Language Planning, Language Ideology and Entextualization: War Naming Practices

BUSI MAKONI
Pennsylvania State University, State College, PA. USA

SINFREE MAKONI
Pennsylvania State University, State College, PA. USA

CHARLES PFUKWA
University of Masvingo State, Zimbabwe

This article examines the relationship between language and war by investigating naming practices through three prisms: language planning, language ideology and entextualization. The article focuses on names assigned to combatants during the War of Liberation for Zimbabwe's independence. In African cultures, names often address a kaleidoscope of issues which may include the collective history and life experiences of the individual name bearer and the people surrounding him or her. In most African contexts changes in an individual's personal circumstances are marked by a name change, which suggests that names are variable and are not immutable. Entering the guerilla movement in Zimbabwe was a significant transformation which, in accordance with African cultural practices, required a new name to be assigned to signify the entry into a new phase of life. The names assigned reflect a "discourse" about the hopes and aspirations of the combatants. However, it appears that the underlying principles of naming in war are not significantly different from those during peacetime. In addition, war naming practices have implications for language planning from below, language ideologies and entextualization.

KEYWORDS Language ideology, Language planning, Language policy, Liberation War, entextualization

Introduction

This study investigates the dynamics and politics of names assigned to guerilla fighters during the liberation struggle for Zimbabwe's independence. There is a very

impressive body of literature on personal naming practices. One of the main topics of this research is the etymology and social significance and meanings of the names in their respective communities (Akinasso 1980; Kimenyi 1978; Mathangwane and Gardner 2002). Our article differs from this tradition in that it uses sociolinguistic theoretical frameworks for interpretive insight in investigating naming practices during the Chimurenga War. War names refer to the names given to the fighters themselves, or the labeling of those against whom the combatants are fighting. The Chimurenga War took place in the past, and therefore the linguistic analysis of naming is a form of a "linguistic turn" of historiography in that the analysis is situated at the intersection of linguistic analysis and history.

Specifically the article addresses the following questions:

(i)   What do naming practices look like when viewed through the prisms of language ideology and language planning, and conversely what do language planning and language ideology look like when viewed through naming practices during war?

(ii) What is the sociolinguistic significance of discourse processes such as entextualization on naming practices during war?

(iii) Are there any significant gender differences in the names assigned to the guerillas?

Since in most African communities "every level of personal development has a name-giving ritual, in which the new name symbolizes the achievement of a new state of social being" (Coplan 1994:47), joining the combatants in a liberation war requires a rite of passage in which a new name is vital for marking this change. However, unlike other name changes in rite of passage situations, in the case studied here, the name change affected both the first name and the surname. In ordinary rites of passage name changes, it is very seldom that the surname is changed. Yet in wartime, at least in the case of the Chimurenga War, the change of name represents the construction of a new identity for the guerilla, in which both first and surname are changed.

In the Chimurenga War, given names were deeply embedded in a politics of resistance and depict futuristic endeavors in an imagined independent state. As such, the war names or names assigned by and to individuals during the war of liberation were pseudonyms (Finnegan 2003) or *noms de guerre* which discursively constructed an "us" and "them" dichotomy wherein "the former is imbued with morally good qualities and the latter constitutes the evil, even inhuman enemy" (Brinkman 2004:2). The new names initiated, legitimated, and changed the identity of the individual during the liberation war. In fact, the war names were seldom used again after the end of the liberation war.

By and large, this article is a continuation of our earlier work (Makoni et al. 2007) in which we analyzed names in a context where the individuals were not engaged in the liberation war, during the period 1960–1990. In this article, we analyze the names of Zimbabwe's war veterans (then referred to as guerilla fighters or *Vakomana* ("boys" in Shona)). These are names they either were given or gave themselves not only to disguise their identities, but also at the same time to construct a new identity; possibly in preparation for the new independent state. We chose the Chimurenga War because it was the most significant nationalist war in the history of Zimbabwe.

War is both a physical act of violence and a social process with discourse practices that have a substantial impact on corpus planning. In wartime, language undergoes rapid changes as new words are added to the language or old words acquire new meanings associated with war experiences (Brinkman 2004). New words are introduced into the language as part of "code-language." This furtive language is often used "to prevent the enemy from knowing about war strategies and plans" (Brinkman 2004:3). Language change also occurs in part because of the deployment of old words/terms to new contexts and the creation of new linguistic configurations made up of multiple languages. The process of creating new words or expressions, as well as modifying old ones, or selecting among alternative forms, is a part of corpus planning. In most cases, corpus planning aims to develop the resources of a language so that it becomes an appropriate medium for communicating new concepts which cannot be communicated using the existing repertoire of words in the language.

Corpus planning, like any other form of language planning, is typically a top-down activity. Yet war naming practices create opportunities for corpus planning from below, as the act of naming is an instance of ground-level practices. From an applied linguistic perspective, naming practices during wartime are indicative of processes of corpus planning from below. Thus, studying war names not only provides insight into language planning from below, but also offers significant insight into "an encompassing social and political history" (Ferme 2001:177).

The article views war names from the quintessential triad of discourse-identity-ideology. War names discursively construct a particular identity and reflect specific ideologies through language use. The paper therefore is conceptualized not only as a contribution to onomastics but also to language planning and ideologies of language (Blommaert, 2005; Makoni and Pennycook, 2006; Woolard and Schieffelin, 1994). Ideologies of language are viewed as contextual sets of beliefs about languages, as cultural and political systems of ideas about social and linguistic relationships (Pennycook, 2007). The manner in "which languages are constructed is never about language only, but also about how individuals are thought about in society and definitions about" (Makoni et al. 2007:6) "languages are always definitions about human beings in the world" (Woolard and Schieffelin, 1994: 55). Ideologies of language are examined through the discursive construction of war names.

In African contexts, names, by their very nature, are "discoursed" or "languaged" (Maturana 1988; Mignolo 2001). Names indicate "the collective history and life experiences" (Mphande 2006) not only of the individual but also of the people surrounding the individual. The term "languaged" encapsulates active engagement, support, appropriation and subversion. To this end, "names of all kinds are social documents, which fix a person's position in the social structure and define his relations to other members of society" (Koopman 1992:1). This phenomenon of using names as discourse elements is also evident in the naming of dogs (Tatira 2004). Dog names "are used to comment on human social relationships" (ibid.:85), especially those things that cannot be expressed on a face-to-face basis. Names are therefore a vital communicative resource and provide a "languaging" opportunity. In wartime, "enemy-construction" (Brinkman 2004) is articulated through the use of names. For instance, the name *Bhidliza Mabhunu* (Destroy Boers/whites) is in its own right an internal or in-group discourse about the out-group, as it expresses a wish by the

in-group. The names are therefore situated within putative discourses which provide an opportunity to analyze processes of entextualization (Blommaert 2005; Bucholtz 2009).

Even though the names analyzed here are from a specific period, the use of names may transcend a particular historical period. For example, *Chimurenga* was the name of the legendary Shona ancestor Murenga Sororenzou (whom mythology describes as an extremely big man with a head the size of an elephant (*nzou*). Murenga was famous for the songs he composed which were sources of inspiration to his war colleagues. "Chimurenga" was subsequently used to refer to any battle against tyranny of any sort, including, ironically, opposition to institutional politics in independent Zimbabwe articulated through a type of protest music referred to as *Chimurenga*. *Chimurenga* has also been used as a metaphor for nationalistic history. It has been actively mobilized in the construction of a national memory, history, and common tradition.

The origins of the name *Chimurenga* can be traced as far back as the battles between the Portuguese and the Munhumutapa Empire in the seventeenth century. It was used again in the 1830s resistance by the Shona against Ndebele raids, and later in the conflict between the British and the Ndebele and Shona. More recently, it has been used by the Zimbabwean government to legitimate its land acquisition from Zimbabwean whites. The semantic and teleological history of a word like *Chimurenga* shows the complicated, constantly shifting, and at times conflicting nature of the concept. It also demonstrates how it has been effectively and astutely used to create continuity in the "nationalistic historiography" (Ranger 2004) of Zimbabwe. The meaning of the word *Chimurenga* shows the complex relationship between the construction of national imagination, entextualization, naming and history. Naming in war encapsulates the tension within post-colonial Africa as it tries to imagine its past by creating what it imagines to be "authentic" preceding epochs through retrospective naming while framing the rendition of that history along the linear Western model of history.

Background: Zimbabwean social and political war context

The naming practices and the attendant names analyzed fall within a very specific political context during Zimbabwe's War of Liberation in the 1970s. In the late nineteenth century, Zimbabwe was colonized by the British South African Company, an occupation which came to an end when Ian Smith unilaterally declared independence (UDI) from Britain in 1965. After the UDI, it became apparent to most African nationalists that the government of Ian Smith would not voluntarily concede power. As a result, the nationalists became militant and the military conflict reached its apogee in the 1970s. The two major political parties during the nationalistic period were the Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU) led by Robert Mugabe, and the Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU) led by Joshua Nkomo. Robert Mugabe's military wing was based in Mozambique, while the main base of Joshua Nkomo's party was in Zambia. A political solution was found in 1979 and was mediated by the British government at Lancaster House in London. The focus of this article is on the naming practices of Robert Mugabe's war combatants, members of the

Zimbabwe African National Liberation army (ZANLA) forces. Restricting the analysis to one period and one ethnic group, i.e., the Shona controls the contexts as tightly as possible.

Robert Mugabe's war combatants were predominantly but not exclusively Shona, while Joshua Nkomo's combatants were drawn mainly from the Ndebele and Kalanga ethnicities in south- western Zimbabwe. Notably, the adoption of new names is a characteristic feature of most guerilla movements. Although a new name might be used for security reasons, there is a sense in which the use of war names is an act of defiance against the existing government which, from the viewpoint of the guerillas, is an illegitimate government that has to be deposed. By not using state-registered names, the guerillas are essentially building "a society outside state control" (Brinkman 2004:8). Nonetheless, high profile leaders of the guerilla movements continued to use their registered names. It is possible that the top leadership felt the need to maintain their actual names for purposes of international recognition (Brinkman 2004). In addition, the Chimurenga War had both male and female fighters, yet there has not been any study that investigates whether female combatants were named in the same way as their male counterparts. In this article, an attempt is made at filling this gap.

Data collection

The names analyzed were drawn from a corpus of about 1875 names of war combatants. Analyzing the names of a clearly defined group, such as war combatants during a specific period (the 1970s), enables us to investigate the nature of prevailing language ideologies during that epoch and the *de-facto* language planning policies therein. More importantly, the corpus was composed of the names of guerillas that died in the war, from a list published in 1983 by the Zimbabwean Ministry of Information. In the data corpus, the meaning of each name is given wherever possible. The meanings of the names were interpreted by one of the co-authors who is not only a linguist and a native speaker of Shona, but also a former combatant in the Chimurenga War. His experiences and involvement in the War rendered it possible to acquire an insider or *emic* (Pike 1944) perspective of the war and the meanings of the names. Even though the interpretation of the entries was made by a linguist-cum-scholar-cum-war combatant, we cannot claim that his interpretations necessarily and identically correspond to the intended meanings of the name-bearers or name-givers. An exact match between the meanings of the names is also rendered difficult because the meaning interpreted by the person named might be different from the meaning intended by the name-giver. Even in instances when the name-bearers named themselves, it is difficult to know the intended meaning as the combatants were deceased.

Data analysis

In analyzing the names, we (a) explored the languages used in the names, and (b) whether the same language was used for both first and surname, i.e. whether first names were predominantly in English and surnames in Shona. In the case of the

names whose etymology appeared to be English, we explored whether the name may be found in localized English usage, if not, we then examined the nature of the linguistic processes on which the name was based (e.g. nominalization, compounding). Wherever possible we tried to establish the source of the name; i.e., whether it had been drawn from popular culture or fiction as part of entexualization.

In this sample, we found that the first name came either from English or from Shona, but the surname was always in Shona. Thus, a name could be a combination of the two languages in that the first name is in English and the surname in Shona. This practice in naming is not unique to wartime in Zimbabwe. Evidence presented in Makoni et al. (2007) shows that while names in Zimbabwe are drawn from English and African languages, very rarely do Africans have surnames drawn from the English lexicon. In the corpus, there were only 5% or 95 cases in which both the first name and surname were in English.

There were also 188 (about 10 %) in which both the first name and surname were in an African language such as *Teurai Ropa* (Spill blood), *Bvuma Zvipere* (Agree and its over). Ideologically, this suggests that while bilingual practices of Shona and English are widespread, the exclusive use of African languages is feasible, and the use of English-only names is limited. These examples show the degree to which English had spread in African communities as well as the extent to which it had been appropriated as one of the local languages even amongst war combatants. This reflects a paradoxically polemical issue. On the one hand, nationalist freedom fighters associated English with colonialism and viewed it as a tool of oppression to be denounced at all costs. Yet, on the other hand, in wartime, they embraced the use of the language in their camps because in that context the "out-group" was not the colonialists but rather the African comrades who were from different ethnic groups (Mazrui 1975). Using a language of any other ethnic group would have been potentially hegemonic. The use of English by combatants who were all non-native speakers of English invoked some "imagined" collective identity and thus avoiding any possible form of ethnic "othering."

In names such as *Admire Chimurenga* "liberation war," *Strongman Hondo* "war," *Liberty Makata* "uphill," and *Talkmore Tichatonga* "We shall rule," the English lexical items are not used as first names in English-speaking communities. There are other names based on English language lexical items which seem to have been formed through a process of nominalization. Names such as *Toasted*, *Worry* and *Stubborn* are examples of the process of nominalization. The proper nouns were derived from verbs (toast), transitive verb (worry) and adjective (stubborn). In some situations, the process of nominalization produced names which were inconsistent with localized English spelling but were an attempt at approximating Shona phonological structure. For example, *Wonderous* "wondrous," *Winai* "win," and *Sayizi* "size" show an approximation of Shona phonology. There is, however, some difference between *Wonderous*, *Winai*, and *Sayizi*. *Wonderous* is made up of morphemes which may be encountered in English (-ous) as a bound morpheme in words such as "riotous" and "righteous." English-like names such as *Winai*, *Sayizi*, and *Seriyasi* "serious" have the CVC Shona syllabic structure. These names are examples of Africanized spellings of English words. The spellings are based on Shona phonetics reflecting the varying degrees to which both languages are combined in practice in multilingual contexts. Names such as Talkmore, Youngman, Saymore, Stepmore, Trymore, Edmore, etc.

reflect a novel form of compounding not found in native-speaker varieties of English. Clearly, some of the names reflect a combination of processes, for example, nominalization and the conversion of English words into Shona phonology. There are also names such as David, Peter and Maxwell which are used as first names in both war and peacetime (see Makoni et al. (2007) for peacetime). Names such as Peter, David and John are also found in English-speaking contexts as first names or surnames.[1] However, what is worth noting is that in the corpus of Chimurenga War names these names are used as first names only. The surnames are all in Shona. The use of English or English-like naming practices in war suggests that English is treated as a "local" language (Higgins 2009) in a manner analogous to the ways in which indigenous languages are framed.

Words such as "strongman" or "talkmore" are also commonly used as first names in peacetime (see Makoni et al. 2007). Names such as *Sinfree, Learnmore* and *Lovemore* are very common in Zimbabwe, reflecting that this form of compounding in name formation is as much a feature of naming practices in peacetime as it is in war. Perhaps this convention for forming names is a cultural practice that found its way into wartime practice. On the whole, the principles underlying naming practices in war are not substantially different from those in peacetime. Thus, naming practices in war and peace are instances of comparable principles under dissimilar circumstances.

Examples such as *Youngman Zvichaita* "young man it will happen," *Stepmore Chamboko* "increase or step up the beating," *Addmore Mauto* "increase the number of soldiers," *Trymore Magorira* "try harder guerillas," *Trymore Shungu* "be more determined," *Newman Hondo* "a new person for the war," *Liberty Makatu* "liberty is an uphill struggle," *Talkmore Tichatonga* "with more talking we will rule," *Winai Nyika* "win the country," *Wonderous Udzai* "wonderful to tell" and *Siriyasi Tichatonga* "we are serious we shall rule" are all examples of bilingual naming practices. This is interesting because, in colonial language policies, it was not the Africans who were expected to be bilingual. White settlers were to be bilingual in English and an African language (Makoni et al. 2007). This suggests that language planning may, in fact, produce unintended outcomes.

The examples cited above are all in non-standard English with the surname drawn from Shona. Yet the war surnames do not resemble any known surnames used during peacetime. The surnames are striking in that they reflect war situations or aspirations. They are, therefore, interesting from an "interpersonal" and "ideational" perspective. From an interpersonal perspective, the names sound as if the name-bearers were engaged in a conversation interpersonally directed in some cases at the individual, but in other cases at the targeted oppressor regime. *Hondo* "war," *Tichatonga* "we shall rule," *Nyika* "the country" are all "discoursing" about war. The discursive aspect of war names is also evident in instances where both names are in Shona. Names such as *Bvuma Zvipere* "give in and it will be over," *Bvuma Titonge* "give in so that we can rule," *Batanai Muhondo* "be united in war" and *Bvrurai Mabhunu* "kill all whites" reflect the aspirations and hopes of war combatants.

This raises the question of whether war has dissimilar effects on naming practices than peace. The answer is "probably not," because at least in the Zimbabwean case, the two social activities, war and peace, are governed by similar naming principles.

The difference between war names and those used in peacetime is the propositions of the names and not the underlying principles of name-assignment. In both war and peace, the names chosen are dialogic and reflect the prevailing context. The practice of using names which are sensitive to context and individual experiences is widespread and common in both war and peace. The differences, however, lie in the nature and type of discourses of the names. For example, war names such as *Mabhunu Muchapera* "all whites shall be killed," *Teurai Ropa* "blood shall be spilt" are encountered in the war corpus and not in civilian usage, which suggests differences in topical issues between war and peace. Similarly, names such as *Runyaradzo* "peace," *Tanatswa* "we are happy" and *Rugare* "we are comfortable" are common in civilian names but are not found in war names. War names are therefore suggestive of a future-oriented sense of agency characterized by a desire to bring to fruition a specific and desirable outcome. War names are therefore "a hidden transcript" (Brinkman 2004:12) through which guerillas express their true feelings about the government they were fighting. The surnames appear to be a dialogue wherein the guerilla fighters are venting their feelings "against the colonial state" (Brinkman 2004:10).

There are also names in the data corpus that are drawn from literature in African languages. Names such as *Chaminuka*, from the 1963 novel *Feso* "the rising white spear" by Mutsvairo, reflect processes of entextualization as the name is associated with a legendary hero who led the defense of the Rozwi empire against invaders. The novel is an allegory of the conflict between Zimbabweans and the British. The use of such a name in war naming practices reflects an astute understanding of the past in nationalistic circles (Kahari 1982).

Names of female combatants

Most female names reflect a similar pattern to those of male combatants. All surnames are in Shona whereas the first names are a mix of Shona and English. There are "conventional" English first names such as *Susan*, *Violet*, *Martha*, and *Lucia*, all of which can be found in civilian naming practices (see Makoni et al. 2007). However, another set of names are either verbs or nouns that are rarely used as proper nouns, for example, *Resistance* and *No Rest and Fix*. There is a small set of names about 2% whose origins are from Afrikaans, a language associated with South Africa and particularly the apartheid regime. For example, in the name *Pfutseki Mabhunu* "f_ _ _ off you whites," the first name is a Shona rendition of the Afrikaans curse word *voetsek*. Pfutseki has a more offensive sense than the Afrikaans "*voetsek*." By and large, however, there were no significant differences between male and female war naming practices.

Discussion

In this article, we set out to establish a connection between language and war by analyzing names assigned to war combatants during Zimbabwe's Chimurenga war. In analyzing the names, the focus was on the potential implications of war naming practices on language planning, language ideology, and entextualization. Even though naming is a potential source of language planning, it has only recently been viewed as a resource for framing language planning, a position which seems to be changing

gradually (see the 2007 special issue of the *Journal of Current Issues in Language Planning*). The creation of new words, or the acquisition of new meanings for old words, is all part of the process of corpus planning. The difference, however, in war naming practices is that this form of language planning is from the bottom up. Similarly, the use of localized varieties of English in naming raises the question of the relationship between language ideologies in naming practices and the nature of language planning involved. Typically, in language planning, the variety of language being promoted and developed is a standard and not a localized one. War names challenge this aspect of language planning and at the same time provide concrete examples of bottom-up language planning.

From the perspective of a normative standard of language ideology, names such as *Addmore* and *Trymore* may be analyzed as a combination of independent morphemes; while perhaps from an *emic* view of the war combatants, the names constitute a chunk, or a fused lect (Auer 1999). The frequency of their occurrence means the process of this form of compounding is quite common. When a multilingual approach is adopted which treats the two names as a single proposition, their meanings become easily apparent: some of the names and surnames seem to be a description of a prevailing state of affairs. *Newman Hondo* "the new individual to the war," and *Trymore Magorira*, (Try harder liberation fighters) wherein the guerillas are urged to try harder. It is relatively easy to conceive of a state of affairs in which a newly-recruited guerilla may describe himself as a new individual to the war, or in which a third person calls upon the guerillas to try harder to achieve their goals. The names describe a prevailing state of affairs or a desired one. The striking aspect is that the description entails drawing upon linguistic resources. The linguistic resources come from two different languages, reflecting the type of participants' bilingualism. The retention of the mixed forms as names even in writing gives them some degree of permanence or institutionalization. They can no longer be treated as fleeting and idiosyncratic even though they might be perceived as such by outsiders. A multilingual interpretation of the names means combining the meanings of the two in order to make "ideational" sense. For example, the first name *Winai* makes nationalistic sense in light of the surname *Nyika*, because the two combined mean "win the country," which was the intended outcome of the struggle. A comparable analysis can be made of *Siriyasi Tichatonga* "we are serious we shall rule."

The fact that most of the names are made up of localized varieties of English and Shona words implies that English and Shona are strongly integrated into the Zimbabwean milieu and this influence is also evident during wartime. Given the fact that one of the main objectives of colonial and Rhodesian language policy was to reduce the availability of English to African language speakers, their wide prevalence as names indicates that English, or a variety of English, has permeated this African society more widely than one might have expected.

The use of non-standard names is suggestive of the localization of English. The use of Africanized English names blurs the distinctions between English and African languages. Localization is a powerful ideology which is not restricted to language but applies to other aspects of Zimbabwean culture such as Christianity. For instance, Christianity in Africa introduced drums to go with church hymns. The drums re-enact a template that exists in African societies in praise hymns. English has been localized to the same extent that Christianity in Africa has.

By and large, the war on independence in Zimbabwe had two main dimensions; both guns in the field and discourses in contexts emerging from the names given to the guerillas. War discourses and the languaging of the war were constantly evolving and dynamic. Some of the war discourses were to become part of everyday Zimbabwean discourses after the war. For the discourses to circulate, they had to be reified and extracted from one context and embedded in another context or (re)entextualized (Bucholtz 2009; Sarangi 2009). Karigoga is an instance of entextualization (i.e. extracting discourse from its original context and then re-inserting it into a new context). An excellent example of entextualization is *Bvuma*, a popular name during the war, meaning "concede." This name was to become the title of a popular song by one of Zimbabwe's top musicians, Oliver Mutukudzi. If the target of the critique in Oliver Mutukudzi's song *Bvuma* is now Robert Mugabe, it is indeed ironic that when the name was introduced before being entextualized, it named the aspirations of Robert Mugabe who led combatants to dislodge Ian Smith. Some other examples of entextualization are the use of words originating from other languages with which the combatants had been in contact. The process of entextualization is also apparent in the use of names derived from Zimbabwean African literature thus providing the literature with a certain degree of nationalistic legitimacy. The entextualization of discourses from African literature is ironic because literature in African languages was initially produced under the tight auspices of a government controlled institution which censored most of it.

Conclusion

Even though naming is an instance of everyday linguistic practices, an analysis of naming practices is invaluable because it provides insight into the interplay between language ideologies and language planning. Language planning and language ideologies provide analytical frameworks within which naming may occur. In this regard, sociology, constrains the type of naming practices which are "authenticable" (Heller 2008) and popular to communities in times of war. Names in wartime are discoursed as much as those used in peacetime. After all, any name is paradigmatically possible, but names that violate sociological norms may not be acceptable. For example, a name praising racist behavior or white supremacy would violate the expected norms and philosophical convictions of a liberation movement.

In this article we have argued that war naming practices are based on exactly the same principles as those on which names in peace are generally based. War names, like other names in peacetime, are texts that provide a dialogue in which the namers/named are engaged with society at large. In wartime, the discourse that emerges from the names constructs the enemy as the "evil other" who must be wiped out. Furthermore, war naming practices give insight into language planning and language ideology. Entextualization also plays a significant role in war naming practices. The use of names drawn from other languages suggests the need to stress the degree to which heterogeneity, multiplicity, and variability are constitutive of linguistic practice (Nicolai 2008). These sociolinguistic processes are of course significantly facilitated in part through the contacts between war combatants and their host communities.

Note

1 These are in fact highly unusual in this form as surnames. Surnames of British origin when they contain a personal name are usually based on a patronymic, indicated by the suffix "son" or just "s"; e.g. from the Christian name Peter, the surnames are Peterson or Peters, but not normally just "Peter."

References

Akinasso, Niyi, F. 1980. "On the Differences between Spoken and Written Language." *Language and Speech* 25: 97–125.

Auer, Peter. 1999. "From Code-switching via Language mixing to Fused Lects: Toward a Dynamic Typology of Bilingual Speech." *International Journal of Bilingualism* 3: 309–332.

Blommaert, Jan. 2005. *Discourse: A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brinkman, Inge. 2004. "Language, Names, and War: The Case of Angola." *African Studies Review* 47(3): 143–163.

Bucholtz, Mary. 2009. "Captured on Tape: Professional Hearing and Competing Entextualizations in the Criminal Justice System." *Text & Talk — An Interdisciplinary Journal of Language, Discourse & Communication Studies* 29: 503–524.

Chakaipa, Patrick. 1963. *Karikoga Gumiremiseve*. Longman. Salisbury: Rhodesia

Chidzero Bernard. 1957. *Nzvengamutsvairo*. Salisbury, Zimbabwe: Longman.

Coplan, David B. 1994. *In the Time of Cannibals: The Word Music of South Africa's Basotho Migrants*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.

Ferme, Mariane C. 2001. *The Underneath of Things: Violence, History, and the Everyday in Sierra Leone*. Berkeley CA: University of California Press.

Finnegan, Ruth. 2003. "Anonymity and Pseudonyms." *Anthropology Today* 19(2): 22–23.

Heller, Monica, ed. 2008. *Bilingualism: A Social Approach*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Higgins, Christina. 2009. *English as a Local Language: Post-colonial Identities and Multilingual Practices*. Clevedon United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters.

Kahari, George. 1982. *The Rise of the Shona Novel: A Study in Development 1890–1984*. Gweru: Mambo Press.

Kimenyi, Alexandre. 1978. "Aspects of Naming in Kinyarwanda." *Anthropological Linguistics* 20(6): 258–271.

Koopman, Adrian. 1992. "The Socio-Cultural Aspects of Zulu Ox- and Dog-names." *Nomina African Journal* 6: 1–13.

Makoni, Busi, Sinfree Makoni & Pedzisai Mashiri. 2007. "Naming Practices and Language Planning in Zimbabwe." *Current Issues in Language Planning* 8(3): 1–31.

Makoni, Sinfree & Alastair Pennycook. 2006. *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages*. Clevedon United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters.

Mathangwane, Joyce. T. & Sheena Gardner. 2002. "Language Attributes as Portrayed by the Use of English Names in Botswana." *Nomina Africana Journal* 16(1 & 2): 74–87.

Maturana, Humberto R. 1988. "Ontology of Observing. The Biological Foundations of Self-consciousness and the Physical Domain of Existence." *Conference Workbook: Texts in Cybernetics*. American Society for Cybernetics Conference, Felton, CA.

Mazrui, Ali A. 1975. *The Political Sociology of the English Language: An African Perspective*. Mouton Publishers: The Hague and Paris.

Mignolo, Walter. 2001. "Coloniality of Power and the Subaltern." *The Latin American Subaltern Studies Reader*. Ed. Ileana Rodríguez. Durham NC: Duke University Press, 224–244.

Mphande, Lupenga. 2006. "Naming and Linguistic Africanisms in African American Culture." *Selected proceedings of the 35th Annual Conference on African Linguistics*. Eds. John Mugane, John Hutchison and Dee A. Worman. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Mutsvairo, Solomon. 1963. *Feso*. Salisbury, Zimbabwe: Longman.

Nicolai, Robert. 2008. "How Languages Change and How they Adapt: Some Challenges for the Future." *Journal of Language Contact-THEMA* 312–330.

Pennycook, Alastair. 2007. *Global Englishes and Transcultural Flows*. London: Routledge.

Pike, Kenneth L. 1944. "Analysis of a Mixteco Text." *International Journal of American Linguistics* 10: 113–138.

Ranger, Terence. 2004. "Nationalist Historiography, Patriotic History and the History of the Nation: The Struggle over the Past." *Journal of Southern African Studies* 30(2): 215–234.

Sarangi, Srikant. 2009. "Editorial: Entextualizing the Institutional." *Text & Talk — An Interdisciplinary Journal of Language, Discourse and Communication Studies* 29: 481–484.

Tatira, Liveson. 2004. "Beyond the Dog's Name: A Silent Dialogue among the Shona People." *Journal of Folklore Research* 41: 85–98.

Woolard, Kathryn & Bambi Schieffelin. 1994. "Language Ideology." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 23: 55–82.

Notes on contributors

Sinfree Makoni and Busi Makoni are scholars in the Department of Applied Linguistics and African and African American Studies, of the College of Liberal Arts in Pennsylvania State University. Their esteemed colleague, Charles Pfukwa, is a scholar in the University of Masvingo State, Zimbabwe. Correspondence to Professor Makoni: (sbm12@psu.edu).

Author contacts: Busi Makoni: Department of Applied Linguistics and African and African American Studies, The College of Liberal Arts, Pennsylvania State University, State College, PA 16802, USA. sud17@psu.edu

Sinfree Makoni: Department of Applied Linguistics and African and African American Studies. The College of Liberal Arts, Pennsylvania State University, State College, PA 16802,USA. sbm12@psu.edu

Charles Pfukwa: University of Masvingo State, Zimbabwe.