

Another isiXhosa Monolingual Dictionary: A Critical Analysis of the *Shuters IsiChazi-magama SesiXhosa*^{*}

Dion Nkomo, *School of Languages and Literatures:
African Language Studies, Rhodes University, Makhanda (Grahamstown),
South Africa (d.nkomo@ru.ac.za)*

Abstract: This article offers a critical analysis and evaluation of the *Shuters IsiChazi-magama SesiXhosa*, the second monolingual dictionary in the history of isiXhosa. The analysis draws theoretical and methodological insights from dictionary criticism as a domain of metalexicography and analyses the dictionary in view of existing dictionaries in the language, especially the first monolingual dictionary published under the auspices of the IsiXhosa National Lexicography Unit (XNLU) a decade earlier. Concise paraphrases of meaning are identified as the major strength of this dictionary when compared to its XNLU predecessor. However, inconsistent provision of microstructural entries, an imbalanced macrostructure and a non-integrated front matter reduce the user-friendliness of the dictionary. Nevertheless, another dictionary in isiXhosa produced without the involvement of a National Lexicography Unit is welcome towards the intellectualisation of African languages.

Keywords: AFRICAN LANGUAGES, DICTIONARY, DICTIONARY CRITICISM, INTELLECTUALISATION OF AFRICAN LANGUAGES, ISICHAZI-MAGAMA, ISIXHOSA LEXICOGRAPHY, MACROSTRUCTURE, MICROSTRUCTURE, NATIONAL LEXICOGRAPHY UNITS, FRONT MATTER TEXTS

Isishwankathelo: Esinye isiChazimaga sesiXhosa esiLwiminye: UHlalutyo lweisiChazimaga sakwaShuter and Shooter. Eli nqaku lihlalutya iShuters *IsiChazi-magama SesiXhosa*, esisesesibini isichazimaga ukuba lwiminye kwimbali yesiXhosa. Olu hlalutyo lulandela ithiyori neenkubo zokuhla amahlongwane izichazimaga njengommandla wofundonzulu ngezichazimaga. Uhlalutyo luahlahlela esi sichazimaga ngokusithelekisa nezichazimaga ezikhoyo esiXhoseni ingakumbi, *IsiChazi-magama SesiXhosa* esaqlunqwa liZiko lesiZwe loChazomaga lweisiXhosa kwiminyaka elishumi ngaphambili, esisesokuqala ukuba lwiminye esiXhoseni. Iinkcazeloo zeentsingiselo eziphe ngqo zichongwe njengezona zinempumelelo kwesi sichazimaga xa sithelekiswa nesasandulelayo. Nangona kunjalo iinkcukacha ezinikezelwa ngemichazwa azinikwa ngokuchanekileyo kananjalo uluhlu lwemichazwa alusibonisi kakuhle isakhiwo sesiXhosa.

* This paper is a revised version of the paper that was presented at the 18th International Conference of the Africa Languages Association of Southern Africa (ALASA), hosted by the University of Fort Hare on 25–27 September 2021.

Oku nokungayondelelani kweziqulatho zesi^u sesichazimagama kunokwenza kungabi lula ukusisebenzisa isichazimagama. Nangona kunjalo ukupapashwa kwesinye isichazimagama esiXhoseni okungabandakanyi iZiko lesiZwe loChazomagama kwamkelekile kupuhhliso lweelwimi zesiNtu.

Amagama angundoqo: IILWIMI ZESINTU, ISICHAZIMAGAMA, UHLALUTYO LWEZI-CHAZIMAGAMA, UPHUHLISO LWEELWIMI ZESINTU, ISICHAZI-MAGAMA SESIXHOSA, UCHAZOMAGAMA LWESIXHOSA, ISAKHIWO SOLUHLU LWEMICHAZWA, ISAKHIWO SEENKCUKACHA NGEMICHAZWA, AMAZIKO ESIZWE OCHAZOMAGAMA, UMPHAMBILI WESICHAZIMAGAMA

1. Introduction

In 2018, a decade after the publication of the first monolingual isiXhosa dictionary, namely *IsiChazi-magama SesiXhosa*, edited by S.L. Tshabe, Z. Guzana and A.B.B. Nokele under the auspices of the IsiXhosa National Lexicography Unit (XNLU) in 2008, Shuter and Shooter published another monolingual isiXhosa dictionary edited by M.M.M. Duka. Only a fine print *Shuters* before the title of the new dictionary distinguishes the names of the two monolingual isiXhosa dictionaries. Duka also claims that his dictionary, just like its predecessor, is for use at all educational levels, including higher education, as well as by the generality of isiXhosa speakers. Specific reference is made to the study of isiXhosa as a subject and its use as a medium of teaching. The publication of a second monolingual dictionary in isiXhosa could therefore be seen as another milestone in the intellectualisation of the language. Kaschula and Nkomo (2019) identify lexicography as a vitally important corpus planning enterprise in the intellectualisation of any language. There is a definite relationship between language policy and lexicography (Gouws 2007a; Nkomo 2018). The relationship is also similar between language policy and other language intellectualisation activities such as the development of orthographies, terminology development, translation and language teaching/learning (Kaschula and Nkomo 2019).

Gouws (2007a) illustrates the influence of language policy on lexicography in South Africa from a historical perspective. The legacy of apartheid history is evident when one considers the lexicographic infrastructure, practices, products and dictionary culture in African languages compared to Afrikaans and English. Some African languages largely remained in the pre-lexicographic era (Gouws and Ponelis 1992; Nkomo 2020) well into the democratic era, while others only had missionary efforts to thank for the few dictionaries that existed (Gouws 2007a; Nkomo 2020). Despite the development of orthographies and terminologies, as well as the production of textbooks for basic education and creative literary works during the missionary and apartheid periods, limited functional spaces crippled the standardisation of indigenous African languages and, hence, their lexicography. Accordingly, the state of lexicographic practice in the languages validates the remarks made by Gallardo (1980) when he writes:

... only fully standardized languages have their lexicon organized in monolingual dictionaries. ... In non-standardized language situations, dictionaries do not exist or, at best, are bilingual dictionaries, that is, compiled in function of a different language. ... apart from being always bilingual, [the dictionaries] are usually not compiled by members of the speech community involved, who are not even able to use them (Gallardo 1980: 61).

This is true for isiXhosa in which dictionaries such as Kropf's *A Kafir–English Dictionary* of 1899, McLaren's *A Concise Kafir–English Dictionary* (1915) and the *Oxford English–Xhosa Dictionary* (Fischer, Weiss, Mdala and Tshabe 1985) were produced, but never a monolingual dictionary. The compilers of those dictionaries were also consistently clear about their target users, i.e. non-mother-tongue learners of isiXhosa who comprised early missionaries deployed in the Eastern Cape and later on English-speaking learners of isiXhosa in formal education. Such a situation prevailed in African languages lexicography in general as reported in Awak (1990) and Busane (1990), among others.

The elevation of the nine previously marginalised indigenous African languages into official languages alongside Afrikaans and English culminated in, among other developments, the establishment of the National Lexicography Units (NLUs). Alberts (2011) outlines the main function of the NLUs as the compilation of comprehensive general-purpose monolingual dictionaries. This focus recognises the role of monolingual dictionaries in the intellectualisation of languages. Such a role has been recognised in the transformation of European vernaculars that were inferior to Latin and Greek into powerful modern languages such as English, French and Italian (Nkomo 2018). Compared to the situation described by Gallardo (1980), as cited above, monolingual dictionaries are a case of *lexicography for the language speakers by the language speakers themselves*. At a time when the NLUs are experiencing challenges that threaten their mandate and long-term future, dictionaries such as the *Shuters IsiChazi-magama SesiXhosa*, henceforth the Shuters dictionary, produced outside the NLUs as the official lexicographic entities are vitally important. However, also of equal importance is their quality and overall lexicographic contributions in the development of the respective languages. The present article seeks to contribute in this respect by describing, analysing and evaluating the Shuters dictionary within the realm of dictionary criticism, the theoretical and methodological perspectives of which are outlined after a brief overview of the dictionary in the next section.

2. An overview of the *Shuters IsiChazi-magama SesiXhosa*

In a celebratory preface, the lexicographer exalts the value of his dictionary, particularly that it is monolingual when he writes:

Lo mqulu, ISICHAZI-MAGAMA SESIXHOSA, usisiphumo solovo lokuba *isiXhosa lulwimi oluvuthiweyo olukwisiqaba sokusetyenziswa kuqulungwe isiChazi-magama sesiXhosa poqo*. Kungoko iintsingiselo zamagama, kulo mqulu, zicaciswe zachazwa ngesiXhosa kuphela (own emphasis in italics).

This compilation, ISICHAZI-MAGAMA SESIXHOSA, is a result of the view that *isiXhosa is a fully-fledged language that is at the level of being used in the compilation of an exclusively isiXhosa dictionary*. Accordingly, the meaning of words in this dictionary are described and explained only in isiXhosa (Duka 2018: v).

Duka is a language enthusiast, an author and an experienced educator who describes himself as an ardent dictionary user (Duka 2021).¹ As a student of languages and literature, he studied English, Latin and Afrikaans in the 1960s before going on to get a doctorate degree in African Languages. He recalls with fondness the pivotal role played by dictionaries in his education, and attributes some teaching/learning challenges and a poor dictionary culture among speakers of South African languages to the paucity of dictionaries of diverse types (cf. Nkomo 2020). Accordingly, he conceived his dictionary with a view to contribute not only towards the learning and study of isiXhosa among its mother-tongue speakers, but also in consolidating its use in the teaching of other academic subjects, particularly Mathematics and Science, of which he is a retired teacher and chief education specialist.

In terms of size, the Shuters dictionary is a small dictionary with 237 pages of the main text and 16 pages of front matter texts (see Section 5.3 below). The dictionary is just less than half the size of its XNLU predecessor, whose main text is 520 pages. In terms of its contents and envisaged role, the blurb text states that:

- Sicacisa amagama ngendlela elula etsho kuthi dlwe.
(It explains words in a simple way that clarifies meaning).
- Sinika iseseko esiqinileyo nesomeleleyo ekubhaleni nasekuthetheni isiXhosa esifanelekileyo.
(It provides a solid foundation for writing and speaking 'appropriate' isiXhosa).
- Sidwelisa amahlelo ezibizo ngendlela elula neyamkelekileyo.
(It outlines noun classes in a simple and accepted manner).
- Sakha ubungqondi kumfundi.
(It builds understanding in the learner/student).
- Sichaphazela izifundo ngezifundo.
(It covers different academic subjects).
- Silungele ukusetyenziswa ezikolweni nakumabanga aphezulu.
(It is appropriate for use in schools and higher levels of education).

Such a text informs potential buyers and users about what they should expect from the dictionary. However, such information is conceived from the compiler's perspective (Hartmann and James 1998). Swanepoel (2017b) notes that blurb texts are prepared by dictionary publishers quite often to promote sales. The user perspective and critical perspectives are necessary to offer a balanced assessment and estimation of the value of dictionaries. Dictionary criticism, discussed in Section 3 and Section 5, respectively provides the relevant theoretical and methodological guidance for this undertaking.

3. Dictionary criticism: A metalexicographical perspective

Hartmann and James (1998: 32) state that dictionary criticism is "concerned with the description and evaluation of DICTIONARIES and other reference works". A mutual relationship exists between dictionary criticism and metalexicography or theoretical lexicography. Wiegand (1984) allocated space for dictionary criticism in his general theory of lexicography at the nascent stages of theorisation of lexicography as a discipline. Writing from the perspective of the function theory, Tarp (2017: 116) posits that "[c]riticism of existing dictionaries should be regarded as an important area of lexicographical research". Its rationale taps deeply from the fundamental importance of dictionaries as functional tools and lexicography as a problem-solving practice. This means that dictionary critics must have noble motivations. Gouws (2017: 40) makes this point when he writes:

Dictionary criticism is not done for the mere sake of criticizing but in order to inform and to improve — to inform dictionary users and to help lexicographers and publishers to improve the quality of future dictionaries.

Nielsen (2009: 25) and Gouws (2017) extend Wiegand's (1984) notion of the *genuine purpose* of dictionaries to dictionary criticism. If dictionary criticism is to achieve its genuine purpose, then it should be "free from bias" (Nielsen 2009: 37) arising from "ethically dubious" motivations noted by Tarp (2017: 117), such as "to humiliate its author, to promote one's own dictionary, to lavish praise on a friend, or to please an authority in order to get personal benefits". Such temptations may arise from a narrow interpretation of the practice, with a potential of equating dictionary criticism to dictionary bashing. Accordingly, some scholars such as Nielsen (2009) and Swanepoel (2017a; 2017b) prefer *dictionary reviewing* and *dictionary reviews* as alternative terms to refer to the practice and its products respectively, both of which ought to yield a "true and fair view of the dictionary concerned" (Nielsen 2009: 36).

In order for dictionary criticism to be fit for purpose, dictionary critics need not only to have good intentions as those posited by Gouws (2017). The dictionary critics also need to be fit for purpose. They must possess "knowledge of lexicographic theories, principles and practices" (Nielsen 2009: 29). In an unpublished paper, Hadebe (2005: 2) bemoaned the quality of some dictionary

reviews because they approached dictionaries "as if they were school textbooks or grammar books and at worst as if they are works of fiction". This happens too often in the case of reviews written for newspapers by journalists with no basic training in lexicography, be it practical or theoretical.

Lexicographic practice in African languages currently appears to benefit less from sound theoretical guidance in the form of lexicographic research and dictionary criticism. Practicing lexicographers, especially from the NLUs in South Africa, are under extreme pressure to meet unrealistic demands by the Pan South African Language Board (PanSALB) that they should publish at least one dictionary every year in spite of inadequate financial, human and technological resources. They therefore struggle to interact not only with the academic research in order to learn from or influence it, but also with the language-speaking communities who are the potential users of their products. As such, dictionaries are produced in African languages with potential users taking very little, if any, notice, while lexicographers get little, if any, useful feedback in the form of dictionary criticism. To paraphrase Samuel Johnson's words of disillusionment, lexicographers become truly harmless drudges whose preoccupation and outputs bear little significance in their communities (cf. Mugglestone 2015: 1).

The poverty of dictionary criticism manifested itself in the aftermath of the publication of the *Oxford Bilingual School Dictionary: IsiXhosa and English* in 2014. The dictionary generated passionate discussions in newspapers, radio and social media platforms (Nkomo 2015). The discussions were particularly characterised by sensational and scathing remarks from disappointed mother-tongue speakers of isiXhosa because of missing words, the inclusion of loan-words, typically from English, at the expense of indigenous coinages, e.g. *igranti* instead of *indodla* (social grant), and some missing senses. Particularly incredible were recommendations for the isiXhosa-speaking community to boycott the dictionary. Remarkably, such protests were made at the neglect of the overall potential of the dictionary to address the lexicographic needs experienced by learners of both isiXhosa and English in the language and content subjects. Since discussions involved largely language speakers, including journalists and the so-called social influencers, without sound lexicographic grounding, they were classified as "common conversations" (Nkomo 2015: 43). As researchers and scholarly products, dictionary critics and their works are expected to be "in a different league than ordinary people and ordinary products" (Nielsen 2009: 25). Nkomo (2015: 45) attributes uninformed and unconstructive dictionary criticism to a lack of a developed societal dictionary culture. In their *Dictionary of Lexicography*, Hartmann and James (1998: 41) define *dictionary culture* as "[t]he critical awareness of the value and limitations of dictionaries and other reference works in a particular community". In the context of a poor or non-existent societal dictionary culture, community members may not only be unaware of existing dictionaries, but they may also be unaware of the value of dictionaries and the qualities of a good dictionary. Thus, Gouws (2017: 33) argues that "dictionary criticism should be part of a comprehensive dictionary

culture". By subjecting the Shuters dictionary to critical evaluation, this article therefore hopes to contribute towards efforts of establishing a dictionary culture among isiXhosa speakers and speakers of other African languages which are being further intellectualised through lexicography, in the same way as the 'Towards One-Learner One-Dictionary' Project in selected Eastern Cape schools (Nkomo 2020).

4. A methodological approach to dictionary criticism

Swanepoel (2017b: 13) makes an important point that dictionary reviewing is "a research process". Every research process needs to be carefully designed with a clear set of methodical activities in order to generate relevant data sets and analyse them systematically using appropriate theories. Dictionary criticism as research is not exempted from this requirement. Thus, Gouws (2017: 34) writes:

Although dictionaries are and should be the target of numerous and diverse reviews, the criticism should not be done in a haphazard way. A scientific approach, even for a review targeted at a small audience is needed.

Svensén (2009) identifies two general methods that are used in dictionary criticism, namely the desktop method and the test method. Their main distinction is that the former evaluates the dictionary by simply analysing the dictionary while the latter evaluates the dictionary based on experimental dictionary usage by selected targeted users. Since dictionaries are utility products compiled to meet specific needs of specific users in practical situations, the latter is undeniably superior to the former. Nevertheless, the desktop method is also capable of generating sound and evaluative conclusions, as long as it is undertaken systematically and consistently with theoretical and practical purposes of dictionary criticism. At that level, desktop dictionary evaluation is akin to literary criticism that is conducted independent of text reception tests being done with real readers of literary works. What is important is that the criticism and evaluation offer useful insights for the producers and consumers of texts. However, for dictionaries the emphasis needs to be placed on their functionality as utility products.

Nielsen (2009) makes a distinction between maximising and minimising dictionary evaluation. The former "attempts to give as exhaustive description, analysis and evaluation of a dictionary as possible" while the latter "is deliberately limited to selected aspects regarding the dictionary" (Nielsen 2009: 32). This article attempts a maximising approach as it reflects on the macrostructure, the microstructure and outer texts in relation to the supposed functions of the dictionary. This approach is capable of yielding a fair reflection of the dictionary, which is possible when the critic follows the guidance of Gouws (2017) in conducting:

... assessment of ... [the] dictionary that reflects both positive and negative features with regard to the macro- and microstructural coverage and its presentation, the data distribution, the dictionary structures, the satisfaction of the envisaged lexicographic functions, the response to the intended target users' needs and reference skills, and to make recommendations for the improvement of the specific dictionary, and ways to make an optimal retrieval of information from the data on offer (Gouws 2017: 38).

However, one needs to heed an important guiding principle for desktop dictionary criticism as inspired by Svensén (2009), i.e. that "a reviewer cannot read, analyze, describe and evaluate any dictionary from beginning to end but necessarily has to make an informed choice out of all the design features under review" (Swanepoel 2017a: 23). Guided by this principle, the present paper adopted the following procedures out of Svensén's (2009: 484-485) comprehensive list:

- Dictionary familiarisation which included reading the blurb and all the introductory texts of the dictionary in order to determine the dictionary functions
- Browsing the main text of the dictionary to determine how it seeks to achieve its functions
- Scanning through the macrostructure of the dictionary to determine the length of alphabetic stretches and the methods of ordering
- Random selection of lemmata to determine their types and lemma selection criteria
- A close study of the articles of lemmata falling under different speech categories to determine the data items and data indicators that constitute the typical microstructural design of the dictionary

It is important to note that these activities were not conducted in a purely chronological order. For example, while studying the dictionary macrostructure, front matter texts referring to specific types of lemmata or grammatical categories in isiXhosa were consulted to corroborate some observations regarding relevant statements of intent made in the front matter texts. This was helpful in distinguishing systemic issues from possible editorial mistakes in the dictionary. Although the intention was never to read the entire dictionary as advised by Svensén, the iterative process was sufficient to get a fair picture of the dictionary in view of its brief overview provided above, while leading to evaluative comments made in the remainder of the article. At the same time, the Shuters dictionary was also compared with other isiXhosa dictionaries in order to determine how it addressed certain issues differently from, or similarly to, its predecessors.

5. A critical analysis and evaluation of the *Shuters IsiChazi-magama Sesixhosa*

Building on the compiler's perspective in Section 2 and the two sections that followed, this section attempts a critical analysis and evaluation of the Shuters dictionary. This undertaking is important in the light of the responsibility that lexicographers have towards society. As Gouws (2017: 26) writes, "[l]exicographers and their works should be judged to determine if they have successfully complied with this assignment" of serving society. Dictionary critics, thus, complement practicing lexicographers who produce dictionaries for specific communities or users within the communities, by making the communities aware of the dictionaries, their strengths and their shortcomings. To do that, it becomes imperative for the dictionary critic to delve deeper into the dictionary beyond the introductory and blurb texts. As per advice from Nielsen (2009: 25), "dictionary reviews should not merely describe but should contain more or less thorough analyses, evaluations and reflections". Accordingly, the three subsections of this section analyse and evaluate the Shuters dictionary in terms of its macrostructure, microstructure and outer texts.

5.1 The macrostructure

On the level of macrostructure, at least three major questions characterise dictionary criticism. The first question pertains to the size of the lemma stock of the dictionary. The second question focuses on the components and composition of the lemma stock. The final question considers the arrangement of lemmata and its user-friendliness. By addressing such questions, a dictionary can be evaluated in terms of whether it can address the needs of users who may consult the dictionary with respect to their vocabulary needs and any other relevant data that constitutes lexicographic treatment. This section of the paper seeks to elaborate on the first two questions and address them by giving examples from the Shuters dictionary in order to evaluate the extent to which the dictionary can or does assist its (identified) target users. The arrangement of lemmata will be addressed anecdotally in Section 5.2.

5.1.1 Size and composition of macrostructure

As noted in Section 2, the Shuters dictionary is a modest dictionary in terms of its size. According to Duka (2021), the publisher stipulated a limit of 3000 lemmata for this dictionary. Based on this figure, one may wonder about the adequacy of the macrostructure in addressing vocabulary needs of quite a broad spectrum of target users, namely basic and higher education, not to mention the generality of isiXhosa speakers. No indication is particularly made regarding the priority of any of those user categories.

In order to determine the macrostructural adequacy of the Shuters dictionary, the composition of the macrostructure was considered. When confronted with a rigid lemma or page limit for a dictionary, the decision of what to include or exclude ought to have been more critical for the lexicographer. Lemma selection needed a clear set of criteria informed by the user profile and the needs of users. This would ensure that every lemma would be worth its space in the dictionary.

Furthermore, the criteria adopted needed to be applied against a dictionary basis from which lemma candidates are identified. Traditionally, existing dictionaries and other published materials such as literary works, textbooks and print media have constituted dictionary bases for new dictionaries. With advances in computational linguistics nowadays, such texts can be assembled into electronic corpora from which lemmata may be drawn using corpus query software such as Wordsmith tools or Sketch Engine. Unfortunately, building adequate African languages corpora for lexicographic purposes is still confronted with challenges in terms of size, balance, representativeness and copyright issues. This undermines the general advantages of using corpora for as dictionary bases.

For the Shuters dictionary, the lexicographer acknowledges a few texts as constituting his dictionary basis. These include *IsiXhosa seBanga leMatriki* (Pahl et al. 1967), *Nasi isiXhosa: Ibanga 7* (Sigcu and Manyase 1981), *The Grammar of isiXhosa* (Oosthuysen 2016), *Introduction to the Phonology of the Bantu Languages* (Meinhof and van Warmelo 1932) and Bongela (1991)'s *Amagontsi*, which are grammar books, as well as an isiXhosa poetry anthology entitled *Isihobe se-Afrika Entsha* (Duka, Mhlontlo and Matoto 2010). Added to these texts are three dictionaries, namely *A Concise Xhosa–English Dictionary* (McLaren 1915), the *Oxford English–Xhosa Dictionary* (1985) and the *Zulu–English Dictionary* (Doke and Vilakazi 1948). The lexicographer does not indicate his motivation for choosing the above texts for his dictionary basis. What is notable is that, apart from the texts by Meinhof and van Warmelo (1932) and Oosthuysen (2016), most of the rest of the grammar books are for basic education. This suggests the prioritisation of the school market ahead of university students and the generality of isiXhosa speakers. What is also remarkable is the exclusion of the XNLU *IsiChazi-magama SesiXhosa*, hitherto the only monolingual dictionary compiled for mother-tongue speakers, in favour of those compiled for non-mother tongue speakers of the language decades ago. Overall, the use of rather old texts creates a potential chasm between the dictionary and its target users, particularly the school market where new contemporary texts are used. Given the small size of the Shuters dictionary, the XNLU dictionary is most likely to remain the more prestigious, authoritative and contemporary of the two monolingual dictionaries. However, as noted earlier, this is in the context of a poor dictionary culture.

Without any cue in the preface or introduction of the dictionary, further analysis of lemma selection and composition of the macrostructure relies on

insights gained from the interview conducted with the lexicographer. Duka (2021) confirmed an intuitive approach to lemma selection, arguing that he knew what he needed to include in the dictionary as a mother-tongue speaker, a writer and an education specialist. A close study of lemmata throughout the dictionary was also conducted to complement the discussion with the lexicographer. Given the modest size of the dictionary, this was not a tall order, and it provided an overview of the composition of the macrostructural entries of the Shuters dictionary.

One important point to note regarding the macrostructure of the Shuters dictionary is a conspicuous word-bias. Semi-lexical items and multi-lexical items were not entered in the dictionary. In an agglutinating language such as isiXhosa, semi-lexical items include prefixes, suffixes and other formatives that make the language morphologically highly productive. Treating such formatives as lemmata would work in a complementary way in serving the cognitive and text production functions with the grammatical notes, which describe the structure, and functions of isiXhosa nouns, verbs, pronouns, adjectives, copulatives, etc., between pages vi-xvi. Multi-lexical items would include proverbs and idioms, which are only included as microstructural entries under specific lemmata. For example, the proverb 'Ucuntsu akafani noshici' is included under the lemma **-cuntsu**, but not as a lemma. This strong word-bias is, however, understandable against the strict prescription of a 3000 word-limit macro-structure.

Existing literature has noted a bias towards nouns and verbs as lemma candidates in Bantu language dictionaries (De Schryver 2008; De Schryver and Wilkes 2008). The bias is ill informed as it is only justified by the dominance and majority of nouns and verbs as content words in the vocabulary of all languages. De Schryver and Wilkes (2008: 828) astutely remind practicing lexicographers that:

One cannot use a language without the content words from other word classes, however, and certainly not without function words which glue all content words together.

Accordingly, "an approach which throws out most word categories" (De Schryver and Wilkes 2008: 831) reduces the utility value and user-friendliness of dictionaries. Instead, De Schryver (2008: 66) argues for "a clear approach to the treatment of each and every ... word class". Such an approach does not prevail in the Shuters dictionary, in which lemma selection was guided by the lexicographer's intuition. Nouns and verbs dominate the dictionary at the expense of other word categories. To illustrate this bias, the two longest alphabetic stretches are letters *Nn* and *Bb*, which have a combined total of six hundred and eight lemmata. Four hundred and sixty-four (76.3%) of the lemmata are nouns, while one hundred and sixty-nine (27.8%) are verbs and only forty-four (7.2%) are drawn from other categories. The implications may not be as catastrophic as lamented by De Schryver and Wilkes (2008), given that this dictionary is for

mother-tongue speakers, but the inclusion of adjectives and quantitative pronouns would benefit some dictionary users. This could be done without consuming much dictionary space, as De Schryver (2008: 67) estimates that Bantu languages have about twenty to thirty so-called 'true adjective stems''. Most examples that are listed in two front matter texts entitled 'Izimelabizo' (Pronouns) and 'Izichazi' (Adjectives) are not even lemmatised in the dictionary.

The lexicographer's emphasis of the value of his dictionary as an educational tool, especially to support the use of isiXhosa as a medium of instruction (Duka 2018: vi) raises expectations regarding the treatment of academic vocabulary. In the interview, he made special reference to the inclusion of Maths and Science terminology as motivated by his commitment to mother-tongue education (Duka 2021). In order to evaluate the extent of his effort in this respect, curriculum words from the *Oxford Bilingual School Dictionary: IsiXhosa and English* were looked up in the Shuters dictionary. In the Oxford school dictionary, five hundred lemmata, which include instruction words and others used in various school subjects, are marked as important curriculum words. According to the compilers, these important words "have been chosen on the basis of ... frequency of use" in a corpus of "novels, textbooks, official documents" (De Schryver et al. 2015: xi) and other relevant curriculum material. While relying on his intuition and experience as a retired educator and education specialist, Duka (2018) managed to enter seventeen (3.4%) of the Oxford school dictionary's five hundred important curriculum vocabulary. A comparison was also made between the Shuters dictionary's Maths and Science terms and those included in the XNLU's *IsiChazi-magama SeMathematika neNzululwazi* (Maths and Science Dictionary), which is mainly for the intermediate phase. This comparison found that the two dictionaries share about fourteen Maths terms and twenty-four Science terms. The XNLU dictionary, which is a subject-field dictionary, treats more words that are not included in the Shuters dictionary. The comparison of the Shuters dictionary with the other two dictionaries in terms of academic vocabulary coverage might suggest that the envisaged impact of supporting mother-tongue education in isiXhosa might be less than anticipated. Of course, the dictionary also includes a few other words that are not found in the other dictionaries. However, the challenge with estimating its value relates to unclear criteria for including academic vocabulary, including terminology for specific school subjects.

In his quest to provide assistance with respect to contemporary language usage, Duka displays a very strong inclination towards loanwords. This can be seen from Figure 1 below, the first page of the Shuters dictionary.

<p>Aqala ngo-A</p> <p>aba, ukwaba. (isenzi): Ukwahlula-hlula oko kululutho phakathi kwabantu. Umzekelo: <i>abantu babelana ngomhlaba ngokulinganayo</i>. Izixando: ukwabisa, ukwabiwa, ukwabela, ukwabelana. Isinizi: umabi, isabelo.</p> <p>-abelo, isabelo. (<i>is-</i>, <i>iz-</i>). (isibizo): Oko umntu akufumanayo kwinto leyo ekwahlulelwana ngayo. Isenokuba yinto ayizuzayo kwilifa abohluelana ngalo. Isinizi: izabelo.</p> <p>abhakhasi, i-abhakhasi. (<i>i-</i>). (isibizo): Isihloho sobalo esisetyenziswa kwisisfundo seMathematiki.</p> <p>-abi, umabi. (<i>um-</i>, <i>ab-</i>). (isibizo). 1. Umntu owabayo. 2. Umntu onesakhono sokwabela abantu. Isinizi: ababi.</p> <p>-adresi, i-adresi (<i>i-</i>). (isibizo): 1. linkcukacha ezimalunga nendawo umntu ahlala kuyo. 2. Imizekelo: I-adresi yokuhlala, i-adresi yokuthumela imbalelwano okanye i-adresi ye-imeyile. Isinizi: ii-adresi.</p> <p>-afidavithi, i-afidavithi. (<i>i-</i>). (isibizo): Ingxelo efungelweyo phambi komKhomishina weziFungo. Isinizi: ii-afidavithi.</p> <p>-Afrika, i-Afrika. (<i>i-</i>). (isibizo): 1. Ilizwekazi elirhanqwe ziilwandlekazi ezintathu ezizezi, i-Atlantiki, iMedithera, nelase-Indiya. 2. Uninzi lwabemi beli lizwekazi ngabantu abamnyama abangabomthonyama.</p>	<p>-Afrika, um-Afrika. (<i>um-</i>, <i>ama-</i>). (isibizo): 1. Ummi wezwekazi lase-Afrika ngokwemveli. 2. Kanti ke isenokuba ngumntu wemveli welinye izwekazi (INtshona, iMpuma, iMelika) othe wamkeleka ngokomthetho wangummi osisigxina e-Afrika. Isinizi: ama-Afrika.</p> <p>-Agasti, u-Agasti. (<i>u-</i>, <i>oo-</i>). (isibizo): 1. EyeThupha. 2. Ngokwekhalaenda yaseNtshona yinyanga yesibhozo enyakeni ukuqalela kweyokuqala engulanyuwari (eyoMqungu). Isinizi: oo-Agasti.</p> <p>-ajenda, i-ajenda. (<i>i-</i>). (isibizo): Uludwe lwemicimbi exoxwayo entlanganisweni. Isihlonipho: <i>USipho une-ajenda yakhe</i>. Oku kuthetha ukuba uSipho lo unenye injongo engeyyiyo le kuditienwe ngayo. Maxa wambi kuye kuthiwe umntu une-ajenda embaxa. Umntu onjalo uyingozi kuba angakhangaleka ehamba nani kanti ujunge ukunonzakalisa. Isinizi: ii-ajenda.</p> <p>akha, ukwakha. (isenzi): 1. Ukunyusa udonga ngezitena okanye ngamatye. 2. Kanti ke useonokwakha umzi ngodaka nezinti. 3. Kukwathetha ukusebenzisa izimvo eziphilileyo zokubumba ubomi bomntu okanye babantu. Izixando: ukwakhsa, ukwakheka, ukwakhiwa, ukwakhela, ukwakhana. Isibizo: isakhiwo, umakhi.</p> <p>Iqhalo: <i>Intaka yakha ngoboya benye</i>. Umntu uncedwa ngabanye ukuze aphumelele.</p> <p>-akhawunti, i-akhawunti. (<i>i-</i>). (isibizo): 1. Ityalalomtali elibhalwe ezincwadini kumzi woshishino. 2. Kulindeleke ukuba lo utyalayo ahlawule isikade sakhe. Isinizi: ii-akhawunti.</p>
--	---

Figure 1: Loanwords on Page 1 of the Shuters dictionary

Six of the twelve (50%) of the lemma on the first page of the Shuters dictionary, namely **abhakhasi** (abacus), **-adresi** (address), **-afidavithi** (affidavit), **-Agasti** (August), **-ajenda** (agenda), **-akhawunti** (account) are loanwords. That the lexicographer prefers loanwords is clearer in cases where they exist alongside indigenous equivalent words. Names of months of the year, such as *August* illustrate this. Indigenous names only appear as part of the microstructural treatment but not as lemmata as can be seen on Figure 1 above. Thus, *eyeThupha* for *August*, *eyoMqungu* (January), *UTshazimpuzi* (April) or *EyoMnga* (December) are not lemmatised in the Shuters dictionary. Lemma selection policies regarding loanwords remain contested in African languages dictionaries. In the case of isiXhosa, the inclusion of loanwords was the major source criticism against the

Oxford Bilingual School Dictionary: IsiXhosa and English (Nkomo 2015).

Besides their inclusion, how loanwords are adapted in relation to the orthographies of African languages remains contentious. Thus, the discussion should not just end by condemning their inclusion, which is not necessarily wrong depending on the functions of dictionaries, among other reasons. For example, the *Oxford English–Xhosa Dictionary*, the *Oxford Bilingual School Dictionary: IsiXhosa and English* and the XNLU monolingual dictionary provide *iadresi* and *idilesi*, as orthographical adaptations of the English word *address*. These spellings are in line with those approved by PanSALB, but the Shuters dictionary has *i-adresi* instead. The Shuters dictionary's departure from existing dictionaries and PanSALB regarding the spelling of loanwords is evident when it renders *April* as *u-Aprili* while the other three dictionaries have *uEpreli* in adherence to the phonetic spelling system. Accordingly, Duka's approach to the inclusion and spelling of loanwords is another area of discussion in the assessment of the dictionary's macrostructure. The remark that was made regarding his non-use of isiXhosa dictionaries that are currently in circulation remains highly relevant as his dictionary tends to deviate, if not regress, regarding matters where existing dictionaries have already made progress.

5.2 The microstructure

This section analyses and evaluates the entries that constitute dictionary articles of the Shuters dictionary. The primary focus will be on items or data items, which are "those entries from which the dictionary user can retrieve some information regarding the subject matter of the ... dictionary" (Gouws and Prinsloo 2005a: 116). To determine "the extent of the data categories ... included in an article" (Gouws and Prinsloo 2005a: 141), the distinction between obligatory and extended obligatory microstructures is applied in Subsections 5.2.1 and 5.2.2. Thereafter, the discussion will proceed in Subsection 5.2.3 to consider indicators or structural indicators as part of the microstructure of the Shuters dictionary, entries from which the user cannot "retrieve information regarding the subject matter of the dictionary but they ... mark a specific item or indicate a specific search field in a dictionary article" (Gouws and Prinsloo 2005a: 116). Altogether, this undertaking evaluates the availability and accessibility of lexicographic information within dictionary entries, and user-friendliness of the dictionary.

5.2.1 The obligatory microstructure

Gouws and Prinsloo (2005a: 141) explain that the obligatory microstructure constitutes of data items included in each and every article. A survey of the Shuters dictionary indicates that all dictionary articles consists of at least the following items (cf. Figure 1 above):

- The lemma sign
- Part of speech data
- Paraphrases of meaning

While each lemma sign is part of the macrostructure of the dictionary, it automatically becomes a data item in the obligatory microstructure. The user can retrieve orthographic and morphological information about the lexical items represented by lemma signs, which are entered as stems. Full nouns which show how a stem combines with the relevant prefix follows, e.g. **inceba** immediately follows **-nceba** as another data item, while the infinitive form, e.g. **ukuhlela** (to edit) immediately follows the lemmatised stem **hlela** (edit). The morphological data is particularly important in the case of nouns whose stems may combine with more than one noun prefix. For example, **iħlelo** (noun class) and **uħlelo** (programme) provided as obligatory entries for two nouns sharing the stem **-ħlelo** enables the user to make the necessary morphological distinctions that also have semantic and grammatical implications. Consider the case of the stem **-phunga**, which yielded six separate lemmata in the Shuters dictionary, five of which are captured in Figure 2 below.

phunga, ukuphunga. (isenzi):
1. Ukungachani ugibisela.
2. Ukugqutya. 3. Ukuphosa. Umzekelo:
<i>ulizo uphosa (uphunga) uToto ngelitye.</i>
Izxando: ukuphungisa, ukuphungeka,
ukuphungwa, ukuphungela,
ukuphungana.
phunga, ukuphunga. (isenzi): 1. Ukusela
ulwelo iwekofu okanye lwesti.
2. Ukusela iyeza xa ligalelwe emanzini
ashushu abilileyo.
Izxando: ukuphungisa, ukuphungeka,
ukuphungiswa, ukuphungela,
ukuphungisana.
Isibizo: impunga, isiphungo.
-phunga, isiphunga. (isi-, izi-). (isibizo):
Elinye lamalungu amabini okuphefumla
athi amkele umoya aze awunikezele
egazini elisemithanjeni yomzimba
womntu okanye wesilwanyana
esinomnqonqo.
Isinanzi: iziphunga.
-phunga, umphunga. (um-, imi-). (isibizo):
Elinye lamalungu amabini okuphefumla
athi amkele umoya aze awunikezele
egazini elisemithanjeni yomzimba
womntu okanye wesilwanyana
esinomnqonqo.
Isinanzi: imiphunga.
-phunga, umphunga. (um-). (isibizo):
1. Ukufuma okusemoyeni
okunjengenkungu. 2. Ngokwezifundo

Figure 2: Five of the six lemmata with the stem *-phunga* in the Shuters dictionary

The morphological data that the user derives from the lemma signs, including the indications of stems and prefixes, serves to highlight the productive nature of isiXhosa and Bantu languages in general.

However, the repetition of full nouns and infinitive verbs as compulsory entries is redundant, particularly in the case of verbal lexical items since there are few instances where the variant prefix *ukw-* is used instead of *uku-*. The same effect regarding orthographical and morphological guidance could be achieved with an added benefit of saving space. This would entail simply including the prefixes in brackets after the lemma sign or attaching the prefix on the left of the lemma sign and excluding the full forms given in the Shuters dictionary. Verbal lexical items could be presented as follows:

Hlela (uku-) ... or uku**Hlela** ...
Ela (ukw-) ... or ukw**Ela** ...

Both these approaches are notable in other isiXhosa and Nguni dictionaries. The XNLU's *IsiChazi-magama SesiXhosa* is a good example of a dictionary that exhibits the latter approach (see Figure 3 below). As the guiding elements regarding the location of the lexical items belonging to different grammatical categories, stems appear in bold face with relevant prefixes, which are in regular font, attached to them on the left. The dictionary, thus, displays a left-expanded article structure, a notion introduced by Gouws and Prinsloo (2005b). Had this approach been applied in the Shuters dictionary, the related isiXhosa terms for *noun class* and *edition*, which share *-hlelo* as the stem could be entered as **iHlelo** and **uHlelo** respectively.

The relevance of part of speech entries in dictionaries is a point that will not be belaboured in this article. Part of speech information can assist users with guidance for sense discrimination in cases where certain words belong to different parts of speech. Gouws and Prinsloo (2005a: 125-126) offer useful examples of such information for both text reception and text production purposes. The Shuters dictionary highlights many instances where the same stem results in multiple words belonging in different grammatical categories, e.g. *-phunga* as shown in Figure 2 above. Although the hyphen distinguishes between noun and verbal lemmata, some inexperienced dictionary users might have to rely on part of speech data to confirm if they are looking at the right lemma.

For the Shuters dictionary, meaning information is alluded to as the most important when the lexicographer makes an emphatic statement about the language's capability to explain isiXhosa words (Duka 2018: v), perhaps in contrast to other isiXhosa dictionaries which provide meaning through English equivalents. It is important to note that this dictionary provides meaning information primarily by means of concise paraphrases of meaning. For example, the meaning of **nyamezela** (persevere) is explained as "Ukumelana neenzima neembandezelo neminye imingeni unganikezeli" (To withstand difficulties, oppression and other challenges without giving up). An equally informative

but wordy paraphrase of meaning is provided in the XNLU monolingual dictionary as shown below.

uku·nyamezela nz (dlul, mi –nyàmèzèlè, -nyàmèzèlê; nzn ukunyamezelana; nzk ukunyamezeleka; nzs ukunyamezelisa; nzw ukúnanyezelwa): 1. okomntu/isilwanyana: ukumelana, ukuthwala nabuphi na ubunzima ngomonde, intlungu, iinkxwaleko, intshutshiso, ingqele, njl; ukubambelela, ukuthi ungancami, usoloko uthe rhoqo ekwenzeni into nangona kukubi okanye kunzima, okanye kubuhlungu: *oku kuziphatha kwakho kubi kangaka*

Figure 3: The explanation of the meaning of *-nyamezela* in the XNLU monolingual dictionary

No real additional information may be obtained from the above article. Instead, some potentially more difficult words and expressions such as *iinkxwaleko*, *intshutshiso* and *uthe rhoqo*, may compel further searches, thereby burdening the user and distracting them from the activity that prompts the initial dictionary consultation. Thus, the concise paraphrases of meaning as the default data for explaining meaning in the Shuters dictionary is a massive improvement for mother-tongue speakers of isiXhosa who had to rely on mainly translation equivalents in the bi- and multilingual dictionaries. However, synonym definitions are also used needlessly in some cases in the Shuters dictionary. Consider the following example illustrating the provision of meaning information for the word **umbuzo** (question):

-buzo, umbuzo. (*um-, imi-*). (*isibizo*):
1. Ugocagoco. 2. Uxambuliso.
3. Bukukhondloza. 4. Ukunxorha.
Isininizi: Imibuzo.

Figure 4: Explanation of *umbuzo* using synonyms in the Shuters dictionary

For the user to benefit from such an article, knowing the meaning of synonyms such as *ugocagoco*, *uxambuliso*, *bukukhondloza* and *ukunxorha* is imperative. Such knowledge may not be taken for granted among young speakers of the language, especially given the diminished space for African languages in the South African education system and the permeation of English even in the

domestic spheres. Young language users no longer have adequate exposure and access to rich vocabulary in their languages.

The treatment of polysemy is another aspect for which the Shuters dictionary might be commended. The lexicographer has provided numbered paraphrases of meaning for lexical items with multiple senses. However, unnecessary repetition of the same senses with slightly different formulations undermines this effort. The screenshot in Figure 5 below is a case in point with respect to the lemma *umakhi*.

-akhi, umakhi. (*um-*, *ab-*). (isibizo):
1. Umntu oyingcali yokwakha izindlu.
2. Umntu oyingcali yokwakha izakhiwo
ngezitena. 3. Ikontrakta yokwakha
izindlu, njalo-njalo.

Figure 5: Article for the lemma *umakhi* in the Shuters dictionary

The first sense translates into "A person who is an expert in building houses". The second one would read as "A person who is an expert in constructing buildings using bricks" in English. The two paraphrases of meaning do not describe different senses of the word but differ in detail. Such cases are prevalent and they undermine the effort of capturing multiple senses of lexical items in the Shuters dictionary. At the same time, this practice takes up more space without providing additional help for the users of the dictionary.

5.2.2 Extended obligatory microstructure

In addition to default entries such as those identified in 5.2.1 above, extended obligatory microstructures refer to dictionary articles with extra data, depending on the types of lexical items represented by lemma signs, their parts of speech and semantic relations (Gouws and Prinsloo 2005a: 142). Nouns and verbs in the Shuters dictionary display an extended obligatory microstructure.

5.2.2.1 Additional data for nouns

For all lemmata falling under the part of speech category of nouns, prefixes are indicated for both singular and plural forms in the Shuters dictionary. These are respectively represented by 'sing. prefix' and 'pl. prefix' in the second and third columns of Table 1 below. However, the explicit class indication given in brackets is not part of the dictionary articles and possibly a regrettable omission for the potential dictionary users. The first column provides examples of nominal lemmata, which the lexicographer lemmatised according to stems

before giving the full singular forms. The obligatory data given in the first three columns of Table 1 constitutes morphological information that could be valuable in the study of grammar at high school and university levels.

Table 1: Morphological data for nominal lexical items in the Shuters dictionary

Lemma	Sing. Prefix	Pl. Prefix	Plural Form
-akhi, umakhi (builder)	um- (class 1)	ab- (class 2)	abakhi (builders)
-mama, umama (mothers)	u- (class 1a)	oo- (class 2a)	oomama (mothers)
-lambo, umlambo (river)	um- (class 3)	imi- (class 4)	imilambo (rivers)
-langa, ilanga (sun/day)	il- (class 5)	ama- (class 6)	amalanga (-/days)
-iselo, isiselo (drink)	isi- (class 7)	izi- (class 8)	iziselo (drinks)
-ja, inja (dog)	in- (class 9)	izin- (class 10)	izinja (dogs)
-thi, uluthi (stick)	ulu- (class 11)	izin- (class 10)	izinti (sticks)
-bomi, ubomi (life)	ubu- class 14)	—	
-tya, ukutya (food)	uku- (class 15)	—	

Apart from the indication of singular and plural prefixes, the extended obligatory microstructure for nominal lemmata includes additional data that apply only to certain types of lexical items. The first type of data is the indication of full plural forms, showing how noun stems combine with different plural prefixes. Examples are given in column 4 of Table 1 above. However, this data type does not constitute part of the extended obligatory microstructure of nominal lemmata in general since not all nouns included in the Shuters dictionary are countable. Nouns denoting uncountable phenomena such as *umunyu* (sympathy) and *amandla* (power/energy) do not have plural forms included as part of dictionary articles. Although sympathy and power or energy may be quantifiable in general terms, they are nevertheless uncountable. However, the first one belongs in class 3 and morphologically looks like countable singular nouns belonging in that class, while the latter belongs in class 6 together with plural forms of nouns belonging in class 5.

In isiXhosa and other Bantu languages, suffixes are added to create forms that bear certain semantic dimensions such as the female gender, augmentation and diminutives. Table 2 below illustrates some examples from the Shuters dictionary.

Table 2: Nominal suffixing in the Shuters dictionary

Feminine gender	Augmentation	Diminutives
inja > injakazi	isixeko > isixekokazi	inkomo > inkonyana
igqirha > igqirhakazi	impixano > impixanokazi	umntu > umntwana
Itshawe > itshawekazi	ipoma > ipomakazi	indlu > indlwana
umqingqi > umqingqikazi		icephe > icetshana
umprofeti > umprofetikazi		Ithumbu > ithunjana

The suffix *-kazi* is used as a gender marker and for augmentation. As a gender marker, it denotes that the subjects referred to in the first column of Table 2 are biologically female. No social connotations or constructions of **injakazi** (female dog) or **umprofetikazi** (prophetess) being weaker than the male counterparts are expressed by the suffix. However, when used in the cases of lemmata in the second column, the *-kazi* suffix augments the subject/object to which the noun refers. Thus, **isixekokazi** is a big city while **impixanokazi** is a fierce conflict. In the case of personal names such as *Siphokazi*, *Vuyokazi* and *Thandokazi* given to females, both the gender and augment senses would appear to be in complementary use. Firstly, they seem to acknowledge that the individuals are females, while at the same time indicating that the phenomena after which they are named, e.g. *sipho* (gift), *vuyo* (joy) and *uthando* (love), are huge or abundant. This has generated contestations of whether African languages such as isiXhosa are gendered or not, with some scholars attributing *-kazi* as a gender marker to colonial linguistics (Maseko 2018). However, a deep engagement with those debates is beyond the scope of this article.

As a diminutive suffix, *-ana* carries a sense of young, little, small or tiny, depending on the context in which nouns are used in Bantu languages such as isiXhosa. The Shuters dictionary included diminutive forms such as those given in the third column of Table 2 as optional data at the end of some articles whose lemma signs are nouns. In the case of **umntu** (person) and **inkomo** (cow), **umntwana** (child) and **inkonyana** (calf) as diminutive forms denote the young ones, while indicating that the house, spoon and intestine are of small sizes in *indlwana*, *icetshana* and *ithunjana* respectively.

Nominal lemmata marked for gender, augmentative and diminutive forms constituting the extended obligatory microstructure of the Shuters dictionary provide morphological and semantic data that could be useful for dictionary users. However, these forms are indicated sparingly in the dictionary. What is not clear is the criteria that was used to decide on the inclusion of those forms that are entered. The augmentative and diminutive suffixes combine with much more nouns than was indicated in the dictionary.

5.2.2.2 Additional data for verbs

Verbal extensions constitute key microstructural entries for all verbal lemmata in the Shuters dictionary. Many scholars acknowledge the prominence of verbal extensions in Bantu languages such as isiXhosa (Bosch, Pretorius and Jones 2007; Cocchi (2009); Nurse and Philippson 2003). Cocchi (2009: 93) observes "several important differences concerning function, productivity, combinatory possibilities and mutual exclusion patterns" of verbal extensions. These differences make the inclusion of verbal extensions an important undertaking, especially for dictionaries that are used in the teaching/learning of grammar for productive purposes. However, the combinatory possibilities and exclusion patterns need to be taken into account. According to Bosch et al. (2007: 135), "verbal extensions are not able to combine with all verb roots". This "necessitates the explicit inclusion of known occurrences as subentries under the base form" (Bosch et al. 2007: 135). Accordingly, while verbal extensions feature for all verbs in the Shuters dictionary, some extensions do not appear for certain verbs. As an example, the reciprocal extension would not apply in verbs whose possible objects do not possess any agentive potential. Thus, for the verb **cula** (sing), *ukuculisa* (to cause to sing), *ukuculiseka* (to be capable to be caused to sing), *ukuculwa* (to be sung), *ukuculela* (to sing for), and *ukuculisana* (to cause each other to sing) are included while *ukuculana* (to sing each other) is excluded. However, the omission of *ukuculeka* (to be capable to be sung) is questionable.

Related to the inclusion of verbal extensions, pseudo-extended verb stems pose another tricky challenge for lexicographers. Phiri (1980: 63) defines a pseudo-extended verbal stem as "that minimal stem whose final element resembles a verb extension which cannot be isolated". He adds that "[t]he resemblance to an extension is usually reinforced by a characteristic meaning common to the series of such stems" (Phiri 1980: 63). Verbs with such stems are abundant in isiXhosa. They require lexicographers to be meticulous and avoid treating them as extended verbs. Examples include **landela** (follow) **phangela** (work) and **thelekisa** (compare) which are included as lemmata in the Shuters dictionary. Their stems could erroneously be treated as extended stems of *landa* (collect) *phanga* (to loot or take forcefully) and *thela* (pour). Yet they do not display strong semantic connections with the former. By including them as lemmata in their own right, the lexicographer avoided such confusion. That he further included applicable extended forms for such lemmata, e.g. *ukuphangelisa* (to cause to work), *ukuphangeleka* (to be able to make work possible), *ukuphangelwa* (to be worked), *ukuphangelela* (to work for), *ukuphangelisana* (to cause each other to work) is commendable. This affords the lemma **phangela** the same treatment as **phanga**. However, inconsistency is noted once again, with verbal extensions not featuring under the article for **landela**.

5.2.2.3 Proverbs and idioms

Proverbs and idioms constitute the final types of data items provided as part of

some dictionary articles in the Shuters dictionary. Including and explaining them is useful for text production and text reception. They are included as part of the extended obligatory microstructure for words serving as bases for the proverbs or idioms, indicated in isiXhosa as *isaci* and *iqhalo* respectively. The article for **khotha** illustrates this:

khotha, ukukhatha. (*isenzi*): *Ukulenya.*
Umzekelo: inkomo ikhatha enye
ngolwimi.
Izixando: ukukhothisa, ukukhotheka,
ukukhothwa, ukukhothela,
ukukhothana.
*Isaci: *Ukukhoth'* exathula. Uncoma*
egxeka.
*Iqhalo: *Inkomo ikhoth'* eyikhothayo.*
Umntu unceda omncedayo.

Figure 6: Article indicating an idiom (*isaci*) and a proverb (*iqhalo*) based on *khotha*

The lemma **khotha** (lick/caress) serves as a base for an important proverb and idiom isiXhosa. The proverb refers to the habitual and reciprocal act of cattle which caress each other using tongues, i.e. *Inkomo ikhoth' eyikhothayo*. Literally, this proverb can be glossed as 'a cow caresses another cow that also caresses it', meaning that a person helps those who also help them). The idiom *ukukhoth' exathula* literally means that one caresses while scratching, which would refer to a diplomatic or treacherous act of criticising while also complimenting.

While the approach taken by Duka is common in many dictionaries, it presents challenges when there is inadequate certainty about the base among the different words constituting a proverb or an idiom. The idiom *imbiza ibona iketile* is a good example. Literally, it means 'the pot sees the kettle'. It refers to someone who sees faults other people's faults but not their own. The lexicographer included it under both **imbiza** (pot) and **iketile** (kettle). If the user is to benefit from proverbs and idioms, they need know their bases. If the user does not know, they may have to access these data types fortuitously under the relevant lexical items even if the need for the data had not initiated the dictionary consultation process.

5.2.3 Structural indicators

Gouws and Prinsloo (2005a: 116) state that structural indicators "are not entries from which the user can retrieve information regarding the subject matter of the dictionary but they ... mark a specific item or indicate a specific search field in a dictionary article". Their distinction between typographical and non-typo-

graphical structural indicators applies to all print dictionaries including the Shuters dictionary. The different screenshots taken from the Shuters dictionary highlight three typographical indicators, namely bold print that is used for lemma signs, italics for examples and regular Roman for the rest of the data types. Non-typographical indicators complement the typographical ones to offer guidance with respect to the identification of data items and indication of specific search fields within the dictionary articles. The following non-typographical indicators are identified with their functions:

(1) **Punctuation marks**

- commas: (a) separating the lemma sign and the full verb in infinitive form and (b) separating different verbal extensions
- full stops: (a) after the infinitive verb, (b) at the end of each paraphrase of meaning, (c) after the idiom; and (d) at the end of the article
- brackets in which part of speech data is provided
- colon: (a) before the first paraphrase of meaning, (b) before the example, (c) verbal extensions; and (d) before the idiom.

(2) **Linguistic labels**

- *isenzi* (verb)/*isibizo* (noun) for indicating part of speech
- *Umzekelo* (example)
- *Izixando* (verbal extensions)
- *Isaci* (idiom)
- *Iqhalo* (proverb)

(3) **Numerals**

- Used for sense discrimination

The most remarkable feature of the Shuters dictionary is the avoidance of abbreviations and place keeping symbols to indicate parts of speech and other data types. The lexicographer opted for full linguistic labels such as *isibizo* (noun), *isenzi* (verb), *isiniinzi* (plural) *umzekelo* (example), *isaci* (idiom), *iqhalo* (proverb), *isikhomokazi* (female gender marker), etc. These non-typographical indicators are used explicitly even in cases where implicit indication could be used. For instance, the indication of examples could have been done implicitly using italics only, as done in many print dictionaries. All this indicates that the lexicographer intended to be as explicit as possible in order to make the dictionary accessible. This is a considerate decision, given that school learners appear to be the primary target users of the dictionary. The unfortunate part is that all these structural indicators are not explained anywhere in the dictionary.

5.3 Outer texts

The analysis of the Shuters dictionary has thus far focused on the contents of

dictionary articles. Gouws (2004: 68) is critical of "[t]he traditional bias towards the contents of dictionary articles as the main field of interest for dictionary users, lexicographers and metalexicographers". He notes that such an approach is "detrimental to the study, the development and the use of the structure of a dictionary and the different structural components" (Gouws 2004: 68). The main-text bias by lexicographers limits the potential of the dictionary in terms of data distribution and the realisation of its functions. On the part of the user, it results in the under-utilisation of lexicographic data that is included in the outer texts. In an effort of making this exercise of dictionary criticism to be as judicious as possible, it is important to consider its outer texts of Shuters dictionary.

The study of outer texts recognises dictionaries as compound texts and it has led to useful characterisations taking into account the relationship between outer texts and main texts in the accomplishment of dictionary functions (cf. Bergenholz, Tarp and Wiegand 1999; Gouws 2004; 2007b; Kammerer and Wiegand 1998). Drawing from this existing literature, a partially extended frame structure (cf. Gouws 2004: 68-9) best characterises the Shuters dictionary. The dictionary contains only the front matter, but no back-matter texts to make it completely extended. Apart from the title page, imprint and the acknowledgement text, which may be classified as non-integrated outer texts (Gouws 2007b), the other texts may be categorised as integrated texts as they play a role in accomplishing at least one of the dictionary's lexicographic functions (Gouws 2007b). The latter include the table of contents, which guides the user to other front matter texts and the beginning of individual alphabetic lemma stretches in the main text. The other texts were conceptualised as integrated function-adhering outer texts, as the lexicographer writes:

Intshayelelo le yenziweyo yeyokuncedisa umfundi aqonde ezinye zezinto aza kuhlangana nazo kulo mqulu. Kanti kanjalo ikwancedisa utitshala ekuxhobiseni umfundi ekuqondeni isiXhosa ngokubanzi nanzulu.

The introduction that has been given is to assist the learner to understand some of the things that s/he will encounter in this compilation. At the same time, it will help the teacher in equipping the learner with understanding isiXhosa broadly and deeply (Duka 2018: xvi).

The statement applies to the front matter texts dealing with various aspects of the language that appear in the main text. These include grammatical texts alluded to earlier, which describe some phonological, morphological and syntactical aspects of isiXhosa, the treatment of loanwords, idioms and proverbs. To a certain extent, these texts also serve as a user guide with respect to specific linguistic phenomena that fall within the lexicographic treatment programme of the dictionary. This is made explicit in some of the texts. For example, the texts dealing with loanwords, compound nouns and verbal extensions are excellent in that respect. However, what is regrettable is the brevity of the available texts and the absence of a user guide which deals with aspects of dic-

tionary structures. The grammar section could have been made more comprehensive and systematic as well in order to enhance the cognitive and communicative functions that the lexicographer alludes to in the introductory and blurb texts.

6. Conclusion

This article undertook a critical evaluation of the *Shuters IsiChazi-magama SesiXhosa* as a recent addition to the inventory of isiXhosa dictionaries. Apart from being relatively new, what makes this dictionary special is that it is only the second monolingual dictionary in the language, as outlined in the introduction. Therefore, the main endeavor of the article was to determine the contribution that this dictionary makes to isiXhosa lexicography in view of its predecessors in the language, including the pioneer monolingual dictionary. The undertaking drew theoretical and methodological insights from dictionary criticism as a sub-field of lexicographic research. The article focused on the macrostructure, microstructure and the front matter of the dictionary.

When viewed against *IsiChazi-magama SesiXhosa* compiled by the XNLU ten years earlier, the Shuters dictionary may be characterised as a basic monolingual dictionary. Of its envisaged target users, the school market may benefit more than university students and the generality of isiXhosa speakers. Concise paraphrases of meaning compete favourably with those of the XNLU's *IsiChazi-magama SesiXhosa*. However, its excessive use of synonyms reduces the user-friendliness of the dictionary as users may be forced onto extended and circular searches for meaning information. Needless repetition of senses may also mislead users into thinking that many lexical items treated in the dictionary are polysemous. Furthermore, the macrostructural composition of the dictionary exhibits the lexicographer's intuitive approach to lemma selection, which resulted in an unbalanced representation of vocabulary belonging from different grammatical categories and registers used in different school subjects for the primary target users of the dictionary. The adaptation of loanwords could also shorten the dictionary's lifespan in the market, as it departs from some orthographic rules established by PanSALB and embraced in existing dictionaries. Finally, better utilisation of the outer texts to enhance the data distribution and purposeful integration with the main text could have resulted in a more user-friendly dictionary. Nevertheless, another dictionary in an African language produced without the involvement of a National Lexicography Unit is welcome towards further intellectualisation of African languages. What is needed is a better application of insights from metalexicography.

Endnote

1. The Duka (2021) reference is based on a telephone interview between this author and M.M.M. Duka regarding the dictionary, his motivation, his approach to lexicographic task and relevant expertise that guided his work.

Acknowledgement

This article is produced within the research programme of the NRF SARChI Chair: Intellectualisation of African Languages, Multilingualism and Education (Grant specific unique reference number 82767). The author acknowledges that opinions, findings and conclusions or recommendations expressed in any publication generated by the NRF supported research are those of the author, and that the NRF accepts no liability whatsoever in this regard. The author would also like to acknowledge Mr Nkosekaya Hlitane, for the support he offered as a Research Assistant, and Dr Bulelwa Nosilela, for assistance with the translation of the abstract and keywords into isiXhosa.

References

- Alberts, M.** 2011. National Lexicography Units: Past, Present, Future. *Lexikos* 21: 23-52.
- Awak, M.K.** 1990. Historical Background, with Special Reference to Western Africa. Hartmann, R.R.K. (Ed.). 1990. *Lexicography in Africa. Progress Reports from the Dictionary Research Centre Workshop at Exeter, 24–26 March 1989*: 8-18. Exeter Linguistic Studies 15. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.
- Bergenholtz, H., S. Tarp and H.E. Wiegand.** 1999. Datendistributionsstrukturen, Makro- und Mikrostrukturen in neueren Fachwörterbüchern. Hoffmann, L. et al. (Eds.). 1999. *Fachsprachen. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Fachsprachenforschung und Terminologiewissenschaft / Languages for Special Purposes. An International Handbook of Special-language and Terminology Research*: 1762-1832. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Bongela, K.S.** 1991. *Amagontsi*. Umtata: Afro Publishers.
- Bosch, S.E., L. Pretorius and J. Jones.** 2007. Towards Machine-readable Lexicons for South African Bantu Languages. *Nordic Journal of African Studies* 16(2): 131-145.
- Busane, M.** 1990. Lexicography in Central Africa: The User-Perspective, with Special Reference to Zaïre. Hartmann, R.R.K. (Ed.). 1990. *Lexicography in Africa. Progress Reports from the Dictionary Research Centre Workshop at Exeter, 24–26 March 1989*: 19-35. Exeter Linguistic Studies 15. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.
- Cocchi, G.** 2009. Bantu Verbal Extensions: A Cartographic Approach. Moscati, V. and E. Servidio (Eds.). 2009. *Proceedings XXXV Incontro di Grammatica Generativa*. Vol.3: 92-104. Siena: Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio.
- De Schryver, G.-M.** 2008. A New Way to Lemmatize Adjectives in a User-friendly Zulu–English Dictionary. *Lexikos* 18: 63-91.
- De Schryver, G.-M. and A. Wilkes.** 2008. User-friendly Dictionaries for Zulu: An Exercise in Complexicography. Bernal, E. and D. DeCesaris (Eds.). 2008. 2008. *Proceedings of the XIII EURALEX International Congress, Barcelona, 15–19 July 2008*: 827-836. Série Activitats 20. Barcelona: Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Institut Universitari de Lingüística Aplicada.
- De Schryver, G.-M. et al. (Eds.).** 2014. *Oxford Bilingual School Dictionary: IsiXhosa and English*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press Southern Africa.
- Doke, C.M. and B.W. Vilakazi.** 1948. *Zulu–English Dictionary*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.
- Duka, M.M.M.** 2018. *Shuters IsiChazi-magama SesiXhosa*. Pietermaritzburg: Shuter and Shooter.

- Duka, M.M.M. 2021. Interview, 28 June 2021.
- Duka, M.M.M., S.W. Mhlontlo and T. Matoto. 2010. *Isihobe se-Afrika Entsha*. Pietermaritzburg: Shuter and Shooter.
- Fischer, A., E. Weiss, E. Mdala and S. Tshabe. 1985. *Oxford English–Xhosa Dictionary*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press Southern Africa.
- Gallardo, A. 1980. *Dictionaries and the Standardisation Process*. Zgusta, L. (Ed.). 1980. *Theory and Method in Lexicography*: 59-69. Columbia, South Carolina: Hornbeam Press.
- Gouws, R.H. 2004. Outer Texts in Bilingual Dictionaries. *Lexikos* 14: 67-88.
- Gouws, R.H. 2007a. On the Development of Bilingual Dictionaries in South Africa: Aspects of Dictionary Culture and Government Policy. *International Journal of Lexicography* 20(3): 313-327.
- Gouws, R.H. 2007b. A Transtextual Approach to Lexicographic Functions. *Lexikos* 17: 77-87.
- Gouws, R.H. 2017. Dictionary Criticism and Dictionary Critics. Bielińska, M. and S.J. Schierholz (Eds.). 2017. *Wörterbuchkritik – Dictionary Criticism*: 33-49. Berlin/Munich/Boston: De Gruyter.
- Gouws, R.H. and F.A. Ponelis. 1992. The Development of Afrikaans and the Lexicographical Tradition. Zgusta, L. (Ed.). 1992. *History, Languages and Lexicographers*: 77-104. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Gouws, R.H. and D.J. Prinsloo. 2005a. *Principles and Practice of South African Lexicography*. Stellenbosch: SUN PReSS.
- Gouws, R.H. and D.J. Prinsloo. 2005b. Left-expanded Article Structures in Bantu with Special Reference to isiZulu and Sepedi. *International Journal of Lexicography* 18(1): 25-46.
- Hartmann, R.R.K. and G. James. 1998. *Dictionary of Lexicography*. London: Routledge.
- IsiXhosa National Lexicography Unit. 2013. *Isichazi-magama seMathematika neNzululwazi*. Cape Town: South African Heritage Publishers.
- Kammerer, M. and H.E. Wiegand. 1998. Über die textuelle Rahmenstruktur von Wörterbüchern. Präzisierungen und weiterführende Überlegungen. *Lexicographica* 14: 224-238.
- Kaschula, R.H. and D. Nkomo. 2019. Intellectualisation of African Languages: Past, Present and Future. Wolff, H.E. (Ed.). 2019. *The Cambridge Handbook of African Linguistics*: 601-622. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kropf, A. 1899. *A Kafir–English Dictionary*. Alice: Lovedale Press.
- Maseko, P. 2018. Language as Source of Revitalisation and Reclamation of Indigenous Epistemologies: Contesting Assumptions and Re-imagining Women Identities in (African) Xhosa Society. Bam, J., L. Ntsebeza and A. Zinn (Eds.). 2018. *Whose History Counts: Decolonising African Pre-colonial Historiography*: 35-55. Stellenbosch: SUN PReSS.
- McLaren, J. 1915. *A Concise Kafir–English Dictionary*. London: Longmans, Green and Company.
- Meinhof, C. and N.J. van Warmelo. 1932. *Introduction to the Phonology of the Bantu Languages*. Berlin: Reimer/Vohsen.
- Mugglestone, L. 2015. *Samuel Johnson and the Journey into Words*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nielsen, S. 2009. Reviewing Printed and Electronic Dictionaries: A Theoretical and Practical Framework. Nielsen, S. and S. Tarp (Eds.). 2009. *Lexicography in the 21st Century*: 23-41. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Nkomo, D. 2015. From Common Conversations around the *Oxford Bilingual School Dictionary*: IsiXhosa–English to Constructive Dictionary Criticism. Bosch, S.E. and D. Nkomo (Eds.). 2015. *Programme and Abstracts: 20th International Conference of the African Association for Lexicography, 6–8 July 2015, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa*.

- Nkomo, D.** 2018. Dictionaries and Language Policy. Fuertes-Olivera, P.A. (Ed.). 2018. *The Routledge Handbook of Lexicography*: 152-165. New York: Routledge.
- Nkomo, D.** 2020. Dictionary Culture in African Language Communities: Research, Development, Challenges and Prospects. *Lexicographica* 36(1): 11-37.
- Nurse, D. and G. Philippson.** 2003. Introduction. Nurse, D. and G. Philippson (Eds.). 2003. *The Bantu Languages*: 1-12. London/New York: Routledge.
- Oosthuysen, J.C.** 2016. *The Grammar of isiXhosa*. Stellenbosch: SUN PReSS.
- Pahl, H.W. et al.** 1967. *IsiXhosa seBanga leMatriki*. Johannesburg: Educum Publishers.
- Phiri, A.G.** 1980. *A Description of Derivational Forms in Tumbuka*. Doctoral dissertation. Austin: The University of Texas.
- Sigcu, A.T. and L.T. Manyase.** 1981. *Nasi isiXhosa: Ibanga* 7. Umtata: Shuter and Shooter.
- Svensén, B.** 2009. *A Handbook of Lexicography: The Theory and Practice of Dictionary-making*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Swanepoel, P.** 2017a. The Contribution of Dictionary Criticism to Dictionary Research. Bielińska, M. and S.J. Schierholz (Eds.). 2017. *Wörterbuchkritik — Dictionary Criticism*: 11-31. Berlin/Munich/Boston: De Gruyter.
- Swanepoel, P.** 2017b. Methods in Dictionary Criticism. Bielińska, M. and S.J. Schierholz (Eds.). 2017. *Wörterbuchkritik — Dictionary Criticism*: 81-112. Berlin/Munich/Boston: De Gruyter.
- Tarp, S.** 2017. Dictionary Criticism and Lexicographical Function Theory. Bielińska, M. and S.J. Schierholz (Eds.). 2017. *Wörterbuchkritik — Dictionary Criticism*: 113-132. Berlin/Munich/Boston: De Gruyter.
- Tshabe, S.L., Z. Guzana and A.B.B. Nokole.** 2008. *IsiChazi-magama SesiXhosa*. Pietermaritzburg: Nutrend Publishers.
- Wiegand, H.E.** 1984. On the Structure and Contents of a General Theory of Lexicography. Hartmann, R.R.K. (Ed.). 1984. *LEXeter '83 Proceedings. Papers from the International Conference on Lexicography at Exeter, 9-12 September 1983*: 13-30. *Lexicographica. Series Maior* 1. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.