the said Ministry.

The Chichewa Board's own rules appeared in 1973 as New Chichewa Orthography. In the new rules it is very clear that the recommendations made by various scholars (Atkins 1950; Young 1949) on the orthography rules of 1931, and the 1947 agreement of the inter-territorial language reform conference were ignored. Below some of the more problematic rules will be discussed. Consider Rule 2 of 1973 which says:

- i. l should be used after a, o, u, and r should be used after e and i
- ii. at the beginning of a word only l and not r be used;
- iii. when a prefix precedes a word which in another form would be written with l-, l does not change to r.

12) See "Chichewa Board 1984 Malawi Convention Exhibition fliers," Ref No.CD/4/25/104.

13) This was a charitable organization whose mandate was to assess the state of education in English-speaking Africa.

- iv. nouns of the Mu-/Mi- class starting in ml- should be written with -l- in plural as well;
- v. all stems should be written with -l- even if the prefix contains i.
- vi. l should be used consistently in the emphatic pronoun ilo (in the singular of the Li-/Ma- class) and in the demonstratives ili and ilo (singular Li-/Ma-class).

In this rule the sub-rules are apparently posited to ensure consistency. However, in practice, these rules do not seem to be used consistently at all. As Mtenje (1980) points out, the boundaries of specification as to when to use them are subject to constant variation sometimes determined by the user's dialectal influence. The source of the problem, Mtenje claims, is that what is thought to be an r sound is actually a velarized lateral (l) which occurs before back vowels. And like Atkins before him, Mtenje advocates the abandonment of the use of r in the Chichewa orthography. It would appear therefore, that what may be called a pseudo-choice between l and r occurs because of the historical mistake that Chichewa has r as a sound and by implications as a symbol in the orthography.¹⁴⁾

The 1973 rules also reopened the debate on c and ch which was controversial when it was first suggested in 1931, and a more curious rule is provided as Rule 14:

- i. when h is in combination with c there is no aspiration, e.g. Chala not cala, chulu not culu.
- ii. when aspiration is expected in a word beginning with ch- then t should be prefixed to the word, e.g. tchinga not cinga
- iii. likewise where nch- or mch- appear t should be inserted between n and c or between m and c e.g. ntchito, ntchira.

Here again Atkins (1950) suggestion was not heeded. The rule also goes against the recommendation of Niamey Conference on African Language transcription that h should represent aspiration (see UNESCO 1978). One may question why kh, ph, and th are aspirated in Chichewa and not ch? The point is that the introduction of t as a marker of aspiration in tch eliminates c as an orthographic symbol in Chichewa. At the same time it increases the number of symbols representing the sound /č/, from one to two. The new rule lacks consistency and also advocates a proliferation of symbols. This is at odds with the need for clarity and simplicity advocated by the African Reference Alphabet (UNESCO 1978). Young's (1949) comment that there is "neither logic nor linguistic expediency discoverable behind such a rule" still holds today.

Apart from reopening old vexed problems, the 1973 rules also introduced a new symbol, w, to represent the bilabial fricative /β/. This symbol is used to contrast with

14) Evidence shows that there are no roots in Chichewa beginning with /r/. For a detailed review of this issue see Young (1949) and Kishindo (1990) and Mtenje (1980).

the semi-vowel w. This is represented as Rule 15 which states:

- i. -ŵ may be used interchangeably with the Mu/A- class as Mu/Ŵa e.g. munthu - ŵanthu
- ii. to differentiate between 'split' - kuŵaza and 'sprinkle' - kuwaza;
- iii. it should be used in all words pronounced as the following list (A list follows).

A similar observation about the existence of the bilabial fricative /β/ in some Chichewa dialects was made by Atkins (1950) but he hastened to point out that there was not enough literature to warrant its introduction. The use of ŵ, like l/r is also highly inconsistent. Apart from the clear cases such as the example given in the sub rule (ii), where ŵ is indeed a phoneme, one cannot predict where else it is used. Listing words which use ŵ as the rule does, does not help either. It is doubtful whether the majority of Chichewa speakers have /β/ in their phoneme inventory.

Another rule introduced in 1973 was Rule 6 which was supposed to standardize the use of the semi-vowels w and y. The rule states:

- (a) Write -w- in all adjectives formed from verbs in the singular of Mu-A, Mu-Mi classes and the emphatic and demonstrative pronouns and whenever the -w- sound is heard in speech sound, as in the following cases:

Chiwongo
 Kuwononga
 Msewu
 Mbewu
 Ndiwo

Exceptions

(oo)	(uu)
kufooka	kuuza
kuboola	kuusa
kubooka	kuungulumwa

Also where -w- stand in between consonants, followed by -aku- (infix), the semi-vowel (w) is elided and replaced by its contracted form "o" e.g.

kwakugona	kogona
ndi wodwala	ngodwala
mwakuipa	moipa

But

munthu wodala
 mudzi woipa
 Emphatic pronoun iwo 'they'

Ndiwo (ndi iwo)

Demonstrative pronouns awo, omwewo. The third person, plural possessive stem.

- (b) W is written in all root-words where the sound is at all recognized, i.e. before a, e and i:

e.g. kuwanda

kuwira

kusowa

usiwa

- (c) Y is written in all root-words where the sound is at all recognized and in all derivatives:

e.g. siya - siyira

- (d) In verb stems with a and e in the first syllable, w or y always to be written

e.g. kuwanda

kuwamba

kuwala

kuyenda

kuyamba

kuyera

- (e) Y not to be written initially in root-words before -i-, neither in their derivatives

e.g. imfa

imvi

kuimba

kuima

kuika

- (f) The object concord in the plural of the Mu-A, LI-MA and U-MA classes is to be written either as -wa- or -a-

e.g. timawaona timaaona

timawapha tinaapha

adzawauza adzaauza

- (g) The object concord in the plural of the MU-MI class and the singular of the I-ZI class is to be written -i- not -yi-

e.g. timaiona (midzi)

ndaitsiriza (ntchito)

In all Rule 6 had twelve subrules. When it was revised in 1980 the subrules were reduced to ten and in 1990 to nine. By any standards this is a very arcane rule. There are too many exceptions as to make it vacuous. It is doubtful whether any ordinary user of the language can master it.

The 1973 Rules were revised and refined. The result was the Chichewa Orthography Rules 1980 Edition. There were no major changes in this edition. No changes were made to the thorny issue of l/r, and the same is true of the distinction between ch- and tch-. The ŵ and w distinction is also maintained. The 1980 Edition was revised again and issued as Chichewa Orthography Rules 1990 Revised Edition. There are no major changes in this edition just a few refinements of some of the rules.

How then did the users of Chichewa respond to these rules? Did they interpret and use them correctly? As part of its Chichewa coordinating activities the Board had as one of its responsibilities "interpreting the Chichewa Orthography". Through contact with some magazines and newspapers both in person and writing the Board discovered that the rules of 1980 Edition were (i) not yet officially introduced to the teachers on a large scale, no seminars had been held to this effect; (ii) the Chichewa reading books were not in conformity with the revised orthography rules; (iii) teachers and other users of the orthography found difficulties in applying Rules 2 (on the l and r), 6 (semi-vowel: w and y) and 15 (bilabial fricative ŵ).¹⁵⁾ These rules could not be mastered by most editors judging by the recurrent lament of the Chichewa Board. This is not surprising because the said rules, have no predictive power. Thus one cannot easily predict when they apply and when they do not.

The problems of the orthography were not restricted to the newspaper/magazine editors. They were also observed in secondary schools. In his report for the 1985 Malawi School Certificate Examination, the Chief Examiner for Chichewa observed that:

Every year, a report is given on the performance of candidates. It has always been hoped that teachers of Chichewa would make use of these reports. In spite of these observations reported over the past years candidates this year still showed weaknesses in their competence to write good Chichewa. The Chichewa orthography booklet currently in use must be seriously adhered to, if the candidates are to produce a substantial material that would be acceptable to examiners.¹⁶⁾

The chief examiners comment is self-explanatory. Not much was done in the schools in order to produce proficiency in using the new orthography rules. Explanations for this may be legion. However one thing is certain, some of the rules

15) See "General Report on Chichewa Coordination December 1982". Ref No.CD/1/25/11.

16) Chief Examiner's Report, the Malawi Certificate and Testing Board MSCE Examination 1985, Subject 09, Chichewa. Ref C/2/4/5/II/54.

themselves are rather unclear; they lack specificity.

Structure

The Board also sought to prescribe the correct usage of language in terms of grammar and vocabulary. A list of the incorrect forms were issued at regular intervals. Some of the incorrect forms are represented below:¹⁷⁾

- 1 (i) Andigwetsa or wamgwetsa not ndagwetsedwa or wagwetsedwa; andiuza or wamuza not ndauzidwa or wauzidwa.
- (ii) Amati not amati kuti.
Aphiri amati tichoke pano not - amati kuti.
- (iii) Malinga not malingana.
- (iv) Ndinu/ndiwe yani? not ndinu/ndiwe ndani? (Ref. Rule 10(11) of 1980)
- (v) Kusamala not kudasopa
- (vi) Kupita not kuvaya
- (vii) Kukonza (njinga, galimoto, wailesi) not kufotokoza (njinga, galimoto, wailesi).
- (viii) Kuotcha (mbatata, chinangwa etc) not kuotcha nyumba, njerwa, tchire etc. Kutentha (nyumba, njerwa, tchire, etc).

Under “Sentences and phrases” the following examples are presented:

- 2(a) (i) kutsuka (mbale, galimoto, nsengwa, etc) not kuchapa mbale, galimoto, nsengwa, etc)
 - (ii) Pamene mwaimitsa galimoto paja mpoipa not paja pamene mwaimitsa galimoto mpoipa.
 - (iii) Zimene wanena zija or zija wanenazi nzoona not zija zimene wanena nzoona
 - (iv) Mtsinje wadzala not wadzadza
 - (v) Ambuye wake not wache
 - (b) i mtundu wa Amalawi not fuko la Amalawi.
 - ii kuŵerenga not kuwerenga.
 - iii kuŵala dzuwa not kuwala.
 - iv kulaŵa not kulawa.
 - v usiŵa not usiwa.
 - vi ŵana not wana.
- } Ref. Rule No.15 of 1980

Surprisingly, there is also a section called “Over Used Word”, and a suggestion is made

17) See Chichewa Board’s presentation at the Workshop on Production and Editing of Chichewa Materials for New Readers in Rural Areas from 1st to 9th September 1985 at the Parliament Buildings.

for alternatives:

- (3) (i) Bambo why not tate
 ii Azimayi why not Amayi
 iii mtsikana why not msungwana
 iv kuswera why not kutandala
 v malume why not mtsibweni
 vi ngongole why not chikwerete

In a section called “Singular and Plural (pl)” nouns there is the following prescription:

- (4) (i) sipuni zambiri (pl) not masapuni
 (ii) sitima (pl) not masitima
 (iii) sitolo (pl) not masitolo
 (iv) sikono (pl) not masikono
 (v) sipanala (pl) not masipanala
 (vi) sekondale (pl) not masekondale

What is interesting about this list is that no explanation is given as to why these forms are incorrect. In fact, they can be easily explained. In 1(i), for example, the form that has been ruled out is simply a passive form of the acceptable one. 1(ii) the supposed ‘incorrectness’ arises from the fact that the verb form -ti is homophonous for ‘say’ and ‘that’ ‘Amati’ (s/he said) ‘amati kuti (s/he said that); (iii) malinga and malingana are dialectal variations so, too, is 1(vii) and (viii). The so-called incorrect forms in (v) is a loan from Zulu, and 1(vi) is a slang word for ‘go’ borrowed from English/Italian via.

The incorrect forms in 2(i), (iv) and (v) are dialectal variation. The variation is the one that is commonly used in Southern Malawi. 2(ii) and 2(iii) are issues of word order. Chichewa being a relatively free word order language, the legislation is here intended to fix the form. Those in (2b) are apparently violations of Rule 15 of the Chichewa Orthography Rules of 1980. Unfortunately this rule, as already pointed out, is so woolly that it is difficult to predict when it can be used.

Section (3) “Over Used Words” is curious in the sense that the Board does not say that the words are over used because they are more popular than the ones it thinks should be used. One would surmise here that members of the Chichewa Working Group are pushing their own variety of the language as the standard. All the preferred alternative forms are those used in the Central region, the home of the members of the Working Group i.e. Ntchisi, Dowa, Kasungu and Lilongwe.

In (4) one witnesses a desire to force all loanwords beginning with s into class 9/10 (the so-called I-ZI class). Loan words are notorious for their recalcitrance. They are not easily fitted in specific classes. The forms that are being rejected are the commonest

forms people use. Why class 9/10 then and not any other class? The Board itself explains this: “fortunately for us, about nouns beginning with *s*, there is no problem now because His Excellency the Life President directed in his lectures (1974 and 1975) that such nouns should be taken under I-ZI class”.¹⁸⁾ This is an example of a linguistic problem being resolved by a presidential fiat. As for those areas where no such fiat is given then matters could be resolved by a “committee of some kind”.

The fact that these rules have been largely ignored by the public suggests that prescriptive rules are, at best, inconsequential little decorations. The very fact that they are drilled shows that they are alien to the natural workings of the language system. As Pinker (1994, p.372) points out in his inimitable way, one can choose to obsess over prescriptive rules, but they have no more to do with human language than the criteria for judging cats at a cat show have to do with Mammalian biology.

The Radio¹⁹⁾

The radio used to employ both didactic and entertainment programmes to encourage the use of Chichewa. An example of didactic programme was “Tiphunzitsane Chichewa” (Let us teach each other Chichewa) prepared and presented by members of the Chichewa Board. Listeners used to write to this programme to express their views about a particular expression, word or syntactic structure. Their views were then discussed by a panel headed by a member of the Chichewa Board. At the end of the programme a conclusion/solution was suggested and recommended to the listener. The tone of these discussions was legislative, setting out how the language ought to be used, not necessarily how it actually was used by the majority of the people. A solution apparently resented by many who saw the Board as having virtual veto power on vocabulary and syntactic innovations in Chichewa.

“Tiphunzitsane Chichewa” was supplemented by “Chichewa cha kumudzi” (Chichewa of the village). In this programme recordings from typical village situations were explained with the aim of broadening the scope of other Chichewa users especially those in the cities where multi-lingualism is the norm.

In brief then, Chichewa programmes could be categorised into purely musical (entertainment), didactic (non-formal education) and educational (school programmes). Thus every opportunity was exploited to bring standard Chichewa into every Malawian home. Even with this array of programmes, the Board was still not satisfied with the presenters’ use of the language. Misuse of words was one area of concern for the Board. One word that the Board felt was misused was zakhali. The Executive Secretary of the Board was forced to write to MBC to explain, “the word is sometimes misapplied by some of the MBC announcers. They apply it in addressing a male. It should be noted that zakhali cannot be male; the word refers to a female (sic) only, my

18) See “General Report on Chichewa Coordination...”

19) At the time of Dr. Banda’s (1964–1994) rule there was only one radio station controlled by the government.

father's sister and not my mother's brother (...). Please advise the announcers on correct usage."²⁰⁾

This admonition notwithstanding Chichewa in the eyes of the Board did not improve at the radio station. The wings of the spoken word proved hard to clip. By 1991 the Board was close to admitting that it had failed in this endeavour. In one of its meetings

The Board expressed concern over the deteriorating situation of bad Chichewa on MBC by some announcers. The Board therefore requested management to exercise authority to correct the bad Chichewa since it was the responsibility of the Chichewa Board to do so. [Emphasis in original]²¹⁾

In order to play this role it was also agreed in the same meeting that examples of bad Chichewa usage should be "collected and those concerned informed to correct the bad Chichewa." However, the Board also realized that it was not enough to tell a native speaker of the language that his Chichewa is bad when he/she has been using it all along. As such the Board,

expressed the need for training of Chichewa announcers in respect of correct pronunciation and good Chichewa usage which appear to be the biggest problems. There was a tendency for a casual and carefree outlook on the use of Chichewa on MBC. [Emphasis in original]²²⁾

From these "concerns" of the Board it can be concluded that standardization through prescription has not been successful in the oral channel.²³⁾ In everyday conversation, it is clear, it has been less effective. Indeed, the norms of colloquial, as against formal, Chichewa have not been codified in anyway.

The Print Media

The mandate of coordinating Chichewa in the country was interpreted as including "checking Chichewa language and spelling in newspapers and magazines and other publications". The Chichewa Working Group dealt with nine publications and the following is a sample of their comments.²⁴⁾

20) See "Letter from the Executive Secretary, Chichewa Board to the General Manager, MBC [Malawi Broadcasting Corporation]" dated 23 December, 1992, Ref. No.CD/4/25/11/49.

21) See minute 82/91 of 33rd Meeting of the Chichewa Board held on Friday 20th September, 1991 at the Board Secretariat, Ref. No.BM/2/2/17.

22) See minute 85/91 of 33rd Meeting of the Chichewa Board...

23) It is interesting to note that at the peak of legislation on the spoken word the interviewers at the radio station used to correct their interviewees even on live broadcasts.

24) See "A Brief Report on Progress of work to the Chichewa Board by the Chichewa Working Group". Not Referenced.

a. Moni Magazine (Montfort Press)

Both Chichewa language and spelling have improved a great deal in this magazine after contacting them both in writing and in person.

b. Kuunika (Nkhoma Synod Press)

This magazine has also improved in both Chichewa language and spelling. The editor had a problem; lack of the letter w̄ but this is now solved after we had approached the editor.

c. Za Achikumbi (Extension Aids)

This magazine has also improved in both Chichewa language and spelling after the Working Group had held a two day seminar with the Extension Aids officers in Lilongwe at their request.

The comments for the other publications are similar: improvement after the Working Group's visit. It would appear that the efforts of the Chichewa Group helped the print media to improve their language and spelling a great deal. It could be argued that standardization through prescription has had a modest success in this area.

The Dictionary

The dictionary was the raison d'être for the Chichewa Board. When the Chichewa Working Group was constituted it was with the sole aim of compiling a dictionary. It may be asked why the dictionary was so overwhelmingly important to the President. There are a number of reasons. Linguistically, there was no doubt that a new Chichewa dictionary was needed. The extant ones, compiled by missionaries, were unsatisfactory, because they did not properly take into account the present day vocabulary of speakers of the language, both in the cities and villages. More important, however, was the political reason. Strictly speaking there was no Chichewa dictionary. All the existing dictionaries were Chinyanja dictionaries since Chichewa was considered a dialect of Chinyanja (see Kishindo 1990; Mchombo nd). Since Banda had elevated the dialect over the language to the status of national language, a dictionary would legitimize the dialect. As Banda had often said, Chichewa is not a dialect but a language with its own rules and grammar. Thus a lot of resources and effort went into the dictionary making exercise.

Apart from collecting material in every Chichewa speaking district in the country, study visits were made abroad. For example, in 1982 a team of two went to visit Oxford University Press' Oxford English Dictionaries Department. There they were attached to the world renown lexicographer Robert Burchfield and his colleagues "observing our methods of work, describing their own project the Chichewa dictionary — and discussing with us how best to proceed."²⁵ In 1985 another trip was undertaken to the Institute of Kiswahili Research, University of Dar es Salaam.²⁶ Here again they

were briefed on how dictionaries are compiled.

The dictionary, the flagship of the Board's work was ironically its own Achilles heel. In its twenty five years the Chichewa Working Group failed to complete the dictionary. The obvious question is why? A number of reasons avail themselves. First there was a shortage of staff. At the time of the Oxford visit only two people were engaged on it full time. Perhaps more importantly the two were not lexicographers *per se* neither were they trained in linguists. One of them described his academic qualifications thus, "my simple education qualifications range from 1949 standard 6 Government Certificate through JC [Junior Certificate] studies with Trans-Africa Cor. Col [correspondence college] in S.A. [South Africa], to GCE. 'O' level with distinction (pass) in NYANJA (now Chichewa in 1964)." As if to explain why then with this limited education he was thought to be qualified to be a member of the Board he opined; "[t]hroughout my career as a teacher, administrator and inspector, my particular interest was and still is "CHICHEWA". It is for this interest, I hope, that I was specially appointed by H. E. [His Excellency the President] in 1975 to be a Chichewa Worker in a position of Deputy Secretary.' [capitals in original].²⁷⁾ The members of the Working Group were just retired primary school teachers ill equipped for the task at hand but full of enthusiasm for the language. As Burchfield pointed out in a letter to the Board Chairman:

It seemed to me that they [the Board] would certainly need three young graduate students to assist them. These would be junior members of staff but they would need to have suitable qualifications in phonetics, and would also acquire a working knowledge of the fieldwork that would be necessary and techniques of drafting entries for the dictionary.²⁸⁾

Apart from the lack of expertise in the field of lexicography and linguistics, the editors did not have clearly defined powers to make necessary appointments, to determine policy and working procedure. At every stage they had to await explicit approval from the Board. The Board itself did not have the necessary powers either. The real power rested with Dr. Banda, the founder. Without his approval there would be no movement. For example, when the first draft of the dictionary was completed, the Board recommended that "[a] fair copy be submitted in due course to His Excellency the Life President for his approval and directive."²⁹⁾ Much time and energy

25) See Robert Burchfield's letter to the Chairman of the Chichewa Board, A.E. Gadama, MP dated 29 October 1982. Ref. Biling. Gen/RWB/kcev.

26) See "Comprehensive Report on the Study Visit to the Institute of Kiswahili Research, University of Dar-es-salaam — Tanzania". Ref. No.VT/9/3/33.

27) See G.B. Kagona Banda (then Chichewa Board's Deputy Executive Secretary) letter to Sam A. Mchombo dated 6th April, 1982. This letter was the CV that the leader of the delegation (S.A. Mchombo) was to send to the Oxford Dictionaries Department.

28) See "Robert Burchfield's letter to the Chairman of the Board..."

was wasted in this procedure of referring to the President all the time.

It is perhaps with much frustration, exasperation and soul-searching that one of the compilers of the dictionary who was also the Board's Executive Secretary reported to the Board thus:

Chichewa research for the purpose of the Dictionary compilation, therefore, is really a complicated task although unfortunately, it does not seem so to ordinary people. The staff is doing its best but the remaining part of the task is incalculable. The Board, therefore, will have to do something in order to achieve its goal. It will have to reinforce its staff.³⁰⁾

However, even when graduate staff were recruited as recommended by Burchfield the old guard was reluctant to let go of the dictionary. It viewed the dictionary as its own preserve to be jealously guarded.³¹⁾ The young graduates were channeled into other chores.

Perhaps with hindsight, it was realized that dictionary making does require some skill, and it comes as no surprise to learn that the Board's draft dictionary was rejected by the President, a man known for his insistence on high standards, as manifestly an inferior job as expected from a group of dilettantes.³²⁾

Modernization of Chichewa

The Chichewa Board was also interested in modernizing Chichewa. This process was tempered with the desire to purify the language. As a result borrowed forms from English which had been "Chichewaized" were frowned upon in favour of indigenous forms. For example a subcommittee agreed on the following alternatives for the borrowed forms.³³⁾

29) See Minute 8/80c of the Meeting of the Chichewa Board held in the Conference Room of the MCE Board in Zomba on 7th August, 1980. Ref. No.BM/2/2/5.

30) See "A Report on Chichewa Language Research" dated December 1982. Ref. No.VT/9/3/17.

31) The present author recalls the reluctance the Working Group showed when Prof. Charles Bird of the University of Indiana then visiting the University of Malawi offered to help with the dictionary.

32) The complexity of dictionary-making was acknowledged when a sub-committee of the Board "noted with regret that authoritative tonal analysis as a precondition for the Chichewa dictionary production was unwise and impracticable for until then there was nobody (...) who could undertake the task." [Emphasis in original]. See Minute 9/84 of the Minutes of the Meeting of the Appointments sub-committee of the Chichewa Board held at Chancellor College on 17th December, 1984. Ref No.MC/7/8/3.

33) See Minute 32/91 of the 3rd Meeting of the Chichewa Grammatical Terms, Orthography Rules, Translation and Chichewanization sub-committee held on Monday, 2nd September, 1991 at the Chichewa Board Secretariat. Ref. No.MC/7/4/Vol. 11/10.

English/Origin	Chichewaized Form	Alternative
apron	epuloni	chiphimbi
bandage	bandeji	mlezo/m'bambe
basin	beseni	chimbale
bed	bedi	kama
bread	buledi	chingwa/mkate
blanket	bulangete	gombeza/chimbwi
broek (Afrikaans)	buluku	mgandapansi
cup	kapu	komichi
curry	kale	chikasu
passport	pasipoti	chitupa/chiphaso
programme	pologaramu	dongosolo
spoon	sipuni	chikombe
telephone	telephone	lamya

Although the alternative forms were the Board's Working Group's preferred forms they were never in popular parlance. In fact, in certain cases borrowing has been motivated by the need to differentiate terms that were not differentiated before, or the desire to be more precise by avoiding vague terms. Usually, shades of meaning between the terms used are distinguished and a choice is made between the native and the loan word. The general trend appears to be that the indigenous term refers to an "indigenous" object, and the loan to an "exotic", or imported type.

For example, buledi (English "bread") has a local variant mkate. Mkate is used to refer to the locally made type of bread (i.e. bananas mixed with maize flour and steamed) while buledi refers to the type made of wheat. Supuni ("spoon") is the imported metal type and chikombe refers to the traditionally made wooden spoon. The word pasipoti ("passport") refers to the official government travel document while chitupa/chiphaso is any kind of permit, dongosolo is a list of events while pologaramu is thought of in terms of a radio or television programme. Thus what is offered by the Board as the alternative does not have the exact identical meaning as the loan.

As part of the modernization process the Chichewa Board also embarked on developing Chichewa grammatical terms. Hitherto, Chichewa used to use English Chichewaized forms. Thus a noun was "nauni", verb was "verebu", adjective was "adijeketive" and so on. After much work and consultations the Chichewa Board issued the Chichewa Grammatical Terms 1991 Edition. These are the terms currently used in teaching Chichewa Grammar. The Chairman of the Board in the introduction to the text has this to say:

The Chichewa Grammatical Terms contained in this booklet reflects a clear and definite translation from the Chewanized English Grammatical terms which have gone under revision and refinement. In translating the grammatical terms

effort has been made to shorten them for ease of application. The grammatical terms also incorporate aspects of common usage of Chichewa. A Chichewa book explaining all the grammatical terms will also be published in due course.³⁴⁾

Unfortunately the Chichewa book was never published.³⁵⁾ Be that as it may, the publication of the Chichewa Grammatical Terms was a major breakthrough in the efforts to modernize Chichewa. It illustrates the point that given the resources and the political will African languages can indeed be developed and modernized. As was the practice these terms were submitted to the President and they were approved.

However, the area which the Board signally failed was that of scientific terminology. There is an influx of borrowed scientific terms from English. When one turns to the Chichewa sections of newspapers or listens to radio programmes, one notices a preponderance of loan words in issues dealing with science, technology, economics, etc. In these areas the writer, the radio announcer and the teacher was and still is left to his own devices. The Board remained uncharacteristically silent in this area; perhaps silently accepting its limitations. To the non-bilingual speaker though this plethora of loan words can be bewildering. The unfortunate thing is that this indiscriminate borrowing obstructs communication (see Kishindo 1987 for details).

In addition, efforts to translate or Chichewaize titles, official ranks and professions also came to nothing. Thus English terms are still being used today.

Evaluation

The Chichewa Board was dissolved in 1995 following the failure of Dr. Banda to win the elections of 1994. In its place the new United Democratic Front government established the Centre for Language Studies, a research Centre of the University of Malawi. With hindsight it can now be asked, what were the achievements of the Board? One could argue that its achievement was to establish, through codification, a much more widespread consciousness of a relatively uniform "correct" Chichewa than had been possible before. Subsequent modest advances in education have continued to ensure that the public have looked to the relatively standardized written form as the model of correctness, despite the fact that spoken Chichewa has continued to change. What was established in the words of Milroy and Milroy (1984, p.36), was the ideology of standardization to which virtually every speaker now subscribes to in principle. Clearly, the Board was answering the need of a developing nation for reliable communication. And in this it was generally successful.

The Board was, however, much less successful in preventing changes in the spoken language as the criticism of the MBC announcers has shown. The spoken language

34) See the introduction to the Chichewa Grammatical Terms, p.i.

35) It is a glaring irony that publications meant to assist Chichewa writers/speakers were invariably published in English.

continues to be the subject of quite extensive variation and change. There are distinct difference for example, between the Chichewa spoken in the cities and those of the villages, that of the youth and that of adults.

The language planning activities at this stage were largely part of the political agenda and prescriptive in intent conforming to what Whiteley (1972) has called the ideological component of planning which required minimum technical expertise. While these activities had undoubtedly been attended with some success; the rhetoric was not balanced by any detailed plan for the development of Chichewa (see Kishindo 1996, 1998). In fact, if there were any plans at all then they were in the mind of the Founder which ordinary mortals could not access. The personnel involved in planning, like their colonial predecessors, were largely non-linguists, who for one reason or another had some reputation for being native speakers of the language, by virtue of zeal, occupation, or commitment, were held to be suitable agents. This is not to say that these were not suitable qualifications at the time, or that some people had not, at some stage or other, received some linguistic training, but rather that linguistic considerations were rarely involved in what was after all, largely a political operation.

Conclusion

This paper has, among other things, discussed the role of Dr. Banda in the development of Chichewa. The interest he had in the language led him to champion Chichewa as a national language and found the Chichewa Board. It has also examined the ideology of standardization which the Chichewa Board pursued through prescription. The paper has observed that standardization through prescription has clearly been more successful in the written form than the oral one. Indeed, the norms of colloquial, as against formal Chichewa, have not been codified to any extent. The Chichewa Board also failed in the modernization process particularly in the area of scientific terminology. Chichewa is still inundated with English scientific terms. However, the ideology of standardization has been inculcated and the idea of "correct" usage is well embedded in the users of the language. This could be the lasting contribution of the Chichewa Board.

References

- Atkins, G. 1950. Suggestions for amended spelling and word division in Nyanja. *Africa* 20: pp.200–218.
- Bolinger, D. 1980. *Language: The Loaded Weapon*, London: Longman.
- Chichewa Board. 1973. *New Chichewa Orthography Rules*. Mimeographed.
- . 1980. *Chichewa Orthography Rules* (1980 Edition). Zomba: Government Printer.
- . 1990. *Chichewa Orthography Rules* (Revised Edition). Zomba: Montfort Press.
- . 1991. *Chichewa Grammatical Terms* (1991 Edition). Zomba: Montfort Press.
- Das Gupta, J. 1970. *Language Conflict and National Development*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Edwards, E. 1994. *Multilingualism*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

- Haugen, E. 1966. Linguistics and Language Planning. *Sociolinguistics: Proceedings of UCLA Sociolinguistics Conference*, Los Angeles and Lake Arrowhead, California, 1964 ed. W. Bright, The Hague: Mouton. pp.50-71.
- Heyd, U. 1954. *Language Reform in Modern Turkey* (Oriental Notes and Studies, 5) Jerusalem: The Oriental Society.
- Kishindo, P.J. 1987. The State of Scientific Terminology in Chichewa. *International Symposium on Professional Terminology in African Languages. Theory and Practice. Logos* 7, 2, pp.103-113.
- . 1990. An Historical Study of Spontaneous and Planned Development of Chichewa. In I. Fodor and C. Hagege (eds) *Language Reform History and Future* Vol 5. Hamburg: Helmut Buske, pp.59-82.
- . 1996. Dr. H. Kamuzu Banda's Language Policy: A Study in contradictions. *AAP48* universitat zu Koln: Institut fur Afrikanistik, pp.55-79. Also in *UFAHAMU: Journal of the African Activist Association* XXV 1997, 1, pp.84-106.
- . 1998. Politics of Language in Contemporary Malawi. In K.M. Phiri and K. Ross (eds) *Democratization in Malawi. A Stocktaking*. Blantyre: CLAIM. pp.252-280.
- Mchombo, S.A. (nd). Chichewa/Chinyanja. Ms. Department of Linguistics, University of California at Berkeley.
- Milroy, J. and Milroy, L. 1985. *Authority in Language: Investigating Language Prescription and Standardization*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Mtenje, A.D. 1980. Aspects of Chichewa Derivational Phonology and Syllable Structure Constraints. Unpublished MA thesis, University of Southern Illinois-Carbondale.
- Phiri, K.M. 1995. Dr. H. Kamuzu Banda: His cultural Philosophy, and its Implications for the "new" Malawi, Seminar on Social Change in Malawi, Chancellor College, University of Malawi, Zomba, 24-25 March.
- Pinker, S. 1994. *The Language Instinct*. New York: William Morrow and Co. Inc.
- Quirk, R. 1982. *Style and Communication in the English Language*. London: Edward Arnold.
- UNESCO. 1981. *African Languages: Proceedings of the meeting of experts on transcription and harmonization of African Languages*. Niamey (Niger), pp.17-21 July 1978.
- Whiteley, W.H. 1973. *To Plan is to Choose: Hans Wolf Memorial Lecture, 7 April 1972*. University of Indiana, Bloomington: African Studies Program.
- Watkins, M.H. 1937 [1996]. *A Grammar of Chichewa*. Supplement to *Language* 24. New York: Kraus Reprint Corporation. Philadelphia.
- Young, C. 1949. A Review of *A Practical Approach to Chinyanja with English-Nyanja Vocabulary* by T.D. Thomson. *Africa* 19: pp.253-254.