

THESIS FOR MASTER OF ARTS IN AFRICAN LANGUAGES.

NAME: LEHLOHONOLO S. PHAFOLI

TITLE: REFLECTION OF HISTORY IN KHAKETLA'S
DRAMAS: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS.

DEGREE: MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT: AFRICAN LANGUAGES

FACULTY: ARTS

SUPERVISOR: PROF. NHLANHLA P. MAAKE.

A thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in African
Languages. University of the Witwatersrand,
Johannesburg 1996.

DECLARATION

I DECLARE THAT **REFLECTION OF HISTORY IN KHAKETLA'S DRAMAS**
.. A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS IS MY OWN WORK AND THAT ALL THE
SOURCES THAT I HAVE USED OR QUOTED HAVE BEEN INDICATED AND
ACKNOWLEDGED BY MEANS OF COMPLETE REFERENCES.

L.S. PHAFOLI

_____ DAY OF _____ 19____

DEDICATION

DEDICATED TO MOHAPI DITEBOHO PHAFOLI,

MY SON WHO WAS BORN ON 28/03/1995.

*Sebata namane e tshehla, motho wa
Manthethe wa Morapedi, ngwana wa lebese
la kgomo. Motho wa ha kemekeme taung motho
ha a kemetswe o a bolawa. Tau-tshehla,
mohapi wa dikgomo le batho.*

A TOKEN OF LOVE AND APPRECIATION TO
MY WIFE, SEMAKALENG HYANCITH AND DAUGHTER
FELLENG PHAFOLI.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to Prof. Nhlanhla Maake for his scholarly guidance. I thank him for his constructive comments and suggestions which contributed to the success of this study.

My thanks to Prof. R.K. Herbert, Prof. I. Hofmeyr, and D.K. Ntshangase who helped to shape this work.

Special thanks to Mrs A. Smyth who sacrificed her time to proofread this work.

I am also indebted to my informants, B.M. Khaketla, Chief Patrick Lehlwenya, Dr. L.B.B.J. Machobane, S.J. Gill and N. Motsetsela.

CONTENTS

Declaration

Dedication

Acknowledgements

Abstract

CHAPTER 1

1.1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.2	AIMS OF THE STUDY	3
1.3	HISTORICAL BACKGROUND	4
1.4	THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	10
1.5	METHODOLOGY	15

CHAPTER 2

2.1	KHAKETLA'S LIFE AND WORKS	26
2.2	PRELIMINARY STUDIES OF KHAKETLA	34
2.3	SESOTHO CUSTOMS	41
2.3.1	SUCCESSION	41
2.3.2	LEVIRATE	48
2.3.3	TLHALO (DIVORCE)	50

CHAPTER 3

3.1	TEXT AND HISTORICAL CONTEXT..COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS	53
3.1.1	<u>THOLOANA TSA SETHEPU</u> AND HISTORICAL CONTEXT	54
3.1.2	<u>BULANE</u> AND HISTORICAL CONTEXT	125

CHAPTER 4

	CONCLUSION	166
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	171

ABSTRACT

"My texts refer to historical facts because I feel that they must have credibility. In this way they can arouse interest among the readers."
(Khaketla, interview 25/04/1994)

This study "**Reflection of history in Khaketla's dramas .. A comparative analysis**" elucidates the view that the playwright utilised the narrative imagination in order to reflect history. His works show imaginary resolution of real conflicts however he has significantly avoided certain areas of real experiences in pursuance of dramatic plot.

In this work the two dramas **Tholoana tsa Sethepu** and **Bulane** are compared to historical episodes concerning Griffith's feud of succession 1926-1939 and the installation of Seeiso as paramount chief in 1939. Khaketla is believed to have been influenced by past historical experiences when writing the texts. The historical context is considered here as a situation around which the dramas were conceived. Boulton (1960) points out that the modern dramatist generally tries to take a plot from his own head or he may show his originality by taking a well-known historical episode and handle it so as to throw new light upon it. Boulton views history as a mine of good stories and that, with imagination a playwright can create a whole play of passion and conflict out of it. This view summarizes my approach to the analysis of Khaketla's plays which are considered as products of historical experiences.

CHAPTER 1

1.1 INTRODUCTION

This study analyses Khaketla's dramas Tholoana tsa Sethepu and Bulane and compares them to history. Tholoana tsa Sethepu is about chief Matete who violates the custom of primogeniture by disinheriting Bulane, his son from his first house, and replacing him with Mohapi, a son from the second house. This play can therefore be said to relate to the feud of succession during Paramount Chief Griffith's reign 1913 to 1939.

Bulane deals with the crowning of Bulane as a chief. It further relates the conflict between Bulane and his wife because of Bulane's insistence on levirate practice. As a result Mohapi and his councillors plot against Bulane who mysteriously escapes the death. This play can be said to cover incidents which occurred after Griffith's death, the period from 1939 to 1940 when Seeiso, his son, took office, contrary to his father's wish.

This study analyses the texts in terms of their themes and the context from which the dramas were drawn. It provides in-depth historical facts and shows how Khaketla has to a certain degree, tried to manipulate historical events in order to build up his dramas. Characters and events in the dramas will be compared to historical figures and events. For example, some of the characters in the plays can be said to represent historical persons.

Historical names

Griffith

Mmaseeiso

Names in the dramas

Matete

Direko

Seeiso	Bulane
Bereng	Mohapi
Mantshebo	Mookgo

The historical figures which the study will focus on are:

Griffith - the paramount chief of Lesotho from 1913-1939.

Mmaseeiso - Griffith's second wife and mother of Seeiso.

Mmabereng - Griffith's third wife, younger sister to Mmaseeiso and mother of Bereng.

Seeiso - son of Griffith, Griffith did not recognize him as his heir.

Bereng - son of Griffith who was chosen as heir and successor to the paramountcy by Griffith.

Leloko - a councillor of Griffith, son of Lerothodi.

In conclusion it will be shown that Khaketla's writing was inspired by historical events, thus enforcing the idea that human experiences contribute to the existence of literary texts. This strengthens the view that literature is a reflection and interpretation of reality.

1.2 AIMS

The study aims to establish the relationship between two literary texts of B.M. Khaketla and historical events. The link will be assessed through comparison and contrast of the texts with history. It is believed that Khaketla was inspired by certain historical incidents, therefore this work seeks to show the importance of history in literature. This study will also

examine how Khaketla's plays deviate from history and the significance of such deviations. The focus will be on the following issues; succession, *tlhalo* - divorce and *kenelo* - levirate. This study will clarify the succession issue which is based on the seniority of the mother's marriage not on seniority in terms of the age of the chief's sons, as sometimes the legal successor may be born after the junior wives' children. It will also explore the conflict over the chieftainship and how personal ambition can overturn the customary laws of primogeniture and succession. This point relates to the two most important characters; Griffith in history and Matete in Tholoana tsa Sethepu. In the treatment of *tlhalo* it will be shown how the purported *tlhalo* by Griffith complicated and destabilized his administration. The *kenelo* practice will also be explained in terms of its impact among the Basotho in the play Bulane.

1.3 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Lesotho is a small country in southern Africa which is surrounded by the Republic of South Africa. It is a country with a traditional administration made up of chiefs. The entire nation is composed of different clans which once had independent chiefs on their own land. But with the appearance of Moshweshwe I during the *difaqane* turmoil, some of the independent clan chiefs sought refuge in his chiefdom. Later these clans became the united body of Basotho nation under one traditional leader, Moshweshwe I. From Moshweshwe I's days up until now the country still has traditional leaders commonly known as chiefs. Since 1868, when Queen Victoria of England agreed to accept Lesotho as a protectorate of England, until 1966 when Lesotho got its independence, the colonial government ran the country jointly with the

traditional leaders. The colonial government exercised power over the traditional administrators who were expected to carry out their laws.

This study touches on some of the administrative problems, especially those concerned with customary succession among chiefs. In order to facilitate the understanding of chiefly succession, the historical background of the Basotho traditional leaders needs to be highlighted. Focus will be on the Bakwena of Monaheng from whom the great king, Moshweshwe I, the founder of the Basotho nation, was born. Ellenberger (1958) writes the genealogical table of the Bakwena in this way although some of the names of less important people have been left out:

Motebang
Molemo

Tsholo Tsholwane
Kadi (Monaheng)

Ntsane Motlohelwa Motlwang Mokgeseng Monyane

Motshwane (Peete)
ka Mmualle wa Lehlubi

Dibe Mokgatjhane
Lepoqo (Moshweshwe)

(Ellenberger 1958:112)

Monaheng is said to have been a strong chief who did his best to bring about stability and good governance during his time. It is worth highlighting Monaheng's marriages to different wives. This may help us to understand some of the Basotho customs and laws. Chieftainess Tsheola, the mother of the twins, Mokgeseng and Monyane, was the first wife Monaheng married although she was a commoner. Later, when Monaheng moved to Fothane, he married

Mmantsane, the daughter of the Bafokeng chief of Komane. Mmantsane because she was of royal blood automatically became the first senior wife. After some time Mamotlwang, who was also from the royal family, was married to Monaheng. Because of her royal blood, she became the second senior wife. Therefore Tsheola the commoner, occupied the third position in the order of seniority amongst Monaheng's wives. Unfortunately the four sons from the two senior wives were not as active as Mokgeseng who became his father's favourite. As active as he was, Mokgeseng had one flaw, an unquenchable lust for beautiful women. This eventually led to his death. He forcefully stole the wife of chief Dijo of Makgwakgwa, who in turn, with assistance from the Basiya, managed to overcome Mokgeseng and his warriors. Among those who were killed in that fight were Motlwang and Mokgeseng.

Ntsane, from the first senior house, could not inherit the chieftainship because during his father's lifetime he left his father's village in search of better land where he could be independent. Motlohelwa, his brother, was too weak and never bothered himself about the chieftainship.

After Monaheng's death, his other sons went in different directions where they ruled their subjects as independent chiefs. Another reason was that the Monaheng sons could not agree on the levirate custom to be practised with regard to the wives of Motlwang and Mokgeseng. Customarily Mokotedi was supposed to take care of Motlwang's wife, but Mmapeete repulsed his advances. She indicated that she could not be taken care of by her husband's younger brother. Mokotedi therefore suggested that Kgojane of Ntsane should take care of Mmapeete. She declined this offer instead she opted for her Hlubi lover, Mmualle. In their marriage Mmapeete and Mmualle were blessed with Peete who,

because of his birth, did not have the status of being an heir. Ellenberger

writes that:

Peete e ne e le mofutsana ya sa tsotellweng ke motho
ya aparang senyepa sa matlalo a dipela.

"Peete was a poverty-stricken individual who was neglected
so he had to wear a blanket made out of rabbit skin."
(1958: 105)

His sons, Dibe and Mokgatjhane, were the ones who were later respected as they fought tooth and nail for their rights as heirs of Motlwang's family. They fortunately succeeded in their struggle and each one of them acquired a village. Although Dibe was the eldest twin, he could not retain the chieftainship because he was too cruel and stingy. It is said that whenever he had an animal slaughtered, he called his brother Mokgatjhane to visit him. Usually Mokgatjhane on such visits was accompanied by his men. As stingy as he was, Dibe would ask his brother to enter his house alone and eat with him, ignoring Mokgatjhane's subjects. Fortunately Mokgatjhane was the opposite of his brother, he was popular among his people and neighbours alike. For instance after his visits to Dibe's village he would slaughter an animal to feed men who had accompanied him as a form of cooling their tempers from ill-treatment they might have received from Dibe. In this way Mokgatjhane gained strength, popularity and his subjects increased in numbers. Automatically chieftainship shifted to his side.

Mokgatjhane among his sons had one by the name of Lepoqo who later became known as Moshweshwe. After Lepoqo had returned from initiation school, he was taken to Mohlomi by Peete for blessing. Mohlomi gave him an ear ring *lesale la puso* "the ear ring of governance". He told Moshweshwe that *motse ha o na*

setlhare setlhare ke pelo. "For one to have a village does not need any medicine, one's heart is the medicine." Moshweshwe successfully became a great king through his peaceful endeavour of building the Basotho nation. He cared for the needy by providing them with something to eat. He protected those who were persecuted by enemies and established peaceful relations with his neighbours. During his time the Basotho nation turned out to be one and united nation under one leader. Damane and Saunders write Moshweshwe's genealogical table in this way:

Mokgatjhane

Moshweshwe Makgabane Poshodi Mohale Mopedi

Letsie Molapo Masopha Majara

 Josefa Jonathan Joel
Lerothodi Maama Nkwebe Mojela

Letsie Griffith

 Seeiso Bereng

Moshweshwe II

(1974: 62)

Moshweshwe, although he had many wives, his successor came from his first and most senior wife, Mmamohato. Thus Letsie I was his successor. Letsie I was succeeded by Lerothodi who, as it will be shown later, had some problems in ascending the throne. His succession to paramountcy was effected by the colonial government. Letsie II, well-known as the weakest paramount chief, came after Lerothodi. When Letsie II died, his brother, Griffith, declined to be a regent and he was therefore chosen as the paramount chief. Griffith's succession, which is discussed in details in this study became a complex

issue. But when it was resolved after twelve years Seeiso became the paramount chief. It should be noted that Moshweshwe I was addressed as the king while his successors were called paramount chiefs by the British authorities. But in Sesotho the terminology had no impact as the paramount chiefs were still called *Morena e moholo*.

There is inconsistency when it comes to succession and the seniority of wives. In short, the seniority of a wife depended upon her connections with the royalty and was not determined according to the order of her marriage. Thus if a chief's first wife is a commoner and his second wife is from the royal family, the second wife would automatically be regarded as being the senior of the first wife. Therefore sons born of the commoner were considered junior to the sons of the wives from aristocratic families. Again succession did not automatically go to the sons born of the senior wives, but depended on the intelligence and personal qualities of which the chief and the society generally appreciated and approved.

Basotho did not have written laws. They did however have their own laws which were verbally conveyed from generation to generation until 1903. Machobane (1990: 89) indicates that a proposal for written laws of Moshweshwe was first suggested on 08-07-1903 by councillor Dichaba Labane of Mafeteng, one of Resident Commissioner appointees to the National Council of Basutoland. The National Council was a body which was made up of mostly principal chiefs but included some appointees of the colonial government. Its major purpose was to advise the government on issues affecting the social life of the Basotho. The move was supported by Josias Mopedi an appointee of the *Morena e moholo*, who suggested that a committee be formed to write the laws and submit them to the

council. A committee of 24 men sat for three days, from 11 July - 13 July 1903, drafting the 21 laws of which the succession law was the first. From that date the written succession law has always been referred to as a guideline in settling the succession disputes.

1.4 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The two plays have been influenced by the events of Griffith's life as a chief. Therefore these dramas may be considered as the playwright's reflection of history. With this view in mind, the historical-biographical approach will be employed for the analysis of the plays. Guerin (1966) defines the historical-biographical approach as one which sees a literary work chiefly, if not exclusively, as a reflection of its author's life and times of the characters in the work. It takes into consideration the view that, for a literary work to be more meaningful, its milieu and that of the author must be understood. This method falls under extrinsic approaches which consider the social context as the base of literature and it stresses that art does not exist in a vacuum. In order to have an insight into a literary work, one must be knowledgeable about the social experience and the cultural background from which the literary work evolved. This approach is to be referred to as it draws on the life of the author and the historical events referred to in the texts. The historical-biographical approach will be of great importance as the content of the texts will be weighed against the historical events to show how the author has tried to reflect events through his literary texts, and also how the author was affected by these experiences.

White's (1978) discusses the relationship between fiction and history. His analysis is relevant to this study, which will compare and contrast the plays as fiction against the background of the historical events. White says that historians are concerned with events which can be assigned to specific time-space locations and which are observable. Whereas imaginative writers like poets, novelists and playwrights are concerned with events which are imagined, hypothetical or invented. His view is that the discourse of the historian and that of the imaginative writer overlap, resemble or correspond with each other. That is, the historian and fiction writer's discourse and aims are often the same as they both wish to provide a verbal image of reality. The novelist may present his notion of reality indirectly through the use of figurative techniques by registering a series of propositions which are supposed to correspond point by point to some extratextual domain of occurrence or happening just as the historian claims to do. On the whole, the image of reality which the novelist constructs is meant to correspond in its general outline to some domain of human experience which is no less than that referred to by the historian. This study will, within the perspective of White, show how Khaketla's plays correspond with the lived experiences in the historical context. The study will weigh the events in the plays against historical ones in order to establish the relationship between fiction and reality.

Another observation raised by White is the correspondence between history and fiction. White states that the historian, just like the novelist, employs coherence in his presentation of factual events. He indicates that a mere list of existential statements does not add up to an account of reality if there is no coherence, logical or aesthetic, connecting them to one another.

Therefore history, like fiction, becomes narrative. It is not just a matter of independent and incoherent facts. In an effective presentation of history, there must be a logical connection of points. This view will help to establish the logical connection of historical events for a better understanding of Khaketla's plays. As White puts it, the crucial consideration for the person who wishes to represent the facts is the notions that he brings to his representation of the ways parts relate to the whole which they comprise. In this way the historian speaks for the facts. By so doing he employs the fictional techniques of representation such as rhetorical devices, tropes, emotions and schemata of words, just as they occur in fiction. Therefore history cannot be said to represent the truth, as facts are interpreted and explained with differing views and feelings when written or verbally transmitted. That is why White refers to history as a mixture of adequately and inadequately explained events, a congeries of established and inferred facts. White's view that historical narrative is not the truth is worth consideration. This is so because different history books, historians and informants in most cases give different versions of one historical episode. (White 1978: 121-123) For an example there are three versions pertaining to Seeiso's death. Some people believe that he was poisoned by chieftainess Agatha because he fell ill and later died in hospital after having been at Agatha's house. Other informants indicate that he died of cardiac failure as proved by the government doctor who attended him while he was in hospital. Gill (1993) says that the official version stated that Seeiso died from internal disorders caused by excessive drinking. Therefore although the dramas are compared against the historical events, the information gathered may not be the whole truth.

This study will also refer to Eagleton (1978) who feels that literature signifies history and that history functions as literature's ultimate source and referent. This idea is related to this study in that the two plays are considered as having been inspired by the historical events. That is, the two plays can be best understood with reference to historical background. Although I agree with Eagleton, I think that there are times when literature does not need history in order to be understood. My objective, however is not to argue the relations between literature and history, as Bennett (1990) does. Basing myself on the plays in focus, my concern is to show that they are related to history. Bennett indicates that there can be no general solution to the relation between literature and history. His argument is that literature and history must be studied in their own particularity, contingency and variability in the context of their variable and mutable relations to the social practices with which they are temporarily co-existent. In his discussion of the literature/couplet, he refers to Widdowson who poses the following options; whether to place literary works in the historical context of their moment of production in order to understand them better, thus privileging literature over history, or to read literature as a form of historical knowledge as a particular mode of access to the past, thus privileging history over literature. Between the two options, this study is inclined to follow the second option which privileges history over literature, although it cannot be denied that literature and history can exchange places with regard to the functions assigned them of supplying either the object of analysis or the method of study (Bennett 1990: 41 - 76). As the relations between literature and history are rather complex, views to be pursued are the ones which help to compare and contrast literature with history in order to facilitate the essence of this study.

1.5 METHODOLOGY:

The researcher obtained information from the relics, documents and oral testimonies. Relics refer to text books which deal with customs and history of Lesotho. Documents covered records, letters and court proceedings from the government archives and Morija Museum and Archives. Oral testimonies were drawn from chiefs, historians, curators and the playwright. The three sources were selected to evaluate the authenticity and trustworthiness of the information from various angles. One major objective was to compare and weigh information from the three sources in order to get a more comprehensive picture. It was also in relation to the view that history may not turn out to be the whole truth as it is interpreted and narrated by different people.

Information obtained from the three sources differed in its content and interpretation, and it therefore needed critical analysis before its acceptance. For example Damane and Sanders (1974) write ".....Sebueng, after many arguments and quarrels...had gone back to her father, Sempe Nkwebe." Chief Lehlwenya, as historian, disputes the statement that Sempe Nkwebe was the father of Mmaseeiso. He maintains Nkwebe was her brother. This is also supported by the Leselinyana of 1926 which says that Sempe Nkwebe was a brother to Mmaseeiso, because in the discussions held at Matsieng concerning the seniority of Mmaseeiso, Sempe addressed her as his elder sister. Sempe indicated that he did not know much about the marriage of his sister Mmaseeiso because their father, Nkwebe, did not consult or even inform him about marriage arrangements as he regarded him as a child. In this context it shows that historical texts cannot be said to be the truth. Truth can therefore be said to be the action as it happens, but once reported the real

truth is interpreted and therefore open to distortion. Therefore the authenticity of the above sources is subject to criticism.

Information gathered from oral testimonies was not from eyewitnesses and was therefore not original. Some interviewees learnt the oral history verbally from their elders while others read it in texts. Oral testimony from Lehlwenya covers a wide range of chieftainship affairs. He also criticized some of the books for distorting history and omitting some crucial events. Interviews were of great importance as they allowed questions and explanations unlike documents and texts. The only criticism is that these are secondary testimonies.

With regard to documents, they provided primary information. They can be said to be authentic in the sense that they contain information recorded by eyewitnesses and participants. For instance, letters between the paramount chief and the colonial administrators in 1926-27 are information which can be relied upon, as it has no explanation or interpretation, it is still as it was in 1926. Again the court proceedings of 1926 held at Matsieng which were recorded in Leselinyana have not been changed. Although these court proceedings are worth recommendation, they still have shortcomings in that the reporter also gave his personal feelings and judgements in his report. Therefore it cannot be said that the report is the truth, rather that it is an interpretation of the real events. Of the three sources, documentary information was more reliable and convincing as it displays contemporary eyewitness testimony.

RELICS

This source covers history books, novels, theses and articles which deal with struggle for power, succession, polygamy and levirate custom. The readings cover the period from the reign of Moshweshwe I until the reign of Seeiso. The texts provide broad information with regard to customary laws and they also cite some historical events in which certain historic persons were affected by the customary laws as well as the problems and solutions that resulted. For instance some of the texts give an account of Griffith's life; his birth, his wives and his alignment with the Roman Catholic church. The texts also relate the core of this study which is the feud of succession between his sons, Seeiso of Mmaseeiso and Bereng of Mmabereng, which remained unresolved until after Griffith's death in 1939, when Seeiso took office. The historical information in these texts is of great importance in comparing and contrasting Khaketla's dramas with the actual historical events.

ARCHIVAL DOCUMENTS

These documents were read in order to check for their reliability as a repository of past events, whether the records were written by eyewitnesses as the events took place or shortly after they had happened.

These archival materials were obtained from the National University of Lesotho library in the government archives section and the Morija Museum and Archives and from the church newspaper Leselinyana.

The government archives provided more information concerning the succession issue between Seeiso and Bereng from as far back as 1899 when Mmabereng was married to replace her sister Mmaseeiso until 1940 after the death of Seeiso. There are files which contain the letters of correspondence between the paramount chief Griffith and colonial administrators, Griffith and Seeiso, as well as Seeiso and colonial administrators. These are specific letters about the succession issue which cover the period from 15 March 1926 until December 1927. They relate the events from the day Seeiso and Bereng were sent to Maseru by their father to appear before the Resident Commissioner with a letter that states Bereng was senior to Seeiso. These letters give a detailed explanation of Griffith's decision to relegate Seeiso in the paramount chief's court, and also the dissatisfaction of Seeiso about that judgement. Furthermore they relate the discontent of the colonial administration and its refusal to acknowledge Griffith's judgement. There are documents of 1939 which show how the sons of Moshweshwe unanimously chose Seeiso as the paramount chief, not Bereng, although Seeiso's reign was short-lived.

The Leselinyana(1926-1928) newspaper in its column of Lesotho current affairs, highlighted chieftainship matters. It covered Seeiso's struggle from 1926 to 1928 when the succession issue was left unattended. One fascinating event is the recorded court proceedings at Matsieng where over 70 sons of Moshweshwe and councillors met to solve the seniority issue between Seeiso and Bereng. The conversation was recorded live, with questions and answers from 29 September to 11 November 1926. The newspaper also covered the appointment of Seeiso by principal chiefs in 1939, as successor to Griffith, his crowning and death in 1940.

INTERVIEWS

Interviews were conducted among people who were deemed knowledgeable about the history of Lesotho, especially chieftainship affairs. Different people were chosen in order to get their views and knowledge concerning the dispute of Griffith's succession, whether they differed or had something in common.

The researcher interviewed B.M. Khaketla - the playwright, P. Lehlwenya - chief and historian (Mahlwenyeng), Dr. L.B.B.J. Machobane - historian and senior lecturer at the National University of Lesotho, S.J. Gill (Morojele) - author and curator at Morija Museum, N. Motsetsela - assistant curator at Morija Museum and P.M. Bereng a historian and researcher at the Institute of Extra-Mural Studies of the National University of Lesotho.

The author B.M. Khaketla was asked to comment on the relationship between his books and historical events, that is, whether his primary concern was with the historical truth or art of drama writing, and whether there is a link between his books and history. He was also asked to relate the dispute over the chiefly succession between Seeiso and Bereng as he understood it. He was also asked to comment on his objective in writing the dramas.

B.M. Khaketla, indicated that he had heard about the problem of seniority between Seeiso and Bereng, although he could not give a detailed explanation of the matter. However, he pointed out that his dramas are influenced by feuds of chiefly succession. He pointed out that he was not concerned with the logical truth of the historical events but the style of writing a drama. That is why, in Bulane, the protagonist, Bulane, escapes death in an

unconvincing manner, while Mohapi and his councillors die a miserable death. This is contrary to historical sources which indicate that Seeiso died after having been at Agatha's house while according to the plays it seems as if Bereng was the one who died at Agatha's house. What Khaketla follows in his writing is the norm that in drama the capable hero becomes victorious in the end while the villain suffers. That is why Mohapi, as an antagonist, is killed by his own trap while Bulane, a protagonist who is customarily the legal heir, survives the plot.

Secondly, the playwright pointed out that one of his major objectives was to expose the effects of polygamy as detrimental to social life. In his view had Matete not indulged in polygamy, he would not have succumbed to Malokobe's lie, and therefore no chiefly dispute could have resulted. In the sequel **Bulane** had Bulane not opted for levirate custom and instead listened to his wife, peace and stability would have reigned in his family. He further pointed out that although some of the characters in his books can be linked to historical persons, others cannot as they are just fictitious and used to shape the structure of the drama.

When asked about why most of his texts refer to history, he indicated that literature as a work of art must have credibility. Literature is a reflection of reality; therefore it must address the human experiences and try to pose solutions to certain human conflicts or social problems. He indicated that the contents in his texts are his views and feelings about the events of the past and life in general. He further indicated that his writing was, among others, inspired by the lack of justice or fairness in this world. He highlighted his experience as a teacher, how he moved from one

school to another in most cases because of the wickedness of other people. For instance, the denial of principalship by an Afrikaner officer, his dismissal as a principal at Charterson and his unfair expulsion from Basutoland High School. He was also disturbed by the ill-treatment of blacks by the Europeans while teaching in the Republic of South Africa. These are some of the factors which urged him to write about the political and social injustices through literature. He therefore based his texts on historical experiences in which he tried to expose some of the human follies which ought to be done away with in our society.

The rest of the interviewees were asked to relate the life of Griffith, his reign and the conflict of chiefly succession between Bereng and Seeiso. They were asked how they came to know about the episode, whether they were involved or were told by others or read about it in books. All of them indicated that they were not involved as they were either too young or not yet born. Some said that they were told by their elders while others got their information from history books and documents.

Lehlwenya, born in 1917, of the Bafokeng tribe, said that his father was one of Griffith's councillors at Matsieng. He grew up at Thaba-Tseka under the care of chief Ntaote. Later he went to Qacha's Nek to be under the care of chief Makgaola. It was during those years that he learned about chieftainship affairs from the elders and senior chiefs. As an adult, he returned to live at his home, Mahlwenyeng, a village of about 5km from Matsieng, where he also learned about chiefs from his grandmother. He trained as a teacher; while at the same time was deeply engaged in the history of Lesotho. Later he became teachers' representative in the National Council during the 1940s. In our

discussion he was able to relate the events surrounding Griffith's life, from as far back as 1900, when Griffith was still at Phamong in the Mohale's Hoek district. He gave an account of the bitter relationship between Griffith and Mmaseeiso, as well as Seeiso's struggle for power from 1926-27 until he gained the position of paramount chief in 1939 followed by his death in 1940.

Motsetsela, assistant curator of the Morija Museum Archives was born in 1922. He indicated that he knew Seeiso. He first met Seeiso in 1939 while studying at Morija Training College. He knew Seeiso as a soccer player. Seeiso played for Diphamola Football Club which in 1933 played in the national finals in Maseru. Motsetsela said that Seeiso loved horses and horse racing. He used to go and watch football, riding on his horse. Motsetsela also spoke about the succession dispute which was told to him by those who had witnessed it. He also indicated that he had learnt about the succession dispute as he read the records in the archives and newspapers like Leselinyana.

Machobane and Gill indicated that they gathered the information from documents, history books and interviews. Gill, who spent a lot of time teaching at Mapholaneng High School, said that he learned about Seeiso from the Batlokwa at Mokgotlong who used to complain bitterly about the placing of Seeiso among them. They saw it as something which belittled their chiefdom. The Batlokwa told him that Seeiso was hardly ever in his office.

In our discussion with Dr. Machobane, he described Griffith as a traditionalist who, although converted to Christianity still indulged in polygamy. For example, Mmaseeiso, Tsebo and Agatha remained his wives until his death although Mmabereng was formally declared the only wife as she was

the only one he married in a Christian way. Machobane related of how Griffith's settled among the Baphuthi tribe whom he then harassed as they protested against him being placed over their chiefdom. He also related Griffith's ascension to the throne in 1913, the succession dispute between Seeiso and Bereng and its resolution in 1939-40.

CHAPTER 2

2.1 KHAKETLA'S LIFE AND WORKS.

Khaketla of the Bakwena of Maiyane was born in 1913 at Makgalong in the district of Qacha's Nek. He started his primary education at Ha Souru in 1920, the same year that his father died. In 1924 his mother sent him to another primary school at Ha Ramohlakwana, in Matatiele, where he stayed with the principal. He completed his primary education in 1929. In 1930 he went to Mariazell Teachers' Training College, where he completed his studies in 1932 with distinction in P.L.111.

In 1933 he went to Durban where he worked as a 'kitchen boy'. He later taught at St Patrick's in Bloemfontein which was headed by Lingalo. He became the vice-principal there, and spent six years teaching at this school. He continued his studies at a Junior Certificate level which he passed in 1936. In 1939 he studied for senior certificate. In the middle of that year he left for Durban where he worked as a typist for a herbalist known as Alexander. He successfully passed his matriculation examinations, and in 1940 he began teaching at Heilbron. At Heilbron he taught with Anton Muziwakhe Lembede who, after obtaining his L.L.B. degree, went to Johannesburg to work as a lawyer. The year 1940 was a heartbreaking one for Khaketla. On 23-02-1940 his sister Martha Mmanoosi died. Within two weeks his mother Elizabeth Sekamotho had passed away too. She died on 02-03-1940. The worst part of it was that Khaketla could not attend her funeral as he had just returned from the burial of his sister. In the same year he resumed his affair with Ntshediseng (Mmasetjhele) who was, by then in Bloemfontein.

Khaketla returned to Lesotho in 1941 to teach at the Roman Catholic School managed by Father Blair. After a few months he was fired from the school because the priest told him that he was a radical and his teaching incited radicalism. Khaketla appealed to Director of Education, O.B. Bull, on the grounds that he was neither given three months notice nor any salary on his dismissal. He asked for assistance from the District Commissioner of Qacha's Nek, E.C. Butler. The appeal was in his favour. He therefore served the three months notice up to September 1941. O.B. Bull advised him to apply to a government school at Mohale's Hoek which was headed by Mmusu Thobileng. He fortunately got the post. But when he arrived the principal regrettably informed him that the post was meant for a female teacher.

He went to teach at Ficksburg and he enrolled with the University of South Africa for a B.A. degree, which he completed in 1942. His major subjects were Sesotho and Political Studies. While still at Ficksburg he had invitations from Bethlehem offering him a job as principal of a school. He left for Bethlehem where to his disappointment, he was denied the post. The reason for his disappointment came from one Afrikaner officer. The officer claimed that one of the teachers at that school was suitable for the post therefore there was no need to offer it to Khaketla. Khaketla left for Botshabelo where he completed his B.A. Degree courses while still teaching.

In the years 1943-1945, he taught at a high school at Kroonstad. In January 1946 he married Mmasetjhele, who was also a teacher. They both went to Lesotho where they taught at Basutoland High School until 1950. During the years 1946-50 Khaketla indicates that he had an urge to write books which

were based on historical events. His objective was that his work should be credible to his readers.

Moshoeshoe le Baruti (1947) is a drama about the arrival of the Paris Evangelical Missionary Society in Lesotho in 1833. This play can be said to be historical in the sense that the setting, actions and the names of the characters are based on real persons who were around when the missionaries arrived.

Meokho ea Thabo (1951) is a novel about youths who have graduated at the teacher training college. When working, they decide to disobey their parents who have chosen marriage partners for them. But later on they succumb to their parents' wishes and end up in a happy marriage.

Tholoana tsa Sethepu (1954) & **Bulane** (1958) These plays are about the succession dispute between Bulane and Mohapi. Bulane is reinstated as the legal heir, and Mohapi plots his death. Unfortunately, Mohapi dies.

Lipshamathe (1954) is a book of miscellaneous poems.

Mosali a Nkhola (1960) is a novel about the ritual murder by an educated chief who is misled by his traditional wife. The chief is imprisoned and sent to the gallows.

Khaketla also wrote grammar books **Thapholiso ea Sesotho** and **Sebopeho sa Sesotho**, which are of great importance to both students and teachers in the teaching of Sesotho.

In 1950 Khaketla was expelled from Basutoland High School. His story is that one teacher, Mohapelwa went on study leave in England and his place was filled by one retired teacher. When Mohapelwa came back Khaketla was dismissed. His protest against this action was in vain. His argument was that the teacher who replaced Mohapelwa was the one whose contract had to be terminated as he (Khaketla) was employed on a permanent basis. Khaketla believes that the Deputy Director of Education, Greed Newton, was behind his expulsion because they had once quarrelled at a synod meeting of the Anglican Church in Maseru.

He was sent to Butha-Buthe district in 1951 by the Resident Commissioner to act as clerk to F.G. Muirhead, the assistant commissioner. Muirhead pointed out that they had the same educational qualifications, university degrees, therefore he would rather promote Khaketla to be his deputy. After a few weeks, Khaketla left for South Africa because he preferred teaching to working in an office. He became the principal at Charterston High School at Nigel where he succeeded Dr. M.O.M. Seboni who left for the University of Fort Hare. He stayed there as principal from 1951-52 when he was forced to resign for two reasons. One was that he was accused of being a foreigner and therefore could not be the principal; One of the teachers by the name of Mrs. Thwala incited his dismissal. She was backed by Mr. Nyathi who was by then the Inspector of schools. He was replaced by N.N. Ndebele. The second reason was that he had always wanted to be closer to his home. He went back to Lesotho to teach at Basutoland High School again.

At this school Khaketla found Ntsu Mokgehle, the leader of the Basutoland African Congress, politicising the nation. Khaketla discovered that there were Indians who were members of the Basutoland African Congress. He objected to their participation as he labelled them opportunists who wanted to use the Basotho people as stepping stones. Khaketla later suggested to Mokgehle and other patriots that they should launch a newspaper which would help to spread their message instead of relying on weekend meetings which slowed the spread of political education. Khaketla made inquiries pertaining to the costs of such a publication. They agreed upon the payment of ten pounds each in order to cover the costs of the newspaper. They were Ntsu Mokgehle, Makalo Khaketla, Dr. Maile Maema, a member of the Basutoland Progressive Association and Zephaniah Mothopeng, a South African teacher who had been expelled from Orlando High School for engaging in politics. He was then teaching at the same school with Khaketla and Mokgehle.

In November 1954 Mohlabani newspaper published its first issue in Lesotho. It drew a lot of interest from different categories of people. Its main objective was to criticise the British administration for its unequal and unfair treatment of the Basotho people. After the publication of the second issue in 1955, Khaketla and Mokgehle were warned by D. Wilson, the Maseru District Commissioner, that they would be dismissed from their posts if they continued to produce the newspaper. They ignored the warning and produced another issue in March 1955, which resulted in their summary dismissal from the school. They challenged the matter in court where they were represented by Oliver Tambo as their lawyer. The court ruled that they be given three months' salary as notice. Khaketla and Mokgehle felt that they would rather forfeit their status as teachers than give up their programme of political

education, which they felt benefitted, the nation. The paper had a strong influence on the Basotho as an organ of political education. After dismissal, Khaketla dedicated most of his time to Mohlabani which continued to castigate the British administration for all its errors. During 1955-56, Mohlabani became the mouthpiece of the Basotho in criticising the report by Sir Henry Moore, who had been asked by the British government to review its administrative structures of Lesotho. His recommendations were against the establishment of a body which would give Basotho a chance to make their own laws. Khaketla is quoted by Machobane as having said that B.A.C. was fighting for the establishment of a parliament whose laws would be enacted by the king and the parliament together. In the 1957 issue of Mohlabani, Khaketla stated that a chief is the chief because of the people. His view was that if the chieftaincy continued to be unresponsive to the needs of the nation, it must be eliminated. This view is also contained in his play, **Bulane**, which is about the reinstatement of Bulane, the son of chief Matete. Khaketla became so influential that the paramount chief sometimes sent for him when dealing with complicated administrative issues during the years 1957-58. It did not, therefore, come as a surprise when Khaketla was elected vice-president of the Basutoland African Congress in 1957, although he was not a member.

(Khaketla 1971: 16-33 & Machobane 1991: 102-110 & 188-260)

In 1960, Khaketla was elected to the legislative council as an executive member, but later resigned for personal reasons. In 1961, Khaketla, together with some of the ex-members of Basutoland African Congress, formed a new party known as Basutoland Freedom Party and he became its president. In 1962, his party merged with the Marematlou Freedom Party and Khaketla became its vice-president.

In 1964, Khaketla was among the delegation which went to London. It was composed of representatives of the major political parties and chiefs to discuss the constitutional report. In 1965 his party contested the elections and won 4 seats. Khaketla was later appointed as the chairman of the University's senate and a member of King Moshweshwe II's privy council (Machobane 1991).

In 1970 Khaketla led his party in the national elections and won one constituency. The elections were nullified by the then prime minister chief Leabua Jonathan, who seized power and detained some of the opposition leaders. Khaketla protested bitterly against the house-arrest of King Moshweshwe II. His protest was in vain as the constitution was suspended. In 1971 Khaketla's book Lesotho 1970: An African Coup under the Microscope which related the atrocities of chief Leabua's government was published in London (Khaketla 1971). Khaketla has been a leading figure in his party till the so-called national elections of 1985 in which he protested bitterly against the way they were run. Those were the elections in which the ruling party won all the constituencies uncontested. As a reward Khaketla was sent to prison in order to silence him. In January 1986 when the military staged a coup d'etat, Khaketla saw light when he was given a ministerial post direct from prison. In 1990 Khaketla together with other ministers, was relieved of his duties. He returned to politics where he was chosen as a vice-president of the Marematlou Freedom Party. He dedicated his time in preparing his party for the 1993 national elections. The elections were won by Basotho Congress Party, which won all the seats in parliament. He is at the moment still a politician and spends his time in his Marema-tlou Freedom Party office.

2.2 PRELIMINARY STUDIES OF KHAKETLA'S WORKS

This dissertation focuses on the treatment of Tholoana tsa Sethepu and Bulane as interpretations of particular historical events which occurred in Lesotho, although they cannot be labelled historical dramas. They are different from historical dramas such as Moshoeshoe le Baruti (Khaketla: 1947) and Tau ya ha Zulu (Lesoro 1982). In historical texts the characters have the names of the historical persons, and most of the discussions and actions are believed to have taken place in the past.

The two dramas in focus have already been treated from the formalist point of view, but not within the biographical-historical approach. For example Van der Poll (1981) analyses Bulane according to the method suggested by Levitt in A Structural Approach to the Analysis of Drama in which he regards the scene as the basic unit in dramatic structure. The concern in this method is how scenes as units build up the structural pattern of the drama. Van der Poll, in his analysis, discusses the plot, not the context around which the dramas were conceived. He treats exposition, development of the conflict and the resolution. His analysis, to a certain extent helps me to look critically at Khaketla's plot basing my thesis on the historical background. Thus to consider whether the playwright has convincingly presented these past experiences. For instance, when we look at his exposition, are we captured by the way he has introduced his characters and the conflict? Van der Poll's feeling is that Khaketla has succeeded in capturing the readers' minds in his introduction as he informs us of the crisis from the onset. From the historical point of view, it can, therefore, be said that he has managed to

reflect the tense atmosphere which brought the change in the succession order of Griffith's sons. The playwright chose to deal with the sensitive issue of the illegitimacy of Bulane which became the basis for demotion of Seeiso. His discussion of the development shows Khaketla's skill as a playwright in that he keeps his audience in suspense until the climax of the drama. Van der Poll's approval of Khaketla's development can also be taken to be his success in depicting events which occurred in the paramountcy in 1926 which led to the culmination of the succession dispute.

Van der Poll (1986) makes a brief summary and critical evaluation of 46 Sesotho dramas. His view is that Tholoana tsa Sethepu deals with the problems caused by polygamous marriages. He appreciates Khaketla's depiction of the characters through the use of character-revealing dialogue and soliloquies which reflect their conflict. He admires the treatment of suspense, which is maintained until the climax is reached. He criticises Khaketla for the long conclusion after the climax. He treats Bulane as a sequel to Tholoana tsa Sethepu which deals with the problem of succession in polygamous marriages. Van der Poll shows his admiration of Khaketla's style in Bulane. He praises Khaketla's description of the stage, his treatment of tension and denouement. His criticism is that the play ends with an unmotivated cheap surprise, where Bulane escapes the plan laid by Mohapi and his conspirators. Even in this analysis, the formalist approach has been applied. The critic concentrated on the drama as a work of art, looking at its structure and not its historical context which is what I hope to pursue in this study. Van der Poll, like other critics of these two dramas seems to be misled by the title Tholoana tsa Sethepu (fruits of polygamy). They believe that these dramas are about the effects of polygamy. In essence when we take the relegation of Bulane, it

is due to Malokobe's fabrication not polygamy. Matete had no problem with Bulane and Direko or either did he favour Mohapi at the expense of Bulane. This confusion is caused by somebody outside the family who fails to control his lust for other men's wives.

Even in his critical overview Van der Poll has not touched on the historical events which led to the writing of the plays. When it comes to the art of writing drama I agree with Van der Poll that the playwright has done his best especially with the description of the stage which portrays the traditional milieu. This setting links the plays with traditional life of the Basotho and proves that the source of Khaketla's inspiration is based on their experiences.

Lenake (1967) mentions the following as common themes in Sesotho literature: the disintegration of tribal society, tribal history, superstition, folktales, polygamy and problems related to love affairs and the impact that western civilisation has had on Africans in general. He places Tholoana tsa Sethepu and Bulane under the theme of "social problems" since they deal with polygamy and extra-marital relationships. Lenake dismisses Khaketla's depiction of chief Matete as unconvincing and unreasonable in that he believes Malokobe's lies without making thorough investigation of the defamation.

In another paper Lenake (1968) briefly deals with the themes of the two dramas. His view is that the dramas deal with polygamy and its effects on chieftainship. He is more interested in what the work of art holds for the reader rather than what underlies the work of art, its historical background. In the present study, although the problems of succession and levirate are

common issues, their treatment is specific in that it deals with particular people at a specific time. The characters in the dramas are treated as symbolic, as representations of certain historical persons who were involved in conflict over succession and levirate.

Lenake, like Van der Poll, feels that polygamy and its effects are the themes in these plays. Lenake does not explain these themes and how are they embodied in the plays thus he mentions them only in passing. His analysis is thin in that it concentrates on the themes, on which he does not expand. I welcome his critical characterisation of Matete, a weak character who fails to reason like a chief. Revenge is the theme which dominates in these plays. That is so, because had it not been Malokobe's initiative to defame Direko, peace and stability would still have reigned. Even in the sequel, Malokobe spearheads the assassination of Bulane; he pursues his revenge until his death.

Gérard (1971) has written a short biography of B.M. Khaketla, which covers his education, his life as a teacher and as a politician. He does not comment much on Tholoana tsa Sethepu, which he says is better than Moshoeshoe le Baruti. He goes on to quote Beuchat who says Tholoana tsa Sethepu is very interesting and has a powerful climax although the conclusion is too long. Concerning Bulane he says nothing except listing it as one of Khaketla's works. Gérard does not link any of Khaketla's text to historical event which could have inspired the author. Gérard's does not analyze the plays, he simply mentions them in passing.

Maake (1992) briefly discusses the contextual aspects of South Sotho literature and its growth. He states that the development of Southern Sotho

literature seems to indicate marked stages of metamorphosis. These stages are the genesis at the missionary presses, the evolution of literary genres from early missionary works, the beginning of divergence and a period of convergence. He places Tholoana tsa Sethepu and Bulane under "the beginning of divergence" stage which he dates as being between 1940 and 1970. In this paper Maake's major concern is the publishing of African Languages literature, including the problems which determined its origin and development. Maake's contextual aspects open one's mind in connection with the development of Sesotho literature. It gives one an opportunity to link literature with the times at which it was written. His periodisation of Sesotho literature also helps one to notice certain similarities in literature from a particular period. It makes it possible to detect how time affects our literature. Maake writes that the 1940s and 1950s saw a remarkable growth in drama in the literature of Lesotho. It is not amazing to find that Khaketla wrote three dramas within this period. Khaketla, like other writers, had the feeling to express and address the social problems of his time through the art of literature. Maake, like Gérard, does not analyze these plays. He only mentions them as part of the literature written during the period from 1940 to 1970. The contextual aspects he discusses are related to publishing conditions, while my study is concerned with the link between the dramas and history of the royal family. He mentions the period in which the two dramas were published but does not treat them as reflections of history.

2.3 SESOTHO CUSTOMS

2.3.1. SUCCESSION

Succession to the throne among the Basotho chiefs is not consistently applied to various social factors. The following paragraphs will illustrate with examples the different procedures which were applied by the Basotho to determine the succession.

The first one is Law 1 of the Laws of Lerothodi which reads:

- (i) Tlhahlamano boreng e tla ba ho ya ka tokelo ya tlhaho hoo ke hore, ngwana ya tswetsweng pele e motona wa mosadi ya nyetsweng pele;

The succession to the chieftainship shall be by right of birth: that is, the first born male child of the first wife married;

- (ii) Ha eba mosadi wa pele a se na ngwana e motona, teng ngwana ya tswetsweng pele e motona wa mosadi wa pele; e motona wa mosadi ya hlhahlamang eo lenyalong e tla ba yena morena.

If the first wife has no male issue then the first born male child of the next wife married in succession shall be the chief.

- (iii) Athe ha eba morena a ka shwa a sa siye ngwana e motona borena bo tla wela ho e motona ya latelang ka ho ya ka tlhahlamano ya matlo.

Provided that if a chief dies leaving no male issue the chieftainship shall devolve upon the male following according to the succession of houses (Government Gazette 1959: 5 & Duncan 1960: 43).

SUCCESSION IS THUS THROUGH THE MALE LINE ONLY.

- The first clause applied to Letsie I, the son of Moshweshwe I, who was the first son, of the first wife, Mmamohato. Moshweshwe I announced at a *pitso*

on 18 January, 1870 that Letsie I would be his successor and Letsie I became the paramount chief after Moshweshwe I.

- The second clause applied to Lerothodi, the son of Letsie I and Letsie II, the son of Lerothodi. Letsie I did not have any male issue in his house of Mmasenate except a girl Senate. In the second house of Mmalerothodi, there was Lerothodi, who was eligible for succession. But Lerothodi had two impediments which nearly barred him from succeeding his father. One was the arrangement made by Moshweshwe I where Senate was married to Josefa, her cousin, the son of Molapo. The rationale behind this arrangement was that the male child born of that union would succeed Letsie I. Motshwene became the offspring of that arrangement. In one pitso Motshwene was shown to the public by Moshweshwe I who held him in his hands. Some sources indicate that the major reason for this type of the union was that Moshweshwe I did not want the succession to leave the first house. Some informants pointed out that Moshweshwe I doubted that Lerothodi was Letsie I's proper son. Another obstacle was that his father, Letsie I, wanted Maama, his son from the fourth house, to be his successor. The story says that Letsie I was not pleased with his marriage to Mmalerothodi. The reason was that he was suspected of being the one who impregnated Mmalerothodi outside marriage. This is the allegation which Letsie I denied although he married her. Letsie I favoured Maama because his marriage to Maama's mother was arranged procedurally by his father, Moshweshwe I. When Letsie I was asked to nominate a successor he indicated that there was still time, but he died before he could appoint a successor. This being the situation, the colonial government resolved to approve Lerothodi as the rightful heir to the throne. Lerothodi was crowned a

paramount chief in 1891. His enemies used to call him the chief of the white man as they said that he had been crowned by them.

Letsie II succeeded Lerothodi because in the first house of Mmaletshabisa there was no male. In the second house Letsie II was the first male and therefore qualified to ascend the throne. His nomination was made in the National Council in Maseru on 28 August 1905. His succession was officially announced to the public in February 1906 after the approval of the High Commissioner (Machobane 1991: 101).

-The third clause in part applied to Griffith's ascension to the throne, although his case is unique as will be shown in the paragraphs to follow. The complication of the matter started with his brother Letsie I who dissociated himself from his three legal wives. He had an affair with his grandmother Mmamojela. Mmamojela was one of Letsie I's youngest wives. During their cohabitation, Letsie II and Mmamojela had a son by the name of Mojela. In an attempt to get Letsie II back to his wives Lerothodi, his father talked to him several times about his negligence to his legal wives but in vain. At one stage Lerothodi sent his armed men to Dikgwele to bring Letsie before him for disciplinary action. There was a fight in which Letsie II ran away. He hid himself in a cave where he was caught by Qamako and some other men who brought him to Lerothodi to be reprimanded. But still, Letsie II did not change his attitude; he refused to stay with his legal wives.

- Lerothodi appealed to the colonial administration for assistance but Letsie would not leave Mmamojela.

Letsie's first wife also appealed to the High Commissioner about her status as chieftainess which she had been denied because of her husband's behaviour.

The High Commissioner referred her to the National Council where she declined to pursue the matter further. Against this background Letsie fell ill and died at Camp Runnymede Farm - Zastron in Orange Free State at 8:30 on the 28 January 1913. He left Tau, a young lad from one of his houses. Tau was to succeed him as a paramount chief.

After his death Griffith was asked to follow the normal procedure of acting as a regent for Tau, but he declined. He said that if a regent was required there were many junior sons of Letsie I, such as chiefs Shwaepane, Mojela and Marakabei who could act as regents. During these discussions Tau died mysteriously. Griffith was asked to raise seeds in his brother's wives, but he refused. He said that he was a Christian and therefore could not practice the levirate custom. He even threatened to go to Phamong which was his ward because the matter had dragged on for so long. Some chiefs suggested he be installed as the paramount chief. Most of the chiefs agreed to the suggestion except Jonathan Molapo. After some time he acceded and the decision was finally unanimous. Griffith asked if he was required to sit on the chair "with both of his buttocks". He further asked whether the succession of the Basutoland paramountcy would in future be followed through his house. His request was agreed to by the chiefs. In this case the law of succession was breached because Griffith refused to act as a regent. Secondly he declined to raise seeds in his brothers houses. Therefore Griffith's ascension to throne was not in compliance with the laws and customs of the Basotho.

-Seeiso succeeded Griffith. His succession will be discussed in detail in Chapter 3.

Apart from Law I of Lerothodi mentioned above there are some other options which are followed when determining the succession.

(i) **Seniority of the Kwena wives;** Kwena wives are automatically senior to wives from other clans, regardless of the order of their marriage. For instance, if the Kwena wife is married as the second wife, she becomes the senior wife and mother of the heir. This was the case with chieftainess Mmalwela, the wife of chief Peete, principal chief of Matshekgeng. Mmalwela was the daughter of Letsie I. Peete married her after he had married Mmaleeto, who was a commoner. Mmaleeto's son, Leeto, was the first born of the first wife, Mitchell, the son of Mmalwela was the first born in the second house. But Mitchell succeeded his father as the principal chief (Jingoes 1975: 140).

(ii) **Seyantlo;** This happens when a wife dies without bearing children. Her parents may be asked to provide another girl to substitute for her sister, occupying her status in the order of the marriage. If her sister occupied the first house, she would also occupy it; therefore her son would be the successor to his father's chieftainship. This custom happened with Mmatheko Makgaola, the wife of the principal chief of Qacha's Nek, who went *seyantlo* after Mmamahabe was married. Although she came after Mmamahabe, she occupied the position of her former sister. Her son, Theko, became the principal chief.

(iii) **Mmasetjhaba;** the mother of the nation. This is the woman who is married in order to beget an heir in the family. She automatically becomes senior to others who were married before her. In some cases she is called the

mother of the nation because the chief's subjects contribute cattle for her *bohadi*. In Leribe Mmajoele was the first wife of Molapo, in the technical sense, she was given to him just *ho ikotlolla letheke* "to stretch his waist". When Molapo married Mmajonathan she was regarded as the mother of the nation who would bear an heir for the family. This custom is also found among the Bafokeng of the former Bophuthatswana. Coertze (1987) states that chief Mokgatle had a first wife by the name of Mmamokatse who bore him only one girl. His second wife was Mmasekete whose sons were Sekete and Kegakilwe. The third wife came from the line of his mother's brothers. This was the wife who was called the mother of the nation, from whom the heir was expected to be born. She became the mother of the nation because the whole chiefdom had contributed cattle for her *bohadi*.

(iv) **Attachment;** this is the custom where the junior wives are attached to the first three houses which are said to be senior houses. If, for instance, the first wife does not have a male child she may ask her husband to marry a certain girl who will be attached to her house. Children born of that junior wife are said to belong to the first wife, they are her children. Therefore an heir may come from such a wife and succeed his father without dispute. Damane & Sanders (1974) write that in 1925-28 the sons of Mojela had a case where Molapo from the sixth house claimed that he was senior to Lerothodi from the fifth house because his mother's house was attached to the senior house. In a Sesotho court this was an acceptable practice and Molapo could have won it, but the judicial committee of the colonial Privy Council overruled it and based its judgement on the logical order of the families. Coertze(1987) on the same topic says that Mokgatle's junior houses were attached to the first three houses. One fascinating incident was when

Mokgatle's wife, the mother of the nation, who had only girls, brought her sister to her husband as was the custom, in the hope that she would bear him a successor. Luckily she had the only son who was called Tumagole.

Above all these factors Basotho believe that "*ngwana ke wa dikgomo*" - A child belongs to the cattle this means that any child who is born of a mother whose bohadi has been paid, belongs to the family of the husband.

Some of the complications raised above are reflected in Tholoana tsa Sethepu, which reflect Griffith's feud of succession. Matete's argument is that Bulane is not his biological son and therefore, he cannot succeed him. But Majara indicates that Direko, Bulane's mother is senior and has been married according to the Basotho custom. That is Matete paid Direko's bohadi and was therefore accepted as the mother of the nation. Her son, Bulane, was therefore a legitimate heir to the throne.

2.3.2. LEVIRATE

The levirate custom is another custom which allows wedlock in different ways. In Sesotho a woman is married into a family of the husband not to her husband alone. She therefore becomes part of the family. She belongs to her husband's people. That is why, even after the death of her husband, she is still expected to increase the family of her husband (Duncan 1960: 34). Levirate happens when a husband dies before he has had children. His younger brother may be asked to raise seeds in the dead brother's name, provided the two people involved agree to it. If, for instance, the wife declines, another man would be chosen or she would be left to make her own choice. One historical

event of this nature is the case of chieftainess Mmapeete, the wife of Motlwang. When Motlwang died, he had no children. According to the custom, Mokotedi was to raise seeds in Motlwang house, but Mmapeete, his sister-in-law, was opposed to him. Mokotedi suggested that Kgojane, from Ntsane's family, who was also a relative, should take care of Mmapeete. But Mmapeete declined instead she chose a man from outside her husband's clan. She chose a Nguni man by the name of Mmualle, who fathered Peete. Peete was accepted by those of Mokotedi's house as their child because his mother was married to them on the basis that the cattle had been paid for her marriage (Ellenberger 1956:102). It should be noted that levirate did not only apply to wives whose husband died without having children. It applied even to those who had children, provided the two parties involved consented.

Among the chiefs levirate was a common practice in a unique way as they were polygamous. In most cases chiefs married even at an old age. It was therefore not surprising that they married girls of their children's age or even younger than their first born. Chiefs sometimes placed their sons under the care of the younger wives. *Hore ba ikotlolle matheka* "to stretch their waists." That is they encouraged automatic levirate custom as their sons felt attracted to their father's wives. Letsie II is an outstanding example of this practice. He became so attached to Bookgolane, one of his grandfather's junior wives that he forgot about his legal wives. All attempts that were made to get him back to his wives as indicated earlier, failed. This was also the case with Seeiso and Bereng who wanted to take care of Agatha, their father's junior wife, as it will be explained later.

Going back to the texts under review, the levirate custom occurs in **Bulane**. Bulane and Mohapi are at odds with each other because of Pulane, their father's third wife. Mohapi's contention is that his father, Matete, had instructed him to take care of Pulane. On the other hand, Bulane feels that, according to the custom, he must take Pulane into his custody.

2.3.3 TLHALO (DIVORCE)

In order to explain *tlhalo* it is necessary to define *lenyalo* (marriage) in terms of Sesotho custom.

Laws of Lerothodi state that:

- (1) Lenyalo ka mokgwa wa Sesotho mona Lesotho le tla tadingwa le phethahetse ha;
 - (a) tumellano e le teng dipakeng tsa ba babedi ba nyalanang;
 - (b) tumellano e le teng dipakeng tsa batswadi ba babedi ba nyallanang kapa dipakeng tsa ba emeng sebakeng sa sa batswadi ba mahlakore a nyalanang mabapi le lona lenyalo le bakeng sa bohadi bo lokelang ho ntshuwa;
 - (c) ho le teng tefo ya karolo kapa ya bohadi kaofela; ha se ha monna a ka shwa pele mosadi a iswa bohadi ba hae, teng bohadi bo tla hlahlwa mme lenyalo e tla ba le kgaoditse ho ba teng.
- (1) Marriage in a Sesotho custom is deemed consummated when;
 - (a) there is agreement between the two to be married;
 - (b) there is agreement between the parents of the people to be married or between the representatives of the parents in connection with the marriage and even for the bohadi which is to be paid;
 - (c) there is a part of payment or the complete bohadi unless the man dies before the woman is taken to her in-laws, then the bohadi will be returned and the marriage will be declared null and void. (Government Gazette 1959: 31)

With this explanation in mind, I proceed to define *TLHALO* as understood in Sesotho:

- (4) Kgaolo ya lenyalo leo ho kenweng ho lona ka dipolelo tsa molaonyana wa (1) wa molao ona e ka nna ya etswa ke Makgotla a Basotho moo kopu e jwalo e etswang ke ofe kapa ofe wa banyalani ka lebaka la paleho ya ka boomo ya e mong wa bona, kapa ya etsetswa mosadi ka lebaka la sehloho se totileng kapa ho se tsotelle hoo a ho etsetswang ke monna wa hae kapa ka lebaka le leng le dumelwang tlasa Molao le Moetlo wa Basotho.
- (5) Lekgotla le etsang kahlolo kgaolong ya lenyalo le jwalo le tla etsa taelo malokana le poloko kapa ho hlahlwa ha dikgomo tsa bohadi, le hore na bana ha eba ba le teng, e tla ba mang, kamoo ho ka fumanwang ho lokela kateng ha ho tadingwa mabaka ao kgaolo ya lenyalo e etswang ka ona.
- (4) Annulment of marriage which is consummated according to (1) can be effected by the Basotho courts in which such a request is made by any of the two due to desertion of any of the two, or can be made in favour of the woman due to absolute cruelty or her husband's negligence or any other law which falls under the Laws and Customs of the Basotho.
- (5) The court which makes judgement on the annulment of such marriage will make ruling in connection with the retention or returning of the *bohadi* cattle, also determine the custody of the children basing themselves on the grounds on which the marriage is annulled. (Government Gazette 1959: 32)

When relating this custom to Griffith's and Mmaseeiso's *tlhalo* we find it rather complicated. In the first place when Mmaseeiso frequented her home at Seapala it was not because she was divorcing. It seemed to have been due to bitterness, because every time Griffith fetched her, she came back. But when it happened that Griffith became tired of fetching her, she declined to go back to him. Mmaseeiso indicated that she had divorced Griffith. An interpretation which may be drawn from Mmaseeiso's feeling is that she must have said that she no longer loved Seeiso. In Sesotho this is not *tlhalo*, it is an expression of one's feelings. Therefore Griffith's understanding that Mmaseeiso had divorced him is not valid. If Mmaseeiso had divorced him, her

father Nkwebe, according to the custom would have returned the *bohadi* cattle but this was not the case. On the other hand, Mmaseeiso could have been accused of desertion. If she was accused of desertion, Griffith would have been in a better chance of having the marriage annulled. But Griffith opted for substitution, an option which his father did not approve. Thus Lerothodi continued to recognise Mmaseeiso as his daughter-in-law. Basically the reasons Griffith's gave for his divorce failed to convince law-abiding citizens, that is why Seeiso ended up being his successor.

CHAPTER 3

3.1 TEXT AND HISTORICAL CONTEXT - COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

This chapter will compare and contrast the two plays with historical events. The similarities between the plays and historical events will be treated as proof that the plays have been influenced by history and that they retain some of its contents. Thus some of the characters and scenes in the play can be matched with historical characters and events. Differences which indicate a deviation from history will also be dealt with to show that the playwright's intention was to write drama not history.

This section has two major parts; the first one is text and historical context. The second one is the comparative analysis. Under text and historical context, the detailed historical background from which Khaketla drew his material will be provided. Comparative analysis will deal with the summary of each scene which will be followed by a comparison of scenes and historical facts.

This approach is more coherent in the sense that it helps one to have an idea of the contents in each scene which makes it easier to identify the differences when compared to history.

3.1.1 THOLOANA TSA SETHEPU AND ITS HISTORICAL CONTEXT.

Tholoana tsa Sethepu can be said to be based on dispute over Griffith's succession. This involved Seeiso of Mmaseeiso in the second house and Bereng of Mmabereng in the third house. Matete can be taken to represent Griffith, Bulane represents Seeiso while Mohapi can be matched with Bereng and Majara can be linked to the colonial government and some principal chiefs. The main issue in Griffith's saga was based on the seniority of Mmabereng over Mmaseeiso after Mmaseeiso returned to Griffith. Griffith claimed that he had divorced Mmaseeiso and later remarried her as his third wife. Therefore her son, Seeiso was junior to Bereng, whose mother became the second wife after the divorce. Although at a surface level this matter was the centre of the debate, the underlying issue was that Seeiso had no biological ties with Griffith. Though the custom states that a child born in wedlock where *bohadi* has been paid is recognised as being legitimate. Khaketla in his play puts stress on the underlying issue of illegitimacy of Bulane which can be merged to dubious birth of Seeiso.

It is worth giving a summary of Griffith's marriage which led to the complex situation of succession. Griffith's first wife, Mmabatho, had three daughters. The second wife had no children. (In Sesotho as Lehlwenya puts it if a wife has no children she is not considered a wife. On the basis of this custom Mmaseeiso who was married as the third wife was considered as the

second wife.) Mmaseeiso (Sebueng) had a son and a daughter and her son had to succeed Griffith. Mmaseeiso quarrelled with Griffith many times. She frequently returned to her home because of the fights with her husband. In the end she did not return to her husband. She spent some years at her father's place, Ha Nkwebe. Griffith asked for her replacement and he was given Mmabereng (Thakane) who became Mmaseeiso's substitute. No cattle were paid for Mmabereng when Griffith married her because she was replacing her sister. Griffith maintained that Mmaseeiso had divorced him. In 1902 Mmabereng gave birth to Bereng, while Mmaseeiso had a daughter named Aa!. In 1905 Seeiso was born. It is not clear whether he was born at Makeneng, in Lerothodi's village or at Phamong. Some documents indicate that when Mmaseeiso left Seapala, she went to Phamong where she was treated as newly wed. But other documents indicate that Seeiso was born at Makeneng because Lerothodi, her father-in-law had asked for her because he said she was his wife. Interviewees claim that the two children were not Griffith's biological offsprings. But were his children because *bohadi* had been paid for their mother. At about that time Griffith, who had more than 25 wives, wanted to be a convert of the Catholic church. The priests advised him to abandon all his wives and remain with one. Griffith had difficulty choosing between Mmabatho and Mmabereng, whom he regarded as his second wife. Shortly afterwards, in 1912 Mmabatho died. In the very same year Griffith was baptized and married Mmabereng in the Roman Catholic church. In 1913 the paramount chief, Letsie II died. Griffith succeeded him as has been related earlier. In 1926 he sent Seeiso and Bereng to Maseru with the message that Bereng was senior to Seeiso and should be his heir. Seeiso protested to the Resident Commissioner and the matter was referred back to his father at Matsieng. Seeiso asked his father to call Moshweshwe's sons together to explain the seniority of Mmaseeiso and

Mmabereng's marriages. In the meeting of the sons of Moshweshwe, it was resolved that Mmabereng was senior to Mmaseeiso. Thus Bereng was rightfully declared senior to Seeiso. Seeiso asked to take the matter on appeal but his request was denied by the paramount chief - Griffith. Griffith wrote several letters asking the Resident Commissioner on behalf of the government to confirm Bereng's seniority but it declined to do so. The government suggested that Griffith should ask all the recognized sons of Moshweshwe to vote on the issue. The government felt that the result of such vote would be welcomed by the government. However without this poll being conducted the government would not confirm Bereng's seniority. The matter was left unresolved from 1927 until 1939.

Having gone this far, it is worth relating the details of Griffith's saga from the day that Seeiso and Bereng were sent to the Resident Commissioner until the debate on the seniority of Mmaseeiso and Mmabereng was held at Matsieng. Information gathered around the succession dispute is that on 15 March, 1926, Bereng and Seeiso, together with Leloko and other men, met the acting Resident Commissioner, Murray, in Maseru. The purpose of the meeting was to present Bereng as the senior son who should succeed Griffith as the paramount chief. Seeiso protested against the decision and asked that the matter to be referred back to Matsieng, to his father. J.C.R. Sturrock writes:

In March this year, Bereng was introduced to Mr. Murray while acting Resident Commissioner, as the heir by certain representatives of paramount chief, but at the meeting, Seeiso, another son of Griffith, protested against such a nomination, alleging that he was the rightful successor by birth. The disputants were referred to their father....(1926).

When they arrived at Matsieng, Seeiso asked his father to call all the sons of Moshweshwe for him to explain why Mmabereng was senior to Mmaseeiso. The meeting was called and the discussions started on 1 September 1926, under the chairmanship of chief Makgaola. On that day Seeiso made this statement:

One day viz 15-05-1926 I heard it said I was to go to Maseru with this, my brother, chief Bereng, and I had no knowledge of what we were going to do. When we were in Maseru I heard the men with whom we were, namely; my uncle, Leloko and others say to the Resident Commissioner that they were sent by my father, the paramount chief, to introduce us to the Resident Commissioner, and to point to the Resident Commissioner that the senior was chief Bereng and that Seeiso came next to him. When I heard this, I was indeed surprised and being thus surprised, I asked the Resident Commissioner to return me to my father so that I might put forward my complaint to him and we returned. When we got to my father, I asked him to be kind enough to call chiefs for me...(1926).

The paramount chief became the first speaker and he gave an account of the marriages of Mmaseeiso, Mmabereng and Tsebo who were the daughters of Nkwebe. He told the gathering how Mmaseeiso had divorced him. He felt attracted to her sister Tsebo, but was advised to check on Thakane(Mmabereng) whom he also loved and married. He married Mmabereng as a substitute for Mmaseeiso. Some years later he sent for Mmaseeiso, telling her to come back and live with him. When Mmaseeiso came back, Mmabereng already had Ntshebo and Bereng. Seeiso, the son of Mmaseeiso, was born sometime after the return of his mother to Griffith. After a short debate the meeting was postponed until Sempe Nkwebe, the brother of Mmaseeiso, was present. His presence was most important because he was, at that time considered the father of his sisters.

The lengthy discussions on the seniority of the marriages started again on 29 September, 1926 and went on until 12 November, 1926 when judgement was given. On the first day Griffith was once again the first speaker. He summarized what he had said in the previous meeting. He spoke about the meeting between Nkwebe and Lerothodi at Seapala. At this point one has to mention that information on the meeting between Nkwebe and Lerothodi is confusing. For instance, in the discussions some men indicated that Griffith approached Nkwebe about the matter between himself and Mmaseeiso at Seapala, while others said that Nkwebe visited Lerothodi at Makeneng. Griffith and other men as it will be shown, pointed out that, at that meeting Lerothodi and Nkwebe agreed on the substitution issue, while other men including Phillip Modise, did not agree that Mmabereng was a substitute for Mmaseeiso, her elder sister. Although this debate was recorded live, it is confusing as the people who were involved in the marriage arrangements gave different versions of the story.

Griffith informed the gathering that Nkwebe had asked Lerothodi to meet him at his ward, Seapala. In that meeting Nkwebe said, "The child is yours, and the cattle, but, chief, we will die, and the children will be left behind claiming that no cattle were exchanged. It will be better if you can take back your cattle as Mmaseeiso is not willing to go back to her husband" (Leselinyana 08/09/1926:2-3). Griffith said that he pleaded with them. He said that if Tsebo was given as a replacement for Mmaseeiso, he would be satisfied. He was advised that it was improper for him to marry the younger sister when the elder one was not married. They were referring to Thakane who was staying with her grandmother Mmabereng. He therefore checked on Thakane, to whom he was attracted. Lerothodi and Nkwebe agreed that she would be a

substitute for Sebueng. After sometime Griffith eloped with Thakane and by so doing, he upset Lerothodi who fined him four oxen. Thakane was later brought to Griffith in the customary manner, accompanied by some bridesmaids. It must be noted that when she went to Griffith no cattle were exchanged, because she was replacing her sister that is, Mmaseeiso's *bohadi* cattle were automatically transferred to her sister Mmabereng. On the other hand, Phillip Modise, the former secretary of Lerothodi, Loto, one of Nkwebe's councillors, Phera, one of Griffith's former subjects while he was at Phamong and other men pointed out that Lerothodi never agreed to the substitution. They also maintained that the meeting was held at Matsieng, not at Sebakala.

Phillip Modise said that he did not know that Mmaseeiso remarried Griffith. He maintains that Lerothodi and Nkwebe's meeting focused on the issue of Caswell Lefojane's proposal to marry Mmaseeiso. In that meeting Lerothodi was quoted to have said, "The wife of the chief can never remarry in the Mokotedi clan. She is not Griffith's, she is mine, she was married by me. You, my younger brother, Nkwebe, if you can give her to the Lefojanes, I will eat your cattle, even the Lefojanes I will eat their cattle if they can go ahead with the matter" (Leselinyana 29/10/1926: 2 & 4).

Loto, in his evidence, informed the gathering that Nkwebe and some of his advisors, Ntho, Teboho and Lehlokwa, had visited Matsieng, at Makeneng, to discuss Griffith's and Mmaseeiso's marriage. In the meeting Griffith and some of Lerothodi's men were present. Nkwebe asked for advice from Lerothodi concerning their children. His feeling was that Griffith could marry one of Mmaseeiso's younger sisters as a substitute. Lerothodi's response was that it would be rather difficult for the wife of the chief to be remarried. He was

not against Griffith's marriage to one of the sisters but he did not approve of the replacement of Mmaseeiso.

Phera disclosed that one day he had accompanied Griffith to see a doctor in Maseru. On their way back they went via Matsieng. Griffith informed his father that Mmabereng was his second wife. Lerothodi's response was, "My child I do not like that word, I have never heard of a situation where, when a woman has gone to her family and, for that matter, is still alive, that her sister can be married in order to replace her. I do not agree to that, and I will never agree to it" (Leselinyana: 05/11/1926: 4).

From the above evidence one is inclined to infer that Lerothodi never agreed to the substitution of Mmaseeiso whom he regarded as his wife, and that as far as Lerothodi was concerned she was always Griffith's senior wife. On the other hand replacement did in fact take place because no cattle were exchanged when Mmabereng was married. This complex issue reinforces White's (1978) view that even history itself does not provide the authentic truth. In the above evidence, people who witnessed the incidents differed in their presentation of the facts.

To proceed with the story, Mmabereng got married to Griffith in 1899, regardless of whether she was to be a substitute or not. Her first child was a daughter by the name of Ntshebo, who was followed by Bereng in 1902. In the very same year Mmaseeiso, while still at her father's village at Sebapala, gave birth to a baby girl named Aa! When Lerothodi was informed of the birth of Bereng, he was so exuberant that he acknowledged him as his heir. He accused his son Letsie II, of having neglected his wives to such an extent

that he had not even borne him a grandson. To show his approval of Bereng's birth, Lerothodi one day called Sekgonyana, one of Moshweshwe's grandsons to Makeneng during Bereng's early childhood. At that meeting Lerothodi held Bereng in his hands and said to Sekgonyana:

Ke o bitseditse mojalefa wa ka ke enwa, o le Bereng
ke le Lerothodi; le mohla ke shwang o tle o pake.

I have called you to see my heir, this is the one,
you, as Bereng, and I, as Lerothodi, so that even if
I die you should be a witness"
(Leselinyana: 29/10/1926: 2 & 4).

Lerothodi's appointment of Bereng as his heir has loopholes which leave many questions unanswered. Lerothodi welcomed Bereng as the heir because there was no male issue in Mmabatho's and Mmaseeiso's houses. But it is not clear as to what could have happened if Aa! was a boy. The question is would he have been given her back to his mother's people as happened with Aa!. Aa! was given to the family of her mother, an action which was in contravention of the customary laws of the Basotho. In Sesotho any child who is born to a married mother belongs to the father's family and not the mother's.

Another concern is that it is not clear that when Lerothodi acknowledged Bereng as his heir, what would happen to Mmaseeiso if she begot a son sometime later, as in fact happened. Was Lerothodi's action not premature? This question is worth asking because Lerothodi indicated that Mmaseeiso was the wife of his cattle, and he therefore regarded her as the senior wife. Sekabatho Mafa one of Lerothodi's men substantiates this point. He said that on the day that they drove the *bohadi* cattle for the marriage of Tsebo and Mmabereng, Lerothodi instructed them to tell Nkwebe that he would like to

have Mmaseeiso sent to him, because she was his wife. It would be discovered that Lerothodi, as much as he welcomed Bereng as heir, also supported Mmaseeiso's status as Griffith's senior wife. One may say that Lerothodi never thought that Mmaseeiso would ever have a son and that is why he welcomed Bereng as the heir. Therefore if Seeiso was born after Lerothodi's death, why was his will not reversed when Seeiso was born, because he still regarded Mmaseeiso as a senior wife? This issue also contributes to the confusion around the succession because if another meeting had been held to reverse Lerothodi's will it could have saved the paramountcy the embarrassment of arguing over who should succeed. If such a meeting had taken place Seeiso could have been appointed a legal heir as his mother was still considered a senior wife.

When it comes to the issue of remarriage of Mmaseeiso by Griffith, it seems to have started around 1902 or 1903, just before the death of her father, Nkwebe, in 1903. In the evidence given by Pheko Kotwanyane, it was pointed out that Griffith once went to Seapala and when he came back he instructed Pheko and Makepe to go to Nkwebe and ask him to hand over Mmaseeiso because they had settled their differences. Nkwebe thanked them and promised to send her back.

Griffith, on the other hand, gave another version of the story. He said that he sent Makgakge to Mmaseeiso to renew their love, but Makgakge failed. Griffith approached Mmaseeiso directly on the renewal of their love. Mmaseeiso told him that misfortune had befallen her and asked if he could accept her under such circumstances. Griffith said that he had forgiven her. After that Griffith sent Makgakge to inform Lerothodi of the settlement.

Although there is no fixed date of her return, Mmaseeiso did at last come back to Griffith after Nkwebe's death.

There is another discrepancy in the information provided by Griffith and Pheko as they contradict each other when recounting Mmaseeiso's visits to Sebapala. Pheko said that after Griffith had gone to Sebapala and settled his love problem with Mmaseeiso, he instructed him and others to go to Nkwebe to inform him of the settlement and to say that he would like to have his wife back. But Griffith denied this claim by Pheko. He said that he sent Makgakge to Mmaseeiso to renew love when he failed, he himself approached her. He sent Makgakge to inform Lerothodi of the settlement. It is difficult to know exactly what happened and whose story to believe. When reading the reports in the Leselinyana (29/10/1926: 1926) it was discovered that the paramount chief refuted many statements which were said to have been made by him. Griffith had his allies Makgakge and Leloko and that anybody who spoke against the two, Griffith accused him of telling a lie. The incident quoted above validates this claim. The question is, was the paramount chief telling the truth? Griffith's behaviour indicates that he was not always truthful. This feature is retained by Khaketla in Matete. Matete ignores Thankga and Mafafa's constructive advice because they tell him the truth when they say that his decision is not procedural and it will cause chaos in his chiefdom. Matete, like Griffith, refutes statements which contain the truth. This turns out to be their great weakness.

It is also not clear whether, when Mmaseeiso left Sebapala, she went to stay at Makeneng, Lerothodi's ward, or whether she went straight to Phamong. Pheko informed the gathering that Lerothodi had asked Nkwebe to send Mmaseeiso to

him at Makeneng. Chief Lehlwenya also confirms that Mmaseeiso came to live at Makeneng with Lerothodi, her father-in-law. It is also alleged that while she was at Makeneng, she met the man who fathered Seeiso. Therefore when she went back to Griffith just before the death of Lerothodi on 19 August 1905, she was already pregnant. Griffith's version of the story was that Mmaseeiso came to his house, where she was received as a newly-wed. But it is not clear whether she had come either straight from Seapala or Makeneng but it was a public knowledge that she was already pregnant when she returned to Griffith.

The main issue of Mmaseeiso's return was the position she would hold, either as a second wife, her former status or the third wife having been replaced by her sister, Mmabereng. There was confusion about her status. Mmaseeiso, in her evidence, claimed that she was told that she would occupy her former position if she came back, one of the reasons for her return. In another version, Mmaseeiso denied *tlhalo* with Griffith, or that Mmabereng had replaced her but it was said that there was evidence that Mmaseeiso herself agreed to *tlhalo* and that Mmabereng replaced her. This was supported by Griffith when he said:

Mmaseeiso o na bolele mona a re o ne a se a sa tle,
le hore Mmabereng o tlile bakeng sa hae. Mohanyetsi
a ka a hlahe.....

Mmaseeiso informed us here in one meeting that she was no longer willing to come back, and that Mmabereng had come to take her place. Can anyone in this gathering refute that statement?
(Leselinyana: 08/10/1926:3)

Tlhakanelo also said that they were once sent to Seapala to chieftainess Mmaseeiso. He was with two other men, namely, Lekgetho and Lebeko. At their

meeting, Mmaseeiso agreed that Mmabereng had married Griffith in order to replace her. But Lebeko, who was with Tlhakanelo, informed the court that Mmaseeiso told them that when she came back to Griffith she was surprised to learn that it was said that the cattle which married her had been transferred to Mmabereng.

Another observation mentioned in 2.3.3, was that *tlhalo* complicates this matter. Mmaseeiso, at one stage was said to have agreed to *tlhalo*, in another she denied the knowledge of such. Mmaseeiso can be said to be an opportunist and untrustworthy person. Khaketla, in his play, hides this weakness in Direko who is depicted as a respectable and disciplined wife. It seems Khaketla abhorred Mmaseeiso's behaviour, that is why he gave Direko a different character.

To proceed with the issue of "divorce" we find that some of the men disputed *tlhalo* while others including Griffith claimed to know of it. It seems this issue was never settled because people continued to argue about it. The truth of this matter does not lie with the side which won the case but in the analysis of the whole process of *tlhalo* whether it was carried out according to the customary laws of the Basotho as defined in 2.3.3. If not why was it called *tlhalo*; how is it associated with substitution in Sesotho? If Nkwebe agreed to it, but Lerothodi disagreed, can we say there was ever an agreement? Which Basotho court approved of the *tlhalo* between Mmaseeiso and Griffith? According to the *tlhalo* custom of the Basotho, Griffith and Mmaseeiso's *tlhalo* was never recognized, therefore they remained husband and wife who were engaged in a temporary and illegal separation.

Concerning Griffith's character we find that he is also in disagreement with some of his subjects because of the *tlhalo* issue. The question is why Griffith should argue with his people over each and every point raised in the discussions held at Matsieng. Did he represent truth and unity as a leader of the Basotho nation should? Could it be that his subjects did not respect him? We therefore maintain that Khaketla's Matete, who spends a lot of time arguing with Thankga and Mafafa, is based on Griffith's character. Thankga and Mafafa threaten Matete. They say that if he does not change his mind they will desert him. Matete's subjects, like Griffith's, seem to worry about the truth which their leaders ignore it.

Going back to the debate held at Matsieng, Seeiso told the gathering of chiefs that he heard Leloko speaking to his aunt, chieftainess Tsebo, the fourth wife of Griffith about his birth:

Ke a kgolwa ke tla bua taba e fokolang. Maoba ka Sateredaha mantsiboya ke ile ka utlwa Leloko le mmangwane Tsebo ba bua; ka ba ka ya ho mme Tsebo a leka ho hana ho mpolella. A re Leloko o re, mmangwane Tsebo o leka ho etsa boakgentenyana le ka dinku tseo a di fuwang, "ho ke ke ha etsahala hore re buswe ke ngwana ya sa tswalwang ke rona. bile a re le Sekgonyana ha se wa bona o na sa lokele ho busa, e se e le hoba ho mpa ho entswe. Le tse ding di ama bo-morena Masopha tseo nna ke sitwang ho di bolela ka leleme; ke tsa marena a mang hape, tse bolelwang ke morena Leloko.

I believe that I am raising a minor issue. On Saturday evening I overheard Leloko and aunt Tsebo speaking; I went to aunt Tsebo to ask what they were speaking about, but she did not want to tell me. At last she told me that Leloko said that she was trying to speak on my behalf because of the sheep given to her; He said: "It cannot happen that we can be ruled by a child who is not of our blood." I therefore feel that is the reason why I cannot be a senior. He even said Sekgonyana does not belong to them, it is just that it is already done. He said other things about chief Masopha and some chiefs which I cannot disclose, as they affect other chiefs, this was said by chief Leloko
(Leselinyana: 26/11/1926: pp. 2 & 4).

In response to this accusation Leloko openly denied having said the above. Griffith also added that he doubted the veracity of the accusation. The paramount chief said that he was bothered by Seeiso's statement that "He is not of royal blood". He further added:

Nna hase taba tsa ka tseo, ha ke e so re ha wa tswalwa
ke nna, empa e le wena o ithohakang ka nna.

I have never discussed such a matter, I have never said
that you were not my biological son, you are insulting
yourself
(Leselinyana: 26/11/1926: p. 4).

The paramount chief advised the gathering to make a decision about the seniority of Mmaseesio and Mmabereng's marriages, and pointed out that once this issue had been decided, they could move on to Seeiso's illegitimacy. The gathering welcomed his suggestion and the issue was never discussed.

When analyzing Griffith's reaction to the questions of Seeiso's legitimacy, it is obvious that he knew about Leloko's accusation although he denied it. Leloko's accusation was a serious allegation which, under normal circumstances, could have led to his being disciplined in one way or the other by Griffith. But Griffith seemed to be lenient on the issue; it did not bother him that much. Instead he told Seeiso that he was insulting himself by taking the accusation seriously. His tactic is to avoid truth at all costs. It is not surprising that Khaketla's Matete fears the truth, it angers him. This is what Griffith did during the debate. Thankga asked Matete to investigate Malokobe's allegation thoroughly but Matete declined, just as Griffith had done when he asked the gathering to postpone the issue of Seeiso's legitimacy. Why did Griffith avoid the discussion of the matter? Why

did Matete refrain from searching for the truth behind the allegation? Thus Matete consistently behaves in a similar way to Griffith.

When analyzing Leloko's behaviour, one feels that he is a liar and a propagandist who sowed seeds of confusion in the chiefdom. Why did he deny that he told Tsebo that Seeiso was barred from succession because he was illegitimate? Can we believe anything he said in the discussion? Seeiso raised the issue because he had Tsebo as his witness. Could it be that both Seeiso and Tsebo were lying? If so, why could the matter not be discussed in details as part of the whole argument? Why did Griffith protect Leloko by asking that the matter be given a special session? It is also not surprising that Khaketla found himself creating a character like Malokobe because he was using Leloko as his model. Malokobe, like Leloko, is one of Matete's close councillors. He is the one who brings up the issue of Bulane's illegitimacy. When Thankga questions the allegations surrounding Bulane's legitimacy, he is spared from further questioning by Matete. Matete feels that Malokobe, as his puppet advisor, should not be harassed by questioning, just as Leloko's accusation was quickly glossed over although it was the crux of the debate. Leloko was a royalist who felt that in order to ascend the throne one should be of the royal blood. Malokobe, as his name connotes, is full of revenge. His intention is to destroy Direko's reputation by any means. If only he could hurt Direko's feelings he would be satisfied. Leloko's contention was that Seeiso should not be given a chance to succeed Griffith. Malokobe feels that if he defames Direko, Bulane will not succeed Matete. We can therefore say that Khaketla's reflection of Griffith and Leloko in Matete and Malokobe is convincing, as they share the same weaknesses, especially inability to face the truth.

The legitimacy of Seeiso's birth was a crucial matter which was never aired at any gathering whereas this is the issue which forms the backbone of Khaketla's drama. Khaketla felt that it was the basic reason that Seeiso was unable to succeed his father and that it should have been brought to the attention of the public. As it was shown above, Griffith avoided the truth by asking the gathering to postpone the issue. The playwright in a way is challenging history; he may be asking why the truth was not revealed to the nation, and raises the question as to why the truth was never pursued at the public gathering. Khaketla feels that he must expose these omissions in a form of art. In support of this idea Gikandi quotes Achebe as having said that:

Literatureis one of the ways available to the writer - to organize himself and his society to meet the perils of living. ..art is man's constant effort to create for himself a different order of reality from that which is given to him; an inspiration to provide himself with a second handle on existence through his imagination (1991: 14).

Thus Khaketla as a playwright used his art to show that he did not approve of the above events. Khaketla used the character, Matete to express his opinion openly. Matete says that if Bulane is not his biological son, he must be deprived of the legacy to the chieftainship. It is only when one analyses Khaketla's characters in relation to history that we learn of the playwright's wisdom in deviating from truth. At times Khaketla draws on the similarity between his characters and the historical people on whom they are based while in some instances his characters behave differently. Thus Khaketla expresses his feelings towards certain historical people and their

behaviour. He indicates what they could have done or how they should have behaved and gives his own imaginary solutions to some conflicts.

On 12 November 1926, judgement on the debate was read by Sekgonyana who was mandated by the president of the court, chief Makgaola. Quoted below are the extracts of the judgement which was sent to the Resident Commissioner by Makgaola:

On the side of the late chief, Nkwebe, no one is knowledgeable about substitution, they have denied any knowledge about the change, or conversation between Nkwebe and Lerothodi in which they agreed that one of the girls must be a substitute for Mmaseeiso.....
The great witness which has clarified this issue is chieftainess Mmaseeiso herself, she is agreeable to the statement by paramount chief, but said that Lerotholi refused to confirm the agreement. Chieftainess was unable to inform Griffith or even Lerothodi about her baptism because she was by then at her home, Sebapala.
Mmaseeiso did not question her position when she got back to Phamong, Mmabereng was married without the payment of lobola to guarantee the exchange.
With the above evidence, the court therefore strengthens your father's explanation that Bereng is senior to you. (12/11/1926).

When it came to voting, Bereng got 23 votes, and Seeiso had 10 votes out of the total of 70. A significant number of principal chiefs abstained from voting. Here is the list of names who voted for Bereng:

- | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Lepolesa Letsie | 13. Mosiuwa Mmota |
| 2. Moloko Bereng | 14. Matshabisa Molomo |
| 3. Setjhatjho Mohale | 15. Phallang Leduma |
| 4. Leloko Lerothodi | 16. Tlotlollo Mohale |
| 5. Hlakanelo Moshweshwe | 17. Goliath Mohale |

- | | |
|-----------------------|------------------------|
| 6. Loto Letsie | 18. Leutswa Letsie |
| 7. Mahodi Letsie | 19. Tshenolo Letsie |
| 8. Tsipinare Letsie | 20. White Lerothodi |
| 9. Mpiti Kgotso | 21. Jacob Moima |
| 10. Josias Mopedi | 22. Sekgonyana Bereng |
| 11. Tshele Motlohelwa | 23. Makgaola Lerothodi |
| 12. James Makgobalo | |

These names are worth mentioning to prove the point that principal chiefs abstained from voting. On this list the only principal chiefs were Makgaola Lerothodi and Goliath Mohale. After the judgement Seeiso asked the court to grant him permission to appeal to a court higher than that of Matsieng. Griffith, who opposed the appeal, wrote to the government requesting that it should not grant an appeal to Seeiso. His contention was that his court was the highest in customary matters and that the matter did not need the intervention of Europeans who did not understand the customs of the Basotho.

The government's legal advisor suggested that the succession issue should wait until after Griffith's death. He said that the government could presumably refuse formally to recognise anyone as Griffith's successor during his lifetime and that the question of succession would not arise until the chieftainship became vacant. He added that the succession dispute must be settled in accordance with the customs and must not be repugnant to the sentiments of the people. But Seeiso insisted on the appeal on the grounds that most of those who voted at Matsieng court were only Griffith's favourites and did not, in fact, represent the actual sons of Moshweshwe, and that most of the principal chiefs had refrained from voting.

The abstention of principal chiefs from voting became a matter of concern as is seen in the letter by J.C.R. Sturrock to Earl of Athlone:

Many of other chiefs were there or represented and, I understand, declined to record their votes one way or the other and those who actually voted in favour of Bereng are mainly the paramount chief's personal following and have little or no claim to be called "Sons of Moshweshwe". This disposes of the idea that the composition of the court can in any way be regarded as fairly representation of the sons of Moshweshwe (13/12/1926).

The Resident Commissioner was therefore asked to make discreet enquiries about the succession dispute and to reserve his judgement. He also had to assess which claimant was suitable for the post. In a survey that was conducted, Seeiso was described as the suitable candidate. His character was described as being ordinarily acceptable, and it was felt that he would make a better ruler than Bereng. Bereng was said to be lacking in initiative, and afraid to make decisions in his ward at Phamong where he always consulted his father.

This matter took another turn when a confidential circular dated 20/01/1927 was sent to all Assistant Commissioners in the different districts. The circular was written by R.B. Smith, the government secretary, who requested the Assistant Commissioners to make discreet enquiries in order to find out what the principal chiefs thought of the rival claimants. The responses were as follows:

-Assistant Commissioner from Mafeteng - chiefs for Seeiso.
Only Goliath favoured Bereng.

- Assistant Commissioner from Teyateyaneng - chiefs for Seeiso.
 - Assistant Commissioner from Mohale's Hoek - chiefs for Seeiso.
Chief Malebanye feared that unless Seeiso succeeded Griffith, the law of succession in the country would be entirely subverted.
 - Assistant Commissioner from Qacha's Nek - Chiefs for Seeiso.
Makgaola's opinion reserved.
 - Assistant Commissioner from Quthing - chiefs for Seeiso.
Sempe in particular supported him.
 - Assistant Commissioner from Maseru - Most of the chiefs support Seeiso.
Sekgonyana and Tsipinare Letsie supported Bereng.
 - Assistant Commissioner from Leribe - chiefs favour Seeiso.
Motsarapane said that judgement or no judgement Seeiso was the heir.
 - Assistant Commissioner from Butha-Buthe - chiefs for Seeiso
- (Government archives: S3/5/12/4).

This survey created a lot of distrust in the judgement delivered by Griffith's court. It clearly showed that it was not a fair judgement, especially given that the principal chiefs had abstained from voting. With this survey the government became reluctant to approve Bereng's appointment. The government felt that approval of Bereng was not in the interest of the nation but in the interest of Griffith and his favourites. The government found it difficult to deal with the case and also felt that it should not be brought before a court of law. But Griffith continued to stress that Mmaseiso had divorced him, therefore Bereng was his legitimate heir. He based his argument on the following grounds:

- Mmabereng's marriage to Griffith was countenanced by Nkwebe although he had received no cattle from Griffith. Procedurally Nkwebe would certainly have claimed cattle for his daughter if her marriage to Griffith was not a substitution.

-Griffith took no action against men who lived with Mmaseeiso. A husband would have had them fined. Again when Mmaseeiso was engaged to Lefojane, Griffith did not object to the proposed marriage, it was only Lerothodi who opposed it.

-Mmaseeiso's illegal child, Aa!, was considered to be the property of Nkwebe's family and when she was married, the cattle of her marriage were paid to Nkwebe's family and not to Griffith. But according to customary law, all illegitimate children are the property of the husband of their mother. Griffith would have naturally claimed the cattle which married Aa!.

-Mmaseeiso called Lerothodi by his name. She would not have done this if she still considered herself as his daughter-in-law, for daughters-in-law use *hlonepha* (respect) language for their fathers-in-law.

-Lastly she was baptized without consulting Griffith or Lerothodi. If they had been her "owners", she would have informed them. (Griffith 1926)

With the above points put before the government, Griffith pressed for the recognition of Bereng as his heir. He reiterated that the decision was in compliance with the customs and laws of the Basotho.

After an exchange of letters on this issue between the paramount chief and the government; the Resident Commissioner made a recommendation to the paramount chief. He suggested that a secret ballot should be conducted. He requested the paramount chief to make a list of those sons of Moshweshwe whom he thought eligible to vote and that the list should be put before the council of the nation for approval. With that done; the results would be recognised by the government and the elected candidate would be confirmed as heir. Griffith dismissed the suggestion as going against the customs of

Basotho. He pressed for the approval of the decision he had reached at the earlier meeting. The government advised him that there was no need for him to fear the secret ballot because, if chiefs were in favour of Bereng, they would still choose him as the heir but Griffith declined. Instead he asked permission to visit the High Commissioner in Cape Town to present his case in person. He was granted permission to go to Cape town.

The arrangements were that he would be accompanied by some principal chiefs, among them chief Jonathan of Leribe. Jonathan was one of the most respected and knowledgeable chiefs when it came to the customary laws of the Basotho. Griffith needed his moral support as a matter of urgency on this issue. Unfortunately, Jonathan refused the invitation and would not send a representative on the following grounds:

This is not the matter for the High Commissioner. We have our own ways and customs which we fully understand and which His Excellency the High Commissioner does not understand. This matter should have been discussed by the sons of Moshweshwe and the Basuto. We, the Basuto do not elect whom we like for the chief; the chieftainship belongs to the first born whose mother was married by the parents of his father after consultation...If there is no son in the family of Letsie II, is it not a fact that the mother of the boy who is in the mountain area is the one who is married by Lerothodi before any other wife of Griffith? If this is correct, what more is required? The paramount chief has not consulted us on this matter at all. On the above grounds I am unable to put my hand on it (Jonathan: 17/11/1927).

Despite chief Jonathan's refusal to accompany Griffith, the trip went ahead as scheduled. The meeting was held on 24 November 1927 in the presence of the Resident Commissioner J.C.R. Sturrock, the Imperial Secretary B.E.H.

Clifford, chiefs Makgaola, Sekgonyana, Masopha and others. The paramount chief was asked to put forward his plea concerning the confirmation of his appointment of Bereng as his successor. Griffith related his story, showing facts and the customary laws which he had followed in order to reach his decision.

In his reply, which was in the form of a letter, the High Commissioner stressed the idea of secret ballot and that the government would formally approve the heir elected in that manner. He even warned Griffith that if he failed to hold a secret ballot, the government would not be in a position to formally recognize Bereng as his successor. He also indicated that the nomination and appointment of the paramount chief was entirely a state matter. The reply came as a great blow to Griffith, who protested against the secret ballot but failed to convince the High Commissioner. The meeting ended up with Griffith being very upset because he had lost the case.

When Griffith got back to Matsieng, he wrote another letter to the High Commissioner which was probably the last one written in connection with the succession dispute. He expressed his dissatisfaction with the High Commissioner's response. He pointed out that the Europeans could not be right in questions of Basotho natural laws, to which a secret ballot was contrary. But his complaint was merely a futile exercise which did not have any impact on the government or the High Commissioner. The matter was therefore left unresolved from December 1927 until 1939 when Griffith died.

Griffith's insistence on having Bereng confirmed as his heir did not only discredit him but it also exposed his weakness as a dishonest person. He refused the government's advice to hold a secret ballot which would, in

actual fact, have shown the real feelings of the sons of Moshweshwe. Khaketla, in his drama, has portrayed Matete whose weakness is his failure to face the truth. Matete fails to find out whether there is any truth behind Malokobe's defamation. Griffith, like Matete, keeps himself away from the truth. In the case of Griffith we have many questions to ask about his character and his administration. Seeiso complained that most of the chiefs who voted at Matsieng were not real sons of Moshweshwe. Why did the principal chiefs abstain from voting? What is the significance of their abstention? Why was Griffith content with the vote of the minor chiefs while the principal chiefs abstained? Could that voting be declared as having been fair and free? It is worth noting that the voting was done by a show of hands but not by secret ballot; that is why those who voted for Bereng were easily identified. One can say that voting was not fair as Seeiso pointed out, basing an argument on the following observations:

The private survey conducted by the assistant commissioners in the districts indicated clearly that Griffith's decision was not supported by most of the chiefs. This loss of support weakened his position in the eyes of the government. In this way we find that Griffith himself ruined his reputation by pressing the matter too far, because he found himself in confrontation with the government.

Furthermore the suggestion by the government that he must conduct a secret ballot to elect the heir proved that they had lost their trust in him. It is true that a secret ballot is foreign to the Basotho but it was the only justifiable way of selecting the successor. The secret ballot is advantageous as it has privacy and allows freedom of choice. Basotho were used to saying

"le dumme" after the chief's speech, by so doing they showed their appreciation of whatever he said in his speech. The other way, was through the show of hands if the matter needed voting. But voting by show of hands although used by Basotho it had limited freedom especially when voting against the chief. Griffith's refusal to conduct the ballot was too vague; the basic problem was his inability to confront the truth. He declined to comment when the High Commissioner told him that it was also not a Basotho custom to seek the approval of the Secretary of State before appointing a paramount chief although it had to be obtained. He failed to answer the question why he was against a secret ballot if the Basotho supported Bereng. It was obvious that Bereng was going to lose the election and Griffith's claim that he was chosen by the majority would be ridiculed. His refusal to accept the government's proposal further exposed his weakness. He failed to use his reasoning power effectively. Griffith's poor reasoning is mirrored in Matete who, without making investigations, suddenly decides to disown Bulane. But, to his dismay, Majara declines to confirm Mohapi, because his promotion is not in the interest of the nation but in Matete's. It is the same as Seeiso's case whose dispossession did not seem to be in the interest of the Basotho nation, but only in the interest of Griffith and his chosen few. Griffith's poor reasoning, like Matete's, belittles him. Both Griffith and Matete in the drama are a disgrace to the nation as they do not promote peace and justice. Although they are the leaders of the nation, they fail to respect the people's will. Instead they advance their own ambitions at the expense of public interest.

Therefore the government was justified in refusing to confirm Bereng, just as Majara declined to confirm Mohapi. The step which the government took of

noting Griffith's claim but not acting on it, helped to conserve the status of customary law among the Basotho. It also unified the nation under one popular figure, Seeiso, who was the people's choice. As indicated earlier by Seeiso, Leloko pointed out different chiefs who were not worth being called chiefs.

Another concern is that some of the chiefs expressed their fear that unless Seeiso became the successor to Griffith, the law of succession in the country was at the risk of being subverted. Therefore the government's action was a just one. To show that the government was right, Khaketla employed the character, Majara, to represent the colonial administration. Majara feels that Matete violates the customary law of succession and reverses Matete's decision. In this way Majara maintains law and order in the chiefdom. As it was pointed out earlier in the playwright's interview, Khaketla regarded Griffith's action of disinheritng Seeiso as a political and social injustice. According to Khaketla it was unfair of Griffith to demote Seeiso especially as this was against customary laws of the Basotho. To show his approval Khaketla expresses his support of the Europeans' government in reserving their confirmation of Bereng.

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS.

ACT 1

SCENE 1

At the beginning of the play we are introduced to the conflict over Bulane's illegitimate birth which becomes the central theme of the drama. Matete appears to be a worried person over the illegitimacy of Bulane's birth. He is waiting for Malokobe to report his findings pertaining to the birth of Bulane. Malokobe enters the stage and reports that he has found out the truth. He says that he has heard Direko, Matete's first wife conversing with Thato and that Direko expressed surprise at the way in which Matete loved Bulane although he was not his biological son:

Ho hobe ke tswalo ya enwa Bulane
Hobane ke mora Matete lebitso
Ha e le ka madi ke tweba le kwena.

What is wrong is the birth of Bulane
Because he is Matete's son by the name
Biologically he is not his son (Khaketla 1954: 8).

After this report Matete makes a decision to change the customary succession procedure. Through this he rejects Bulane and replaces him with Mohapi. He even sends for Majara to come and bless his decision. Matete refuses to listen to one of his advisors, Thankga, who says that Matete must find out the truth and not believe what Malokobe says.

This incident refers to paramount chief Griffith's row over who should succeed him. He indicated that Bereng was his successor though he was from

the third house of Mmabereng, while Seeiso, who was from the second house of Mmaseeiso, was said to be Bereng's junior. The reason for the change is said to have been due to Seeiso's dubious birth resulting in Griffith not considering Seeiso as his biological son.

Another similarity is that Matete, like Griffith, has some men who support his decision and those who oppose his unprocedural action. Malokobe and Tladi wholeheartedly support what Matete says. In the play, Malokobe is the one who is behind the chaos. Malokobe is sent out in search of the truth, as Matete's trusted councillor. Matete's trust of Malokobe is evident in this extract:

Hantle, hantle, motshepuwa wa ka:
Ha e le wena ke hlile ka tseba
Tsohle ditaba ke tla di fumana----

Indeed, indeed, my trusted one
I knew in advance that if it were you
All the information I will get ----
(Khaketla 1954: 7).

To prove his trust in Malokobe, Matete replaces Bulane by Mohapi. Tladi welcomes the idea as the correct decision. When Thankga challenges the judgement, Malokobe interrupts him:

Kgutsa Thankga ! U lahla morena!
(*Ho Matete*)
E nepahetse kahlolo, sebata!

Shut up Thankga! You want to mislead the chief!
(*To Matete*)
It is the right judgement, ferocious animal!
(Khaketla 1954: 8).

Malokobe and Tladi represent Griffith's favourites such as Makgakge and Leloko Lerothodi. Leloko was one of the top councillors who worked closely

with paramount chief Griffith on various administrative matters. For instance on 12 March 1926, Leloko was sent by Griffith to other principal chiefs like Masopha and Seeiso. Griffith's request to the principal chiefs was that they should make proper arrangements with regard to who should succeed them. This move was due to the succession dispute between the sons of Mojela, whose case had to be decided by the judicial committee of the Privy Council in England.

In the discussions held at Matsieng from September to November 1926, where chiefs had gathered to clarify the seniority of Griffith's sons, Leloko still supported Griffith. He indicated that he knew about the divorce between Griffith and Mmaseeiso. Leloko told the other chiefs that whatever Griffith had told them was the absolute truth.

Makgakge, who was Griffith's councillor, was revered for his knowledge concerning the paramount chief's marriages. On one occasion Griffith sent him to Mmaseeiso, with the purpose of renewing their relationship. In the debate held in 1926, Griffith pointed out that it was only he and Makgakge who knew about the agreement between Lerothodi and Nkwebe concerning the exchange of marriage status between Mmabereng and Mmaseeiso.

We also find that Malokobe and Leloko are, to a certain extent, associated with women when it comes to the issue of birth of the heir. Malokobe says that he overheard Direko and Thato's conversation concerning the birth of Bulane, while Leloko is said to have discussed the issue of Seeiso's birth with Tsebo, Griffith's fourth wife.

The playwright diverges from history when Matete sends Malokobe to investigate the truth surrounding Bulane's birth. Griffith never made any enquiries about Seeiso's birth. He did not need to investigate the matter because Mmaseeiso's pregnancy was not a secret; it was known even by his councillors. It was also a well-known fact that Mmaseeiso had a steady lover who was suspected of being Seeiso's father. However, even if Seeiso was not Griffith's biological son, Griffith would still have been bound by customary law to accept him as his legitimate son because cattle had been paid for his mother. By sending Malokobe to seek the truth Khaketla could be referring to how evidence was collected from as early as 1899 when the succession dispute began to grow in intensity. The evidence was based on what had happened during the two decades. Therefore it was rather difficult for anyone to recall clearly what had really happened. It meant that only partial truth would be told; that is why Thankga feels that Malokobe is not telling the truth and hence his allegation must be thoroughly investigated.

The playwright decided on the sensitive issue of illegitimacy so as to capture the minds of his readers. He used a dramatic plot, where the conflict has to be presented in a convincing manner. Khaketla manages to capture our minds in his introduction. The way we are exposed to the conflict is fascinating, as we see chief Matete who, without much consideration, takes a drastic decision. Thankga, his opponent, remains a considerate man who opposes Matete and his puppets.

It might also be said that Khaketla wants to show that some people believe that they are above the law because of their status. Matete's change in the order of succession was against the customs and laws of the Basotho. In Sesotho any child born in wedlock where *bohadi* has been paid is legitimate, regardless of the identity of his biological father. The playwright disapproves of the action by Griffith which violates these succession laws. It will be recalled that when Griffith assumed the paramountcy, he did so through violation of succession procedure. He refused to raise seeds in his brother's family and he also declined to act as regent for his brother's son. As a paramount chief he denied Seeiso his rights. Khaketla shows how some chiefs abuse their powers in order to satisfy their personal ambitions. He makes a mockery of such chiefs and indicates that they do not represent the nation, but only their personal interests.

Khaketla disapproves of Mmaseeiso's substitution and Lerothodi's acknowledgement of Bereng. Khaketla maintains that Mmaseeiso was the senior wife and reflects this in his play through Direko, Matete's first wife. Although the playwright supports Lerothodi's decision to keep Mmaseeiso as the senior wife, he dismisses Lerothodi's premature decision of confirming Bereng as heir. Lerothodi was not sure what the future held for Mmaseeiso, therefore he could have withheld his confirmation.

Towards the end of scene one, Matete instructs Mafafa to call his uncle, Majara, to his court. If Majara is taken to represent the colonial administration, the colonial authorities were not subordinate to the paramount chief and they could not be called to Matsieng in that manner. Instead the paramount chief went to them in the capital town Maseru, to

address administrative matters. The government had more political power over the paramount chief who acted as their right hand in the enforcement of law and order in the country. The playwright decided to refer to Majara an elderly relative, as a subordinate, to show that the decision needed the sons of Moshweshwe's blessing before it could be taken to the government.

ACT 1

SCENE 11

In this scene we are introduced to Majara's court. When the scene opens, Majara and his men are engaged in a discussion about a leopard which is causing havoc by killing goats. They are planning to hunt it down. In the course of the discussion, Mafafa enters, he jokes with Kgwapha. He later tells Majara that he has been sent by Matete who would like to meet Majara at his court the following morning.

Majara promises Mafafa that he will come as instructed by Matete. As Mafafa leaves, Majara and his men start organising themselves to hunt down the leopard. There is no parallel between the action of the play viz when Mafafa who is sent to call Majara to Matete's ward, and historical events viz no message was sent to the government representative to come to Matsieng. Procedurally, when Griffith had some administrative issues which involved the government he sent his councillors to the Resident Commissioner in Maseru. Sometimes the paramount chief himself would consult the Resident Commissioner.

This scene contributes to the development of the play. It follows the accepted dramatic structure, by beginning with an exposition, which is followed by the development of the conflict. Thus in order to show that Matete is serious about his decision to demote Bulane, Mafafa is sent to Majara. Matete needs Majara to confirm the change in the succession order. By doing this Khaketla establishes a continuity of events which helps him to develop the plot in the play.

Khaketla portrays Mafafa as a jester. His jokes are meant to make people laugh in order to ease the tense atmosphere established in scene I. Scene II is the opposite of scene I, in the sense that Majara and his men are concerned about the social welfare of their people. They plan to hunt the leopard which is threatening the social stability in Majara's chiefdom. By contrast Matete disrupts the social stability in his chiefdom with his unilateral decision. Matete does not unite his people, rather he creates confusion, division and hostility.

On the other hand this scene can be said to reflect how the playwright perceived events in Matsieng and Maseru in 1926. At Matsieng there was no peace, as Griffith was worried about his decision. He was worried whether the government would accept his decision or not. Thus as is portrayed in the play, there was no peace at Matsieng, the atmosphere was tense, the men were at one another's throats. But in Maseru things were smooth. There was no conflict of any kind in the colonial government. Khaketla portrays this through the peaceful atmosphere in Majara's ward, where the men are concerned about the social welfare of the people and not individual interest as it

happened in Matete's or Griffith's ward. Khaketla has succeeded in contrasting the tense atmosphere at Matsieng and the relaxed one on the side of the colonial administration.

ACT 11

SCENE 1

In this scene Mafafa has just returned from Majara's place. He tells Direko about his journey, and that Majara has been called by Matete. Mookgo, Bulane's wife, comes in and after few minutes Mafafa leaves the house. Direko tells Mafafa's story to her daughter-in-law. As they leave the stage, Bulane enters. He is joined by Moleko and Kakana, his councillors. They also discuss the issue of the succession and the pitso to be held. They are worried about the purpose of the pitso because it is a well-known fact that Bulane is to succeed Matete, therefore there is no need to hold *pitso* for such an issue. It also gives them an impression that something strange will be discussed at Matete's pitso. They feel that if it affects the succession order they will fight for justice until death. They promise Bulane their support and that they will stand by him through thick and thin. This scene is of the playwright's imagination.

The discussions in this scene may be based on what the playwright thought could have happened before Bereng and Seeiso were sent to Maseru to see the Resident Commissioner. This scene also contributes to the development of the play. We were first exposed to the conflict at Matete's ward; the second step is Mafafa's trip to Majara's ward. This scene is the third step, where the

playwright introduces us to the guilty parties which include Direko and Bulane. Khaketla's intention is to bring the accused to the fore so that we can get their views on the matter at hand. This is done so that the defendant can respond to the accusations brought forward by the complainant. The development of plot is facilitated by the two sides in the different scenes discussing the succession issue. This scene can not be traced to any particular historical events; rather it contributes to the playwright's imaginative plot.

Thus Khaketla is taking liberties with history when he writes that Seeiso could have heard rumours that there was going to be a change in the succession order, as happens with Bulane in the play. There is no historical evidence which indicates that Griffith called the Resident Commissioner to Matsieng as happens in the play.

ACT II

SCENE II

The scene begins with a conversation between Malokobe and Tladi. Malokobe reveals to Tladi the rationale behind his allegation that Bulane is not Matete's biological son. Malokobe informs Tladi that Direko once turned down his suggestion for an extra-marital affair; therefore his allegation is just a revenge. When Tladi tries to find out more information about Malokobe's defamatory claim, Malokobe dismisses him, saying that the truth of the affair does not concern him at all. They are joined by Matete, and later by Mafafa. Mafafa reports that Majara will be coming to Matete's court. Immediately

after his report, Sesedi, Majara's councillor arrives. He informs Matete that Majara will not be able to come due to injuries he sustained from a leopard attack.

This scene also develops and increases the suspense in the play. The fact that Malokobe told chief Matete a lie about Bulane's birth unfolds. Khaketla delays Majara's arrival. He keeps his readers in suspense. If Majara had come, a solution would have been reached at the onset and the plot and the suspense would have been foiled. It would also have resulted in deviating from the playwright's major objective of retaining links with the historical events in his play. His play would have been too short and would have lacked some of the dramatic features expected in a drama, especially development and climax. On the other hand this scene also proves that Khaketla was not simply re-writing history, he was concerned with the characteristics of drama.

There is no historical evidence for Malokobe's claim of an extra-marital affair which led him to defame Direko. As pointed out earlier, Seeiso's birth was not a secret. It was a well-known fact that Mmaseeiso was pregnant when she returned to Griffith. Malokobe's version, as used by the playwright, is a deviation from the truth. It is true that Griffith could have given Seeiso a chance to be his successor but he doubted his birth. That is why Seeiso was named S-e-e-i-s-o something that is not liked, something which is shameful, to be looked down with contempt. This name was meant to discredit the birth of a child who does not belong to his legal father, but is the child of the mother's lover. We might say that Malokobe's revelation reveals that Khaketla's thought that the issue of Seeiso's legitimacy was never considered as a matter of importance. Khaketla undermines Matete's reasoning power by

exposing the truth through Malokobe who boasts of having taken revenge on Direko. Khaketla shows that Griffith was weak when it came to the succession dispute. As the chief he failed to abide by the customs of the Basotho. Khaketla pokes fun at him through Malokobe, an influential character. The playwright feels that Griffith did not get constructive advice from his councillors and that he failed to reason like a paramount chief of the Basotho who should be familiar with the procedures pertaining to succession. With regard to Mafafa's report and Sesedi's excuse for Majara's absence, we can say that they are a creation of the playwright's imagination. The incidents do not relate to any historical events.

ACT 111

SCENE 1

In this scene Matete is soliloquizing; his concern is his decision to change the normal succession procedure. He blames his wife, Direko, for being unfaithful, which has made Bulane, her son, to suffer the consequences. Matete's soliloquy justifies his wicked deed. This conforms to Boulton's view that soliloquy can be used to reveal hypocrisy. Boulton writes:

Far more wrong is done by people who think they are doing right, from some honest mistake or that self-deception which we all practise more or less, than by the rare people who wilfully choose to do what is wrong. (1960:84).

Matete feels that his action is right although it is illogical and lacks social acceptance. Later he calls Bulane and Mohapi. He tells them to go to

Majara who will tell them about administrative matters and their rights as future leaders of the country. Matete says that he wants them to know their rights before he dies, as death may terminate his life at anytime. As his sons leave the stage, Matete asks them to call Mafafa for him. He tells Mafafa to go to Majara to inform him of the changes he has made with regard to the succession order and that Mohapi is the heir. Mafafa argues, saying that Mohapi is the junior son but Matete ignores him. Instead he tells Mafafa that he did not ask for his advice. Mafafa warns Matete that his decision will cause confusion in his chiefdom. Mafafa insists that Bulane is senior to Mohapi.

Majara's authority as a paternal uncle can be linked to historical episode. It is obvious that Mohapi cannot be recognised as the heir without Majara's consent; that is why he has to give the final word. This incident is based on Griffith's sending of Bereng and Seeiso to the Resident Commissioner in Maseru on 15 March 1926 with a letter stating that Bereng was senior to Seeiso. The government had the power to endorse or refute Griffith's decision. It was only with confirmation from the government that Bereng could be declared the legal heir, just as Majara, who has the final word concerning customary succession in Khaketla's play.

The last part of this scene during which Matete sends his sons to Majara is influenced by the court case between the sons of Mojela in which they fought over seniority. This case was discussed Chapter 2 under succession. The dispute was between Lerothodi from the fifth house and Molapo from the sixth house. The case of the sons of Mojela prompted Griffith to tell the government who his successor was during his lifetime to avoid embarrassment

after his death as it happened with Mojela's sons. Griffith also instructed some principal chiefs to choose their successors before their deaths.

According to the playwright, Mafafa represents the principal chiefs; Seeiso, Maama, Api, Sempe and Masopha. Griffith informed them that he would be sending Bereng and Seeiso to the Resident Commissioner in Maseru to confirm that Bereng was his senior son. In response to this, Griffith's junior brothers said that the matter of Bereng's seniority needed consultation with the sons of Moshweshwe as the matter was complicated. In his anger Griffith told them that he had not asked for their advice, rather he was just informing them of his plans. But in the play Mafafa is just a commoner, who does not belong to the royal family though he argues with Matete on the succession issue. Mafafa argues with Matete as an individual, while the five chiefs made a unanimous decision against Griffith. Furthermore, Mafafa is sent in advance to inform Majara of the coming of Matete's sons, and to tell him that Mohapi is senior to Bulane. The principal chiefs mentioned above were not sent to Maseru to inform the Resident Commissioner about the coming of Bereng and Seeiso to his office. Their concern was that the succession issue had to be discussed by the family of Moshweshwe.

This scene has some events which cannot be traced historically. Matete, in his soliloquy, points out that Bulane is innocent as a child, but that the fault lies with his mother, Direko. He says that he loves Direko and Bulane very much but he has made up his mind that Mohapi should be his successor and he cannot reverse this decision. Seeiso was never at any time Griffith's favourite. For instance, Griffith sent Seeiso to the mountains of Mokgotlong far away from him, while he sent Bereng, his beloved son, to his former ward

at Phamong. Bereng was Griffith's favourite because he knew that Bereng was his legitimate son and because Griffith had married his mother in church. Furthermore Mmaseeiso and Griffith's marriage was not happy one. What Matete says in his soliloquy is contrary to what really happened. Mmaseeiso and Griffith's marriage was not a happy one.

We also find that although Direko is said to be a flirt, she appears in the play as the most disciplined wife. Therefore if she represents Mmaseeiso, there is no sign of any misbehaviour by her in the play. Instead she is humble and respects her husband. She has qualities which Mmaseeiso did not have. Khaketla decided to make Direko a disciplined character because he felt that Mmaseeiso was by right Griffith's senior wife. He therefore gives Direko good qualities because his wish is that Mmaseeiso should have been dignified chieftainness. Direko represents ideal wives of men with outstanding social status. The playwright, in short, dismisses the behaviour of Mmaseeiso as unacceptable.

Furthermore when Bulane and Mohapi visit Majara, they are accompanied by their own advisors; for instance Bulane has Moleko and Kakana and Mohapi has Marora and Kgang. But when they visited the Resident Commissioner, Bereng and Seeiso were accompanied by Leloko, Griffith's top councillor. In Khaketla's work we would have expected Malokobe to have accompanied the sons to Majara's ward.

ACT III

SCENE II

Events in this scene take place at Majara's court where men are busy playing *morabaraba*. Mafafa joins them in the game and manages to win the first game against Kgwapha. Afterwards he asks to be taken to Majara as he has an important message for him. Mafafa leaves the rest of the men playing the *morabaraba*, while he delivers Matete's message to chief Majara.

This scene, short as it is, can be categorized as a scene which has no reference to history; rather it contributes to the development of the plot in the play. In the preceding scenes we were told that Majara was unable to get to Matete's court, therefore Matete sends Mafafa to Majara to deliver the message that his sons will be visiting him. Matete's intention is to have his decision confirmed by Majara in one way or the other. Khaketla pursues the issue in this scene in order to bring about unity of action in his plot. That is, Majara's failure to show up at Matete's court has led to his sons being sent to their grandfather so that he will confirm Mohapi as Matete's successor.

But, on the other hand when one looks at this scene from another angle, it is used to ease the tense atmosphere at Matete's court. In this scene, readers laugh from the beginning to end. It makes us forget about the clash in the play. Khaketla introduces us to the peaceful atmosphere at Majara's court where men are engaged in playing *morabaraba*. The playing of *morabaraba* in this context shows us that these men are socially at ease, they are at peace with one another. *Morabaraba* provides the traditional Sesotho milieu where men come together to be jolly and to informally discuss some of the issues affecting their lives. It symbolises a form of togetherness, it is a game which brings friends and enemies together. The playwright uses this scene to contrast the difference between Matete and Majara's chiefdoms. Khaketla makes his readers forget about the conflict and hatred in Matete's ward. Thus it refers to the tension which existed at Matsieng when the sons were about to be sent to the Resident Commissioner and the peace which reigned in Maseru, the government headquarters.

ACT III

SCENE III

When this scene opens, Mohapi discloses to his advisors that Matete had called him together with his brother, Bulane, and told them that they would be going to Majara's ward to be informed of their rights. Mohapi tells them that as they left Matete's house, he called him and informed him that he has been designated as heir. The reason for their journey to Majara's court is that Majara should confirm Matete's decision. As Mohapi and his colleagues exit, Bulane and his men enter. Bulane tells them of their impending journey to Majara's court with Mohapi. In their conversation, Moleko discloses that Kgang, Mohapi's advisor has warned him that things have changed and that Mohapi has been designated Matete's successor. This information infuriates the three men; Kakana, Mosesi and Moleko who vow to protect Bulane's rights even if it means paying with their lives. Towards the end of their discussions, Bulane thanks them for their support which he says strengthens him.

In this scene the playwright is preparing the readers for the climax. He introduces us to the claimants so that we know what their feelings are with regard to the change in Matete's succession. Khaketla has presented the two opposing sides in one scene in order to construct a convincing plot for his readers. After this scene the readers want to know more about the appearance of the two sons before Majara. Although this scene is not based on any historical events, Khaketla feels that there must have been some discussion on the issue. Thus he imagines the discussions that might have taken place on both Bereng's and Seeiso's side before they went to Maseru. He feels that probably Bereng as Griffith's favourite already knew that he was to be made heir to the throne before he went Maseru. But with regard to Seeiso, he could not have known the reason for their appearance before the Resident Commissioner.

ACT IV

SCENE I

This scene opens with a soliloquy from Mafafa who is waiting for Bulane and Direko in Direko's house. He voices his concern that "man" misuses his reasoning power. Mafafa relates how he argued with Matete who refused to listen to his advice, instead he accepted Malokobe and Tladi's wicked counsel. As Direko and Bulane enter the house, he tells them that Bulane has been secretly demoted because he is not Matete's biological son. The news shocks Direko who faints when she hears it.

This scene is the playwright's own creation and it is meant to develop his plot, although one fails to comprehend how it fits with the rest of the play. Mafafa's visit to Direko's house has no historical parallel. It is the playwright's invention that a messenger, who was sent to the Resident Commissioner, might have secretly informed Seeiso and Mmaseeiso what the purpose of their visit to Maseru was. If it had happened that Seeiso knew in advance of the demotion, he would not have gone to Maseru, instead he would have objected from the onset. Khaketla's portrayal of Bulane knowing in advance of the changes about to take place with regard to the succession order may pertain to a wish on the playwright's part that Seeiso should have been told before the meeting. When Seeiso left for Maseru he had no knowledge of what was to transpire in the meeting. He even informed the sons of Moshweshwe in a debate held at Matsieng in 1926 that he knew nothing about the meeting. When Seeiso came back from Maseru he confronted his father on the issue. If as Khaketla portrays it, Seeiso knew before hand, he would not have gone to Maseru. He would have confronted his father when he first heard the news. It is rather difficult to understand Khaketla's intention in making Bulane to know in advance that when he goes to Majara's place he would lose his status as heir.

Still with regard to this scene we can say that Khaketla's depiction of Mmaseeiso as Direko is at odds with the kind of person Mmaseeiso actually was. In the play Direko says:

Botshepehi ke ntho feela.....
Matete o nthohaka ka hore ke hloka
botshepehi.

Trustworthiness is nothing.....
Matete insults me by saying that I am untrustworthy

(Khaketla 1954: 41).

In the play Direko is portrayed as a respectable and disciplined woman who loves and listens to her husband. But Mmaseeiso is said to have been unfaithful and, as a result, had uncountable quarrels with Griffith as a result of her behaviour. For instance when she was at Seapala, her father's home, she lived with different men and in the end one of them fathered the girl, Aa!. Mmaseeiso was in love with Caswell Lefojane who even asked her to marry him. When Mmaseeiso returned to Griffith, she was already pregnant. None of Mmaseeiso's weak points are observable in Direko who is portrayed as an ideal, humble wife. Khaketla obviously would have liked Mmaseeiso to have been a disciplined wife as Direko. Direko is genuine when she says that Matete insults her by labelling her as unfaithful wife. Mmaseeiso could not feel insulted if Griffith told her she was a flirt because she was indeed unfaithful to him. Khaketla wants Direko to represent righteousness as opposed to Mosele who represents evil. Mosele is the worst character in the play because she is the second wife and as such, is part of the polygamous family which Khaketla strongly rejects. But Mmabereng, who is represented by Mosele was a peaceful wife and in no way like Mosele. Khaketla's desire to have Mmaseeiso as a disciplined wife is due to his belief that Seeiso's case was genuine, and therefore his mother had to be a dignified character. He regarded her as the mother of the nation, therefore she had to be exemplary in every way.

ACT IV

SCENE II

In the first part of this scene Matete, Malokobe, Thankga and Tladi are in Matete's house in the middle of the night. They are discussing the issue of

Mohapi's promotion as a successor to Matete. Matete informs them that he has already sent the boys to Majara to confirm his decision. Malokobe and Tladi support the steps which Matete has taken, while Thankga is opposed to them. Thankga points out that Matete must provide sound reasons for rejecting Bulane as his heir other than Malokobe's fabrications. Matete's response is that Bulane is not his biological son. Thankga objects to this allegation and tells Matete to be true to himself as the leader. He points out that he will rather die defending truth than going along with lies. Matete is angered by this, he threatens Thankga saying that he must shut up or else he will give instructions that he be eliminated. But Thankga stands firm. He takes the spear and asks Matete to stab him because he will continue to stand by the truth. Thankga then leaves Matete and his puppet councillors. As Thankga exits, Malokobe and Tladi point out that he should be killed because he has belittled Matete's dignity. Mafafa enters and starts joking when Matete asks him about Majara's response. Matete tells him about Thankga's behaviour. Mafafa supports Thankga. He warns Matete not to listen to Malokobe and Tladi's suggestion to kill Thankga. Mafafa also threatens Matete saying that he will desert Matete's village and expose him to the public.

In the last part of this scene we are introduced to the two characters, Mosele and Dipuo who are engaged in conversation. Mosele expresses her happiness about Mohapi's promotion to being a successor. The two of them insult Direko and Mookgo, her daughter-in-law. Mosele contemptuously speaks of Direko's poor background before she married Matete. As the conversation continues, Malokobe joins them. He tells them that Direko cries day and night because of the changes in the succession order. Mosele and Dipuo are pleased to hear of Direko's agony.

This scene can be paralleled to historical events. Thankga represents Qamako Mafa and his brothers, while Malokobe represents Leloko and other Griffith's favourites who assaulted Qamako and his brothers. Malokobe poses a threat which is meant to instigate Matete to kill Thankga. Malokobe says "*Ka nna a ka ba a sa bata! Ke qala ho bona sebete se sekana, le tello e kana!*" (If it were by me he would be dead by now. I have never seen such disrespect!)

(Khaketla 1954: 45) This sentence shows Malokobe as an uncompromising character who resorts to death penalty as a solution to the difficult situation. We find that Malokobe, like Leloko, is a violent character who believes that if negotiations fail, terrorising people is an alternative. Therefore both characters threaten men who oppose their chiefs. Malokobe's behaviour is modelled on Leloko's who could not withhold his anger and ended up assaulting Matete, the brother of Qamako, who was one of Griffith's opponents. On 14 December 1926, Qamako Mafa wrote a letter to the Assistant Commissioner informing him that the paramount chief had threatened them - the sons of Mahao and Matete. He indicated that the threat came after the judgement had been passed in the case in which Seeiso challenged Bereng's seniority. He also pointed out that the paramount chief informed them that their wards might be diminished. The letter further stated that when Qamako and his brothers were at Matsieng, his younger brother, Mabidikwe, was assaulted by a man named Ramosothwane. When they were in Maseru, Matete was assaulted by "Leloko Lerothodi", while Kgwai was assaulted by Rabasothwane's son (Qamako: 14/12/1926). It must be noted that the three men who carried out the assault were Griffith's favourites. Without doubt, Khaketla's Malokobe parallels Leloko. Instead of being peaceful and concerned with nation-

building, Leloko and Malokobe are hostile and jeopardize peace and stability in the kingdom.

Furthermore we can say that Matete in the play and Griffith condone Malokobe and Leloko's behaviour. Because of Malokobe's allegation, Matete changes the succession order. Secondly when Thankga disagrees with Matete, Matete becomes angry and rebukes him. He warns Thankga that if he does not refrain from accusing him of having made the wrong decision with regard to his heir, he will say "*E be ke laela hore ntja e felehetswe*", (I would then command that the dog be killed) (Khaketla 1954: 44). Matete's behaviour can be correlated to that of Griffith's who supported Leloko in his misdemeanours. Griffith wrote a letter on the 22 October 1927 to the High Commissioner complaining about the sons of Mahao and Matete. He indicated that they were threatening his position and challenging his authority in order to test whether their opinions would be accepted by the paramount chief's court. He quoted the cases of Patrick, Mojela and Seeiso and said that they were always against his judgement:

Ba iketsa sehlotshwana ho leka ho bona hore na
ka matla a bona kapa ka thato tsa bona ba ka
sisinya borena ba ka.

They group themselves to threaten my authority
to see whether with their influence they can
unseat me from my chieftainship (Griffith: 22/10/1926).

His request was that the sons of Mahao and Matete should be made to withdraw from chiefly affairs of succession order. Under normal circumstances Griffith would have been expected to reprimand Leloko and other men who assaulted the sons of Mahao and Matete. Unfortunately it did not happen that way. Instead

Griffith accused the people who had been wronged and on top of it, he asked the government to intervene. This shows that Griffith approved of the assault carried out by Leloko. In the play Matete agrees with Malokobe that Thankga should be eliminated. The two chiefs fail in their duty to encourage unity instead they instil hatred and confrontation among their subjects. Matete is an autocratic leader just as Griffith who believed in victimising his opponents. Like Griffith, Matete's rule does not allow freedom of speech, but demands obedience and submissiveness. Griffith's attitude is reflected in the judgement against Seeiso on the 12 November 1926 when Seeiso challenged the seniority of Bereng in the presence of the sons of Moshweshwe. Over 70 chiefs and advisors attended the hearing. When they voted, Bereng got 23 votes while Seeiso got 10. It was discovered that those who voted were Griffith's favourites. Most of the principal chiefs abstained from voting because they feared that Griffith would diminish their wards. This feeling was also raised by the High Commissioner in his letter in Cape Town.

And I must tell you quite frankly, chief, that I am not satisfied that the sons of Moshweshwe have decided beyond doubt in favour of Bereng. The sons of Moshweshwe have always had the very greatest respect for the paramount chief and I feel that many of them might hesitate to vote if they thought they were expressing an opinion different to your own (24/11/1927).

It seems as though Griffith had threatened his people and therefore they did not want to be in conflict with him. It shows that they had no freedom of speech and feared victimisation by the paramount chief. Their abstinence clearly shows that the vote was not fairly conducted, which is why Griffith was afraid to hold a secret ballot. He feared that if it was conducted,

chiefs would be in a position to choose their future paramount chief freely. Matete like Griffith reigns with an iron fist.

There are deviations from history in his scene, especially in the second part. Mosele says that Direko comes from a poor family. However if we accept that Direko represents Mmaseeiso, Mosele's accusation is not true. Mmaseeiso was the daughter of a principal chief. She belonged to one of the top-ranking families in Lesotho. She could not be classified as a commoner. Proof of this lies in the fact she was married to a son of the paramount chief. Furthermore it will be recalled that Mmabereng was Mmaseeiso's biological sister. Griffith married four daughters of Nkwebe in the order of their age; Mmabatho, Mmaseeiso, Mmabereng and Tsebo. Thus Mmabereng would not have defamed her family as happens with Mosele in the play. Khaketla's Mosele has such a great hatred towards Direko that she steals her milk and insults her. But if we refer to history we find that the two sisters, Mmaseeiso and Mmabereng had a close relationship. Their closeness was obvious when their eldest sister, Mmabatho, Griffith's senior wife died in 1912. According to custom, one of the wives had to occupy the deceased's house. Griffith suggested that Mmakaredi, another of his wives, should occupy Mmabatho's house so as to take care of her children. Griffith's fear was that Mmabatho's sisters would not treat her children well. But on the contrary, Mmabereng suggested that Mmaseeiso should occupy Mmabatho's house because she was the second senior wife. Moreover in 1926 when Mmabereng was asked to give evidence concerning Mmaseeiso's seniority, she indicated that she felt Mmaseeiso should occupy Mmabatho's house because she was senior to her. Mmabereng felt that Mmaseeiso was senior to her regardless of Griffith's

attempts to discredit Mmaseeiso. The fact that she gave evidence in favour of Mmaseeiso in 1926 shows that they were on good terms.

Khaketla deviated from history in order to show that polygamous marriage results in enmity as proof of its wickedness. But in reality this was not the case. The senior wives were respected by the junior ones. Respect for seniority was part of the contract and had to be adhered to as shown by Mmabereng towards Mmaseeiso. Mmabereng did not consider her substitution as a reality, and she did not see her Christian marriage as having overridden customary practices.

ACT V

SCENE 1

We are told of the discussions held at Majara's court prior to the settlement of Bulane's seniority. When the scene opens, Majara is asked by his men why Bulane and Mohapi have come to see him. He tells them that Matete has asked him to confirm that Mohapi is senior to Bulane. When asked for his view of the matter, Majara indicates that under no circumstances will he be obliged to abide by Matete's wicked will. His men, Rankgo, Sesedi and Kgwapha fully support him, and say that Matete's decision is unprocedural since according to customary law Bulane is senior to Mohapi. In the course of the discussions, Bulane, Mohapi and their men join Majara's court. After an exchange of greetings Majara tells them to listen to what he will tell them. He further says that for unity to prevail there must be respect and that as

the "Law is Law" it must be adhered to at all times. Majara calls Bulane and Mohapi to stand next to him and he instructs Bulane to distribute food to the men inside the court:

Bulane, mahlong a lekgotla lohle la ka, leo
ke le kgobokantseng mona hore le tle le etse bopaki
ke re ho wena dijo ke tseo abela batho ba hao.

Bulane, in the presence of my councillors
whom I have called together here, to witness,
I instruct you to distribute this food to your
people (Khaketla 1954: 55).

Bulane obediently does what he is told to do. Having eaten breakfast, Mohapi lodges a protest against Majara for not abiding by Matete's decision:

Ha ke kgotso ke seo o se entseng,.....
Ha se dumellane le seo ntate a mpoleletseng
sona ke e-so tle kwano.

I am not satisfied with what you have just done,
It is not in accordance with what my father told me
before I came here (Khaketla 1954: 56).

Mohapi points out that his father has disclosed to him that he is to be his successor and that he will inherit whatever property belongs to Matete. In response to the accusation Majara says that he is senior to Matete, and knows the law better than Matete. Majara says that it is his responsibility, as a senior member of the family, to correct and help straighten out issues if Matete fails to get them right. He warns Mohapi that if he gets out of control and becomes unruly, he must know that the nation will always be on Bulane's side. As the discussions continue, Tladi, Matete's councillor,

arrives, and asks for Mohapi saying he is urgently needed by his father. Bulane and Mohapi leave for Matete's ward as instructed by Majara.

When comparing Majara and the colonial government, we find some similarities in the manner in which they deal with the succession issue. Majara appears in the play as Matete's great uncle who refuses to acknowledge Matete's change in the order of succession. Majara can therefore be said to represent both the colonial government and the principal chiefs who did not approve of Griffith's decision. Like Majara the colonial government declined to recognise Bereng as heir after Seeiso challenged his seniority. Although the case was decided in favour of Bereng at the Matsieng court, the government insisted on a secret ballot as it felt that vote held at Matsieng was not fair.

In this scene there are some deviations from historical events. In history Bereng and Seeiso were not sent to their grandfather as Khaketla portrays Mohapi and Bulane as doing when they appeared before Majara, their grandfather. Instead Seeiso and Bereng appeared before the Resident Commissioner Murray.

The solution to the succession problem was not as easily resolved as shown by Khaketla. The Resident Commissioner did not resolve the succession dispute by reinstating Seeiso as the heir just as Majara does in the play when he tells Bulane to distribute food to his people. The government did not settle the matter. Discussions dragged on from March 1926 to December 1927, when the matter was left unresolved. The matter was only resolved after Griffith's

death, not during his lifetime as happens in the play where Bulane is retained as the legal heir during Matete's lifetime.

Khaketla had to resort to Majara's immediate and short judgement in order to keep his play to a reasonable length. The playwright seems to have been influenced by regulations governing the length of a drama on stage. Normally a play should not be more than two hours. He had to avoid details which would have lengthened his play. He found it convenient to exclude the details of the debates held at Matsieng from September to November 1926. However one can say that Khaketla opted for a quick solution to Matete's ruling because he felt that the conflict over Griffith's succession was a simple issue which should have been solved by the family. According to Khaketla, there was no need for Griffith to have failed to call the family before he made a decision which affected the whole nation. His opinion is that the matter was straightforward and need not have dragged on for 12 years. Khaketla's position is that lengthy discussions were useless because customary law was still in place. In his view the matter was complicated by Griffith's behaviour as he failed to comply with the customary laws of the Basotho.

In the play, Mohapi complains to Majara about being denied the chieftaincy promised by Matete. This is not the case in history; Bereng did not complain while they were in Maseru before the Resident Commissioner. Instead Khaketla makes Mohapi complain and silences Bulane who represents Seeiso who complained bitterly about the decision made by his father. Bulane is satisfied with what Majara has done because it favours him. Historically the decision went against Seeiso who then asked his father to call the sons of Moshweshwe for him to thrash out the matter.

Khaketla has changed the actions of the historical characters, Bereng and Seeiso to suit his plot. Mohapi (Bereng) reacts like Seeiso, while Bulane (Seeiso) behaves like Bereng. The playwright wanted to retain and develop the conflict in the play in a convincing manner. Khaketla denounces Matete's decision as being unprocedural. Therefore Mohapi must suffer because his appointment does not follow the customary law. The way in which he changes the candidates' reactions helps to develop his plot because Bulane must be portrayed as innocent and victorious, while Mohapi is wicked and loses the case in the end. It must be noted that Khaketla wanted to stress that justice would only be reached if customary laws were properly followed. If Mohapi had been confirmed as heir, it would have meant that evil had overpowered good, but Khaketla is concerned that good should always triumph over evil. If Bereng became the paramount chief lawlessness and chaos would have ensued in the country. But given that, in the long run Seeiso succeeded his father, law and order were retained.

After the re-instatement of Bulane, Tladi, Matete's councillor brings the news of Matete's illness. Mohapi and Bulane rush home because their father is seriously ill. Historically no messenger was sent to Maseru to inform Bereng and Seeiso about their father's illness. Bereng and Seeiso were not called by Griffith while they were in Maseru. Instead they were referred back to Matsieng, not because their father Griffith was ill but to settle the dispute in the presence of the sons of Moshweshwe. Matete's illness in the play might be seen as an author-inspired punishment caused by the wrath of the ancestors. The ancestors punish Matete for his wrongdoing, for overlooking

the legal heir for personal reasons. He must suffer the consequences of his wickedness.

ACT V

SCENE II

This scene is about Matete's illness. Matete is looked after by Malokobe, Mosele and Direko. Matete later dismisses Direko, accusing her of being the source of his sickness. Malokobe is asked to fetch a traditional healer by the name of Phepheng. With Direko gone, Mosele, Matete's second wife asks her husband to publicly announce Mohapi as his successor. Then Malokobe accompanied by Phepheng joins them. Malokobe tells Phepheng to do a good job and in return chief Matete will reward him well. Phepheng starts his doctoring by throwing the divining bones which he later praises. Phepheng says that the source of Matete's illness is his wife; he says that Matete has been bewitched by Direko. In the course of the discussions Bulane, Mohapi and Tladi arrive. Matete welcomes Mohapi, but expels Bulane. He calls him a young puff-adder which bites like its mother. Afterwards Mohapi tells Matete that Majara has ignored his command and instead has confirmed Bulane as heir. Matete's illness is aggravated by Mohapi's report and he asks to be left alone.

ACT V

SCENE III

This scene opens with Direko and her daughter-in-law, Mookgo, discussing her expulsion from Matete's house. Mookgo is sympathetic to her mother-in-law and consoles her. They are joined by Bulane who is accompanied by Thankga and Mafafa. Bulane is upset that Matete has chased him from his house with insults.

ACT V

SCENE IV

Scene IV continues to deal with Matete's illness. Matete, although sick, is haunted by a dream which discloses the falsity of Molokobe's allegation. He wants to confess to Bulane and Direko. He points out that Malokobe lied to him when he said that Bulane was not his biological son and that Bulane is the legal and rightful heir. Matete asks Malokobe to call Direko and Bulane for him, but they are reluctant to call them. Instead they pretend to fetch them but they do not do so. When Tladi enters, Matete tells him that he would have liked to admit his error to Direko and Bulane before his death. He therefore asks him to deliver that message to them. But the angry Mosele stops Tladi that he must never say anything to anyone. When Matete is about to give his last breath, Mosele and Malokobe soften their hearts and decide to call Direko and Bulane. When they enter Matete can no longer speak but his

face shows remorse and repentance. His last words; Kea le..b... "I thank....." He dies smiling (Khaketla 1954: 71).

Matete's prolonged illness which appears in the last three scenes is Khaketla's way of portraying the twelve years in which the succession matter was left unattended. Gérard (1971: 171) quotes Beuchat who criticizes Khaketla for having a long conclusion after the climax. Beuchat considers Majara's resolution of the succession dispute as the climax while Matete's illness is the denouement. These three scenes add to the suspense of the play when Dipuo and Malokobe delay in calling Direko and Bulane until Matete is unable to speak audibly. Khaketla does this so that his readers do not lose interest before the end of the play. At the same time he portrays the length of time before the succession issue was resolved as happened historically.

Some of the incidents in this scene differ from the historical records. We find that in the play, Matete is attended by the traditional doctor, Phepheng, in his house. Historical records show that Griffith became ill on the 21st July 1939 and was taken to Queen Elizabeth II Hospital in Maseru. He died on the 23rd July 1939. The cause of his death was not disclosed but some oral sources say it was due to excessive intake of alcohol. The historical information contrasts with Khaketla's version which portrays Matete as dying because of witchcraft. At the hospital Griffith was cared for by specialists who diagnosed his sickness professionally while Matete's doctor throws divining bones. In addition to that Phepheng is a liar and an unreliable person. Griffith died at dawn in the hospital in Maseru far away from his house, but Matete dies smiling in his house in the presence of Bulane, Direko, Malokobe, Mohapi, Mosele and Tladi. There is no historical evidence

to show that when Griffith died at the hospital he was surrounded by his wives, sons and councillors. Before he dies Matete asks for Direko and Bulane because he wants them to pardon him. When Griffith died, he did not ask Mmaseeiso to pardon him nor did he accept that Seeiso was his biological son. Griffith could not have said that Seeiso was his biological son while he knew that he was not.

The ending of the play reflects the influence the Christian religion had on the playwright when he wrote the play. Khaketla is a staunch Anglican who believes that good always triumph over evil. This is reflected in the play as Matete smiles at Bulane and Direko to show his remorse. This allows his death to be a happy one because he has settled the dispute and he has renounced evil as represented by Malokobe and Mosele.

Through the traditional doctor, Phepheng, Khaketla portrays the inefficiency and unreliability of some traditional doctors. Phepheng is portrayed as a symbol of wickedness. He is filthy. By so doing Khaketla renounces traditional medical practice. In short, he shows that he does not approve of such practices. Phepheng does not come across as having professional knowledge rather he emerges as an amateur who tells lies in order to please Malokobe and Mosele. As Phepheng throws the bones, Mosele winks at him. It is obvious that Phepheng and Mosele had made a secret deal, and thus his doctoring could not be relied upon. Matete does not seem to be suffering from an illness caused by witchcraft initiated by Direko because he confesses that ancestors are angry with him. When he asks for Bulane and Direko we are made aware that Phepheng is in fact lying by blaming Direko for Matete's illness. Phepheng symbolises cheating doctors who are only after rewards or payments.

He tells a lie because Malokobe has hinted to him that chief Matete will give him satisfactory payment if he cures him. In short Phepheng shows how traditional medical practice has lost its respect and dignity among the Basotho.

In his play *Khaketla* ridicules Griffith's personality and his actions. Griffith failed to behave like a chief when he did not part with some of his wives when he got converted to Christianity. But in 1913 he refused to raise seeds in the family of Letsie II under the pretext that he was a Christian. He remained polygamous, one of the things rejected by the church. *Khaketla* doubted the sincerity of Griffith as a Christian. It should be noted that Griffith asked the missionaries to build a Roman Catholic Church at Matsieng for his convenience. He was the first paramount chief to be buried in the mission cemetery at Matsieng. The other paramount chiefs and Seeiso his son were buried on the Thaba-Bosiu plateau. *Khaketla* questions Griffith's faith in Christianity. Why Griffith, as a Christian still practised polygamy? What type of a Christian was Griffith? *Khaketla's* answer is that Griffith was a part-time Christian, because his deeds did not reflect his commitment to Christianity. The playwright's feeling is that he became a true Christian when he died because he withdrew from worldly affairs, passions of love, hatred and anger which destabilised his kingdom. That is why in the play Matete dies happily because he has repented. That is, *Khaketla* is saying that Griffith gave himself up to passions which led him astray and discredited his dignity.

There is also the point of Matete's dream, which the playwright invented in order that Matete could repent. Griffith did not change his mind on the issue

of his successor or dubious birth of Seeiso. Khaketla chose to use a dream because among the Basotho, a dream is a revelation of some unknown facts. Dreams establish a connection between the living and the ancestors and they are highly revered by the Basotho. The concept of ancestors is another issue which influences the life of Basotho. As people who died long ago ancestors are highly respected people. They are said to be guardians of the living. They help people to behave well; they determine people's successes and failures in life. Therefore when people disobey them they are likely to be doomed. As a result ancestors are revered; they are seen as messengers who have direct contact with God. They act as go-betweens, between man and God. Khaketla decided to use them in his play to show their importance in the life of the Basotho. Thus Matete is bound to abide by the revelation in his dreams or else he would have been cursed forever. Therefore, in fear of his life, he agrees to what they tell him to do.

3.1.2 BULANE AND THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT.

This play is a sequel to Tholoana tsa Sethepu. It is about Bulane, the son of Matete who becomes the paramount chief. Later he insists on levirate practice. This decision inflames the anger of his rival, Mohapi, who plots to assassinate him. As a play, Bulane is also based on the historical events which occurred after Griffith's death in 1939. It deals with the succession dispute which followed the death of Griffith. Seeiso became the paramount chief on February 1940. He reigned for only 10 months and died after a short illness. The characters in Bulane and the events are based on history. Bulane still represents Seeiso and Mohapi represents Bereng. Majara still represents the government and Pulane is linked to chieftainess Agatha.

There are two major events in this play, the installation of Bulane which resembles the crowning of Seeiso. The other one is the clash over Pulane which relates to the conflict between Seeiso and Bereng over Agatha. After Griffith's death, Basotho were eager to fill the position of the paramount chief with the person they thought was the legal heir.

The Basotho Progressive Association was one of the first groups which met to straighten out the succession issue. This was an organisation of the educated Basotho which was founded in 1907. Its major aim was to work for the progress of the Basotho and to work in harmony with the government, chiefs and the missionaries. Most of its members were commoners who had received higher education. Members of the Basotho Progressive Association met at Morija on 2 August 1939 to discuss Griffith's successor. In the meeting four names were suggested; Seeiso Griffith, Bereng Griffith, Makgaola Letsie II and Goliath

Mohale. Members were given a chance to express their views of the candidates. After deliberations, secret ballot was held. The outcome of the voting favoured Seeiso. Over a hundred members had attended the meeting and only 5 votes were against Seeiso. On the 3rd August 1939 at 9.00 a.m. the president of the association sent the following telegram to Resident Commissioner:

Chief Seeiso Griffith's claim to the paramountcy was supported by overwhelming majority at a large meeting of Progressive Association here yesterday. It resolved to request Resident Commissioner to uphold this rightful claim of legal and popular heir of the late paramount chief.
Mangwaela - President (Leselinyana: 09/08/1939: p.1).

The meeting of the Basotho Progressive Association was followed by another meeting of the sons of Moshweshwe, called by the Resident Commissioner. The meeting was held in the chamber of the National Council on the 3rd August 1939. The sons of Moshweshwe were given the chance to conclude the succession dispute. Machobane writes:

The sons of Moshweshwe this time stayed clear of the techniques of the alleged swapping of ranks by the chieftainesses. They also stayed clear of an allegation of illegitimacy, with which the late *Morena e Moholo* had belatedly saddled Seeiso. They stuck strictly to the Sesotho interpretation that offspring derive their legitimacy from the validity of their mother's marriage; *Ngwana ke wa dikgomo* (a child belongs to the bohadi cattle) They followed closely the principle of succession embodied in Law I of the Laws of Lerothodi (1990: 195).

In their meeting, three candidates were suggested; Makgaola Letsie II, Bereng Griffith and Seeiso Griffith. Leloko wanted Makgaola as the paramount chief. He even threatened to appeal because Makgaola was Letsie II's son. But Makgaola could not be the paramount chief because, in terms of the agreement of 1913 between Griffith and the sons of Moshweshwe, the heir was to come

from the house of Griffith and not Letsie II. Theko Makgaola and Soko Mpiti supported Bereng. But Bereng's appointment was dismissed on the grounds that he was from the third house. On that day principal chiefs whose names appear below voted for Seeiso:

Tumane L. Matela	Seeiso Maama
Kwini Mopedi Joele	Molapo Maama
Letsie K. Motshwene	Ramabanta Api
Jonathane Matheadira	Moholobela
Kgethisa Tau	Lerotholi Mojela
Boshwane Peete	Moeketsi Mokgele
Gabashane Masopha	Mohale
Majara Leshoboro	Bolokwe
Makgobalo Theko	Qefate S. Nkwebe

Seeiso was virtually elected as the paramount chief of Lesotho. His name was put before the Resident Commissioner, Sir E.C. Richards, on the 3rd August, 1939 as the paramount chief-elect. Procedurally the government had to consult with the High Commissioner before implementing the decision by the nation.

Leselinyana of 20 September 1939 reported that:

The nation was informed that, with the consent and consultation with the government's secretary for chieftainship affairs, the High Commissioner has confirmed in principle Seeiso Griffith to be the paramount chief of Lesotho, succeeding his father, Griffith Lerothodi (20/09/1939).

Seeiso was crowned paramount chief on the 17th February 1940 by Sir Edward Harding, the High Commissioner. On that day Seeiso was seated between Bereng Griffith and Sekgonyana. In his speech Sir Edward Harding pleaded with the Basotho nation to support the new paramount chief just as they did to his father. He also asked Seeiso to work in harmony with the Basotho and wished him good luck with his new responsibility. He said:

Peo ya morena e moholo ke ketsahalo e hlomphehang.
.... Boikarabelo ba hae ke bo boholo. Ho qala
letsatsing leo a tshwarang borena ka lona, e ka kgona
a lokele ho ikabela bophelo ba batho ba hae. Hore a
fihlele seo e ka kgona taba tseo eleng tsa boiketlo ba
hae e be tse boellang kamorao. Batho ba hae ba shebile
yena ho ba sebeletsa ka toka le ho ba tataisa ka toka
dinyeweng tse ngata-ngata.

The crowning of a paramount chief is a momentous occasion...
He has got much responsibility. As from the day that he
resumed his duty as a chief, he must devote his life to
serve his people. In order to achieve this goal, his
personal commitments should come last. His people are expecting
him to serve them in a just manner and also to guide them fairly
in their many court disputes (Leselinyana: 21/02/1940: pp. 1 & 2).

There are two other issues worth mentioning which relate to **Bulane**. The first one is Seeiso's relationship with his first wife, Mmantshebo and his negative attitude to the Roman Catholic Church. With regard to the Catholic Church, the story goes as far back as 1926 during the debate over the succession dispute, the Roman Catholic priests supported Griffith's claim that Bereng was his rightful heir. Their support was based on the fact that Mmabereng was his legitimate wife because she was married in church while Mmaseeiso was not. This position of the Roman Catholic Church infuriated Seeiso to such an extent that he developed a negative attitude towards it as is shown in the play in a conversation between Bulane and Direko. His first wife, Mmantshebo, was a staunch Roman Catholic Christian.

George, in his praise poems, highlights Seeiso's ill feelings towards the Roman Catholic Church:

Tshwana Lere ha a sa kena kereke;
Ena ea Roma ha a sa e rata,
Morena e ka o lebetse Modimo.

Tshwana Lere does not attend the church;
He does not like this one of Roman Catholic,
It seems as though the chief has forgotten God
(Lerotholi 1940: 12)

These lines prove that Seeiso's attitude to the Roman Catholic Church was publicly known to the Basotho. On the day of Seeiso's funeral, Father Thomas of the Roman Catholic Church, when delivering his condolences, pointed out that Seeiso was a Christian although, because of some weaknesses, he had not received sacraments. He further stated that:

Although God is a judge whose judgements are just, He has eternal mercy; though the chief has died before he could repent, we hope that he ended up looking at God's mercy, we hope that God will accept him because He is merciful
(Leselinyana: 08/01/1941 p.1).

The remarks by Father Thomas substantiate the rumour that the relationship between Seeiso and Roman Catholic Church was so tense, that even at the funeral, the priest failed to hide his ill-feeling.

Seeiso was also described by the Assistant Commissioner in Qacha's Nek as having bitter relationship with Mmantshebo. In a letter dated 06-11-1927, it was said that Seeiso thrashed his wife to such an extent that she fled to Serobanyane, one of the headmen in the ward of Mokgotlong. In another quarrel

Seeiso severely beat his wife and this time she fled to Rafolatsane, one of the chiefs at Mokgotlong. When Seeiso claimed her, Rafolatsane refused to hand her over to him. The relationship between Mmantshebo and Seeiso became so tense that she sought refuge in Matsieng, Griffith's royal village. In another letter dated 30/06/1930 it is said that Seeiso was called to Matsieng, where he was reprimanded but when he went back to Mokgotlong, he left his wife behind. After sometime Griffith asked him to come and collect his wife but Seeiso declined. His excuse was that his horses were in poor conditions. These events happened before the death of Griffith.

The last point is the position of chieftainess Agatha in connection with her affair with Seeiso and Bereng. Motsetsela disclosed that she was said to have been a village beauty with which Seeiso and Bereng fell in love. They used to quarrel over her to such an extent that their father, Griffith, intervened. His intervention was in the form of marriage; he married Agatha to ease the tension between his sons but still the two brothers did not terminate their affair with her. That is why after the death of Griffith they both revived their extra-marital affair with her. As a result their old quarrel re-emerged.

On the 20th December 1940 Seeiso is said to have visited Agatha at her place, Qeme, Ha Mmantshebo, when he fell fatally ill. He was taken to Queen Elizabeth II Hospital where he died in the night of the 25th December 1940. Rumour had it that he was poisoned by Agatha who had been instructed to do it by Bereng. Some sources close to the doctor who attended Seeiso refuted the allegation, saying his illness was caused by excessive drinking while Leselinyana reported that he died from pain caused by his bile.

Khaketla, in the sequel, Bulane, completes the story of the row over Griffith's successor. It might be that he felt he had left out the later part of the dispute which would still be of great interest to the readers. One might say that the playwright held the chieftaincy in great esteem as being part of the custom and in the interest of the people. This is the view he expressed in the Mohlabani newspaper as shown earlier. Khaketla seems to have been captivated by the reaction of the Basotho Progressive Association when it called its meeting to discuss the issue of succession in a democratic manner. Therefore in his play he employed the characters known as *monna I*, *monna II* and *monna III* who seem to be commoners but were engaged in a discussion concerning the succession. Thus these men represented the members of the Basotho Progressive Association whose majority was comprised of commoners. The playwright felt that commoners form the majority of those ruled, and, as such, they should have a say in choosing who is to rule them. He makes a breakthrough into democratic politics by maintaining that people must choose their leaders, just as in Sesotho it is said that a chief is a chief by the people. He rules people, not members of the royal family.

Expanding on his view of democracy Khaketla brings in a platform where high ranking councillors and members of the royal blood take the stage. Majara, who can be called a presiding chief, opens the floor for discussion on succession dispute so that men can air their views on the issue. Khaketla was fascinated by the debate which the principal chiefs had over Griffith's successor as is shown by Machobane earlier in this work. The principal chiefs freely debated the issue without fear of victimisation. Khaketla welcomed the idea and reflects this in his play where men like Thankga and Malokobe argue

bitterly over Matete's will. The playwright felt that open discussion which leads to consensus is the gate to peace and stability; hence he uses it in his drama. Khaketla approved of the way the government and principal chiefs chose the paramount chief. He believes that people must have a say in matters which affect them.

The playwright seems to abhor levirate custom in every form and therefore feels that it should be discouraged. Thus Bulane is in conflict with Mookgo, Direko, Mafafa and Mosesi because of his insistence on levirate. It should be noted that these are the people who supported him during the succession crisis. Although Khaketla kills Mohapi in his play, he implies that Bulane's insistence on the levirate custom is the source of his troubles. The playwright avoids killing Bulane because he considers him the people's choice, who must learn through his mistakes. In short Khaketla feels that Seeiso could have stopped his affair with chieftainess Agatha. His concern is that Seeiso's affair would be detrimental to Seeiso, especially when Agatha was so close to Griffith and Bereng. By continuing his love relationship with Agatha, Seeiso was putting his life at risk. The only way to avoid this was to terminate the relationship. But Seeiso did not terminate the affair until when he fell fatally ill at Agatha's house.

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

ACT 1

When the play opens, some men are debating the succession issue. Some of the men believe that *molao ke molao* "law is law" and that it must be adhered to. This group believes that Bulane, as the son from the first house, is the legal heir and successor to his father, Matete. Their argument is that this follows customary laws of succession. The other group states that *lentswe la mofu le ahelwa lesaka*, "the will of the dead has to be fulfilled" (Khaketla 1958: 7 & 8). As their argument continues, Majara enters the stage followed by Bulane, Mohapi, Thankga, Malokobe and some other councillors.

After the councillors have taken their seats, Majara formally opens the meeting. He informs the public that the purpose of the gathering is to introduce Matete's successor to them. Majara relates how he has rejected Matete's wish to make Mohapi his successor. He opens the discussions by asking the public to express their views on his decision. Thankga, a former councillor of Matete, and other men like Mafafa, Kgwapha, Rankgo and Sesedi support the step taken by Majara. Their greatest opponent is Malokobe who challenges Majara's decision. He asks this question:

Ke re na setjhaba se na le matla a ho etsolla se
entsweng ke morena wa sona na?

I am asking whether the nation has a mandate to
reverse the will of their chief (Khaketla 1958: 10).

Thankga responds to this question by saying that the nation does not have the powers to reverse the will of the chief if he did it in consultation with the nation. If a chief's decision does not follow the customary laws of the Basotho, it can be reversed. He explains to Malokobe that the chief is a chief by the people, he is the servant of the people. Therefore a chief must be installed according to the customary laws of the people whom he will rule.

After the debate Majara stands up to make a few remarks. He reprimands Mohapi for misconduct at the funeral of Matete, when he wanted *ho tshela mobu pele ho Bulane* (to pour soil before Bulane) (Khaketla 1958: 12). According to Sesotho custom it is procedural that male relatives should pour soil in the grave in the order of their seniority in the family tree. If by mistake a junior member pours soil before his senior, the senior will automatically not take part in the process. What Majara says is that Bulane, as the son of the senior wife, should have come before Mohapi, but Mohapi insisted on being the first at Matete's funeral. After the remarks, Majara introduces Bulane to the gathering as Matete's successor. The nation welcomes him with ululation while Moleko sings praise poems for the new chief. The praise poems relate Bulane's sufferings and how he was nearly barred from ascending the throne. Events mentioned above are related to history. The playwright states that there was debate on the succession issue, as there were two candidates for the position of the paramount chief namely, Bulane and Mohapi. This debate correlates with the discussions held by the Basotho Progressive Association and the sons of Moshweshwe on Griffith's successor.

The unidentified men who are labelled as Monna I, Monna II and Monna III therefore represent members of the Basotho Progressive Association. The

Basotho Progressive Association was the first group to meet and reach a decision about who should be Griffith's heir. It should also be noted these men are not referred to by their names during the debate. The reaction of the Basotho Progressive Association like that of the unknown men in the play shows that even the commoners were involved in the choice of the paramount chief.

After the argument of these unidentified men, Majara, Bulane, Mohapi and other high ranking councillors enter the stage. Majara gives the public an opportunity to express their opinions. This event is paralleled to the meeting of the sons of Moshweshwe called by the Resident Commissioner, in which Seeiso was chosen by the majority of the principal chiefs. In this meeting Seeiso beat his rivals just as happens in the play where Bulane's appointment is supported by the majority of the people. Votes for Bereng were disappointingly few like those for Mohapi who is only supported by Malokobe.

The speech by Thankga and the praise poems by Moleko, to a certain extent parallel some historical documents.

Thankga says:

Seo morena a se entseng se ke ke sa etsollwa haeba a
ile a se etsa ka therisano le tumellano le setjhaba
sa hae, empa seo morena a iketseditseng sona
a le mong, a sa rerisana le setjhaba sa hae, se sa ye
ka melao le meetlo ya Sesotho..... setjhaba se na le
matla a ho se etsolla.

What the chief has done cannot be reversed if it was
done in consultation and agreement with his people,
...But what the chief has done..... alone, not in
consultation with his people, ... not in
compliance with ways and customs of Sesotho.....
the nation has the right to reverse (Khaketla 1954: 10).

This view by Thankga is similar to the opinion expressed in the letter written by Jonathan to the Resident Commissioner when he declined to accompany Griffith to Cape Town. He said:

We have our own ways and customs which we fully understand..... This matter should have been discussed by the sons of Moshweshwe and the Basotho.... The paramount chief has not consulted us on this matter at all. On the above grounds I am unable to put my hands in it (Jonathan 17/11/1927).

Although Jonathan was already dead by 1939 it is obvious that Khaketla had heard about the views in his letter, even if he had not read it. The letter expressed Khaketla's opinion as quoted by Machobane (1990) that a chief is chief by the people, an opinion which Khaketla expressed on page 4, in the Mohlabani newspaper of June 1957. He said that chiefs must be responsive to the people's needs, if they fail to do so, they may as well be eliminated. The above quotation also reveals the playwright's feeling about customary laws. He really supports them, although there are some which ought to be discarded, especially polygamy. Thankga indicates that:

Morena ke morena ka batho, ke mohlanka wa setjhaba
.... Ha ho le jwalo, he, o tshwanetse hore a behwe
ka molao ke setjhaba seoa tlang ho se busa.

A chief is a chief by the people, he is the servant of the people,.... Therefore he must be installed customarily by the people he will rule (Khaketla 1958: 11).

This opinion concurs to what was said by the High Commissioner in the meeting held in Cape Town with Griffith in 1927. In his response which was in the form of a letter, he said:

Although I have already observed, I attach great importance to consider the opinion of those over whom the next chief will be called upon to rule (High Commissioner 24/11/1927).

Khaketla has wisely collected these different views to show that chiefs in everyday life must feel that they are the servants of the nation. Just as the High Commissioner pointed out, people who were to benefit or suffer under the reign of Bereng were the ones he would be ruling, not Griffith who appointed him. Therefore the subjects, who are governed, have a right to choose their leaders just as happened in 1939 when they chose Seeiso.

Towards the end of the scene Majara makes a remark against Mohapi who misbehaved at the funeral of his father Matete when he wanted to throw the soil in the grave before Bulane. In reality chief Lehlwenya and Motsetsela indicated that there was a row at the graveyard between Bereng and Seeiso at Griffith's funeral. Bereng had wanted to pour soil before Seeiso, and as the dispute could not be solved, neither of the sons was allowed to throw the soil in their father's grave. The logical order of the normal procedure was suspended and instead the public was asked to retrieve the soil in the grave. This action shows the seriousness of the conflict between Bereng and Seeiso; they could not compromise even at their father's death. Thus the playwright still calls for the enforcement of customary laws which do not clash with his Christian belief. That is, according to him there would not have been a clash at the graveyard had the customary law of succession been enforced.

The scene ends with praise poetry by Moleko. The praise poetry relates Bulane's birth, his pathetic growth, his reign in the mountains, the decision to demote him, Majara's rejection of Mohapi's promotion and his peaceful reign over his people. Moleko's praise poem is influenced by George

Lerothodi's praise poems about Seeiso. Lerothodi's praises cover the same topics mentioned above although they are longer than Moleko's. Lerothodi's praise poetry first appeared in 1940, while the manuscript for the play was completed in 1954. Khaketla might have read Lerothodi's work and highlighted its contents in his play.

BIRTH: They both relate to the birth of Bulane and Seeiso.

LEROTHODI:

Mohla a hlahang Tshwana-Mantata,

On the day that he was born Tshwana-Mantata,
(1940:5).

KHAKETLA:

Kwena mohla e qalang ho tswa lehlakeng.

The crocodile on the day it came out of the reed
(1958:13).

The word *mohla* appears in both lines which denotes the day he was born. Khaketla writes about the crocodile which is the clan or totem of the royal family in Lesotho thus Seeiso was also a member of the crocodile clan.

PATHETIC GROWTH: It relates to the sufferings they experienced as they grew up.

LEROTHODI:

Kgutsana ya se-hola-sotho-le-keqa,
Ngwana a hola ka bothata Seeiso!

An orphan which grew up when Lesotho was shaky,
The child that grew up with difficulties Seeiso!
(1940:8).

KHAKETLA:

Ngwana-sehola-ka-bothata, Bulane!

The child which grew up with difficulties Bulane!
(1958:13).

The use of hyphen in the first lines, the wording and the meaning is similar in both poems. Khaketla has used the similar structure of words and meaning to those used by Lerothodi. It therefore shows that he had read Lerothodi's praise poems before he wrote his play.

ASSOCIATIVE REFERENCES: These are words or names which refer to the relatives of the person who is being praised.

LEROTHODI:

Ngwana madi a Mokgatjhane, Seeiso,

The child of the blood of Mokgatjhane, Seeiso,
(1940: 8).

KHAKETLA:

Letlakapipi la ba ha Mokgatjhane,

Black vulture of the Mokgatjhane's,
(1958: 13).

Khaketla associates Bulane with Mokgatjhane just as Lerothodi has done with Seeiso. Lerothodi takes Mokgatjhane to be the great grandfather of Seeiso. They are therefore relatives. But it is not clear in Khaketla's poem how Bulane is related to Mokgatjhane. However it is an allusion which provides more proof that Khaketla has used historical records in his play. He gives tribute to Mokgatjhane, the father of Moshweshwe, who, in most cases is regarded as the father of the Basotho nation.

DEMOTION: This relates to the case when Bulane or Seeiso are stripped of the title of their heirship.

LEROTHODI:

O na hane le lengolo le balwa,...
Moo ho newang Bereng borena.

He even refused to have letter read,...
In which Bereng was given chieftainship
(1940: 8).

KHAKETLA:

Ba re kgoronkgotjhwe kala le matswekana...
Le ke ke la mela, le ke ke la ba la hola...
Boholo le ka mpa la besetsa Mohapi mollo.

They said that the crooked branch....
It cannot grow, it cannot sprout....
Most of the time it will make fire for Mohapi
(1958: 13 & 14).

In this case the wording is different but the concept of demotion is retained. George indicates that Seeiso refused to accept the decision which made Bereng the successor. It shows that he was being relegated to a junior position while Bereng was promoted as a senior. Khaketla states that some people (Matete included) felt that Bulane was not worthy of being a chief. Instead Mohapi was considered a more suitable candidate and therefore Bulane should be his junior.

OBJECTION TO THE RELEGATION: This refers to the situation in which Bereng and Mohapi's promotions were rejected.

LEROTHODI:

Ka hana ho bewa Morena Bereng
Ho thwe Bereng a o buse e le moena.
Ka re motlotlehi a thibele ke thibetse.

I objected when chief Bereng was crowned

It was said that Bereng should rule though he is junior.
I said Her Majesty should object, I have objected
(1940: 23).

KHAKETLA:

Enwa Majara wa leka e se Maleke,
A na hana le dilepe di se di tswile,

This Majara keeps on trying though not Maleke,
He refused even when the axes were taken out,
(1958: 14).

As can be seen Khaketla still follows Lerothodi who shows that Bereng's seniority was rejected by the government. Khaketla states that Majara dismissed the appointment of Mohapi as the senior son and therefore as successor to the throne.

PEACEFUL REIGN: This relates to peace experienced during Seeiso and which would exist in Bulane's rule.

LEROTHODI:

Kwena, sefate sa bewa monateng,
Sa hlongwa ka Motete, Madibamatsho.
Maqheku a teng le sa tla iketla,
Le sa tla ora letsatsi monateng!

The crocodile, the tree was put at the right place,
It was planted at Motete, Madibamatsho.
You the elders of the place will live happily,
You will bask in the sun at the right place
(1940: 10).

KHAKETLA:

Makala a phatlaletse, mahlasi-hlasi;
Thunthung tsa sona ke mmitsa-dinotsi;
Nonyana ka mefuta tsa ha Thesele,
Di aha moathameleng,

Branches have spread quite well,
Its flowers call the bees;
Birds of different kinds of Thesele,
They make nests in the warm place

(1958: 14).

Khaketla uses the same metaphor just as Lerothodi has done. Lerothodi refers to calls Seeiso as a tree, and so Khaketla refers to Bulane as a tree. Lerothodi's praise poem relates to Seeiso's experience when he was sent to Thabang in the Mokgotlong district to be the chief from 1924 to 1939. Khaketla also praises Bulane as though he had experienced being the popular chief just like Seeiso.

MENTION OF ENEMIES: The names of the enemies of Seeiso and Bulane are mentioned in the praise-poems.

LEROTHODI:

Tjhaba se hlola se tshwentswe sa Tsholo,
Se neheletswe ka ngwana moqekweng
Ho ntso thwe Leloko a se shape.

The nation of Tsholo,
It is administered by the child of the junior wife
It is said that Leloko should whip the nation
(1940: 14).

KHAKETLA:

Ngwana hola a nyefolwa le ke Direthe,
A nyefolwa ke Maloko re sa mo tsebe.

The child grew up being scolded by junior wives,
Scolded by Maloko whom we do not know
(1958: 13).

Here Khaketla is using the same approach as Lerothodi again. Lerothodi mentions the names of the people who were involved in relegating Seeiso to be second in line. One of them is Leloko Lerothodi who strongly supported Griffith's decision that Seeiso should not be his successor because he was

not of royal blood. Leloko was one of Griffith's most important councillors. Khaketla mentions Malokobe, Matete's top councillor, who, like Leloko, stressed that Bulane should be denied the right to succeed his father because he was not Matete's biological son. Khaketla shortens Malokobe's name to that of Maloko so that it has similar length to Leloko as mentioned in Lerothodi's praise poetry. Thus Khaketla simply changed the prefix of Leloko - {le} to {ma} to become Maloko. This therefore shows that Khaketla used Lerothodi's praise poems when he composed Moleko's praise poems for the play. Furthermore this proves that Khaketla could not escape from historical parameters in his writing of this play.

Although this act has incidents which can be compared to historical events, it contains other incidents which deviate from history. Historically on the day that Seeiso was installed as the paramount chief, there was no public debate over his succession. The meetings in which this issue was discussed viz that of Basotho Progressive Association was held on the 2nd August 1939. The meeting of the sons of Moshweshwe was held on the 3rd August 1939. As noted earlier the government had approved election of Seeiso by September 1939 and was waiting for the High Commissioner's confirmation. Thus there was a seven months period between the last day of the debate over succession and the day of installation but Khaketla has squeezed it into one day. Khaketla avoided details which did not suit his plot. He left out this information because it would have affected the length of his play. We can also say that Khaketla is being critical of the length of time that the government took to instal Seeiso. His feeling is that the government should have solved the problem as soon as possible and not waited for seven months.

The celebration takes place at Matete's court. It is presided over by Majara. In reality this big event was celebrated at Pitso Ground in Maseru. The guest speaker was Sir Edward Harding who publicly introduced Seeiso while in the play Bulane is introduced by his grandfather. The playwright is perhaps saying that it would have been more convenient if the celebration had been held at Matsieng - the royal village, and not in the capital town, Maseru. He is perhaps indicating that the crowning should have been conducted in a traditional manner. The playwright uses a traditional background. There are men sitting under the tree, some are seated on their stools. All these factors contribute to the traditional setting. The playwright may therefore be said to have been against the involvement of the Europeans in this matter.

ACT II

In this act Bulane and his councillors celebrate their victory by drinking. Mosesi, one of the councillors raises, the fact that Mookgo was crying. He asks Bulane to explain why Mookgo was crying. In response, Bulane indicates that Mookgo is against the levirate practice. Mosesi advises chief Bulane that if the chieftainess objects to levirate, he must compromise by refraining from it. But Bulane refuses saying that his action is allowed by customary law and that he cannot go against the very customs which have helped him to get back the chieftainship. They decide to go to *the Kgotla*. On their way out, they meet Mookgo and Direko who request to speak to Bulane. Khaketla describes Bulane as having a negative attitude towards the church. This attitude is revealed when Mookgo, his wife and Direko, his mother, plead with him to refrain from the levirate practice. Mookgo says:

Taba e bohloko ke ya hobane ke modumedi, mme kenelo ena eo o e rerileng e tla hlorisa moya wa ka, e ntlhokise borapedi ba nnete, e ntahlise tumelo ya ka.

What hurts me most is that I am a Christian, and this levirate you intend to enforce will persecute me spiritually, will weaken my faith, will force me to turn against my belief (Khaketla 1958: 19).

She reminds Bulane that he is also a Christian, and was baptized when on the verge of death. Bulane's response is that he had not asked anybody to baptize him. He goes further to say that if he had had strength during his illness he would have objected to his baptism.

Bulane's view is that:

Kereke e lokile moo e sa hananeng le meetlo ya heso.
Ke rata hore ha ke e-shwa ke tle ke ye moo
bo-ntate-moholo ba ileng teng..... Ba shwele ba sa
sokoloha, ba kenela;.. le nna ke tla shwa jwaloka bona,
ke sa sokoloha, ke kenela ke tle ke ee moo ba ileng teng.

The church is good where it does not come into conflict with our customs. When I die, I would like to go where my grandfathers have gone, they did not die as converts, they died practising levirate custom,..Even I, myself, would like to die like them, not as a convert, practicing the levirate custom so that I can go where they have gone. (Khaketla 1958: 19-20).

Indeed Bulane does not compromise, he goes ahead with his decision to take care of Pulane. Towards the end of the scene, Bulane meets Mafafa who also objects to Bulane's decision but chief Bulane ignores him. Instead he threatens to terminate his relationship with Mafafa.

Bulane's negative attitude to the church is related to Seeiso's suffering which he attributed to the Roman Catholic Church as shown earlier. The Roman Catholic priests supported Mmabereng's marriage which had been confirmed in church. They were against Mmaseeiso's marriage which they did not recognize.

Gill (1993) writes that Seeiso disliked the Catholic Church because his father belonged to it. He became a polygamist, in spite of his nominal commitment to the church and that there were indications that he wished to convert to the Paris Evangelical church which his mother belonged to. With this background in mind Khaketla had reason to reflect Seeiso's ill-feelings towards the Catholic Church in his character, Bulane. Seeiso and the Roman Catholic Church were at odds for the rest of Seeiso's life. Khaketla shows Bulane as a traditionalist who does not care about the church because how it clashes with his culture.

In this act Khaketla has included certain incidents which differ from historical events. The idea that Bulane had problems with his wife due to the levirate practice does not follow historical events. Indeed Seeiso had problems with his first wife as indicated earlier but this did not stem from the levirate custom as Khaketla portrays in his play. Government records indicate that Seeiso had problems with his wife, Mmantshebo, while at Mokgotlong. Seeiso went to an extent of beating her. It is recorded that she sometimes had to seek refuge in other minor chiefs' wards. This information was contained in letters between the Assistant Commissioner and the government head office in Maseru. In this play Bulane does not beat Mookgo he only disagrees with her verbally on the levirate issue. One might say that the playwright denounces violence or woman battering as was practised by Seeiso. Khaketla's feeling is that verbal argument is a better way of dealing with misunderstanding between the two parties. Bulane becomes exemplary in that although he is hard-hearted he refrains from violent actions. The playwright is therefore appealing to his readers to engage themselves in negotiations whenever they do not see eye to eye with their partners.

Bulane has one wife, Mookgo, who is against the levirate custom. But Seeiso had three wives, namely, Mmantshebo, Mmabereng and Mmaleshoboro. He married these wives during Griffith's lifetime which means that Seeiso was already polygamous even before the death of Griffith. Mmantsebo could not have complained about polygamy after Griffith's death as she was already part of the polygamous marriage. There is also no evidence of Mmantshebo having been against Seeiso's decision to take care of Agatha. Khaketla's feeling is that Bulane must be different from Seeiso who was polygamous. The playwright discourages polygamy because it destabilizes peace and stability in the families. That is why when Bulane insists on levirate he is nearly assassinated. Khaketla favours monogamy which follows the Christian norms. He is appealing to other chiefs to practice monogamy.

Another deviation from history is that Bulane, in his argument with Direko and Mookgo, says that Matete was not a convert when he died. Griffith who is represented by Matete was a Christian when he died. Griffith was initially a Protestant church convert, but later joined the Roman Catholic Church in 1912. When he died he was buried at Matsieng in the Roman Catholic mission cemetery. However although he claimed to be a Christian, he still kept some of his wives.

What could be the playwright's intention in deviating from history? Firstly Khaketla had to deviate in order to comply with the stylistic devices of drama writing. He decided to create a tense atmosphere through the conflict between Mookgo and Bulane. The conflict is based on tradition versus Christian values. It is this conflict which becomes the base upon which the

play evolves. Thus it can be taken to be an exposition. It exposes the conflict and characters involved. It therefore shows that Khaketla follows a normal dramatic pattern of creating tension between individuals in order to develop his plot. The playwright makes Bulane firm and hard-hearted so that the misunderstanding between him and Mookgo prolongs the conflict.

Bulane's celebration is the playwright's invention. His feeling is that Seeiso and his close friends celebrated after he was installed as the paramount chief. This follows the Sesotho custom that after every success there must be a thanksgiving celebration. Khaketla differs from custom in that Bulane drinks with his friends but not with all of his subjects. Through Mosesi and Mafafa's advice to Bulane that he should not go ahead with the levirate custom, Khaketla shows his objection to polygamy. He feels that conclusions should be reached on the basis that both the husband and the wife agree to them. He rejects unilateral decision which benefits only one individual in the relationship. Thus if Mmantshebo had been against the levirate, Seeiso should have given in to his wife. Khaketla is critical of Bulane's behaviour when he turned a deaf ear to his mother, Mosesi and Mafafa. Bulane, as a chief should have listened to this piece of advice.

It is also Khaketla's wish that Mantshebo who was Seeiso's first wife should not have allowed her husband to indulge in a polygamous marriage. He would have liked her to be strong enough to show her faith regardless of her husband's behaviour. She should also have objected to her husband's practice of the levirate custom that led him to take Agatha which, according to rumour cost him his life. Through Mookgo, Khaketla wants to display a woman with determination, who is adamant in whatever she does. Mookgo is shown as a

reasonable woman. After failing to convince Bulane, she seeks the assistance of her mother-in-law. Her approach is a lesson to other women. Through Bulane, Khaketla shows how hard-hearted a traditionalist can be, while Direko and Mookgo as Christians, are considerate and understanding. His wish is that Seeiso should have abstained from polygamy and adhered to Christian values. He should have ignored his clash with the Catholic priests who were against the marriage of his mother.

There no logical connection between these two acts. The first act should have been the last scene in Tholoana tsa Sethepu. Bulane reads well with the conflict of *kenelo* as the base around which the play evolves. The conflict between Bulane and Mookgo is not a continuation of Bulane's coronation. It is a different theme altogether which on its own, forms the basis of another play. In his analysis, Van der Poll (1982) points out that the first scene fails to be an exposition because the play itself is not centred around Bulane's coronation but the levirate practice. This second scene can be regarded as an exposition which deals with the conflict which is carried throughout the play. The historical narrative would have been well coordinated if the coronation had been included in Tholoana tsa Sethepu. The coronation itself is the most desired moment which would have completed the play.

ACT III

This act introduces us to Mohapi and his supporters. They are also against Bulane's decision to take care of Pulane.

It opens with a dialogue between Dipuo and Mosele where they highlight Bulane's intention to take Pulane into his custody which they oppose. Dipuo states that she would not mind if Mohapi practises levirate because she understands what it means, unlike Mookgo who objects to it because she is a Christian. They are joined by Mohapi, Malokobe, Tladi, Marora and Kgang. Mosele indirectly encourages them to assassinate Bulane:

Hojane ke ne ke le monna, Bulane o na sa tlo geta
lemo sena e ntse le morena.

If I were a man, Bulane would not be still alive by
the end of this year (Khaketla 1958: 23).

As the two women exit, Mohapi and his advisors make plans to eliminate Bulane. Malokobe suggests that Bulane must be waylaid and be killed. But his suggestion is rejected. His colleagues indicate that if Bulane is killed in this manner, they will definitely be the first suspects. They agree that if there is no other way to get rid of him, it will be better to give up their assassination plan. Afterwards these men leave the stage except Mohapi who remains, soliloquizing. He describes Bulane as an egoist who has inherited all of Matete's property and as though that is not enough he has even taken Pulane:

Ke enwa o sa hlothile Pulane
Pulane eo ho neng ho thwe ke mmoloke ke ntate!

He has even taken Pulane,
Pulane, the one whom my father asked me to take care of!
(Khaketla 1958: 25).

He describes Bulane as an insatiable ingrate, who is egoistic and stingy. Mohapi and his colleagues plan to kill Bulane. They conspire with Pulane to

poison Bulane's food on Moshweshwe's day. He is later joined by Marora who hints to him that Pulane is surprised that Mohapi is neglecting her. Mohapi requests that Pulane be called but to his disappointment Pulane turns down his proposal because Bulane has already approached her and asked her to remain in his custody. The contents in this act contribute to the development of the plot. Thus after exposing the conflict between Bulane and Mookgo, Khaketla introduces Mohapi's position and shows how he plans to take advantage of the complex situation to further his interests. Mohapi accuses Bulane of stealing Pulane, though legally Bulane has the right to take Pulane into his custody as he is the heir. Pulane's refusal to accept Mohapi's proposal helps to prolong the plot. Mohapi is not discouraged but hopes that one day he will win her love.

This act deviates from the history. Dipuo says that Mookgo, as a Christian, does not accept the levirate custom. But she points out that as a Mosotho child, understands and accepts the levirate custom. The deviation from history is that Mmabereng (Mosele) was the only wife of Griffith who was married in church. Therefore Mmabereng and her children became Roman Catholics. That is, Bereng and his wife were Christians not non-Christians as is reflected in the play. But in the play Mosele is seen as a non-convert. Direko, who can be said to represent Mmaseeiso, is depicted in the play as a staunch Christian. Mmaseeiso became a Protestant convert on her own while she was living at her father's place. She never followed her faith as such she could not discourage her son from polygamy.

The playwright has a negative attitude towards polygamy. That is whatever comes from a second wife is unacceptable. As a Christian and member of the

elite, he rejects some traditional practices like levirate. Therefore he uses characters like Dipuo and Mosele who still adhere to the traditional beliefs. Khaketla associates polygamy with evil; characters who believe in it are discredited. Their actions and behaviour are portrayed as backward.

ACT IV

Malokobe and Mohapi have paid Pulane a visit with the purpose of asking her to reconsider Mohapi's proposal. Pulane is in a desperate financial situation. She tells them how Bulane has refused to give her money to buy clothes for Moshweshwe's day. Her problem pleases Mohapi and Malokobe who, without delay, make use of the opportunity. Mohapi tells her that he has no money but asks her to accept R10.00. He tells her that the amount would be four times bigger, if he had occupied Bulane's position. Malokobe asks Pulane to help them if she really loves Mohapi. He tells her that she must poison Bulane's food. Pulane gets frightened and throws away the money. She threatens to tell Bulane about their conspiracy. Malokobe cools her off and then threatens her with death if she refuses to help them.

O ntso sa lebale horeo phela o le mong, mme ha
ho letho le ka re thibang morerong o mong wa rona,
..... ha e le mona o soka ka hore o ka nna bolella
Bulane. O tla ba hlakoreng la hao motsheare le bosiu?

You should not forget that you live alone in your house,
therefore there is nothing to stop us from one
of our plans, ...especially when you threaten us by
saying that you will disclose this information to
Bulane. Is he going to be by your side, day and night
(Khaketla 1958: 34-35)?

Fearing for her life, Pulane agrees to help them. Malokobe goes out to fetch Phepheng, the village doctor. As they enter, Pulane leaves the house so that the three men can discuss their business. Malokobe asks Phepheng to give them the most effective poison. Phepheng seems to be reluctant to do this but the cunning Malokobe tells him that Mohapi will pay him with about five cows. Once Phepheng having heard the price, he agrees. Afterwards Malokobe instructs Phepheng:

Ha o sa rate hore o tlo nyamele jwaloka Mokadi
o etse tjena....(o supa molomo wa hae o momilweng
hathata) Hang feela ka ho utlwa bo-tlhatsinyane ba
di hafa, o tla jewa ke marwana.

If you do not want to disappear like Mokadi do this...
(he points at his mouth which is tightly pressed) If I
can hear some people discussing this, you will be
eaten by ants. (Khaketla 1958: 39)

As Phepheng leaves the stage, Pulane enters. She is given the poison to mix with Bulane's food. This scene like the one which precedes it, contributes to the development of the plot. It deals with Mohapi and Malokobe's conspiracy to have Bulane eliminated. The plan is taking off, it is developing. Tension is high and we are anxious to know what will follow in the next act.

The row over Pulane is similar to the contest between Seeiso and Bereng for chieftainess Agatha. Motsetsela, one of the informants, disclosed that Agatha was a village beauty with whom both Seeiso and Bereng fell in love. The regular visits to Pulane's house by the two brothers relates to visits which Seeiso and Bereng made to Agatha's house. The two of them frequented Agatha's place because neither of them was willing to withdraw. It was on one such visit that Seeiso fell fatally ill. In the play Mohapi and his group,

including Malokobe, pay Pulane several visits in an attempt to win her love and favour. During their first visit Mohapi told her that he had come to fulfil his fathers's will. They visit her for the second time to see if she has agreed to their proposal. This time Malokobe threatens her with death. They also visit her on Moshweshwe's Day to cheer her up and to make sure she will fulfil her promise. Bulane pays Pulane several visits and as a result, becomes an easy victim. Thus Khaketla indicates that perhaps there were some underground movements to assassinate Seeiso. It is obvious that some members of the royal family, especially Griffith's favourites, were not pleased with Bereng's failure to ascend the throne. Thus there might have been attempts to eliminate him, just as Mohapi and his colleagues plot to kill Bulane.

With the appearance of Phepheng again in this play, the playwright portrays his negative attitude towards traditional medical practice. In Tholoana tsa Sethepu, Phepheng lied to Matete. He said that he was bewitched by his first wife, Direko. In the sequel, Bulane, Phepheng appears again still as an unscrupulous opportunist. He lacks determination, and behaves unprofessionally he is easily persuaded to give Malokobe the poison. Phepheng's behaviour shows how Khaketla dislikes the traditional doctors, insinuating that they are unfaithful and unreliable liars. They do not save the lives of their subjects. They tell destructive lies instead of helping to build the nation. The impression readers get about Phepheng is that doctors of his calibre should not be trusted or allowed to practice as they are cheats. Khaketla shows how Phepheng has failed to contribute to the welfare of the society and that he represents the corrupt norms. Phepheng, like Malokobe and Pulane are portrayed as forces of evil. They are opportunists who selfishly look after their own interests, instead of caring about the

welfare of the nation. Malokobe threatens his opponents with death in order to get them to submit to him. Pulane fails to reason like a normal being. She becomes easy prey for Malokobe and Mohapi because she has no money. As a result, she agrees to poison Bulane.

ACT V

This last act is about Pulane who is experiencing an internal conflict about her involvement in poisoning of Bulane. It takes place on Moshweshwe's day, which is also to be the assassination day of chief Bulane. As the scene opens, Pulane is debating whether she should carry out the promise she made to Malokobe and Mohapi about poisoning Bulane. She says:

Empa ha e le hantle ke hlile ke tsekang le Bulane?
Ha ho letho..... ke mpa ke le letsoho la Mohapi le
Malokobe feela;.... mme le letswalo la me le hlile
le nnyatsa haholo.

But basically why am I against Bulane? There is
nothing... I am just Mohapi and Malokobe's
helper; my conscience goes against my decision
(Khaketla 1958: 40).

While she is soliloquizing Mohapi enters, he tells Pulane to suppress her conscience and be brave so that she can fulfil her promise to poison Bulane's food. As Mohapi leaves, Pulane again expresses the confusion she feels. In her soliloquy she tells of how she declined an offer of marriage by one Mohlalefi because she wanted to be chieftainess. She also regrets her affair with Mohapi as it has turns out to be costly. Its cost is Bulane's death.

While she is in this miserable state, Pulane is joined by Malokobe who exhorts her to be brave and once again threatens her by saying:

Haeba bo ka sa o sa etsa letho, tseba o tla
bo le bona la getelo.

If by tomorrow morning you would not have done
anything, know that it will be your last day
(Khaketla 1958: 42).

After threatening her, Malokobe leaves Pulane crying. Some time later Bulane and his men arrive at Pulane's house. They ask for beer. After a few minutes Mohapi and his men join the celebration of Moshweshwe's day at Pulane's house. Bulane even thanks Mohapi for his outstanding performance in leading the traditional dancers. Bulane and Mohapi drink brandy while the rest of their subjects enjoy home-made beer. Pulane gives Bulane and Mohapi each a roasted chicken to eat with his men. Mohapi and Malokobe exchange ironical statements about Bulane. These statements have double meaning, they convey one meaning to Mohapi and Malokobe but another meaning to the other characters like Bulane. For example Malokobe says that he has to eat while he has time, because chief Bulane might send him on a long journey without food. Mohapi says to Malokobe:

E hle ke wa ja Malokobehobane eto la hao le le lelele,
mohlomong o tla haola mahwatata a se nang leha e le
phophi ya metsi.

You have to eat a lot Malokobe because you have a long
journey, you may have to walk in deserts which do not
even have a drop of water (Khaketla 1958: 46).

This statement is in fact directed at Bulane who is unaware of the plot against him; he must eat as it is his last day, as he is about to die. Bulane is not aware of the double meaning contained in these statements, he keeps on

passing complimentary remarks to his assassins-to-be. In the course of the celebration Mohapi, Malokobe and Marora complain of stomach pains and end up spitting blood. Phepheng is called in to help but indicates that there is no way they can be helped as they have eaten poison. Everybody is stunned as the three men die in agony. After this pathetic sight, Bulane regrets his refusal to listen to his wife's advice.

Some of the events in this act deviate from the historical episodes. Bulane is assassinated on Moshweshwe's day, which is usually celebrated on 12 March. My informants and Leselinyana (08/01/1941) indicate that Seeiso died on 25 December 1940 after 4 days of illness, not on 12 March 1940 as happens in Khaketla's play. Mohapi is the one who is poisoned while Bulane escapes death. In reality it is Seeiso who died after having been at chieftainess Agatha's house, not Bereng. In addition Seeiso did not die at Agatha's house but at the Queen Elizabeth II hospital, in the capital, Maseru, while Bereng died in 1949 after he was accused of ritual murder. Moreover when Seeiso died in hospital, he died alone, not with his councillors as happens in the play. On his death he bid farewell to his wife, Mantshebo and mother, Mmaseeiso.

Khaketla employs dramatic surprise to save Bulane from death because he is the hero of the play. This surprise is criticized by Lenake (1973) who defines it as a cheap and unmotivated surprise. Van der Poll also supports Lenake's criticism when he states that:

The play, ending in the fashion that it does, comes as a somewhat unmotivated surprise and therefore as a *deus ex machina*. According to the law of the continuation one would have experienced good closure had Bulane been poisoned (1981: 448)

The playwright seems to have been influenced by the norms of drama writing, where the protagonist who is also the hero. In most cases the hero survives attempts to end his life although in some plays like, Senkatana, the hero dies. This is done with the idea that villains are in most cases wicked and deserve severe punishment just as happens with Mohapi. Mohapi's aim is to claim paramountcy through foul means and therefore he has to be punished. Bulane, as the rightful heir and successor to his father, must live because he deserves to become the chief. Those who deny him that status are against the law and the nation, therefore deserve nothing other than death. This is done to portray the view that good must always overcome evil. If Mohapi's plot was a success, the play could be viewed as encouraging villains like Mohapi to seize power through illegal means, thus justifying evil practices as means to succeed in life. It will be observed that Khaketla felt that the chiefs should convert to Christianity. In Tholoana tsa Sethepu Matete wants to ask forgiveness from Direko and Bulane in order to die happily. In Bulane, Bulane repents and realizes how important women are.

We can therefore say that Khaketla's deviation from history is attributable to his belief in Christianity. The playwright condemns traditional practices like polygamy, and wicked deeds. He therefore kills Mohapi and Malokobe. He portrays Phepheng as a cheating scoundrel who calls himself a doctor. He also objects to Mohapi's struggle to maintain levirate practice which is against Christian norms. Khaketla discourages these actions and eliminates those who practise them. If perpetrators of such deeds are removed from the society, that gives Christianity a chance to assert itself, as happens with Bulane who repents and promises to listen to his wife. The removal of Malokobe and

Mohapi helps Pulane to become a free woman who could fairly listen to her conscience without fear.

CONCLUSION

This study embarked on establishing the link between Khaketla's two works, Tholoana tsa Sethepu and Bulane. The purpose was to show that human experiences influence the writing of literature. The researcher consulted various historical materials about the Basotho chiefdom and paramountcy in order to collect the information to be used in the study. He visited places like National University of Lesotho and Morija Museum where he read documents concerning the paramountcy from 1900 until 1940. He also conducted interviews with the author, chiefs and historians on the issue of succession among the Basotho and the royal family.

Information gathered from these various sources enabled him to compare and contrast the dramas with historical events. He was therefore in a position to critically interpret the themes in the texts by looking at where and why the playwright deviated from history. He later analyzed the texts focusing on the characters. To a certain extent the characters of the play matched the historical figures. The comparison was made scene by scene, checking whether Khaketla's plot followed the historical events which occurred during Griffith, Seeiso and Bereng's lives. The comparison showed some similarities which proved that the texts do refer to events which actually occurred while the deviations indicates that the playwright was in fact, writing fiction.

In these dramas Khaketla deals with the feud between Seeiso and Bereng which occurred during the period 1927 until the death of Griffith in 1939. Khaketla has skillfully turned this episode into an interesting piece of literature. He has used characters with different names; however their behaviour and actions reflect those of the historical figures. While the incidents in his plays differ with historical events there is enough evidence for these historical events to be recognized. Although Khaketla has used fictitious names, setting and actions, some readers can be able to detect that they correspond with history as is shown earlier in this work. The plays highlight events which suit the playwright's plot. Again for the convenience of the dramatist there are some additional events and deviations which are meant to shape the plays. That is why some of the incidents which appear in the plays cannot be traced historically as they are Khaketla's own invention.

In Tholoana tsa Sethepu, Khaketla gives us an overview of Griffith's struggle to have Bereng recognized as his heir. Khaketla touched on the sensitive issue of dubious birth of Bulane which is one of the reasons which barred Seeiso from succeeding Griffith. Khaketla deals with the discussions which were held when the sons of Moshweshwe were called at Matsieng to discuss the seniority of Bereng.

The playwright sends Bulane and Mohapi to Majara, who is expected to confirm Matete's will. This is based on Bereng and Seeiso when they were sent to Resident Commissioner, where Bereng was to be introduced as being Seeiso's senior. Majara refuses to carry out Matete's instruction to confirm Mohapi as heir. This is based on the colonial government's refusal to approve Bereng's appointment. Matete dies leaving the succession issue unresolved just as

Griffith died without a confirmed successor. Although Khaketla used fictitious names he did not operate outside historical parameters. Thus there are similarities between the rest of his characters and the people who were involved in the real events. In the same way the actions by some of his characters reflect the influence history had on the playwright.

The deviations illustrate that Khaketla was in fact writing fiction not history. He has employed the characters and events which cannot be traced back to historical events. The behaviour of some characters is opposite to the way in which the people on which they are based actually behaved. Thus Direko's behaviour is quite different from that of Mmaseeiso. Mmaseeiso is said to have been uncompromising, and quarrelled with her husband while Direko is portrayed as a well behaved wife. In Tholoana tsa Sethepu the issue of successor is resolved during Matete's life but this is historically not true. The succession issue was only solved after Griffith's death. By doing this the playwright was indicating what he thought should have happened. Through this play Khaketla wanted to show the strength of customary laws with respect to the laws of primogeniture. According to this law, Bulane is the rightful heir to the throne, which is why, towards the end of the play, Matete confesses to Bulane and Direko and confirms Bulane as such. The playwright uses his play to ridicule Griffith's unfair demotion of Seeiso.

Bulane opens with a scene in which Bulane is voted into power as Matete's successor after a long a debate. Most of the characters support Bulane's installation except Malokobe who feels that the nation does not have the right to change the will of their chief. This event in the play refers to the

occasion where the sons of Moshweshwe unanimously voted for Seeiso as paramount chief.

During his rule, Bulane takes care of Pulane, thus practising the levirate custom. As a result he becomes an easy target for Mohapi who wants to assassinate him. This incident relates to Seeiso's affair with chieftainess Agatha, one of Griffith's young wives, who lived at Qeme. Like Pulane and Mohapi, Agatha had an affair with Bereng. Through the deviations from history, Khaketla uses the levirate custom as source of conflict between Bulane and Mookgo. Historically the levirate custom was not a big issue in Seeiso's family. Seeiso was polygamous, he had three wives Mmantshebo, Mmabereng and Mmaleshoboro although in the play he has only one wife. Seeiso's affair with chieftainess Agatha was never disputed by Mmantshebo.

In this play Khaketla avoids killing Bulane, instead it is Mohapi and his councillors who suffer the consequences of their evil plot. Mohapi's death does not correspond with the death of Seeiso who died four days after having been at Agatha's house. In this play, the playwright shows that he believes that a chief is a chief by the people, a highly valued saying among the Basotho. However the playwright also shows how selfish and dictatorial chiefs can be. Thus when Bulane ignores advice from Direko, Mookgo, Mosesi and Mafafa who feel that he should not practice the levirate custom. But Bulane feels that he is a chief his word is final and cannot be refuted especially with regard to levirate custom. It is only after the death of Mohapi and his colleagues that Bulane repents. By repenting Bulane shows that he should have listened to his wife.

The plays reflect Khaketla's view point of historical episodes. He has tried to follow history in order to express his views. Thus he puts forward strategies which he thinks could have been adopted to solve the succession dispute. Thus Khaketla's plays are his reflections of history not the way events actually happened. He has changed some of the characters and their actions so as to present his own views. He has also included some of the incidents which cannot be traced historically to avoid the historical constraints which would not have allowed him a freedom of expression as a playwright. Therefore these books can be said to be the portrayal of Khaketla's imaginative and creative writing of history.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY TEXTS

Khaketla B.M. (1954) Tholoana tsa Sethepu Morija: Morija
Sesuto Book Depot.

Khaketla B.M. (1958) Bulane Morija: Morija Sesuto Book Depot.

SECONDARY TEXTS

Ashton E.H. (1952) The Basuto London: Oxford University
Press.

Bardill J.C. &

Beuchat P.D. (1963) Do the Bantu Have Literature?
Johannesburg: Wits University press

Bennett T. (1990) Outside Literature London: Routledge.

Boulton M. (1960) The Anatomy of Drama London: Routledge &
Kegan Paul LTD.

Casalis E. (1965) The Basutos Cape Town: C. Struik.

Cobbe J.H. (1985) Lesotho Dilemmas of Dependence in Southern
Africa London: West view Press.

Coertze R.D. (1988) Bafokeng Family Law and Law of
Succession Pretoria: SABRA.

Damane M &

Sanders (1974) Lithoko: Sotho Praise Poems Oxford:
Clarendon Press

Duncan P. (1960) Sotho: Laws and Customs Cape Town:

Oxford University Press.

- Eagleton (1978) **Criticism and Ideology** London: NLB
- Ellenberger F.D. (1956) **Histori ea Basotho** Morija: Morija Sesuto Book Depot.
- Gérard A.S. (1971) **Four African Literatures** Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gikandi S. (1991) **Reading Chinua Achebe** Nairobi: Heinemann Kenya.
- Gill S. (1993) **Short History of Lesotho** Morija: Morija Museum and Archives
- Groenewald H.C. (1986) Nature of vernacular drama according to H.I.E. Dhlomo. In: **South African Journal of African Languages** vol 6 (4) pp.42-145.
- Guerin W.L. (1966) **A Handbook of Critical Approaches to Literature** New York: Harper and Row Publishers.
- Guma S.M. (1960) **Morena Mohlomi Mora Monyane** Pietermaritzburg: Shuter and Shooter.
- Guma S.M. (1962) **Tshehlana tseo tsa Basia** Pietermaritzburg: Shuter and Shooter.
- Jafta D.N. (1967) The principle of conflict in the Zulu novel and how it is exposed in the works of some of the prominent Zulu authors.
In: **LIMI** (4) pp 38-40.
- Jameson F. (1981) **The political Unconscious** London:

Methuen and Co Ltd.

- Jameson F. (1988) **The Ideologies of Theory Essays 1971-86**
Vol.1 Minneapolis.The University of
Minnesota
- Jingoes S.J. (1975) **A chief is a Chief by the People**
London: Oxford University Press.
- Khaketla B.M. (1947) **Moshoeshoe le Baruti** Morija: Morija
Sesuto Book Depot.
- Khaketla B.M. (1954) **Lipshamathe** Morija: Morija Sesuto Book
Depot.
- Khaketla B.M. (1960) **Meokho ea Thabo** Morija: Morija Sesuto
Book Depot.
- Khaketla B.M. (1960) **Mosali a Nkhola** Morija: Morija Sesuto
Book Depot.
- Khaketla B.M. (1971) **Lesotho 1970** London: Oxford University
Press.
- Lenake J.M. (1967) The common themes and their development in
modern Southern Sotho literature. In: **LIMI**
(4)pp.53-54.
- Lenake J.M. (1968) A brief survey of modern literature in the
South African Bantu Languages: Southern Sotho. In:
LIMI (6)p. 78.
- Lenake J.M. (1982) The poetry of K.E. Ntsane. unpublished
doctoral thesis: University of South Africa.

- Lerotholi G. (1940) Lithoko tsa Morena e Moholo Seeiso
Griffith Morija: Morija Sesuto Book Depot.
- Lesoro E.A.S. (1982) Tau ya ha Zulu Johannesburg: Educum
Publishers.
- Lesotho Government (1976) Melao ea Lerotholi Morija: Morija
Sesuto Book Depot.
- Maake N.P. (1986) Every critical act analyses and evaluates
the culture from the text is drawn. In: Publisher-
writer-reader ed S. Gardner pp. 337-347.
Johannesburg, University of the Witwatersrand.
- Maake N. (1991) Kgabane ha di Rwesane Mekadi
Cape Town: Maskew Miller Longman.
- Maake N.P. (1992) A Survey of trends in the development of
African Language literature in South Africa:
With specific reference to written Southern
Sotho Literature c1900 -
1970's In: African Languages and cultures
5 : 2 pp. 157 - 188.
- Maake N. (1992) Up from orature, down to tragedy: A case
study of two Southern Sotho plays. In: South
African Journal of Folklore Studies
vol(3)pp. 29-40.
- Machobane L.B.B.J. (1990) Government and Change in Lesotho
1800-1966 London: Macmillan Press LTD.
- Malaba M. (1986) The legacy of Thomas Mofolo's Chaka. In:
English in Africa Vol 13 (1)

- Mantutle M.M. (1986) An analytical study of N.M. Khaketla's four Southern Sotho dramas. Unpublished Honours dissertation. University of Witwatersrand.
- Masiea R.J.R. (1983) **Boo Borena!** Johannesburg: Educum.
- Mofolo T.M. (1925) **Chaka** Morija: Morija Sesuto Book Depot.
- Ngcangca D.J.M. (1989) **Mabalankwe ka Bangodi**
Pietermaritzburg : Shuter & Shooter.
- Ould H. (1938) **The Art of the Play** London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons LTD.
- Peacock P. **The Art of Drama** London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Shanafelt R. (1988) The heroic ideal in three Sotho novellas of the labour migration. In: **African Studies**.
47 (1)pp.48-62.
- Turkington K.T. (1975) The Novels of Chinua Achebe
Published M.A. Thesis Johannesburg:
University of the Witwatersrand.
- White H. (1978) **Tropics of Discourse : Essays in Cultural Criticism** Baltimore: The Johns and Hopkins University Press.
- Van der Poll J.D.P. (1986) A Historical overview and critical evaluation of published Sesotho drama. In: **South African Journal of African Languages**
Vol 6 (3)pp. 32-34 & 38-39.

Van der Poll J.D.P. (1982) Structural analysis of the Southern
Sotho drama, Senkatana by S.M. Mofokeng In: **South**

African Journal of African

Languages. Vol 2

(1)

GENERAL

Boorman S.C. (1987) **Human Conflict in Shakespeare**

London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Bradbury M. &

Palmer D. (1984) **Shakespearian Tragedy** London: Edward
Arnold Publishers.

Bevington D. (1968) **Tudor Drama and Politics: A Critical**
Approach to Tropical Meaning

Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Palmer J. (1945) **Political Characters of Shakespeare**

Toronto: Macmillan Company Ltd.

Peck J & Coyle M. (1984) **Literary Terms and Criticism** London:
Macmillan Press LTD.

Hawkes T. (1977) **Structuralism and Semiotics**

London: Methuen & Co Ltd.

Pretorius W.J. &

Swart J.H. (1982) **Teaching African Literature**

Pretoria : University of South Africa.

Thompson A.R. (1942) **Anatomy of Drama** Berkeley: University of
California Press.

Wells R.H. (1986)

Shakespeare, Politics and the state

London: Macmillan Education Ltd.