Cohesive Cosmologies or Pragmatic Practices? Tenancy in Matatiele (Transkei) and Dualist Approaches in Southern African Anthropology.
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Much recent anthropological work on southern Africa has been concerned with the effects of rural people's incorporation into the capitalist-industrial complex of apartheid South Africa. This has required a detailed examination of the impact of enforced oscillating labour migration on rural labour-supplying areas (Murray 1981, Mayer 1980, Spiegel 1987) and of the consequences of forced population relocation (James 1983, Sharp & Spiegel 1985). For the most part, this work has adopted an approach that has attempted to understand the rural and the urban-industrial as part of a single political-economy and not, as previously, as two separate 'worlds' linked almost fortuitously by the passage of labour migrants between them (Hobart Houghton 1960). Emphasis has thus been laid on the unity of the region's political economy.

For some researchers, this has been paralleled by a rejection of dualist analyses of the world views of people trapped in the system of oscillating labour migrancy. For them, the impact of people's experiences in the mining and industrial environment of the region is paramount in shaping the way people view their world (McAllister 1985, Ferguson 1985). As a result they find little value in presenting such people as 'men of two worlds' (Sharp & West 1982). Nonetheless, others have attempted to wed an approach which unifies the region's political economy with an analysis of the conflict, in that single political-economic environment, between two clearly defined and bounded world-views. The most prominent of these argue that people continue to subscribe to the values and principles of their pre-industrial world as a means of resisting the anomie of the capitalist-industrial one into which they have been dragged,
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as it were, screaming (McAllister 1980, 1981, Comaroff 1985, Comaroff & Comaroff 1987).

This article presents ethnographic material from the Transkei district of Matatiele. That material reflects the inappropriateness of searching for persistences of a pre-industrial world view in the ways in which people order and perceive their contemporary relationships. It focuses on the different types of tenancy found on areas of freehold land in that district. Its one aim is to present a set of empirical material showing the variety of tenancy arrangements in the district and to compare these with others described in the South African literature. Secondly I aim to address the question of continuities as regards perceptions of different forms of land use. I do this by showing how people explain some of the more prevalent types of land-based relationships in the district, and by examining how, in doing so, they draw upon their perceptions of practices believed to have occurred in the past and/or in other, nearby areas of rural settlement and of the language used to describe such perceived practices. Finally, I use this discussion to refute the usefulness of a dualist approach to understanding the ways people view their world. I suggest we need to adopt an approach recognising that people draw pragmatically upon their cultural resources rather than adopt postures which derive from systematic sets of ideas that they see as clearly distinct. As Keesing (1987, 1989) has recently pointed, there are various pressures on contemporary anthropologists to focus on exotic data and to give them the most exotic interpretation possible. The resulting distortion, which I hope to avoid here, misrepresents a variety of practices as parts of whole ‘cultural systems’: as Keesing argues (1989: 460), the rules for these practices are ‘constructed [...] mainly in terms of pragmatic experience, not cosmological schemes’.

Matatiele, A Transkei District

Matatiele is one of twenty-six districts in the Transkei, the first of South Africa’s nominally ‘independent’ bantustans. It is situated on the southern slopes of the Drakensberg mountains, the escarpment of which

1. The data presented are drawn from research on a larger study of rural living conditions in the district, and their local interpretation. The research, conducted between 1982 and 1985, was funded by grants from the Co-operative Scientific Programme of the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research, and by the Human Sciences Research Council. Views expressed are my own and are not necessarily shared by either funding agency.
2. In a larger study I also examine the extent to which people’s own understanding and interpretation of agricultural co-operation—particularly sharecropping—represent pragmatic ideological choices rather than precolonial persistences.
3. Recently the military government in the Transkei has indicated that it may soon attempt to revoke the territory’s independence.
MAPS. Matatiele District, with insets of its location in southern Africa and the areas discussed.
marks the boundary with Lesotho. The district also borders on an area of white-owned farmland, popularly known as East Griqualand, that has been retained within the boundaries of the Republic of South Africa even though the Transkei’s rulers have in the past claimed it should be theirs (Streek & Wicksteed 1981: 170 sq.). When Pretoria granted the Transkei its ‘independence’ in 1976, attempts were made for Matatiele to secede and to become part of either Lesotho or the non-independent Qwaqwa bantustan that had been designated as the homeland for Basotho (ibid.: 50 sq.).

According to the 1980 census, the 2,140 square kilometres of land comprising the Matatiele district was home to 112,947 de facto residents (Muller 1984: 13). To this figure must be added an estimated 20,000 absent labour migrants. Most of this population is resident in twenty-five ‘locations’ (administrative areas), portions of rural land administered by local headmen and chiefs who are part of the Bantu Authority system put in place by the South African government during the 1950s (cf. Hammond-Tooke 1975). The district also includes large areas of freehold land, much of which was owned privately by white farmers until the 1940s when it was expropriated by the South African Native Trust (henceforth SANT) in terms of the 1936 Native Trust and Land Act. Many of these farms lie along the escarpment and are now utilised for communal grazing for location residents’ livestock. Others in more accessible areas became residential and arable annexes for overcrowded locations, one such annexe being used as a demob-village for African Second World War veterans. Another block of farms was used to provide a 1940s relocation site for the people of Makoba’s location which was situated in the midst of an area of white farms to the east of the district’s present boundary (Spiegel 1985). Another area of freehold, now occupied as if it were a location annexe, comprises two farms purchased, by public subscription in 1895, by the people of an adjacent location and then settled by them (Spiegel 1988).

A further 5% of the district’s land is still privately held freehold. During the late 19th and early 20th century, some wealthy Africans came into the district and purchased farms which their descendants still own. This article concentrates on the nature of tenancy on these farms.

Freehold Farms in Matatiele: Their Utilisation

The farms in Matatiele district, still in private African ownership, can usefully be divided into two broad categories: farms still treated primarily as agricultural resources, and farms that, despite some agricultural activity, have come to be regarded primarily as informal locations with dense settlement of tenants. Broadly speaking, where farms of the first type have resident tenants, their relationship with the landowners is
one of labour-tenancy (described locally as *sethabathaba*), while tenants resident on the second type of farm have no such obligation to the landholders: they are called *maloso*. (I deal below with both of these terms and their derivation.) In addition, various forms of productive tenancy are practised on the freehold farms of the district, including sharecropping as well as the leasing of arable and pasture land. On most farms, however, one can find a variety of different types of arrangements simultaneously. Although it was an extreme case, this was exemplified by the variety of land-use relationships that pertained on 'Glen Alfred', a farm situated on the upper reaches of the Kenikga River and lying in the lower slopes of the Drakensberg ridge which marks the border with Lesotho.

Case 1. A variety of land-use relationships

'Glen Alfred' was one of the farms in which Ned Sekhosana and other members of his family invested their transport-riding income around the turn of the century. They bought the 944-hectare farm in 1902, but sold half of it five years later to Freemantle & Company, traders based on the neighbouring farms 'The Retreat' and 'Makomereng', who in turn sold three years later. A further half of the half-shares remaining in the hands of the Sekhosana family—the 236-hectare share owned by Ned's first son of his first house—was transferred to the SANT in 1944, so that only 236 hectares were left in the Sekhosana name.

In the 1980s, this 236-hectare portion was home to three of Ned Sekhosana's now aging grandchildren, descended from his second house, and their families. One was regarded as the landowner even though the Umtata Deeds Register had no record of a transfer to his name after his father, Kallang, had died. The others, both much more junior genealogically, had residential rights on the farm, but were regarded as tenants rather than part-owners. They each had rights to a field and were entitled to run stock on the farm. And, unlike the other four tenants, they were not expected to provide labour for landowner Ramote in exchange for their residential sites, their one small stony field each, and the right to graze their livestock on the farm's pastures.

By the 1980s, the SANT portion, which had earlier become part of a belt of cattle-post pasturage for residents of nearby locations, was used as summer pasturage by various people from a neighbouring location. Indeed, its availability had meant that Ramote had lost the little income he had previously received from location-based stockholders hiring pasturage: 'There's nobody hiring here now because of those large government pasture areas'. In 1910, Freemantle & Co. had had the farm formally partitioned, their 472-hectare portion being registered as 'Glen Alfred West'. Having done this, they sold it to Mbulelo (Mvulelo) Mbedu, a headman in Mount Frere who used it as a cattle-post and allowed various labour-tenants to settle on the land. By the early 1960s, 'Glen Alfred West' had been inherited by Mvulelo's grandson, Peter Bonagele Mbedu. He settled there permanently and soon replaced his labour-tenants with rentpaying leaseholders. In

4. The South African Native Trust was the statutory body established in terms of the 1936 Native Trust and Land Act to administer areas of land purchased for African occupation.

5. This was Ramote, the first surviving son in the first house of Kallang, the first son (of five) in Ned's second house.
1972 he sold a 242-hectare portion for R2 000 to a retired policeman who wanted the land to run his herd of over 300 cattle. These had earlier been pastured on another freehold farm, 'Manning', where he had been able to hire pasturage, but at a rental which was eating into his herd. When the ex-policeman died in 1978 the farm was left to his widow who was still resident there in the 1980s (Deeds Register, Umtata).

In 1982, the 230-hectare Mbedu portion of 'Glen Alfred West' was being worked through a variety of different types of relationships established between the owner and others. A nearby store-owner had an annually renewable leasehold contract allowing him to pasture his livestock on the farm and to work a 26-hectare area of arable land for his own benefit. In 1982, his rental of R800 gave him access to resources allowing him to generate 200 bags of maize (worth about R4 000) and to run 77 livestock units on the farm. During this time he employed three herdsmen who also assisted on the fields when his tractor was brought to plough, plant and cultivate his hired fields.

Three sharecroppers, among them the neighbouring ex-policeman's widow, also worked sections of Mbedu's arable lands, one of them also running a small number of animals on the farm (see Table II). The sharecropped fields yielded 286 bags of maize and 4 bags of beans before being shared, while Bonagele Mbedu, the landowner, using his own tractor and labour to work some fields for his own account, obtained a yield of 50 bags of maize and 8 bags of beans, plus some turnips which were sold loose and not bagged. Table I summarizes his total estimated annual arable returns for 1982—I have calculated the values by using prices slightly lower than that obtaining for commercially available 80 kg bags at the time.

| Table I. — Estimates annual arable income to landowner, Mbedu portion of 'Glen Alfred West', 1982 |
|---------------------------------|------------------|
| Fields (and pastures) leased out to store-owner | R800 |
| Fields sharecropped by non-residents: | | +/— R3 000 |
| 143 bags maize, 2 bags beans: | |
| Fields worked by landowner: | +/— R1 300 |
| 50 bags maize, 8 bags beans: | |
| Total: | +/— R5 100 |

The farm's pastures were treated as commonage by the landowner, Mbedu, his leaseholder and one of his sharecropping partners. Their livestock holdings on the farm in 1982 were:
During the same year, the ex-policeman's widow was running 65 stock units, all of them her own, on her portion of the farm. However, its lack of much arable soil meant that there was virtually no crop harvested. To overcome this deficiency, she had entered a sharecropping contract on the Mbedu portion of the farm and, in 1982, this provided her with a crop of 75 bags of maize from those of Mbedu's fields which had been worked by her four hired labourers who were normally employed on her own portion of the farm.

The variety of forms of relationship between landowner and worker on 'Glen Alfred' was particularly marked, probably because of the extent to which the farm, which had quite extensive arable areas, had been subdivided among a number of unrelated landowners. Other farms had been subdivided to an even greater extent, albeit amongst large numbers of heirs: one was 'Freemantle', one half of which was taken over from its white owner by the SANT in 1938, while the other half, owned by an African, was inherited in fourteen equal shares two years later. Being situated high in the Drakensberg mountains, it was useful only for summer pasturage and thus provided little scope for complex sharecropping arrangements. It had, nonetheless, provided opportunities for large stockholders to lease grazing rights there.

Labour Tenancy: *Sethabathaba*

I referred above to the existence of labour-tenancy on the Sekhosana portion of 'Glen Alfred'. This kind of tenancy was known throughout the district by the Sotho term *sethabathaba*. Tenancy relationships described by this term were common on many of the freehold farms in the district, although, as elsewhere, description by a single term does not mean uniformity in the details of the relationships thus described. Let us
first look at the term’s derivation and then at the various forms such tenancy was reported to have taken.

The term *sethabathaba* is most commonly used to describe a ‘special tax levied by a chief on all his people’ (Paroz 1974: 508). Earlier commentators and translators suggest that it was a ‘tax in cattle for a public purpose’ (Jacottet 1893: 178) such as to finance a lawsuit involving the tribe or to pay the chief’s debts to save him the disgrace of prosecution. According to Ellenberger and MacGregor (1969: 265) chiefs imposed such a tax in cattle only in extraordinary circumstances. Informants in Lesotho confirmed this meaning of the term, referring to collections taken during the two World Wars in support of the allied war-effort as examples of *sethabathaba*.

In a discussion in 1982, one particularly knowledgeable old man in Qacha’s Nek was telling me about his childhood years during the First World War when he made unelicited reference to *sethabathaba*:

‘Kaizer was a German who fought with King George in 1914. I was still a boy then, yet I know it [viz. remember that time]. It was when those cattle that were taken as *thabathaba* were eaten. It was [the case] that every person took out a beast which went to feed the soldiers, in 1914 . . . ’ In Sesotho this is called *sethabathaba*.

Prompted further he added that during the Second World War, collections amounting to five shillings per person were taken, and that these too were known as *sethabathaba*, although he was unhappy with this usage because this levy had been in relatively small amounts of cash rather than in cattle. He was quite certain, moreover, that *sethabathaba* was not a term which could readily be used to describe labour service. Indeed, confirming what various authors have said about chiefs’ rights to labour service, he said that earlier forms of corvée labour exacted by chiefs were best described as *matsema* (sing. *letsema*, ‘work party’).

6. Ashton (1952: 208) also refers to such a levy as *morokhaoana*, a term which does not appear in that form in the standard Sotho-English dictionaries (Dietelen 1911: 290, 1937: 292), although Paroz (1974: 294) translates the word *mmorogoane* as ‘special tax’ and gives its derivation as possibly from Afrikaans without identifying its source. Hunter (1961: 385) cites a Mpondoland chief as pointing out ‘that in times of special necessity the chief could levy tribute (*isithabathaba*) from each man according to his capacity to pay’. This was reportedly done ‘when chief Poto had a motor accident and was permitted by Government to levy a tax of 1 shilling’ per head on his people to meet the damages claimed against him (ibid.). See also Kropp & Göddey (1915: 401) who define the Xhosa *isit'abat'aba* as ‘that which, as a breach of the law, is imputed to all in the vicinity, or to a whole clan, the actual transgressor being unknown; fine; tribute’.

7. In oral use of Sesotho, the nominal prefix is often left off. This is because the concordant verbal prefix indicates the class, and thus the prefix, of the noun to which it refers.

None of the variously updated editions of the Southern Sotho–English Dictionary makes any reference to use of the term sethabathaba to describe labour-tenancy. Yet various landowners and tenants in Matatiele insisted not only that local labour-tenancies were sethabathaba, but also that the term described labour service performed for a chief in Lesotho: 'It is just as in Lesotho. In Lesotho, it is said, the chief would be worked for on a particular day. Similarly, this [sethabathaba here on the farm] is something like that'.

There is one area, however, where sethabathaba describes a site-rent, and that is the high density settlement relocation areas of Qwaqwa. According to Leslie Bank people in the closer settlements on the immediate perimeter of that bantustan's only town, Phuthadithjaba, were obliged to pay R2 per annum in 1984-85 to the local headman or chief, the money going ostensibly into 'tribal authority' coffers. People described this payment as sethabathaba which Bank's interpreters translated for him as 'tax'. Yet he believes that his informants thought of it as a rent because they commonly compared this sethabathaba with the rents of R16.16 per month paid for a township house—it was one reason many elected to live in nearby closer settlements rather than in the town.

In Matatiele, the precise expectations and obligations of sethabathaba varied quite extensively from one farm to another and indeed from one tenant to another on any particular farm. On 'Glen Alfred', situated far from the main roads and in hilly infertile country, only one day's work per week was expected of the four tenants who were not of the Sekhosana family, while those who could demonstrate direct descent from Ned Sekhosana were not obliged to provide any such formal labour-service. They were, however, asked to assist the landowner to raise funds to pay annual rates on the farm. On 'Etheldale', by comparison, the owner expected all those who had a homestead on the farm to contribute three days of work per week for his benefit. Alternatively, tenants could arrange to be available on a full-time basis for six months in the year, while a select few had arranged to make a regular cash payment in lieu of such service (cf. Walker 1981: 11; Surplus People Project 1983, IV: 28). Interestingly, the owner of the farm in the early 1980s insisted that every single resident tenant was obliged to him in this way. Indeed, he said that even his own children who had elected to build their homes on the farm had to contribute: 'My children are now working for me on this farm. All of them except those who have gone to Makhooeng produce of which should be used to feed the messengers and other officials', while WALLMAN (1969: 34) points out that the chiefs' legal right to make demands for such labour was abolished in 1948 when an additional shilling was added to the annual 'head tax to enable chiefs to pay for any "public" works'.
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and the place of the whites i.e. who are away as labour migrants. It's that word [ruling] which I told you about, that they should work three days. . . . And regarding those of his children who were labour migrants with homesteads on the farm he said: 'Yes, they too must pay. After all, where do they pass [stools]? It's here on the farm . . . he [my son] must help me, see, so that I will be able to pay rates . . .' While this reveals a clear shift in practice from pure labour tenancy to a form of regular cash-rent tenancy, the latter was seen as a concession allowed to family members whose proper obligation was to provide three days labour-rent per week. Indeed all the landlord-tenant relations on a farm in the early 1980s, including those between landowner and his sons, were described by the term sethabathaba. Moreover, even the six months system was seen as a concession: 'because that person who works three days wastes his time [for the three days he's free].

Part of the reason for the difference between the two farms was that the 587-hectare portion of 'Etheldale' still in private ownership was a much more attractive farm on which to be resident than was 'Glen Alfred'. 'Etheldale' bordered on the Kenigha River and had quite extensive fertile arable lands in its flood plain. As Segar (1989: 35) has pointed out, the fertility of these alluvial fields meant that landholders in neighbouring St Paul's village had no need to apply additional fertilisers to generate good crops, an advantage they shared with farmers along the Mabele tributary of the Kenigha in the Ongeluksnek strip. All tenants on 'Etheldale' were allocated a field in this area, as well as being allowed free range for their livestock. Moreover, 'Etheldale' is situated right alongside the main road into Matatiele, and indeed within relatively easy walking distance on the town. The landowner's problem there was to restrict the number of his tenants, which by 1982 included 22 households, and not to allow his farm to become a 'squatter' area like 'Harry Ebden' directly across the road, an area which was commonly described not by the farm's name, but as malosong (lit. 'the place of the maloso or non-paying tenants').

Squatter-tenants: Maloso at 'Harry Ebden' 'Harry Ebden' was a 744-hectare farm where 252 homesteads had been built by 1983, and where new tenants were settling all the time. Virtually all of these tenants were described by the term maloso (sing. leloso), a word deriving from the Afrikaans los meaning loose or unattached.11

11. PAROZ (1974: 282) translates the Sotho word loso as 'loose, unattached; in bulk'. Some colloquial Xhosa describes unexpected helpers in the fields and young boys who go along with the regular herders, as amalose (sing. ilose). Here again the term reflects uncertain and insecure tenure.
Maloso commonly refers to Africans living on white-owned farms who are not employed there (cf. Paroz 1974: 282, Dieterlen 1911: 191). My informants referred to ex-farmworkers who were too old to continue working but remained insecurely on their ex-employer’s land as maloso.

Common to all maloso I came across in Matatiele was their access to residential sites on a freehold farm without any obligation to pay a regular rent, rate, tribute, etc. Almost all had made just a single payment when they had first settled on the farm, and this had ensured their right to remain, although their landlords did occasionally impose a levy for a particular purpose.12. The exceptions to this rule were tenants who, without payment, had retained their access to residential allotments because they were descendants either of the first African titleholders of the farm where they now ‘squatted’, or of those titleholders’ earliest sharecropping tenants. As for sethabathaba, there was some variety in the nature of tenancies popularly subsumed under the term maloso.

By the 1980s, ‘Harry Ebden’s’ population comprised at least three different categories of tenants: (a) very long-settled families, a number of whom were directly descended from the farm’s first African landowners or from early sharecropping tenants; (b) tenants who had settled on the farm twenty or more years before and had expectations that the farm would become a Trust area where their tenure would be ensured; (c) and those who had arrived very recently and saw the farm primarily as a rural dormitory for relict dependants of labour migrants, albeit one with the potential for some agrarian production.

Many of those in the first category still had free access to arable allotments, which they worked either for themselves or put out to sharecroppers. But they complained about the way in which the arable land areas to which they had access were diminishing and how they had come to have to rely on participation in the migrant wage-labour market in order to subsist. Some descendants of the first African owners of the farm felt aggrieved that they were not treated as full partners on the farm, particularly—said one of first owner Philip Khauoe’s sons—because they had been called upon to help raise funds to pay annual rates and mortgage bond repayments on the farm in the past.

In the absence of any testamentary condition to this effect, however, only the heirs by primogeniture had any legal right to be regarded as a part-owner of the farm. Nonetheless, past practice had been that many of the Khauoe family’s descendants, for example, had remained on the farm and had been allowed to work fairly extensive portions of arable land, without—as in the case of ‘Etheldale’—being treated as formal tenants who had somehow to recompense the titleholder for access to

12. In 1982, tenants on ‘Harry Ebden’ were subjected to a R2 per head levy for provision of a water supply that did not subsequently materialise.
these resources. By the 1980s, however, this had begun to change and those with arable allotments were handing them on to just one heir, leaving their other children to become landless 'squatters' like the rest of the maloso on the farm.

Older tenants who were not descended from the landowning family described a similar experience of dispossession and deprivation. They talked about the past when their antecedents had arrived to settle as sharecropping tenants on the farm, having been recruited by the farm-owners for this purpose. And they bemoaned the fact that their arable rights on the farm had been undermined over the years, making them have to turn, like so many others, to a dependence on the wage-labour market for their subsistence requirements.

**Case 2. From sharecropper to leloso**

FM, born in 1914, remembered a time when his father was a sharecropper working extensive areas of arable land on 'Harry Ebden' farm. His father, he said, had been born in a place called Noteng in Natal but had come to settle in Matatiele after having been invited by the owners of 'Harry Ebden' to become a tenant on their farm. This was before FM was born. Both his father and his father's brother had come to the area, although his father's brother had settled on a neighbouring farm, 'George Herbert'. At the time they came, they had brought numbers of cattle and sheep with them, and had soon settled into a productive routine producing sufficient grain every year to be able to sell much of it to local traders. In this way they were able to increase their herd size, and thereby improve their draft power for working the land. FM claims to remember a time—probably in the 1920s—when their own half-share of the crop amounted to 150 bags. At that point, said FM, they were certainly not maloso, although he was not so certain in 1983 that the term could not be used to describe his existing situation.

He had retained the site and house that his father had built, and still had a field on the farm. For a while in the early 1980s this latter right had been in doubt when one of the farm's titleholders attempted to appropriate the field. But FM's close association with and support for the other titleholder was rewarded by this decision being reversed. In addition, in 1983, FM was sharecropping a portion of quite extensive arable land which had been leased by one of the titleholders to a well-off resident of a nearby location. The leaseholder had in turn contracted a number of sharecroppers to work sections of it, while he worked the rest himself. In 1983, FM's byre housed twelve cattle and some thirty sheep and goats. His two sons were both labour migrants, one on the mines, the other with the Johannesburg municipality. Neither had yet built his own homestead.

Maloso in the second category—those who had settled on the farm during the 1950s—were of the opinion that by the 1980s their tenure as tenants was much less secure than they had expected it might be when they arrived, and much less secure too than that of people who had been there since the first decades of the century, some of whom still retained arable rights. In the mid-1960s they had faced a brief period when the farm's titleholders had attempted to evict forty-nine 'squatter families'. But the former's lack of funds prevented them from proceeding with litigation, although they did briefly try to effect the eviction by having
the farm declared a betterment area. More recently, they had begun to feel increasingly threatened by the rapid influx of new tenants during the late 1970s and early 1980s. This had resulted in the loss of previously-granted fields and diminishing access to sharecropping as more and more of the farm was demarcated into residential sites. This was despite their compulsory per household contributions towards the farm's rates of R10 per annum for three years at the end of the 1960s, after the attempts to have them evicted had failed.

Many of these people had found refuge on the farm after having been dispossessed of their homesteads when a betterment plan was implemented on the neighbouring communally-owned farms 'Polygon' and 'Simpson' (Spiegel 1988). Some explained that among the factors that had enticed them to 'Harry Ebden' was the promise of its 'red' soil in the area where they were granted fields, and the fact that there were areas of 'black' alluvial land along the farm's river frontage where they expected they would be able to sharecrop. More importantly, they had understood that the farm was due to become a Trust farm offering full residential, pasture and arable rights. This, they knew, was the case on other areas of communal land such as locations, and on other Trust farms which by definition would have been planned in terms of betterment principles. As one man put it:

'When I came here in 1955 I had to pay fifteen pounds. I was given three [Sotho] acres of land to plough, and my site also. Then they said that I'll get another field when the Trust comes here. This was said when we first came here. There was a chief here called Mokokoana Khauoe, who is now dead. He said it. Now they have taken my field and those of others too, and new people have been given sites on our fields. Now I have no field, and I'm having to live by sharecropping. First I ploughed with different people every year, but now I am working with a man from Pontseng who has hired a land here... He ploughs half himself, and has people who sharecrop on the other half.'

Tenants in this second category felt that their length of residence on the farm, and the promises that had been made them about the likelihood

13. SpiEGEL 1988: 151. Betterment refers to state interventions whereby areas of African-occupied land were divided into separate residential, arable and pasture areas, with resulting forced relocation. A 'betterment area' is an area subjected to such an intervention, which is itself formalised as a betterment plan (ibid.). Trust farm are areas of previously freehold land purchased by a government agency in terms of the 1936 Native Trust and Land Act in order to be handed over for African occupation. All trust farms were first subjected to betterment planning before being thus transferred.

14. Cf. WALLMAN (1965) on the difficulty of defining acres as units of land area. See also KeEGAN 1988: 47.

15. He used the word morena (lit. 'chief', 'headman', 'person in authority' [HAmNET 1975: 86]) to describe one of the farm's titleholders.

16. Pontseng is a nearby village in an area of 'communal' tenure (location). My informant was one of seven sharecroppers working portions of the Pontseng man's hired land.
of the farm becoming a Trust farm where they would gain full residential status, were good reasons that they ought to have more security and greater rights on the farm than more recent arrivals. Yet they found that increasingly they were being treated as if they were no different from the rest. They no longer had fields, and they were not given special preference when it came to sharecropping contracts with the farm's titleholders. Indeed, new arrivals to the farm, who of necessity were just beginning negotiations for a site, were often given preference by the titleholders. This was because their concern to insert themselves into agricultural relations made them ready to accept much less favourable sharecropping conditions than older tenants would.

The tenure of these new arrivals was substantively as insecure as that of the longer-settled 'squatters', yet they did not express similar feelings of insecurity. This was probably because they had arrived expecting that their one-off payments would gain them little other than their sites and the right to run livestock on the farm's depleted pastures. They recognised that they could expect no access to arable resources without paying for them either in cash or significant contributions of labour through sharecropping on very disadvantageous terms. For most of them, the decision to settle on the farm had been taken because its position alongside a main road and near to Matatiele town offered them advantages over the places from which they had come, and where they had had no greater access to agricultural resources than they now had as 'squatters' on the farm (Spiegel 1984). Moreover, for those who had come from white-owned farms, the sums they had had to pay for their sites were of the same order as what they would have been asked for by a headman had they wanted to settle in a location. Even for those who came from locations where they had not yet built their own homes, their payments to the 'Harry Ebden' titleholders were not significantly greater than what they might have been asked for in order to obtain sites in the locations from which they came. And, in any event, many villages in locations were experiencing a shortage of available residential sites as a result of the residential areas demarcated in terms of betterment already having been filled.

Freehold Tenancies: Continuities in Time and Space

What would no doubt have unsettled all of the tenants on 'Harry Ebden', both old and new, would have been the imposition of a regular annual or, worse still, monthly rental for their sites. Whereas it was commonly accepted that portions of the farm's arable lands were leased out for cash, there was an understanding between landlords and tenants that the right to reside on the farm was obtained through a one-off payment when the tenants first arrived. Indeed, this was a distinguishing characteristic of
maloso: having made their one-off payment, they had no further obligation to their landlords, unless exceptional circumstances arose.

None of the literature on contemporary tenancy on African-owned freehold farms elsewhere in the country refers to tenancies where there is no regular rental payment, whether this be in cash, kind (through sharecropping) or labour. Indeed in Natal—the closest area for which similar kinds of present-day tenancies are documented—resident tenants on African-owned farms are reported to have had to pay a regular rental to the landowner (cf. Mngadi 1981, Cross & Preston-Whyte 1987). A 1983 survey of shack settlements on both freehold and ‘traditional tenure’ (location) areas in Natal/KwaZulu indicated that the most common form of tenancy there was what was described as ‘site-rental tenancy’ (technically “tenancy at will”) (Fourie cited in Surplus People Project 1988: 201), whereby tenants paid a regular (monthly or annual) rent to their landlords for the right to retain and occupy a residential site. Interestingly, this was found to occur only on freehold land, and not in areas of what was described as ‘traditional’ or ‘tribal’ land. Where the latter were experiencing ‘modernizing forms of indigenous tenure’ (ibid: 201-202), changes in land allocation procedures were said to be leading to greater informal purchase of land from local landholders (Cross et al. 1982: 8), and to increasing ‘squatting’ without any payment at all (Fourie 1987: 9). In these areas, it seems, the principle was still applied that once one was settled as a resident in a headman’s area of authority (a location) then the only regular payments required of one were head and stock taxes and contributions to levies for projects of public concern.

This is not to say that new arrivals to such areas were conventionally accepted without charge. Although neither Fourie (1987) nor Cross et al. (1982) mention any such payments in areas of ‘traditional tenure’ in Natal/KwaZulu,17 Preston-Whyte (1988: 184) has described the payment of amounts of between R10 and R50 to the chief and his headmen for sites on the Mission reserve at Indaleni in the Natal midlands (cf. Preston-Whyte & Sibisi 1975: 301). This practice appears to have had much earlier precedent when American missionaries in control of Mission reserves in Natal during the 19th century had ‘charged’ rent, at least for new settlers, even though they lacked the authority to make people pay’.18 Similarly, Hunter (1961: 114) points out that headmen

17. They do, however, refer to immigrants’ informal purchase of land from households that control sufficient land to allow for such a transaction. These transfers are reportedly ‘witnessed’ by neighbours and the local headman—but again there is no report of the latter demanding any payment for performing this role.

18. Kiernan 1989: 3. By 1803 the American missionaries were claiming that ‘for years now, no revenue has accrued from any of our eleven reserves’. Possibly this was because they had not themselves taken in any new settlers during those years, this prerogative having been captured by chiefs who were ‘exercis-
in Pondoland in the 1930s were demanding payments for fields allocated to residents of their locations and that in earlier times ‘newcomers entering the country of a chief paid him a beast’ (ibid.: 385). My own informants referred often to the necessity of a newcomer to an area ‘taking out a beast for the headman’ in order to obtain a site in a Matatiele location, in much the same kind of transaction as has been described as having occurred elsewhere in the Transkei (cf. Haines, Tapscott, Solinjani & Tyali 1984: 14). This was neither a new practice in the region nor one which had been looked on with official disfavour earlier, despite its supposed illegality by the 1980s (ibid.): in the 1960s the local magistrate pointed out that people wishing to settle in a headman’s domain on location land ‘would have to agree to pay the customary fee’. It is this practice that gives us a clue as to the way in which maloso-tenancy was understood by both residents and others in Matatiele.

Beinart (1986: 283-284, 1987: 51) has pointed out how during the last decade of the 19th century freehold owners in Umzimkulu were accommodating immigrants on their land in exchange for a settlement fee, and as rent-tenants. The Surplus People Project (1983, IV: 27) reports the same for Natal where ‘by the early twentieth century African landowners were taking on rent-paying tenants in lieu of producing agricultural goods for an elusive market’. In some respects this practice was also used to support the efforts of some landholders to have themselves recognised as headmen, at least in the making, precisely through their assembling large numbers of followers around them. More recent reports from areas of African freehold near Durban show that a similar process has been occurring there during the 1970s and 1980s, although tenants are expected to pay a regular cash-rental (Jenkins et al. cited in Surplus People Project 1988: 201).

In many respects, the nature of maloso-tenancy on ‘Harry Ebden’, and on a few other farms in Matatiele, can be seen similarly. Indeed, there was a strong local perception of continuity between the relationship of the titleholders to their tenants, and those of headmen to villagers in locations or on communally-owned freehold areas. Just as new location residents paid a tribute to the headman for the right to take up their normal right to allocate land to newcomers, even in the Mission reserves. Indeed, the terms of the missions’ deeds were altered in 1895 to give them, rather than the chiefs, the right to introduce new settlers. But they traded their right to claim rent for one to select tenants on the basis of religious acceptability. And they became rent-collectors for the colonial government which imposed an annual cash rent of thirty shillings per household on Mission reserves (ibid.).

19. Magistrate Matatiele to Attorneys van Niekerk and Gray, 3 Sept. 1965, File 19/3/3-5, Department of Agriculture and Forestry, Maluti.
20. I was told that maloso-tenants were also to be found on one or two farms in the east of Matatiele district, in the area of the farm ‘Black Diamond’. I did not manage to visit the area to confirm this.
residence in a location village, new maloso paid a one-off sum to the title-holder for a site on freehold land. Moreover, the fact that one of the titleholders on ‘Harry Ebden’ attempted, during 1983, to hold regular weekly meetings of the farm’s tenants suggests that he was trying to emulate the headman model and to draw on a well-established tradition of local authority and power which resonated with people’s experience and practices throughout the neighbouring areas. During the time I was on the farm in 1983, the weekly meetings were markedly unsuccessful as the village moots they were intended to be. But there were various other pointers to suggest that the titleholders did, in some ways, aspire to becoming headmen. One of these was their promises during the 1950s that the farm would become a betterment area, and their subsequent attempts in the 1960s to effect that transformation, but without giving up their freehold rights. Another was the fact that many tenants did come to the more approachable of the two titleholders to seek help in sorting out domestic disputes and the like. In this respect that titleholder was expected by his tenants to perform at least one of the roles of a location headman or village subheadman. This indicates that, to some extent, the perception of titleholder as headman was shared by at least some tenants on the farm, and it was for this reason that they tended to use the term morena when addressing or referring to the titleholders. That the latter aspired to this status is also reflected in the fact that the most senior son of one titleholder had Morena as his given name.

Similar circumstances have been described for areas of African freehold around Durban, most of which have been occupied in recent years by rent-tenants. As Jenkins (quoted in Surplus People Project 1988: 201) points out: ‘The landlord has replaced the induna and is consulted by his tenants for help in solving various problems’.

By contrast with the virtual uniqueness of the maloso status as non rent-paying tenants, labour-tenancy relationships have a long history throughout the Natal midlands, the Free State and Transvaal and the north-eastern Cape. Indeed, when I queried its precise mechanisms

21. I am not, of course, suggesting that the headmanship was not in itself an invention of colonial rule, cf. Hammond-Tooke 1975: 77-78, Spiegel & Boonzaier 1988: 49-51.

22. Cf. Slater 1975, Walker 1981, Morris 1981, Surplus People Project 1983 Vol. IV, Keegan 1983, 1986: 121 sq., 1988, Beinart & Delius 1986. Significantly Beinart and Delius (ibid.: 35) point out that ‘progressive settler farmers in East Griqualand [. . .] had a stated preference for waged migrants already by the turn of the century, not least because they sought to graze their own flocks on the whole area of their land’. African landowners in the region clearly took their model from further afield and from their less ‘progressive’ neighbours, many of whom were still using forms of labour-tenancy along with wage-payment in livestock in the western reaches of East Griqualand (around Barkly East, Elliot, Ugie, Maclear and Rhodes as well as in the Onge-luksnek pasture areas) during the 1930s and 1940s, and in some areas into the 1950s and 1960s.
in Matatiele, some informants explicitly referred me to the practice that has continued in some cases virtually right up to the present on white-owned farms in parts of Natal (Walker 1981: 14), and that was widespread in that province from the early decades of this century when labour-tenancy began to replace cash-tenancy (Surplus People Project 1983, IV: 28): 'It's just like there in Natal where people stay on farms... They work for six months on the farms and then they work for six months in Johannesburg or Durban. Now, see, they do just like that'. Walker (1981: 11-12) has succinctly described the expectations of labour tenancy in Natal until the late 1960s:

‘Until the late 1960s, the most common form of farm labour in Natal was that of labour-tenancy, a system that had evolved over several generations into what was commonly known as “the six-month system”. Under this system a family supplied the white landowner with their labour, generally for six months of the year, at a nominal or non-existent wage, in return for the right to graze some stock and cultivate some land on the farm: labour serving as a form of land-rent’.

Considering the ready availability and use of this model from white-owned farms to explain labour-tenancy in Matatiele, it is interesting that people in the area should have attempted to 'indigenise' it by giving it a putative continuity with a Sotho past and a Sesotho name that, as we have seen, is not wholly appropriate as a term for its description. Similarly, it is noteworthy that maloso, a term that derives from Afrikaans and refers to relationships more commonly found on white-owned farms, has been used to describe residents on land whose titleholders were keen to be seen as quasi-headmen in the traditions of authority in nearby locations rather than landlords whose relationship to their tenants could be seen as purely material and exploitative. At first sight, both examples suggest a kind of paradox: where an exogenous model is available and readily used to understand the landlord-tenant relationship, it is described by an endogenous term, and vice versa.

Is this really paradoxical, or is its appearance as such reflection of a particular perspective that attempts to pursue analytically an idea that the endogenous and the exogenous represent two readily distinguishable worlds of experience and cognition? A number of recent

---

23. She also details how attempts by the state to abolish it subsequently led to mass removals in that province.

24. According to the Surplus People Project report (1983, IV: 28), the period of labour service was initially three months per year. Walker (1981: 14) reports that in the Louwsburg area some farmers responded to a 1979 proclamation finally to abolish labour-tenancy by increasing the labour obligation to twelve months, but without improving or even instituting wages, and without converting the tenant's obligation to work from a family one to an individual one. Beinsart and Delius (1986: 12) cite Morris (1981) as saying that when, in the 1920s, labour-tenancy began to replace rent-tenancy and sharecropping in the Free State, it involved two days labour per week continuously through the year.
contributors to the anthropological literature on rural southern Africa have presented an argument that there are indeed two cognitive worlds that are brought together, albeit in opposition to each other, through the experience of labour migration and the effects of industrialisation and incorporation into a world-capitalist system (cf. Comaroff 1985, Comaroff & Comaroff 1987, Alverson 1978, McAllister 1980, 1981, Robertson 1987). These authors have then sought to show how people have attempted to make sense of their life experiences by reference to the perceived chasm between these two worlds: particular activities and sets of behaviours are categorically placed in one or the other such world.

Alverson (1978) and, following him, Comaroff and Comaroff (1987) have argued that the Tswana, including the Tshidi, make a clear categorical distinction between subsistence work, such as in agriculture, or where one works ‘for oneself’, and wage labour.25 They do this by tagging each of these with a different lexeme: tiro (from the Tswana go diha, go dira, ‘to work’, ‘make’, ‘create’—implicitly in a non-alienating productive environment) for production of one’s own use-values, and in an egalitarian communal context; and bereka (from the Afrikaans, werk, ‘work’) for wage-work (implicitly alienating). Moreover, those items which Tswana place in what they see as their own ‘authentic’ environment (tiro) are more valuable than those relegated to the world of whites and their callous industrial society and production processes (bereka).

Extrapolating this kind of argument to the data presented above would necessarily lead to a view that it is somehow paradoxical for those who have a ready model in endogenous ‘tradition’—as do the maloso’s landlords—to allow their relationship to be tagged by a term derived from the exogenous world. Similarly, one may ask why labour-tenancy, a practice with a long history on white-owned farms, should be tagged...

25 In what follows I focus particularly on Comaroff’s and Comaroff’s analysis (1987) along these lines because I sense there is a tension, if not a contradiction, between their pragmatic claim that they are not dealing with ‘a confrontation between a primordial folk tradition and the modern world’ (ibid.: 195), and the substance of their presentation that tends to reproduce Jean Comaroff’s apparent acceptance (1985) of just such a primordialism when she describes a Tswana ‘cultural order [that] would seem to contrast sharply with a Western epistemology in which persons appear as self-contained, determining individuals, acting out of rational utility upon a compliant world; one in which, as a Tshidi commentator put it, “the air is empty of forces and powers”’ (ibid.: 128).

By thus limiting my focus, it may seem I have caricatured the Comaroffs’ argument. My sole intention is to emphasise that persisting with systemic symbolic analyses makes escape from dualisms extremely difficult.

There are, of course, significant differences between Alverson’s and the Comaroffs’ approaches. The former adopts a highly individualistic perspective derived from Schutz’s phenomenology, and argues that Tswana ‘reinterpreted their mine experiences in terms of their own wider [personal] rural life-plans and goals’ (Moodie 1988: 4). Comaroff and Comaroff (1987: 16 fn. 20) attempt a more structuralist approach that sets up an opposition between two cultural structures, and that fails ‘to recognise the extent to which migrant cultures bridge the contrast between tiro and bereka’.
with a 'genuine' Sesotho word.\textsuperscript{26} Surely, one would expect that both labour- and maloso-tenancy would each be placed neatly into either the endogenous or the exogenous category: either the practice is exploitative and of the 'white' world of bereka, or it is communitarian and of the African world of iiro.

Of course, the argument would still hold if one could explain the apparent paradox by reference to different interests within the local population. To do this one would have to show that landlords emphasised the 'traditional' features of the respective tenancy practice while tenants stressed those of its characteristics that derived from the 'white' world. If that were the case, then we would have clear evidence for the cultural playing out of localised class struggle, landlords appealing to a tradition of reciprocity and communitarianism to legitimize their enterprise, tenants denying them the legitimacy which such appeals might support by stressing the exogenous nature of the landlord-tenant relationship. As Moodie (1988: 7) has recently pointed out, we need to disaggregate the Tswana and be able to conceive 'of the alienation experienced in their "working" [viz. tiro] by subordinate classes', particularly among subordinates within the local structures of rural society. It is now a well-established procedure to look out for manifestations of different class and gender interests in studies of precolonial society. And in the contemporary period one cannot stress sufficiently the importance of incorporating an understanding of the differentiated nature of rural labour-supplying populations into analyses of cultural practices and discourse: both Alverson (1978) and, surprisingly, the Comaroffs (1987) have tended to overlook this.

Unfortunately for the argument outlined above, there was no clearcut division between landlords and tenants—and indeed others in the district—as regards the terms of reference used for the two types of tenancy, or as regards the derivation of these practices. I am not suggesting that there was complete unanimity on these issues, but the differences which did appear did not correspond neatly with any wealth or class differentials. In fact the titleholder on the farm 'Etheldale', when explaining the origins in Natal of the kind of labour-tenancy he enforced on his land, went so far as to say that, in Natal, such labour tenants today were in fact maloso, although he would never have used that term to describe his own tenants. Indeed, he was at pains to distinguish tenancy on his farm from maloso-tenancy which was generally regarded with some contempt, primarily because most maloso had no

\textsuperscript{26} At a seminar where I presented an earlier version of this paper, David Hammond-Tooke suggested that setlabathaba was 'originally' a Xhosa word subsequently taken into Sesotho, a claim for which I can find no documentary evidence. The implication, of course, is that both forms of tenancy were recognised linguistically as 'imported'.

rights whatever to arable land and because their security of tenure was very limited. The reasons for this contempt were thus much more material than ideological.

How then can we explain the fact that both kinds of tenancy in the district were explained and described by reference to a combination of both exogenous and endogenous practices and terms? The answer seems almost too simple: the two cases show very clearly how practices, traditions and descriptive labels can be drawn from whatever source is available, often without any clearly instrumental motivations for drawing from one or other source. There may well be a sense in which people attempt to use images and experiences from each of the two worlds of ‘home’ and ‘work’, of tiro and bereka, and thus try to understand their changing practices in terms which derive from the variety of their experience as labour migrants and their relict dependants. But, I would argue, this is less to signify an opposition between the idyllic and the prosaic or unpleasant than to accommodate their variety of experience in their social and cultural practices. As Coplan (1987, 1989, 1990) has shown with regard to the songs sung by migrants from Lesotho and by their ‘discarded’ women who populate the shebeens (backyard bars) of Lesotho’s towns, people draw into their practice as wide a variety of images as are available to them from their own personal and especially their vicarious experience. They may do this in playful mockery and with a fine sense of the incongruencies their images create, but they do not always do it as an instrumentally conceived means of reflecting a fundamental opposition between sekhooa (the white way) and Sesotho (the Sotho way of doing things). They are acutely aware that the past has as many immoralities to it as does the present, and they express them in the songs which they sing: thus the horrors to be found in the belly of the earth where miners must today work find their analogy in ‘the cannibals of war’ of old (Coplan 1989: 6). By implication, therefore, Sesotho is as blemished as is sekhooa, although many of those who see themselves as the custodians of Sesotho would deny this, particularly when presented in such stark terms.27

There are two reasons for this almost eclectic use of symbols and images: firstly such a procedure enables people to integrate ideologically the variety that is their life-experience, and thus to bridge the contrasts to which those experiences expose them. Their sense of personal integrity, itself dependent on authorisation from those around them, depends on such an integration: as Moodie (1988: 16 fn. 20) has pointed out, the

27. Indeed, COPLAN ([1989], personal communication, 1989) has found that many such self-appointed custodians—all of whom are of the elite in Lesotho—prefer to regard the songs of migrants (lifela tsafitsama-ma-na, lit. ‘songs of the inveterate travellers’) as a phenomenon outside of ‘the authentic’ Sesotho. Shebeen women’s songs in the same genre receive similarly disparaging treatment.
Comaroffs’ madman (1987) is highly representative of this integrative process, much more so than their insistence on dualism and opposition allows them so see. Secondly, albeit more prosaically, people usually use those symbols and images most readily available and convenient in order to express themselves. Only in those cases where there is explicit pressure to be able to legitimate their practices, or to deny that ability to others, will their choice of images to explain those practices be constrained by perceptions of moral and immoral sources for those images. Put into Giddens’ language (1984), unless there are particular factors that lead people explicitly to consider which terms they will use to describe phenomena, thereby raising them to the level of discursive consciousness, they will merely ‘get on’ with relating to those phenomena in the most practical ways possible, and the terms they use to describe them will come from whatever words happen to be at hand. Their consciousness of those phenomena will thus remain at the level of the practical. This does nor, however, mean, as Jean Comaroff’s analysis (1985) would have it, that their use of terms reflects a kind of cultural persistence via the habitus. It reflects a much less structured process of pragmatic convenience, or of what Fernandez (1989: 470) calls a ‘pragmatics of metaphor’—a playful enlivening of life through tropes that resonate with the variety of life experience, without indicating any clearly structured cognitive wholenesses.

Read together, these two cases of tenancy in Matatiele show that people draw from diverse yet convenient language and practical traditions to explain their practices. Without political need for them to prove their bona fides, there is no pressure on them to look to images which will give their practices special legitimacy, and their choice of images thus becomes a matter of convenience.

*  

Roger Keesing (1989: 467, and fn. 20) has recently alerted us to the need for scepticism of interpretations for which the main evidence lies in the stuff of language [. . . unless] strongly supported by folk exegeses of other evidence of corresponding “beliefs”’. He develops his argument around the problems of interpretation of the ‘indigenous’ matter in Malaita languages, particularly Kwaio. Sensibly he does not complicate his problem by attempting to deal with the use of metaphors in Kwaio which come from another language which ‘belongs’ to politically powerful ‘invaders’ as Comaroff and Comaroff (1987), and Alverson (1978), have done when looking at borrowings from Afrikaans into Tswana, and
which procedure I have followed here with respect to Afrikaans and Sesotho.  

This paper has thus far indicated that simple-minded interpretations of metaphor in language are by no means conclusive of the ideational existence of cohesive cosmologies and ‘cultures’ which people can then set up against one another. But I would wish to go one step further. Both the Comaroffs’ and my own arguments are based on quite thin ethnographic data lacking any really detailed ‘folk exegeses’. I have adopted this approach here in order to show how easily it can be used to produce an explanation directly opposed to that of the Comaroffs. But ultimately I would wish to adopt Keesing’s position and thereby deny the legitimacy of that approach.

Language use and construction is far more complex than any southern Africanist anthropologists have yet explicitly recognised. We are thus lacking in thorough and systematic analyses of the historical construction of metaphor and the ‘grammaticalization’ of lexical forms in the region, with its multiplicity of languages which have long borrowed from one another. By saying this I do not mean to ignore the scholarly work on vernacular praise-poetry (cf. Kunene 1971, Damane & Sanders 1974, Wainwright 1980, Opland 1983, Gunner 1986), nor the important growing corpus on migrants’ oral poetry (Coplan 1987, Moletsane 1982, Mokitimi 1982). The problem with these texts, however, is that they are concerned with metaphors used in extraordinary circumstances. Unless, and until, we have thorough and systematic analyses of everyday metaphor, however, we will have to continue to work with the kind of pragmatic approach I use above. This is because such an approach prevents our assumption ‘that […] peoples’ [and people’s] schemes of conventional metaphor are […] deeply expressive of cosmological schemes […] or that “cultural models” are uniform’ (Keesing 1989: 463). The southern African experience continues to deny such separate wholenesses.

University of Cape Town, Department of Anthropology, 1989.

---

28. Robertson (1987) has adopted a similar stance in comparing two terms used in Sesotho to describe sharecropping: seahlolo (the authentic Sesotho) and lihalofote (from Afrikaans halfte half).

29. At the seminar mentioned above (fn. 26) Hammond-Took pursued the same method to attempt to counter my argument by suggesting that I was creating a ‘straw man’.
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