
Book Section:
Fitzmaurice, S.M. orcid.org/0000-0002-8804-1987 (2018) Transnational languages, multilinguals and the challenges for LADO. In: Patrick, P.L., Schmid, M.S. and Zwaan, K., (eds.) Language Analysis for the Determination of Origin: Current Perspectives and New Directions. Language Policy, 16 . Springer International Publishing AG , pp. 193-209. ISBN 978-3-319-79001-5

https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-79003-9

Transnational languages, multilinguals and the challenges for LADO[*]

Susan Fitzmaurice
S.Fitzmaurice@sheffield.ac.uk

Abstract

The question of the role that language plays in a person's national identity is acutely problematized when a person's claim to a particular identity rests on language alone. However, the simple term language obscures the complexity of the claim. For example, a person's national identity may be expressed not only by an accent or dialect that others might recognize or note using specific regional, class or ethnic criteria. Listeners might also make particular assumptions about the status of the language claimed by a speaker as a mother tongue; and further, draw particular inferences about that speaker from his or her claim to be monolingual. In other words, the claim to be a member of a particular speech community on the basis of several claims about language competence and use poses a set of expectations on the part of the analyst. I discuss the problem of assessing such claims in the context of an increasingly complex sociolinguistic situation in which concepts such as native speaker or mother tongue are highly unreliable in describing the relationship between speakers and their languages. Present-day Africa is a striking case of this kind of complexity. I consider the complex and diverse linguistic repertoires of Zimbabweans of different ages, ethnic communities and socioeconomic and educational backgrounds as evidence. I examine the impact of language contact and transnational mobility, migration from rural to urban areas and multilingualism on the sociolinguistic individual in Africa and consider the implications for Language Analysis for the Determination of Origin (LADO).

Introduction: The Imagination of Language and the Multilingual Individual

There is a paradoxical disjunction between the transnational lives of people and the national frames used to categorise and define them, from national identity to national language. The matter of national identity, if construed as the formal, official identification of a person with a designated country of origin, is uncontroversial for individuals whose choice of place of abode presents no legal problems for the

[*] I acknowledge the support of the British Academy (SG101916) for the investigation of undocumented varieties of English in Zimbabwe. The research was conducted in 2011 in Harare, Zimbabwe. I am very grateful to the reviewers, who asked excellent questions and suggested significant changes to this paper.

bureaucracy that ratifies the national identity of an individual. However, the matter of national identity becomes a particularly contested and critical problem in the context of the continual mass movement of people between war zones and geopolitical conflict areas, and in circumstances in which they are not agreed to have a legal right to settle in another place. The question of a person's national identity and national origin therefore becomes critical in a situation in which displaced people and migrants seek asylum in host countries as refugees and permission to settle in new communities.

In fact, in present-day Africa as elsewhere, peoples' national identities do not map easily onto linguistic communities aligned with specific nation states because languages are rarely constrained by national boundaries. Languages and their varieties tend to be distributed across national boundaries, which in turn are historical legacies of the methods used by its colonisers to divide the territory. At the same time, many countries in Africa are home to multiple languages and varieties of those languages, and the habitual movement of people within as well as across national boundaries contributes to a linguistic situation that is inherently fluid and multifaceted (see Chapter 7, this volume, by Muysken).

However, this linguistic reality appears ephemeral in the face of the rigid though idealised construction of language and language difference that persists in the determination of people's categorisation in terms of rights and laws judged and administered in line with the boundaries set up by states. Jan Blommaert (2009: 415) characterises this dissonance as "a very modernist response to postmodern realities", observing, "in the context of asylum application procedures, the imagination of language, notably, is dominated by frames that refer to static and timeless (i.e. uniform and national) orders of things. So while asylum seekers belong to a truly global scale of events and processes, the treatment of their applications is brought down to a rigidly national scale".

What this means is that language and language differences are imagined in the same way that lines on a map are understood to distinguish between nation states, as unmoving and permanent. Thus there is a disjunction between the notion of the state imagined as a stable speech community with a single language and the reality of the multilingual, mobile speaker. The fact that multiple linguistic varieties coexist within a speech community makes the speaker a complex and multi-faceted notion. Indeed, the speaker is a complex linguistic individual, required to accommodate and adjust their speech in order to negotiate their lives. Thus the observation that speakers construct their linguistic identities by using a range of styles, registers and even languages in response to different situations, purposes and interlocutors, renders it difficult to reduce the active, social speaker to a single homogeneous style.

The question is what this situation means for Language Analysis for the Determination of Origin (LADO)? In other words, how is it possible to determine the place of origin of a person who is actually a multi-faceted speaker who has to negotiate multiple speech activities within a range of situations? This contribution focuses on the questions of the consequences for LADO of a highly mobile multilingual society.

To explore in more specific detail the implications of a complex linguistic situation for the practice of LADO, I consider the case of the sub-Saharan African country, Zimbabwe. Zimbabwe represents a relevant case for discussion because Zimbabweans in their tens of thousands have sought asylum on political grounds in northern Europe in several periods since Independence in 1980. In the early 1980s, government sponsored violence (Gukurahundi) in the south and west of the country led to mass migration. In the early 1990s, the implementation of the Economic Structural Adjustment Programme (ESAP), sponsored by the IMF and the World Bank, resulted in economic decline and the out-migration of many skilled workers, mainly health workers (Bloch 2006). The most recent and sustained wave of migration began in 2000, during an extended and violent crackdown on opposition political parties, when Zimbabweans migrated in their hundreds of thousands to the neighbouring states of Botswana and South Africa but also abroad to Britain and the USA. Among the factors influencing flight are political turmoil, mass unemployment and continual economic crisis (Fitzmaurice 2011). In each of these waves of displacement and asylum seeking, LADO was used by the authorities as part of the assessment of people's asylum claims.

A Case in Point: Zimbabwe

Introduction

The current total population of Zimbabwe is estimated at 16.3 million, dispersed across a largely sparsely populated territory (26 people per square kilometre).[1] The major cities account for about 3 million people. The Bantu-speaking ethnic groups amount to 98% of the population. The majority of languages belong to the Bantu language family, including those with the most speakers. These are Shona, which is geographically most widespread and spoken as a primary language by approximately 71% of the population, and Ndebele, spoken as a primary language by about 16% of the population who are predominantly in the southern province of Matabeleland. About 11% of the population has as first language other African languages, 1% has Asian languages as first language and 1% has European languages as first language (Makoni et al. 2006).

A standard resource for mapping the linguistic geography of the world is Ethnologue, a compendium of reports by SIL International that purports to provide detailed information on the languages of the world, listed for each country by number of speakers (population) and location within national boundaries. This information includes "languages that are either indigenous to the country or which immigrated in the past resulting in well-established multigenerational speaker communities"

[1] worldpopulationreview.com. All websites checked on 14 July 2017.

(Lewis et al. 2015). Accordingly, *Ethnologue'*s map provides a summary approximate graphic representation of the geographical distribution of languages spoken in Zimbabwe (see Figure 1).

Figure 1 Ethnologue map of the languages of Zimbabwe[2]

Apart from the two majority first languages (Shona, Ndebele), Ethnologue identifies a further 19 languages that are spoken together with their status ("institutional", "developing", "vigorous", "in trouble", and "dying"; Lewis et al. 2015: 6-7). Included in this number are English, Zimbabwe sign language and Pidgin Bantu (known locally as Fanakalo, Chiraparapa, or chiLapalapa), all codes that traverse the traditional boundaries of identified ethnic communities. Despite its undoubted utility in providing a basic inventory of languages within national borders, Ethnologue represents the dominant discourse regarding language that holds sway within asylum proceedings. As it lists languages in terms of L1 speakers, the report does not easily allow the inference that there is widespread multilingualism within national borders. For instance, the Zimbabwe map includes a legend indicating that Afrikaans is "widespread" but there is no reference to English. Further, because Ethnologue does not incorporate a historical dimension, it does not mark any

[2] https://www.ethnologue.com/map/ZW

changes in the distribution of languages over time. Accordingly, Ethnologue illustrates very strikingly Blommaert's characterisation of the modernist language imagination.

A number of the languages listed by Ethnologue are associated with communities located in border areas (Hachipola 1998). Many of these languages are spoken by sizeable communities in neighbouring countries, for example, Manyika, predominantly spoken in the east of the country, Manicaland—in districts northwest of Mutare—is also spoken in Mozambique on the border with Zimbabwe. Tonga, spoken in northern Matabeleland, concentrated in the Kariba area as well as in Zambia, is an example of a language whose community is split across national borders. The community was further divided and separated in space by a major project, the construction of the Kariba hydroelectric plant in the 1950s, which filled the Zambezi valley with a dam. Makoni et al. (2008: 433) argue that the idea of a homogeneous [Zimbabwean] Tonga ethnolinguistic community is a "post-colonial and post-independent Zimbabwe consequence rather than an accurate reflection of the ecological systems in pre-colonial Africa".

This situation illustrates the point that many languages are transnational as they are spoken in communities in geographical areas that boundaries drawn by trade charters, and subsequently colonial treaties, have divided. For instance, the historical communities of several ethno-linguistic groups straddle Zimbabwe's southern border with South Africa, including the Shangaan, the Venda, and the Sotho. Over time, members of these communities have tended to be highly mobile. The northern South African Shangaan were mine workers. Makoni et al. (2006: 388) note that young Ndau men (from the south eastern border areas) migrated to work on the South African mines as "a rite of passage", where they assumed a new ethnic identity, a Shangaan identity, marked by adopting Shangaan names which they retained upon their return home. The Ndau are a markedly transnational group as they constantly traverse the borders between Zimbabwe, Mozambique, and South Africa (Makoni et al. 2006). In addition to the multiplicity of ethno-linguistic groups in Zimbabwe, the principal Shona language group is itself marked by dialectal diversity the nature of which is itself contested. The Shona language group is also marked by dialectal diversity over time, leading Makoni et al. (2007) and Makoni et al. (2008) to criticise Ethnologue for its simplistic and static representation of the linguistic ecology of states.

It is possible to counter Ethnologue's somewhat simplistic and static representation of the linguistic ecology of Zimbabwe (Makoni et al. 2007; Makoni et al. 2008) with a historically situated account of language practices and policies in colonial Zimbabwe (Rhodesia). I describe, in some detail, the nature of Zimbabwean speech communities and consider the domains in which English is used, discussing the range of variation in linguistic practices in present-day Zimbabwe. Against this backdrop, I explore the impact of language contact and transnational mobility, migration from rural to urban areas, and multilingualism on the sociolinguistic individual in Zimbabwe.

Language Policies and Practices

As a former British colony, Zimbabwe retains the legacy of British colonial education policies, among them, English as an official language and the ability to write in English as the key measure of literacy. In order to grasp the complexity of the language situation in present-day Zimbabwe, it is useful to review briefly the history of language policy and practices in colonial Zimbabwe (Rhodesia), in particular, in education.

As early as 1884, missionaries working in the territory translated the New Testament into written versions of the languages of the people they encountered. This work was not very systematic; Doke (1958) notes that the New Testament was translated into what were regarded as four languages between 1907 and 1919, each by a different missionary group apparently independently of the others: Zezuru by the Wesleyans in Mashonaland, Manyika by the Anglicans, Ndau by the "American Board" at Mount Selinda, and Karanga by the Dutch Reformed Church in what is now the Masvingo district. Acts of the Apostles and the Gospels were translated into a fifth, Kalanga. In fact, all but Ndau were subsequently constructed by Doke (1931) as dialects of Shona, leading to the publication of a (unified) Shona Bible in 1949. Thus the classification of the Shona dialects is largely the result of historical literacy projects carried out by different missionary groups.

In consequence, maps of Zimbabwe now show distinct Zezuru, Manyika, Karanga and Kalanga dialect areas. The status of Ndau as a language rather than a Shona dialect remains contested, not least because of the historical weight given to its linguistic status by the Ndau Bible published in 1957. Notwithstanding the amount of effort expended in rendering the indigenous languages as written languages, when Rhodesia became a self-governing British colony with a white settler administration in 1923, English assumed status dominance. Until 1966, Received Pronunciation was the idealised linguistic norm upheld as a prestige dialect and target for speakers of English as a Native Language (ENL), the variety associated with people of white British descent. Localised and regional ENL varieties, such as South African English, and white ethnic varieties like Afrikaner English were strongly stigmatised among white English speakers.

The education systems for blacks and whites were administered by separate boards, the Native Affairs Department for African Education and the Department of Education respectively (Mlambo 2014). Inequity accompanied segregation; whereas education for whites became compulsory in 1930, secondary education for Africans became available only in 1939 (Atkinson 1972). Atkinson (1972: 188) reports that from 1962 onwards, "more than 70 per cent of all Africans aged 16 and over were functionally illiterate". From 1966, after the white Rhodesian Front's unilateral declaration of independence (UDI) from Britain, the divide between African and white education systems sharpened. Government funding continued to be heavily skewed in favour of white education: Mlambo (2014) notes that in 1974, the annual education expenditure per person was R$34.90 for Africans whereas it

was R$461 for whites. Fewer than half the African children of primary school age were in school in 1979. Despite making English the medium of instruction in rural mission schools, urban schools and boarding schools attended by African children, a chronic shortage of trained teachers of any type ensured that the quality of English language teaching along with the general curriculum were far inferior to those delivered to whites. The guerrilla war which intensified between the Rhodesian regime and Zimbabwean nationalists in the 1970s had a devastating effect on black education, particularly in rural areas. By 1979, 1,000 schools had been closed, leaving 2,000 secondary school teachers unemployed and displacing 483,000 schoolchildren (Mlambo 2014: 168).

The first years of independence in the 1980s were spent tackling the deficit left by eighty years of deprivation. The government invested heavily in education, increasing the number of primary and secondary schools by 80 per cent by 1990 (Mlambo 2014). The Education Act of 1987 also introduced free compulsory primary education, a measure that was reversed in the Education Act of 1991, which introduced fees for primary education. The gains made in increasing the number of children, especially girls, in education in the early years were compromised as parents withdrew their children amidst acute economic collapse and rising unemployment (Mlambo 2014).

English continued to be the language of highest status in all domains after independence. The Education Act of 1987 specified that English and either Shona or Ndebele be the languages taught in primary schools. In early primary school, before grade four, children were taught in the first language of the majority in the area, namely Shona or Ndebele. From the fourth grade, the medium of instruction was English, "provided that Shona or Ndebele are taught as subjects on an equal allocation basis with the English language" (Makoni et al. 2006: 406). These measures meant that even in areas where the majority had a language other than Shona or Ndebele as a first language, one of these was used as the medium of instruction in early primary school. Hwange, a coal mining district in the north west of the country, has a diverse ethnolinguistic population, including Tonga, Nambya and Ndebele communities, as well as the descendants of migrant Lozi and Chewa speakers. Hachipola (1998) observes that whereas Nambya was specified as the medium of instruction in Hwange primary schools, it was not implemented owing to vigorous resistance from the Tonga community. The somewhat contentious solution was the selection of Ndebele, acknowledged to be the first language of a minority in the area. Accordingly, Hwange primary school children were taught first in a second or even third language and subsequently in a foreign language.

After 1980, the alignment of class distinctions along racial lines became less clear. Prior to independence, bursary schemes operated by independent schools like Peterhouse and Whitestone since 1965 had enabled the children of black elites to share the privileges of their white counterparts (Atkinson 1972). After 1980, government schools in the affluent suburbs hitherto restricted to whites were opened to all, allowing the children of black residents to be taught by "white first-language

speakers of English, unlike their counterparts from less affluent families who were taught by African second-language speakers of English" (Makoni et al. 2006: 406).

In the first decade of the twenty first century, the country witnessed an economy in freefall with hyperinflation of 231 million per cent, a devastating HIV-AIDS epidemic which brought the average life expectancy of adults to 36, and a cholera pandemic caused by the country's collapsing water supply (Mlambo 2014). The period also saw the government implementation of the fast track land reform programme via the mass violent invasions of farms, which displaced almost 500,000 farmworkers and their families. The ruling party ZANU-PF waged a series of violent election campaigns in the countryside against supporters of the opposition, Movement for Democratic Change (MDC), in 2000, in 2008 and again in 2013, making large parts of the country "no go areas" (Mlambo 2014: 234). The government-sponsored human rights abuses culminated in a brutal campaign, Operation Murambatsvina, to clear urban areas of informal settlements in May 2005, which left more than 700,000 of the urban poor homeless. The height of the crisis saw mass migration to neighbouring countries, or abroad to the UK, the USA and Europe for economic reasons and a significant growth in the number of refugees seeking political asylum abroad. It is in this context that we examine the nature of the sociolinguistic individual whose claim might be examined on the basis of language.

Multilingualism and Transnational Language Varieties in Zimbabwe

Present-day Zimbabwe exhibits high levels of multilingualism, depending upon people's locations and the opportunities for contact with speakers of other languages. The assumption that the more rural and remote people's locations, the less likely they are to encounter speakers of other languages regularly appears reasonable when considering an area like Mashonaland West, which is predominantly Shona-speaking and relatively monocultural. However, this assumption is challenged by the massive increase in mobility within Zimbabwe over the past twenty years, and with it, the increase in contact among people of different language backgrounds. As Bolt (2011: 16) notes, "following Zimbabwe's political and economic crisis, 'displacement' –with its focus on upheaval and up rootedness—has replaced 'migration' as the dominant paradigm for understanding Zimbabwe's mobility".

Farm workers In the course of the first decade of the twenty-first century, there has been significant internal migration in Zimbabwe. The fast track land reform programme was inaugurated in 1999 with the government gazetting a number of white-owned commercial farms in the proximal area around Harare in Mashonaland Central, East and West and in Manicaland (Pilosoff 2012a). Subsequently, a number of farms were invaded and resettled, and in the process, many farm workers and their families were themselves moved off the land. Many of these workers are the descendants of migrant workers from Botswana, Mozambique and Malawi, many of whom have maintained their home languages across successive

generations. As migrants in Zimbabwe for employment in colonial times, farm workers did not have homes outside of their employment because of their foreign origins. In the course of the land reallocation, farm workers were excluded as a result of their being branded as '"belonging to the farmer" and under the "domestic government" of commercial farmers, or as foreigners in the politics of "the nation"' (Raftopolous 2009: 216). Rutherford (2004: 139) explains that although many thousand farm workers of foreign descent had been born in Zimbabwe and so had "a legal right to Zimbabwean citizenship, many do not have the proper documents to prove it". I have discussed the role of land rights and possession in the determination of citizenship in Zimbabwe nationalist politics elsewhere (Fitzmaurice 2015b: 347). The government's amendment of the Citizenship Act in 2001 resulted in a very narrow definition of citizenship; specifically, "only "native Africans" or vanavevhu/abantwana bombhlabathi ('children of the soil')" were regarded both "as the original and true inhabitants of Zimbabwe but also as having pre-eminent rights over the country's land and other resources" (Muzondidya 2004: 225). This narrow definition thus excluded farm workers of foreign descent, for whom qualification for citizenship involved renouncing their perceived dual citizenship (Raftopolous 2009: 216; Rutherford 2004: 139).

Bolt's work on a border farm in South Africa ("Grootplaas") offers a case study of the nature of the contact among migrant workers of different types and backgrounds. On the border farm, he encountered seasonal workers who included both people who regularly crossed the border from Zimbabwe to work the harvest and more recent recruits who were looking for work to escape the crisis. Additionally, he found that traders from both South Africa and Zimbabwe, of a range of occupations, including "farm labourers, displaced entrepreneurs, workers from other sectors, members of an aspirant middle class" were "drawn by the lucrative markets represented by hundreds of waged workers" on the farm (Bolt 2011:17). The white farmers tended to use the pidgin Tatelapa (< ChiLapalapa) to communicate with the black workers. Bolt (2011: 196) characterises this transactional code as "the agricultural equivalent of Fanakalo, a hybrid language developed on the mines largely as a means for whites to direct black subordinates and lacking much range of expression".[3] The core population of the farm consists of "mapermanent" Venda speakers "who grew up in the border area, have a history of work on the farms, enjoy support from dense cross-border networks and cross into Zimbabwe regularly to visit kin" (Bolt 2011: 132). More marginal are people from further afield, many of them Shona speakers, driven to the border by economic and political problems. Among these is George, a well-educated Shona English speaker from Harare. Bolt (2011: 181) introduces him as "a Rastafarian musician with A-levels from a multiracial (i.e. formerly "white") school…his handicraft business had been destroyed during the "slum clearance" of Murambatsvina, and he eventually decided he had no option but to jump the border". While Venda is the principal language of the

[3] For a recent creolist view see Mesthrie & Surek-Clark (2013).

border farms, Shona is spoken highly frequently; a Zimbabwean woman fruit picker used first Shona and then Venda to call for empty bags to replace full ones: Waiter papi? Waiter u gai? Her language use is explained as an attempt to conform to the majority language by using Venda (Bolt 2011: 196). The Zimbabwe-South Africa border bisects the Venda ethnic group's area of habitation, a dry and inhospitable territory.

Bolt spent some considerable time in the borderlands with three Zimbabwean friends, two from Bulawayo and one from Harare, whom he observed "chatting, mixing languages and peppering their English with Americanisms to display a "hip" urban sophistication" (Bolt 2011: 179). Bolt observed that educated professional middle-class urban men and women whose linguistic repertoire includes English, an urban vernacular in addition to an indigenous language – as well as uneducated unskilled rural people from border villages with multilingual repertoires – worked on the border farms. Thus the development of border farming represents opportunities for employment and residence that have drawn people from diverse areas in Zimbabwe across it. In such contact zones, people accommodate their speaking styles, accents and even languages to the speech of those they encounter. This environment promotes the proliferation of speaking styles at the same time as levelling of marked differences among idiolects. The consequence is a linguistically complex and fluid transnational environment, one in which languages have a strategic communicative function.[4]

Urban speech communities Zimbabwe's cities represent sites of linguistic diversity and innovation as well as multilingualism. Over more than a decade of economic and political crisis, Harare, Zimbabwe's capital city, located in Mashonaland, has been a major magnet for people of all backgrounds in all circumstances. Its population of over 1.5 million is ethnically, socially and economically highly diverse, and moreover, mobile. Indeed, as Makoni et al. (2007: 34) note, as an urban centre, Harare is a prime example of the "pattern of migration to cities that brings people from different linguistic and socioeconomic backgrounds to the same urban space". Urban communities depend on people's ability to understand and operate in local languages and lingua francas as well as their willingness to adapt to and accommodate their interactants, regardless of their preferred codes for communication. Accordingly, social interaction in the city is necessarily responsive to the multilingual nature of the space.

Harare (colonial Salisbury) has a history of migration. Historically, the city has brought in migrant workers from neighbouring states, including Zambia, Mozam-

[4] Many people who cross the border into South Africa, like the women who travel to Johannesburg to buy goods for resale in Zimbabwe (*vakadzi veku South Africa*), are highly mobile people with multifaceted transactional networks who marshal new linguistic repertoires.

bique and particularly Malawi. For instance, Makoni et al. (2007) report that Malawians made up close to 60% of (Salisbury's) City Council workers in the 1950s, and that in the first decade after independence there was a second wave of Malawian immigrants. The city has also attracted internal migration over the past thirty years, notably from other provinces and from the rural areas, particularly around election time.[5]

In the first decade of the 21st century, Harare and its hinterlands were occupied by displaced farm workers and significant numbers of unemployed youth, the "born free" generation, many of whom were AIDS orphans. Mate (2012: 110) notes that "many of these youths joined the growing ranks of homeless 'street children', surviving by begging on urban streets". Potts (2006: 72) argued that the rationale for Operation Murambatsvina ("Drive out the rubbish" or "Restore Order") in 2005 was to rid the city of "the presence of the poorest urban people, by driving them out of the towns, because of an incapacity to provide sufficient and affordable food and fuel for them". Raftopolous (2009: 221) suggests that the operation was "based on an assumption that those pushed out of the urban areas could "return" to homes in the rural areas, but by 2001 half of them were urban-born and did not have a rural home to return to". In this context, it should not be surprising that the city should be marked by considerable linguistic innovation and complexity.

As has been observed in other African cities, the emergence and practice of urban vernaculars are typical of Harare too. Makoni et al. (2007: 32) note that "much everyday interaction and primary language socialization outside (and increasingly, perhaps, within) formal schooling takes place not in either written chiShona or even in the codified dialects but increasingly in urban vernaculars like chiHarare". They go on to describe in detail the use of urban vernaculars by Harare residents of Malawian origin in transactions in the public transport system of the kombis, operated by mawhindies.[6] They report their informants using multiple styles to negotiate their identities as they encounter different people in a range of settings through their day. For example, they observe the mixing or codeswitching of Chewa (also Nyanja) and

[5] See http://www.governanceanddevelopment.com/2014/05/unresolved-wounds-trauma-of-youths-in.html for discussion of the extent to which rural youth experienced party-sponsored violence during elections and how movement to urban areas provided some respite.

[6] The term 'kombi' is used as a generic label for the vans used in this cheap public transport system and derives from the kombi model of the VW bus. 'Mawhindies' serve as bus conductors, spotting passengers and taking fares. The term 'whindy' is reputed to be an onomatopoeic neologism informed by the noise that the kombi door makes when closed. The noun is assigned, as most innovations, to class 6 which has the plural prefix ma-.

Shona in the everyday interactions of Malawian men and their Zimbabwean, ethnically Shona wives.[7] In the public sphere, their informants adopt the transactional code of what they label chiHarare, a vernacular marked by English-Shona codeswitching. This code is ubiquitous, spoken across ethnicities and classes.

My own informants, all urban dwellers working or studying in Harare, report being acutely conscious of the extent to which their elders, particularly relatives in the rural areas, disapprove of their (Shona) speech as "corrupt" and regard it as unintelligible.[8] This clutch of urban vernaculars is not in fact restricted to urban areas. Increasingly, it is associated with youth rather than region. As Mate (2012: 113) observes, the linguistic creativity practised by youth speaking "Street Shona" is "disconcerting to "purists" who might include many adults, cultural gurus and government officials", as it challenges "official attempts at presenting dignified subjectivities as part of cultural nationalism".[9]

Veit-Wild (2009) and Mate (2012) examine the lyrics of songs produced within the Zimbabwean variant of hip-hop, urban grooves, the former in terms of the linguistic creativity displayed in English-Shona code-switching, the latter in terms of the levelling of Shona prefixes to create a distinctive rebellious idiom that challenges language standards. Nyota and Sibanda (2012) write about the language contact and emergence of an antilanguage around illegal diamond mining activities in the Marange diamond fields at Chiadzwa in Eastern Zimbabwe. This "highly transient world of illegal miners, informal traders and security forces" generated an "ingroup language code" that distinguished this community both from the surrounding settled rural population and from the state authorities (Nyota and Sibanda 2012: 130-133). Nyota and Sibanda (2012) characterise this code in terms of Halliday's notion of antilanguage to explain its operation in opposition to mainstream society. Strikingly, they note that at the height of Zimbabwe's crisis between 2006 and 2008, the old " 'traditional' middle class of teachers, nurses and lecturers suffered along with the poor", many forced to seek a living in Chiadzwa "as vendors, miners and diamond traders", thus contributing to a highly diverse, transient environment.

---

[7] Chichewa (a.k.a. Chinyanja, Nyanja) is also spoken in Botswana, Malawi, Mozambique, Swaziland, Zambia (Lewis and Simons 2015: 11). Some linguists follow a convention that prefixes Ki- or Chi- to the name of Bantu-speaking groups to designate their languages.

[8] In 2011, I interviewed fifteen black Zimbabwean university students as part of a British Academy (SG101916) funded research project to investigate undocumented varieties of English in Zimbabwe.

[9] A popular pejorative label for this variety is Shonglish, though some scholars, among them, Mlambo (2009) and Kadenge (ms.) argue that this English, as spoken as a second language by Shona speakers, should be regarded as a new English, a distinctive Zimbabwean English variety. The amount of disagreement about the status of this variety is good evidence of the degree of internal variation observed to characterise this cluster of codes.

Elites At the other end of the economic spectrum, Zimbabwean elites of all races are also characterised by mobility, traveling both to neighbouring countries and abroad to the USA, Britain and Canada for work and study. This class is predominantly English speaking, the younger generation in particular having benefitted from a private multi-racial education acquired in Zimbabwe and abroad. Ethnicity is generally less salient than the socio-economic conditions offering opportunities to acquire and practise English in multiple domains. Access to private education and living in "acquisition-rich" suburbs in urban areas, predominantly Harare and Bulawayo, assure high levels of English use in the home as well as in the classroom. Zimbabwean speakers of English include Zimbabwe-born [native (mother tongue, first language)] English speakers whose accent is identified as a southern hemisphere variety proximal to South African English, but is ethnically and historically associated with colonial Britain and white settlers (Fitzmaurice 2010; 2012; 2015a). There is a sizeable community of black speakers born after 1980 who are considered to be "near native" English speakers who are highly proficient and highly fluent. They tend to have been privately educated and live particularly in and around Harare. The accents associated with this social group exhibit Rhodesian [white Zimbabwean] phonological features (Mlambo 2009).[10]

Taf, one of my informants is a good exponent of Mlambo's "near native" variety or of what Mesthrie (2010: 600) identifies as "a cross-over (or post-acrolectal) variety acquired on the basis of new non-racial networks at [private schools]". Taf has an accent that is typically associated with white Zimbabweans of the same age and experience and to that extent exhibits a de-ethnicised or deracinated variety of English. Specifically, he shares with the Zimbabwean whites with whom he went to primary and secondary school the segmental and suprasegmental phonological patterns of southern African English (cf. Fitzmaurice 2010; 2015a for detailed discussion of this variety and its antecedents). Taf's father is a doctor who was educated

[10] One reviewer reports the case of a young woman asylum seeker whose English was revealed by a speech analysis to be "a kind of English that is used by the white upper-class in South Africa". The conclusion drawn from the analysis was that she was raised in Zimbabwe as the speech analysis indicated a high competence in Shona, but that she must have lived in South Africa for a longer period before her flight (maybe as a house maid, according to the explanations of the administration). This analysis was informed by descriptions of English in southern Africa that are now out-dated (Mesthrie 2008; Bobda 2001). In fact, the variety of English the applicant was determined to be speaking is just as likely to be that spoken by white L1 English Zimbabweans and by black Zimbabweans privately educated in Harare. The point is that it is now exceedingly difficult to draw a clear dividing line between the variants of English in Southern Africa (see Fitzmaurice, 2015a for discussion of perceived differences in the speech of young white Zimbabweans and South Africans).

and practised medicine in the USA before returning to Zimbabwe after independence in 1981. Taf was born in 1985 in Harare and was educated at St John's Preparatory School for Boys and then St John's College before attending Africa University in the Midlands. He spent 18 months in Germany on an exchange programme and six months in the UK after school. He reports that his Shona provokes laughter among his rural relatives in Chishawasha and the family maid. When asked how his fellow students react to the fact that he appears to speak only English, he responds that at the University, "There is this thing that if you're not speaking Shona then "you're a snob, you think you're better than us". My friends know that "It's not that he doesn't want to, it's literally that he can't [speak Shona]"." Taf has English as a mother tongue, in Mesthrie's sense of it as "the child's peer-group tongue", highlighting the problems that attend to the standard interpretation of the native speaker. Taf's case is not a new phenomenon in Zimbabwe though it is now much more frequent. Atkinson (1972: 194) reports the headmaster of Whitestone observing in 1969 of African boys attending the private school: "The boys' English is automatic after a few terms, and relatively unaccented after two or three years".

Concluding Remarks: The Implications of Diversity for LADO

The challenge that such linguistic complexity — illustrated by the Zimbabwean situation — poses for the linguist who is tasked with analysing an example of speech in order to determine its producer's identity is enormous. The situation that I have outlined demonstrates conclusively that the received taxonomy of speaker type (acrolect, mesolect, basilect, L1, L2, native speaker, mother tongue) for the description of language uses and functions is not fit for purpose.[11] The types and degrees of complexity that attend language situations and speakers' linguistic lives have

11 Things have changed since 2008, when Raj Mesthrie published his volume on Varieties of English in Africa, South and Southeast Asia (Mesthrie 2008), in which he reviews the historical emergence of several types of English, namely, ENLs (English as Native Language), "spoken by British settlers and/or their descendants (as in Zimbabwe, South Africa, Hong Kong); ESLs (English as a second language), spoken in territories like India and Nigeria, where access to English was sufficient to produce a stable second language (L2) used in formal domains like education and government". He notes specifically, "the ESL is also used for internal communication within the territory, especially as a lingua franca amongst educated speakers who do not share the same mother tongue" (2008:23). Mesthrie also raises the notion of language shift Englishes, "varieties which started as ESLs but which stabilise as an L1. They then develop casual registers often absent from ESLs (since a local language fulfils "vernacular" functions). However, they retain a great many L2 features as well. He includes among these varieties South African Indian English and Irish English.

significant implications for the conduct of language analysis for the determination of a person's original place of abode.

As speakers vary their linguistic habits and practices according to attributes such as gender, age, socio-economic status, and type and level of education, they vary too in terms of the number and types of languages they negotiate in their everyday lives. Speakers who are most likely to be the subjects of LADO are highly likely to be multilingual; in addition to operating in a code that is preferred in the community in which they live, they might have control of another preferred language (or first language) and perhaps a lingua franca for temporary, transactional purposes. Multilinguals are rarely equally proficient in all the languages or varieties they know; speakers necessarily control a repertoire of varieties and styles which they practise in different domains to perform different tasks. Of course, speakers vary in the extent to which they accommodate to other speakers. Accordingly, they may exhibit different types and degrees of stylistic or even linguistic shift. For example, my informants report that people living in the high density suburbs of Harare, like Mbare, find themselves switching with uncertainty from the urban vernaculars they share with their peers into the conservative Shona style of their rural relations when they go to the countryside. They note that they adjust their linguistic behaviour in response to the attitudes they perceive of those they encounter, often with little confidence.

The traditional Eurocentric assumption that ethnicity is synonymous with language identity is increasingly challenged and now shown to be highly problematic for most communities in present-day Africa. In a place marked by a high degree of geographical and social mobility, social and language contact, language cannot be assumed to be consonant with ethnic group membership. In these contexts, speakers may experience language shift—the replacement of the language of their first community with that of an adopted community. My informant, Taf, for example, illustrates the case of a person who has experienced language shift through high social and geographical mobility, so that the language of his family (Shona) has been replaced by white Zimbabwean English, the prestige dialect of English that dominated his formative years in expensive private schools. Significantly, salient features of his de-ethnicised, deracinated accent of English have not been studied properly to date. Given the diversity of people's experiences, it is not currently possible to distinguish between the varieties of English spoken in southern Africa sufficiently clearly to inform a speech analysis. The linguistic expert, unaware of the complexity of the sociolinguistic situation, may well fall back on conservative, outdated linguistic descriptions and run the risk of constructing an anachronistic, highly unreliable linguistic profile for a subject.

As a key participant in the collection of the speech sample and in the actual conduct of LADO, the native speaker (NS) also requires inspection (Zwaan et al. 2010; Chapters 5, this volume, by Fraser, and 8 by Preston). The role of the native speaker who shares the language (and implicitly the national identity) associated with the claimant is multifaceted. The tasks of the NS range from conducting the interview to serving as a witness to ascertain the authenticity of the variety illustrated in the

sample collected in the interview (see Chapter 6, this volume, by Foulkes et al). These tasks presuppose that the NS has mastery of skills and competencies, including skills in interviewing potentially vulnerable subjects in uncommon situations. The matter of competence relates to a level of familiarity informed by auditory, grammatical and discourse knowledge as well as experience of varieties likely to be salient to the analysis (Cambier-Langeveld 2010; Chapter 4, this volume, by Lundberg). The perceived value of the NS in these roles is based on the assumption that the language under investigation is not marked by variation shaped by region or socioeconomic and educational background, a highly problematic assumption in the present day. If the NSs themselves have been absent for a considerable time from the place of putative origin ostensibly shared with the subject, there is a reasonable likelihood that the NS could not be familiar with rapid sociolinguistic developments, including the emergence of new urban vernaculars borne of rapid and continual urban migration and language contact among speakers of different languages (cf. Kiessling and Mous 2007; Mate 2012).

It is extremely challenging to delineate or even identify a current monolingual, monocultural speech community, given a social and political context in which established social categories such as education, occupation, age (and in the colonial African context) ethnic background, are now more fluid and less reliable indicators than these would be in western European settings (de Rooij 2010). Accordingly, in an extraordinarily complex and rapidly changing sociolinguistic situation, and the concomitantly complex experiences of people whose own language practices change rapidly, we must question how feasible it is to assume that reliable current research on such variation and the features of the varieties involved can serve as the robust foundation of a linguistic analysis for the determination of a person's origin.

References

Atkinson, Norman. 1972. Teaching Rhodesians. A history of educational policy in Rhodesia. London: Longman.

Bloch, Alice. 2006. Emigration from Zimbabwe: Migrant perspectives. Social Policy & Administration 40(1): 67-87. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9515.2006.00477.x

Blommaert, Jan. 2009. Language, asylum, and the national order. Current Anthropology 50(4): 415-441. doi:10.1086/600131.

Bobda, Augustin Simo. 2001. East and Southern African English accents. World Englishes 20(3): 269-284. doi:10.1111/1467-971X.00215.

Bolt, Maxim. 2011. Rooting production. Life and labour on the settler farms of the Zimbabwean South African border. Unpublished PhD thesis. London School of Economics.

Cambier-Langeveld, Tina. 2010. The validity of language analysis in the Netherlands. In Language and origin: The role of language in European asylum procedures: A linguistic and legal survey, ed. Karin Zwaan, Pieter Muysken & Maaike Verrips, 21-33. Nijmegen: Wolf Legal Publishers.

de Rooij, Vincent A. 2010. Language Analysis for the Determination of Origin (LADO): A look into problems presented by East and Central African cases. In Language and origin: The role of language in European asylum procedures: A linguistic and legal survey, ed. Karin Zwaan, Pieter Muysken & Maaike Verrips, 133-144. Nijmegen: Wolf Legal Publishers.

Doke, Clement. 1931. Report on the unification of the Shona dialects. Hertford: Austin.

Doke, Clement. 1958. Scripture translation into Bantu Languages. African Studies 17(2): 82-99.

Eades, Diana. 2010. Guidelines from linguists for LADO. In Language and origin: The role of language in European asylum procedures: A linguistic and legal survey, ed. Karin Zwaan, Pieter Muysken & Maaike Verrips, 35-41. Nijmegen: Wolf Legal Publishers.

Fitzmaurice, Susan. 2010. L1 Rhodesian English. In The lesser-known varieties of English: An introduction, ed. Dani Schreier, Peter Trudgill, Edgar Schneider and J. P. Williams, 263-285. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fitzmaurice, Susan. 2011. Talking politics across transnational space: Researching linguistic practices in the Zimbabwe Diaspora. Studies in Variation, Contacts and Change in English 7. How to deal with data: Problems and approaches to the investigation of the English language over time and space. http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/journal/volumes/07/fitzmaurice/. Accessed 14 July 2017.

Fitzmaurice, Susan. 2012. White Zimbabwean English. In The Mouton world atlas of variation in English, ed. Bernd Kortmann and Kerstin Lunkenheimer, 483-92. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Fitzmaurice, Susan. 2015a. History, social meaning and identity in the spoken English of postcolonial white Zimbabweans. In Developments in English: Expanding electronic evidence, ed. Irma Taavitsainen, Merja Kytö, Claudia Claridge and Jeremy Smith, 200-223. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fitzmaurice, Susan. 2015b. Ideology, race and place in historical constructions of belonging: The case of Zimbabwe. English Language and Linguistics 19(2): 327-354. doi:10.1017/S1360674315000106.

Hachipola, Simooya. 1998. A survey of the minority languages of Zimbabwe. Harare: University of Zimbabwe Publications.

Kadenge, Maxwell. Ms. (n.d.) Some characteristic features of Shona-English.

Kiessling, Roland, and Marten Mous. 2004. Urban youth languages in Africa. Anthropological Linguistics 46(3): 303-41.

Lewis, M. Paul, Gary F. Simons and Charles D. Fennig. Eds. 2015. (18th ed.) Ethnologue: Languages of the world. Dallas, Texas: SIL International. http://www.ethnologue.com.

Makoni, Sinfree, Busi Dube, and Pedzisai Mashiri. 2006. Zimbabwe colonial and post-colonial language policy and planning practices. Current Issues in Language Planning 7(4): 377-414. doi:10.2167/cilp108.0.

Makoni, Sinfree, Busi Makoni, and Nicholus Nyika, 2008. Language planning from below: The case of the Tonga in Zimbabwe. Current Issues in Language Planning 9(4): 413-439. doi:10.1080/14664200802354419.

Makoni, Sinfree, Pedzisai Mashiri, and Jeannette Brutt-Griffler. 2007. The use of 'indigenous' and urban vernaculars in Zimbabwe. Language in Society 36(1): 25-49.

Mate, Rekopantswe. 2012. Youth lyrics, street language and the politics of age: Contextualising the youth question in the third Chimurenga in Zimbabwe. Journal of Southern African Studies 38(1): 107-127. doi:10.1080/03057070.2012.642722.

Mesthrie, Rajend, ed. 2008. Varieties of English 4: Africa, South and Southeast Asia. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Mesthrie, Rajend. 2010. New Englishes and the native speaker debate. Language Sciences 32(6): 594-601. doi:10.1016/j.langsci.2010.08.002.

Mesthrie, Rajesh & Clarissa Surek-Clark. 2013. Fanakalo. In Survey of Pidgin and Creole Languages, Vol. III: Pidgins, Creoles and mixed languages based on languages from Africa, Asia, Australia and the Americas, ed. Suzanne Michaelis, Philip Maurer, Martin Haspelmath and Magnus Huber, 34-41. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mlambo, Alois S. 2014. A history of Zimbabwe. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mlambo, Muzi. 2009. A survey of the language situation in Zimbabwe. English Today 25(2): 18-24. doi:10.1017/S0266078409000145.

Muzondidya, James. 2004. 'Zimbabwe for Zimbabweans': Invisible subject minorities and the quest for justice and reconciliation in post-colonial Zimbabwe. In Zimbabwe: Injustice and Political Reconciliation, ed. Brian Raftopolous and T. Savage, 213-235. . Cape Town: Institute for Justice and Reconciliation.

Nyota, Shumirai, and Fortune Sibanda. 2012. Digging for diamonds, wielding new words: A linguistic perspective on Zimbabwe's 'blood diamonds'. Journal of Southern African Studies 38(1): 129-144. doi:10.1080/03057070.2012.656436.

Pilosoff, Rory. 2012a. The unbearable whiteness of being*: Farmers'* voices from Zimbabwe. Harare: Weaver Press.

Potts, Deborah. 2006. 'Restoring order'? Murambatsvina and the urban crisis in Zimbabwe. Journal of Southern African Studies 32(2): 273-291. doi:10.1080/03057070600656200.

Raftopolous, Brian. 2009. The crisis in Zimbabwe, 1998-2008. In Becoming Zimbabwe: A history from the pre-colonial period to 2008, ed. Brian Raftopolous and Alois Mlambo, 201-232. Harare: Weaver Press.

Raftopolous, Brian and Alois Mlambo, eds. 2009. Becoming Zimbabwe: A history from the pre-colonial period to 2008. Harare: Weaver Press.

Rutherford, Blair. 2004. Desired publics, domestic government, and entangled fears: On the anthropology of civil society, farm workers, and white farmers in Zimbabwe. Cultural Anthropology 19(1): 122-153.

Veit-Wild, Flora. 2009. “Zimbolicious”. The creative potential of linguistic innovation: The case of Shona-English in Zimbabwe. Journal of Southern African Studies 35(3): 683-97. doi:10.1080/03057070903101896.

Zwaan, Karin, Pieter Muysken and Maaike Verrips, eds. 2010. Language and origin: The role of language in European asylum procedures: A linguistic and legal survey. Nijmegen: Wolf Legal Publishers.