

NAMES AS INDIGENOUS KNOWLEDGE FOR MAKING MEAT EDIBLE AND/OR INEDIBLE: IMPLICATIONS ON FOOD SECURITY IN ZIMBABWE

SAMBULO NDLOVU

Department of African Languages and Literature,
Great Zimbabwe University, Zimbabwe

Abstract: Meat forms a part of cultural diets all over the world and it is taken from different animals and insects. Cultures permit and prohibit the eating of certain meats. Due to food scarcity and the conglomeration of cultures, some people tend to eat meat that is forbidden in their cultures. When need arises to eat a prohibited animal, names are at times used to baptise the animal or meat in edible terms. However, the reverse is also true: people can choose a name that de-markets a particular type of meat to prevent individuals within a specific culture, religion or clan from eating the meat in question.

This paper aims to probe naming patterns in some Zimbabwean cultures that brand meats as eatable and otherwise. The study argues that animals and meats can be re-named as a way of branding and re-branding to make them appealing to the eating public of that culture. Moreover, the paper avers that names can also be used as prohibitions on the “edibility” of some meats. Selected Zimbabwean cases are used as examples of branding and un-branding of meat to make it edible and inedible respectively.

Keywords: naming, food, framing, IKS, edible.

Introduction

Human beings depend on animals, insects and birds for meat and different cultures, religions and other human social aggregates prescribe meats that are to be eaten and they also prohibit the eating of some meats. The consumption of meat in cultures can be religiously or biologically perceived: “Consumer perceptions can be biologically perceived as they can be guided by sense organs such as eye, ear, skin, nose and tongue” (Mutsikiwa and Basera 2012: 114). The senses people use to perceive meat eating include the ear that hears the names given to different meats. The name given to a type of meat can influence people into eating the meat, yet at the same time the name can help prohibit people from eating a particular meat.

Classification of meat as edible and otherwise is prevalent in some world religions, such as Christianity and Islam, in which names are used to label meat as edible or not. Islam classifies all edible meat as *halal* and the inedible as *haram*. Mohammad and Hartini (2003: 02) note that: “Halal is a Quranic word meaning lawful or permitted. In

reference to food, it is dietary standard, as prescribed in the Quran the Muslim scripture. General Quranic guidance dictates that all foods are halal except those that are specifically mentioned as haram (unlawful or prohibited)". Zimbabwean religions and cultures also use names as vehicles of branding meat to make it edible and negative branding is applied in cases where eating of some meats is prohibited.

In many cultures the name of the animal is not used when referring to its meat, and the names chosen to refer to the meats are usually associated with class. In English, for example, meat from cattle is called *beef*, from pigs – *pork*, from sheep – *mutton* and even within beef there are branded parts, such as *top side*, *steak*, *ox tail* and *brisket*. Names are used as marketing tools to add value to meat and these names are the meat brands. Keller and Lehmann (2006: 740) aver:

Brands serve several valuable functions. At their most basic level, brands serve as markers for the offerings of a firm. For customers, brands can simplify choice, promise a particular quality level, reduce risk, and/or engender trust. Brands are built on the product itself, the accompanying marketing activity, and the use (or non-use) by customers as well as others.

Branding can also be used in the negative sense to prohibit people from eating certain meats. In the case of bad names used to name meat, the intention is to make sure the targeted audience and users of the name do not eat the referred meat. In some cases names that are linked to deities in that culture or clan are used on meat animals as a way of discouraging people from eating them and this is prevalent in Africa through the totemic system. Religions like Christianity also prefer some "bad names" on animals that they doctrinally prohibit people from eating. Bad naming meat and meat animals can be said to be a reverse form of branding that advertises non-eating of some meats instead of their eating. Brand names are not only found in the marketing media but are now part of our everyday lives, including the branding of the food we eat. Clankie (2013: 28) argues:

The brand name is one of the most pervasive linguistic forms found in the major languages of the world today. They are an inescapable part of modern capitalist culture, flooding not only our airwave via our television, radio and internet, but even so far as being present in our more personal moments, on the clothing we wear, the food on our shelves, and in our conversations with one another.

The way most of the names that encourage eating and those that are meant to discourage eating are formed can be perceived in terms of the framing theory in sociological research. There are animals that are known to be meat animals like cattle, sheep, goats, rabbits, chicken etc.; these animals are used as frames to create new names for some animals that are generally not used for meat. Errington, Fujikura and Gewertz (2012: 21) argue: "There are, of course, other contemporary foods that are widely available, are considered generally acceptable, have a worldwide reach, and appeal to

rich and poor”. The reverse is also true in that the generally non-meat animals can be used as negative frames to discourage the eating of some meats. Frames are used in the media to communicate especially human values using a well-known personality that embodies the values. Bergien (2013: 20) exemplifies the Obama frame in world politics:

The result is, for example, a compressed style of expression which is less explicit in meaning. The development is paralleled by an increase in the use of names rather than complex noun phrases to describe and evaluate persons, places, physical objects or events in media texts. For example, in the sentence *Nick Clegg is the British Obama* the name Obama serves as a source to characterise the leader of the Liberal Democrats, Nick Clegg.

In the same manner the goat frame can be used on another animal as a way of encouraging people to eat that animal as they already eat goat. A non-meat animal in a particular culture can be used as a negative frame to prohibit people from eating the animal framed to the non-meat animal. The framed meat names are realised as *retronyms*. Fromkin and Rodman (1998: 519) define the retronym as: “An expression that would have once been redundant but which changes in society or technology have made non redundant”. Ndlovu (2012: 154) avers: “A retronym is a new name for an object or concept to differentiate it from the original form or version. The original name is most often augmented with an adjective, rather than being completely displaced, to account for later developments of the object or concept”. Brand names also take this compound structure, as Clankie (2013: 29) notes: “By law, a brand name must be a proper adjective followed by a common noun or noun phrase representative of the semantic class to which the product belongs”. Most of the framed meat names are compound nouns like all other retronyms.

Framing is not the only method used in Zimbabwe and elsewhere to name meat for eating and non-eating purposes. There are some names that do not make use of frames but still edify or condemn certain meats. In some cases alternative names are used to refer to an animal as a way of encouraging people to eat its meat. Alternative names are also used on certain types of meats or meats in different states as a way of encouraging eating and in some cases to discourage eating. Framing, branding and alternative naming, which is a form of branding, are used in some Zimbabwean cultures to create good and bad names for meat to encourage and discourage eating, respectively.

Background to culture and food in Zimbabwe

Food can be identified as part of culture and for many Zimbabwean cultures food is related to the environment. Traditionally, people in Zimbabwe were hunter-gatherers and ate all edible food around them for survival. The coming of Christianity and ethnic rivalries created some food laws that at times make people go hungry although there is food, which, however, they are prohibited to eat. The Zimbabwean culture

is dominated by Christian religion (Mutsikiwa and Basera 2012: 114). Different Zimbabwean cultures prefer some foods for religious and cultural reasons and these foods help to define the people. Tonukari (2009: 225) notes that:

As a cultural group portray its own cultural traits and patterns through the collective representation of its membership, so too individuals bear and highlight the peculiarities of the culture they hail from. Consequently, language, idiosyncrasies, values, taboos, dietary preferences and habits are cultural identities.

Zimbabwe is a country prone to droughts and yet the farming industry has been heavily compromised by politics. The situation is such that food security is almost always in a precarious situation. In light of the worsening food security situation, cultures are beginning to rebrand certain meats to make them edible. It is clear that during yester-times of plenty in Zimbabwe people created negative frames on some meats to brand the meats as uneatable, however, with the deteriorating food security situation in the country the shift is on branding previously prohibited meats to make them eatable. The cultures borrow from each other as far as meats are concerned and in the process they break some known food taboos to avert starvation. "As a result of the Zimbabwean government's accelerated land resettlement programme of the early 2000s, these communities are a complex mix of cultures, ethnicities, traditions and practices, integrating people from diverse/disparate socio-cultural and geographical contexts across the country" (Shava, O'dunoghue and Zuza 2009: 03). It is no longer possible for a culture group in Zimbabwe to be isolated from others and this has shown people that some eat the prohibited meats and never die.

Insects and animals are used by all Zimbabwean cultures as food and it is from these organisms that the people derive meat foods. Christianity and tradition has prescribed some of these as uneatable and as a result some people may starve amidst some insects or animals that they are prohibited to eat. In cases in which food is scarce the latitude to choose which meat to eat and which not to eat may not be a logical survival skill and there is a need for a system that makes men able to make food of all possible meats around them. While food security is a challenge in Zimbabwe there is an abundance of sources of meat that can help populations in times of need and, indeed to improve nutritional value. DeFoliart (1999: 30) avers:

More than 40 species of insects representing at least 25 genera, 14 families, and 7 orders have been reported as foods in Zimbabwe. Gathered wild food, of which insects are an important part, play a daily role in rural diets and are most important for making the relish that accompanies the characteristic stiff cereal porridge.

Insects are not important as relish for rural folk only, but urbanites are rather dependant on insects for food as well. There are so many insects and animals that are prohibited as food, but it is important to note that meat taboos are increasingly being broken by people seeking survival. Rebranding of some of the prohibited meats plays

an important role in making the meats acceptable to the various populations. Naming and renaming of animals, insects and meat is used as an indigenous knowledge to brand meat as edible for food security. The tendency now is to ensure food security ahead of culture and religious beliefs and taboos.

Negative frames to prohibit eating of some meats

There has been a tendency in some Zimbabwean cultures to use negative frames in naming some animals and meats as a way of prohibiting people from eating the meats. Likening an animal to a commonly disliked one or associating it with a known non-meat animal in that culture is used as a way of discouraging people from eating the animal. Likening is a form of framing in the negative sense, aimed at tarnishing the object using a negative frame. The use of negative animal names creates a frame that is aimed at stopping people from eating and the repetition of the framed name creates emphasis and further repels prospective eaters. Bergien (2013: 24) states:

The conceptual frames we use to make sense of the world can be manipulated relatively easy, especially via repetition in the media. Their use thus gives the sender or framer enormous power to influence how the receivers will interpret the message. The frame that is activated via the name does not only provide an adequate description, but signals the value given to the element in question.

The negative frame in this case creates a form of negative brand that reverses marketing. Instead of people appreciating a brand they detest it because it is framed on a detested frame. Branding is the same process used as an IKS name for meat in Zimbabwe. “Branding is an act in which an organisation uses a name, phrase, design, symbols, or combination of these to identify its products and distinguish them from those of competitors, while brand name is any word, ‘device’ or combination of these used to distinguish a seller’s goods or services” (Mohammad and Hartini 2003: 03). The negative frame is used to distinguish an animal as unfit to be eaten using a framed name. The animal becomes one of the uneatable cultural goods through a bad secondary name given to it.

Ndebele and Shona cultures in Zimbabwe are the predominant ones, with the Shona making up the bulk of the population. Over the years the two groups have antagonised over power and control of the country. As a result of the antagonism there is sensitivity on the influence of one over the other. The Ndebele guard against undue Shona influence on their culture and the Shona do the same. Names have been used and continue to be used as an IKS to prevent in-group members from eating meats that are eaten and identified with the antagonising out-group.

The Shona eat some animals and insects that the Ndebele identify with the Shona culture and for some reasons believe eating these is tantamount to Shona cultural imperialism. The Shona eat mice and they call them *mbeva*, and they make a clear distinction between mice and rats. The Shona also eat wild winged insects, which they

call *harurwa*. These two sources of meat are alternatively named in Ndebele using negative frames to prevent the Ndebele people eating them.

The Ndebele use the name *igundwane* ('rat') to refer to both mice and rat because they do not eat mice. Asked why he does not eat mice, Mr. Moyo indicated in an interview that "mice are rats living in the wild, and it is Shona food that is prohibited in Ndebele". The Ndebele use the rat frame to brand mice as rats to prohibit potential eaters and they call mice *amagundwane eganga* ('wild rats'). Eating mice is associated with the Shona identity in Ndebele cosmology and it is discouraged. The Shona influence on the Ndebele culture through eating mice is guarded against using the rat framed negative name *amagundwane eganga* ('wild mice').

Mice are not the only meat source that the Ndebele prohibit eating using a negatively framed name, the wild insects *harurwa* are another case in point. The *harurwa* are bugs that look like cockroaches; their botanical name is *encosternum delegorguei* and they are referred to as *green bugs*. There are two types of green bugs, *harurwa* and *mchipera*. The *mchipera* are smaller and they stink worse, while the *harurwa* eaten by the Shona are bigger and stink less. The Ndebele use the *mchipera* and cockroach frames to discourage Ndebele people from eating *harurwa*. The Ndebele call *harurwa amawuwu eganga* ('wild cockroaches') or bunch them under one name *imitshiphela* ('stinking bugs'). Reporting on the eating of *harurwa* in the Bikita district of Masvingo, Musa Dube a reporter with the Standard newspaper also used stinking as a frame to name *harurwa* and called them "stinking bugs"¹.

The Shona also have names that may discourage Shona in-group members from eating Mopani worms, *amacimbi*. To be Ndebele is associated with eating Mopani worms in Zimbabwe because Ndebele regions have abundance of Mopani trees compared to Shona areas. "Another overlapping theme is the environmental and geographic exploration of regions-bioregionalism- as ecological containers around which moral and social behaviour is constructed" (Feagan 2007: 32). Mopani worms are butterfly larvae and the Shona use the fly lava frame to brand the Mopani worms negatively by calling them *makonye* ('worms/larvae'), a name that is not appetising and discourages eating.

Religious framing to prohibit the eating of some meats

Religion is a very important part of human aggregates and it shapes behaviour and attitudes of the believers. While Zimbabwean cultures had African traditional religion as their denomination before colonialism, nowadays most people in different cultures are Christians. There are certain names that are framed along traditional African religion and some framed along Christianity to prevent the eating of some meats. The strict adherence to religious doctrines on food may mean that people can die of hunger when there is meat they are prevented from eating by religion. In a country prone to droughts and with a poor food security record like Zimbabwe, naming meats on religious grounds to prevent their eating may cause starvation.

¹ <http://www.thestandard.co.zw/2013/09/08/bikita-villagers-sell-stinkbugs-living/>

In African traditional religion, certain animals are revered and named in ways that prohibit eating them. The belief in life after death and the belief that animals can be abodes of spirits makes Africans name some animals in religious frames that prohibit the eating of their meat. Totems are part of many African cultures and make use of animals. People name using an animal framing of the animal in religion and thereafter eating of the totem animal is tabooed. “Culture has, is and will play a significant role in the way consumers behave towards food products in any given market, thus; it can influence consumers to buy or not to buy certain food products as it sets acceptable standards” (Mutsikiwa and Basera 2012: 113). Framing human identity on an animal name prohibits people of the totem from eating the meat.

The Ndebele and the Shona name some bulls and he-goats with names that make the animals abodes of the spirits. If a beast is named *ubabamkhulu/sekuru* (‘grandfather’) in Ndebele and Shona respectively, the name is a religious frame that prohibits believers from eating the meat of the beast. The beast cannot be used as draught power even in cases where the family should use the beast to yield better crops. The name gives the animal religious sacredness that makes its meat immune to human consumption. The Ndebele also rename some animals of their totems as *inkaba* (‘umbilical cord’). The Khumalo clan, for example, throw their umbilical cords in water and they are believed to be eaten by fish; the fish become *inkaba* to them and they are not eaten.

Christianity came with western civilisation and this saw black people in Zimbabwe leaving some of the meats they used to eat. “The western attitude is important because acculturation toward western lifestyles tends to cause a reduction in the use of insects” (DeFoliart 1999: 22). Some Christian sects prohibit the eating of animals like horses, donkeys, dogs, cats, pigs and many insects and reptiles. The nicknaming or renaming of the pig by Christian sects can prohibit its eating. The name of the demoniac in the Bible from whom a legion of demons was removed by Jesus and cast into pigs is used as a negative religious frame to name pigs in both Shona and Ndebele. Christianity rather than survival conditions the non-use of pigs for meat by some Christians. DeFoliart (1999: 22) argues: “I have come to the conclusion that it is the west which is out of step in its aversion to insects as food. There is much evidence to support that viewpoint. Food preferences are the result of cultural conditioning which is influenced by many factors”. The legion and demon frames are used to derive the names *uligiyoni/rigiyoni* (‘legion’) for pigs and in some cases they are referred to as *amadimoni/madhimoni* (‘demons’) as a way of prohibiting believers from eating pigs. In this case the negative name tarnishes the pig religiously. Naming and renaming to prohibit eating is an IKS that can threaten food security in Zimbabwe. People should be environmentally-minded and survival should not depend on eating some meats according to cultural and religious prohibitions.

Positive frames to brand meat as edible

Meat is an important part of Zimbabwean diets and names that are aimed at discouraging people from eating certain meats expose the prohibited to a precarious

food security situation. While culture and religion have worked to banish some meats from some Zimbabwean meals people have developed IKS naming skills that challenge the taboos and encourage people to eat as many meats as they can find in their environment. The prohibited meats have been named using positive frames that make the meats appetising.

Framing is an important strategy in the IKS of using names to ensure food security through eating available meats. Entman (1993: 52) says: "To frame is to select some aspect of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation for the item described". The good frames derived from known meat animals are to attract people to the otherwise unattractive meats. Neethling (2013: 53) notes: "Consumers are often attracted by the names of products, and hence the provider of the product takes great care in selecting a name for a product". Bergien (2013: 24) exemplifies positive framing using the Obama frame: "For example, the name *Obama*, if used in the sentence *Pope Franziskus is a new Obama*, evokes a very special frame of the name *Obama*, i.e. a person on whom great hopes are pinned". In the same way expectations regarding one type of meat are transferred to another through a framed name.

The Shona, Ndebele and Changana cultures of Zimbabwe exhibit cases in which an otherwise bad meat animal is named using a known meat animal to make it eatable. People tend to prefer antelopes and bovines for meat to the exclusion of canines, cats, donkeys and cold blooded creatures. However, due to lack of food in Zimbabwe people have turned to animals which they would not eat under normal food situations for meat. The animals are renamed in terms of other appetising animals to brand them as part of the family of the edible meats.

The Changani in the south-eastern parts of Zimbabwe live in a dry area that is prone to droughts, but when rains come, the rivers, streams, and ponds are filled with water and frogs breed in the water bodies. Frogs are not usually part of menus in Zimbabwe, but the Changani have used an IKS name to make frogs part of their menu. The bull frog is eaten by the Changana and now many people in Zimbabwe outside the Changana communities also eat the bull frog. To eat the bull frog the Changana renamed it using the cattle frame; it is actually a special type of cattle not a frog when it is named to be eaten. While other frogs are called *machela/matlambya*, the bull frog is called *homu yatatana* ('the father's cow') – the cow frame is used to edify a frog and brand it for eating.

The Ndebele and Shona live in rocky areas that are home to large populations of baboons. Excessive hunting due to hunger has made antelopes rare and in some cases extinct, while the bushes are infested with baboons that are even a threat to crops. Feagan (2007: 23) avers: "Food and place are intertwined in robust ways in the geographic imagination and central to our life world". The two culture groups have used the goat frame to name a baboon as a way of 'purifying' it for eating. People eat goats but not everyone can afford a goat and changing a baboon to a goat by name affords

everyone goat meat. The baboon is framed on to a goat and it is christened a rock goat by both the Ndebele and the Shona. The Ndebele call it *imbuzimawa* ('rock goat') and the Shona call it *nhongoruwere* ('rock he-goat'). These names are designed to brand a baboon as a goat so it can be eaten. The goat brand helps people experience a baboon as meat. Keller and Lehmann (2006: 742) argue that:

Brands can help to create five different types of experiences: sense experiences involving sensory perception; feel experiences involving affect and emotions; think experiences which are creative and cognitive; act experiences involving physical behaviour and incorporating individual actions and lifestyles; and relate experiences that result from connecting with a reference group or culture.

The chicken is a popular source of white meat and this has led to it being used as a frame for many white meats to derive appetising names. The popularity of the chicken brand is genericised on white meats. Clankie (2013: 29) argues that: "when a brand name becomes too popular it can be diluted in the legal interpretation of the process or genericised in the linguistic sense. This is whereby a brand name is widened to refer to all brands of its kind due to its popularity". The Ndebele refer to the tortoise as *inkukhu yeganga* ('wild chicken') when the intention is to eat it, yet, ordinarily it is called *ufudu*. The crocodile is sometimes referred to as *inkukhu yamanzi* ('water chicken') to brand it for eating; its usual name is *ingwenya*. The Shona name for a rock lizard is *burwa*, but the lizard, which has white meat, is framed on the chicken to create the name *hukurutombo* ('rock chicken') and, when it is called *hukurutombo*, the intention is to "purify" it for food.

While the Shona eat mice it would appear eating mice is despised in some Christian sects even within the Shona communities. The Ndebele have also learnt to eat mice from the Shona to alleviate food shortages. The discouragement to eat rat/mice meat has seen the Shona at times choosing to rename mice instead of using their known name *mbeva*. Mice are framed on a goat in Shona to encourage eating and they are called *mbudzimwena* ('goat that lives in holes'). The Ndebele choose to frame mice on the rabbit because they eat the rabbit; mice are called *imvundla emncane* ('small rabbits'), not *amagundwane*, if they are to be eaten. The edifying names are an IKS to ensure food security in Zimbabwean communities, especially in rural communities.

Alternative naming to make some meats edible

Framing is not the only strategy used in Zimbabwe to make some meats edible. In some cases people choose a name that makes meat eatable over the counterpart name that is not palatable. There are names of some meats which, when used to refer to the meats, may motivate people not to eat the meats, but when an alternative name is used, people can comfortably eat the same meat.

Shortage of food usually pushes people to the extremes of survival when it comes to looking for food. In the quest for food the Ndebele and the Shona use creativity

in naming meat to encourage its eating. Rapeane-Mathonsi and Mohlomi (2012: 95) aver: “Thus, in simpler terms, renaming can be viewed as the act or process of assigning new names to specific entities. [...] people are often motivated by various circumstances and observations to give new names to different phenomena which surround them”. The choice of one name over another in some cases is motivated by the need to eat the meat named. Monitor lizards are scary things that are detested for milking cows and are not appetising enough to be eaten among the Ndebele community. The monitor lizards are called *ukhwathe* or *uxamu* and these names are only used on the creature as long as it is alive in the bush. When monitor lizards are cooked, the meat is not named using the same names as for the live animal, but rather it is called *iswayi*. The meat is alternatively named to create food out of an otherwise unappetising creature such as the monitor lizard. The name *iswayi* introduces the Ndebele to more food and more nutrients in lizard meat.

Africans have always eaten blood from animals; in some cases the blood is drained from live animals like cattle to supplement nutrition. The coming of Christianity and western health standards saw the de-campaigning for blood as part of the meat. When a beast is slaughtered, the blood is collected and cooked. Christians who discourage the eating of blood choose to call the blood *igazi/ropa* (‘blood’) in Ndebele and Shona respectively. However, those who eat the blood choose to call it *ububende* and *masiya* in Ndebele and Shona respectively – the names refer to blood as food not as dirt. The alternative names are an IKS of choosing the name that suits branding blood as food, yet those who call it *blood* do so to label it as dirt and unfit for human consumption. The names *ububende/masiya* sound great and of good quality as indicated by Neethling (2013: 40) in the following example: “Swartland is a predominantly Afrikaans winery, situated in a predominantly Afrikaans-speaking area close to Malmesbury. They have decided to exploit the name *d’vine*, which could be interpreted as ‘the vine’, but obviously also as ‘divine’ = great, fantastic, wonderful, of good quality, etc.”

Lack of refrigeration in Zimbabwean rural areas results in meat getting bad, while meat preservation methods also expose the meat to flies. Flies leave their larvae on the meat and these larvae are called *impethu/makonye* in Ndebele and Shona respectively. Fly larvae are detested and are associated with disease and the names used can make one vomit. However, most meats in rural Zimbabwe end up with these larvae because of lacking refrigeration and meat cannot be thrown away in areas where there is usually serious food shortage. The Ndebele use an alternative name *isihlava* to refer to fly larvae when they are on meat so that it can be eaten, but elsewhere on rotten things they are called *impethu*. The Shona transfer the name *boys* to the larvae when they are on meat to be eaten. Kolobe (2012: 63) says: “Renaming is another productive process for vehicle names in Lesotho. Here the name of another entity (usually a person or place) is transferred to the bus”. The Shona use the same strategy by calling the larvae *machinda* (‘boys’) and in this way they encourage the eating of meat that has larvae. The meat can also get bad without the larvae; this meat is otherwise called *nyama yakawora* (‘rotten meat’) in Shona, but they name it *mvumvira*, a special name for this type of meat so that

people are prompted to eat it, as it is not classified under rotten meat. The alternative naming helps save food and making sure that no food is thrown away.

The food situation in Zimbabwe and indeed other African countries can be improved through the IKS of using names that brand some meats as eatable. While some people may not be fooled by the name to eat something that they do not eat, branding is a known marketing strategy that makes people buy out of coercion. Looking at consumer perceptions on cars, Brown, Kozinets and Sherry (2003: 24) say: "Our study of consumer perception of the new beetle, however, reveals bitter sceptics and true believers. Consumers demonstrate that they are sophisticated interpreters of marketing cues about a brand's authenticity. "Jane" posted a simple one sentence statement: 'In my view, the "new" beetle is a beetle in name only'". While baboon for example may be a goat in name only, the idea of a goat in reference to a baboon justifies those who eat the baboon and may even encourage others to eat baboon as they already eat goat. Alternative naming takes away the bad in some meats through the use of the alternative name to encourage eating.

Conclusion

Africans and other indigenous people in the world over have always used IKS as a survival strategy. Zimbabwe is home to different cultures that have food as part of the identity markers. The meat that people eat is environmentally conditioned to be food; however, some cultural practices and religion have made some people come up with names that discourage the use of some animals and insects for meat. To discourage people from eating some meats in Zimbabwe, negative frames are employed in deriving alternative names for the condemned meats. The negative frames are created around the type or class of animal and in some cases negative religious images are used to create a bad name to discourage the eating of the meat. The religious and cultural tendencies that prohibit the eating of some meats are not good for poor countries like Zimbabwe that have serious food shortages especially in rural areas. The IKS of using bad and sacred names to discourage the eating of some meats goes against the efforts made to improve food security in Africa. Zimbabweans have shown that they go beyond the bad names in their quest for food and better nutrition. Names are used in the Ndebele, Shona and Changana cultures of Zimbabwe to make food out of meats that are discouraged. Naming strategies also use positive or good frames and alternative naming to encourage people to eat meat from prohibited creatures. Implications for food security in Zimbabwe are that, if bad names and frames are used to discourage eating of some meats, people may die of starvation. However, if known non-meat creatures in cultures are named in ways that encourage and market the eating of the meats, food security and nutrition can be improved in the country.

References

- Bergien, A. 2013. Names as Frames in Current-Day Media Discourse. In *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Onomastics "Name and Naming": Onomastics in Contemporary Public Space, Baia Mare, May 9–11, 2013*, O. Felecan (ed), 19–27. Cluj-Napoca: Editura Mega, Editura Argonaut.
- Brown, S, R.V. Kozinets and J.F. Sherry. 2003. Teaching Old Brands New Tricks: Retro Branding and the Revival of Brand Meaning. *Journal of Marketing* 67(3): 19–33.
- Clankie, S. 2013. An Overview of Genericization in Linguistics. In *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Onomastics "Name and Naming": Onomastics in Contemporary Public Space, Baia Mare, May 9–11, 2013*, O. Felecan (ed), 28–34. Cluj-Napoca: Editura Mega, Editura Argonaut.
- DeFoliart, G.R. 1999. Insects as Food: Why the Western Attitude Is Important. *Annual Reviews Entomol* 44: 21–50.
- Entman, R.M. 1993. Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm. *Journal of Communication* 43(4): 51–58.
- Errington, F., T. Fujikura and D. Gewertz. 2012. Instant Noodles as an Antifriction Device: Making the BOP with PPP in PNG. *American Anthropologist* 114(1): 19–31.
- Feagan, R. 2007. The Place of Food: Mapping Out the Local in Local Food Systems. *Progress in Human Geography* 31(1): 23–42.
- Fromkin, V. and R. Rodman. 1998. *An Introduction to Language*, 6th ed. New York: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Keller, K.L. and D.R. Lehmann. 2006. Brands and Branding: Research Findings and Future Priorities. *Marketing Science* 25(6): 740–759.
- Kolobe, M. 2012. A Morpho-Sociolinguistic Analysis of Vehicle Naming in Lesotho. *Nomina Africana* 26(2): 53–72.
- Mohammad, N.B.N and B.M. Hartini. 2003. *An Explanatory Research Among Consumers in Malaysia*. Ultra Consulting Research and Training. www.nuradli.com/no03.pdf (accessed in September 2015).
- Mutsikiwa, M. and C.H. Basera. 2012. The Influence of Socio-Cultural Variables on Consumers' Perception of Halal Food Products: A Case of Masvingo Urban, Zimbabwe. *International Journal of Business and Management* 7(20): 112–119.
- Ndlovu, S. 2012. Structural and Philosophical Aspects in Ndebele Retronym Derivation. *South African Journal of African Languages (SAJAL)* 32(2): 153–160.
- Neethling, B. 2013. Innovation and Creativity in the Coining of New Names for South African Wines: A Few Case Studies. *Nomina Africana* 27(1): 35–56.
- Rapeane-Mathonsi, M and M.J. Mohlomi. 2012. Nicknaming in Lesotho: The Case of Bars and Restaurants. *Nomina Africana* 26(2): 91–110.
- Shava, S., R. O'Donoghue and C. Zuza. 2009. Traditional Food Crops as a Source of Community Resilience in Zimbabwe. *International Journal of the African Renaissance* 4(1): 1–21.
- Tonukari, U.E. 2009. Language Use in Social Context: Cultural Identity. In *Language, Literature and Society*, H.M. Batibo, R.S. Dikole and S.T.M. Lukusa (eds), 221–229. Gaborone: Associated Printers.