

Notation

SWOHP, Hamilton series, Mazendlola Myeni, 21-3-1983.

Matsebula, (*History* (new edition), chart opposite p.18).

Grotpeter, *Historical Dictionary*, p.18.

J.S.A., vol.1, p.34.

- Distinguish between footnotes and endnotes. Footnotes contain information that helps in the understanding of the narrative (eg. all language questions and ambiguities are explained here).

Endnotes contain all substantive historical and geographical information.

- Footnotes - for all info on narrative, for ease of reading, done repeatedly, our interpretation

Endnotes - for all info that is factual, for background, done on first occurrence, see chart on wall for further rules.

When we use ethnographic information to understand a *s*Swati expression, still a footnote. When we add longer (more opinion) it becomes an endnote.

- Always use '' (single inverted commas) when not giving direct speech.

- remember that index must also refer to endnotes, because we are using unpublished (and unknown) SWOHP information in endnotes.

- Check that Matsebula page references are correct. [re: done]

- Standardize the Matsebula references to new book. [re: done]

- this interview is extremely long - perhaps we need to edit astringently, remembering the primary aim of book is historical.

- remember in second edit to check on the english grammar.

- When we are sure of our intervention, will have it in text

eg. 'he, <the king> did so and so

when we are not sure, we keep it

eg. 'he^{FN}, did so and so'

^{FN} In this context the 'he' appears to refer to the king.

- Always talk about Swaziland area or present-day Swaziland when referring to incident/movement in the past

- Use hyphen when word used in adjectival sense

The north east, north-eastern Swaziland

the twentieth century, twentieth-century kingdom

the present day, present-day Swaziland

- kwa-Zulu: use when referring to general area. re: wrong orthography for *s*Swati

Kwa-Zulu: use when referring to specific administrative area, similar in meaning to Natal etc. re: doesn't exist anymore, have to use KwaZulu-Natal.

- Titles: we keep capital letter, not italicised

Nkhosi, Mbangazitha, Ngwenyama, Silo emaSothsa = name

- Factually wrong - we as editors indicate that we think it is wrong by saying 'Conventionally see as ...'

- Standardise * * . wrong

* * . right, ie. no space after left-out sign and full stop.

- RE is indicating left out, when obviously so from from the text - even when not so marked by CH

-Huw Jones comment on the various sections of praises - how will we handle the variations of praises - we will need to say that it differs from some of the published versions [CH: will decide later]

-Huw Jones makes the point that is misleading to refer to certain sibongo as 'Swazi *sibongo*' because since it makes the inference that all these people were are aree under swazi influence [CH: Huw Jones is right RE: what about saying 'a *sibongo* commonly found in Swaziland']

-How much do we comment in our EN? eg. Huw Jones says we should point out that Thandile is not the sister of Mawewe [p76]. In other words, do we comment on the validity of our informants claim in the footnotes, or do we leave that level of comment/interpretation to the essays that Philip will write? What did they do in the JSA? CH answer; depends on each EN - use phrases such as " it is commonly accepted that ...", "the accepted convention is ...", etc. never say that narrator is wrong.

- note that by repeating standardised ednnotes for each interview each interview functions neatly as a unit, BUT it will make the index very tedious in that it refers to the same information repeatedly but on different pages [ch: index EN only when it refers to something exceptional, eg. an unpublished source]

- we will have to standardize use of roman small numerals i) ii) etc as opposed to using ';' to indicate different parts of a note (end and foot) (2x)

[NO, NO] ~~When footnote gives different meanings or interpretation, we just seperate by ';'. We do not use numbering system i) ii).~~

- uniform sytem when praises are used in text

bla bla text text bla bla,

praise, praise

praise praise

bla bla text start again.

DO NOT USE single quotation mark ' anymore. Praise already in special format

- quotation marks: punctuation on inside of quotations.

- we indictae our enlish suffixes, eg. Dlamini's, *hlales*'ing; but not when people are speaking is siSwati saying Dlaminis, we keep their form, and do not indicate that it is english-ized. ch: never seen anything like this.

- We will use do not etc. and not don't

We use full form 'do not' and not 'don't' etc.

- When narrative goes over into the dramatic form, then following applies: The king said, "Now, my *imphi*..." double quotation

Quotation marks:

only use double quotes " when somebody is really speaking

punctuation inside

- Codes

[p1] [refers to page of the original transcription jotters](#)

< > words added by editors to clarify meaning of text

/ \text moved out of original place in the narrative, accross pages of the transcription jotters

* * some of the words spoken by present speaker, edited out of text

where * * occurs on a new line, it indicates that the words of one (or more) speaker left out.

_____ words indistinguishable on tape

...speaker did not complete sentence

...speaker was interrupted and now continues his sentence

[in fine print] comments to ourselves, will be deleted in final publication

[african languages need to consult with african language expert on specific translation problem](#)

Construction of narrative

- Ask PB about leaving king's inaudible out [[CH agrees, let put them in A1]]
 - Note how much of the interview is spent on explaining to the king on how the information was gotten, what are the connections and background of the informants.
 - Use real past tense when referring to other people's histories.
 - Mixes historical info with narrative info. (P) often change direction mid air in sentence. Will start in one direction eg historical fact, then in middle of sentence wants to give indication of how the conversation he is reporting on, came about, or what he thinks of it.
 - Check on position of praises. Praises used in the beginning and end of a coherent story. Also seems to follow pattern of: {start of sentence} PRAISE {sentence continues}{body of story}PRAISE{repeat sentence}.
 - Often praise indicates that informant is answering in response to question from Sobhuza II.
 - 'that is all - *kuphela*'; 'that is what I know, which I heard from the elders' - devices Ndelela uses to end cycle of narrative
 - do not reflect stutter, when narrator in conversation repeat 'he, he did so and so', or 'these people of - of so and so'
 - throughout this interview the interviewer affirms the interviewee by saying 'yes' or 'Hlatshwako', this is not an interruption but seems to be a device of polite conversation. It does fragment the conversation terribly, though. [ch decide later]
 - why do certain interviewer talk about Somhlolo, and others call him Sobhuza? [CH: keep this difference]
 - impossibly difficult to interpret who all the his/him/he 's are. But quite crucial to correct understanding of information
 - notice how in this interview the information is just streaming out. All that the interviewer is doing is saying yes or Hlatshwako! at the appropriate spots and VH just continues to talk. Perhaps the closest to a pure narrative that we have
 - note that in English one would say, when one wants to interrupt "hold it right there" ie more distant from the speaker. When speaking in siswati about the past, these 'distancing' devices are not used eg. "here, where you are now, what happened/ who begot whom?"
 - note how in genealogies, it is only a direct line that is given, sons and brothers only matter when events are discussed ie. they are not unknown, but the citing a geneology is a very clearly defined exercise.
 - are names/presence of *libutfo* always given in the present tense?
 - Was Velamfu more relaxed being interviewed by another Hlatshwayo in 1987 and did not feel the need to speak formal/ educated zulu?
 - needs better translation for : 'in the reign of/time of' is really a wrong translation - *seku* at/ with has strong locative connotations not time; eg. in Mswati's <reign> ^{FN}
- ^{FN} Original has: *ku*Mswati, locative prefix for nounclass 1a look for, and change all 'in the time of' to locative 'in the reign of'
- Also important to note that even if there was a translator, which of the interviews the informant understood english - sometimes SM answers CH directly

- we are losing how the interview was constructed in the way we are stating how the questions were asked - quite often CH would ask question in english and this then translated into siswati by JD but this is not reflected in our edit. BUT how do we reflect it without it being too long AND is it important enough?? - happens in all the interviews

- Quest Answer Question Answer.. etc. tedious, but historically correct as to how the interview went.

- Look how (SM) moves over from discussing 'the history' to incwala [p18] Songs all based on historical incidents? songs, and order in which they are sung especially, reinforces some historical principles. (Remember Tsandile song from under the tree, and in one other interview long explanation when who sing what)

- why are these informant reluctant to speak?

- when people do not know answer, they often say we will not speak of something we have not seen -ie the history is something that is visible and present

- privilege questioner that speak in siswati - because that is what the people responded to'

- because the past is in the present, what you say now 'determines' your past to some extent - that is why these stories are so important

- narrative device of 'there where you are' - means at the point at which your story is, at that time such and such happened as if though in space something happened next to it. See how narrative has very strong internal logic and also how time references are spatialised

- 'it seems that' *ngathi*: emphasises the speculative nature of history Events and genealogy is not absolute but are always subject to interpretation. By using these phrases the speaker absolves himself from the duty of having to make final decisions

ch: do we want note saying that Ch posed quest in english, translated by Hd and put by Hd to narrators? re: what about general note saying in which interviews this happened?

- Do we want to indicate when other voices are heard in the background, but not fully participating in the conversation

- rather use *kuphela* than 'that is all' - important narrative device.DECISION (ch & re): many similar devices used we will use give attention to these but use english format

- Do not indicate ee, um, or were somebody is stuttering

- interjection such as Wo! Hau! etc - should stay in.

- Are keeping in text expressions such as *Awu*, *Enhle* etc. when they add to the meaning , specifically when it is in the instance of an agreement/disagreement response to a question

eg. do not keep when

(Q) What is your name?

(A) ~~Ehe~~, Ronette rather

(A) * * Ronette

keep when

(Q)Up there at Ngudzeni?

(A) *Enhle*, below Ngudza.

- sometimes we allow questions that start interview such as tell us who you are, etc and sometimes we don't.

- Note how up to p8, Mantintinti is the one 'who came back', but in reality he never lived at Mbelebeleni I.

- in many of these interviews the translator actually seems to have a lot of expert knowledge/ fore knowledge and opinions about the incident/ history under discussion. Sometimes they directly intercede and tell the informants that they are not speaking the (whole) truth. Sometimes, in their translation back to the interviewers, they add information. This must be seen as distinct from the information that the interviewers in question have/ are willing to give. Ie. note that this is yet another veil between 'us' and the 'pure, unadulterated' past.
- throughout interview, information is translated into english for CH, ie. break in the flow of conversation, we have indicated it by ** in new line.

Anthropological/historical quest.

- Mamisa: 'was only a man known for his physical prowess (jara), and could not know much. JSA vol3, p.285.
- *umkhwakhwa* tree and ceremonial staff
- want to be able to be able to look up peoples names and geographical places again and again, perhaps alphabetical list rather than endnote. (3x)
- Do we continually EN personae like Somhlolo, Mswati, Tsandile etc. they occur in just about every interview.
- Do we use 'Somhlolo', as opposed to 'King Sobhuza I'
- ask pB about issue around reeds, hlahlata'ing, how much should we explain in an endnote
- on [p60] there is again the metaphor of trees used when talking about some origin issue - also remember Makhatswa interview with trees covering some origin issue. What is this metaphor??
- is there some people who can call Somhlolo Sobhuza, is it a specific prerogative of some people to use particular names?
- threat by Hlatswayo therefore need to placate/ get alliance through marriage -head wife. Later on threat disappear/ greater threat from Ndwandwe marry Tsandile. notice how some of the sons of tinhlanti of LaMlalati took part in rebellion or is it the sons on the tinhlanti of tsandile?
- CH: compare VH version of Shaka praises with Cope
- Shiselweni: "There are no stones, there are ashes" [p32] [Clear ref to past in terms of Nguni building style IN OPPOSITION to Sotho stone walled building. Shiselweni most important site of the past, point at which Ngwane became true masters of the Swaziland area. OR OR, could be that 'stones' is reference to wild/ nature/ the bush, where people live there is no stones. Or it could be ref to mourning site that is always build of stone as opposed to some real living site](#)
- remember interview (?Simelane) where lot of attention is given to women. Is that because those people have land claims that can only be made through female line and therefore woman in general become important. in these interviews
- Look how (SM) moves over from discussing 'the history' to incwala [p18] Songs all based on historical incidents? songs, and order in which they are sung especially, reinforces some historical principles. (Remember Tsandile song from under the tree, and in one other interview long explanation when who sing what)
- Could the big thing about being a the only king and the fact that all the besutfu people's kings had to stop being kings not be linked to fear of the indigenous people's control of the rain. The conquering group had to stop the locals from controlling the rain and laying the essential claims to land, and therefore military control and khonta etc. just by the by, the real terrain of deep struggle lay in who is the final ritual controller?? re p17
- 'making fire' - what does this denote - land ownership or war - Hlophe interview similar fire making reference
- Why is being published in the section dealing with Ngwane Phongolo period - these people only remember their own history from the time of Mbandzeni and nothing is being said about earlier periods. Only serves to corroborate the far more detailed Sibadndze interviews.
- there is something about *emabutfo* These organisations/institutions become completely personalised, they have human attributes such as existing in the present tense, and a person's name and his 'communal' *libutfo* interchange-able.

- when can what name be used. Under what circumstances does one use the praise name and when the other names of deceased kings??
- difference between ancestors buried at place and right to build (always have to ask if one can build at a certain spot)
- notice prominence of women in interview - lot of land claims etc centre around women as mother of -. Is this because of their Somnjalose connection and therefore if that connection is to be strengthened all other women claims important? Is there a different quality to the land claims through women as opposed to through men? Also, are older claims to land through men and later claims (device to allow strangers in) through women??
- remember to add list of explanation about central persons like Somhlolo, Mswati, Shaka etc
- repetitive nature of explaining what the Lubombo, Phongolo etc is in every interview

Translation / Language

- Orthography decision 6 3 1996:

- We reflect the dialectical differences of the speakers in the text.
- In our endnotes/footnotes we use *siSwati* orthography
- we recognise the principal that we call people by the names that they called themselves, using the appropriate orthography eg. Moshoeshoe and not ~~Mshweshwe~~
- In case of lost kingdoms, and where we do not know/we are uncertain which dialect might have been favoured in the period under discussion, we use *siSwati* eg. we say Zidze (and not Zwide)

- At this stage we do not worry too much about amount of *Siswati* words in text. Easier to keep words in *siSwati* and later change to english, than to later having to find the *siSwati* word. ch and re:8/8/94

- There are three levels of translation:

- i) We have translated those *siSwati* words that we feel have an unambiguous english meaning (eg. *inkosi* - king).
- ii) When we feel that english translation is adequate, but a serious researcher might want to read the original *siswati* so as to decide for him/her self the exact meaning we give a footnote in the form of Original has: *siswati word* (eg. place, Original has: *izindawo*).
- iii) When there is no english word that adequately translates the concept, we have kept the *siSwati* word in the text. Some of these words occur regularly and will be explained in a glossary (eg. *libutfo*, *umntfwanenkosi*). Words that do not occur regularly are explained the first time they occur in a footnote (eg. *isokanchanti*).

- *inkhosi yemakhosi* - king of kings

wena waphakati - do not translate

luSutfu river

- careful in use of the term variant, surely not all words in the variation same frequency of use.

One word the standard, the other the variant

- do not ever delete dialectical differences.

Decision; in an effort to reflect dialectical differences, we will reflect them in text, and then use them as keywords in FN/EN. **BUT** we will use standardised orthography when we refer to this word.

The use of variants then disappear.

- Why beast when cow/cattle would do?

- standardise positive reply: *ehhee* or yes

- standard way of dealing with *ka*- prefix: "text, text, *ka*Tembe text, text" - "EN: Tembe, *ka*Tembe: place of bla bla .."

- standardise way in which we use original has: ... when referring to a verb, ie. do we use the (ku)- prefix, or do we use verb as used in text, that is with its specific nounclass prefix

- begat/ fathered??

- indeed in this interview translated from *vele* [p21]

- *thatha* or marry

- people of Ngwane OR people of *ka*Ngwane???

- rather use *kuphela* than 'that is all' - important narrative device. DECISION (ch & re): many similar devices used we will use give attention to these but use english format
 - get original of 'time of Dlamini'.
- look for all *emuve*, *etula*, *dzabuka*, etc. and standardise use
- Do we keep prefixes in front of *libutfo*? [ch: yes]
- standardise ~~Lohiya~~ or [ch yes] Lohiya
 - eThunzini or * *Thunzini
 - standardise Natal province Transvaal province to *KwaZulu-Natal*, Maphumalanga etc.
 - ~~homestead~~/[yes] residence???
 - 'that is all - *kuphela*'; 'that is what I know, which I heard from the elders'
 - note that gave birth/ begot similar word in Swazi, so umuti gave birth/or begot other umuti
 - we need to check on translations of great grandfather/ ancestors and make sure that we use it consistently - ?check back on all the interviews [re: it is definitely not consistent between translators]
 - translation of 'in the time of' - wrong
 - ~~grandfather~~ / [yes] *babe*
 - decide about fathered/begot
 - RE we need to decide on which form we put 'Original has:', do we stick with the verb/noun form as used in sentence eg passive form of verb, prefix as used in sentence or do we give neutral form; [CH: explain somewhere that we give in 'Original has:...' the part of the word that might be contentious]] From [p21] I have given form as used in sentence.
 - Comment on using of Nkhosi - king
 - All okay (*wo*) written as 'indeed' or stuck to *wo* were more appropriate [ch: standardise: re to which form]
 - this translation is very literal and it is good in that sense, it is however, difficult to read and the simplistic, 'baby-like' english does not do justice to narrator, if he was as comfortable in english as he is in *siswati*, he would not have spoken in english in this way. [ch: lets explain this in our translation essay]
 - Ya translated as Yes
- nhn translated as yes [ch: yes]
- reflect the use of Hlatswayo/ Hlatswako [CH: Hlatshwa- with *siswati* ending. re: what is *siswati* ending]
 - needs better translation for :
- 'in the reign of/time of' is really a wrong translation - *seku* at/ with has strong locative connotations not time; untill today;
- beat or throw the bones; [CH: beat]
- (SM) uses a lot of 'So,...', 'Now, ...' to start sentences with OR is it just translation??
- is it really necessary to give 'Original has: *nqaba*. every time it occurs?
 - Is it correct to translate *siswati* sentence structure like - 'They are of Nsibandze, Madlangyoka'. If english was the first language he would have said - 'The Madlangyoka are of Nsibandze' - not so? [CH: agrees]
 - We have to watch our english, that we do not put subject clauses at the end of sentence. "They were clever, these grandfathers of mine". [CH: Change]
 - We prefer to keep interjections like *Wo!*, *Hawu!*, *Enhhe* etc. in the text. They provide valuable information on the construction of the narrative. Since the meaning of these interjections often depends on their tone, we do not offer any reading as to their meaning and leave it open to the reader.

eg do not keep when

(Q) What is your name?

(A) ~~Ehe~~, Ronette.

keep when

(Q) Up there at Ngudzeni?

(A) *Enhle*, below Ngudzeni.

- Edits reflect the form of the word as used by informants in the text - eg. we reproduce when people said Nhlabatsi, Nhlabathi.

However, where we, the editors are speaking, we would like to use modern standard Swazi orthography, except for the names of people living outside the borders of Swaziland. In that case, we prefer to use the orthographic form of their names which they themselves ascribe to. Likewise, when discussing Zulu "regiments", we will use the form *amabutho* and not *libutfo*.

- We seek to avoid tautologies in the translation where we keep a siSwati word in our English text. Thus the passive: we do not say "He was *patfwad*", but rather, "He was *patsa'd*", since the English form carries the passive sense already, and it is not necessary to keep it in the *siSwati* form. Likewise, with locatives: we prefer to have an English locative "at", "in", and where we do, we leave out the prefix: thus, "at Zikotheni" not "at *eZikotheni*". But we are inclined to keep the siSwati locative in some instances: eg. "the goat of *eZikotheni*, since in the latter case it would be clumsy to introduce an English locative.

- We have translated inkhosi as king (see glossary for full explanation).

We have translated sikhulu as chief (see glossary for full explanation).

We have translated indzawo/indawo as area unless otherwise specified (see glossary for full details).

- Also standardised across minor dialectal differences. **BIG MISTAKE:** we do not want to do this anymore.