

With Respect to Zulu: Revisiting *ukuHlonipha*

Hlonipho, to give its form as a Zulu noun stem, is a form of respectful behavior in speech and action.¹ Mentioned in colonial-era documents and other writings since the mid-19th century, it has been widespread in southern Africa, practiced among (at least) the Zulu, Xhosa, Swazi, and Sotho. Recent studies, including several very useful sociolinguistic and ethnographic descriptions, have focused their attention mainly upon *isihlonipho sabafazi*, the linguistic form of hlonipha associated with women (the *isi-* prefix implies a way of speaking).² Indeed, a stereotype of hlonipha as “women’s language” goes back to ethnographic and linguistic literature of decades ago, and is described as a form of linguistic taboo in which a married woman must avoid speaking the name of her father-in-law. It is also often described as “old” or “traditional,” or even vanishing.

While the existence and prominence of this stereotype is of interest in itself, the practice of *ukuhlonipha* (the general term, with infinitive prefix) is much wider than much of the literature on it recognizes. To focus solely on “women’s language” is to excise a wider frame of social, semiotic, and somatic meaning. Hlonipha is not only about language; bodily posture, comportment, and clothing are part of it too. Moreover, a narrow focus on “women’s language” implies ignoring hlonipha as practiced by men, as well as the practice of praise-performance (*bonga*), which, we propose, is the semiotic complement to hlonipha and joins with it in a broader Zulu notion of “respect.” The cultural background to these practices, we argue, is an ideology of language and comportment that understands performances of all kinds, including linguistic utterances, fundamentally as actions of the body.³

Focusing first on *isihlonipha*, we argue that the linguistic practice is itself seen as bodily activity in a Zulu ideology of language, and we explore the semiotic connection with other forms of respectful bodily comportment. We then compare *ukuhlonipha* with another way of displaying respect. As a display of honorification through avoidance and “covering,” *ukuhlonipha* contrasts with practices that celebrate and honor someone through exuberance and elaboration. *Ukubonga* “praising” is such a practice, well known for its performance in the Zulu royal court, for example. These contrasting ways of speaking, gesturing, and acting have usually been described separately in the literature, which also assigns them to gendered actors and domains: a female domestic sphere and a male public sphere. That is, *ukuhlonipha* has usually been presented as married women’s domestic practice, *ukubonga* as male public practice. Instead, we consider these practices in relation to one another as forms of display of respect, and we show that the gender stereotyping overlooks important ways in which each practice can be, and historically has been, done by the other gender. Archival sources, such as the statements of Zulu informants in the voluminous records collected by James Stuart more than a century ago (JSA 1-6), suggest a wider and more complicating picture of *ukuhlonipha*, and a more flexible usage of the two genres.

In some instances what we point to may have nothing directly to do with a “woman’s language of respect” and far more connection with a network of language practices in which respect features but which may also include elements of admiration, fear, and a hierarchy of power. Even today the varieties of *hlonipha* social practice are not limited to women, and these practices – *ukuhlonipha* and *ukubonga* – constitute important elements in “doing” and “being” Zulu. Guided not only by the early records and our own fieldwork, but also by recent work on the practice of *isihlonipho* in modern settings – among gay men (Rudwick and Ntuli 2008), in

situations of social and political conflict (e.g., Dlamini 2005), and in uses by women (Finlayson 1995) – we seek to situate isihlonipho in relation to a wider Zulu construction of honorific performance that relies both on hlonipha in its not entirely gendered existence and on the expansive practice of ukubonga.

Our purpose, in short, is to explore a broad semiotic economy of performance in which honorific displays take various forms, grounded in an ideology of language as bodily and social practice. Our argument thus connects with recent work on language and materiality (Shankar and Cavanaugh 2012, Cavanaugh and Shankar 2017, Irvine 2017) as well as with work on honorific language (such as Agha 1993, 1994, 1998, 2007; Irvine 1992, 1995, 1998), and directs attention toward wide-reaching semiotic relations that are often obscured by conventional taxonomies of knowledge and discipline boundaries.

1. An ethnographic moment.

[Mzimhlophe Hostel, Meadowlands, Soweto, August 18, 2012]

We are having tea with Mama K-, wife of the pastor of a Zionist church in Soweto, at her home. Two other local women are present, one of whom, Ma N-, is a member of another, much smaller Zionist church. The radio, Radio Ukhozi FM (a Zulu-language station), is playing quietly in the background. The conversation, a snippet of which we translate below, turns to *ukuhlonipha*.

Mama K- explains: “If a woman’s husband’s father’s name is Bhekumuzi [‘care for the homestead’], she can not use the word *bheka* [‘care for’] or *muzi* [‘homestead’].

To respect the name, she must substitute. The substitute for *bheka* is *bona*; for *muzi* is *mkhaya*.”

We ask: “And do you still use the hlonipha expressions now?”

“**Of course we still use it!**” Mama K- replies.

She continues, now describing her own mother’s usage. “When my mother was married, her husband’s father’s name was *Bodwe* [‘pot’]. So she never said ‘*bodwe*’ – though it was very inconvenient! [general laughter] Because you talk about pots all the time, when you’re cooking and washing! Instead, she had to say *geza amatikili* [*geza* is ‘wash’, *amatikili* is a hlonipha word for ‘pots’].”

Ma N- adds: “There are things you can’t do when you’re married, if your father-in-law is alive. You don’t walk in front of his house; you must go around the back. That’s during his lifetime. You may not walk in front of his house even if he’s not there, but instead away working, off (say) in Durban. You never go in the front unless you have made a sacrifice. If you do go in the house, you always go on the women’s side [the left side of the house; the right side is the men’s].”

Mama K- comments, “All these customs have been dumped, here in Johannesburg. But when people go home, they put on a headscarf and a neckscarf and a pinafore, and they do the hlonipha words, like for ‘pots’. Even the young people do this, because it’s the law.”

What Mama K- and Ma N- describe in this conversation corresponds to some of the classic descriptions of Zulu hlonipha usage: lexical substitutions that married women must use in order to avoid uttering the father-in-law’s name (since names are composed of ordinary words,

those words must be avoided); avoiding the front of the father-in-law's house, instead taking a circuitous route; and covering the head and body with additional clothing. In fact, "covering," avoiding, and "respect" are important conceptual ingredients of hlonipha in all its forms, language included. As in the classic descriptions (of hlonipha as "women's language," e.g. Mncube 1949, Finlayson 1982, 1984) the conversation focuses on the domestic duties of married women, saying nothing about men's usage or a public sphere. There is also the assertion by Mama K- that hlonipha behavior does not occur in the city, although it is still important in a village context: "Of course we still use it!"

What is explicitly stated in conversations of this kind, however, is not the whole story. Notice, first, that Mama K- describes her mother's usage, not her own; but this does not locate hlonipha only in the usage of a generation ago. Instead, by this means Mama K- can describe hlonipha practice to us in detail while avoiding uttering her own father-in-law's name. Moreover, while the conversation takes place in the city, she and Ma N- clearly know the details and relevant forms of the practice. A few moments later, Ma N- comments on how you must wear similarly extra coverings (scarves and skirts) if you go to any meeting at the church or the minister's house, "for respect of the place and because you are respecting uNkulunkulu [God]." So the women are actually doing some of the avoiding and covering practices they allege, hyperbolically, are absent from the urban scene.

In this ethnographic moment several important aspects of Zulu hlonipha can be observed. First, the emphatic assertion, "Of course we still use it!" attests to the persistence and contemporary significance of hlonipha among Zulu. Mama K-, a married woman aged about 40, lives in the city with her husband, although she visits rural areas frequently. Clearly, hlonipha usage is part of lived knowledge of social life for women like Mama K- and Ma N-, even though

most of their lives are spent in the city. It is clear, too, that hlonipha usage is not only a matter of linguistic form. It also concerns bodily position, movements, and clothing.

2. The Materiality of Language: Linguistic hlonipha as bodily practice.

Isihlonipho (linguistic hlonipha) is conceived, in a longstanding Zulu ideology of language, as a bodily practice with material consequences. Unlike the dualisms of European/Western philosophy that for centuries have opposed body and mind, materiality and spirit, or the Saussurean *parole* and *langue*, this South African philosophy considers linguistic practice as always already embodied. As we have indicated, isihlonipha is part of a broader concept of *ukuhlonipha*, “act respectfully.” Whether it concerns movements of the vocal apparatus or of other parts of the body, *ukuhlonipha* comprises a complex of practices displaying respectfulness through “covering,” avoiding, suppressing affect, and subservience. For now, we focus on the voice and the speech praxis that enacts differences in social roles or identities. These identity effects are utterance effects, understood as bodily action.

The semiotic particulars of hlonipha practice cannot be adequately accounted for solely by the relatively low status of women in Zulu society, whatever the extent of the connection between women’s status and hlonipha practice may be. Women’s status alone cannot explain, for example, why linguistic hlonipha is not, or not primarily, a matter of euphemism – semantic avoidance. Instead, the focus of hlonipha linguistic avoidance is the *sound* of a personal name, especially the initial consonant of the first syllable of its stem, and the physical act of producing that sound. As our informant EV emphasized, “You never call the name!”

Because Zulu personal names are derived from everyday vocabulary -- often referring to some circumstance of the bearer’s birth -- the stem that must be avoided might refer to

something one needs to speak about. Some substitute must be found, as when in the conversation we excerpted above, Mama K- described her mother calling “pots” *amatikili* rather than *ibodwe*. So, how is one to do this – to denote the object or activity to which a personal name’s stem refers, while avoiding the act of uttering the stem itself? The solution is either some alternative linguistic construction,⁴ or a different medium of expression. The main strategies we have encountered are the following:

- (a) Replacing the name with a synonym well known in the general vocabulary, i.e. not a word restricted to any special “hlonipha” register; e.g. replacing *dinga* “need” (as in the name of the Zulu king Dingane, r. 1828-1840) with *ntula* “need”.⁵ Or, in the conversation excerpted above from our own data, if a personal name is Bhekumuzi (“look after the homestead”): *bheka* “look after,” *muzi* “homestead”), the hlonipha substitutes would be *bona* “look, consider” and *mkhaya* “home.” Similarly, a hlonipha substitute for *indlela* “road” is *inyathelo* “path”;
- (b) Replacing the name with a term widely known to be a hlonipha word. For example, from our own data, some women whose father-in-law’s personal name is Mandla (stem *-dla* “eat”) never say a word constructed from the stem *-dla*. Instead, they replace it with *maya*, a hlonipha word meaning “eat”;
- (c) Creating an entirely new hlonipha word, the only meaning of which is exactly that of the word it replaces (from the stem of the personal name);
- (d) Writing the name down, rather than uttering it. Our informant AK offered an example:

According to our culture akufanelanga ukuthi ulibize. Kufanele ubize enye into ezocover leyo nto. Kufana nomntwana ma vele bambiza ngobabazala igama lakhe, wena kawulibize lelogama. Kawulibizi lelogama, njengomama wakhe, uzombiza

ngokuthi baba. Noma ma use *clinic* mabathi umusho ulibhala phansi. Uyahlonipha. Awumbizi igama lakhe ngoba yini, ngubaba, ngubabazala wakho. Uzolibhala phansi lase *clinic*.

According to our culture it is absolutely not fitting that you call it out [the personal name]. You have to utter something that will “cover” that thing [stand in for it]. It’s like, for instance, say your child has been given the same personal name as your father-in-law, you simply don’t utter that name. You simply don’t utter that name, as his mother, you won’t call him by your father[-in-law’s name]. And even if you are at the health clinic, [when they ask for your child’s name] you simply write it down. You hlonipha. You don’t call his personal name because it’s your father, your father-in-law. **You will write it down, there at the clinic [but not utter it].**

This last example is especially revealing, though certainly not unique (another example of a woman writing, rather than speaking, her father-in-law’s personal name is given in Raum 1973:58.) Clearly, it is the *physical utterance*, not the linguistic item as a mental construct, which is at the core of hlonipha practice.⁶

Observe too that the pitch and volume of the voice are also relevant. T-, a young professional woman whom we met at an Anglican church in Auckland Park, Johannesburg, told us that her mother uses a lot of hlonipha words; when T- goes to visit she can’t understand a lot of what her mother says, because she (T-) doesn’t know those words. (When T- asked her mother to teach her the hlonipha words, the mother said “I cannot, because you’re not married.”) One day, T-’s mother was shouting at T- to bring her something, but T- couldn’t comply because she didn’t know what she was to bring: “Why are you shouting at me? I don’t understand what

you're saying – I don't have the word!" The mother kept shouting, to no avail. Finally, the mother came over to T- and whispered in her ear: "Pot!" – using the everyday word.⁷ T- repeated aloud, "Pot," and brought it over to where her mother needed it.

In the past – perhaps today too, but we have no direct evidence – there seems to have been a phonological pattern to the construction of hlonipha words, such that hlonipha avoidance forms could be created by changing the initial consonant of the stem of the personal name. The high frequency of click consonants in the hlonipha vocabulary listed in the Doke and Vilakazi (1948) Zulu dictionary, as well as hlonipha forms that differ from the "everyday" stem only in substituting a click consonant for a non-click consonant, is evidence of this pattern.⁸ There are other phonological regularities in Zulu hlonipha forms as well (see Irvine 1998, Mncube 1949). Here it is worth noting the creativity involved in choosing or inventing hlonipha words, at least in the past. While there are conventional hlonipha words – and our informants often seemed to speak as if they assumed there was always a single "correct" hlonipha form they simply might not happen to know – hlonipha practice can include finding one's own substitute for a father-in-law's name stem, or creating a new hlonipha word oneself. After all, the point is not so much what word one does utter, as what word one avoids.

It is difficult to know whether any particular example of a hlonipha word encountered in the literature was actually a completely new creation. The examples we heard in our fieldwork evidently were not. Nevertheless, the distribution of knowledge of particular items of hlonipha vocabulary seems to be uneven. Although many forms are listed in the Doke and Vilakazi dictionary as if they were in common usage, it seems that hlonipha forms are seldom distributed throughout the Zulu-speaking area. Their distribution is more regionally limited, and some forms might even be limited to the homesteads and followers of particular individuals. As a result,

there can often be more than one hlonipha word corresponding to the same everyday word; for example (from our data), *inyathelo* and *inyathuko* as hlonipha forms for *indlela*, “road.” Still, some hlonipha words, such as *maya* (hlonipha term for *-dla*, “eat”) are very widely known.

Why is “calling out the name” of a person so much to be avoided? Zulu individuals have many names, but the practice of hlonipha focuses on the *igama lasekhaya*, the “home name” or personal name, also sometimes known as *igama elikhulu*, the “big name.” This particularly important name is the one given to a baby at birth. Constructed from ordinary Zulu words, it usually refers to some circumstance of the child’s birth, or a quality noticed or desired in the individual. While it situates the child in relation to the birth context and possibly links the child to an older namesake, this name does not usually index the family as collectivity. Instead, the “home name” singles out an individual and is intimately connected with that person’s body. It provides little or no biography (since the baby doesn’t have one yet), and little or no reference to ancestors. As a bare representation of an individual it differs from clan names, praise-names (*izithakazelo*), “school names” conferred within the world of formal education, and praise-poems (*izibongo*), all of which open up the account of the named person and index other people as well. The only people who may appropriately utter the bare personal name are older family members resident in the homestead when the person was born. Otherwise, a bare personal name – unaccompanied by praise, genealogy, or mention of consociates – especially if uttered in public, could imply peculiarity, oddness, even abnormality.

Moreover, because the personal name singles out an individual (and the individual’s body) in this way, and intimately summons him/her, its use makes an addressee vulnerable – vulnerable above all to attacks from witches, especially if the summoner might himself or herself be a

witch.⁹ In an investigation of Zulu thought and symbolism, A-I Berglund discussed this matter with an *isangoma* (diviner):

B. ...Everywhere I am told that *umthakathi* [the witch] mentions the name of the person who is to be killed. Why does *umthakathi* mention the name?

“It is the name of that person.”

B. “Is it important that the name should be mentioned?”

“It is very important. It is the important thing in *ubuthakathi* [witchcraft practice]. If a man can hide his name from people, then he can hide from much evil. *Umthakathi* can kill a man if he lacks vileness [the victim’s excreta] and hair, but has the name. So the name is very important.”

B. “Why is the name of the person so important?”

“The name is that person. They are the same, the name and the person. ...So the person and the name are one. *Umthakathi* kills a man by combining the words of death with the name.

He throws (*ukuphonsa*) these at the man and they kill him.” (Berglund 1979:291-2)

The “words of death” are “the intention to harm, expressed in words ... it is the expression of intended evil in words that puts into effect and sets into motion the bad desires of a witch into witchcraft,” (Berglund 1975: 292-93). Uttering the personal name, especially if accompanied by words of evil intention, can inflict physical harm. It is only the personal name (“home name”) that offers this possibility. Witches do not attack through clan names, because they would have to attack a large set of people all at once, perhaps including protective ancestors (Berglund, *ibid.*).

But there is also a kind of vulnerability that affects the speaker of a personal name: being accused of witchcraft. Because the most likely witches are persons who are outsiders to a

victim's homestead and lineage, which are patrilineally organized, a new bride (*makoti*) married into a homestead is an outsider and therefore vulnerable to being accused. One can think of hlonipha practice as the bride's defense against the possibility of being accused of witchcraft – or of actually doing witchcraft, since witches may be quite unaware of their witchhood. Herbert (1990a) emphasizes this point, explaining hlonipha practice in these terms. We note, however, that it is the person whose name is to be avoided who would be most directly affected if the name were uttered. Moreover, hlonipha practice is not limited to women anyway, as we shall discuss in later pages.

What if a word that ought to have been avoided is uttered anyway, perhaps by mistake? One possibility mentioned in the literature is for the name-utterer to spit – thus spitting out any anger or capacity for harm. For example, Raum, who interviewed many people about hlonipha and related practices in the 1950's, pressed one of his female informants to say the name (Raum 1973:58): “An old woman spat into the air after she had given her Husband's Father's personal name. She had done wrong (*uKhulume kaBi*) and expressed her repentance (*uyaXolisa*).” (See also Berglund 1976:331-32 and p. 292: “Spitting is throwing out anger.... He washes his speaking with the spittle.”) But sanctions might be imposed anyway, and they become increasingly severe if the offense is repeated or if there is evidence that the utterance was done in anger rather than in error. Like the repentance a speaker might enact through spitting, the sanctions are material: ejecting fluids, paying a fine, removing oneself to another homestead, offering a goat (Raum 1973 and others; e.g. JSA 1:15-20). Sanctions such as spitting and fines imply, again, an ideology that immerses words in the material world. Spoken words are vocal acts, emerging from the body and materially consequential.

An ideology of language focused on its somatic and material characteristics shows up in other aspects of Zulu life and language too. For example, in the early twentieth century, many informants interviewed by James Stuart described linguistic variation – ways of speaking that European authorities categorized as “Zulu dialects” spoken by Zulu subgroups – in terms focusing on their physical production. “We Ntungwa [a Zulu subgroup] speak with our tongues in a low position,” said Magidigidi, an informant interviewed in 1905 (JSA 2: 92). Stuart’s notes on the interview continue:

The amaNtungwa were said by the Zulu etc. to *qotshamisa* the tongue, whereas the amaLala were said to *ratula* or *tekeza*. We see then that 1) *tefula*, 2) *tekeza* or *ratula*, and 3) to *qotshamisa* the tongue were the three great dialects.¹⁰ (JSA 2:97.)

In this passage and in other interviews, Stuart’s many informants offer metalinguistic terms and accounts that describe Zulu linguistic varieties and link them with social groupings. The metalinguistic descriptions often focus on tongue position: “the tongue lies flat (*qotsheme*) in the speech of the [amaNtungwa] Zulu,” agreed Melapi, another of Stuart’s informants, offering an example: “*kona loku*, instead of *kona yoku*” (JSA 3:87). As these informants observe, the main body of the tongue when articulating the sound [l] lies low in the mouth (even though the tip of the tongue rises up to the alveolar ridge); in contrast, when articulating the sound [y] the body of the tongue is held up near the palate.

These accounts, like other informant accounts in the Stuart archive that describe tongue position, are essentially somatic. Thus (*uku*)*qotshamisa* is “to cause to squat down”; this is what the amaNtungwa speaker is said to do with the tongue.¹¹ The other two dialects are labeled in terms of qualia – qualities attributed to the sound, or to the physical conditions of its production, or both. The Doke and Vilakazi (1948) dictionary defines *tefula*¹² as “oily, slimy, greasy” –and,

in a transitive sense, to make something greasy. This way of speaking substitutes [y] for [l] in almost all positions: *yoku* “this one,” not *loku* (see above), and *yeyeya*, not *lelela* “to speak in the *tefula* manner.”¹³ *Ratula* (or, *-hadula*) is to “race along, rush headlong” or “to use harsh sounds in speech.” This describes the dialect also known as *tekeza* or *tekela*, in which [t^h] becomes [ts^h] and [z] becomes [dz] or [tʔ] (e.g., *tʔinkomo* “cattle” instead of *izinkomo*). This way of speaking is supposed to be characteristic of the Swazi language SeSwati, Zulu dialects influenced by SeSwati, and Swazi people speaking Zulu.

Evidently, the informant accounts in the Stuart archive from a century ago represent speakers’ constructs about language. They do not represent the dialectology a linguist might offer. As is consistent with their basis as ideology of language, they vary in detail according to the perspective of the informant providing the account. Yet, the appeal to somatic and material-quality explanations of variation recurs many times and across informants. It also recurs in more recent accounts. Kubeka’s (1979) study of Zulu dialectology, while distinguishing six major Zulu dialects on the basis of sound features and the geographical bundling of isoglosses, also mentions how speakers themselves conceive of Zulu varieties. “Proper Zulu” (*isiZulu sempela*), for those speakers, is described as *misa* – high, clear, robust, and upright, as opposed to “Improper Zulu” (*isiZulu esingaphelele*), which is low, soft, and flat. This last is the *tefula* variety described in the Stuart archive.¹⁴

An ideology of language as bodily practice also underlies the vocal performances of diviners who mediate between living clients and deceased ancestors. The diviners’ vocalizations and, in some cases, unusual movements and posture are supposedly caused by the presence of spirits who enter the diviner’s body. A woman diviner whom we visited explained that her possessing spirit (*indlovu*) enters her body through a liquid (*imphepho*, so named for the incense

infused in it) she drinks at a particular point in the divination, just after an invocation praising ancestors and requesting their presence. When she had drunk some of the liquid, she crouched down on the floor and began to speak in an unusually deep voice, often calling out “Yoh yoh yoh!” as did her three apprentices, who had drunk the liquid as well. The changes in vocalization and movements indicate the presence of spirits at the divination, and the diviners’ reaction to their presence, all brought about through the entrance of the *imphepho* incense into the body. The literature on Zulu religion and ritual (e.g., Berglund 1979) is full of similar descriptions of diviners, their vocalizations and their behavior.

We have mentioned Zulu ideas about dialectology and about the vocalizations of diviners not because they are *hlonipha* practices – they are not – but because they illustrate broader aspects of an ideology of language that situates linguistic acts in a material world and understands linguistic practice as bodily action. It is an ideology of language as voice, emanating from the body. In that understanding, *hlonipha* linguistic practice is continuous with the behavioral acts that “cover” the body, cover the utterance, cover up and minimize the expression of affect, and avoid direct confrontation with the respected person. Such acts include covering one’s head, (women’s) covering the breasts in the presence of the father-in-law, never walking in front of his house unless you have made a sacrifice, kneeling down, closing off talk. But “covering” applies to the linguistic usage too. Our informants as well as those reported in the literature use the same descriptive vocabulary for what happens in linguistic *hlonipha* as in other behavioral expressions of *hlonipha*: “covering,” “avoiding,” “lowering.” These informants also situate *hlonipha* in a wider realm of polite and respectful behavior. In linguistic avoidances just as in actions like walking behind one’s father-in-law’s house (cited in our data) or suddenly dropping down when meeting the king unexpectedly (JSA 1:374), *ukuhlonipha* draws together a

broad repertoire of performance, unified in being understood as “covering/avoiding/lowering” behaviors, thus assuaging anger in powerful or dangerous beings.

In requiring the speaker to close off talk, to be quiet, to avoid danger-invoking utterances, and to cover the head and other body parts, *hlonipha* practice contrasts with and complements other Zulu modes of honoring a respected person – modes in which a speaker waxes enthusiastic, elaborate and even ebullient. This contrast is stereotypically linked with gender, but (as we shall see) does not actually map onto women’s and men’s usage in a full range of circumstances.

3. Praise-performance and other celebratory genres

Another way of showing respect and honoring someone is in displays that celebrate and honor through exuberance and elaboration. *Ukubonga* “praising” is one such practice. Well known historically for its performance in the Zulu royal court, it is in fact far more deeply embedded in social practice than much of the literature suggests, and widely performed by ordinary individuals as well as by the gifted performers who act as praise poets (*izimbongi*).¹⁵ Although now attenuated as any constant part of modern life, it still exists in the memorial practices of the state. For instance, in December 2013 at the packed FNB (First National Bank) stadium in Soweto, at the memorial service for the late Nelson Mandela, a Xhosa *imbongi* “praised” the deceased national hero. The practice still has a place as well in the family rituals of numerous homes in cities and country areas. Moreover the media, especially radio, have proved a receptive platform for new and older forms of *ukubonga* (see Part 5 below).

Accounts of *ukubonga*, both historical and contemporary, focus frequently on the flamboyant gestures of the performers and their eloquence and command of a wide range of aesthetic language. A feature often mentioned by Zulu oral historians was the powerful delivery

of the izimbongi (praise poets), whose voices could carry over a large distance. They were not only eloquent and inventive – while attentive to compositions of the poets before them – but vocally powerful too. Famous royal izimbongi such as Magolwana are as enshrined in Zulu history as the kings themselves. It is the izimbongis’ acts of composing the histories of the kings that has enabled the kings’ histories to be remembered at all. Images of their lives and characteristics in richly condensed praise epithets have passed from one talented performer to another across and between generations. The acts of praising (ukubonga) for royalty saturated life at the court of the Zulu kings, and of other, subordinate rulers.

On these occasions the name of an individual would be called out and, never bare, it would be placed within a dense biographical frame and in a longer genealogy and set of social relations. The praise poems for each person created a sense of the past in the present as individuals – of the royal Zulu house for instance – were constantly “recreated” through poetic performance. As an embedded and highly valued rhetorical practice providing a sense of lived identity, it was part of the times of peace and also of marches and campaigns (JSA 1-6 passim). The names and praises of highly placed and ordinary individuals circulated too as common knowledge and practice. In many intimate and informal situations, snatches of praising would take place. They enlivened and gave pleasure as well as sometimes seriousness to many levels of life. In general, praising (ukubonga) was a means of uttering *respect* in the most elaborate poetic way, a way too of celebrating and honoring.

The praise poems (*izibongo*) performed at the royal Zulu court have received most attention in the broad critical literature, and this can be seen as a consequence of several hegemonies – the colonial, that of the Zulu royal house itself, and later that of an apartheid ideology of racial difference, imposing a narrowed vision of a Zulu ideology of language. We

must remember, however, that praising (*ukubonga*) in fact happened on multiple occasions where lineages needed to be celebrated and honored and where respect was shown to the ancestors through *ukubonga*. For ordinary families (*imindeni*) as for chiefly ones, the same attention was paid to words, their poetic shape, the individuals' histories, and to the force and the skilled exuberance of *ukubonga* utterance.

As we have said, the literature assumes that *ukubonga* was largely, if not entirely, the practice of men. This assumption may have had more to do with the lens of the viewers than with the wide map of actual practice. Nevertheless, we can see *ukubonga* as a kind of bodily and linguistic practice *contrasting* with the bodily practice of linguistic *hlonipha*. In voice volume and pitch range, in lexical elaboration and semantic detail, and in its expansive gestures, *ukubonga* is the inverse of *ukuhlonipha*. As with *isihlonipha*, *ukubonga* performance too shows the linguistic and the somatic in consonance, and was much valued as an expressive and aesthetic practice, full of affect and ritual associations.

Alongside *ukubonga* praising is the use of clan praises, *izithakazelo* (Mzolo 1978, Rycroft 1976, Sithole 1982). Overlooked in much of the literature, these were, and still are, crucial means of marking clan – or surname – identities in an unstable world, and linking a person with the lineage ancestors. Acting as highly condensed praise names each with its own allusive hinterland of history, a string of *izithakazelo* or even one single name from the longer string is enough to pinpoint a person's social and historical identity. The clan praises can be spoken with great fervor and affect and at great length if the occasion demands such formality. In a more personal situation, a single clan praise (*isithakazelo*) uttered as greeting is enough to signal respectful recognition.

The isithakazelo, or clan praise name used as greeting, marks, too, a kind of shared social belonging, social knowledge and social etiquette. Whether uttered briefly or as a longer string (like beads), it also represents a certain sort of *avoidance*: the user *avoids* the main clan name (surname) and instead substitutes the clan praise name/s. For example, the clan name *Zulu* has as its most widely known clan praise name, *Ndabezitha*, but behind that sits a host of other praise names available for use when the situation calls for them. Though uttered by both women and men, when praise names are called out with the most force and affect and in moments of ceremony they are regarded as most often a male preserve. An important exception is their utterance by diviners (*izangoma*), who can be male or female (see Part 4).

Eloquence, heightened affect and exuberance also mark the performance of worship in Zionist congregations (Oosthuizen et al 1994). In a service we attended in Mzimhlophe, Soweto (August 2012), the dominant figure, as dramatic performer and master of gesture and sound, was the pastor, Willie Dlamini. Forming a sonic and somatic foil to the pastor was his younger assistant, Mr Zwane. The pastor moved dramatically, at moments crouching, growling in the manner of a diviner, closing his eyes, suddenly standing and hitting the ground with his staff. He led the singing of the hymn “*Oyinhlanhla leyo!*” (The good fortune of it!) and expounded on the text from Matthew Chapter 9 relating to Jesus’ healing of a sick child. Zwane worked with a different rhythm and mode of utterance. He read and expanded on the second text of the service (*Umshumayeli* [Ecclesiastes]12 v 13-14). This focused on the heart of all things being the worship of God. Zwane’s reading style was declamatory and intense, even ferocious. His brief sermon was powerful. He expounded on “*Nakhu ukuphila kwendaba...*” “The vital essence of the matter” was to fear God. And what does this entail? It means you must praise God and respect him through your deeds.

Two of the women members of the congregation we talked to afterwards commented that Zwane had spoken very well; in fact they thought he was “quite inspired.” What stood out in the performance of both the pastor and his assistant were the varieties of power both in the speaking out and the acting of the service (*inkonzo*) as they orchestrated their leading roles. Like ukubonga this was an example of rhetorical celebration and exuberance, though in a different social situation. Here too it seemed that men flourished. Nevertheless the women of the small congregation also spoke with eloquence and power during the service, as they testified on the texts introduced by the pastor and his assistant. Although the gender roles were differentiated, the women too displayed heightened affect and rhetorical elaboration as they gave witness at some length.

In what follows we set out a further case for these two forms of honorific practice, the muffled (*ukuhlonipha*) and the exuberant (especially *ukubonga*), as linked in a broad semiotic economy. Each has been seen in isolation from the other. The stereotype largely maps them on to gender. We explore the complexities in this mapping below.

4. Gender issues: Stereotypes and complications

As our opening vignette showed, *hlonipha* practice is stereotypically associated with women, the domestic sphere, rural life, and the past – “tradition.” The stereotype focuses on married women living in the homestead of their husband’s patrilineage, where the husband’s father (or other agnatic patriarch) may be living as family authority figure. Those conditions are most often found in rural settings. So, when women who spend most of their lives in the city visit their homes in rural areas they must observe the requirements of *hlonipha* that prevail there. Urban women we talked with spoke of covering up and quieting down when they go “home” to a

rural region. As informant AK commented, “Women are not as quiet as they would have been before, if they had never been to Jo’burg, but they are still quieter when they go home than they are in Jo’burg. You calm down, you look at who’s around. No talking.” Agreeing, informant EV further linked these rural requirements to the oppression of women: “If you’re a woman, you’re really pushed down, especially among the Zulus.”¹⁶ Linguistic hlonipha is evidently most extensively practiced in those rural settings, and rural women of the older generation are expected to have the greatest knowledge of hlonipha words. It is they who should instruct incoming wives in the lexical substitutions necessary to avoid the particular names of senior men in that household.

But despite the stereotype, hlonipha practice – even linguistic hlonipha – has never been limited to women. It also applies to the followers, male or female, of a political leader. Historically, at least, it applied as well to a man’s avoidance of his mother-in-law’s name, among other male avoidances. Looking at the historical record, one finds in the archive of James Stuart’s interviews in the early twentieth century many statements about these practices. (There are earlier reports as well, but they tend to generalize, rather than offering an informant’s own testimony.) In a less distant past, male hlonipha practices are reported by Raum (1973), who interviewed hundreds of informants from various Zulu regions, mainly in the 1950’s. Raum’s work remains the most detailed and extensive publication on Zulu hlonipha practice to date.

It is clear from these historical sources that in the heyday of the Zulu state, men avoided uttering the names of kings (such as King Mpande, r. 1840-1872) and other important personages. For example, according to Stuart’s informant Lunguza kaMpukane,

Instead of saying *izimpande* (‘roots’) of trees, we, in Mpande’s day, had to hlonipha and say *izingxabiyo*. The month *uMpandu* was called *uNgaxabiyo*. ... Even at this day, the

Iziggoza [a Zulu subgroup residing in Natal] I live with do not say *izimpande* for the roots of a tree but *izingxabiyo*. (JSA 1:339)

Similarly, according to Mkando ka Dhlova, “boiled grain (*izinkobe*) was called *izimpotulo*, to hlonipha the father of Ndlela, prime minister, and paths (*izindlela*) were called *izinyathuko*” (JSA 3: 81). There are many similar statements in the Stuart archive. Not only royal and politically important men, but all respectable older men were hlonipha’d by younger men. Stuart’s informant Ndukwana (JSA 4: 376) offered various examples: when meeting along a path, an unmarried youth (*insizwa*) would make way for a grown man (*indoda*); a headringed man – a mature man recognized for his achievements – was always shown respect and never touched by a youth; a man smoking a hemp horn (weed) would say to a younger man, “Go boy and fetch me a light.” A younger man always hlonipha’d an older one, even though both had headrings. Even youths hlonipha’d one another, i.e. the younger the older ones.

Although these practices were pervasive, the army context made them especially salient and tended to organize them according to army structure. As Ndukwana pointed out, men hlonipha’d one another according to age and regiments. Stuart adds, “This informant said they hlonipha’d because they were afraid of the king, for a young man could not fight with an old one” (JSA 4:376). Other forms of restrained behavior were observed in the king’s actual presence, and these too were considered forms of hlonipha: speech was restrained in manner; when talking, the king was agreed with (*vunyelwa*’d); a man would walk in a stooping position, and sit squatting, with his hand down. On meeting the king suddenly, a man would drop down – they could not stand together (JSA 4:374).

Although the Stuart archive has less to say about male practice of linguistic hlonipha in domestic settings, men did hlonipha their mothers-in-law. Apparently, however, there were ways

to get around this. Stuart's informant Nombango (alias Topsy) mentioned that her husband, Dhlozi, had a mother-in-law still living whose name was Nyangambili. Dhlozi sometimes needed to say the word *nyanga* "moon," so he decided to buy the privilege of using *nyanga* and not substituting a different word. He freed himself from the necessity of hlonipha-ing her by paying her one shilling, and consequently "[held] himself exonerated" (JSA 4:365). Furthermore, according to informant Mkando ka Dlova a husband would not go to the side of the hut his mother-in-law was on (JSA 3:154). This avoidance parallels a woman's avoidance of her father-in-law's door.

In another example of male hlonipha practice, one of Raum's most elderly informants – he was 8 or 10 years old when King Mpande died (1872) – who had served in the Zulu army reported that men who had killed people observed special hlonipha avoidances:

I observed the taboos of a slayer when I killed a man in a faction fight... I was known as a 'killer' since I carried a sign: an *iPhunganhlo* leaf in my hair and *isiQunga* grass to scratch myself with. I could not scratch my body with my finger nails, since it would get irritated. 'Killers' hlonipha their own bodies (*siHlonipha ukwEnwaya*). (Raum 1973:266)

These historical examples, and there are many more, date from a century ago or more – the period of Stuart's interviews and, probably, Raum's informants' early memories. There are later examples of male hlonipha usage too, however. In his research from the 1950's, Raum offered evidence for then-current male usage, and reported a gendered patterning to the consonants used in creating a hlonipha lexical substitute. In hlonipha substitutions that altered the initial consonant of the name's stem, Raum observed, "women commonly prefer the h sound and the frontal click; men choose the lateral click. ... Where women would form *isiCiko [hlonipha word] for isiVimbo 'stopper', men might substitute with *isiXiko" (Raum 1973:79).¹⁷

It is not clear what might be meant by “prefer” and “choose” in this context, or what ideas about speaking the gendered differentiation might involve. Nevertheless, Raum’s statement attests to male usage of isihlonipho and male creation of new hlonipha forms. It also attests to a widespread Zulu awareness and manipulation of a connection between linguistic sound, vocal tract behavior, and social differentiation.

Today, even where linguistic hlonipha practice has become attenuated, some kinds of male hlonipha practice remain. In the domestic context, for example, it is reported that men making *lobola* (bridewealth) payments to their in-laws may use hlonipha terms to show respect for the mother-in-law (Rudwick and Shange 2006).¹⁸ As an example from more public spaces, when knowledgeable people speak respectfully of an *imbongi* (praise-singer), rather than using the term *imbongi* they refer to him by the hlonipha term *inyosi*.¹⁹ In the recent political realm, Chief Mangosuthu Buthelezi, major political figure and eventual head of the Inkatha Freedom Party, substituted the hlonipha term *impisholo* for *mnyama* “black” when referring to “black unity” and the “black nation,” in honor of his ancestor Mnyamana, king Cetshwayo’s prime minister. Dlamini (2005:84) maintains that Buthelezi actually invented this substitution – widely conventionalized later in the expression *isizwe esimpisholo* (the Black Nation) – as a form of hlonipha usage. But whether Buthelezi invented this expression or only highlighted it, bringing it into broad national usage, it certainly looks like a hlonipha substitution honoring the nineteenth-century political leader Mnyamana – an ancestor his great-grandson Mangosuthu Buthelezi refers to often. Nowadays the phrase *isizwe esimpisholo* as shorthand for “the black nation” in the widest sense has acquired new political connotations and relevance beyond Buthelezi’s original usage.

These examples – and we could cite others – show that linguistic hlonipha was not historically or even today practiced only by women. Nor was women’s hlonipha practice directed only at avoiding the names of patriarchal men. The historical sources indicate that women also hlonipha’d one another according to rank and circumstance, junior wives respecting senior wives when all drank beer together (JSA 4:376). What seems to have been most important in hlonipha usage is not gender as such, but forms of power, authority, and the perception of danger. Both men and women avoided the names of dangerous animals (leopards, crocodiles, porcupines), diseases, and instruments of war.²⁰ In the presence of those sources of power and danger, hlonipha substitutes were used, no matter whether it was a man or a woman who was speaking.

The hlonipha terms for the porcupine merit a closer look, even though it is not clear whether these expressions are still used. The source is apparently Callaway (1868:3), cited by Raum:

The real name of the porcupine is *iNgungumbane*: to prevent it causing destruction in the gardens it is respectfully referred to as *umFazana* [‘little woman’], *inKosana* [‘little chief’], even *uNomKhubulwane* [Princess of Heaven!] i.e., kinship terms and respect terms are used to avoid their proper names. (Raum 1973:78)

Thus the hlonipha expression substituting for the real name of the porcupine combines avoidance of the name and an expression of praise – just as occurs with clan praise names, a brief version of which allows the speaker respectfully to avoid using a personal name. And whether addressing Princess Porcupine or a person to whom one wants to show respect, both the hlonipha forms and the clan praise-name can be uttered by either men or women.

The contraction and “scrunching up” of the self, through suppression of affect and agency, in women’s hlonipha practices are counterbalanced by the possibility that women too

can be part of the physically expansive and celebratory domains of performance, including ukubonga. Just as ukuhlonipha is not solely female, ukubonga (praising), with its exuberant uses of language and the body to respect and celebrate, is far from solely a male practice. It needs, instead, to be understood in a wider domain of performance. Close scrutiny of the archive reveals something far more linguistically and performatively nuanced, and less gendered, than the usual stereotypes afford. There is evidence of women's ukubonga performance both in the oral testimonies gathered in the Stuart archives (JSA 1-6) and in contemporary sources. The imbongi Baleka, for instance, was well enough known for her skills as a praise poet to be called in by James Stuart to speak about Qwabe history and to recite the praises of the Qwabe chiefly lineage for him (JSA 1:4-14).

In recent times Princess Magogo of the Zulu royal house, daughter of King Dinuzulu (d 1913), sister of King Solomon and wife of Chief Mathole Buthelezi, was known as an accomplished imbongi. Her public performances were, it seems, few, but within the inner circle of Zulu royalty and of the Buthelezi house, her expertise was well known. On the occasion when the statue of King Shaka at Dukuza (Stanger) was unveiled in 1953, she praised each of the Zulu kings so powerfully that one of the royal uncles, a senior prince, felt driven to present her with a cow.²¹ Decades later in Durban in 1979, not long before her death, she again recited the royal praises at another such commemorative event. The press picture from the time in *Ilanga* ("The Sun") showed not a male praise poet (imbongi) but a dignified elderly woman in a smart dress of the era standing next to the object of commemoration (Gunner 1984).

On another occasion some years earlier (1967) the Zulu-language paper *UmAfrika*, reporting on a royal wedding in Durban, noted that the Royal Princess Constance Magogo – honorifically called *Umntwana*, "the Child" – dressed on this occasion in full Zulu regalia

(*wavunula ngomdabu*), had performed the izibongo praise poems of the royal house at the wedding (Gunner 2012:197). Such knowledge, both formally in the public domain through press reportage and informally present through personal memory, shows that a woman of the royal house could hold her own as an imbongi praise poet and that eloquence, vocal power and affect did not depend on gender.

Similarly, northern KwaZulu-Natal in the mid-1970s saw Adelina Dube declaiming the praise poems (*izibongo*) of the Dube chiefly house when a Dube woman married Chief Lindelihle Mzimela (Gunner and Gwala 1991:144-153). There was no sense that a woman *praising* in the eloquent expressive mode constituted some moment of cultural crisis. It was merely a performance event important for both wedding parties, for honoring and celebrating the couple's lineages, and for the future wellbeing of husband and wife. On this occasion, the imbongi, Adelina Dube, wore the tall headpiece (*inhloko*) used by married women of that region, and the long skirt and blouse of a married woman.²²

The body "in flight," expansive, propelled in exuberance by poetic words, also defines women's ukubonga praising in more private social spaces. The (auto-)biographies of women captured in compact praise names, strung together in loose and shifting order, can be performed time and again, usually in the company of other women as part of a social event such as a wedding, or a coming-of-age party, or a similar joyous occasion. These performances are usually termed *izigiyo*; the same term is used for men's performance.²³ Here the praise names (*izibongo*) are substitutes for a woman's given name, in a kind of avoidance in order to celebrate. The praising creates a history, an identity, and sometimes a jeweled chronology from youth to old age. In the praise names of MaMhlalise Mkhwanazi (Gunner 1995) echoes of this passage can be

heard as her praises begin with a reference to her youth, while later segments mark the phases of her married life.

Izibongo praises have discrete pieces that can be assembled and reassembled in any order. In the version MaMhlalise recited for Gunner they had perhaps settled into a chronology from youth to her old age. Her first praise name suggests that. But through all chapters of her life her praise names were surely known to men too. After all, *ukubonga* as social practice is widely embedded in social life, and praises exist as “lived” knowledge. The performed words, the memory of them, and some knowledge of their inner meanings and stories were part of the web of social interactions that had marked MaMhlalise’s life. So had manners and the practice of respect, including *isihlonipho sabafazi* in its broadest sense. The poetic, rhetorical, and dancing skills were part of a sociality that existed throughout her life alongside the *hlonipha* practice. For example, on Gunner’s visits to her, in the hills above KwaDlangezwa,²⁴ the *hlonipha* word *maya* was always used for *dlana* (“eat!”).²⁵ As the widow of a chief, Nikiza Mkhwanazi, MaMhlalise must have experienced *hlonipha* practices as a normal part of life, as was dancing to, knowing and being *known by* her *izibongo* praises. For her as for many women of her generation and the next, respect as social practice incorporated *ukuhlonipha* and *ukubonga* in a single whole.

On this note, Princess Magogo (in an interview with Gunner in 1976) revealed, almost in passing, a hidden presence. In a room at KwaPhindangene, her son Chief Buthelezi’s home in Mahlabathini, the Princess had with astonishing power recited the praise poems of the Zulu kings from Senzangakhona to the present.²⁶ Then, with the praise poets of the Buthelezi still present, she launched into the praise poems of two *wives* of the royal house. One set was that of Ngqumbazi (composed from c. 1820) and the second was of Nomvimbi (composed from

c.1860). Their usage, as Princess Magogo explained it, shows women as the object of honorific language, in the domain of manners as well as social hierarchy.

These two quite ancient praise poems of royal women – King Cetshwayo’s mother, Ngqumbazi, and Nomvimbi, mother of King Dinuzulu – also relate in other ways to the wider practices of women’s izibongo and hence the language of celebration, affect and biography.²⁷ They *mark* the praised person as existing within a circle of assessing eyes, of persons who notice and comment on character and behavior as well as particular events. Ngqumbazi’s honorific name of “Msizi!” (Helper!) by which both men and women greeted and thanked her “after they had eaten food prepared by the royal lady” was part of a longer narrative praisename noting how *over-careful* she was with food supplies:

UMsweyazi wakomgengneni/The needy one at the grain basket

Uzincisha yena/ She stints herself

Waze wancisha ngisho iNkosi yoHlanga/She went further and stinted even the Royal One

*UMsizi wabakude abaseduze bekhala naye/Helper of the distant, those close by cry with her.*²⁸

Here celebration, etiquette, and implicit criticism all combine. They signal too a network of cross-gender usage marking how female royalty was addressed at the time. These royal women’s praise names lay largely hidden outside documented history until emerging in another royal woman’s speech over a century later. This moment of emergence reveals a certain erasure of women’s izibongo from both an internal and an external gaze. James Stuart’s informants, many of whom were knowledgeable and gifted praise poets or indigenous historians of the era, simply treated women’s izibongo as nothing noteworthy. Stuart in turn passed this view on, and in his search for the big picture – as he saw it – made no attempt to pursue the small leads he was

given.²⁹ Women's performance of izibongo, and the praising of women, remained largely excluded from the "known" archive.

The construction of the archive is a way gender stereotyping of these practices has tended to block out non-stereotypical practices. We argued earlier that what seems to have been most important in hlonipha usage, particularly in the past, is not gender as such, but forms of power, authority, and the perception of danger. Still, given a generally patriarchal Zulu society in which women married into a household governed by the senior men of their husband's lineage, women may have more often experienced situations in which they were the junior, less authoritative party. This would especially have been the case after the colonial conquest, when the Zulu state had been undermined and its army, an important locus of male hlonipha practice, dispersed. When one also considers the assumptions about gender that colonial-era observers like Stuart – so important as sources of our information about historical practice – brought to their documentation of Zulu life, it is not surprising that isihlonipha would become known as "women's language." This gendered stereotyping of isihlonipha, to some extent already present in English-language sources since the mid-nineteenth century, was further solidified when reproduced in general and comparative works in ethnology and linguistics later in the nineteenth century and into the twentieth, for example in works by Lubbock (1882) and Jespersen (1922). These general works have had a feedback effect on some local scholars. Mncube (1949), for example, cites Jespersen as an authority and applies Jespersen's ideas about "women's language" to his own study of hlonipha.³⁰

5. Hlonipha and Praise-related Practice (izithakazelo) in radio and telephonic mediations of voice

In our introductory scene, Zulu-language radio was playing in the background. Indeed, radios and cellphones are ubiquitous presences in contemporary urban Zulu life and everyday linguistic experience. How are the vocal practices that are so salient in the performance of respect manifest in, or affected by, these technological mediations?

Contemporary hlonipha practice for women, especially in an urban context, can be a matter of skillful negotiation and piecemeal usage (see Rudwick 2008:164). Such adaptations go far beyond face-to-face communication. The instance below points to the enduring importance of *voice* as a vector of hlonipha when a speaker is communicating telephonically, probably by mobile phone, with someone for whom respect must be conveyed. Suppose a woman finds herself speaking to her father-in-law – perhaps by accident, as in a telephone call answered by the wrong addressee; or suppose for some reason she must refer to him. Our informant EV explained:

Ngokuzithoba, okusho ukuthi ma ukhuluma naye uba phansi, izwi uyehlisa, *ivoice* yakho ibe phansi, kubonisa ukuthi usamhlonipha noma uthi “Baba,” ngubaba wakho, noma angekho, ukhona noma akekho *you must change your tone, you must change your tone.* By making yourself very humble; that’s to say if you speak to him you would do so in a low voice, you would speak more softly, your voice would be soft, to make it clear that you still respect [hlonipha] him, you say “Father,” he is your father [-in-law], even if he is not present, or if he is present, *you must change your tone, you must change your tone.* The soft, respectful tone, which EV emphasized *must* be used in speaking to one’s father-in-law, is clearly part of a telephonic hlonipha practice important to family harmony. Voice and tone as somatic markers stand in for the absent deferential body and ensure appropriate respect between daughter-in-law and father-in-law.

EV's statement provides a glimpse of telephonic mediation shifting women's respect practices (*isihlonipho sabafazi*) "into a new key," as it were. The radio usage we now turn to shows hlonipha practice covering interpersonal and social relations in a wider arena while still firmly anchored in the concept of respect. In each of the radio examples below, speakers use a clan praise name (*isithakazelo*) to signify their social knowledge of "right" usage, and to show admiration and respect for the person they address. (As we have pointed out, an *isithakazelo* combines praise with avoidance of the personal name.) However, they use *isithakazelo* so much, in such a range of broadcast situations, as to suggest that hlonipha use signifies a bundle of symbolic capital with wide implications.

Zama Ngcobo is a popular woman radio presenter on Ukhozi FM, the Zulu language station of the national broadcaster SABC. Along with Sipho Mbatha (known usually by his nickname "Sgqemza" – "Big-Head"), she hosts the Vuka Manzi Breakfast Show, 6:30 - 9:00 AM, Monday to Friday. The co-hosts take a light, fine-tuned tone, as they compete with other commercial radio stations working largely in English, smaller isiZulu stations in KwaZulu-Natal, and other popular stations operating in languages spoken in the multilingual Johannesburg region. Zama combines an exuberant personality with a sharp interest in regional and national affairs, as well as an eye for social injustice and the rights of women. Clearly something of a celebrity, she never lets her listeners forget that she is from the small rural town of Eshowe in central KwaZulu-Natal. As a model of an urban isiZulu-speaking woman performing an important public role on Ukhozi FM she mixes and holds together the competing demands on Zulu women. She seems to keep at bay the pressures of patriarchy while living comfortably with a modern Zulu identity. For this radio persona she is widely admired. Thus when on 12 May 2014 a young man called in to the Breakfast Show and addressed her as "*Mashiya Mahle*"

(literally, Beautiful Eyebrows) – one of the main clan praise names for her surname “Ngcobo” – he was making it clear that he respected and admired her. His usage also showed that he shared with her (and many other listeners) a social knowledge of how respect and admiration could be performed and voiced on radio.

A very different program, the Sunday *Indumiso* (“Worship”) – an evening program combining worship, music and motivational advice – presents other situations where respect, admiration and social knowledge are voiced through the use of clan praise names. When (in August 2012) the show’s host, Sbu Buthelezi, read out an email from one Vusi Mkhize, the message addressed him not as Buthelezi but as “Shenge,” a Buthelezi clan praise name. The writer went on to say how the program had “changed my life.” In turn, the announcer greeted the email writer, Mkhize, by *his* clan praise name, “Khabazela.” This response not only returned the compliment but also showed how an easy interchange of address forms in a radio talk show can foreground admiration and respect through the use of clan praises. Such exchanges are common. For example, football commentary on Ukhozi also often shows the seemingly casual and easy exchange of praise names. Thanda Ndlovu, famed sports commentator and sometime reporter of the music genre *isicathamiya*, is often addressed as “Gatsheni,” and sometimes exuberantly by another segment of his clan praise name, “Boya beNyathi” (Buffalo Hair). The Saturday morning program on *maskanda*, another Zulu music genre, brings clan praises in extensively. Hlonipha as a broad category of respect is thus being voiced (Gunner 2017).

Sometimes callers-in to Ukhozi FM use clan praise names conspicuously to display their knowledge of “right” Zulu practice and voice it on air. On the Breakfast Show in March 2014, a caller, “Linda umfo kaNtuli” (Linda son of Ntuli) came on air to publicize his recent book on “Teenage Suicide”; he addressed the show’s co-host as “Shando kaNdaba,” one of the best-

known praise names for the host's surname, Mbatha. On this occasion, Sgqemeza (Big-Head) Mbatha was suddenly "elevated" by the use of his clan praise name – with its punch of respect and praise – by the caller, Ntuli, whose motives we can only guess at: to get as much airtime as possible about his new book? Or, by portraying himself as knowledgeable, to enhance his book's appeal?

What emerges from our examples is how hlonipha and ukubonga, as a complex linked practice of respect, move across various social spaces and interpersonal uses in many differently contextualized radio programs. With the frequent presence of clan praise names as a mode of greeting on Ukhozi FM, we see that a national radio station (with approximately 7.7 million listeners) shows honorific forms working in various ways, sometimes markedly "Zulu" (in the maskanda program, for instance) but at other moments as part of something far broader: a concept of "respect" seeping out into a wider social understanding of good practice. These usages expand our understanding of "performing respect" in a contemporary context that uses the Zulu language but on a station with wide national coverage.

Our findings from Ukhozi FM concur with Dlamini's (2005) study of youth culture in Durban in the 1990s, a period of tense national transition. Dlamini pointed to hlonipha as a pivotal concept in competition between a rigid hegemonic "Zuluness," represented by the Inkatha political party, and a far more negotiated and flexible bundle of ways of "being and doing Zulu." Today too, hlonipha, broadly conceived as "respect," is part of "doing and being Zulu" in a multicultural and multilingual state, in a way that moves outside any narrow or hegemonic definition of Zuluness.

6. Conclusion

Ukuhlonipha and ukubonga practices, we have argued, are best understood in terms of a general semiotic economy that organizes behavioral practices – including ways of speaking – and associates them with social identities and relations. We have situated these genres, traditionally discussed separately, in a broader field of ideologies of language, comportment, and honorification, and we have explored their place in performance repertoires across genders and across historical settings. These repertoires, we suggest, offer Zulu-speakers resources for contemporary concerns with identity – gender identity, ethnic identity, national identity – and play a role in everyday life and the public politics of the postapartheid nation. It is important, therefore, for researchers to consider how performance practices and their connections with social belonging may be extended – whether within or beyond the ethnic – in a modern multilingual state.

The atomizing and narrowing of performance forms into tightly bound categories may have been a helpful step in earlier taxonomies of knowledge. Yet these categories, especially when cemented into gender stereotypes, may have obscured access to a wider network of interconnectedness. Returning to the archives alongside contemporary fieldwork can in some cases offer a compelling case for reconfiguring our understanding of how things work: how linguistic practices are not only actions of the mind but also of the body; and how language use binds together, differentiates, and enables its speakers. The holistic approach that we adopt here, in looking again at “respect” in its Zulu usage, has implications for other studies of language and social practice.

This is not quite the first time Zulu ukuhlonipha and ukubonga have been juxtaposed. In an earlier paper (Irvine 1998) they were placed together as honorific modalities, but their relationship was not much explored there, since the paper’s main purpose lay in considering a

larger set of ethnographic cases. Yet, it is exactly in bringing these two forms of Zulu respectful practice together that one can see the broader semiotic economy that organizes their relationship with affect, agency, and other bodily acts.

Moreover, we are certainly not the first to situate acts of language use in the material world or in bodily practice. In our text, however, we have paid special attention to the terminology that describes and interprets such practices. Consequently we have tried to avoid terminology that might imply, even inadvertently, that linguistic acts are always, everywhere, and necessarily to be seen as mental acts first, and only subsequently “embodied.” Cultural understandings of language as, essentially, voice, like the Zulu views we have discussed, work against such mentalistic assumptions.

Finally, our analysis offers suggestions, we believe, for the literature on linguistic honorifics: that understandings of these forms will be enhanced if studies branch out into explorations of respectful bodily practice, and also into a range of other expressive genres. Honorific language is not only to be seen as linguistic structure, and it is not only to be compared with “everyday” ways of speaking, as is generally the case in the literature. Zulu ukubonga in its more florid forms is hardly everyday talk. And there are implications too for studies of practices of the body. Acts of speaking are produced by the body, after all. So if “embodiment” and social practices – of the body or in general – are topics of current anthropological attention, they need to include linguistic practice.

Acknowledgements:

We are grateful to the African Studies Center of the University of Michigan for funding for our joint fieldwork. Thanks are also due to Faith Xaba, for facilitating many contacts in Mzimhlophe hostel; to Willy Dlamini and the congregation of the Mahlokohloko Zionist Church in Mzimhlophe; and to Rebecca Mofokeng for facilitating some interviews in Johannesburg. We thank Beverly Stoeltje, Joel Kuipers, and Krisztina Feherváry for their helpful comments on an earlier draft of this paper.

Endnotes:

¹ In the Zulu language (*isizulu*), *-hlonipho* is the noun stem, *-hlonipha* is the verb stem. The prefix *uku-* creates an infinitival form, thus *ukuhlonipha* is “to behave respectfully” and refers to the general practice, while the prefix *isi-* locates the practice as a way of speaking. Many Zulu words have prefixes (part of the concord system) before the stem. Some authors in the past capitalized the first letter of the stem (e.g., *isiZulu*), but current orthographic practice usually does not. We retain the capitalization when quoting authors who used it.

² Taking the massive Doke and Vilakazi dictionary (1948) as watershed, major works on *hlonipha* since 1948 that offer primary data include Mncube 1949; Raum 1973; Finlayson 1982, 1984; Bengela 2001; Rudwick & Shange 2006, 2009; Luthuli 2007. Some of these authors wrote on Zulu *hlonipha*, some on Xhosa, some on both. We have focused primarily on Zulu, but occasionally mention Xhosa when relevant.

³ Our joint fieldwork on *hlonipha* was carried out in August 2012 and August 2014; Gunner’s most intensive periods of fieldwork on *ukubonga* were 1975-1976, 1986, 2000, 2004. Our fieldwork took place in Soweto, Braamfontein, and Auckland Park, Johannesburg. Gunner transcribed and translated all Zulu material we have worked with for this paper.

⁴ See Irvine 1998 for some linguistic analysis, and Mncube 1949 for many examples. The Doke and Vilakazi (1948) Zulu dictionary provides many *hlonipha* forms.

⁵ See JSA 1:339.

⁶ Luke Fleming (2011) discusses this type of avoidance form in terms of its materiality.

⁷ Presumably, *ibodwe* “pot.” T- was speaking English to us when she told us this story, but of course her mother would have been speaking Zulu. The *hlonipha* word T-’s mother used was probably *itikile*. See the conversation in Mzimhlophe Hostel, earlier in this paper, which also involves “pots.”

⁸ The pattern suggests that *hlonipha* practice may well have been the route through which click consonants entered Zulu and related Southern Bantu language as phonological borrowings from Khoi and San languages (see Herbert 1990b, Irvine 1992, Irvine & Gal 2000; Herbert and Irvine came to this conclusion independently). Clicks did not exist in the original Southern Bantu consonant repertoire. So, in the era when the southward-moving speakers of those Bantu languages came into contact with click-rich Khoi and San languages, the clicks would have made an excellent resource for creating a *hlonipha* avoidance form that could not possibly represent any Bantu-language personal name (at the time). Possibly the clicks’ association with Khoi/San speakers would have conveyed a sense of “foreignness” – and subservience, at least in the Southern Bantu speakers’ eyes/hopes – appropriate to the usage of subservient persons, and

doubly appropriate for in-marrying women who would be outsiders to the husband's patrilineage.

⁹ Koopman's (2002) extensive study of Zulu naming practices opens with the quote from Berglund (1975) given below, on the relationship between the name and the individual, and the name's use in witchcraft (Koopman 2002:17).

¹⁰ Stuart's notes continue: "Viz. the Mzansi (alias uMzansi wensimu), the amaLala, and the amaNtungwa or umNhla." Like other analyses of the late Victorian period, perhaps especially that of Bryant (1929), Stuart's discussion assumes discrete dialect boundaries within a (bounded) Zulu language. Later discussions such as Kubeka's (1979) and Hamilton's (1986) contest this view of Zulu dialectology. Tefula and Tekeza/Tekela ways of speaking differ from the "pure Zulu" Ntungwa speech – differences that have been salient to speakers – but without being internally consistent in other respects, and without being territorially bounded.

¹¹ The Doke & Vilakazi dictionary gives *-qoshamisa*.

¹² Or *thefula*, with aspirated /t^h/.

¹³ Exceptions to this pattern of substitution include, especially, prefixes marking concords of certain noun classes.

¹⁴ In fact, Kubeka's six dialect areas seem to reproduce the three "main dialects" mentioned in Stuart's notes, plus three others described in terms of external influence (by English and Afrikaans; by Xhosa; by Sotho; and by Swati, respectively). Moreover, Kubeka too draws on qualia and somatic practices in describing some of these dialects. Thus the Central Zulu area (present-day version of the amaNtungwa speech with some influence from Thefula (Shaka's original dialect) is "soft, flowing and musical," and "the */ulimi oluqokothileyo/* quality of this dialect" is illustrated by demonstrative copulative forms.

¹⁵ The most detailed accounts of *ukubonga* (performing praise poetry) are given in the dense records of the Zulu historians, praise poets *izimbongi*, and knowledgeable individuals whom James Stuart interviewed between 1903 and 1923 at various sites in what was then the province of Natal and occasionally in what was still known as Zululand. The Stuart papers are housed at the Killie Campbell Library, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban. Volumes 1-6 of the James Stuart Archive (JSA) have been edited by Colin Webb and John Wright. See also Stuart (1923, 1924 a and b, 1924). Commentators on and recorders of *ukubonga* are too numerous to list here exhaustively. They include: Arbousset (1842); Ndawo (1928); Grant (1929); Samuelson (1929); Lestrade (1935); Nyembezi (1948); Ngubane (1951); Kunene (1962); Rycroft (1974, 1975, 1976, 1980, 1984); Rycroft and Ngcobo (1988); Cope (1968); Gunner (1979, 1984, 1995); Gunner and Gwala (1991); Kunene (1962); Brown (1998). Major commentaries on Xhosa *ukubonga* include Opland (1975; 1983); Kaschula (1995; 2002).

¹⁶ See also Rudwick and Shange 2009. Our urban informants also noted that rural customs "had their good points" – and as Rudwick and Shange (2006) point out, customs such as hlonipha requirements are valued by many Zulu women for their cultural richness and their connection to Zuluness.

¹⁷ Among Xhosa, a related type of avoidance vocabulary is associated with male circumcision practice. In this male type (*isihlonipho sabakhwetha*, vs *isihlonipho abafazi*, the women's usage) the hlonipha words are not consonant oriented, unlike the women's practice. Instead, the circumcision hlonipha forms are lexical substitutions involving a semantic shift (Bongela 2001:181). The pattern of forming substitutions differs from the women's pattern even though the boys are said to be "like new *makoti*'s [brides]"; Bongela 2001:31. Since Shaka abolished

circumcision for Zulu youth in the early nineteenth century, the question of special avoidance forms for newly-circumcised youth does not arise.

¹⁸ We have not ourselves observed this practice or seen it described in detail.

¹⁹ In this case what is hlonipha'd is not the praise-singer's personal name – possibly avoided too – but, presumably, the name of an important person that includes the sounds in the stem *-bongi*.

²⁰ Similarly concerning power, several of Raum's informants, recorded in the 1950's, remembered that smiths used to use hlonipha words because they "respected the objects they were making," as well as their tools. Many of these words, such as *umpikade* for *umkhonto* "spear," *insicilo* for *imbokodwe* "hammerstone or anvil" were also general hlonipha words used in Raum's own day, since these words were often given to men of rank as personal names. (Raum 1973:215).

²¹ Interview Princess Constance Magogo with Liz Gunner, KwaPhindangene, Mahlabathini, Feb 5, 1976. See also Gunner and Gwala (1991:120, photo inset 3). The Princess mentioned on that occasion that there were also those who were a little uncomfortable at a woman *imbongi* performing this important role of national commemoration. Ambivalence was thus present! See also Rycroft (1975) on music in royal Zulu life, based on extensive interviews with Princess Magogo.

²² Adelina Dube was a member of the Shembe church and her dress emphasised this.

²³ See the *izigiyo* and song of Dayi Mhlongo, Gunner and Gwala (1991:120, photo inset 7). See also photo inset 8.

²⁴ Not far from the University of Zululand and the teeming settlement of KwaDlangezwa near Empangeni.

²⁵ Gunner does not remember other instances of hlonipha words. Her knowledge of Zulu at the time was probably not deep enough to notice them.

²⁶ The *izimbongi* of her husband's house, the Buthelezi, were also present and had recited the Buthelezi *izibongo*. See Gunner and Gwala (1991:112-125 and p.120 photo insets 1 and 2).

²⁷ See also Turner 1988.

²⁸ See Gunner 1979 for a discussion of royal wives' *izibongo* and others by or of women.

²⁹ The James Stuart Zulu readers are also important in regard to gender erasure, and the erasure of the *izibongo* of ordinary people, since they foreground the *izibongo zamakhosi* (praises of the [Zulu] kings). See Stuart 1923, 1924 a and b, 1925. Moreover, they artificially "frame" the *izibongo* so that their textual apartness becomes a mirror of their envisioned separation from everyday life.

³⁰ Notice too the play with stereotypes that seems to be involved in gay men's hlonipha usages, described by Rudwick and Ntuli (2008). Hlonipha in this case serves as a resource in expressing gay gender identities.

REFERENCES

Abbreviation: JSA = James Stuart Archive. 6 volumes. See Webb and Wright, below.

Agha, Asif. 1993. "Grammatical and Indexical Convention in Honorific Discourse." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 3:131-163.

_____. 1994. "Honorification." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 23:277-302.

_____. 1998. "Stereotypes and Registers of Honorific Language." *Language in Society* 27:151-193.

_____. 2007. *Language and Social Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Arbousset, Jean Thomas and F. Daumas. 1846. *Narrative of an Exploratory Tour to the North-east of the Cape of Good Hope*. John Croumbie Brown, trans. Cape Town: A.S. Robertson and Saul Solomon. [Repr. 1968. Capetown: Struik.] First published 1842 as *Relation d'un Voyage d'exploration au Nord-Est de la colonie du Cap de Bonne Espérance*. Paris: Arthus Bertrand.

Berglund, Axel-Ivar. 1979. *Zulu Thought Patterns and Symbolism*. Uppsala: Swedish Institute of Missionary Research.

Bongela, Knobel Sakhiwo. 2001. *Isihlonipho among AmaXhosa*. PhD Dissertation, Department of African Languages, University of South Africa (Pretoria).

Brown, Duncan. 1998. *Voicing the Text: South African Oral Poetry and Performance*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

Bryant, A. T. 1929. *Olden Times in Zululand and Natal, Containing Earlier Political History of the Eastern-Nguni Clans*. London: Longmans, Green.

Callaway, Henry. 1868. *Nursery Tales, Traditions, and Histories of the Zulus*. London: Trubner.

Cavanaugh, Jillian and Shalini Shankar, eds. 2017. *Language and Materiality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Forthcoming.

Cope, Trevor. 1968. *Izibongo: Zulu Praise-poems*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Dlamini, Sibusisiwe Nombuso. 2005. *Youth and Identity Politics in South Africa 1990-1994*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Doke, Clement M., and B. W. Vilakazi. 1948. *Zulu-English Dictionary*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press. (2nd ed. 1958.)

-
- Finlayson, Rosalie. 1982. "Hlonipha – Women's Language of Avoidance among the Xhosa." *South African Journal of African Languages* 1, Supplement 1: 35-60.
- _____. 1984. "The Changing Nature of Isihlonipho Sabafazi." *African Studies* 43:137-146.
- _____. 1995. "Women's Language of Respect: Isihlonipha Sabafazi." In Rajend Mesthrie, ed. *Language and Social History*, 140-154. Cape Town and Johannesburg: David Philip.
- Fleming, Luke. 2011. "Name Taboos and Rigid Performativity." *Anthropological Quarterly* 84(1):141-164.
- Gunner, Elizabeth. 1979. "Songs of Innocence and Experience: Women as Composers and Performers of Zulu Praise Poetry." in *Research in African Literatures*, 10(2):239-26.
- _____. 1984.. *Ukubonga Nezibongo: Zulu Praising and Praises*. PhD dissertation, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.
- _____. 1995 [2008]. "Clashes of Interest: Gender, Status and Power in Zulu Praise Poetry." In Graham Furniss and Liz Gunner, eds. *Power, Marginality and African Oral Literature*, 185-196. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 2012. "The Politics of Language and Chief Albert Luthuli's Funeral, 30 July 1967." In Arianna Lissoni, Jon Soske, and Noor Nieftagodien, eds. *100 Years of the ANC: Debating Liberation Histories Today*, 191-209. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.
- _____. 2017. "The Man from Where? Ukhozi FM and New Identities on Radio in South Africa." *Journal of African Media Studies* 9(2). Forthcoming.
- _____ and Gwala, Mafika. 1991. *Musho! Zulu Popular Praises*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press. Series. African Historical Sources.
- Hamilton, Carolyn. 1986. *Ideology, Oral Traditions and the Struggle for Power in the Early Zulu Kingdom*. MA Thesis, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.
- Hanong Thetela, Puleng. 2002. "Sex Discourses and Gender Constructions in Southern Sotho: A Case Study of Police Interviews of Rape/Assault Victims." *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies* 20(3):177-189.
- Herbert, Robert. 1990a. "The Sociohistory of Clicks in Southern Bantu." *Anthropological Linguistics* 32:295-315.
- _____. 1990b. "Hlonipha and the Ambiguous Woman." *Anthropos* 85:455-473.
- Irvine, Judith T. 1992. "Ideologies of Honorific Language." *Pragmatics* 2:251-262.

-
- _____. 1995. "Honorifics." In Jef Verschueren, Jan-Ola Östman and Jan Blommaert, eds. *Handbook of Pragmatics 1995*, 1-22. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- _____. 1998. "Ideologies of Honorific Language." In Bambi Schieffelin, Kathryn Woolard, and Paul Kroskrity, eds. *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*, 51-67. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 2017. "Materiality and Language, or Material Language? Dualisms and Embodiments." In Jillian Cavanaugh and Shalini Shankar, eds. *Language and Materiality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Forthcoming.
- _____ and Susan Gal. 2000. "Language Ideology and Linguistic Differentiation." In Paul Kroskrity, ed. *Regimes of Language*, 35-83. Santa Fe: School of Advanced Research Press.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1922. *Language, its Nature, Development and Origin*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Kaschula, R. 1995. "Mandela Comes Home: the Poets' Perspective." *Oral Tradition* 10(1):91-110.
- _____. 2002. *The Bones of the Ancestors are Shaking: Xhosa Oral Poetry in Context*. Cape Town: Juta.
- Koopman, Adrian. 2002. *Zulu Names*. Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press.
- Kubeka, Isaac Sibusiso. 1979. *A Preliminary Survey of Zulu Dialects*. MA Thesis, University of Natal.
- Kunene, R.M. 1962. *An Analytical Survey of Zulu Poetry both Traditional and Modern*. MA Thesis, University of Natal, Durban.
- Lestrade, G.P. 1935. "Bantu Praise Poems." *The Critic* 4(1):1-10.
- Luthuli, Thobekile Patience. 2007. *Assessing Politeness, Language and Gender in Hlonipha*. MA Thesis, Linguistics, University of KwaZulu-Natal.
- Mncube, Francis Stephen Mabutha. 1949. *Hlonipha Language as Found among the Zulu-Xhosa Women*. MA thesis, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.
- Msibi, Thabo and Stephanie Rudwick. 2015. "Intersections of Two IsiZulu Genderlects and the Construction of Skesana Identities." *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics Plus* 46:51-66.
- Mzolo, Douglas. 1978. "Zulu Clan Praises: Structural and Functional Aspects." In J. Argyle and E. Preston-Whyte, eds. *Social System and Tradition in Southern Africa*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

-
- Ndawo, H.M. 1928. *Izibongo Zenkosi zamaHlubi nezamaBhaca*. Mariannhill [Natal]: Mariannhill Mission Press.
- Nyembezi, C.L.S. 1948. "The Historical Background to the Izibongo of the Zulu Military Age." *African Studies* 7:110-125, 157-174.
- _____. 1958. *Izibongo Zamakhosi*. Pietermaritzburg: Shuter and Shooter.
- Oosthuizen, G.C. , M.C. Kitshoff, and S. W. Dube, eds. 1994. *Afro-Christianity at the Grassroots*. Leiden and New York: E. J. Brill.
- Opland, Jeff. 1975. "Imbongi Nezibongo: The Xhosa Tribal Poet and the Contemporary Poetic Tradition." *Publications of the Modern Language Association* 90:185-208.
- _____. 1983. *Xhosa Oral Poetry: Aspects of a Black South African Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Raum, Otto F. 1973. *The Social Functions of Avoidances and Taboos among the Zulu*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Rudwick, Stephanie. 2008. "Shifting Norms of Linguistic and Cultural Respect: Hybrid Sociolinguistic Identities." *Nordic Journal of African Studies* 17(2):152-174.
- _____. 2013. "Gendered Linguistic Choices among IsiZulu-Speaking Women in Contemporary South Africa." In L. L. Atanga, S. E. Ellece, L. Litosseliti and J. Sunderland, eds. *Gender and Language in Sub-Saharan Africa*, 233-251. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- _____ and Mduduzi Ntuli. 2008. "IsiNgqumo – Introducing a Gay Black South African Linguistic Variety." *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies* 26(4):445-456.
- _____ and Magcingo Shange. 2006. "Sociolinguistic Oppression or Expression of 'Zuluness'? 'IsiHlonipho' among IsiZulu-speaking Females." *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies* 24(4):473-482.
- _____ and Magcingo Shange. 2009. "Hlonipha and the Rural Zulu Woman," *Agenda* 82:66-75.
- Rycroft, D. K. 1974. "Zulu Izibongo: A Survey of Documentary Sources." *African Language Studies* 15:55-79.
- _____. 1975. "A Royal Account of Music in Zulu Life with Translation, Annotation and Musical Transcription." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 37, Part 2:351-402.

-
- _____. 1976. "Southern Bantu Clan Praises: A Neglected Genre." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*. 39(1):155-159.
- _____. 1980. "The Question of Metre in Southern African Praise Poetry." In P.J. Wentzel, ed. *Third African Languages Congress*, 289-312. Pretoria: University of South Africa.
- _____. 1984. "An 1842 Version of Dingana's Eulogies." *African Studies* 43(2):249-274.
- _____ and A.B. Ngcobo, eds. *The Praises of Dingana. Izibongo zikaDingana*. Durban: Killie Campbell Africana Library and Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press.
- Samuelson, R.C. 1929. *Long, Long Ago*. Durban: Knox. [Reprint 1974. Durban: Griggs.]
- Shankar, Shalini and Jillian Cavanaugh. 2012. "Language Materiality in Global Capitalism." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 41:355-369.
- Sithole, E. Thamsanqa. 1982. *Izithakazelo nezibongo zakwaZulu*. Marianhill: Marianhill Mission Press.
- Stuart, James. 1923. *uTulasizwe*. London: Longmans.
- _____. 1924a. *uHlangakula*. London: Longmans.
- _____. 1924b. *uBaxoxele*. London: Longmans.
- _____. 1925. *uKulumetule*. London: Longmans.
- Turner, Noleen. 1988. "Comparison of the *Izibongo* of the Zulu Royal Women, Mnkabayi and Nandi." *South African Journal of African Languages* 18(1):28-33.
- UmAfrika* 22 July 1967.
- Vilakazi, B.W. 1938. "The Conception and Development of Poetry in Zulu," *Bantu Studies* 12:105-144.
- Webb, C. de B., and John B. Wright .1976, 1979, 1982, 1986, 2001, 2014. *The James Stuart Archive of Recorded Oral Evidence Relating to the History of the Zulu and Neighbouring Peoples*. 6 vols. Pietermaritzburg: University of Kwazulu-Natal Press; Durban: Killie Campbell Africana Library.