

PERSUASION IN SELECTED SESOTHO DRAMA TEXTS

by

MABITILE MOOROSI



**Dissertation presented for the degree of Doctor of Arts at Stellenbosch
University.**

Promoter: Prof NS Zulu

DECEMBER 2009

DECLARATION

By submitting this dissertation electronically, I declare that the entirety of the work contained therein is my own, original work, that I am the owner of the copyright thereof (unless to the extent explicitly otherwise stated) and that I have not previously in its entirety or in part submitted it for obtaining any qualification.

Date:

ABSTRACT

This study examined persuasion in selected drama texts from the literary period 1981 to 2006. The selection was organised through the examination of two such texts in each of the following three periods:

- 1981–1989: *Le ka nketsang* and *Mpowane*
- 1990–1999: *Bana ba khomo tsa batho* and *Tsiketsing sa qomatsi*
- 2000–2006: *Ha le fahloe habeli* and *Leholimo la phetloa*

Since persuasion is a relatively new topic in literature, particularly in African languages, the study examined the persuasion strategies used in the selected texts. These strategies either entail persuasion applied purely as an upfront aspect for changing the targets' attitudes, behaviours, beliefs or opinions or entail certain situations during which the persuaders, as literary characters, employ another type (or types) of persuasion – coercion, manipulation or propaganda – in order to change the targets.

The main thrust of this thesis was the persuasive tactics or techniques that might be applied by literary characters in an attempt to stimulate change in other literary characters. The study also examined whether additional persuasive interactions are employed to motivate change in others and whether counter-persuasive actions are employed to resist the proposed change.

Chapter One introduces the aspect of persuasion as propounded by persuasion practitioners and experts and gives the framework of the study as a whole. Chapter Two initiates the literature review on the goals-plans-action (GPA) model as part of the psychological theories on persuasive messages produced by various interactants. This model presupposes reasons for persuaders to create certain plans for achieving their goals. Chapter Three is concerned with *Le ka nketsang* and *Mpowane* as the selected 1981 to 1989 drama texts. Chapter Four concentrates on *Bana ba khomo tsa batho* and *Tsiketsing sa qomatsi* from the 1990 to 1999 literary period. Chapter Five deals with the literary period 2000 to 2006 and analyses the two drama texts *Ha le fahloe habeli* and *Leholimo la phetloa*. Chapter Six draws a conclusion from the findings on persuasive strategies and makes observations, per chapter, on the persuasive attempts from each literary period.

OPSOMMING

Hierdie studie het oorreding in geselekteerde dramatekste uit die letterkundige tydperk 1981 tot 2006 ondersoek. Die seleksie is georganiseer deur twee sodanige tekste in elk van die onderstaande drie tydperke te ondersoek:

- 1981–1989: *Le ka nketsang* en *Mpowane*
- 1990–1999: *Bana ba khomo tsa batho* en *Tsiketsing sa qomatsi*
- 2000–2006: *Ha le fahloe habeli* en *Leholimo la phetloa*

Aangesien oorreding 'n relatief nuwe onderwerp in die letterkunde is, in die besonder in Afrikatale, het die studie ondersoek ingestel na die oorredingstrategieë wat in die geselekteerde tekste gebruik is. Hierdie strategieë behels óf oorreding wat toegepas word suiwer as 'n spontane aspek vir verandering van die houdings, gedrag, oortuigings of menings van die teikens, óf dit behels sekere situasies waartydens die oorreders, as letterkundige karakters, 'n ander soort (of soorte) oorreding – dwang, manipulering of propaganda – gebruik ten einde die teikens te verander.

Die belangrikste dryfkrag van hierdie tesis was die oorredende taktieke of tegnieke wat deur letterkundige karakters toegepas kan word in 'n poging om verandering in ander letterkundige karakters aan te moedig. Die studie het ook nagegaan of addisionele oorredende interaksies ingespan word om verandering in ander te motiveer en of teen-oorredende optrede gebruik word om weerstand te bied teen die voorgestelde verandering.

Hoofstuk Een stel die aspek van oorreding bekend soos dit by oorredingspraktisyns en deskundiges aangebied word, en gee die raamwerk van die studie as 'n geheel. Hoofstuk Twee onderneem die literatuurstudie oor die doelstellings-planne-optrede (DPO)-model as deel van die sielkundige teorieë oor oorredende boodskappe soos gelewer deur verskeie persone wat in interaksie tree. Hierdie model voorveronderstel redes vir oorreders om sekere planne te ontwikkel vir die bereiking van hulle doelstellings. Hoofstuk Drie word gewy aan *Le ka nketsang* en *Mpowane* as die geselekteerde dramatekste uit die tydperk 1981 tot 1989. Hoofstuk Vier konsentreer op *Bana ba khomo tsa batho* en *Tsiketsing sa qomatsi* uit die tydperk 1990 tot 1999. Hoofstuk Vyf dek die letterkundige tydperk 2000 tot 2006, en analiseer die twee dramatekste *Ha le fahloe habeli* en *Leholimo la phetloa*. Hoofstuk Ses kom tot 'n gevolgtrekking na aanleiding van die bevindings oor oorredende strategieë en maak waarnemings, per hoofstuk, oor die oorredende pogings van elke letterkundige tydperk.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express thanks to EAS Lesoro for his support and encouragement in this research project; to Basil Van Wyk for his never-failing hold up and sustain; to the staff and postgraduate students of the Department of African Languages at University of Stellenbosch for their reinforcement in my study; the Lesotho students at the University of Stellenbosch for their unending keep up, especially Sebataolo Rahlao who has almost always been there for me in times of struggle in my study.

My deepest gratitude is expressed to all the staff members of the National University of Lesotho (NUL), for their buttress and enthusiasm, especially during my hospitalization after the car accident I sustained during my third year of study. I am also grateful to them for dedicating their time and energy to visiting me while I was hospitalized at the Worcester Mediclinic. I am especially humbled; as their presence in the company of my wife and son functioned as some cure to all my pains and sufferings. I express gratitude in particular to Prof Rakotsoane (Dean of FOH) and Sr Makoae (Representative of Dept of ALL).

My most heartfelt gratitude to the Lesotho Government through the National Manpower Development Secretariat (NMDS), for the generous financial assistance of my study.

I also express thanks to the African Languages Association of Southern Africa (ALASA), for funding part of the research work towards this study.

I would also like to express gratitude to Steve Ndinga-Koumba-Binza, for his assistance and encouragement; to Surena du Plessis, for organizing and compiling my study into a doctoral thesis; to Dr Dlali for his support, confirmation and endorsement in discussing some academic issues relating to my study.

My greatest indebtedness goes to my supervisor Prof N S Zulu, for his commitment, encouragement, guidance and inspiration – even as I had become despondent at times because of the injury that I was nursing.

Finally, my greatest ever gratitude goes to my family, friends, and Libhadla leBaphuthi, for their sustenance, substantiation, enthusiasm and tolerance.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to my wife, 'M'e 'Manthati, as well as to my son, Lebitsa; and to my three daughters: Nthati, Ntsieleng, and Ntholelo.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1	RATIONALE OF STUDY	1
1.2	THE SCOPE OF THE STUDY	4
1.3	THE APPROACH OF THE STUDY	4
1.4	PERSUASION AS DEFINED BY SELECTED THEORETICIANS	5
1.5	PERSUASION VERSUS PROPGAGANDA, MANIPULATION AND COERCION	12
1.5.1	Persuasion versus propaganda.....	13
1.5.2	Persuasion versus manipulation.....	16
1.5.3	Persuasion versus coersion.....	18

CHAPTER 2 : LITERATUREE REVIEW ON GPA MODEL

2.1	GOALS PLANS ACTION (GPA) MODEL	22
2.1.1	The concept of goals.....	22
2.1.2	Primary goals.....	23
2.1.3	Secondary goals.....	26
2.2	THE CONCEPT PLANS.....	33
2.2.1	Features of plans.....	33
2.2.2	The content of complaine seeking and resisting plans	33
2.2.3	Generating and selecting plans.....	36
2.3	ACTION AND INTERACTION.....	56

CHAPTER 3: THE ANALYSIS OF DRAMA TEXTS FROM 1981 – 1989

3.1	INTRODUCTION	75
3.2	<i>LE KA NKETSANG</i>	75
3.3	<i>MPOWANE</i>	144

CHAPTER 4: ANALYSIS OF 1990 TO 1999 DRAMA TEXTS

4.1	INTRODUCTION	237
4.2	<i>BANA BA KHOMO TSA BATHO</i>	237
4.3	<i>TSIKETSING SA QOMATSI</i>	314

CHAPTER 5: THE ANALYSIS OF SELECTED DRAMA TEXTS FROM 2000 – 2006

5.1	INTRODUCTION	358
5.2	<i>HA LE FAHLOE HABELI</i>	358
5.3	<i>LEHOLIMO LA PHETLOA</i>	476

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION

6.1	INTRODUCTION.....	515
6.2	OBSERVATIONS IN CHAPTER 3	515
6.2.1	<i>LE KA NKETSANG</i>	515
6.2.2	<i>MPOWANE</i>	517
6.3	OBSERVATIONS IN CHAPTER 4	519
6.3.1	<i>BANA BA KHOMO TSA BATHO</i>	519
6.3.2	<i>TSIKETSING SA QOMATSI</i>	521
6.4	OBSERVATIONS IN CHAPTER 5	523
6.4.1	<i>HA LE FAHLOE HABELI</i>	523
6.4.2	<i>LEHOLIMO LA PHETLOA</i>	525
6.5	CONCLUDING REMARKS	527

REFERENCES.....	528
-----------------	-----

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 RATIONALE OF STUDY

This study examines persuasion in selected Sesotho drama texts published in South Africa and Lesotho from 1981 to 2006¹. It is therefore a literary study of dramatic texts and not drama *per se* as it is performed on stage. The main motive for persuasion is to achieve intended goals and objectives by changing the behaviour and opinions of the persuadee².

Literary work – be it poetry, short story, the novel, or drama³ – always depicts some kind of persuasion in its creation through the interaction of characters. Since literature reflects human interaction in its various aspects - culturally, economically, politically, religiously, socially and otherwise – characters find themselves engaged in the persuasion process in order to achieve certain ends. Like politics, any literary work, especially drama, “resides beneath the broad umbrella of persuasion” (Dillard and Marshall, 2003: 480).

A dramatic text is usually abounding with persuasive messages, in which characters attempt to influence each other or one another – either positively or negatively – via actions and interactions. The target’s⁴ ideologies, values, attitudes, beliefs, behaviours or thoughts, in one way or another, are always susceptible to some kind of influence through literary creation. This is so because drama involves direct interactions by, between and among characters, where persuasion is observable through what Styan (2000) calls “action” and “dialogue”, and such forms of persuasion are often the source of conflict in drama.

Though it may be argued that persuasion “has been a common denominator in the areas of economics, politics, religion, business and interpersonal relations ever since humans began to interact...” (Larson, 1995: 2), this aspect of human interchange has not been a subject of much analysis in the literature of indigenous languages in Southern Africa, nor (in particular) in analyses of Sesotho drama. It is therefore the aim of this study to research this aspect, focusing on verbal and non-verbal persuasive strategies employed in the selected Sesotho dramas. This objective is in line with Reardon’s (1991: 3) view that persuasion is an “activity

¹ The motivation for choosing the literary period 1981-2006 is provided under the heading ‘the scope of study’ below.

² ‘Persuadees’ are literary characters who have been targeted for change. The goal-directed approach to the study persuasion, as a theoretical framework for this study, is discussed in detail in 1.4 below.

³ In this study, ‘drama’ is to be regarded as a play in its text form, not necessarily its theatrical performance on stage.

⁴ The concept ‘target’ and ‘persuadee’ will be used interchangeably in this study to refer to the object of persuasion.

of attempting to change the behaviour [...] through [...] interaction.” Reardon (1991: 3) posits that changing the persuadee’s behaviour is conscious and happens in various situations. The rationale of the study is to observe how literary characters achieve changes of *behaviour*, *beliefs* and *opinions* (Dillard and Marshall, 2003: 483) of those characters they have targeted.

With this view in mind, the study aims to ascertain what social contexts create the conditions within which persuaders fail to influence their targets or do so successfully, and what the consequences of such persuasion are. The study aims to identify whether

- The change in behaviour, beliefs and opinions which is prompted by the persuader’s goals is *formative*, i.e. the “individual acquires a new belief, attitude or behaviour where none existed before”;
- The change may be some form of *reinforcement*, i.e. it “aims to strengthen pre-existing beliefs, attitudes or behaviour”; or
- It is some form of *conversion*, “where beliefs are altered from true to false, attitudes shift from positive to negative, or individuals act on behalf of a cause rather than against it” (Dillard and Marshall 2003: 484).

Persuasion as a communication skill involves at least two persons whose joint actions determine the outcome (Reardon, 1991: 3). O’Keefe (2002a) notes that persuasion is not something that one person does *to* another, but is that which he does *with* another person or persons.

These are forms of persuasion. But what is persuasion? In his definition of what it means **to be persuaded**, Miller (2002) observes that

persuasive attempts fall short of blatant coercion; persuasion, as typically conceived of, is not directly coercive. Coercion takes the form of guns or economic sanctions, while persuasion relies on the power of verbal and nonverbal symbols (p4).

Elaborating on this issue, Miller (2002: 4) surmises that much persuasive discourse “is **indirectly** coercive”; because the persuasive effectiveness of messages “often depends heavily on the credibility of threats and promises proffered by the communicator” (2002: 4). In an attempt to support the foregoing submission, Miller draws our attention to Kelman’s notion of persuasion as **means control** - a term describing “a situation where the influence agent, or persuader, is successful because of his or her ability to dispense rewards or punishments” (2002: 4). For Miller (2002) the above situation is opposed to the way in which persuasion is supposed to function in a democratic dispensation (p4).

Among the most effective persuasive strategies for compliance gaining that Miller mentions are: **promise**, **threat**, and **aversive stimulation** – all of which derive their effectiveness “from the persuader’s ability to dispense rewards or mete out punishments to the intended persuadee/s” (2002: 5). Of high importance are those strategies that stress the harmful consequences of failure to comply, and those **underscoring** social rewards for compliance. These include, among others, **moral appeal**, **altruism**, **esteem position**, and **esteem negative**. It would be a mistake then to disregard or underestimate “the coercive potential of social approval and disapproval” (Miller, 2002: 5), as elements of successful compliance or its failure. Further, Miller (2002: 6) makes reference to **conviction/persuasion duality**. Miller (2002: 6) holds that “persuasion relies primarily on symbolic strategies that trigger the emotions of intended persuadees, while conviction is accomplished primarily by using strategies rooted in logical proof and that appeal to persuadee’s reason and intellect.” Furthermore, Miller (2002: 6) points out that the phrase “being persuaded” applies to situations where behaviour has been modified by symbolic transactions (messages) that are sometimes, but not always, linked with coercive force (indirectly coercive) and that appeal to the reason and emotions of the person(s) being persuaded.⁵

Whereas O’Keefe (1990; 2002a) and Larson (1995) concur that reference to persuasion assumes the success of the persuasive attempt, Reardon (1991: 3) argues that persuasion is not necessarily measured in terms of an “implication of success”. This aspect is now well-known as it is pointed in an older study such as the one by Bettinghaus (1968: 14-15) where it is stated that:

Persuasive communication implies a judgment of a situation in terms of the intentions of the communicator and the resultant behaviour of the receiver. Persuasive communications can thus be judged in terms of their *success* in producing desired behaviour or their *failure* to produce a desired result [emphases added].

In line with the recognition that persuasion may succeed or fail, this study aims to address the problems of achieving the goals of persuasion, and then it critically examines the success or failure of goals, plans and actions as a result of counter-persuasion, resistance or a range of relevant social factors.

The main research question that this study addresses involves the ways employed by various characters in their endeavours to change the behaviours, attitudes, beliefs and opinions of other characters. In other words, the research question is whether or not the persuasion strategies that the characters use in the drama texts attempt to “coerce or manipulate others into taking action or rather to move them towards considering taking that

⁵ Further discussion on ‘being persuaded’ will be dealt with in the literature review on persuasion in 1.4 below.

action by giving them good, logical, emotional and cultural reasons for taking the action” (Larson, 1995: 2).

The impact of the study will be to serve as a demonstration of the extent to which the study of persuasion techniques can enrich literary studies. The potential significance of the findings of the study is an important advance in the knowledge of both persuasion and literary studies. The study is specifically relevant to the study of the literature of the indigenous languages in Southern Africa in showing how some persuasion theories and models can be applied to literary texts.

1.2 THE SCOPE OF THE STUDY

It has already been indicated above that the area of concentration for this study is selected Sesotho drama texts from 1981 to 2006. The reason for leaving out drama texts before 1980 is that Van der Poll (1981) has already done intensive research on Sesotho drama texts up to 1980. It is the intention of this study, therefore, to work on a different literary period, and to begin from where he left off.

The published drama texts to be studied are divided into three literary periods, listed in the sections below. This sectional demarcation is based on the researcher’s hypothesis that each decade had its own challenges to which authors had to respond. In response to such challenges, the drama writers would create literary characters that change the behaviours, opinions, as well as attitudes of their target persuadees. The sections are as follows:

Section 1. Selected texts from 1981 – 1989.

- Mokoena, V. K. 1988. *Mpowane*. Pretoria: J L Van Schaik;
- Mosuhli, M. 1989. *Le ka nketsang?* Johannesburg: Educum Publishers,

Section 2. Selected texts from 1990 – 1999.

- Mahalefele, M. 1990. *Bana ba khomo tsa batho*. Maseru: Macmillan Lesotho;
- Maboya, P. S. 1993. *Tsiketsing sa qomatsi*. Cape Town: Vivlia Publishers and Booksellers.

Section 3. Selected texts from 2000 – 2006.

- Ramakau, N. 2004. *Ha le fahloe habeli*. Maseru: Longman Lesotho;
- Lesupi, M. 2005. *Leholimo la phetloa*. Maseru: Longman Lesotho;

1.3 THE APPROACH OF THE STUDY

The critical approach of this literary study will be informed by the ‘goals-plans-action’ (GPA) model of persuasion as employed by Dillard and Marshall (2003), Metts and Grahskopf

(2003) and Wilson and Sabee (2003). Wilson and Sabee (2003: 18) define the 'goals-plans-action' model of persuasion as "speakers produce messages to accomplish goals and thus develop and enact plans for pursuing goals".

Following the application of this approach, in each dramatic text the emphasis will be on what *goals* the characters have, and then what *plans* they put into place to achieve these goals, and what *actions* they take to *change the behaviour of the targets (or persuadees)*. The concept of goals will be investigated on the basis of studies by Dillard (1990a; 1990b; 1998), Dillard and Marshall (2003), Metts and Grohskopf (2003) and Wilson and Sabee (2003), who classify goals as primary and secondary, depending on their complexity in relation to the change of the persuadee. In establishing plans, the emphasis will be on message features, as defined by Hosman (2002), Salovey and Schneider (2002), Sopory and Dillard (2002), and Dillard and Marshall (2003). Analysis of actions will focus on the persuasion strategies employed to change targets through emotional appeals and effects; the emphasis will be on the work of Witte (1993), Mongeau (2000), Witte and Allen (2000), Dillard and Meijnders (2002), O'Keefe (2002b), Nabi (2002), deTurck (2002), and Dillard and Marshall (2003).

The study is organised as follows, and in chapters 3-5 two drama texts are analysed:

Chapter 2 – Literature review on the GPA Model.

Chapter 3 – Analysis of 1981 – 1989 drama texts.

Chapter 4 – Analysis of 1990 – 1999 drama texts.

Chapter 5 – Analysis of 2000 – to 2006 drama texts.

Chapter 6 – Conclusion.

I shall proceed in 1.4 below with literature review on persuasion as the theoretical framework for this study.

1.4 PERSUASION AS DEFINED BY SELECTED THEORETICIANS

This literature review is presented with special reference to persuasion, the aspect upon which this study is anchored. The purpose of reviewing literature on persuasion is to obtain a firm grasp of the pertinent issues discussed by communication scholars, and, in particular, persuasion theoreticians in their varying styles and degrees. It is hoped that the discussion of this literature review will open up the inroads into the areas of analysis in which this study is going to engage itself with. The issues raised in this literature review are hoped to become handy during the analysis. Moreover, such literature review paves the way for all the stakeholders involved in the examination of this study.

In this section, I am going to define persuasion as propounded by various communication and persuasion scholars and researchers. Second, I intend to discuss the similarities and differences between persuasion and propaganda; persuasion and manipulation; and finally, persuasion and coercion – as outlined by selected scholars of communication and persuasion researchers.

This section defines the concept, persuasion. Without giving extensive definition of persuasion, this study may be considered as wanting in certain respects, and may be open to some uninformed conclusions in the analysis. Second, numerous theoreticians come up with individual definitions that are at times in harmony or conflict with each other/one another. Thirdly, as Simons (1976: 35) would note, critics from various quarters render a vitriolic attack against persuasion, and accuse it of being “a manipulative activity....with deception and role-playing, domination and exploitation.”

Having noted the above view, Simons (2001: 7) provides his definition of persuasion as human communication “designed to influence the autonomous judgements and actions of others.” Somehow, Simons’ definition is similar to that of Perloff below, in the sense that both authors view persuasion as human communication in which the persuader attempts to influence a target – thus relegating it a one-directional process.

According to Gass and Seiter (2003: 34), persuasion “involves **one** or more persons who are engaged in the activity of creating, reinforcing, modifying, or extinguishing beliefs, attitudes, intentions, motivations, and/or behaviours within the constraints of a given communication context” (emphasis added). It is important to realise that this definition is unique, in the sense that it brings into play the aspect of self- or intra-personal persuasion, as it states that persuasion “involves one or more persons,” thus bringing in an element of self-search that involves one as both the persuader and persuadee simultaneously.

Seiter and Gass (2004: 3), on the other hand, claim that plenty of people have used persuasion “for the wrong reasons, sometimes with tragic consequences.” Further, Seiter and Gass note that in the process of construction theories, a definition “determines the behavioural field observed, which in turn affects the principles derived, the hypotheses generated, and the system of laws stated” (2004: 16). Seiter and Gass also claim that, since definitions limit what is studied in a field, they may also limit certain variables to which attention is given and in turn the ways in which individuals think and construct theories of communication (2004: 16). Furthermore, these co-authors maintain that there is no ‘correct definition of persuasion’, but that there exist many definitional vagaries that may “be clarified, if not resolved, by focusing on two considerations:

First, whether a given scholar or researcher is attempting to define pure persuasion – what Simons (1986) and O’Keefe (1990) have labelled paradigm cases of persuasion – versus **all** of persuasion, including its periphery, which we call ‘borderline’ cases of persuasion; and

Second, **pure persuasion** – clear-cut cases on which almost all scholars in communication and related disciplines would agree” (2004: 17).

In an attempt to draw a distinction between pure persuasion and borderline cases, Seiter and Gass (2004: 17) claim that the following would be commonly accepted by persuasion scholars and researchers as instances of pure persuasion: (1) closing presidential debate; (2) a television commercial; or (3) an attorney’s closing remarks to a jury. On the other hand, **borderline** cases, according to Seiter and Gass, are those instances that lie closer to the boundaries of what is termed persuasion: for example, “a derelict’s mere appearance; speed humps on a street where speeding is common – these are less clear-cut cases” (2004: 17).

In line with the above argument, Seiter and Gass (2004: 17) surmise that the disparity in persuasion definition is anchored on these demarcations, that is pure and borderline cases. Further, the co-authors observe that the threshold between pure and borderline persuasion is “fuzzy rather than distinct” (2004: 17). Furthermore, Seiter and Gass (2004: 19) advance the following as choice limiting criteria for defining persuasion: whether

- persuasion is intentional or unintentional;
- persuasion must be effective or successful;
- free will or conscious awareness must be involved;
- persuasion necessarily occurs via language or symbolic action; and
- persuasion can be intra-personal as well as interpersonal.

For Seiter and Gass (2004: 19), the above-captioned criteria presuppose “source-centred definitions, focusing on the sender’s intent as a defining feature of persuasion, making it the most common characteristic of standard textbook definitions.” Be that as it may, these co-authors concede that there may be ‘accidental influence’ that often occurs “with little or no conscious awareness on the part of the influential individual” (2004: 19). Finally, Seiter and Gass (2004: 20) observe that few of the standard textbook definitions virtually draw any distinction whatsoever between the terms in question.

As Reardon (1991: 1) puts it, it is important to understand “what persuasion is; what it is not; and how it is maintained: debunking some myths.” She further observes that persuasion has three characteristics that distinguish it from other forms of influencing behaviour. First, this

author claims that it is “always a conscious activity,” that “involves conscious intent,” (1991: 3). Second, she observes that the persuader’s perception of threat to his/her goal “need not be explicit – merely sufficient in the eyes of the persuader to warrant an attempt to change the behaviour of others” (1991: 3). The third and final characteristic of persuasion, according to Reardon, is that it “often involves threat to the persuadee’s self-concept” (1991: 3). Reardon views self concept as an aspect playing a more central role “in interpersonal persuasion than in mass communication, since the message is directed to one or a few people” (1991: 3).

In view of the above-captioned three criteria in mind, Reardon (1991: 3) offers her definition of persuasion as an attempt at “changing the behaviour of at least one person through symbolic interaction.” For her, the activity of attempting to change someone’s behaviour is “conscious and occurs” when

- a threat to at least one person’s goals is observed; and
- the source and degree of this threat are sufficiently important to warrant the expenditure of effort involved in persuasion.

Furthermore, Reardon (1991: 3) cautions that an attempt at persuasion is a “delicate activity,” and that any attempt at changing another person can be viewed as “a suggestion that the individual’s beliefs, attitudes, and/ or actions are faulty.”

Viewing persuasion from a social skill’s perspective, Dillard and Marshall (2003: 479) describe it as a process in which the involved parties – persuader and persuadee – find themselves moving from the “left pole of the dimension” to the right one, where they encounter an assortment of “nice” techniques that might include a simple, polite request, a promise of a future favour in return for compliance today, or an appeal to the targets’ sense of altruism. Further, Dillard and Marshall (2003: 479) say that, as the process unfolds itself towards the right pole, the concerned parties realise their being positioned in a territory “that becomes increasingly hostile, moving through criticism, negative alter casting: ‘Only a bad person could refuse my request’, and threat, before arriving at the opposite anchor: physical aggression,” and they define this vast area between the two poles as “social influence”.

Dillard and Marshall’s (2003: 479) word of caution is that the persuasion is “limited to social interactions that involve verbal exchanges, or their near equivalents, not phenomena such as conformity, group pressure, or subliminal influence.” As further clarification of their view of persuasion in communication, these two authors clearly spell out their line of concentration, as the examination of

literature pertaining to interpersonal influence, much of which highlight messages that are brief, relatively spontaneous, lacking in detailed argumentative structure; and integrate persuasion research: longer messages, usually carefully planned; often consisting of a fairly lengthy number of arguments on topics of social, political and commercial interest...we use the terms *influence* and *persuasion* interchangeably ((2003: 479).

In their examination of targets of persuasion, Dillard and Marshall (2003: 483) claim that they “use the term **target** in very specific manner – to refer to aspects of individuals that might be changed by a persuasive interaction.” They mention and describe the three objectives for attempting to change an individual as:

- **Beliefs** are estimates of the truth or falsity of some proposition....the existence of objects, the occurrence of events, the relevance of evidence, the causal relationship between one event and another, and so on;
- **Attitudes** are summary evaluations of the goodness or badness of an attitude object, where the term attitude object means virtually anything that be represented mentally; and
- **Behaviours** are actions performed by some individual.

Also Dillard and Marshall (2003: 483) claim that an important skill for any message producer is to have a clear understanding of which of the above targets of change he/she intends to change. In the same vein, these co-authors indicate that the three targets can be arrayed in terms of their pliability – as “beliefs are the most pliable, attitudes less so, and behaviour presents the greatest persuasive challenge” (2003: 483).

Further, Dillard and Marshall (2003: 483-4) point out that there are cases where the difficulty of change may be in contrast with the foregoing submission, depending on the entrenchment of the target envisaged for change. They give an example of attempting to convince an individual to stop smoking – which is “a persuasive challenge of a different order and magnitude” (2003: 484).

Furthermore, Dillard and Marshall (2003: 484) observe that it is common for people to make reference to persuasion “as if the result of the process were a more or less homogeneous set of outcomes.” For these co-authors, such misconceptions fail to take into cognizance that the three goals of message-sources – formation, reinforcement, and conversion – have different processes and time constraints. Lastly, Dillard and Marshall (2003: 484) observe that some people fail to realise the “important means of nuancing what it means to be persuaded” – as propounded by Miller. For these co-authors, these message-sources operate as follows:

- **Formation** occurs when an individual acquires a new belief, attitude, or behaviour where none existed before;”
- **Reinforcement** occurs when persuasion discourse aims to strengthen pre-existing beliefs, attitudes, or behaviours, either for the purpose of increasing their extremity or combating the effects of counter-persuasion by other message sources; and
- **Conversion** occurs when beliefs are altered from true to false, attitudes shift from positive to negative, or individuals act on behalf of a cause rather than against it (2003: 484).

Unlike Dillard and Marshall who see persuasion as a social skill, Simons (2001: 7) defines persuasion as a form of human communication “**designed to influence the autonomous judgements and actions of others [...]** a form of attempted influence in the sense that it seeks to alter the way others think, feel, or act, but it differs from other forms of influence” (Simons’ emphasis). Further, Simons indicates that persuasion is

not the iron hand of torture, the stick-up, or other such forms of **coercion**. Nor, in its purest sense, is it the exchange of money or other such material **inducements** for actions performed by the person being influenced... Nor, is it pressure to conform to the group or to the authority of the powerful (Simmons’ emphasis) (2001: 7).

It is important to realise at this juncture that the above-captioned definition does not stop only at defining the concept of persuasion, but goes further to indicate what persuasion is not. Simons draws a line of demarcation between persuasion and coercion; persuasion and material inducements for action; and conformity to group or authority – thus highlighting some elements in “debunking some myths,” to borrow Reardon’s (1991: 1)) statement.

On the other hand, O’Keefe (2002a: 5) defines persuasion closer to Reardon (1991) in the sense of seeing it as “a successful intentional effort at influencing another’s mental state through communication in a circumstance in which the persuadee has some measure of freedom.” It would seem that O’Keefe, in the afore quoted definition, is conscious of the fact that an attempt may succeed or fail, for in the same vein, he goes further to elaborate this aspect of success and failure, as indicated below:

When we say that one person persuaded another, we ordinarily identify a successful attempt to influence. That is, the notion of success is embedded in the concept of persuasion. For instance, it does not make sense to say, “I persuaded him but failed.” One can say, “I **tried** to persuade him but failed,” but to say simply “I persuaded him” is to imply a successful attempt to influence (O’Keefe’s emphasis).

One only wonders how O'Keefe would define the process of attempting to influence the autonomous decision of another, that is, before there is either success or failure; the period during which "communicators try to convince other people to change their beliefs" to use Perloff's statement quoted below. Alternatively, one wonders how O'Keefe, and those who share the same perspective with him, would view O'Donnell and Kable's (1982: 9) definition that persuasion is "a **complex, continuing, interactive process** ..." If persuasion is indeed a continuing process, then it may not only be based on just the positive outcome.

Perloff (2003: 8) posits that

Persuasion undoubtedly helped early homo sapiens solve adaptive problems such as pacifying potential enemies and enlisting help from friends. In short: Persuasion matters and strikes the core of our lives as human beings. **This means we must define what we mean by persuasion and differentiate it from related terms** (emphasis added).

Unlike being a "human communicative" process as O'Keefe sees it, Perloff (2003: 8) goes a step further to see persuasion as "a symbolic process" "**in which communicators try to convince other people to change their attitudes or behaviour regarding an issue through the transmission of a message, in an atmosphere of free choice**" (Perloff's emphasis).

Furthermore, Perloff (2003: 8-12) demarcates his definition into the following five components:

- **Persuasion is a symbolic process.** Under this bald statement, Perloff quips that persuasion does not occur within two shifts of a dove's tail, as it ideally takes a number of steps. He opines that persuasion is more like teaching than boxing. He depicts a persuader as a teacher, moving people step by step to a solution, helping them to discern why a given method solves the problem best. More importantly, he considers persuasion as a symbolic phenomenon which transmits messages through language and non-verbal signs such as the Holy Cross, etc.
- **Persuasion involves an attempt to influence.** In respect of the foregoing pronouncement, Perloff advances that the success of persuasion is not gained automatically, nor is it a guaranteed certainty. He nonetheless concedes that persuasion involves a deliberate attempt to influence another person.
- **Persuasion involves the transmission of a message.** Perloff states the obvious fact that a message may be verbal or non-verbal. He goes on to say that the message can be relayed interpersonally, through mass media, or via the Internet. He further says that the message may be reasonable or unreasonable, factual or emotional. Further

still, he indicates that the message can comprise arguments or simple cues, like music in an advertisement that brings pleasant memories to the mind. He nevertheless holds strongly to the idea that, although news and art contain messages that change attitudes, they are not pure exemplars of persuasion. They are best viewed as borderline cases of persuasion, he avers.

- **People persuade themselves.** As regards this component, Perloff claims that to understand the power of self-persuasion, one must consider an activity that does not at first flush involve persuasive communication, such as therapy. He concedes that therapists indubitably help people to effect changes in their lives, and is in harmony with Kassan (1999), who observes that “the therapist offers suggestions and provides an environment in which healing can take place”. But he opines that if the healing progress does occur, it is the client who makes the change – and it is the client who is responsible for making sure that she does not relapse into her old undesirable ways of doing things. He calls this a classical example of self-persuasion.
- **Persuasion requires free choice.** In this fifth and last component of his definition of persuasion, Perloff pronounces that self-persuasion is the key to successful influence. He subsequently posits that, viewed from this premise, an individual must be free to alter his own behaviour or to do what he wishes in a communication setting.

It is evident from the definitions of persuasion by Reardon (1991), Dillard and Marshall (2003), O’Keefe (2002a) and Perloff (2003) above that persuasion is similar to other modes of influencing people’s choices, behaviours and judgements. Whereas Reardon views persuasion as a conscious activity that involves conscious intent, Dillard and Marshall view it from a social skill’s perspective and define it as a process involving persuader and persuadee. On the other hand, Simons regards persuasion as a human communication designed to influence the autonomous judgements and actions of others, while Perloff regards it as a symbolic process in which communicators try to convince other people to change their attitudes or behaviours.

The aim of the next subsection, 1.5, is to show the differences and similarities existing in the sister concepts: persuasion and propaganda, persuasion and manipulation, and persuasion and coercion.

1.5 PERSUASION VERSUS PROPAGANDA, MANIPULATION AND COERCION

There exists a grey area between persuasion and its related concepts – propaganda, manipulation, and coercion. This section focuses on the similarities and differences between persuasion and each of these other influence aspects, as advanced by various theoreticians. In this section I aim going to start off with the comparison and contrast of persuasion and

propaganda; second, deal with persuasion and manipulation; and finally, examine the similarities and/or differences prevailing between persuasion and coercion. Like the previous sub-section, this one is going to enrich this study and enable me to notice any instances pertaining to these aspects whenever they emerge in the analysis of the selected drama texts.

1.5.1 Persuasion versus propaganda

Propaganda, according to De Wet (1988: 42) is a term that is congruent with “mass persuasion”; and these have to be viewed as interchangeable terms. Offering the etymological perspective of the term, propaganda, De Wet indicates that it originates from the Latin word **propagare**, which means “the gardener’s practice of pinning the fresh shoots off a plant into the earth in order to produce new plants which will later take on a new life of their own” (1988: 42).

Further, De Wet (1988: 42) traces the development of the concept propaganda, and indicates that Pope Gregory XV, had undergone the renewal of the Catholic Church in Europe in the light of the effects of the Protestant Reformation, when he “created the Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fide (Sacred congregation for the propagation of the faith) in Rome in June 1622” (1988: 42). Furthermore, De Wet (1988: 42) claims that this congregation functioned as an official organ of the Roman Catholic Church responsible for “carrying the faith to the new world, and for strengthening and reviving it in the old.” Pope Gregory’s aim for establishing the congregation was also “to set a precedent later to be followed by others interested **in the control of opinions and actions of men**” (1988: 42) (emphasis added).

The word “propaganda,” according to De Wet (1988: 42), was later “extended to cover all efforts and methods to mislead, to tear down as well as build up group morale, to influence and in every manner to direct and control the thoughts and actions of men.” It would then seem correct for one to concur with De Wet (1988: 43) that propaganda is now imbued with connotations and overtones “implying a process which is frequently sinister, lying, and based on the deliberate attempt on the part of an individual or group to manipulate, often by concealed or underhand means, the minds of others for their own ulterior ends.”

Further, De Wet (1988: 44) points out that the concept, propaganda, has developed through history, and has now become increasingly “the method through which the people hit back rulers” (1988: 43) whom they consider to be “tyrannical or in any way objectionable,” (1988: 43) and is considered as “highly valuable to revolution” (1988: 43). He explains that, on the other hand, today, as was the case in Germany, propaganda is used as “the means of communication to sustain a ruling party itself and to deprive its subjects of the power of

independent thought” (1988: 43). Indeed, propaganda has been used as an influence aspect in various situations concerning mass recipients – in politics, in sectors and religious organizations as well. Note that De Wet does not address himself to propaganda as a sister concept of persuasion. The reason behind this may be due to the fact that persuasion and communication scholars and researchers have discussed a number of issues in their definition of the concept.

Larson (1995: 36) poses the rhetorical question, “is propaganda unethical?” He then attempts to answer himself by pointing out that it all depends “on how propaganda is defined” (1995: 36). Further, Larson concurs with De Wet that efforts in establishing propaganda were institutionalised in 1622 by Pope Gregory when he created the Sacred Congregation for Propagating the Faith (1995: 36).

Furthermore, Larson (1995: 36) surmises that today, “one cluster of definitions of propaganda presents a “neutral position” towards the ethical nature of the concept.” To round up his presentation, he gives a definition combining the key elements of such neutral views as “a campaign of mass persuasion” – thus echoing De Wet, as was seen above. Larson (1995: 36) then elaborates his position that propaganda “represents an organised, continuous effort to persuade a mass audience, primarily using the mass media”. He posits that propaganda would thus include the following areas:

- advertising and public relations efforts;
- national political election campaigns;
- the persuasion campaigns of some social reform movements; and
- the organised efforts of national governments to win friends abroad, maintain domestic morale, and undermining an opponents’ morale both in ‘hot’ and ‘cold’ war (1995: 36).

Unlike De Wet who says nothing about persuasion in this section, Larson (1995: 30) regards persuasion and propaganda as unifying agents “that help to spread and maintain the fantasy of the movement” – thus referring to “the kind of propaganda that is used within the movement to build emotion and develop loyalty in its membership” (1995: 30). He posits that propaganda by itself succeeds “mainly with the frustrated” (1995: 30). Further, he indicates that the latter’s “throbbing fears, hopes, and passions crowd at the portals of their senses....It is the music of their own souls they hear in the impassioned words of the propagandist” (1995: 30). Furthermore, he submits that, if fanaticism begets violence, “it is equally true that violence begets fanaticism or at least reinforces it”(1995: 30). Persuasion and propaganda,

for Larson (1995: 30), frequently result in a powerful need to “proselytise or ‘spread the word’ to ‘the committed.’”

Mulholland (1994: xvi) realises the controversy surrounding these two seemingly synonymous concepts, and quickly draws a line of demarcation between propaganda and persuasion as follows:

- Propaganda uses strong and mainly covert tactics, and hardly allows for resistance to its influence;
- It has as its goal an absolute imposition of its own wishes on others;
- If it meets with an opposition it simply increases the pressure on others to accept what it seeks;
- It insists that its message be accepted, and further that it be acted on;
- It can and does fail if its tactics are inappropriate or badly used, but in the hands of experts it more often succeeds than not;
- It can work quickly, as in agitation propagandas which seek an instant result; or
- It can permeate social life slowly as in integration propagandas which are used to impose a steady long-term adherence to a certain view of life (1994:xvi).

In contrast with the above, Mulholland (1994: xvi) claims that persuasion is characterised by the following aspects:

- It differs in its aims, in the means it uses, in the pressure it exerts, and in the range of people it affects;
- It is a factor of ordinary everyday life; and
- It is what can make people feel more or less comfortable, improve or weaken cooperation between colleagues and friends, and maintain relations with family and the community 1994: xvi).

Mulholland (1994: xvi) further observes that “persuasion certainly seeks to achieve the goals of the person using it, but unlike propaganda, if it proves unsuccessful or meets too much opposition, the persuasion may be withdrawn” (1994: xvi). Further, she posits that “persuasion acts rather to encourage the other person to share the view of the user, than to insist on imposing it” (1994: xvi); and that the persuader merely presents “the best case possible,” (1994: xvi) and then leaves it in the hands of the persuadee to either “accept or reject it.” Further still, Mulholland (1994: xvi) advances that persuasion “will take into account and allow for differences in view points.”

In addition, Mulholland (1994: xvi) indicates that “as opposed to propaganda, which either succeeds or fails, persuasion can be partially successful.” Furthermore, she posits that “like propaganda, persuasion can either work quickly or can only gradually increase its influence; but unlike propaganda, persuasion can be quite open and aboveboard in the tactics it uses (though it can employ covert tactics as well)” (1994: xvi).

Like Mulholland, Perloff (2003: 17) views persuasion and propaganda as also overlapping concepts that are “invoked to describe powerful instances of social influence.” He spells out three differences prevailing between persuasion and propaganda, as they are hereby tabled:

Propaganda, according to Perloff “is typically invoked to describe mass influence through mass media” while by contrast, persuasion “occurs in mediated settings, but also in interpersonal and organizational context” (2003: 17);

Further, for Perloff propaganda refers to “instances in which a group has total control over the transmission of information, as with Hitler in Nazi Germany, the Chinese Communists during the Chinese revolution, Saddam Hussein in Iraq, and in violent religious cults” (2003: 17). By contrast, Perloff views persuasion as an aspect that “can be slanted and one-sided” (2003: 17), though it ordinarily “allows for a free flow of information” (2003: 17). Furthermore, Perloff indicates that in persuasion situation, “people can ordinarily question the persuader or offer contrasting opinions”; (2003: 17) and lastly, Perloff postulates that here the difference “lies in the connotation or meaning of the terms” (2003: 17). Perloff regards propaganda as a concept with “a negative connotation” (2003: 17), as it is “associated with bad things or evil forces” (2003: 17). Further, Perloff postulates that persuasion, by contrast, “is viewed as a more positive force, one that can produce beneficial outcomes” (2003: 17). Furthermore, Perloff claims that subjectively, they use the term propaganda “to refer to **persuasive communication with which one disagrees and to which the individual attributes hostile intent**” (Perloff’s emphasis) (2003: 17).

Perloff (2003: 18) rounds up this discussion, and leaves us with the information that opposing sects or sectors, such as Liberals and Republicans, for example, usually relegate aspects of news that is not so positive to their disposition as “unadulterated propaganda” – while the conservatives would term it “propaganda for the Left.”

1.5.2 Persuasion versus manipulation

This sub-section discusses the relationships or non-relationships observed by communication scholars and researchers in their varying outlooks and perspectives. The idea behind this exercise is to discover the nuances surrounding these seemingly related aspects of communication and influence, so as to enrich this study, hoping that the findings will enable the present researcher an opportunity for employing them in the analyses.

According to Mulholland (1994: xv), 'persuasion' for some people is associated with "the misuse of powerful tactics and the exerting of improper influence over others at a mass national or cultural level". Mulholland further posits that, in this way, persuasion is "seen as manipulation of other's minds and therefore as unethical" (1994: xv). She further claims that this concept is also regarded as "the manufacturing of consent;" (1994: xv) and thus as "an artificial activity, and one which covertly limits the options of those receiving it" (1994: xv). She calls attention to the note that "the artificiality of the notion is made persuasive by the metaphor of 'manufacturing'" (1994: xv).

Mulholland (1994: xvi) claims that persuasion is characterised by the following aspects:

- It is what can make people feel more or less comfortable, improve or weaken cooperation between colleagues and friends, and maintain relations with family and the community.

As her line of departure, Reardon (1991: 1) indicates that 'persuasion' "has come to be considered by many [as] an activity reserved for the unethical," and she is all out to clear up this misconception, she says. She spells out her disputation by pointing out that

- persuasion is a form of communication in which every person who ventures forth into the company of others must participate;
- persuasion is necessitated by the single fact that all of us differ in our goals and the means by which we achieve them;
- the inevitable result is that our goals are often at cross-purposes with those of others; and that
- when one person's goal achievement is blocked by the goal-seeking behaviours of another, persuasion is one means of achieving cooperation.

Further, for Reardon manipulation involves "furthering the goals of the manipulator at the expense of the person being manipulated" (1991: 1). For her, this aspect essentially involves "pulling the wool over the eyes" of others (1991: 1). Reardon also goes on to claim that the people being manipulated "are not encouraged to reason about the situation, but are entranced by false promises, deceived by insincere verbal or non-verbal behaviour, or 'set up' in the sense that the situation is contrived to limit their choices" (1991: 1-2). In addition, she posits that manipulation and persuasion differ in that "it does not involve up-front reasoning with others" (1991: 1) Finally, Reardon cautions that manipulation robs individuals of choices "through deceptive tactics rather than attempting to guide them to make, of their own free will, the persuader's preferred free choice" (1991: 2).

1.5.3 Persuasion versus coercion

This sub-section examines the similarities and differences between persuasion and coercion, as viewed by scholars and researchers in the fields of persuasion and communication. This examination is hoped to become quite handy in the analysis of the dramatic texts in question, as the present researcher will have gained knowledge in how these sister concepts operate.

Hart, Newell, and Olsen (2003: 769) observe that coercion is considered as a means of ensuring immediate compliance in children. Further, Hart et al. suggest that coercion “comes with a number of costs including the diminishing of children’s abilities to learn how to regulate their own behaviour from within” (2003: 769). Furthermore, these authors conclude that parents who dispel their children’s negative emotions in punitive or dismissive ways “only invite more intense expressions that children have difficulty regulating with peers” (2003: 769).

Also Hart et al. (2003: 770) caution that:

Persistent parenting that derides, demeans, or diminishes children by continually putting them in their place, putting them down, mocking them, or holding power over them via physical and verbal or psychologically controlling means are manifestations of coercive stylistic interactions....such parenting appears to impede social and communicative competencies in children [...] that are driven by both child and parent aggressive behaviour.

Further still, Hart et al. (2003: 770) suggest that persistent application of physical and verbal coercion often occurs in families in which there exists “the climate of hostility manifested by frequent spanking, yelling, criticizing, directing, and forcing and has been linked to many forms of childhood externalizing behaviour directed toward peers that include relational and physical forms of aggression noted earlier” (2003: 770). According to these authors, coercive stylistic features “tend to exacerbate already difficult temperamental dispositions in children.” In addition, Hart et al. (2003: 770) indicate that hostile parenting of this kind “has also been linked to peer-group rejection.” They claim that there exist “associations between reciprocally hostile parent-child interactions and rejection by peers as mediated by aggressive behaviour with peers” (2003: 770).

In moderate forms with more normative samples, Hart et al. (2003: 770) suggest that “this style of parent-child interaction has been associated with children thinking they will get their way by using force with peers [...], particularly if parents model coercion as an efficacious means of resolving interpersonal conflict.”

Observe that these authors are the only ones who present coercion that takes place among some families against children by their parents. Indeed the inroads into the present study will

have been made towards the forthcoming analysis of the texts in question, such that the present researcher will be in a position to use this information appropriately.

According to Reardon (1991: 2), it is important to draw a line of demarcation between persuasion and coercion. She posits that coercion is “another means of influencing behaviour that does not involve up-front reasoning” (1991: 2), for it employs “physical force or some form of threat” (1991: 2). Further, she gives an example of children being coerced into certain behaviours by their parents – and encourages parents to employ some persuasion to their children, so as to assist them “to reason on their own” (1991: 2). In addition, Reardon surmises that “coercion is less likely than persuasion to lead to long-term changes in behaviour because the persuadee has not **chosen** to adopt the new behaviour and thus is not committed to retaining it” (her emphasis) (1991: 2).

According to Reardon (1991: 2) this “does not mean that persuasion at its best is totally spontaneous and uncontrived.” She further posits that “there are effective and ineffective ways to present ideas” (1991: 2), such as “skill in identifying what matters to the people being persuaded” (1991: 2), and shaping one’s arguments “to guide the thinking of those persons” (1991: 2). Reardon furthermore proposes that it is important for one to present oneself “in a credible manner,” and by so doing such an individual encourages people “to see one’s perspective without setting them up as in manipulation or backing them into a corner as in coercion” (1991: 2).

In line with the above, Reardon (1991: 2) submits in summary the following line of argument, arranged in points form for clarity’s sake:

- Persuasion involves guiding people toward the adoption of some behaviour, belief, or attitude preferred by the persuader through reasoning or emotional appeals;
- It does not rob people of their ability to choose but presents a case for the adoption of a persuader-preferred mode of action, belief, or attitude;
- It does not use force or threat and does not limit the options of others by deceit;
- Even the persuader with good intentions may lead persuadees to do what might not be in their best interests; and
- In all cases, however, persuasion does not deprive persuadees of other choices by deceit or force.

According to Perloff (2003: 12-13), on the first flush, the difference between persuasion and coercion may appear to be simplicity incarnate. He indicates that persuasion involves reason and verbal appeals, while coercion entails force and suggestion. He further points out that

there are subtle relationships between the two terms, which overlap, and which do not matter-of-factly dawn on one's mind.

Further, Perloff (2003: 13) suggests that it is important to define coercion, so as to grasp at its understanding and how it operates. He then provides his own definition of coercion as a technique employed for "forcing people to act as the coercer wants them to act" (2003: 13), regardless of what those people's preferences are. Perloff furthermore postulates that coercion usually applies "a threat of some dire consequences" (2003: 13), should the coerced person not perform in accordance with the coercer's demands.

Further still, Perloff (2003: 13), bases himself on the foregoing definition of coercion, and posits that if individuals are pushed into acting in ways that are "contrary to their preferences" (2003: 13); and the communicators "employed a direct or veiled threat;" then the targets are coerced, especially because the authorities-that-be "wielded power over the targets" (2003: 14).

According to Perloff's (2003: 13) view, "it's all a matter of how people perceive things," for people are free to reject the communicator's stand – when these very people believe in their own liberty to do so. Perloff further opines that if people are free to act the way they want, "the influence attempt falls under the persuasion umbrella" (2003: 13). Contrary to this position, Perloff suggests that when individuals believe that they are bound to comply to the influence, then such an attempt is "better viewed as coercive" (2003: 13). Needless to say, this is a rather controversial issue, for, as Perloff views it, "most people would say that they [targets] could resist communicator's appeals;" (2003: 14) especially if no direct threats of any kind were employed.

For further and clearer comprehension of the extenuating circumstances pertaining to persuasion and coercion, Perloff (2003: 13) surmises that if the target feels that he/she has power to refute the coercer's demands, then performing in accordance with those demands may be viewed as persuasion, for the target had freedom of choice.

Furthermore, Perloff (2003: 14) posits that if the targets lack confidence in themselves, and regard themselves as being incapable of resisting the sources of communication, then people might consider these targets as having minimal choice and bound to comply. In this case, then one might concur with Perloff that "coercion, not persuasion, had occurred" (2003: 14). Indeed, it is not an easy decision sometimes to draw a line of demarcation between persuasion and coercion.

My own view is that the first case is the clearest instance of coercion. The communicator employed a veiled threat. What's more, Tom's boss wielded power over him, leading to the reasonable perception that Tom had little choice but to comply. The other two scenarios are

more ambiguous, arguably more persuasion because most people would say that they could resist communicator's appeals; in addition, there were no direct threats of any sort.

Perloff (2003: 14) finally leaves us with the reminder that persuasion and coercion "are not polar opposites but overlapping concepts."

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW ON GPA MODEL

This chapter examines the 'goals-plans-action model' as part of the psychological theories of persuasive messages. Communication competence has now shifted away from 'input processes' and is concentrating on 'message production' theories, and it reviews the theories falling within the goals-plans-action model (henceforth GPA model). This chapter pays attention to the GPA model of theorists who use Dillard's theoretical framework as a point of departure, as we shall see in section 2.1 below.

2.1 GOALS-PLANS-ACTION (GPA) MODEL

The goals-plans-action model presupposes motives or reasons for persuaders to establish certain plans to achieve them, then take appropriate action/s for achieving such goals. As Dillard (2004: 185) would view it, the GPA model is "an attempt to shed light on the way in which messages are produced and on the effects that they have." Further, Dillard posits that the structure of the model might be adapted "to a variety of different communicative functions," (2004: 185) such as "self-disclosure, social support or information seeking" (2004: 185).

My aim in discussing the GPA model is to identify and be conversant with the way it operates, as would be propounded by its exponents. The findings will empower me with knowledge and enable me to find out "how and why individuals influence one another," as Dillard (2004: 185) would put it. In addition, I hope to be able to deal with related issues wherever they emerge in this study. Since the model "advances a number of specific claims regarding the nature of goals, plans and actions as well as their relationship to one another" (Dillard, 2004: 185), I hope to learn from the explications of those claims as proposed by the GPA proponents.

2.1.1 The concept of goals

This sub-section aims at identifying primary and secondary goals of persuasion, and discovers their similarities and differences. I also intent to find out how these goals may be employed by various communicators in their persuasive endeavour; and whether or not such goals may emanate from both the source/s and/or target/s. Dillard (2004: 185) surmises that goals are "future states of affairs that an individual is committed to achieving or maintaining." According to Dillard and Marshall, persuaders usually employ – in their persuasive engagements – both "**primary** (influence) **goals** and **secondary goals**" (2003: 482). They assert that, whereas primary goals are "driving the intention," secondary goals "shape the range of behavioural options available to the speaker" (2003: 482-3).

Also, Metts and Grohskopf (2003: 365) acknowledge Dillard and Marshall's view that "goals can be distinguished as primary or secondary based on the priority during a given episode." Unlike Dillard and Marshall, who consider goals as reasons for persuading someone, Metts and Grohskopf (2003: 358-9) regard goals as **motivations**.

According to Metts and Grohskopf (2003: 365), goals "serve as an important function in activating a set of behaviours and possible contingencies that are believed to be efficacious in obtaining that goal." Additionally, Metts and Grohskopf claim that goals provide "the impetus for planning which in turn makes action possible" (2003: 365).

Wilson and Sabee (2003: 19) suggest that communicative competence "is evident in the number and types of goals that speakers spontaneously form and pursue" (2003: 19) and that as such, people "may gain insights about communicative competence by exploring how individuals form interaction goals" (2003: 19).

Additionally, Wilson and Sabee (2003: 19) state that interaction model "assumes that people possess cognitive rules, or associations in long-term memory, between representations of interaction goals and numerous situational features." Also, Wilson and Sabee give an example of a parent who might link the goal of 'giving advice' with features such as 'my child is contemplating a problematic action,' and 'I care deeply about my child's well-being.'

According to Wilson and Sabee (2003: 19), these three features are processes operating in parallel on this associative network, and they maintain that such situations "can activate rules for forming multiple goals simultaneously" (2003: 19). In addition, Wilson and Sabee (2003: 19) indicate, however, that a cognitive rule "must reach a certain activation threshold before it is triggered and forms a goal," and that the probability of a rule being triggered "is a function of three criteria: fit, recency and strength" (2003: 19). Further, Wilson and Sabee (2003: 19) point out that individuals may form a goal when they notice that many represented conditions in the rule "are present in the current situation (the fit criterion)...cognitive rules are more likely to be triggered if those rules have been activated recently (the recency criterion) or frequently in the past (the strength criterion)."

As indicated above already, following Dillard (2004), goals are divided by attention as placed on primary and secondary goals. I proceed with the investigation of primary goals.

2.1.2 Primary goals

Metts and Grohskopf (2003: 365) assume that primary goals are associated with influence attempt, and might include "changing someone's opinion, soliciting a favour, giving advice, or terminating a relationship." These co-authors define primary goals as "the fundamental motivation for an interaction sequence" – as they provide motivation, which in turn "generates communicative actions" (2003: 365).

According to Dillard (2004: 186), people engage themselves in persuasion for various reasons, including the primary influence goals as indicated in the table below.

Table 11.1 Influence goals

Type	Description	Examples
Gain assistance	Obtain material or non-material resource.	Can I borrow your car?
Give advice	Provide counsel (typically about health and relationships).	I think that you should quit from using so much Prozac.
Share activity	Promote joint endeavours between source and target.	Let's do something tonight. How about going to that new band?
Change orientation	Alter target's stance toward a socio-political issue.	There is another, more realistic, way to look at the abortion laws.
Change relationship	Alter the nature of the source-target relationship.	I think that we ought to have a monogamous relationship.
Obtain permission	Secure the endorsement of the (more powerful) target.	Would it be OK if I handed in the assignment one day late?
Force rights and obligations	Compel target to fulfil commitment or role requirement.	You promised that requirement. Would you keep the music down? So, how about it?

Dillard (2004: 186) postulates that, in the parlance of the GPA model, the above listed goals are **primary goals**; and are so named "because the theory attributes several unique properties to them" (2004: 187). The following are the attributions Dillard (2004: 187) hereby makes reference to:

First feature:

- Primary goals lie at the beginning of the GPA sequence, as they initiate the series of constructs that model message construction;
- Goals are reflections of a reality that does not yet exist, but has to be created, and they connect present with future (quoting Hacker);
- Primary goals are, therefore, potential realities that individuals strive to construct; and

- Because primary goals energise cognition and behaviour, they **serve as a motivational function** (2004: 187).

Second feature (which derives from the previous point):

- Primary goals allow one to bracket the interaction, to identify its beginning and ending point;
- Knowledge of what is being attempted permits social actors to segment the stream of interaction into meaningful units;
- Such segmentation affords interactants to make sense of what would otherwise be viewed as an undifferentiated outpouring of behaviour;
- Bracketing is made possible by the fact that the primary goal imbues the interaction with meaning;
- Knowledge of the primary goal allows the interactants to say what the exchange is about; and
- Primary goals are culturally viable explanations of the discourse produced by two or more interlocutors – the **social meaning function** of primary goals (2004: 187-8).

Third feature:

- Primary goals direct a number of mental operations;
- Primary goals determine perceived aspects of a situation;
- They influence encoded and retrieved perceptions;
- Primary goals set into motion an ensemble of lower-level cognitive processes that occur in parallel and align with the overall aim represented by the primary goal; and therefore,
- Primary goals serve a **guidance function** that promotes temporary reorientation and unification of various mental subsystems (2004: 188).

In agreement with Dillard above, Dillard and Marshall (2003: 482) state that there exist numerous reasons (or goals) for which people are persuaded, and present the following as the most frequently used ones:

- **give advice** (i.e., provide guidance regarding the target's health or lifestyle);
- **gain assistance** (i.e., obtain favours, objects or information);
- **share activity** (i.e., spend time together);

- **change relationship** (i.e., initiate, escalate, or de-escalate the source-target relationship);
- **change orientation** (i.e., alter target's opinion or behaviour with regard to some social or political issue);
- **obtain permission** (e.g., secure the endorsement of someone in power); and
- **enforce rights and obligations** (e.g., compel the target to fulfil a previous commitment or to stop an annoying behaviour)

It is important to note that the primary goals indicated along the bullets above bear all the similarities with those enlisted by Dillard (2004: 185), in his Table 1.1, which comes not as a surprise as Dillard has been involved in both of these studies. I now continue with the discussion. Dillard and Marshall (2003: 482) claim that "it is possible to parse certain of these goals more finely and that it may be useful to do so in some circumstances."

I now proceed to discuss secondary goals, and find out how they are formulated and how they operate to achieve persuader's intended ends.

2.1.3 Secondary goals

Secondary goals, according to Dillard (2004: 188), are other concerns that arise in the course "of pursuing or planning to pursue a primary goal." Such concerns are called **secondary goals** because "they follow from the adoption of a primary goal," Dillard (2004: 188) postulates. Additionally, Dillard advances that these secondary goals emanate from the interactant's desire to achieve his/her primary goal successfully, without jeopardizing the achievement of that goal by making an error in the approach.

In relation to the foregoing view, Dillard (2004: 188) gives an example of a situation where one embarks on initiating relationship with another person (primary goal), and then ensures that his/her approach may not engender rejection – in which case he/she would be hurt (secondary goal). In this case, according to Dillard, the speaker "holds a secondary goal only because he or she is trying to influence someone else" (2004: 188) and his/her desire is "to achieve the primary goal that brings into play one or more secondary goals" (2004: 188).

Dillard (2004: 188) acknowledges the fact that many scholars have revealed the existence of GPA model's five secondary goals, yet he cautions that not every goal will be appropriate to every situation. The following are the five secondary goals that Dillard (2004: 188-9) hereby discusses:

- **Identity goals** focus on ethical, moral, and personal standards for behaviour. They emanate "from individuals' principles and values, and, at the broadest level, their self-

concept” (2004: 188). Dillard observes that, though people may like to perform according to their principles, it is “probably not the case that individuals actively consider their identity goals in every interaction” (2004: 188);

- **Conversation management goals** involve concerns about impression management and face (called ‘interaction goals’ in Dillard, 1990a and 1990b). Dillard acknowledges that individuals usually prefer smooth interactions rather than awkward ones, and that interlocutors avoid presenting threats to each/one another’s face. Thus, Dillard (2004: 188) posits that, “while conversation management goals may have implications that extend beyond the conversation, they also have a relatively short time frame (typically the duration of the conversation).”
- **Relational resource goals** focus on relationship management. They are manifestations of the value that individuals place on desired social and personal relationships. Dillard observes that people often engage themselves in endeavours that maintain or improve their relationships with others – particularly if relationships already exist or there exists an intention to establish one. Further, Dillard (2004: 189) indicates that these goals “focus on the benefits that flow to the source because of the relationship itself. As a consequence, relational resource goals have a longer time frame than conversational management goals.”
- **Personal resource goals** reflect the physical, temporal and material concerns of the communicator. Dillard (2004: 189) surmises that in particular, these goals appear where there exists a desire to retain or enhance “one’s physical well-being, temporal resource, finances, and material possessions.” Further, Dillard (2004: 189) advances that the wish for behaving efficiently is “viewed as a personal resource goal” (2004: 189), although the GPA model “does not suppose that individuals always prefer a high level of efficiency” (2004: 189). Additionally, Dillard claims that similar to other secondary goals, “personal resource goals will not be relevant to every interaction” (2004: 189). Further still, Dillard indicates that when they are relevant, these goals can be of importance in controlling the creation and utterance of messages.
- **Affect management goals** are derived from the assumption that individuals strive to maintain preferred affective states. Dillard (2004: 189) cautions of the significance that these goals “are not so simple as the wish to enjoy positive feeling and elude negative ones.” For example, he makes a submission that individuals strive at increasing their level of anxiety for motivating vigilance or enhancing their level of anger “so that they are emotionally aligned with a plan to take a hard interactional stance” (2004: 189).

According to Dillard (2004: 189), the introduction of the concept of 'secondary goals' has "at least one broad implication for how we conceive of the task of interpersonal influence....it suggests that most, and possibly all, interactions involve multiple goals that individuals try to achieve more or less simultaneously." Dillard once more posits that since this premise enjoys quite a broad acceptance among communication researchers, "it is to be viewed as truism" (2004: 189). In the same vein, Dillard (2004: 189) expresses his surprise that there are some researchers in other fields who claim the existence of a "paucity of data-based research underlying that altruism: multiple goal striving appears to be the rule, **yet little empirical research addresses the topic**" (Dillard's emphasis).

As a verification of his stand, Dillard (2004: 189) quotes numerous communication scholars who have undergone dozens of empirical studies that "examined precisely that topic" (2004: 189), and claims that this solid and growing empirical base "has helped to inform the GPA model and other theories of influence" (2004: 189).

Additionally, Dillard (2004: 189) points out those secondary goals are "wants that arise in response to the consideration or adoption of a primary goal." Further, Dillard concedes that research supports "the existence of five conceptually distinctive secondary goals" (2004: 189); and quickly points out that the exact number has not much importance, but the appreciation of the fact that "individuals are almost always attempting to satisfy multiple goals" (2004: 189). In addition, Dillard indicates that the primary goal "defines the situation, while secondary goals are the entailments that follow in its wake" (2004: 189). In reference to GPA model's position, Dillard (2004: 189) claims that "understanding the relationship between primary and secondary goals is crucial to explaining planning and action."

With reference to existing relationships existing between primary and secondary goals, Dillard (2004: 189) surmises that there is a possibility that "the most fundamental communication decision is whether to engage another person in interaction or not," and assumes that the interplay of primary and secondary goals "can help to shed light on this choice point in the message production process" (2004: 190). He further assumes that if one primary goal and one secondary goal have their compatibilities evaluated, the following three possibilities would emerge:

First, the two goals "may be **incompatible** with one another" (2004: 190). In this vein Dillard (2004: 190) concurs with Brown and Levinson that "influence attempts are by their very nature intrusive" – in which case he presumes that "any effort to produce behavioural change in another will necessarily run the risk of threatening that person's autonomy" (2004: 190);

Second, the secondary goals “are irrelevant to the primary goal” (2004: 190). Here, Dillard draws an example of a concern whereby a friend’s well-being becomes a non-issue when invited for an occasion; and

Third, the primary and secondary goals “are **compatible** or align with one another” (2004: 190). According to Dillard, relational initiation of compatibility would be in a situation where “individuals repay favours provided to them by others”(2004: 190). Even in situations where repayment may take place at a later time, the whole exercise is still “a defining feature of friendship” (2004: 190) – where the speaker “may obtain a ride and, in so doing, also solidify a nascent relationship” (Dillard, 2004: 190).

According to Dillard (2004: 190), the third case above is “clearly the most desirable of the three alternatives;” yet he pronounces his suspicion that “it is also the least common” (2004: 190). In addition, Dillard suggests that a blend of the first two cases above may be considered as instances of common interactions. Further, Dillard (2004: 190) posits that since there are **numerous** secondary goals, “it is likely that some of them create opposition to the primary goal, while others will be irrelevant. Hence, in most instances, the **set of relevant secondary goals** will constitute a counter-dynamic to the primary goal” (2004: 190). Furthermore, Dillard points out that although he has drawn the possibilities in a categorical fashion, the rate in which primary and secondary goals are (in)consistent with one another “is more accurately viewed as a matter of degree”(2004: 190).

Whereas the above-quoted seven are primary goals, secondary ones emanate from the relationship and intentional approach made by the persuader, according to these co-authors. For example a persuader may either be aggressive or less aggressive in his/her approach toward the target, depending on his/her secondary goal/s, they say. For Dillard and Marshall (2003: 483), the concept of secondary goals prompts consideration of related ideas that can aid efforts to understand persuasive social skill.

According to Dillard and Marshall (2003: 483), circumstances that give rise to multiple goals “create interactions that are relatively higher in **goal structure complexity**; e.g., giving advice to one’s parents activates a relatively large number of secondary goals.” If persuasion is to be successful, “then as complexity increases, the degree of social skill necessary to manage it must raise accordingly,” they conclude. Further, Dillard and Marshall (2003: 483) advance that the understanding of persuasive skill is in the following three ways:

1. by identifying the six common persuasive aims above;
2. by recognizing that, when engaged in persuasion, individuals are typically trying to accomplish other ends as well; and

3. by revealing that influence attempts vary in complexity to the extent that persons are trying to address more, rather than fewer, goals.

Metts and Grohskopf (2003: 357) place goals, strategies, and skills under impression management – as they regard all forms of human interaction as a form of engaging “in some level of impression management.” They posit that in every human activity, “people display awareness that their verbal and non-verbal actions are open to scrutiny by other people” (2003: 357). Further, Metts and Grohskopf (2003: 357) advance that the purpose of their discussion is “to synthesise the large and increasingly sophisticated body of theoretical and empirical research that informs our understanding of the skills involved in managing impressions.” Further still, Metts and Grohskopf (2003: 358) offer five goals (motivations), each of which is associated with a characteristic strategy and various tactics to implement that strategy in the following scenarios:

- A. A person who seeks the attribution of affiliative or likeable will probably use an **ingratiation** strategy (e.g., doing favours, giving compliments, telling self-deprecating anecdotes, and agreement);
- B. A person who seeks the attribution of competent will probably use a **self-promotion** strategy (e.g., talking about good performance or commenting on achievement to make it evident to others) (2003: 358);
- C. A person who seeks the attribution of worthy will probably use an **exemplification** strategy (e.g., demonstrating abilities, honesty or integrity, or claiming high moral values) (2003: 359);
- D. A person who seeks the attribution of helpless will probably use a **supplication** strategy (e.g., soliciting help by inducing guilt, appearing weak to evoke nurturance, or claiming incompetence to avoid responsibility for task);and
- E. A person who seeks the attribution of dangerous or powerful will probably use an **intimidation** strategy (e.g., demonstrating the willingness and ability to inflict harm).

According to Metts and Grohskopf (2003: 359) if these impressions are sustained adequately, “they lead to intended attribution.” Since these goals fall under self-presentation, one may correctly conclude that they are secondary goals, and as they are what Dillard (2004) and Dillard and Marshall (2003) call secondary goals.

Additionally, Metts and Grohskopf (2003: 365) define secondary goals as “concerns that arise in pursuit of primary goals and constrain the choices that a person might make in achieving the primary goal.” Further, Metts and Grohskopf claim that secondary goals “can also emerge as the primary goals of an interaction when, for example, a faux pas needs to

be corrected or a relationship threat needs to be minimised.” In the same vein, they add that “when an influence goal is to persuade others that a speaker is likeable, dependable, qualified, and so forth (e.g., a job interview), impression management is likely to be the primary goal” (Metts and Grohskopf, 2003: 365).

Metts and Grohskopf (2003: 365) identify the following types of secondary goals, which function at least when the primary goal is influence: “identity goals, interaction goals, relational resource goals, personal resource goals, and arousal management goals” (2003: 365) – four of which these co-authors regard as implicating “some degree of impression management concern” (2003: 365). These goals are described as follows:

- identity goals refer to the maintenance of ethical, moral, and personal standards:
- interaction goals refer to concerns about impression management and conversation maintenance; and
- arousal management goals refer to concerns for controlling displays of anxiety, and presumably, detracting emotional states (2003: 365).

In the same vein, Metts and Grohskopf (2003: 365) posit that even relational resource goals “may imply impression management to the extent that they invoke concern for the worth, value and inclusion of a partner (i.e., positive face).”

Wilson and Sabee (2003: 19) consider interaction goals as “states of affairs speakers desire to attain or maintain through talk.” These co-authors surmise that speakers often endeavour to engage themselves in numerous goals during conversation; and the goals they employ usually change quickly in the conversation process. Furthermore, Wilson and Sabee (2003: 19) advance that numerous insights concerning goals and competence are interpretable with the CR model discussed in the foregoing paragraph above. These co-authors provide an example of interactants who may be regarded as incompetent “for pursuing goals that others evaluate as ‘inappropriate’ by some standard” (2003: 19); the occurrences which may be prompted by “inter-cultural interactions” (2003: 19). Further still, Wilson and Sabee (2003: 19) claim, in the same vein, that the persons entering a new culture “may give advice when native speakers view it as inappropriate or fail to give advice when doing so is obligatory.” In the same vein still, Wilson and Sabee (2003: 19) allege that, from the cognitive rule (CR) perspective, “acculturation necessitates associating goals with new sets of situational features.”

But then what happens for interactants in the same culture, one might ask? Wilson and Sabee (2003: 19) concede that even within a single culture, “speakers may be judged incompetent for pursuing goals that others view as inappropriate....a speaker must correct

another's problematic behaviour." Further, some speakers may be accused of embarking on 'goalless' scenarios, where message production is considered as an unclear or empty set of goals.

Apart from pursuing inappropriate goals, Wilson and Sabee (2003: 20) observe that speakers "may seem communicatively incompetent for failing to pursue goals that others view as desirable or obligatory." These co-authors claim that actions such as asking for assistance, giving advice, attempting to change another's political views, or offering criticism "create potential threats to both the speaker's and hearer's face" (2003: 20). Wilson and Sabee (2003: 20) caution that to appear oblivious to such threats is "to risk appearing communicatively incompetent."

For more elaboration, Wilson and Sabee (2003: 20) provide the following reasons for some speakers' failure to form and pursue goals that others in a given situation, view as desirable or obligatory:

- lacking perspective-taking skill needed to recognise psychological implications of their actions;
- associating goals such as providing face support with an insufficient number of situational conditions; or
- failing to mentally link rules of conditional goals, so that the triggering of one rule (e.g., for the goal of giving advice) does not automatically spread activation to the rule for a second goal (e.g., the goal of not appearing nosy) (2003: 20).

According to Wilson and Sabee (2003: 20-21), there are other possibilities that fall beyond the CR model. They observe that "speakers simply may not care whether they appear competent or may want to support face but be unable to generate or implement actions that integrate this concern with their primary goal given time constraints" (2003: 21). Further, Wilson and Sabee (2003: 21) postulate that speakers may be judged communicatively incompetent "for failing to alter their interaction goals across situations." They assume that people high in interpersonal construct differentiation, "varied their supportive interpersonal goals depending on why the target had failed to fulfil an obligation as well as how close they were to the target" (2003: 21).

In contrast with the foregoing assumptions, Wilson and Sabee(2003: 21) posit that less differentiated people did not vary their supportive goals in response to manipulations of attributions or intimacy. In conclusion, Wilson and Sabee (2003: 21) presuppose that the CR model suggests numerous explanations for a failure to adapt interactive goals, including that speakers may:

- associate interaction goals with only a small number of situational conditions;
- fail to develop subcategories of a goal that apply to different situations; or
- overemphasise base-rate data and under-emphasise individual information, under conditions that promote heuristic processing.

As Dillard (2004: 189) would put it, primary and secondary goals “can be distinguished in terms of their logical priority vis-à-vis one another.” Since goals are linked to plans, executing such goals in accordance with the plans becomes a matter of importance – for communicators have to be selective in their plans for proper and appropriate action/s. The next section involves plan, as applied by the selected persuasion scholars.

2.2 THE CONCEPT PLANS

Under the GPA model, plans presuppose the implementation of goals that persuaders aim to achieve in their engagements with the targets. In other words, persuasion plans may be viewed as schemes of arrangements designed for the attainment of either/both primary or/and secondary goals. Metts and Grohskopf (2003: 366) view plans as “schemes for goal attainment.” In this section my intention is to discover

- the methods applied in establishing plans; and
- ways used for the choices of appropriate plans for different persuasion processes.

2.2.1 Features of plans

According to Dillard (2004: 192), under GPA model influence plans can be differentiated “in terms of their hierarchy, complexity, and completeness.” Dillard defines hierarchy as a term referring to the position at which the plan can be launched; whereas complexity relates to the number of steps and possibilities it contains. Further, Dillard surmises that plan completeness, on the other hand, “is a measure of the extent to which a plan is flashed out” (2004: 192). He furthermore postulates that, since it is sometimes difficult to predict the behaviour of others, the assumption is that even when interlocutors involve themselves in pre-conversational planning, the resulting plans are hardly complete. For Dillard (2004: 192), these three entities may be employed in the analysis plans of any kind, but “it is the **content** of influence plans that sets them apart from plans more generally” (Dillard’s emphasis).

2.2.2 The content of compliance-seeking and resisting plans

According to Dillard (2004: 192), influence plans “contain guidelines for the production of verbal and non-verbal behaviours. Whereas **strategy level plans** are concerned with lines of action and sequence behaviour, **tactic plans** exist at a lower level of abstraction.” In his note 4, Dillard points out that “one can conceive of many hierarchical levels different from the two

offered here, and it may prove useful to do so depending on one's research question" (2004: 203). Additionally, Dillard (2004: 192) defines these tactic plans as "instructions for producing smaller units of behaviour such as utterances." He makes an example of a persuader who may approach an influence attempt from the perspective of implementing a liking strategy; in which case the persuader may decide to select from numerous strategies, such as the following utterance, to employ at the tactical level: 'you look great! Looks like you lost some weight,' or, 'That was a really smart thing that you said in our discussion group. I was impressed' (Dillard, 2004: 192).

Dillard (2004: 192) mentions and delineates the following four dimensions for understanding influence plans – each of which can be represented "as a point (tactic) or a vector (strategy) in this four-dimensional space" (2004: 192).

Explicitness, is the degree to which the message source makes her or his intentions transparent in the message itself. Under this dimension, Dillard advances that "whereas implicit messages require little or no guesswork regarding the speaker's wants, inexplicit messages necessitate more interpretation" (2004: 192); and refers readers to Table 11.2 (which will be drawn in due course bellow);

Dominance references the relative power of the source vis-à-vis the target as that power is expressed in the message. Dillard surmises that a statement of dominance in any one speech does not of necessity "accurately reflect formal differences in status nor a consensual definition of the source's perception of, or desire for, a particular source target power relationship" (2004: 192);

Argument is defined as the extent to which the message presents the rationale for the sought-after action and refers to the degree to which the source provides explicit reasons for why s/he is seeking compliance, rather than simply making an elaborated request. For Dillard, messages may be argumentatively structured, though there is no sufficient evidence in this respect. Further, Dillard views argument as "the perceived quantity rather than quality of reason giving" (2004: 192); and

Control over, characterises influence plans. The property indexes the extent to which the source can exercise control over the reasons for compliance. Dillard indicates that among other things, "this distinction makes clear the difference between a threat (e.g., I will hurt you, if...) and a warning (e.g., you could be harmed if...)" (2004: 192).

TABLE 11.2 The content of compliance seeking plans and actions

Dimension of Plan/Action	Example of one room-mate urging another to exercise
Explicitness	High: "I would like you to come to the gym with me." Low: "Hey, I'm going to the gym..."
Dominance	High: "You said that you wanted to work out. Now let's do it." Low: "I would really, really appreciate it if you work out with me."
Argument	High: "I sleep a lot better when I work out. I'll bet that you would too." Low: "We should go work out."
Source control	High: "If you want to get some exercise, I'll go to the gym with you." Low: "If you don't get some exercise, you are probably going to die."

(2004: 193).

In addition, Dillard (2004: 193) cautions that these four dimensions "are central to characterizing the content of influence plans." He notes, however, that messages intended for refuting compliance-seeking attempts can be analysed "in terms of the same four concepts" (2004: 193).

According to Dillard (2004: 193), there is a lot missing "from the characterization of plans" along the four plans that have just been discussed in this section. Dillard further indicates that many elements to plans and conversation "are not encompassed by explicitness, dominance, argument, and source control" (2004: 193). He further points out that individuals who pursue to influence usually expect different kinds of resistance, and try to gather information about the likely problematic encounters they are to experience. For instance: "Are you busy right now?" "No? Then you wouldn't mind helping me out with this, would you?" (2004: 193-4).

Further, Dillard (2004: 194) posits that, even following the target's compliance, the source may still come up with more visitations that lead to other requests in another episode/s and try to secure other commitments, as in : 'So you agree to pick me up at 6 pm., right?' Furthermore, Dillard (2004: 194) cautions that since so much evidence is available as viewed by social actors in these terms, they must be considered as "essential aspects of any influence episode." The following is Table 11.3, as drawn by Dillard (2004: 194):

TABLE 11.3 The content of compliance-resisting plans and actions

Dimension of Plan/Action	Response to one room-mate urging another to exercise
Explicitness	High: "I don't want to." Low: "I'm pretty busy right now."
Dominance	High: "I'll decide when I exercise, not you." Low: "I really appreciate your helping me out in this way, but now is not a good time for me."
Argument	High: "Can't do it now. I've got to study for an exam later today." Low: "Nope, I don't think so."
Source control	High: "I'm just going to take it easy right now, but I may go later." Low: "Can't do it. I have to wait for the telephone repair person to come."

2.2.3 Generating and selecting plans

This subsection deals with the way influence plans are generated in accordance with the goals; and the selection of appropriate ones for anticipated actions in persuasion. According to Dillard (2004: 194), once the desire to influence has emerged, "individuals will initially search long-term memory for boiler-plate plans that are likely to achieve the primary goal". Moreover, Dillard assumes that persuaders choose from their already existing collection of plans, those which are adequate for the anticipated actions – measured in abstraction, complexity and completeness (2004: 194).

Dillard (2004: 194) further assumes that, in a situation where the pre-existing plans are relegated as less than satisfactory in connection with the importance of the primary goal, "individuals will devote additional cognitive effort to:

- making existing plans more complete or more complex; and/or
- creating new plans" (2004: 194).

What's more, Dillard labels this scenario as "top-down planning," that is restricted by the recognition that "successful interaction partially depends on behaviour of the target" (2004: 194). Additionally, Dillard indicates that, should the source consider those reactions as unforeseeable, s/he will be less inclined "to expend cognitive effort in the service of plan development" (2004: 194); and "the number of plans viewed as adequate should show a negative correspondence with goal structure complexity" (2004: 194-5). In the same vein, Dillard (2004: 195) cautions that there exists a variety of numerous means applicable in achieving primary goal, where none of the secondary goals is triggered; and considers it a

challenge for persuaders to revise plans congruent in presenting episodes high in goal structure convolution.

As Dillard (2004: 195) would put it, the availability of multiple plans or plan variations forces the message source to “select among them. The GPA model assumes that selection is made with regard to finding a satisfactory configuration of primary and secondary goals.” In addition, Dillard points out that though the afore-mentioned contemplative process may be drawn out, this does not mean that the conversation moves so fast – as there are “detailed accounts of the cognitive operations involved in plan generation and selection” (2004: 195)).

For Dillard and Marshall (2003: 485), every skilled attempt at persuasion “is predicated on the source’s prediction about how the recipient will respond to the message;” the accuracy of which rests on predictions that may be maximised “by knowledge of the recipient’s ability and motivation to process the message as well as his or her processing goals” (2003: 485). Moreover, the co-authors take into cognizance that information about ability, motivation, and goals is not easy to come by. Additionally, Dillard and Marshall (2003: 485) postulate that if the audience comprises more than one person, “they may vary on any or all of these three variables.”

Also, Dillard and Marshall (2003: 486) view cultural information as an important issue to observe in message planning – and in accordance with anthropologists’ perspective, define culture as “the totality of the behaviour patterns, beliefs, values, language, and practices shared by a large group of people living in some definable geographic area.” Besides, Dillard and Marshall provide a list of dimensions used to characterise various cultures as: (a) individualism versus collectivism, (b) power distance, (c) femininity versus masculinity, (d) uncertainty, and (e) long-term versus short-term orientation to life (2003: 486).

According to Dillard and Marshall (2003: 486), probably the most researched of the above culture characteristics is individualism versus collectivism – the distinction of which, they claim, rests on the observation that “some cultures emphasise the rights and responsibilities of individuals (i.e., individualistic cultures)” (2003: 486); whereas in other cultures the group “is seen as more important than any of the individuals that compose it (i.e., collectivistic cultures)” (2003: 486). On this basis, Dillard and Marshall suggest that if individualism-collectivism is, in fact, “an important determinant of persuasion” (2003: 486), then individuals might expect to see its manifestations “in products of the mass media” (2003: 486).

According to Dillard and Marshall (2003: 486), matching the appeal to a cultural value “is more effective than the alternative.” In addition, the co-authors postulate that members of individualistic cultures “do respond more favourably to appeals to self-benefit” (2003: 486); whereas, in contrast, members of collectivistic cultures “are relatively more susceptible to

other-benefit messages” (2003: 486). In view of the preceding findings, Dillard and Marshall (2003: 486) advance that use of cultural information requires the assumption that “all members of the category are interchangeable” (2003: 486); though they take cognizance of the fact that “cultures do value some things over others” (2003: 486), as there exists huge variation “in the extent to which those values are internalised among members of a given culture” (2003: 486).

Another aspect that Dillard and Marshall (2003: 487) consider important in planning, is that of sociological information – which they define as “that which locates individuals with regard to groups.” Moreover, Dillard and Marshall (2003: 487) advance that demographic data, one form of sociological information, “are relatively objective features of individuals that provide the basis for certain social categories such as gender, age, race, income, and level of education.” In addition, the co-authors view information of this kind as quite inexpensive to gather, and claim that it is put to heavy use by marketing enterprises and political campaigns.

Further, Dillard and Marshall aver that although demographic information suffers from the same problems of generalization related to cultural information, “the problems exist to a lesser degree”(2003: 487); as sociological groupings are usually narrower “than cultural groupings” (2003: 487), since sociological data “are typically used in conjunction with cultural data” (2003: 487). Furthermore, Dillard and Marshall (2003: 487) observe that, while membership in a number of demographically defined groups “is largely a matter of fate”, individuals do make choices “about becoming elements in other social categories” (2003: 487). Further still, Dillard and Marshall observe that groups are “constructed around particular causes or values” (2003: 487), and that knowledge of group membership “may permit relatively accurate inferences about an individual’s related beliefs and attitudes” (2003: 487).

Having discussed the sociological information above, Dillard and Marshall (2003: 487) embark on psychological trait information, which they regard as an aspect “concerned with the mental make-up of the message recipient.” Now, Dillard and Marshall (2003: 487) pose rhetorical questions concerning values that an individual holds; his/her likes and dislikes; his/her being either introvert or extrovert; and, his/her quarrelsomeness or agreeableness. Moreover, the co-authors postulate that all these rhetorical questions “are concerned with the psychological make-up of individuals” (2003: 487). In addition, Dillard and Marshall (2003: 487) give situational examples of trait information applications, and suggest that since it speaks more to mental functioning, “knowledge of trait information about the message recipient permits a source to make predictions with greater specificity than either cultural or sociological data alone.”

Yet Dillard and Marshall (2003: 487) observe that people may possess different goals “for processing a persuasive message: accuracy motivated, defence motivated, and impression motivated.” In view of this observation, Dillard and Marshall (2003: 487) urge that whichever of these goals is activated is “largely determined by the way in which the audience member is involved with the message.” According to Dillard and Marshall (2003: 487), the above goals operate in the manner explicated below.

First, accuracy goals “result from the perception that the message describes some circumstance with tangible positive or negative consequences for the recipient or someone close to him or her” (2003: 487). In this regard, Dillard and Marshall presume that the possibility of substantial consequences “encourages systematic, accuracy-motivated message processing” (2003: 487). In contrast, Dillard and Marshall (2003: 487) claim that “when the issue is viewed as trivial, heuristic processing is the result.” When something substantial is at stake, according to the co-authors, “individuals are willing to devote more effort to evaluating the message” (2003: 487); and when the issue is unimportant, “most individuals are content with the ‘good-enough’ solutions that are the result of heuristic processing” (2003: 488);

Second, defence processing takes place “when audience members relate to the message or topic in a way that has implications for their self-concept” (2003: 488). In addition, Dillard and Marshall opine that messages that run counter to an individual’s values, world view, or past actions “are likely to prompt defence-motivated processing” (2003: 488); “to enhance or maintain” an individual’s self-concept” (2003: 488). Moreover, Dillard and Marshall advance that the primary mechanism for obtaining this “is selective information processing” (2003: 488); and

Third, Dillard and Marshall surmise that impression-motivated processing is “primarily concerned with the interpersonal consequences associated with expressing a given judgement in a particular social situation” (2003: 488). Besides, the co-authors opine that a required state for stimulating an impression management goal “is the presence of others whose opinion or relationship the message recipient sees as significant” (2003: 488). On the other hand, Dillard and Marshall (2003: 488) claim that impression-motivated processing might emanate from the expectation that people would eventually learn about other’s stand on the issue “via interpersonal or mediated channels.” Besides, Dillard and Marshall (2003: 488) posit that the goal of impression management “might promote either deep or superficial [concerns], depending on the magnitude of the anticipated interpersonal consequences.”

According to Wilson and Sabee (2003: 21), interactants differ not only in their goals, but “also in their procedural knowledge (plans) for coordinating multiple goals as well as skill at

enacting plans.” These co-authors describe plans as “knowledge structures representing actions necessary for overcoming obstacles and accomplishing goals” (2003: 21). Further, Wilson and Sabee (2003: 21) draw a line of demarcation between plans and strategies as follows: “Plans are mental representations of actions, whereas strategies are overt behaviours exhibited by individuals.”

Moreover, Wilson and Sabee (2003: 21) claim that plans for accomplishing social goals “vary in complexity and specificity.” For instance, they postulate that complex plans “include a large number of action units than simple plans [...] [and] also include contingencies...” (2003: 21). An example given here is of a teacher’s plan of communicating with a student dissatisfied with a grade, by sitting down with him/her and explain how such a grade was achieved. According to these co-authors, this example indicates that specific plans “are fleshed out in detail, whereas abstract plans provide only vague guidelines for action” (2003: 21). Further, Wilson and Sabee (2003: 21) aver that a vague plan for dealing with a dissatisfied student is merely ‘talk about the grade.’

As Wilson and Sabee (2003: 21) would put it, plan complexity and specificity “should facilitate communicative competence in many institutions.” For these co-authors, persons with complex plans “have multiple alternatives should their initial efforts fail; those with specific plans already have considered how to implement abstract acts during conversation itself.”

Further, Wilson and Sabee (2003: 22) advance that, though a number of studies indicate that plan complexity and specificity facilitate communicative competence, the qualifications listed below should be noted.

A complex plan is neither necessary nor sufficient for competent performance. In the former case a simple plan may include an appropriate and effective action that obtains the desired results. In the latter, speakers still need skills to enact a complex plan in an efficient, smooth, and error-free fashion;

Planning too many alternatives in advance itself can undermine fluid speech performance;

The relationship between plan specificity and competence may vary depending on whether a culture values detailed, short-range plans versus flexible long-range plans; and

Complex and specific plans still must be adapted in light of changing circumstances and unforeseen opportunities during interaction [...] even though such changes are cognitively taxing.

In addition, Wilson and Sabee (2003: 22) define planning as “the set of psychological and communication processes” that are employed in “generating, selecting, implementing, monitoring, adapting, and coordinating plans” (2003: 22). Moreover, the co-authors surmise that planning “occurs in advance of many interactions” (2003: 22), though a great deal also “occurs on-line as a conversation unfolds” (2003: 22); since competent communicators are “adept at monitoring and adjusting their plans on-line during conversation” (2003: 22).

In line with the foregoing, Wilson and Sabee (2003: 22) claim that individuals with cognitive efficiency are associated with the ease “with which they can develop a pre-interaction plan for persuading others, and hence with their own confidence that the plan will succeed” (2003: 22-3). In the same vein, these co-authors suggest that plan confidence, in turn, “predicts whether individuals actually carry out their plans” (2003: 23). Further, Wilson and Sabee advance that communication competence “is evident in people’s ability to deploy, monitor, and adjust plans efficiently during interaction” (2003: 23).

In his reference to plans, Hosman (2002: 371) centres his argument on language and persuasion. He claims that his chapter’s aim is to review research that has examined “the persuasive impact of various components of language” (2002: 371), in particular, “a structural component and a use component” (2002: 371). Further, Hosman (2002: 371) posits that the structural component “focuses on the hierarchical organization of language and consists of several parts,” the relevant ones for his chapter being “phonology, syntax, lexicon, and texts or narratives” (2002: 371). Further, Hosman (2002: 371) defines these four parts of the structural component in the following manner:

- **Phonology** deals with a language’s sound system and how sounds are combined into meaningful units;
- **Syntax** addresses the rules underlying the construction of sentences;
- The **lexicon** originally referred to the vocabulary of a language. More recently, study of the lexicon has diversified [...] and includes a language’s words and meanings, idioms, abbreviations, euphemisms, and other meaningful units; and
- **Texts** or **narratives** are ‘self-contained units of discourse,’ usually with some form of internal organization. Often text is a frame of reference for the interpretation of a language’s phonological, grammatical, and lexical elements (2002: 371).

According to Hosman (2002: 371), the use component’s focus is on the way speakers use language in communicative contexts; which includes, among others, regional, ethnic and social, as well as pragmatic variations in language use. In view of the foregoing, Hosman proposes that these individual parts are interrelated, with fuzzy boundaries among them – as

speakers are capable of using various lexical elements in different situations for varying purposes.

In an attempt at answering the question: What effects do variations in the phonological, syntactical, lexical, textual, and use elements of a message have on persuasion? Hosman (2002: 372) has this to say: "...variations in nearly all of the levels of language can be important." In line with the foregoing, Hosman indicates that language variations affect "one of three elements of the persuasion process: judgements of the speaker, message comprehension or recall, or attitude toward the message" (2002: 372); and he quickly points out that many studies have placed their focus "on judgements of the speaker."

In relation with the above judgements, Hosman (2002: 372) surmises that the assumption is that language variation affects the impression formation process, and in a persuasion context an important impression affected is that of the speaker. Language variations may affect listeners' judgements of a speaker's source credibility, attractiveness, likeability and/or similarity. Other research has examined the impact of language variation of listeners' comprehension, recall, and/or understanding of a message. Finally, some research has investigated the effect of language variations on attitude toward the message.

Also, Hosman (2002: 372) postulates that research focussing on judgements of the speaker and message comprehension or recall "implicitly assumes that effects in these two areas will ultimately affect attitude toward the message and persuasion. That is, ... if a particular language variation has a positive impact on speaker credibility, it will also have a positive impact on attitude toward the message."

Under phonological level, Hosman (2002: 372) assumes that the research that is relevant to persuasion "focuses on the perceptual outcomes of different sound combinations." For example, "men's and women's first names could be distinguished by their phonetic attributes [...] At least at the level of impression formation, a speaker's name might have persuasive implications," as Hosman (2002: 372-3) puts it. Under syntactic level, Hosman (2002: 373) advances that sentences may differ with their complexity, which leads to either clear understanding or comprehension difficulty – as the assumption is that those with more complex grammatical structure are considered as more difficult to comprehend. Hosman (2002: 373) claims that this comprehension difficulty "could affect the persuasion process negatively, presumably because comprehension of a message is an antecedent to persuasion or attitude change." For Hosman, this assumption is "consistent with information processing models of persuasion" (2002: 373).

According to Hosman (2002: 373), research has discovered that positively worded statements are comprehended with more ease than negative ones. For him, this result is in

agreement with other psycholinguistic research that has discovered that “negative grammatical transformations are more complex than positive [ones] because they either require a longer time to process [...] or tax the cognitive system more during processing” (2002: 373).

Under lexical diversity, Hosman (2002: 374) surmises that a high-status speaker exhibiting high lexical diversity “was perceived positively,” while one exhibiting low lexical diversity, “was perceived negatively” (2002: 374). Another finding, according to Hosman (2002: 375), is in connection with lying, where it has been found that “those who lie or are duplicitous exhibit higher lexical diversity than do those who do not lie [...] the process of lying requires speakers to plan their utterances more carefully, thus increasing the use of new words.”

According to Hosman (2002: 375), “the richness of a speaker’s vocabulary is related to listeners’ judgements about a speaker’s credibility or status.” Further, Hosman claims that the preference for complexity principle “would suggest that high lexical diversity would have a positive effect on the persuasion process” (2002: 375).

Concerning equivocal language, Hosman (2002: 377) advances that one choice communicators have to make is “how clear or how vague to be in a persuasion context;” whether for one to state one’s clear and unequivocal position on controversial subjects such as abortion, or be equivocal and vague in expressing one’s views. Hosman (2002: 377) surmises that, though some view equivocation negatively, strategic ambiguity plays a valuable role in organizations – it “helps to build consensus on abstract goals, such as a mission statement, while simultaneously allowing for individual interpretations of these goals.”

Additionally, Hosman (2002: 377) regards equivocation as tantamount to vagueness, and say that “equivocal, attitudinally incongruent messages led to higher ratings of speaker character, greater message acceptance, and greater recall of argument content than did unequivocal, attitudinally incongruent messages.” Moreover, Hosman (2002: 378) states that equivocation messages “avoid one of four elements in a communicative situation: sender, content, receiver, or context;” and that such message “may avoid showing whether the message is a speaker’s own opinion” (2002: 378) or not. What’s more, Hosman claims that a speaker using the expression ‘noted authorities say’ “is not clearly saying whether it is his or her opinion, and the message is therefore equivocal” (2002: 378). Further, Hosman (2002: 378) indicates that a message “may be viewed as equivocal for its lack of a clear content” – which is consistent with the operational definition: “An equivocal message does not address a particular receiver in the setting” (2002: 378).

Also, Hosman (2002: 380) posits that power of speech consists of two links, “power of speech style and the persuasion process. The first is an indirect link among power style, impression formation, and attitude change.” He says that, in accordance with researches, a powerful speech style “will enhance a speaker’s perceived credibility, and to the extent these impressions will positively affect attitude change, a powerful style should be more persuasive.” Further, Hosman (2002: 380) advances that powerful speech style did not induce more attitude change than powerless ones. Furthermore, this author postulates that powerful speech style “resulted in a more favourable verdict than did powerless style” (2002: 380).

For Salovey, Schneider, and Apanovitch (2002: 391), psychological research on attitude change has focused “primarily on one of three aspects of persuasive communication:

- the source of persuasive message (e.g., the communicator’s expertise, credibility, trustworthiness, attractiveness, and similarity to the recipient);
- the recipient of the message (e.g., his or her knowledge about the attitude domain, experience with the attitude object, and demographic and dispositional characteristics expected to be associated with influence-ability); and
- aspects of the message itself” (2002: 391).

According to Salovey et al. (2002: 391), of the afore-mentioned areas of research activity, “message variables have been studied the least systematically, although interesting findings have emerged.” These authors advance that fear-arousing appeals usually become effective only when there are instructions on how the fear is to be reduced in the message. Further, Salovey et al. (2002: 392) propose that messages encouraging personal responsibility can provide more motivation than those that assign responsibility to others. Furthermore, Salovey et al. (2002: 392) claim that forcefully delivered messages “are more persuasive than subtle ones,” and that messages which are “delivered quickly (even if by fast-talking salespeople) are surprisingly more effective than leisurely delivered messages” (2002: 392).

In addition, Salovey et al. (2002: 392) surmise that message framing is an aspect of messages that has been studied quite systematically in the context of health and illness; and they define the aspects as follows:

- **Message framing** refers specifically to the emphasis in the message on the positive or negative consequences of adopting or failing to adopt a particular health-relevant behaviour:

- **Gain-framed** messages usually present the benefits that are accrued through adopting the behaviour (e.g., “Obtaining a mammogram allows tumours to be detected early; this maximises your treatment options”); and
- **Loss-framed** messages generally convey the costs of not adopting the requested behaviour (e.g., “If you do not obtain a mammogram, tumours cannot be detected early; this minimises your treatment options”).

Additionally, Salovey et al. (2002: 392) advance that prospect theory “provides the context for understanding the psychological processes involved in the influence of framed persuasive messages on health behaviour [...] [and] was proposed to understand decision making under conditions of uncertainty.” The framing postulate, according to Salovey et al. (2002: 392), proposes that “decision makers organise information in memory relevant to such decisions in terms of potential gains (i.e., costs) as compared to a current reference point (e.g., one’s current level of health.” These authors suggest that factually equivalent stuff may be presented discrepantly to individuals so that its encoding reflects either a gain or loss from this reference point.

In an attempt to illustrate the way the above suggestion could operate, Salovey et al. (2002: 392) present a situation in which two groups of individuals were offered two options from which they would work on:

- An outbreak of a disease is expected to kill 600 people. The participants were presented with gain-frame information. They had to engage themselves in a program guaranteeing that 200 of the original number would be **saved** or one claiming that there was a .33 probability that all 600 would be saved but also a .67 probability that no one would be saved. Note that although the “expected value” of the programs was identical, the first option emphasised a **certain** outcome, but the second emphasised a **probabilistic** or **risky** outcome. The concerned participants overwhelmingly selected the first option, the certain outcome, in which 200 people were guaranteed to be saved.
- A second group was presented with the same two options. However, this time, the potential losses were emphasised. In this comparison, participants had to choose between a first program in which 400 of the original 600 people would certainly **die** and one in which there was the same .33 probability that no one would die and a .67 probability that all would die. Once again, the expected value of these two options was identical. Furthermore, these two options differ from the two previous options only in that they make salient the potential costs or losses (i.e., deaths) as compared

to the options that made salient potential benefits or gains (i.e., lives saved). In the loss salient situation, participants overwhelmingly chose the second option, in which there was a .67 probability that everyone would die (2002: 392).

In view of the above-captioned findings, Salovey et al. (2002: 393) postulate that, when losses are anticipated, “people no longer prefer the option that is a sure bet. Rather, they choose the option that involves some uncertainty or risk.” Further, Salovey et al. (2002: 393) observe that the value function of prospect theory summarises these decision strategies by noting that individuals are, in general, “**risk seeking** in the domain of losses but **risk averse** in the domain of gains.” Furthermore, the authors opine that the value function “assumes that an S-shaped function relates outcomes to their subjective values” (2002: 393), and that the function is “concave for gains and convex for losses and steeper in the loss domain” (2002: 393). Further still, Salovey et al. claim that when the behavioural choices involve some risk or uncertainty, “individuals will be more likely to take these risks when information is framed in terms of the relative disadvantages (i.e., losses or costs) of the behavioural options. At the same time, conservative or risk-averse options are preferred when gains are made salient” (2002: 393).

Besides, Salovey et al. (2002: 393) postulate that loss-framed persuasive messages stimulate individuals into opting for negative consequences of their choices – as they are motivated by the associated subjective unpleasantness into some form of loss aversion. In addition, Salovey et al. (2002: 393) surmise that, in accordance with prospect theory, “people are subsequently more likely to engage in a risky behaviour (i.e., a behaviour with an uncertain outcome) if there is a possibility of avoiding the loss.” By contrast, exposure to gain-framed messages may “cause people to feel less endangered, making them less likely to perform a behaviour with uncertain outcomes,” as Salovey et al. (2002: 393) put it.

In line with the fore-going findings, Salovey et al. (2002: 394) hereby advance what they call the main hypothesis guiding their program of research as follows:

Gain-framed messages are more persuasive when promoting prevention behaviours, but loss-framed messages are more persuasive when promoting early detection (screening) behaviours (authors’ emphasis).

Further, Salovey et al. (2002: 394) posit that gain-framed messages can concentrate on achieving desirable results “or not attaining (avoiding) an undesirable outcome – both beneficial.” These authors hereby provide a comparison of two messages as follows:

- If you decide to get HIV tested, you may feel the peace of mind that comes with knowing about your health; to

- If you decide to get HIV tested, you may feel less anxious because you won't wonder whether you are ill" (2002: 394).

In line with the above, Salovey et al. (2002: 394) aver that, on the other hand, loss-framed messages can stress attaining "an undesirable outcome or not attaining a desirable outcome – both costly; and offer the following examples for comparison:

- If you decide not to get HIV tested, you may feel more anxious because you may wonder whether you are ill; to
- If you decide not to get tested, you won't feel the peace of mind that comes with knowing about your health" (2002: 394).

In view of the above-captioned argument on message-framing, Salovey et al. (2002: 400) suggest that "individuals tend to be guided by two general motives: safety (the avoidance of negative outcomes) and nurturance (the attainment of positive outcomes)." In addition, Salovey et al. (2002: 400) assert that "prevention-focused individuals are more likely to be motivated to take action by any message that emphasises undesirable outcomes," while promotion-focused individuals "are more likely to be persuaded by messages that emphasise desirable outcomes" (2002: 400). Consequently, Salovey et al. (2002: 402) assert that framed messages "motivate an individual to consider the affective consequences of initiating (or being prevented from initiating) a health behaviour;" and that anticipated affect "motivates salubrious action" (2002: 402).

According to Sopory and Dillard (2002: 407), public discourse has an abundance of "figurative comparisons designed to change people's minds;" and they view metaphor as "the typical trope of comparison in such messages" (2002: 407). It is important for this study, therefore, to comprehend the nuances surrounding the use of metaphor as a form of persuasive language device that may be employed during the planning stage in persuasion. Accordingly, Sopory and Dillard (2002: 407) pose the following two questions upon which their discussion is based:

- Do we know whether figurative comparisons in persuasive message are really effective? And if so,
- what is the process by which they achieve their impact? (2002: 407).

Further, Sopory and Dillard (2002: 407) define a metaphor as "a linguistic phrase of the form 'A is B', such that a comparison is suggested between the two terms leading to a transfer of attributes associated with B to A." In line with this definition, Sopory and Dillard (2002: 407) view the two terms, A and B, as "representing different concepts or conceptual domains,"

though they observe that different theoreticians have employed various terminologies for describing the two parts. In relation with the foregoing observation, Sopory and Dillard refer to the more recent use as “**target** and **base** (e.g., Gentner, 1983) for A and B, respectively.”

Furthermore, Sopory and Dillard (2002: 407) advance that simile, analogy, and personification “cognitively function similar to metaphor in that all three also involve comparison of concepts or systems of concepts,” though they differ in some respects. In view of this understanding, these co-authors suggest that the study of these other literary entities is “generally subsumed into that of metaphor” (2002: 407); and they claim that they “use **metaphor** as a general term to refer to all tropes of comparison” (2002: 407).

According to Sopory and Dillard (2002: 408), the word metaphor usually denotes a particular language use or its characteristic, known “as **linguistic metaphor**” – in which sense metaphor is “a rhetorical property that is observed in spoken or written language” (2002: 408). Two other ways in which metaphor is used, according to these co-authors, are: “as a cognitive process and as a cognitive structure” (2002: 408). As a linguistic property, metaphor is viewed by Sopory and Dillard (2002: 408) as “a conceptual process by which one mental entity is understood via mapping to another mental entity [...] commonly referred to as metaphorical processing or reasoning.” Further, Sopory and Dillard (2002: 408) surmise that, in the second instance, metaphor is “a structure inherent in mental entities that come about as a consequence of a cognitive mapping process,” known as “**conceptual metaphors**” (2002: 408). These co-authors suggest that their discussion in this chapter encapsulates all the three senses, and distinguishes them where need arises.

Sopory and Dillard (2002: 408) draw a distinction between linguistic metaphors as novel and conventionalised or ‘dead’ metaphors in the following manner:

- Novel metaphors, sometimes inaccurately conflated with metaphor itself, are expressions whose equation of target with a base creates new information about the target (e.g., “This new legislation is no ordinary headache pill,” provides novel information about the new legislation); and
- Conventionalised metaphors (also called ‘frozen’ metaphors) are figurative comparisons that were once novel but with repeated use have been completely absorbed into the conventions of everyday language (e.g., ‘the **arm** of a chair,’ ‘time just **flew** by’). Such metaphors are not immediately recognised as metaphors.

Sopory and Dillard (2002: 408) postulate that natural language is so pervaded with conventionalised metaphor that it is taxing to draw a distinction between metaphorical and literal language. Notwithstanding this observation, these co-authors suggest that it is

important to process some sort of discrimination between metaphoric and literal language. Accordingly, “it may be proper to study message (or language) effects on attitudes using a metaphor-literal distinction,” Sopory and Dillard (2002: 408) would say.

In line with the foregoing suggestion, Sopory and Dillard (2002: 408) pose the question: “Do metaphor-using messages exert a greater effect on attitude and communicator credibility than do literal messages?” In an attempt to answer the rhetorical question, Sopory and Dillard (2002: 409) make reference to 29 data-based studies “with a metaphor versus literal experimental design and attitude as the dependent variable” that were used in a meta-analysis. According to these co-authors, the studies identified many moderator variables of interest “based on their potential for influencing the persuasion process, including number of metaphors, extendedness of metaphors, position of metaphors, familiarity of target, novelty of metaphors, modality of presentation, and communicator credibility” (2002: 409).

Sopory and Dillard (2002: 409) advance nine propositions upon which their meta-analysis of the project and findings are based:

Proposition 1: **Relative to their literal counterparts, metaphorical messages are more likely to produce greater attitude change.** Under this proposition, the co-authors aver that the results indicated that metaphor-using messages “do exhibit a small persuasive edge over literal-only messages for attitude change ($r = .07$). This relationship was positive across all moderator variable conditions except 2.” In the same vein, Sopory and Dillard (2002: 409) posit, after a lot of arguing, that the effect of metaphor on attitude “is in the same order as other observed effects in persuasion research. Moreover, the effect of metaphor becomes more pronounced when particular moderator variables are taken into account, as the results that follow show.” And then they delve into the second proposition.

Proposition 2: **Use of 1 metaphor is associated with greater attitude change than is use of larger numbers.** According to Sopory and Dillard (2002: 409), a metaphor-using persuasive message “may contain any number of metaphors.” These co-authors surmise that, in accordance with the message pool collated from various studies,

“three ranges of metaphor use were identified: 1, 2 to 8, and 9 or more,” [and] “it was 1 metaphor that was associated with maximum attitude change ($r = .08$)...Thus, less may be more when it comes to using figurative comparisons in a persuasive message, as there is a decreasing suasory effect with increasing number” (2002: 409).

Proposition 3: **Extended metaphors are associated with greater attitude change than are non-extended metaphors.** Sopory and Dillard (2002: 409) aver that metaphors “may be extended or non-extended.” They suggest that an extended metaphor “uses one base to

construct a number of different sub-metaphors with the same target.” In the same vein, Sopory and Dillard (2002: 409) allege that by contrast, a non-extended metaphor “uses a given base only once to suggest a comparison with a target.” The effect sizes gained from the meta-analysis, according to Sopory and Dillard (2002: 409-10), indicated that “extended metaphors ($r = .09$) were associated with greater attitude change than were non-extended metaphors ($r = .05$).” Based on these findings, Sopory and Dillard (2002: 410) posit that a message intending to employ multiple metaphors for affecting attitude “may be better off using the same base repeatedly than using many distinct bases.”

Proposition 4: Metaphors are associated with greater attitude change when positioned in the introduction of a message, rather than in the conclusion or the body of the message. Sopory and Dillard (2002: 410) indicate that metaphor may be placed at the beginning, middle or at the conclusion of a message. Sopory and Dillard (2002: 410) infer that the effect sizes from the meta-analysis showed that “metaphors were more persuasive when placed in the introduction ($r = .12$) than when placed in the body ($r = .07$) or conclusion ($r = -.01$) of a message.” Similarly, in the case of a message with multiple metaphors, “a trope may first appear in the message in the introduction, the body, or the conclusion of the message,” Sopory and Dillard (2002: 410) advance. In view of the foregoing, Sopory and Dillard (2002: 410) conclude that “using a metaphor to provide a title to a message or to frame a message at the beginning may be more persuasive than using it to summarise the message.”

Proposition 5: Metaphors are associated with greater attitude change when there is high familiarity of the target than when there is low familiarity. Sopory and Dillard suggest that the target and base of a metaphor “may have varying degrees of familiarity for a message recipient;” and that, to facilitate the movement of information “from base to target (as a metaphor does), the familiarity of the base is generally high” (2002: 410). In contrast with the foregoing, according to Sopory and Dillard (2002: 410), “the target term of a metaphor (typically the attitude object) may be familiar or unfamiliar to an audience of a particular message.” To elaborate this issue, the co-authors give examples of making references to unfamiliar systems or operations to the target audiences, which, in essence, would strike a miniature motivational or persuasive cord to such an audience – whereas, in contrast, familiar references are expected to persuade the same audience’s attitude/s to a high level, due to familiarity of target term.

Sopory and Dillard (2002: 410) advance that the effect sizes from the meta-analysis “showed that metaphors were more persuasive when there was high familiarity of the target ($r = .07$) than when there was low familiarity ($r = .06$).” On the base of this finding, these co-authors

suggest that “familiarity with the target of a metaphor may foster enhanced persuasion” (2002: 410).

Proposition 6: **Metaphors are associated with greater attitude change when more novel than when less novel.** Sopory and Dillard (2002: 410), urge that novelty of a metaphor “for a given message recipient may be defined in terms of knowledge of the similarities between the two terms of a metaphor [...] novelty of an ‘A is B’ equation depends on whether the similarities between A and B exist in the minds of a message recipient prior to encountering the metaphor.” The example provided here is that of someone who is said to have ‘a heart of gold’, which is regarded as of low novelty, as the correspondences of A and B are quite familiar in the minds of the concerned audience/s.

In contrast with the familiar example applied above, Sopory and Dillard (2002: 410) provide the following stanza from a classical Sanscrit poem: ‘Now the great cloud cat, darting out his lightning tongue, licks the creamy moonlight from the saucepan of the sky,’ which they consider as of high novelty, “because (most likely) the similarities between **cloud** and **cat** do not exist for readers prior to comprehending this metaphor” (2002: 410). These co-authors propose that the emphasis of the focus is to be “on the familiarity of the similarities between the terms and not the familiarity of the target and base themselves per se” (2002: 410); as people may possess “high familiarity with the terms **cloud** and **cat**, yet similarities with the two entities may not have occurred in their minds “prior to encountering the metaphoric expression” (2002: 410).

According to Sopory and Dillard (2002: 410), the effect sizes of the meta-analysis “showed that novel metaphors ($r = .12$) were associated with more attitude change than were non-novel ones ($r = .1$). In line with this analysis, these co-authors postulate that “metaphors that create new similarities between entities, as their function has been traditionally described, may be more persuasive than ones that do not produce such new linkages” (2002: 410).

Proposition 7: **Metaphors in the audio modality are associated with greater attitude change than are metaphors in the written modality.** Sopory and Dillard (2002: 411) observe that persuasion is encountered by people through a variety of media, such as print, radio and television. These co-authors also claim that the effect sizes from the meta-analysis “revealed that metaphors presented in the audio modality were more persuasive ($r = .09$) than those presented in the written modality ($r = .06$)” (2002: 411). Based on this premise, Sopory and Dillard (2002: 411) aver that “metaphor-using messages may be more effective when listening, when one can process a message only once in a limited amount of time, than when reading, which allows for more processing time as well as multiple reviews of the message.”

Proposition 8: **Metaphor messages used by low-credibility communicators are associated with greater attitude change than those used by high-credibility communicators.** In accordance with Sopory and Dillard (2002: 411), message recipients may regard communicators as either possessing high or low credibility before message processing. Further, Sopory and Dillard (2002: 411) reveal that meta-analysis' indicated that "messages containing metaphors were associated with greater attitude change when the communicators had low credibility ($r = .12$) than when the communicators had high credibility ($r = .02$)." Based on this ground, Sopory and Dillard (2002: 411) conclude that message sources with low credibility "may benefit more from using metaphors to affect attitudes than may message sources with high credibility."

Sopory and Dillard (2002: 411) go a step further to discuss effect of metaphor on communicator competence, character, and dynamism judgements. They postulate that perceptions of credibility of a communicator "can be determined at two points during message processing:

- pre-message, or before the audience members process a message (initial credibility); and
- post-message, or after the receivers process the message (terminal credibility)" (2002: 411).

In the same vein, Sopory and Dillard (2002: 411) claim that metaphor's persuasive effects "can also be assessed in terms of its impact on judgements of terminal credibility" Furthermore, Sopory and Dillard (2002: 411) observe that many scholars have asserted that speakers who employ metaphoric language "are judged more favourably than those who use literal language." Additionally, these co-authors advance, however, that credibility is a construct associated with other subcomponents, including the following as most common: competence, character, and dynamism.

Proposition 9: **Metaphors are more likely to be effective for enhancing terminal communicator credibility judgements for dynamism aspect than for competence and character aspects.** Sopory and Dillard (2002: 411) suggest that, of the three post-message credibility facets, "the effect of metaphor was functionally non-existent for character and competence aspects. For the **competence** aspect of credibility, the effect size r was $- .01$." Further, Sopory and Dillard disclose that "analysis of the moderator variable of initial (low and high) credibility showed the same null results [...] no effect of metaphor on the **character** aspect of credibility ($r = - .02$)" (2002: 411).

According to Sopory and Dillard (2002: 411), for both low and high initial credibility communicators “use of metaphors again did not affect character judgements [...] the **r** for **dynamism** was .06” (2002: 411); and that “the effect for both low- and high-credibility communicators was positive” (2002: 411). On this basis, Sopory and Dillard (2002: 411-2) postulate that of the three facets of terminal credibility, “metaphor has its strongest effect on judgements of communicator dynamism.”

Having discussed the nine propositions above, this study now addresses itself to theories of metaphor and persuasion, as delineated by these co-authors. Sopory and Dillard (2002: 413) suggest that there are five general views of metaphor and persuasion “in the existing empirical literature” (2002: 413) that attempt to explain the process by which “metaphor achieves its suasive outcomes,” (2002: 413) such as “pleasure/relief, communicator credibility, cognitive resources, stimulated elaboration, and superior organization” (2002: 413).

The following is the delineation of the theories, as viewed by Sopory and Dillard (2002: 413ff).

Pleasure/Relief: According to Sopory and Dillard (2002: 413), pleasure/relief view “stems from the assumptions of the literal primacy view,” with two variants, both of which argue “that a metaphorical expression is a semantic anomaly, recognition of which leads to negative tension that gets relieved when the metaphorical meaning is finally understood” (2002: 413). These co-authors provide the terms given to the three steps in the persuasion literature as “**perception of defect/error, conflict (or recoil), and resolution**” (2002: 413). Further, Sopory and Dillard (2002: 413) advance that the process of going through these three steps results in “dissipates the negative tension, leading to relief. The reward of pleasure and relief leads to a reinforcement of the metaphorical meaning and the evaluation associated with it.”

Consequently, Sopory and Dillard, draw a contrast that “literal language does not pose any linguistic puzzle to resolve and consequently yields neither pleasure nor relief” (2002: 413). Additionally, Sopory and Dillard (2002: 414), advance that their meta-analysis “did not speak directly to the reinforcement principle of the pleasure/relief view,” (2002: 414) and view the literal primacy view as suggesting “that the literal meaning of an expression is obligatorily understood before the metaphorical meaning is understood” (2002: 414). The co-authors deduce that, as such, the comprehension of a metaphor has to take longer than that of literal language – which in essence indicates the importance of written language; as it provides the reader with an opportunity to comprehend a message, and simultaneously, “depressing the likelihood of pleasure/relief in the audio modality” ((2002: 414).

Once more, Sopory and Dillard (2002: 414) provide yet another paradox, that the results of their analysis showed that “audio modality was more persuasive” than written modality. Based on these findings, the Sopory and Dillard (2002: 414) postulate that “the pleasure/relief view of metaphor’s persuasive advantage does not have any empirical support.”

Communicator Credibility: Sopory and Dillard (2002: 414) urge that the enhancement of communicator credibility view “proposes that communicators who use metaphors are judged more credible than are those who use literal language.” Basing themselves on this premise, these co-authors suggest further that this presupposes a greater persuasion by regarding the message advocacy more positively, and therefore leading to higher credibility judgement. Furthermore, Sopory and Dillard (2002: 414), quote Aristotle’s *Poetics*, where he referred to masters of metaphor as geniuses, that “metaphors are exceptional language and are like ‘ornaments’ on the literal language that are used only by poets and writers, not by ordinary folks in everyday discourse.” Contrary to the foregoing quotation borrowed from Aristotle, Sopory and Dillard (2002: 415) advance a contradictory statement that metaphors “are not mere ornaments on literal language used only by poets and writers; rather, they are common in everyday language.” Premised on this statement, Sopory and Dillard (2002: 415) posit that “use of metaphor does not seem to require any special genius, and as such, there is little reason to expect its use to enhance credibility, at least as related to expertise and character of a communicator.”

Cognitive Resources: Sopory and Dillard aver that two views of metaphor and persuasion employ the assumption “that understanding metaphors demands more cognitive resources than does understanding literal language.” With reference to what Sopory and Dillard (2002: 415) call **reduced counter-arguments** view, the process of metaphor comprehension, according to these co-authors, “generates a great number of associations that result in ‘an overload in the receiver’s mental circuitry’ (quoting Guthrie). The outcome, according to these authors, “is reduced counter-argumentation and greater agreement with the message advocacy” (2002: 415).

According to Sopory and Dillard (2002: 415), the **resource matching** view is more sophisticated than the above-discussed view above. Sopory and Dillard (2002: 415) suggest that this perspective proposes that “deriving meaning of a metaphorical expression requires elaboration to construct the ground [...] elaboration also requires greater mobilization of cognitive resources.” In line with this suggestion, Sopory and Dillard (2002: 415) surmise that if there is limitation of resources, “then the message (whether pro- or counter-attitudinal) is not adequately understood and persuasion is inhibited; similarly, the persuasive impact of a

message is diluted when excess resources are available [...]because irrelevant and idiosyncratic thoughts are generated.”

On this basis, Sopyry and Dillard (2002: 416) assume that novel metaphoric messages “have a persuasive advantage over literal messages only under resource-enhanced conditions, such as message repetition, where the knowledge generated by repetition, ensures a match of resources to the requirements of a metaphorical message but leads to excess resources for a literal message.” In line with the above-captured discussion, Sopyry and Dillard (2002: 416) state that these two cognitive resources views “are not the ideal candidates for a theoretical explanation of metaphor’s persuasive effects.”

According to Sopyry and Dillard (2002: 416), the stimulated elaboration view is “linked to two different metaphor processing theories.” Relative to Hitchon’s salience imbalance theory, Sopyry and Dillard (2002: 416) indicate that “when the ground is assembled from the common attributes of target and base to comprehend a metaphor, the evaluation (valence) associated with the attributes is also part of the ground [...]formation of the ground requires elaboration of the ground-relevant attributes as well as their associated valence.” In that way, Sopyry and Dillard (2002: 416) posit, “elaboration leads to a greater number of valenced thoughts, which (when in the appropriate direction) lead to greater persuasion.” In contrast with this postulation, Sopyry and Dillard (2002: 416) suggest that “extracting the meaning of a literal expression does not require constructing a ground and hence elaboration of the message content.”

Further, Sopyry and Dillard (2002: 417) claim that the key variable in the stimulated elaboration account “is the number of thoughts generated in response to a metaphorical language message as compared to a literal one.” Furthermore, Sopyry and Dillard (2002: 417) observe that it may be the case that elaboration is “influenced by other variables in tandem with type of language. This idea is developed as a more refined version of the stimulated elaboration hypothesis in the **motivational resonance** view.” On this basis, Sopyry and Dillard (2002: 417) suggest the employment of dual-process approach to persuasion, thus proposing that “metaphoric language creates greater interest in a message than does literal language, thereby increasing motivation to more systematically process the message.”

Further still, Sopyry and Dillard (2002: 417) have this to say:

This motivation to elaborate the message content is moderated by argument strength/quality and prior interest toward the metaphor target. When the quality of message arguments is high and message recipients have a positive interest toward the

metaphor target, such that the metaphor 'resonates' with their prior preferences, maximum elaboration and hence greatest suasion occurs.

In line with the above argumentation, Sopory and Dillard (2002: 417) advance that the number of linguistic expressions "might not be the only processual variable indexing elaboration as an explanation of metaphor's greater persuasive capacity."

Superior Organization: According to Sopory and Dillard (2002: 417) the superior organization view structure mapping theory "proposes that a metaphor helps to better structure and organise the arguments of a persuasive message relative to literal language." Further, these co-authors indicate that a metaphor evokes numerous semantic associations; and that many arguments, when consistent with metaphor, form coherent inter-connection, via semantic pathways. Furthermore, Sopory and Dillard (2002: 417) add that "the links to the metaphor 'highlight' the arguments making them more salient." Further still, Sopory and Dillard (2002: 417-8) posit that, consequently, this more coherent organization, and the resulting highlighting of the arguments, "increases the persuasive power of metaphor-using message;" as opposed to literal-only messages that lack in "organizing function of metaphor and therefore are not as persuasive" (2002: 418).

According to Sopory and Dillard (2002: 418), the results of their meta-analysis tend to support the superior organization view, that metaphors were most persuasive "when extended and when placed in the introduction position of a message." They go further to posit that, as superior organization view implies, "it is only a single metaphor that should provide optimal opportunity for enhanced organization of the message information." Sopory and Dillard (2002: 418) claim that their studies indicated that "receivers showed enhanced attitude change in the desired direction with metaphorical messages than with literal ones." On this basis, the co-authors advance that metaphor may persuade "not only by linking various arguments of a message into a coherent whole but also by organizing the attitude-relevant information into an evaluatively consistent package."

2.3 ACTION AND INTERACTION

This final component of the GPA model is addressed in this subsection with the purpose of discovering how it is modelled, in relation with its above-discussed sister components. It is hoped that this discussion will enrich this study by informing the present researcher of the operations and behaviour of this aspect in the forthcoming chapters involving the analysis. As Wilson and Sabee (2003: 23) put it, the "GPA framework suggests several avenues for improving an individual's communication competence."

According to Dillard (2004: 195), the GPA model was designed "to model the processes by which individuals produce actions intended to alter or maintain the behaviour of others [...]"

This segment [...] addresses theory and research regarding how individuals produce influence behaviours and how, together, two individuals create an interaction.” Further, Dillard (2004: 195) postulates that individuals:

- assess their goals, decide to engage the target, and then move to plan generation and selection [...] this sequence is likely to obtain when the importance of the primary goal substantially outweighs the counter-dynamic represented by the set of relevant, incompatible secondary goals; and
- generate one or more plans that are considered likely to succeed; promote the decision to engage and plan section. For this path to arise, there must be a fairly close matching of the approach and avoidance forces.

Dillard (2004: 195) cautions that “although these two paths are logically distinct possibilities, they need not be approached in a deliberate manner [...] because real-time conversation takes place very quickly, we might expect travel time on these paths to be measured in milliseconds.” Furthermore, Dillard (2004: 195) points out that, since movement from plan selection to tactic is “the translation of cognitive entities empirical action,” this operation must of necessity “involve a host of very rapid, elemental processes, many of which do not involve conscious awareness.” He assumes that the connection from tactic employment to target response presumes a target that deals with the source’s utterance and offers a closely appropriate response.

Dillard (2004: 195-6) assumes that, on the basis of that response, “the source may return to the goal awareness stage and move through the entire process again[as] goals are re-evaluated in light of the target’s behaviour.” In Light of the foregoing, Dillard brings the alternative into play, where the source may store numerous tactic plans in safeguard and repeat only up to tactic selection stage. But Dillard (2004: 196) immediately points out that, when the source experiences non-compliance reaction from the target, “the first tendency will be to change low-level elements in the existing plan [...] [as] the plan itself is seen as having failed, the source may discard it wholesale and move to other available options.” Should there emerge a situation where there is non-availability of plan for satisfying primary-secondary goal arrangement, coupled by a low value of devising one, “individuals may attempt to exit the episode [...] by changing the topic or physically leaving the interaction,” as Dillard (2004: 196) would posit.

Dillard (2004: 196) posits that individuals “try hard to achieve influence goals that are important to them. As the importance of the primary goal increases, so does the amount of planning and cognitive effort that individuals expend in the service of that goal.” Further, Dillard (2004: 197) advances that the importance of primary goal has implications regarding

message construction; and he maintains that “more important primary goals correspond with messages that use higher levels of argument.” With reference to Wilson and Zigurs’ study, Dillard (2004: 197) indicates that primary goal importance “is negatively associated with the use of images and emphatic text formatting (i.e., the use of bold, italics, underline, font changes, or type size changes);” which, for him, it is evident that “important primary goals promote a focus on message content and away from message style.”

In line with the above argument, Dillard (2004: 197) suggests that, as predicted by the model, secondary goals “shape message production as well.” Giving an example of a face-face situation, Dillard (2004: 197) postulates that “increased importance of the identity goal is associated with increases in the use of argument and decreases in explicitness.” For Dillard, these findings presuppose a desire for influencing on principled grounds and affording the target an option to resist. Dillard (2004: 197) further makes reference to computer-mediated exchanges, and advances that “heightened importance of the identity goal yields reduction in the use of images but increased use of emphatic text formatting [...]. The lowered use of images might be seen as a move away from form in the direction of function, but the growth in emphatic text is more difficult to understand.”

Relative to affect management goal, Dillard (2004: 197) surmises that greater efforts to control one’s arousal are “associated with messages that are both more dominant (i.e., lower in positivity) and less dependent on dominance (quoting Dillard 1989). Further, Dillard observes that as affect management is increased in importance, individuals reduce their verbosity and concern about conformity to language rules relative to spelling, capitalization and punctuation. In view of these finding, Dillard (2004: 197) would aver that “strong concern with managing one’s affect interferes with the ability to produce fluent, competent influence messages.”

According to Dillard (2004: 197), the behaviour of both the source and target “can be modelled as GPA processes. Thus, while the GPA model is essentially individualistic, it allows for the study of interaction as a pair of collaborating GPA processes [...] top-down processes highlighted in the GPA sequence are receptive to many bottom-up influences, including the action of the other interactant.”

In line with the above information, Dillard (2004: 197) takes the **rebuff phenomenon** to clarify his view, and employs Hample and Dallinger’s description as “... when an initial persuasive effort is rebuffed, follow-up persuasive messages are ruder, more aggressive, and more forceful than the first one.” Dillard (2004: 197-8) then posits that, conceived in this way, “the rebuff is clearly a pattern of interaction [...]that may occur for two reasons:

- Individuals may become more aggressive because they exhaust their supply of pro-social appeals; or
- message sources may adjust their standards for behaviour in such a way that more aggressive messages are seen as acceptable.”

Offering an explanation for the above points, Dillard (2004: 198) has this to say:

People’s concern for effectiveness increased as a positive function of number of rebuffs, while their concern for principles and desire to harm the hearer declined. In the terminology of the GPA model, it might be said that resistance (i.e., rebuffs) increased the importance of the primary goal and decreased the importance of the identity and conversational management goals.

Relative to interaction processes at multiple levels of abstraction, Dillard (2004: 198) suggests that the four variables that describe tactical and strategy plans and actions “can also be conceived of as features of the interaction.” Dillard elaborates this issue by pointing out that it is valuable to understand the influence episode at the level of both utterance and episode; and urges readers to consider a single utterance in comparison with a series of messages in the following manner:

- Single utterance (hint): “Do you think that it’s a little breezy in here?” - which he views as low in explicitness; and
- A series of such messages: “Do you think that it’s a little breezy in here?”; “I’m kind of chilly”; “Do you suppose that someone meant to leave that window open?” - which he regards as having cumulative effect of conveying the source’s intent very clearly.

Dillard (2004: 198) advances that the same variables “are used to characterise both strategy and tactic,” and that the above example has the following point which he views as surprising:

The impact of a series of utterances that occupy one location in the four-dimensional message space may produce an outcome opposite to that of a single utterance in the same location. Or, in this particular case, a series of inexplicit messages is explicit. The implication of this illustration is clear: If our understanding of influence interactions can vary so dramatically as a function of level of analysis, it may be important for future researchers to use both perspectives whenever possible.

According to Dillard (2004: 198), research on GPA model “has stimulated research on message effects,” and he hereby considers the impact of influence such messages have “on target emotions and relational judgements;” as well as the way the perceived competence of influence messages “varies as a joint function of message form and goal structure” (2004:

198). For Dillard, the utterances of individuals “have implications for their feelings and well-being of their relationship [...] [which] is true of influence attempts as it is of communication more generally” (2004: 198). Further, Dillard (2004: 198-9) indicates that this observation is in agreement with some studies’ findings, that influence attempts relegated high on dominance “have of negative relational implications;” as opposed to highly dominant influence messages that are perceived as “illegitimate and as obstacles, two perceptions that typically result in anger” (2004: 199).

Dillard (2004: 199) argues that, whereas certain message production theories maintain that explicit requests result in unfavourable relational inferences, “the reverse is true at least among interactants who are in friendly relationships with one another [...] highly explicit requests seem to signal solidarity between the interactants and correspondingly favourable emotions and interpretations of the influence attempts.” Further, Dillard postulates that, though explicitness and dominance seem to occur simultaneously, “dominance is responsible for the negative relational judgements and for feelings of anger. The relational meaning of explicitness seems to be highly context-dependent” (2004: 199).

Furthermore, Dillard (2004: 199) suggests that reasons are not necessary “for producing compliance in close relationships [...] the obligations inherent in close relationships substitute for persuasion.” Nonetheless, Dillard (2004: 199) concedes that messages in high argument “seem to indicate positive regard for the target [...], and whether they are necessary or not, they may contribute to the long-term health of a close relationship.” Further still, Dillard (2004: 199) indicates that research is yet left with the examination of the relationship between argument and emotion, yet posits that, based on the just reviewed research, there is likelihood that “messages high in argument will engender favourable emotional responses.”

Dillard (2004: 199), in addressing goal structure complexity and perceived communication competence, postulates that the notion of communication competence “hinges on the ability to comprehend the situation accurately and formulate messages appropriate to the circumstance.” Basing his view on Schrader and Dillard’s study on goal structure complexity, Dillard suggests that some primary goals pose much more a difficulty to achieve than others – as speakers attempt to achieve more relational secondary goals simultaneously. In view of the foregoing, Dillard (2004: 199) advances that “a priori information concerning goal structure complexity can provide the basis for one aspect of communication competence, that is, accurate identification of the important aspects of the situation;” and refers to this as the first step “toward constructing effective and appropriate messages” (2004: 199).

Dillard (2004: 199-200) makes reference to Schrader's study of the relationship between message behaviour and perceived competence as a function of goal structure complexity, and advances the following pieces of information concerning communication competence:

- Higher levels of dominance are associated with higher levels of perceived **in** competence regardless of goal complexity;
- Whereas explicitness will not harm competence judgements in the low-complexity clusters, explicitness correlates negatively with competence in the high-complexity clusters [...] one's ability to formulate inexplicit messages may substantially enhance effectiveness in complex situations (which notably contain highly important primary goals); and finally
- The use of argument correlates positively with competence, except in the high stakes cluster (i.e., the most complex cluster) [...] In highly unpredictable circumstances wherein the target has the power to embarrass or humiliate the source, perceptions of argument use become decidedly negative (2004: 200).

Dillard (2004: 200) suggests that as a group, then these conclusions present "fairly specific guidelines for what qualifies as competent influence behaviour across episodic variations in goal structure complexity. Knowledge of the way in which particular message forms will be perceived encourages planning aimed at developing competent messages."

According to Dillard and Marshall (2003: 489), several research works have emerged with consistent findings in connection with perceptual dimensions that are naturally employed by individuals to characterise influence messages, labelled explicitness, dominance, and argument. Conceding that messages may be examined along numerous lines, Dillard and Marshall (2003: 489) advance that this threesome serve as a serviceable detailed introduction and delineate them as follows:

- **Explicitness** is the degree to which the message source makes her or his intentions transparent in the message itself. Whereas explicit messages require little or no guesswork regarding the speaker's wants, inexplicit messages necessitate more interpretation and cognitive labour [...]. Thus, explicitness is best considered as a message property that is present to a greater or lesser extent, rather than as a dichotomous quality that either is present (on record) or absent. It is also important to bear in mind that in a persuasive message of any length, portions may be highly explicit, whereas others are more indirect.

Explicitness is not, however, an intrinsic feature of a message. Rather, message explicitness is a function of the context in which the utterance occurs [...] a question that is classified as

conventionally indirect by virtue of its linguistic form (e.g., “How about a movie?”) is judged as highly explicit when posed as a dating request.

- **Dominance** is the term used to reference the relative power of the source vis-à-vis the recipient as that power is expressed in the message [...] not, however, some objective feature of the source-recipient relationship. Rather, it is a source’s bid for power. The recipient may respond to a dominant message with submission, in which case the bid has been accepted. Alternatively, the recipient may respond defiantly, thereby rejecting the source’s attempt to define the relationship in that manner. Thus, an expression of dominance need not accurately reflect formal differences in status nor a consensual definition of the source-recipient relationship.

Dominance may be communicated via multiple communication modalities [...] (a) variation in the vocalic parameters of speech (e.g., pitch or volume); (b) gross body movements, such as gesture or lean; (c) facial displays; and (d) message content. In this channel sense, dominance is a broader communication variable than explicitness, which is primarily (although not exclusively) communicated through linguistic means. In the same sense, it is also broader than argument...

- In studies of interpersonal influence, **argument** has been defined as the extent to which a rationale for the sought-after action is presented in the message [...] [and] refers to the degree to which the source provides reasons for ... seeking compliance rather than simply making a non-elaborated request. Thus, “Would you close the door?” is low in argument because no justification is offered for the sort-after behaviour change, whereas “I’m cold. Would you close the door?” includes a reason and is higher on argument [...] Argument, as the term is used in this literature, refers to the perceived **quantity** of reason giving.

As with explicitness, arguments are primarily expressed verbally, not non-verbally [...] the perceived degree of argument will be shaped by the context in which the utterance occurs. In natural discourse, arguments often appear as enthymemes, that is, arguments with a missing premise made more or less obvious by the context [...] receivers fill in missing premises and evidence when they are absent or only implied by the message itself.

According to Dillard and Marshall (2003: 490), there exist a variety of conceptual schemes used in analysis, though they hereby chose to focus on claim, data, and warrant; and define them as follows:

A **claim** is synonymous with a conclusion, that which the source would have the recipient believe or do;

Data is the term used to describe the reasons and evidence offered in support of the claim. Data may be more or less plentiful, but to say that a persuasive utterance constitutes an argument, at least one datum must be present (although the degree to which it must be explicitly stated is a matter of some contention); and

The **warrant** in an argument is the concept that connects data to claim. Warrants consist of beliefs, values, assumption, or generalization that in some way links the argument's conclusion back to the data.

As illustrative measure, Dillard and Marshall (2003: 490) borrow Herrick's example in the following manner:

Claim: Gambling should be legalised.

Data: Gambling cannot be stopped.

Warrant: That which cannot be stopped should be legalised.

In view of the above examples, Dillard and Marshall (2003: 490) claim that data and warrants may both "become the focus of argument themselves;" and suggest that an individual may take issue "with the quality of the data or with the fatalism of the warrant" (2003: 490) - thus essentially transforming the components to claims. These co-authors further point out that, at this juncture, one is encouraged by the model "to search for the data and warrant that undergird those claims" (2003: 490). Furthermore, Dillard and Marshall (2003: 491) postulate that, in accordance with Toulman's analysis of persuasive messages, "suasory appeals also depend on linguistic variations (i.e., explicitness) and that all messages embody implications for the source-recipient relationship (i.e., dominance)."

Dillard and Marshall (2003: 491) indicate the importance of making claims explicit for a number of potential pay gains – and aver that "explicit claims have the property of **clarity**. They leave little doubt as to the position that the source would prefer the recipient to hold or to the action that the source desires" (2003: 491). In addition, Dillard and Marshall, point out that explicit claims "translate into improved comprehension, although comprehension alone has little impact on opinion change [...] are also **efficient** [...] [and] **encourage favourable source judgements**." Furthermore, Dillard and Marshall (2003: 491) posit that individuals who form explicit utterances "may earn social credit for plain speaking (i.e., honesty) and avoid the risk of being labelled manipulative" (co-authors' emphases).

According to Dillard and Marshall (2003: 491), speakers who favour inexplicit speech "also **encourage favourable source judgements** but of a different sort. In interactions marked by indirect claims, hearers and observers may conclude that the source is tactful, sensitive, and non-coercive [...] inexplicit claims permit **plausible deniability**, a term that entered the

national lexicon as a legacy of the Reagan administration.” Further, Dillard and Marshall (2003: 491) advance that inexplicit characterizations also “allows for the appearance of unity even though the reality of positions is quite diverse” (co-authors’ emphases).

In light of the above argument, Dillard and Marshall (2003: 491) caution that, the fact that both explicit and inexplicit claims “could both promote positive source judgements might, at first flush, appear paradoxical; however , individuals vary in their preference for indirect speech [...] Thus, preference of indirectness becomes a useful piece of psychological trait information.” Dillard and Marshall (2003: 492) further advance that “skilful communicators will recognise the important role that explicitness may play in the persuasion process and grant attention to it accordingly. Matching message explicitness to the recipients’ preference for directness will enhance persuasive impact.”

In addition, Dillard and Meijnders (2002: 309), addressing persuasion and the structure of affect, pose the rhetorical question: ‘What is the role of affect in persuasion?’ and base their argument on the 18th-century philosopher George Campbell, whom, they regard to have provided an answer to their above question. These co-authors regard Campbell’s view as noteworthy, as it suggests that “not only do feelings serve reason, but they can do so in ways that ‘usher in the truth”” (2002: 309), they say. For these co-authors, feelings may also “entice opinion change based on specious logic” (2002: 309). In line with the above views, Dillard and Meijnders (2002: 309) view the contents of Campbell’s quotation as a claim that “the relationship between affect and persuasion is a mercurial one that varies in outcome” - and suggest that it is “borne out by contemporary empirical studies” (2002: 309).

Dillard and Meijnders (2002: 309) assume that the most striking aspect of Campbell’s contention is that “persuasion **cannot occur in the absence of passion**” (co-author’s emphasis). In view of this assumption, these co-authors posit that persuasive messages “must evoke passion” (1993: 309) in order for them to succeed. Further, Dillard and Meijnders (2002: 309) align themselves with the notion that views people as always being in some state of affect, and assume that “affective states occurring prior to a suasory appeal might propel message recipients toward either veracity or beguilement” (1993: 309), the possibility that they claim to be supported by the current research work

According to Dillard and Meijnders (2002: 310), Campbell’s theory makes a clear case “for the central role that affect plays in the process of persuasion;” and they deem it necessary for them to “draw some distinctions regarding the affect-persuasion relationship” (2002: 310). First, the co-authors grapple with the source of affect, and suggest that “it has nothing to do with the message whatsoever.” Borrowing Simonson and Lundy’s phrase, **irrelevant fear** to describe the evoking of fear prior to message presentation on an unrelated topic – later

developing into **message-irrelevant affect** (Dillard and Wilson; Jorgensen) – Dillard and Meijnders (2002: 310) postulate that, though affect is expected to influence message processing, “the event that induces it, and indeed the affect itself, bears no logical relationship to the content of the message.”

In line with the above postulation, Dillard and Meijnders (2002: 310) advance that when affect is the product of the message itself, it is referred to as “**message-induced affect.**” These co-authors illustrate this point by indicating that some messages such as appeals to fear and guilt, are designed “to evoke particular affects so that these feelings serve as the basis for acceptance of the advocacy” – though many persuasive appeals attempt to derive affect through other means outside the propositional content. As a further illustration, Dillard and Meijnders make reference to some adverts with eye-catching images and memorable melodies, which are often added to some propositional content. Furthermore, Dillard and Meijnders (2002: 310) suggest that message-induced affect “is not necessarily relevant; for example humour often has little to do with the message topic.”

Subsequently, Dillard and Meijnders (2002: 310) address the structure of affect, and aver that conceptions of affect are “as diverse as emotional life itself,” though, for shortage of space, they hereby deal with only three by reference to their structural complexity, they say. Dillard and Meijnders (2002: 310) advance that the “simplest **bipolar valence model** is the epitome of parsimony,” where affect is treated as a phenomenon anchored on varied dimensions by positive affect on one side and negative affect on the other. These co-authors surmise that slightly more complex are “the **two-dimensional models** that may themselves take two forms” (2002: 310). Dillard and Meijnders (2002: 310) indicate that, whereas some scholars consider pleasure and arousal as terms that best characterise this affect space, “others advocate a bivariate model in which positive and negative affect constitute separate but interactive systems” (2002: 310); and add that, for them, “**discrete emotion models** are the most complex of the lot” (2002: 310). These co-authors surmise that, from this perspective, affect is viewed as “a set of distinct states such as anger, fear, and happiness, each of which may vary in intensity” (2002: 310).

According to Dillard and Meijnders (2002: 310), the value of these models arises from the fact that they provide an allowance for individuals “to partition research on persuasion and affect into groupings that share common assumptions and research focus.” The co-authors point out that their chapter is organised three sections corresponding with the above-discussed models; where frequent application of the message-relevant/message-irrelevant distinctions will be realised.

Dillard and Meijnders (2002: 310-11) suggest that the bipolar valence model “assumes that the affect is best conceived as a single continuum described by antonymic pairs such as positive-negative, good-bad, and happy-sad.” These co-authors point out that recent studies strongly advance that bipolarity is a practical structure “for the experience of affect when methodological artefacts are controlled” (2002: 311). Dillard and Meijnders (2002: 311) put emphasise on the phrase “**experience of affect**” for highlighting “the boundaries of the claim of bipolarity” (2002: 311). For these co-authors, evidentiary base from which claims of bipolarity are issued, abounds with self-reports of subjective experience. On this basis, Dillard and Meijnders (2002: 311) view it important to mention that “any number of mental and physical subsystems, themselves wholly distinct from one another, might interact to jointly produce ‘experience’.” Further, Dillard and Meijnders (2002: 311) caution that, whenever reference is made to the structure of affect, individuals must be careful “to distinguish the domain (i.e., subjective or physiological) in which that structure resides” (2002: 311).

In accordance with Dillard and Meijnders (2002: 311), numerous persuasion research studies conceive of mood as “structured in terms of a bipolar valence model. In addition, most of these studies... conceptualise mood as a diffuse affective state that occupies the background of consciousness.”

Dillard and Meijnders (2002: 311) suggest that current interest in mood and persuasion has its bearings on Worth and Mackie’s study, not only as a historical background but also as a typical design of subsequent investigations. Worth and Mackie’s study, according to Dillard and Meijnders, concerned a group of positive mood participants who won some money in an allegedly random lottery, whereas neutral mood participants had only to indicate whether they participated in the lottery or not. Based on these results Dillard and Meijnders (2002: 311) advance that positive mood “consume **cognitive capacity**, thereby constraining participants’ **ability** to engage in systematic processing” (Dillard and Meijnders’ emphasis). Further, Dillard and Meijnders (2002: 311) concur with the notion that positive mood participants “might have suffered **motivational** deficits,” and aver that such a notion “provides the cornerstone to an alternative explanation” (2002: 311).

According to Dillard and Meijnders (2002: 311), the hypothesis termed “**mood-as-information**” suggests that “affective states may function as heuristics conveying to individuals whether there is a need to process the message carefully” (2002: 311). Further, Dillard and Meijnders (2002: 311) posit that a positive mood “signals that all is well, and by implication so is the advocacy of the suatory appeal. By contrast, a negative mood gives notice that something is amiss.” In view of the foregoing, these co-authors then suggest that

the individual should, therefore, “devote cognitive resources to an analysis of the environment, including the persuasive message” (2002: 311).

Also, Dillard and Meijnders (2002: 311-12) observe that earlier works on mood and cognition clearly stipulated that individuals had a tendency of producing “cognitions that were evaluatively consistent with their mood states.” Referring, to the foregoing as “**mood congruity** position” (2002: 312), these co-authors postulate that it anticipates “that cognitive responses to a persuasive appeal should mirror the valence of the individual’s mood” (2002: 312). Furthermore, Dillard and Meijnders (2002: 312) advance that, in the view of “**mood management** position,” message recipients “make careful decisions regarding message processing with an eye toward maintaining or improving their affective state” (2002: 312).

Additionally, Dillard and Meijnders (2002: 312) postulate that individuals with positive mood are believed to be quite particular about messages they engage, so as to avoid the disruption of their state of elation. Further, for Dillard and Meijnders, persons with positive mood “avoid (i.e., superficially process) depressing topics, loss-framed messages, and counter-attitudinal claims” (2002: 312). These co-authors indicate, however, that a positive mood might inspire systematic processing “if the message recipient believes that close analysis would make him or her feel better” (2002: 312). Contrary to the foregoing assumption, Dillard and Meijnders (2002: 312) aver that “a very sad mood should encourage systematic processing more generally. Affectively speaking, there is nothing left to lose and much to be gained.”

According to Dillard and Meijnders (2002: 312), the following are three major findings that emerged “from a meta-analysis of the mood and persuasion literature:

- As positivity of mood increased, so did attitude change [...] the strength of the mood-persuasion relationship varied depending on features of the message. A stronger mood-attitude correlation was for topics that were positive in tone, claims that were gain framed (as opposed to the loss framed), and messages that were pro-attitudinal rather than counter-attitudinal;
- Positive moods led to decreased depth of processing. That is, people in good moods tended to report fewer cognitive responses than did those in neutral or negative moods; and
- The more positive an individual’s affective state, the greater the number of favourable cognitive responses (2002: 312).

Moreover, Dillard and Meijnders (2002: 312) surmise that these three findings “point to the complexity of the mood-persuasion linkage;” and further suggest that, though existing theoretical positions put emphasis on single processes, the data suggest that “a more

realistic portrayal would be one in which multiple processes occur simultaneously” (2002: 312). Furthermore, Dillard and Meijnders (2002: 312) assume that, although researchers in the mood and persuasion tradition used three kinds of experimental designs, the most common approach is “to induce positive and negative feelings.”

Further still, Dillard and Meijnders (2002: 313) postulate that when individuals are prompted to consider the cause of the mood,

“the relationship between mood valence and persuasion disappears...Thus, the mood and persuasion findings are circumscribed along two lines: They apply in circumstances in which (a) the affect is irrelevant to the message and (b) message recipients have no reason to de-bias the effects of mood.”

O’Keefe (2002: 329) addresses himself to the aspect of guilt as a mechanism of persuasion; and surmises that guilt may be viewed as “a negative emotional state aroused when an actor’s conduct is at variance with an actor’s own standards” (2002: 329). Further, O’Keefe assumes that a paradigmatic guilt-arousing circumstance is one in which an individual “has acted in some manner inconsistent with his or her conception of proper conduct,” and has involved him/herself in conducts such as “lying, stealing, failing to perform duties, neglecting others, failing to maintain a diet or exercise plan, and cheating” (2002: 329). In view of the above postulations, O’Keefe (2002: 329) concedes that guilt as an aspect involving “some self-perceived shortfall with respect to one’s own standards, where the focus of attention is some particular behaviour.”

In line with the foregoing submission, O’Keefe (2002: 329) suggests that the reactions characteristically associated with guilt “make it especially well-suited to exploitation for purposes of social influence [...] such as ‘thinking that you were in the wrong,’ ‘thinking that you shouldn’t have done what you did,’ ‘feeling like undoing what you have done,’ ‘wanting to make up for what you’ve done wrong,’ and ‘wanting to be forgiven’” (2002: 330) (quoting Roseman et al.). Furthermore, O’Keefe advances that individuals who have experienced guilt describe themselves as “wanting to make amends, feeling responsible, feeling as though they had violated some moral standard, and wishing they had acted differently” (2002: 330). Plainly, according to O’Keefe (2002: 330), “guilt (in contrast to, say, sadness) has a distinctive action-motivating character;” the aspect that O’Keefe views as “connected to guilt’s being based in a transgression of the actor’s own standards” (2002: 330).

Consistent with the above argument, O’Keefe (2002: 330) posits that guilt can “straightforwardly be put to the service of social influence by the influencing agent’s arousing guilt in the target, which in turn motivates the target’s performance of the desired action.” The

two ways in which an influencing agent may apply guilt arousal in an influence target, according to O'Keefe are:

- for the influencer to draw the target's attention to some existing inconsistency between the target's standards and target's previous conduct; and
- for the influencer to induce the target to act in a way that creates such an inconsistency (2002: 330).

Accordingly, O'Keefe (2002: 330) suggests that the persuader can "exploit some existing inconsistency between the target's previous behaviour and the target's own standards simply by drawing the target's attention to the inconsistency; the target's resulting guilt feelings then provide a basis for shaping the target's future behaviour."

O'Keefe (2002: 330-31) advances that there exist three different areas of empirical research that highlight guilt-based influence mechanism such as the following:

Guilt arousal in interpersonal relationships: Under this area, O'Keefe views guilt arousal and attempted guilt arousal as a matter of everyday life that "occur primarily in the context of close relationships." Further, O'Keefe (2002: 330) postulates that individuals seek to arouse guilt in others "primarily for purposes of influence – as a means of inducing the target to undertake some action, refrain from some action, or stop some ongoing action." O'Keefe surmises that there are various techniques that may be employed in attempting to arouse the target's guilt, each of which may be seen as saying "see how you are hurting me" (2002: 330); and in the context of close relationships, according to this author, "hurting the other would plainly represent a transgression of the target's own standards" (2002: 330). Drawing the target's attention to such conduct, according to O'Keefe (2002: 330), "thus offers the prospect of guilt arousal and subsequent behavioural influence."

Guilt appeals in persuasive messages: O'Keefe advances that guilt appeals in persuasive messages, such as advertisements, commonly have two parts:

One presents material designed to evoke guilt, characteristically through drawing attention to some existing inconsistency between the receiver's standards and the receiver's actions; and the other describes the message's recommended viewpoint or action, which is meant to offer the prospect of guilt reduction (2002: 331).

Elaborating on this issue, O'Keefe gives an example of a commercial advert that makes people feel guilty about the plight of the homeless "and then ask for a charitable donation (which offers the prospect of reducing the guilt)" (2002: 331).

O'Keefe (2002: 331) alleges that, "when guilt-based appeals (of any level of explicitness) successfully arouse relatively greater guilt, those appeals are unlikely to be persuasive." Furthermore, O'Keefe posits that, although explicit guilt appeals may create greater guilt, "they may also arouse other negative feelings that interfere with persuasive success" (2002: 331).

Hypocrisy induction: According to O'Keefe (2002: 331), research on hypocrisy induction has illustrated the persuasive effects of drawing attention to inconsistencies "between the target's conduct and the target's standards." O'Keefe advances that in such studies, hypocrisy condition participants are led to support some position they support, but are, at the same time, "reminded of their failure to act consistently with that view" (2002: 331). The expectation is that participants "will alter their behaviour so as to become more consistent with their beliefs," as O'Keefe (2002: 331) puts it. The author offers here an example of participants who failed to engage in the use of condoms, and yet were given a platform to deliver speech advocating condom use. O'Keefe (2002: 332) postulates that such participants "subsequently avowed significantly greater intentions to increase their use of condoms than did participants in control conditions."

For O'Keefe (2002: 332), this research is "exemplifying dissonance-based influence mechanism," where hypocrisy induction is "presumed to create dissonance through the 'inconsistency between advocated personal standards and past inconsistent behaviours'" (referencing Fried and Aronson) (2002: 332). O'Keefe observes, however, that such inconsistency is "a paradigmatic guilt-inducing circumstance," and he suggests that the effects of such hypocrisy induction "might reflect guilt arousal effects rather than dissonance arousal effects" (2002: 332). Furthermore, O'Keefe (2002: 332) surmises that arousing guilt by drawing the target's attention to existing inconsistencies between his/her conduct and his/her own standards

is potentially a successful mechanism of influence but can also be counter-productive. In particular, interpersonal guilt induction and guilt-based persuasive appeals seem especially prone to evoke negative reactions that may undermine the success of influence attempts.

Witte (1993: 147), addressing fear appeals, advances that fear appeals "are developed intuitively, rather than systematically." This author surmises that, since most scholars identify fear appeal when seeing one, he finds it important to provide a definition of this aspect, so as to enable them to identify precisely that part of message that may be categorised as a fear appeal. In an attempt to answer the question: what exactly is fear appeal? Witte (1993: 147)

postulates that fear appeals “contain (a) **structural**, (b) **stylistic**, and © **extra-message** features;” and delineates these aspects as follows:

Furthermore, Witte (1993: 147) indicates that two message components “relate to the **efficacy** of the recommended response:

- (a) **response efficacy**, which refers to the effectiveness of the recommended response (e.g., ‘seatbelts prevent death from car accidents’);and
- (b) **self-efficacy**, which refers to one’s ability to perform the recommended response (e.g., ‘You can easily use a seatbelt to prevent death from a car accident’).

Further still, Witte (1993: 147) posits that the structural message components of severity and susceptibility “induce perceptions of threat, which lead to fear arousal (e.g., I’m at-risk for being in a fatal car accident, and this scares me’).” In the same vein, Witte suggests that message performances of response efficacy and self-efficacy “induce perceptions of efficacy (e.g., ‘but, I believe I can effectively use my seatbelt to prevent my dying in a car accident’)” (1993: 147). Once more, Witte (1993: 147) cautions readers to note that “threat and efficacy are message-based variables, whereas perceived threat, perceived efficacy, and fear arousal are audience-based variables.” Rounding up the structural feature, Witte (1993: 148) cautions that some people “view threat and fear as a single variable,” whereas the perception of threat “is a cognitive process (i.e., one is thinking about the threat) and feeling fear is an emotional process” (1993: 148).

According to Witte (1993: 148), “[f]ear appeal **style** variables refer to a message’s words, audios, or visuals.” For this author, message style variables “include language intensity, vividness [...], emotional interest [...], and personalised language” (1993: 148). In contrast, Witte (1993: 148) postulates that

extra-message features refer to those variables that have the capacity to influence persuasion but are ‘outside’ of the message. More specifically, extra-message variables pertain to those issues or variables that can be separated from the content of the message, such as source credibility [...], message sidedness [...], duration of message [...], message repetitions [...], or medium of the message.

Structurally, fear appeals present a threat, and then follow it with a recommended response to avert the threat. The **threat** portion of a fear appeal contains two message components: (a) **severity** of the treat (e.g., “car accidents lead to death”); and (b) the audience’s **susceptibility** to the treat (e.g., “You’re at-risk for being in a car accident”) (1993: 147).

Witte (1993: 148) argues that message style variables “**distinguish** between different levels of a fear appeal, while extra-message variables **confound** the effects of a fear appeal.” To elaborate on this argument, Witte provides the definition that, “a high fear appeal is one that contains personalised, intense, and emotional language, as well as graphic and vivid visuals” (1993: 148). For Witte (1993: 148), “the more intense and personalised the language, the greater the perceptions of threat and arousal of fear (e.g., ‘If **you** smoke cigarettes, you’ll experience excruciating and agonizing pain as you die in misery from lung cancer’).” In contrast, according to Witte (1993: 148), extra-message variables confound the effects of fear appeals “by contributing to message acceptance, even though they are unrelated to the strength or level of the fear appeal [...] Extra-message variables should remain constant across fear appeal conditions in order to avoid confounding effects.”

According to Witte (1993: 148) fear appeal studies typically use a single-message design “where a ‘base’ message is varied across levels;” and notes that “one must have carefully specified procedures to develop valid instantiations of each fear appeal level” (1993: 148). Based on the above argument, Witte recommends the following four procedures:

- Each structural component of a fear appeal must be defined specifically with reference to a given audience. For example, if our goal were to increase seat belt usage (the recommended response) among high school students (the audience) to prevent injuries and deaths from car accidents (the threat), we would ask ourselves the following questions: What are high school students chances of being killed or injured in a car accident (susceptibility)? What interferes with their wearing seat belts (self-efficacy)?
- Message style variables may be used to create different fear appeal levels. In a high fear appeal one would emphasise the severity of the threat through vivid and intense language, audios, or visuals, while in a low fear one would minimise the severity of the threat through neutral, bland, and impartial language, audios, and visuals. Similarly, in a high fear appeal personalised references to the audience’ susceptibility to the threat would be emphasised, while in a low fear appeal general and vague references to the audience’s susceptibility to the threat would be highlighted;
- Extra-message variables should be identified and equated across fear appeal levels to prevent confounding. For example, if the high fear appeal’s source is C. Everett Koop, former surgeon General of the United States, then the low fear appeal’s source also should be Koop. Similarly, the different levels of fear appeals should be equated for accuracy, objectivity, reading level, length, repetition, message order, and complexity; and, finally

- As in any persuasion research, it is important to:
 - (a) target the messages to the appropriate audience and goal (e.g., one might promote abstinence to junior high students and condoms to college students to prevent sexually transmitted diseases); and
 - (b) have correspondence in specificity between the messages and dependent variables (e.g., if the message promotes general attitude change, then the dependent variable should be general attitudes; if the message promotes specific attitude change, then the dependent variables should be specific attitudes.) (1993: 149).

Witte (1993: 149-10) examines threat and fear arousal at different levels and assumes that they can take various effects, including curvilinear effects, as demonstrated in the following findings:

Positive linear results: Six studies found a positive linear relation between threat and acceptance. Witte indicates that attitudes toward health maintenance organization developed positivity “as levels of threat in the message increased;” and that, similarly, when messages detailing some ailment increased in threat, individuals are “more likely to take preventive drugs” (1993: 149). Further, Witte points out that it was also observed that increases in level of threat about some ailment results in increases in attitude change towards care. Furthermore, Witte indicates that the more at-risk individuals were to their objective, the more their intention to take up the recommended response; and finally, he surmises that “ the greater the level of a threat in a message, the more individuals agreed that an unknown (and fictional) drug should be avoided.”

Boomerang and negative results: Boomerang results, where people responded opposite to that which was advocated, were found in one study. The study on drinking and driving, according to Witte, found a boomerang, as participants adopted more positive attitudes “toward drinking and driving in some fear conditions” (1993: 149). This author also indicates that negative findings were found in two studies, “where increased threat caused decreased message acceptance” (1993: 149): first, negative effects emerged with findings that “the low fear message was more persuasive than the high fear [one]” (1993: 149); and second, that individuals respond minimally “in the strong fear condition when compared to the low fear condition” (1993: 149)

Curvilinear results: Curvilinear (i.e., inverted U-shape) relations were found in four studies. According to Witte, one study observed that participants in the moderate-fear condition “were most likely to get a vaccination to prevent mumps” (1993: 149); while another study indicated that individuals lost more weight “in the moderate fear condition when compared to the high

or low fear conditions” (1993: 149). Further, Witte points out that the third study found a curvilinear relationship “between how fearful subjects said they were and weight loss” (1993: 149); whereas the fourth one detected a curvilinear relationship “between smoking behaviour and fear-arousal in a correlational study” (1993: 149).

Mixed results: Five studies found positive, boomerang, and/or curvilinear relations in the same study, depending on certain conditions. Witte advances that Horowitz’s study showed that fear arousal was “positively related to volunteers’ agreement with a message, but curvilinearly related to non-volunteers’ agreement” (1993: 149-50). Further, Witte puts it that another study observed that increases in fear “resulted in increased protective behaviours (e.g., reduced smoking), but decreases in detective behaviour (e.g., getting X-rays)” (1993: 150). In accordance with Niles’ findings, “trait vulnerability resulted in a curvilinear relation between threat and acceptance for high vulnerable subjects, and a positive linear relation for low vulnerables,” as Witte(1993: 150) would put it. Furthermore, Witte concedes that another finding that increases in threat “resulted in a trend toward decreased message acceptance (boomerang effect), but increased adoption of the message’s recommendations” (1993: 150). Finally, Witte (quoting Witte) observes that, “as threat increased when efficacy was high, sexually active college students were more likely to use condoms to prevent AIDS, but as threat increased when efficacy was low, college students did the opposite of what was advocated – they used condoms less than before” (1993;10).

CHAPTER 3

THE ANALYSIS OF DRAMA TEXTS FROM 1981 TO 1989

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter consists of the analysis of two drama texts, *Le ka nketsang?* by Mosuhli, P. T. and *Mpowane*, by Mokoena, V. K. The analysis starts off with *Le ka nketsang*.

3.2 LE KA NKETSANG?

In this section it is intended to centre the analysis of *Le ka nketsang?* on the main characters in this study, that is, Rankakata, Kesentseng, Bafedile, and Mmasebueng. Other characters will be brought in wherever necessary, to include their persuasive endeavours to any of the main four characters mentioned above.

Le ka nketsang? has sixteen characters altogether. The main characters, as has been shown above, and their relations to other characters in the drama text are as follows:

Rankakata: Kesentseng's husband and Bafedile's father ; and Mmasebueng's lover, and husband later;

Kesentseng: Rankakata's wife and Bafedile's mother;

Bafedile: Rankakata and Kesentseng's daughter; and

Mmasebueng: Rankakata's paramour and his wife later in the play.

At the beginning of the play, the aspect of persuasion is centred on Rankakata, Kesentseng and Bafedile. Whereas Rankakata has no interest in educating Bafedile, Kesentseng is geared towards providing Bafedile with education. Bafedile is, therefore, the bone of contention here; while Rankakata and Kesentseng are forever engaging themselves in persuasion that is centred on her education.

Rankakata calls out Bafedile, and yet retorts to himself as follows: "He ngwana o ntenne ya kang mmae enwa!" (Act I: scene i). [Goodness! This child who is the replica of her mother disgusts me so much.] When Bafedile responds to Rankakata's call, saying, "Ke nna enwa ntate" (Act I: scene i) [Here I am father]; Rankakata confronts her with a rhetorical question: "O a be o ntse o ahlame kae?" (Act I: scene i) [Where have you been gaping at?] This initial rhetorical question clearly highlights Rankakata's vindictive mood towards Bafedile. He tends to regard Bafedile as a good-for-nothing person who is always gaping somewhere at something. The next two questions indicate the vitriolic fashion in which Rankakata relates with his daughter: "Na o se o lokisitse dijo tsa badisana? Ha o bone hore mehlape ke ee e orohile?" (Act 1: scene i) [Have you already prepared food for the shepherds? Don't you realise that domestic animals have already come home?]

Needless to say, Rankakata is a troubled man, with something gnawing at his fabric. He seems to take out his troubles on Bafedile. He then instructs Bafedile to quickly prepare food for the shepherds. Bafedile responds by saying, “Ke tla etsa jwalo ntate.” (Act I: scene i) [I will do so, father]; and goes into the house to prepare the food. All these verbal exchanges demonstrate the father-daughter relationship prevailing here. Whereas the father is rough and harsh towards his daughter, the daughter is amicable, cool and submissive. It would seem that Rankakata has a certain goal that he plans to achieve through this kind of dialogue with Bafedile. Seemingly, he employs harshness as an action geared towards persuading Bafedile to think of nothing else but all that is concerned with the domestic animals and shepherds.

As may be observed, this father-daughter relationship has affected Bafedile, to an extent that she swallows the harsh words without response to them, except being submissive, and hardly making any complaint to her father. Even when she is inside the house with her mother, she is afraid of complaining, lest her father overhears her, as contained in the following extract:

(O a tholathola, eka o tshaba ho bua) “Ke hore ntate yena, mme, leha ke bapala le bana ba bang, a ka ka nkgarumela jwalo ka ha eka ha ke tsebe mosebetsi wa ka wa ka mehla.” (Act I: scene i)

[(She is silent for a while, seemingly fearing to speak.) As for father, mother, even as I play with other children, he can scold me as if I do not know my routine duty.]

Kesentseng’s response to Bafedile’s complaint reveals that Rankakata’s behaviour towards Bafedile is a recent one, as he was known for his story-telling and nightly jokes. When Bafedile indicates to her mother that Rankakata has gone towards Mmasebueng’s house, Kesentseng remarks, “Ha Mmasebueng bo, tjhe ha Mmasebueng!” (O a sisimoha). (Act I: scene i) [Towards Mmasebueng’s house, yes, indeed at Mmasebueng’s house. (She pants).]

It would appear that Mmasebueng has been the instigator of Rankakata’s latest behaviour towards his relations with his daughter. Kesentseng’s remark about Mmasebueng’s home, accompanied by her panting, presupposes that there has been a long-time pain deeply consuming her spirit. Whatever it is, it remains to be seen.

Later on, Rankakata comes home, drunk, engaged in a monologue. This monologue reveals Rankakata’s deep thoughts, as well as his attitude towards his family. The following is the monologue in question:

“Banna, ka dulela ho nna ke bua. Anke ke ye ke ba bone lapeng mane. Mehofe, bafo ba fumaneng borena loting. (O thola motsotswana) E ... ba kuta dinku ba rekisa bolo.

Dintja! (O ya a kgothometseha monyako, ebile a wa ka sanketse hoba a rahe lemati) Meleko, bulang mona ke ha ka, dintja ting!” (Act I: scene i).

[Goodness, I am engaged in this idle talk. Let me go to the home there and see them. Vagrants, commoners who attained chieftaincy in the mountains. (He pauses) Yes ... they shored the sheep and sold a bale. Dogs! (He staggers towards the entrance and falls on his back as he kicks the door) Devils, open up, this is my home, you dogs!].

In this monologue, a revelation is made that Rankakata values his family no more. He regards his wife and daughter as vagrants, or the poorest of the poor who only attained better status due to lack of competition from other human beings, as contained in “Mehofe, bafo ba fumaneng borena loting.” Further, the implication of the idiomatic expression, “Ba kuta dinku ba rekisa bolo,” bears connotations of people who, through some cheating, attained some riches for themselves. Furthermore, Rankakata relegates his wife and daughter to the level of dogs, or devils who have to open up the door for him at a shout. In other words, for him they are mere doglike underlings – “Meleko, bulang mona ke ha ka, dintja ting!” – as has been indicated above.

Indubitably, Kesentseng and Bafedile are no strangers to this kind of verbal harassment and ridicule by Rankakata. This view is supported by Kesentseng’s verbal persuasion for Bafedile to open up the door:

“Ao! Bafedile ha o ka bula ngwana ka. Ruri ha re ya le bona la moepamoholo-molelele-monyolosa-thaba lapeng lena” (Act I: scene i).

[Fie! Bafedile, can you please open up my child. Indeed we are faced with harsh problems that are tantamount to climbing the steepest of the steepest mountains in this family.]

Seemingly, Rankakata has a primary goal that is not yet revealed. Through this kind of behaviour, it can be concluded that Rankakata is a vindictive character, who employs coercion rather than persuasion to deal with his wife and daughter. Through vindictiveness and harassment, he forces them to operate as he wishes. When Bafedile opens up the door, she is surprisingly confronted by Rankakata’s state of lying down with his knees up. Without any waste of time, Bafedile calls upon her mother, and persuades her to help her carry the collapsed Rankakata into the house. Both mother and daughter realise that Rankakata has collapsed due to excessive drunkenness.

Whereas one would expect Rankakata to express his gratitude to both Kesentseng and Bafedile for carrying him into the house, he threatens to fix up the very helpers. He accuses them of beating him when they realise that he has enjoyed the consumption of the people’s beer, the food of his grandfathers –“mabele thabisa dihoho”, [sorghum, the instigator of mirth

to the cruel ones], he says. As if bound to accuse them of something else, Rankakata poses a rather strange rhetorical question to his carriers, saying, “Kapa ha le battle ho ba dihoho meleko ting?” (Act I: scene i). [Or don’t you want to be cruel ones you devils?]

Since Bafedile and Kesentseng are used to this kind of behaviour by Rankakata, they ignore his final rhetorical question. Instead, Bafedile responds to the original accusation of their being pinned with a blame for beating him, saying, “Ha re a o otlantate. Dula fatshe ke tsebe ho o phomosetsa tsa mantsiboya.” (Act I: scene i)

[We have not beaten you father. Sit down so that I may serve you some supper.]

Kesentseng follows up with a rhetorical question concerning Rankakata’s accusation saying,

“Re ka o otlare o tsekisang manna Modimo? Ha ntho tsa hao di ntse di o kakalatsa, o ntse o kgutla o re ke rona. Rone o ke o re fete.” (Act I: scene i).

[What could we have beaten you for, man of God? When your matters turn you upside down you cast the blame on us. Please leave us alone.]

It would seem that this harsh approach that Rankakata applies towards Bafedile and Kesentseng is a well-planned strategy for him to give some instructions that he does not want them to argue against. In addition, Rankakata appears to be shying away from upfront persuasion, where the persuader engages with the target in a fair and an open communication, attempting to persuade the latter to behave according to or adopt the attitude, or belief of the former. His goal becomes clear when he addresses Bafedile in this form:

“Wena, Bafedile, ha kgoho ya pele e otlalepheyo, o tsohe re ye masimong ho ya lema. Ha e le mmao, o tla sala a sila le ho pheha hae mona.” (Act I: scene i).

[You, Bafedile, when the first cock strikes the wing, you should get up and go to the fields with me to plant. As for your mother, she will remain here at home to grind maize and do the cooking.]

Bafedile’s mere questions, on this matter, clearly invite trouble for her from Rankakata, as contained in the following dialogue:

Bafedile: Ha ke re ke ya sekolong na ntate! Kapa hosasa ha ke ye ke tsebe?

[But I am supposed to go to school tomorrow father! Or am I not going tomorrow, may I know?]

Rankakata: O reng? O mpoella ka sekolo! Sekolo ke ntho nngwe? Ha esitana le mophato ola wa mehlang ya sehloholo o ne o le molemo ho feta ntho ee ya lona. Rona re ahilwoe, re banna kajeno. Ke moo ke morui ke ntse ke sa bala. O ntse o senya manyane a ka, o ntse o

re thuto thuto. Ba ntse ba le roka mahlwana naketsana ba re lefa ... ke lefa la eng? Maruo ana a ka ke lona lefa la hao. (Act I: scene i).

[What are you saying? You tell me about school! What is school after all? Even that traditional initiation school was more profitable than this thing of yours. We have been groomed, we are men today. Here I am a rich man without education. You waste my money, talking about education, education. They cheat you by making reference to inheritance ... what inheritance? These riches of mine constitute your inheritance.]

No doubt, Rankakata has had a long term plan to fulfil his goal of derailing Bafedile from schooling. He now clearly takes action to accomplish his goal by telling her to wake up early in the morning and go to the fields with him, yet he knows for a fact that Bafedile is supposed to go to school. His verbal action of condemning school and education is meant to function as a persuasive strategy for Bafedile to look down upon education. Instead of clearly answering Bafedile's questions of whether or not she should not go to school, he employs harshness towards her. Then he uses what Larson (1995:7) calls **doublespeak**.

According to Larson, doublespeak is "the opposite of language: it tries to **not communicate**; it tries to conceal the truth and to **confuse**" (1995:7) (Larson's emphasis). This harshness towards Bafedile, coupled with the doublespeak that Rankakata hereby applies, is aimed at confusing Bafedile and make her wonder whether or not there is need for her to continue schooling. Further, Rankakata refers to himself as a rich and uneducated man, in order to persuade Bafedile to look down upon schooling, and base her hopes upon his riches for inheritance. Small wonder that he even makes flimsy comparison of modern schooling with the traditional initiation school, relegating the former as inferior, while at the same time he makes reference to the latter as the superior one that groomed him to become the rich man that he is today.

Since Kesentseng is poised at sending Bafedile to school and prepare her for the future, she intervenes to rescue her from this persuasive trap of doublespeak. She pleats with Rankakata to stop talking to Bafedile as he does, and encourages him to demonstrate love and respect for the daughter. Instead of responding to Kesentseng's suggestions, Rankakata accuses her of banding words with him, thus forcing her to refrain from any further interventions. Even if Rankakata's communication with Bafedile were to be analysed as a persuasive strategy, his accusation of Kesentseng, that she bandies words with him, is not an upfront persuasive exercise, but coercion because he is being vindictive, and not allowing Kesentseng to air her views openly and freely.

Realizing that Bafedile is trying hard to read and comprehend her studies, Rankakata once more applies more persuasion for her to identify with his wishes and refrain from pursuing

education. The following form of address he directs to Bafedile tells it all – that he wants the girl to feel small and wish that she had gone through the traditional initiation school:

“Wena lethisa towe, ha ke tloha mona o time lebone leo. (Bafedile o dutse tafoleng o ntse a leka ho qetela mosebetsi wa hae) Ha ke na tjehelete ya ho be sale ke tenwa ho thwe eng e fedile. Di sengwa ka boomo dintho tsena. Kgele!” (Act I: scene i)

[You uninitiated girl, when I leave this room you should blow off that lamp. (Bafedile is sitting at the desk trying to read and complete her school work.) I have no money for always being irritated about depleted stuff. All these things are being purposely wasted. Goodness me!]

When Rankakata addresses Bafedile as “Wena lethisa towe” above, his motives become clear – he uses two strategies/plans to achieve his goals. Goal number one is to intensify the aspect of cultural upbringing – that demands that for a girl or boy to qualify for womanhood or manhood, they should go through the initiation school. He addresses Bafedile in this form so as to dampen her spirit and verve for learning, thus hoping to whet her desire for going to the initiation school, rather. Larson said it well that some persuaders usually “use two major strategies to achieve their goals. They either **intensify** certain aspects of their product, candidate, or ideology, or they **downplay** certain aspects. Often they do both” (1995:15), (Larson’s emphasis). Indubitably, Rankakata’s second goal is for Bafedile to cease schooling, and regard it as a waste of time.

With an intention to persuade Rankakata to consider Bafedile’s ability and expertise in learning, Kesentseng gives a report from Bafedile’s teacher. She tells him that Bafedile’s teacher has recommended her for furthering her education at Morumotsho High School – in preparation for training as a teacher for the national school. Needless to say, Kesentseng reveals this information as a persuasive plan/strategy for Rankakata to change his attitude and allow Bafedile to pursue her education. Since he is already geared towards downplaying education, Rankakata retorts harshly to this information, and accuses Kesentseng of colluding with teachers in the affairs of his family. Employing sarcasm in his retort, Rankakata says:

“Eu, ho na le baruti ba ntseng ba rera ditaba le wena mo, nna ke le siyo. Ke a bona o jele tlwae mosadi towe. Ke makgetlo a makae o rera ngwaneo, nna ntatae ke sa tsebe? O ntelletse ho lekane.” (Act I: scene i).

[Really, there are teachers who go through planning some stuff with you here, while I am not around. I realise that you have acquired a bad habit you woman. On how many occasions have you been planning about this child, when I, her father, have no knowledge? You have done enough of despising me.]

Clearly, Rankakata is twisting the logic as a persuasive tactic to dissuade Kesentseng from the issue in question. Whereas Kesentseng only gives him the report concerning this issue, he accuses her of colluding with teachers in planning Bafedile's future, and further accuses her of undermining him, as Bafedile's father. As Larson observes, persuaders of Rankakata's calibre act like magicians, "they want to draw attention away from some things and toward others in order to pull off the illusion" (1995:15). Since his goal is to persuade Bafedile to change her attitude about education, Rankakata puts his emphasis on being sidelined and undermined, or despised by Kesentseng. It would appear that this is a ploy to create guilty conscience in Kesentseng, thus shutting her off from the ensuing discussion.

Upon realizing this line of action taken by her father, Bafedile intervenes, possibly to save her mother from Rankakata's ridicule, saying:

"Hao ntate! O batla lapeng la hao ho se be le moneketsana o tswetse-tswetseng pele ka sedinyana la thuto. Ako bone ausi Dineo yane wa ntate Sehloho ka moo a thusang batswadi ba hae ka teng." (Act I: scene i).

[What, father! You do not wish to see even one person who attains a ray of education light in your family. Just consider how much assistance that Dineo of Mr. Sehloho renders to her parents.]

Bafedile's intervention is timely, and quite persuasive. It captures some of the five elements of persuasive speaking identified by Cicero, the Roman orator:

Inventing or discovering evidence and arguments, organizing them, styling them artistically, memorizing them and finally delivering them skilfully (Larson, 1995:9).

If Rankakata were a man of upfront persuasion, this intervention would make him think and argue more to persuade both Kesentseng and Bafedile to change their own attitudes and adopt his own, or else to reconsider his own attitude and change for the better. But, since he is harsh, vindictive, and scornful, he adheres to his style of communicating with the two ladies, Kesentseng and Bafedile. As Reardon (1991:6) would put it, in upfront persuasion, the persuader "guides persuadee to make his/her choices – it is more upfront than manipulation."

It would then be correct to label Rankakata as a manipulative character, who is out to further his own goals at the expense of his wife and daughter. Seemingly, his goal is to rob the two women of their freedom and liberty to develop themselves – in particular, Bafedile, whose chances and prospects of being provided with further education are quite high; as she has been thought of as being worthy of proceeding to Morumotsho high school. Rankakata is essentially pulling the wool over the eyes of Kesentseng and Bafedile. He fails to present

upfront reasoning with them. In this way, he robs them of their choices through deceptive tactics, rather than attempting to give them an opportunity for making their preferred choices.

Not surprisingly, Rankakata further employs coercive means by using some form of threat in his dealings with Kesentseng and Bafedile. Worse still, he coerces Bafedile to engage into menial jobs, rather than schooling. He even limits the choices of Kesentseng and Bafedile by deceit – turning himself into a self-made, all-knowing man, intimating that education is a valueless activity. Rankakata is also arrogant, insulting, and uses specious argument. He argues that Sehloho is a poor man, while he is a rich man. This is an irrelevant issue, or a none-issue for that matter.

As if Bafedile has not made Rankakata aware that she is to go to school, he, nonetheless, wakes up early in the morning and instructs Kesentseng to shake her up, so that they go to the fields together. As he is known as a coercer in his family, Kesentseng shakes up Bafedile without a word to Rankakata. Bafedile gets up and accompanies her father to the fields to plant. When they are through with the work they were engaged in, Rankakata addresses the question of education by asking Bafedile what she thinks of it. He poses a number of questions to which he wants Bafedile to answer, thus opening up an upfront persuasive communication with her as follows:

“Bafedile ngwana ka, na ehlile o bona thuto ee, e tla hle e o bope o be mosadi wa popota bokamosong ba hao? Na o elellwa ka moo barutehi baa, e leng baikgantshi le baikgohomosi ka teng? Na o bona ba phedisana hantle le batho ba bang?” (Act I: scene ii).

[Bafedile my child, do you really consider this education, as an instrument that is going to develop you and make you a formidable woman in your future? Do you realise how arrogant and self-centered these learned people are? Do you see them living harmoniously with other people?]

These questions mark Rankakata as a changed man, in attitude and behaviour, and one wonders whether or not he is going to keep it up or relapse into his well-known character, of bullying members of his family and applying coercion and manipulation against them. One tends not to put any trust in Rankakata, that he will from henceforth engage himself in any upfront persuasive communication with anybody, especially his wife and daughter. Nonetheless, Bafedile openly responds in a persuasive verbal communication, making her father understand the importance of education, as well as how learned people think and behave. For Bafedile, the learned people are not arrogant and self-centred, but they hate any form of unbecoming behaviour in which some of the unlearned people engage themselves.

Further, Bafedile indicates to Rankakata that the unlearned people have to behave themselves, so that they may also be respected by other people.

Still in an upfront manner, Rankakata downplays the behaviour of the learned people, as a plan to induce Bafedile into aligning herself with him in his beliefs and attitude. He says:

“Ba loketswe ke tlhompho yang? Hona ke mang ya ka hlomphang bokgwanatshwana baa? Ruri ke bona hantle hore o kgabile ka moro wa mashwele ...” (Act I: scene ii).

[What respect do they deserve? Besides, who can respect these white-blacks? Indeed I clearly realise that you embellished yourself with the gravy of coagulated blood ...]

As a persuasive strategy to change her father’s attitude, behaviour and believes, Bafedile takes advantage of the upfront persuasive communication in which she and her father are engaged. Putting it in a rather tactical way, she dwells on respect, yet centring and directing it to Rankakata’s character, attitude and behaviour, saying:

“Ntate, na o eellwa hore ha o sa re natse ka tlong, o etsetsa dintho poaneng, re ke ke ra o hlompha?” (Act I: scene ii).

[Father, are you aware that if you do not mind us in the house, doing things in the open, we cannot giving you a respect?]

Whereas Rankakata attempts to persuade Bafedile to regard education as useless, and the learned people as arrogant, self-centred and disrespectful, Bafedile’s goal is different. She is apparently applying a counter-persuasion for him to change his attitude and behaviour toward, not only education and the learned people’s characteristics, but his own behaviour of openly indulging himself in an extramarital affair within the boundaries of the same community. As may be expected, Rankakata does not respond to Bafedile’s remark/question in the spirit for which it is intended – that of upfront persuasive communication. Rather, he becomes harsh and calls Bafedile names – such as “halaoleng towe ya ngwananyana!” (Act I: scene ii). [you talkative and senseless girl]. Since Bafedile senses her father’s mood at this juncture, she immediately proposes that they drop the subject and postpone it for later at home.

Rankakata and Bafedile part ways, the former heading for Mmasebueng’s home, while the latter goes home. Bafedile joins her mother, Kesentseng at home, who immediately inquires about Rankakata’s whereabouts. The revelation of Rankakata’s location at this time sparks fury in Kesentseng. She employs persuasive talk with Bafedile, seemingly to motivate her to side with her in the struggle against Rankakata and Mmasebueng’s prevailing extramarital

affair. Calling for Bafedile's sympathy and empathy, Kesentseng downplays Rankakata's visit to Mmasebueng's house as "ho phaqola," [an aimless and idiotic walk]; "jwalo ka ntja e batla monga yona" (Act I: scene ii) [like a dog looking for its owner].

Further, Kesentseng employs a pastoral image to persuade Bafedile to realise and understand the depth of her suffering due to the prevailing extramarital affair between Rankakata and Mmasebueng, saying:

"Kannete ke jela kgwebeleng jwalo ka leeba ke mosadi enwa monneng wa ka. Feela ha ho nang, Morena o teng." (Act I: scene ii).

[Indeed I eat with a sore heart like a dove because of this woman's affair with my husband. Anyway it does not matter, The Lord exists.]

Kesentseng's use of this pastoral image clearly highlights the extent of the suffering she experiences. Her situation is only comparable to that of a dove that is forever cautious of a hawk whenever looking for its food. In his definition of a pastoral image, Abrams traces its originality from Greece. He eventually labels it as "any work which contrasts simple and complicated life, to the advantage of the former;" and further indicates that critics apply it to any work "which represents a withdrawal from ordinary life to a place apart that is close to the elemental rhythms of nature ..." (1993:142). Kesentseng's use of a pastoral image, therefore, is a highly persuasive one for Bafedile to take this extramarital affair between her father and Mmasebueng as a torturous one to her mother – as Kesentseng hardly enjoys the matrimonial fruit leisurely, for she is like a dove, while Mmasebueng is forever hovering over her like a hawk poised to kill and consume its target.

Her final statement, following the pastoral image in question – where she says "feela ha ho nang, Morena o teng" - calls for Bafedile's emotional sensibilities, and works as a persuasive strategy for both herself and Bafedile to put all their trust in the Lord as the Saviour. As a sign that she has indeed been persuaded into putting the whole matter in the hands of the Lord, Bafedile does not respond to what her mother has just said, but goes away, and wishes Kesentseng a peaceful stay. Kesentseng collaborates with Bafedile and wishes her the same, saying, "Tsamaya le yona le wena thotholokwane ya ka." (Act I: scene ii). [Go with it (peace) too, my sole child.] This form of address that Kesentseng uses in reference to Bafedile, is an endearment that is calculated at bringing the latter closer to the former, and identity with her as a mother, in contrast with the father who openly gallivants with his paramour within the same vicinity.

Now that Rankakata has just paid a visit to Mmasebueng, it becomes important for this study to find out what persuasive communication they engage themselves in with his paramour. To Rankakata's surprise and dismay, he finds Mmasebueng only then busy collecting the house

dirt, which signifies that she has just got out of her blankets, while the former and Bafedile are already back from the fields. Worse still, Rankakata is amazed and infuriated by the sight of the chamber vessel that has tilted, with the night urine spilled all over. To show his disgust, Rankakata makes the following remark:

“Ke eng hoo, ke metsi a eng jwale a tlang ntlo aa? Phoo, banna utlwang lephoka (O kwala monyako o pjetletsa mathe) See!” (Act I: scene iii).

[What is this, what water is this now that fills up the house? Shit, guys what a smell! *(He closes the door and emits spittle)* What rubbish!]

Naturally, one would expect Mmasebueng to be ashamed of herself, and show some remorse over the filthy state of the house in which Rankakata finds it. On the contrary, she merely asks for an excuse, and yet takes the whole matter casually, not minding the disgust demonstrated by Rankakata. Instead, it is Rankakata himself who shows remorse upon being reminded by Mmasebueng that the other dirt in the house was caused by him and his company last night. Further, Rankakata applies endearment as a persuasive strategy for Mmasebueng to excuse him for his lack of insight into the whole matter of filth prevailing in the house, saying:

“Tshwarelo bo, lesapo la ka. Ke ho se bone. Ke a bona ke se ke le kgaba le ileng, hoba ke mona pono e se e nkgahella.” (Act I: scene iii).

[Forgiveness, please, my bone! It is lack of clear sight. I realise that I am already an old thing, as sight has now become diminished for me.]

For Mmasebueng, this is a moment of mirth, and she capitalises upon it to persuade Rankakata to take steps into making her his second wife. In fact, ‘making her his second wife,’ is an understatement; she actually aims at driving Rankakata towards getting rid of Kesentseng, then take her in as a substitute wife. This view emanates from the following statement she makes after a merry laughter:

“O se o le kgaba le ileng? Rona re sa ja ‘laefe’ ngwanaka, ha wena o sa iphirimeditse ka sekuapana seno se meno a dipapa. Ruri ha ke tsebe ke tla etswa sephoqo ho fihlela neng?” (Act I: scene iii)

[You are an old thing? We enjoy life my child, while you continue to blindly stick to that skinny woman with filthy teeth. Indeed I know not for how long I will be turned into an imbecile?]

Needless to say, Mmasebueng’s second statement above suggests that Rankakata should either get rid of Kesentseng, or else leave her, so that he may take in the former to wife.

Instead of responding to Mmasebueng's complaints, Rankakata merely asks her to stop gibbering, and requests her to kiss him, as a persuasive attempt to gain peace.

As may be expected, Mmasebueng gives Rankakata the demanded kiss, and follows it up with more persuasion for him to consider her present status. She pampers him with loving and intimate words, and requests him to kiss her again, praise-naming him "wena mollelwa wa Dithotaneng ... senakangwedi se bontshang kganya bosiu." (Act I: scene iii). [You desirable one of Dithotaneng ... fire-fly that illuminates light in the night.] Obviously, Mmasebueng's plan in using these endearment words and praises is to persuade Rankakata into regarding her as a loving woman, in whose hands he may snuggle and enjoy the fruit of being loved by her. Then she fondles him more, as a persuasive action aimed at winning his love and attention, and to create a wider gap between him and Kesentseng.

Consequentially, Rankakata is quite taken up, to the extent that he finds himself emerging quite poetic himself, as he creates a praise poem for Mmasebueng, in an endeavour please her and persuade her to fondle him more, saying:

"Wena seilatsatsi wa ka
Tjhobolo e nko di mafamo
Thope e ntle seka lenyoronyoro
Pelong ya hao ho rena le ho busa nna feela
Nna Rankakata mora Diau." (Act I: scene iii).
[You sunlight dodger of mine
Vanity with broad nostrils
A girl as beautiful as a film-star
In your heart I am the only chief and ruler
I, Rankakata, Diau's son.]

As one would expect, this praise poem is highly motivating and persuasive for Mmasebueng to be gleeful. It makes her swell up with merriment and positive assurance that she commands beauty, and therefore, regard herself as the most beloved to her admirer/praise poet. This pampering stimulates her into adopting a seemingly negative approach towards Rankakata in response. She downplays his expression of joy and admiration for her into mere talk, with no action taken towards the fulfilment of this worshipping; and lays the following complaint:

"Ha o nkgahle le ha o iphafaka jwalo. Ke tla putlama ho fihla (sic) neng moo? O tshaba sethepu na lekwala towe ke tsebe? Ha ho a thwe ke eo ke o bolelle. Ha ke tlo ipeha ka mosing ese ha nkgono mona. Ke itse ha o tshaba sethepu, o tlose tshase eo tseleng ke tswe ke kenakena, kgobe ke e hlabane ka lemao." (Act 1: scene iii)

[You do not impress me by being so poetic. For how long am I going to stupidly sit here like a chicken? Are you afraid of polygamy, you coward! May I know? It was never said that there he/she is I tell you. I am not going to place myself in the smoky side as if this is my grandmother's place. I have said, if you are afraid, get rid of that lark so that I may indulge in plentiful, and play around with food.]

It would be quite interesting for one to observe and listen to the way Rankakata would respond to the above complaint. But alas! At this juncture, Kesentseng, who has been eavesdropping at Mmasebueng's doorpost all along, throws herself into the house, and strikes the latter on the mouth with a stone. Rankakata tries to intervene, but Mmasebueng's teeth are already scattered on the floor. Seemingly, Kesentseng's patience was over-stretched by Mmasebueng's use of insulting words in reference to her, "... o tlose tshase eo tseleng ..." above. Whereas Mmasebueng's action of insulting Kesentseng was to fulfill her plan of enticing Rankakata and win him for herself, for Kesentseng, this was tantamount to a personal and direct challenge. It is, therefore, not surprising that she attacks Mmasebueng and not only breaks her teeth, but even bites off her ear as well.

As it is common for people to gather at the place of strife or commotion, community members quickly gather at Mmasebueng's house. The fight has already ended, though there is still an uncertainty as to what will happen next. Sehloho addresses himself to Rankakata, persuading him to explain what the whole commotion is all about. As may be expected, Rankakata hardly finds words to explain, which prompts Sehloho to remark as follows:

"Rankakata keng monna haeka o ntse o tatasela jwalo ka qheku le nyala morwetsana tje! Bua monna, molato ke eng?" (Act I: scene iii)

[Rankakata what's wrong man, as you keep fidgeting like an elderly man getting married to a virgin! Speak up man, what's the matter?]

Sehloho's comparison of 'qheku le nyala morwetsana,' is quite loaded with meaning – it works as a persuasive action for Rankakata to reconsider his involvement in this extramarital affair with Mmasebueng, the woman who is, apparently, younger than him. But Rankakata fails to yet respond to the questions posed to him by Sehloho. Whether it is his failure to find words to respond to Sehloho's question, or it is Kesentseng's vivacity and anger, one can hardly tell, as the latter finds herself responding by saying: "Ke marabe ntho ena ... ntja ya selahlwa-le-boya! Yona kolobe e qhafutsang feela." (Act I: scene iii) [This thing is a puff-adder ... a dog that deserves to be thrown away with its own fur! A real pig that simply wades in the mud.]

Though Kesentseng's above response may be considered as some kind of reaction that is prompted by her fury, it also functions as a persuasive attempt to call Rankakata to order and

make him aware of the embarrassing situation in which he has put himself and his whole family. The pastoral images that have been employed by Kesentseng in these remarks are powerful. One can vividly conceptualise a puff-adder being eaten up by its own young ones at birth. 'Ntja ya selahwa-le-boya,' on the other hand, creates a clear image of a dog that has to be thrown away when it dies, as people may not even make use of its fur. Kesentseng is, therefore, using these metaphors in an attempt to persuade Rankakata to reassess himself and realise the low level into which he has ebbed. Finally, Kesentseng applies the metaphor of a pig to persuade Rankakata into realizing that, even if he may think of any extramarital affair, his involvement with Mmasebueng depicts him as a pig, which more often than not, chooses to wade in the mud and dirt in search of food, leaving clean stuff that is at its disposal.

Since Kesentseng has never spoken to him like this before, Rankakata cannot hold himself. He shouts at her, saying, "Thola wena mosadi! O ntse o ntlhapaola, na o ntse o ikutlwa?" (Act I: scene iii). [Shut up you woman! You are insulting me, do you hear yourself?] Instead of shutting up, as would be expected, Kesentseng defies him and shouts back as follows: "O buang? Ha ke a phonyohelwa. Eseng o nahana hore ke phonyohetswe." (Act I: scene iii). [What are you saying? I have not said that by mistake. May be you think that I said that by mistake.] These verbal exchanges somehow spell out the relationship of the husband and wife in this situation. Kesentseng has never spoken like this about, and in the presence of, Rankakata even once, not because she was afraid of him, but because she respected him, as a wife ought to do so, one would conclude. Since she considers Rankakata as someone who has disgraced himself by ebbing to the lowest standards – of a puff-adder, a dog, and a pig – he deserves no usual respect he has been afforded by her, she seems to think.

When Rankakata shouts at her and tells her to shut up, one sees a man attempting to regain his lost status. It is not surprising then that even the instruction for Kesentseng to shut up ends up with "wena mosadi." Seemingly, this is a calculated persuasive attempt to remind Kesentseng that she is a woman, and that, as such, she has no right to talk like that about her husband, especially in his presence. In order for Rankakata to realise that she has not erred, Kesentseng addresses herself to him directly, and confronts him with the rhetorical question "O buang;" apparently to make him aware that, in his presently low personal status, he deserves no right to speak. Indeed Rankakata has been successfully persuaded by Kesentseng's approach and words, for he shuts up and merely listens as other people around him talk. One may add that Rankakata shuts up in order to save his face.

Although Kesentseng has managed to shut Rankakata down, Sehloho, pleadingly, persuades her to cool down, in the following words:

“Beya butle, mmarona. Ha e hate ka maro tauhadi. Ntwa ke ya madulammoho. Ha re yeng lapeng ho ya utlwa sesosa, ditaba di buuwa ho dutswe. Na ruri ha le bone le a itlotlolla. Lelapa le hlomphehileng seka la lona, ke lona le etsang merusu e swabisang tjee!” (Mmasebueng o se theola thabeng. Metswalle ya hae e mmokanetse ho mo neha matshediso ana a se nang phofo.) (Act I: scene iii).

[Take it easy, our mother. Let there be peace. Fighting is normal for those living together. Let us go home to learn about the cause; issues are discussed when people are seated. Don't you indeed realise that you embarrass yourselves? A respected family such as yours, is it the one that causes such shameful chaos! (Mmasebueng cries bitterly. Her friends have gathered around her to give her mere unfruitful consolations.)]

Sehloho's persuasive words have worked successfully on Kesentseng, for she henceforth utters no more a word. Even if Kesentseng were not going to be easily persuaded to behave herself as Sehloho wanted, the kind of pleading words that Sehloho uses have disarmed her – words such as

1. 'mmarona', which is aimed at motivating Kesentseng into the awareness that she is not a mere woman, but, by status, a mother to those gathered at the scene, and therefore has to give them the respect they deserve;
2. the idiomatic expression 'Ha e hate ka maro tauhadi,' which typically captures the whole meaning of being asked to cool down, even as the addressed individual may be as highly furious as a lion/lioness;
3. the expression that 'ntwa ke ya madulammoho,' which is aimed at motivating those at loggerheads with each other to remember that such squabbles take place almost everywhere where people live together; and
4. the fact that, since theirs is such a respected family, it should fill them with shame to be displaying this kind of behaviour in public.

Sehloho's intervention and his pleading to the couple that they, together with him, should go home where they can sit down and discuss issues, also works as a persuasive plan for them to leave Mmasebueng's place. Besides, his reminder that theirs is a highly respected family, persuades them to refrain from indulging into any more shameful displays while they are at Mmasebueng's home.

As for Mmasebueng's wailings, one can only draw a conclusion that she is calling for attention, as she realises that nobody addresses her. In addition, she is using this action as a persuasive action to invite those who may feel pity for her to come clear and share with her

this painful moment for her. It is therefore, not surprising that at this juncture her friends gather around her to give her those fruitless consolations.

Consequently, at Rankakata's home in the evening, there prevails utter silence and gloominess, as Bafedile continues working on her studies. Whereas her mother is lying on a grass mat, Rankakata is seated on a chair, with his head between his knees. This is an unusual kind of behaviour demonstrated by both Bafedile's father and mother. It would seem that this sombre mood somehow disturbs Bafedile, for she ultimately poses the following questions to her parents:

“Hao! molato keng mme haeka pelo e ile mafiasa? Le ntate ha a sa qoqe, empa ke itse re tla tjhesa lekomo ka phirima, ekaba jwale ho senyehile kae ra tswa re lokisa?” (Act I: scene iv).

[Oh! What is the matter mother as you are so despondent? Even father does not chat, yet I had said that we shall engage ourselves in discussion, by the way, what has gone wrong, so that we may mend?]

Obviously, Bafedile is ignorant of the matter that has triggered the prevailing sombreness in the family. Her questions are, therefore, genuine ones that simply need an answer. But nobody offers an answer to these questions, which prompts Bafedile to employ a comic relief, as a persuasive strategy to invite the parents' response, saying: “Ha eka batho ha ba nkarabe ha ke botsa ... ekaba ke jeleng ka tima batswadi ba ka?” (Act I: scene iv). [Since people do not answer my questions ... what have I eaten and denied my parents?]

These persuasive questions ultimately make an impact on Kesentseng, such that she responds as follows:

“Ha o botse yena ntatao keng? Haeka o duletse ho nna a o nyemotsa le ho o setotsa jwalo. (Rankakata o raoha setulong jwalo ka motho ya kgorohelang ho hong. O a tswa mme o kgahlela lemati) Hei, o se ke wa nthobela lemati nna, ke o jwetse. Tsamaya o ye ha nyatsi eo ya hao setsetse towe.” (Act I: scene iv).

[Why don't you ask your father? As he continually casts an eye on you and glances at you? (Rankakata starts off the chair as if rushing for something. He storms out and slams the door) Hello, you dare not break my door, I tell you! Be off and go to that concubine of yours, you wild cat!]

Apparently, Kesentseng's intention was never to infuriate Rankakata, such that he storms out of the house and slams the door behind him. Rather, her plan was for him to come upfront and emit the whole truth to Bafedile. One would then draw a conclusion that the reference to him as one who was to be questioned, stimulated negative feelings for Rankakata, thus

causing his fury and an urge to storm out of the house, as he did. His slamming of the door may correctly be analysed as a signal to both Bafedile and Kesentseng that he is angry with them: Bafedile as her mother's informer that he had gone towards Mmasebueng's house; and Kesentseng for taking action to go and harm Mmasebueng, while the latter and him were in the process of discussing the fate of the former, thus causing him the whole embarrassment and shame.

Since, by nature, Rankakata is a vindictive and arrogant character, his starting off the chair and the slamming of the door behind him may correctly be labelled as a display of forms of vindictiveness and arrogance, calculated for forcing the two women to cut off the subject in question. Indubitably, this whole matter has embarrassed and infuriated him, to an extent that he dares not be upfront with them and allow himself to be persuaded to adopt any form of change of his attitude and behaviour. Rankakata's action may then be analysed as coercion, rather than persuasion, for, indeed, these ladies cannot persuade him to adopt any change without his presence, and an upfront involvement in that kind of persuasive communication.

On the other hand, Kesentseng's statements, that she throws at Rankakata as he storms out and slams the door, are manipulative in nature. It would appear that she is somehow adopting the latter's character of malice in response to his actions. Since Bafedile, their daughter, is present in the house, it appears as if Kesentseng snaps at Rankakata in this nature as a way of indirectly informing the daughter of her father's unacceptable behaviour. Further, she throws these words at him in a bid to manipulate Bafedile into hating her father, or to judge him without discussing the matter with him upfront; and, worse still, for Bafedile to regard her father as one who is no different from a wild cat in attitude and behaviour.

As for Bafedile, she is perplexed by Kesentseng's attitude towards Rankakata. She, therefore, directs her question at Kesentseng, saying:

“Hobaneng ha mme a tjhwalakanya tjee ha a bua le ntate? Hona ntate o entseng ha mme a jele ditlhokwa tjee? Nna le se ke la ntshosa la mpherekanya hoja dihlahlobo di atametse.” (Act I: scene iv).

[Why is mother so vindictive when speaking to father? Otherwise what has father done that warrants mother to be so arrogant? Please don't frighten and confuse me you people, now that the examinations are approaching.]

Needless to say, these persistent questions persuade Kesentseng into divulging all that has prompted this kind of situation. Rankakata's sudden departure has in itself worked as a motivation for Kesentseng to reveal all the information, to straighten up this matter. It seems important for her to highlight Bafedile on this issue, so as to relieve her of the strain of trying

to guess what could have prompted the prevailing mood; otherwise failure to do so may impact negatively on Bafedile at this crucial period of preparing for the forthcoming examinations.

In fulfilment of her desire to persuade Bafedile to fully identify with her, and possibly to motivate her into hating Mmasebueng, and consider her as a vile woman whose mission is to cause Rankakata to quit his family, Kesentseng relates the whole story to Bafedile. She tells her that she has broken Mmasebueng's teeth, referring to her as 'baehlotse elwa wa mosadi;' and 'torobese,' ['that incorrigible woman;'] and 'wild/troublesome one']. Indeed, if the above qualifications fit Mmasebueng well, one would say that Kesentseng had reason enough to use violence against her, and consequently she feels entitled to persuade Bafedile to also abhor this 'vile' woman.

In the same vein, Kesentseng regards Rankakata as also a corrupted and incorrigible man, as he is all out to gallivant with a woman of Mmasebueng's character disposition. One may surmise then, that Kesentseng is hereby also attempting to persuade Bafedile to look down upon Rankakata, and consider him as one who has deteriorated from his formal respectable position within the community to that of Mmasebueng, the incorrigible one. Finally, the qualifications that Kesentseng puts on both Rankakata and Mmasebueng, are meant for motivating Bafedile into feeling pity for and identify with the former in this state of affairs; and further view the extramarital affair couple as the troublesome twosome that is out to cause damage to their family. To round up her point with reference to Rankakata, Kesentseng says, "Ha a phetse honna a nyela leletelele matsatsing ana." (Act I scene: iv). [He never ceases to cause trouble these days].

As Reardon (1991:25) would put it, persuasion is "facilitated by a meeting of the minds on some common ground that is often not easily identified." Further, Reardon posits that for people to communicate effectively, they adopt some similar perspectives – a "common ground from which dissimilar people may begin to build a common understanding" (1991:25). It follows, therefore, that, for Kesentseng to relate all these sensitive issues to Bafedile, it is to ensure that they share a common ground against Rankakata and Mmasebueng. It comes not as a surprise, therefore, that Bafedile remarks to the breaking of the latter's teeth in the following manner:

"Hoja ke ne ke le teng, nkabe ke ile ka o thusa ebe eba re a ntshitse kaofela, ya sala ele mmoroso. Jwale la namolelwa ke mang? Ke yena ntate?" (Act 1: scene iv)

[If I had been there, I would have helped you so that we would by now have extracted them all so that she remains toothless. Then who separated you? Was it father himself?]

No doubt, Bafedile has been fully persuaded by Kesentseng in this respect. The fact that she even wishes that she were there to assist Kesentseng in breaking Mmasebueng's teeth, clearly indicates the common ground on which they stand together. She has without doubt adopted Kesentseng's hatred against Mmasebueng, and desire for causing harm to her, which fits well with Larson's (1995:307) view that hate is "a powerful unifying device" that is often employed by some manipulative persuaders to achieve their goal/s. It would be correct then for one to observe that Kesentseng's persuasive strategy has been rather manipulative in nature, since Bafedile is only a young girl who was not supposed to be provided with all such details concerning the darker side of her father. Besides, Kesentseng's use of qualifying words against both Rankakata and Mmasebueng are not supposed to be said to such a young girl who still yet has to further her high school or college studies.

Upon realizing the extent to which Bafedile has formed an alliance with her, Kesentseng pampers her more with exciting piece of news to guarantee the daughter's support and initiative to rally with her on the ensuing war of self-liberation against Rankakata and his concubine, Mmasebueng. She says:

"Ke ile ka mo shemola le tsebe ena. Ke ha ke mo lesa. Feela ke a hlapanya ka Bataung ba ntswetse, ha e le yena o sa tla di tholla ho nna mona. Bokaako ba tsie mokopu bo tla mo timella ke a o hlapanyetsa. Ke mang ya neng a tseba hore lapa lela le neng le sa tanakellwe ke dilathalatha le ka fetoha tjee! Kajeno bona ka moo le fetohileng setsi sa maferefere (sic) le manyofonyofo ka teng. (O thola motsotswana) Motho a hola yare kgolong ya hae a bona diaba. Ke re ke otlanya thupa le lefatshe, mosadi eo, tsa hae di tla buuwa kgabareng. O ntse a nkutlwa ka hlokwana la tsela le bona boshuushu!" (Bafedile mahlo a se a benya ke kameho ya maikutlo. Ba kena dikobong). (Act I: scene iv).

[I even bit off her ear. Then I released her. But I vow by the Bataung who bore me, as for her she is still going to get what she deserves from me! The coquetry of female locust will elude her I vow! Whoever knew that this formerly respected family which was never common for fools could so much change so much. Today, witness the extent to which it has become a nucleus for contempt and disorderliness. (She pauses for a moment) A person grows up and in the process saw wonders. I bet, that woman, hers will be talk of the town sooner or later. She has heard of me from the hearsay and rumours! (Bafedile's eyes are shining with concern. They get into bed).

Indubitably, Bafedile has now been wholly manipulated, and persuaded into fully identifying with Kesentseng in her prevailing troubles. The fact that her eyes are even glittering with concern, is indicative of the fact that she not only sympathises with Kesentseng, but also

empathises with her. Given a chance, she would be ready to cause any form of injury on Mmasebueng, for Kesentseng's sake, as she shares the same sentiments with her. In other words, Bafedile has now become Kesentseng's complete ally against Mmasebueng, and possibly Rankakata too.

Since she has been so much thinking about this matter, in the morning, Bafedile wakes Kesentseng up, and relates her dream to the latter. In the dream, Bafedile and Kesentseng were together on the mountain side, where, due to overcast, the former lost sight of the latter, only to regain it when the overcast had waned off. Before the overcast could wane off, Bafedile could slightly hear Kesentseng's feeble voice, as if coming from a far off place. Eventually, Kesentseng's voice was completely diminished; only to be replaced by a different one, shouting and seemingly coming down the mountain side. At this point, Bafedile saw Rankakata coming down towards a limp form of Kesentseng. He then shook up Kesentseng, in an effort to wake her up, but alas, Kesentseng could not move. Rankakata then wailed, while at the same time Bafedile saw Mmasebueng standing next to herself, staring at her with pity. Then Mmasebueng took out a knife and chased her (Bafedile), apparently with the intention to pierce her with the knife. It was at this moment that she woke up, and this being the moment at which the dream came to an end.

It would seem that, since Kesentseng, in a manipulative way, persuaded Bafedile to identify with her so much before they went to bed, this persuasion caused the latter's mind to overwork, ending up in this fearful dream. In her subconscious mind, she bundled together Rankakata and Mmasebueng as murderers who are out to get both Kesentseng and herself, it appears. One may surmise, therefore, that, whereas Rankakata is the instigator of the whole strive that leads to possible murders, according to Bafedile's subconscious mind, Mmasebueng is the true murderer who is poised to kill her (Bafedile).

For Kesentseng, the whole dream portends doom. She foresees a time in life when she will experience some hardships as the time goes. Further, Kesentseng remarks that one should shy away from this world and all that is in it. Without any doubt, Kesentseng says these words as a persuasive action for Bafedile to be wary of the two characters in her dream, and take as much precaution as possible against them. As a persuasive strategy for Bafedile to be emotionally charged, and completely be in alliance with her, Kesentseng sheds some tears, and they well down her cheeks. As a sign that she is overcharged with desire in the revelation of this dream, Bafedile persuades Kesentseng to go on analysing the dream, so that she may understand it better. Rather than attempting to analyse the dream further, Kesentseng only tells Bafedile that from henceforth she should observe the happenings that take place around them and try to find out what they indicate. In this way, Kesentseng has persuaded Bafedile to be vigilant and wary of their supposed enemies.

Apparently, Bafedile has been disturbed very much by the dream, to an extent that she applies her persuasive skill for Kesentseng to continue with the analysis, saying:

“Mantswe ana a hao, ke mantswe a nang le moelelo o tebileng; moelelo ona motho o sitwa ho o fihlela ha bonolo. Feela ke lemoha hore o eletswe ntho e se kaa ka letho torong ena, empa seo o se etsang pipietsa ya hao o nnotshi.” (Act I: scene v).

[These words of yours, are words with a deep meaning, this meaning is not easy for one to get. But I realise that you have noticed something great in this dream, though you make it your own secret.]

Bafedile’s challenge for Kesentseng to open up and divulge the secret is very forceful. Her first tactic is that of commenting her mother for deep insight into this dream, while the second one is that of making Kesentseng aware that for now she has decided to keep that secret for herself. By so saying, Bafedile is challenging her mother to reveal her analysis of the dream. As a sign that she has been successfully persuaded, Kesentseng retorts by using these words: “Tjhe, nke ke ka o kwalla sefuba sa ka.” (Act I: scene v). [No, I cannot close my chest for you.]

No doubt, this response has given hope for Bafedile’s persuasive talk to succeed. She turns and faces her mother’s side saying:

“Ya ka fihlelang botebo ba pelo ya motho ke mang? Ke ha e le mang ya ka senolelwang lekunutu la motho le Morenae! Mpolelle hle, seo o se utlwang ka toro ena. (O thola motsotswana) Toro eo nna monga yona ke sa tsebeng tlhaloso ya yona.” (Act I: scene v).

[Who can reach the depth of someone’s heart? Who could it be to whom a human being’s secret with his/her Lord may be revealed! Please tell me that which you feel about this dream. (She pauses for a moment) The dream that I, the owner, do not know its revelation.]

Apparently, Kesentseng suspects that if she were to reveal the meaning of the dream blatantly, it may shock Bafedile, or else be too much for her to comprehend, for she now makes some biblical allusions. First, she tells Bafedile that even Faro never understood the dream he had, but Joseph analysed it; revealing everything that eventually came as a confirmation of the analysis. Further, Kesentseng explains to Bafedile that she has no explanations, but eventually the latter will realise that her dream was correct; and will also realise the truth of the matter concerning the way their lives are bound together. As Bafedile still seems not to comprehend Kesentseng’s explanations, the latter, once more, uses a biblical allusion; that the whole matter is similar to that of Elia and Elisha, and that in the same way, one will be removed from the other.

An allusion in a literary text, according to Abrams (1993:8), “is a reference, without explicit identification, to a person, place, or event, or to another literary work or passage;” and it implies “a fund of knowledge that is shared by an author and an audience.” Instead of working as a persuasive tactic for Bafedile to understand the meaning of the dream in question, this employment of allusions confuse her, and worse still, end up frightening her, as indicated in this response:

“Ka utlwa ke sehwa ke letswalo ha o bua jwalo. (O phahamisa lentswe) Ekaba ntate yena, o robetse kae mme? Esebe mohlomong ke yena ya tla tloswa ho rona!” (Act I: scene v).

[I feel some fright striking me when you talk like that. (She raises her voice) What about father, where might he be sleeping, mother? I hope he is not the one who is going to be removed from us!]

Kesentseng retorts with a stress in her response: “Tjhe! ...” (Act I: scene v). [No! No! ...], thus emphasizing that Rankakata is not going to be affected by such a split. The emphasis she puts on her words frighten Bafedile more, as the following response would show: “Mme, athe o ntse o bua jwang?” (Act I: scene v). [Mother, by the way how are you talking?] Upon realizing the extent of the fright experienced by Bafedile, Kesentseng further more attempts to persuade her into cooling down. She gives the daughter an assurance that as for Rankakata, ‘thota e sa namme’, [the high flat ground is still broad] that he yet has to traverse. While Bafedile is still listening and hoping for more explanations from Kesentseng, the latter makes her aware that light has penetrated the house, indicating that the night is over. She then persuades Bafedile to get up and start performing her usual morning chores. Bafedile gets up and starts working as persuaded by Kesentseng.

Upon realizing the state of weakness in which Kesentseng is, Bafedile communicates with her in an attempt to persuade her to go and see the doctor. She even offers to accompany her to the doctor’s place. Instead of responding to Bafedile’s suggestion, Kesentseng comes up with something else, that

“Seo nna ke se lemohang wena ha o ka ke wa se elellwa. Kgotsofala ha a ntse a tjhaba a dikela; o nne o lebohe Ramasedi ha a sa ntsane a o adimile nna matsatsing ana, a ba hao bophelo. (O thola motsotswana) O se o hodile, ha ke kgolwe hore o ka lahleha bophelong ba hao ha feela o ntse o hopola thuto ya ka mme o itshetlehile ka yona.(...) Thuto ya ka ke lefika le tebileng haholo moo le emeng teng. O tla bolokeha ha o ka ela mantswa a ka hloko.” (Act II: scene i)

[That which I observe you cannot realise. Be satisfied as they rise and set; continue giving thanks to The Almighty while he still continues lending me to you in these days,

of your life. (She pauses for a moment) You have already grown up, I do not think that you may get lost in your life as long as you remember my teaching and adhere to it. (...) My teaching is a very deep rock where it stands. You will be safe if you take care of my words...]

It would appear that Kesentseng has certain insights into her kind of suffering, such that she sees no need for her to go and see the doctor about her present condition. In a way, she refers to her life as some kind of lending to Bafedile as a persuasive strategy for the daughter to drop the idea of taking her to the doctor. Though it may not be very easy for Bafedile to comprehend all what Kesentseng is saying, one can surmise that the latter somehow considers her life as ebbing, to an extent that she has lost hope of ever recuperating. It would, therefore, seem that Kesentseng's intention is to persuade Bafedile to realise that she is about to be on her own, as she (Kesentseng) is on the verge of dying. That is why she now persuades Bafedile to also realise that she (Bafedile) is now a grown up girl who has been imbibed into life teachings that are bound to carry her throughout her life; as long as she adheres to them.

Further, Kesentseng indirectly persuades Bafedile to avoid bad friends who may dissuade her into bad behaviour, by introducing to her their immoral actions, as in:

“Motho o ye a fetolwe ke maemo a bophelo kgodisong ya batswadi ba hae. Phetoho eo e hlahiswa ke metswalle e fosahetseng; ke bolela hore mekgwa e mebe eo ba hotseng ka yona, e ye e tshwaetse motho ebe qetellong o fetoha ntja-selahlwa-le-boya.” (Act II: scene i).

[Usually a person is changed from the parents' upbringing by life situations. Such a change is brought about by bad friends; I mean bad manners they grew up engaging in, usually affect a person, such that he/she ends up becoming a useless dog.]

Indubitably, Kesentseng's verbal persuasive attempt for Bafedile has been successful, as she immediately responds by indicating that, should she pass both her preliminary and final examinations, she will go to Morumotsho – where she is sure to meet different friends from different families and backgrounds. Bafedile even goes further to illustrate that some children come from extremely poor families, where they hardly have anything to eat; while others come from rich ones. Further still, she intimates that the latter children usually care but very little about their future, as they put their trust in the useless inheritance of their parents' properties.

In response to Bafedile's analysis of some of the children from the rich families, Kesentseng emphasises to her that she should put no trust in her father's riches: “Bafedile ngwana ka, o se ke wa mpa wa tshepa maruo ana a ntatao...” (Act II: scene i) [Bafedile, my child, please

do not put any trust into these riches of your father.] Bafedile retorts as follows: “Ke se ke utlwile ebile e se eka nka dula ke thuhisa mantswe ana ao o sa tswa a bua hona jwale.” (Act II: scene i). [I have already heard that and I wish I can keep on thinking about these words that you have just said to me.]

Needless to say, Bafedile now fully identifies herself with her mother. In short, she has been successfully persuaded by Kesentseng to see things the way she sees them. One may even further surmise that from now on she is likely to closely observe Rankakata, and see whether or not he is genuine in whatever thing he will say to her. As a further persuasion for Bafedile not to put any trust in Rankakata’s riches, Kesentseng makes her aware that as for him, he is only pretending to laugh with her (Bafedile) because Kesentseng herself is still around. Further, she cautions the daughter that once she is gone, “ruri o tlo lebelle ha ngwale e kgiba” (Act II: scene i). [indeed you will see wonders]. Furthermore, she encourages Bafedile to write and succeed in her examinations so that she may be able to work for herself in her future; using the proverbial expression that “[p]hokojwe ho phela e diretsana” (Act II: scene i). [It is a muddy jackal that is to survive]. This means that Bafedile should work hard and fend for herself, otherwise, she may be sure to experience some problems in life.

In addition, Kesentseng employs yet another proverbial expression, that “mphemphe e a lapisa motho o kgonwa ke sa hae” (Act II: scene i); [(literally) give-me-give-me causes hunger, a person is satisfied by his/her own stuff]; in essence, meaning that he/she who relies on gifts, will for ever go hungry, as one gets full satisfaction from one’s own stuff. Obviously, Kesentseng’s use of these proverbial expressions is calculated at persuading Bafedile to aim at being self-reliant in life, rather than putting her trust in her father’s riches – “haeba o sa battle ho iketsa mokopakopa ka lemo se seng,” says Kesentseng (Act II: scene i).

As a testimony that she has grasped all her mother’s teachings, and that she is prepared, not only to meditate upon them, but to abide by them too, Bafedile takes the following pledge: “ke tla rola dieta ke kene kgabong ho netefatsa mantswe a hao,” (Act II: scene i). [I will take off the shoes and get into the burning fire to fulfil your words (literal)]. Undoubtedly, Bafedile has been fully motivated by Kesentseng’s proverbial expressions, and she fully aligns herself with the latter – she, like Kesentseng who emerges quite proverbial in her persuasive expression, also comes out idiomatic in conformation of her alliance with her mother.

In an effort to show her appreciation of the alliance Bafedile has hereby pledged, Kesentseng thanks the former, and indicates that, as the mother, she would not like Bafedile to complain about her in future, saying “ke ile ka o phinya lonya,” (Act II: scene i), [I deceived you]. Once

more, Kesentseng proves her mastery of idiomatic expressions for achieving her goal in persuasion.

In addition to her attempt at persuading Bafedile to be self-reliant, Kesentseng relates to the former, her background story. She informs Bafedile that she lost her parents at a very early age, such that she eventually had to be brought up by her maternal uncle. Further she informs Bafedile that, though her uncle had two sons, they were involved in a fatal accident while she was in the initiation school. It follows then that she remained the sole child in her uncle's family. Furthermore, she relates to Bafedile that she was separated with that family by her marriage to Rankakata. Further still, she informs Bafedile that her marriage to Rankakata was initially very enjoyable and successful, as there were never any troubles that she has experienced of late. Bafedile has, without doubt, been highly impressed by this persuasive communication. She now realises that their family has no relatives she knows of, and as such she has to align completely with her mother, and follow her persuasive pieces of advice.

Nonetheless, Bafedile inquires whether or not they do not have even distant relation somewhere, thus persuading Kesentseng to give her the connections with their family. Without any form of disappointment, Kesentseng informs her that they might have one somewhere far off, yet Rankakata would be quite furious if anyone would venture into that subject. At this moment, they hear some murmurs outside, and since one of the voices is that of Rankakata, Kesentseng urges Bafedile that they should be silent, lest he overhears them. In order for Bafedile to clearly understand the relations they have with Rankakata, Kesentseng refers to him as 'qhibididikgwaqa ena ya monna!' (Act 11: scene i) [an untrustworthy man who may look happy but suddenly become furious over nothing] The two women, in alliance, avoid Rankakata's untrustworthy nature by Kesentseng's pretence in sleeping, and Bafedile's reading.

Upon realizing that Bafedile is busy reading her books, Rankakata asks her whether or not she ever takes a break from her books. Further, he asks her if he is right that education is what she has said she wants, to which Bafedile answers in the positive. She even goes further to inform Rankakata that she wants to form some friendship with her books, as they indicate for her the way of life. Further still, Bafedile reminds her father that the examinations are at hand, and asks him the following question: "Na o tla thabela ha thotholokwane ya hao e tea kalala? Tjhe, ha ke kgolwe e le se ka o hlatswang qati seo!" (Ba tsheha). (Act 11: scene i) [Will you be happy to see your only child failing? No, I don't think that is what would please you]

Needless to say, Bafedile's words have been quite persuasive for Rankakata to open up and relate with her at father-daughter level, in harmony. It comes not as a surprise then that they are joined in laughter. Rankakata then smilingly expresses his wish that Bafedile could go through her education, so that she may rest. In addition, he inquires whether he is right that this is the final year. Bafedile raises her voice and answers that there still lays a wide ground to cover; as there still remain five years for her further studies.

As if in fulfilment of Kesentseng's description, of calling him 'qhibididikgwaqa', as was shown above, Rankakata's mood swiftly changes. That friendly, fatherly mood immediately wanes off, giving way to that of fury, as marked by the following words by him: "O reng? Na o tiisa hore o sa ya pele isao? O tla qeta na! Ke bua ke lomahantse meno ngwana ka, ha ke sa na matla a makaalo." (Act 11: scene i). [What are you saying? Are you seriously saying that you still go further next year? Are you really going to complete! I hereby speak with tight teeth my child, I do not have any more money.]

As a persuasive attempt, Bafedile employs the tactic of weeping, so that her father may feel pity for her and change his way of thinking, or his attitude towards her continuing with her education. Tears well down her cheeks, and are accompanied by snivelling. At the same time she spells out her disappointment, especially now that her mother has become a friend to the sick bed. Without doubt, Rankakata has been persuaded by Bafedile's action and words. Remorse shows on his face as he says, "O se kgathatsehe moradiaka. Ke tla o isa sekolong." (Act 11: scene i). [Do not worry my daughter. I will send you to school.]

Now that her father has promised to send her for further education, Bafedile extends her thanks in advance to him. Like someone who has been brewing up a hidden agenda all along, she immediately tells Rankakata that she would be quite gleeful if he could take care of her mother, just as much as he did at the time of their marriage. She even indicates that she longs for those days as if she had seen them; the happiness that was prevailing in the family; as well as tranquillity and mutual understanding they shared together. As if this was not enough, she adds that she would also like to see them planning together as they did in those days, unlike now when they are old things.

Obviously, Bafedile's persuasive strategies have worked wonders. When Kesentseng pretends to be only then waking up, and speaks like one who comes from a deep slumber, Rankakata asks her how she is keeping. Further, he comments that he realises that she has been in deep sleep. As if he cares, he even inquires after her health. In an attempt to persuade him to continue with his friendly communication, Kesentseng tells him that she is better off today. Furthermore, she intimates to him that she even plans to go to the fields,

since the pangs have somehow waned off. Rankakata retorts that it is good, thus showing that he is at peace with Kesentseng and wishes her well.

With the intention of keeping this momentum going, Kesentseng suggests that Rankakata should be thirsty, and asks Bafedile to pour him some sour porridge. In a friendly and submissive manner, Rankakata indicates that he would appreciate that – saying, “Nka thaba haholo ka nnete.” (Act II: scene i). [I would be very grateful indeed.] Basing oneself on the knowledge of the character of Rankakata, one observes that he has been persuaded by these interactants, Bafedile and Kesentseng, into somehow change his attitude and behaviour towards them.

One wonders, though, whether Rankakata can be trusted as one who has truly changed his attitude and behaviour. No wonder that Bafedile is worried that, though she is likely to succeed in her examinations, she is likely to fail to go to Morumotsho for further education. The main source of her worry is the fact that her mother is in a weak state of health, and therefore may not have so much influence on Rankakata to pay for her education. She passes a remark saying,

“Ka Labobedi re qala hlahlobo ya makgaolakgang. Pelo ya ka e tletse maswabi ha ke lemoha hore le ha nka atleha ke tlo fetoha le letsatsi hae mona jwalo ka mokotla o mahlo mohlohlwa o rapame...Wa tla wa kgathallwa ke pere nakong e mpe, mme.” (Act II: scene iii).

[On Tuesday we start writing the final examinations. My heart is covered with shame when I realise that, even if I pass, I am going to be continually turning around with the sun here at home like an eyed bag that is crammed with corn in a lying down position [...]. Your horse has been knocked up at the wrong time, mother.]

Bafedile’s remarks are quite persuasive, for Rankakata immediately responds as follows: “Mmao o kgathallwa ke pere ya eng? O ipona meno a tletse lehano tjee, o ntse o re ke mang ya o hodisitseng?” (Act II: scene iii). [What horse of your mother is knocked up? You realise yourself with a mouth full of teeth, who do you think has brought you up?]

Indubitably, Rankakata’s rhetorical questions prompt Bafedile into applying her persuasive attempt on him to change his attitude towards her furthering education. She grabs this opportunity and addresses her father as follows:

“Ke yena ya nkgodisitseng hobane o na le kutlwelobohloko jwalo ka motswadi; o sekehela ditabatabelo tsa ka tsebe. [...] Haeba o ile wa nkotla, hobaneng o sa sekehele ditlhoko tsa ka tsebe? Mme o na le thahasello ya ho nkisa sekolong, empa ke a bona ha a na matla. Le ha ho le jwalo Morena o tla nthusa. Ke a hlapanya ke sa

tla be ke atlehe ditorong tsa ka. Le ha lefatshe lena le ka mphetohela. O teng ya tla ntshedisa; Motshedisi wa sebele.” (Act II: scene iii).

[She is the one who has brought me up because she has pity on me as a parent; she gives attention to my desires. [...] If you brought me up, why don't you pay attention to my desires? Mother has interest in sending me to school, but I realise that she has no power. Even so, The Lord is going to assist me. I bet I shall eventually succeed in achieving my dreams. Even if this world can turn against me, He is present he who will assist me; the true Comforter.]

Even though Bafedile has attempted so much to move her father and persuade him to adopt a change towards her schooling, Rankakata is still a hard character to persuade. He does not respond to Bafedile's wails. All he can say at this juncture is that “Rona re tla boka ha di oroha.” (Act II: scene iii). [We shall give thanks when they come home, i. e., when all is well]

It is, instead, Kesentseng who motivates Bafedile in her endeavours to attain higher education, saying, “Morena a o nehe kutlwisiso ya tseo o di balang.” (Act II: scene iii). [May the Lord give you an understanding in what you read!] Bafedile goes out to read her books, thus giving an opportunity for Kesentseng and Rankakata to discuss any of their issues freely. Like someone who has been waiting for this very moment, Kesentseng uses this moment to persuade Rankakata to retrace his steps and rectify his ways, beliefs and attitude towards life. She then spells out what Rankakata seems not to so much consider, and says: “Ke nahana hore lapa la rona le ka boela la eba le kgotso ha feela o ka eellwa moo o kileng wa wa teng.” (Act II: scene iii). [I think that our family can once more boast of peace if you can only realise where your fall emanates from.]

As usual, Rankakata takes out his smoking pipe, lights it, and smokes. One may rightly surmise that Rankakata's action is symbolic, of his intention to add more fire to the already prevailing troubles in his family. Nonetheless, Kesentseng pays no attention to this action, but makes reference to the former's riches, elaborating on the extent to which the riches have multiplied. Then she touches on a sensitive issue, asking Rankakata whether or not he knows who is responsible for multiplying the riches he has. She says, “Hana maruo aa ha se bohlang ba hao hore ebe a ntse a ngatafala empa a ...” (Act II: scene iii). [By the way, these riches have multiplied so much not due to your wisdom but ...]

Though Kesentseng's statement is meant for persuading Rankakata into thinking of the Lord as the one who gives such riches to certain people, he takes it as a challenge to his wisdom and expertise. He interrupts Kesentseng by confronting her with the question, “Ke bohlang ba mang?” (Act II: scene iii). [By whose wisdom is it?] In an attempt to persuade Rankakata to consider the Almighty as the giver of such riches, she tells him that it is through the mercy

of God, and further makes a reminder to Rankakata that he never gives anything to God in return. Furthermore, Kesentseng explains to Rankakata that he should perform some thanksgiving ceremonies in return for God's divine mercy in immersing him with such riches, emphasizing that it is not through his own wisdom.

Rather than being persuaded of thinking about God's mercy in the multiplication of his riches, as Kesentseng attempts to do, Rankakata takes offence at this suggestion, and retorts in this manner: "Ke a bona o fapane hlooho!" (Act II: scene iii). [I realise that you are running mad!] This reaction may be regarded as an antagonistic one, since Kesentseng's intention was to persuade Rankakata into giving some consideration for God's mercy in him by making him get richer, yet his response is a hostile one. For him, Kesentseng's reference to God as being responsible for the multiplication of his riches, makes no sense at all, rather it makes him regard Kesentseng as someone who is running berserk.

As Kesentseng is poised at persuading Rankakata to change his behaviour, attitude and beliefs, she continues with her verbal motivation. She remarks that, though the latter's response is tantamount to an insult, the fact remains that she is his advisor. In reference to the peace that was enjoyed by their family in earlier times, Kesentseng intimates that it has waned off due to his failure in giving thanks to God. Finally, she makes a reminder to him that the spirit has no truck with bad words and scolds; thus attempting to persuade Rankakata to refrain from his attitude of ever scolding and using abusive words against members of his family.

But it would seem that Rankakata is a flat character, for instead of even considering a change of some sort, he reacts by smashing his own smoking pipe on the floor, as an indication of his fury. According to Abrams (1993:24), a "**flat character** (also called a **type**, or 'two-dimensional') ... is built around 'a single idea or quality' and is presented without much individualizing detail, and therefore can be fairly adequately described in a single phrase or sentence" (Abrams emphasis). He then asks Kesentseng whether she means that he never gives any thanks to the Lord; and even before Kesentseng can respond to the rhetorical question, he suggests, in a question form, that it was only recently when he performed a thanksgiving ceremony at their home. As a reminder that such a thanksgiving was done a long time ago, Kesentseng indicates to Rankakata that it was performed when Bafedile had just been weaned off the breast. Needless to say, this must have been a long time ago, since Bafedile is presently a big girl who is poised to go to the high school; and the fact that Rankakata even ventures to address her as 'lethisa' (uninitiated girl), as was shown earlier in this section.

Upon realizing that his suggestion of having offered a thanksgiving ceremony recently is queried by Kesentseng as untrue, Rankakata grabs at a different but similar thanksgiving. He brags that he sometimes slaughters to the ancestors, but Kesentseng is adamant that he should offer to God himself, and not only to the ancestors. Further, Kesentseng persuades Rankakata to take all possible measures to maintain peace and stability in the family, as riches do not surpass human life, she says. Furthermore, she persuades him to attend church services for thanksgiving, praising, and making requests to the Lord. In addition, Kesentseng suggests that at the church she has turned into a widow, while her husband still lives. The foregoing suggestion is aimed at persuading Rankakata to realise the gap he has caused by his absence from the church services.

In addition, Kesentseng sums up her persuasive attempt for Rankakata to start attending the church by saying: "Modimo o hloka banna ba kang wena hore ba mo sebeletse le tlohele ho iketsa masole a mmuso wa lefifi." (Act II: scene iii). [God needs men such as you to work for him and stop turning yourselves into soldiers of the government of darkness.]

For someone who is a round character, this would be a strong enough persuasive attempt to make him/her adopt change of behaviour and attitude by either reconsidering his own status or argue the point otherwise. A round character, according to Abrams, "is complex in temperament and motivation and is represented with subtle particularity; such a character therefore is as difficult to describe with any adequacy as a person in real life, and like real persons, is capable of surprising us" (1993:24). But for Rankakata, this whole persuasive talk bears no fruition. He claims that he has no small child that needs to be baptised, which would require his presence at the church service. Additionally, Rankakata complains about the exploitation they experience, as they pay out certain money to the church minister for him to maintain his family and wellbeing.

Once more, Kesentseng's attempt at persuading Rankakata fails to bring any change in his behaviour or attitude. For him, paying certain moneys to the church ministers is daylight robbery. Seemingly, Rankakata has been sending the same moneys to the church minister, though he never goes to church himself. He suggests that the moneys he has always been sending to the church are meant for safeguarding him when he dies, so that he may also be afforded a Christian burial. He even brings it to the attention of Kesentseng that the church ministers simply accept his contributions without asking any question whatsoever.

Undoubtedly, Kesentseng's teachings to Rankakata have not persuaded him to change his attitude, beliefs, and behaviour. His response to all the teachings Kesentseng has rendered unto him is: "...eseng o tshwarwa ke hlooho jwale, mohatsa ka?" (Act II: scene iii). [... are you not being struck by a headache now, my wife?] Clearly, Rankakata regards Kesentseng

as a mad woman; one whose headache has blurred her vision. For Kesentseng, this remark triggers a realization that her attempt at persuading Rankakata is like fighting a losing battle. All she can say at this juncture is:

“Ka seballwa ruri. Ka Bataung ba ntswetse e tjena ntwala ho boima ho e fenyala. Rankakata ekaba o kenwe keng ngwana, nnyeo? (O seka meokgo) Na ebe jwale o dumellana le nna hore Sontaha re tla ya kerekeng? E tlabala yona pheko ya hao eo!”
(Act 11: scene iii)

[Now I am at a loss indeed. I bet by the Bataung who bore me, that this kind of battle is difficult to win. Rankakata, what has come into you, you son of so and so? (Tears gather in her eyes) Do you now agree with me that you will go to church with me on Sunday? That will be your only cure.]

In line with the foregoing, one can surmise that, Kesentseng has lost hope in successfully persuading Rankakata to adopt any change. Further, she regards him as a sick character that needs a cure. Yet the only cure she can think of, or that which seems appropriate for him, is that of taking him to the church on Sunday. The tears that gather in Kesentseng's eyes indicate her utter desperation in this persuasive exercise with Rankakata. It would then follow that even the final question she poses to Rankakata above signifies her final desperate attempt to change his behaviour.

Basing oneself on the knowledge of the character of Rankakata, his response to Kesentseng's question comes not as a surprise. He tells her that he has already thrown a stone there, meaning that he has long made a conviction that he will never go to church anymore. To emphasise his conviction, he even goes further to say:

“Ke se ke tla ya teng ke sa bue; ke se ke le setopo. Mabaka a mangata ao nka a phethang ka letsatsi leo. Ha ke tlo itshenyetsa nako ka mabakanyana a fofotsang a kereke mona. (Ho thola tu!) (Act II: scene iii).

[I will eventually go there when I am silent; when I am already a corpse. There are numerous commitments I could engage myself with on that day. I am not going to waste my time for flimsy reasons of the church. (There is utter silence).]

It would seem that Rankakata has reached a final conclusion; and pursuing the same goal further would not help Kesentseng in her persuasive endeavours. Since she has already expressed her desperation above, Kesentseng has nothing more to say. After all, she has just said that going to church is the only panacea for him; thus indicating that any other attempt in persuasion with him is tantamount to lashing a dead horse, as they say.

Since she has already expressed her desperation as regard her attempt to persuade Rankakata to change his attitude and behaviour, Kesentseng approaches Pontsho, one woman in the same village, and relates to her the prevailing problem in the family. She also expresses her envy in the way peace and tranquillity reign in Pontsho's family; which motivates Pontsho into volunteering to organise a meeting, where her husband and other men would attempt to persuade Rankakata to change for the better. Even as Pontsho has so volunteered, Kesentseng registers her desperation, saying, "Ba nnile ba leka ba bang empa ba tea kalala." (Act II: scene iv). [Some have tried, but to no avail.]

As if the above expression was not enough, Kesentseng relates to Pontsho the way she has attempted to initiate a change in Rankakata as follows:

"Ruri nna ke hlotswe, empa ho tseba mang? Ke itse ke mo hlahisa leseding, yaba o hlwa mekwalaba ka ba ka hlolwa. A bile a nyefola le tseo ke neng ke ntse ke sa lebella hore a ka di nyefola. Ruri ke hlotswe!" (Act II: scene iv).

[Honestly I am beaten, but who knows? I tried to show him the light, and he climbed to the top of the mountain, and I ended up losing. He even reviled those things that I never thought he could condemn. Indeed, I am beaten!]

In the next event, Mmasebueng, Rankakata's paramour, has, together with other characters, accompanied Rankakata to a marriage ceremony taking place at Ha Ramosa. As is common practice among the villagers, the women in Rankakata's company join other women to prepare and feed the ceremony attendants; thus creating an opportunity for the men accompanying Rankakata to confront him with his prevailing extramarital affair with Mmasebueng, as in the following verbal exchanges:

Mofella: Rankakata, monna, o ntse o kgema le mosadi eo? Ruri ke a utlwa ke a tshaba.

[Rankakata, man, are you still galloping with this woman? Indeed, I feel I am scared.]

Qhokofa: Ke ye ke utlwe ba re mmutla-kotlwa-tsebe o tshoha difotle. Ke hore ha o nahane hore di ka tshwana di fihla tsebeng tsa mohatsao hore o no khukhuntha hlakoreng la Mmasebueng?

[I usually hear them saying that once beaten twice shy. Don't you think that your wife may be wised up that you have been gallivanting with Mmasebueng?]

Rankakata: (O a halefa) Di tla be di builwe ke mang? Le hloka sefuba na banna? (Act III : scene i)

[(He becomes angry) By whom will such information be divulged? Don't you have a chest, guys? (i.e, can't you keep secrets?).

From this moment, Mofella and Qhokofa exchange slandering remarks directed at the person and character of Mmasebueng as follows:

Qhokofa: Ka nko tse kang ho ile ha nkwa seretse sa pharehwa sefahlehong mona, yaba ho nkwa mofeng wa peke ho phunya masobahadi ao. (O opa matsoho ebile wa tsheha) Ha se nko ke seolo ntho eno. Tlhashwana tsena ekare tsa popi ya thutswana. (Ba tsheha).

[With a nose that seems to have been created out of some mud that was thrown over her face, then a pick's handle used for opening up the nostrils. (He clasps his hands and laughs) These tiny legs of the calf look like a stick doll. (They laugh).

Mofella: Ke re moroho o mona o bitswang khabetjhe hantle. (Ba boela ba tsheha).

[I say the vegetable called cabbage at its best. (They laugh again)]

Qhokofa: Tjhe o buile le ha o ka thola thakaka!

[Indeed you have spoken, even if you may keep mum, my age mate!]

Mofella: Monna, mahlong mona o meqile dintshi ka poletjhe e ntsho e mona. Fahleho sena o se ditse ka ntho e mona e dubang hlama ya dikuku ...

[Man, here on the face she has smeared a black polish on the eyelashes. On the face itself she has heavily applied this thing used for making cakes' dough...]

Qhokofa: O tjho yona bakepoiri! (Ba tsheha) (Act III: scene i)

[You mean the very baking powder! (They laugh)]

Though he has been silently listening to these character assassinating verbal exchanges between the two men, Rankakata's patience has now gone beyond endurance, and he shouts: "Di etseng mohatlagweti banna! Ho seng jwalo, ntshonyana e tla tloha e ikgata molala hona jwale tjena." (Act III: scene i) [Cut it short, guys! Otherwise a tiny black one will soon tread on its own neck right now.]

It would seem that Mofella and Qhokofa have been passing these nasty and taunting remarks in reference to Mmasebueng as a persuasive measure for Rankakata to reconsider his own attitude and behaviour regarding his love affair with Mmasebueng. In other words, they have been jeering at him in style, as a challenge for him to look at Mmasebueng with a negative eye. As was indicated earlier in this analysis, this is a downplaying strategy aimed at influencing change of behaviour and attitude of the target. As Dillard and Marshall (2003:482) observe, such a primary persuasive goal is aimed at 'driving the intention,' and in this instance, that of causing a rift between Rankakata and Mmasebueng, so as to initiate the end of the affair in question.

But then one may ask as to whether or not this strategy is effective enough for Rankakata to change his attitude and behaviour. In a way, Rankakata has been affected by these jeers.

Testimony of this fact is contained in his reaction that Mofella and Qhokofa should cut it short, lest he is going to inflict pain on them, if they continue in this strain. For him, Mofella and Qhokofa's taunting remarks are mere vilifications against his loving paramour. Whereas Rankakata's reaction to the two men's taunting remarks may be regarded as a means of driving a secondary goal – of saving his own face and that of Mmasebueng from embarrassment by employing threats – his failure of employing an upfront persuasive strategy against the taunts signifies the effect of the primary goal as described above.

Indubitably, for Rankakata, all those who demonstrate any attitude against his extramarital affair with Mmasebueng are his enemies, who deserve nothing else but some kind of punishment. It would then follow that, with this kind of attitude, it would not be realistic for one to expect some change from Rankakata. Rather, he is likely going to reinforce his relationship with Mmasebueng. In that case, the endeavours applied by these other characters towards persuading him to end his relationship with Mmasebueng are likely to boomerang into a creation of reinforcement – where individuals' pre-existing beliefs, attitudes and behaviour are strengthened, rather than otherwise (Dillard and Marshall, 2003:484).

Indeed, Mofella and Qhokofa's persuasive words to Rankakata have fallen on deaf ears, or else, have reinforced and whetted his love and desire to continue his relationship with Mmasebueng. In line with this conclusion are the following instances and verbal exchanges that take place here at the marriage ceremony:

Mmasebueng is observed by Mofella and others that she is already playing at courtship with another man, and Mofella quips as follows:

“Bona he, Rankakata, ke eo o hakile motjhaufa wa hao. Bona leoto o le raha jwang! O hloka ona mohatla a ka be a o korallatsa ke thabo.” (Act III: scene i)

[Oh, take a look, Rankakata, there your concubine has engaged herself in. Look at how she shakes her leg! She only lacks a tail, otherwise she would be bending it with glee.]

Qhokofa: Mantswe a rona ha a na be a wela fatshe lekgale!

[Our words will never vanish into the thin air!]

Rankakata: Banna e seng ke ntse ke bona! Ebe ha se (O thola motsotswana) empa mokgwa oo a bonyang ka teng o a mpelaetsa. Ha ke re fara, ba buisana ka ho hong. O batla ho ntswa fatshe. (O ema a hulanya mosaqa. Ha a sa botsa o se a bea. Monna o re thee hanyenyane. Ya kupa e mahlo mafubedu. Rankakata leoma ke le sa tshelweng ke nta) (Act III: scene i)

[Guys, not when I can still see! Is it not (He pauses for a moment) but the way she smiles makes me suspicious. I have no doubt, they are discussing something. She wants to cheat

on me. (He stands up dragging his thick fighting stick. Without any question, he strikes at the other man. The other man dodges a little. Then a furious fight ensues. Rankakata sustains a gaping wound)

Mofella: Rankakata, ha se rona ba ntseng ba o kgalemella mosadi eo? (Act III:scene i)

[Rankakata, are we not the ones who have been scolding you against this woman?]

Unfortunately, Rankakata cannot at this point respond to any questions or comments, for he is unconscious. When he finally gains his consciousness, he addresses himself to Mmasebueng, saying: “Itjhuu! Ha ke sa o batla moleko towe.” (Act III: scene i) [Oh, the pain! I don’t want you anymore you devil!]

As this incident indicates, Rankakata has not been successfully persuaded by Mofella and Qhokofa to end his relationship with Mmasebueng; otherwise he would not have been consumed by this jealousy that has even driven him to engage himself in the senseless fight over her. But now the question is whether or not he is indeed going to terminate this relationship, as he has just pronounced it to Mmasebueng. When Mmasebueng asks him for forgiveness, and deceives him that the man in question is her cousin, one waits with anxiety to see how Rankakata is going to react – especially when she also quips as follows: “... le teng haeba o sa ntshwarele le ho nteballa, jwale o no ntshetsang mejo hanong?” (Act III: scene i). [... and if you do not forgive me and forget about the whole matter, then why did you deprive me of the spoils I was about to enjoy?]

Though Mofella regards the foregoing remark, by Mmasebueng, as an indication that she is a shameless woman who hardly shows any remorse over this incident, the fact remains that Rankakata is still poised to continue in this relationship. Otherwise, he would not have taken this action against the other man, who seems to be the competitor in the ensuing amour. One is therefore bound to doubt Rankakata’s pronouncement of terminating this affair in public. His pronouncement, about termination, may, therefore, rightly be considered as an emotional statement that he may even refute in future, should a need arise for him to be confronted with it.

As a persuasive plan for all present to understand and realise that she is now in control of the prevailing situation, Mmasebueng bandies words with Mofella as follows:

Mofella: Ha o motho o ntja mosadi towe. (O thola motsotswana) Ha o swabele ketso e mpe ee? Bona batho ba re tjametse jwang. (Act III: scene i)

[You are not a human being you woman! (He pauses for a moment) You have no remorse about this bad incident? Look at how the people are staring at us.]

Mmasebueng: Wena Mofella eka o a lebala hore meno ana a ka a tswile ka baka la Rankakata. Yena e ne e boetse e le mang ya sa tlo utlwiswa bohloko ka baka la ka? (O

swenya nko) O ke o ntlohele ke u jwetse. Salang le oka baoki ba rupelletswe, boradipoloma ba bolelwang. (O ba siya ba itse ahla!) (Act III: scene i) [You, Mofella, seem to forget that these here my teeth were extracted because of Rankakata. Who on earth is he that he may not experience pain because of me? (She twists her nose to signify her sadness) You should leave me alone, please. Stay back and continue nursing, you trained nurses, the so-called diploma holders. (She leaves them gaping)].

Seemingly, Mmasebueng is balancing equations here. Since she lost her set of teeth because of her having an affair with Rankakata, she finds it justifiable for him to also experience an injury for her sake – tit for tat, as they say. Ironic as it may seem to be, Mmasebueng's analysis of this situation seems to suggest that incidents of this nature may be expected from now on between herself and Rankakata, as long as their amorous affair continues. When she leaves everybody gaping, as she calls them 'baoki ba rupeletsweng,' she seems to suggest that more of these skirmishes should be anticipated between her and Rankakata in the future – brawls that will leave everybody gaping with fright and dismay. Her act of leaving everybody here, as she vanishes into the thin air, while all are trying to nurse Rankakata, may be regarded as a sign of arrogance and cruelty of high order. It should also work as a persuasive plan for Rankakata to back off, lest he finds himself in dire situations in future.

Not surprisingly, Mofella and Qhokofa take advantage of this state of affairs to apply more persuasion for Rankakata to cut off his ties with Mmasebueng, in this vein:

Mofella: O bone Rankakata, re itse re o tentsha tsheya jwalo ka banna, yaba o ila mantswe a rona sekgethe. Ikwale ditsebe, o itjelle nthwa hao. O tla mamela keletso tsa manong.

[You have seen, Rankakata, we tried to dress you up with short drawers as men, but you arrogantly rejected our words. Block your ears, continue eating your spoils. You will listen to the vultures' pieces of advice.]

Qhokofa: Ho thusang ho bua, Mofella. Ke lejwe ntho ena. Le ho bua o itshenyetsa nako. (Act III: scene i)

[What is the use of talking, Mofella. It is a stone this thing. You waste your time by talking.]

Both Mofella and Qhokofa employ a verbal persuasive action of casting a blame on Rankakata for the whole mishap that has taken place here – the plan being to induce in him the state of guilt, thus driving him towards self-search. Mofella's expression that, 're itse re o tentsha tsheya jwalo ka banna ...,' suggests that Rankakata's actions were so despicable, in the eyes of all people around him, that he was no different from a naked man. Since the latter rejected their words with impunity, Mofella's feelings are that the latter's obstinacy has

become so incorrigible that he may only attentively listen to the vultures. The statement, 'o tla mamela keletso tsa manong', embodies a very powerful pastoral image.

As Abrams (1993:142) puts it, the term 'pastoral' has been identified as "any work which contrasts simple and complicated life, to the advantage of the former..." It follows then, that, since Rankakata is such an obstinate person who refuses to listen to anybody's advice, the only persuasive attempt left for him is that of the vultures – as they are likely to hover over his dead body when Mmasebueng will have finished with him, the statement seems to suggest. In other words, Mofella warns Rankakata that, if he fails to change his attitude and behaviour, he will die like an ownerless dog that is left in the wilderness for vultures and crows to devour.

With a clear understanding of the implications embodied in Mofella's statement, Qhokofa adds stinging words against the target (Rankakata), so that the latter may realise the dire situation in which his arrogance and stubbornness have led him. For his remark to bear a persuasive impact on the target, Qhokofa employs a metaphoric language – calling Rankakata 'lejwe' (a stone), and referring to him as 'ntho ena' (this thing) – thus trying to shake him out of his stupor and drive him towards awareness that he (target) has lost human status and adopted that of a mere object. A metaphor, according to Abrams (1993:66-7), is a figurative language, used in order to "achieve some special meaning or effect;" (1993:66-7) and it is a word or expression which in literal usage "denotes one kind of thing or action as applied to a distinctly different kind of thing or action, without asserting a comparison" (1993:66-7)

It would appear, therefore, that Mofella and Qhokofa use these metaphoric expressions and terms as compliance-gaining strategies for Rankakata to reconsider his stance and change his attitude and behaviour. Wilson (2002:93) calls this strategy, "the **ethical threshold**, measuring the extent to which the persuader can produce a negative emotional feeling and response in the target to gain compliance." When Mofella says to Rankakata, 'O tla mamela keletso tsa manong', as was shown above, he employs both pastoral and metaphoric expressions – thus producing a vivid image of one listening to vultures making their own sounds, as they hover over a dead body.

In line with the above observations, Mofella and Qhokofa's feelings are that the only way that would induce compliance-gaining or change of attitude and behaviour by Rankakata is to induce in him negative emotions and fear. For example, their final words to him at the point of departure go as follows:

Qhokofa: Robala hantle monna. Ha ke tsebe o tla beolwa ke mang. Kesentseng o ilo le eketsa. O se ke be wa tla o phausela ho rona mona.

[Sleep well, man. I do not know who will shave you. Kesentseng is going to extent it (wound). Don't come stupidly running to us here.]

Mofella: Monna ho robala ke ho fetoha. Kopa tshwarelo o kgutle mekgweng; o thehe lelapa ka maikutlo a phodileng. (Act III: scene i)

[Man, to sleep is to turn over. Ask for forgiveness and change your ways; construct a family with a cool mind.]

As has been noticed above, even as he bids him a good sleep, Qhokofa follows that with fear-inducing expressions – that Kesentseng is going to extent the same wound Rankakata has sustained from the stupid fight; and also forewarning the same target not to come running for their assistance. Like someone who avoids the application of more fear to the already frightened target, Mofella employs constructive and soothing words, as seen above. In other words, whereas Qhokofa's expressions have been centred on condemnation and fear-inducement, Mofella's statements are tantamount to parental persuasive guidance to one who has erred through inexperience, coupled with some form of naivety and sentimentality.

Not surprisingly, when Sehloho has come to see him at his home, Rankakata displays the usual arrogance, coupled with obstinacy. He still clings to his known attitude and behaviour. As usual, he is vindictive and shouts at all around him as nonentities who have no power to do anything to him. Nonetheless, through much persuasion by Sehloho, he finally promises to adopt change of attitude, behaviour and beliefs – but not before he lights his smoking pipe and blows the smoke around, saying, “Ke ha ka mona. Hore ke etsang ho mang; ha e batle motho.” (Act III: scene ii) [This is my home. Whatever I do and to whom, it's nobody's business.]

This behaviour is quite typical of Rankakata. He more often than not, displays this kind of arrogance, vindictiveness and obstinacy, and further posing his infamous rhetorical question: ‘Le ka nketsang?’ [What can you do to me?] In addition, he almost always lights up his pipe and blows out the smoke. This action is quite symbolic – it seems to symbolise the causing of some fracas that ends up being even blown out of proportion, thus ending up with people crying, as they are affected by its ‘smoke’.

Though Rankakata is so stubborn and vindictive, he finally promises to change after Sehloho has cautioned him of the fact that even those who are considered to occupy the lowest ebbs of the society are worried about the kind of life he leads. Additionally, Sehloho makes him aware that nobody in the village pays any more respect to him and his family – as it is infamous of ever being engaged in brawls that are instigated by the target himself.

Furthermore, Sehloho persuades Rankakata to refrain from the present over-indulgence of liquor, as it spoils his personality, reputation and integrity, saying:

“O inehetse jwala, bo o nyetse hoo bo seng bo o fifaditse pono e phethahetseng ya botho ... o tima lapa la hao kgotso le thabo kamehla. Kopo ya ka ke hore o ke o thehe dikamano tse ntle pakeng tsa hao le bana ba hao; o ba bontshe lerato le hloakang boikaketsi ele hore ba tle ba o hlomphe ho feta mme ba utlwe lentswe la hao.” (Act III: scene ii)

[You have surrendered yourself to liquor; it has married you to the extent that it has darkened your entire vision of human conception ... you deny your family happiness and peace daily. My plea is for you to form good relations with your family and children; show them love without any form of pretentiousness so that they may in turn respect you more and listen to your word.]

Rankakata responds to these persuasive words positively, as someone who has been found wanting, and therefore, prepared to undergo a change of attitude and behaviour. He even promises Sehloho that he will perform as suggested by the present persuader, as stated above. With happiness radiating on her face, Kesentseng also thanks Sehloho for his persuasive verbal communication, emphasizing as follows: “haholo jwang ha eba o tla ba le kutlo le ketso” (Act III: scene ii) [especially if he will have understanding and action.]

As would be expected, neither Sehloho nor Kesentseng entirely believe what Rankakata has just promised, as Kesentseng’s statement above indicates. In addition, Sehloho also asks the target whether he promises that his family will be that of peace and tranquillity. In his response, the target says, “Ke a o tshepisa mora ntate” (Act III: scene ii) [I promise you, son of my father.] Even if one were in doubts, this kind of pledge is likely to be considered a genuine one, due to the speaker’s identity with the interrogator – the expression, ‘mora ntate’ carries weight in relations, it binds people together, as brothers in whatever the issue concerned.

Now that Sehloho has achieved his persuasive goal – of changing Rankakata’s attitude and behaviour – he rounds up his mission by addressing himself to the second part of his goal. His goal two is to remind the target of his church-going obligations. Though the latter endeavours to shy away from this church-going topic, the former presses him to give a clear answer as to whether he is going to revive his beliefs and attend church services. Rankakata’s response to this is terse and rather all-encompassing, as he says, “Ke di ananetse tsohle” (III : ii) [I have agreed to all (your proposals).]

As if Rankakata never promised Sehloho any change he was going to undergo, he once more demonstrates his obstinacy when some other villagers have been invited at his home

to apply some persuasion for him to start attending church services. As usual, his obstinacy is accompanied by arrogance, realizable in the expression, “O/le ka nketsang?” (Act III: scene iii) [What can you do to me?] Ultimately, all the invited villagers leave him alone, as he tells them that he will decide when to go to church. He also continues his consumption of liquor, as well as his amorous involvement with Mmasebueng, as if nothing has happened. Like someone who is all out to defy the community, Rankakata publicly addresses Mmasebueng as ‘ratu’ (my beloved one). Members of the community comment about this verbal display, yet Rankakata seems to be impervious of their complaints, and ignores them. He has obviously not undergone any change of behaviour and attitude, as was to Sehloho in the last meeting.

Worse still, Rankakata is still poised at stopping Bafedile’s further education. The indication of this aim is demonstrated by his lack of interest in the latter’s achievement of first class pass, the achievement that opens the inroads into further education. Since this lack of interest is demonstrated in public at Mmasebueng’s liquor house, one can correctly assume that this behaviour is due to external influence, and, most likely, that of Mmasebueng. When addressing himself to Bafedile in connection with her attainment of a first class pass, Rankakata says, “Ke o lebohetse bo! Hoja o ne o ka bula fuba sena sa ka, o se mpale mahlong, o ne o tla bona ka moo ke nyakalletseng ka teng.” (Act III: scene v) [I do congratulate you! If you were to open this here my chest, and not read my facial expression, you would realise the extent of my mirth.]

It would be anybody’s guess that whoever influenced Rankakata to go against Bafedile’s education is someone he is highly indebted to, and bound to follow their instructions or insinuations to the letter. The following verbal exchanges in Rankakata’s family indicate the extent to which he is unprepared to assist in Bafedile’s further education:

Bafedile: Ntate ka moo ke thabileng, hake tsebe nka iketsa jwang. Ke utlwa eka lefatshe lena kaofela le matsohong ana a ka.

[Father, the way I am so happy, I don’t know what I can do with myself. I feel as if the whole world is in these here my hands.]

Kesentseng: Jwale re tshwanetse ho dula re le ma-lala-a-laotswe, ke bolela ho etsa dihlophiso tse mabapi le ho isa moradi enwa wa rona Morumotsho.

[Now we should be ever-ready. I mean to make arrangements for sending this our daughter to Morumotsho.]

Rankakata: (Ka bohale) Dithlophiso dife? [(With fury) What arrangements?]

Kesentseng: Tse jwalo ka ho reka diaparo le dibuka tsa sekolo.

[Such as the buying of some clothes and school books.]

Rankakata: Di tla nne di bonwe ntho tseno. Nako e sa le teletsana hakere? (Act III: scene v)
[Those things will be seen. There is still time, is it not?]

At Mmasebueng's house, on the following day, Masebueng and Rankakata are engaged in a discussion about Bafedile's education. The former is also confronting the latter in connection with his decision about his relations with Kesentseng. Among other things, Mmasebueng remarks that she observed a gleeful radiation on Rankakata's face when he learned that Bafedile had obtained a first class pass. She adds that, for her, such a smile was an indication of love for Kesentseng, as the mother of Bafedile. Further, Mmasebueng complains that, had it been her own child who had so successfully performed, Rankakata would not have been so mirthful. Indubitably, this kind of complaint is meant for influencing the attitude and behaviour of Rankakata to change against both Kesentseng and Bafedile.

Whereas the idea that Rankakata had an external influence against Bafedile's further education was based on presumptions, it now surfaces clearly that the instigator has been Mmasebueng – as her complaint highlights it. This discussion, between Rankakata and Mmasebueng, functions here as a double barrel. It serves as a revelation of the source of Rankakata's external influence against Bafedile's further education; and also as an indication that his practice of harassing his family as he usually does, bears its source from no other than the same paramour, Mmasebueng. It is apparent that Rankakata not only intends to destabilise Bafedile's education, but to also to get rid of Kesentseng, to ensure an undisturbed relationship with Mmasebueng. Evidence of the foregoing revelations resides in the following verbal exchanges between Rankakata and Mmasebueng:

Mmasebueng: Ke bone hlathe e lelekisa tsebe ha moradia Mofella a o behela hore Bafedile o atlehile. Ke a tseba hoja e ne e le moradi wa ka, hoja ke yena le yena o ne o sa tlo bososela jwalo.

[I realised your mirth when Mofella's daughter put it to you that Bafedile has succeeded. I know that were it my daughter, if she were the one concerned, you would not have such a smile.]

Rankakata: O bua jwang na? [How do you speak, eh?]

Mmasebueng: Seratangwana ke seratammaona. Ke hore o ntso mphunya mahlwana naketsana moo, o re ha o battle tshase ela ya hao. O hloma eka ha ke bone letho. Ha o a phoqeha he!

[A child lover is the mother's lover. It means you have been cheating me, saying that you do not love that lark of yours. You think that I do not notice anything. You have been so deceived!]

Rankakata: Ke ngwanaka eo! Hoo ha ho bolele hore ke rata mmae ha kaalo.

[That is my child! That does not mean that I love her mother so much.]

Mmasebueng: Ha ebe o sa hlole o mo rata, o putlametseng le yena? Ke itse haeba o tshaba sethepu, mphe marapo nna ke sebetse ditaba. (Act III: scene vi)

[If you do not love her anymore, why do you keep on stupidly living with her? I have said that if you are afraid of polygamy, give me the reins so that I can perform accordingly.]

Eventually, this discussion is cut short by the appearance of Bafedile, who has brought a message that there is an important visitor who needs to see Rankakata at home. Rankakata takes his time, and asks Bafedile to go home, as he will follow. In the meantime, he and Mmasebueng continue with the same discussion, as follows:

Mmasebueng: Jwale mpoelle, ke o botsitse hore na o ntlohellela dintho matsohong, ke fiele shwaahle eo ya mosadi.

[Now tell me, I have asked you whether you leave everything in my hands, so that I sweep off that talkative woman.]

Rankakata: O ikgathaletsang? O se a iketse eo.

[Why worry? That one is already gone.]

Mmasebueng: Tieho e tswala tahleho nnyeo! Keng ekang o batla o le lekgonono tjee! (Act III: scene vi)

[Procrastination bears perdition, you so and so! Why do you seem to be so doubtful?]

Needless to say, there is something highly fearful that is broiled by this couple, as it is revealed in the above discussion. Apparently, they concoct to kill Kesentseng by using witchcraft. It follows, therefore, that Rankakata has become quite malicious towards his family, due to the influence of this woman who hopes to substitute Kesentseng as his wife. Since Kesentseng is considered by the two as an impediment in their planned engagement, the only way they consider appropriate for them is to eliminate her from the face of the earth. It comes not as a surprise then, that, as he goes out, Rankakata whispers to Mmasebueng that she may perform as she wishes, and goes off to see the visitor at his home.

Even before he gets home to discover who the visitor is, and the issues in waiting, Rankakata confronts Bafedile and they exchange the following verbal utterances:

Bafedile: Ho thwe o phakise ntate. [You are asked to hurry up father]

Rankakata: Ke bomang bona bao? [Who exactly are those?]

Bafedile: Ke titjhere Motshepehi. [It is teacher Motshepehi.]

Rankakata: O bewa keng mo? [What puts him here?]

Bafedile: Hao ntate, ke titjhere wa rona sekolong kwana. Owee! Hle ntate o mpo bue le yena hantle.

[Oh father, he is our teacher there at school. Please, father, endeavour to speak nicely with him.]

Rankakata: (Ka bohale) Ke mang yena? Hona a ka nketsang yena? Hobaneng ha o re ke buisane le yena hantle ho itswe ...

[With fury) Who the hell is he? And what can he do to me? Why do you say that I should speak nicely to him, has it been said ...]

Bafedile: Ke hoba ke tseba mokgwa oo o buisanang le batho ba bang ka ona, ke ka hoo ke etsang boipiletso. (Act III: scene vi)

[It is because I know the way you interact with other people; that is why I make an appeal.]

The above interactions, between Rankakata and Bafedile, reveal the character of the former. He comes home already annoyed, and he employs self-persuasion to be more agitated, so as to build up the spirit of spite and arrogance. Seemingly, his goal is to employ arrogance as a wall against any form of persuasion that may be tried with him. Indubitably, he is aware that he has no reasoning power, enough to face upfront persuasive communication with anyone.

For that matter, he starts building a cocoon of paranoia around himself, so that his likely persuaders may shy away from his venom, arrogance, unreasonableness and obstinacy. Once he wears the above character dispositions, he feels infallible enough to face anybody – and he believes that nobody can do anything to him. His is, therefore, not upfront persuasion, but coercion; for, almost all his likely persuaders are forced to back off and leave him alone.

Even as he knocks at his door, Rankakata makes the visitor immediately aware that s/he is in someone else's home – as he says, "Ha ka mona." (Act III: scene vi) [Here at my home!] As Kesentseng responds by saying, "Kena ntate" (Act III: vi) [Come in sir/father], Rankakata employs his usual arrogance, and responds: "Ke se ke kene" (Act III: scene vi) [I have already come in]. He then greets the visitor with arrogance and pomposity, saying, "Dumela monna. O lla kang?" (Act III: scene vi) [Hi man! What are you crying about?] In the Sesotho cultural practice, this is an impolite and unfriendly greeting, particularly when it is being directed at a stranger who has come to the home of one who is extending the greetings. Rather, one would politely greet the individual by calling him/her 'ntate'/ 'mme' [sir/father/ madam/ lady]

Besides, one is not expected to simply greet someone and stop at that; he/she has to ask after the visitor's health, such as 'O phela jwang?' [How are you?] Otherwise, such a person will be going against the Sesotho lore that uses the greeting as an element through which interlocutors initiate decorum and the establishment of rapport. In addition, one is regarded

as arrogant and harsh if one asks the visitor: “O Ila kang?” It is considered as, not only unbecoming, but as a sign of vindictiveness, which is the opposite of peace and tranquility upon which the Sesotho greeting is based. To make it worse, Rankakata’s approach to the visitor may be described as ‘ho qhobela motho majwe ka hanong’ (to ram stones into someone’s mouth), which is tantamount to a fight against the individual in question. Needless to say, Rankakata is employing this kind of behaviour to scare off the visitor, so that the latter may not dare engage himself in any kind of persuasion he may have planned to address.

Without any hesitation, Motshepehi returns the greeting, addressing Rankakata as ‘ntate’ [sir/father], as would be the case among normal Basotho people. In Sesotho, the meaning of ‘dumela’ is derived from the act of ‘ho dumela’ (to agree). It means ‘dumela hore kgotso e teng pakeng tsa rona’ (let us agree that peace prevails between/among us). It is, therefore, important for the one who initiates the greeting that they wait for the respondent’s utterance before even asking after one’s health. As someone with no bad intentions, Motshepehi returns the greeting as shown above, notwithstanding the fact that Rankakata has ‘rammed stones into his mouth.’ It would seem that Rankakata cares not about any greetings decorum, his anxiety lies in the learning of the news that has brought Motshepehi to his home. He, therefore, ‘rams more stones into Motshepehi’s mouth’, saying, “Bolela taba tsa hao monna.” (Act III: scene vi) [Tell us about your issues, man!] No wonder that Motshepehi finds himself stammering; as he is not sure whether Rankakata’s vindictiveness exposes his character or he has an attitude towards him in person.

Even before Motshepehi can manage to come off his stammering, Rankakata harshly addresses him as follows: “Tlohela ho itoma maleme. O tletse masawana monna ke tsebe? Ha o bue, o kenwe keng?” (Act III: scene vi) [Stop biting your tongues. Have you come here for nonsensical things, man, may I know? You do not speak, what has got into you?]

From this point, Bafedile and Kesentseng endeavour to intervene on behalf of Motshepehi, but to no avail. Rankakata insists that the visitor himself should talk. As is his style of communicating with other people, Rankakata treats Motshepehi with all the harshness he can mount, apparently to dismiss whatever information he is about to divulge. Further, Rankakata interrupts Motshepehi at every point of relating the issue at hand, as in:

Motshepehi: Ke ne ke tliho buisana le lona mabapi le moradi enwa wa lona ... [I have come to talk with you about this daughter of yours ...]

Rankakata: O entseng ke tsebe? Bua hle monna. (Act III: scene vi) [What has she done, so that I may know? Speak up please, man.]

Motshepehi explains that Bafedile has won a grant for being supplied with books free of charge. Even before he completes the explanation concerning parents’ responsibilities,

Rankakata cuts him short, as in the following: (O kgokgotha peipi fatshe ho ntsha bokwadi) “Le utlwile ho thwe nna ke hlolwa ho mo rekela tsona? (...) Bana ba bafutsana ba bangata motseng mona bao le ka nnang la ba rekela!” (Act III: scene vi) [(He strikes his pipe upon the ground to do away with nicotine) Have you heard that I am unable to buy them for her? (...) Children of the poor are many in this village, whom you may buy for them.]

Motshepehi explains that this is a won grant, and not anything else, but for the best student. Kesentseng declares her own position in this situation, saying: “Nna ke utlwa taba tsa hao titjhere, ebile ke di ananela ka hohlehohle”. (Act III: scene vi) [I understand your explanations teacher, and I accept them in all respects.] Typical of him, Rankakata mounts all the fury he can manage, and verbally attacks Kesentseng, as if she were an outsider in his family:

“O di ananela ngwaneng wa mang? O nkgella fatshe mosadi towe! Ke nyatse ntho wena o bolela kananelo ya yona. Ha o mpone he!” (Act III: scene vi)

[You welcome them over whose child? You look down upon me, you woman! I disapprove of something and you tell about its welcome. You do not recognise me, eh!]

Obviously, all these tantrums that Rankakata hereby displays, are meant for dissuading the persuader/s from the normal path of persuasion, an upfront persuasion in which all come up with own views, in an attempt to make the target change his/her behaviour, attitude and belief/s. Being aware of her father’s intent, Bafedile reminds Rankakata of his declaration that he has no money for her further education. Further, she makes him aware that this achievement is through her hard work and commitment to her school work, and as such, she deserves that grant. For someone with an intention to involve oneself in an upfront persuasion, Bafedile’s words are quite persuasive, and deserve to be hearkened to. But this is not the case with Rankakata. For him, Bafedile and her mother are defying his authority, as contained in the following utterances:

Rakakata: Ha ke hlaola lehola, lona le ema ka lepaketla. Le bomang lona, hona le ka nketsang? Ke buile ho fedile. Nakedi e tloha e phinya hona tjena.

[When I weed out the weeds, you stand up against me! Who are you after all; and what can you do to me? I have spoken and it’s over. A polecat might expel air right now!]

Since this kind of behaviour, and attitude, is no novelty to them, Kesentseng and Bafedile manage to bid farewell to Motshepehi, as he departs. Nonetheless, he leaves them with shame, declaring that he is sorry that he brought them this piece of information that he hoped would boost their morale, and please the whole family; and yet achieved the opposite. As for Rankakata, he is so determined to disappoint his family, that he hardly notices the tears welling down on Bafedile’s cheeks. Employing his final vindictiveness against the departing

Motshepehi, Rankakata shouts at him, saying: “Tsamaya o ba bolella hore ke ha Rankakata mona, seboko ke le ka nketsang! ...” (Act III: scene vi) [Go about telling them that this is Rankakata’s home, the clan name is what can you do to me! ...]

Seemingly, Rankakata takes pride in his own attitude and behaviour, otherwise he would not speak this way. The fact that he even calls himself by this phrase, as a clan name, indicates that there is no way of persuading him to change his beliefs, attitude and behaviour. In short, it becomes clear that an attempt at persuading him to change his behaviour, attitude or beliefs, is quite a waste of time – as he is not prepared to engage himself in an upfront persuasive communication.

It then comes not as a surprise, that Rankakata becomes impervious with any form of persuasion towards thanks offering to the ancestors. It is at Qhokofa’s home where he displays his imperviousness towards adopting any change in this respect. Though Qhokofa and Mofella deeply believe in the importance of this ceremony, Rankakata has a different view. For him, those who still perform this kind of ceremony are quite backward, as in his pronouncement that:

“Le sa ntsane le le morao le se mangole a kgoho boQhokofa. Ke hore o kgaoletse nku ee ditshiu, o ntse o re o hlabela badimo! Ha ke bone ho hlokahala hore o nne o re o fa badimo – ke rona badimo he ka mokgwa o jwalo, hoba ke rona bao o ba hlabetseng hore re tlo ja.” (Act IV: scene ii)

[You are still backward though you are not chicken knees, you Qhokofa and others. That means you have cut short the days of this sheep, saying that you slaughter for the ancestors! I see no need for you to say that you offer to the ancestors – we are the ancestors then in that way, for we are the ones for whom you have slaughtered so that we may come and eat.]

It is important to realise that this is the first reasonable upfront persuasive attempt employed by Rankakata – regardless of whether others are successfully persuaded by it or not. Somehow, Rankakata’s foregoing submission persuades Qhokofa to defend his belief and stance, in the following words:

“Nna ke phetha moetlo. Ke hlaha mahlo ke bona ntate le mme ba ntse ba etsa phabadimo. Nke ke ka akaaka sejwale yaba ke lahla sekgale kgerehlwa se ka moko wa pere.” (Act IV: scene ii)

[I fulfill the custom. When I started realizing my surroundings, my father and mother were practising the ancestors’ offering ceremony. I cannot adhere to modernity and throw away the beloved old custom like a horse’s marrow.]

It would seem that Mofella's reasoning power is waning off, or else, he merely wants to use Rankakata's own strategy to silence him, or to avoid being persuaded by him. For instance, when the latter says, "Jwale le mamele ditaba le tlohele ho nna le iphoufatsa tjena" (Act IV: scene ii) [Now you should listen to issues and stop this business of blinding yourselves]; the former uses arrogance as his persuasive plan, saying:

"Nna setsweng ke hole. (O khwefa mathe) O ka ipolella hore o ka mpula mahlo wena! Ka eng ya hao, hona o le mang? Hlooho eno e a tjhesa ke a bona." (Act IV: scene ii)

[As for me never. (He spits out saliva in a powerful blow) Can you tell yourself that you can open my eyes, you! With what of yours, and as who are you? That head is hot I can see.]

Instead of being angry, or keeping silent, Rankakata asks Mofella to shut up, as he explains to Qhokofa. Further, Rankakata says to Mofella, "Wena etswe ha ke o kgathalle" (Act IV: scene ii) [As for you I don't care]. He then explains as follows:

"Monna, ka phabadimo o fepa tjhaba sena sa motse, bana ba ntseng ba robala ba itsosa, ba kollang ntsi hanong." (Act IV: scene ii)

[Man, with ancestral offering you feed this village population, these ones who sleep and wake themselves up, those who have only enough for hand-to-mouth existence].

Further, Rankakata explains that he has come to this ceremony so as not to disappoint Qhokofa, as it is his habit to visit people at such ceremonies. When he is asked whether or not he has ever slaughtered a beast for doing away with such a custom, Rankakata retorts that even that he cannot do. He even strikes the ground with his foot to demonstrate his seriousness and intent never to perform such a ceremony too. Capitalizing on this situation, Qhokofa inquires whether Rankakata's relatives still follow their customs. As if all should know that he has no regard for relatives, the latter asks the rhetorical question: "Baheso bafe?" (Act IV: scene ii) [What relatives of mine?]

It is at this juncture that Rankakata spells his position clearly, that, since he has worked so hard to achieve what he has, he is not intending to share his riches with individuals who were resting on their laurels during his hardworking days. It also emerges from his utterances that he has stopped to perform any rites for ancestors so that he would have no reason to involve himself with his relatives – as, indeed, performing customs and rites presupposes the involvement of relatives and extended family members. It would then follow that Rankakata has nicknamed himself 'o ka nketsang', so as to be regarded as the sole chief in his family – with nobody vested with powers to call him to order whenever he derails/misbehaves. In short, Rankakata has turned himself into race less individual, and thus adopting the sole authority in his family, as the head of that family.

When he finally chants his personal praise poem, his intentions and characteristics are clearly illustrated:

“Ha ke motho wa ho tshwarwa ka mantswe ke sa dulelwa majwana;
 Hona nka etswang ke mang?
 Nna ke nna; nna Rankakata wa ho tshwarisa banna pupe ka lefe.
 Rankakata wa ho siya makwala a kgathetse
 Ba mpatle mona ba mpatle mane.
 Ba sale ba tshwere hlolo ka boya
 looho di ruruhile ke tswedipane ka bona
 Ere ba hlwa mekwalaba ke pudufale pududu!
 Ke ba tshepise sepolo ba sale ba tetema
 Ha ba ne ba ka nketsang nna mora Diau
 Ha e nye bolokwe kaofela!” (Act IV: scene ii)

[I am not a person who can be caught through his words without a court case sitting;
 And who can do anything to me?
 I am who I am; I Rankakata who slips out of men’s hands.
 Rankakata who outran tired cowards
 They looked for me here, they looked for me there.
 They ended up holding a red hare by its hair
 With bulging heads I have wound round with them
 When they ultimately climb the alps I become completely grey!
 Then I threaten them with my fighting stick and they remain shivering
 And what could they to me, I son of Diau?
 It does not drop all its dung!]

In simpler terms, Rankakata is aware of his behaviour, that of always having to be called to the community tribunal for his usual anti-social actions. He is also content and proud that nobody can do anything to him, for he is only answerable to himself, no family members to call him to order when he acts in any anti-social manner. He is like a fugitive who is for ever on the run from the concerned people. Another important revelation is that he always threatens people with harm; which is a sign of being vindictive by nature or by intent. He is also aware that people are usually reluctant to confront him with his anti-social actions and language, for they can do nothing to him. One may safely assume, therefore, that Rankakata takes pride in this kind of his personality. Seemingly, he has learned to use these personality traits against any form of persuasion directed to him, in order to avoid any form of upfront persuasion in which he may find himself succumbing into the persuader’s desires and

intentions. It is, therefore, not surprising that, in his avoidance action, he employs coercion, manipulation, arrogance, obstinacy and vindictiveness as defensive strategies.

As for Kesentseng and Bafedile, their relationship is that of mother and daughter, with mutual respect and care for each other. Whereas Kesentseng is poised to send Bafedile for further education, the latter is always concerned about the former's wellbeing and happiness. When she approaches home from Morumotsho high school with Diepollo and Molefi, Bafedile experiences some kind of fright that continually strikes at her fabric. She tells these companions of hers about this kind of feeling. Ultimately she arrives home, only to find out that her mother has fallen ill, with a paining foot. She learns that her mother sustained this pain as she crossed the homestead area into the house; where she had felt like something pricked her foot, yet found no prickly stuff in examining it. As it were, this marks the beginning of Kesentseng's habitat with the sick bed.

Realizing the excruciating pain gnawing at her mother's foot, Bafedile persuades her to have faith in the Lord, saying, "Basadi! Empa Morena o moholo, o tla fola." (IV : iii) [Goodness! But the Lord is great, you will heal up.] Bafedile's persuasive talk motivates Kesentseng into relating her suspicions about the source of this strange happenstance. She tells Bafedile that she suspects that this emanates from Mmasebueng, who is out to revenge herself. She suspects that Mmasebueng concocted this incident with some witch-doctor, not only as a measure of revenge, but she stops at that without divulging what is in her mind. Finally, she declares that "Le ha ho le jwalo, meleko e hlolwa ka thapelo" (Act IV: scene iii). [Even so, witchcraft is defeated through prayer.] This indicates that Kesentseng has been successfully persuaded by Bafedile to put her trust into the Lord.

As if talking about prayer has worked on Rankakata by osmosis, he comes in and inquires over Kesentseng's suffering. She relates the same story she related to Bafedile earlier. Rankakata pretends to be concerned and even offers to approach Mofella to assist with some herbal stuff that would help to cure this strange attack on Kesentseng's foot. Readers learn that Rankakata has been party to the whole bewitchment, as he engages himself in the following soliloquy on his way to Mmasebueng's home:

"Banna, ka Bakwena ba ntswetse, Mmasebueng ke moloji wa nnete. Eitse a bolela hore le ha ho se ho thwe o a tseba, a ke ke a phonyoha. Na ebe ke entse ntho e lokileng? (...) Empa ha ele Kesentseng ke ntse ke mo rata, ebile ke tseba hantle hore le yena o nthata haholo. Hana hloyo e hotetsa dikomang empa lerato le apesa ditshito tsohle? O a nthata, e, o nteballetse tsohle moo ke mo hlokofoaditseng teng. Ha ele Mmasebueng yena ke tseba hantle hore o shebile maruo ana a ka. Lerato la nnete ha le yo ho yena. (O phahamisa lentswe) Ke mothetsi, mmolayi, moeki! Hana

banna, ke tena ke batwa tje, ka baka la tjhobolo ee ya mosadi! Empa jwale ho tla ba jwang ha Kesentseng a ka laola ngakeng ya ditaola mme ho fumanwa beng ba morero e le nna le Mmasebueng? Mahlong a Kesentseng ke tla shebahala jwang, hona motseng moo teng? Empa ba ka nketsang, Bee! Ke se ke fihlile. Ko ...ko ...ko. Ke nna Rankakata.” (Act IV: scene iii)

[Goodness! I bet by the Bakwena who bore me, Mmasebueng is a true witch. Indeed she said that even if she knows, she cannot escape. But, have I done a correct thing? (...) But as for Kesentseng, I still love her, and I know for sure that she also loves me so much. By the way, hatred ignites squabbles, but love covers all wrongs? She loves me, yes, she has forgiven me all the pains I have inflicted upon her. As for Mmasebueng, I know very well that she is aiming at these riches of mine. True love is not in her. (He raises his voice) She is a deceiver, a murderer, a traitor! By the way, I have sustained this wound, because of this unreliable woman! But then how will it be if Kesentseng were to consult a divining doctor and discover that the responsible conspirators are myself and Mmasebueng? How am I going to appear in Kesentseng’s eyes, and in this village? But what can they do to me, ho! I have already arrived. Knock ...knock ...knock. It is I, Rankakata.]

Abrams (1993:196-7) defines soliloquy as

the act of talking to oneself, whether silently or aloud. In drama it denotes the *convention* by which a character, alone on stage utters his thoughts aloud; playwrights use this device as a convenient way to convey information about characters’ motives and state of mind, or for purposes of general exposition, and sometimes in order to guide the judgments and responses of the audience.

In this soliloquy, Rankakata reveals that the ailment sustained by Kesentseng has resulted from his and Mmasebueng’s conspiratorial plan to kill her by means of witchcraft; so that Mmasebueng may become the substitute wife to him. Further, it is disclosed that, though Mmasebueng is the mastermind of the whole plan, Rankakata has actually performed the whole operation. Furthermore, Rankakata publicly declares that he is sure that Kesentseng loves him very much, and as much as he loves her too. Surprisingly, it is also disclosed that Rankakata is clearly aware of Mmasebueng’s intentions behind the killing of Kesentseng – to have a full access to his riches. Further still, it becomes clear that, though he has inflicted a lot of pain on Kesentseng, Rankakata has been pardoned by the culprit – as love covers all the wrongs perpetrated upon one by the other. One wonders, therefore, why Rankakata could not opt out of this malevolent operation, as he seems to have been so clear about the prevailing situation.

Clearly, Rankakata takes no solace in the bewitching of Kesentseng, though he expresses some doubts as to whether he has done the right thing or not. Recalling his expression when he left Mmasebueng's house, as he was called to meet Motshepehi, one becomes aware that it was through his permission that Mmasebueng produced the concoction that was used for bewitching Kesentseng – as he said, “O se o tla etsa kamoo o bonang. Sala,” (Act IV: scene iii) as was indicated earlier in this section. Apparently, Rankakata goes to Mmasebueng's house without clear intentions, as his evaluation of the two women is so clearly articulated in his soliloquy. His soliloquy indicates that he has had enough time to evaluate these two women, and knows exactly which of the two is the worthy one. In other words, it becomes important to find out what his goal-plans-action were against Kesentseng.

Indubitably, Mmasebueng has used her persuasive strategies – such as endearments or downplaying his indecisiveness in taking action – thus making sure to win Rankakata entirely to her side. For example, she almost always calls him ‘ratu’ (love), and kisses him to welcome him before she communicates her plans towards winning him for good. Besides, whenever Rankakata shows some hesitation before taking any action, or indicates some guilty conscience in any action, Mmasebueng downplays the whole thing as a weakness that emasculates him.

As opposed to Rankakata's feelings of uncertainty, as well as guilty ones, for Mmasebueng, the act of bewitching Kesentseng constitutes good news, as the end result will be Kesentseng's death. According to Mmasebueng, Kesentseng's death creates a vacuum in Rankakata's life, and therefore, in accordance with the plan, calls for her to fill up such a vacuum as the substitute wife. Not surprisingly, she welcomes Rankakata with her usual charm and endearment, saying “... Ha se moo thatohatsi ya ka. O sebeditse jwang jwale? Bua kapele hle, ke tjhesehella ho utlwa ditaba tse monate!” (Act IV: scene iii) [There you are, my beloved one! How have you operated now? Speak quickly please, I am anxious to hear the good news] Apparently, Mmasebueng has studied enough of Rankakata, to realise that he still has some love for Kesentseng, and therefore, likely to have guilty conscience. She, therefore, has created some goal-plan-action to engage herself in persuading him to remove the guilty conscience he presently seems to experience. That is why she ends up her reception utterance with “... ke tjhesehella ho utlwa ditaba tse monate,” (Act IV: scene iii) as has been shown above.

But Rankakata is not to be so easily persuaded this time, as observed in:

Rankakata: (Ka bohale) Tse monate eng moloi towe! Mosadi wa moeki, wa moloi!
(Mmasebueng o mo makalletse) O betlabela meno ha o swabe. Ruri ke swabela

ketso eo ke e entseng mosading wa ka, mmangwana ka, mosading wa tsa ntate, ho thabisa wena leqitolo towe! (Act IV: scene iii)

[(With fury) What good news you witch! A traitorous woman, a wizard! (Mmasebueng is baffled by him) How dare you show your teeth, you are not ashamed! Indeed I am sorry for the performance I have done to my wife, my child's mother, to the wife of my father's cattle, to please you, you betrayer!]

Needless to say, Rankakata's condemnation that he renders upon Mmasebueng is not only surprising, but also unfair, since everything has gone according to conspiratorial plans between the two of them, Mmasebueng and himself. To make it worse, he has finally been the operator in this murderous performance. Though there was a time when he expressed some hesitation, as was seen earlier, he eventually succumbed to Mmasebueng's persuasion to co-plan and give a hand in this whole operation. Mmasebueng is, therefore, justified to be baffled by his reaction at this late moment.

Since Rankakata is only consumed by guilty conscience after achieving the goal, in accordance with the plan and action, Mmasebueng becomes more perplexed, and engages her usual downplaying tactic to persuade him calm down and come to terms with the operation in question, and says:

“O kenwe keng na? O ntse o bona na o bua le mang, eseng o nwele ba kgaeyane? (...) Theola maikutlo hle abuti! Athe hoo ho tswa tumellanong ya rona bobedi! O kukunelwa keng maikutlong a hao, athe sebaka sa hae se tla nkwa ke nna? Monna morui ya jwalo ka wena o hloka mosadi ya di shebileng jwalo ka nna ho wa le ho tsoha le yena ha ho nyolosetsa. (...) O se ke wa kgathatseha ratu! Tlo o nkake ke bone hore o ananela mantswa a moratuwa wa hao. (Rankakata, nkele morohong, o ema a aka Mmasebueng) Ha se moo he, moratuwa! (Act V: scene iii)

[What has got into you? Do you see with whom you are speaking, or maybe you have drunk highly intoxicating stuff? (...) Please cool down brother! By the way, that emanates from our mutual agreement! What is it that disturbs your mind, as her position is going to be replaced by me? A rich man as you needs a woman who is clear as me, to fall and rise with him as it is steep. (...) Don't worry, love! Come and kiss me so that I may realise that you welcome sweetheart's words! (Rankakata, an idiot, stands up and kisses Mmasebueng) There you are, my love!]

As was shown earlier, Mmasebueng employs a number of persuasive strategies or tactics in an attempt to win Rankakata for finality, as is the case in the above communication. Initially she condemns him and downplays his behaviour, accusing him of having drunk 'ba kgaeyane', thus persuading him to start doubting his own feelings and consider them as

similar to those of one who has consumed highly intoxicating stuff. The second tactic she uses is that of reminding him of the dual commitment and conspiracy they have involved themselves in. She goes further to make Rankakata aware that he should stop worrying, as Kesentseng's position is going to be filled up by her (Mmasebueng). Furthermore, she puts it to Rankakata that a rich man like him needs a clear headed woman/wife ('ya di shebileng') who will assist him in all matters when the going gets tough. Further still, Mmasebueng applies her final and strongest tactic to achieve her goal. She uses endearment as a persuasive style, and instructs Rankakata to come over to her and kiss her, as a sign of his welcoming his sweetheart's words.

Indeed, Rankakata has become fully persuaded. Like someone who is in a hypnotic state, Rankakata loses the whole mood and temper he has just displayed, and pleads for forgiveness, saying:

“Ntshwarele hle moratuwa ha ke ile ka apeswa ke menahano ena e fosahetseng. Ke phethile ditaelo, ratu.” (Act V: scene iii)

[Please forgive me, my beloved one, that I was covered by these wrong impressions/thoughts. I have fulfilled the instructions, dear.]

Nonetheless, Rankakata expresses some worry he has never before revealed to Mmasebueng – that of how and where Bafedile, his only daughter, is going to live. Using convincing words, Mmasebueng promises him that she will live with Bafedile as her step mother; and adds, “Ho totobetse hore ke moradio mme nna ke tla ba mosadio.” (Act V: scene iii) [It is clear that she is your daughter, and I will be your wife.] Further, she gives Rankakata an assurance that Bafedile will be safe in her hands, by saying, “Ke a o tiisetsa. Ke ha o ka mo tshepisa mang? Ha ke re ke madi a hao?” (Act V: scene iii) [I bet. Otherwise under whose trust would you place her? Is she not indeed your blood?] This kind of talk fully persuades Rankakata into believing in Mmasebueng – that she will indeed be a second mother to Bafedile. As the following statement indicates, Rankakata is fully persuaded into believing that Mmasebueng will live harmoniously with Bafedile: “Ke a utlwa o bua jwalo ka mosadi wa mmakgonthe.” (Act V: scene iii) [I hear that you speak like a true woman]

A few days have passed, since Kesentseng has fallen ill, due to the miraculous foot ache, and her friends have come to see her. These friends are baffled by the fact that Rankakata has not informed anybody in the village about Kesentseng's unusual ailment. They persuade Kesentseng to go and consult a divine doctor, so that the source of this strange attack on her foot may be revealed. Since Kesentseng would have to, first of all, liaise with Rankakata in this respect, she finds it uses, as she already suspects that he has had a hand in fermenting the strange ailment. Both Pontsho and Mmapotso persuade Kesentseng to take it easy, and

never lose hope that her ailment will be cured. But their persuasive words hardly have any positive effect on the latter, as the pain keeps gnawing at her foot. She even finds herself saying:

“Lefifi le se le tla latela lesedi. Ke bolela hore monna yane ya tshabehang o se a nkemetse hore ke tlame thoto ke ye badimong.” (Act V: scene iv)

[Darkness shall soon follow the light. I mean that to say, that frightening man is already waiting for me to fasten my baggage and go to the ancestors.]

It would, therefore, seem that Kesentseng is impervious to the verbal persuasive attempts made by Pontsho and Mmapotso, to make her relax and gain some hope for a cure. Resultantly, she even applies her own verbal persuasion for Pontsho to take care of Bafedile after her death, and treat her as her own child. In addition, Kesentseng proposes that Bafedile should look up to Pontsho as her solace in times of strife, when Mmasebueng will be ill-treating her as her step mother. Though initially Pontsho considers this as a heavy pledge to undergo, she is more verbally persuaded by Kesentseng to take up the pledge. She, therefore, finally vows to assist Bafedile with all the possible means she can afford.

It is at this moment that Rankakata comes in, and Kesentseng wastes no time in persuading him to undergo a change of behaviour and attitude. The following are their verbal exchanges:

Kesentseng: Ekaba o ntwela kae! Ke kgale ke lebelletse o tjena motsotso. Dula fatshe moo o nkadime ditsebe.

[Where have you come from for me! I have long been expecting a moment like this. Sit down there and lend me your ears.]

Rankakata: Hao! Mosadi, hobaneng ha o ntlhwa ka mantswe tjee, le pele ke botsa Pontsho bophelo? Ke dutse he, bua ke utlwe!

[What! Woman, why do you pack words upon me like this, even before I can ask Pontsho about her health? I am seated then, speak let me hear you.]

Kesentseng: Ke a leboha. Hlwaya ditsebe he. Ke a tsamaya. O sale o fetoha monna ka.]

[Thank you. Open up your ears. I am going. Remain changing, my husband.]

Rankakata: (O a tshoha) O ya ... o tsamaya o ya kae?

[(He becomes afraid) You go ... you are going where to?]

Kesentseng: Hoja wa thola ke qete puo ya ka. Ke o kopa hore o fetohe hle. Mosadi eo ha a o rate leha a bile a o sebedisitse. Feela nkutlwe ha ke o bolella hore o tla llela metsotso ebile o tla shwa hampe ha o ka nna ya ka mora hae ... (Act V: scene iv)

[Better be silent that I finish my talk. I plead with you to please undergo a change. That

woman does not love you although she has misused you. But listen to me when I tell you that you will cry for wasted time and you will die badly if you follow behind her ...]

From this moment on, Kesentseng continues with her lengthy persuasive talk with Rankakata, stressing the following points:

- pleading for forgiveness wherever she may have erred against him in their life together;
- asking him to take care of Bafedile;
- emphasizing that every drop of tear from Bafedile will bring him a great misfortune or bad luck; and finally
- announcing that she has finished – “Ke qetile,” (Act V: scene IV) she says.

Bafedile comes in at this moment, a gloomy moment at which all in doors seem to be undergoing some pain. In the same way Kesentseng addressed herself to Rankakata, she asks Bafedile to sit down and listen to the one who is on the verge of going to the ancestors, that being Kesentseng herself. In her persuasive talk with Bafedile, Kesentseng points out Pontsho as a surrogate mother to her: in hunger, clothelessness, and any other difficulty that may emerge. She adds that Bafedile should always consider Pontsho as her pillar of strength against which she must lean. Having said that much, Kesentseng’s breath seems to cut off. But when Pontsho blames Rankakata for his treachery, Kesentseng pleads with her to let go of Rankakata. It becomes clear that she experiences pain, and she is on the verge of death. Like someone who acknowledges his sin in the open, Rankakata pleads for forgiveness from Kesentseng: “Jo! Jo wee! Kesentseng ntshwarele hle! Jo! Banna wee! Bua le nna hle ... bua ... bua hle (Batho ba utlwa seboko mme ba tla ba phalletse.) (Act V: scene iv)

[Alas! Alas poor me! Kesentseng, forgive me please! Alas! Goodness me! Talk to me please ... talk ... talk please (People hear the wailings and come over rushing)]

No doubt, Kesentseng’s persuasive talk, at the verge of her death, has successfully motivated all the addressees to look forward to each performing in accordance with the related instructions. While some have managed to pledge their allegiance with; her instructions/pleas, others are bombarded by this talk, so much that they hardly say a word. Nonetheless, their reactions and wailings prove that they have been affected by this persuasion. Rankakata even wails like a child, as Kesentseng dies in front of all present. Since death usually affects all concerned people, Rankakata is highly affected, though he is the instigator of the whole operation leading to Kesentseng’s death. He now wishes that Kesentseng were to live for a longer time, but there is no way of stopping her from dying.

Now that Kesentseng has passed away, Bafedile begins to realise that she has no one on whose shoulder to cry in times of pain and distress. She nonetheless, engages herself in a self-persuasion, to rely on nobody, especially because her father, Rankakata, spends almost all his nights at Mmasebueng's home. As she cogitates over the prevailing situation, Bafedile ends up thinking, and persuading herself to commit suicide, rather than running away from her lonely home; as contained in the following soliloquy:

“Hana ho thwe motho ha a shwele o tswile matshwenyehong a lefatshe? Ho molemo ha nka shwa le nna, ho fapana le ho ineha naha.” (Act V: scene V)

[By the way, it is said that someone who is dead has come out of earthly troubles? It is better for me to die than to run away from home.]

Bafedile's main complaint is that her father, Rankakata, spends nights at Mmasebueng's house, leaving her alone in the home, thus making her vulnerable for the rascals who may be out to harm unprotected individuals such as herself. Rankakata arrives while she is busily engaged in her soliloquy. Since she does not expect him to come over at this late time of the night, as he usually spends nights at Mmasebueng's, she decides not to answer his knock, lest she may respond to rascals. Nonetheless, she eventually opens the door as Rankakata shouts that it is himself knocking at the door.

To Bafedile's dismay, her father has brought bad news for her – he is to bring in Mmasebueng as his surrogate wife, taking the place of the late Kesentseng. From now on, he tells her, she should regard Mmasebueng as her step mother ('mmangwane'). Bafedile pronounces her opposition to this act, but to no avail. Since Rankakata has made conclusions with Mmasebueng, he disregards Bafedile's opposing pleas and brings in Mmasebueng the same night. This action by Rankakata comes not as a surprise, for he is now known for his being impervious to any kind of upfront persuasion by anybody. Instead of attempting to persuade him reconsider his already taken a decision, Bafedile decides to forget about this matter. Rather, she once more applies self-persuasion as follows:

“Ke bona hore ha nka nna ka dula mona ke tla be ke emela e marothodi a maholo. Ke elellwa hore ntate ha a sa nthata le nna. Ke tshwanela ho petla kgupi nako e sa le teng. (...) Empa ke tla ya kae hona ho mang, ha mme a ne a mpoelle hore ha re sa na moneketsana ho lee!” (Act V: scene v)

[I realise that if I continue staying here I shall be waiting for a heavier rain. I am aware that father has stopped loving me too. I must run away while time permits. (...) But where shall I go and to whom, since mother once told me that we do not have even one relative in this part of the world! [...]]

Due to the realization that she has nowhere to run, Bafedile decides to continue schooling, and bear the bitter presence of Mmasebueng as step mother in her home. Bafedile's continuation of schooling, coupled with the fact that she hardly gets a chance for cooking, sweeping around or fetching some water from the spring, due to the long walk to and from Morumotsho daily, does not augur well with Mmasebueng. In an endeavour to destruct Bafedile's progress in schooling, Mmasebueng always metes out complaints to Rankakata against her – that she always hardly performs the above-mentioned chores. When Rankakata rejects her complaints, and reminds her of Bafedile's schooling, Mmasebueng threatens him of stopping to cook any food for him, if he fails to reprimand Bafedile. It becomes clear that Mmasebueng applies this threat as a persuasive plan for Rankakata to turn himself against his daughter and derail her educational process.

Instead of showing any worry about the ensuing threat, Rankakata ignores Mmasebueng's quips, and just blurts out a warning reminder of associations, saying, "O a lebala hore ngwana ke wa ka eo." (Act VI: scene ii) [You forget that that child is mine.] Mmasebueng retorts: "Le nna ke mosadiao." (Act VI: scene ii) [I am also your wife], and thus invites the wrath of Rankakata, who bursts out in the following manner:

O mosadiaka? Ke o nyetse ka tse kae? Bohadi bo thethesitswe neng, hona ke mang? O a ntubela he!" (Act VI: scene ii)

[You are my wife? How many (cattle) did I produce (for your bohadi)? When was the bohadi negotiations done and by whom? You are mixed up about me, eh!]

Seemingly, this persuasive response about the relationship binding Rankakata together with Mmasebueng indicates that their stay-together has no base on which Mmasebueng can hold, and she is aware of it. Clearly, this counter-attack meted by Rankakata against Mmasebueng hits her where it hurts most. Not surprisingly, she feigns crying, as a persuasive attempt, to attract Rankakata's pity; only to arouse the opposite reaction from him. Instead of attracting his pity, she has invited his bitterness, as Rankakata condemns her thoroughly.

It would appear that Rankakata is so fed up with Mmasebueng that, by this condemning persuasive slandering, he drives his goal of bringing Mmasebueng to order. His condemnation includes, among others, to:

- stop her from engaging herself in this loud cry;
- force her to desist from irritating him;
- make her realise that the idea of bringing her into his family was erroneous;
- caution her that if she fails to mend his clothes, she may be on her way out of his life;

- make her aware that her failure in keeping the home clean may cause him to reject her; and
- show her that he is aware that she has deviated from the promises she made before they came to live together as husband and wife.

Having heard all these points, Mmasebueng ceases the pretence of the crying she has so far been engaged in, and bandies words with Rankakata. She has been persuaded to defend herself and straighten up her stand, concerning the above points. She tells Rankakata that she is not bound to him by any means; but only asking him to reprimand the girl, Bafedile. Once more, she applies the crying pretence, as a persuasive plan to attract Rankakata's compassion for her. Instead, Rankakata quips as follows: "Haeba o nahana hore ke tlo hloya thootse ya ka ya bohlokwa ka baka la hao, o lahlehile ke o jwetse." (Act VI: scene ii) [If you think that I am going to hate this here my important seed, because of you, you are lost I tell you.]

As a persuasive tactic for Rankakata to identify with her in this matter under discussion, Mmasebueng uses threats against him. She threatens to leave him alone, if he is going to treat her as a second wife in a polygamous marriage. Instead of winning Rankakata towards identifying with her, he becomes furious, and challenges her to action, saying:

"O reng? Ngwana o kenekene ka tjelete tsa ka! Setsweng ke hole haeba o nahana hore o tla tswa le nthwana feela mona. O tla be o thota (sic) eng hoba o tjhesitse katana tse nkgang tsela tsa hao? Le tseo o di beileng mmeleng ke tsa ka. O tswa tjoro jwalo ka sapo la sopho. O tla tswa; o tla bo tswe, ke re o sa tla bo tswe, ke a hlapanya. Kgele! ke tennwe." (Act VI: scene ii)

[What are you saying? The child indulges so much in food with my moneys! You are deceiving yourself if you think that you will carry with you any object from here. What will you be transporting, as you burned those smelling rags of yours? Even those you have on your body are mine. You should go out empty handed like a soup bone. You will go out; you will eventually go out, I say that you will ultimately go out, I bet! Goodness me! I am disgusted.]

But Mmasebueng is not to be so easily intimidated. She retorts that she cares not what Rankakata has been gibbering about; as she is not even threatened by the whole gibberish. Further, she tells him that she is not a pushover, and as such, she insists on taking her belongings. Furthermore, she accuses him of having suggested that she burns her clothes, promising to buy her new ones. Upon realizing that what she has been saying has no impact on Rankakata, she uses the wailing tactic – crying like someone who has lost a husband or child through death – "hi ... hi ... hi...." (Act VI: scene ii)

In contrast with her seeming hopes of persuading Rankakata to change his attitude towards her, through the application of the wailing ploy, he downplays the whole attempt. He mocks her by telling her that all that wells down her chicks is water. In addition, he even calls her a murderer, saying: “Etsa ka moo o bonang mmolai towe. Feela ha ke sa o hloka.” (Act VI: scene ii) [Do as you like, you murderer! But I need you no more.] Contrary to Rankakata’s expectations, his persuasive plan to openly declare Mmasebueng as a murderer, backfires like a boomerang; as Mmasebueng wastes no time in grabbing the opportunity to slander his image in public, as in:

Mmasebueng: Hei, o se ke wa mpitsa mmolai ke o jwetse. Tshwene ha e ipone makopo basadi! Ke bolaile mang nna? Ha Moalosi a itjhweletse lefu la Modimo, a otlwa ke letolo a le naheng kwa! Mmolai ke wena o bolaileng mosadiao. (Act VI: scene ii)

[Hallow, you dare not call me a murderer I tell you! A monkey fails to see its own protruding face bones! Whom have I murdered? As Moalosi died a God’s natural death, struck by lightening over there in the wilderness! A murderer is you who has murdered your own wife.]

Apparently, Mmasebueng’s rebuttal has struck a point for her. In short she has managed to successfully persuade Rankakata to change his attitude and behaviour. She has managed to obviate the imminent expulsion that would embarrass her so much and lower her dignity, if she has any. Instead, it is Rankakata who now finds himself in a tight corner – that of being declared a murderer in public by her, among the members of the community. Testimony to this analysis is in Rankakata’s sudden change of behaviour, as well as his frightened stammering: “O ... o ... ph ... phetlela ... mo ... hatla ... n ... nku ... masho ... du. Thola hle ke a o rapela!” (Act VI: scene ii) [You ... you ... re ... reveal ... se ... crets. Please keep mum, I beseech you!]

Realizing the fear engulfing Rankakata at this juncture, Mmasebueng shouts more: “Ke tholeleng, athe ke wena ya qadileng?” (Act VI: scene ii) [Why should I keep mum, since you started it all?] Needless to say, this threatening tactic is quite an effective persuasive plan to win the target and make him/her to change his/her attitude or behaviour. But is it an upfront persuasive strategy or coercion, one might ask. One might conclude that it constitutes an aspect of coercion, since the target finds him/herself bound to perform as desired by the persuader or coercer. On the other hand, as Perloff (2003:13) would indicate (see chapter 2 of this thesis), that coercion usually applies a threat of some dire consequences, should the coerced person fail to perform as desired by the coercer. Since Mmasebueng uses a veiled threat, one would regard her as a coercer, rather than a persuader in this section. Since reference to murderer was initially brought in by Rankakata himself, one may argue that Mmasebueng has merely beaten him at his own game. In that case, both characters are guilty of employing coercion at the expense of persuasion.

In order to release himself from this snare into which he inadvertently put himself, Rankakata finds himself at the beseeching end, pleading with Mmasebueng to stop behaving as she does, as in:

Rankakata: Thola hle, Mmasebueng mohatsa ka! Ntwa ke ya madulammoho. Kopa seo o se batlang, mme ke o tshepisa ka hohlehohle hore ke tla se pethisa. (Act VI: scene ii)

[Be silent please, Mmasebueng my wife! Fighting takes place among those who live together. You can ask for anything you want, and I promise you by all means that I will perform as requested.]

Taking advantage of Rankakata's vulnerability, Mmasebueng comes up with an unthought-of proposition, contained in the following dialogue:

Mmasebueng: (O a bososela) Hlwaya tsebe o mamele buti! Bafedile a se hlole a le beha sekolong hobane o ntshiya le kenyakenya ya mosebetsi mona ebile o ...

[(She smiles) Listen carefully brother! Bafedile should never put hers at school because she leaves me with a lot of work here at home and she ...]

Rankakata: O wee! hle Mmasebueng. Ke entse kano le mmangwanenwa hore ke tla phethisa ka hohle ka moo a ...

[Oh no! please Mmasebueng. I have made a vow to the mother of this child that I shall by all means do as she ...]

Mmasebueng: Eu! jwale he, o tsebe hore hosasa ke tsoha ke phahla makunutu. Motse ona kaofela o tla tseba hore o mmolai wa Kesentseng (Rankakata o nyeka melomo) O mametse ka hloko buti! (Act VI: scene ii)

[Is that so! now then, you should know that tomorrow I wake up to reveal the secret. The whole village will know that you are Kesentseng's murderer. (Rankakata licks his lips) Are you carefully listening to me brother!]

It is quite clear that now Mmasebueng is in command of the situation, coercing Rankakata into yielding to her demands. Rankakata's fright has obviously boosted Mmasebueng's morale, to the extent that even if she can demand almost anything from him, he is sure to perform accordingly – as instructed by her. As Bafedile has been silently listening to the whole verbal exchanges between these two, she decides that the only way she is left with is to commit suicide. It would seem that Bafedile's decision to commit suicide results more from Rankakata's final submission that he will perform as instructed by Mmasebueng to end her education. For Bafedile, there is only one person to find solace in, and that is her late mother. She, therefore, strongly feels that her death will unite her with the late Kesentseng. These feelings and beliefs evolve from her self-persuasion, as contained in these final words:

Bafedile: Tsela e nngwe feela e tla nkisa thabong e sa feleng. Tsela eo ke lefu. (O a Ila) Ke tla ... tla ... ya ... ho ... ho ... m ... me. Hosasa mantsiboya tjena, ke tla be ke dutse le yena. Ho thusang ho iketsa nonyana kahlamela mmolai? Ho thusang ho ja mafura moo kgotso le thabo di leng siyo.? Ke fokoletsa ntate thoto. Ke bona hantle o tla boela a sebediswa ho mpolaya. Ke qenehetseng? Ke qenehetseng ho lena lefatshe? (O Ila ha bohloko) (Act VI: scene ii)

[There is only one way that will take me to everlasting happiness. That way is death. (she cries) I ... will ... will ... go ... to ... to ... mo ... mother. Tomorrow afternoon like now, I shall be sitting with her. What is the point of partaking of fatty stuff where peace and happiness do not exist? I am relieving father of the luggage. I clearly realise that he will once more be misused in murdering me. What am I unwilling to part with? What am I unwilling to part with in this world? (She cries miserably)]

As was indicated above, Bafedile is a self-persuaded individual determined to commit suicide, which is her primary goal. It comes not as a surprise then, that when they come back from school with her friends the following day, she informs them that she will not attend school with them the next day. Her secondary goal in this information is to highlight them of her intention, yet to mislead them into believing that she will be attending some other business. When she bids them farewell, adding that they should also greet other students at their school, she drives her secondary goal, that of hiding her true intentions – of performing her suicidal exercise without any interference from anybody. No wonder that as she turns off the usual path, and heads towards the suicidal rock of her choice, neither of her friends, Molefi and Diepollo, bears any suspicion of malicious intentions whatsoever. Her secondary goal is, therefore, fulfilled.

Typical of her to engage herself in self-persuasion, even when she is at her place of death, or suicidal area, Bafedile continues her usual attitude. She employs a monologue in which, among other things, she addresses herself to Dithotaneng, her village, as if talking to someone who hears her. She sees Molefi at her own home, and then observes him coming towards where she is. She once more engages herself in self-persuasion, to take action, so as to fulfill her primary goal of committing suicide without any disruption, saying:

“Ke iteta sefuba ho tobana le lefu la ka, ke ona motjha o tla nkisa ho mme ... Ke ntse ke senya nako, mme o nkemetse pele kwana. Ho yena ke tla fumana thabo le nyakallo ya ka mehla eohle. Sala hantle lefatshe la matshwenyeho, nka qenehelang ho wena!” (O kwala mahlo, a itsubelletsa. O ratlana fatshe hodima majwe. Yaba ke phetho) (Act VI: scene ii)

[I strike my chest in order to face my death, it is the way that will take me to my mother ... I am wasting time, mother is waiting for me yonder. From her I will find daily peace and merriment. Stay well world of difficulties, what can I be unwilling to part with from you! (She closes her eyes, and let herself go. She is smashed upon the rocks. That was the end]

Now that Bafedile is dead, it is interesting to discover how Rankakata and Mmasebueng react to the situation; and how they persuade each other to be consoled, if at all they have any feelings for the late Bafedile. As circumstances would have it, it is Molefi, the late Bafedile's school companion, who first discovers the smashed still body of Bafedile. On his way home he meets Rankakata, who is worried and afraid. Since Molefi is so much touched by his school mate's death, he can hardly explain it to Rankakata. All he can say is, "Tlase lefika lane le leholo. O ...". (Act VI: scene iii) [Bellow that big rock. She ...]

Rankakata is affected by this death. He falls down, but gets up again and wails as follows:

"Oho banna, ke kenwe keng! Ke ne ke itlisetsang mathateng ana? (O fihla tlase lefika, moo a fumanang setopo sa moradiae) Ke ka baka la ka ngwana ka. Ha ke sa tla fumana tshwarelo, ke mmolayi. (O a tholathola, meokgo e keketla mahlong) Matsoho aka a kgenathetse madi. Ke hlokile pelo ya botswadi, lerato la nnete le kutlwisiso e phethahetseng. Kajeno letsatsi le mahlonoko le ntjhabetse. Ke aperwe ke tshwabo le tshabo ya mohla re teanang. Pela setulo sa kahlolo ke tla ema le lona." (Act VI: scene iii)

[Oh no! what has got into me? Why did I bring myself into these problems? (He reaches the area bellow the rock where he finds his daughter's corps) It is because of me my child. I shall never be forgiven, I am a murderer. (He pauses, tears welling down his face) My hands are soaked in blood. I have failed to have a parental heart, true love and complete understanding. Today a very painful day has risen upon me. I am covered with shame and fear of our meeting day. Next to the seat of judgement I will stand with you.]

Apparently, Rankakata has now come to the realization that he has failed in his duties as a parent, husband and member of society. More importantly, he is now conscious of the fact that he has had numerous problems: domestic problems for which he has to bear the brunt for his failure to perform and administer accordingly. He, therefore, believes that he deserves no forgiveness. As if he is already judged, he considers his sins to be so incorrigible that he regards this day as the beginning of the hardships he yet has to face in life. Shame and fear have overpowered him, to an extent that he begins to doubt whether he will ever be forgiven by Kesentseng and Bafedile, whom he has wronged so much in life. For him, therefore, this

is the moment of truth, no self-deceptions of 'Le/o ka nketsang?' [What can you do to me], that has become his customary nickname.

Not surprisingly, Mofella tells him that "Ngwana-mahana-a-jwetswa o bonwa ka dikgapha," (Act VI: scene iii) that is, 'a child who refuses to be guided will be identified by rears rolling down the cheeks.' Further, Mofella indicates that, had Rankata listened to pieces of advice given to him by his community members, he would not be experiencing this pain today. No doubt, Mofella's submission to Rankakata functions as a persuasive measure for him to reconsider his attitude, behaviour and beliefs, so that he may not fall prey to the same in future. All that Rankakata can say at this juncture is to ask for forgiveness. As a reminder and condemnation, Mofella tells Rankakata to face the fact that this is not the moment of asking for forgiveness, but of repeating the latter's usual expression of arrogance and obstinacy: 'Le ka nketsang?' In line with the prevailing situation, Mofella's verbal communication to Rankakata is intended for functioning as a persuasive attempt to make him adopt appropriate change in his life time – change of all the misnormers he has so far fallen prey to.

Incidentally, community members hold discussions about this painful death in the village, and try to find out and assess its cause. They eventually arrive at the conclusion that both deaths in Rankakata's family have been caused by his attitude and behaviour towards his family and other people around him. Most notably is the fact that he has contributed a lot to these deaths through his arrogance, vindictiveness, obstinacy, and above all, bad behaviour. Some of these feelings and analyses are articulated in the following interactions among some community members:

Sehloho: Mofella monna, ho molemo ha re ka ithuta ka diphoso tsa babang, hana le hore o etse diphoso o be o ithuta ka tsona. Le ka nketsang ha e ahe motse.

[Mofella man, it is better for us to learn through other people's mistakes, rather than making mistakes and then learn from the same mistakes. What can you do to me builds no village/family.]

Mmapotso: Hei, le ka nketsang! [Indeed, what can you do to me?]

Mofella: Le ka nketsang mohatsa ka! [What can you do to me my wife!]

Sehloho: E jwalo ka mehla qetello ya mekgwa e mebe. Ha eba ha a na ho imamela, a kgutla, o tla shwa se ka ntja. (Act VI: scene iii)

[The end of bad behaviour is always like that. If he is not going to listen to himself (think), and change, he will die like a dog.]

Since death affects everyone in the community, especially of this kind, it is not surprising that members of the community discuss this incident wherever they are. As they engage in these

discussions, they discuss among other issues, what is to be done, as they have a role to play in matters of this kind. It is in grappling with customary engagements, such a visit/s to the bereaved family and pass their condolences, where certain agreements have to be reached. For example, women would go there in groups, so that they may also divide themselves into units for pre-funeral, funeral, and post-funeral chores for women. Men also decide on their chores and set programs for performing such chores.

As would be expected, Sehloho, Mmapotso and Mofella are engaged in dialogue, grappling with some issues concerning this bereavement. In these verbal interactions, these people persuade one another to do and not to do certain things that, by custom, would not even be debated upon. For example, Sehloho is on the verge of leaving for his home, when he bids them farewell and suggests to the others that they will meet at Rankakata's home. It is at this point that Mmapontsho poses questions: "Ho isa matshediso! Re yo tshedisa mang?" (Act VI: scene iv) [To carry condolences! Whom are we going to console?]

Apparently, Mmapontso's questions arouse, in the other interactants, the question of occupants of Rankakata's home. Mofella then responds by persuading others to consider who to take condolences to, and not to. He suggests that he sees no need for their wives to carry any condolences to that home, though the men should go to carry their condolences to Rankakata, as he has relationship with the late girl. In addition, Mofella verbally persuades others to ignore Mmasebueng, as she has been well known for her ill-treatment of the late Bafedile. All seem to be in one voice that women can go on the day preceding the burial, to help with some of those final chores – as it would be difficult for the women to liaise with Mmasebueng for her notoriety.

As it is normal for people to speak about the cause of death in question, some people gain an opportunity to speak at Bafedile's funeral. Mahabe, the church minister presiding over this funeral, employs persuasive language in his opening speech. He makes reference to the way people have been affected by this painful death. Further, he points out that all are pitiful about this death, as Bafedile, in accordance with the read verse, has left her home and gone to the land chosen for her by God. Furthermore, he makes a reminder that all become happy when a child is born in the family; even vow to bring the young one/s up in accordance with God's instructions and wishes. It has been the case with the late, and she has followed it, Mahabe says. Surprisingly, some people simply show children the way towards serving the Lord, while themselves, as parents, take an opposite one, Mahabe once more says.

Further still, Mahabe demonstrates how the late followed at the footsteps of her mother, who unfortunately passed away earlier the same year. In relation to the way the world treated Bafedile, Mahabe puts it in the following words:

“O tsamaile metsamaong ya mmae, metheong le meepeng ya bophelo. Lefatsheng leo a neng a phela ho lona, lapeng labo, metswalleng ya hae, ho thwe a tlohe a tsamaye, a ye lefatsheng la thabo. Ha se le hore o na sa hlomphe lapeng lena mme matsatsi a hae a kgutsufala. Tjhe! (Bongata ba lla sa mmokotsane) Empa o ne a sa hlole a fumana thabo ho lena.” (Act VI: scene v)

[She walked in the footsteps of her mother, in descents and ascents of life. In the world in which she lived, at her own home, among her friends, she is instructed to leave and go, and go to the world of merriment. It does not even mean that this child was not respectful in this family, and, therefore her days were shortened. No! (Many wailed greatly) But she no longer gained happiness in this world.]

Seemingly, Mahabe has set himself a goal which he aims at achieving by this speech. One would rightly assume that his aim is to hint on the possible cause of Bafedile's suicide. It would be assumed that Bafedile had, more or less, the same sufferings that her mother experienced in life; to an extent that she saw no value of living under the prevailing circumstances – especially where peace and tranquility existed no more in her family. Since she gained no more happiness in this life, she opted for committing suicide, as the only alternative available for her, Mahabe seems to say. It comes not as a surprise then, that Mmapotso and Kedisaletse – members of the community present at this funeral – beckon to each other, when Mahabe says, ‘Empa o ne a sa hlole a fumana thabo ho lena,’ as seen in his speech above.

Like someone whose primary goal is to inspire all who have gathered at the funeral to demonstrate their understanding and feelings of pity for the late Bafedile to have enjoyed no peace in her family, Mahabe continues his speech in the following manner:

“Tsamaya hantle ngwana ka. Thabo le lerato la mmao o tla di fumana pele. (Sello sa phohomela thakeng tsa Bafedile) Tsamaya, o tlohe lefatsheng lena, tlong ya ntaao.” (Act VI: scene v)

[Go well my child! You will gain your mother's happiness and love yonder. (Crying of lamentation among Bafedile's age mates.) Go, and leave this world, at your father's house.]

It would seem that this speech has persuaded, not only the people who are gathered at this funeral to pass their condolences, but Mmasebueng too; though hers is not the feeling of pity as demonstrated by the crowd. Testimony of the difference of her feelings, in relation to those of the crowd, is contained in the following reactions and verbal utterances:

Mmasebueng: (O bua a seba) Ha a qete ho bua. O tseba ho nna a kobisa batho. (Mmapotso o mo sunya lenala) (Act VI: scene V)

[(She speaks in a whisper) He never ceases to speak. All he knows is to continually apply some indirect blame to people. (Mmapotso pinches her)]

Obviously, Mmasebueng is consumed by guilty conscience. For her, the greatest part of Mahabe's speech, if not the whole of it, is pinning Bafedile's suicidal death on her, as she has borne the notoriety of forever causing a lot of distress for the late Bafedile since she has moved in with Rankakata as a surrogate, wife to him, and mother to the late girl. It is, therefore, not surprising that she considers Mahabe's remarks as allusions that are meant for slandering her character disposition. Be that as it may, Mmasebueng remains the same proud and cruel woman, who would never merely accept a blame that were directed to herself without antagonism.

In contrast with Mmasebueng's character, as discussed above, Rankakata has been painfully touched by the suicidal death of his daughter, probably because he had made a pledge to the late Kesentseng, his wife and mother to the late Bafedile, that he would take care and provide merriment to the late young girl. After the burial of Bafedile, he and a few other men are engaged in some verbal interactions, as follows:

Rankakata: Banna ba beso, ke rata ho le leboha haholo ha le ile la ema le nna lefung la moradiaka. Haholoholo seo ke se kopang ke tshwarelo ho lona. (O sheba hojana, eka o bona morwerwe) Ke etsa boinyatso ha ke ile ka hloka mamelo ha le ne le nkeletsa. Ke a tseba hore moiketsi ha a llelwe ho llelwa moetsuwa.

[My country men, I want to thank you so much for standing with me during the death of my daughter. I am especially asking for forgiveness to you. (He looks at a distance, as if seeing a far off human figure/s) I appeal to you to bear with me for failing to listen to your pieces of advice. I know that a self-made person is never wept for, but the victim.]

Mofella: Ya sa mameleng dikeletso tsa batho o tla mamela tsa makgwaba!

[One who fails to hearken to human's advice will listen to those of crows!]

Lesawana: O wee! Mofella, motho enwa o sa inyatsitse. Tjhe, re sa tsebeng fuba sa motho, empa ha re mo ineleng matsoho metsing.

[Oh no! Mofella, this person has already pleaded for forgiveness. Though we may not know the depth of a human being's chest, but let us be merciful to him.]

Mofella: Ho thusang banna ho aha serobe phiri e se e jele?

[What is the point in building a nest when the hyena has already consumed?]

Rankakata: Owee! Mofella moreso. Ke se ke kopile tshwarelo ho lona bohle. Ke bone hore "le ka nketsang" ha e ahe motse. Motse wa ka o fedile ka baka la lefu le lebe, botekatsi! (sic) Ebile ha ke kgolwe hore Morena o sa tla nkamohela matsoho a ka a se a kgenathetse tjena!

[Oh please! Mofella my brother. I have already asked for forgiveness from you all. I have realised that “what can you do to me” constructs no home. My home is finished, due to a bad sickness, prostitution. And I do not believe that the Lord will ever welcome me as my hands are so deeply imbedded in blood!]

Motshepehi: Ntate Rankakata, o sa tla fumana tshwarelo ho lena. Leha o ka ba moetsadibe ya motsho, feela ha o sokoloha, Morena o tla o amohela.

[Mr./father Rankakata, you will still obtain forgiveness in this one (world). Even if you may be an incorrigible sinner, as long as you change, the Lord will welcome you.]

Rankakata: (O hotetsa peipi ebile o butswela leruhadi la mosi) Ke a leboha, mme ke ba le tshepo ka mantwe ao. (...) Banna baheso, le mmamedisise. (O boela a thola a inama. Banna ba shebana). Hosasa hona ho sang, le tla ntjhabela ke le hole. Ke sa ilo batla nale moferong, beheso! Banabeso ke ba entse bafu ka baka la ho itshepa. Kajeno ke a itshwabela, ke yona podumo ya moemanosi (sic) hantle. Maruo ha a molemo ho feta bophelo ba motho ebile a tlatsa motho mabela. Mmasebueng yena (O tila fatshe ka leoto sa ngwana tshabang thupa) ke tla mo ntsha ka tjhofa siung bona bona. (O seka meokgo) Ke sentse nako. Ntshalleng le mehlape eo ya ka. (O phahamisa lentswe) Ke sentse nako.

[(He lights the pipe and blows a cloud of smoke) I thank you, and I gain hope from those words. (...) My country men, listen to me carefully. (He once more pauses and bows. Men look at one another.) This very tomorrow, it will rise upon me being far off. I am going to hunt for a needle in the forest, brothers. I have turned my siblings into the dead, due to my arrogance. Today, I humble myself, I am a real lone gnu. Riches are not more important than human life, and they fill up one with effrontery. As for Mmasebueng (He stumps upon the ground with his foot, like a child who is so much afraid of being whipped) I am going to push her out this very night. (Tears well in his eyes) I have wasted time. Look after those domestic animals of mine. (He raises his voice) I have wasted time!]

Sehloho: Ke lebohela boiphihlelo bona ba hao, morena a be le wena. Haholoholo jwang ha o inyatsitse. O tsamaye hantle! Morena a be le wena hle.

[I congratulate you for this achievement of yours. More especially as you have asked for forgiveness. Go well! May the Lord be with you, please!]

Mofella: Mayo ke maboyo thaka mphato. (Banna ba mo siya a eme a le mong a ntse a shebile fatshe.) (VI : v)

[Going away is equal to returning, my initiation mate. (Act VI: scene v) (The men leave him alone, as he is still gaping at the ground.)]

In contrast with Mmasebueng, Rankakata is painfully touched by this suicidal death of his daughter, especially as he had taken a pledge with Kesentseng, to care for her and make her

happy in life. It, therefore, comes not as a surprise that he thanks the men for standing with him in these hard times he has gone through in his family. When he appeals for them to bear with him for having failed to listen to their pieces of advice all along, the addressees accept his apology, though Mofella makes him aware that he who fails to heed people's advice, 'o tla mamela tsa makgwaba.' The foregoing statement by Mofella is similar to the earlier reference that was made to Rankakata, that, since he fails to listen to people's advice, 'o tla mamela tsa manong,' thus employing the same pastoral image, as was indicated in this section.

Indeed, Rankakata has learned the hard way, similar to one who only learns his/her mistake when the crows or vultures already hover over him/her to tear his/her still body into pieces. Be that as it may, it is highly encouraging that Rankakata is self-motivated, as he rounds up his plea for forgiveness by observing that 'moiketsi ha a llelwe, ho llelwa moetsuwa,' thus accepting in public that he is the originator of all his sufferings, due to his arrogance, obstinacy and malice.

Lesawana's plea, for the men to accept Rankakata's submission for forgiveness, makes a lot of sense – for, indeed Rankakata has, undoubtedly, persuaded himself to undergo this drastic change; after learning the hard way. Although Mofella feels that there is no use for one to adopt change after the damage (ho aha serobe phiri e se e jele), Rankakata's adoption of change is still appreciated, especially as he now makes a vow that he is going out on a hunt for his relatives that he has sidelined since his attainment of riches. It is further encouraging and motivating, that Rankakata even turns himself into a self-anointed religious minister and upfront persuader, by telling those gathered around him that 'le ka nketsang ha e ahe motse.' In addition, Rankakata has come to the realization that the practice of extramarital affair is a terrible disease that has now consumed his family. In addition, he has even judged himself of deserving no mercy from the Lord, as his hands are so full of innocent blood.

Clearly, Rankakata has now risen from the state of ridiculousness to the sublime, for his self-judgement and submissiveness. Moreso, he has an intent to end his relationship with Mmasebueng, as his vision is clear that she is the source of his whole downfall, from the sublime to the ridicule. Not surprisingly, Motshepehi, the teacher who was once ridiculed and embarrassed by Rankakata, takes advantage of the latter's submissiveness and persuades him to have faith in the Lord, and gives him an assurance for His mercy – no matter how incorrigible his sins may seem to be. As a changed man, Rankakata accepts this persuasive talk from Motshepehi, and, in contrast with his former attitude towards the latter on their initial meeting, he thanks him and expresses the hope he gathers from those encouraging words.

In contrast with his former behaviour, of lighting his pipe whenever he was about to start some strive, this time Rankakata lights his pipe, seemingly to highlight his intentions of taking drastic action for change, after the bitter lessons he has experienced in his life, resulting from his arrogance, stubbornness and vindictiveness. Once more, as a self-persuaded individual, Rankakata declares that he has personally turned his brethren into the dead due to his own arrogance. Further. As a self-made persuader, he declares that riches are not more important than life, as he now realises that he is a lone person, without any relatives from whom he could obtain some solace in these trying times. As an indication of his intention and desire to change for the better, Rankakata even asks those around him to take care of his domestic animals, as he will be out on a hunt for a fruitless exercise - 'ho batla nale moferong.'

Finally, Sehloho thanks him for this positive change that Rankakata presently seems to have taken, especially because he has also asked for forgiveness from all of them. Further, Sehloho wishes Rankakata a safe trip, under the Lord's protection; thus persuading him to have no fear in his mission for this hunt he is about to undertake. After Mofella expresses his belief that 'mayo ke maboyo,' all the men leave Rankakata alone. Whereas the act of leaving Rankakata alone usually signified people's desperation, as he was known for his arrogance and obstinacy, this time, one may deduce, these men leave him alone so as to provide him with an opportunity to think carefully about the steps he is about to take for a positive change he has pronounced. Mofella's final expression above, functions as a motivation for Rankakata, not only to go and come back, but also for persuading him and other hearers, that it is not wise for one to spoil one's prevailing good relationships with others, thinking that one would never need them again. In short, he persuades Rankakata to go, find his relatives and make peace with them, and finally come back to the same people at Dithotaneng, and keep on living in peace and tranquility with them.

Indubitably, for Rankakata, this whole incident marks the moment of truth, a reminiscent irony, if you may. He has now come to terms, not only with himself, but with all the forewarnings and pieces of advice that have continually been given to him, by the late Kesentseng, the late Bafedile, and other community members, in connection with his unbecoming attitude, behaviour and beliefs. Though he has always been arrogant, vindictive and impervious to any form of persuasive communication, he now realises that he has wasted a lot of his time by adhering to the unreasonable character dispositions mentioned above. Such an adherence, coupled with his customary utterance, 'le/o ka nketsang?' has caused him dearly, as he has lost both his wife and daughter, Bafedile and Kesentseng. To make matters worse, he has allowed himself to be bullied, coerced and manipulated by

Mmasebueng into taking the initiative to destroy his own family; and worse still, take her as the surrogate wife who has a full control over him and his possessions.

3.2 **MPOWANE**

There are ten characters in Pmowane, though much action is centered on the following ones:

1. **Hlakahlothwane**: Habai's father, Mmakgaeng's husband;
2. **Mmakgaeng** : Habai's mother, Hlakahlothwane's wife;
3. **Habai**: Hlakahlothwane and Mmakgaeng's son; and
4. **Mmaboitshwaro**: Habai's wife.

Mpowane opens with Hlakahlothwane and Mmakgaeng grappling with a matter that seems to be the source of worry in their family, as the following dialogue reveals:

Mmakgaeng: Monnamoholo, ke a kgolwa o ntse o nahana taba ena ya ha Habai eo ho bonahalang hore eka bana bana ha ba na thari (Act I: scene i).

[Old man, I suppose that you are thinking about this issue concerning Habai, as it seems that these children are barren.]

Hlakahlothwane: Mosadia heso, ke touta haholo ke taba eno hoo ke bileng ke nahanang leqheka la Sesotho leo re ka le lekang. Ke hore ngwana wa ka a le mong feela banna, ka hara banana ebe a ka hloka bana! Tjhe bo! Ka ntate a ntswetse re lokela ho ema ka maoto mosadimoholo (Act 1: scene i).

[My wife, I am very much worried about this issue, so much that I even think of a Sesotho plan that we may adopt. As for my only child, guys, among girls, to have no children! Never indeed! I bet by my father who bore me, we have to take action.]

It would seem that this situation has been worrying this couple for quite some time now – especially because Habai happens to be the only son among girls. One can guess that, as Hlakahlothwane and Mmakgaeng are in their old age, they have had a desire to see Habai's offspring, to satisfy their ego as grand parents. It, therefore, comes not as surprise that Hlakahlothwane even expresses his desire to take it into their hands to adopt a Sesotho plan that will probably solve the prevailing problem. His vowing, coupled with the idiomatic expression, "Ka ntate a ntswetse re lokela ho ema ka maoto mosadimoholo", not only indicates his serious concern about this matter, but also persuades Mmakgaeng to identify with him and join hands in the proposed attempt. The idiomatic expression, 'ho ema ka maoto,' is usually employed for an indication of a serious intent, as Hlakahlothwane hereby does. Seemingly, Mmakgaeng's persuasion on Hlakahlothwane has functioned as a reinforcement of his pre-existing ideas and intentions; that is why Mmakgaeng not even employed much persuasion before he can identify with her.

As a sign that she identifies with him in this matter, Mmakgaeng responds to Hlakahlothwane's suggestion in the positive, and says:

“O a bolela ntate. Re lokela ho thusa bana bana ba rona re sa phela le ha re se re fokola ha kaalo. Nna ke ne ke bile ke nahana ho ya itjhekela thwesane mane thajaneng ke tle ke bone hore nka e kopanya le eng, ebe ke behela bana bana pitsa. Le ha jwale bana ba dulang ditropong ba le kgathatso ka hore ntho tseba tsa rona tsa Sesotho ba di shebela tlaase” (Act I: scene i).

[You are correct sir. We have to assist these children of ours while we live, even though we are already so weak. I was even thinking of going to dig 'thwetsane' (an indigenous herb) at that small mountain, so that I may decide on what to mix it with, for concocting a pot for these children of mine. But now these children who stay in towns are troublesome because they look down upon these Sesotho things of ours.]

Hlakahlothwane immediately reviles against Mmakgaeng's skepticism that the children who stay in towns may not agree to use the Sesotho herbs, saying:

“Tseo tsa ditropong o hle o di kwenye mosadimoholo. Ha ka mona ho tla sebetswa ho ya ka tsela ya ntate. Bana ba tla mmamela, ha ke na taba le toropo eno ya bona.” (Act I: scene i).

[Those of towns you should immediately swallow them, old woman. Here at my home it will be performed in accordance with my father's way. Children will listen to me; I have no truck with that town of theirs.]

When he employs the idiomatic expression, 'o hle o di kwenye,' above, one perceives that Hlakahlothwane is not a man of upfront persuasion, but that he is either a coercer or manipulator. In Sesotho, 'ho kwenya ditaba' [to swallow the news/words] bears implications of force, where one is forced to withdraw their words. Hlakahlothwane's above expression, therefore, implies that he is not intending to listen to anything that may be said by Habai and Mmaboitshwaro in opposition to the present suggestion of using the indigenous herbs for boosting their fertility. In principle, he agrees with Mmakgaeng upon using the indigenous herbs for boosting the fertility of Habai and his wife; and adds that he also knows it for certain that these indigenous herbs are quite helpful in matters of this kind, as they have always been used by their parents whenever need arose.

Upon realizing that Hlakahlothwane is also aware of the importance of these herbs, Mmakgaeng asks him what he is intending to do; thus persuading him to take action towards the fulfillment of his desire. The former points out that he will consult his famous indigenous doctor to come over and assist. Furthermore, he describes the said doctor as a person who is knowledgeable in matters of this kind, and who has a long time experience. Further still, he

explains the purpose of consulting him/her as, “a tlo behela Habai le mosadi dipitsa ke tsebe ho bona setloholo pele ke eshwa” (Act I: scene i). [to make fertility herbal mixture for Habai and his wife, so that I may see a grandchild before I die.]

Needless to say, it is this desire for seeing a grandchild that sparks Habai’s parents to look for a solution into the ensuing problem. Since they observe that they are already weak, their longing for a grandchild is honed. No wonder that Mmakgaeng immediately agrees with her husband’s suggestion without any question. In short, both parents are mutually persuaded by their wish to see a grandchild before they die. In an attempt to seal up this mutual agreement between the two of them, Hlakahlothwane thanks Mmakgaeng for her understanding; and further highlights his intention to find a knowledgeable doctor that has foundation ties with the ancestors, as opposed to those who pretend to be – “Ho fapana le ha o ka iketsa ngakanamotwana,” he says (Act I: scene i).

As would be expected, Mmakgaeng demonstrates her total agreement with Hlakahlothwane by even boosting his totemic pride, calling him ‘tau’ (Act I: scene i) [lion]. In an attempt to show that his totemic pride is really boosted up, Hlakahlothwane even chants poetic lines of the Bataung totem, as in the following:

“O qetile ha o re ke Motaung. Ke yena Motho wa Mmanthethe wa Morapedi; Motho wa teng ha a shwe feela a eso kgaohle hlooho; A sale a nyeketla ka mahetleng” (Act I: scene i).

[You are correct when you say that I am a Motaung. I am indeed a Person of Mmanthethe of Morapedi; That Person does not merely die without the head being amputated; He then remains jerking his shoulders.]

Upon noticing the extent to which Hlakahlothwane’s moral has been boosted, Mmakgaeng comments the poetic expertise of the former by calling him by his totem (Motaung), and persuades him to spell out the time for calling Habai and his wife over for the intended treatment. Indubitably, Mmakgaeng’s use of Hlakahlothwane’s totem as a form of address is meant for establishing a common ground upon which they can both plan to assist their son and wife in time. Needless to say, this is a persuasive strategy that is employed for achieving the intended goal by the persuader. In addition, she inquires after the name of the indigenous doctor in question, apparently, to ensure that they consult a famous one who is known to her as well.

As if unprepared to divulge the name of the indigenous doctor he aims to consult, Hlakahlothwane shouts out the doctor’s name as ‘Tshika-le-marapo;’ (Act I: scene i) the name which, for Mmakgaeng, is rather difficult and unusual. She, therefore, inquires after the

meaning of the name, to which Hlakahlothwane fails to respond; except for illustrating as follows:

“E, le thata, mme le tshebetso tsa hae di jwalo. Ke tla roma moshanyana ka bese a yo ba tsebisa hore ka Sontaha sona sena ba fihle mona.” (O hlahlela peipi, o a hotetsa, o a ema o a tswa.) (Act I: scene i).

[Yes, it is difficult, and his operations are just like that. I will send a boy by bus to go and tell them that they should arrive here this very Sunday. (He stuffs his pipe, he lights it, stands up and goes out.)]

Though it has been indicated above, that this couple share the same desire for their son, Habai, to get an offspring, so that they may enjoy the sight of such a grandchild, it now appears as if they differ in the consideration of a knowledgeable doctor. Hlakahlothwane's failure to give a proper name for the doctor that he intends to call is an indication that he does not want to reveal the name, lest Mmakgaeng may doubt the said doctor's expertise in matters of this kind. One may even guess that his verbal act of associating the compound name with the so-called doctor's expertise in operations; is an attempt into coercing Mmakgaeng to stop asking anymore questions.

Further, when Hlakahlothwane spells out the time for calling Habai and Mmaboitshwaro over as the immediate Sunday, one realises that his intentions are to block Mmakgaeng from any further discussion about the concerned doctor. To emphasise his aim of blocking Mmakgaeng from further reference to the so-called doctor, he diverts his attention from her and directs it at his smoking pipe, as he packs it, lights it, and goes out of the house. This action may, therefore, be viewed as a signal that, since Mmakgaeng has sparked his anger, he may start a raw, should she continue in that strain. One may, therefore, label him as a coercer, or manipulator, rather than persuader – for persuasion demands that both persuader and the target communicate and exchange ideas, in an attempt to reach the desired goal.

Whereas, in principle, Hlakahlothwane and Makgaeng agree on consulting an indigenous doctor, they seem to differ on the actual doctor to be approached. Further, they seem to put their full trust in the Sesotho doctors, without even making any reference to the modern medical doctors. Since Habai and Mmaboitshwaro are town dwellers and modern age young people, one wonders how they are going to take their parents' suggestion to consult the indigenous doctor – considering the fact that Hlakahlothwane coerced Mmakgaeng into ceasing any further discussions concerning that matter.

Indeed, Habai and Mmaboitshwaro arrive on the very Sunday proposed by their father, Hlakahlothwane. They find both Hlakahlothwane and Mmakgaeng already waiting for them.

As is normal for people to start off with the exchange of greetings, such greetings go as follows:

Habai le Mmaboitshwaro: Kgotsong mme le ntate!

[May peace be with you mother and father!]

Hlakahlothwane: Kgotsong bana ba ka. Ekaba le ntse le phela hantle!

[May peace be with you my children. How is your health?]

Habai: Re ntse re phela hantle ntate ha ho molato. Re thabela ho le fumana le phela hantle mmoho le mme.

[We are alright father, no problem. We are happy to find you and mother in good health too.]

Mmakgaeng: Re leboha re tiile Motaung. O a tseba hore ho bonana ha difahleho ke sehlare se thobang pelo le ho feta ha le ka nna la ngollana feela ka nako e telele le sa bonane.

[Indeed we thank you Motaung. You know that meeting face to face is a healing device that consoles the heart, even more than continually writing to each/one another without seeing each other.]

Mmaboitshwaro: Wa tla wa bua mme le ha o ka thola. Thabo e bonahalang difahlehong tse shebaneng e feta eo motho a e balang sefahlehong sa lengolo. Ekaba taba ke dife mme? Re ile ra tshoha ha moshanyana a re ntate o laetse hore re be re tlo fihla kajeno ka Sontaha. (Act I: scene ii)

[You have well-spoken, mother, even if you may be silent. The joy that radiates from the faces is greater than the one that a person reads from a letter. What is the news, mother? We became shocked when the boy informed us that father has instructed us to make sure that we arrive here today, this Sunday.]

Whereas greetings are generally used for establishing rapport, and as a way of paving the way for persuasive attempts, the foregoing ones seem to cover more than these points. For example, while the usual and common Sesotho greeting is 'dumela/ng' (agree), without being specific about what to agree upon, the one exchanged by the above characters is 'kgotsong.' As has been shown in the above translations, this greeting specifically pronounces a wish for peace to prevail among the interactants. Further, these characters are concerned about one another's health, and express their wish and joy over finding one another in good health. In essence, one may surmise that the ground is well-paved for whatever persuasive communication that is aimed at in this family meeting. Furthermore, these characters express their joy over seeing one another, where they even make some comparison of face to face interaction with the face of a letter, as has been indicated above. In this manner, they have all attempted to persuade one another to maintain peace and tranquility in the ensuing meeting.

Now that the ground has been paved for persuasive interactions, Mmaboitshwaro wastes no time in posing the question concerning the issues for which they are hereby summoned by the parents, as above. In addition, she informs the parents that this urgent call frightened them; which means that this is the first time they are summoned in this manner. In essence, Mmaboitshwaro's inquiry of the pressing issues that have prompted this meeting persuades Hlakahlothwane to go straight into the matter, without any hesitation, and the following interactions ensue:

Hlakahlothwane: Ke teng ngwetsi ya ka. Ke le bitseditse kwano mona le monna wa hao Habai, ka tabanyana e re hwayahwayang le mma lona hore re tlo e shebisana nako e sa dumela.

[It is so, my daughter-in-law. I have called you to here, you and Habai, in connection with a minor issue that has been itching at us with your mother, so that we may discuss it while time permits.]

Habai: Ho lokile ntate. Re behele ditaba hobane re lokela ho mamela.

[It is correct father. Give us the news because we have to listen.]

Hlakahlothwane: Ho jwalo thakaka. Ditaba ke tsena. Re ngongorehile haholo le mmao ke taba ena ya lona ya ho hloka thari. Re buisane nako e telele ho bona hore re ka leka matsapa afe.

[It is so my age-mate. Here are the issues. We have been very much worried with your mother over this issue of your being barren. We discussed for a long time to decide on what strategies to try.]

Habai: Re mametse motswadi wa ka. (Act I: scene ii)

[We are listening my parent.]

Like someone who is about to start a spark of conflict, Hlakahlothwane packs his smoking pipe and lights it. He then explains to them that he has decided that it is now time for them to consult a Sesotho doctor to come and concoct some herbal stuff for them. He also adds that such a doctor is "nkggekge ya motho eo e leng kgale a di bona." (Act I: scene ii) [a great doctor who is highly experienced] Like someone who has been poised at reacting to the slightest mistake from his father, Habai does not wait for anymore explanation from Hlakahlothwane, but employs downplaying, as a persuasive strategy to reject the whole idea; and poses a question as follows, "Ngaka ya Sesotho mehleng yee ntate?" (Act I: scene ii) [A Sesotho doctor these days father?] The implication of Habai's question is that this is no more an appropriate period to consult a Sesotho doctor, thus relegating such doctors as being useless, outdated, or inferior; as compared with the medical ones.

Clearly, there is misunderstanding between Habai and Hlakahlothwane; which is possibly caused by the fact that Hlakahlothwane fails to engage with Habai and Mmaboitshwaro on a persuasive level. As can be seen in his laying out of the issue in question above, Hlakahlothwane tells them that he has already reached the conclusion, and, seemingly, the conclusion is his own, without involving the concerned people. It comes not as a surprise therefore, that Habai downplays the whole issue as he does. In line with Hlakahlothwane's earlier reaction to Mmakgaeng's worry about the possibility of this idea's being rejected by the children who live in towns, it is anybody's guess what Habai's downplaying statement triggers in Hlakahlothwane.

Since Habai has merely posed a question, without clearly registering his own position, as regards the issue in discussion, Hlakahlothwane simply answers in the positive that Habai has heard him well. Hlakahlothwane's answer is to be seen as a persuasive utterance for Habai to come up with his idea, whether he agrees with the whole decision taken by his father or not. Basing himself on the downplaying question above, Habai attempts to persuade Hlakahlothwane by pronouncing himself in the negative. He tells Hlakahlothwane that he is very sorry, adding as follows, "... hobane nna ha ho moo ke teanang teng le ngaka ya Sesotho. Nako ya ditumelo tseno tsa ho tlwejwakwa ka mahare e fetile." (Act I: scene ii) [... because I have no connection with a Sesotho doctor. Time for those beliefs of for ever being cut with raiser blades has passed.]

As may be expected, Habai's reaction and his analysis of the Sesotho system infuriate Hlakahlothwane very much. He addresses Habai in the following manner:

"O reng Habai? Ha ka moo, o se o ye o mpuele manyampetla ka molomo wa hao! Moshemane ke o tswetse o a nkutlwa. (O ema ka maoto.) Ke tla o bata ha eba re se re le dithaka nna le wena." (Act I: scene ii)

[What are you saying, Habai? Here at my home, you dare talk a lot of rubbish with your own mouth! Boy, I bore you, you hear me. (He stands up.) I am going to strike you if we are already age-mates, me and you.]

In line with the analysis made of Hlakahlothwane's character in scene one of this same act, his approaches for inducing change in other characters is not upfront persuasion. He comes to the meeting with drawn conclusions concerning Habai and Mmaboitshwaro's wellbeing; and to make it worse, he fails to engage with them on upfront persuasion. Instead, he threatens to strike Habai with his fighting stick for not agreeing with him. By so threatening, Hlakahlothwane applies coercion, for he puts his trust on the fighting stick, instead of debating the issue with his family. When he stands up, as he threatens to strike Habai above,

one sees a character that is agitated and vindictive, seemingly in preparation for fulfilling his threats.

Undeniably, Habai may also be blamed for right away downplaying his father's ideas concerning the consultation of some herbalist. Probably, it would have been proper for him to ask Hlakahlothwane some questions for a better understanding of the conclusion he has already made; rather than simply opposing without questioning the idea. Indubitably, this is conflict of ideas, springing from the age gap prevailing between father and son; or tradition and modernity, for that matter. Whereas Hlakahlothwane puts his trust in the Sesotho doctors with their herbal applications, Habai has, understandably, been introduced to modern healing methods. It may not be surprising therefore, that Habai downplays the Sesotho healing and pronounces his hatred of Sesotho doctors.

Since Hlakahlothwane is already on his feet as he threatens to strike Habai, Mmakgaeng attempts to intervene; and further blames the two men of causing confusion, while there is this important matter that has brought them together. As may be expected, Hlakahlothwane puts the blame on Habai, for banding words with him, since he regards himself (Habai) as a man too. Seemingly, Hlakahlothwane's casting of blame on Habai persuades the latter to also blame the father. In an attempt to persuade Mmakgaeng to identify with him, Habai even attempts to analyse the character of Hlakahlothwane. For him, Hlakahlothwane is the kind of character that always draws conclusions and expects everyone to accept his ideas without any question. In addition, Habai indicates that Hlakahlothwane seems to forget that he is also a man now, and he can also think for himself.

Clearly, Habai has analysed Hlakahlothwane's character well; yet one would have expected him to have taken precaution in addressing himself to the ensuing issue. On the other hand, Hlakahlothwane has addressed Habai as 'thakaka' (my age-mate), thus sending signals that Habai, as a married man, has a right to be addressed as an equal to him, rather than bringing him some conclusions which affect his own life. It may be everybody's guess that Hlakahlothwane's fury may now be at the exploding level, as Habai now openly pronounces himself as man enough to be consulted before making any decisions about his life.

Indeed, Hlakahlothwane can no more hold himself. His rage is now at the boiling point, as it illuminates itself in the next reaction and dialogue:

Hlakahlothwane: (O a bela ke kgalefo.) Hela moshanyana, o reng? (A mmata phatleng ka mosaqa.) Ha mang? (Basadi ba leka ho thiba monnamoholo.) Ntloheleng ke mo phete. (O a mo laimela. Habai a phakisa a tswela ka ntle.) Moshemane eo o re ha ke kgathalle maikutlo a mang kapa mang? Ke mang yena nka tla mo kgathallang? O re ha ke nke keletso tsa batho! Hmm, ngwana eo o nahanang banna? Ngwana eo o re ke a lebala hore o hodile ke

monna? Ke monna wa mang, wa ka? Ke bitsa badimo ba heso ke re ha e le nna le yena ke hona re sa tla nkgisetsana mahafi. (Act I: scene ii)

[(He boils with anger) Hei you small boy, what are saying? (He strikes him on the forehead with a fighting stick.) In whose home? (The women attempt to stop the old man) Let me strike him again. (He rushes at him. Habai quickly steps out) This boy says that I care not about anybody's view? Who is he that I may care for? He says that I do not take other people's pieces of advice! Hmm, what does this child think guys? This child says that I forget that he is grown up and is a man? Whose husband is he, mine? I call to my ancestors and say, as for I and he we are still going to smell each other's armpits.]

Obviously, Hlakahlothwane's anger has been worsened by Habai's analysis of his character disposition. Whereas Habai might have said all these things with an intention to persuade Hlakahlothwane to come upfront and engage in persuasion, he only invited his rage. Seemingly Hlakahlothwane has always been this kind of a character, with arrogance, obstinacy and spite; such that this open character analysis by Habai causes him both anger and embarrassment. In that case, it is not surprising that he may be on denial, and as such, the only salvation he sees is to use aggression against this defiance by Habai. When he vows by his ancestors, that he and Habai are still going to smell each other's armpits, one gets the feeling that he is going to stick to his behaviour and attitude, no matter how anybody may persuade him to change. For him, coercion is the only panacea towards coming to terms with Habai, it would seem.

As a persuasive measure, Mmakgaeng pleads with Hlakahlothwane to calm down and reconsider what has just ensued in the house. Further, she asks Mmaboitshwaro to approach Habai and persuade him to come into the house, so that the discussion may be resumed. Mmakgaeng even goes to an extent of throwing a rhetorical question, whether or not the ancestors are going to hear their prayers – thus attempting to persuade Hlakahlothwane to reconsider his attitude and behaviour. Furthermore, she declares that this is the first time she has ever witnessed such fracas in this home; which is also to be regarded as a persuasive endeavour for Hlakahlothwane to change his behaviour. The whole of Mmakgaeng's talk functions as a persuasive plan to calm down Hlakahlothwane and make him rethink about his relations with Habai. As an indication that Mmakgaeng's verbal interactions have worked on Hlakahlothwane, he drops his soliloquy.

Not surprisingly, Hlakahlothwane is moved, to an extent that, for the first time in this meeting, he addresses himself to Mmakgaeng. In short he has been persuaded to be considerate of the problem at hand. He explains to her that she fails to understand that Habai's pronouncement, that he is also a man that should be consulted before drawing any conclusions about him, is tantamount to an insult. In addition, Hlakahlothwane emphasises

the fact that this is his home, where he is entitled to give instructions, even to Habai, as his son. Finally, with arrogance, he pronounces himself that, if that may not be the case, then he bets that "... ke tla kgaohana le yena ho isa ka ho sa feleng. Le mohla ke ileng ha 'nkwaale' a se ke a ba a jwetswa. Re tla hlobohana ho isa lefung" (Act I: scene ii). [... I will be separated from him for ever. Even on the day I die he should not be informed. We shall part ways till death.]

It would seem that Habai is not prepared to come back into the house where the meeting is taking place; for, Mmaboitshwaro comes back to report that she tried to persuade him to come in, but to no avail. Upon receiving this information, Hlakahlothwane becomes angry again. He even pronounces that it is time that he fights with Habai, so as to prove who the elder one is between the two of them. The two women block his way, as he tries to go out to attach Habai. Additionally, they verbally persuade him to stop confronting Habai, and advise him to try and keep peace with the latter. For Hlakahlothwane, Habai is spiteful, and as such, deserves to be disciplined. As Mmakgaeng continues to plead with him to refrain from this kind of behaviour, Hlakahlothwane, unwittingly, spells out his intentions, as embodied in the following submission:

Hlakahlothwane: Mo emele ngwana eno wa hao. Jwale o se o bile o batla hore ngwana a fe nna ntaae mabaka a tla ntlosa kgopolong ya ka? Ke fetohela tsela eo ke hodisitweng ka yona? Le kgale ka Bataung! (Act I: scene ii)

[Support that child of yours. Now you even want the child to give me, his father, some reasons that will cause me to change my intention? Should I turn against the way in which I was brought up? Never, by the Bataung!]

As was stated earlier in this analysis, Hlakahlothwane fails to apply any form of upfront persuasion with his family, and employs coercion, rather. His reasons for behaving that way are very clear here – he is afraid that he will be forced to change his intentions. Needless to say, he is an autocrat, and as such expects all who deal with him to be submissive to his way of thinking, failing which, they become his enemies. He may, therefore, be described as a dictator, intimidator, and coercer, rather than persuader, as was shown earlier. Since Mmakgaeng attempts to speak on behalf of Habai, as she advises Hlakahlothwane to bear with him and allow him to explain himself, the latter seemingly disowns the son – as in 'Mo emele ngwana eo wa hao,' above.

Since Hlakahlothwane has just so clearly spelt himself out, Mmakgaeng inquires from Mmaboitshwaro whether or not Habai had given her his reasons for reviling the Sesotho doctors – thus persuading her to divulge those reasons. Mmaboitshwaro explains that, though Habai has given her those reasons, she is rather hesitant to spell them out, under the

prevailing circumstances. Like someone who has a soft heart for Mmaboitshwaro, Hlakahlothwane persuades her to lay those reasons down; adding that “wena ke a o tseba o na le tlhompho; e seng enwa wa mala a ka ya ntlotlolseng.” (Act I: scene ii) [as for you I know that you have respect; as opposed to this one of my intestines (literal – that I begotten) who has embarrassed me.] The above statement by Hlakahlothwane is to be regarded as a persuasive attempt for Mmaboitshwaro to relax and say out the reasons behind Habai’s denial for consulting a Sesotho doctor.

In response to Hlakahlothwane’s persuasion, Mmaboitshwaro lays out the reasons, but addresses herself to Mmakgaeng, saying:

“Mme, aubuti Habai o re mabaka a hae ao a nyatsang ngaka tsena tsa methokgo ka ona ke ana: La pele, dingaka tsena tsa habo rona di se di tletse bonokwane. Ba bang ba bona ha ba sa tseba ho laola ebile ha se ba neuweng ka nnete. Hwa bona ke ho utswa dijhelete tsa batho ka mano ebe ha ho bonahale phekolo ya letho. Tseo ba di bolelang e se e le thetso feela. O tla utlwa motho a ntse a re hoo ke ntho e nyenyane feela ho nna mona. Taba e nngwe hape ke hore ba rata le ho tlweba batho ka lehare o fuman motho a aparetswe ke dihlolong ha o le ka hara batho ba bang, mme ba ntse ba o tadima mesidi ena eo dingaka tsena di thalehang batho ka yona.” (Act I: scene ii)

[Mother, brother Habai says that his reasons for reproving these herbal doctors are as follows: The first one, these doctors of ours are full of cheating. Some of them are no more conversant in divining, and they are not really gifted. Theirs is the stealing of people’s moneys by deceit, resulting in no healing whatsoever. All they say is mere lies. You will hear one saying, that is a minor thing to me. Another thing is that they are fond of cutting people with the raiser blade, such that people find themselves full of embarrassment when with other people, as they continue looking at those powders that these doctors smear people with.]

Indubitably, some of the above reasons, if not all, are clear, and rather convincing. Besides, whoever feels otherwise has an opportunity to debate against them, in an attempt to persuade one who holds them to change their beliefs and attitude. Were Hlakahlothwane a man of upfront persuasion, he would take action towards defending the Sesotho doctors/herbalists, since he has this dire belief and trust in their performance. But, since he is not that kind of person, he loses patience, and addresses Mmakgaeng in the following intimidating manner:

“Hei wena mosadi, ha ke panya feela mona ngwana eno wa hao a be a le siyo ha ka mona. Ha ke tlo qhobelwa majwe ka hanong ke ngwana. Haeba ha a ikemisetsa ho

mmamela; mo jwetse e ntse e le hona jwale hore ke a mo tebela, a tsamaye, a ye ha ntatae eno eo a tla mo laela. Ema o mo jwetse bo, mosadi!” (Act I: scene ii)

[Hey you woman, when I just blink that child of yours should be away from this home of mine. I am not going to allow a child to ram some stones into my mouth. If he is not prepared to listen to me, tell him right now that I expel him, he should go, and go to that father of his that is going to be instructed by him. Stand up and do tell him right now.]

As Hlakahlothwane is a coercive character, he only waits for Mmaboitshwaro to finish laying out Habai’s reasons for refusing to consult the herbal doctor; before he adopts his coercive attitude and uses threats against him. It may be important to realise that, though Habai’s feelings are spelt out by Mmaboitshwaro, Hlakahlothwane addresses himself to Mmakgaeng. He once more disowns Habai by referring to him as ‘ngwana eno wa hao,’ in addressing Mmakgaeng; and further instructs Mmakgaeng to inform Habai that he is expelling him from his home; and that Habai should be away within the blink of an eye. As may be expected, Mmakgaeng is quite perplexed by this kind of behaviour by Hlakahlothwane, as contained in her exclamation, “Ntate!” (Act I: scene ii) [Father!]

Seemingly, Mmakgaeng’s exclamation above has induced more fury in Hlakahlothwane, though it might have been meant for persuading him to reconsider his beliefs, attitude and behaviour towards Habai. He now shows his true attitude in the following verbal exchanges:

Hlakahlothwane: O re ntate! Ema bo! Ke tloha ke o tjeke tjela ka molamu ona hona tjena!

[You say father! Yes do stand up! I might throw this stick at you right now!]

Mmaboitshwaro: Ntate hle! [Please father!]

Hlakahlothwane: Tswang ka tlung ya ka ka mona! (Ba tswa.) Ke a bona hore ha le ntsebe hantle. Ke tla le hatisa masepana a manamane. Ke ha ka mona! (Act I: scene ii)

[Get out of this house of mine! (They get out) I realise that you do not know me very well. I shall make you walk upon calves’ dung. This is my home!]

It would seem that, at this juncture, Hlakahlothwane not only reflects his true personality, but also displays the reasonableness he has lost. Since Habai has indicated his fears about the indigenous doctor’s operations to Mmaboitshwaro, Hlakahlothwane wants to harm everybody around him, as if they have already taken Habai’s side in the ensuing issue. To make it worse, he even expels both his wife and daughter-in-law from his house, yet they have done nothing to induce in him this kind of behaviour. As if that was not enough, he adds that he is going to really beat them up, by employing the idiomatic expression: ‘Ke tla le hatisa masepana a manamane,’ as shown above.

The foregoing idiomatic expression functions as a metaphor that derives from the fact that, at times of battle, one who happens to step upon calves' dung is bound to slip, and ends up losing his balance and prowess in fighting – thus becoming an easy victim for the opponent. Even if such a victim were to try and stand up to fight or defend himself, he would once more slip and fall again – in which case he would find himself wobbling in the dung; while his opponent maintains his balance and beats him into a pulp. In line with this understanding, it would be stupid and quite daring for Mmakgaeng and Mmaboitshwaro to be hesitant about getting out of the house. In other words, they are not persuaded to get out, but, through intimidation, coerced into taking the intended action. Worse still, Hlakahlothwane not only ends at these threats, but further spells out that this is his own home; thus insinuating that the other three discussants are foreigners, with no base to hold on, when he starts beating them.

Apparently, when he is in this kind of mood, Hlakahlothwane forgets that these other discussants are members of his family, or else arrogance and malice take precedence over his thinking and reasonableness. That is why he keeps on repeating the expression, 'ke ha ka mona,' as has been observed up to this juncture. Realizing this state of affairs, the other discussants hold their own communication outside, in an attempt to persuade one another towards finding the solution to the prevailing problem in the family:

Mmakgaeng: (...) Habai ngwanaka ditaba di mosenekeng. Ke le kopa le Mmaboitshwaro hore le mpe le tsamaye le boele ha lona; e se eka le beana dikgopi le ntatao. Etlare ha maikutlo a hae a se a kokobetse, o tla o bitsa le tlo lokisa ditaba.

[Habai my child, matters are difficult. I plead with you and Mmaboitshwaro that you should please go back to your place; it is as if you place each other for stumbling blocks with your father. When his feelings have subsided, he will call you to come and straighten up matters.]

Habai: Mme, moya wa ka o bohloko, o tletse boiphetetso. Ke tsieleha feela ha ke hopola hore motho ya nkentseng hona ke ntate. (O phahamisa lentswe) Ntate, ntate banna!

[Mother, my soul is painful, is full of retaliation. I only become puzzled when I consider that the person who has done this to me is father. (He raises his voice) Father, father guys!]

Mmakgaeng: Habai ngwanaka hle! Ntatao ke Modimo wa hao; mo inele matsoho metsing. Taba di tla loka, o se ke wa iketsa nketjwane mo-etsisa-nkolane. (Act I: scene ii)

[Habai my child, please! Your father is your God; forgive him. Matters will be right; do not turn yourself into a small frog that imitates the big one.]

In accordance with the above verbal exchanges, Mmakgaeng continues with her persuasive attempts for the family members to eventually change their attitudes, behaviours, and beliefs, so that they may finally amicably settle this matter. Since her husband, Hlakahlothwane, has

presently lost his persuasive mood, and adopted coercion instead; she was forced to come out and attempt to persuade Habai and Mmaboitshwaro to, not only calm down, but also go back to their own home, and cool down till Hlakahlothwane could call them over once more.

Her initial statement above, 'Habai ngwanaka taba di mosenekeng,' is quite a persuasive one. It is meant for Habai to realise the volatile situation in which the matters have developed. In that case, it persuades Habai into listening carefully to her mother's persuasive attempts with them, more especially as she addresses him as 'ngwanaka,' thus identifying with him – while Hlakahlothwane has pronounced his rejection and malicious intentions against him. The second idiomatic expression she employs, 'e se ka le beana dikgopi le ntatao,' is also persuasive for Habai to realise that his delay in going back to his own home in town may cause more problems for both himself and Hlakahlothwane.

Though Mmakgaeng has taken so much initiative at persuading Habai to calm down and be ready to settle this matter amicably when the time is due, he registers his deep feelings about the injury he has just sustained – that, though he nurses feelings of retaliation, he is baffled by the fact that it is his father that has caused him so much pain. In this way, Habai attempts to persuade his mother, and possibly his wife too, to identify with him and help him to solve this problem. As a sign that Mmakgaeng is duly persuaded, she advises Habai that, since his father is his God, he should forgive him. Additionally, she assures him that matters will be alright; and, as a persuasive attempt, employs another idiomatic expression to caution him against his feelings of revenge, saying: 'o se ke wa iketsa nketjwane mo-etsisa-nkolane,' as indicated in the dialogue above.

This idiomatic expression bears its source from oral legendary tales that relate the story of a small frog that had its stomach ruptured, as it tried to make a sound as big as that of a big one. In essence, the persuasive message Mmakgaeng hereby delivers to Habai, is that, should he retaliate in a similar manner against his father, his God, as she puts it, then he should be ready to bear the consequences similar to those that were borne by 'nketjwane' after the action. Seemingly, Mmakgaeng's persuasive message has affected both Mmaboitshwaro and Habai, as the following verbal exchanges show:

Mmaboitshwaro: Mme re utlwile. Re tla leka ho ya imamela hanyenyane. Le yena aubuti Habai o tla utlwa moya wa hae o kokobetse hosane ha re tsoha. Athe ha e le leqeba lena lona, ke tla le thoba mantsiboya le tla bohlela. (Ho Habai) Ntate ha re tsamaye ngwaneso. O mokeresete hle. Ketsahalo ena e se ke ya o dula hampe.

[Mother we have heard. We will try to listen to ourselves (think) a little while. Even brother Habai will feel that his spirit has ebbed tomorrow when we wake up. As for this wound, I shall

foment it tonight and it will heal up. (To Habai) Father, let us go my brother. You are a Christian please. This happenstance should not sit badly on you (not make you grieve).]

Habai: Ke a utlwa ngwetsi ya mme. Ha re tsamae. Mme sala hantle. [I hear you my mother's daughter-in-law. Let us go. Mother, stay well.]

Mmaboitshwaro: Mme sala hantle. O re dumedisetse ntate. O nne o re rapelle. (Koloi e a rutla e a tsamaya.)

Mmakgaeng: (O opa diatla.) Basadi! Ka ntate ka monna. Mosotho o re le tla le bonwa ha le dulelwe. Ruri ke lokela ho e hlanaka ho seng jwalo lelapa le a qhalana. (Act 1: scene ii)

[(She claps her hands.) Women! By my father, the man! A Mosotho usually says that an observed one (danger) is never waited for. Indeed, I must roll it around, otherwise the family is breaking into pieces.]

Since Habai's feelings are deeply hurt, Mmaboitshwaro, above, makes it her duty to persuade both Mmakgaeng and Habai to come to terms with the present situation, and plan for future interactions. First, she assures Mmakgaeng that she and Habai have been persuaded accordingly; and that they are going to cogitate over this matter. Second, she expresses her belief and assurance that Habai will feel better in the morning, when they wake up at their place – in this way, persuading Habai to realise the importance of time as the healer of people's painful feelings. Thirdly, she persuades Mmakgaeng to remain with an assurance that Habai's wound will be afforded the treatment it deserves; and, simultaneously, injecting into Habai the feeling that he will be in good hands when they arrive home.

In an endeavour to attract Habai's attention, Mmaboitshwaro addresses him directly, and calls him 'ntate' and 'ngwaneso' at the same time, apparently to ensure him that, for her, he occupies both status of father and brother; now that Hlakahlothwane harbours rancour against him. Indubitably, Mmaboitshwaro's goal here is to persuade Habai into accepting Mmakgaeng's persuasive attempts into harmonizing the situation; and hope that matters will be discussed better in future. Unsurprisingly, she even reminds Habai that he is a Christian, unquestionably to persuade him to adhere to Christian attitudes, behaviours and beliefs; and follows this reminder with the plea for him to refrain from maintaining the grudge.

As indicated in the above dialogue, Habai highlights his compliance to the persuasive attempts directed to him by both Mmakgaeng, and Mmaboitshwaro. Since Mmaboitshwaro has just addressed him as both 'ntate' and 'ngwaneso' at the same time, Habai, in return, addresses her as 'ngwetsi ya mme,' as reflected above, seemingly as an attempt to persuade her to identify with her mother-in-law, as Hlakahlothwane has stated his animosity towards all the three of them. Although Habai bids farewell to his mother, without saying

anything to or about his father as they leave, Mmaboitshwaro not only bids her mother-in-law farewell, but also asks her to pass their greetings to her father-in-law; and finally pleads with Mmakgaeng to continue praying for them.

Excessive to say, Mmaboitshwaro's intentions here are to persuade all concerned to strive at forming peace among them; and adhere to the hope that there is still a chance for Habai and herself to bear a child. She also seems to be persuading Mmakgaeng to negotiate with Hlakahlothwane for reconsidering his present stand; and further make him understand that all concerned apologise for today's mishaps. By so doing, Mmaboitshwaro is laying the foundation for the likely future meeting of similar forum. It would seem that Mmakgaeng is perplexed, as she claps her hands with dismay, saying, 'Basadi!' as an interjection common among Basotho women. When she vows by her father, and relates that 'le tla le bonwa ha le dulelwe,' this is to be seen as a statement of an intent for her to do all in her power to rectify the prevailing situation; more so as she also employs the idiomatic expression 'ho e hlanaka,' thus pronouncing her determination to fight against this problem to the bitter end.

Indeed, all matters settle down; as can be observed in Mmaboitshwaro and Habai's dialogue – where the former attempts to persuade the latter to make arrangements for them to go back to Hlakahlothwane's home for peace-making processes: "Re tshwanetse ho etsa kgotso" (Act I: scene iii). [We have to make peace], she says. For Habai, Mmaboitshwaro looks down upon him, if she thinks that he will ever make peace with his father. Using a biblical allusion, he explains to her that, though his wound is now healed up, he bears an indelible mark: "Kajeno ke fetohile Kaine, ke na le letshwao phatleng" (Act I: scene iii) [Today I have turned into Kain, I have a mark on the forehead.] Further, he questions Mmaboitshwaro as to whether he sustained such a wound due to his or her shortcoming, obviously attempting to cast a blame on her as the source of the whole squabble; and quickly asks a rhetorical question: "O a bona hore taba ee e tla qabanya rona jwale?" (Act I: scene iii) [Are you aware that this matter is going to cause strife between us now?] Obviously, Habai still bears rancour towards the incident that culminated into the sustenance of his wound, and as such, has no intentions of even discussing the matter.

Nonetheless, Mmaboitshwaro pleads with him to calm down and reconsider the idea of forming peace with Hlakahlothwane; making him aware that, no matter what, a parent will remain a parent. In addition, she attempts to persuade him to realise that the wound he has sustained is not a mark on him alone, but on the whole family of Bataung; since even Hlakahlothwane himself will never come to terms with such a mark on his son's forehead, at the next meeting. As if in imitation of Hlakahlothwane's aggressive behaviour, Mmaboitshwaro's reference to the next meeting enrages Habai; to an extent that he throws an intimidating question: "Kapa o batla re qabane?" (Act I: scene iii) [Or do you want us to

quarrel?]) Instead of being intimidated by Habai's threats, Mmaboitshwaro plugs courage to really confront him, and further attempts to persuade him to reconsider his stand, saying:

“Ntate Habai ako ipokeletse maikutlo mmannyeo. Motswadi wa hao e tla ba mang, ho feta moo o tla hlompha Modimo jwang athe o tla be o se o hlotswe ho etsa jwalo ho motswadi?” (Act I: scene iii)

[Father Habai please put your thoughts together mother-of-so-and-so. Who will be your parent, and further, how are you going to respect God as you will have failed to do so to your parent?]

Indubitably, these are quite persuasive words that Habai has no clear response for. Since the word 'mmannyeo' is used in addressing a female person, especially in indicating some disapproval, when Mmaboitshwaro uses it in addressing Habai, it impacts on him that further argument against her persuasive words may end up with a strife between the two of them. Apparently, Habai would not like such a situation to occur between them. He is resultantly persuaded to respond in the following manner: “Monna ako tsamaye o yo phetha mesebetsi ya hao. Ke tla sala ke imamella ditaba tsena tsa hao” (Act I: scene iii) [Man please go and perform your duties. I will remain listening to myself over these matters of yours.]

Seemingly, Habai has been affected by Mmaboitshwaro's addressing him as 'mmannyeo,' such that he retaliates by also addressing her as 'monna' (man), possibly as an attempt to persuade her to stop this discussion and go out as he suggests. As an indication that she has played her persuasive part well, Mmaboitshwaro goes out as Habai suggests; leaving him alone to engage himself in a short soliloquy, as follows: “Banna, mosadi ke fuduwane enwa empa kwana o a bolela. Ke tla ikokobetsa ha ntate a ka tshoha a mpitsitse.” (Act I: scene iii) [Guys, this woman is a real stirrer, but she is indeed correct. I shall humble myself if father may happen to call me.] It would appear that Mmaboitshwaro's persuasive attempts with Habai have been successful enough to make him change his attitude towards his father; for he now entertains the hope and desire for Hlakahlothwane to call him – as contained in his final statement above. One might then observe that this persuasion is formative; for Habai had already decided to stay off his father, for how long, one cannot say.

Meanwhile, Hlakahlothwane and Mmakgaeng are also engaged in persuasive verbal communication with each other. Whereas Hlakahlothwane still regards Habai as a bad child, who may not even comply with their recalling him back to their home for further discussions; Mmakgaeng states that he will comply with the call and attend the meeting; as she believes that he also wishes for reconciliation. Further, she persuades Hlakahlothwane to write Habai a letter that states the meeting date; and assures him that he will comply accordingly.

In line with the mutual hopes and desires expressed above, Habai and Mmaboitshwaro waste no time in fulfilling Hlakahlothwane's call for them to come home for further discussions. In his opening speech that lays the foundation of the meeting in question, Hlakahlothwane explains the idea as 'ho theha selekane se setjha,' [to form new alliance] and re-unite. Further, he addresses Habai in this manner, "Ke a swaba Habai ngwanaka ha ke se ke o bona o ena le letheba phatleng." (Act 1: scene iv) [I am sorry Habai my child that I now see you with a wound on your forehead.] Relative to the last meeting's unwarranted developments, Hlakahlothwane's present address persuades Habai to interrupt him, and explain that he has already reconciled with that day's happenings. In addition, Habai reiterates Mmakgaeng's former statement, that, "Mosotho o re: Le tla le bonwa ha le dulelwe." (Act I: scene iv) [A Mosotho says: An observed one (danger) is never waited for.] Further, Habai attempts to persuade all in the meeting to refrain from waiting for a possible danger; whereupon, Mmakgaeng stands up and embraces both the son and daughter-in-law, thanking them, as a sign that she is persuaded by their intentions to forget the past and start anew. For all these interactants, these persuasive remarks work as reinforcement; as they had already been gone through persuasive endeavours for establishing harmony and reconciliation among members of the family.

As an indication that all have been persuaded to reconcile, the following verbal interactions prove the spirit of oneness in this meeting:

Hlakahlothwane: Habai ke lokolotse matsoho a ka. [Habai I have untied my hands]

Habai: Ntate ke a ikokobetsa. [Father I humble myself]

Hlakahlothwane: Jwale ke tla tswelapele ka morero wane wa mohla monene wa pelo ya ka. Ngaka eno ke a e tshepa hle bana ba ka. [Now I will proceed with that former plan of mine. I trust that doctor, please my children.]

Mmaboitshwaro: Re se re itse re a o lokolla ntate, o se ke wa ngongoreha. [We have already said that we set you free father, don't worry.]

Hlakahlothwane: Ke leboha ka nnete ngwetsi ya ka. Monna eno ha a ile a o sebetsa, a o neha letairi hore o le apare; o ka tsamaya le motho mona pula e ntse ena, yena a kolobe a be metsi tee, ebe wena o ntse o omme kere. (Act I: scene iv)

[I truly thank you my daughter-in-law. That man if he has worked on you, and given you an old blanket to wear; you can walk with someone in the rain, he/she will be fully drenched in rain, while you remain completely dry.]

Looking at the above verbal interactions, it is realised that Hlakahlothwane is still intent on seeking a Sesotho indigenous doctor; though he is now prepared to come upfront with his family in persuading them to change their attitude and beliefs. While he might expect Habai

to reason out and support his stand, Habai simply informs him that he humbles himself. By so saying, Habai persuades his father to come up with his plan. Hlakahlothwane is then motivated by Habai's behaviour to inform them of his intention to implement the same plan he mentioned in the first meeting. In addition, he assures them of the trust he bestows upon that particular doctor – apparently with an intention to persuade them to accept his suggestions without any problem. It comes not as astonishment then that Mmaboitshwaro indicates that they give liberty for him to make decisions without any worry.

It would seem that Hlakahlothwane had not expected this form of behaviour from his son and daughter-in-law, for he adds that this particular doctor does the wonders mentioned above. Whether or not these wonders constitute some reality, Hlakahlothwane's plan is, apparently, to convince all in this meeting that the doctor in question is quite dynamic; so that they may be persuaded to accept his proposal without any doubt whatsoever. Further, this reference to the said doctor as being capable of performing mysteries is calculated at persuading the young couple to be stupefied and entirely put their trust in him/her.

As might be expected, Mmaboitshwaro is quite perplexed by these revelations; such that she finds herself exclaiming and interjecting whether it is indeed true. In an effort to embellish more mysteries upon this doctor, Hlakahlothwane gives yet another piece of information that arouses more skepticism, as shown in the following verbal exchanges:

Hlakahlothwane: Monna eo jwalo ka ha re ntse re bua ka yena tjena, baphaphi ba hae ba seng ba ntse ba mo bolella hore re ntse re bua ka yena, ba bile ba se ba ntse ba re bitsa ka mabitso. (Act I: scene iv)

[That man even as we continue talking about him now, his dummies are already telling him that we are talking about him, and they already call us by names.]

Mmakgaeng: (Ka ho tshoha.) Monnamoholo! Na o ntse o ikutlwa hore o reng! Mmanyeo e se ka ba ngaka eno ya hao e a loya! Ana o itse ke mang lebitso, Tshifa-di-marapo? (Act I: scene iv)

[Old man! Do you hear what you are saying! Mother-of-so-and-so, it should not mean that that doctor of yours is bewitching! By the way, who did you say his name is, Tshifa-di-marapo?]

In accordance with his personality trait, Hlakahlothwane cannot bear these doubts about his 'wonderful' doctor. He immediately becomes furious, and adopts his usual intimidation against Mmakgaeng:

“Hei, mosadi o se ke wa ba wa leka ho mphahla. Ngaka ya ka ya Semonkong ke Tshika-le-marapo. O tlohe mona ka ditshifa tseno tsa hao. Ka ntate ka Motaung a

shwele, ho tla nkgga ho sa bola hona jwale. O reng? Ngaka ya ka e a loya?" (Act I: scene iv)

[Hallo, woman dare not try to dazzle me. My doctor from Semonkong is Tshika-le-marapo. You go away with those dregs of yours. By my father by the late Motaung, there is going to be offensive smell without any rot right now. What are you saying? My doctor is bewitching?]

As one might observe, the naming aspect is regarded by Hlakahlothwane as a highly important point; especially in matters that are concerning indigenous healing. Indeed, Pretorius (1989:51) said it well that, names "play an important role in the expression of particular thoughts and ideas." Further, quoting Kunene, Pretorius points out that, among the Basotho, a name is given "for its relevance to a given situation, or for certain purpose that the name was supposed to fulfill" (1989:51). It follows, therefore, that for Hlakahlothwane, Mmakgaeng's distortion of his doctor's name loses the said doctor's expertise and wonderment. Whereas the name Tshika-le-marapo denotes the doctor in question as the shining star (Mabille and Dieterlen, 1985:481) that is expected to perform wonders, Mmakgaeng's distorted one would denote the said doctor as mere dregs, as Hlakahlothwane seems to suggest.

Whereas Hlakahlothwane's goal has been to persuade the other interactants into regarding his doctor as the most versatile one, his extensive embellishments have functioned as a reversal; for it achieves the opposite of his intentions by creating suspicion among his listeners, such that they begin to doubt and question the credibility of the said doctor. Since his embellishments are rather difficult to prove, he immediately changes his upfront persuasive attempts and adopts his usual arrogance; apparently to intimidate them and coerce them into following his intentions without any further questions. Bearing in mind the previous meeting's incidents, the other interactants fear for his wrath. They are, therefore, coerced into pleading with him to cool down; attempting to persuade him as follows:

Habai le Mmaboitshwaro: (Hong) Owele ntate bo! Ha e hate ka maro. [(Together) Oh please father! Let there be peace.]

Habai: Ntate, mme o ne a sa ikemisetsa ho bua hampe, o ile a mpa a tshoswa ke ditlhaloso tseo o ileng wa be o se o mo fapha ka tsona enwa mongake wa hao. O ile wa be se o mo fapha haholo. (Act I: scene iv)

[Father, mother had not planned to speak badly, she only became frightened by the explanations that embellished this indigenous doctor of yours. You over-embellished him.]

Though Habai's persuasive attempt at siding with his mother is meant for creating peace and stability, Hlakahlothwane fails to take it as such. For him, Habai's statements not only

challenge his authority, but also suggest that his embellishments are rather overly done and, therefore tantamount to lies; as may be observed in:

Hlakahlothwane: O re ke mo fapha! Mohlankana o imamele! Ke bolela dinnete ka motho eo. Tshika-le-marapo ke motho e seng dikatana. O a nkutlwa! Ka mme Mmanthethe, le a bapala lona. Mona ke batla tshebedisano ya lona. (Act I: scene iv)

[You say that I praise him! Young man, tread carefully! I tell truths about that person. Tshika-le-marapo is a person, not rags. You hear me! By mother Mmanthethe, you are playing. Here I want your cooperation.]

As may be observed, Hlakahlothwane's tone of voice against Habai is frightening, and suggestive of his usual employment of intimidation. Mmaboitshwaro, therefore, endeavours to persuade him to address himself to the subject matter in question, as in:

“Ke kopa tshwarelo ntate. Ke kopa hape hore re boele temeng eo re neng re le ho yona hle ka boikokobetso. Pelo a e boele madulong hle motho wa Mmamorapedi.”
(Act I: scene iv)

[I plead for forgiveness father. I also plead for us to once more resume the subject matter that we were discussing, please! Let the heart settle down please, you person of Mmamorapedi!]

It would seem that Mmaboitshwaro has learnt to choose words and style of presenting them in verbally persuading Hlakahlothwane to cool down and adopt persuasive procedure. She has learnt to plead with him, as her persuasive strategy to make him calm down, whenever he seems to apply any form of intimidation. For example, though she has not erred in any form, she pleads for forgiveness; then follows it up with her suggestion. Further, she employs Hlakahlothwane's totemic praise and/or parental associative/s as a strategy to achieve her goal, as in 'motho wa Mmamorapedi,' above.

Significantly, Hlakahlothwane swells up with joviality; and praises Mmaboitshwaro as one with clear proof that hers (dowry) has been live-cattle, rather than some forms of money that is usually referred to as some form of cattle. In addition, Hlakahlothwane agrees to resume the discussion of the issue according to Mmaboitshwaro's suggestion; but not before he pleads for Mmakgaeng's forgiveness. While he has excused himself and gone out, the other interactants find an opportunity to discuss him. It is in this discussion, where both Habai and Mmakgaeng commend Mmaboitshwaro for her strategy of calming him down by using the above indicated strategy. Furthermore, Hlakahlothwane's temporary absence from the group gives them a chance to persuade one another to tow the line with him, for the sake of cooperation and progress.

In line with the above realizations and suggestion to simply agreeing with Hlakahlothwane, all the three agree with him when he suggests that he is going to send someone the same week to call Tshika-le-marapo for his herbal assistance. Seemingly as an after thought, Habai suggests to his father that recruiting someone from Mokhotlong may be rather expensive; and proposes that they use other alternatives. As may be expected, Hlakahlothwane reminds Habai that this matter has already been settled, that the said herbalist doctor has to be called. Further, Hlakahlothwane indicates that, if Habai has no money for transport fare, then his cattle may come to his assistance; apparently suggesting that he would rather sell one or some of them to achieve his goal. In this way, Hlakahlothwane attempts to persuade Habai, and possibly all other members of the family, to consider this as an important matter for which he is prepared to lose his wealth.

When Habai indicates that he does have the required money, Hlakahlothwane pronounces that they have come to an end of the discussion; but also questions Mmakgaeng whether or not she has anything to say. The latter pronounces that she has nothing more to say, but suggests for Mmaboitshwaro to say a few words, if any. For Hlakahlothwane, this suggestion for Mmaboitshwaro to say some words is inappropriate, stipulating reasons behind his feelings in the following manner:

“Tjhe, mosadi, jwale o tla fosa ditaba. Ngwetsi ke ngwana. Sa hae ke ho dumela feela; ha ho na lentswe leo a ka le etsang kapa a le ntsha moo ke leng teng. O tla bua ho monna wa hae kwana.” (Act I: scene iv)

[No, woman, now you are going to err. Daughter-in-law is a child. Hers is to agree, there is no word she can make in my presence. She will talk to her husband far away.]

In order to demonstrate that his word is final, Hlakahlothwane pronounces that he is going to rest a while, since he has been up for long; and bids his son and daughter-in-law a farewell, and goes out. All that Habai and Mmaboitshwaro can say to him, at this juncture, is to also wish him well; for they are intimidated enough to know that anything else they may say could spark up some more trouble from Hlakahlothwane. Needless to say, the final conclusion reached here is not, of necessity, achieved through persuasive verbal exchanges, but through coercion; since all the three interactants are intimidated into accepting Hlakahlothwane's word as the final one.

In line with Hlakahlothwane's invitation for Tshika-le-marapo to present himself this Sunday, the whole family of four is together with him. Without any waste of time, Hlakahlothwane asks him to consult his divining bones to discover the prevailing problem in the family. As a persuasive attempt for all to consider him as a versatile herbal doctor, Tshika-le-marapo's

attire is quite unique – his blanket is made of skins of rock rabbits; his belt is decorated with beads; his hat is a kuwane (made of skins of wild animals); while the bag for carrying the divining bones is also of skins of wild animals.

In preparation for throwing the divining bones, Tshika-le-marapo takes off his kuwane; and rubs the ground upon which the bones will fall. Apparently, these operations are meant for persuading the observers to pay attention to the way the bones fall. As an additional persuasive strategy, he throws the bones and exclaims: “Aa –a –a –a –a, tsa tla tsa wa lewa le lebe banna. Wa bona nna ntho tse tjena ho hang ha ke di rate.” (Act I: scene v) [Ah –ah – ah –ah –ah, what a bad position in which they have fallen! You see, I hate things like these.] Unsurprisingly, all eyes are staring on the divining bones; with anticipation for the doctor to explain what their fall portents. As would be expected, Hlakahlothwane comes closer and inquires after the revelation of the divining bones; additionally saying, “Ke hlile ka belaela.” (Act I: scene v) [I suspected it.]

It would appear that Hlakahlothwane’s pronouncement, that he has had some suspicion, has worked as a motivation and booster for Tshika-le-marapo to chant the following divining bones praise poem:

Ke nna Tshika-le-marapo nkgekge
 Tsamaya ka mphiphi hobane ha o ka tsamaya ka nyene,
 Batswetse matswele a ka hlasa,
 Bana maseya mpa tsa manama
 Ba hloka ho mokonya.
 Theosa le dikgohlo mosepedi o laelwa ke badimo,
 Batho ba haufi le Modimo re tolokeleng,
 Ka ha ya medimo puo, balefatshe ha ba e utlwisise;
 Modimo le badimo a ke le utlweng re a rapela;
 Mmaakane jo, ho ilwe kae?
 E, ho jwalo.
 (O nyolla mahlo ho sheba monnamoholo) (Act I: scene v)

[I am Tshika-le-marapo the versatile one
 Go during the night because if you go during the day
 The nursing mothers’ breasts would become sour
 Infants’ stomachs cleave
 They have nowhere to suckle.
 Go down the gorges traveler you are instructed by the ancestors,
 You people who are closer to God interpret for us,

Since of the gods' language, earthly ones do not understand it;
 God and gods please hearken we pray;
 Mmaakane (interjection) alas, where have the people gone to?
 Yes, it is so.

(He raises his eyes to look at the old man)]

Apparently, Tshika-le-marapo's goal in chanting this poem is to persuade the other present characters to regard him as a highly knowledgeable doctor; and put trust in him that he is going to solve their problem. Further, he uses his poem as a motivation for these characters to realise that his insights are springing from God and the gods; thus persuading them to consider him as a trustworthy man that identifies himself with, not only the gods, but God himself. Furthermore, he employs this poem to create suspense; so as to keep these other interactants wondering what revelations he is about to divulge. When he finally raises his eyes and looks at Hlakahlothwane, he appears to be posing a nonverbal question to him, as to whether he realises the danger in which the family is; thus creating more suspense and desire for him to reveal his findings. Not surprise therefore, Hlakahlothwane asks the question: "Monna wa ngaka taba di reng hle, re nyorilwe monna." (Act I: scene v) [Man of doctor what is the news please, we are thirsty man.]

In accordance with Tshika-le-marapo's persuasive attempts, everyone waits with anxiety for the revelation. In response to Hlakahlothwane's expressed anxiety, Tshika-le-marapo demonstrates his supposed expertise in divining, and relates as follows: "Monna heso, wa e bona taola ena, e bitswa talolo. E supa hore moetsi wa dintho tsena, ha re fihla mothating ona, o se a talolehile." (Act I: scene v) [My fellow man, you see this divine bone, it is called an exposure. It indicates that the creator of these things, when we come to this level, is already exposed.] Like someone who has been waiting for any slight mistake from the so-called knowledgeable doctor, Habai inquires about the instigator of the things in question. As if all present are informed of the person referred to, Tshika-le-marapo answers Habai in the following manner: "Ke bolela moloi ya loileng lapa lena." (Act I: scene v) [I mean the witch that bewitched this family.]

In line with Habai's negative feelings about the Sesotho herbalist doctors, expressed by Mmaboitshwaro in the first meeting, Tshika-le-marapo's reference to the witch and his/her bewitchment infuriates the former. Apparently without even thinking about hurting anybody, Habai expresses his disgust by interjecting: "Oho!" (Act I: scene v) [Oh no!] As would be expected, Habai's statement of disgust invites Hlakahlothwane's wrath; and he expresses it in the following words: "Habai, bala mantswe a hao. Ngaka ena e bitsitswe ke nna. Bua tsa hao ngaka." (Act I: scene v) [Habai, count your words. This doctor has been called by me. Talk about yours doctor.] As an indication that Habai's expression of disgust has hurt him,

Tshika-le-marapo makes a warning that, since the divine bones are instruments that are meant for communicating with the ancestors, people should refrain from inviting their wrath; and that, in the same vein, he may also become fed up.

In an effort to persuade the doctor to give more revelations, Hlakahlothwane simply asks him to continue; whereupon the doctor makes more revelations in accordance with the way the bones have fallen. Further, Tshika-le-marapo assures the observers that their ancestors have already intervened, in order to protect them. To demonstrate his satisfaction in the doctor's pronouncement that the ancestors are out to protect the family, Hlakahlothwane makes a jovial smile, and expresses their understanding of the situation. In this way, the doctor is persuaded to bring into bare, the actual problem experienced by the family.

Like someone who has been informed of the situation that troubles this family, the doctor casts his eyes at Habai and intimates that he sees his family as the one experiencing the prevailing problem. He describes the situation in these words:

“Monna tlung ha hao ho bodutu; ditsohadi di llela thari. Mosadimoholo o labalabela ho tlamahanya masoto. Tsietsi e hlaha hona motseng mona. Mosadi enwa wa hao o tlwepetswe ke motho eo e neng e le motswalle wa hao pele o nyala, eo ebang mohlomong o ne a ntse a tshepile hore o tla mo phutha. Ka hoo, motlwepelo oo, o omisitse thari ya mosadi wa hao. Ke re e itse kere!” (Act I: scene v)

[Man at your house there is loneliness; the old women are anxious for your off springs. The old woman is craving for carrying grandchildren on her bag. The trouble emanates from this very village. This wife of yours has been bewitched by someone who was your friend before you got married; who might have hoped that you were going to marry her. In that case, that bewitchment has dried up the womb of your wife. I mean it is completely dry.]

Since Hlakahlothwane has persuaded his family members to put their trust in this doctor, Mmakgaeng demonstrates her complete belief in what has just been pronounced by Tshika-le-marapo, as she wails and speaks as follows: “Hi, hi, hi, hi, ao basadi, ke meleko ya eng eo ke tla e bona botsofading ba ka. Hi, hi, hi, hi!” (Act I: scene v) [Hi, hi, hi, hi, oh women, what witchcrafts are these that I see at my old age period? Hi, hi, hi, hi!] This wailing and the expressions made by Mmakgaeng are regarded by Mmaboitshwaro as unnecessary, as she would like the doctor to tell them more for better understanding. As for Hlakahlothwane, Mmakgaeng's behaviour encourages him, for it signifies that he has always been correct in defining this doctor as knowledgeable; as highlighted in:

Hlakahlothwane: (O kgothetse) Bana ba ka se keng la etsa tjena. Ke le boletse hore monna enwa wa ngaka ha se Tshika-le-marapo wa kajeno. Mo feng sebaka. (Act I: scene v)

[(He is brave.) My children do not do this. I have told you that this man of doctor is not Tshika-le-marapo of today. Give him a chance.]

Obviously, Hlakahlothwane's praise of Tshika-le-marapo boosts the latter's morale; thus persuading him to poetically praise himself in these lines:

Nkgekge lesa papadi ntwā e kgolo,
Thenthetsa o tshware lerumo le kwakwa
O hlathe botjhabela, o hlathe bophirima;
Halala! Ya boi ke mang! (Act I: scene v)

[Versatile doctor stop playing the fight is great,
Lean backward and forward and hold a spear and war axe
Strike at the east, strike at the west;
Halala! (an interjection) Who is a coward!]

As would be expected, Mmaboitshwaro has been affected by the doctors' revelation that her womb has been bewitched, though she seems to nurse some conviction that the herbalist might assist in altering the situation. It would appear that her hope and trust in the herbalist's operations spring from the way he has divined the prevailing problem – that there is no peace in their family due to her barrenness; coupled with the burning desire for Habai's parents to see and hold their grandchild. Even if she might have been rather skeptical about the sincerity of the Sesotho doctors, just as Habai pronounced himself, she now seems to believe Hlakahlothwane's words, that this is a knowledgeable doctor who simply needs to be given a chance to perform accordingly. Needless to say, the above poetic chant by Tshika-le-marapo has also persuaded her to inquire more about this situation, and find out what is to be done under the prevailing circumstances; as highlighted in:

Mmaboitshwaro: Jwale ntate taba ee e tla etswa jwang bathong? Basadi anthe batho re ntse re jere dintho tse kaalekale? O e tshabe ena phoofolo e kgapane e sa besweng. (Act I: scene v)

[Now father, how on earth is this problem going to be solved? Women, is it true that we people are carrying such gigantic stuff with us? Beware of this animal whose dry dung is never used for fire-making.]

Upon realizing the fear that Mmaboitshwaro has about his revelation, Tshika-le-marapo persuades her to plug up courage. He explains to her that, as far as he can observe, the former is quite fertile, except for this disgusting work of a sorcerer. In addition, he quips:

“Empa le teng e ntse e le hantle hore le ke le lekwe. Ha ke re le bukeng ya lona ya bahalaledi le re mora Modimo, Satane o kile a mo leka? Ha se nnete?” (Act I: scene

v) [But even so it is still good that you also be tried. Is it not true that even in your book of the holy ones you say that the son of God was tried by Satan? Is it not so?]

Indubitably, Tshika-le-marapo has induced fear on all the other interactants present here to ensure the achievement of his goal. Apparently, his goal is not, of necessity, that of rectifying the prevailing sorcery, if indeed there is any; but that of making money for himself through treachery. He therefore induces fear, as a persuasive plan to reduce his targets to a situation in which they find themselves putting their trust for cure entirely in him; such that they dare not entertain any second thought about employing his expertise in these circumstances. For example, when he declares to Habai that ‘motlwepelo oo, o omisitse thari ya mosadi wa hao. Ke re e itse kere!’, as was shown earlier in this section, one shudders with fear for Mmaboitshwaro’s plight. Indeed Witte (1993:148) said it well that “the more intense and personalised the language, the greater the perceptions of threat and arousal of fear.”

It would appear that Tshika-le-marapo’s reference to the whole situation as a trial made towards Habai and Mmaboitshwaro, is meant for persuading them to understand that, like in any other trial, they have to gather up courage and hope for solving the problem. Further, by his reference to the son of God being tried by Satan, he attempts to persuade them to regard Him as the emissary of trials. Apparently, he is employing this biblical allusion as a persuasive attempt for them to have trust in the Lord. Since he has defined his divining bones as instruments that connect him with God, through him they are likely to receive His salvation; he seems to say.

In line with Tshika-le-marapo’s above persuasive attempts, Hlakahlothwane declares his agreement with him, saying, “Ho jwalo ngaka” (Act I: scene v) [It is so doctor], thus persuading the former to spell out his operational intentions. In a persuasive attempt for all to regard him as a doctor that is even imbued with mysterious powers, Tshika-le-marapo lays down his assumed profile as follows:

“Jwale he monna, taba ke tseo. Nka sebeta ha e le ha o ntumella. Ha ke Tshika-le-marapo wa maobane . Kgale ke ja mabele. Meleko ke e qhalla kwana. Ha e le monnga yona yena ke mo talola jwalo ka ha talolo yane e se e ile ya bontsha. Haeba le batla hore ha le tsoha hoseng le fumane motho eno a tsetlaletse mono ke tla etsa jwalo, ha ke tswafe. Batho bana ba re tenne ka tlhaka tse na tsa bona tse hlohlonang.” (Act I: scene v)

[Then man, there is the news. I can perform if you allow me to. I am not Tshika-le-marapo of yesterday. I have for a long time been consuming sorgum. I tout witchcraft there yonder. As for the owner her/himself I expose him just as that exposure has signified. If you wish that when you get up in the morning you find that person

remaining standing there, I will do so, I am not disinclined. These people have disgusted us with these itching scars of theirs.]

Surely, Tshika-le-marapo is now aware that he has achieved his goal, of persuading the family to believe that he can help them in this situation. In line with that understanding, he now puts it in Hlakahlothwane's hands to allow him to perform accordingly. As a persuasive attempt for Hlakahlothwane and his family to behold him with a high esteem, Tshika-le-marapo embellishes himself and his capabilities even more, as can be observed above. First, he indicates that he has been in this business for a long time, by making reference to the idea that he is not 'Tshika-le-marapo wa maobane,' and that he has been consuming sorgum for a long time. Second, he suggests that he can blow off any form of witchcraft. Finally, he promises that, should the family so wish, he can ensure that the concerned witch will be in a trance as people get up the following day.

As might be expected, both Mmaboitshwaro and Hlakahlothwane indicate their unwillingness for exposing people in accordance with the herbalist's suggestions. It might be anybody's guess that Tshika-le-marapo was merely testing them by suggesting so, possibly with the view that they would react the way they have just done. In other words, he merely wanted to shock them a little, so as to whet their desire for the required cure to the prevailing ailment. In this way, one would guess, Tshika-le-marapo employs this tactic as a persuasive plan to achieve his purpose as described above. It comes not as a surprise therefore, that Tshika-le-marapo does not even drive this point further, but merely reminds them that he has already said that "thari e sephara mme bana ba bangata." (Act I: scene v) [fertility is broad and children are many.] Further, he mentions that he has already been instructed that he should never use a razor.

Not surprisingly, Habai and Mmaboitshwaro appreciate the idea of not using any razor on them; while for Hlakahlothwane, that would be the correct way of applying a cure to this ailment. Realizing that all is well with everybody in this meeting, Tshika-le-marapo suggests ways in which Mmaboitshwaro should perform; thus attempting to persuade them to believe in the cure from the situation in question. Further, he takes out of his 'kgetshi' (herbalist's bag) some roots and leafy herbal stuff he recommends for both Habai and Mmaboitshwaro to use for boosting their fertility. Furthermore, he instructs them to use those herbs only on a Friday, making sure that they drink the whole content on the same day; lest that concoction be consumed by evil spirits, if left over. Further still, Tshika-li-marapo explains that his herbs should be used only on a Friday for them to scatter off any form of witchcraft that is likely to be used against anyone on that day, since it is a pay day for most men.

Accordingly, Hlakahlothwane inquires about the payment to be incurred for in these herbal healing. Without any waste of time, Tshika-le-marapo explains that his is quite an exorbitant charge, since he is from far. He proceeds to mention a charge of five cattle in all, though he mentions that this is especially if he succeeds in curing the ailment in question. It might be anybody's guess that by so saying, Tshika-le-marapo attempts to persuade his audience to believe that he is quite a powerful doctor; and also to persuade them to offer as much money as possible now, even before the anticipated cure can manifest itself. Seemingly, he doubts himself in as far as versatility is concerned; such that he aims to gain as much money as possible now, even if he may never get any other money here after.

Not surprisingly, he estimates the price of one beast at three hundred rand; the total of which is one thousand five hundred rand. All Habai and his father can manage to pay at this juncture is five hundred rand only. Even that much is quite exorbitant for Habai and his father. When they hand this money to Tshika-le-marapo, announcing how much it is, Mmakgaeng exclaims: "Eng?" (Act I: scene v) [What]. This exclamation is indicative of the fact that even five hundred rand is by far more exorbitant than the divining and supply of the herbal stuff; and might be regarded as a persuasive attempt for Habai and Hlakahlothwane to reconsider the matter carefully, and possibly debate the issue further.

Apparently, even Tshika-le-marapo himself had not expected that much money at a go; that is why he thanks Hlakahlothwane, and further claims that he has never seen anyone like him. He even quickly packs his bags together, to ensure a quick exit before anybody can stop him and accuse him of robbing them. Finally, the herbalist doctor pronounces that "Mohlomong ha re sa tla hlola re bonana. Salang ka kgotso." (Act I: scene v) [Maybe we shall never see one another again. Stay with peace.] Then he goes out, leaving everybody merely gaping; without even returning the farewell greetings as would be normal. The speed at which Tshika-le-marapo collects his stuff together, coupled with his quick exit, might be regarded as a persuasive attempt for the family to be mesmerised and be stupefied until he has gone off.

In line with Tshika-le-marapo's charges, his behaviour and his impromptu exit, without even waiting to be served any food; the members of the family are persuaded to discuss these incidents. Every one of them recalls various words the herbalist pronounced as he received the money; including his pronouncement that maybe they are not going to see one another again. These people are, therefore, persuaded by the circumstances prevailing to re-evaluate Tshika-le-marapo and find out if indeed he is the versatile doctor that was highly recommended by Hlakahlothwane; as well as himself in his praise chants. Seemingly, he is found to be wanting. Hlakahlothwane himself has lost all faith in him; to an extent that he

even persuades Mmakgaeng to check the herbal stuff, as he claims to have had his speed cut off; continuing as follows:

“Haholo ke swabetse bana bana ba ka bao monna enwa a ntlhabisitseng dihlong ka pele ho bona. E teng ngaka e sa phatseng le ha e se e le ho hlaba ka noko feela? Ka Bataung ba ntswetse ke qala ho hlollwa hakana. Banna, monna eo ha a sa ntsha le mokubetso feela le ha e se e le mothaleho! Ke yona ntho eo ngwanaka a e porofetileng ena banna, ka mpa ka hloka kutlo ka baka la letsoku lena le tletseng ka tsebeng tsa ka. Oho badimo ba ka!” (Act I: scene v)

[Worse still, I am sorry for these children of mine that this man has embarrassed me in their presence. Is there a doctor that does not lance, not even to prick with a porcupine? By the Bataung who bore me, I have never been so perplexed. Guys this man does not even produce a mere fumigation or even stuff for marking the forehead! This is exactly what my child foretold guys, and I only lacked understanding due to this red ochre filling up my ears. Oh please my ancestors!]

Since Hlakahlothwane has been known as an intimidator, a manipulator and a coercer, this change of behaviour becomes quite interesting. Had he agreed to come upfront and persuade his children and wife to change and adopt his behaviour, beliefs and attitude, he would not have experienced the foregoing disappointment and embarrassment. At list he would not be unilaterally carrying this guilty conscience alone; and as such, he would be free from these lamentations. Otherwise, he would probably have been persuaded into changing his attitude, behaviour and beliefs; to an extent that a better solution to the problem would possibly be found. Nonetheless, though he still believes in herbal doctors, for Hlakahlothwane this is a moment of truth; a painful moment of realization that his attitude has caused them dearly. Should he fail to adopt new attitude towards matters of this kind, he might find himself incurring more problems in future.

Interestingly, Habai attempts to persuade Hlakahlothwane to come to terms with himself; and encourages him to regard Tshika-le-marapo as an expert swindler and nothing else. Diverting his attention to the herbs in question, Habai checks some of the roots; only to discover that they are roots of ordinary shrubs he knows very well. Habai's discovery now functions as a persuasive attempt for Mmakgaeng to examine some that were recommended for sniffing. To her surprise and dismay, she finds out that it is an ordinary snuff that is obtainable from the shops; but she refrains from pronouncing it. Instead, she attempts to persuade Hlakahlothwane to examine the stuff himself by pretending that she is not sure what that is. Upon examining the stuff, Hlakahlothwane explains as in these words:

“Ntho ena ke senifi bana ba ka. Tjhe bomadimabe ha bo tlohlwe mafura, ha e le bona, bo hlwele mekwalaba banna. Le sehwana sane ke hore se lahlelwe mollong. Re tloha re robatsa bana ba rona le dintho disele.” (Act I: scene v)

[This thing is snuff my children. Indeed bad luck is never removed by anointing oneself with some fat, as for this one, it has climbed the alps, guys. Even that small calabash has to be thrown into the fire. We might cause our children to sleep with bad things.]

Be that as it may, Mmakgaeng suggests that they should forget about the whole matter; and persuades everyone around to put Tshika-le-marapo in the hands of God, to be judged by Him on the judgement day. As for Hlakahlothwane, all the herbal stuff that has been left by Tshika-le-marapo must be left behind, as Habai and Mmaboitshwaro leave for town where they live. He announces that “ke tla di besetsa kganare ya tonana ya mollo ke di tjhese;” (Act I: scene v) [I will light up a great flare of fire and burn them up] thus persuading all around him to realise that the whole undertaking has been a futile exercise. As an indication that all are persuaded to forget the whole matter, they bid one another farewell by wishing for peace to prevail; and part ways.

Since the prevailing problem still exists, without any solution reached, Habai constantly thinks about it. He comes home from work, seemingly with something gnawing at his mind. This is indicated by the way he addresses himself to Mmaboitshwaro, as in the following manner: “Dumela hle ngwetsi ya ntate!” (Act II: scene i) [Good afternoon please my father’s daughter-in-law.] It would seem that this kind of address, of calling his wife ‘ngwetsi ya ntate,’ is meant for persuading Mmaboitshwaro to remember her relationship with Habai’s family; and as such, to make her think of the family’s expectations about her. In other words, Habai seems to remind Mmaboitshwaro that, as daughter-in-law to his father, the expectation is for her to produce an offspring.

Further, Habai reminds Mmaboitshwaro that, “Ke ne ke itlame motshehare tsatsi le tjhabile; ka re: ‘Ho fihlela re arohannawa ke lefu.’” (Act II: scene i) [I made a vow in the daylight; and said: ‘Till death do us part’.] Seemingly, the foregoing statement is a persuasive attempt for Mmaboitshwaro to remain assured that, no matter what happens, she will remain Habai’s wife. Since at this juncture Habai is rather unsettled, one might rightly deduce that this kind of talk indicates that whatever matter is worrying Habai has to be handled with care. In passing, he mentions to Mmaboitshwaro that he and his colleagues have been going up and down at Maloukomong; yet he hardly says what the matter was. Not surprisingly, Mmaboitshwaro is aware of this unsettled state in which Habai is. That is why she persuades him to sit down, undo his tie, and partake of a cake she has prepared for him. Indubitably, her goal is to drive

him towards a position where he will find himself free enough to divulge whatever might have caused him to be so unsettled.

Habai tastes the cake; and, like someone who aims at flattering his wife or pleasing her, he shows his appreciation by quipping as follows: “Hm-m-m-m! Banna! Sejo se tswile ho moji, se monate ho Ya Matla!” (Act II: scene i) [Hm-m-m-m! guys! The food has come out of the eater, it is appetizing to The Almighty!] Apparently, Habai utters this biblical allusion as an attempt, not only to please his wife, but to persuade her to identify with him in the matter he is about to relate to her. This biblical allusion is derived from the story of Samson and Delilah; where the former demonstrated his appreciation of the honey that was fermented by the bees on the body of the lion he had killed with his bare hands (Bibele, 1961: Ch 11, verses 11-14). In order to show her appreciation of Habai’s remark and persuade him to relate the matter he has just hindered about Maloukomong, Mmaboitshwaro responds accordingly and says, “Wee! O reng na Samosone!” (Act II: scene i) [Ah! What are you now saying Samson!]; and they laugh together.

As if he has not been persuaded enough, Habai maintains the suspense, and hardly relates the happenings at Maloukomong. Even as Mmaboitshwaro keeps on asking him what was happening at that place, Habai is still hesitant; saying this and that. In an attempt to apply more persuasion for him to relate the withheld story, Mmaboitshwaro even quips that, “Ke a shwa jwale ke tjantjello.” (Act II: scene i) [I am now dying with anxiety.] In a jocular manner, Habai responds to his wife’s foregoing quip by saying:

“O reng? A ka ntseba ‘Tjantjello’ ha nka mo fumana a mpolaetse mosadi. O re le yena Tshika-le-marapo elwa wa bona ke mo tlohetse; ya neng a rata ho tla re bolaisa qhaqhawe moo, a re qhaqhe methapo ya madi.” (Ba tsheha) (Act II: scene i)

[What are you saying? He can know me ‘Tjantjello’ if I can find him having killed my wife. You mean even that Tshika-le-marapo of theirs that I have left; who wanted to come and cause us to be killed by dog’s grass here, and cut open our blood streams. (They laugh a lot.)]

Eventually, Mmaboitshwaro’s persuasive attempts for Habai to relate the matter in question produce positive results; but not until she sits down next to him and makes him aware that she does so in order to listen to the piece of news expected. He tells her that today’s news is not pleasing; especially to them as a childless couple that has lived together for so long. His reference to the childless situation affecting them frightens Mmaboitshwaro; thus working as a persuasive attempt for whetting her desire for Habai to relate the incident; and she asks: “*Ho etsahetse dife?*” (Act II: scene i) [*What has happened?*] Realizing the anxiety and desire expressed in Mmaboitshwaro’s question, Habai relates to her that some phone call had

forced him and two of his colleagues at work to go and investigate a pressing matter at Maloukomong.

Though Mmaboitshwaro attentively listens to the story, Habai continues with his suspense by expressing the way he felt, and so on and so forth; without getting into the real cracks of the matter. Seemingly, his intention is to persuade Mmaboitshwaro to have as much concern as he has in the ensuing story; so as to achieve a certain goal. Indeed, his plan works; for she now pleads with him to stop frightening her more than this far, saying: “Bua hle Motaung, se ke wa nna wa phahamisa matshwafo a ka tjena.” (Act II: scene i) [Please speak up Motaung, do not carry on raising my lungs like this.] Obviously, Mmaboitshwaro employs Habai’s totemic address (Motaung) as a persuasive attempt for him to relate the story as it is, and cut off his suspense.

As an indication that his wife’s persuasive attempt has been successful, Habai goes straight into the matter as: “Re fumane ho beilwe lesea tafoleng le mokotlana oo le neng le kentswe ka hara ona mmoho le botlolwana ya lebese.” (Act II: scene i) [We found an infant placed on the table and the bag in which it had been put, together with a bottle of milk.] It would be anybody’s guess that this is a shocking story for Mmaboitshwaro, as she and Habai have been struggling so much for bearing a child of their own. To register her shock, she exclaims and poses the following rhetorical question: “Helang Bataung! Jwale lesea leo le tswa kae, hona ekaba le ntse le phela?” (Act II: scene i) [Alas, Bataung! Now where does that infant come from, and is it alive?] Needless to say, Mmaboitshwaro is both shocked and dismayed; which is seemingly the goal that Habai has been driving while he was keeping her on suspense all along. In other words, Habai’s persuasive plan for Mmaboitshwaro to share the same feelings and attitude has been achieved.

Now that his goal has been achieved, Habai no more hesitates in relating the whole incident to his wife. Starting off with the comment that she is correct in asking her above question, Habai explains to her that the infant was discovered at the railway station, in the waiting room, by one female cleaner. Further, he recounts that their office was eventually phoned by the police; so that they might take the infant to hospital, after checking it. As an indication of her perplexity, Mmaboitshwaro claps her hands, exclaiming that since she was born, she has never heard of such a thing. In addition, she wonders at such an act of cruelty, while they are barren. She yet additionally poses the following questions: “yena ha Modimo a mo thusitse ebe o lahla moya wa Modimo kgerehlwa? Ntate ngwana a ka ba mokae, hona ke motho mong?” (Act II: scene i) [and when God has helped her, she throws away the spirit of God just like that? Sir, how old may be the infant, and what gender is it?]

Unquestionably, Mmaboitshwaro has been persuaded to share the same sentiments with Habai; for she now intends to find out more about the infant in question. For her, it might seem, since the infant is the gift of God, it needs to be taken care of and be brought up accordingly. Basing oneself on her foregoing questions, one might even assume that she has started to entertain feelings of adopting that infant; so as to fill up the gap in their lives with Habai. Once more, Habai fails to answer his wife's questions directly. Rather, he lectures her on the God's plan in putting a human being on the earth as: to work for Him; and to choose a way between the broad and narrow one, as s/he is provided with a choice. Additionally, he indicates that human beings almost always choose the broad one. Finally, he addresses himself to the questions and answers as follows: "O ke o bone mosadiaka. Lesea leo le ka ba nako ya kgwedi feela le hlahile mme ebile ke ngwananyana." (Act II: scene i) [Just imagine my wife. That infant may be only two months old, and it is a girl.]

In line with these revelations, Mmaboitshwaro demonstrates her sentimental feelings and sadness in uttering these words:

"Oho Keresete ya mahodimong ekaba ke ka baka lang ha tsena tsohle di etsahala? Ekaba ya o sitetsweng ke mang ka hare ho motlotlwane ona! Ako re rute hle, mme o re bontshe tsela eo re lokelang ho tsamaya ka yona! Ha o ntse o sitsa ba bang a ko re sitse le rona hle!" (Act II: scene i)

[Oh Christ who is in heaven! Why do all these things happen? By the way who has erred against you in this home! Please teach and show us the way that we are to follow! When you give others, please give us too!]

Indubitably, Mmaboitshwaro and Habai's feelings and beliefs are in unison. Both of them wish and pray God that He could give them a child; rather than giving such an important gift to the ones whose cruelty drives them to abandon such a spirit in the strange places. It is also clear that Habai's foregoing lecture to Mmaboitshwaro has also persuaded her to put her trust in the Lord for providing them with an infant. It therefore comes not as a surprise that Habai ends up caressing Mmaboitshwaro's hair, as a sign of affection, and possibly as an attempt at persuading her to be assured that they share the same aspirations. Needless to say, Habai has successfully reinforced Mmaboitshwaro's attitude and beliefs in the Lord as the giver of all things. In addition, he has whetted her desire and intent in obtaining a child that their parents will be proud of.

Since both Habai and Mmaboitshwaro are in the same mood, with feelings of self-pity and loneliness; it takes Nkokoto no time to realise their state as he enters the house – though he mistakes it for an ailment. After being informed about what prompted the prevailing mood in the house, Nkokoto, who is Habai's colleague, also makes an attempt at persuading

Mmaboitshwaro to have faith in the Lord, and that He will provide one day. Initially, he lectures her that on earth, people are planned for different performances that they should accept, even though they may be painful. In addition, he persuades her to let go of painful feelings in order to avoid stress; ending up with: “empa ka tsatsi le leng Morena o tla re arabela.” (Act II: scene i) [but one day the Lord will answer us.] The foregoing final statement by Nkokoto is quite persuasive for Mmaboitshwaro and Habai to realise that they are not alone in their struggle to have an infant; as Nkokoto includes himself by employing the pronoun, ‘re,’ [we] above.

In an answer to Habai’s question concerning his visit, Nkokoto explains in a persuasive manner for Habai to accompany him to the hospital. He says, “Ke ne ke lakatsa hore re ke re yo hlaha ka sepetlele ka mane ho bona hore ekaba mothwana yane wa rona o ntse a eya jwang.” (Act II: scene i) [I had desired that we go to show up at the hospital to find out how that young person of ours is doing.] The persuasive aspect of this statement is contained in Nkokoto’s stating that it is his desire; and yet the purpose of **their** visit would be to see how **their small person is doing**; thus pronouncing their joined ownership of the infant, and purpose for visiting the infant with Habai. Seemingly with this understanding, Habai accepts the proposal and even adds that they will go there, even if it would be during the working hours.

When they arrive at the hospital, Habai extends his greetings to Kedisaletse, the nurse in charge, by wishing her peace; saying, “Kgotso mooki Kedisaletse.” (Act II: scene ii) [Peace (be with you) nurse Kedisaletse.] This kind of greeting not only pleads for peace to prevail among the interactants, but also establishes rapport between/among them. It is, therefore, Habai’s persuasive attempt for Kedisaletse to afford them an opportunity to see ‘their’ small person. It therefore comes not as wonderment that Kedisaletse reiterates the same kind of greeting to both Habai and Nkokoto; and further, inquires after their health; and finally asks how she might be of assistance to them. Significantly, Kedisaletse has been persuaded to be of assistance to the two characters. Needless to say, her inquiry into how she may assist them functions as a persuasive attempt for Habai to pronounce himself in the following manner:

“Re phetse mme, ha ho molato. Re ne re lakatsa ho hlwela mothwana yane wa rona wa maobane ho bona hore na ekaba o ntse a eya jwang?” (Act II: scene ii)

[We are alright madam, there is no problem. We were intending to visit that small person of ours of yesterday to see how she is keeping.]

Indeed, as has been shown in Chapter two that persuasion is incremental, Habai now persuades Kedisaletse to also identify with them and consider the said infant as her own too;

as contained in 'motho yane wa rona' above. Apparently as a concerned nurse in charge, Kedisaletse leads the two characters to where the infant is. She shows them where the infant is; and, upon realizing that it is asleep, Kedisaletse states as follows:

“Feela o kgalehile nthwana Modimo; o bolailwe ke dirame tsa bosiu tsa tlung ya baeti seteisheneng; jwale ke hona mmejana wa moeka o kgatholohang.” (Act II: scene ii)

[But she is asleep the little thing of God; she has been executed by night colds in the waiting room at the station; it is only now that the fragile body of the poor thing is relaxing.]

It would appear that Kedisaletse has been touched by this infant's situation; and she feels pity for it. In an attempt to persuade the other interactants to identify with her in her feelings, she makes reference to the infant as 'nthwana Modimo.' In this way, she drives them into considering the fact that, though the infant was abandoned, it is the gift of God. Additionally, she points out that 'o bolailwe ke dirame ...,' apparently to highlight the fact that, for this infant to have experienced such an excruciating cold, it was tantamount to an execution. In this way, Kedisaletse employs a hyperbole as a persuasive attempt for Habai and Nkokoto to create sense perceptions of thermal imagery (Abrams, 1993:87) in which the infant was imbued. Pretorius (1986:50), quoting Cuddon, defines hyperbole as “a figure of speech which contains an exaggeration for emphasis”. Ebewo (1997:49), on the other hand, refers to hyperbole as a “deliberate exaggeration used to achieve emphasis and heightened effect.”

While they are discussing these issues, Nkokoto notices that the infant is a beautiful light complexioned girl. He further realises a smile flickering on her cheeks, whereupon he remarks that women usually suggest that such is a sign that the infant is communicating with her female ancestors. Though Habai remarks in the positive, and pronounces that he believes that to be so, Kedisaletse intervenes by making the two male characters with her aware that such is not the case; since they at the hospital are taught and practically demonstrated to, that such reactions are associated with blood vessels and brain activity. Seemingly, Kedisaletse's statement is used as an attempt to drive her goal of shuttering the myth behind infants' reactions of this sort being associated with ancestors; and further plans to persuade and highlight Habai and Nkokoto on the way human beings react at infancy stage. Not surprisingly, Nkokoto exclaims as follows: “Banna! O reng na mooki!” (Act II: scene ii) [Guys! What do you say nurse!], thus indicating his acceptance of the new teaching from Kedisaletse.

Having observed the way in which Kedisaletse was handling the infant, demonstrating care and love; Habai persuades his colleague, Nkokoto, to regard her as a distinguished woman. Further, he suggests that anyone may consider oneself lucky to marry the same woman;

seemingly demonstrating to Nkokoto that he has high regard for her. Whereas Nkokoto mistakes Habai's insinuations as his indication that he has fallen in love with the nurse, he is eventually persuaded by Habai to consider the whole occasion as an incident that has touched on the latter's sensibilities. In other words, Habai has been entertaining the idea of adopting the same infant; and as such, has been doing the round-about way as an attempt at persuading Nkokoto to help him debate this issue. As a persuasive measure, Habai mentions to Nkokoto that this idea has been brought into his mind by the fact that he and Mmaboitshwaro have been struggling to have a child but to no avail. He therefore registers his fear that even if they were to finally bear one, it may be too late for them to bring up the child accordingly, as they might have reached their old age by then.

As a counter persuasion, Nkokoto responds in this manner:

“Monna jwale o bua kgobahadi ya taba. Ena qaka le lokela ho e dulela fatshe le mohatsao le e shebisise ka hohlehohle e tle e se ke ya eba molato wa hao ka moso haeba ngwana eo a ka le tshwara ka mokgwa o mong ha a se a hodile.” (Act II: scene ii)

[Man now you come up with a very sophisticated issue. As for this problem, you have to sit down with your wife and examine it in all respects; so that it may not be regarded as your fault in future when that child might treat you in a certain manner when she has grown up.]

In this way, Nkokoto neither agrees nor disagrees with Habai's suggestion and desire. Rather, he persuades him to put the whole matter in front of Mmaboitshwaro, and discuss it thoroughly before undertaking such a project. Indeed, Habai is accordingly persuaded; for he even remarks that such children are quite dangerous; and that they are no different from orphans. In addition, Habai remarks that sometimes an orphan might misbehave while the foster parent is properly upbringing the same orphan. In summary, Habai also illustrates that while the orphan is properly behaving, it might be the opposite with the foster parent, in that s/he may be ill-treating the innocent child. One may thus correctly observe that, in essence, Habai is self-persuaded in coming up with all these insights. It would then mean that the kind of persuasion Nkokoto has applied with Habai is one that helped the latter to reinforce his beliefs.

Since Habai and Nkokoto have discussed this matter this far; one suspects that Mmankokoto's visit to Mmaboitshwaro later is aimed at driving a goal that is related to the one above. Mmankokoto, Nkokoto's wife, has paid a visit to Mmaboitshwaro during the day, while both their husbands have gone to work. When she knocks at the door at Mmaboitshwaro's home, Mmankoko says this: “Lapeng mona. Ausi Mmaboitshwaro! Na

batho ba teng basadi?” (Act II: scene iii) [Here at home. Sister Mmaboitshwaro! Are there people here women?] As if she already expects to find nobody in the home, Mmankokoto questions whether there are any people there. Since she knows that at this time of the day only Mmaboitshwaro would be available, one wonders whether or not Mmankokoto’s question concerning the presence of people is not meant for the former to realise the void prevailing in her family. If that be the case, then one might correctly deduce that Mmankokoto’s question is used as an attempt at persuading Mmaboitshwaro to seriously consider some medical options that might assist them in solving the seemingly barren situation.

Like one who clearly understands the implications of Mmankokoto’s statements and question, Mmaboitshwaro retorts in this manner:

“Ke teng bo ngwaneso, kena. Ha o bona nka ya kae hara lee Mmankokoto ngwaneso? Ke ntse ke ituletse ka phaposing ya ho phomola ka mona ke a korotjha.”
(Act II: scene iii)

[I am indeed here my sister, come in. Where do you think I can go in this devastating situation Mmankokoto my sister? I am remaining seated in this launch; I am knitting.]

In line with her retort above, Mmaboitshwaro seems to have been self-persuaded to accept her situation as a desperate one – she has no child, and is therefore a lonely and devastated woman. When she poses the question, ‘Ha o bona nka ya kae hara lee?’ above, one perceives a voice of an agonised woman who has lost all hope of ever achieving whatever she desires. Further, the statement that ‘Ke ntse ke ituletse ... ke korotjha,’ marks her as someone who probably regards herself as a recluse that has since lost any purpose in life; as all she can do is knitting, thus involving herself in an endless business for merely whiling away time.

It would then seem that Mmankokoto observes that Mmaboitshwaro is susceptible to persuasion she aims at engaging with her. She persuades her to switch off the radio, so that they may be able to discuss without any form of disturbance. Mmaboitshwaro retorts in the following manner:

“Ao, wai-i-i, ekaba re qoqa eng mohatsa ngwaneso hara lee? O se o tsamaisa melaetsa ya motseng moo le wena? O se ke wa ntshosa mmannyeo; ke mang ya seng a itse ke buile ka wena?” (Act II: scene iii)

[Fie, shame, what on earth are we to discuss my brother’s wife in this devastating situation? Are you also delivering this village’s messages? Please do not frighten me mother-of-so-and-so, who has already said that I have talked about you?]

It would appear that, though the two women stay home, as they are unemployed, it is rather uncommon for them to visit each other. Mmankokoto's visit, therefore, causes Mmaboitshwaro a lot of worry; as she even suspects that there is something unusual that they are about to discuss; especially when the former asks the latter to switch off the radio for concentration sake. It is therefore not surprising that the latter says this and that, instead of listening to what the former has in store for her. Eventually Mmaboitshwaro persuades Mmankokoto to speak up, saying: "Bua he mofumahadi, mofo wa hao o mametse." (Act II: scene iii) [Speak up then queen, your subject is listening.] Both women laugh at this statement; seemingly realizing the amount of time they have already spent without addressing the issue Mmankokoto might have intended to deliver to Mmaboitshwaro. As a persuasive measure for Mmaboitshwaro to realise the importance and seriousness of the issue in question, Mmankokoto says: "Ngwaneso ka ntle le tshenywa ya nako e re ke mpe ke wele lekoteng, hobane moqoqo wa ka ekaka o molelele." (Act II: scene iii) [My sister without any waste of time let me fall onto the lump, because our discussion seems to be lengthy.]

The idiomatic expression, 'ho wela lekoteng,' presupposes the urgency, and therefore importance of the matter to be discussed without any waste of time. It would then follow that Mmankokoto employs such an expression with calculated intention of persuading Mmaboitshwaro to regard the importance of this matter and pay her utmost attention. Since both women share knowledge of the meaning of the idiomatic expression, Mmaboitshwaro asks Mmankokoto to speak; though she suggests making some tea first, so that they might partake of it while they discuss. In an effort at persuading the former to pay attention to time and the urgency of the matter, the latter suggests that they forget about the tea and go straight into the matter.

Without much time wasted, Mmankokoto relates to Mmaboitshwaro about the visit she paid to her home in Dibataolong, whereupon she learned about a highly reputable German medical doctor who has just arrived in that area, saying:

"Hara ntho tsohle tse nkgahlileng ha ho e fetang taba ya ngaka ya Lejeremane e fihlang sebakeng seo; eo ho thweng mmannyeo ha e etse mehlolo le kgale. Batho ba bangata ba se ba bone mehlolo ka baka la tshebetso ya monna eo. Jwale mosadi, ke tlile ho wena hore re ke re shebisane taba ena; hore na o ke se ke wa leka metsi aa ka lere jwalo ka ha o ile wa leka a mang?" (Act II: scene iii)

[Among all things that pleased me there is none that surpasses the issue of a German doctor that has arrived at that place; who, mother-of-so-and-so, is reputed for performing unbelievable wonders. Many people have seen wonders because of the

work of that man. Now woman, I have come to you so that we may discuss this issue; as to whether you may not try these waters with a scepter as you have tried others?]

In line with Mmaboitshwaro's seeming barrenness, Mmankokoto relates this story as a plan to drive her persuasive goal for the former to take the initiative to go and see the reputable doctor. When she mentions that this issue has pleased her most, it is to be seen as an attempt at persuading Mmaboitshwaro to also align with her and consider its importance too. Further, the statement, 'eo ho thweng mmannyeo ha e etse mehlolo le kgale,' is seemingly calculated at persuading Mmaboitshwaro to also believe in miracles; even as she presently appears to have lost hope in ever achieving her goal. Furthermore, Mmankokoto's reference to Mmaboitshwaro as 'mmannyeo,' in the same statement above, seems to be aimed at persuading her to regard herself, not only as one lonely woman, but a mother of somebody who is likely to be born after consulting the said doctor.

In addition, Mmankokoto's information that 'batho ba bangata ba se ba bone mehlolo ...,' is also to be regarded as a persuasive action of driving a plan to give Mmaboitshwaro some evidence; or an assurance that she will not be the first person to be assisted by that particular doctor. She therefore persuades the latter to positively hope and trust that her going to consult the said doctor will bring good results for her. Finally, Mmankokoto's final statement above, 'Jwale mosadi ...; hore na o ke se leke metsi ka lere ...,' employs an idiomatic expression that is designed to persuade Mmaboitshwaro, as a woman, to at least take it as a trial to consult that doctor, even if she may have some qualms about the whole matter. Since she has tried other means that have not been profitable to her, there is no harm in trying this one, the persuader, Mmankokoto, seems to say. The idiom, 'ho leka metsi ka lere,' is a pastoral image that emphasises the importance of trying; which is similar to an action of testing the depth of the waters before one crosses a river – and it is therefore a persuasive statement for Mmaboitshwaro to go and try her luck in this case.

Although Mmaboitshwaro's first reaction is that of fright and despondency, she is eventually persuaded by Mmankokoto's pleading her to cool down, saying, "Kgutlisa moya mmannyeo re bue ditaba o se ke wa iketsa ngwana." (Act II: scene iii) [Cool down mother-of-so-and-so so that we discuss the issues and stop turning yourself into a child.] Once more, it is important to note that Mmankokoto refers to Mmaboitshwaro as 'mosadi,' which would once more seem to be employed as a reminder for the latter to remember that as a woman, she is expected to be considerate in these matters that concern them as women – unlike a child who might be ruled by emotions, without using reasoning power.

Not surprisingly, Mmaboitshwaro makes an attempt at initiating an understanding into Mmankokoto about the misery experienced by barren women – thus counter-persuading her

to comprehend the seemingly childlike behaviour she has so far displayed. In an effort to persuade Mmankokoto to identify with her and sympathise with her in her painful situation, Mmaboitshwaro says:

“Taba ya ho hloka ngwana, Mmankokoto, e bohloko mme e thonkga eo e mo amang ha bohloko. Nna ka nnete ke se ke shebile feela tjena; ke se ke re ho tla etsahala mohlolo mohla nako ya wona. Ha e le nna ke se ke *akgetse thaole*.” (Act II: scene iii)

[The issue concerning childlessness, Mmankokoto, is painful and it hurts the concerned person deeply. Indeed as for me I have resigned to my fate; I even say that a miracle will happen at its own time. As for me, I have already *thrown a towel* (i.e., have given up)]

In an effort to persuade Mmankokoto to thoroughly comprehend her seemingly unbearable situation, Mmaboitshwaro employs and puts emphasis on the idiomatic expression, ‘ho akgela thaole.’ The idea of ‘ho akgela thaole’ is commonly associated with the boxing sporting activity. It is in reference to a situation whereby one boxer is completely on the losing end; that is, where that boxer is being hammered intermittently with blows from his challenger or defendant – thus causing his side to realise that, unless they throw in a towel, as a sign of surrendering, the boxer in question may even sustain worse injuries. In other words, the idea of throwing a towel is a sign of utter desperation from the side of the loser. Mmaboitshwaro is therefore applying this idiomatic expression for Mmankokoto to fully come to terms with the former’s state of desperation, in as far as the idea of progeny is concerned.

It would seem that Mmankokoto has been persuaded by Mmaboitshwaro’s above submission to identify with her in her dire situation – as she says to the latter, “Ke a utlwa ngwaneso empa le teng ha se hore o ka be o se o tlohela feela, o se o sa leke matsapa a mang. Modimo o a thuswa hle ngwaneso.” (Act II: scene iii) [I understand my sister, but even so it does not mean that you should let go, without trying other means. God is to be assisted please sister.] Seemingly, Mmankokoto’s submission is an attempt at persuading Mmaboitshwaro to continually try any means through which her desire might be achieved. Her reference to God, as needing assistance, presupposes that the latter should always put her trust in God; yet should she quit and resign to her fate, then no positive answer might be anticipated; she seems to say.

As might be expected, Mmaboitshwaro has lost faith even in God Himself. Not surprisingly, she interrupts Mmankokoto and states that they have for a long time now been assisting God; but to no avail. Whereas one might think that her statement would persuade the latter to join her into this line of desperation, the latter counter-persuades her to stop behaving like Jobo’s wife, saying: “Butle bo mosadi keng eka o tla ba mohatsa Jobo wa bobedi.” (Act II:

scene iii) [Wait a minute please woman, how come that you will end up being Jobo's second wife.] Seemingly, Mmankokoto employs this Biblical allusion here to persuade Mmaboitshwaro to refrain from behaving like Jobo's wife – who, through loss of hope in God's mercy, encouraged Jobo to insult Him and die. (Bibele: Jobo, Act:2 verse 9)

Realizing that Mmaboitshwaro has now been partially persuaded, Mmankokoto uses a proverb as another persuasive attempt for her to pay attention to the stories she is about to tell her in connection with the specialist doctor in question. She says: "O mmamedise hantle hobane Mosotho o re hlaahlela le lla ka le leng;" (Act II: scene iii) [You should listen carefully to me because a Mosotho says that one handcuff makes noise because of the other.] Since the explanation of the foregoing proverb, according to Mokitimi (1997:37) is 'Unity is strength;' it can be deduced that the present persuader employs it in order to persuade Mmaboitshwaro to accept assistance from the concerned people like herself as persuader. In addition, Mmankokoto apparently uses this proverb in an attempt to persuade Mmaboitshwaro to go and consult this famous doctor – and consider that action as a step into assisting God in the pursuit of her dire need.

Having used the above-quoted proverb, Mmankokoto once more makes reference to numerous people who have come from all walks of life to be assisted by this famous doctor. Needless to say, she gives this evidence as a persuasive endeavour to concretise the abilities of the doctor in question. In order to cement the target's belief and trust in the expertise of the said doctor, Mmankokoto even ends her stories by saying, "batho ba ditsietsing tse kang ena ya hao mme ere ka mora tshebetso ebe motho o sitswa ka seo a se labalabelang." (Act II: scene iii) [people who are experiencing the same problems as this one of yours, and after the operation they are afforded what they needed.] When the target remarks with perplexity, as to whether the persuader is saying the whole truth, it becomes clear that the attempt at persuading her is likely to achieve positive reactions.

In order for the persuadee, Mmaboitshwaro, to be fully persuaded, Mmankokoto divulges more information about this famous doctor. She informs the persuadee that this is a modern doctor who goes through different kinds of examinations and tests on his patients before he can decide on the relevant operation. As an indication that she is identifying with the persuader, Mmaboitshwaro remarks as follows: "Jo nna basadi! Ka ba ka utlwa moriri wa ka o shwababa. Ekare nkabe ke se ke ya hosane." (Act II: scene iii) [Poor me guy! I even feel my hair standing with petrification. I wish I were already going tomorrow.] Whereas the foregoing target's remark might be taken as a sign of appreciation for the persuasive exercise undergone with her; it may also be regarded as a persuasive trial for the persuader to reveal more of that she has learned about this doctor.

Further, Mmaboitshwaro inquires about medical fees that this doctor usually charges for such examinations and tests; whereupon Mmankokoto informs her that the charges are quite steep – in the region of R400.00 for an operation that is meant for opening up the inroads towards impregnation. Though Mmaboitshwaro expresses her shock about these charges, indicating that some people are poor; Mmankokoto applies more persuasion for the target to regard such charges as appropriate – by indicating that, besides being subjected to serious interrogation about the patient’s health history, that doctor also examines the patients thoroughly. Realizing the rising desire for more information from the persuadee, Mmankokoto furthermore intimates that she is going to relate all that she knows about performances done by the same doctor. As an indication that as the persuadee she has hopes and expectations; Mmaboitshwaro says:

“Mphetele hle ngwaneso. Ke hore ekare morena o se a ntse a nkaraba. Ke se ke re le ha nka fumana thootse le ha e le nngwe hle basadi. Ke se ke re le ha e ka ba sebopuwa ha a sa na taba. Hore feela le nna nke ke supe ka monwana ke re enwa ke wa ka.” (Act II: scene iii)

[Please tell me my sister. Indeed it is like the Lord is already answering me. I mean even if I may simply obtain just one seed please women. I mean even if it can be just a fool it does not matter. So that I may also point out that this is mine.]

Indubitably, these are statements of an agonised woman who has for a long time been anxious to obtain an offspring like all other women. They are also expressions of one who has been persuaded to believe in, not only the wonders of the doctor in question, but also the powers of God himself to bring about what she regards as a miracle. For Mmankokoto, as the persuader in this discussion, these expressions motivate her to cement the target’s hope and faith in the powers bestowed upon the said doctor to perform wonderful operations upon those who believe. She therefore applies more persuasion for the target to remain with full hope that this marks the moment of her redemption, saying:

“O tshepe ngwaneso. Modimo o etsa tse bonwang ka tse sa bonweng. E tla re ka tsatsi le leng ha ho le tjena ebe re lla se mothamo mmannyeo, ebe re lla meokgo ya thabo. Le ha tefo ya hae e le hodimo hakaalo le wena o tla kgotsofala ka morao ho moo ha o se o tshwere mpho e mahlo.” (Act II: scene iii)

[You should have faith my sister. God performs wonders. There will come a day on which you will be crying over something tangible mother-of-so-and-so, crying tears of joy. Even though his charge is so high, you will also be satisfied thereafter when you will be holding an eyed gift.]

As a persuasive measure, Mmankokoto employs a Biblical allusion to make her target understand and believe that some miracle will also be performed by God in her favour. Apparently, this Biblical allusion is derived from Bible (1961 Johanne Act 2: verses 1-12), where Jesus performed his first miracle by turning ordinary water into wine at a certain marriage ceremony – thus creating something that people failed to comprehend. For her target to have clear implications of the Biblical allusion employed here, Mmankokoto explains to Mmaboitshwaro that she will cry tears of joy, as she will have been afforded the bearing of a child after such a struggle – thus persuading her to cogitate over and desire for such a joyous moment.

Even if Mmaboitshwaro were not to fully comprehend Mmankokoto's implications, the reference to the gift as 'mpho e mahlo' revives her hope and desire to consult the said doctor for making it possible for her to have a baby. As an expression of her desire and wonderment, the target says, "E, e, hle mosadi se ke wa bua jwalo, ho thwe ngaka eo e ithutile mahlale aa, a makalekale kae?" (Act II: scene iii) [No, please woman do not say so, where has this doctor learned such wonderful knowledge from?] Mmaboitshwaro's wonderment and question indicate that she has been positively persuaded to regard the doctor as a wonderful individual upon whom she may put her full trust for assistance in her prevailing problem.

In line with the target's wonderment and question above, the persuader informs her that the doctor achieved his knowledge in his home, Germany. Further, the persuader highlights the target that even so, this doctor manages to communicate in both English and Afrikaans; notwithstanding the fact that he also partially interacts in Sesotho, especially where it concerns some basic interactions in the medical field. Furthermore, the persuader divulges the information that, should the target have low iron content in her blood system, that doctor is sure going to install it; as part of the steps he takes for boosting the fertility of his patient. In an attempt to persuade her to prepare herself for these performances, Mmankokoto further still highlights Mmaboitshwaro of the fact that only a few days after then might the doctor perform the intended operation.

Finally, Mmaboitshwaro assures her persuader that she is going to take the initiative to see this doctor; as she already experiences the anxiety prevailing in herself. In addition, she expresses a wish that her husband may not ask her questions; as she may feel as if he is refusing to take her to such a gynaecologist. In summary, Mmaboitshwaro addresses herself to God, as if He is just nearby to answer her prayers, saying: "Oho Modimo wa ka o mpe o nthuse." (Act II: scene iii) [Oh my God, please help me!] Undoubtedly, Mmaboitshwaro is fully persuaded, and she hereby applies self-persuasion so as to pave her way towards her intended communication of this matter with Habai. When she addresses herself to God,

Mmaboitshwaro employs an apostrophe as self-persuasion for her to put all her trust in God as the Almighty. According to Abrams (1993:182), an apostrophe is “a direct and explicit address either to an absent person or to an abstract or nonhuman entity. Often the effect is of high formality, or else of a sudden emotional impetus.” In other words, Mmaboitshwaro invokes God’s divine guidance towards the appropriate approach she might take to convince Habai about the importance of consulting the gynaecologist in question.

Upon noticing that her persuasive trials have been successful on Mmaboitshwaro; to an extent that the same target is also self-persuaded; Mmankokoto uses a Biblical allusion, saying:

“Modimo o tla o thusa Mmaboitshwaro. Modimo ke Modimo wa ba hlirileng moyeng, wa bao dira tsa bona di iqabolang ka bona. O se o lebala mantswe a ‘Thuto ya thabeng, Mahlohonolo’; moo ho thweng ‘ho lehlohonolo ba llang hobane ba tla tshediswa.” (Act II: scene iii)

[God will help you Mmaboitshwaro. God is the God of those who are spiritually suffering; of those whose enemies amuse themselves over their plight. Do not forget the words of ‘The mountain education, Blessings’; where it is said, “blessed are those who wail because they will be consoled.”]

The above-captioned Biblical allusion is derived from Bible (1961 Mattheu Act 5: verse 1-12), where the teachings of Jesus Christ, concerning various sufferings experienced by people, are articulated. Since Mmaboitshwaro is suffering from the seeming barrenness, Mmankokoto hereby applies this Biblical allusion, not only to comfort her, but also to induce more self-persuasion in her. In response, Mmaboitshwaro not only demonstrates her appreciation of Mmankokoto’s persuasive attempt on her, but also signifies the extent to which this persuasive exercise has achieved compliance in her, by making the following submission:

“Ausi ngwaneso o a tseba o iphetotse mme ya ntwetseng. Ka moo o ntshedisang le ho nkgannela tseleng ya nnete ka teng, ke ne ke lokela hore ebe ke mokereste wa nnete, ho fihlela mothating ona....” (Act II: scene iii)

[My dear sister, you know that you have turned yourself into my real mother. The way you console and drive me towards the right direction, I was supposed to be a true Christian up to this juncture....]

Now that her persuasive trials with Mmaboitshwaro have achieved positive response and appreciation, Mmankokoto assures the former that, should the doctor want her to be around Dibataolong for more than just a day for more checkups, then the former could be accommodated either at the latter’s parents’ home or at her sister’s place. This assurance of

accommodation for her at Dibataolong motivates Mmaboitshwaro into finally demonstrating her appreciation in the following words:

“Ngwaneso Mmankokoto o fela o le ngwaneso ka sebele, motswalle le ditlhophelong. Jwale o ntokolotse, ke lebohile. Ha taba tsa ka di ka loka, ke tla fihlela ha monyane wa hao jwalo ka ha o se o nkeleditse. Batho ke ho buisana, mme batho ke ho eletsana ngwana mme....” (Act II: scene iii)

[My sister Mmankokoto you are indeed my true sister, a friend even in troubles. Now you have liberated me, and I thank you. If my issues go well, I will be accommodated at your sister’s place in accordance with your suggestions. People are to talk, and people are to advice each/one another my mother’s child....]

Needless to say, Mmaboitshwaro has been fully persuaded into entertaining some hope and trust in the wonders that the highly reputed gynaecologist is going to perform on her. She therefore regards Mmankokoto, not only as a sister somebody who has come to her assistance by advising her accordingly; but also as a liberator who has rescued her from the tethers of uncertainty and utter desperation she demonstrated at the beginning of this discussion. It is not surprising therefore that, when Mmankokoto bids her farewell, she responds as follows: “Eya hantle ngwaneso, morena a be le wena.” (Act II: scene iii) [Go well my sister, may the Lord be with you!] Apparently, Mmaboitshwaro’s foregoing farewell utterance to Mmankokoto is used as a sign of appreciation for the latter’s persuasive endeavours. In addition, one might venture to assume that it is also meant for persuading Mmankokoto to maintain the same spirit of extending some assistance towards those who are in dire situations like the utterer of this statement herself; and it is also intended for motivating her to maintain her trust in the Lord.

When Habai arrives home from work, Mmaboitshwaro reports to him that there is some heavy stuff in her chest that needs to be discussed between the two of them; adding that, “mme ke lokela ho fokoletsa maikutlo a ka ho wena.” (Act II: scene iv) [and I have to lessen my feelings onto you.] It would appear that Mmaboitshwaro introduces this issue to Habai in this way as a persuasive plan to drive her goal of consulting the gynaecologist in question. As a persuasive plan for Habai to pay his utmost attention to the ensuing issue, Mmaboitshwaro makes reference to some heavy stuff in her chest, thus persuading him to regard this as an important issue that needs an immediate attention. In addition, the final part of her statement quoted above is apparently meant for persuading Habai to realise that, whatever the issue is, he is the only person that can help towards the alleviation of this heavy load on his wife’s mind.

Rather than merely regarding this as an important issue that needs immediate attention, Habai becomes shocked; as if he is being accused of some kind of misbehaviour or mistreatment against his wife. He even poses the following questions:

“Ebe ho ka ba jwalo moratuwa? Ke se ke o fahlile kang banna, o a tseba ha ke rate ho qabana le wena mosadiaka? Na o tseba hore ha ho wa heso ya o fetang?” (Act II: scene iv)

[Can it be so my love? What have I displeased you with guys, you know that I hate to quarrel with you my wife? Do you know that there is no relative of mine who surpasses you?]

This series of questions persuade Mmaboitshwaro to quickly assure Habai that there is nothing of what he has in mind; and that he has never caused her a pain of any kind. As might be expected, this assurance diminishes Habai's guilty conscience; yet works as a motivation for him to desire to hear the news that Mmaboitshwaro is about to relate. In preparation for relating the story to Habai, Mmaboitshwaro organises some tea for both of them; and explains to him that today they are to partake of biscuits, instead of cakes – thus persuading Habai to accept and enjoy the biscuits as much as he would the cakes. As a sign of appreciation, Habai convinces her that the biscuits are alright for a change. Further, he encourages her to relate the news while they continue partaking of their tea. Mmaboitshwaro relates the story of the gynaecologist as was recounted to her by Mmankokoto.

Since Habai has also been worried over their status of having no child of their own, a mere mention of a gynaecologist, inspires him to listen attentively as his wife recounts what was related to her by Mmankokoto. Capitalizing on Habai's seeming interest, Mmaboitshwaro says, “Ngaka ena ke a utlwa e ka nna ya re thusa le rona ho fumana ngwana.” (Act II: scene iv) [I hear that this doctor might help us to also get a child.] Not surprisingly, Habai retorts thus: “Jwang na mosadiaka? Ke utlwa eka o tla tla le taba tse kgolo.” (Act II: scene iv) [How is that my wife? I feel that you are about to divulge some important news.] Apparently, this is a subject matter that is closest to Habai's feelings; such that he is already self-persuaded to apply required seriousness in this discussion.

Whereas Habai might be regarded as a self-persuaded listener, the mention of the operations that are likely to be performed by the gynaecologist worries him a lot; as he thinks that such operations will be performed on himself. In an attempt to persuade him to cool down and pay more attention to the story, Mmaboitshwaro explains to Habai that such operations are done on the woman that needs such assistance, not to him. Additionally, Mmaboitshwaro relates to Habai that the charges are rather high, as she has learned from Mmankokoto. In this way, Mmaboitshwaro endeavours to prepare Habai for the fee that the

doctor might charge; so that it does not come as a shock for him when she finally reveals it. Seemingly, Habai's attention is not on what his wife has just made mention of; for he makes some irrelevant remarks, including these ones:

“Ke se ke itse ngwana ya ka tshohang a hlahile ka hara ntlo ena, lebitso e tla ba Boitshwaro kapa ke ntse ke reng na banna? E be ke ingola meno? Ha ho na taba; feela ke rata ho bona hore e be boporofeta ba batswadi ba ka bo tla lebisa kae. Tswela pele mme.” (Act II: scene iv)

[I have already said that any child that may be born in this house, the name will be Boitshwaro or what am I saying guys? Am I deceiving myself? It does not matter; but I would like to see what direction my parents' prophecy will take. Carry on mother.]

Seemingly, Habai has been in deep thought about the matter that Mmaboitshwaro is relating to him presently; so much that he has temporarily lost the attention he has been paying on this issue. Presently, his hopes for success in bearing a child are high; as indicated in the above quips. To prove the point, he has already thought of the name as Boitshwaro, which would rightly be in congruence with his wife's one; as 'mma' means the 'mother of' in naming among the Basotho people. It is important to also realise that Habai is rather skeptical though, about ever obtaining a child – as indicated by his rhetorical question above, 'E be ke ingola meno?' It would seem that he employs this idiomatic expression as a sign of his skepticism in his own quips; for, the action of writing on one's teeth is almost impossible. Nonetheless, since his parents have named his wife Mmaboitshwaro (Mother of Boitshwaro) so to speak, he seemingly assumes that they prophesied that she will bear them an offspring. His final statement above, in which he addresses Mmaboitshwaro as 'mme' (mother), seems to be aimed at persuading her to regard herself as a mother of somebody from now on. In this way, one sees in Habai a character that bears the conviction that they might be afforded what they have desired for a long time since their marriage.

It would seem that Habai's quips above have persuaded Mmaboitshwaro to right away spell out the related charges she has alluded to earlier. Though she puts this matter in a round-about manner; even stating the reasons why the said doctor charges so much; Habai, like a self-persuaded character, assures her that she is the nearest person to his heart. Further, he indicates that since he is the only boy among his siblings, he is more than prepared to do all in his powers to make this desire turn into a reality – especially because he has already wasted a lot of money for nothing; as they paid the good-for-nothing Tshika-le-marapo. Furthermore, Habai employs a proverbial expression that, “Seja-monna ha se mo qete,” (Act II: scene iv) [A man eater never finishes him (literal)] as a persuasive action for Mmaboitshwaro to realise that he is prepared to pay for all those performances, regardless of

whether or not they may materialise as promised by the doctor. According to Mokitimi (1997:26), the foregoing proverb means that an able-bodied person “is capable of surviving and making ends meet even if what belongs to him/her has been taken away.”

Finally, Habai pronounces that he welcomes this issue; thus signaling that he complies with the whole persuasion concerning the doctor in question. Having come to this mutual agreement, Mmaboitshwaro proposes for Habai to transport her to Dibataolong on a Sunday, so that she may see the doctor as early as Monday morning to avoid the long queue that is said to be always there. As if Mmaboitshwaro has just said something out of the ordinary, Habai shouts at her as follows: “Hei mosadi o reng? O re o tsamaye moo Sontaha le Mantaha o be o ntse o le siyo? Na o ikutlwa hantle Mmaboitshwaro?” (Act II: scene iv) [Hallo woman what are you saying? You mean that you leave here on Sunday and on Monday you are still not here? Do you hear yourself well Mmaboitshwaro?] Though Habai’s reaction initially confuses Mmaboitshwaro, it ultimately dawns to her that this has been a persuasive attempt for her to refrain from being absent from home for two successive days. In unison, the couple ultimately plans to go and see the gynaecologist the next Saturday, when Habai will not be going to work.

In accordance with the above agreement, Habai and Mmaboitshwaro drive to Dibataolong on the Saturday in question. They arrive at the surgery, whereupon they realise the distinguishing sign of an eagle drawn on the windows. As a persuasive action for Mmaboitshwaro to mount courage and conviction in considering this place as a centre for her cure, Habai quips in this manner:

“Ke ona. Ha o bone difensetere tsela tse pentilweng ntsu e ubellang? Na o ne o ka lahleha le ha o ne o ka ba mong? O a bona ntsu eno e a bua mosadiaka. Mona mafu aa ubellwa. A sa tla be a tswe tjoro, ho bao a ahileng ho bona.” (Act II: scene v)

[It is. Don’t you see those windows that have been painted on with an emblem of a seizing eagle? Would you get lost even if you were alone? You see that eagle is talking my wife. Here ailments are seized. They will eventually flee out of those in which they have dwelled.]

It would appear that Habai’s intention in the above quips is also to convince Mmaboitshwaro that her seeming barrenness has come to an end; as it will be seized off like a lamb seized by an eagle. The metaphoric expression employed in this allusion is meant for persuading Mmaboitshwaro to go into the surgery on a positive mood, that no matter how long it may take her to go through all stages of the operation she will eventually achieve her intended goal. In line with their mutual agreement, as well as their compliance with each other’s persuasion, Mmaboitshwaro agrees with Habai; and suggests that, “Ba kulang ba lokela ho

tloha sebakeng sena e le ba lokolotsweng ditlamong.” (Act II: scene v) [The sick are supposed to leave this place as the emancipated ones from their tethers.] In this way, both Habai and Mmaboitshwaro have been successfully persuaded into believing that they have at last come to a place of rescue from their bondage of childlessness.

Eventually Habai and Mmaboitshwaro are checked by the doctor. There after, Habai is called into a private room, where the doctor explains to him that Mmaboitshwaro needs some blood supplement; as she seems to have some deficiency. As a persuasive attempt for Habai to comply with the intended action, the doctor asks him whether that will be alright with him. Since he has already come to an agreement with his wife, Habai complies with the doctor’s suggestion; but inquires as to when such an activity would be performed, and the time duration spent on it. Like someone who has analysed the intention of Habai’s question, the doctor explains that the operation would be done on Tuesday the following week; and it would be from eight o’clock in the morning up to four o’clock in the afternoon. In a persuasive attempt at guiding Habai towards collecting his wife in time, the doctor gives him a letter with which he has to bring the patient to the hospital. Further, the doctor tells Habai that he will phone the latter’s superiors at work and advise them to release him early enough on that day; so that he may have the opportunity to be in time for taking his wife home after four o’clock.

In a persuasive attempt for the doctor to feel good about himself, Habai thanks him for his insights; and quips that the doctor is a good man. Instead of accepting Habai’s complement, the doctor retorts in this manner: “Tjhe ntate. Ha se nna ya molemo. Molemo ke wa Modimo. Wena le mosadi wa hao le nthuse ka dithapelo.” (Act II: scene v) [No sir. It is not me who is good. Goodness belongs to God. You and your wife should assist me with prayers.] As a sign of understanding, and agreeing with the doctor’s retorts, Habai thanks him and pays him off. In response, the doctor also thanks Habai and bids him and his wife farewell.

On their way home, Habai and Mmaboitshwaro take some time before they can discuss their meeting with the German doctor. They both marvel at the humane character of this doctor; such that they both feel tongue-tied. In an attempt at persuading Mmaboitshwaro to consider this state of being expressionless as a temporary thing; and as a sign that this is a wonderful doctor, Habai quips in this manner:

“Ke bona eka re tla lokoloha melomo ha re fihla hae; ke ikutlwa ke rarehile leleme. Ke bona eka monna enwa o tla fela a re etsetse mehlolo e le ka nnete. Ke ntse ke tsota mosa wa hae ha ke thotse tjena, le ka moo a shebahalang a tseba mosebetsi wa hae ka teng. Ke bona eka motho enwa o apesitswe ka matla a moya o halalelang” (Act II: scene v)

[I think that our mouths will be untied when we reach home; I feel tongue-tied. I realise that this man is indeed going to perform wonders for us. I still marvel at his kindness as I remain silent now, and the way he appears to be an expert in his work. I think that this person is empowered with the holyspirit.]

Seemingly, Habai's above utterances are meant for persuading Mmaboitshwaro to have faith in the operations and performances of the doctor in question; for he has proven to them that he is an expert in this field. Further, Habai's final statement above appears to be made with an intention to persuade Mmaboitshwaro to regard the doctor as someone who, through the holyspirit, has been sent for their salvation from their problem. Indeed, as persuasion is incremental, Mmaboitshwaro reinforces Habai's beliefs by indicating that even during the Bible days, people were salvaged from their ailments by their beliefs. Needless to say, Mmaboitshwaro quips in this way as a sign that she is also persuaded to believe in all that Habai believes in; and as such, she reinforces Habai's beliefs and convictions in this medical exercise. Significantly, the husband and wife are in unison in their dealings with this matter.

In line with Habai's suggestion that their tongues would be untied when they reached home; when they arrive home, Mmaboitshwaro surmises that she is even lazy to cook. In response, Habai persuades her to suspend the cooking business, saying: "Tlohela tsa ho pheha, re ke re bue tsa moo re tswang teng. O a lebala hore ha se ka dijo feela motho a ka phelang." (Act II: scene v) [Let go of the cooking business, so that we can discuss issues about our journey. You forget that it is not by food only that a human being can live.] For Habai, this is the moment he had in mind when he suggested to Mmaboitshwaro that their tongues would be untied when they reach home; that is why he even persuades his wife to suspend the cooking by alluding to the Biblical allusion; Bible (1961 Mattheu, Act 6: verse 31-36) as contained in his final statement above.

As a sign that she believes in the performances of this doctor as special and leading towards the solution to their long time problem, Mmaboitshwaro indicates her desire to see how the iron element is going to be installed into her blood system. Further, she surmises as follows:

"Ke neng motho a behelwa dipitsa basadi! Motho melomo e se e bile e baba. Ke utlwisisa hantle ha a bua ka methapo e harahaneng e sa sebetseng hantle ka tshwanelo." (Act II: scene v)

[For how long has one been indulging in herbal concoctions, women! Someone's lips have even become bitter. I understand very well when he speaks about the twisted tubes that do not function accordingly.]

Apparently, Mmaboitshwaro has for a long time been taking some herbal concoctions towards aiding her to conceive, but to no avail. That is why she pronounces her clear

understanding of the problem of twisted fallopian tubes that made it almost impossible for her to conceive. It would therefore seem that her above-quoted remarks are used as an attempt for persuading Habai to share her perception; and also realise the futility of the herbal concoctions that she was made to partake of for such a long time. In other words, Mmaboitshwaro seems to persuade Habai to put all his trust and conviction in the performances and operations of this particular doctor; as all others have failed to diagnose the real source of the seeming infertility.

In agreement with Mmaboitshwaro, Habai highlights his self-persuasion by suggesting to her that they have to pray together for the success of the forthcoming operations the following week. Additionally, he remarks that he harboured some fear that he would also be part of the suggested operations; and expresses his relief and joy as follows: “Athe Jeso o ile a mpona mme a mphodisa matswalo.” (Act II: scene v) [Where upon Jesus saw me, and relieved me of my fears.] Upon realizing Habai’s state of relief, Mmaboitshwaro asks him to pray for her, seemingly attempting to persuade him to identify with her and assist her in going through the forthcoming operation successfully. As he is already self-persuaded, Habai assures her in these words:

“Ke tla o sebeletsa mosadiaka. O kgobe matshwafo. Ruri ha e le nna ke na le tshepo e tiileng ya hore kajeno Kreste o re shebile ka mohau. E se e bile e le phirima e kgolo; e ne e ka re ka bona Nkokoto le mohatsae; ra ka ra ba phetela tseo re tswa di utlwa le ho di bona. Feela tjhe nako e sa le teng. E ne e bile e ka re ka tshwara difuba tsena tsa rona le maleme ho fihlela ka morao ho oporeishene.” (Act II: scene v)

[I shall work for you my wife. You should master your feelings. In fact as for me I have a full trust that this time Christ is viewing us with mercy. It is already late in the night; it would be good for us to go and see Nkokoto and his wife; so that we may relate to them what we have heard and seen. But there is still some time. It would be good for us to hold our chests and tongues until after the operation.]

According to the above submission, Habai attempts to assure his wife that he is not only going to pray for her as she has just asked him to; but that he is also more than prepared to work for her too. In addition, he asks Mmaboitshwaro to master her feelings; which might also be analysed as an endeavour into persuading her to remove whatever worries and fears she may be experiencing at this point in time. As a further persuasive measure for Mmaboitshwaro to put her trust in Christ for salvation, Habai spells out his believe that He is watching them mercifully. Having given her these persuasive assurances, Habai further suggests their delivering the good news to their friends, Nkokoto and his wife; but furthermore pleads with Mmaboitshwaro that they should keep the matter as a secret till after

the operation. In this way, Habai attempts to persuade his wife to treat this matter with all the confidentiality it deserves; seemingly fearing that too much publicity might rob them of proper joviality for success.

It comes not as a surprise that Mmaboitshwaro agrees with Habai on these matters; and adds in the following manner:

“Ha re ke re itshware re lebele sethole sa rona. Ka nako e nngwe ha re ka hafatsa taba ena re ka tshoha re e senya hobane mohlomong mehopollo ya batho ba bang e ke ke ya thabela mohato ona oo re o nkileng. Ha se ka setlhare feela motho a ka loyang monnaheso; ke re le ka pelo ena e pala motho a ka o qeta. Feela Mmankokoto yena ke tla mo otlela mabala a nkwe haeba a ka tla ntlhwela.” (Act II: scene v)

[Let us hold ourselves and observe our fully grown female animal. Sometimes if we spread this matter we might spoil it because possibly some people's views may not appreciate the steps we have taken. It is not with herbal charm only that one can bewitch you my countryman; I say that even with a mere heart someone can finish you up. But as for Mmankokoto, I will briefly relate them to her if she may come to see me.]

Since this couple is in unison in almost all these matters concerning steps they have now taken, it comes not as shock that Habai demonstrates his agreement with his wife; and further promises her that he may also briefly divulge the matter to Nkokoto. But as one might expect, Habai and his wife ultimately go home to relate the story to their parents, Mmakgaeng and Hlakahlothwane. Having related to the parents that Mmaboitshwaro still has to go for operation; the parents get worried and inquire as to whether their daughter-in-law is going to live. In an attempt to persuade them to identify with them in this matter, Habai pleads as follows:

“Ke ka hoo mme re tlileng hae mona ho tla le behela mehato ena e le hore le lona le tle le re behe ho Morena ka thapelo. Seo re se lilelang ke bophelo.” (Act III: scene i)

[That is why mother we have come here at home to relate to you about these steps, so that you may also place us under the mercy of the Lord with prayer. What we are in need of is life.]

It would appear that Habai's statement is meant for persuading Hlakahlothwane and Mmakgaeng to also join them in prayer for Mmaboitshwaro to successfully undergo the intended operation. Further, Habai's idea might be interpreted as intent for his wife to go for this operation with a feeling and trust that she not only has her husband's support but also that of her parents-in-law. Furthermore, it can also be deduced that Habai and

Mmaboitshwaro have come home specifically to persuade their parents to give their daughter-in-law some blessings and wish her well in the forthcoming operation.

Since the parents-in-law have had a burning desire for their daughter-in-law to be blessed with an offspring, it comes not as a surprise that Hlakahlothwane tells Habai and his wife that they are listening to their report “ka tsebe tse lethwethwe” (Act III: scene i) [with acute ears.] By so saying, Hlakahlothwane seemingly not only refers to attentive listening, but illustrates to his son and daughter-in-law that they also want to finally decide where and how they may be of assistance to them. Not surprisingly therefore, he inquires about the charge for the operation in question. When Habai mentions the charge as five hundred rand, Hlakahlothwane makes a joke out of that information, saying: “Banna, ehliile re qhongwe ke makgolo a mahlano. Ke Mosotho, ke Lekgowa ho a tswana batho bana ke baji kaofela.” (Act III: scene i) [Guys, we are always to pay five hundred. It is a Mosotho, it is a European it is the same; all these people are cheats.]

On a serious note, Hlakahlothwane says,

“Le ha ho le jwalo ditaba re di beha matsohong a Modimo le badimo. E se e le bona ba tla re sebeletsa. Re tla le haka bana ba ka moo le haellwang. Ke tla rekisa kgongwana yane e kwebu e le hore re le thuse.” (Act III: scene i)

[Even so we put the matters in the hands of God and the gods. They are the ones who are to work for us. We shall extend our assistance wherever you run short. I shall sell that roan ox so that we can help you.]

Apparently, Hlakahlothwane has been persuaded by the steps taken by Habai and his wife towards ensuring that Mmaboitshwaro achieves the long time desire for all to see her bearing a child of her own. He is therefore persuaded to financially assist wherever need may arise. Since he is a man of his own conclusions, Hlakahlothwane unilaterally makes this promise without any inkling at consulting with Mmakgaeng; possibly assuming that as he is the head of the family, Mmakgaeng would have no qualms with those decisions. As a sign of appreciation, Mmaboitshwaro passes their gratitude with Habai, saying:

“Ntate le mme, maleme a rona a a rareha ha re lokela ho leboha. Re ne re sa lebella hakana. Ka nnete sena e se e le sesupo sa hore lesedi le tla kganya tseleng ya rona. Re a leboha.” (Act III: scene i)

[Father and mother, our tongues become tied when we have to express our gratitude. We had not expected this much. Indeed this is a sign that light will shine in our way. We thank you.]

Whereas Hlakahlothwane makes an offer to assist his children in this heavy charge, one may also deduce that his offer is an attempt at persuading them to realise the extent to which he, as their father, appreciates the steps they have taken in this matter. Seemingly Mmaboitshwaro has been quite moved by this gesture made by Hlakahlothwane, such that she feels bound to extend their gritudes and persuade all other characters to entertain the believe and trust that Hlakahlothwane's offer opens the inroads into achieving the long desired goal. When she employs the idiomatic expression, 'maleme a rona a a rareha,' above, one reads the intensity of the gratitude Mmaboitshwaro is extending towards the parents-in-law. In line with these gestures and pronouncements, it becomes clear that these members of the family are positively persuaded to be one unit whole; with the same purpose and aspirations. It therefore becomes appropriate for Habai to give the final thanks to his parents as follows: "Ntate le mme le a re tseba re bana ba lona. Re leboha ka dipelo tsohle." (Act III: scene i) [Father and mother you know that we are your children. We thank you with all our hearts.]

Since Mmaboitshwaro was advised and persuaded by Mmankokoto to consult the German gynaecologist in question; it comes not as a surprise that Nkokoto has now accompanied his wife to visit Habai's family, to check on Mmaboitshwaro after the operation. As would be expected, Mmaboitshwaro and Habai are motivated by this visit to extend their gratitude towards the visitors; as indicated in the following expressions by Mmaboitshwaro:

"Ke a kgolwa ke bua maikutlo a ntate (Habai) ha ke re re ikutlwa re matlafetse le ho feta ha re le bona; haholo difahleho tse re fupareletseng lerato. Ha ho jwalo ntate?" (Act III: scene ii)

[I suppose I speak the words of father when I say that we feel quite strengthened to see you; especially the faces that radiate with love. Is it not so father?]

Obviously, Habai is persuaded by Mmaboitshwaro's expressions above to pronounce his agreement with her; seemingly motivated by her reference to him as 'ntate.' When she refers and addresses Habai as 'ntate,' Mmaboitshwaro seems to boost his ego and assurance that the operation might indeed result into him becoming a father to a child she is likely to bear. Unsurprisingly, Habai responds to her question in the affirmative, saying:

"Ho jwalo moratuwa wa ka. Motho ha a tliilo o hlwela, a itlisitse ka seqo, ketsahalo eno e matla ho feta ha a ne a ka o romella mphonyana ka poso. Mosotho o re taba di mahlong. Ha ho jwalo ausi Mmankokoto?" (Act III: scene ii)

[It is so my darling. When a person has come to see you, and has come in person, that action is more meaningful than if s/he were to send a small gift by post. A Mosotho says that affairs are on the face. Is that not so sister Mmankokoto?]

Needless to say, Habai is in congruence with his wife. To all intents and purposes, in response Habai addresses Mmaboitshwaro as 'moratuwa wa ka' in an attempt to boost her morale, and persuade her to realise the depth of his love for her. In an attempt to reiterate Mmaboitshwaro's utterance, that the presence of Nkokoto and his wife instills strength in them, Habai draws a comparison between a personal visit and the sending of a gift. He employs a proverb, 'taba di mahlong,' in an endeavour to persuade Nkokoto and Mmankokoto to appreciate the depth of their admiration as hosts. According to Mokitimi (1997:62), the explanation of this proverbial expression is that the face "is a reflection or index of the mind." It follows, therefore, that Nkokoto and his wife's visit is highly valued by the hosts, Habai and Mmaboitshwaro.

In response to Habai's question above, Mmankokoto responds in the affirmative, and further addresses herself to Mmaboitshwaro, inquiring after her health since she has been operated upon. It would be clear that Mmankokoto's inquiry over Mmaboitshwaro's health is meant for persuading the latter to relate her state of health to them without any reservations; so that the former may advise her accordingly; as she addresses her as 'ngwaneso' (sister). Having been thus persuaded, Mmaboitshwaro explains that she feels alright, though she still experiences some weakness; also indicating that she pushes herself to perform some basic chores such as cooking, and others. Like someone who suspects that the former might overwork herself, Mmankokoto makes the following suggestion:

"Empa ka ha ho sa le ho tjha haholo ekare o ka be o ena le motho ya haufi kapa ya hlileng a leng lapeng mona ho o thusa mosadi." (Act III: scene ii)

[But since it is still very new, it would be better for you to have someone nearby, or one who actually stays with you here at home to assist you woman.]

Clearly, Mmankokoto's suggestion is a persuasive attempt for both Mmaboitshwaro and Habai to take action and find someone as a domestic helper, and nurse for Mmaboitshwaro during these early days after the operation. Not surprisingly, Habai agrees with Mmankokoto's suggestion; and further reveals his deep feelings that he would have favoured such a person to be his own sister that is married in their own village. In an attempt to motivate his wife into considering his suggestion for a helper, Habai furthermore remarks in this manner: "Mosadi enwa wa ka ha a tsebe hore ke tshabana le yena ha kae banna." (Act III: scene ii) [This wife of mine does not know how much I care for her.]

It would also appear that Habai's final statement above is also meant to function as a persuasive trial for the visitors to advise Mmaboitshwaro to accept her husband's suggestion for recruiting his own sister to come over, stay with them and perform certain chores to alleviate the patient's strain. It is not surprising that Mmankokoto even asks Mmaboitshwaro

the reason behind her refusal for recruiting her husband's sister as a helper. In her response, Mmaboitshwaro indicates that she would hate to end up becoming too much reliant on the helper, and fail to perform her duties accordingly. Further, she relates the instructions she was given at the hospital; that she was advised not to stay too much in bed, but to move around and do some chores that are not so straining to her. Even as she accepts Mmaboitshwaro's explanations, Mmankokoto advises her to take care of herself, as she is still a patient.

In relation to the strings used in stitching up the operation, Mmaboitshwaro mentions to the visitors that they are to be removed after seven days. In addition, she tells them that, though they have been given a letter that was to be submitted to the local doctor for the removal of such stitches; Habai insists that those stitches should be removed by the specialist himself. It might not be a wrong assumption for one to suggest that Mmaboitshwaro's aim in revealing Habai's proposal is to persuade the visitors to take action and persuade Habai to change his behaviour and belief. In an effort at exercising a counter-persuasion, Habai explains himself as follows:

“Le jwale bo ba heso, ha ke batle diphoso tsa letho ha ke fihla pela bophelo ba mosadiaka. Ke batla hore Modimo o nthuse ke hlokomele hore a phele. Ntate o senyehetswe hle hodima mosadi enwa.” (Act III: scene ii)

[Indeed my fellow people, I do not want any mistakes in connection with my wife's health. I want God to help me ensure that she lives. My father has really spent a lot on this woman.]

Obviously, Habai's utterances are used as an attempt at persuading the visitors to identify with him and agree with him that his intentions and proposal have strong basis; as he is not prepared to bear the idea of mistakes that might be done by unprofessional doctors when removing the strings from the operation on his wife. Additionally, Habai's reference to God as his possible assistant in making sure that Mmaboitshwaro lives, is quite a persuasive statement for Nkokoto to support him; as he declares:

“Tjhe le nna ngwaneso ke dumellana le wena. Dintho tsa ka ke ye ke rate hore di sebetswe ke motho ya tsebang hore na o etsang.” (Act III: scene ii)

[But I also agree with you my brother. I always want my matters to be performed by someone who knows what s/he is doing.]

In this way, Nkokoto supports Habai's beliefs; and at the same time, his utterances persuade Habai to thank him. Further, as an attempt at persuading others to change their possibly opposing thoughts and beliefs, Habai says:

“Motho ya sa boulelleng dikgomo tsa ntatae ke motho ya sa ithateng ka boyena. Etswe ha ke kgolwe hore motho ya jwalo a ka ba le botshepehi.” (Act III: scene ii)

[A person who does not value his father’s cattle is a person who does not love himself. And I do not believe that such a person can be trustworthy.]

Indeed, all are persuaded to identify with Habai in his behaviour and belief that his wife is to go back to the same specialist who operated on her for the removal of the strings in question. It then comes not as a surprise that hereafter the visitors thank the hosts, wish them good health, and finally bid them farewell as they depart. As a persuasive attempt at making the Nkokoto family regard themselves as part of the Habai family, Mmaboitshwaro bids the Nkokotos farewell as follows: “Tsamayang hantle bana beso.” (Act III: scene ii) [Go well my brethren.]

Three months have now passed since the operation on Mmaboitshwaro has healed up. To Habai’s surprise, Mmaboitshwaro has been experiencing nausea that seems to take place in the mornings. Upon realizing this situation, Habai becomes worried, as he thinks that his wife may be sick. In an endeavour at persuading Mmaboitshwaro to relate all that concerns her health, Habai asks her what she might have eaten, that might be the source of the nausea. In response, Mmaboitshwaro relates how it all started; adding that of late she even experiences moments in which she falls into deep sleep; more especially after performing some of her house chores. For Habai, this state portends some kind of sickness that is to be diagnosed by a medical doctor. In line with that understanding, he persuades Mmaboitshwaro to prepare herself for seeing the doctor, saying:

“Eseng ho tla batla hore re mpe re bone ngaka ...Nna haholo ke boulella leqeba lane la oporeishene hore le se ke la tshoha le utlwa bohloko ka hare ke taba ena ya ho nyokgoloha hobane nnete ke hore ha o hlatsa mesifa ena ya mpa e a tiya. Jwale he re lokela ho itshela kelello mohatsaka.” (Act III: scene iii)

[Don’t you think that we have to consult a doctor ...As for me I am concerned about that wound from the operation, so that it may not be painful inside due to this business of nauseating because the truth is that when you vomit your stomach tendons constrict. We therefore have to pour some sense into ourselves (be prudent) my wife.]

In accordance with Habai’s concern and his persuasion for her to go and consult the doctor, Mmaboitshwaro relates to him yet another unusual aspect that has recently started affecting her health. She mentions that of late she is negatively affected by the smell of chicken, especially as it is being cooked; and for persuading Habai to refrain from ever bringing it over, she uses the following hyperboles for emphasis: “lephoka la nama ya kgoho ... **le**

mpolaya le ho feta; ke shwa nyele. Oho ha ke le utlwa **ke sallwa ke ho qhibidiha feela.**” (my emphasis) (Act III: scene iii) [the smell of chicken ...**kills me more; I completely die.** Oh! When I experience that smell **I am only left with melting.**] Indeed, Abrams (1993:85) said it well that hyperbole “is bold overstatement, or the extravagant exaggeration of fact or of possibility.”

In line with Abrams’ view above, one realises that Mmaboitshwaro extravagantly exaggerates the negative affectation the smell of chicken induces in her by referring to it as some kind of a killer; and further as an embodiment of an immoderate heat that can cause damage in her body. With an aim of rapping up her persuasive attempt, Mmaboitshwaro makes the following direct request to Habai: “Ke se ke o kopa hore o se ke wa hlola o tla le nama ya kgoho hle, wa utlwa.” (Act III: scene iii) [I beg you to please never bring along any chicken, do you hear?]

As it might be expected, Habai is persuaded by the above hyperboles and direct request for him to cease bringing any more chicken home for consumption. He promises to comply with his wife’s request; yet insists on the need for her to go and consult the doctor. In addition, he suggests that he will go via Mmankokoto’s house and invite her to come over and discuss the matter with Mmaboitshwaro; as he is now late for work. Indeed, Mmankokoto later arrives at Mmaboitshwaro’s house; where she finds the latter in deep slumber. In line with Habai’s earlier suggestion for inviting Mmankokoto to discuss Mmaboitshwaro’s health status; the latter divulges the whole information to the visitor. It would seem that Mmankokoto is quite experienced in matters of this kind; for she expresses herself in the following way:

“Ke a thaba ebile ke a nyakalla ho utlwa ditaba tsa mofuta o tjena. O tla tseba kajeno hore o kene temeng e ntjha bophelong. Dithapelo tsa hao di sekehetswe tsebe ngwaneso, Modimo o o arabetse. Le ha ke se ngaka empa ke a tseba hore ka matshwao ao o a bolelang re tla sitswa mme dikgathatso tseo o mpoelletse tsona di tla fela haufinyane le bophelo ba hao bo tla fetoha.” (Act III: scene iii)

[I am happy and also rejoice over hearing this kind of affairs. You will know today that you have entered a new way in life. Your prayers have been answered my sister, God has answered you. Even though I am not a doctor, but I know that by these signals you have related to me we shall be granted and the troubles that you have mentioned to me will cease eventually, even your status of health will be different.]

Even though Mmankokoto does not directly say what status Mmaboitshwaro is in, and what her troubles are; in line with the purpose of the operation that was performed on the latter, her words clearly indicate that those signs indicate that Mmaboitshwaro is pregnant. Since the two families of Habai and Nkokoto have always been concerned with Mmaboitshwaro’s

seeming status of barrenness, it makes sense that Mmankokoto rejoices over the present signals experienced by Mmaboitshwaro; and thanks God for it. It comes not as amazement then for Mmankokoto to persuade Mmaboitshwaro to consult the doctor in these words:

“Jwale le tla lokela ho ya bona ngaka yane ya hao ya Lejeremane e le hore e tle e hle e lokise dipitsa tsa yona tsa sekgowa le ho o tshehetsa.” (Act III: scene iii)

[Now you will have to go and consult that German doctor of yours so that he may start to prepare his medicinal mixtures even to support you.]

In this way, Mmankokoto reiterates Habai’s suggestion for Mmaboitshwaro to consult the doctor; yet she goes further to persuade her to consult no other than the German doctor that has made it possible for Mmaboitshwaro to conceive. In addition, she makes Mmaboitshwaro aware that her action of consulting the German doctor will enable him to supply her with relevant medical mixtures to ensure her good health; and further offer her appropriate pieces of advice for securing her pregnancy. As an indication that persuasion is incremental, Mmaboitshwaro has been persuaded to understand her health status in accordance with the signs she has been experiencing; yet she responds by declaring that if the doctor also confirms Mmankokoto’s analysis, she may not be able to hold her tears. Further, she expresses her imagination as to how happy Habai is going to be upon hearing this piece of good news. Furthermore, she indicates that they now have to go and see the doctor over the next weekend. Finally, as a sign of wonderment, she even poses the following rhetorical question to Mmankokoto: “Ao mmannyeo ke hore na ekaba ke nnete?” (Act III: scene iii) [What mother-of-so-and-so but is it really true?]

Since Mmaboitshwaro has spent so many years in marriage without falling pregnant, the idea of being pregnant now sounds unbelievable to her. It therefore means that the above rhetorical question is intended for persuading Mmankokoto to give her an assurance that it is indeed so. Realizing the aim of her posing the rhetorical question as above, Mmankokoto gives Mmaboitshwaro the assurance she requires in this manner:

“Ke nnete ngwaneso ha ke qeaqee. O tla tla mpoella ha le kgutla ngakeng. Ke a kgolwa le batswadi hae kwana ba tla utlwa ba sa kgolwe. Ke leboha ditaba tsena tse molemo. E re ke o siye ngwaneso. Bana ba se ba tla kgutla sekolong ke mpe ke yo ba lokisetsa.” (Act III: scene iii)

[It is true my sister I have no doubt. You will come and tell me when you come back from the doctor. I believe that even the parents at home will believe it. I am thankful for this good news. Let me leave you my sister. The children will soon come back from school and I have to make some preparations for them.]

No doubt, Mmankokoto is convinced about the situation in which Mmaboitshwaro is; and in persuading her to gather that assurance and conviction about her own situation, she makes a supposition that the parents at home are also likely to believe. Seemingly, she makes reference to the parents with an intention to try and persuade Mmaboitshwaro to have faith in the information that she has just given to her – thus making her aware that all concerned may be rather skeptical about the revelation of ‘ditaba tse na tse molemo.’ In order for Mmaboitshwaro to fully understand the commitments her present situation is going to introduce her to, Mmankokoto suggests that she has to go and make preparations for the children. It would seem that by so suggesting, Mmankokoto persuades Mmaboitshwaro to from henceforth regard herself as a mother-to-be too. In order to persuade Mmankokoto to pray for her and continue motivating her in these matters, Mmaboitshwaro passes her gratitude to her, saying, “Ke lebohile ausi; e se e mpa eka Morena a ka nkutlwela bohloko ka tla ka fela ka kgaketswa.” (Act III: scene iii) [I thank you sister; I only hope that the Lord will have mercy on me so that I might also be supplied with the gift.]

Now that Mmankokoto has gone home, Mmaboitshwaro engages herself in the following soliloquy: “Basadi! Na ka nnete? Athe mohau wa Modimo o jwang? Na ekaba nka hlola ke sa batla eng ho feta moo?” (Act III: scene iii) [Women! Is it so indeed? By the way how is the mercy of God? What else would I ever want beyond this?] Clearly, this revelation is too much for Mmaboitshwaro to believe. She is therefore attempting to persuade herself into believing in the analysis that Mmankokoto has made for her. It is quite interesting to observe Habai and see how he receives this good news; as he arrives as Mmaboitshwaro finished her above soliloquy.

It is clear that Mmaboitshwaro has been overpowered by this matter; for she hardly hears when Habai enters the house. Upon observing that Mmaboitshwaro is weeping, Habai inquires after the cause; as to whether it is related to the morning sickness she experienced in the morning. Instead of answering Habai’s questions, Mmaboitshwaro asks Habai why he has come home early today; thus persuading him to respond as follows: “Ke kopile hore ke tle hae ke tlo tla bona hore o ntse o etsa jwang ka ha ke o siile o se na tsela e ntle hoseng. O kgotso jwale mme?” (Act III: scene iii) [I asked for permission to come home and see how you are doing, as I left you in a rather confused state. Are you now satisfied mother?]

As Habai’s question is asked, Mmaboitshwaro answers in the positive, and addresses Habai as ‘morenaka’ [my chief]; as if in response to Habai’s address to her as ‘mme’ above. In this way, Habai is persuading Mmaboitshwaro to tell him whether or not the morning sickness is the source of her present weeping – yet in essence it would look like he aims to initiate in her the feelings of her soon being a mother. As might be assumed, Habai responds to Mmaboitshwaro’s address in a similar manner, saying, “Jwale he araba dipotso tsa ka

mofumahadi wa ka.” (Act III: scene iii) [Now answer my questions my queen.] Thus persuaded to answer her husband’s questions, Mmaboitshwaro relates her story in this manner:

“Ke nnete o fumane ke lla ntate, empa ke lla meokgo ya thabo ke bile ke tlelwa ke mafutsana ka moo ke eellwang hore lerato la Modimo le leholohadi hodima ka.” (Act III: scene iii)

[It is true that you found me crying father, but mine are tears of joy and I consider it as a miracle when I realise the greatness of God’s mercy on me.]

At this juncture, Habai can hardly believe what he hears; and he is therefore persuaded to find more and clear information from Mmaboitshwaro, as he says, “O reng na mosadi? Itlhalose hle!” (Act III: scene iii) [What are you saying now woman? Please explain yourself.] Seemingly persuaded by Habai’s apparent interest in her story, Mmaboitshwaro quips in this way:

“Monnaka ke hloka ona maleme a sekete ao nka tlerolang ka ona le ho utlwahatsa boholo ba Morena. Ho kula hoo o ntshiileng ke le ho hona ho ile ha ya ka theko ha letsatsi le ntse le phahama. Yaba ke etelwa mona ke Mmankokoto ya ileng a mphumana ke ile le sephumo sa boroko. Ha ke se ke dutsadutse le yena ka nna ka mo phetela tsa bophelo bona ba ka. Ho makaleng ha ka ho ho holo, a mpoella hore ke se ke le tseleng ya bommabana.” (Act III: scene iii)

[My husband I lack those one thousand tongues with which I could shout and publicise the greatness of the Lord. The sickly state that you left me in this morning subsided as the time went by. Then I was visited by Mmankokoto who found me deeply asleep. While we had been together, I related to her the state of my health. To my great surprise, she told me that I am now in the way towards motherhood.]

For Habai, this is very good news that can hardly be believed; as indicated in these words by him: “Hao, mosadiaka! Na ekaba ke nnete?” (Act III: scene iii) [Indeed, my wife? Is it really true?] As a sign of his glee and excitement, Habai jumps up and hugs his wife; thus even persuading her to reveal more of what she learned from Mmankokoto. Accordingly, Mmaboitshwaro ensures Habai that indeed it is so. Further, she informs him that Mmankokoto even advised her to go and consult the doctor; as that move would ensure that she is supplied with appropriate medication as well as other services that might be needed to ensure her good health state. It would appear that all these explanations have functioned as persuasive endeavour for Habai to continue marveling at the whole revelation; as embodied in these utterances:

“Ngwaneso, wa mpoella e nngwe jwale pale. Ke hore banna ngaka ee e tseba mosebetsi wa yona ha kaakang? Ke ka baka lang ha re sa ka ra utlwela ka yena ka nako e fetileng?” (Act III: scene iii)

[My sister, you tell me yet another story. That means guys that this doctor knows his work so much? For what reason were we not informed about him during the past time?]

One might venture to say that Habai’s above rhetorical questions are employed as some persuasive attempt, for both of them to understand the timing of the development of events surrounding their lives. Like someone who has been inspired to persuade Habai to welcome the situation and take matters as they come; Mmaboitshwaro attempts to answer Habai’s above rhetorical questions in this way:

“Tjhe ntate, re ne re ke ke ra utlwela ka yena ka nako e fetileng hobane hona jwale ke hona e leng nako ya hore bohola ba Morena bo tlo phethahatswa ho rona. Etswe ke hona e leng nako ya hore jwale re tle re be le ngwana.” (Act III: scene iii)

[No father, we could not learn about him in the past because now is the time for the Lord’s greatness to be fulfilled upon us. The more so that it is now time for us to have a child.]

Indubitably, Mmaboitshwaro is now a self-persuaded individual; and now she is all out to try and persuade Habai to identify with her and consider the greatness of the Lord; as she puts it above. For her, one would venture to say, there is a moment for everything; in accordance with Bible (Moeklesia Act 3: verse 1-22). She therefore employs this Biblical allusion in an attempt to persuade Habai to realise the truth embodied in Moeklesia’s words; for indeed themselves, as a couple, have borne this pain of seemingly barren for many years; yet now it is the time for them to praise the Lord, she says. Now Habai is mesmerised; such that he finds himself repeating these words: “Banna! Nako mosadiaka. Nako! Nako! Na-a-ko!” (Act III: scene iii) [Guys! Time my wife! Time! Time! T-i-me!] Significantly, Habai has been successfully persuaded by Mmaboitshwaro to accept time as an element that is capable of destining every happenstance in life. As a result, Habai finds himself weeping tears of joy too; such that it takes him sometime before he continues speaking in the following strain:

“Mosadiaka ke a leboha haeba sena se fela se phethahetse ho rona. Re lokela ho bua jwale ka Davida wa kgale ha a kile a re; efela mohau wa Modimo o hlola ka ho sa feleng. Re ne re se na tsebo le ha e le bohlale.” (Act III: scene iii)

[My wife I am thankful if this has indeed been fulfilled upon us. We have to speak like David of the olden days when he once said; indeed the mercy of God is forever existent. We never had knowledge or brilliance.]

Without any doubt, the foregoing utterances highlight the fact that, like Mmaboitshwaro, Habai is fully persuaded to believe in the power of God; and especially in his timely offerings and fulfillments of certain promises or prayers. He therefore uses a Biblical allusion in reference to Bible (David Act 1: verse 1) to signify his belief and intent to remain hopeful that the expected child is in fulfillment of God's promises for His everlasting mercy. In addition, one might say, Habai uses this Biblical allusion as a persuasive action for Mmaboitshwaro to gather more faith in God's timely offerings.

Capitalizing on Habai's self-persuasion, Mmaboitshwaro agrees with him in all that he has said; and additionally suggests that they should give themselves time to go and consult the doctor during the weekend. Further, Mmaboitshwaro proposes that they should also inform Habai's parents, so that they might also remain in the knowledge of this good news. Since Habai is already self-persuaded too, he agrees with his wife in all respects; yet to signify his submission to her persuasive attempts, he requests her to kiss him; and she willingly performs as requested; in which case Habai comments upon the enjoyment and sweetness of the kiss. Finally, the couple makes an agreement that they should keep this matter as a secret for the greatest period of its revelation; except that they might not keep all the information away from the Nkokoto's family, even after their consulting the doctor.

In accordance with their agreement, Habai and Mmaboitshwaro are traveling by car to go and see the doctor. As a sign of his uncontrolled desire for the doctor's confirmation of Mmaboitshwaro's pregnancy; Habai somehow engages a high speed in his driving; the act that worries the former, and resultantly persuading her to caution the latter of his seeming over speed. The following are their persuasive interactions with each other:

Mmaboitshwaro: Ntate keng ekang o se o sa shebe lebelo leo o palameng ka lona. Nna ha ke rate mopalamo o tjena. [Father why does it seem that you do not check the speed you engage in your driving. I do not like this kind of driving.]

Habai: Mosadiaka ke habile hona hoo ke seng ke sa iphumane le kelello. Feela ntho eo o e bolelang ke nnete. Le ha ke tatile ebile ke thabile ke lokela ho hlompha melao ya tsela le bona bomolaola-sephethephethe. (Act IV: scene i) [My wife I am in such a hurry that I do not think well. But what you are saying is true. Even though I am in a hurry and happy, I have to respect the traffic regulations and even the traffic corps.]

From then on, Habai observes the traffic regulations by engaging a normal speed that might not cause them any worry. By so doing, they even find themselves discussing other issues concerning the present state in which Mmaboitshwaro is. This situation even gives Habai an opportunity to realise that, for the first time since he noticed Mmaboitshwaro's nausea, she has not shown any signs of revulsion this morning. He therefore inquires from her whether or

not she has been nauseous today. In this case, Habai is attempting to persuade his wife to divulge to him whether she has already started experiencing the other change as was indicated by Mmankokoto when she had visited her on the day of Mmaboitshwaro's discovery of her pregnancy. To his relief, Mmaboitshwaro assures him that she has not experienced any such a feeling today; and that she has even forgotten about that. In addition, she suggests to him that this could be the beginning of the new change to which Mmankokoto had alluded the other day. Finally, Mmaboitshwaro suggests to Habai that they should record every other change in the development of her pregnancy; since for them as husband and wife, this is a new experience. Not surprisingly, Habai is persuaded to agree with her on this move.

When they have come into the consulting room, the doctor remarks that it has been a long time since he was with them. Further, he inquires after their health; in which case Habai explains that they have not been feeling very well of late. Seemingly, Habai's explanation persuades the doctor to examine Mmaboitshwaro. In order for her to relax and be comfortable, the doctor asks her to lie on the bed for examination purpose. Having examined her in different ways, the doctor asks Habai to relate her health situation. In this way, the doctor endeavours to persuade Habai to confirm what the examination has revealed about Mmaboitshwaro's present situation. In response to the doctor's inquiries, Habai says, "Oho ngaka re hlile re maketse haholo; ke ka hona o re bonang re le kwano hore re hle re tlo utlwa ka wena e seng ka bobare." (Act IV: scene i) [Please doctor we are really greatly surprised; that is why you see us here so that we come and hear it from you and not from hear-says.]

Apparently, Habai's interactions also work as persuasive measure for the doctor to openly say all that has to be said in connection with Mmaboitshwaro's health state. Without any hesitation, the doctor interacts as follows:

"Ke a bona batho ba heso. Ke a kgolwa ha ke qala mona ke itse mme o kula haholo. Ha a tshwane le mehleng, o fetohile; o kene bohatong bo botjha. O kula lefu le monate leo ke kgolwang hore o le lakaditse ka nako e telele. Ha ho Jwalo? (Mmaboitshwaro o a tsheha, ho araba monna mme a dumela.) Mme o tsebe hore o lebeletse, mme leeto la hao le se le fokotsehile ka kgwedi tse pedi. O thabile?" (Act IV: scene i)

[I see my country people. I believe that when I started I said that mother is very sick; she is not as usual, she has changed; she has entered a new stage. She suffers from an enjoyable ailment which I believe that she has for a long time been graving for. Is it not so? (Mmaboitshwaro laughs; it is the husband that replies in the positive.) Mother

you should know that you are expectant, and your journey has been diminished by two months. Are you happy?]

As might be assumed, both Habai and Mmaboitshwaro are gleeful to hear this piece of good news from the doctor himself; as he is confirming all that was said by Mmankokoto to Mmaboitshwaro previously. Possibly overpowered by happiness at the doctor's confirmation, Mmaboitshwaro simply laughs without uttering a word. By so behaving, it would seem that she persuades the doctor to reveal more information concerning her health status. It is with that understanding therefore that the doctor reveals as indicated above, that her pregnancy is two months old. Though it might be apparent that the couple is happy, the doctor asks them as shown above, whether or not they are happy. One would venture to regard the doctor's question in this respect as a persuasive attempt for the couple to regard this as a moment of joviality that they should value. As an indication of his glee, Habai smiles and pronounces that he is very happy; thus persuading the doctor to also comment more on this aspect of happiness.

In response to the couple's merriment, the doctor thanks them; and yet states that, "Ya sebeditseng ke Modimo mme thato ho phethahetse ya hae." (Act IV: scene i) [The one who has performed is God and His wish has been fulfilled.] In this way, the doctor is making an attempt at persuading the couple to realise and understand that it is through God that they have finally been afforded this status. In other words, one might say, the doctor attempts to initiate in the couple the belief that all his (doctor) operations and medical performances could hardly succeed without God's help. In response to Habai's question concerning how they should relate with this latest development, the doctor expatiates in this way:

"O botsitse hantle. Batho ba bang e ye e be ba se ba nyamela ha diphetoho di hlaha maphelong a bona. Ka nako e nngwe ba be ba teane le mathata hona tseleng eo. Athe botle ke hore motho a nne a hlahe ngakeng ho hlahlojwa le ho fumana dikeletso le hore haeba ho bonahala hore ho ka ba le mathata ho nahanwe maqiti a ka etswang e sa ntse e le nako." (Act IV: scene i)

[That is a good question. Some people would now start disappearing when changes are realised in their health. Sometimes they even meet some problems along that road. Whereas the right thing is for one to visit the doctor for examination and obtaining some pieces of advice, so that if there appears to be some problems, then some strategies that might be applicable may be thought of while time permits.]

The doctor's intervention above is to be regarded as aimed at persuading this couple to refrain from staying away from the doctor during the pregnancy of Mmaboitshwaro; for such behaviour is likely to cause them some bitter problems as time goes on. Additionally, the

doctor inspires them to consider it important for them to be medically examined and be offered relevant advice concerning their status. In this way, the doctor drives his goal of persuading them to avoid some unforeseen complications that might cause them dearly; especially if such problems are only realised too late.

Seemingly as an endeavour for the doctor to give them more information concerning the present status of health experienced by Mmaboitshwaro, Habai indicates to the doctor that they are listening. In response, the doctor pronounces this to Mmaboitshwaro: “Hona jwale ke tla o hlaba ka nale mme. Kapa o a e tshaba?” (Act IV: scene i) [Right now I am going to give you an injection mother. Or are you afraid of it?] As if with an aim of persuading the doctor to perform as he suggests, Mmaboitshwaro retorts that she is not so much afraid of the injection. In order to ensure that Mmaboitshwaro takes the tablets in accordance with his descriptions, the doctor offers her some tablets and instructs her to take them right away, in his presence. In addition, the doctor gives the couple a prescription note for purchasing other tablets from the chemist; and persuades them to carefully observe the instructions given for taking those tablets. Finally the doctor instructs the couple to come for consultation in intervals of two months. Yet as a persuasive measure for them to come for unscheduled consultations wherever need arises; the doctor indicates to them that they are free to consult him for any problems that might frighten them or worry them.

As if to remind them that they are now parents-to-be; the doctor addresses them as such in posing the rhetorical question, “Na re a utlwana batswadi?” (Act IV: scene i) [Do we understand one another parents?] In response, Habai answers in the affirmation. After indicating that the charges will be paid at the nurse’s counter, the doctor bids the couple farewell; and they retort similarly. Alone in their car, the couple now gets a chance to marvel at the latest news. In response to Mmaboitshwaro’s remark that they have even forgotten that they have not had anything to eat; Habai makes an attempt at persuading her to consider the present situation as an answer to their problems, saying:

“Ngwaneso, re tshwanetse. Taba ena eo re leng ho yona ha se thaka motho. Banna! Jwale re kgotswe mohatsaka hore thapelo tsa ba swabileng di utlwaletse. Ke hore tsena tsohle ekare ke toro ee? Ke a e tshaba taba.” (Act IV: scene i)

[My sister, we have to. This issue concerning us is not someone’s age mate. Guys! Now we are convinced my wife that the prayers of the grieved ones have been heard. Indeed all this is like a dream, eh? It is so perplexing.]

Obviously, Habai and Mmaboitshwaro are quite touched by the doctor’s confirmation that indeed the latter is pregnant. As a persuasive measure to show the importance of being a father, Habai, like someone engaged in a soliloquy, expresses his feelings as follows:

“Banna ke hore kajeno motho ha a le ka hara banna ba bang ho qoqwa ka bana, le wena motho o tla ke o kene moqoqong. Banna thabo ya ka e a kgaphatseha. O a tseba ke bile ke ikutlwa ke sa lapa, nka ba ka ya kena hae ke se na mathata” (Act IV: scene i)

[Guys it means that from today when a person is among other men where the discussion is based on children, even you person you will be able to participate in the discussion. Guys my happiness is overflowing. You know I am not even feeling hungry, I can even reach home without any problems.]

It would seem that Habai has been a tormented man all along; and the confirmation of his wife’s pregnancy has now liberated him from this long-term suffering. His suggestion that from now on he will be able to join other men’s discussion about children indicates that he never felt free enough to participate in such discussions; lest other men were to mock him of his situation of being childless. Habai’s verbal communication above seems to be aimed at persuading Mmaboitshwaro to also feel free to interact with other mothers hereafter; as she might have experienced the same isolationism too. As an indication that she has been sharing the same experience with Habai, Mmaboitshwaro simply responds to Habai’s remarks above in this manner: “Ngwaneso ha e le nna ke se ke fetohile semumu.” (Act IV: scene i) [My brother, as for me I have become mute.] The foregoing expression by Mmaboitshwaro suggests that she is so baffled that she has lost words to describe how she feels; and at the same time seems to identify with Habai’s submission above, that she also hardly speaks to other women.

Since Mmaboitshwaro’s health status has now been confirmed by her very gynaecologist, Habai finds it a matter of grave import for them to go home and divulge this information to the parents. He therefore, in a question form, attempts to persuade Mmaboitshwaro to identify with him in this thought, and says: “Ha o bona mme, o tla be o sa kgathala hosane ha re ka leba hae kwaa ho isa ditaba tsee tse molemo ho batswadi?” (Act IV: scene i) [The way you see it mother, will you not be tired tomorrow if we were to go home over there to deliver this good news to the parents?] Indeed, Mmaboitshwaro accepts the persuasion; except that she would like them not to go too early in the morning. As a persuasive exercise for Mmaboitshwaro to realise the extent of his love for her, Habai welcomes her suggestion; addressing her with an endearment tone, saying, “Tsohle di matsohong a hao palesa eso.” Act IV: scene i) [All is in your hands flower of my home.] Needless to say, Habai addresses her in this form so that she may from now on regard herself as, not only his loving wife, but also the flower of the whole family; as she is about to bear his parents a grand daughter or son. In short, everyone in the family is going to look up to her as an important flower that not

only radiates beauty, but the source of germination that ensures propagation of the family; Habai seems to say.

In line with the above analysis, coupled with the couple's agreement to go and inform their parents about the change in their lives; one foresees interesting reactions among the members of the family – for indeed this change has come as a miracle to Habai's family. It is therefore not surprising that upon viewing the arrival of Habai and his wife, Hlakahlothwane remarks as follows: "Mmakgaeng bona bana ba ka ke bana ba fihla hle mosadi." (Act IV: scene ii) [Mmakgaeng please witness as here come my children, woman.] In this way, Hlakahlothwane is registering his surprise and appreciation of the fact that his children have come to see them; and seemingly persuading Mmakgaeng to share with him his feelings of surprise and appreciation. As a sign that she is also affected in the similar manner, Mmakgaeng interacts in this way:

"Ke a ba bona ntate; ebe taba ke dife basadi? HmMMM, ka utlwa ke otlwa ke letswalo! E se e hlile e le nakwana ba nyametse. Ba amohele ntate." (Act IV: scene ii)

[I see them father; what could be the news women! HmMMM, I experience the striking of fright! It has been some time since they have disappeared. Welcome them, father.]

Whereas Hlakahlothwane is surprised and appreciative of the arrival of the son and daughter-in-law, Mmakgaeng, in addition, experiences some fright. Seemingly she even regards herself unfit for welcoming them; that is why she persuades Hlakahlothwane to perform that part. In an attempt at persuading them to realise the extent of their joy over this visit, Hlakahlothwane employs a totemic address in welcoming and greeting the young couple; saying, "Hela, Bataung!" (Act IV: scene ii) [Hi, Bataung!] In response, Habai and Mmaboitshwaro return the greetings, addressing the parents individually: "Dumela ntate. Dumela mme." (Act IV: scene ii) [Good morning, father. Good morning, mother.] In contrast with the young couple's returning the greetings by addressing their parents individually, Mmakgaeng responds by addressing them collectively; though her final statement is addressed particularly to Mmaboitshwaro in:

"Dumelang bana ba ka. Ekaba le phela jwang? Mmaboitshwaro; le se ke la re tshosa basadi." (Act IV: scene ii)

[Good morning, my children. How are you otherwise? Mmaboitshwaro; please do not frighten us women.]

Since the young couple has for some time not visited the parents, their present arrival causes mixed feelings to their parents. For example, while they are surprised and yet appreciative of their children's visit; they also experience some fright, and possibly expecting

to hear some bad news – as Mmakgaeng’s final statement in addressing Mmaboitshwaro suggests. Even as Mmaboitshwaro retorts that they are well; as they hereby see one another; the parents seem anxious to hear more; as Hlakahlothwane informs Habai and Mmaboitshwaro that they remain thinking about them most of the time. Further, he tells them that these days they hardly stop talking about them; as they remember different things that connect them together. As an indication of the extent to which the discussion about the young couple is, Hlakahlothwane even informs them that he and Mmakgaeng have even cautioned themselves that they should cease discussing their children in that strain. Seemingly with an endeavour to persuade Mmaboitshwaro to relate the issues that have caused them as a couple to have paid them this visit; Hlakahlothwane addresses her, saying: “Ha se hantle ho be sa le re bua ka batho ka tsela e jwalo; ngwetsi ya ka.” (Act IV: scene ii) [It is not right for us to continue talking about people in that form; my daughter-in-law.]

Possibly, for Hlakahlothwane and Mmakgaeng, the action of talking a lot about people who are closer to one’s heart portends doom of some kind; that is why they even cautioned themselves to stop talking about this young couple. In line with this possibility, Hlakahlothwane’s anxiety for Mmaboitshwaro to divulge the issues relating to their visit might be regarded as a persuasive action for her to give them the news now, rather than harping on irrelevant issues. In response to Hlakahlothwane’s persuasive action, Mmaboitshwaro responds in this way:

“Ntate, ke nnete re phetse hantle mme he nna ke fumana e le taba ya bohlokwa hore ebe ha re tlohe malemeng a lona. Ha o bona ha le sa bue ka rona le tla bua ka mang? (Mmakgaeng oa a tsheha) Ebile kajeno tjena re le tlišeditse ditaba tse molemo; tse tla etsa hore le bue ka rona le ho feta le be le re tjhakele pasela; le ho qeta kgwedi ho rona ditoropong kwana.” (Act IV: scene ii)

[Father, it is true that we are well and I also find it important that we are hardly off your tongues. For, if you do not talk about us, about whom shall you talk? (Mmakgaeng laughs.) And today we have brought you some good news; that will cause you to talk about us even more and inspire you to visit us as well; and further spend a month with us there in the towns.]

Whereas the parents had these mixed feelings, including some fear that there may be some bad news they are to hear of; their fears are now dismissed by Mmaboitshwaro’s submission above. In reference to her suggestion that they will have to visit them for some time there in the towns, both parents are persuaded to respond in the negative. While Hlakahlothwane complains that there would be nobody looking after his cattle if he goes away, Mmakgaeng anticipates a situation in which nobody would take care of her chickens and her dog. In

response to the parents' way of seeing things, Habai and Hlakahlothwane briefly exchange ideas on the idea of staying at the same place for ever – whereupon Hlakahlothwane emphasises that, “Monna mona re ne re tsehe kgomari. Re kgomaretse; le ha o ka bua tsa mehlolo dipuo ha re tlohe mona.” (Act IV: ii) [Man here we have poured an adherent. We have adhered; even if you talk miraculous languages we are not going to go away from here.]

In a persuasive action for the young couple to furnish them with the good news that their daughter-in-law has alluded to earlier above; Mmakgaeng quips in thus: “Helang batho, le itse le re tliseditse ditaba tse molemo. Nna ha ke sa ipatla ka sefubeng ka mona le ha re ntse re etsa metlae ena. Buang hle bana!” (Act IV: scene ii) [Oh please people, you said that you have brought us some good news. I am tired here in the chest even as we joke like this. Please speak up children.] Without any waste of time, Habai delves into the matter, saying: “Ke nnete ntate le mme. Re le tliseditse ditaba tse molemo. Le tsebe hore kajeno ngwetsi ya lona e boetse morao.” (Act IV: scene ii) [It is true father and mother. We have brought you good news. You should know that today your daughter-in-law is expectant.]

Interestingly, Hlakahlothwane expresses his delight over the revelation of good news by immediately jumping up and dancing around; chanting totemic praise song in the process:

“Halala, Motaung wa ha Mmanthethe wa Morapedi,
Motho wa teng ha a shwe feela a eso kgaohe hlooho
A sale a nyeketla ka mahetleng;
Wa Mmalehahanyana le borutho
Wa Mmamontwedi’a phuma
Ako phumele Barwanyana.”
(Act IV: scene ii)

[Halala, Motaung of Mmanthethe of Morapedi
That person does not merely die without the head being amputated
He then remains jerking his shoulders;
Of Mmalehahanyana that is warm
Of Mmamontwedi’s bucket dropping
Please beat up the Hottentots.]

Significantly, this totemic chant is engaged by Hlakahlothwane as a persuasive action for his family members to identify with him and rejoice over this piece of good news for which they have for a long time been aspiring. It would also seem that it is meant for persuading everyone around to accept his foretelling that the conceived embryo is a boy child – as the above praise poem is a war chant that is almost always performed for male warriors, and

hardly ever for females among the Basotho people. In support of this view, it becomes important for one to note that the references made in the foregoing chant are related to a war situation; which has always been regarded by many, if not all nations, as a calling for men; even if there may be some women involved in it.

Not surprisingly, Mmakgaeng signifies her identity with Hlakahlothwane's persuasive attempt by indicating that, were she not afraid, she would ululate; and employs an idiomatic expression to explain the reason for her fear as follows: "... empa ha ke batle ho tsosa dibata masene." (Act IV: scene ii) [... but I do not want to awaken the cunning of the carnivorous beasts.] The idiom, 'ho tsosa dibata masene,' presupposes the idea of betraying one's plans to the enemy; in which case such plans may end up being forestalled. According to Mokitimi (1997:46) the literal meaning of this idiom is "to alert the dangerous animals;" and further explains it as "To put a person on his/her guard." It would then be assumed that Mmakgaeng's persuasive plan here is to caution all members of the family to keep this information as a secret; in case some bad wishers may forestall this pregnancy somehow.

Like someone who can hardly believe what they hear, Mmakgaeng addresses Habai, asking him whether indeed the information they have given is indeed so. As both Habai and Mmaboitshwaro do not seem prepared to reiterate the same information, Mmakgaeng is persuaded to understand that what they have told them is just as it was related. With this understanding, Mmakgaeng remarks as follows: "Ke tshaba Modimo le badimo." (Act IV: scene ii) [I fear God and the gods.] It would seem that Mmakgaeng's expression is meant for persuading the other interactants to regard God, in association with the gods, as the provider of individual's requirements; as long as the concerned individual fears Him.

It is significant that persuasion is incremental; for, Hlakahlothwane expatiates on Mmakgaeng's foregoing statement in these words:

"Bana ba ka, ka mehla ha motho a tshaba Modimo o ye a tshediswe leetong la hae. Ke bolela tjena hore lefatsheng mona Modimo wa motho ke motswadi wa motho. O ke ke wa tella batswadi ba hao yaba o lebella hore Modimo o mahodimong o ka o hlompha. Jwang? Tjhe, o lokela ho qala ka tseo o di bonang o ntano fetela ho tseo o sa di boneng. Le re hlomphile bana ba ka. Re a leboha. Ao batho ba Ranthethe!" (Act IV: scene ii)

[My children, when one always fears God, one is consoled in one's journey. I mean that on this earth the God of an individual is the individual's parent. You cannot disrespect your parents and hope that you can respect God in the heavens. How? No, you have to start with those that you see and then pass over to those that you do

not see. You have respected us my children. We give thanks. Oh, people of Ranthethe!"]

Apparently, Mmakgaeng's statement above has worked as a persuasive plan for Hlakahlothwane to interact in the manner stated above. First and foremost, he reiterates Mmakgaeng's statement above, concerning the idea of fearing God; and further persuades his son and daughter-in-law to continue fearing God; as He is the source and giver of all that people need. Furthermore, Hlakahlothwane restates Mmakgaeng's earlier statement she addressed to Habai (Act I: scene i) that 'ntatao ke Modimo wa hao.' In this way, Hlakahlothwane is persuading both his son and daughter-in-law to maintain the respect they have so far afforded them as parents; thus reinforcing the belief and understanding they already have proved to their parents so far. Testimony of the foregoing is contained in Mmaboitshwaro's statement addressed to Habai towards the end of Act I: scene iii; where she attempted to persuade Habai to reconcile with his father after the squabble that ensued between them. Further still, Hlakahlothwane's final statement above seems to be an endeavour at persuading the other interactants to give thanks to the gods; and also seems to remind them of their ancestors by making reference to 'batho ba Ranthethe.'

In line with Hlakahlothwane's teachings above, Mmakgaeng demonstrates her full agreement with him. She comments that Hlakahlothwane's words are great; for as parents, they have always been afforded respect by both Habai and Mmaboitshwaro – and according to her, that is why God and the gods have provided Habai and Mmaboitshwaro with an opportunity for bearing their own child. Additionally, Mmakgaeng expresses her wish and desire that the expected child be a boy; for it is the only way in which their name as a family will be sustained, even after their death, she says. As a form of prayer, and a persuasive plan for all to support her in her wishes and desires, Mmakgaeng says, "E se e ka e ka ba moshanyana basadi. Morena a roriswe. Amen!" (Act IV: scene ii) [How I wish that it be a boy guys. May the Lord be praised! Amen!] It would seem that Mmakgaeng's foregoing communication has worked as reinforcement for all to be in unison with her wishes and desires – as they collectively pronounce their agreement with her by saying "Amen!" (Act IV: scene ii) [So be it, they say]

With a goal of persuading the young couple to ensure that they consult their gynaecologist, Hlakahlothwane inquires as to whether or not they have informed him of the present situation. In response, Mmaboitshwaro explains to him that they were with him mere yesterday; whereupon he gave them a confirmation; adding that, "Ke ka lebaka lena e itseng ha e le mona re e na le bonnete ra re ekakgona re tlise ditaba badimong ba rona." (Act IV: scene ii) [It is for this reason that when we were given the assurance, we found it important to bring this news to our gods.] Needless to say, the above-captioned statement persuades

Hlakahlothwane to regard Mmaboitshwaro as a very important and vulnerable person in the family. The testimony of this view is highlighted in the following utterances by Hlakahlothwane in his address to Mmaboitshwaro:

“Ngwanaka o itlhokomele. Ke se ke ka ba ka utlwa ho thwe o ne o hlweletse hodimo o hlatswa mabota, o phahamisakaka dintho tse boima, o hopole hore o ntse o fokola. Ha e le hantle ha ditaba di le tjena, re ne re tla lokela ho tswela ntlo re ye ho lona kwana le mosadimoholo empa jwale oho leruonyana la rona. (Ba tsheha.) Kapa wena o tle kwano ngwetsi ya ka dikgwedinyana tsena tsa pele.” (Act IV: scene ii)

[Please take care of yourself my child. I should not hear that you were on a stepladder washing the walls, continually uplifting some heavy stuff, remember that you are still weak. By right when matters are like this, we were supposed to leave the house and go to you there with the old woman, but now please, our small possessions! (They laugh) Or you come here my daughter-in-law during these first months.]

As a parent that is experienced in matters of this kind, Hlakahlothwane makes it his goal to conscientise Mmaboitshwaro of what activities to avoid; lest she causes complications and problems for herself. In addition, he suggests that by right they should be leaving their house with Mmakgaeng so as to go and look after his daughter-in-law; or alternatively, she could come over to their home for safety keeping and protection. Apparently, Hlakahlothwane is voicing all these suggestions as a persuasive action for Mmaboitshwaro to safeguard her life; and always bear it in mind that in her state, she has to take extra care of her health to ensure good health for the expected child as well.

The above persuasive suggestions by Hlakahlothwane are also seemingly meant for Habai to take care of Mmaboitshwaro; and make sure that she never performs the mentioned activities, for she may experience some problems, as discussed above. It therefore comes not as a surprise that as Hlakahlothwane suggests that Mmaboitshwaro should come over and spend the first few months with them; Habai becomes fierce and says, “Butle ntate eo taba ke e mpotang ka ho le sa boneng.” (Act IV: scene ii) [Wait a minute father that issue goes around me from the blind side.] The idiomatic expression used by Habai above, ‘ho pota motho ka ho le sa boneng,’ is usually employed by an addressee who demonstrates his/her complaint about someone else’s action/s or suggestion/s that seem to disturb his/her peace and tranquility. It would then be anybody’s guess that Habai applies it here as persuasive action for his father to refrain from suggesting that Mmaboitshwaro should come over and stay with them for some time.

It then appears as if Hlakahlothwane was only teasing Habai; in which case one might deduce that his goal is to test Habai's love and care for Mmaboitshwaro. Now that Habai has demonstrated his possessiveness for his wife; Hlakahlothwane commends him for love and care for Mmaboitshwaro. He further makes reference to some men who have made it a point to be almost always away from their wives; or else exercise some harshness in addressing them; while in contrast, they use loving words in addressing concubines. Further, he indicates that the world is spoiled; but suddenly changes this view by saying, "... empa hona moo, lefatshe la Modimo ha le na molato, molato o ho motho." (Act IV: scene ii) [... but right there, the world of God has no fault, the fault is with a human being.] It would look as if Hlakahlothwane's employment of the above verbal expression is meant for persuading Habai to continue taking care of his wife; and to make sure that he does not behave as those men who ill-treat their wives, and blame the world for their misbehaviours. Upon realizing the depth of Hlakahlothwane's foregoing persuasive statement, Mmakgaeng interacts as follows: "O buile ntate. Ke a utlwa jwale pelo ya hao e tloha e eya mafisa." (Act IV: scene ii) [You have spoken father. I now hear that your heart might become despondent.]

In concert with all the interactions their parents have so far engaged in, Habai thanks them, indicating that he realises the unity into which they have all formed. In addition, he thanks the parents for persuading them to hang on to their behaviour of proving dear love for each other; as the parents' encouragements are indicative of the fact that his love with Mmaboitshwaro pleases them. Now that all has been discussed, Mmaboitshwaro suggests to Habai that it is late in the afternoon; thus persuading him to realise that it is about time they left for town, where they stay; using the idiomatic expression: "... hoja ra di bona matswele." (Act IV: scene ii) [... it is better for us to flee. (see Mabile and Dieterlen, 1985:205)]

In agreement with her daughter-in-law, Mmakgaeng reiterates her earlier statement in which she persuades the other interactants to keep Mmaboitshwaro's pregnancy state as a matter of secrecy. She even emphasises that, "Ebile bottle ke hore batho ba ke ba o sebe. E seng e be e se e le wena ya ntseng a ipolela. E re ha ho ka senyeha moo, motho o etse jwang?" (Act IV: scene ii) [And the right thing is for people to talk about you. It should not be you that already makes revelations. What about if it gets spoiled, what would someone do?] Signifying her feelings and her fright in Mmakgaeng's mention of the possibility of losing the foetus; Mmaboitshwaro says, "Mme se ke wa bua jwalo hle. Uhhh! Ke a kgolwa nka shwa le nna." (Act IV: scene ii) [Mother do not speak like that please. Ohhh! I believe that I can die too.] Without doubt, all these final interactions by these members of the family signify their concern for the survival of this foetus for which they have all contributed so much for its achievement. In other words, they are all persuaded to help one another in ensuring that Mmaboitshwaro is taken care of, so that she might succeed to bear the long-wished

offspring. Not surprisingly, Habai thanks all members of the family present here, addressing them as “ba heso,” (Act IV: scene ii) [my fellow people] thus seemingly indicating his commitment in abiding by all the persuasive attempts that have been made so far.

When time has come for her to deliver, Mmaboitshwaro pleads with Habai to go home and request Mmakgaeng to come and be of assistance to her during these final days of her pregnancy. As a persuasive action for Habai to understand the reason why she wants Mmakgaeng in particular; Mmaboitshwaro completes her request in this way: “... jwalo ka motho e moholo hore a mpe a tlo ba kwano ho fihlela ke eya sepetlele.” (Act IV: scene iii) [... as an elderly person to please come and be here until I go to the hospital.] As might be presumed, Habai welcomes the request; and adds that Mmakgaeng’s presence will alleviate his usual routine of ever coming back from work to check on Mmaboitshwaro. For him, the other person who will be relieved of her daily involvement in giving some assistance to Mmaboitshwaro is Mmankokoto; as he says:

“Esitana le yena Mmankokoto ke motho. O tla tloha a kgathala. Jwale monna ha ke ya hae kwaa o tla sala le mang? (Act IV: scene iii)

[Even she, Mmankokoto, is a human being. She will eventually get tired. Now man, when I go to that far off home, with who will you remain?]

After ensuring him that she will request Mmankokoto to check on her while Habai has gone home, the husband and wife come to an agreement that Habai should go right away after work. In addition, Mmaboitshwaro asks him to go via Mmankokoto’s home, so as to give her the message for keeping in touch with her. Since he has already persuaded himself that Mmakgaeng’s presence will be a relief for both himself and Mmankokoto; Habai wastes no time by coming via his town home, but drives straight home to collect his mother. Like someone who was poised to go and assist her daughter-in-law, Mmakgaeng willingly gets into the car and goes to town with Habai.

When they arrive at Habai’s home in town, Mmakgaeng straight away inquires after her daughter-in-law’s health, addressing her as “ngwana mokgotsi.” (Act IV: scene iii) [my in-law’s child] It would appear that this kind of address is a reminder for Mmaboitshwaro that, as daughter-in-law, she is to fulfill her part by going through her pregnancy period successfully, in order to secure her place in this family. In addition, this address seems to be aimed at posing a question to Mmaboitshwaro after the reasons for which she has summarily summoned Mmakgaeng to her place in town. In line with that understanding, Mmaboitshwaro replies that her health is not so good. Further, she gives Mmakgaeng the goal behind her asking Habai to have summoned her here as that of gaining assistance, as in these words:

“Ke kopile ntate Habai ho ya o lata hae kwana hobane bekeng e tlang ena ke lokela ho ya kena sepetlele mme ngaka e se e bile e beile letsatsi la yona.” (Act IV: scene iii)

[I have asked father Habai to go and fetch you from home because next week I shall have to go into the hospital, and the doctor has already stated his date.]

As would be assumed, Mmakgaeng is baffled by the mention of an already decided date of delivery; for she is an elderly person that belongs to the rural areas where these modern practices are unheard of. In an attempt at persuading Mmaboitshwaro to explain more about this phenomenon to her, she quips in this manner: “Helang basadi, o se a beile letsatsi?” (Act IV: scene iii) [Hullo guys, he has already decided on the day?] In order to alleviate Mmakgaeng’s wonderment, Mmaboitshwaro explains to her that today’s wisdom is quite high. Mmakgaeng marvels more, and registers her wonderment by even calling out to the God of the Israelites; and further persuades Mmaboitshwaro to tell her more by asking this question: “Jwale haeka o dumetse diphate tjee mosadi o ne o ntse o etsa jwang matsatsi aa?” (Act IV: scene iii) [Now that you have made an agreement with the bed woman, how have you managed these days?]

Apparently, Mmakgaeng fails to understand how a woman in Mmaboitshwaro’s present situation manages to be alone without anybody assisting her, as she is so highly expectant. Attempting to persuade the former to calm down and understand how she copes with the present state of her pregnancy; Mmaboitshwaro explains that she usually gets up and perform certain chores whenever possible, because “... le yena ngaka o itse ke se ke ka fetoha motswalle wa diphate.” (Act IV: scene iii) [... even the doctor said that I should not become a friend to the bed.] The idiomatic expression, ‘ho fetoha motswalle wa diphate,’ is used in a situation where one is frequently in bed, due to illness. It would therefore mean that Mmaboitshwaro employs it here to conscientise her mother-in-law of the fact that she has not completely become bed-ridden; though she needs some assistance now and then.

In her further explanation, Mmaboitshwaro surmises that:

“Ha ho dumela ke nne ke tshwaretshware. Ke ntse ke thuswa ke motswalle wa ka Mmankokoto. Ke a kgolwa lebitso lona o tla le hopola le ha monnga lona o sa mo tsebe. Ho feta moo monna enwa wa ka o fumane sekoropo sa honna a kgutla mosebetsing a tlilo ntlhwela.” (Act IV: scene iii)

[Wherever possible I usually perform some chores. I am being assisted by my friend Mmankokoto. I believe that you will remember the name, even though you do not know the owner. Besides that this husband of mine has got a job of forever coming back from work to come and check on me.]

It would seem that Mmaboitshwaro gives Mmakgaeng the foregoing explanations with a purpose to persuade the former to realise that her coming to her for assistance is highly appreciated. Further, Mmaboitshwaro seems to conscientise Mmakgaeng of the fact that since she is in this advanced stage of her pregnancy, she needs her assistance; for she might not be able to perform all the necessary chores. Furthermore, Mmaboitshwaro's explanations may be analysed as persuasive attempts to make Mmakgaeng aware that even though Mmankokoto has sacrificed herself by giving some assistance here and there, it would be better and fair for Mmakgaeng, as mother-in-law, to take over from her; for from now on Mmaboitshwaro will need a family member, rather than a mere friend. Further still, when she mentions that her husband has got a job that forces him to always come back home to check the state of her wife; Mmaboitshwaro appears to drive her persuasive goal for Mmakgaeng to realise how costly the whole exercise is for Habai.

Unsurprisingly, Mmakgaeng has been persuaded to understand the prevailing situation in Habai's family; a situation that calls for her to stay with Mmaboitshwaro for now in these final stages of her pregnancy. Mmakgaeng's submission to Mmaboitshwaro's persuasion to gain her assistance is realizable when she claps her hands with amazement, saying: "Basadi! Bana ba ka ba tla ba le bona ka ntate a shwele. Jwale ausi o re sepetlele o ilo kena neng?" (Act IV: scene iii) [Oh women! My children have experienced hard times, I bet by my dead father. Now sister, when are you going to the hospital?] In response to Mmakgaeng's expressions above, Mmaboitshwaro mentions Tuesday as the day on which she has to go to the hospital. As if with an expectation that Habai should have decided whether or not Mmaboitshwaro should go to the hospital on her due date, Mmakgaeng inquires: "Habai o itseng? Jo nna ngwanaka!" (Act IV: scene iii) [What has Habai said? Alas my child!]

Apparently driving her persuasive goal of eliciting support from Mmakgaeng during this stage of life and death situation that might be experienced during labour; Mmaboitshwaro answers her as follows: "Ha ho letho leo a ka le etsang. O ntokolotse ka pelo e tshweu. Taba ya hae e se e le hore ke kgutle ke ntse ke phela." (Act IV: scene iii) [There is nothing he can do. He has released me with a white heart (glad heart). What matters for him is for me to come back alive.] As an indication of her support, Mmakgaeng persuades her daughter-in-law to plug up courage and hope that she will go through the labour process successfully and come back alive; saying:

"O tla kgutla o ntse o phela ngwanaka. Dingaka tsa lona di tseba mosebetsi wa tsona. Ke mona re bone ntho eo re neng re sa kgolwe hore re ka e bona. Eseng nke ke o tlohele o phomole mosadi?" (Act IV: scene iii)

[You will come back alive my child. Your doctors know their work. Here we have seen something that we never thought we would see. How about leaving you alone to rest woman?]

In line with Mmakgaeng's words of encouragement and assurance for her to go through the labour processes successfully; Mmaboitshwaro agrees with her mother-in-law's suggestion for her to be given a chance to rest. It would seem that Mmakgaeng's comforting words have functioned as an action to persuade Mmaboitshwaro to pluck up courage and trust that her road towards bearing her child is going to be smooth; since her doctors are such versatile ones that have performed a seemingly miraculous achievement, by making it possible for her to conceive after so many trials by other doctors.

Finally, Mmaboitshwaro has been admitted into the hospital for going through the labour processes. At work, Habai is unsettled; to an extent that he requests Nkokoto to check whether or not the paperwork he has been engaged in is properly done. As a persuasive action for Habai to stay calm and relax; Nkokoto informs Habai that he has long realised that he is rather unsettled. In light of that realization, he assures Habai that he has traversed this road of anxiety, whenever his wife, Mmankokoto, would be in Mmaboitshwaro's present situation. Further, he encourages Habai to be courageous and restrain himself against this state of inconstancy. Furthermore, in response to Habai's pronouncement that he is so confused and afraid that he can not even perform his duties efficiently; Nkokoto advises him as follows:

“Bea butle more. Tseo tsohle di matsohong a Mmopi. Mookamedi o ne a mpitsitse ka taba ya hore o elellwa hore o batla o ferekane ha e le mona letsatsi le ntse le phahama empa o sa fumane molaetsa wa letho.” (Act IV: scene v)

[Take it easy brother. All those are in the hands of the Creator. The manager had called me about his realization that you seem confused now that the sun continues rising, and you have not yet got any message.]

Since Nkokoto reiterates the gynaecologist's earlier words in their meetings with Habai and Mmaboitshwaro – that 'tsohle di matsohong a Mmopi' – it would seem that Nkokoto's statement is meant for persuading Habai to be in concert with the gynaecologist in that respect. In addition, Nkokoto's revelation that the manager has registered his concern about Habai's situation would appear as a persuasive action for Habai to understand that he is not alone in this matter – as he has the support of the manager himself.

Ostensibly, Habai misses the point and Nkokoto's intentions in highlighting him on the manager's concern; for he poses the question, “Jwale?” (Act IV: scene v) [And so?] Habai's question then motivates Nkokoto to divulge the whole information concerning the manager's

feelings and suggestions. He quips in this manner: “Jwale o ne a re o mpe o yo phomola hae. Hang ha molaetsa o fihla ke tla tliša ditaba tseo.” (Act IV: scene v) [Now he was suggesting that you go home and rest. Immediately the message arrives I will carry the news to you.] Rather than working as a persuasive plan for Habai to change orientation; the manager’s suggestions work as a reversal; for Habai vehemently registers his intent to stay here at work so that he might receive the news himself. To that effect he quips in this manner to demonstrate his noncompliance with the manager’s suggestions:

“Tjhe, tjhe, tjhe, tjhe ngwaneso. Ke lula mona; ke batla ho ikutlwela ditaba tšeno ka tša ka ditsebe. (Ka bohale) Ke a dula mona, Nkokoto o a nkutlwa?” (Act IV: scene v)

[No, no, no, no my brother! I stay here; I want to hear that news with my own ears. (With fury) Do you hear me, Nkokoto?]

Since Habai has made his mind to stick around and hear the long waited for piece of news himself; it is interesting to see how he behaves when the phone rings. Indeed, even as Nkokoto has merely retorted: “Ke a utlwa moreso,” (Act IV: scene v) [I hear you my brother] the phone rings. As would be anybody’s guess, all Habai’s colleagues become confused, and none ventures to go and pick up the phone. Ultimately, Nkokoto is called in to receive the message. To his surprise, when he comes back to tell Habai that the message is for him; Habai can only stare at him like one that is in a trance of some sort. Ultimately, Habai comes out of his stupor like one who has been dreaming; and goes out shouting: “Jo! Jo! Jo! Nna wee! Jeso wa ka! Modimo wa ka!” (Act IV: scene v) [Alas! Alas! Alas! Poor me! My Jesus! My God!]

Since Habai has always been concerned about whether or not Mmaboitshwaro would come back alive from the labour chamber; it makes sense that he presently seems to have lost all his senses. Though he demonstrated his intent at obtaining the news personally earlier; his present state of shock and uncertainty are now overpowering him. In order to drive his goal of saving Habai from any further damage to either his senses or his brain; the manager instructs the workers to catch him and bring him in. Once inside, the local nurse is instructed to give him an injection that would lower his tension. As a further persuasive action to save Habai from a possible damage to his sensibilities, the manager drives the goal of changing orientation by instructing Nkokoto to take him home, where he might rest until he feels alright once more. Without any waste of time Nkokoto performs as he is instructed; and puts Habai into bed for resting at home.

It might be anybody’s conjecture that Habai’s present state frightens Mmakgaeng; as Habai left home in a seemingly good state of health. In an effort at persuading Mmakgaeng to take this situation easy; and be positive that Habai will be alright when he comes to; Nkokoto

involves Mmakgaeng in the following verbal exchanges, after Habai has been placed in his bed:

Mmakgaeng: Nkokoto ngwanaka jwale ke bontshwang?

[Nkokoto my child, what am I being shown now?]

Nkokoto: Mme monna enwa wa heso o ile a thaba ho tlola tekanyo; le jwale o phephisehile feela. Le hoja re ntse re sa ke dingaka haeso mosebetsing mane, monna enwa a ka be a tswile kotsi kelellong.

[Mother, this fellow man was overpowered by merriment; even now he has just been saved. Even though we are not like doctors there at our work, this man might have sustained some brain damage.]

Mmakgaeng: Ngwanaka! (Act IV: scene v)

[Oh my child!]

Now that he has managed to calm down Mmakgaeng, Nkokoto further makes an attempt at persuading her to take matters more positively. He reveals the message contents that have somehow caused Habai's present state of health; in the following words:

“Ka nnete mme. Mohlomong ha a tsoha mona o tla be a boetse boyeneng, ha re tshepe. Jwale ditaba tseo re di fumaneng ho tswa sepetlele kwana nkgono ke tse reng mohlankana o fihlile mme a yo latwa ka Labohlano; neng kapa neng.” (Act IV: scene v)

[It is true mother. May be when he wakes up he will have come back to his true senses, let us hope. Now the news that we received from the hospital grandmother is that the young man has arrived and must be fetched on Friday; at any time.]

In the light of Habai's present state, Nkokoto employs the foregoing communication to achieve more than one persuasive goal. In the first place, he ensures Mmakgaeng that though Habai might have been in a worse position; he will wake up in his right senses. In this case his goal is that of creating some hope in Mmakgaeng for Habai's recuperation from his present state. In addition, he addresses Mmakgaeng as 'nkgono' to drive his goal of inspiring her to happily accept her status of being a grandmother to Habai's newly born son, it would seem. Finally, he makes reference to Habai's newly born son as 'mohlankana,' the reference which might be viewed as a persuasive action of elevating Mmakgaeng's spirit; and inspire her to regard the infant as one who is soon going to grow into a young man that the family will be proud of.

As an indication that she has been permeable to Nkokoto's persuasion, Mmakgaeng responds by quipping in these utterances:

“Ke a leboha ngwanaka. Hodima tsohle ke leboha Modimo. Ke re ke leboha Modimo. (O dula fatshe o itlhakola meokgo.) Ke se ke tshaba ho thaba tlolo ya molao esere ra tswa kotsi kaofela ha rona. Modimo ke leboha leseae. Ke bile ke leboha bophelo ba lona le ba mma lona. Ke mang ya neng a tseba? Ekaba ntataemoholo o tla re lebitso ke mang basadi?” (Act IV: scene v)

[I thank you my child. Above all I thank God. I say that I thank God. (She sits down and wipes off the tears.) I am now afraid of being extremely happy, in case we all fall victim to accident. God, I thank you for the infant. I also give thanks for its health and that of its mother. Who had known? By the way what name will its grandfather give to it, women?]

Needless to say, Mmakgaeng thanks Nkokoto for all that he has done to ensure that Habai comes home to rest safely in his house. In addition, she thanks him for persuading her to look at this matter from the positive point of view; as has been illustrated above. Further, it comes not as astonishment for Mmakgaeng to state that above all she thanks God; for since the beginning of the family struggle for making it possible for Mmaboitshwaro to bear a child; the family and the gynaecologist have always put their trust in God. That is why Mmakgaeng even puts emphasis on that aspect (Ke re ke leboha Modimo.); to signify the depth of her thanks to God. When she sits down and wipes off the tears, it becomes clear that Nkokoto's persuasive attempts have worked positively on her; they have been formative persuasive attempts that have motivated her into taking matters easy for the sake of good health for all. Were she not afraid of ending up as Habai has, she would demonstrate her merriment at this moment; rather, she engages herself in a soliloquy and applies an apostrophe by addressing God Himself, as in: 'Modimo ke leboha leseae,’ above.

According to Abrams (1993:182), an apostrophe is “a direct and explicit address either to an absent person or to an abstract or nonhuman entity. Often the effect is of high formality, or else of a sudden emotional impetus.” Since the greater part of Mmakgaeng's utterances above is in a soliloquy, and not addressed to him per se, all Nkokoto can say is, “Nkgono ke sa o siya. Tsebisa moreso ditaba tseo.” (Act IV: scene v) [Grandmother I now leave you. Inform my brother of those issues.] He then goes into his car and drives off; apparently with the feeling and trust that his persuasive endeavours with Mmakgaeng have been successful.

Whereas Nkokoto left Habai resting, and seemingly in a stable condition; it comes as a big surprise for Mmakgaeng to learn from Habai – when he becomes conscious – that he is really sick. As a persuasive action for Mmakgaeng to consider the prevailing situation as an urgent one, Habai quips thus: “Hlooho ena ya ka e opa haholo. Batla thuso ka pele ho Mmankokoto.” (Act IV: scene v) [This head of mine is very painful. Quickly seek for

assistance from Mmankokoto.] To her astonishment, Mmakgaeng realises that Habai does not respond to her quips anymore; nor can he manage to open his mouth. As might be expected, this prevailing state of Habai forces Mmakgaeng to waste no more time, but to rush towards Mmankokoto's home to gain assistance.

Even as she tries to call his name, Mmankokoto fails to get any response from Habai; and she resultantly finds herself left with no option but to phone Nkokoto for taking Habai to the doctor. In response, Nkokoto comes in and persuades Mmankokoto to assist him to carry the patient into the car and ferry him to the doctor. At the surgery, the doctor discovers that Habai needs an immediate operation; such that he informs Nkokoto of this requirement in these persuasive words:

“Monna wa heso ke lokela ho bitsa koloi ya bakudi e ntse e le hona jwale ke mo romele sepetlele mona hae mme ho be ho yo etswa oporeishene e potlakileng ya mothapo ona wa madi a hloohong.” (Act IV: scene v)

[My fellow man I have to call an ambulance right now and send him to the local hospital where a quick operation of this blood vessel can be done.]

As might be observed, the foregoing doctor's expression is unpunctuated, except for the full stop. In the light of this observation, one might venture to say that this is a persuasive action for highlighting Nkokoto of the emergency required for safeguarding Habai's life. No doubt, Nkokoto is absorbent to the doctor's persuasion; for he quips as follow: “Ka moo o ka bolelang feela ngaka.” (Act IV: scene v) [As you may say it doctor.] As a result, Habai is ferried to the local hospital for an immediate operation as suggested by the doctor. Though the doctor suggests that Nkokoto is at liberty to go together with Habai in the same ambulance, the former retorts that he is going to use his own vehicle, since he is with his wife.

Eventually, Nkokoto and Mmankokoto arrive home and go straight to Habai's house to highlight Mmakgaeng of her son's condition. As a persuasive action for comforting Mmakgaeng, Nkokoto informs her that Habai has been admitted in the hospital; and further tells her that they have been asked to see him tomorrow – apparently aiming to ensure her that Habai is now in able hands that will ensure his safety. In an effort to convey her gratitude for their assistance, Mmakgaeng says the following words to Nkokoto and Mmankokoto: “Oho bana ba ka, ke hloka mantswa le dipotso; ha ke tsebe hore ke botse tse reng eng.” (Act IV: scene v) [Oh please my children, I lack words and questions; I do not know what kind to ask.” Further, she asks them what the doctors have said; thus persuading them to divulge Habai's state to her; as she has been so much affected by the state in which he was when he was taken to the hospital.

In response to Mmakgaeng's question above, Nkokoto gives this answer:

“Ngaka e re ka baka la thabo, ho na le mothapo o ileng wa tlala madi hoo o neng o saletswe ke ho taboha mme he e ne e ka ba kotsi e tshabehang. Le ha ho le jwalo o re tshepitsitse hore ho tloha hosasa fela, o tla ikutlwa a pholohile.” Act IV: scene v)

[The doctor says because of happiness, there is one blood vessel that got filled up with blood to an extent that it was just left with rupturing and in that case that would have been a terrible accident. Even so he promised us that as from mere tomorrow, he will feel that he is safe.]

Once more, it becomes important to observe the speed with which Nkokoto gives the above information to Mmakgaeng. For example, the initial sentence has only one comma, which marks a pause for Mmakgaeng to understand the reason behind Habai's ailment. In addition, while one would expect another comma after the word 'taboha,' such is not the case in this sentence. It would then appear that Nkokoto ignores this pause with calculated intention of ensuring Mmakgaeng of Habai's safety; even though he was nearly involved in that unpronounced accident. In line with this speculation, it might be safe for one to conclude that Nkokoto engages this quick speed in delivering this message to drive a persuasive goal of eliciting support by assuring Mmakgaeng that Habai is in safe hands. Finally, Nkokoto makes an attempt at persuading Mmakgaeng to calm down by indicating that the signals that indicate Habai's recuperation will be noticed as soon as tomorrow, according to the doctor's reassurance, he says.

In highlighting her satisfaction and appreciation of Nkokoto's interventions, Mmakgaeng surmises that “Ke kgotso.” (Act IV: scene v) [It is peace.] Seemingly, Mmakgaeng is mesmerised by Nkokoto's persuasive attempts to calm her down. Upon noticing this mesmerism, Nkokoto gives her the final information that concerns Mmaboitshwaro and the infant, saying:

“Ke hantle mme. Ke kopile e moholo mane mosebetsing hore hosane ke tla ya lata Mmaboitshwaro le ngwana. Jwale ka ha e ne e le takatso ya Habai ke tla be ke yo lata ntate Hlakahlothwane a mpe a tlo ba hae mona.” (Act IV: scene v)

[It is alright mother. I have asked the manager there at work that tomorrow I shall go and fetch Mmaboitshwaro and the child. Since it was Habai's wish I will also fetch father Hlakahlothwane so that he may be here at home.]

Although Mmakgaeng appreciates Nkokoto's intentions concerning Mmaboitshwaro, she advises him that Hlakahlothwane should not be brought over; for he might be overly affected by the present situation in which Habai is; and cause other problems. For that matter, she finally proposes that Hlakahlothwane should only be informed about the child; thus

persuading Nkokoto to withhold the issue concerning Habai's ailment. Apparently with an aim of propelling the persuasive goal of eliciting support to Mmakgaeng; Nkokoto quips in this manner:

“Tsohle di utlwahetse. Re tla bonana he nkgono. Ke tla o romella ngwananyana wa ka e moholwanyane hore a tlo o lota.” (Act IV: scene v)

[All are understood. We shall see each other then grand mother. I will send you my older daughter so that she may keep you company.]

When he comes back the following day, Nkokoto continues to motivate Mmakgaeng into adopting a positive mood. He engages a mood of joviality in relating Habai's health in these words: “Mme Mmakgaeng ke ne ke le sepetlele kwana ka hora ya leshome. Hei, motho wa ka ka nnete ka fumana a hlaphohetswe a bile a qoqa.” (Act IV: scene vi) [Mother Mmakgaeng, I was over there at the hospital at ten o'clock. Hallo, I found my person much better and even chatting.] Possibly with an intention of persuading Nkokoto to tell her more about Habai's health state; Mmakgaeng registers her appreciation of the information by quipping in this manner, “O reng na ngwanaka!” (Act IV: scene vi) [What are you saying now my child!] In response to Mmakgaeng's above expression of wonderment, Nkokoto corroborates his statement above and says, “Ka nnete mme. O re o robetse hantle ka tsela e makatsang ebile ba mo tshepitsitse ho mo lokolla ka Mantaha.” (Act IV: scene vi) [Indeed mother. He says that he has had such a wonderful sleep and they have promised to release him on Monday.]

In the light of Nkokoto's above information, Mmankokoto elicits support for him by opining as follows: “Ruri ke lehlohonolo le makatsang. Ka moo re neng re ferekane maobane ke ne ke sa kgolwe hore re ka utlwa ditaba tse kgothatsang tjena.” (Act IV: scene vi) [Indeed it is a wonderful luck. The way we were so confused yesterday I never thought that we were to hear such encouraging news.] Even before Mmakgaeng can respond, Nkokoto suggests to Mmankokoto that they should go, so as to ensure that they come back home in time. In agreement with her husband, Mmankokoto corroborates the aspect of time and indicates that she has already put together the infant's items; thus persuading Mmakgaeng to remain with clear conscience that everything is in order. As an indication that she is satisfied about everything this couple has done for Habai's family, Mmakgaeng quips thus: “Ho lokile bana ba ka. Eyang le Morena.” (Act IV: scene vi) [It is alright my children. Go with the Lord.] Since this couple has given Mmakgaeng some good news and encouraged her to accept that matters concerning Habai's family are in good hands; they quickly go into their car and rush to the hospital to fetch Mmaboitshwaro and the infant.

When they arrive at the hospital, Mmankokoto and Mmaboitshwaro engage in the following verbal exchanges:

Mmankokoto: Dumela hle Mmaboitshwaro ngwaneso! (O a mo aka) Mmannyeo re thaba jwang ho boela re bonana! Moshanyana o kae hle?

[Good morning please Mmaboitshwaro my sister! (She kisses her) Mother-of-so-and-so how happy we are to see each other once more! Where is the small boy please?]

Mmaboitshwaro: Dumela ngwaneso! Le nna ke a leboha ha re boetse re bonana. Moshanyana ke enwa moalong mona, hlo o mo apese haeba o mo tletse sanketlana. (Mmankokoto o nka ngwana o a mo dumedisa o mo apesa a ntse a mo kgotsa ho rateha.) Empa monna ka o kae Mmankokoto?

[Good morning sister! I am also grateful that we once more see each other. The small boy is here in bed, please dress him up if you have brought him some clothing. (Mmankokoto takes the infant, greets and dresses it while marveling at its loveliness.) But where is by husband, Mmankokoto?]

Mmankokoto: O teng hle ngwaneso, feela ke tlile le ntate Nkokoto. Ke yena ya seng a tla o behela ditaba. (Act IV: scene vi)

[He is there please my sister, but I have come with father Nkokoto. He is the one who will furnish you with the issues.]

As contained in the above-quoted verbal exchanges, Mmankokoto and Mmaboitshwaro exchange greetings, and even kiss each other. Greetings, as it was shown earlier in this study, are meant for establishing rapport between/among interlocutors. These greetings might therefore be regarded as some form of persuasive endearment for these communicators to open up and feel free to discuss any issues that are in the characters' plans; while kissing each other signals their sisterly intimacy and love. When Mmankokoto addresses Mmaboitshwaro as 'ngwaneso' above, one ventures to conclude that she employs this form of address and action as some persuasive strategy for the latter to appreciate the former's love and care for her. Further, when she declares that it is pleasurable for them to once more see each other; Mmankokoto augments her sisterly attachment to Mmaboitshwaro; thus encouraging the latter to value their oneness in the prevailing situation.

Having gone through the formalities of greetings above, Mmankokoto inquires after the small boy's whereabouts as an indication that both mother and child are their main concern as friends and family. As is normal among communicators, Mmaboitshwaro returns the greetings and the pleasure of seeing her sisterly friend; as a sign of her gratitude and appreciation for gaining assistance of this kind from the Nkokoto's family. Without any waste

of time, she inquires after the whereabouts of her husband; as a forewarning that she has been worried that he has never communicated with her since the day of labour. Whereas one might suggest that Mmankokoto's inquiry about the small boy was on the other hand intended for persuading Mmaboitshwaro to focus her attention at the infant; the latter's inquiry over Habai's where about persuades the former to pronounce that he is present; and yet she intimates that, since she has come with Nkokoto, he is the one who will relate the matters to the latter.

It might be important to realise that Mmaboitshwaro poses the above question about Habai's situation, even as Mmankokoto continues marveling at the loveliness of the infant. In this way, this moment marks her as a tormented woman who has since been hoping to communicate this wonderful gift of a baby boy with Habai after such a long struggle. It comes not as astonishment, therefore, that Mmankokoto's retort persuades Mmaboitshwaro to remark in this manner:

“Ke ile ka hla ka utlwa moyeng hore ntho e nngwe e teng. Monnaka o letswalo ke a mo tseba ebile o hlolwa ke thabo. (Act IV: scene vi)

[I had already felt it in my spirit that there is something. My husband is a coward I know him, and he is overpowered by happiness.]

Mmaboitshwaro's above statements indicate that she is a self-persuaded woman; for the knowledge of her husband's character disposition has motivated her in sustaining herself up to this moment. Otherwise, she would possibly be in a state of trauma at this moment; for she would not know what to think about Habai's absence. Even as Nkokoto explains everything concerning Habai's state, Mmaboitshwaro remains calm and resilient; thus signifying her state of being self-persuaded. As the playwright puts it, Nkokoto "... a fumana mosadi ya tsebang ho jara ditaba." (Act IV: scene vi) [... regarded her as a woman who knows how to shoulder the news.]

When the mother and child arrive home, they are welcomed by Mmakgaeng; who pronounces her joviality in these words: "Oho bana ke thabile hona hoo ke sitwang ho itlhalosa. Ke ngwana, ke mohala, oho ke kopane hlooho." (Act IV: scene vi) [Oh children I am so happy that I fail to explain myself. It is a child, it is a phone message, oh, I am bewildered.] Needless to say, though her statements force one to speculate, Mmakgaeng has reason enough to be so happy; for seemingly all has finally gone well. In the light of the foregoing statements, one might undertake to say that Mmakgaeng's persuasive goal is for all to realise that Habai is alright too. She therefore elicits their support in this respect. In response, Mmaboitshwaro once more demonstrates her resilience and self-persuasion in these statements:

“Mme dipelo tsa rona di tletse teboho e fetisisang. Re se re tla leboha hape ha ntate Nkokoto a ka ya re latela ntate Habai sepetlele. Ka moo ke mo tsebang ke motho ya nang le tshepo le ha a le boi.” (Act IV: scene vi)

[Mother, our hearts are full of overflowing gratitude. We shall give thanks again if father Nkokoto can go and fetch father Habai from the hospital for us. The way I know him, he is a person with hope even though he is a coward.]

Apparently with persuasive attempt for all to relax and leave everything in his hands, Nkokoto surmises that all is well. Further, he announces his intentions towards assisting this family by saying:

“Ke tla fihla ka Mantaha lapeng mona. Hosane ke tla ke ke letsetse sepetlele ho utlwa hore o ntse a eya jwang. Ke sa ya ba heso. Mmankokoto, ke tla o lata ka phirimana o se ke wa tshwenyeha.” (Act IV: scene vi)

[I shall arrive here at home on Monday. Tomorrow I will try and phone the hospital to find out how he is doing. I am gone my fellow people. Mmankokoto, I will fetch you in the night, do not worry.]

One might guess correctly that besides persuading all concerned to feel at home and realise that he is there for them; Nkokoto also propels his persuasive goal for Mmankokoto to feel free to render her assistance to the Habai’s family without being pressurised in any way. His final statement above functions as a persuasive assurance for her to stay there for Mmaboitshwaro’s sake; as he is prepared to fetch her in the night.

Since Nkokoto has promised to fetch Habai on this Monday, Mmakgaeng and Mmaboitshwaro engage in verbal exchanges about the latter’s state of health. In their discussion, Mmakgaeng expresses her happiness for having learned that Habai is alright, after a successful operation that was performed on him. Seemingly, Mmaboitshwaro is party to this information, for she answers Mmakgaeng in this way:

“Mme re hloka mantswe a teboho. Ke tla boela ke leboha motsotso oo ntate Habai a tlang ho kopana le letsibolo la hae. (Ho utlwahala modumo wa koloi.) Helang mme e se e le bontate Habai. Ao basadi ke lehlohonolo le le kaakang.” (Act: IV: scene vi)

[Mother, we lack words of gratitude. I will also give thanks to the moment father Habai meets his first-born child. (A car sound is heard) Hallo mother it is already them. Oh guys what a great luck!]

Clearly, Mmaboitshwaro, as a self-persuaded character, endeavours to persuade Mmakgaeng to join her in her positive mood and give thanks for matters to be ending so well. In addition, Mmaboitshwaro persuades Mmakgaeng to consider the moment of father-meets-

first born son as an important moment that calls for thanks-giving. Not astonishingly, when she realises that Habai and Nkokoto are arriving now even before she finishes her communication with Mmakgaeng, Mmaboitshwaro claims that this is a moment of great luck. In this way, she seems to augment her own foregoing utterance above in an attempt at persuading Mmakgaeng to indeed consider this as an important moment that has been awaited for.

When Mmakgaeng welcomes Habai and Nkokoto outside, she greets them, and, in response, Habai hugs her; seemingly as a persuasive action for her to share the happiness that is overpowering him. Apparently as a motivation for Mmakgaeng to say something about the health state of the nursing mother and her infant; and also to register in his mother's senses that today he is also a father; Habai says, "Ao mme dumela hle! Ekaba bana ba ka ba kae?" (Act IV: scene vii) [Oh mother good morning please! By the way where are my children?] Like someone who is aware of the importance of this moment, of father-meet-son; Mmakgaeng responds to Habai's question, saying: "Ba teng ngwanaka mme ba tatetse ho teana le wena. Ha eka ha o hlotse tjee monna, o sebeditswe kae?" (Act IV: scene vii) [They are there my child and are in a hurry to meet you. How come you are not limping man, where were you operated on?] As an indication of his haste towards meeting his first born son, Habai explains to his mother that he was operated on the head; and quickly says:

"Ha re fete hle Nkokoto ngwaneso. (Ba kena ka phaposing moo Mmaboitshwaro a dutseng le ngwana.) Oho banna! Mosadiaka dumela hle! (O a mo aka.) Ekaba o phela hantle, hona ngwanaka o kae, na ke yena eo? Oho banna ke thaka ntatae. Banna o moholo ha kaakang. Dumela hle monna!" (Act IV: scene vii)

[Let us pass please Nkokoto my brother. (They go into the room in which Mmaboitshwaro is with the infant.) Oh guys! Good morning please my wife! (He embraces her.) By the way, are you alright, and where is my child, is he this one? Oh guys he is the age mate of his father. Goodness he is so big. Good morning please man!]

Seemingly, the happiness that is overpowering Habai causes him to say and ask many questions at the same time. With an aim of persuading him to ask at least one at a time, Mmaboitshwaro makes Habai aware that the issues and questions he asks are so many that it becomes impossible for one to respond to them at the same time. To everybody's surprise, instead of responding to Mmaboitshwaro, Habai now addresses Nkokoto, saying:

"Nkokoto ngwaneso ako shebe ngwanaka hle! Ekaba banna ke tla mo reha lebitso lefe? E sa le ke ntse ke nahana taba ya lebitso. Ekaba motho o tla re ke mang? Letlotlo, Palesa, Lehakwe, Tlhaku? Banna ke kopane hlooho!" (Act IV: scene vi)

[Nkokoto my brother please look at my child! By the way guys what name am I going to give to him? Letlotlo, Palesa, Lehakwe, Tlhaku? Guys I am so bewildered.]

No doubt, Habai's happiness has reached an uncontrollable stage; as he ironically even says it himself above. He thinks of so many names from which he might chose one for his child – thus indicating that he has even forgotten his cultural and customary regulations and practices concerning the naming of a first born in a family. As a Mosotho child himself, Habai is expected to realise that his first born child is to be named by his father, Hlakahlothwane in this case; for he is still alive and well. When he even remarks that he is bewildered, it becomes clear that he is not clear of what he is talking about. Otherwise, he is eliciting support from Nkokoto to join him in his moment of happiness.

It therefore comes not as a surprise that at this stage Mmakgaeng intervenes and cautions him as follows:

“Se ke wa nahana haholo ka taba eno. Mohlomong ntatao o tla rata hore e be yena ya rehang ngwana lebitso jwalo ka ha ebile e le letsibolo. Etswe o sa ntse o fokola haholo Motaung.” (Act IV: scene vi)

[Do not think much about that issue. May be your father would like that it be himself that gives a name to the child, especially because this is the first born child. The more so you are still weak Motaung.]

The above intervention by Mmakgaeng is to be regarded as a persuasive action for Habai to take matters easy; and refrain from thinking too much about matters that do not even seem to concern him. In addition, this intervention is to be seen as a persuasive attempt for Habai to be conscious of the fact that the naming of first born, among the Basotho, as shown above, is an aspect that is left for the father's parents; and in particular, the male parent. Further, Mmakgaeng's intervention above might be regarded as a trial for persuading Habai of the importance of staying calm; as he is presently weak due to the effect of operation he sustained.

In response to the persuasive attempts above, Habai responds in a lengthy monologue; as if he is merely talking to himself; without realizing the fact that he is in other people's company. Importantly, his monologue still marks him as a muddled up character with uncoordinated speech, as in the following:

“O a bolela mme. Re lokela ho neha ntate sebaka sa ho reha ngwana lebitso. Motswalle Nkokoto a mpe a yo tsebisa ntate ditaba tsena e le hore a phethe mosebetsi wa hae. Ke hopola hore a ka ya hosane mantsiboya empa tjhe ke bobebe mme; ke tshwana le tlou e ka kanyapang morwalo wa yona e ntse e le hona jwale. Nka ya hohle moo motho a ka ntaelang; Nkokoto o tla lokela ho nkisa; e bo, Nkokoto

ha a sa ya a le mong. Ha ke utlwe le ha e le lehlaba mona moo ke teng. Banna, le utlwisise hore kajeno ke fumane perela, letlotlo, ntho eo e leng kgale ke e llela. Ke tla tseba le hore ha ke ntse ke sebetsa tjena ke sebeletsa mang. Ke a o leboha mosadiaka. (Act IV: scene vi)

[You are correct mother. We have to give father a chance of naming the child. My friend Nkokoto will please go and inform father about these matters so that he may perform his duty. I think that he can go tomorrow afternoon but no I am light mother; I am like an elephant that can forcibly carry its load right now. I can go anywhere where someone might instruct me to go to; Nkokoto will have to take me there; yes indeed, Nkokoto is no more going alone. I do not even feel any pain here where I am. Guys, you should understand that today I have got a pearl, a fortune, something that I have for a long time been crying for. I will also know as for whom I continue working as I do. I thank you my wife.]

Since Habai's monologue contains so many disjointed issues; one might consider him as someone who is still vulnerable; and as such one who still needs some assistance here and there. In the light of this vulnerability, Nkokoto is persuaded to drive him home to see Hlakahlothwane. When they arrive at Hlakahlothwane's home, Habai leaves out the nitty-gritties of greetings; as a persuasive action for the former to share with him the prevailing joviality. He calls upon his father; telling him that he has brought him some good news. In response to Habai's statement that he has brought him some good news; Hlakahlothwane asks the following rhetorical questions:

"Tse kang dife na Motaung? Na lesea le fihlile? Wena o ikutlwa jwang, o tswile neng sepetlele ha ke utlwile ka hlokwana-la-tsela hore o ile wa tsietsana ke thabo?" (Act IV: scene vi)

[Like which ones Motaung? Does it mean that the infant has arrived? How do you feel, when did you come out of the hospital as I got it from the grapevine that you were bewildered with happiness?]

For Habai, Hlakahlothwane's series of questions seem to waste time for him to share this happy moment with him as the grand father to the infant. As a demonstration of his desire for Hlakahlothwane to share this happy moment with him; Habai employs excitement as persuasive action, saying:

"Oho ntate dipotso tsa hao di ngata haholo. Lesea le fihlile Moshanyana! Moshanyana! Moshanyana ntate! (O kopa ntatae molaleng.) Ke tswile sepetlele maobane! Ke ikutlwa ke phetse le ho feta pele!" (Act IV: scene vi)

[Oh father your questions are too many. The infant arrived. A boy! A boy! A boy father! (He hugs his father) I came out of the hospital yesterday! I feel healthier than before!]

As might be expected, Hlakahlothwane submits to Habai's persuasion; and excitedly applies a totemic address in congratulating the son for this important achievement; as indeed it is not only Habai's achievement but for the whole family. Hlakahlothwane even chants his totemic poem that encapsulates some formulas as follows:

"Motaung! Motaung! Motaung!
 Eo ke motho wa Mmanthethe.
 Eo ke ngwana wa Mpowane.
 E, ngwana wa mpowane.
 Ngwana ya mong ha mmae le ntatae.
 Setloholo sa ka botsofading ba ka.
 E, ngwana ya ratwang." (Act IV: scene vi)

[Motaung! Motaung! Motaung!
 That is the person of Mmanthethe.
 That is the child of Mpowane.
 Yes, the beloved child.
 The only child at its mother and father's place.
 My grand child at my old age.
 Yes, the beloved child.]

Pretorius (1989:30), quoting Swanepoel, describes a formula as "[A] dynamic compositional device consisting of words fairly regularly employed in performance to express an essential idea, and consequently creating recurring rhythmic conditions." In line with the foregoing definition, Hlakahlothwane's above-quoted praise poetry boasts of repetitions of *Motaung*, *ngwana wa mpowane*, *ngwana* and so on; as formulas that build up to the main idea – that of deciding on the name to be given to Habai's son. It then comes not as astonishment that, at the end of the chant, Hlakahlothwane calls Habai and says:

"Wena le motswalle wa hao, kgutlelang ho mmao le ho mohatsao, le ba tsebise hore nna Hlakahlothwane ke re moshanyana eo wa Bataung lebitso ke Mpowane. E, Mpowane. Ke mo amohela ka atla tse pedi. Le ha nka ithoballa e ntse e le hona jwale, ha e le lebitso la Ranthethe lona le tla nne le phele. Modimo le badimo ba hlohonolofatse. Ke a leboha mme ngwana a re holele." (Act IV: scene vi)

[You and your friend, go back to your mother and your wife, and inform them that I, Hlakahlothwane, have named that Bataung boy Mpowane. Yes Mpowane. I welcome

him with my two hands. Even if I may go to sleep right now (die), as for the name of Ranthethe will continue living. May God and the gods give their blessings! I extend my gratitudes and may the child grow up for us!]

Since Hlakahlothwane's initial persuasive action has been that of employing some form of totemic referencing in his praise poetry; Habai has been completely persuaded to agree with him in naming his son Mpowane. Testimony of this conclusion is in the way Habai welcomes the name in this final utterance:

“E, motswadi wa ka. Mpowane. Ngwana ya ratwang. Mpowane. Ha re boele hae Nkokoto re ise lebitso la ngwana. E, Mpowane. (Ba kena koloing, ba rutla.) (Act IV: scene vi)

[Yes, my parent. Mpowane. The beloved child. Mpowane. Let us go back home Nkokoto and deliver the name of the child. Yes, Mpowane. (They get into the car, and take off.)]

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF 1990 TO 1999 DRAMA TEXTS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The first drama text to be dealt with is *Bana ba khomo tsa batho* [The children of people's cattle]. The second drama text to be analysed in this chapter is *Tsiketsing sa Qomatsi* [At the centre of state of emergency]. *Tsiketsing sa Qomatsi*. The analysis of these texts is foregrounded on the aspect of persuasion, as applied by different communicators in establishing their plans and action/s for achieving certain goals.

4.2 BANA BA KHOMO TSA BATHO

Mahalefele writes in the preface *Bana ba khomo tsa batho* that the inspiration for writing the drama text emanates from the realization that, "Lenyalo la Sesotho le thata holim'a mosali ho feta la sekhoaa le la kereke hobane ha le khaoloe ke lefu" [Sesotho customary marriage is more complex than the civil or the religious one, because it is never ended by death]. It follows therefore, that Mahalefele presents this drama text as a persuasive model for the characters to debate issues and strive for reaching some settlements in accordance with their goals-plans-action.

In this play, there are twelve characters that interact at various stages in the course of its development. There are however five main characters in this drama, namely 'Mamohau, 'Malefilo, Lefilo, Khongoana and 'Mamolotolotsi. The setting is in 'Malefilo's house, where she has assembled these other characters to interact and exchange views concerning 'Mamohau's present situation. In her opening presentation, 'Malefilo illustrates the matter as follows:

"Lefilo, ngoana'ka, ke le bilelitse mona ka litaba tsa enoa khaitsetli ea hau, oa tseba phelisano ea hae le monna ha e ntle; joaleka mehla o balehisitsoe ke tlhobolo le tlala le ho tetekoa. Ke bona eka joale e se e le mojaroo oa rona, hoseng joale re tla qetella re tetiloe ka setopo ha monna enoa." (Act I: scene i)

[Lefilo, my child, I have called you here in connection with this here your sister, you know that their way of living with her husband is not good; as usual she has been forced to flee from nakedness and starvation plus being beaten. I now realise that it is our burden, otherwise we shall end up being struck with a corpse at this man's home.]

It would seem that 'Malefilo's primary goal is that of changing relationship between 'Mamohau and her in-laws; for 'Mamohau to permanently stay here at her original home; and never to go back to her husband anymore. As a persuasive plan to drive her goal towards her intentional end; 'Malefilo directly addresses this matter to Lefilo, calling him 'ngoana'ka'

as an endearment action for him to identify with her in this situation – as Lefilo is understandably the head of the family. Further, in her address, ‘Malefilo refers to ‘Mamohau as ‘khaitsele ena ya hao;’ once more as a persuasive action for Lefilo to pay attention to the bonding ties between himself and ‘Mamohau. Seemingly, the secondary goal here is to instill into Lefilo that, as head of the family, he has to take responsibility in the present situation. Furthermore, ‘Malefilo presents her daughter’s situation in a manner that seems to have been calculated at striking at the very core of ‘Mamohau’s troubles – thus persuading all her listeners to feel pity and sympathise with the culprit. This attempt at appealing to people’s feelings of pity and sympathy is mostly realizable in ‘Malefilo’s final statement above; as she makes an insinuation that ‘Mamohau (and her two children, Mohau and Mojabeng, who are present in this meeting) ‘e se e tla ba mojaro oa rona, hoseng joalo re tla qetella re tetiloe ka setopo ha monna enoa.’ In other words, ‘Malefilo registers her intentional goal by indicating to her listeners that they are left with no other option but to bear up the proposed burden.

Indeed as indicated in Lefilo’s response to his mother, ‘Mamohau’s unhappy life is well known by all the interactants in this meeting; as in this submission:

“Taba tsa ‘Mamohau le monna rea li tseba ha li ncha tsebeng tsa rona; monna enoa oa hae o khalemelletsoe boitsoaro bona ba hae ke rona le ke bahabo, ‘me o bonahala a sa khalemelehe. Ke tla kopa ‘Mamorongoe ho buoa pele.” (Act I: scene i)

[The issues of ‘Mamohau and husband are well known to us they are not new to our ears; this husband of hers has been reprimanded about this behaviour of his by us and his family, and he seems not to be responding to the scolding. I will ask ‘Mamorongoe to speak first.]

Apparently with a clear understanding of ‘Malefilo’s goal, ‘Mamorongoe poses a question of time in which they will have to bear this burden – thus persuading all interactants in this meeting to imagine the heaviness of this proposed burden; and the repercussions involved. Since ‘Malefilo has no answer for that too, all she can say is that only God knows. Basing herself on this answer, ‘Mamorongoe pronounces her main concern as that of approaching the father of these children and make him support or bring up his children while they continue staying here with this family. In response, ‘Mamohau says, “... ke re, ho hang leloabe leno ha le na thuso, ke ho ituba feela ho leka ho buisana le eena.” (Act I: scene i) [... I say, that good-for-nothing person is altogether useless, it is only a waste of time trying to speak to him.] It would be anybody’s guess here that ‘Mamohau’s foregoing statement is meant for persuading the interactants and emphasizing the need for her and her children to be accepted as a burden for this family.

It would appear that 'Mamorongoe is conscious of the trend this discussion is taking; yet she states that she is through with her questioning, though she is still itching to pursue this matter further. In refutation, Lefilo cautions his wife of the importance of saying out her views without any form of hesitation; in this way he is persuading her to spell out her views so that all may discuss and come up with some settlement. Having been given this motivation by Lefilo to clear up that which is itching in her, 'Mamorongoe spells out her point in these words, "Ke hoaea-hoaea ka thoto ea monna e mong e mahlo, ea rona e ntse e re hlotse." (Act I: scene i) [I am concerned about another man's eyed load, while our own is overpowering us.] As might be expected, for 'Malefilo, "Hona ha se puo, ke lisuoa." (Act I: scene i) [This is not a talk, it is rancour.] It would seem that for 'Malefilo, everybody should simply agree with her and accept this load of a mother and two children as this family's responsibility.

Possibly with an intention of driving his goal of persuading all to consider customary lore with reference to this matter, Lefilo directs this question to his mother; "M'e, ua hlahla?" (Act I: scene i) [Mother, are you returning marriage cattle to the man's father?] (see Mabile and Dieterlen, 1985:78)] Clearly, 'Malefilo fails to fully understand the Sesotho expression of 'ho hlahla' here, as she says:

"Kea hlahla bo! Ha ke na ngoana ea tla phelisoa joaloka ntja e utsoang mahe lirobeng tsa batho. Ebesale a khakhathoa ke leloabe leno la monna." (Act I: scene i)

[I divorce yes! I have no child that will be treated as a dog that steals eggs from people's hens' nests. And continually being beaten by that good-for-nothing type of man.]

Upon noticing that 'Malefilo fails to understand the underpinnings of the customary lore in question; Lefilo now puts the matter clearly to his mother – that if that be the case, then she should return the people's cattle that were produced as bohali (marriage obligations or dowry), so that she might be at peace with her daughter thereafter. Since for 'Malefilo all that is nonsense, Lefilo propels his persuasive goal further by clarifying the following points:

"M'e bohali bo thethesitsoe, bo hlabisitsoe; ka hona u koentse khoele, 'me u tla tlameha ho e hlatsa, hoseng joalo u ipitsetsa lenohonoho." (Act I: scene i)

[Mother the offer of cattle for marriage was completed; an ox was slaughtered for concluding the marriage arrangement; as such you have swallowed a string, and you will have to vomit it, otherwise you invite grudges for yourself.]

Indeed, Lefilo's foregoing words are persuasive for one to think twice before taking the action of 'ho hlahla;' for it would be so difficult for any parent to retract those cattle which were used for those customary obligations that bound the two families together. It is important to realise that Lefilo's foregoing presentation, concerning the Sesotho customary lore, covers

conviction/persuasion duality (Miller, 2002:6). One would then tend to agree with the view that “conviction derives its force from people’s rationality, while persuasion caters to their irrationality” (Miller, 2002:6). In the light of this view, Lefilo applies rationality as conviction; while at the same time he persuades ‘Malefilo to change her attitude of irrationality in addressing this matter.

But ‘Malefilo seems to hold onto her irrationality; as illustrated in the following verbal exchange she poses, “Na ha kea ja likhomo tsa molatelle, empa a sa ntlhokomelle ngoana.” (Act I: scene i) [I have not brought trouble upon myself (see Mabile and Dieterlen, 1985:271), whereas he fails to take care of my child.] At this juncture, ‘Mamohau employs wailing as her own persuasive attempt for Lefilo and his wife to feel pity for her and allow her to stay here for good. In addition, she registers her complaint in the following expressions for entrenching her persuasive attempt for them to change their attitudes and beliefs:

“M’e ha ke batle ho u kenya maqakabetsing; ho molemo ke tsoe, ke tsamaee, tlou ha e hloloe ke moroalo. Abuti Lefilo ekare hase ngoan’eso, oa nkhoba. Ekare ke mohlolo ka ‘na hore mosali a hloloe ke lenyalo; kea itsamaela.” (Act I: scene i)

[Mother, I do not want to put you into problems; it is better for me to go out, and go, an elephant is never overpowered by its load. Brother Lefilo seems as if he is not my brother, he crushes me. It is as though it is a miracle for me to be overpowered by marriage; I am going away.]

In response to ‘Mamohau’s wailings and suggestive expressions above, Lefilo employs more persuasive language against her irrationality; and ends it by addressing his mother, as follows:

“Eseng joalo khaitsetli, le pele li na le baji, ke mpa ke u lemosa mathata ao re tla thulana le ‘ona bophelong. Mona ke heno, empa u abilo, u lokela ho lahloa ka lelahlo le sele. Haeba lenyalo le u hlotse, le hlotse uena eseng bana bana ba khomo tsa batho. Joale ‘m’e, a k’u ntlhaketse hore na ha re hlaheloa ke mekhohlane bana bana ba tla sebeletsoa joang?” (Act I: scene i)

[Not in that way sister, even further on there exist problems, I only caution you of some problems that we are going to bump against in life. This is your home, but you have been given away, you have to be afforded a different burial. If marriage has overpowered you, it has overpowered you but not these children of people’s cattle. Now mother, please highlight me as to how these children would be administered when we are faced with death?]

Obviously, Lefilo’s above submission is meant for more conviction/persuasion duality for both ‘Mamohau and ‘Malefilo to gain better understanding of the nuances pertaining to Sesotho

customary lore. In addition, it is geared towards persuading them to consider the seriousness of this matter; and change their attitude and behaviour. For example, it is a fact that a married woman is usually buried in accordance with her in-law's customary practices; for she has been given to that family as its part. But now, it would seem that the main problem is the way 'Mamohau's children would be treated by the Lefilo family; as they belong to her in-law's family, in agreement with the Sesotho customary lore.

In her answer to Lefilo's above question, 'Malefilo gives two options that if:

- They are to be regarded as Lefilo's siblings, then they will be treated in the same manner as would be to Lefilo; and
- Lefilo regards them as his sister's children they should be treated as nephews/nieces.

In the light of the above retort, Lefilo persuades his mother to spell out her stand regarding these children in question; whereupon 'Malefilo answers as follows:

“Na bana bana ke ba nka e le ba ka, ha ke ba khetholle, ha ke sehe mpa ka lehare, ha ke rate pokopeli ka har'a lelapa la ka.” (Act I: scene i)

[I consider these children as my own, I do not disfavour them, I do not cut the stomach in two parts (I do not make differences between the children), I do not like double-adultery in my family.]

Needless to say, 'Malefilo's above response to Lefilo's question suggests that the concerned children be regarded and treated as Lefilo's siblings; in which case she proposes to go against the Sesotho customary lore regarding the present situation. It therefore becomes important for Lefilo to caution her in this manner:

“Joale u tla baka khathatso e kholo. Moshanyana enoa h'a ka tšela mobu kamor'a ka, ba ha rangoane ba tla hana ho tšela hobane ha se lesala-lapeng; ho molemo a sebetsoe e ntse e le mochana.” (Act I: scene i)

[Now you will cause a very big problem. If this boy can throw the soil after me, those of my uncle will refuse to throw because he is not a premarital child; it is better to treat him as a nephew.]

In this way, Lefilo makes an attempt at persuading 'Malefilo to be considerate of the fact that these children do not belong to this family, but to that which produced some dowry cattle as a marriage obligation. In line with that understanding, it would not only be wrong for these two children to be treated as members of this family; but such a treatment would also induce some conflicts and complications among the members of this family. In support of Lefilo's above clarification of the Sesotho customary lore, 'Mamorongoe expresses her personal, yet

related, concern as follows: “Ke eo taba! Ke mang ea ka lumelang hore Mohau ke moena oa hau? ‘Na ha se rangoane oa bana ba ka, ha se matšeo.” (Act I: scene i) [There goes the issue! Who can agree that Mohau is your younger brother? As for me he is not my children’s uncle, he is not a premarital child.] Though these Sesotho customary lore guide lines are meant for persuading ‘Malefilo to change her attitude and behaviour in connection with this issue; it would seem that ‘Mamohau is the one who is more affected by these persuasive expressions; as she claims that, since she hates problems, she would rather go away with her children.

Apparently, ‘Mamohau’s suggestion that she would rather go away functions as some persuasive endeavour for ‘Malefilo to respond as follows:

“Che, bo, ‘Mamohau, u balehetse ho ‘na; ke tlameha ho bona hore ua sebeletsoa mona heno, haeba bana bana ha se ba ka hobane feela e se ba letsoele, ba tla sebeletsoa e le bachana, ‘me ba tla tšela mobu pele.” (Act I: scene i)

[No please, ‘Mamohau, you have run to me, I must see to it that you are assisted here at your home; if these children are not mine simply because they are not breast ones, they will be treated as nephews/nieces, and they will throw the soil first.]

No doubt, ‘Malefilo clearly understands how the Sesotho customary lore operates in matters of this kind; for Lefilo now agrees with her – though he yet seeks a clarification of the issue concerning their related treatment, were they to go to the initiation school.

It would seem that, as far as the requirements are concerned for initiation school going, ‘Malefilo has no knowledge. That is why she retorts that such initiation requirements will have to be cast off; since she has even concluded that she does not want to do anything with ‘Mamohau’s in-laws. But then Lefilo realises that this kind of thinking is a dangerous one; as one dares not throw away Sesotho lore operations when it comes to initiating youngsters, especially boys. In an effort to persuade ‘Malefilo to change her attitude and behaviour in these matters; Lefilo says, “U tla holofatsa bana, u tlohe o re ba u loile.” (Act I: scene i) [You will cripple the children, and claim that they have bewitched you.] On this issue, ‘Malefilo totally agrees with Lefilo; and further suggests that Molotolotsi, ‘Mamohau’s husband, should be taken to court.

Although one would tend to agree with the idea of taking Molotolotsi to court; both ‘Mamohau and ‘Mamorongoe consider such a move as a waste of time and money; for they regard Molotolotsi as a good-for-nothing piece of humanity that might not even recuperate from his wrong-doings. Seemingly, Lefilo agrees with the two women that taking Molotolotsi to court would not yield any good or positive results; because for Lefilo, the courts of law hardly change the attitudes and behaviours of good-for-nothing individuals. Rather, Lefilo rounds up

his persuasive talk by further suggesting for 'Mamohau to leave Mojabeng, her daughter, behind if she is still intent on going away – as he at least hopes to gain some cattle on the day of her marriage. But this mere suggestion infuriates 'Mamorongoe; as she considers the idea of achieving something when Mojabeng gets married as a far fetched idea that might not even materialise. In response to 'Mamorongoe's attitude and behaviour, Lefilo attempts to persuade her to give positive and constructive suggestion to no avail. Ultimately Lefilo is bound to take a harsh stand by coercing 'Mamorongoe to leave; threatening her that her presence in this meeting might cause some strife between them – ending with these words: "E re ba le bolela hore lingoetsi le nka balamo joaleka bohalitsong ba lona." (Act I: scene i) [Indeed they describe you correctly that you daughters-in-law regard your sisters-in-law as your mothers-in-law.]

In accordance with her suggestion that she would rather go away than staying here where her children might end up being the source of strife among members of this family; 'Mamohau wakes up early in the morning and goes away; to where, nobody knows. Even as she may not stop her from going, 'Malefilo succeeds in persuading 'Mamohau to leave behind Mojabeng; proposing that she will be handy to her as she is still a small girl. In addition, 'Malefilo pleads for 'Mamohau to take with her some bread and porridge as a provision for Mohau to consume on the way.

On the way to their unknown destination, Mohau and 'Mamohau pass some remarks about the stinging cold. Resultantly, 'Mamohau is persuaded by Mohau's complaint about his cold feet that she tears an old piece of blanket that she rapped around her waist; so as to rap up Mohau's feet. Her goal here is to prevent the stinging cold from harming Mohau; and also to ensure that Mohau increases his pace in their walk. As a sign that her goal has been achieved, Mohau remarks thus, "Ke tsamaea ha monate joale." (Act I: scene iii) [I am enjoying the walk now.] Now 'Mamohau even gets a chance to stimulate faster walk in Mohau by saying, "U tiise maoto ntate, re eo hloa moepa oane, ha re o qeta, re tla phomola khorong mane." (Act I: scene iii) [You should walk fast father, so that we go up that slope, when we finish it we will rest at that pass.] It would seem that 'Mamohau's intention is for persuading Mohau to plug up courage and increase his pace by addressing him as 'ntate;' thus boosting his ego and motivating him to regard himself as a grown up man who is out on adventure.

Upon reaching the pass in reference, 'Mamohau suggests to Mohau that they should rest awhile in preparation for going over the alps, with the intention of resting in the gorge; where they suppose to get some warmth, as opposed to the cold breeze in the alps. Once more with an attempt at persuading Mohau to be courageous and adopt a manly pace; 'Mamohau addresses him as 'ntate,' and indicates to him that their destination is in the low lands,

saying, “Che ntate, moo re eang ke mabalane, re tla fihla hosesane, e seng kajeno ho hole, ha re ye, ...” (Act I: scene iii) [No father, where we are going is in the low lands, we shall arrive there tomorrow, not today it is far, let us go, ...] Though Mohau is prepared to keep up with the pace, he suggests to his mother that he feels hungry; thus motivating her to give him some bread for boosting his stamina. ‘Mamohau cuts him a piece and remarks: “Tsamaea o ntse u e-ja ngoan’aka, thota li sa name.” (Act I scene iii) [Eat while you walk my child, the plateaus are still stretched.] By so saying, ‘Mamohau cautions Mohau of the fact that they still have a long way to go; and thus encouraging him to pick up speed so that they may reach their destination in time.

In the meantime, back home at Lefilo’s house, Lefilo reports to ‘Mamorongoe that ‘Mamohau has gone with Mohau. In response to this information, ‘Mamorongoe remarks that she is correct, as a woman has to take with her the children as she goes. Further, she remarks that the only mistake ‘Mamohau made was that of leaving Mojabeng behind; for by so doing she has left them with a burden of bringing the young girl up in her absence. Furthermore, she intimates that if she were in ‘Mamohau’s shoes she would have run away with her daughter; so that she does not bind her mother with such responsibility of bringing up that girl while her mother is not in a position to gather food for herself. For Lefilo what ‘Mamorongoe is saying is quite infuriating; as she never came to his home with any child. It would then become clear that while ‘Mamorongoe might have been driving her goal of spewing spite over ‘Mamohau, for Lefilo this is a direct challenge to him. That is why he ends up saying, “Khele! Ha u tšabe batho kea u bona;” as ‘Malefilo arrives. (Act I: scene iv) [Goodness! You lack respect I see you.] Apparently, ‘Mamorongoe’s remarks have persuaded Lefilo to be angry with her; such that he feels that she must be disciplined.

Upon hearing the source of the squabble, ‘Malefilo reprimands ‘Mamorongoe in the following words:

“Mamorongoe ngoan’aka tšoela mokhubu. U khalemetsoe maobane ka taba ena, u sa boetse u e pheta? Rona Basotho re boulela bana haholo lenyalong, mosali h’a na ngoana, ngoana ke oa monna; Bontat’a rona-moholo ba ne ba nyala sethepu ho eketsa leloko, ke re le lebitla le ne le nyalloa mosali, kapa lebotla; ke re le sebopuo se ne se nyalisoa hore feela se be le bana. U re rea thaba ha esale u etsa thokoloana ee! Re lebeletse thari, hoja empe ebe ke moshemane a tle a tsose lelapa lena la ngoan’aka.” (Act I: scene iv)

[‘Mamorongoe my child spit at your navel (ask for forgiveness). You were cautioned about this issue yesterday, yet you repeat it? We Basotho are proud of children at marriage, a woman has no child, a child belongs to a man. Our forefathers practised

polygamy to increase the totem, I mean a woman would even be married for the grave (for one who is already dead), or the wall (for reproduction); I mean even a fool were to marry so that he may have children. Do you think that we are happy that you have since had just this sole child! We expect children, and it was better if it were at least a boy so that he may revive this family of my child.]

The primary goal for this lengthy reprimand is that of giving advice to 'Mamorongoe that, in marriage, bearing children is a very important aspect among the Basotho people. In addition, 'Malefilo persuades her daughter-in-law, 'Mamorongoe, to refrain from even thinking of the situation where she might decide to take her child with her; should there be need for her to run away from Lefilo – as children do not belong to a woman, but to a man, according to her. It therefore comes not as astonishment that she even relates to 'Mamorongoe those unusual cases where marriage can be performed just to ensure that the concerned family bears children for posterity sake.

In an effort to augment 'Malefilo's preaching on 'Mamorongoe, Lefilo says:

"A k'u mo joetse 'm'e, kea bona o re ekaba batho kaofela re bo-Molotolotsi ba sa khathalleng tsoala ea bona. O buoa joaleka semakuoana, h'a bone leha a khoatha motho ka leihlong." (Act I: scene iv)

[Please tell her mother, I realise that she thinks that we are all Molotolotsis who do not care about their progeny. She speaks like a fool, she does not even notice as she pokes one in the eye.]

Apparently, Lefilo's goal here is to motivate 'Malefilo to continue reprimanding his wife, for he presently regards 'Mamorongoe as someone who is out to spark some conflict between him and herself by continually rejecting his acceptance of bringing up Mojabeng.

Thus motivated by Lefilo to scold 'Mamorongoe, 'Malefilo now propels her primary goal further, by putting it clearly that:

"Kea kholoa o utloile, 'me ho tloha kajeno o tla tseba hore mosali ke mosali ka thari. Ha a tsebe hore leha a ka ea koo re sa tsebeng, a ea etsa bana hona teng, re tla ea mo ntšetsa joaleka nonyana, re nke bana bao ba khomo tsa rona; oa soasoa, lehona hampe." (Act I: scene iv)

[I think that she has understood, and from today on she will know that a woman is a woman by fertility. She does not know that even if she were to go that far where we do not even know, and make children there, we shall take out the eggs as of a bird, and take away those children of our cattle; she is joking, and badly too.]

It would seem that 'Mamorongoe also agrees with the foregoing clarifications by 'Malefilo, for she keeps silent like someone who has learned a lesson for the first time.

With reference to Mohau and 'Mamohau on the way to the low lands, it becomes important to find out what persuasive attempts they are engaged in with each other. Since 'Mamohau is an adult, she suggests strategies they have to engage in order for them to survive in this journey. As it is towards sunset, 'Mamohau's goal is for them to find a place of safety; where they may spend the night and continue with their journey tomorrow. To fulfill her goal, she suggests for Mohau to be on the look out for a cave or cattle post as they continue walking. But since he is tired and unfamiliar with this area, Mohau hardly locates a nearby cave. However, 'Mamohau cautions him that this is an area for cattle ranches, and therefore there would hardly be anybody here, now that it is winter time; when all the shepherds will have gone to the low lands. By so saying, 'Mamohau might be making an attempt at persuading Mohau to regard themselves as lonesome beings in this area; and therefore indicating to him the importance of locating a place of safety.

Eventually, 'Mamohau locates a cave, in which they decide to spend the night. Seemingly it is already dark; for Mohau pronounces his fright and complains about the darkness in the cave; and further says, "... mong'a lehaha lee o tla re'ng ha a fumana re robotse kateng?" (Act II: scene i) [... what will the owner of this cave say when he finds us sleeping in it?] His mother angrily shouts at him and instructs him to come into the cave. One might assume that 'Mamohau shouts at Mohau in an endeavour to persuade him to be courageous; and also to make him aware that they are in the wilderness, where almost everything belongs to nobody – as she ends up by saying, "lehaha ke la baeti ha le na mong'a lona, ak'u se ke ua ntšokolisa hle." (Act II: scene i) [the cave belongs to visitors and has no owner, please do not trouble me.]

Upon hearing the howling of a fox, Mohau mistakes it for a child's cry, only to be informed by 'Mamohau that it is a hungry fox that is in search of sheep for consumption. Although 'Mamohau explains for Mohau what the fox eats, he wonders as to whether or not it is going to eat his mother and himself; since there are no sheep around here now in winter. Seemingly, 'Mamohau is tired of answering Mohau's questions; for she now tersely answers as follows: "Phokojoe ha e je batho, a k'o robale!" (Act II: scene i) [A fox does not eat people, please sleep] In this way, 'Mamohau is driving her goal of giving advice for Mohau to go to sleep and get a rest in preparation for tomorrow's journey. Since he is tired after a long walk, Mohau falls asleep; giving his mother an opportunity to cogitate over their prevailing situation.

It would appear that 'Mamohau persuaded Mohau to go to sleep so that she might find a moment to engage in a soliloquy. In her soliloquy, 'Mamohau realises that she is a troubled woman that never knew that one day she would traverse over these alps in this dire cold. Importantly, she observes that her troubles have been induced by her husband's shortcomings – "mathata a moratuo a oa me," as she puts it. (Act II: scene i) [problems of my darling.] At this moment, it dawns upon 'Mamohau that "mofuta ha o nkho e ka nko e se qoba la koae." (Act II: scene i) [a race is never sniveled through the nose as it is not a tobacco leaf.] In other words, 'Mamohau hereby persuades herself to be impervious of blame; for she never knew that Molotolotsi was going to turn against her as he has done; for had he been in a position to be sniveled through, she would have done so. In this way, 'Mamohau is persuading herself to feel consoled, since she could never foretell what kind of character disposition Molotolotsi was before he married her. In short, she feels that she was deceived by Molotolotsi's mere pretence as a loving and caring husband, she seems to say.

Having gone through this character analysis, 'Mamohau engages in self-persuasion by putting her trust in God, saying, "Ha Modimo a ka nthus a ka fumana bophelo moo ke eang, Molotolotsi a keke a hlola a mpona." (Act II: scene i) [If God can help me find the living where I am going, Molotolotsi will never see me again.] She then goes into the planning session for the following day's travel; and makes a decision to leave at dawn for Mohau's sake – for had she been alone, she feels that she would continue on the journey, even now in the night; as she cares no more whether she dies or lives. Further, 'Mamohau regards this as a painful moment for her, as she feels betrayed by someone she dearly loves – "Ha ke phoquoe ke moratuo a oa ka, ntat'a bana ba ka, lerato la pelo ea ka ebe ke mang lefatšeng ea ka nkutloelang bohloko?" she says. (Act II: scene i) [When I have been disappointed by my darling, the father of my children, love of my heart, who else on earth may sympathise with me?]

Finally, 'Mamohau puts her trust in nobody else but the troubles and the grave. In this case she persuades herself to be prepared to face any form of trouble in order to reach her goal of finding a living for herself and her son; even if it may mean death as finality, she seems to think. Now that she has reached this final decision, she persuades herself to go to sleep, saying:

"E re ke robale ngoan'a motho ke lese ho lomaloma, mohlomong ka ha boroko ke sera bo tla nkuka ebang pelo e a roalla ke tla leta thojane bosiu hosa le sephooko kapa baloi." (A khutsa, a ea le sephume sa boroko.) (Act II: scene i)

[Let me sleep someone's child and stop grumbling, may be a sleep as an enemy will take me, and if the heart goes gathering then I will watch with initiated girls the whole night together with an owl or witches. (She stops talking, and goes into deep sleep.)]

When she wakes up, 'Mamohau observes that it is at dawn as she peeps through the door. To her surprise, she notices that her feet are swollen; while her thighs are painful due to some dislocations. As she tries to go out to look for a well from which she may obtain some water; she experiences some discomfort from both her feet and thighs. Seemingly this pain she undergoes persuades her to imagine the suffering that Mohau will perceive as he wakes up. In the light of this situation, 'Mamohau loses hope of their advancing any nearer to the lowlands. Worse still, she realises that she is very hungry; and to fight against this hunger, 'Mamohau drinks the water together with some mud from the well. Then fearing that Mohau might wake up before she returns to the cave, she motivates herself into speeding up, saying, "Ere ke khe, ke nyolohe pele Mohau a tsoha." (Act II: scene i) [Let me draw the water, and go up before Mohau wakes up.]

But at this very moment Mohau wakes up and, upon realizing the absence of his mother, he cries and shouts: "M'e, 'm'e! u ile ho kae? Jo-oe! U ho kae? Joo! 'M'e o ntšihile lehaheng oee!" (Act II: scene i) [Mother, mother! Where are you? Alas! Where are you? Alas! Oh mother has left me in the cave!] In response to Mohau's wailing, 'Mamohau shouts for him to remain in the cave as she tries to climb the steep towards the cave; yet Mohau keeps on shouting that he is afraid and cold. Like someone who has been sent to come and rescue the suffering mother and son; a traveler hears these shouts from both the boy and the mother. These wailings work as persuasive attempts for him to rush to the cave; with a goal of rescuing the boy first and then rescue the mother; if need be. When he reaches the boy, the traveler persuades Mohau to come with him to the cattle post where he will make some fire for warmth. Unfortunately, Mohau's feet and thighs are sore and hurting; so much that he may not stand and walk. The traveler is then forced by the prevailing circumstances to pick up the boy and carry him over to the safe place where he makes fire for him.

After satisfying himself that the fire is burning and warming up the boy, the traveler rushes out to look for the mother. He tries to shout for the woman to come and show up; but since 'Mamohau is suspicious that the man might be a murderer or something, she has hidden herself. Even as the traveler keeps shouting for her to come out so as to be assisted, 'Mamohau remains dubious about the man's intentions. Ultimately, the traveler addresses 'Mamohau in the following words: "M'amoshanyana u ho kae, kapa u na le mathata ke tl'u thusa?" (Act II: scene i) [Mother of the boy where are you, or do you have some problems so that I can come and assist you?] It would seem that these words are persuasive enough for 'Mamohau to realise that her hiding is not going to help her much; for she employs soliloquy

and persuades herself as follows: “Ha ho thuso, o tla mpona mona tlas’a mafika moo ke manameng, etsoe nke ke ka baleha ke bohloko ba maoto.” Then she addresses him: “Ke ‘na enoa ntate (Oa lla.) Ke hloloa ho tsamaea.” (Act II: scene i) [There is no use, he will see me here under the rocks where I am cleaving, and besides I cannot run away because of the pain on the feet. Here I am sir. (She cries) I am unable to walk.]

Now that the traveler has finally located ‘Mamohau, he assists her towards the cattle post where he has already made some fire for Mohau. Persuading them to stay there and warm themselves, the traveler suggests that he is going to collect his animals. This moment provides a chance for Mohau to question his mother where she has been; as he had thought that she had already left him. Seemingly, ‘Mamohau is persuaded by Mohau’s skepticism to cry and further explain herself that she would never leave her son alone. In addition, she informs him that she had gone to the well to draw some water. Upon realizing that both her son and herself are suffering from the same pain, ‘Mamohau persuades him to relax and remain assured that they can only travel the following day when they will have rested themselves.

Even as they discuss the how and where the helpful traveler came from, he comes in carrying some provisions and offers them to eat. Apparently as a persuasive measure for them to relax and open up to relate the story that has put them here; the traveler informs them that some chilly wind has developed outside; though the mist seems to be waning off; as an indication that towards sunset it will have completely waned off. Then he asks ‘Mamohau what her name is, where she comes from and where she is going. Possibly affected by the traveler’s humaneness, ‘Mamohau is persuaded into crying, as she explains to him where she comes from and where she is going to. As if also affected by ‘Mamohau’s crying, the traveler retorts that he understands, though he has touched the lady’s spirit; and further introduces himself as Thuso from ha Letseka. Furthermore, he tells her that he is also going to the low lands for shopping.

Through some discussions concerning their journey, Thuso discovers that ‘Mamohau is an agonised woman; especially as she is even going to the low lands for the very first time; and worse still, that she has absolutely no acquaintances there. This discussion works as a persuasive attempt for Thuso to speak as follows:

“Khele, ‘m’e, ho bonahala mathata a hau a le boima, ha se ka bonolo motho oa ‘m’e a ka furallang motse a ea moo a se nang le moneketsana oo a balehelang ho oona. Ha se feela u fafotseng ngoana ha kana, ua baleha. Le hle le mpe le silile maoto ana ka mafura ana a nama, a thapolohe, e tle e re ha le phahama, moholi o tloha ke mpe ke le belese pereng, ‘na ke kalle pokola, re totobiseng mohlomong ha le likela re tla

kena ha monna oa haeso oa morui ea bitsoang Khongoana, re robale teng, e re bo esa le bone ea ka le tholang.” (Act II: scene i)

[Indeed, lady, it seems that your troubles are quite heavy, it is not easy for a female person to turn her back on the village and go to a place at which she does not even have a mere person to whom she runs. That is why you have hurt the boy so much, you are fleeing. You better rub your feet with the fat of this meat, to relax them, so that when it rises, and the mist wanes off, I may put you on horse back, while I ride on the donkey, then we go, so that when it sets we might reach the place of one fellow rich man called Khongoana, then sleep there, so that in the morning you can see who will take care of you.]

Indeed, Thuso has been persuaded by the agony of these travelers to make it his duty to take care of them as he suggests to them above. His offer of putting them on horse back is a great assistance that they probably have not even thought of. In general, he has been their rescuer from harsh weather and terrain in which they were to traverse from here onwards. It therefore comes not as surprise for ‘Mamohau to thank him in these words:

“Ntate, nkeke ka u lebala ruri bophelong bohle ba ka, hoja u se fihle re ne re le ba shoeleng ke tlala le serame moo lehaheng ka ha re ne re tla hloloa ho tsamaea ke lekhethe le ho thaphoha hona, ruri u re thusitse le ka mofao.” (Act II: scene i)

[Sir, I can never forget you in my whole life, if you had not arrived we were the dead ones due to starvation and cold there in the cave because we would not be able to walk due to our injury and this dislocation, indeed you also helped us with the provision.]

Indeed Thuso’s mercy and humaneness have persuaded ‘Mamohau to give him the foregoing thanks. Finally, Thuso is humbled by ‘Mamohau’s persuasive thanks, such that all he can say at this juncture is that people have to assist one another in this world.

Just as Thuso has promised, he, together with ‘Mamohau and Mohau, arrive at Khongoana’s home just before sunset. To Khongoana’s surprise, the mother and son can hardly get off the horse back by themselves. As might be expected, this very realization motivates him to ask whether they are sick or not; whereupon Thuso relates to him the whole story surrounding their travel to here. Further, Thuso informs Khongoana that “taba tsa mosali enoa li thata, o re o lahliloe ke monna, o tliilo batla mosebetsi. Ke letoai.” (Act III: scene i) [issues of this woman are hard, she says that the husband has rejected her, she has come to seek for a job. She is a loner.] It would appear that for Khongoana the arrival of this woman who seeks a job has been by providence divine; for as it is now winter time, during which there is some

reaping of grain food stuff, her getting a job here would be quite handy for him. Be that as it may, Khongoana explains his qualms to Thuso as follows:

“Mohlomong ke molietsi, kapa motšetšele a le tjenana. Ke ntse ke hloka motho ea ka nthusang ho kotula, empa kea tšaba, e tla re ke re a nthuse a be a nqaka, a koasa ka motse oa ka, a ntlhorisetsa ngoana enoa oa mosali oa ka. Basali ka mohlomong ke tau-li-mesana.” (Act III: scene i)

[Perhaps she is a notorious someone, or a witch as she is. I actually need someone who might assist me in reaping, but I am afraid, whereas I may ask her to assist me, she may put me into trouble, withhold my home, and persecute this child of my wife. Women are sometimes lions in small dresses.]

Even as Khongoana has so elaborately explained his fears to Thuso, the latter persuades him to try her; suggesting that, “haeba a itlhantša, u mo jarise ka monkhoane.” (Act III: scene i) [if she maddens herself, then you help her carry her load with a weak stick.]

The Sesotho idiomatic expression, ‘ho jarisa motho ka monkhoane,’ is usually employed in a situation in which the person in reference has misbehaved, and therefore deserves to be expelled from the place of abode; empty-handed, except for his/her mere belongings such as clothes and nothing else. Since such a practice is often associated with a woman that is expelled from marriage by the husband’s family, or the husband himself; it would suggest therefore, that in this case ‘Mamohau will have to be expelled empty-handed – should she misbehave as Khongoana fears that she might do.

Whereas Khongoana still maintains that he does not want to overburden himself with someone else’s troubles; Thuso augments his persuasion for the former to engage ‘Mamohau by saying, “Mohlomong o tla hana motho oa sebele, eba monna oa hae ke eena qoabi.” (Act III: scene i) [May be you will refuse a person of substance, while her husband is the wild cat.] Apparently, Thuso’s above submission has persuaded Khongoana to actually consider the possibility of taking in ‘Mamohau; for Khongoana now brings into play the following other aspects:

“Haele motho eena kea mo hloka; feela moloi h’a mele litšiba monna Thuso. Leha ho le joalo ke tla mo leka, feela o mamarane monna, na h’a na ho mpakela mathata a ee masihloane ke sa tsebe le ba habo?” (Act III: scene i)

[As for a person I actually need; but a witch never grows feathers Thuso man. Even so I shall try her, but she is very lean man, and won’t she cause some troubles for me and die while I do not even know her family?]

Though Khongoana's above concerns seem to be realistic enough, Thuso persuades him to stop thinking too much; as there will be a chance for him to discuss with 'Mamohau and find out about her family. In addition, Thuso makes Khongoana aware that they also know some people from Majoe-matšo; and as such, it will not be difficult for them to find out about 'Mamohau's family – should matters end up the way Khongoana seems to fear. Possibly with an intention to close this subject, Thuso immediately suggests to Khongoana that they should go and harness the animals for the night.

Now that the animals have been harnessed, Thuso and Khongoana go back into the house; where they find out that 'Mamohau and Mohau have already been supplied with all the requirements for the night, as suggested earlier on. Since the mother and son have now relaxed, Khongoana uses this moment for communicating with 'Mamohau and find out about her name, home and her intended destination. Without any waste of time, 'Mamohau explains herself as follows: "Ntate, lebitso la ka ke 'Mamohau, ke tsoa Majoe-matšo, ke letoai ke batla mosebetsi, ke lahliloe ke monna." (Oa Ila.) (Act III: scene i) [Sir, my name is 'Mamohau, I come from Majoe-matšo, I am a loner I seek a job, I have been rejected by a husband. (She cries)] As Khongoana is a humane person, he sympathises with 'Mamohau and responds to her in the following manner:

"Se ise pelo mafisa hle 'm'e. Re batho, re tseba mathata a bophelo, matoai a mangata mona haeso ka ha re sa le ka har'a mokotulo o matla. Haeba u khahloa, u ka lula le rona, ra 'na ra thonakang meseeka masimong, ra tla ra bona hore na ka mor'a kotulo re u tshaparela joang." (Act III: scene i)

[Please do not think too much of sad things. We are people we know about life problems, there are many loners around here at our home since we are still in the midst of heavy reaping. If you are interested, you can stay with us, and collect some seed of the **matolo** grass (see Mabile and Dieterlen, 1985:294) from the fields, so as to see how we might offer you the grain after reaping.]

It would appear that, even though he had already thought of hiring 'Mamohau while he was discussing her situation with Thuso, Khongoana has also been affected by 'Mamohau's crying; such that it has worked as a persuasive strategy for him to pity her and come to the conclusion of actually taking action and hire her without any more questions. As for 'Mamohau, all she can say at this moment is to thank Khongoana, and add that such is the very reason for her to be here. Since there appears to be nothing more for them to discuss at this juncture, Khongoana instructs his daughter, Kharebe, to prepare some bedding for 'Mamohau in these words: "Kharebe u lokisetse 'm'e mosuela, 'na ke tla phomola le ntate

Thuso kamoreng ea ka.” (Act III: scene i) [Kharebe, please prepare some bedding for the lady, I shall rest with Mr Thuso in my bedroom.]

Since Thuso is on his way to the shopping areas in the lowlands, he bids Khongoana and his family farewell and goes – but not before ‘Mamohau thanks him once more for assisting her and Mohau up to here at Khongoana’s home. Though Khongoana needs some assistance at the fields; he persuades ‘Mamohau and Mohau to stay home and relax while they are still tired from the journey up to here. Accordingly, the mother and son stay home; and are eventually persuaded by Kharebe to relax as she goes to the fields for delivering some food for her father. The prevailing warmth in the house induces some sleep upon Mohau; which creates an opportunity for ‘Mamohau to engage in a soliloquy about the prevailing situation, in these words:

“Morena’ka ngoananyana enoa a tla a nkotla pelo ha bohloko; o sebetsa joaleka khutsana, ebe ‘m’ae o kae? Esebe mosali oa batho o inehile naha joaloka ‘na! Ebe li mo qhalile? Kea belaela, mohlomong ke ha meritšoana-soe (sic) mona! Ebe ke teane le pela li falla? Ebo; mohlomong ke k’o-mo-ja-le-mang! Ke re ea ka e ntse e ntlhotse. E nqhalile bo; ke re ke baleha malakabe a mollo athe ke mathela nokeng e sheshang? Uu! Nka etsa joang ngoan’a motho? Empa bitsong la ngoananyana enoa ea molemo ke tla emisa hose hokae, ke ntse ke ithuta sebopelo sa ntat’ae; ha se ka mpalla ke tla tsoa ke phole; haeba ke motho oa sebele ke tla thusa ngoana enoa oa hae, a se ke a khohlela pelo ke mosebetsi o mo tlameng oa lelapa a sa le mokananyana....” (Act III: scene ii)

[My Lord this girl has painfully struck my heart; she works like an orphan, where could her mother be? I hope that her mother has not run away like me! Could they have defeated her? I suspect, may be this is a dangerous place, where one’s hair stands on end. Could I have come to an unusual situation? Yes, he may be a cannibal! I mean while mine has defeated me. Yes, it has scattered me; I try to run away from flames of fire, yet I run towards a rumbling river? Hear! What can I do someone’s child? But in the name of this good girl I shall encamp awhile, while I study her father’s character disposition; if it beats me I shall go out and cool up; if he is a man of substance, I shall assist this child of his, so that she may not have a diminished heart due to this binding family work while she is so young.]

Clearly, ‘Mamohau’s foregoing soliloquy is a means by which she engages in self-persuasion concerning her present situation at this point. First, she observes that she has been deeply touched by the way Kharebe performs the family chores as if she is an orphan; which persuades her to have interest in finding out whether or not her mother has run away like

herself. In that case, 'Mamohau figures that if the answer to her rhetorical question is in the positive, then she is also in danger; as she may have run away from the hot fire into some rumbling river; thus employing a comparison of pastoral images that stimulate her into taking a decisive action timely. Second, in her wonderment 'Mamohau uses another pastoral image by suggesting that this place might be 'ha meritšana-soe,' the expression that presupposes a place at which she may never feel at home due to some harsh treatment she might experience. Thirdly, 'Mamohau even imagines Khongoana's character as that of 'k'o-mo-ja-le-mang,' which literally means 'with-whom-am-I-going-to-eat-her;' in which case it would relegate Khongoana as a cannibal that might devour her at any given time.

Indeed, these strong images are persuasive enough for her to even want to run away from this place; but due to the goodness that has been displayed by Kharebe, she intends to stay and study the situation. Nonetheless, she gives herself a chance to plan ahead, should matters force her to quit this place due to its roughness for her. Further, 'Mamohau self-persuades herself to stay so as to assist Kharebe with the family chores and release her from the present situation that might cause her heart diminish in this young age. Needless to say, 'Mamohau even entertains possibilities of her becoming a mother figure in Khongoana's house, should he be a man of substance; and in case Kharebe is truly an orphan.

Furthermore, 'Mamohau's self-persuasive thoughts take her back to Mojabeng, her daughter that has been left in her grandmother's hands. She imagines her being ill-treated by 'Mamorongoe while she herself is still alive. As a sign that this thought painfully gnaws at her spirit; 'Mamohau even applies an apostrophe by addressing the faraway Mojabeng as if she is here and listening to the following pleadings: "Joo, haeba ho joalo, u ntšoarele hle ngoana'ka, ke etsoa ke mathata a lefatše ha se thato ea ka Lekholokoe, ke tlii'o u tsoanela metsuntsunyane!" (Act III: scene ii) [Poor me, if that be so, please forgive me my child, I am forced by earthly problems it is not my wish Lekholokoe, and have come to seek some edibles for you.] As if this is not enough, 'Mamohau even prays for the Lord to assist her with strength and endurance in her strives to work for her children. Finally, she takes a rest next to already asleep Mohau, and persuades herself as follows: "ha kea tliša boiketlo mona, ke tloisitsoe ha ka ke matšoenyeho, ke tlamehile ho itela." (Act III: scene ii) [I have not come here for well-being I was removed from my home by troubles, and have to renounce myself.]

It is not astonishing that 'Mamohau and Mohau are still fast asleep when Khongoana arrives from the fields; as both are still tired from the previous days' travel. When Kharebe tells Khongoana that the mother and son are still asleep; Khongoana persuades her to leave them alone so that they may freshen up; and further asks her to make all appropriate preparations for them. Kharebe informs him that she has already made all the preparations and is simply waiting for them to wake up; and Khongoana commends her on that, and

further intimates that, “mohlomong Molimo o re tliselitse batho ba bohlokoa, ba tla thoba lipelo tsa rona, hoba metsi a pshele rea bona. U hlomphe ‘m’e enoa joaloka ‘m’ao ngoana’ka, le moshanyana enoa u mo nke e le ngoan’eno, ba tle ba mpe ba itlosetsoe ke tsa bona.” (Act III: scene iii) [it may be that God has brought some important people for us, who will calm our hearts, because the water dried up as we were watching (for we have lost some important person/s). Please give respect to this lady as your own mother my child and also consider this small boy as your own brother, so that they might only be repelled by their own (affairs).]

For Kharebe, these are quite persuasive expressions; that is notable by her merely answering that “Ho lokile ntate, ke tla etsa joalo.” (Act III: scene iii) [It is alright father, I shall do so.] Now that he has succeeded in persuading Kharebe to take care of these visitors; and also to regard them in the respect he has pronounced above, Khongoana goes out to enclose his animals in their rightful enclosures. Like someone who has been waiting for Khongoana to go out, ‘Mamohau wakes up and inquires why Kharebe has not woken her up as she has had an exhausted slumber. Kharebe tells her that she has long returned from the fields; and that she has already prepared some water and food for her and Mohau; thus persuading ‘Mamohau to feel at home and realise that they are in good hands here. As a sign of appreciation for Kharebe’s persuasion, ‘Mamohau says, “Ao ngoananyana oa batho! Kea leboha ruri manana, e re ke tsose Mohau; Mohau tsoha hle (Oa mo sisinya.) (Act III: scene iii) [Oh the people’s small girl! I thank you indeed new friend (see Mabile and Dieterlen, 1985:230), let me wake Mohau up; Mohau please wake up (She shakes him.)]

Like a boy that comes from a place with domestic animals, Mohau wakes up and goes out to give a hand to Khongoana; though the latter tells him that he has already put the animals into their enclosures. Both Khongoana and Mohau go into the house, where they find food ready for all to eat. During the course of partaking of food, Khongoana inquires from ‘Mamohau whose wife she is at Majoe-matšo – and therefore persuading her to open up and engage in some conversation. In response, ‘Mamohau shortly retorts that she is Molotolotsi’s wife; and to drive his goal for ‘Mamohau to open up and relate her situation clearly to him, Khongoana poses this persuasive question for ‘Mamohau to answer, “Kea utloa ‘m’e, ebe ke motho ea joang?” (Act III: scene iii) [I hear mother, what kind of person is he?] Since the foregoing is a point blank question, ‘Mamohau finds herself persuaded to divulge relevant information concerning her husband’s character disposition in the following words: “Ao, ntate, ha se motho oa letho, ke leloabe lee ntoa, motho ea se nang boikarabelo ho hang.” (Act III: scene iii) [Oh, father, he is not a worthy person, he is a good-for-nothing person with fighting propensities, a person with no responsibility at all.]

As if with an intention to protect the said Molotolotsi, Khongoana makes a persuasive talk for 'Mamohau to change her attitude and beliefs with regard to her husband; that "mohlomong o ntoa hobane a imeloa ke bophelo, mathata a etsa hore batho ba bang ba be mofere-fere, ba ikhohomose, ba hloee batho ba hloke khotso, ba mpa ba pata sehlotso. Empa e re ha ba fumana mokhoa oa ho phela ba fetohle ba tlale thabo le khotso." (Act III: scene iii) [perhaps he has fighting propensity because life is heavy for him, problems cause some people to be troublesome, arrogant, hate other people and have no peace, simply to hide the real cause. But when they discover means of living they change and fill up with happiness and peace.] Even though she might agree with Khongoana about his analysis, 'Mamohau gives Khongoana her side of the story that concerns the character of Molotolotsi; in an attempt at persuading Khongoana to see Molotolotsi for what he really is in these expressions:

"Kea utloa ntate, empa lelapa labo hase la bofutsana u ikentse leloabe, h'a tsoare ka thata, hape h'a itsotelle h'a tsotelle le bana ba hae, ke se ke sa re letho ka 'na, mohlomong hobane ha ke oa habo." (Act III: scene iii)

[I understand father, but his family is not a poor one, he has turned himself into a good-for-nothing one, he does not perform duties seriously, and in addition he cares not, does not even care for his own children, never mind me, perhaps as I am not his relative.]

Having listened to 'Mamohau's submission, Khongoana addresses himself to the last point; that 'mohlomong hobane ha ke oa habo,' as his main persuasive point of reference for 'Mamohau to change her attitude and belief in this respect, saying, "M'e, u oa habo ka ho tlala le pele ho bana." (Act III: scene iii) [Mother, you are completely his relative even before the children.] He then proceeds to analyse Molotolotsi in accordance with 'Mamohau's above explanations: "Haeba ke ngoana oa batho ba khorang mohlomong, o ile a hola a etsetsoa, a bokotsoa, a oloa ka lesiba. Le teng ngoana ea joalo o hloloa hoba motho oa 'mankhonthe (sic)." (Act III: scene iii) [If he is the offspring of rich people perhaps, he grew up things being done for him, pampered, and flattered. In that case, such a child fails to be a true man.] Indeed Khongoana's analysis of Molotolotsi now seems to be correct; as 'Mamohau now corroborates it by indicating that Molotolotsi's mother pampers him so much, because she claims that she got him through the use of concoction pots.

Upon learning that even so Molotolotsi is not the sole child in his family, but with one brother and two sisters, all hardworking individuals; Khongoana comes up with yet another persuasive analysis for 'Mamohau to change her attitude and beliefs, saying:

"Mohlomong o re ke mojalefa h'a hloke ho sebetsa, geto eno le eona e fetola ngoana leloabe, h'a sebetse ka thata, u re batsoali ba mo sebelelitse. Le ngoana ea mong

habo o joalo. 'Na Molimo o nkile mosali oa ka kapele, ke ne ke batla bana ba bangata." (Act III: scene iii)

[Perhaps he says that he is the heir and does not need to work, such a conclusion turns a child into a good-for-nothing being, s/he fails to work hard, says that the parents have worked for her/him. Such is also the case with a single child in the family. As for me God has taken away my wife early, I wanted many children.]

Upon learning that Khongoana is a widower, 'Mamohau affectively poses her questions in this form: "Ao, batho, athe u mohlolohali ntate? Ke taba e bohloko ruri. Ebe molato e bile ofe?" (Act III: scene iii) [Oh, guys, so you are a widower father? That is a painful thing indeed. By the way, what was the cause?] Needless to say, the foregoing concern and emotive questions by 'Mamohau are employed as a persuasive action for him to divulge all that needs to be revealed for her to know about his status and matters that precipitated into the wife's death. Without any waste of time, Khongoana gives her the following explanation:

"Mohatsa'ka o nkiloe ke lefu la lona bo-'m'e, o fetile h'a pepa ngoana oa bobeli. A be a entse leseea la letonana la moshanyana a hlaha a khathetse, ka sareloa ha bahloko (sic), le joale lerumo leo le ntse le es'o tlohe pelong ea ka." (Act III: scene iii)

[My wife was taken by the common ailment of you women, she passed away as she was giving birth to a second born. She had made quite a big boy infant that was born tired, I was very much disappointed, even now that spear has not been removed from my heart.]

Clearly, 'Mamohau has been affected by Khongoana's situation; and she commends that his story is a painful one. Further, she inquires whether or not Khongoana has been living solely with Kharebe, without any motherly assistance. It would appear that her concern and question have worked as persuasive attempt for Khongoana to inform her about any motherly being that ever came into his life since the death of his wife. In response, Khongoana informs 'Mamohau that he has since been living with his mother who only passed away at the beginning of this year; in that way informing her that his mother has been the one who brought up Kharebe up to the present stage. In addition, Khongoana tells 'Mamohau that his mother brought up Kharebe from her three years young to the present eight years old stage. Furthermore, in an effort at persuading 'Mamohau to realise the importance of his mother's assistance in bringing up Kharebe, Khongoana says, "Le mpolokile qheku leo la ka." (Act III: scene iii) [That old person of mine had taken care of me.]

As might be expected, this final statement by Khongoana indicates the extent to which he has suffered after both the losses of his wife and mother; and shows how it resultantly persuades 'Mamohau to pour out her emotions as reflected in these expressions:

“Ntate hase feela lerumo le sa tloheng pelong ea hau, u fetile har’a mathata. Empa mosali-moholo o holisitse ngoana enoa hantle. Le ‘na oa ka ngoanana o lekana le enoa oa hau hantle, o setse le ‘m’e.” (Act III: scene iii)

[Sir it is not for nothing that the spear never leaves your heart, you have passed through problems. But the old woman has brought up this child well. Even my little girl is of the same age as this one of yours, she is left with my mother.]

Realizing that he and ‘Mamohau share some similarities – such as having girls of the same age that find themselves being brought up by their grandmothers; including the fact that each of them is on his/her own without a partner – Khongoana persuades ‘Mamohau to put her trust in her mother for bringing up her daughter well; saying, “O setse le matsoho a sebele; maqheku ke liqhoku tsa bophelo bona, kea ba tšepa ruri.” (Act III: scene iii) [She has remained with substantial hands; old people are favourites of this life, I really trust them.] In addition, Khongoana drives his goal of persuading ‘Mamohau to feel at home and consider herself as, not only an employee in this family, but one that belongs to it as well – by stipulating his intentions as follows:

“Joale he ‘m’e ‘Mamohau haele mona u amohela ho sebetsa le ‘na masimong, ke lakatsa hore pele u qala mosebetsi u ke u ee le Kharebe mabenkeleng u eo batla liaparo, ke tšaba hampe ho lula le batho ba ikapereng. Ho fahla leihlo la ka, ho otlapelo ea ka ho lula ke futhumetse, ke apere, ke khotše, empa pel’a ka ho ena le motho ea hatseseng ea hlobotseng ea lapileng.” (Act III: scene iii)

[Now then mother ‘Mamohau since you accept to work with me in the fields, I wish that before you start working you should go with Kharebe to the shops and get some clothes, I am very much afraid of staying with people who are without clothes. It dazzles my eye, strikes my heart to stay warm, clothed, well fed, yet next to me there is someone who is cold, without clothes, and hungry.]

It might be anybody’s guess that at this juncture ‘Mamohau is appalled; and as such, she is moved into tears; for indeed this kind of gesture is uncommon, and possibly something she could never have even thought of. In a persuasive attempt for Khongoana to realise the extent of her appreciation of the offer; ‘Mamohau says, “Ao ntate Khongoana mohau oa hau ke oo mo kaaka’ng!” (Act III: scene iii) [Oh father Khongoana how extensive is your mercy!] Unsurprisingly, even the young Mohau is perplexed; as noted in his question, “M’e, ntate enoa ke ea joang?” (Act III: scene iii) [Mother, what kind of father is this one?] As a further sign of appreciation and determination to work hard for Khongoana, ‘Mamohau first addresses Mohau, cautioning him about paying respect to elderly people; and further

expresses herself as follows to Khongoana: “Kea leboha ruri ntate. Ese e ka nka u sebeletsa hantle.” (Act III: scene iii) [Thank you very much sir. I really hope to work well for you.]

As further persuasive action for ‘Mamohau to feel free and appreciative of the offer extended towards her; Khongoana finally communicates as follows to her:

“Ke bona tsietsi ea hau ‘m’e, u keke ua phuthuloha ha u ntse u shebahala u le manokotho tjenana. Ke batla u ke u lule hae mona, u phomole, u itlhophe, u nt’o ea masimong. Moea oa ka ha u (sic) thabele ho etsa motho eo ke lulang le eena lekhabunyane; tsietsi kea bohle, ha e tšoere motho e mong, e ntšoere le ‘na, ke utloa bohloko.” (Act III: scene iii)

[I see your problem mother you cannot be free as long as you look so shabby. I want you to stay here at home, rest, prepare yourself, and finally go to the fields. My spirit does not rejoice over making a person I stay with a slave; distress is for all, if it has a hold on you, it has a hold on me too, I feel pain.]

It would appear that Khongoana’s above speech is also meant for persuading ‘Mamohau to be humane with people she comes into contact with; as she is hereby introduced to humane relationships with Khongoana as a stranger to her. Another possibility concerning this speech is for Khongoana to ensure that by the time ‘Mamohau goes to the fields; she is free enough to work without thinking of her poor status that might be of some hindrance to her progress at work. In addition, Khongoana seemingly persuades ‘Mamohau to start working at the fields when she no longer regards herself as a mere worker, but as part of the family; thus inducing in her some commitment similar to his as the owner of the fields and the grain to be reaped.

Significantly, ‘Mamohau has been persuaded enough to become, not only a worker in Khongoana’s family, but also a member and part of the family. In support of this idea, ‘Mamohau relates to Kharebe and Mohau as her own children; as illustrated by the following verbal exchanges between her and the two children:

‘Mamohau: Mohau le Kharebe tsamaeang le eo lata patsi ka lifateng ke tl’o pheha. Le nke selepe le tle le khaole makalana a tla lekana hore le a nke. [Mohau and Kharebe go and fetch some wood from the trees so that I may come and cook. You should take an ax so as to cut the branches for easy carrying.]

Mohau: Eseng re hle re hule sefate seo re tle le sona, re tl’o se kapela hae moo? [Is it not better to draw that tree and bring it over, and chop it here at home?]

‘Mamohau: U se leke oa etsa joalo uena moshanyana tooe, le ka hla la hula sefatehali seo? [You dare not do that you small boy, do you think that you can draw such a big tree?]

Kharebe: (Oa tšeha) Re ka se hula hle 'm'e, re matla. [(She laughs) We can draw it please mother, we are powerful.]

'Mamohau: Nkang selepe le tie le makala. (Act III: scene iv) [Take an ax and bring the branches.]

In accordance with 'Mamohau's instructions, Mohau and Kharebe take an ax and a rope for working on the tree in question. In fulfillment of their self-persuasion, when they have come to the tree to work on; Kharebe suggests to Mohau that they should try and pull it; whereupon Mohau makes the following intervention as persuasion for unity:

“Ha re le bohlale ha re se fokotse makala re fokotse boima, ebe re se fasa ka mohala, uena u be Maseka 'na ke be Koepere, khomo tse peli li ke ke tsa hloloa ho hula sefate sena.” (Ba tšeha) (Act III: scene iv)

[If we are clever let us diminish the branches to reduce the weight, then we fasten it with the rope, you become Maseka I become Koepere, two cattle cannot fail to pull a tree.]

Having cut off the branches according to plan, Mohau once more persuades Kharebe to unite with him in pulling the tree, putting it in these words: “Joale he, ha re tšoare mohala, re kope thuso ho lipholo tseno re re: 'khomo eso mphe matla le 'na ke tla o fa matla.' Ebe rea hula.” (Act III: scene iv) [Now then, let us hold the rope, ask for assistance from those oxen and say: 'my beast give me power and I shall give you power.' Then we pull.] Pronouncing those words of unity, Mohau and Kharebe pull the tree towards home; resting now and then for gathering more power.

Ultimately, they are seen by Khongoana and 'Mamohau as they are in the vicinity of home. Motivated by these children's unity strategy, Khongoana asks 'Mamohau to join him in assisting the two children. Even as 'Mamohau rebukes them for daring to pull that big and heavy tree; Mohau jovially persuades their parents to come to their assistance in these persuasive words: “Ke Maseka le Koepere li pannoe, ntate u thuse Maseka 'm'e a thuse Koepere.” (Act III: scene iv) [It is Maseka and Koepere bound together, father you assist Maseka mother assists Koepere.] Once all are holding their parts accordingly, Mohau once more intimates that they should gather more power by using these persuasive words: “Ha re kopeng matla pele re hula.” (Act III: scene iv) [Let us ask for power before we pull.] Thus being duly persuaded by Mohau's words, the parents and the children together say, “Khomo eso mphe matla le 'na ke tla o fa matla, ha re eeng” (Ba se hula baa hasana ke litšeo.) (Act III: scene iv) [My beast give me power I shall also give you power, let us go (They pull it and they scatter with laughter.)] Finally, when they have achieved Mohau and Kharebe's goal;

Mohau remarks as follows to Kharebe: “Kharebe oa bona, kopano ke matla, re se nyolotse.” (Act III: scene iv) [Kharebe you see, unity is power, we have brought it up.]

It would look as though Khongoana’s family has now been extended into four members, including ‘Mamohau and Mohau. Tonight they are sitting together at supper when the following remarks are passed:

Mohau: ‘M’e mona ho monate ho feta Majoe-matšo hoja Mojabeng o teng le eena. [Mother here it is more enjoyable than at Majoe-matšo, I wish Mojabeng were here too.]

‘Mamohau: Kea bona o mo hlolohetsoe, nkabe ke re u eo ‘mona hoja ha ho hole. Etsoe ho a futhumala joale. [I realise that you miss her, I would suggest that you go and see her if it were not far. For it is now getting warm.]

Khongoana: U buoa hantle Mohau, re lokela ho ba isetsa moelela mokotla oa poone le oa mabele. Ha Thuso a ka fihla ke tla re a nyolohe le uena a u bofise. [You speak well Mohau, we should deliver some grain stuff to them, a bag of maize and of sorghum. If Thuso can arrive I will ask him to go up with you and help you to bind the stuff.]

‘Mamohau: Ke leboha khopolo e ntle ea hao ntate, etsoe re ba lahlile kherekhloa. Feela ebe Mohau a ka khutla le mang? Eseng ke mpe ke nyolohe le ‘na? [I thank you for your good thought father, for we have simply forsaken them. But with whom would Mohau come back? Is it not better for me to go up too?]

Khongoana: Ho ntse ho itoketse ‘m’e. [It is alright mother.]

Kharebe: Ache, ‘m’e, re ka hlora ha le ka nyoloha ka bobeli. (Act III: scene v) [No mother, we can be unhappy if you can both go.]

It would seem that Mohau’s suggestion that this place is more enjoyable than his home place has persuaded all the members of Khongoana’s family to think of those people left at Majoe-matšo. Whereas ‘Mamohau is persuaded to send Mohau to see Mojabeng and ‘Malefilo, Khongoana is persuaded at sending Mohau to take some stuff to those very people, including some clothes and other necessities. In addition, ‘Mamohau’s suggestion that she should accompany Mohau homeward bound sparks up in Kharebe the sense of loneliness she and her father are likely to experience during the absence of both Mohau and ‘Mamohau. Needless to say, Khongoana also shares Kharebe’s sensibilities; that is why he asks Mohau whether or not he foresees any problems on his way back after delivering the foodstuff in question; whereupon Mohau pronounces that he foresees no problem.

As if by providence divine, at this very moment Thuso arrives; and in this way creating an opportunity for Khongoana to persuade him to accompany Mohau as he goes to Majoe-matšo to deliver the stuff. To everybody’s delight, Thuso suggests that he can go with Mohau

the following day as he goes back to his home; as long as everything can be ready by tomorrow. Seemingly persuaded by Thuso's assurance that he will be going back tomorrow, Khongoana tells him that all things will be ready; thus also persuading Thuso to make some remarks relative to this plan; saying:

“Khele, mohaeso, ke thuso e kholo eo, mosali-moholo o tla phomola moeeng a bone hore bana ba hae ba ntse ba phela. Ke sa fetela ha khaitseli; ke tla tla fihla mona ha ho futhumala, ke fumane le lokisitse.” (Act III: scene v)

[Goodness, my fellow man that is a big assistance, the old woman will have peace of the mind and realise that her children are still alive. I pass over to my sister's home, I shall arrive here when it becomes warm, let me find everything ready.]

Since Thuso is in a hurry to reach his sister's home before bedtime, Khongoana takes him halfway as he does not even want to waste time; and thus creating an opportunity for Thuso to pass some remarks about 'Mamohau's status; saying, “Ho joang monna, mosali eo u mo fepa'ng h'a atlehile hakaale?” (Act III: scene v) [How is it man, what do you feed this woman with that she is so prosperous?] As if he has always been waiting for this kind of question, Khongoana is persuaded by Thuso's question to relate to 'Mamohau's situation as follows:

“Mosali enoa o pelo e jeoang, o matsoho, ke bona eka motho ea neng a mo tlaila ke monna oa hae. Ha ke mofe letho le mohlolo haese thabo le khotso. Mosali o tšoana le phoofolo e ruiloeng, o batla ho nahaneloa, ho kothatsoa, ho lebohuoa nthong tsohle tseo a li etsang, ho babatsoa h'a entse hantle, le ho lefelloa h'a fositse.” (Act III: scene v)

[This woman has a heart that could be eaten (a kind heart), dexterity, I suspect that the person who was failing her was her husband. I give her nothing that is miraculous except happiness and peace. A woman is like a domestic animal, she needs to be thought of, to be encouraged, to be thanked in all things that she performs, to be praised if she has done a good thing, and be paid for when she has erred.]

As a persuasive action for Khongoana to carry on and explain himself, Thuso asks, “Ho lefelloa joang?” (Act III: scene v) [What kind of payment?] Indeed Khongoana elaborates on the way he relates to 'Mamohau in this lengthy presentation:

“Monna, phoofolo ea hau ha e jele mabele, e le sekete e lefelloa ke uena. Le mosali o joalo, h'a fositse o sekete ka moeeng, o phakise o mofe tšoarello, o mo lopolle, u se ke ua 'malla melato, u mo tšepe, u tla etsa mosali ea thabileng, 'me thabo e tsoala monono le khotso. Soothoana ena e hloka letsoalo, ke 'm'arona ruri, ke hlokometse litlhoko tsa hae. Ka hoo ngoan'eso ke kopa hore u mpe u eo fihlisa ngoana enoa ho nkho'ae hle monna.” (Act III: scene v)

[Man, when your animal has eaten some sorghum, and held up at a pound kraal it is paid for by you. Even a woman is just like that, if she has erred she is held up in spirit, you should quickly forgive her, and release her, do not relate her wrongs, trust her, you will create a happy woman, and happiness delivers riches and peace. This brownish beauty has no fear, she is our true mother, I take care of her requirements. So my brother, I appeal for you to go and deliver this child at his grandmother's, please man.]

In response to the foregoing lengthy and persuasive speech, Thuso corroborates Khongoana's ideas by showing that "mosali o tšaba khalefo, ntoa le mefere-fere, o rata mohau kamehla;" (Act III: scene v) [a woman is afraid of anger, a fight and troubles, she likes mercy always], and further promises Khongoana that he will take the boy to his grandmother.

After these verbal exchanges between Khongoana and Thuso, the former goes back into the house, as the latter goes to his sister's home as intended. Once in the house, Khongoana explains to 'Mamohau that Thuso is his friend with whom they grew together; and as such he assures her that he will deliver Mohau to his grandmother as he has promised. In response, 'Mamohau announces that she also trusts Thuso; and further addresses Mohau and instructs him to advise 'Malefilo to ferment some of the sorghum for commercial purposes geared towards buying some requirements for Mojabeng. Seemingly, this suggestion functions as a persuasive action for Khongoana; to take it upon his hands and announce that he is going to buy all the requirements needed by a girl of Mojabeng's age. In addition, Khongoana also promises that he is also going to buy 'Malefilo a sleeping blanket and one for day time occasions; as well as some cloths for dressmaking purposes; together with other requirements. Finally, everybody goes to bed with happiness, knowing that those at Majoe-matšo will probably appreciate all that has to be delivered to them by Mohau the following day.

In line with the preparations made for Mohau's journey to Majoe-matšo, he, together with Thuso, arrive at their destination at dusk. Since it is a bit dark, such that their faces are hardly recognizable, Thuso introduces himself and explains that he is from Mokoallong; while he starts unloading the bags of grain from the pack animals. Upon noticing that Lefilo hardly recognises him; Mohau greets him, calling him 'malome' [maternal uncle] and additionally introduces himself by name. It would seem that Mohau's self-introduction persuades Lefilo into sending him into the house to greet 'Malefilo, while he assists Thuso to unload the pack animals. When he enters the house, Mohau greets his grandmother, saying, "Lumela hle nkho." (Act IV: scene i) [Good evening please grandmother.] It would seem that Mohau has overgrown his age, for 'Malefilo remarks with surprise as follows:

“Qhoqhorohali ee ea mohlankana ekaba Mohau? Ka ntate a shoele re tla bona mehlolo, a ku ‘mete hle monna, ‘Metete, hee! Motho a tla a hola basali, ‘ma’o o kae?”
(Act IV: scene i)

[Can this tall big boy be Mohau? With my dead father we shall see miracles, please kiss me man. Kiss-kiss, yes! The person has really grown up guys; where is your mother?]

Needless to say, the remarks made by ‘Malefilo pamper Mohau with pride and assurance that he is really a big boy now. In addition, this suggests that he is living a good life wherever he is; which in essence surprises ‘Malefilo, as she might have never expected to see her grandson having grown up so fast. It therefore comes not as surprise that she is persuaded by this sight to ask about the whereabouts of ‘Mamohau; even before she completes her appreciation of Mohau’s fast growth. To signify her bafflement at Mohau’s fast growth, when he informs her that ‘Mamohau is at Mokoallong; ‘Malefilo responds as follows: “O ntse a phela? Helang basali ka tla ka makala!” (Act IV: scene i) [Is she alright? Goodness me, I am so surprised!] Clearly, ‘Malefilo’s posing a question and employing a statement of her bafflement at the same time signify some incongruence in her mind; for the two do not tie up together.

In line with ‘Malefilo’s question above, Mohau answers that she is alright; and adds that she has sent him to come and deliver some food and clothes; and quickly inquires where Mojabeng has gone to – thus also registering his concern of longing to meet his sister. Apparently, Mohau’s mention of some stuff that he has been instructed by his mother to deliver here persuades ‘Malefilo to be anxious to know what stuff that is; that is why she responds to Mohau’s question; and at the same time poses the question, “liphahlo li tsoa kae?” (Act IV: scene i) [where are the items coming from?] Seemingly, Mohau’s persuasive idea is to relate the way they are treated by Khongoana at Mokoallong; for he responds to his grandmother’s question in this form: “Nkhono, li tsoa ha ntate eo re lulang hahae. Ntate ea molemo hakalo ha ke e-s’o ‘mone.” (Act IV: scene i) [Grandmother, they are from the father at whose home we stay. I have never seen such a good father.]

Eventually, Thuso and Lefilo bring the stuff into the house; where Thuso addresses ‘Malefilo in these words:

“Nkhono, pahlo tsa hau tsohle ke tsena. Ke kopiloe ke motsoalle oa ka Khongoana oa Mokoallong moo morali oa hao a lulang teng hore ke fihlise ngoana enoa matsohong a hau, ‘me ha e le mona ke phethile thomo ea ka, ke fetela haeso ha Letseka.”

[Grandmother, here are all your items. I have been asked by my friend, Khongoana of Mokoallong, where your daughter is staying, to deliver this child into your hands; and now that I have fulfilled the sending, I proceed to Letseka's place, my home.]

Though both Lefilo and 'Malefilo attempt to persuade him to sleep over, as it is late, Thuso insists that he should reach home tonight. Without much to say, 'Malefilo thanks him and wishes him a good journey; thus persuading Lefilo to take him out to where Thuso's horse is tethered. This moment works as a persuasive chance for Lefilo to commend over Thuso's horse in this fashion: "Ke lehantamo la pere, ke sebata sa sebele, ha se feela u sa tšabeng le ho tsamaea le masiu, ke mok'hongk'hotho oa nyamatsana, moleko ruri!" (Act IV: scene i) [It is a big horse, a real beast, no wonder that you are not even afraid of traveling in the nights, it is a high-structured beast, a temptation indeed.]

It would seem that Lefilo's praise of this horse has motivated Thuso into corroborating it in this manner:

"Ena ngoan'antate ha e hopotse moiteling ha e thijoe. Ha ke tloha mona ho tla lla tlhako feela, ho tlole malakabe ha e otlala moralla; ke tla kenya molomo kobong, e tla tšetšetha, e tla re ha ba tloaela likobo ke be ke kena, ke sa e shape, e ikhanna. Sala hantle." (Act IV: scene i)

[This one my father's child when it is longing for its kraal manure stable it is not stopped. When I leave here there will be just the sound of the hooves, sparks of fire will jump when it hits the stony hills; I shall put my mouth into the blanket, it will strike the ground, so that when they get used to the sleeping blankets I arrive, without lashing it, as it will be self-driving. Stay well.]

As soon as Lefilo enters the house, 'Malefilo informs him that they have been waiting for him to come and unfold the parcels. Just as he begins unfolding the parcels, Mojabeng comes in; and the two children rejoice over meeting each other. Lefilo has just completed unfolding the parcels, when Mohau pronounces that they are for both 'Malefilo and Mojabeng; the announcement that seemingly persuades Lefilo into losing interest in the stuff, as he passes no remark about this heap of parcels – as opposed to 'Malefilo, who remarks: "Ke phahlo e kaakang basali!" (Act IV: scene i) [What a big pack of stuff, guys!] Instead, Lefilo simply inquires from Mohau as to when he is intending to go back. After Mohau has answered that he plans to go a day after tomorrow, the discussion now seems to centre itself around 'Malefilo, Mohau and Mojabeng; while Lefilo has just turned himself into a mere observer.

Since Mohau is the focus of attraction at this juncture, he is asked a number of questions, and persuaded to include the distance to Mokoallong and how they fared on their day of departure with his mother. In response Mohau tells them that Mokoallong is not so far off

from Majoe-matšo; as one has to traverse the plateaus and immediately get downwards towards Mokoallong. In addition, Mohau relates to them how Thuso came to their assistance in these words:

“Re ne re tholoe ke eena ntate Thuso Lehaheng la Masole re hatsetse re katlehile, re lapile, a re isa motebong, a re besetsa mollo a ba a re fepa a ntoo re palamisa pereng ea hae a re isa ha ntate Khongoana.” (Act IV: scene i)

[We were found by the same father Thuso at Lehaheng la Masole where we were cold, lump, and hungry; then he took us to the cattle post, made fire for us and fed us; then put us on his horse back and took us to father Khongoana’s place.]

In appreciation of Thuso’s assistance to Mohau and ‘Mamohau, ‘Malefilo remarks that he is a man of substance, and that she respects him. It would once more seem that this remark persuades Lefilo into no more remaining a mere observer here, but to go away and leave the discussants to themselves – for he now stands up and pronounces himself in this form: “Ke sa ea, re tla tla hlaha hosesane, robalang ha monate.” (Oa tsoa.) (Act IV: scene i) [I am gone, we shall show up tomorrow, sleep well. (He goes out.)] Now that Lefilo has just gone away, ‘Malefilo and Mojabeng engage in the following verbal exchanges:

‘Malefilo: Mojabeng itekanye lieta, u tla ke u be motho le uena, u lese ho alima limphachana tsa Morongoe ha le ea meketeng, le ‘na ke sa lekanya tsa ka; ke tla ba hata. [Mojabeng, fit on your shoes; you will also be a human being too, and stop borrowing Morongoe’s crooked objects; I am also fitting in mine, I will trample them.]

Mojabeng: Tseo mong’a tsona a reng ke li tšoare ka letsoho, ke li roale ha re fihla moketeng? (Act IV: scene i) [Those that the owner instructs me to hold in hand, and put them on when we reach the feast area?]

Upon realizing the level of appreciation exuded by both ‘Malefilo and Mojabeng, Mohau finds himself persuaded to give them an assurance that, “Re tla le tlisetsa liphahlo khafetsa, u ke ke ua hlola u kalima.” (Act IV: scene i) [We shall often bring you some clothes, you will no more borrow.] Since Mohau seems so confident about what he says, Mojabeng is persuaded to imagine the enjoyment both Mohau and ‘Mamohau are experiencing there at Mokoallong; and suggests to also go there so as to share the comforts of life they are exposed to. Apparently, for ‘Malefilo, Mojabeng is so handy to her that she dares not lose her; and that is why her suggestion of going with Mohau infuriates her and persuades her to rebuke Mojabeng as follows: “Heletoane tooe! Nka sala ke roma mang? Ua hlanya.” (Act IV: scene i) [You fool! Who would I remain sending? You are mad.]

Significantly, ‘Malefilo and Mojabeng have had a rough time since they have been living together; such that they have depended on borrowing and provisions from other people. That

is why they feel that from now on they will also be regarded as human beings. In line with that understanding, 'Malefilo persuades Mojabeng to perform in the following manner: "Mojabeng pata tsoekere ena le sesepa ka morifing, baseline u e potetse ka mor'a limmethe; 'Mamorongoe h'a ka li bona a ka li qela letsatsi le letsatsi. Mekotla ke eang?" (Act IV: scene i) [Mojabeng hide this sugar and the soap in the clay pot, and place the Vaseline behind the canvas bags; if 'Mamorongoe were to see them she would ask for them day after day. What is in the canvas bags?] In response to 'Malefilo's question above, Mohau retorts that it is maize and sorghum; and in addition gives her some money he has brought for them.

With apparent joviality and appreciation of the stuff in question, 'Malefilo is persuaded to respond in these expressions:

"Ra tsotsa! Re bolaile re sa tsoe letšolong. Bona feela mese ea hau le liele tsa ka, le likobo tsa bosiu le tsa motšoare, re tla ke re robale hamonate, maoto le melala li sa kene litereteng. Ke re ke morena kajeno le 'na. Mojabeng ngoathela ngoana enoa oa ka papa le moroho a tsoe a phomola. (Act IV: scene i)

[There we gain! We have killed without having gone for hunting. Just look at your dresses and my dress materials, and blankets for day and night, we shall now sleep peacefully, the feet and necks not bound into the cruppers. I say that I am a chief today too. Mojabeng please serve this child of mine with papa and vegetables so that he may rest.]

Indeed 'Malefilo and Mojabeng have gained a lot of stuff without even taking the initiative to go and hunt for this much stuff. No wonder that 'Malefilo assures Mojabeng that from today on, they will sleep like normal human beings; without binding the necks and feet with some cruppers; which presupposes that these things were used for safeguarding some kind of cloths bound around the heads and feet for warmth during sleep. It is therefore this feeling of liberation from these tethers that persuades 'Malefilo to even regard herself as a 'morena' today – a 'morena' who is even in a position to give the following instructions to Mojabeng, 'ngoathela ngoana enoa oa ka papa...', as shown above.

In order for 'Malefilo and Mojabeng to be more persuaded into gaining more happiness and gratification, Mohau pronounces to the former that there is some food provision in the saddle bags; and asks the latter to hand those backs to him. He takes out all the various provisional stuffs carried in the saddle bags and gives them to 'Malefilo, and some sweets to Mojabeng. In the light of this action, 'Malefilo becomes so elated that she is persuaded to prove her eloquence in the following fashion:

“Re tla ja sa mpana phatloha kajeno, tlotlo le oele mekhoabane. Papa le moroho li ke li chechelle koana! Mojabeng, hantle koae ea ka e kae, u thabetse khaitselie hoo u seng u lebetse hore ke ne ke u romile?” (Act IV: scene i)

[We are going to eat to the small-stomach-rupturing level today, there is abundant supply. As for papa and vegetables let them go back there! Mojabeng, by the way where is my tobacco, have you rejoiced over seeing your brother that you have even forgotten that I had sent you?]

The idiomatic expression, ‘ho ja sa mpana phatloha,’ is usually employed in a situation where a very hungry person/s eat/s more than enough; to an extent that his/her normally small stomach due to hunger might even rupture out of over eating. ‘Malefilo therefore employs it here to signify that the food provisions from Mokoallong are in such an abundance that she and Mojabeng are even prepared to over eat tonight. In addition, she uses the proverb, ‘Tlotlo le oele mekhoabane,’ (‘Tlotlo le oele makhoabane’; according to Matšela and Moletsane, 1999:95) which originates from the times of drought and starvation. These would be times where animals would die in big numbers, and as a result end up being plenty consumption for crows; thus being “Lehlohonolo le oetseng ba bangata ka nako e le ‘ngoe,” (Matšela and Moletsane, 1999:95) [Some luck that has befallen many at the same time.] ‘Malefilo, therefore engages this proverb as a metaphoric expression for persuading her two grandchildren to understand and appreciate the greatness of supply they have just received from Mokoallong. In addition, it is a pastoral image that she uses for highlighting the extent to which her family is going to feed on the supplies – since it has for long been suffering from starvation, coldness and walking bare footed or in borrowed crooked objects; as was shown by Mojabeng above.

Obviously, in the light of ‘Malefilo’s feelings above, these supplies are rather overpowering for her; such that she is persuaded to use some tranquiliser for lowering her tension. Seemingly, that is why she ends up by asking Mojabeng where her tobacco is; so as to use it for calming down her nerves. Being thus persuaded by her grandmother, Mojabeng remarks after finding the tobacco that, “Morongoe o tla khala ha a bona mese ea ka.” (Act IV: scene i) [Morongoe is going to crave as she sees my dresses.] Finally, as if to boost Mojabeng’s ego, and persuade her to adopt positive attitude; ‘Malefilo responds to her quip by saying, “U mo chese ngoana’ka.” (Act IV: scene i) [You should burn her, my child.] In this way, the idiomatic expression hereby applied would appear to be meant for persuading Mojabeng to rise up from her lowly and cold status, and adopt a hot and positive stand in comparison with Morongoe; the girl that has always been dominating her in dress as they used to go for feasts.

Back at Mokoallong, Khongoana and 'Mamohau are sitting together outside; where the former thanks the latter for being such a mother figure in his family; since they have been together for a full year now. For Khongoana, 'Mamohau has handled his home with dexterity; more especially for the way she treats the children as her own, without any discrimination whatsoever. In response to Khongoana's gratitude, 'Mamohau reciprocates the same in this manner:

“Ao, ntate Khongoana, ke 'na letoai ea lokelang ho u leboha ruri, u re phuthile, u re entse batho, re bile re lebetse matšoenyeho a rona. Le 'm'e hae koana eka motho ka baka la hau.” (Act V: scene i)

[Please, father Khongoana, it is I the loner that has to give thanks to you indeed, you have gathered and treated us humanely; we have even forgotten our troubles. Even my mother back home is like a human being because of you.]

Indeed as persuasion is said to be incremental, Khongoana retorts in the following manner as a persuasive attempt for 'Mamohau to adopt a positive attitude and consider herself as a woman of importance in his eyes:

“Ke leboha haholo haeba ho joalo. Koana nka lumela hore ho joalo; ha u tsamaea u nyabolla lifutši, o hakotse, u lereli, ho bontšang thabo le khatholoho ea moea. Ho re saletseng ho hong feela ke hore re tšoarane ka matsoho ho holisa bana bana ba rona. Etsoe ke ikemiselitse ho tšoaela Mohau namane e tšehali selemo le selemo, e le hore h'a hola hoba monna a be a ena le likhomo tseo a tla nyala ka tsona. Ha ke rate ho ja tsuo ka hore a ntisetse mahala.” (Act V: scene i)

[Thank you very much if that be so. Truly I can believe that it is so; when you walk you display your well-built female structure, you are well-fed, you command beauty, and that indicates happiness and the freedom of spirit. We are left with one thing, it is to join hands and bring up these children of ours. More so that I am determined to earmark for Mohau a female calf each year, so that as he grows into manhood he should have some cattle with which he may pay bohali with. I do not want to cheat him by making him herd for me free of charge.]

Needless to say, Khongoana's above complements and adoration for 'Mamohau's versatility and glamour are meant for propelling his goal of persuading her to accept him as her 'husband' that is more than prepared to share almost everything with her – as long as she is agreeable to his proposal. In addition, Khongoana signifies his intent on the positive upbringing of the children by ensuring 'Mamohau of his plan to earmark a female calf for Mohau on annual basis in preparation for Mohau to be independent when he reaches his

maturity stage. It would seem that by so suggesting, Khongoana is cementing his persuasive goal for 'Mamohau to have no alternative but to accept his proposal.

Yet it would appear that 'Mamohau is still doubtful of this proposal; for she responds thus, "Ntate Khongoana, ke leboha maikutlo ao a hau a mohau ho matoai." (Act V: scene i) [Father Khongoana, I thank you for that compassionate view of yours about the loners.] Seemingly, this statement does not augur well with Khongoana; for he now applies more persuasion by downplaying 'Mamohau's supposed strong points and upgrading his unclear points to her as follows:

"M'e 'Mamohau, ha ka mona ha ho na letoai hle! Ho teng ke batsoali le bana; ke 'm'e le ntate, mosebetsi oa rona ke ho holisa bana bana ba rona. U moholo 'm'e 'Mamohau, ha ke hloke ho buoa ho feta mona; Mosotho o ee a re 'moeti o thetehile' joale le 'na ke re 'letoai le thetehile.' Ho tloha hona joale botoai bo fele ho hang, ha bo nthabise, ho phele 'm'e le ntate le bana lapeng lena; ke a kholoa ke buile ho utloahetse" (Oa tloha, o likela ka sakeng.) (Act V: scene i)

[Mother 'Mamohau, here at my home there is no loner please! Only parents and children are there; it is mother and father, our work is to bring up these children of ours. You are a grown up mother 'Mamohau, I do not have to say more than this; a Mosotho usually says that 'a visitor has rolled down' and now I also say that 'the loner has rolled down'. As from now the loneliness should cease altogether, it does not rejoice me, there should live mother, father, and children in this home; I think that I have spoken and it is understood (He leaves, and disappears into the kraal.)

In line with Khongoana's above submission, one might correctly deduce that he now applies some directives and imperatives; rather than employing an upfront persuasive practice, where both the persuader and target engage in open and free communicative exchanges intended for both parties to debate issues in order to reach an amicable settlement. Further, it seems that for Khongoana to achieve his goal, he regards it as a matter of importance to simply pronounce himself without any more debates with 'Mamohau; for as a loner who had to flee from a number of troubles, 'Mamohau might not be free enough and be in a position to debate this issue to the fulfillment of his goal. The idea of 'ho theteha' (rolling down) of a visitor presupposes a situation in which a male visitor moves from his own bed into a woman's bed for copulation purposes. It would then follow that when Khongoana proposes that 'letoai le thetehile,' he clearly puts it for 'Mamohau to move into his bed for the same purpose – thus proposing that she be his lifetime wife.

Furthermore, Khongoana's departure after the presentation of the above argument, highlights his final intent to be together with 'Mamohau from henceforth. Further still, this very

departure appears to be meant for affording 'Mamohau an opportunity to cogitate over this matter and realise the importance of their togetherness as husband and wife; rather than the weightings of the present relationship of the master and the loner. Additionally, Khongoana leaves 'Mamohau alone, seemingly to conscientise her of the fact that he has reached a point of no return to the ensuing master-servant relationship; and therefore coerces her to either adopt the same or face the consequences of ending the whole relationship.

It therefore causes no astonishment that once left alone, 'Mamohau engages into some poetic self-persuasive soliloquy for calming herself down and weigh up the pros and cons of this proposed and apparently imminent new relationship as follows:

“Maakane, ha ho letho nka le buoang!
 Mong'a motse o buile, ana 'na ke mang?
 Esere ho bua ka fothola hlahlana sa me,
 Meea, lipula le likhohola tsa nthuthuka,
 Ana nka tšabela kae ke le tlakasolle?
 Ana a buoa Mosotho oa mathata,
 A re sepa-leholo ke la molata,
 La mong'a motse ke kotokoana,
 Se senye lehaha ngoananyana,
 Morarane o ntharile, ke thatelehile,
 Balimo ba heso tlo'ng le ntharolle,
 Ke tšaba ho jara ka monkhoane.
 (Act V: scene i)

[Alas, there is nothing that I can say!
 The home owner has spoken, and who am I?
 Lest I speak and uproot my small shrub,
 Winds, rains and downpours demolish me,
 And where may I run to as I am a lone vulture?
 Once a troubled Mosotho spoke,
 And said the big faeces is that of a foreigner,
 That of a local is very little or unnoticed,
 Do not spoil the cave little girl,
 Cunning has entangled me, I am bound on,
 My gods come and disentangle me'
 I am afraid of carrying with a weak stick.]

'Mamohau's above self-persuasive poetic soliloquy is an elegy; which, in Greek and Roman literature, according to Abrams (1993:49), "denoted any poem written in **elegiac meter** (alternating *hexameter* and *pentameter* lines); the term was also used to refer to the subjects and moods frequently expressed in the elegiac verse form, especially complaints about love." Since Khongoana has just proposed love and coerced her to adopt this husband-wife relationship from now on; 'Mamohau employs this elegy as a "**monody** for an elegy or dirge which is being presented as being the utterance of a single person," (Abrams, 1993:50) (Abrams' emphases). As such, she wails for being in this situation, where she is coerced to come into bed with Khongoana by virtue of her being a troubled loner that might otherwise have no where to run – for indeed she would be inviting more troubles for herself, as she has just spelt them out in this monody. She therefore cautions herself to the fact that, since Khongoana is the home owner, his instructions may not be vetoed by a loner such as herself; for she would be inviting for herself a situation in which she might find herself leaving this place empty handed – 'Ke tšaba ho jarisoa ka monkhoane,' as she puts it. Having cautioned herself as indicated above, 'Mamohau soliloquises thus: "Ngoan'a motho, e re ke eme ke eo lokisetsa bana lijo, ke tlohele ho lohotha ntho li hana ho fela." (Act V: scene i) [Somebody's child, let me stand up and go and prepare some food for the children, and stop wishing for this and that.]

As anyone might have expected, Khongoana and 'Mamohau have spent some time now living together as husband and wife; in accordance with his proposal and coercion. In line with that situation, it comes not as surprise to learn from 'Mamohau's soliloquy that she is now pregnant. Whereas one might consider this pregnancy as a situation she would appreciate and be at peace with, for her this is a worrying situation, as reflected in her soliloquy below:

"Morena'ka, ke ne ke sa nahane hore nka hlola ke ima. Ebe ha nka etsa moshanyana katisa leloko nka etsa joang? Khongoana a ka ka a thaba hobane h'a na moshanyana. Empa ha ke hopola lipuo tsa abuti Lefilo ha ke tla tloha hae, ke utloa ke tšaba! Ke ikopela hoba le ngoanana lefa la balichaba." (Act V: scene ii)

[My Lord, I never thought that I could still fall pregnant. By the way, if I were to have a boy the genealogy expander what can I do? Khongoana would be so happy because he has no boy. But as I recall brother Lefilo's words on my departure's day from home, I feel afraid. I request to have a baby girl, the foreigners' inheritance.]

Just as she completes her soliloquy, Khongoana arrives and inquires after this soliloquy – whereupon 'Mamohau informs him that she has merely been considering the fact that her times are shortening up for child-bearing. Her pronouncement that her pregnancy period is

shortening persuades Khongoana to respond by indicating his desire for a baby boy – “Ke kopa feela hore eka nka fuoa moshemane, le hona a tšoane le ‘na, ha ke batle ha maruo ana a ka a ka jeoa ke balichaba.” (Act V: scene ii) [I only pray that I be given a boy, and one who resembles me, I do not want these riches of mine to be consumed by foreigners.] As may be observed, ‘Mamohau’s predictions concerning Khongoana’s feelings and desires above were correct; for indeed he hereby spells them out as she had thought. Even as ‘Mamohau passes some joke that her bearing him a girl would benefit them by earning some cattle that belong to the foolish ones; Khongoana retorts as follows:

“Le khale, ‘Mamohau, ke batla banna ba tla nchekela, ke ea kae le banana lefa la balichaba: Kharebe le eane oa hao ba lekane. Re hloka moshanyana ea tla jarela Mohau thoto.” (Oa tsoa.) (Act V: scene ii)

[Never, ‘Mamohau, I want men that will dig for me, where am I going with girls the inheritance of foreigners: Kharebe and that one of yours are enough. We need a small boy that will carry a load for Mohau.” (He goes out.)]

In the light of Khongoana’s above statements, one might correctly deduce that his wishes for a baby boy are not mere wishes; but very deeply embedded desires that, for him, have even coagulated into reality. The denial statement that he hereby employs, ‘le khale,’ spells out his convictions that ‘Mamohau is going to bear a baby boy for him. Similar to his former action when he proposed and coerced ‘Mamohau into becoming his wife earlier, Khongoana once more goes out just as he has finished stating his deeply embedded desires. One might then correctly conclude that his departure, similar to that day in question, is meant for persuading and instilling it into ‘Mamohau that she has no alternative but to bear a boy for him – for bearing a girl might spell the end of their relationship, he seems to say.

Not surprisingly, ‘Mamohau is once more left alone to internalise Khongoana’s words and weigh his desires; in comparison with her own feelings and beliefs concerning the present pregnancy. Unlike last time when she engaged in a monody, ‘Mamohau now applies a lengthy soliloquy that may even be described as a monologue, “a speech delivered by one actor or actress” (Ebewo, 1997:26). Here go ‘Mamohau’s comparisons and contrasts:

- “Khongoana o batla moshanyana, o batla mojalefa – ‘Mamohau o batla ngoanana;
- Khongoana o bona moshanyana a tla mo chekela kamoso – ‘Mamohau o bona khathatso e ba tlelang
- Khongoana o bona Mohau le moena ba tla thusana le ho hlomphana – ‘Mamohau o bona lesele le tla qabanya le be le qabane le Mohau, joaloka ha e se bana ba motho: lesele ke mojalefa oa Khongoana, athe Mohau ke mojalefa hahabo;

- Seng sa Khongoana se ke ke sa lumela hore ngoana eo ke oa bona, ha se oa khomo tsa bona – hoja ebe bonyane o inyalisitse ka ha o se a ile a nyalisoa;
- Khongoana o nka ‘Mamohau e le ‘m’e oa bana ba bona – ‘Mamohau o ikuka entse e le letoai le mpang le qhoaolotse likobo; hape
- Khongoana a ke ke a roala thapo ha ‘Mamohau a shoele – ‘Mamohau le eena a ke ke a roalla Khongoana thapo.” (Act V: scene ii)
- [Khongoana desires to have a boy, an heir – ‘Mamohau wants a girl;
- Khongoana considers a boy as one who will dig a grave for him – ‘Mamohau sees some forthcoming troubles;
- Khongoana foresees Mohau and the boy in question as brothers who will assist and respect each other – ‘Mamohau foresees them as being quarrelsome against each other; Mohau will be heir at his home, the boy in question be Khongoana’s heir;
- Khongoana’s relatives will not consider the boy in question as their own, as he will not be of their cattle – it were better if Khongoana had at least paid some bohali for the mother of the boy;
- Khongoana regards ‘Mamohau as the mother of their children – ‘Mamohau regards herself as still a loner that has only become too relaxed; and
- Khongoana may not wear a mourning cloth if ‘Mamohau dies – ‘Mamohau may also not wear Khongoana’s one.]

After weighing the above captured comparisons and contrasts, ‘Mamohau adopts some self-persuasion in reference to her present situation as a ‘wife’ to Khongoana; and in the same soliloquy analyses it in this manner:

“Hantle fika lena lea reketla leha tlas’a lona ke bochame. Empa nka etsa joang? Mathata a ntšoere, ke mofo oa ‘ona. Joko ke e jere leha molala o le sekhoakhoa. Ha ke ikhaohanele ngoan’a motho, ke lese ho itoutisa ka litaba tsa banna ke sa li tsebe, mohlomong o tseba seo a tla se etsa ho tsitsisa litaba.” (Act V: scene ii)

[In actual fact this rock is trembling though I am squatting under it. But what can I do? Problems are withholding me, I am their slave. I am carrying a yoke even though the neck is itching. Let me ignore everything someone’s child, and stop worrying myself about men’s issues that I do not know; may be he knows what he is going to do to level the matters.]

In summary, ‘Mamohau is aware of her unstable settlement with Khongoana. That is why she applies a pastoral image by referring to her situation as similar to one’s taking solace under a

rock that is trembling and likely to fall upon one at any given time without any further notice. In this way, she convinces herself that though she continues couching under this perilous situation; she has no choice but to remain in this kind of relationship with Khongoana as an additional problem that tethers her into slavery. In addition, for 'Mamohau this is an itching experience, yet she persuades herself to adopt an attitude of indifference, and let this additional problem be for men; as she supposes that Khongoana has already thought of some strategies to employ for settling this matter when time comes.

As 'Mamohau indicated above that her pregnancy has developed, she has now succeeded to bear a child for Khongoana. In the light of Khongoana's deeply embedded desire for 'Mamohau to bear him a son; he at this moment sits next to her and thanks her as follows: "Ua tla ua ntlhatsoa pelo 'Mamohau, kajeno ke monna, ke na le bashemane ba tla sala le maruo ana a ka le ha nka show." (Act V: scene iii) [You have so much washed my heart 'Mamohau, today I am a man, I have boys that will remain with these riches of mine even if I die.]

In line with this statement, it becomes clear that 'Mamohau has born him a baby boy; as he had so deeply desired. Since Khongoana had pressured and seemingly coerced 'Mamohau to have no alternative but to bear a baby boy; it would appear that she did all in her powers, if any, and persuaded herself to ensure that she indeed begets a baby boy. That is why at this point Khongoana applies an idiomatic expression, 'Ua tla ua ntlhatsoa pelo,' as indication of the kind of happiness she has afforded him in begetting a baby boy (see Mabile and Dieterlen, 1985:338); for he now suggests that even if he may die, his riches will be in the hands of these two boys; rather than being the consumption of foreigners, as he stated earlier.

Apparently basing herself on her earlier fears about the birth of a boy for Khongoana, 'Mamohau engages some tired laughter, and retorts as follows: "Kea leboha ntate, le 'na ke thabile kamoo u neng u llela moshanyana kateng." (Act V: scene iii) [Thank you father, I am also happy as you were so much graving for a boy.] To signify his happiness and appreciation for the newly born boy child; Khongoana gives to 'Mamohau this historical information for naming the infant: "Ke mo fa lebitso la ntate, e leng eena mong'a letšoao lena la ka. Lebitso la hae ke Khomo leoelana le Khongoana. Khongoana eo o ne a hlokahale a e-s'o nyale, feela e le mohlankana ea tiileng." (Act V: scene iii) [I give him the name of my father, who is the owner of this earmark of mine. His name is Khomo, a twin brother to Khongoana. That Khongoana died before he could marry, though he was already a strong young man.] In response, 'Mamohau inquires about the cause of the said Khongoana's death; where she learns, to her fright and dismay, that the said Khongoana had been killed by a man called Mosololi – as the two men were fighting over the pastures.

In line with this information, 'Mamohau makes an attempt at persuading Khongoana to realise the minuteness of the matters over which men can even fight; and further asks whether Mosololi's family made any payment towards the killing of the late Khongoana as the matter was so insignificant. In response, Khongoana informs her that he was told that some ten cattle were produced by the Mosololi's family; and that part of those cattle makes some of his present herd. To reiterate her point about men's fighting over minor things; 'Mamohau responds to Khongoana's information by remarking thus:

"Ka tla ka utloa litaba tse bohloko ruri. Feela banna ha ba utloelane bohloko, lefu ho bona ke papali, mohlomong ke hobane ha se bona batsoetse, hape ha ba roale thapo halelele joaleka basali." (Act V: scene iii)

[I have indeed heard very painful news. But men do not feel pity for one another, for them death is a play, may be it is because they are never in labour, in addition they never wear a mourn cloth for a long time as women do.]

Apparently as an indication that he has been persuaded by 'Mamohau to share the same pain that she has hereby alluded to; Khongoana retorts as follows: "Ha re li tlohele, le 'na ha ke li rate, ke sona sesosa se fallisitseng ntate hore a tl'o jaka mona, a tlohe ha Letseka. O ne a sa rate lehloeano la malapa ao a mabeli. Che tseo ha se tsa rona, hoa rona ke ho holisa bana." (Oa tsoa.) (Act V: scene iii) [Let us leave them, I also do not like them, that is the cause of father's immigration to come and settle here, leaving Letseka's village. He did not like the hatred of the two families. But those are not ours, ours is to bring up the children. (He goes out.)] In the light of Khongoana's attitude of usually departing whenever he intends to apply some coercion for 'Mamohau to change her behaviour and attitude; his departure at this juncture might be considered as being aimed at driving his goal of coercing 'Mamohau to leave this topic and never to bring it up again in future. Seemingly, he has realised that pursuing this issue further might cause some problems for him or for both of them.

Now that 'Mamohau is left alone, this moment of solitude gives her an opportunity to employ her usual soliloquy and persuades herself as follows:

"Morena'ka ka tla ka utloa litaba tse ntšosang, Mosololi ke leonelana le Mosolotsoana ntat'a Molotolotsi manna oa ka. Ebe Khongoana h'a ka tseba taba ee a ka nkuka joang? Ke tla le nyaea le kolobe, ke batla ho holisa bana ba ka. Letsoalo lona le ntse le e-ja setsi ka pelong ea ka; ke se ke tla bona moo le tla ntahla teng." (Act V: scene iii)

[My Lord I have heard quite frightening news, Mosololi is a twin brother to Mosolotsoana the father of Molotolotsi my husband. If Khongoana were to know this issue how would he relate to me? I will be quiet about it, as I want to bring up my

children. As for the fright it continues gnawing at my heart; I will end up seeing where it will lose me.]

Obviously, this is frightening revelation for 'Mamohau; as Khongoana and Molotolotsi are sons of families in conflict, and therefore foes. In short her two sons might end up being foes to each other, she fears. It therefore comes not as shock that the fright keeps gnawing at her fabric. One then wonders whether or not Khongoana coerces 'Mamohau to file and forget this issue because he also has an inkling that Mohau and the infant Khomo may end up being enemies rather than loving brothers; by virtue of the fact that Molotolotsi's father is the twin brother to Mosololi, the killer of Khongoana's uncle. It might be important then for 'Mamohau to persuade herself, just as she has already done, to from henceforth cease from ever discussing this subject; for safeguarding her present relationship with Khongoana and to avoid some likely conflict between their two sons, Mohau and Khomo.

Khongoana and 'Mamohau have now spent many years living together as husband and wife; so much that their children, Mohau and Kharebe, have reached the marriageable stage. At this moment, these youngsters are sitting together in front of the house; and Mohau employs persuasive communication to propose love to Kharebe; saying, "Kharebe khaitsele ea ka, ke na le mathata, ke kopa thuso ho uena, feela kea tseleha ha ke lokela ho u bolella 'ona." (Act V: scene iv) [Kharebe my sister, I have problems, I need your assistance, but I become puzzled when I have to pronounce them to you.] As might be observed, Mohau hereby paves his way as an attempt at driving his primary goal – that of proposing love and marriage to Kharebe; as will be revealed in due course. When he addresses Kharebe as 'khaitsele ea ka,' one may consider that as an expression of endearment, and relational address at the same time; for the two of them belong to the family of Khongoana and 'Mamohau as their parents; yet Mohau has an intention to take Kharebe to wife. It would then seem that this is where his puzzlement emerges as he has to pronounce himself to Kharebe about his love and intention for marrying her.

Like someone who is naïve and sentimental of such feelings and marriage intentions; Kharebe responds as follows: "Bua feela uena ngoan'eso, mathata a hau ke a ka, ke tlameha ho u thusa, ke be ke bone hore u tsoile ho 'ona." (Act V: scene iv) [Just speak up you brother of mine, your problems are mine, I must assist you, and make sure that you have come out of them.] It is important to realise that, even though Kharebe hereby displays her intentions to assist with the solution of Mohau's problems, her preparedness functions as a persuasive attempt for Mohau to explain himself clearly; as he hereby does:

"Tsatsing lena ha u tlamehe joalekaha u le ngoan'eso; ke batla u imamele hantle hobane seo ke se kopang ho uena ke se amang botebo ba maikutlo a hau; etsoe ha

ke batle ha 'm'e le ntate ba ka se tseba; ke taba ea ka le uena feela." (Act V: scene iv)

[Today you are not bound as my sister; I want you to clearly listen to yourself because what I am asking from you is something that concerns your deep feelings; more so that I do not want mother and father to know; it is an affair of me and you only.] As might be expected, this explanation somehow puzzles Kharebe; more so because for her understanding, if she fails to solve Mohau's problems, the parents are available for consultation, she says. In the light of Kharebe's innocence above, Mohau applies more persuasion for her to fully understand his problematic intentions in this manner:

"Bophelong ho na le mathata a mang a sa hlokeng batsoali, a hlokang hore beng ba 'ona ba a qhaqholla pele a ka fetela ho batsoali, ana mathata kea lerato, eseng la liketoana, empa ebe la lenyalo, ke holile." (Act V: scene iv)

[In life there are some problems which do not need parents, they require that the owners solve them before taking them to the parents, these are problems of love, not that of games with stones, but that which leads to marriage, I am mature.]

Due to her displayed innocence, this explanation comes to Kharebe as a shock; and she retorts in the following persuasive words for Mohau to think otherwise:

"Helang, abuti Mohau! Ke mohlolo oang oo? Na bana ba motho ba kile ba nyalana? Ebe 'm'e le ntate ba tla re'ng ha ba ka utloa mohlolo o tjee? 'Na kea tšaba." (Act V: scene iv)

[Hallo, brother Mohau! What wonder is this? Has it ever happened that a brother and sister get married? What will mother and father say when they hear this wonder? I am afraid.]

Since Mohau and Kharebe have spent so many years living in the same home as brother and sister; it comes not as surprise that Kharebe reacts in the above manner. Her rhetorical questions and remarks work as persuasive attempt for Mohau to spell out himself on these issues; especially as she tells him that she is afraid of how their mother and father will react to such revelations. Like someone who has had some long-term plan on this issue, Mohau, with cool and collected mood, persuades Kharebe to relax and leave the matter in his hands in these words:

"U se tšohe Kharebe, ke 'na ea tla jara boikarabello bohle. Ke buoa sena ka sebetse, etsoe ho khale ke se lohotha, ke se lohela maqiti. Ha feela re ka utloana ka puo, u tla qala ho bona hore ke qetile tsohle." (Act V: scene iv)

[Do not be afraid Kharebe it is I that is going to shoulder the whole responsibility. I say this with courage, more so because I have long desired that, weaving some strategies for it. As long as we agree on the issue, you will begin to realise that I have completed everything.]

Seemingly, Kharebe is aware that Mohau is serious about this matter; and that he is prepared to handle the whole matter; but in order for her to have a full assurance of how the parents are going to be informed; she retorts: “Ke uena ea tla joetsa batsoali? U seke ua nkholoa ‘na!” (Act V: scene iv) [Is it you that is going to inform the parents? Please do not put me into trouble!] In this way, Mohau finds himself persuaded to once more give Kharebe an assurance that all should be left in his hands; and further relates to her that he is presently twenty-four years of age; and therefore old enough to get married and start his own family. Mohau then rounds up this information by convincing Kharebe of the importance of telling the parents the whole truth, if only she can come to some agreement with him on this issue.

Be that as it may, Kharebe remains baffled by this proposal; such that she poses the following questions and interjection: “U tšaba banana, u batla ho ja tali ea hae? He-e! Ebe batho ba tla reng?” (Act V: scene iv) [You are afraid of girls, so you want to eat a domestic rat? Hear! What do you think people will say?] In line with these challenging questions directed to his person and integrity, Mohau applies more persuasive language to propel his goal, saying:

“Kharebe, pelo e-ja serati, le tšefa li jeoa ke pelo. Tlohela taba tsa batho, le banana bohle ha se ba pelo ea ka. ‘Na ke u ratile ke fihla mona, ke lekile ho hatella lerato leo empa la ‘na la tota, ho fihlela ha kajeno le ntlhotse. A k’u mphe hle pelo ea hau ke e ruoe, ke ‘ona mathata a ka ana, a batlang thuso ea hau qhaa!” (Act V: scene iv)

[Kharebe, a heart eats what it likes, even dregs are eaten by the heart. Leave out people’s matters, even all the girls are not of my heart. I loved you at my arrival here, and have tried to suppress that love but it kept on increasing, up to today that it has overpowered me. Please give me your heart so that I may possess it; these are my very problems, that seek only your assistance.]

Indeed, Mohau’s above submission is quite persuasive; in that he expertly applies two seemingly incongruent yet congruent proverbial expressions to stress his point, by saying, ‘pelo e ja serati, le tšefa li jeoa ke pelo’ above. According to Mokitimi (1997:63), the proverb ‘Pelo e ja serati,’ has this explanation: “A person is free to choose what he/she thinks is good for him/her;” while “Tšifa li koenngoa ke pelo;” is explained as “The heart chooses its own” (Mokitimi, 1997:64). It would then follow that, no matter how many girls are out there waiting for him, Mohau has made his choice; and he cares less what people shall say; for he is

determined to get married to Kharebe, as long as she accepts his proposal. In addition, Mohau emphasises his commitment and love for Kharebe by persuading her to realise that his love for her has since been in existence from the day they met each other; in those years of their childhood, though he has since suppressed it; till now that it has overpowered him. In this case, Mohau's persuasive endeavours personalise love as an entity that bears the capability of employing power against an individual concerned; thus impressing upon Kharebe's understanding that unless she comes to his rescue, he will remain suppressed by this powerful entity.

Even as Kharebe complains about the problem of their looking and smiling at each other hereafter; Mohau is still poised at convincing her that since he loved her from the day he arrived here at Mokoallong; he has never ceased loving her, and therefore, they will look and smile at each other in the usual way; without casting any suspicion on their parents. To emphasise his persuasive action, Mohau says, "Ke itse ho uena, ke u ratile ke fihla mona, ke 'nile ka shoela mahalapeng, ka u siela sebaka, le kajeno ho tšoana feela; 'me le uena ke u kopa ho bonyetsa ka mpeng ho fihlela mohla litaba li phunyehang, 'me ha ena hoba khale haholo." (Act V: scene iv) [I have said to you, I fell in love with you when I arrived here, but remained silent, and gave you some space, even today it is the same; even you I ask you to smile into your stomach till the matters rupture, and that is not going to be too far.] As if in acceptance of Mohau's suggestion that she should also 'bonyetsa ka mpeng,' above, Kharebe merely asks Mohau to say who will reveal the matter and as to where she will be at that moment; ending up with the expression, "Kea utloa kea tšaba hle!" (Act V: scene iv) [I feel I am afraid please!] By so saying, Kharebe attempts to persuade Mohau to reveal the matter in her absence; for she fears for the reaction of the parents at that moment.

Although Kharebe does not directly spell it out that she accepts Mohau's proposal, her above expression of fear says it all – that she only hopes and trusts that Mohau will save her the embarrassment of being present when the whole matter is revealed to the parents. In line with that understanding, Mohau takes it upon his hands to persuade her to remain with an assurance that the matter will be expertly handled, saying:

"Li tla phunngoa ke 'na mong'a tsona, ka makhetha a tšosang, ha ke saofe, ke tla bapala leoa leo batsoali ba sa tl'o le lebala, feela le ithatang." (Act V: scene iv)

[They will be opened by me their owner, with frightening cleanliness; I am not joking, I shall play a strategy that the parents will never forget, but a smart one.]

In an attempt to persuade Mohau to put this matter straight to her for a better understanding; Kharebe poses this question, "U tla shobelisa, u shobelisetsa ho kae?" (Act V: scene iv) [Will you cause to elope, and to where?"] It appears that for Kharebe the idea of eloping is the

appropriate one for a couple that is fearful of informing the parents about its marital intentions; and that is why she inquires whether that is the strategy Mohau has in mind. In addition, since Mohau and his mother came here running away from their family; she fails to understand where else he is likely to cause to elope to. Realizing this line of thought, Mohau says, “Ha ke motho oa mafela-felane.” (Act V: scene iv) [I am not a simpleton.] In the light of this statement, one might guess that, since he seems to regard the idea of eloping as befitting simpletons; Mohau hereby makes an attempt at persuading Kharebe to regard him as a serious person that has a smart strategy to apply at the right time in the right manner.

But before he may spell out his smart strategy, Mohau observes the coming of his mother towards them; and cautions Kharebe to be silent, so that they may not be overheard by her. It would seem that ‘Mamohau has noticed the suspicious way Mohau and Kharebe are looking at each other; for she asks them, “Hei lona, la shebana ka mahlong molato ke’ng?” (Act V: scene iv) [Hi you, why look into each other’s eyes?] In an endeavour to quell his mother’s suspicions, Mohau states that they are merely basking themselves in the sun; which hardly answers the question of looking into each other’s eyes. In the light of the foregoing idea, Kharebe comes to Mahau’s rescue by inventing a story as persuasive action for ‘Mamohau to cast off her suspicion; saying, “Abuti o ntse a nqoqela ka tsa naheng koana ha ba qabantse lipoho. Mankhoe le Mosuhla.” (Act V: scene iv) [Brother is chatting to me about the affairs of country area when they cause bulls to fight. Mankhoe and Mosuhla.]

Upon observing that ‘Mamohau believes in Kharebe’s inventive story, Mohau capitalises on it and tells her that Mankhoe defeats Mosuhla; since Mosuhla is old enough to be sent off for slaughter – thus persuading her to go off, while they continue with their own topic. Once ‘Mamohau has gone back into the house, Mohau addresses Kharebe in this way:

“Ua tla ua nthusa Kharebe, u arabile ‘m’e ka bohlae bo nang le ‘nete; ha Mosuhla e holile le mong’a eona o holile, ‘me ‘na ke tiile molala joaleka Mankhoe. (Ba tšeha) Joale na u sa belaela hore ke lokela ho nyala? Le teng ebe kapele, e se re ha Mosuhla e ea fantising le mong’a eona a re thobela re e-so qete litaba tsa rona? Kharebe ruri ha ho e mong eo nka kenang lenyalong le eena ntle le uena. Mphe hle pelo ea hao.” (Act V: scene iv)

[You have assisted me so much Kharebe, you have answered mother with the cunning that has some truth; if Mosuhla is grown old, then its owner has grown old too, and I have become strong necked like Mankhoe. (They laugh) Then are you still skeptical that I have to get married? And it should be quickly, so that when Mosuhla is sent off for slaughter and even its owner slips away from us while we have not completed our issues? Kharebe indeed

there is no one else with whom I can come into marriage besides you. Please give me your heart.]

Apparently, Kharebe has finally been successfully persuaded by Mohau's comparative analysis of the two bulls' situation in contrast with himself and Khongoana as quoted above; and therefore observes the urgency of this matter for her to comply with Mohau's proposal; as they finalise their discussion with the following verbal exchanges:

Kharebe: (O taba-tabanya mahlo.) Abuti, ke sitoa ho u thiba, tsoela-pele ka taba tsa hau, feela li se nqabanye le batsoali. [(She sweep a bit with her eyes) Brother, I am unable to stop you, continue with your matters, but they should not cause some dispute between me and the parents.]

Mohau: Kea leboha, u nthuse, u se fetohle bothong ba hau, e le hore 'm'e le ntate ba se tšohe ba hlokomela hore taba li teng. [I thank you, please help me, you should not change from your personality, so that mother and father may not accidentally notice that there is something unusual.]

Kharebe: Ke tla leka. (Act V: scene iv) [I shall try.]

Now that Kharebe has finally complied with his marriage proposal, Mohau takes advantage of being alone in the house with his mother; and informs her that since his cattle have increased in number; it is time that he sent one to his maternal uncle, Lefilo, as **masalio/masalieo**. According to Mabile and Dieterlen (1985:285) *masalieo* refers to "cattle given to his uncle by a boy who has earned it by his work." It follows, therefore, that since Mohau has earned these cattle through his hard work at Khongoana's home; it is proper for him to offer one or some to his maternal uncle – thus signaling his intentions that he is about to get married. It therefore comes not as surprise that in appreciation, 'Mamohau quips thus:

“He-e! Ngoana tooe, ua tla ua nahana ntho e phela. Ke Sesotho he seo. Ke qholotso ho malom'ao hore mohla o nyalang a tsoe letho.” (Act V: scene v)

[Hear! You child, have thought of a living thing. That is proper Sesotho. It is a challenge to your maternal uncle that when you get married he should produce something.]

In line with his mother's appreciation of this matter, Mohau surmises that he is a true Mosotho child; and wants to follow the Sesotho customs and practices in their totality. At this moment Khongoana comes into the house and 'Mamohau informs him about Mohau's intentions; with the purpose of persuading him to air his view in this matter. In response, the following verbal exchanges ensue:

Khongoana: ‘Mamohau, ke hlola ke u joetsa hore Mohau o bohla, ke ngoan’a Mosotho, re ke ke ra iphapanyetsa ‘nete eno. U na le likhomo, ‘me u holile, oa sebetsa ... U tla isa efe monna? [‘Mamohau, I have been telling you that Mohau is brilliant, he is a Mosotho child, we can not ignore that fact. You have cattle, and you have grown up, you are working ... Which one are you going to send man?]

Mohau: Ke batla ho isa Tsoelike ntate. [I want to send Tsoelike father.]

Khongoana: Ho lokile monna, ke tla e nkela ‘Bobeisi,’ ngoan’e motona o etsa joalo h’a itokisetsa ho batla mamphahi. [It is alright man, I will organise a certificate of ownership for it, a male child performs that way when he prepares for seeking one who cooks.]

‘Mamohau: Ke lenyalo la’ng na ntate ka serathana se se kaa? [What marriage please father with this little child?]

Khongoana: Leha ekaba u mo nka e ntse e le ngoana, feela o tla nyala ka tsatsi le leng. (Act V: scene v) [Even if you regard him as being still a child, but he will marry one day.]

As may be observed, whereas for ‘Mamohau her son is still a little boy, that is not the case with Khongoana; that is why when he hears this piece of news he chooses to address him as ‘monna,’ as indicated in the above verbal exchanges. In order for ‘Mamohau to also realise this physical development in Mohau, Khongoana simply tells her that even if she presently regards him as a small boy; he is going to get married one day –therefore persuading her to start thinking of Mohau’s action as a signal for his desire to get married.

In due course, Khongoana happens to be troubled by fearful dreams, and mumbles like an angry person. Upon observing this situation, ‘Mamohau shakes him up and quips as follows: “Molato ke’ng ha u ntse u honotha ntho eo ke sa e utloeng tje, u omanyang mang?” (Act V: scene vi) [What is the matter that you keep on mumbling something so indistinct? Whom are you scolding?] Seemingly, ‘Mamohau’s question works as a persuasive action for Khongoana to spell out his dreams in this manner:

“Khele, ke lora Mankhoe e koeba Mosuhla hampe, e bile e e kharamelletsa ka lengopeng, ha e tloha moo e khonya e fataka makoatsi, e hlaba fatše, Mosuhla e bohla ha bohloko e hloloa ho tsoha. Joale u ntsosa e le moo ke khorohelang Mankhoe ke re ke e mamola ka molamu.” (Act V: scene vi)

[Khele (interjection of astonishment), I dream of Mankhoe terribly parrying Mosuhla, and even pushing it into the donga; from there it roars and brings about quarrel, striking the ground, then Mosuhla roars painfully and unable to stand up. Now you wake me up as I rush towards Mankhoe to strike it with the fighting stick.]

Whereas 'Mamohau regards this as a mere dream; since she believes that bulls of the same kraal never fight; for Khongoana this portents something ugly; that is why he even suggests to 'Mamohau that he should go and check whether or not they have not skipped the kraal. Even then 'Mamohau succeeds to persuade him to ignore that and go back to sleep – suggesting that since the boy's room is so close to the kraal, they are bound to hear anything that might take place in that kraal. But as if it is meant to be, Khongoana hardly sleeps without being destructed by yet another fearsome dream. Relating his other dream, Khongoana quips: "Ke lora Mohau a fihla a khokhoetsa ngoana oa motho oa ngoanana, a re o shobelisitse. U ntsosa e le moo ke ntseng ke mo omanyana. Ke re a khutlise ngoana eo oa batho, chobeliso ha ke e rate ha ka mona." (Act V: scene vi) [I dream of Mohau arriving and violently pushing someone's girl child, saying that he has caused her to elope with him. You wake me up as I am scolding him. Saying that he should take back that people's child, I do not like elopement here at my home.]

In line with the foregoing dream, it would seem that Mohau's suggestion of sending a masalio to his maternal uncle has worked as a persuasive attempt for Khongoana to think of the way Mohau would pronounce his intention to marry. That self-questioning, one might say, would then subconsciously work on Khongoana's mind; to the extent that it turns itself into a dream that involves Mohau actually taking action to fulfill his desire or intention. In the light of that understanding, Khongoana now dreams of the above happenstance as a persuasive measure for him to pronounce himself against such a move that Mohau might take. Even as 'Mamohau persuades him to disregard that dream, and consider the elopement as something so bad that Mohau would never do; Khongoana counter-persuades her in these words:

"Taba tsee u re re ka li tseba, ha bana ba joale ba se ba ithera? Hommeng ekaba o ntlotlototse, hobane ke rata ho mo rera, ke mo nyalise hantle, Sesotho, ke hlahlele lehali banna ba potile lesaka ho thethesoa." (Act V: scene vi)

[Do you think that we can know these matters, when today's children make their own plans? And he would have embarrassed me, because I want to plan for him, and organise his marriage well, Sesotho wise, and give out cattle with men surrounding the kraal while bargaining over the marriage cattle.]

In the light of Khongoana's counter-persuasion above, one is bound to conclude that since he hates elopement; the idea of Mohau's taking that direction has been gnawing at his subconscious mind and finally coagulated into this dream. Though in agreement with Khongoana that today's children do not anymore like their lives to be planned by the parents; 'Mamohau pronounces her trust in Mohau that he would not dare apply such a shameful act;

and further says, “ke a tšiea o tla u rerisa h’a batla motlhatlehi.” (Act V: scene vi) [I vow that he shall inform you when he wants a wife.] Obviously, this assurance given by ‘Mamohau above functions as a persuasive attempt for boosting Khongoana’s morale; as might be noticed in his next response:

“Leno letsatsi ke le nyoretsoe, u ka qala ho mpona hore ke lekaako la motho, le hona la kheleke. Ke se ke tenne borikhoe bo mona ba ka ba semolo, ke roetse libutsi, ke thatile lipatise litlhafung, ke tenne hempe e tšoeu ea sokisi, kobo ke apere ea qibi, katiba ke roetse ea bathasibi, ke le kubu letsohong, ke khelekenya mokorotlo, banna ba hoasa eka kiriatšoana, ke kaletse Fito ke qhoba selelekela. Ao ‘Mamohau ke’ng eo le kekeng la e bona? Le ka beha matsoho liphatleng.” (Act V: scene vi)

[I am thirsty for that day; you can begin to be aware that I am a swell, and a gifted singer/dancer. Already dressed up in that semolo trousers of mine, wearing the boots, with rolled straps on the lower legs, wearing a white inner shirt, as for a blanket I will be wearing an otter, wearing a buttersby hat, with a shambok in hand, chanting a war song, men roaring as thunder clouds, as I ride Fito and driving the initial beast. Oh ‘Mamohau what is it that you might not see? You can put hands on your foreheads.]

Upon observing this self-acclaim by Khongoana, ‘Mamohau capitalises on it in an attempt to persuade him to say out all his views on this matter; saying, “Nka o hlaba ka o laola.” (Act V: scene vi) [I can strike and direct it (ululation).] Seemingly, Khongoana’s morale has been boosted by ‘Mamohau’s foregoing statement; for he now gives a persuasive talk for ‘Mamohau to give instructions for her two sons to ensure that they inform him when they wish to get married; so that their marriages may be proper Sesotho ones; unlike the modern weddings that merely boast of song and dances; as he puts it. Apparently with an intention to show the seriousness of his intentions for these boys to be afforded proper Sesotho marriages, Khongoana assures ‘Mamohau that he intends to deliver quite a sizeable herd of cattle for the boys marriages. According to him, all those who shall witness the spectacle will be bound to marvel at the sight of such a good herd of cattle provided for marriage at the same time. In order for ‘Mamohau to realise the seriousness of this matter, Khongoana even persuades her to be assured that the boys’ marriage conclusions will be done on the same day; thus signifying that each of these boys’ bohali (cattle for marriage) will be completed at once.

In line with Khongoana’s desires and aspirations for the boys’ marriages above, ‘Mamohau assures him that since she also wishes for such kind of marriage ceremonies; she is going to make it a point for them to adhere to his wishes and intentions when such times come into their lives. As a further persuasive measure for Khongoana to realise that she is in unison

with him in this respect; 'Mamohau says, "Ke tla bua le bona, ekaba b'a ikhanya ruri, le 'na ke utloa ke thohotheloa hobane ruri lehali le bokhabane, le seriti." (Act V: scene vi) [I shall speak with them, they would be refusing with themselves indeed, I also feel touched because lehali (marriage cattle) is spectacular, and authoritative.]

In order to persuade 'Mamohau that the idea of talking to these boys is an urgent matter, Khongoana indicates to her that Mohau is already at a marriageable age; and as such he may, together with his maternal uncle, agree that it is time for him to get married. Further, Khongoana intimates that as parents to Mohau, he and 'Mamohau should make appropriate preparations for such a situation. Even though she agrees with Khongoana on this idea of being ready for anything, she proposes that such an idea of marriage for Mohau may not be soon; thus persuading Khongoana to relax and take it easy; as he remains assured that there is yet time for them to make such preparations.

In fulfillment of his request to contribute masalio, of one cow, to his maternal uncle, Mohau arrives at Lefilo's place; where he presents to him a cow, as agreed upon by himself and his parents, 'Mamohau and Khongoana at Mokoallong. Though he appreciates this masalio, Lefilo is surprised that there are in these days some nephews who still undergo such a Sesotho practice of offering such gifts to their maternal uncles. To signify his appreciation and to persuade his wife, 'Mamorongoe, to realise what this gift entails, Lefilo calls upon both 'Mamorongoe and 'Malefilo to the kraal site to witness this gift. As it is in her character to be skeptical about many things, 'Mamorongoe complains that this may be a call for useless things. Even as she learns that they have been called to witness the masalio from Mohau to his maternal uncle; 'Mamorongoe registers her suspicion that it might be a stolen animal. In addition, 'Mamorongoe quips that, should Mohau be thinking of getting married to her daughter, Morongoe, he should forget about that thought; as he is not fit enough to marry her daughter, she says. It would seem that all these negative thoughts about Mohau are meant for persuading Lefilo and 'Malefilo to look at Mohau with a negative eye; as she says:

"Ekaba o beheletsa ngoana oa mang? A tlohe ha ka mona, ha ke na ngoana ea ka nyaloang ke eena. Kapa che ke ea seotla o tlilo hlahla khaitsetsi ea hae?" (Act VI: scene i)

[By the way whose child is he engaging? He should get away from this home of mine, I do not have a child that would be married by him. Or else it is an indemnity and he has come to retrieve his sister?]

For 'Malefilo, this is quite a commendable act done by Mohau. She signifies this by ululating and saying, "A nyalisoa ngoana enoa oa ka; cho-cho. Tsa bo moshemane ha li jeoe." (Act VI: scene i) [This child of mine should be assisted into marriage; serves you right. Those of the

boy's home are never eaten.] In order for 'Mamorongoe to appreciate and understand the implications of the masalio, Lefilo explains to her that "re tlameha ho tsoa letho ha mochana a nyala." (Act VI: scene i) [we must produce something when the nephew gets married.] But as someone with a negative attitude towards Mohau, 'Mamorongoe responds to Lefilo's explanations as follows:

"Ka mantsoe a mang, re khutlise khomo ena ea hae, haeba e ka shoa, re tla e nka kae? A hle a potlake a shobelise e sa phela." (Act VI: scene i)

[In other words, we should return this cow of his, if it dies, where shall we take it from? He should hurry up and elope with a girl while it is still alive.]

Needless to say, all these negative expressions by 'Mamorongoe are meant for persuading Lefilo to regard this act as one that bears negative repercussions for himself and his family. In line with the realization of 'Mamorongoe's intentions, 'Malefilo simply remarks and persuades her to change her attitude in these words:

"Mamorongoe, u tloetse ho fefetsa taba tse se nang molemo ho mang kapa mang; baheno bao u ka ba khahlisang ke ba linaka?" (Act VI: scene i)

['Mamorongoe, you are used to utter foolish things that have no benefit to anyone; your people that you may please are those with horns?]

With reference to Mohau's act, 'Malefilo says, "Mohau rea leboha ngoana-ngoana'ke ha u hopotse malom'ao, li tsoale 'moella." (Act VI: scene i) [Mohau we thank you my grandchild that you have remembered your maternal uncle, may they now and then bear young ones.] In this way, 'Malefilo gives thanks to the young Mohau, and persuades him to perform all the Sesotho rites in his powers, so that he may get some due blessings in return. It therefore, comes not as surprise that Lefilo adds with his persuasive words as follows:

"Mochana, 'm'e o se a lebohile, 'me ke tlatsa ebile ke tiisa mantsoe ao a hae. Feela monna u holile, Mosotho o re 'khomo o holile, boela hae' u se jele matla a hau thoteng kapa lichabeng, u sebeletse hae; boea sekoele monna u tl'o tsosa lelapa leno. U hloho ha Mosolotsoana, u tšela mobu pele, u kuta pele, u bile u phatsa pele haeba ba ha ntat'ao-moholo Mosololi ba le sieo. U ke ke ua lahla boholo ba hau, le leloko la heno." (Act VI: scene i)

[Nephew, mother has already given thanks, and I add and augment those words of hers. Otherwise man you have grown up, a Mosotho says 'bovine you have grown, go back home' do not devour your power in the wilderness or foreign lands, you should work towards home; come around man and revive your family. You are the head at Mosolotsoana's, you throw

soil first, you cut hair first, you even incise first if those of your grandfather Mosololi are not around. You cannot throw away your seniority, and your genealogy.]

In the light of the above persuasive words for him to consider himself as a grown up person that is supposed to think of returning home with whatever belongings he has gathered so far; Mohau is easily persuaded. Whether it has been his purpose or not, Mohau now understands the implications of Lefilo's words; to an extent that he has no more words to say; except that he is going to come back soon. In this way he ensures his maternal uncle that all his words have been understood; and that he is ready to take action in fulfillment with those persuasive words.

In line with the act of sending a cow as masalio to his maternal uncle; the act that precipitates a desire for the concerned young man to get married, as was indicated earlier; Mohau now confidentially confronts his mother with the idea of getting married. In order for his mother to be easily persuaded into coming to an agreement with his proposition, Mohau opens up his confrontation by addressing 'Mamohau as follows: "M'e oe, moratua oa ka!" (Act VII: scene i) [Please mother, my dear one!] Since this form of address is uncommon for Mohau against his mother, 'Mamohau immediately suspects that whatever the son is about to say must be of a serious nature. In response, she therefore poses the following question: "Ua mpitsa ha monatjana tjee, ebe taba ke life?" (Act VII: scene i) [Why do you address me so dearly, what is the news?] In this way, 'Mamohau is signifying her awareness of the importance of the matter; and she is asking Mohau to go straight into the matter without any waste of time. Nonetheless, Mohau hardly goes into the matter with any immediate effect; rather he stipulates his desires for his mother to treat the matter as not only important but highly confidential – in this way proposing for 'Mamohau to keep this matter between the two of them only.

As might be expected, this revelation even frightens 'Mamohau; to an extent that she asks Mohau this question: "Ebe ke'ng joale Mohau, buoa hle, se ke ua ntšosa!" (Act VII: scene i) [What could it be now Mohau, please speak up, and don't frighten me!] In an endeavour to persuade his mother to understand the level of confidence to be bestowed between the two of them; Mohau puts it in this manner: "Ke na le mathata a batlang uena qaa, u le motsoali oa ka. U se ke be ua leka ua bolella ntate hle 'm'e." (Act VII: scene i) [I have problems that require you only, as my parent. Please, mother, do not try and tell this to father.] But rather than persuading 'Mamohau to comprehend the level of confidentiality required in this matter; it frightens her even more. She therefore persuades Mohau to stop vacillating and come straight into the subject. Seemingly, Mohau's intention is to psychologically prepare 'Mamohau for accepting the news as normal as possible, rather than as shocking ones; for even then he clears up his situation before he spells out his point in this manner:

“M’e, se ke oa feha motšoafo hle; ntho eo ke e kopang ha se mohlolo, ke tokelo, ke tšoanelo ea ka ha ke le lilemong tsena; ke motlhatlehi” (Act VII: scene i)

[Mother, please do not have your lungs on edge; that which I am asking for is not a miracle, it is a right, it is proper for me when I am this old; it is a wife.]

Rather than taking this matter as a normal information, ‘Mamohau registers a shock, saying, “Eng? Na ke utloa hantle tje? Mohau! U re’ng?” (Act VII: scene i) [What? Do I really hear it well? Mohau! What do you say?] Realizing this state of shock on ‘Mamohau, Mohau once more attempts to persuade her to calm down and be considerate of the matter in question, saying:

“Khoba matšoafo hle motsoali, u nkutloile hantle, nkeke ka raha moritšoana ka khomo tsena tsa ntate Khongoana hobane ha ke batle ha a ka tseba tsena pele ho uena.” (Act VII: scene i)

[Crush the lungs please parent, you have heard me well, I cannot perform the sign of desire for marriage with these cattle of father Khongoana because I do not like him to know these issues before you do.]

This explanation adds more fright to ‘Mamohau; for she regards the keeping of the secret from Khongoana as tantamount to backstabbing; as she considers him the only person who may respond to Mohau’s request for marriage. In an attempt to make Mohau to understand the tight corner into which he puts her; ‘Mamohau even relates to him that Khongoana once even dreamed of Mohau having caused a girl to elope with him. Further, she informs him that the dream resulted into Khongoana’s asking her to advise them as her sons to report the matter whenever they feel that they have reached the marriageable stage; so that they may be afforded proper Sesotho marriage ceremonies. Even so, Mohau thanks those good views of Khongoana; yet further persuades ‘Mamohau to realise that for now, this matter concerns only the two of them – though Khongoana will be duly informed when time and circumstances permit.

In the light of the fact that in Sesotho, marriage is usually organised by men; ‘Mamohau finds it difficult for her to keep this issue for herself, without informing Khongoana. Once more, Mohau endeavours to persuade her more by asking her to put all her trust in him as someone who will come up with a solution to this problem. In addition, he asks his mother to accept his assistance in this matter with boldness; and further intimates that before he can get married, he asks for permission to visit his maternal home. Instead of this suggestion being a persuasive attempt for ‘Mamohau to relax and put her trust into Mohau as he has just suggested; she registers a worry that Mohau is now going to cause a girl to elope with him to that particular home – thus creating a burden for her grandmother, ‘Malefilo. Additionally,

'Mamohau considers that act as the sauce of causing 'Mamorongoe to insult her; while Khongoana will be terribly hurt by that action; as he has always wished to organise and perform marriage ceremonies for both Mohau and Khomo.

Upon observing that his mother is rather skeptical about his intentions and movement, Mohau gives her this assurance as a persuasive attempt to accept all his plans:

“Malome ha se ntate, nkeke ka mo khoka ka lenyalo la ka; ke tseba malome 'Mamorongoe ha se potele, ke mpa ke ba chakela feela; nkopele ho ntate hle.” (Act VII: scene i)

[Uncle is not my father, I cannot embarrass him with my marriage, I know aunt 'Mamorongoe, she is not a simpleton, I merely visit them, please put my request to father for me.]

Apparently as an assurance that Mohau's visit to his maternal home is not for getting married there, 'Mamohau inquires as to whether or not he is interested in marrying Morongoe. In response to that, Mohau persuades her to stop thinking about that possibility; saying, “Ao, 'm'e, malome 'Mamorongoe a ka mpolaea moraling oa hae, ha ke itoe baloi ba le teng.” (Act VII: scene i) [No, mother, aunt 'Mamorongoe can kill me about his daughter, I do not bewitch myself while there exist witches.] Although she now seems persuaded enough and convinced that Mohau may not do any of whatever she had thought; she still warns him against burdening 'Malefilo with a newly wed woman. Besides, she promises him that she will put forth his request to Khongoana as requested. Simply making a final remark as a persuasive attempt for her to stop thinking about any negative feelings about his intentions; Mohau tells her mother that he would not dare put his grandmother in that kind of situation; and then goes out, leaving 'Mamohau alone to think over the matter.

Now that she is alone in the house, 'Mamohau engages herself into intra-personal examination. It would appear that, for her, this matter that has been introduced by Mohau to her is an additional burden or problematic issues she has since experienced; that is why she wonders whether or not her problems will ever come to an end. For her, 'mathata a hae' (her problems): “A kolla joale ka seliba se tšikhunyang fatše.” (Act VII: scene i) [They gush out just as spring water.] It is important to notice in this expression the use of both simile and metaphor; apparently as a persuasive expression for 'Mamohau's self-persuasion for weighing up her troubles that seem never to end. Since the idea of 'ho kolla' is associated with 'seliba,' and yet employed for expressing the extent to which 'mathata' accumulate over one another; one might as well regard this metaphor as a pastoral image that is intended for clarifying and justifying the accumulative way in which these problems add one upon the other. In addition, since such 'mathata' may not be easily concretised, the simile, 'joale ka

seliba se tšikhunyang fatše' is also engaged as a pastoral comparison of using the known to explain the unknown phenomena.

Additionally, 'Mamohau asks herself these questions:

“Ha ke patela ntate Khongoana kilibitla ee,
Na ha ke mo kenyetse lerumo ka likobong?
Le teng na ha ngoana a re ke boloke lekunutu
Ebe ke hloka botšepahi, na o sa tla ntšepa?”
(Act VII: scene i)

[If I conceal this gigantic heavy stuff from father Khongoana,
Don't I put for him a spear in the blankets?
On the other hand, if the child asks me to keep a secret
Then I become untrustworthy, will he ever trust me?]

Obviously, 'Mamohau has no answer to these questions; though she is such an agonised woman whose problems seem to gnaw so much at her conscience. Her intra-inspection seems not to ease her conscience; though she attempts at persuading herself to calm down and learn to accept the prevailing situation – while a number of other concerns seem to eat up her subconscious mind, as seen in the following:

“Ntho li ntutse sefubeng ha bohloko ruri,
Li kututsa li ntlhokisa phomolo moeeng.
Hoja fuba sea phetloa, Khongoana a ka tšoha,
Teng h'a ka tseba hore ke ngoetsi ea Mosolotsoana,
A ka taboha letsoalo, a re o holisa masumo.
Ebe Mohau ke noha, joale e tla loma moholisi?
Ke ntja ea seloma mokhoki? Jo-ka le tjamela,
Ha ke mpe ke thole ngoan'a motho!”
(Act VII: scene i)

[Indeed matters have settled painfully in my chest,
They make noise and deprive me of spiritual rest.
If a chest were opened up, Khongoana would be frightened,
Then if he were to know that I am Mosolotsoana's daughter-in-law,
His remorse would rent, he would say that he brings up a cobra.
Is Mohau a snake, now it is going to sting the up bringer?
Is he a dog that bites the owner? Alas, I stare angrily!
Let me simply keep mum someone's child!]

In the light of her agonizing situation, 'Mamohau has hereby applied poetic soliloquy in which she employs various persuasive strategies for her understanding the depth of the issues surrounding her; as stated above. First and foremost, she concretises matters as elements that have settled painfully in her chest. In this way she metaphorically engages the familiar to explain the unfamiliar concept; so that she may easily understand the impact of these matters that cause her pain and suffering. Second, 'Mamohau uses yet another pastoral and metaphoric expression for persuading herself to realise the way these matters operate in her at this moment; as she says, 'Li kututsa li ntlhokisa phomolo moeng.' Since the act of 'ho kututsa' (making noise) is normally in reference to some concrete living beings; one might conclude that, for 'Mamohau, these matters keep on troubling her and make noise in her chest, just as living beings would perform. Nonetheless, she is aware that as long as she keeps these matters secretively from Khongoana, there is no way he may learn of their existence in her chest – that is why she adds that 'Hoja fuba sea phetloa, Khongoana a ka tšoha;' thus persuading herself to remain assured that there is no way matters may be revealed to him, unless she divulges them herself.

In addition, 'Mamohau persuades herself to imagine how Khongoana would behave if he were to discover that she is Mosolotsoana's daughter-in-law. She once more employs a metaphoric expression that, 'A ka taboha letsoalo, a re o holisa masumu;' in this case persuading herself to understand the level of fright Khongoana would experience by learning this piece of news – where he would even conclude that the upbringing of Mohau is tantamount to that of upbringing up a cobra that would supposedly end up biting him one day. It therefore, comes not as surprise that at this juncture, 'Mamohau regards herself as someone in a tight situation – as she says, 'Jo-ka le tjamela,' – by so doing, stating her hopeless situation that might only call for her keeping silent.

In the light of the fact that Mohau asked his mother to seek for him a permission from Khongoana to go and visit his maternal family; Mohau is now arriving at Molotolotsi's home – his own home, so to say, though he had made no mention of visiting his own home. It therefore comes not as astonishment that in his persuasive soliloquy Mohau pronounces the following revelations:

“M'e le ntate Khongoana ha ba tsebe hore ke ne ke sa ee ha malome, ke ne ke tla mona heso, ke tllil'o bolella ntate hore ke batla ho nyala; ruri mophongoa h'a na moholo.” (Act VII: scene ii)

[Mother and father Khongoana do not know that I was not going to uncle's home, I was coming here to my home, coming to tell father that I want to get married; indeed the dupe has no elder.]

In line with his soliloquy above, it becomes clear that Mohau deceived his mother and step-father by suggesting that he wanted to visit his maternal home – as his primary goal was to seek his father’s assistance to fulfill his desire for getting married. Apparently with a persuasive intention for himself to realise the extent to which deceit can operate; Mohau even employs the above proverb, ‘mophongoa h’a na moholo;’ for he has indeed used deceit against his parents; while he is but a young man who still has to get married. According to Matšela and Moletsane (1999:61), this proverb is used in reference to “Boitelelo ba ea thetsitsoeng a sa elelloe.” [Lamentations of someone that has been duped unawares.] It would then follow that had they known about his true intentions, Mohau’s parents would not have permitted him to come here at his own home. He then uses this proverb as an attempt at persuading himself that his deceit had good intentions; as it would have been difficult for him to pronounce his intentions without attracting a number of questions from both ‘Mamohau and Khongoana.

When observing the activities at his home, Mohau quips in these words:

“Joale ebe ke mokete oa’ng moo heso? Batho b’a phethesela, ho kubella mosi sakeng, banna ba buoa khomo le linku. Rangoane Mahlabe ke eane, feela o bonahala a sa thaba, e re ke hle ke tobe ho eena. Lumela rangoane.” (Act VII: scene ii)

[Now what festivity could be taking place here at my home? People are going to and fro, there is rising smoke at the kraal, men are skinning a beast and some sheep. There is uncle Mahlabe, but he looks unhappy, let me go straight to him. Good afternoon uncle.]

Though Mahlabe returns the greeting, it becomes clear that he can hardly recognise Mohau; for he replies as follows: “Lumela monna, ana u mang?” (Act VII: scene ii) [Good afternoon man, by the way who are you?] After Mohau has given his identity to Mahlabe, he is informed of his father’s death (Molotolotsi’s). Without any waste of time, Mohau responds to the information in this manner:

“U re’ng na rangoane (Oa lla.) Banna ke tla etsa joang? Ke tlile ho ntate ke tlisa mathata a ka; ekaba ke tla thusoa ke mang? Ke malimabe ha kaaka’ng?” (Act VII: scene ii)

[What are you saying now uncle (He cries.) Guys what am I going to do? I have come to father to deliver my difficulties, by whom shall I be assisted? How unfortunate I am?]

It would seem that Mohau’s behaviour and his self-pity have functioned as some persuasive attempts for Mahlabe to realise that now that Molotolotsi is late, it is for him to render the

required assistance to Mohau; as he assures Mohau that he will assist him immediately after the funeral. Having been thus assured of the required assistance, Mohau inquires after his father's burial; and learns from Mahlabe that it is the following day in the afternoon. Further, Mahlabe inquires as to whether 'Mamohau can be found; to which Mohau responds in this manner: "Rangoane, ha re ka palama hona joale, e tla re ha ba kena matlung re be re fihla Mokoallong, e re hoseng re be re le mona le eena." (Act VII: scene ii) [Uncle, if we can mount right now, we shall arrive at Mokoallong just as they go into the bedrooms, so that we may be here with her early in the morning.] This assurance by Mohau functions as a persuasive attempt for Mahlabe to inform Lefilo, who has just arrived too, that they have the problem of calling over 'Mamohau. Incidentally, it is revealed by Lefilo that he has come over with the intention of going to Mokoallong to bring 'Mamohau over; as he was sure that no one in this village knew where she was.

In appreciation of Lefilo's intentions for bringing 'Mamohau over, Mahlabe suggests for Mohau and Lefilo to go into the house and greet the mothers. Since Mohau left home while he was only a small boy; 'Mamolotolotsi hardly recognises him. As if her failure to recognise Mohau was a persuasive measure for her to afford him high appreciation; 'Mamolotolotsi marvels at seeing Mohau as a grown up young man and welcomes him. Having gone through the introductions, Mahlabe informs 'Mamolotolotsi that both Lefilo and Mohau are off to Mokoallong to collect 'Mamohau; and he accompanies them to the horses' stables; where he persuades them to speed up the journey to ensure that they will be here early in the morning the next day. They give him the assurance that they will speed up; and Mohau immediately asks Mahlabe whether the young Khomo at Mokoallong may be brought along for the funeral.

Apparently, Mohau's question has been quite relevant and persuasive for Mahlabe to respond to it in this manner: "Le tle le eena, a ka sala joang? Ke ngoan'a khomo tsa rona, ke ngoan'eno." (Act VII: scene ii) [You should bring him along, how can he be left behind? He is the child of our cattle, he is your brother.] As persuasion is incremental, Lefilo also adds in the following manner for highlighting Mohau better on this matter: "Mochana, khomo ea lefisa ha e latoa e tla le manemane a eona kaofela, 'mapoho h'a nyaloe." (Act VII: scene ii) [Nephew, the cow of **lefisa** (that was sent under someone's care for nurturing) when brought home is collected with all its calves; the mother of a bull is never married.] It would seem that both Mahlabe and Lefilo's answers to his question have persuaded Mohau to adopt a positive mood in that issue; for he retorts by merely saying, "Ho lokile baholo ba ka. Malome ha re ee." (Act VII: scene ii) [It is alright my seniors. Uncle, let us go.]

As could be anticipated, Mohau and Lefilo arrive at Mokoallong at the sleeping time; as people have just got into their bedrooms. Since Mohau's arrival at this time of the night is

unusual and therefore unexpected; it works as persuasive cause for both 'Mamohau and Khongoana's fright; as they both understand that this travel must be due to some pressing matter that needs an immediate attention. But, as might be expected, for 'Mamohau, this night visit seemingly has something to do with Mohau's intentions to get married; although she initially suspects that her mother, 'Malefilo, might be dead, as Mohau is accompanied by Lefilo. Testimony to this view resides in the following statements made by 'Mamohau; even before the visitors may pronounce their cause for the night visit: "Mohau oa tla oa nkho!..." and "Mohau ha kea re u se...", (Act VII: scene iii) [Mohau you have caused me so much har...] and [Mohau have I not said that you should not...] Consequently, 'Mamohau's state of fright as indicated in the above two unfinished expressions persuades Khongoana to reprimand her fiercely in this manner, as Mohau has been interrupting her and asking her to keep silent:

"Molato k'eng na 'Mamohau? U batla ho khalengoa joang? Ho neng ngoana a re u thole; ke tla qabana le uena ha u ka boela ua buoa hape." (Act VII: scene iii)

[What is wrong please 'Mamohau? How do you want to be rebuked? For how long has the child requested you to be silent; I will be at quarrel with you if you speak again.]

Seemingly with assurance that his persuasive way of addressing 'Mamohau's unbecoming behaviour will be observed through her silence; Khongoana addresses himself to Lefilo, saying, "Ke thabela ho u tseba ntate Lefilo. Ekaba le re tlela ka life le har'a masiu? Mokhosi oa bosiu o ntša batho matlung, re fehile mahlo." (Act VII: scene iii) [I am glad to know you father Lefilo. By the way what issues do you bring for us in the nights? A night call takes people out of the houses, we are frightened.] It would seem that Khongoana's foregoing question and statement as communicative expressions are persuasive enough for Lefilo to go straight into the matter, saying, "Ehlile ha re a tla ka tse monate ho hang, ntate; re tlisitse pehi ea monna oa enoa khaitis..." (Act VII: scene iii) [Indeed we have not come here for happy news, sir we have brought the report of death of the husband of this sist...] As may be observed, 'Mamohau hardly waits for Lefilo to finish up his presentation of the matter in question; for she wails and refutes her husband's ownership in these words, "Jo-oe! Jo-oe! Monna oa mang?" (Act VII: scene iii) [Alas! Alas! Whose husband?]

Apparently, 'Mamohau's wailing and disowning the husband in public as she has just done above is meant for persuading Khongoana to identify with her and agree with her that she no longer belongs to Molotolotsi as her husband. In line with that intention, she augments her disownment quipping as follows: "Molotolotsi o ntšotlile ho lekane, nkeke ka mo roalla thapo 'na, le khale!" (Act VII: scene iii) [Molotolotsi has ill-treated me enough, I cannot wear the

mourning cloth for him, never!] Even as Lefilo has just placed Mosolotsoana's family request for Khongoana to release her together with her two sons, so as to perform the funeral rites and other requirements; 'Mamohau wails and expresses herself in the following manner; apparently to persuade Khongoana to refute the request that has been put forth:

“Jo-jo-jo! Joee! Ha ke ee 'na mono hle; ha ke eo itšotla ka thapo ea monna ea sa nketsetsang letho bo; kea hana hle, Jo! Kea hana bo; ntloheleng ka taba tsa Molotolotsi hle, ha ke 'matle le moo a shoeleng, ha ke batle le ho bona setopo sa hae hle. Kea utloa nka hlatsa hle.” (Act VII: scene iii).

[Alas-alas-alas! Poor me! I am not going there please, I am not going to ill-treat myself with a mourn cloth for a husband who never did anything for me please; I really refuse, Alas! I refuse please; leave me alone with Molotolotsi's issues please, I hate him even where he has died, I do not even want to see his corpse please. I feel I can vomit please.]

In the light of the above wailings and refutations of a late husband by 'Mamohau; it would appear that Khongoana has had enough of this kind of behaviour displayed by 'Mamohau; such that he reprimands her in this communicative manner:

“Mamohau, ua hlanya na? U mametse hore na ho thoe'ng? Ho kopuo a 'na hore ke u lokolle, u saofa ka litaba. Ha u kopuoe kapa hona ho batloa maikutlo. Ke monna oa hau oa likhomo eno. Ua tlameha ho tsamaea, ekaba ha re sa tseba Sesotho. Joale kea u laela, lokisa kapele le tsamae. Mohau tsamaea u tsose Khomo a itokise le tsamae. Ha ho masaoana a ka mamelloang ha taba li se li le tjenana.” ('Mamohau o kena ka kamoreng a lla, Mohau a tsoa a hlohotse ho ea ka mokhorong ho ea tsosa Khomo.) (Act VII: scene iii)

['Mamohau, are you really mad? Are you listening to what is being said? It is I that is asked to release you, you joke with important matters. You are neither requested nor asked for your view point. That is your cattle husband. You are bound to go, otherwise it would mean that we no longer know the Sesotho culture. Now I instruct you, make quick preparations so that you go. Mohau, go and wake up Khomo so that he prepares himself for the journey. There are no jokes that may be borne when matters are in this form. ('Mamohau goes into the bedroom crying, Mohau goes out angrily towards the outhouse to wake up Khomo.)]

As may be observed, Khongoana's persuasive strategies used above for calling 'Mamohau to order and influence her to take the appropriate action of behaving as required in this situation are:

- Rebuking her by employing rhetorical questions that make her aware of the seriousness of the matter in question;

- Highlighting her of the fact that the matter is not directed to her for airing her views on it, but to Khongoana himself, as he is presently in charge of her;
- Cautioning her to realise that the late man in question is her true husband, 'oa likhomo,' so to say; and as such
- Persuading her to bear it in mind that she is bound to go and perform the funeral rites in accordance with marital expectations concerning the Sesotho culture;
- Applying coercion by instructing her to go and make appropriate preparations for her to leave with Lefilo and Mohau with immediate effect;
- Instructing Mohau to go and awake Khomo for also joining them in the ensuing journey, as he is also Molotolotsi's son, according to the Sesotho culture; and finally
- Seriously alerting her to the fact that all her quips up to now are mere jokes that may not be tolerated when matters are like this.

It is therefore not surprising that 'Mamohau goes into the bedroom crying to perform in accordance with the requirements of this journey. Even as she has gone into the bedroom to make some preparations for the ensuing journey; 'Mamohau is not sure of the stuff she has to take with herself; seemingly because she was not intending to behave in accordance with the Sesotho lore requirements – as contained in her following expression/question: "Na ha ke tsebe nka nka'ng?" (Act VII: scene iii) [As for me I do not know what to take?] In line with the customary requirements that 'Mamohau is bound to follow and perform at her marriage home; Khongoana advises her as follows:

"U hle u ikatele haholo, u ea mosebetsing o boima, o tla u nka nako e telele haholo; feela che bashanyana ba tla 'ne ba tle ho tla u nkela tseo u li hlokang." (Act VII: scene iii)

[You should take enough clothes for yourself, as you are going for quite a tough job, it will take you a very long time; but then the boys will always come to fetch for you the requirements.]

In this way, Khongoana attempts to persuade 'Mamohau to clearly understand the requirements of the matter that is binding for her to perform without failure at her marital home. Seemingly as a counter-persuasion against changing her behaviour and attitude, 'Mamohau retorts in this manner, "Na ke tla khutla ka mor'a lepato, ke bolela ha ho khutloa mabitleng, ha ke batle ho emela thapo ea tla ea nkiba ke itšebeletsa." (Act VII: scene iii) [As for me I shall come back after the funeral, I mean when coming back from the grave yard, I do not want to wait for the mourn cloth that will be some hindrance to me while I work for myself.] Once more, in accordance with his understanding and knowledge of the Sesotho

cultural lore; Khongoana rebukes and cautions 'Mamohau in these communicative expressions:

“Ua pota joale, rona re Basotho, re na le meetlo ea rona e re tlamang eo ba manganga joaleka uena tjenana ha ba sa e phethe ba hlaheloang ke mathata bophelong, hoo motho a beng a re o loiloe. U tlameha ho roalla monna oa hau thapo ho fihlela u e rolisoa ka molao ke baheno, ba u hlatsoe bofifi ba monna oa hau oa matsoa-thaka, ea u lihileng letsoele, u ka hla ua lelera ka sesila sa monna oa hau?”
(Act VII: scene iii)

[Now you are raving, we are the Basotho, we have our customs that bind us to perform so that the stubborn ones like you if they do not perform meet difficulties in life, so much that someone might even say that he/she has been bewitched. You have to be in mourning for your husband until you are released from it legally by your family, wash you off mourning of your first husband that flattened your breast; can you really roam about with the mourning of your husband?]

In the same vein as was indicated above, Khongoana hereby applies more strategies for persuading 'Mamohau to change her attitude and behaviour regarding the Sesotho lore affecting the issue at hand; such as:

- Repudiating her quips as nonsensical ones that might only be tantamount to raving;
- Identifying himself as a typical Mosotho that not only believes in but adheres to the Sesotho customs as binding to those affected by them;
- Advising her to take prudence in observing them, as she might end up thinking that she has been bewitched, as painful things happen to her due to her failure to observe and perform accordingly;
- Showing her that to be in mourning for her husband is not just a matter of choice but binding, as he was the original husband that changed her girlhood into womanhood; and
- Indicating to her that until she has been cleansed from such mourning by her family customarily, she may not dare roam about as a free woman from that mourning.

It would then seem that Lefilo has also been affected by Khongoana's persuasive communicative expressions above; such that he augments his sayings in this manner:

“U mo joetsa hantle ntate Khongoana, bo-'Mamohau ba hopola hore ba ka iketsetsa boithatelo ka meetlo, ha u ba bolella eona ba re u ba hloile, athe ua ba rata u ba phemisa mathata a bophelo. Ha ho motho ea ka hanang ha a sebeletsa bana ba hae

ha feela a phethile meetlo. O batla a tle a 'ne a re monna oa mo tsamaela, kapa a re o re o lapile kapa o hatsetse, ebesale a etsa mekete ea balimo, a hlabaka likhomo. Ke lumellana le uena hore 'Mamohau a mpe a pesetse a phethe meetlo ea lefu la monna oa hae, e tle e re le haeba a ka khutlela mosebetsing a be a se na sisila." (Act VII: scene iii)

[You tell him well father Khongoana, the likes of 'Mamohau think that they may do whatever they want with customs, when you explain such customs to them they say that you hate them, whereas you love them and cause them to avoid the difficulties of life. There is no one that may hinder her from working for her children as long as she has obliged to the customs. She wants to end up saying that the husband marches for her, or she says that he says that he is hungry or cold, and continuously holding ancestral festivities, often slaughtering cattle. I agree with you that 'Mamohau should persevere to perform the customs for the death of her husband, so that even if she were to come back to work she be free from pollution.]

In line with the way Khongoana uses certain persuasive strategies for 'Mamohau to change her attitude and behaviour; besides being in agreement with Khongoana, Lefilo adds more strategic persuasion to cause her to adopt the desired change, such as:

- Cautioning her against her thought and belief that she may do whatever she desires about customs;
- Repudiating her against the thought that whoever shows her the right way demonstrates hatred, but rather to regard that as an assistance for helping her to avoid future problems; and
- Motivating her to perform her husband's death customs, so that she might then work as a free woman from any form of pollution emanating from failure to perform accordingly.

As if what Lefilo has just said were not enough, Khongoana also congratulates him for speaking like a true man; adding that, "Hobane hohle moo a ka eang a le sesila, a sa hlatsuoa, o tla ba malimabe, a nyopuoe ke batho hobane o na le senyopotsiea." (Act VII: scene iii) [Because wherever she goes with that pollution, without being cleansed, she will have misfortune, be detested by people because she has a terrible pollution.] As an indication that she has now been positively persuaded, 'Mamohau has now decided to adopt a change from her previously displayed attitude and behaviour. To prove this point, when Khongoana asks her whether or not she has finished, as the children have long finished and merely waiting for her; she only says, "Na ebe ke sa tla khutla?" (Act VII: scene iii) [But am I still going to come back?] In this way, it would seem that she wants an assurance because

she has been cautioned that the kind of customary performance she is facing is going to take her some time. In order to prepare her for the time duration she is likely to take; Khongoana makes an attempt at persuading her to come to terms with it by indicating that, “bofifi bo nka nako e telele – bonyane khoeli tse tšeletseng kapa selemo.” (Act VII: scene iii) [a mourning takes a long time – at least six months or a year.] Nonetheless, as another persuasive attempt for her to remain with an understanding that she is at liberty to come back here; Khongoana suggests to her that she may come back if she wants to, but adds that should she experience any difficulty, she should not hesitate to send the children for assistance from him. Finally, Khongoana addresses ‘Mamohau and the children by indicating to them that since “maeo ke maboeo,” (Act VII: scene iii) they should remain with assurance that they shall always be welcomed here with two hands; [the going is the coming back].

As ‘Mamohau, her two sons and Lefilo have just gone; Khongoana notices that Kharebe is standing by her doorpost in a lonesome manner. He then approaches her and quips to her that, “Kharebe ngoana’ka ke tšoana le Seeteetelane, ba ile bana beno le ‘m’ao, ntat’a Mohau o hlokahetse.” (Act VII: scene iii) [Kharebe my child I am like Seeteetelane (a legendary person who wore a blanket made out of rats’ skins that could hardly protect her/him against any weather hardships) your brothers and mother have gone, Mohau’s father has passed away.] Since both Khongoana and Kharebe were used to the presence of all the three people, she inquires whether or not they will ever come back – thus indicating her worry over the emptiness and loneliness that is likely to prevail here without their company. In an attempt at persuading her to remain with an assurance that it will be so; Khongoana retorts that they will come back since their animals still remain here at Mokoallong. It would seem that both Khongoana and Kharebe have just resigned to their fate and learned to accept the likely situation they have just alluded to; as the following verbal exchanges between them show:

Kharebe: Ho tla ba bolutu lapeng mona. [It is going to be so lonely here at home.]

Khongoana: Re tla lula le bona Letebele. Ha re boele likobong. (Act VII: scene iii) [We shall stay with it Letebele. Let us go back to our beds.]

Ultimately, in the light of the usual Sesotho practice concerning customs obtaining to the burial; the families of Mosololi and Mosolotsoana are gathered together at Molotolotsi’s home to remove the mourning they have afforded for the late Molotolotsi for a one month period. As a persuasive attempt for all present at this occasion to exchange ideas concerning Mohau and Khomo as sons of the late Molotolotsi; Mahlabe calls all to pay attention as he introduces both Mohau and Khomo – asking them to stand up so that all might see them well. After they have sat down as instructed after the introductions, Mahlabe points at his ox

that is nearby and tells the family members present that he has decided that it be slaughtered for the removal of the mourning situation experienced by the late Molotolotsi's children after his death. Further, Mahlabe indicates that the other purpose for slaughtering this ox is to welcome these children and also to accept the new name of Mosololi that has just been given by 'Mamolotolotsi to Khomo. Thus persuaded in the foregoing presentation; all accept these good intentions and demonstrate their belief and trust in the ancestors by saying: "Rea leboha, ba amohelahile, balimo ba ba roballe." (Act VII: scene iv) [We give thanks, they are welcome, may the ancestors be restful for them.]

Now that all are in unison concerning Mahlabe's intentions as stipulated above; he then pronounces to them that Mohau only happened to learn about his father's death by coincidence; as he had come to seek some assistance from his father concerning some pressing matter. In order for all to be duly persuaded at paying attention and assisting with some solution on the matter in question, Mahlabe asks Mohau to stand up and present his case himself, in front of the whole gathering. In line with Mahlabe's instructions, Mohau addresses this matter in the following words: "Kea leboha Rangoane; bo 'm'e le bo-ntate, batsoali ba ka." (Oa lla.) (Act VII: scene iv) [Thank you Uncle; mothers and fathers, my parents. (He cries)] Seemingly, Mohau's crying is caused by his wonderment upon the manner in which Mahlabe has handled his case; as well as the appreciation they are afforded by the whole family as Molotolotsi's sons who deserve to be released from the mourning session that they have endured up to the present moment. Besides, one might conclude that his emotions are also affected by the fact that his uncle, Mahlabe, has also decided to give up his ox for the removal of mourning for their sake as the children of Molotolotsi that was infamous as a good-for-nothing fellow. Another conclusion one might draw about Mohau's emotional affectation is that he has possibly not anticipated to be afforded this opportunity to address the whole family on the day of his father's mourning removal.

It therefore comes not as astonishment for one of the members of the family to encourage Mohau to be strong, in these words: "Tiisa pelo monna, ngoan'e motona ke nku h'a lle." (Act VII: scene iv) [Strengthen the heart man a boy child is a sheep he never cries.] Thus persuaded to be strong, Mohau delivers his speech in these words:

"Kea itebohela ha ke iphumana ke le ka har'a lona, ke leboha le kamohelo e mofuthu eo le re fang eona. Se neng se ntlisitse mona heso ho ntate se seng feela, ke tlil'o kopa motlhatlehi, ho lona batsoali ba ka. ('Mamohau a bokolla.) (Act VI: scene iv)

[I give thanks that I find myself among you; I also give thanks for the warm reception you have afforded us. What had brought me here at my home to my father is simply

one thing; I have come to ask for a wife, from you my parents. ('Mamohau weeps loudly.)]

Obviously, 'Mamohau's loud weeping is rather abnormal; for it functions as a persuasive attempt at inviting the following verbal exchanges among some members of the family:

'Mamolotolotsi: 'Mamohau ngoana'ka lesa ho Ila, u re bolelle hore na taba tsena oa li tseba kapa ke lehoetla oa le shoama? ['Mamohau my child stop crying, and tell us whether you know these matters or they are fresh and you hear them for the first time?]

'Mamohau: (O ntse a Ila.) Kea li tseba 'm'e. [(She continues crying.) I know them mother.]

'Mamolotolotsi: O re o khahliloe ha mang? [Whose daughter does he say that he has been attracted by?]

'Mamohau: (O ntse a Ila.) Ha kea 'motsa hobane ke ne ke sa khloe hore o tiile. [(She is still crying.) I did not ask him because I did not believe that he was serious.]

Mahlabe: Mohau, u khahliloe ha mang? [Mohau, by whose daughter have you been attracted?]

Mohau: Hona ha ntate Khongoana moo re lulang teng, ke morali oa hae ea bitsoang Kharebe. [Right there at father Khongoana's home where we stay; by his daughter called Kharebe.]

'Mamohau: (A bokolla.) Jo-'na-'na-oe! Joo! Ka le bona 'na ngoana motho! Jo, ngoana a nkholoa oe! Joe! Ekaba ke tla etsa joang? Jo-'na-ntate Khongoana oee! Jooo! (A ilibana.) [(She weeps loudly.) Alas-me-me-alas! Alas! Poor me someone's child! Alas, the child has so much embarrassed me! Alas! By the way what am I going to do? Alas for poor father Khongoana, please! Alas! (She faints)]

In the light of what ensued between Khongoana and 'Mamohau when Mohau was asking for taking a masalio to his maternal uncle, Lefilo, at Mokoallong; one might rightly conclude that 'Mamohau's weeping aloud emanates from her knowledge that Khongoana has indicated that Mohau should inform him when he intends to get married. Now that Mohau has come to his original/true home to get his parents' permission; she is seemingly worried that this is going to be a shocking experience when it comes to the ears of Khongoana – for he now seems to regard Mohau as his own son that is to inform him of the ensuing matter. Worse still, 'Mamohau wails worse and even faints due to Mohau's pronouncement that he has been attracted by Kharebe, Khongoana's daughter who is now thought of relating to Mohau as a sister – since Khongoana regards them as both his children.

Nonetheless, the immediate necessity at this juncture is for applying all possible persuasive tactics for rendering assistance to 'Mamohau into regaining consciousness. Since the

members of the family that are gathered here do not know what might have caused 'Mamohau's fainting; they come up with varying views regarding her behaviour; while at the same time they suggest different supposedly first aid applications for helping her regain her consciousness; as observed in these verbal exchanges:

E mong: Mo kotlobanye. [Shrivel her up.]

'Mamolotolotsi: 'Mamohau molato ke'ng? ['Mamohau what is the matter?]

E mong: Mo iseng moriting (Ba mo thathasa.) [Take her to the shade (They seize her limp structure.)]

E mong: O ne a sotlehile haholo! [She had been suffering too much.]

E mong: Mo noeseng metsi. (Act VII: scene iv) [Make her drink some water.]

Since it appears as though there is no final suggestion for reviving 'Mamohau from her fainting condition; Mahlabe comes up with this proposal: "Ha re boeleng tabeng. Mohau, ana u itse lebitso la mosetsana eo ke mang?" (Act VII: scene iv) [Let us go back to the issue. Mohau, by the way what did you say the girl's name is?]

Mohau: Ke itse ke Kharebe, Rangoane. [I have said that she is Kharebe, Uncle.]

Mahlabe: U se u buile le eena? [Have you spoken to her?]

Mohau: Re qetile; o se a emetse 'na hore ke ntšetse pele morero oa rona." [We have finished; she is already waiting for me to propel our plan forward.]

Mahlabe: Kea utloa monna; 'me kea tšepa le utloile kaofela. (Act VII: scene iv) [I hear man; and I trust that you have all heard.]

Though all have demonstrated their intent on hearing what Mohau's request was at the beginning; it would seem that no one wants to commit themselves into this matter now – possibly because Khongoana is known for his riches – such that all might be wondering as to how he is to be approached. Unsurprisingly, only 'Mamolotolotsi responds to Mahlabe's final statement above, saying:

"Re utloile, ho se ho sallane le uena hore u phethahatse kopo e ntle ea ngoana. U re hlomphile haholo Mohau, re a u leboha ngoana-ngoana'ke. Ke ne ke se ke lahlile tšepo ea hore ke sa tla le bona, ka ha ke se ntse ke okametse lebitla." (Act VII: scene iv)

[We have heard, it now remains with you to fulfill this good request of the child. You have respected us Mohau, we thank you my grandchild. I had already lost hope of ever seeing you again; since I am already hanging above the grave.]

By so saying, 'Mamolotolotsi's persuasion is clear. She persuades Mahlabe to make it a point that he carries Mohau's request over to Khongoana as soon as it may be possible. The final part of her statement, that she is already hovering over the grave, suggests that this matter should not be delayed; for as an old grandmother to Mohau, it might be pleasing for her to see Mohau's wife in her lifetime. As if Mohau read the desire for urgency of the matter from 'Mamolotolotsi; he makes his final request as follows: "Kopo ea ka ea ho qetela tabeng ena ke hore pele 'm'e a ea hahabo ho ea hlobola, mosetsana eo a be a le lapeng mona re tl'o tsosa motse oa ntate." (Act VII: scene iv) [My final request on this matter is that before mother goes to her home for casting off the mourning, that girl be here in the family so that we revive my father's village.] The foregoing Mohau's statement comes up as a persuasive challenge for Mahlabe to think and decide on the ways they have to prepare for approaching Khongoana for requesting for his daughter's marriage to Mohau. In order for Mohau to understand the crux of the matter; and to persuade him to realise the importance of producing something for proposing this marriage; Mahlabe puts it in this manner:

"Kea utloa monna, feela bothatanyana bo sa le teng; ha motho ha ho uoe ho itsobokiloe matsoho, ho tšepiloe ho ea kolokisa majoe holima lesaka ho ntse ho thetsoa batho ho thoe likhomo li lefisa, ebe bohali bo'a hoba, bo boholoa ke lintja."
(Act VII: scene iv)

[I hear man, but there is still some problem; at somebody's place people do not just go empty-handed, trusting the act of lining up some stones on top of the kraal while deceiving the people by saying that the cattle are in the care of someone else, ending up with marriage discussions failing, barked at by the dogs.]

In essence, the final part of Mahlabe's statement above means that, "Lenyalo le reroang le senyehile;" [The marriage being organised has been destroyed] according to Matšela and Moletsane (1999:17). In line with Mahlabe's persuasive goal of encouraging Mohau to produce something for requesting this marriage, his use of the above idiomatic expressions function as persuasive action for Mohau to reveal to the whole family whatever cattle he has and prepared to pay out towards this intended marriage. In response to this persuasive challenge, Mohau reveals his status of cattle ownership in the following words:

"Rangoane, joaleka ngoana e motona ke ne ke lisa ha ntate eo, 'me o ne a ntšoaela. Ha ke buoa le lona tjenana ke na le likhomo tse leshome le manemane a tšeletseng a marole." (Act VII: scene iv)

[Uncle, like a male child I was looking after cattle at that father's place, and he was earmarking for me. As I presently speak with you I have a herd of ten cattle and six weaned calves.]

As if Mohau's intention was for challenging the family to decide as to whether or not he has enough cattle to carry him through into this intended marriage issue; together the family comment that, "Moshanyana enoa u ikemetse senna! H'a nyalisoe. Khili, ke monna ruri!" (Act VII: scene iv) [This small boy is manly self-fulfilled. Let him be organised marriage for. Khili, (interjection of astonishment) he is indeed a man.] Thus assured of Mohau's self-fulfillment, Mahlabe thanks him and makes a public announcement that he is not going to stand aloof, but will also produce five cattle plus a horse as "moqhoba kapa molisa." (Act VII: scene iv) [an ox killed by young man's father when he receives a newly married woman, or a shepherd.]

Though Mahlabe's intentions may be merely to perform his duty as substitute father to Mohau after Molotolotsi's death; his public announcement functions as a persuasive attempt for whoever has something to pledge it for the marriage at issue. In response to that persuasive challenge, 'Malefilo puts forth her own contribution as follows:

"Ekaba ke holetse bohata, ngoana enoa oa ka o ntlhomphile, ke tlameha ho mo nyalisa. Mahlabe, letšoaong la ntat'ao u khethe marole a leshome le linku tse leshome tsa setsiba. Ke batla lesaka le tlale likhomo-naka, bohali bo oe hang ha le fihla, le be le hlabisetsoe. Mohlomong moruinyana eno o tloha a shata ka likhomo tseno tsa ngoana'ka. Ke batla ho theohe tsa ka; a ka nahana hore re mehofe, re re ngoana a inyalise. Hape Mahlabe ha u qetile ho nyalisa ngoana enoa, o mo fe liphoofolo tsohle tsa letšoa la ntat'ae-moholo." (Act VII: scene iv)

[It would mean that I have grown up for falsehood, this child of mine has respected me, I have to assist him in his marriage. Mahlabe, on the mark of your father's you should select ten weaned calves and ten sheep for a drawer. I want the kraal to be filled up with live cattle, the marriage cattle should be accepted at once as you arrive, and end up with your being slaughtered an ox for the marriage finality. May be that small rich man might refuse with those cattle of my child. I want mine to be driven down there; he might think that we are vagrants, saying that the child should produce marriage cattle himself. In addition Mahlabe, when you have completed the marriage activity for this child, give him all the animals with his grand-father's earmarkings.]

Seemingly, as persuasion is supplementable, every one here intents pledging something towards this marriage ceremony at issue – for now there speaks someone from Mosololi's family; pledging as follows on behalf of his family:

"Re tlameha ho tšelisa ngoana enoa, mofu ntat'ae e ne e le lehlasoa; mohlankanyana enoa re tlameha ho mo tšehetsa. Le rona ba ha Mosololi re re ha le isa likhomo le re

joetse, re sa il'o iphenya mahafi, re tlameha ho bontša monna eno hore ha re mohaung oa hae." (Act VII: scene iv)

[We are bound to console this child, the late father of his was a negligent person; we have to support this young man. Even we of the Mosololi's family say that when you are about to send the cattle you should inform us, we are going to examine our armpits, we have to show that man that we are not under his mercy.]

As if all these forms of pledging were not enough, 'Mamolotolotsi makes a reminder for Mahlabe to remember to inform Lefilo about this intended marriage issue – apparently as a persuasive measure for Lefilo, as maternal uncle, to ensure that he also produces something as his contribution towards the marriage of the young Mohau. Indeed Mahlabe promises his mother that Lefilo and others will be duly informed; and puts this matter in a persuasive chanting form in the following words:

“Ba tla tsebisoa 'm'e,
 Khomo ha e oe Makholokoe,
 Re iphetse meokho,
 Kajeno le 'na ke lla se mothamo,
 Mosolotsoana o tsohile bafung,
 Hloho ea ntate e tsohile,
 Khomo ha e itome leleme,
 Banna re qate ka lehloele.”
 (Act VII: scene iv)

[They will be informed mother,
 Let the ox fall Makholokoe,
 So that we remove our tears,
 Today I also cry with half mouthful,
 Mosolotsoana has risen from the dead,
 My father's head has risen,
 Let the ox bite its own tongue,
 We men fasten drawers with coagulate blood.]

It would seem that Mahlabe's aim in this praise chant is to persuade the family members to observe the fact that Mohau's back homecoming has precipitated into the revival of the head in the Mosolotsoana's family; more especially now that Molotolotsi is late, though his behaviour had almost turned the family into a headless unit. It would then also appear that the ox in reference is not only slaughtered for the already specified purposes; but also for rejoicing over Mohau's return, not only as a son that was regarded as long lost, but he who

signifies the revival of the head of the family. Significantly, men have to slaughter and work on the ox for thanks-giving and celebration for the two families of Mosololi and Mosolotsoana as a unit whole – as both families have made pledges in support of the young Mohau.

Ultimately, in fulfillment with 'Mamolotlotsi's instructions for Mohau's marriage organization to be performed in time, and for Lefilo to be informed accordingly; Mahlabe and Lefilo arrive at Khongoana's home at Mokoallong, where they find Khongoana at his kraal. As if he has been expecting some visitors of this kind, Khongoana is the first to greet them, and they exchange greetings in this manner:

Khongoana: Khotsong baeng! [May there be peace visitors!]

Lefilo: Ntate Khongoana, enoa ke soare Mahlabe moena oa monna oa 'Mamohau. Soare, enoa ke eena ntate Khongoana eo re leng baeti ba hae. (Ba lumelisana ba tšoarana ka matsoho.) (Act VII: scene v) [Father Khongoana, this is brother-in-law Mahlabe the younger brother to the husband of 'Mamohau. Brother-in-law, this is the very father Khongoana whose visitors we are. (They greet one another by shaking hands.)]

Though the common greeting among the Basotho people usually starts with 'lumela/ng,' Khongoana's one above specifically employs the word 'khotsong,' seemingly as a persuasive attempt for the visitors to maintain the existing peace with him, as their host. In accordance with a seeming agreement for such peace to continue prevailing, the visitors shake hands with their host, thus signifying their intent on the maintenance of such peace in their verbal exchanges concerning this visit. Only after shaking hands as a sign of their concert in maintaining peace in their discussion does Khongoana ask them after the health of those they have left at home. They answer in the positive that all are well, except for 'Mamohau who seemed to have been affected by the death of her husband. In response to health situation, Khongoana answers that "Ha ho lere le khopo." (Act VII: scene v) [There is no crooked staff (there is no fault).] In this way, the discussion ground has been leveled by the fact that both parties have established rapport for unity and peaceful discussions.

As a sign of his accommodative welcoming of the visitors, Khongoana invites them to go into his sitting house with them; apparently driving his primary goal of making them comfortable enough for them to discuss whatever issues that put them here today. Even before he may sit down with his visitors, he peeps through the door, calls upon Kharebe and persuades her to slaughter a chicken as food for the visitors, saying, "A k'u soeneletse baeti bana ba ka motsuoane." (Act VII: scene v) [Please break a chicken neck for these visitors of mine.]

Apparently, this statement is meant for persuading Khongoana's visitors to realise that even if there is no readily available food for them; there is always a chance to slaughter a chicken for food provision whenever visitors come unexpectedly. As if to demonstrate to the visitors

that there are enough chicken from which a choice can be made; Khongoana leaves the whole matter for Kharebe to do the selection; hence motivating her to choose the best – as noted in her persuasive dealings with the chickens as she calls them and then chases her choice in the following manner:

“Kipi, kipi, kipi, (Ea chophola.)
 Ke tla tšoara motetepahali
 Ha en’o lula-lula
 Ha en’o kokomala
 Ha en’o lula-lula
 Ha en’o kokomala
 Ka e qhautsa.”
 (Act VII: scene v)

[Kipi, kipi, kipi, (It loosens)
 I shall catch the fattest one
 Let it sit-sit
 Let it crouch-crouch
 Let it sit-sit
 Let it crouch-crouch
 I have snatched it.]

Needless to say, Kharebe’s poetic chanting in her chase functions as persuasive attempt at making the chicken behave the way she wants – as opposed to the style of merely chasing chickens without chanting the way she does; where they would be motivated to run off as fast as they can manage. In short, Kharebe’s chanting while chasing the chicken of her selection is a persuasive action to drive her goal of motivating the chicken to sit down and allow her to catch it; in which case she does not have to run around behind a chicken that flees away from its enemy. It therefore comes not as surprise that she does not take long to catch the chicken of her choice; as her chanting has persuaded it to change its behaviour of running away from whatever seeming enemy.

Inside Khongoana’s sitting house, all are settled in their seats as he addresses them in the following persuasive manner for them to reveal their intentions of the ensuing visit:

“Ekaba le re tlisetsa life kajeno, re labalabela tse molemo, tse tla thoba maikutlo a rona; mohla re qalang ho le bona ho ne ho le mahlonoko.” (Act VII: scene v)
 [By the way what issues do you bring us today, we crave for good ones, that will sooth our feelings; the first time we saw you was distressful.]

Apparently, Khongoana's primary goal is for his visitors to reveal some good news about which they have come to see him; and thus motivates them to perform accordingly. Mahlabe therefore puts it well that, "Kajeno re tlile ka tsa khotso! Re romiloe ke bana ba Mosolotsoana ho uena ntate ho tla kopela mora oa bona Mohau ea khahliloeng ke morali oa hau ea bitsoang Kharebe, mohope oa metsi." (Act VII: scene v) [Today we have come for peaceful ones! We have been sent by the children of Mosolotsoana to you father to come and request for their son Mohau that has been attracted by your daughter called Kharebe, as water calabash (wife).] Though Mahlabe has said it well that today they have brought peaceful matters, for Khongoana, this is so shocking piece of news that he can hardly believe his ears; as may be noted in the following verbal exchanges with his visitors:

Khongoana: (A ema, a lula, a fufuleloa.) Khelele! Banna, na ke utloa hantle? Mohau? Mohau ofe? [(He stands, sits, and perspires.) Khelele! (interjection of astonishment) Guys, do I hear well? Mohau? Which Mohau?]

Lefilo: Oee, ntate, khoba matšoafo hle, re bolela eena Mohau eo u mo tsebang. [Oh father, crush the lungs please, we mean the very Mohau that you know.]

Khongoana: Oho banna, esekaba Mohau h'a nke hantle. Ke mehlolo e mekaakang! Ke re ekaba Mohau o batla khomo a eo sella 'm'ae? Ha ke khloe; a k'u buoeng ho hong hle; hoo le tlileng ka hona. [Oh guys, it should not be that Mohau does not take well. What wonders are these! I thought that Mohau is in need of a bovine so as to buy some food stuff for his mother? I do not believe this; please say something else, that which has brought you here.]

Mahlabe: Ke tsona litaba tse re behang mona ntate, ha ho tse ling, re kopa mohope oa metsi. [These are the matters that are putting us here father, and no others, we are asking for a water calabash.]

Khongoana: (Oa hoeletsa.) Kharebe, Kharebe tl'o mona. [(He shouts.) Kharebe, Kharebe come here.]

Kharebe: (O kena a apere kobo a iname a soabile.) [She comes in wearing a blanket, looking down and embarrassed.]

Khongoana: Kharebe, enoa ke ntate Lefilo malom'a Mohau; enoa ke ntate Mahlabe rangoan'a Mohau. Ba re ba mona ka uena. Athe le ntse le tšepisane lenyalo le Mohau? [Kharebe, this is father Lefilo maternal uncle of Mohau; this is father Mahlabe paternal uncle of Mohau. They say that they are here because of you. Is it true that you have promised marriage to each other with Mohau?]

Kharebe: (Oa lla.) Ho-ho-joa-lo, ntate.(She cries) [I-it-i-is-so, father.]

Khongoana: (Ka bohale.) Joale u llela'ng, hoba ke uena u lumellaneng le Mohau hore a romele ba habo hore ba tl'o u kopa? Tsoa mona! U mobe, ha ke khahloe ke seboko sa hau. (O tsoa a lla.) (Act VII: scene v) [With fury.] Now what are you crying for, since you are the one that agreed with Mohau that he should send members of his family to come and request for you? Get out of here! You are bad, I am not impressed by your wailing. (She goes out crying.)]

As might have been expected, even though Lefilo has used persuasive words for Khongoana to 'khoba matšoafo,' these matters baffle Khongoana; as he has brought up Mohau for quite some time; such that he was already hoping that since Mohau is old enough to seek a wife he would be performing as father to him (Mohau) – rather than being father-in-law as Mohau now proposes. For Khongoana, these revelations bring a new perspective with which to regard both Mohau and Kharebe – they have somehow betrayed him by conspiring against him in this way, he seems to feel. It therefore comes not as wonderment that when these matters come to his ears for the first time he becomes quite unsettled – as has been demonstrated by his standing up, sitting down, and finally perspiring. One might even dare say that all these mixed feelings of uncertainty and confusion function as persuasion for him to apply anger against Kharebe and even blame her for being a bad girl.

In line with this understanding and upon realizing the extent to which Khongoana's anger has developed; Lefilo makes a persuasive attempt to calm him down; communicatively addressing him as follows:

“Se ke ua halefa hle moren'aka; taba tsa bana, ke tsa bana, rona re lokela ho buoa tsa rona, haholo ha ba re hlomphele, ba re rerisitse morero oa bona; re lokela ho ba sebeletsa ka tlhompho le ka lerato, re le batho ba baholo, ba utloisisang.” (Act VII: scene v)

[Please do not be angry my chief, children's affairs are those of children, we have to discuss ours; especially as they have respected us, and caused us to plan their purpose; we have to perform for them with respect and love, as mature people with understanding.]

In the light of Lefilo's foregoing persuasive talk; Khongoana's state of anger and confusion ebb; such that he wipes off his tears and sweat, thus indicating that he is prepared to change his attitude and behaviour and go back to the discussion of this important matter. In line with Lefilo's appeal for them to handle this matter with respect and love, as mature people – and even addressing Khongoana as 'moren'aka' as a persuasive attempt for him to change his attitude and behaviour above; Khongoana pleads for forgiveness in these words:

“Le ntšoarele hle beng ba ka, ke ile ka ferekana habohloko, le ntlhahile lesumatha. E ne e le morero oa ka ho nyalisa Mohau haeba a ka batla ho nyala a ntse a le mona ha ka. Mohau ke ngoana eo ke mo khotšeng moea, eo ke mo ratang joaloka ngoana oa ka, o bohlale, o matla, o sebete, o ntšebelelitse hantle haholo joaleka ngoana oa ka, ‘moho le ‘m’ae. Ke ne ke ba nka e le bana baka.” (Act VII: scene v)

[Please forgive me my masters, I became highly confused, you took me by surprise. It was my plan to organise Mohau’s marriage if he were to marry while he was here at my home. Mohau is a child that I trust, that I love as my own child, together with his mother. I had regarded them as my own children.]

Indeed, persuasion is incremental; as observed in the way Khongoana now addresses his visitors above, as ‘beng ba ka,’ – which is similar to the way Lefilo has just called him ‘moren’aka’ earlier; and as such showing that both parties have persuaded each other to hold mutual high respect. Upon realizing the way Khongoana was now relating with Mohau and ‘Mamohau; and his apparent fear that he is now likely to lose all of them, including Kharebe, his own daughter; Mahlabe applies his persuasive verbal exchange to propel the primary goal concerning the matter in question. He calls Khongoana to the realization that, even though Mohau and Kharebe have planned to get married, they remain his children, just as he has always considered them, and says, “Ntate, bana e ntse e le ba hau ruri, ha re a tla ho tla u amoha bona, re hlile re tlii’o tiisa sekhotso sa hau le ausi ‘Mamohau haeba u ka re amohela.” (Act VII: scene v) [Father, the children are still yours indeed, we have not come to deprive you of them, in fact we have come to intensify your relationship with sister ‘Mamohau if you can accept us.]

It would seem that Mahlabe’s foregoing persuasive words have motivated Khongoana to change his beliefs and be considerate of Mahlabe’s proposition. As a demonstration of his change of beliefs, Khongoana employs the following communicative expressions to indicate his stance relative to this pressing matter:

“Bo-ntate ruri litaba tsa lona ha ke li thesele, ke mpile ka ferekana. Nka mpa ka re ho lona ngoana ha se oa ka, ke oa Matebele, ‘na ke molisa feela. Ke tla fetisetsa litaba ho bona; ‘me ke tla le fa qeto ea bona kapele.” (Act VII: scene v)

[Fathers indeed I do not thump your issues, I only became confused. I can only say to you that the child is not mine, she belongs to the Matebele, I am only a shepherd. I will pass the matters to them; and I will give you their conclusion soon.]

Indeed this is the answer that is appreciated by both Mahlabe and Lefilo as messengers of Mosolotsoana’s family on this matter; for they have managed to achieve their primary goal through persuasive communication. In essence, Khongoana has been persuaded to agree to

their proposal, but as a matter like this is usually the concern of the family; his pronouncement that he will pass the matter over to the Matebele for approval spells it all out. He is to report to them about this untimely visitor's proposal as a way of liaising with them for their blessing of the matter. In line with this understanding, Mahlabe extends their thanks to Khongoana; and by extension he requests him to plead with the Matebele to speed up the process.

For them, he says, it is their intention that when 'Mamohau goes for the removal of the mourning garment; their daughter-in-law be already at her marital place for taking care of the family – thus attempting to achieve their secondary goal as suggested by Mohau. In response to this request, Khongoana quips in this manner, "Re tla leka ho potlakela litaba hle bo-ntate re se siteloe bana." (Oa tsoa.) (Act VII: scene v) [We shall try to speed up matters please fathers so as not to be impossible to the children.]

Needless to say, Khongoana's statement above still bears some inflections of his feelings of losing all his children to the family of Mosolotsoana; that is why he even goes out at this juncture; possibly to cool down a little. Obviously, Lefilo and Mahlabe are aware of this state of Khongoana's likeliness to remain lonely in his home, due to losing all the children he loved so much. This awareness is indicated by Lefilo and Mahlabe's verbal exchanges below:

Lefilo: A ferekana monna enoa banna, ho bonahala o ne a se a re tlotlo le oele mekhoabane (Ba tšeha.) [This man has become terribly confused guys, it is clear that he was already saying that a boon has fallen people who were not looking for it. (They laugh.)]

Mahlabe: 'Na ke ne ke tšohile hore o tloha a re ntša ka sepolo. Hoane h'a ema, ke ne ke se ke itokiselitse ho baleha. (Act VII: scene v) [I was already afraid that he might drive us out with a big stick. At that moment when he stood up, I was already prepared for running away.]

Seemingly, the idiomatic expression applied by Lefilo above, 'Tlotlo le oele mekhoabane,' presupposes that Khongoana was regarding 'Mamohau and her sons as some kind of treasure he never went out to hunt for – and as such losing such treasure might have caused him pain and suffering. Mokitimi (1997:29) tends to regard the proper word for 'mekhoabane' as 'Mokhoabane,' with capital M to denote a place; and refers to the sauce as follows: "There is a great treasure at Mokhoabane mountain because hunters have trapped many wild animals;" and goes on to explain the idiom in this fashion, "There is abundance of food or necessities" (1997:29). In the light of this sauce and others with their differences and similarities, the main idea remains the same; which is that of a boon or blessing that Khongoana seemingly regards as an aspect he is about to lose.

In line with his possible fears, Khongoana persuades himself to bring the food for his visitors; as he ultimately comes back carrying it. Apparently, tension builds up between Khongoana

and his visitors; for they eat and go without any further verbal exchanges among them. Now that Khongoana is left alone in the house, the atmosphere of solitude somehow works as persuasive measure for him to reconsider the situation in question in this form:

“Banna, ‘mapoho h’a nyaloe;
 Mohau o mphile thuto e kholo;
 Ebe o tla nyala ka khomo tsee?
 Le khale, ke tla li khutlisa;
 A ka phelisa thatohatsi ka’ng?
 Ke tla mo laea, ee bo ke tla mo laea;
 Ke li busetse ho eena hape;
 Khomo! Jo, Khomo ngoana’ka;
 Ke mo rata haholo bo;
 Tšoaona lena ke la hae, ee ho joalo;
 Bana bana ke ba ka hle; ke re ke ba ka, le ha maru a luma;
 Ke tla ba hlokomela bo;
 ‘Nete ke bana ba khomo tsa batho.
 (Act VII: scene v)

[Guys, the mother of a bull is never married;
 Mohau has given me great education;
 Could he be planning to give these cattle for marriage?
 Never, I shall return them;
 With what may he treat the beloved one?
 I shall punish him; yes indeed I shall punish him;
 And return them to him again;
 Khomo! Alas, Khomo my child;
 I love him very much indeed;
 This earmark is his, yes it is so;
 These children are mine please; I say they are mine, even if the clouds may thunder;
 I shall take care of them please;
 The truth is that they are other people’s cattle.]

The above self-persuasion by Khongoana clearly indicates that he now realises for the first time that the act of marrying a Mosotho woman with a baby boy is not advisable – as that baby boy will seek his original home and relatives once grown up into manhood; thus leaving the man that brought him up stranded and lonely. Further, he is aware that it is not wise for any man to bring up someone else’s children – as they end up going back to their original home – while the up bringer remains living a lonesome kind of life here after. In this way,

Khongoana has been successfully persuaded to change his attitude and beliefs that 'Mamohau is his wife; and also to refrain from the belief that both Mohau and Khomo are his sons that he was hoping to perform for on their marriage days. In other words, he has been living under some deceit that he had some easy treasure that would benefit him in the future; while the fact remains that 'bana ke ba khomo,' in accordance with the idiomatic expression into which the title of the text was produced.

But it would also seem that, as far as Khomo is concerned, Khongoana still entertains some belief and understanding that he is his own son, biologically and otherwise; which is indicated by his persuasive reference in the chanted soliloquy above. Be that as it may, one might venture to regard Khomo as a likely bone of contention here. He is the late Molotolotsi's son, by virtue of the fact that he is a brother to Mohau, and a child of the cattle of Mosolotsoana, according to the Sesotho custom. On the other hand, one might also dare say that since Khongoana has already persuaded himself to pledge and surrender his earmarked cattle to Khomo, as observed in the above chanted soliloquy; Khomo stands a good chance of being heir to his belongings. But such a situation would only emerge if Khongoana customarily marries 'Mamohau and informs the Matebele family of such a situation. Finally, one might conceive a situation in which Mohau and Khomo, by choice, break family ties in order that Khomo may inherit Khongoana's belongings.

4.3 *TSIKETSING SA QOMATSI*

Maboya's *Tsiketsing sa qomatsi* is centred on the prevailing decadence in the community of the same name, Tsiketsingsaqomatsi. This drama text is quite economic with characterization – as it boasts of only the following six characters upon whom the whole play revolves:

Radihlaba:	Mosidi's husband
Mosidi:	Radihlaba's wife
Mamello:	A girl that is looking for residence
Qhobela:	A friend of Kakatjhelana
Kakatjelana:	A friend of Qhobela
Mmadiatheng:	A widow

It would appear that this drama text is afforded this name as an indication that this location is replete with antisocial behaviour; such that those who are worried and disgusted with such behaviour even decide to desert it and seek some kind of redemption else where. Although such people regard their desertion as a solution for ending their disgust and dissatisfaction; it would seem that social problems are almost all over – such that the same people might end up running into worse situations in the foreign lands. On that basis, one might dare say that

there is no where to run; as the characters in the text demonstrate through their actions and verbal interactions.

At the beginning of the play, Radihlaba is at the outskirts of the location, alone and involved in a soliloquy in which he self- demonstrates his determination to quit the village in the night. Seemingly, Radihlaba is intent on deserting this place as a way of running away from some moral decay prevailing in it. As this soliloquy shows, it is in the middle of the night, and Radihlaba apparently self- uses the night's cover so that nobody sees him and ventures into dissuading him from his plans:

“Ka nnete ha e le geto yona, ke e nkile. Bosiu bona bo tla sa ke le hole. Ke kgathetse ke manyampetla a motse ona. (O a kgutsakgutsa, o bile o a qamaka) Be, ke bonang na? Ha e ka ke bona motho tjee? Kapa ebe ke bona hantle? Eseng mohlomong ke a lora? Ebile eka ka ke motho wa mosadi. E, ka nnete ke hlile ke bona hantle. Ke ne ke hopola hore hara mpa bosiu tjena ke nna feela mona kgorong ya motse, athe ke ntse ke ithetsa. Ke tla etsa jwang na jwale? Le yena ke eo a tla a ntobile. Ere ke mpe ke atamele ho yena, ke tle ke utlwe hore na ebe o lla ka eng. Empe ebe ha se moloi. Motho wa batho ka tloha ka kena tsietsing. (O dumedisa a le hojana) Hela, mme, kgotso!” (Act I: scene i)

[Indeed as for final decision, I have taken it. When this night wanes off I shall be far away. I am tired of this village's disgusting behaviour. (He pauses and looks around) Oh, what am I seeing? Why does it look like I see a person? Or do I see well? Or may be I am dreaming? And it looks like it is a female person. Yes, indeed I see well. I had thought that in the middle of the night like this it is only I that is here at the outskirts of the village, whereas I have been deceiving myself. Now what am I going to do? There she also comes straight to me. Let me also go towards her, so that I might find out what she is after. I hope she is not a witch. For poor me I might be in trouble. (He greets her from a distance) Hallow mother, good evening!]

In the light of the above self-persuasive soliloquy, it becomes clear that, whereas Radihlaba capitalises on the night cover for deserting Tsiketsingsaqomatsi without anybody's notice; he is not the sole nocturnal human being on the run from social problems. This realization somehow makes him aware that, while he has self-deceptively persuaded himself to abandon his village – hoping to get some salvation somewhere else; there are other people who might be experiencing more or less the same feelings and inclinations. To make matters worse, Radihlaba even realises with shock that the other human being with whom they share more or less the same troubles is a female one. It would appear that for him, it is unusual for a female person to traverse the outskirts of a village in the middle of the night. That is why he even self- cautions himself about the possibility of this one being a witch – in which case he

might find himself encountering some problems. It makes sense then that he offers his greetings from a distance for safety's sake, as indicated in the soliloquy above.

Since greetings are employed as means of establishing rapport between/among human beings – Mamello, the woman in question, returns them, saying, “Dumela ntate!” (Act I: scene i) [Good evening sir/father] Although Radihlaba was rather suspicious that this woman was a witch; it would now seem that, based on the greetings as establishment of rapport, he considers her as a normal woman who might be out on a certain mission. Seemingly as a persuasive goal for her to explain herself about her traversing the outskirts of the village in the middle of the night; Radihlaba employs anger, saying: “Wa papaelakaka le masiu tjee o le masadi, taba ya hao ke efe? Hona monna wa hao o re o hokae moo a leng teng?” (Act I: scene i) [As you so much run around in the nights like this as a woman, what is your problem? And in addition where does your husband think you are, wherever he is?] Upon noticing the fury employed by Radihlaba in his questioning, Mamello humiliates herself, as a strategy for achieving her persuasive goal of gaining some assistance in her search for a place of sojourn, saying, “Ke mona, ke mona ka ditsietsi, Ntate.” (Act I: scene i) [I am here, I am here due to problems, father.] Apparently, Radihlaba hereby propels his persuasive goal of finding the truth about Mamello's situation; as he says: “Le be le ntse le re ditsietsi, ditsietsi, athe le ntse le le mererong e mona ya lona ya botseetse. O mang ka lebitso, o bile o tswa kae hara lee? Bua!” (Act I: scene i) [You keep on saying problems, problems, whereas you are still in those plans of yours for gallivanting. Who are you by name, and where are you from in this situation? Speak up!]

Employing the same meekness as a persuasive tactic for gaining that assistance, Mamello spells out her name. In addition, she gives the name of her father, Masedi, and her home village as Dijabatho. Contrary to her hope of achieving her persuasive goal, Radihlaba dampens her hope by accusing her of being one of the human eaters like the name of her village purports. Further, he remarks about her boldness in traversing these arrears in the night; ending by posing the question: “Kapa o thetswa ke ngwedinyana ena, mme o se o ithetsa ka hore o baballehile?” (Act I: scene i) [Or you are deceived by this small moonshine and you end up deceiving yourself that you are safe?] It would appear that Mamello is conscious of the fact that Radihlaba's verbal interactions are hardly going to take her anywhere; in as far as her persuasive goal of gaining assistance is concerned. She resultantly spells out her persuasive goal directly, saying, “Ke kopa thuso ya hao hle, Ntate! Ha o mpona ke le mona tjena, ke mophaphathehi. Ke motho ya ipatlelang tjako.” (Act I: scene i) [I hereby ask for your assistance please father. As you see me here in this form, I am a refugee. I am a person that seeks refuge.]

It is apparent that Radihlaba has been motivated by Mamello's above verbal interactions to change his attitude towards her. He now adopts a humble mood and, calling her 'ngwanaka,' (my child) quips that she now tells him some wonderment he has never heard in his lifetime. With a persuasive attempt for her to explain herself further and more clearly; Radihlaba asks Mamello:

“O le motho wa mosadi, o batlana le tjako, le hona hara masiu tjee, ebe ha ho banna motseng oo wa heno wa Dijabatho? Nna ke tseba tjako e batlwa ke banna, le hona banna, eseng dihatamarikgwana. Jwale wena, o le mosadi, o mpoella hore o batlana le tjako? Ka nnete mehlolo ke dinoha mesenene ke batho!” (Act I: scene i)

[Your being a female person, you are looking for a sojourn, and worse in the mid of the nights like this, are there no men in that Dijabatho village of yours? I personally know a sojourn to be sought for by men, and I mean men, not men-like beings. Now you, as a woman, you tell me that you are seeking a sojourn? Indeed miracles are snakes, wonders are human beings!]

Although Radihlaba has just made a lengthy persuasive attempt for Mamello to explain herself more; the latter simply quips: “Ke re tjako feela hle, Ntate.” (Act I: scene i) I merely say a sojourn please father! As might have expected, Radihlaba is not to be so easily persuaded to give or suggest any possibility of her getting that which she is looking for; at least until she can answer a few other questions – the interactive response that may motivate him take an appropriate action. In response to Radihlaba's persuasive question regarding the reasons that have caused her to desert her own village; Mamello surmises that, as she has already indicated, troubles have caused her to take action and desert her own village. As one might correctly guess, Radihlaba is not yet convinced; as Mamello has not said exactly what troubles have brought her here. He therefore insists on the aspect of self-explanation as a persuasive action that might make him offer Mamello the required assistance: “A ko hle o ale leleme phate he, ke tswe ke utlwa hore na ke ditsietsi tsa mofuta ofe tsena tse o tlosang haeno. Mohlomong nka nna ka o tswela khomo.” (Act I: scene i) [Then please spread the tongue, (i.e., spread a full picture) so that I may learn about the kind of troubles that cause you to desert your home village. May be I might give you some assistance.]

Seemingly, Mamello has this time been successfully persuaded by Radihlaba to explain herself about her troubles; as she now delves into a lengthy explanation that is supposedly meant for Radihlaba to change his former attitude and render the assistance Mamello hereby seeks. Though she initially informs Radihlaba that she is driven here by so many troubles that the whole night would not accommodate her relating them to him – Mamello nonetheless

explains that she has run away from the prevailing murders among the villagers at Dijabatho. Further, apparently as an attempt at driving her primary goal towards an achievement, she reveals that she is presently a lone orphan; as all members of her family have been slaughtered – “le nna ha ke tsebe hore na ke phonyohile jwang,” she says (Act I: scene i) [I also don’t know how I escaped] As might be expected, Radihlaba is now successfully persuaded to identify with Mamello – as she has touched at itchy sensibilities of human life. He quips: “A masisapelo ruri!” (Act I: scene i) [Oh, what a tragedy!] and further informs Mamello that he is also on the run – as even here in his home village there exist bitter matters.

It would appear that for Mamello, only her village is experiencing painful troubles; as she remarks that she never thought that there were any troubles in this village. In addition, she inquires as to whether there exist killings of one another in this village; as she had hoped that it was only her own village that was replete with such human killings. In response to Mamello’s persuasive question for him to relate the bitterness prevailing in his village; Radihlaba persuades Mamello to realise that even if the village is not notorious for human killings – there are painful instances that have caused him to also desert it. He says, “Ngwanaka, Mamello, ha ke o araba nka re ho wena: ‘E, ho jwalo.’ Ka boela ka re: ‘Tjhe, ha ho jwalo.’” (Act I: scene i) [My child, Mamello, when I answer you I can say to you: ‘Yes, it is so.’ I can also say: ‘No, it is not so.’] Since Radihlaba’s foregoing answer is not telling her much, except for her to draw unfounded conclusions, Mamello poses the following question: “Jwang jwale, Ntate?” (Act I: scene i) [How now father] No doubt this question is employed with calculated intention for Radihlaba to clarify himself – so that Mamello might understand the prevailing situation in this village; since she has already taken the initiative to come and seek refuge in it.

Whereas one might expect Radihlaba to try and explain his seeming riddle, it is not to be so with him. Instead of supplying her with a straight forward answer to her question, Radihlaba encourages Mamello to go and enter the village and try her luck; as she is likely to see and learn for herself about the status of the village. As if with persuasive attempt for Mamello to start thinking hard as to whether she really wants to sojourn in this village – Radihlaba informs her that the village is called Tsiketsingsaqomatsi. Further, he tells her that the troubles of the village are congruent with the namesake; though there are no manslaughters as in hers. As a motivational intention for Mamello to go into the village with some knowledge, Radihlaba quips that: “Tsa mona ke tse tetebebsang moya wa motho; tse utlwisang pelo ya motho bohloko.” (Act I: scene i) [Those (matters) of here are dispiriting someone; they cause pain to someone’s heart.] It appears that Mamello has been successfully persuaded by Radihlaba to weigh herself and decide whether she might bear

the troubles experienced in this village – for she responds that in comparison, those matters might be tolerated – as long as there are no human killings like what happens in her own village. Finally, Mamello and Radihlaba part ways in agreement that, whereas she is intent on going into the village and try her luck; Radihlaba is also determined to leave this village – even if he may find himself persuaded to come back to this village due to some problems that might emerge with time.

Having traversed the whole village in search of a place for staying in; Mamello ultimately finds herself at Radihlaba's home. As she socially interacts with Mosidi, Radihlaba's wife, Mamello is persuaded to regard this family as a home in which she might sojourn; even if it might be temporarily. In order for the host to feel at home and relax, Mosidi, employs the following verbal interaction: "Ka nnete o fela o le ngwanahloohoyabadimo, haele mona o bile wa tla fihla lapeng lena." (Act II: scene i) [Indeed you are actually a child of the ancestors' head, (i.e., you are lucky) as you have finally come into this family.] Even as Mamello merely responds to Mosidi's foregoing reference for her being lucky by just agreeing with her; the latter emphasises her point by assuring the former that she has already found a sojourn right here at her home. As further promise for Mamello to accept this as a genuine and permanent offer for her refuge; Mosidi adds: "Nka hla ka re, yona tjako eo o ntseng o lla ka yona o se o e fumane. Ha ho sa hlokahala hore o nne o re o sa ilo teana le batshwari ba motse. Ke nna ya seng a tla phetha tseo tsohle bitsong la hao." (Act II: scene i) [I might as well say that you have already found the very sojourn you have been crying about. There is no need for you to say that you are going to meet the people responsible to this village. It is I that is going to perform all that in your name.] In response to this persuasive assurance for accommodation in this home, Mamello thanks Mosidi and surmises that, "lehlohonolo ha se lebelo." (Act II: scene i) [a luck is not dependent on speed.]

According to Matšela and Moletsane (1999: 45), this proverbial expression means that "Katlheho ha e ee ka hore na ea qalileng pele ke mang" [Success is not dependent on first come first served.] It would then follow that Mamello employs this proverbial expression to thank Mosidi for affording her a refuge; even though there might have been many who had come around without being offered the same accommodation as she has just been now. Seemingly as a persuasive goal of finding out how Mamello has come over here, Mosidi questions her: "Jwale he tshadi, o re ha e le mona of fihla ha kgomo di tlwaela makgulo tje, ebe o ne o robaeditse kae le hona ha mang?" (Act II: scene i) [Now tell me, female, since you arrive here now that the cattle only get used to the pastures, where did you sleep over and at whose home?] In response, Mamello explains that she has not had any sleep, since she had to walk the whole night through. Further, in an answer to Mosidi's persuasive question concerning her choice of this home; Mamello employs pampering as persuasive

strategy for boosting Mosidi's morale and fill her with pride; saying "Ke mpile ka fapohela feela ka ho hohelwa ke seriti sa lapa lena, Mme." (Act II: scene i) [I came via because I was merely attracted by the dignity of this family, mother.] As a sign that persuasion is incremental, Mosili also employs the following words to corroborate Mamello's statement:

"Moo teng o a bolela, ngwanaka. Lena lelapa le seriti e le ka nnete. Ha se wena wa pele wa ho bua tjena ka lona. Dihlahlasolle tsohle tse fihlang mona motseng wa heso, di fapohela mona ha ka pele. Di fihle di phomosetswe, di nto fetela moo di yang teng."

[You are quite right there my child. This family has a very high dignity. You are not the first one to talk like that about it. All the loiterers that come into this village of ours come via here first. They come in and are served with some food, and they ultimately go to wherever they are going.]

Since she has been assured of permanent accommodation in this home, Mamello pretends to have no knowledge about Radihlaba; and, as a persuasive attempt to discover the extent to which Mosidi is informed about that issue – Mamello inquires: "Na ebe ntate Radihlaba yena o kae hajwale? Kapa o se a ile mosebetsing?" (Act II: scene i) [By the way where is father Radihlaba right now? Or has he gone to work already?] Whether Mosidi has some knowledge concerning Radihlaba's whereabouts or not, nobody knows; yet she laughs and finally answers Mamello's question by indicating that Radihlaba is a versatile agriculturalist who hardly comes home before the completion of his work. Seemingly, Mosidi divulges this information as a persuasive measure for Mamello to remain with some conviction that Radihlaba is someone that is capable of staying in the fields for a number of days. In short, Mamello is persuaded to take Radihlaba's absence as a normal behaviour that she has to ignore.

Further, as if driving a persuasive goal for some hidden agenda concerning Mamello, Mosidi informs her that Radihlaba's absence over nights is of advantage to her, because "... le nna ke fumana nako e ntle ya ho phetha mabaka a ka a bosadi, mmannyeo," she says. (Act II: scene i) [... I also get a good chance of fulfilling my commitments of womanhood, mother-of-so-and-so.] It would appear that, for Mamello, this is a shocking statement; as she exclaims: "Hao, Mme!" (Act II: scene i) [Indeed, mother!] In this way, Mamello's statement of shock functions as a persuasive attempt for Mosidi to explain herself further for the former's comprehension. It would appear as if Mosidi did not anticipate this kind of shock from Mamello; for she responds to the latter's statement of shock by saying:

"E, mosadi. Haeka o a makala tjee? Feela ha ke makale hobane lona bana ba diotlwaneng, haele sesadi, ha le se tsebe. Rona boMosidi re hodisitswe re rutwa

sesadi. Ke thabela le taba ya hore jwale o se o tla dula le nna, mme ke tla o rupella ntho di le ngata tsa bophelo. O tla tloha mona o le mosadi wa mmakhonthe. Hana jwale o itse le ka dinala o tla batla ho iphatela, mmannyeo?" (Act II: scene i)

[Yes woman! How come you sound so shocked? But I am not surprised because you children from different families, as for womanhood, you do not know. We the Mosidis were brought up by being taught about womanhood. I am also happy about the fact that you are now going to live with me, and I am going to train you for a number of things pertaining to life. When you depart from here you will be a versatile woman. By the way you said that you would also want to get a job?]

Needless to say, Mosidi's above verbal interaction is suggestive of some bad behaviour perpetrated by women of Mosidi's kind. In line with Mamello's shock at Mosidi's mention of the freedom she is usually afforded by Radihlaba's absence to perform acts of womanhood; one realises that the former does not approve of such behaviour. It therefore makes sense for Mosidi to encourage Mamello to be prepared for the womanhood lessons she is going to give her in due course. For example, Mosidi's persuasive assurance for Mamello that by the time she leaves this place she will be 'mosadi wa mmankhonthe' functions as an attempt at driving her goal of rendering some teachings that will turn the latter into a prostitute, she seems to say. It then makes a lot of sense for her to downplay Mamello's background as that of 'bana ba diotlwana' who were not brought up 'sesadi,' as compared to herself as she was well groomed in that respect. When she finally asks Mamello for a confirmation that she also wanted a job; one suspects that Mosidi is about to suggest to her persuasive target that job finding will be an easy thing to obtain – as long as the former is prepared to perform 'sesadi,' as the persuader is prepared to train her accordingly.

As a sign that she has been successfully persuaded into being prepared to perform 'sesadi,' Mamello responds to Mosidi's above question in the affirmative – thus attempting to propel her goal of seeking Mosidi's assistance in job finding. Seemingly, Mosidi is already poised at assisting Mamello in the search for a job; as she suggests to her that since job finding may be problematic, Mamello should be aware that "malepa a bophelo a fumanwa ho rona makaubere." (Act II: scene i) [the tricks of life are found in us professionals.] Further, Mosidi promises Mamello that she will take her to a friend that will ensure that she gets a job – thus encouraging Mamello to be prepared for paying the dues towards job finding – saying: "Yena ke a tseba hore o tla hle a potlakise ditaba." (Act II: scene i) [As for him I know that he will speed up the matters.] As might be expected, Mamello worries about the torn clothes she is wearing, and resultantly registers such a worry with Mosidi – seemingly persuading Mosidi to lend her some clothes, if she may.

In response to Mamello's worry over her torn clothes, Mosidi downplays that aspect of self pity; and further makes the following persuasive promises for assistance:

“Malabulabu a eng na, wena? Motswalle eno wa ka Qhobela, ha se motho e mobe le hanyenyane feela. Ke motho ya nang le kutlwelobohloko ho batho. Ebile ha o tlišwa ke nna teng, ho tla ba bobebe le ho feta. Etswe ke tla o adima mose wa ka oo ke neng ke o rekelwe ke yena Qhobela, mmoho le dieta tse tsamaelanang le wona, hobane ke bona eka re ka nna ra apanelana. Le wena o hle o phaphame, mosadi. BoQhobela ba sebetsa ka makaako a kang rona boMosidi tjena.” (Act II: scene i)

[What rags you? That friend of mine, Qhobela, is not a bad person at all. He is a person who feels pity for other people. And if you are brought to him by me personally, it is going to be even much better. Actually I shall lend you the dress that Qhobela himself bought for me, together with the matching shoes; as I realise that we might be wearing the same size of clothes. You should also ensure that you wake up, woman. The Qhobelas function with vain people such as us, the Mosilis.]

Needless to say, Mosidi's above verbal interaction is meant for driving her primary persuasive goal of introducing and training Mamello into employing prostitution as a way of life prevailing here at Tsiketsingsaqomatsi. She therefore spells out her plans for driving such a goal, banking on her target's vulnerability – as Mamello desperately needs both an accommodation and a job. Since she has already assured Mamello of her preparedness to share the same home with her; Mosidi now applies these other persuasive tactics as the initial teachings she promised to offer. It makes sense for her to assure Mamello that Qhobela is a humane person that is prepared to render assistance to those who are in need of jobs – especially those who are brought to him by Mosidi herself, such as Mamello is about to be introduced to him.

Be that as it may, one wonders what persuasive goal Mosidi attempts to propel by suggesting to lend Mamello the very dress that was bought for her (Mosidi) by the same Qhobela. It may be anybody's guess that her persuasive goal is for Qhobela to notice that Mamello is a desperately needy person that depends on herself (Mosidi) for almost all human requirements – including accommodation, clothing, and other imaginable items. In that way, Mosidi seems to be discrediting Mamello in Qhobela's eyes by bringing her in borrowed apparel that he is quite familiar with. It would then follow that Mosidi's secondary goal is to ensure that, even if Qhobela might find himself falling for Mamello; he should consider her as his second fiddle – as his number one concubine is apparently Mosidi herself. It then makes sense for Mosidi to forewarn Mamello that she should wake up; as the likes of Qhobela use vain people such as herself.

In the light of Mosidi's above persuasive interactions, Mamello feels bound to respond by thanking her and promising her that she is going to do all she can to ensure her success in finding a job around this place. In addition, she relates the story of her life to Mosidi; that after the loss of her family, she had become "mmutlakotlwatsebe" (Act II: scene i) [an ear struck hare (always on the run)] Further, Mamello assures Mosidi that she now sees a ray of light in this village; and therefore she already thanks her for her initiatives, even before achieving the envisaged benefits, she says. With response to Mamello's foregoing persuasive gratitude, Mosidi cautions the target against premature gratitude, as "Tsena tseo ke o tshepisang tsona e sa le dinyane. Tse kgolo di sa tla," she says (Act II: scene i) [These ones that I promise you are minor things. Great ones are still coming.]

Whether by coincidence or by design, one hardly knows, yet Kakatjhelana arrives at Mosidi's home; whereupon he is introduced to Mamello as a woman that is out looking for a job. Though Mosidi inquires from Kakatjhelana whether Qhobela will be available at work tomorrow; seemingly as an indication that they would like to see him for assisting Mamello in job finding – Kakatjhelana ensures them that: "Haele mabapi le tsa mosebetsi, enwa, Mamello, a hle a iteanye le nna hosane. Ke tla hle ke lale ke lokisitse tsohle. Wena o ka nna wa ya bonana le Qhobelanyana eo wa hao." (Act II: scene i) [If it is in connection with work, this one, Mamello, should meet me tomorrow. I shall prepare everything tonight. You may go and see each other with that small Qhobela of yours.] To Mamello, Kakatjhelana promises her that she will find everything ready; and that she should come straight to him. In response to Kakatjhelana's persuasive promise for organizing everything tonight for Mamello; Mosidi likewise makes a promise to him, saying: "Ke tla hle ke mo tlise ho wena he, Kakatjhelana. Ke batla hore o mpe o kgotsofale." (Act II: scene i) [I shall indeed bring her to you, Kakatjhelana. I want you to be satisfied please.]

As might be expected, Kakatjhelana becomes happy to hear Mosidi's above promise; and in reference to it he encourages her as follows: "O tla be o sebeditse ka sesadi ha o ka etsa jwalo. ... Wena motswalle, ke tla hle ke tsebise Qhobela hore hosane a o lebelle." (Act II: scene i) [You will have performed in a womanly way if you do so. ...You friend, I shall actually inform Qhobela that he should expect your coming tomorrow.] As persuasion is said to be incremental, when Kakatjhelana bids them farewell, Mosidi takes it into her hands to encourage Mamello to take him halfway out; saying: "Mamello, eseng wa ntsha moeti wa hao ka heke, ngwanaka!" (Act II: scene i) [Mamello, why don't you take your visitor halfway my child?] In fulfillment of the persuasive suggestion, Mamello complies by taking Kakatjhelana halfway – thus creating an opportunity for Mosidi to engage herself into a soliloquy for analyzing the present situation. In her soliloquy it is revealed that she regards herself lucky to have been offered this gift (Mamello) from God – as she will be of assistance to her, "...ha ke

ntse ke leka ho kuta mahlaswa ana a banna.” (Act II: scene i) [...while I try to rob these negligent men.]

As a way of illustrating her point in connection with men’s negligence, Mosidi analyses them as follows:

“Hee, banna ke diphoqo e le ruri. Motho wa bona o mathela sefing a ntse a se shebile. Ka nnete Mosotho o a be a bua ha a re: E bona mahe empa leraba lona ha e le bone. Haele mona Kakatjhelana le yena a se a wetse lerabeng, ke bona hantle hore jwale masokotso a khomo e thele e mohasula a tla jewa mona lapeng la ka.”
(Act II: scene i)

[Hallo, men are very stupid. Stupidly a man runs towards a trap while he sees it. Indeed a Mosotho has been correct in saying: It sees the eggs but fails to see the trap. Now that even Kakatjhelana has fallen onto the trap, I clearly see that now the remainders of the milk from the cow with big udder will be consumed here at my home.]

In the light of Mosidi’s above persuasive verbal interaction, one realises that she has for a long time been in the business of luring men into a set trap; of which trap it remains to be seen. Since her verbal interactions have been implying that she has an affair with Qhobela – as he had even bought her a dress with matching shoes, as was seen earlier – one might correctly guess that her persuasive goal is that of capitalizing upon men’s stupidity, as she says; and benefit from their spoils. In other words, as men are infamously known for financially supporting their concubines, even at the expense of causing pains to their families – Mosidi’s above interaction might correctly be analysed as a persuasive endeavour for driving her goal of using Mamello in consuming such monies.

Ultimately, Mamello comes back into the house, only to be confronted by Mosidi in this form: “Hao mosadi, wa tla wa kgutla kapele bo! Kapa Kakatjhelana ha a hlile ha a o fe hlooho? Eseng le yena ha a nepe difela hantle?” (Act II: scene i) [Indeed woman, you have come back so quickly! Or is it because Kakatjhelana does not impress you? Or is he failing in his approach?] In accordance with Mosidi’s above confrontation, it becomes clear that she had persuaded Mamello to take Kakatjhelana halfway so that the two of them might get a chance to work on their seeming social relations. It would then follow that she had expected them to take some time to even work on their plans for tomorrow’s meeting and job offer. In addition, Mosidi’s two questions above are suggestive – she presupposes that as seeming lovers; they were to have afforded more time for each other – unless Mamello was not impressed with Kakatjhelana as her possible future lover.

It would seem that Mamello is aware of Mosidi’s suggestive persuasive means; as she answers her questions in these words: “Tje Mme, eseng jwalo. Ha ke re jwale ditaba boholo

di hosane.” (Act II: scene i) [No mother, it is not that way! Is it not true that affairs are mostly for tomorrow?] With response to Mamello’s answers to her questions above, Mosidi agrees with her; yet suggestively persuades the former to regard Kakatjhelana as her lover, saying, “Ke hantle, ngwanaka. Le moeti enwa wa hao o batlile a re tshwaratshwarella.” (Act II: scene i) [It is alright my child. Even this visitor of yours nearly delayed us.] Like someone who was waiting for Mamello to come back in and excuse herself; Mosidi informs the former that she has to go to a certain family in the village to offer some assistance where necessary. In addition, she assures Mamello of her safety here, saying: “Ke tla be ke le mona pele tsatsi le dikela. O phutholohe ngwanaka. Ke hae mona.” (Act II: scene i) [I shall be here before sunset. You should be free my child. You are at home here.] In response, Mamello merely says, “Ho tla ba jwalo Mme,” as Mosidi leaves. (Act II: scene i)

As might be expected, Mamello’s solitude in this home functions as a persuasive chance for her to analyse her own situation in connection with the trend in which her life appears to be taking. She therefore engages herself in the following soliloquy:

“Basadi! Ka nnete tsietsi e latella tshotleho. Ke tlohile haeso ke le mophaphathehi ka baka la bothata bo aparetseng tulo ya heso. Ke bile papatleleyasehlokabeng, ka hahola le dithota ka kgopolo ya hore nengneng, kaekae, ke tla fumana setshabelo. (O a kgutsakgutsa) Jwale, ke mona ke fihlile motseng ona wa Tshalemaduke, tulong ya Tsiketsingsaqomatsi. Motho wa pele eo ke teaneng le yena kgorong ya motse, o ne a le palehong, mme ho ya kamoo ke seng ke utlwile kateng, ke yena hlooho ya lapa lena. Jwale, le nna ke mona ke se ke fetolwa nonyanakahlamelammolayi. Feela, erekaha ke tsietsing, ha ho letho leo nka le etsang. Etswe setsomi se kgethang nakedi se a kgora. Butle ke kgaohane le ho ipherekanya ho ya pele nna kgutsana. Hosane, nna Mamello, ke tla be ke fumane mosebetsi, ke bile ke ena le motjhaufa. Butle ke iphomolele.” (Act II: scene i)

[Oh guys! Indeed trouble follows misery. I have deserted my home as a refugee due to the problems overpowering my village. I have been refugee-with-no-owners; traversing the plateaus with a belief that sometime, somewhere, I shall get a refuge. (She pauses for a minute) Now here I have arrived at this village of Tshalemaduke, at the area called Tsiketsingsaqomatsi. The first person that I met at the entrance of the village was on the run, and according to what I have learned, he is the head of this family. Now here I have also turned myself into bird-gape-for-the-killer. But since I am in trouble, there is nothing I can do. Indeed the hunter that shuns a polecat is a satisfied one. Let me cease from continually confusing myself, I the orphan. Tomorrow, I Mamello, I shall have obtained a job and a boyfriend in addition! Let me take a rest.]

In the light of the above soliloquy, one realises that Mamello hereby self-cautions herself about her misery and vulnerability; as she has no relatives, and therefore has nowhere to run. Seemingly with the persuasive goal of plucking up some courage and strength for withstanding the apparent hardships she is faced with; she reminds herself of her struggles from her own home to where she is today. On that basis, she persuades herself never to succumb to any form of self-pity, but to accept the situation as it presents itself to her for survival's sake. It therefore makes a lot of sense for her to take pride in her likely achievement of a job and a boyfriend that might become handy in her life struggles. On that note, she instructs herself to take a rest and stop this act of confusing herself.

In accordance with yesterday's verbal interactions among Mosidi, Mamello and Kakatjhelana; at work, Kakatjhelana and his friend and colleague, Qhobela, are communicatively engaged and already making persuasive plans concerning today's operations. Seemingly, Kakatjhelana is almost positive that Mamello is his catch; as he quips as follows:

“Ka nnete ke re haele ena phofu eo ke e fumaneng maobane, ke yona! Le ha feela e ne e bonahala eka e sotlasotlehile ka baka la tsela le mokgathala, ke dumela hore ha noha tsa madiba a maholo a mona Tsiketsingsaqomatsi di ka e nyeka, e tla hlatsweha. Ke bolela noha tse kang rona boKakatjhelana.” (Act III: scene i)

[Indeed I say that as for this eland that I found yesterday, it is a real one! Even though it appeared a bit ugly due to travelling and fatigue, if the snakes of the big dams of here at Tsiketsingsaqomatsi could lick it, it would be smartened up. I mean snakes such as we the Kakatjhelanas.]

It then comes not as amazement for Kakatjhelana to boast so much about his newfound girlfriend that needs only some grooming for her beauty to be fully appreciated. Realizing the extent to which Kakatjhelana boastfully appreciates his newfound girlfriend; Qhobela complains that the whole praise leaves him (Qhobela) out of the picture – thus persuading Kakatjhelana to surmise in this way: “Tjhe bo, ntjamme, kotong sena ke sa iphafa ka bonna hobane ha ke re jwale phofu e motjheng wa ka. Le wena ha ke a o siya. Ha ke re boMosidi ba tjha mpa le diatla ka wena!” (Act III: scene i) [No please, my mother's dog, at this juncture I praise myself because the eland is in my way. I have also not left you out. Indeed the Mosidis are terribly in love with you!] Significantly, Qhobela is appreciative of Kakatjhelana's praise for his being terribly loved by Mosidi and her kind – such that he incrementally persuades his friend to appreciate him as a versatile lover to Mosidi, saying: “E, moshaneso. Moo teng o a bua. BoMosidi ba sila tele ka sanketse ha rona boQhobela re hlile re se re kgobohetswe hantle.” (Act III: scene i) [Yes, my brother. You are saying something there. The likes of Mosili end up lying on their backs when we the Qhobelas are really disgusted.]

Apparently, Qhobela hereby applies self-praise as a persuasive strategy for Kakatjhelana to regard him as a versatile lover that is appreciated by the likes of Mosidi and possibly the likes of Mamello as well.

Ultimately, Mosidi and Mamello arrive at Qhobela's office, where they enter in a sneaking manner; as if afraid of being noticed as they come into this office. Like someone with a hidden agenda of some sort; Qhobela verbally attacks Mosidi and accuses her of failure to greet them and introduce her companion to him. Even as Kakatjhelana tries to intervene, Qhobela employs anger and interrupts his colleague; saying:

“Ha e le wena o hle o thole tu! Ke lemoha hore wena le Mosidi le batla ho ruta ngwanenwa wa batho mekgwa e mona ya lona e ditshila, nthwana batho e iphihlela le ho iphihlela tjena. Le hopola hore mosebetsing mona teng ngwanenwa o tla itshwara jwang ha e le mona le se le mo tsibola ka mekgwa e tjee? Ebile tswang le ye ka kantorong ya Kakatjhelana ka kwana, le a nnyontshetsa. Ke se ke tla bitsa ausinyana enwa wa batho ha ke se ke qetile ho imamela. A hle a itelele a le mong ha ke mmita. Ha ke batle dikopano tse kang matsema kapa tsona diphabadimo nna ka kantorong ya ka. Jwaloka mookamedi ya hlwahlwa, ke batla hore kantorong ya ka ho kene motho a le mong ka nako.” (Act III: scene i)

[As for you it is better that you shut up! I realise that you and Mosidi want to teach this poor child your usual dirty manners, while the poor thing has just arrived here. How do you think this child is going to behave here at work, as you start her off with these manners? And get out and go into Kakatjhelana's office over there, you disgust me. I shall call this poor young girl when I have listened to myself. She should come alone when I call her. I hate meetings that involve groups of people or some gatherings for thanks offering for ancestors in my office. Like a versatile manager that I am, I want to see one person at a time coming into my office.]

In line with Qhobela's verbal attack on both Mosidi and Kakatjhelana, one realises that no upfront persuasion is applied at all here. Instead, Qhobela employs some manipulative approach that is seemingly calculated at winning Mamello to his side by discrediting the other two characters, Kakatjhelana and Mosidi, in front of her. Even as he accuses the two characters of attempting to teach their bad manners to the poor Mamello; it becomes clear that Qhobela is manipulatively smearing these characters' faces with dirt – while at the same time he attempts to save his own by pretending to be a clean character himself. Indeed one might correctly deduce his seeming anger as mere display of pomposity for ingratiating himself in front of Mamello – possibly as a strategy for grabbing her himself; as Kakatjhelana is likely to shy away at this juncture. In the same vein, it would also appear that Qhobela's

other aim is to frighten Mosidi, so that she dares not become an obstacle in his way towards grabbing Mamello for himself, as Mosidi is his present concubine. In addition, when he suggests that Mamello should come alone for his call; one may correctly deduce that verbal interaction as another manipulative attempt for creating a chance in which Qhobela might seduce Mamello freely – without any fear or embarrassment of any kind.

Clearly, Qhobela's display of the above behaviour is a new phenomenon to Mosidi, and possibly to Kakatjhelana as well. Testimony to the foregoing realization is contained in Mosidi's registering of her surprise as follows: "Atjhe basadi, ha e le e tjee ntho, nna ka nnete ke qala ho e bona." (Act III: scene i) [No please guys, as for something like this, I see it for the first time.] No doubt, this is Kakatjhelana's worry as well; as may be observed in his persuasive verbal address to Qhobela in the following expressions: "Hao mohlomphehi, nna ke ne ke hopotse hore taba ya Mamello o tla e fetisa ka potlako pele ho tsohle. Jwale o a mmakatsa!" (Act III: scene i) [Indeed sir, I had thought that you would consider this matter concerning Mamello quickly before anything else. Now you baffle me!] Whereas one might regard Kakatjhelana's foregoing intervention as persuasive enough for Qhobela to change his newly adopted attitude and behaviour; it is not to be so with Qhobela – as he responds to his colleague's pleadings in these words:

"Monna Kakatjhelana, ha ke buile, ke buile. Ke nna matwetwe mosebetsing mona. Kapa o batla ho ntsekisa tulo sena sa ka?" (Act III: scene i)

[Kakatjhelana man, when I have spoken, I have spoken. I am the manager here at work. Or do you want us to quarrel over this position of mine?]

As if his manipulative way of denigrating Kakatjhelana in front of Mamello and Mosidi was not enough, in the same vein Qhobela turns to Mosidi and manipulatively surmises:

"Wena Mosidi, ke se ke tla o bona mohlantse ke nang le nako. Ha e le kajeno, ke tla ba le sebaka sa ho ka lokisa taba ya enwa ngwaneso feela hobane, ho ya ka tlhaloso ya Kakatjhelana, taba eo e leng ya bohlokwa ke e amang yena feela. Etswe le a tseba hore mosebetsi o tla pele ho ntho tse ngata. Ke qetile." (Act III: scene i)

[You Mosidi, I shall then see you the day on which I have time. As for today, I shall have a chance of organizing the matter concerning this sister of mine only because, according to Kakatjhelana's explanation, an important matter is the one that concerns her only. In fact you people know that work comes before many things. I have finished.]

In the light of the above verbal exchanges effective from the moment the two women entered Qhobela's office; it becomes clear that Qhobela has plotted this manipulative behaviour of his for achieving a number of goals. First and foremost, his verbal attack on Mosidi seems to have been aimed at denigrating her in front of Mamello – possibly to induce in her some

embarrassment and disgust; so that she might opt for leaving this place – thus creating an opportunity for himself to interact with Mamello without any interference from Mosidi. Second, Qhobela hereby employs the other manipulative strategy of belittling Kakatjhelana in front of Mamello – so that the latter might realise that her hope and chances of being employed in this sector are dependent on him (Qhobela), as he is apparently the senior manager in this institution. Third, Qobela bundles both Mosidi and Kakatjhelana in the same slot; as he manipulatively accuses both of them of their intention to teach their rotten manners to Mamello – thus disparaging them as a pair of corrupt pieces of humanity that Mamello has to avoid. Fourth, he pushes the two characters into establishing an affair that would open up inroads for himself to engage with Mamello freely, without any disturbance from them. Lastly, as a manipulative way of impressing Mamello – at the expense of undermining both Mosidi and Kakatjhelana – Qhobela spells out his seniority at this workplace by telling Kakatjhelana that his word is final. In the same vein he also dismisses Mosidi by telling her that his decision is that of seeing her when he has time. All in all, Qhobela applies all these manipulative strategies to achieve numerous goals, as has been shown above.

Since Qhobela has spelt himself so well that his word is final, the three characters are next seen in Kakatjhelana's office; where they engage in verbal interactions in an endeavour to find out why Qobela decided to act as he has just done. In his persuasive analysis of Qhobela's prevailing behaviour, Kakatjhelana quips as follows:

“Ke hlile ka o bolella re sa le kwana hae Mosidi, hore motho enwa wa hao ha e bile ha se motho wa letho. Yaka hoja ke a mo etseletsa. Jwale ho jwang kajeno? Hoba feela a bona Mamello, o se a itjesa masooko. Hoo a seng a ho habile, ke ho senya taba ya ka le Mamello. Ha ho ho hong. Nna ke se ke mo tseba hantle.” (Act III: scene ii)

[I actually told you while we were still there at home Mosidi, that this person of yours is not human at all. It was as if I was calumniating him. Now how is it today? Just because he sees Mamello, he suddenly feigns anger. His manipulative goal is that of spoiling my affair with Mamello. There is nothing else. I already know him very well.]

Indeed this is correct analysis of Qhobela's character disposition that he has displayed for these other characters. It is then understandable for these characters to wonder whether or not Mamello is still going to be offered any job at all. Nonetheless, as a persuasive aim for Mamello to sustain some hope towards obtaining a job; Kakatjhelana indicates that, though he is not sure of that, the former should wait until the moment Qhobela decides to call her – as he will have hopefully listened to himself. Whereas one were to regard Mamello's being called to Qhobela's office as a moment that might be appreciated by all the three characters;

this is not the case with Mosidi. Like someone that might have learned a bitter lesson, she expresses her views on the issue, saying:

“Nka se dumele hore Mamello a ye ho Qhobela a le mong. Le kgale! Ha ke batle ho boela ke hlahelwa ke koduwa e kileng ya ntlhahela ka Mmadiatheng hape. Sesotho se re monna ha a bone habedi, nna ke re le mosadi ha a bone habedi. Jwale Kakatjhelana, ha o hla wa fa Mamello mosebetsi keng, hobane maobane o ne o ntse o ikotla sefuba, o re bolella hore le wena eta ho lla sa hao mona mosebetsing? O bile o bolela hore o ka nna wa thusa Mamello ntle le hore a qale ho Qhobela!” (Act III: scene ii)

[I cannot allow Mamello to go to Qhobela’s office alone. Never! I don’t want to once more experience a catastrophe similar to the one that befell me about Mmadiatheng. The Sesotho saying is that a man does not see twice, and I say that even a woman does not see twice. Now Kakatjhelana, why don’t you offer Mamello a job, as you were striking your chest yesterday telling us that even your shoe cries here at work? You even said that you might assist Mamello without her starting off with Qhobela!]

Seemingly, Mosidi has had some painful experience that causes her to refrain from seeing it happen again. Since Qhobela has clearly indicated that Mamello should respond to his call by coming alone; Mosidi feels rather threatened – as she has learned from experience, she says. It would appear that Mmadiatheng went to Qhobela’s office alone at one point in time; and something painful to Mosidi happened between the two characters. Whatever it was, Mosidi’s self-persuasion for not allowing Mamello to go alone to Qhobela’s office now is a clear indication that she knows him as an untrustworthy person that is likely to perform some actions that would cause pain to her, as his concubine. In accordance with that understanding, it shocks but little that Mosidi is so emphatic on this point, as she says, ‘Le kgale!’ above. Apparently, this emphasis is meant, not only for self-persuasion but also for Mamello to dare not even try to do that when Qhobela calls her into his office. As further persuasive attempt for herself not to allow Mamello to go there alone; Mosidi even improvises her own proverb, that ‘mosali ha a bone habeli,’ as opposed to the usual one that makes reference to ‘monna’ rather than ‘mosali,’ as seen above.

As her further persuasive verbal interaction in the same vein, Mosidi questions Kakatjhelana why he may not offer Mamello a job, in fulfillment with his previous promise. Needless to say, Mosidi’s persuasive goal here is that of ridiculing Kakatjhelana against telling lies and boasting about positions and powers that are not at his disposal. It then becomes reasonable in response for Kakatjhelana to fabricate a lie that things change so rapidly these day; to an extent that only this morning was there some information that all job allocation matters are to

be in Qhobela's jurisdiction only. As some persuasive attempt at soiling Qhobela's face also; Kakatjhelana even goes further to suggest that it must have been Qhobela himself that, through the offer of some bribery, persuaded the business owners to establish such a ruling.

In order to indicate her desire in obtaining the promised job, Mamello inquires whether or not she is still going to get such a job; given the prevailing circumstances. Further, she quips that she has lost hope of ever getting such a job – thus attempting to drive her goal of being assured of job finding or failure; so that she may know where she stands at this point in time. Seemingly, Mamello's persuasive indication of her worries has motivated Mosidi into responding as follows:

“O ka nyahama o nyahame wena Mamello. O tla reng haele mona boKakatjhelana motho a se a itomaka maleme, a se a bentshaka mahlo sa tweba e pitlilwe ke sifi? Feela haele Qhobela yena, o sa tla be a fe Mamello mosebetsi, a ratang kapa a sa rate. Ke Mosidi nna, ha ke sebakallwa! Hoseng jwalo, le nna ke tla iphetetsa.” (Act III: scene ii)

[You may understandably lose hope you Mamello. What can you say as the likes of Kakatjhelana now bite their tongues; continually brightening eyes like a rat captured under a trap? But as for Qhobela himself, he will eventually offer a job to Mamello, whether he likes or not. I am Mosidi me, I am not a play-thing! Otherwise, I am also going to revenge.]

Significantly, in the light of Kakatjhelana's behaviour at this point, Mosidi is aware that something is wrong somehow somewhere – as he seemingly fails to look straight into their eyes. That is why she verbally responds in a manner toward Mamello's indication of disturbances in the above manner. In order for her persuasive goal to be clearly comprehended, Mosidi employs an idiomatic expression, 'motho a se a itomaka maleme,' seemingly as a persuasive attempt at signifying the extent to which Kakatjhelana has been caught up in his lying. This idiomatic expression is employed in reference to someone whose face has been lost, to an extent that s/he becomes overpowered with embarrassment – to the extent that s/he might not easily explain her/himself to the people around her/him. Another persuasive tactic that Mosidi hereby uses is the simile, 'ho bentsha mahlo sa tweba e pitlilwe ke sefi.' This simile is employed here as a persuasive aim for Mamello to realise the level of embarrassment engulfing Kakatjhelana under the prevailing circumstances. When she pronounces that, 'Ke Mosidi nna, ha ke sebakallwa,' Mosidi might be regarded as pushing her persuasive goal for all to be aware that she is not the kind of person anybody may play fool of without experiencing some pain in return. Even as she ends up by saying, 'Hoseng jwalo, le nna ke tla iphetetsa,' one becomes aware that Mosidi now applies threats against those who might be responsible for causing her the pain she is presently enduring.

Even though Mosidi fails to directly answer Kakatjhelana's question concerning the method of revenge she is going to apply against Qhobela – for his seeming refusal to employ Mamello; eventually she spells herself out. She indicates that since Qhobela is an untrustworthy man, she also aims at finding herself a man or some men in the village and start gallivanting with them in return; so as to gain the assistance she needs. In response to Mosidi's threats for engaging herself with other men; Kakatjhelana says: "Ke utlwisisa bothata boo o leng ho bona mabapi le taba ena ya hao le Qhobela, Mosidi. ...nna ke na le tlhahisonyana e itseng, eo ke hopolang hore bobedi e ka re tswela molemo." (Act III: scene ii) [I understand the difficulty you are in with this affair you have with Qhobela, Mosidi. ...I have a minute proposal that I think can be beneficial to us both.] Like someone that has been waiting for this kind of persuasive suggestion from Kakatjhelana; Mosidi's eyes light up with interest, and she says, "Ebe ke tlhahiso efe na, Ntate? A ko tle le yona hle, Mokwena e motle!" (Act III: scene ii) [What suggestion is that please, Father? Please bring it along you handsome Mokwena!]

Obviously, Kakatjhelana's reference to some suggestion that might benefit them both functions as a persuasive drive for Mosidi's appetite to be whetted up as above. That is why in response she even addresses him as 'Ntate.' By so saying, Mosili pushes her persuasive goal for him to explain himself clearly – so that they might eventually benefit from the suggestion in waiting. As if the act of calling him 'ntate' is not enough, Mosidi applies a totemic reference, calling Kakatjhelana 'Mokwena e motle!' thus boosting his moral and driving her goal of sharing that idea with him, so that they might benefit from it as he has suggested. Taking advantage of Mosidi's gullibility at this point in time, Kakatjhelana spells himself clearly that they might start to secretly have a love affair; so that they might console each other whenever time and circumstances permit them. As might be expected, Mosidi hardly hesitates to welcome Kakatjhelana's proposal; though she suggests that they withhold it until they are sure that there is something brewing between Qhobela and Mamello.

Since Mamello has eventually gone to check Qobela, as a persuasive means for him to say whether he is in a position to offer her a job or not; it hardly surprises Kakatjhelana and Mosidi for Qhobela to come into Kakatjhelana's office and tell Mosidi that she may leave for home – as he is still going to be busy with Mamello. As if this is exactly what they have been waiting for, Mosidi and Kakatjhelana strike an appointment for meeting at the former's home the following day. Employing it as a persuasive attempt for propelling her goal of avenging herself – Mosidi invites Kakatjhelana in the following verbal expressions:

"Ebile hosasa, wena mokgotsi wa ka, hang ha Radihlaba a eya mosebetsing feela, o be o hata o kena mane lapeng ha ka. O tla fumana ke se ke bile ke o hlabetse kgoho

ya tonanahadi. Nka kgathala ke ho nna ke tloiswa kgati ke boQhobela ke le mokaana.” Act III: scene ii)

[And tomorrow, you friend of mine, immediately Radihlaba is off to work, you immediately step in there at my home. You will find me already having slaughtered for you a big chicken. I can be tired of being made to skip the rope by the likes of Qhobela at my age.]

Needless to say, Mosidi hereby promises to slaughter a chicken for Kakatjhelana; as some incentive for enticing him into this affair and ensure that they maintain it. It therefore sounds normal for Kakatjhelana to respond to this promise in the following short but meaningful verbal expression: “Ka utlwa monate!” (Act III: scene ii) [Oh, I enjoy that!] When they part ways, Mosidi promises to tell Kakatjhelana some news the following day; and in addition invites him to come over and give her some goodbye kiss; as a persuasive goal for bonding in this newly formed affair. Mosidi then goes home; only to leave behind Kakatjhelana, who engages himself in a soliloquy meant for analyzing the women folk, saying:

“Banna, athe basadi ke phoofolo tse jwang? Ke hore ka thutswana ya mmowana feela motho o se a hapehile! Mosidi ke enwa o se a nkehile ho nkeha. Feela le ha ho le jwalo, Qhobela yena o tla ntseba ha re kopana. Ke bona eka monnana eno ha a mpone ka letho.” (Act III: scene ii)

[Guys, by the way what kind of animals are women? This means that with just a small stick a person has been caught! Here is Mosidi already highly involved. Even as that is so, as for Qhobela, he will know me when we meet. I realise that such a small man hardly sees me at all.]

In accordance with the above soliloquy, it becomes clear that Kakatjhelana is surprised that Mosidi can be such an easy catch for him; even as he is Qhobela’s friend and colleague. He therefore persuades himself to regard women as weaklings who are always ready to engage themselves with men in forming love affairs. Be that as it may, Kakatjhelana, in the same soliloquy, goes further to self- make a vow for fixing Qhobela, as a means of avenging himself for the latter’s seeming involvement with Mamello. As to the method of avenging himself is concerned, Kakatjhelana goes short of that; and therefore that remains to be seen in due course.

On the other hand, Radihlaba has come back from wherever he had gone to; and as he is at the outskirts of the village he engages himself in a soliloquy. It is revealed in this soliloquy that Radihlaba’s hopes and expectations have been shattered; as he says:

“Banna, ke hore ke nna enwa ya khutlileng, ke khutlela tulong ena hape! (O hula moya faatshe) Ke ne ke ikemiseditse ho tsamayela ruri, ke siye tulo ena mmoho le tsa yona, haholoholo ke suthela manothonotho a etswang ke baahi ha tulo ena.

Jwale ke mona ke se ke kgutla hape. (O a tholathola ho imamella taba ena) Feela ha ho nang, hoba le tsa moo ke neng ke re mohlomong moya wa ka o tla ke o fumane phomolo, di hlile tsa nqhala ke re ke sa fihla feela.” (Act IV: scene i)

[Guys, so it is I that has come back, coming back to this same place again! (He breathes deeply) I was determined to go for good, and leave this place together with its matters, especially to give way to the despicable actions performed by its inhabitants. Now here I have already come back. (He pauses for cogitating over this matter) But it does not matter, because even though I had some expectations for my spirit to get some rest where I had gone to, I was immediately disappointed.]

In the light of the foregoing soliloquy, it is revealed that Radihlaba’s persuasive goal of deserting this village was for finding sojourn somewhere else – where he was hoping to find differently behaving inhabitants. Since he was disappointed by finding such a place worse than his own home village; he persuaded himself to return, as he hereby divulges in the above soliloquy. In other words, since he has been demystified by discovering worse situations in the foreign lands at which he had hoped to find some habitable sojourn, Radihlaba has self- returned – seemingly with an understanding that it is better to deal with matters one is familiar with, rather than experiencing unfamiliar and worse ones. In other words, Radihlaba has adopted attitudinal and behavioural change.

As this lengthy soliloquy unfolds, one learns that Radihlaba did not even report at duty for those two days during which he had deserted his home village and family; nor did he say anything to Mosidi, his wife. Wondering what everybody thinks and says about him; Radihlaba employs the following self-persuasion:

“Ke lokela ho kena motseng mona ke patile mohwasa, ke yo ipatlela selao kaekae, moo ke tla kgonang ho fuputsa hantle hore na maemo a ditaba ke afe ka nna. Butle ke se senye nako. Letsatsi le tloha le ntjhabela mona.” (Act IV: scene i)

[I have to enter this village silently, and search for a lair somewhere, where I will be able to properly research about the condition concerning my affairs. Let me not waste anymore time. The sun might rise while I am still here.]

Indubitably, Radihlaba now considers himself as a renegade that has caused worry over a number of people – including his wife and authorities at his workplace. Since he is not sure of the state of affairs regarding his behaviour, he now self- decides to take an action that is similar to that of a wild animal – as his goal is to find a ‘selao’ for himself; so that he learns about all the affairs surrounding his attitude and behaviour. He therefore persuades himself to perform as he has just formulated his plan for achieving his goal before sunrise.

Eventually, Radihlaba arrives at Mmadiatheng's home; even as the latter is busily engaged in her soliloquy. Since her soliloquy is centered on her loneliness that has resulted from her husband's death; it would seem that this is the right moment for Mmadiatheng to welcome this unexpected visitor, though it is very early in the morning. The following are the verbal interactions exchanged by Radihlaba and Mmadiatheng:

Radihlaba: Kgotso bo, kgomohadi! Keng ha eka o a makala tjee ha o mpona? Kapa o ne o sa lebella hore o ka nna wa ba le moeti ya kang nna tjee ka tsatsi le leng? [Peace be with you please, big cow! Why do you look surprised to see me? Or you were not expecting a visitor such as me on any day?]

Mmadiatheng: Ka nnete ke maketse, ntate Radihlaba. Ke ne ke sa hopole hore le ka mohla o ka nketela. Ha ke re jwale rona re se re le nku tse lekgwegwe motseng mona? [Indeed I am surprised father Radihlaba. I never thought that you would visit me even once. By the way are we not some sheep with scab in this village?]

Radihlaba: O bolela jwang ha o realo, Mmadiatheng? [What do you mean by that, Mmadiatheng?]

Mmadiatheng: Ke bolela hore haesale mofu Moswang a re siya, ha ho sa na motho ya le behang mona ha ka. E se eka batho ba motse ona kaofela ba ne ba bolaele noha mona ha ka. [I mean that since the late Moswang left us, nobody ever puts their foot here at my home. It even looks like all the people in this village had killed a snake here at my home.]

Radihlaba: Ha ke re ke mona kajeno ke tlile. Kapa o bolela jwang na, kgaitsemi ya motho? [But now here I have come. Or what exactly do you mean, someone's sister?]

Mmadiatheng: Ke mohlolo wa pele ona o entsweng ke wena, ngwaneso. Le jwale ke ntse ke ipotsa hore na ebe o ne o robotse ka lefe lehlakore. Kapa ebe ho na le tse mahlonoko tseo o tlileng ka tsona? [It is the first miracle that has been performed by you my brother. Even now I am asking myself as to which side you were sleeping. Or are there painful matters that have brought you here?]

Radihlaba: Tjhe, ha ho molato wa letho bo, mme. Motho botle ke ho nna o thathika le metse ho bona metswalle, haholoholo ha o ile wa etelwa ke ditiro bosiu. (Act IV: scene ii) [No, there is no problem at all, mother. What is good for a person is to go around the families to see friends, more especially as you have been visited by dreams during the night.]

According to the above verbal interactions between Radihlaba and Mmadiatheng, it makes sense for them to be together at this point in time – as they are both experiencing some kind of loneliness emanating from the aspect of solitude. Whereas Radihlaba experiences loneliness due to his attitude for being disgusted with the decadence prevailing in this village;

Mmadiatheng is a lonely widow that hardly has any visitors at all. It therefore follows that both are motivated by their loneliness to come together and interact for sharing ideas and other human requirements. As a persuasive attempt for establishing rapport, Radihlaba greets Mmadiatheng by making reference to 'kgotso,' and addresses her as 'kgomohadi.' It would appear that the idea of using the word 'kgotso' is calculated by Radihlaba as a persuasive attempt for Mmadiatheng to realise that the intention of his visit is a peaceful one. Further, his address of calling her 'kgomohadi' might be regarded as a persuasive endeavour for her to observe the fact that she is a mature woman that is expected to have clear understanding of life; as well as social relations of mature men and women like the two of them.

When he asks Mmadiatheng as to why she is surprised to see him here, Radihlaba seems to employ his questioning as persuasion for her to cool down and stop worrying about this early visit that he has afforded her. It would then follow that, since she also shares the state of loneliness; Mmadiatheng is happy to have a visitor of Radihlaba's caliber this early – especially as she even made reference to her loneliness in the soliloquy that was interrupted by Radihlaba's arrival. Understandably therefore, she also employs some persuasive tactic of applying a metaphor of 'nku tse lekgwegwe,' to highlight the way she is being sidelined by almost everybody in the village. By so verbally interacting, Mmadiatheng is propelling her goal of inviting Radihlaba to relax and feel at home – as she appreciates his visit. Incrementally, Radihlaba also employs his persuasive tactic measured for driving his goal of striking relationship with Mmadiatheng, by creating the story of having dreamt of something he needs to communicate to her.

As might be expected, Radihlaba's persuasive tactic strikes the desired interest for Mmadiatheng. She responds by saying: "Ntate Radihlaba, jwale o a ntshosa! Ebe o lorile eng ka nna kapa ka lapa lee la ka? Mpolelle kapele hle!" (Act IV: scene ii) [Father Radihlaba, now you frighten me! What have you dreamt about me or about this family of mine? Tell me quickly please!] Seemingly as an application of some delaying tactics as a persuasive strategy for creating more anxiety and interest in Mmadiatheng; Radihlaba pleads with her to take it easy in these words:

"Se potlakele ditaba, kgomohadi. Ebile nka re o fehe matshwafo, hobane tse fuperweng ke toro ya ka, ha se tse mpe hohang. Ke tse monate, tse tla o tlisetsa thabo le monyaka ha feela o ka di mamedisisa hantle." (Act IV: scene ii)

[Don't be hasty for the matters, big cow. In fact I might say please cool down, because the contents of my dream are not bad at all. They are enjoyable, and will bring you some happiness and merriment as long as you listen to them carefully.]

Surely Mmadiatheng is bound to be excited and anxious for the revelation of the dream in question – as she has been leading this lonely life that could hardly bring her happiness, never mind merriment. To signify her interest and understanding of what the said dream entails, Mmadiatheng questions Radihlaba whether Mosidi is informed of the impending dream. Apparently, this kind of question has been expected by Radihlaba; as he responds to it in the following manner:

“Tsa toro ya ka di tobane le wena, Mmadiatheng. Ke re di tobane le wena feela, e seng motho mang kapa mang. Kahoo he, ha ho kamoo ke neng nka di amela Mosidi ka teng. Mosidi le yena o tla tseba diphiri tse fuperweng ke ditoro tse tobaneng le yena, e seng tse tobaneng le semomotela se kang wena tjena, Mmadiatheng mohatsa motswalle wa ka wa hlooho ya kgomo, mofu Moswang.” (Act IV: scene ii)

[Those of my dream are directed to you Mmadiatheng. I say that they are directed to only you and not anybody else. For that matter, there is no way I could have related them to Mosidi. Mosidi will also know the secrets contained in the dreams that are directed to her, not those that are directed to a beauty such as you, Mmadiatheng my greatest friend’s wife, the late Moswang.]

In line with Radihlaba’s above explanation, it becomes clear that whatever the dream entails, it will remain a secret between himself and Madiatheng. Since Mmadiatheng has been referred to as ‘kgomohadi’ more than once; one might conclude that she is expected to understand what the dream might entail – for she is supposed to be mature enough and command experience in matters of this kind. Even if she were not quite clear with the trend this matter is taking; she must now have been persuaded enough to understand the direction leading to this dream – as contained in ‘eseng tse tobaneng le semomotela se kang wena tjena, Mmadiatheng mohatsa motswalle wa ka wa hlooho ya kgomo, mofu Moswang.’ The foregoing quoted final statement is replete with qualifications that are apparently aimed at pampering Mmadiatheng; so that she regards herself as a beautiful widow of the late Moswang who was a close friend of Radihlaba. Needless to say, this pampering is applied as a persuasive plan for driving Radihlaba’s goal of making Mmadiatheng his paramour.

It would appear that Mmadiatheng is almost successfully persuaded by Radihlaba to understand what the dream entails; as she comments that Radihlaba is an important person, as he hereby displayed his knowledge of organizing his matters accordingly. Further, she indicates that if he were not imbued with that talent of organizing his items accordingly, he would have informed Mosidi of the dream and end up causing an unnecessary friction in the family – ending up with “O a re tseba rona basadi hore na re batho ba mofuta ofe.” (Act IV: scene ii) [You know what kind of people we women are.] Seemingly with a persuasive

attempt at pampering her more, Radihlaba responds to Mmadiatheng's final statement by saying: "Ke le tseba hantle. Ke ka hoo eitseng ha ke di raha feela, ka tatamala ho tla kwano." (Act IV: scene ii) [I know you well. That is why the moment I kicked them (sleeping blankets) I ran forward to here.] Nonetheless, Mmadiatheng is still intent on hearing Radihlaba's explanation of the dream itself; and to indicate that interest she persuades him to come up with it.

Instead of relating the dream as persuaded by Mmadiatheng; Radihlaba inquires whether she might render him some assistance concerning a certain matter – to which she answers in the affirmative, saying: "Ke se ke ntse ke o dumeletse, ntate. Kopa feela seo o lakatsang ho se kopa, re nto kena ditabeng." (Act IV: scene ii) [I have already allowed you father. Please make a request for anything you intent to make a requisition for, so that we get into the affairs.] Indeed, one might correctly analyse Mmadiatheng's foregoing statement as packed with meaning that is intended for Radihlaba to realise that she is ready to be of his assistance over any kind of matter. That is why she clearly promises him of her readiness in providing him with anything he might require assistance for.

To Mmadiatheng's delight, Radihlaba requests her to give herself an off from her work; though he is aware that she has already been preparing herself for work, he says. As an indication of her appreciation of this request, Mmadiatheng even interrupts Radihlaba while he is trying to explain the reasons surrounding his request for her better understanding. She says:

"O re ke sa tla finyella tjee kajeno mosebetsing! Ka nnete ha ke hopole jwalo hobane le nako ke mona e se e ntshiile ha bohloko. Feela ha ho molato wa letho le ha ke sa theohele hobane hangata nna le motswalle wa ka Mmadibotjhe re batho ba atisang ho emana nokeng. Ha e mong a le morao nakong kapa a le siyo hohang mosebetsing, ya teng o phetha tsohle. Le nna maobanyana mona ke ile ka mo thusa ha a ne a ile kaekae mabakeng a hae." (Act IV: scene ii)

[Do you think I shall still reach the working place today? Indeed I don't think so since I am even very much behind time. But it doesn't matter even if I have not gone down because I and my friend, Mmadibotjhe, we are a pair of individuals who render assistance to each other. If one is late or even absent from work, the one that is around performs all duties. I even rendered her assistance just a few days ago as she had gone somewhere for her certain commitments.]

In response, Radihlaba thanks Mmadiatheng by indicating his appreciation of her words. Since he has not gone into the dream itself; Mmadiatheng presses him to come up with it; yet to her astonishment, Radihlaba informs her that he does not know how to explain this

dream. In response to Mmadiatheng's shock, Radihlaba explains that the theme of his dream is for individuals like him to take over from where the late ones such as Moswang left off when they left this world. Apparently, Mmadiatheng has for a long time guessed the essence of this dream, for she also interacts in these words:

“Jwaloka motho e moholo, ke hopola hore ke utlwisa hantle seo u se buang. Feela ke ne ke re o ke o lokodise tsa toro ya hao hantle. O hle o qale le yona moo e qadileng teng ho fihlela pheletsong ya yona. Ke realo hobane Sesotho se re monate wa kgolu o tswa mokopung;” (Act IV: scene ii)

[Like a grown up person, I believe that I clearly understand what you are saying. But I suggest that you relate those of your dream clearly. Please begin it from its source, up to its end. I say so because the Sesotho language says that the nice taste of the broth originates from the pumpkin.]

In the light of Mmadiatheng's intervention above; one becomes aware that, though she agrees that she understands Radihlaba's request; she insists that he divulges not only the essence of the dream but in a detailed form. As a persuasive measure for inducing Radihlaba into submitting to her request, Mmadiatheng ends her above persuasion with the Sesotho saying that 'kgolu e tswa mokopung,' yet she puts it in her own style by referring to 'monate wa kgolu;' that being an expression that is rather suggestive of the likely enjoyment they are to share together. In response, Radihlaba demonstrates his possible understanding of what Mmadiatheng is driving her persuasive goal at; as he also plays with words, saying:

“Mmadiatheng ngwaneso, mokopu o sa ya kae kgodu e se e le teng, e bile e fupere monate? Nna ke hopola hore, jwalokaha maikutlo a rona a se a dumellane, tsa manollo ya toro re tla di bona hamorao. Se teng feela ke hore re hle re hlohonolofatshe selekane sena sa rona.” (Act IV: scene ii)

[Mmadiatheng my sibling, for what is the pumpkin still needed, since the broth is already here, as it also contains the sweetness? I think that, since our feelings are congruent to each other, the analysis of the dream will be seen later. What should happen is for us to actually bless this alliance of ours.]

Since persuasion is incremental, Radihlaba's foregoing verbal interaction is also persuasive, as he seems to suggest that there is no need to go into any details of the dream; for he carries within himself the needed 'kgodu' that is 'fupere monate.' Indeed persuasion for establishing an affair between the two characters has succeeded; as it clearly displays itself in Mmadiatheng's following response against blessing the alliance: “Jwalokaha ke se ke itse ke utlwisa taba ya hao, ha ho sa le moo ke tlang ho phea kgang le wena. Se teng feela ke re ho wena: ntaele morena, ke mofo wa hao.” (Act IV: scene ii) [Just as I have already said

that I understand your affair, there is nowhere I shall enter into a debate with you. All there is for me is to say: instruct me chief, I am your subject!'] Resultantly the two characters reach their final agreement on establishing their love affair; hence they engage themselves in fondling and kissing each other – as the initial step in preparation of enjoying their newly formed alliance.

Ultimately, Mamello and Qhobela's meeting seems to have not borne any positive fruit for her obtaining a job as was planned. Nonetheless, promise after promise is made, but to no avail. Since Mamello has been persuaded by Qhobela to now and then come over to his workplace with a promise for the possibility of obtaining a job; this time Qhobela is together with Mamello about the same issue. Apparently she still entertains the same hope that something will happen for her to obtain the promised job. But alas, Qhobela once more informs her that there is still no job available. As a persuasive aim of driving his goal of causing a gap between Mamello and Kakatjhelana, Qhobela informs Mamello that Kakatjhelana seems to be still angry over her deserting him and associating with Qhobela himself – thus using that misinformation as an excuse, as he shifts the blame from himself to Kakatjhelana. When Mamello complains about the decadence prevailing in Tsiketsingsaqomatsi, Qhobela gives her the following lecture as some persuasive ploy geared at winning her and changing her attitude and behaviour:

“Hela wena thope, mona ke Tsiketsingsaqomatsi ebang ha o eso tsebe. Tsa teng di fetoha bosiu le motshehare. Dipelo tsa bana ba batho di a tujwa mona, ha ho sebaka. Mosadi o tloa leseyo mmoho le ntata lona hodimo, e le ha a habile timiting, matswele ana a ntseng a dutla kgatsela, a a bofile ka ntho tse mona tsa lona basadi, tseo ho thweng ke dibodisi. Banna ba bangata ba se ba bile ba inehile naha mme ho fihlela lena le hodimo, ha ho tsejwe moo ba leng teng. Ho ntse ho itshaletse rona boQhobela feela hobane ha re sa tsotella letho. Haele kajeno, re phela bophelo ba kajeno. Ba le hlahlamang bona, re bo phela ha tsatsi leo le tjhabile. Ke phetho!” (Act V: scene ii)

[Hallo you girl, this place is Tsiketsingsaqomatsi if you do not know it yet. Affairs of this place change nightly and daily. The hearts of people's children are tormented here, without any rest. A woman skips over an infant and its father, as she hurries up for a night concert; these breasts that are still oozing out first milk, she has wrapped them up with those things of yours women, those which are called the bodice. A number of men have already run away from their homes and up to now, nobody knows where they are. It is only us the Qhobelas that are still remaining since we do not mind anything. As for today, we live the life of today. As for that of the following day, we live it when the sun for that day has risen. That is all.]

No doubt, Qhobela's foregoing lecture on Mamello sums up the entire decadence seemingly prevailing at Tsiketsingsaqomatsi, as he puts it. Up to now, one realises that almost all the characters in this drama text are indulging themselves into decadence of some sort; with Mamello as an exceptional case, since she is still new in this place. Yet one might guarantee that, given a chance and enough enticements, she would also venture into the prevailing behaviours in this place. To prove the point, Qhobela gives this lecture to Mamello, not because he discourages her from indulging in such behaviour, but drives his own persuasive goal of changing Mamello's attitude and behaviour that, due to her naivety, is in contrast with those of Tsiketsingsaqomatsi. In short his is for persuading Mamello to formatively adopt the common behaviours and attitudes of this area's inhabitants.

Resultantly, Mamello volunteers to inform Qhobela about her meeting with Radihlaba, as the latter was on the verge of fleeing from his family. In addition, she informs him that Radihlaba has not come home since that day – as a proof that he has indeed run away from home, and possibly never to be seen again – as nobody knows where he is up to now, she says. Additionally still, Mamello relates to Qhobela how Mosidi welcomed her at her home and promised her of permanent sojourn with her; even promising to teach her many womanly lessons that would come handy to her in coping with the kind of life she is likely to live in this place. Finally, Mamello pleads with Qhobela for offering her a job; since even the teachings that were promised by Mosidi seem to have waned away – as Mosidi has already persuaded her to look for some refuge – as she does not want to live with her anymore. Seemingly as a persuasive aim for Mamello to divulge more of her relationship with Mosidi; Qhobela says: “Na jwale o a lemoha hore lefatsheng moo, batho boholo ke mamao a ntlha di pedi, haholoholo ba kang boMosidi tjena?” (Act V: scene ii) [Are you now aware that most people on this earth are double sharpened pins, especially those of Mosidi's kind?]

Since the foregoing Qhobela's question is a direct persuasion for Mamello to respond, either positively or negatively – Mamello responds in these words:

“Ke hona ke ntseng ke eya ke lemoha taba eno, hobane ke mona mme Mosidi o ne a se a ntshepitsitse mahodimo le mafatshe, empa kajeno o se a mphetohetse, o se a bile a mpona ha ke le sera sa hae ka botlalo.” (Act V: scene ii)

[I have only begun to realise that point now, because mother Mosidi had already promised me heavens and earths, but today she has turned against me, and she also considers me as a complete enemy of hers.]

In the light of Mamello's revelation of her relation with Mosidi above; Qhobela takes advantage of the situation and, applies promise as some persuasive strategy for Mamello to submit to his proposal for having an affair with her; saying: “Kajeno he tema o tla e bona,

kgaitsedi, ha feela re ka feta mona pele.” (Act V: scene ii) [As for today you will see progress, as long as we pass here first.] In response Mamello asks, “Re feta kae pele jwale, ntate?” (Act V: scene ii) [Where do we pass first, father?] By so saying Mamello hereby aims for Qhobela to explain himself well; so that she might know the part she has to play in order to obtain a job where Qhobela has displayed himself as manager. Accordingly, Qhobela responds in these words:

“Nna ke ne ke nahana hore, jwalokaha e le mona boMosidi le Kakatjhelana ba se ba re eteletse pele ka hore re se re thehile setswallenyanana pakeng tsa rona, re hle re mpe re etse jwalo, e le hore le nna ke tle ke be le morolo wa ho lokisa taba tsa hao, hobane ke tshepa hore jwaloka ngwana wa Mosotho, o tseba maele a reng: matsoho a lemisetsa mmetso.” (Act V: scene ii)

[I personally suggest that, since the Mosidis and Kakatjhelana have already gone ahead of us by saying that we have already formed some relationship between us, we simply do exactly that, so that I might also have power to organise your affairs; as I hope that as a Mosotho child you are familiar with the saying that: The hands plough for the throat.]

It would seem that, through naivety, Mamello has since been hoping that Qhobela will eventually offer her a job on the basis of her relations with Kakatjhelana. That is why she now indicates her surprise as Qhobela suggests that they establish love relationship with her, as she says: “Atjhe, ntate Qhobela, ka nnete nna jwale le a mpherekanya.” (Act V: scene ii) [No, father Qhobela, indeed you people now confuse me.] Like someone that has been waiting for this moment, Qhobela responds to Mamello’s foregoing statement by saying: “Re o ferekanya jwang, Mamello, hobane le wena o iponetse hore Kakatjhelana ha a na petso ya letho?” (Act V: scene ii) [How do we confuse you Mamello, as you have also seen for yourself that Kakatjhelana has no power at all?] In accordance with Mamello’s above statement, one would regard her complaint as emanating from the fact that Kakatjhelana had already formed some love relationship with her. She therefore gets confused as Qhobela also attempts to form the same ties with her; as the two men are co-workers and supposed friends. Yet Qhobela’s foregoing question appear to be addressing something else, especially as he gives the reason that ‘Kakatjhelana ha a na petso ya letho’. Indeed this final part of Qhobela’s statement is quite persuasive; for in accordance with the diction he has employed, Kakatjhelana is to be seen as a powerless man that may not successfully throw any stuff to any aimed-for target.

In a way, Mamello observes that Qhobela is missing her point in her complaint; and as a persuasive aim for the latter to respond to the point she is making, Mamello quips: “Ke hore ha ho so fete, ke re le beke feela ke le mona, homme ke se ke fetohile tholwana ya morusu!”

(Act V: scene ii) [I mean that it has not even been a week since I have been here, yet I have already been turned into a source of scuffling.] With an aim of propelling his persuasive goal of forming love relations with Mamello; Qhobela responds to the former's surmise by saying:

“Ho a etsahala, Mamello. Feela le teng, ebang ha o sa le maikemisetsong a ho fumana mosebetsi mmoho le bodulo, ho ho wena. Nna nka se o hlohle majwe ka hanong.” (Act V: scene ii)

[It does happen, Mamello. But even so, if you are no more intending to obtain both a job and a sojourn, it is up to you. I cannot ram some stones into your mouth.]

Seemingly, Qhobela's persuasive goal has been successfully achieved, as contained in Mamello's following response: “Ere kaha mosebetsi le bodulo tsona ke a di hloka, ha ke sa na boikgethelo.” (Act V: scene ii) [Since I do need both a job and a sojourn, I have no more a choice.] In appreciation for Mamello's acceptance of his proposal, Qhobela comments her in this way:

“O a bona he, motho ya bohlale o bua jwaloka wena tjena. Jwale, ke tla qala ka ho o fumanela bodulo pele. Haele tsa mosebetsi tsona, di tla latela hobane tsona di matleng a ka.” (Act V: scene ii)

[You see now, a clever person speaks in this form like you. Now I shall begin by finding you a sojourn first. As for a job, that will follow because everything is in my power.]

Though one may wonder why Qhobela might not offer Mamello a job right now; one may correctly surmise that his persuasive aim is that of ensuring himself of his meeting place with his target – where he might boast of his authority, his hope for secrecy and non-disturbance from any quarter. In order to guarantee Mamello's success for a sojourn, Qhobela employs promise as a persuasive strategy to organise with one widow that lives alone in the village, so that she may offer the persuadee such required sojourn. Even as Mamello spells out her qualms that the widow in reference might end up treating her in the same way Mosidi has done; Qhobela assures her that the widow is a person that never has problems with anybody. In addition, Qhobela once more applies promise as persuasive strategy for Mamello to stay with conviction that her affair with him will be secretively treated – to ensure that the widow in question remains ignorant of the fact. In accordance with Qhobela's assurances, Mamello makes further inquiries as to how the former might manage to keep their affair as a secret – thus driving her goal of going there with some conviction that all will go right at that place. In his response Qhobela illustrates his persuasive plan in the following manner:

“Ho bonolo haholo. Ke tla fihla ho yena ke le motho ya tliilo batlela motjhana wa ka bodulo. Ke hore ho yena, wena o tla ba motjhana wa ka. Hono ho tla etsa hore,

ebang le yena a ka ba le lefufa jwaloka basadi ba bang, re mo time sealolo. Le ha ke le moeti wa hao, ke tla be ke tllilo iponela motjhana wa ka.” (Act V: scene ii)

[It is very easy. I will come to her as someone that is looking for accommodation on behalf of my niece. It means to her, you are going to be my niece. That will ensure that, if she might also bear some jealousy like other women, we give her no chance at all.]

Ultimately, Mamello is convinced of finding an accommodation; yet she inquires after the name of the said widow, as well as the day and time for seeing her. While one was to expect him to simply give the name and time for seeing the owner of the likely accommodation – Qhobela spells the name as that of Mmadiatheng. Further, he tells Mamello that they will go and see the widow after work today. As a persuasive measure for Mamello to make her preparations for departure from Mosidi’s house timely – Qhobela encourages her to go to Mosidi’s home and prepare herself; and bid Mosidi farewell as a sign that she is not as bad as Kakatjhelana and Mosidi herself had concluded. With these assurances of her going to get an accommodation and a job; Mamello thanks Qhobela and goes away for making preparation as discussed. As a sign of his satisfaction with the way their meeting has progressed; Qhobela encourages his target to go by saying, “Ke hantle setshwana seso, re tla bonana.” (Act V: scene ii) [It is alright my dark complexioned sister, we shall meet.] In this way, Qhobela applies complement as a persuasive goal for boosting his target’s morale and ensure her of the appreciation for her dark beauty.

Now that Mamello has gone, Qhobela uses this moment to cheer himself up over the new found girlfriend, as seen in this soliloquy he hereby employs:

“Banna, ka nnete haele e tjee kgora, nna ha ke so e bone. BoKakatjhelana motho wa bona o duletse ho llakaka mona, jwalokaha eka o hloilwe, athe o ntse a lliswa ke bophogo bo mona ba hae. Motho a ka lla jwang kwekwe di fofela faatshe hakaale, hwa hae e le ho pola feela! Ka mohlomong le melamu ya ho pola ha ba sa na yona boKakatjhelana ba le tjena, ho tseba mang? Butle ke kgaohane le tse ngata, ke wele mosebetsing.” (Act V: scene ii)

[Guys, indeed as for this kind of sufficiency, I have personally never seen. The person of Kakatjhelanas is continually crying, as if he is hated, whereas he cries due to his usual foolishness. How can a person cry as the quails fly so closely to the ground, while for him is merely to beat them! Maybe as they are now, these Kakatjhelanas no more have the fighting sticks for beating, who knows? Wait and let me forget about numerous things and fall back to work.]

In the light of Qhobela’s above soliloquy, it is clear that he regards himself as a self-sufficient man – as he has just managed to get for himself a new girl friend – while he has many more,

he seems to say. He therefore fails to understand the reason behind those of Kakatjhelana's kind to keep on wailing as if people hate them. On that basis, Qhobela surmises that the likes of Kakatjhelana are consumed by their own stupidity; what stupidity or foolishness, one can hardly say. But then in the same vein Qhobela considers his persuasive success in reaching an agreement with Mamello for forming love affair as a sign that, like quails, women have become easy collections for whom no one is to complain. On that note, he then questions this aspect of failure that seems to cause so much misery to the likes of Kakatjhelana – and finally begins to doubt their masculinity, as in 'Ka mohlomong le melamu ya ho pola ha ba sa na yona boKakatjhelana ba le tjena.' According to Mokitimi (1997:50), the proverb "Koekoe tsa tsoha melamu e felile," on which Qhobela's foregoing expression is based, means that "New things appear when some people are no longer young enough to take advantage of them." One might then correctly deduce Qhobela's statement as self-persuasive attempt for dismissing Kakatjhelana's complaint as a significant indication of his loss of masculine potency.

Later this very day, Mamello has come home at Mosidi's house to collect her belongings and bid her farewell as she is now going somewhere else. Basing herself on the suspicion that Qhobela might have found an accommodation for Mamello at Mmadiatheng's home, Mosidi quips as follows for Mamello to wise up:

"Feela ke a belaela. Ebe ha a a re o tla ya o batlela bodulo ha Mmadiatheng tjee? Ebang ho jwalo, e tla ba mosadi o meleko eo. Ka nnete motho a ka kgona jwang ho dula le mohaditsong wa nyatsi ya hae? Feela wena ha o bone hore Qhobela o ntse a o tshwarisa phupe ka lefe mabapi le tsa mosebetsi, ngwana towe? Le tjabang le le likelang o ntse a re tsa mosebetsi hosane, tsa mosebetsi hosane. Hosane ena ya hae na e tla qetella e fihlile tjee, wena ha o bona? Nna ke bona eka mokola ho na le seo o se habileng. E tla re hoba o se fumane, ebe ke phetho. O tla sala o ithwetse medi hloohong ke a o jwetsa. Athe ebe o ne a se a o fumanetse mosebetsi, mohlomong le nna ke ne ke tla fetola maikutlo, ebe ha o sa tsamaya mona hae." (Act VI: scene i)

[But I have a suspicion. By the way has he not said that he was going to seek an accommodation for you at Mmadiatheng's home? If that is the case, it will mean that that woman is full of witchcraft. For indeed how can a person manage to live together with someone with whom they share the same lover? But are you not aware that Qhobela is playing a fool of you in connection with work, you child? On daily basis he keeps on saying work tomorrow, work tomorrow. Is this tomorrow of his ever going to come to an end, as you see it? I personally think that this guy has a hidden agenda. Immediately he achieves his goal that will be the end. You will remain painfully crying I tell you. Had he already found you a job, maybe I would also change my decision, so that you might not go any more.]

In accordance with Mosidi's quips above, it is clear that Qhobela has a hidden agenda in connection with Mamello. In fact, looking at his earlier soliloquy in which he considers Mamello as one of 'likwekwe tse fofelang faatshe,' one ventures to say that he is indeed aiming to misuse Mamello to a point of destruction. For him to regard his success in establishing an affair with Mamello as 'kgora' demonstrates his selfishness that depicts him as an untrustworthy person that Mamello should not take seriously. To make it worse, Mosidi divulges some important information for Mamello to be careful in her relations with Qhobela, as he is likely to cause her an indelible pain in future. Worse still, Mosidi rightly questions Qhobela's daily promises for Mamello to obtain a job through his influence as manager at the workplace – but to no avail. Indeed, Mamello has been successfully persuaded by Mosidi to be ware of the trap that might be set for her by Qhobela. It then becomes reasonable for her to request Mosidi to be prepared for her possible return; since she does not know whether she is going to succeed or fail to get the promised accommodation.

Indeed problems overpower the characters in this drama text. Now that she is left alone after Mamello's departure, Mosidi engages herself in a soliloquy in which her problems are exposed – resulting from the failure of her plans, and other circumstances as well. The following is the soliloquy in question:

“Ka nnete ha e le ditaba tsa ka, ha di tsamaye hantle hohang. Ke itse ke iphumanetse papatelele ya ngwananyana ho tla ba seepamokoti sa lapa lena la ka, jwale ke ela e phuruseditse. Ke itse ke itshwareletsa ka baki ya Qhobela, ke mona le yena ha a sa nnatsa le ho nnatsa. Ke itse ke mmakisa ka ho nkana le Kakatjhelana, ke mona le hona hono ho ho kgutshwane ha ho bontshe tema ya letho. Se nqakang le ho feta, ke hore monna wa ka Radihlaba o nyametse. Ke tsatsi la boraro lena le dikelang a sa bonahale. Feela yena ke a mo tseba. O ba a ntse a semeletse mosebetsing kwana tekong ya ho kgahlisa monga hae. Hee, monna ke phauphau eo, basadi! Banna ba bang ba phaphame, ba a pepeaka hara motse mona, ba kganna dikgomohadi tse rona boMosidi. Yena o korobane, eka ka o jele mokoko o shweleng. (O tsheha a le mong) Ka nnete ke re o tla ikutlwa. Thaka tsa hae di mo etse ka diphilana a ntse a shebile.” (Act VI: scene i)

[Indeed as for my matters are not going well altogether. While I had found for myself a girl renegade to be a hole-digger for this family of mine, now there it has left the nest. I ventured into holding on to Qhobela's jacket, lately he does not even care for me. I endeavoured into correcting him by gallivanting with Kakatjhelana, now that very short thing shows no development of any kind. What perplexes me even more is the fact that my husband, Radihlaba, has vanished. This is the third setting day since he has not been seen. But as for him I know him. He continually stays there on the job in an attempt at pleasing his boss.

Hallo, that man is a real fool guys! Other men have awakened and they walk around slovenly in this village, driving big cows such as us the Mosidis. As for him he is bent down, as if he has eaten a dead cock. (She laughs alone) Indeed I say that he is going to feel himself (i.e., he is going to experience self-induced pain). His age mates have run away with the small whistles in front of his eyes.]

Indeed Mosidi's foregoing soliloquy is quite persuasive for analyzing her own character disposition. In this self-analysis Mosidi reconsiders whether to change her own attitude and behaviour; as she envisages no progress in her endeavours for leading a meaningful kind of life; or to try other means that might advance her standard of living. In her self-persuasion to analyse her present situation, Mosidi observes the fact that she offered Mamello a refuge at her home with a calculated persuasive goal of turning her into a slave that would assist in improving the former's home. She therefore regrets that like a bird that leaves its nest for the first time, there Mamello has gone. Further, Mosidi regrets the fact that her love affair with Qhobela is seemingly over; as it was founded upon some hope that the latter would become handy for her in almost all her requirements.

It would have then made sense for her to correct him by gallivanting with Kakatjhelana as a solace for her; yet to her dismay, Kakatjhelana has demonstrated no advancement at all, she says. Finally, as it is clearly spelt out in the soliloquy, Mosidi's main worry emanates from the fact that Radihlaba, her husband, has since three days ago vanished. Nonetheless, Mosidi consoles herself by basing this act of Radihlaba's failure to report at home as some usual phenomenon. Seemingly, Radihlaba has made it a point to remain at work after hours, as a persuasive ploy for pleasing his master by demonstrating his dedication to work. For that matter, Mosidi regards Radihlaba as a stupid man that never ventures in the common practices of gallivanting with women in the village as other men do. In essence, for Mosidi, Radihlaba's behaviour is the cause of her being involved with other men that appreciate her – while he is goading like someone that has eaten 'mokoko o shweleng,' as she puts it above.

As the saying goes that: talk of the devil and he is sure to appear; Mosidi hears a knock at the door and to her surprise here comes Radihlaba into the house. Instead of responding to his following persuasive greeting for establishing rapport: "Hela thope ya tsa ntate, dikgomo bo!" (Act VI: scene i) [Hallo girl of those of my father, those cattle please! (i.e., good morning)]; Mosidi interviews Radihlaba. She poses the following questions: "Radihlaba, na ebe le kotong see, e sa le tsa mosebetsi tse entseng hore ebe ke hona o orohelang hae tsatsing la boraro? Kapa ebe o a ntlholla monna ke wena.?" (Act VI: scene i) [Radihlaba, could it once more be true at this juncture that it is due to work commitments for you to only come back home on the third day? Or maybe you are gallivanting for me you man?] Though

the meaning of 'ntlholla' captured here is that which emanates from 'bohlola' [immorality], the other meaning for the same word could bear its derivation from 'ho hlola' [to forebode a calamity] (See Mabile and Dieterlen: 1985 pp 17, 87). Its application in Mosidi's persuasive confrontation against Radihlaba's behaviour therefore seemingly fits either way – especially bearing it in mind that Radihlaba has since been seen at Mmadiatheng's home; where they established their love affair.

Apparently demonstrating his comprehension of the double meaning contained in that word, Radihlaba surmises: "Mosidi mohatsaka, o tseba hantle hore wa rona mosebetsi ha o pokile o pokile. Motho le beke o ka e qeta o sa tle ha hao. Ebile matsatsing ana teng, monga rona Raditsebe, o ne a befile hampe." (Act VI: scene i) [Mosidi my wife, you know very well that when our work is properly roaring, it is indeed bellowing. As a human being you can even spend a week without coming to your home. And especially in these days, our boss, Raditsebe, was terribly violent.] It would seem that Radihlaba has successfully persuaded Mosidi to change her attitude and behaviour against his own – for they discuss everything in harmony thereafter. Ultimately Mosidi gives the following information to Radihlaba: "Bosiyong ba hao re bile le moeti mona lapeng." (Act VI: scene i) [During your absence we had a visitor here at home.] Like someone that suspects some bad behaviour of some sort; in a persuasive response, Radihlaba poses these questions: "Ebe ke mang moeti eo ya kgethang ho etela ha ka ke le siyo? Hona o ne a tswa kae hara lee?" (Act VI: scene i) [By the way who could have been that visitor who chooses to visit this home of mine when I am away? And from where was the visitor coming in this situation?]

In response to these persuasive inquiries, Mosidi explains that it was unfortunate that the visitor arrived while Radihlaba was still busily engaged at work. Further, she explains that the visitor in question was a mature girl from Dijabatho village. Furthermore, Mosidi employs the following words, seemingly as an attempt at driving her persuasive goal for Radihlaba to sympathise and empathise with that visitor: "Ngwaneo wa batho o fihlile mona, mme a kopa ho duladula le rona ha a ntse a lokisa taba tsa tjako." (Act VI: scene i) [That poor people's child arrived here and made a request for staying temporarily with us while she is still organizing her sojourn.] It would appear that Radihlaba develops fear that the very visitor might expose him as a person she met as he was deserting the home and village; as he asks, "Jwale o kae hona jwale?" (Act VI: scene i) [Now where is she now?] In this way it would appear that Mosidi is persuaded by this question to vilify the character of Mamello as follows:

"O ile a be a se a nkana kgikgitha le Qhobela, mme ha jwale eka ka Qhobelanyana eo wa hae o se a mo fumanetse bodulo kaekae. Feela ke a belaela ebang ha a a mo fumanela ha Mmadiatheng! Hee, ha e le Qhobela, ka tsatsi le leng Modimo o sa tla

mo otlala ka baradi mmoho le basadi ba batho, bana bao a ntseng a bapala ka bona. Feela le bona basadinyana bana ba mona ke dithoto. O tla ba fumana ba ntse ba ahlametse banna, ba ikentse bokenang-bohle, kapa tsona thuwana tsa bohle banna ba tulo ena. Nna Mosidi, motho a ka ba a ya wela matjoing kwana.” (Act VI: scene i)

[She ultimately fell headlong with Qhobela, and for now it appears as if that mini Qhobela of hers has already found an accommodation for her somewhere. But as I suspect, he must have found her that accommodation at Mmadiatheng’s home! Hallo, as for Qhobela, one day God shall punish him about the daughters together with the people’s wives, these ones that he plays fool of. But even these women of this village are fools. You will find them always gaping for men, turning themselves into the come-in-alls, or the very night chambers for all the local men. As for me, Mosili, a person can end up falling there at the stink-blaar!]

No doubt Mosidi’s above report is persuasive for one to realise that she considers Qhobela as someone who plays a fool with a number of girls and women in this vicinity; such that she even wishes for him to be punished by God for his unseemly behaviour. Besides, she relegates this village’s women as fools – seemingly to shift the blame from herself and load it over the shoulders of other women. In a persuasive attempt at finding fault and foolery in the local women, Mosidi labels these local women as ‘basadinyana,’ ‘ba ahlametse banna,’ thus turning themselves into ‘bokenang-bohle,’ or alternatively ‘thuwana tsa bohle banna.’ Needless to say, these are very strong images that seem to have been employed by Mosidi as a persuasive means of demonstrating for Radihlaba the extent to which the prevailing decadence in this village disgusts her.

Yet since she is known to be sharing the same blame, or even worse ones; one might correctly draw a conclusion that her persuasive goal for smearing these women’s faces with so much dirt is to propel her persuasive goal of saving her own face in the eyes of Radihlaba. In this way she hopes to continue cheating on Radihlaba by casting blame over those that are not even here to answer for themselves. Nonetheless, her final statement above clearly indicates that she is merely embarking on the trial to clean up and save her face from the blemishes she incurs from her attitude and behaviour – as this is otherwise quite an uncalled for statement. Were Radihlaba not already involved in the same decadence himself, it would be clear to him that Mosidi is attempting to shift the blame from herself. But due to the fact that the two of them as husband and wife wobble in the same pool of decadence; Radihlaba dares not engage himself in these debates. Rather, upon learning that the visitor in question is the very Mamello that he met at the outskirts of the village; Radihlaba confronts his wife with the following words:

“Mosidi, na o tsebisitse ngwanana eo hore mona ha ka nna ha ke dumelle baphaphathehi ho fapohela? Ebile ke hore hang feela ha a ka kgutla, o hle o yo mo thiba pele nka teanya mahlo le yena. A hle a kgutle le yena mothonyana eo wa hae. Ebile hlo o ntsholele ke hle ke eo ithoballa.” (Act VI: scene i)

[Mosidi, have you informed that girl that at this home of mine I do not allow any refugees to come via? And what should happen is that once she comes back, you go and stop her before I can direct my eyes at her. She should go back with that mini person of hers. And please serve me so that I may go and sleep.]

No doubt, Radihlaba’s attitude against the said Mamello emanates from the fact that he is the very first person she met in this village. As such he is afraid that Mamello will register her familiarity with him and reveal his secret that he had ventured on deserting his family and the village in general. So, to save his face, Radihlaba feigns anger and hatred for Mamello as a refugee. In this way he is indirectly hiding away from her for fear of being exposed as nothing else but someone that has lost his masculinity by deserting his own family. On top of everything else, Radihlaba is worried over the embarrassment he is likely to experience when his attitude and behaviour are exposed to the whole village by Mamello, it would appear.

As Radihlaba has now come back home after the three days of his absence, it is interesting to find out how Mmadiatheng behaves in her solitude. Seemingly, Mamello has succeeded in finding the accommodation at Mmadiatheng’s home; as the latter addresses the former in this way:

“O a bona Mamello ngwanaka, ha ditaba tsa hao di le matsohong a enwa malomao Qhobela, o tsebe hore tsohle di tla tsamaya hantle. Qhobela ke motswalle wa ka wa kgale, ebile ke tseba le melemo ya hae e mengata. Feela ke a o sebela ngwanaka. Taba ena e hle e be pinyane. Ke re ho se be motho ofe kapa ofe a ka e tsebang. Malomao, mohatsa Qhobela, a ka kopana hlooho ena ha a ka utlwela ka yena. Ho malomao Qhobela mona, basadi boMosidi ba lekile ho ntshitisa empa ba hlotswe. Ebile ha ke o sheba tjena, ke bona o le ngwanana ya tshepahalang, ya mpileng a welwa ke bomadimabe ba fatshe lena. Feela le ha ho le jwalo, o phuthulohe ngwanaka. Mona ke lapeng.” (Act VII)

[You see Mamello my child, when your affairs are in the hands of this uncle of yours Qhobela, you should know that all will go well. Qhobela is an old friend of mine, and I know his numerous assistants. But let me whisper for you my child. This affair should be a secret. I mean nobody should ever learn about it. Your aunt, Qhobela’s wife, can go mad if she can learn about him. In connection with this uncle of yours, Qhobela, women such as Mosidi tried

to destabilise me but to no avail. And when I look at you, I realise that you are a trustworthy child that only sustained this world's misfortune. But even so, you should be free my child. This is your home.]

Clearly, Mmadiatheng has been made to believe that Qhobela is Mamello's maternal uncle, as was suggested by Qhobela himself when he promised Mamello of finding an accommodation for her. Though rather indirectly, Mmadiatheng reveals her secret to Mamello about her affair with Qhobela – as she seemingly believes that Mamello's relationship with Qhobela is as she has been informed. It is then sensible for her to plead with Mamello to refrain from divulging the hidden secret that she has an affair with Qhobela. With an aim of driving her persuasive goal of assuring her of her deep involvement with Qhobela, Mmadiatheng informs Mamello that women such as Mosidi have tried to win Qhobela for themselves but failed. She finally persuades Mamello to be faithful by pampering her of her seeming trustworthiness; and assures her that this is her home as well.

In the long run, after some days since she has been accommodated at Mmadiatheng's home, Mamello informs Mmadiatheng that she is expecting a newly found boyfriend at about eight o'clock in the evening. Since Mmadiatheng is a mature woman with a lot of experience in matters of this kind – she advises Mamello to do a smart job in entertaining the said visitor. For emphasis' sake, she rounds it up with the following persuasive words: "O hle o itokise, mosadi; O tsebe hore motho o kgothatswa ke lehlaso la pele. Ho tloha moo, o se a kena pineng ha bonolo." (Act VIII: scene i) [You should prepare yourself well, woman. You should be aware that a person is encouraged by the first song. From there, he enters into the song quite easily.] Needless to say, Mmadiatheng is hereby encouraging Mamello to perform well in her relation with the coming boyfriend as a persuasive means of driving her goal of ensuring that Mamello becomes busy with her boyfriend. Understandably Mamello's engagement with her boyfriend is considered by Mmadiatheng as an opportunity for herself to be at leisure with either of her lovers, Qhobela and Radihlaba. After being so clearly persuaded to satisfy her boyfriend, Mamello goes to her room to wait for the visitor as expected.

Finally the expected visitor arrives and knocks at the window as was seemingly persuaded to do so by Mamello. It is revealed that the new found boyfriend is Kakatjhelana himself, the very friend and colleague of Qhobela. Even as they have not gone far with their discussion, at the kitchen door there is a knock. In answer to the knock, Mmadiatheng discovers that it is Qhobela who has just come over, hopefully as her own visitor. Now as if by persuasive plan, in no time there also arrives Radihlaba; apparently as Mmadiatheng's visitor as well. It is important to remember that originally, Kakatjhelana had succeeded in striking love relations with Mamello, a day before the latter came to the offices and met Qhobela. Another

important thing to remember is that Qhobela is also in love with Mmadiatheng, apart from Mosidi, Radihlaba's wife. Since Radihlaba is also involved with Mmadiatheng, one might call this some kind of love triangle; though this one is rather complicated due to its intertwining among three women: Mamello, Mosidi, and Mmadiatheng; in comparison with the three men: Radihlaba, Qhobela and Kakatjhelana. Since Kakatjhelana and Qhobela supposedly share both Mosidi and Mamello; while Qhobela on the other hand shares Mmadiatheng with Radihlaba – these complexities make it difficult for all concerned to solve the problem that has just ensued now.

As might be expected, Qhobela and Radihlaba exchange persuasive verbal interactions against each other as follows:

Qhobela: Mmadiatheng, jwale Radihlaba yena o bewa keng mona? [Mmadiatheng, now what puts Radihlaba here?]

Radihlaba: Le nna ke ntse ke ipotsa yona potso ya hore na wena, sera sa ka se seholo, o bewa keng mona hobane haele hantlentle, ha ke le mona tjena, ke ha ke leka ho fa wena le mohatsaka Mosidi sebaka se setle sa hore le nyanyake jwalokaha le hlola le nyanyaka. Kapa o ntse o ithetsa ka hore tabanyana ya lona le Mosidi ha ke e tsebe? [I am also asking myself the question that you, as my great enemy, what puts you here because as a matter of fact, as I am presently here, it is when I try to give you and my wife, Mosidi, a good chance for gallivanting as you usually do. Or have you been deceiving yourself that I do not know this small affair of yours with Mosidi?]

Mmadiatheng: Butleng hle, bontate, se keng la lwanela mona hle. [Wait a minute please fathers, don't fight here please!]

Radihlaba: Mmadiatheng, ha ho ntwana ya letho mona. Ke ne ke mpa ke araba tseketsake ena e hopolang hore monna ke yona feela mona motseng. Ha ke le mona ke tlile ha hao, ka mabaka a tsejwang ke nna le wena. Ha ke utlwisise hore na yena tokelo o e fumana kae ya ho mpotsa hore ke bewa keng mona ha hao, empa wena monga motse o sa mpotse. [Mmadiatheng, there is nothing like a fight here. I was merely answering this fool that considers itself as the only man in this village. As I am here I have come to your home, for the reasons known to me and you. I fail to understand where he gets the right to ask me what puts me here at your home, as you the owner of the home does not ask me.]

Qhobela: Nna nka mpa ka ya itulela le motjhana wa ka ka mane ka kamoreng ya hae. (Act IX: scene ii) [I would rather go and sit together with my niece in that room of hers.] As may be observed, the love triangle concerning Mmadiatheng and her two lovers, Qhobela and Radihlaba, has come to a peak; to an extent that one of the two lovers has to either quit now or a fight might ensue. Not surprisingly, Radihlaba attempts to push Qhobela out of this love

triangle by conscientizing him that his affair with Mosidi is of common knowledge to him, as Mosidi's husband. Further Radihlaba indicates that his presence here is for affording Qhobela and Mosidi an opportunity to gallivant at leisure as usual. Since Qhobela finally decides to leave Radihlaba and Mmadiatheng alone, as he goes into Mamello's bed room; one may correctly conclude that Radihlaba's persuasive goal of pushing Qhobela out of this love triangle has succeeded.

In line with Qhobela's involvement in the love triangle that involves himself and Kakatjhelana in association with Mamello; it becomes interesting to observe how this love triangle is solved – as Kakatjhelana is already in Mamello's bed room. Like someone that never expected to find Kakatjhelana together with Mamello in her bed room, Qhobela opens the door without even knocking. To his surprise, he finds Kakatjhelana already there. Resultantly, his first reaction is that of the following verbal interaction: “Hao, motswalle Kakatjhelana, athe le wena o moo? Kapa ebe ke a lora?” (Act IX: scene ii) [Indeed, Kakatjhelana my friend, are you here too? Or am I dreaming?] Whereas one would expect Kakatjhelana to respond to Qhobela's persuasive inquiries by explaining himself, this is not the case. Mamello takes the matter into her own hands and engages herself into some persuasive verbal interaction with the two lovers of hers, saying:

“Ha o lore ntate Qhobela. O hlile o bona yena motswalle wa hao Kakatjhelana, yena eo le etsang tse kgolo le yena, yena eo ho lona basadi e leng dintho tsa ho bapala. Ebile ke batla hore re hleng re yeng ka mane ka kitjheneng, ke hle ke yo ntsha maikutlo a ka ho lona le le mmoho. Etswe ke se ke bile ke qetile le maikutlo a ka hore haele tulo ena ya bo lona, ke a e furalla. Ha re yeng!” (Act IX: scene ii)

[You are not dreaming father Qhobela. You actually see the very friend of yours, Kakatjhelana, he with whom you perform great acts, he that together with you consider women as play things. And I want us to actually go there into the kitchen, so that I may air my views to your being together. In fact I have already made up my mind that as for this area of yours, I am turning my back to it. Let us go!]

Even though Kakatjhelana tries to argue his way out by refusing to go into the kitchen, Mamello calls out Mmadiatheng, as a persuasive attempt for Kakatjhelana and Qhobela to realise the seriousness of the matter. To Mmadiatheng's astonishment, Mamello's supposed boy friend that she has been waiting for is Kakatjhelana. As a persuasive aim of registering her surprise at seeing Kakatjhelana here with Mamello, Mmadiatheng quips as follows: “Hao batho, ke bontshwang na jwale? Kakatjhelana, athe le wena o moo? Mamello mosadi, anthe ha o ntse o re o lebeletse moeti, o ne o bolela Kakatjhelana?” (Act IX: scene ii) [Oh please guys, what am I being shown now? Kakatjhelana, are you also here? Mamello woman, while

you were saying that you were expecting a visitor, you meant Kakatjhelana?] Seemingly, Mamello is determined to expose these individuals for what they are by confronting them together in the kitchen as she responds to Mmadiatheng's questions in this form:

“Ke ne ke bolela yena, mme. Le jwale Ramasedi o sebeditse ka hore ditsetse tsena di tlo kgobokana mona kajeno. Ke batla hore re hleng re yo kopanelang ka mane ka kitjheneng, ke tle ke fane ka maikutlo a ka re le mmoho pele ke arohana le lona kamoso.” (Act IX: scene ii)

[I was referring to him mother. And indeed God has functioned in that these wild cats have come to gather here today. I want us to go and meet in the kitchen there, so that I may air my views as we are together before I depart from you tomorrow]

Congruent with Mamello's persuasive intention of exposing the prevailing behaviours and attitudes of these people; Mmadiatheng corroborates the former's persuasive goal by surmising in these words:

“Bana beso, ha ho sa na thuso. Ke mona re se re bile re kgalengwa ke bana ka baka la botjena bo mona ba rona. Ha re mpeng re yo mamela maikutlo a Mamello. Nna ka nnete ke swabile nko ho feta molomo.” (Act IX: scene ii)

[My siblings, there is no use any more. Here we even end up being scolded by children due to our prevailing behaviour. Let us please go and listen to Mamello's views. As for me my sorrow is more on the nose than the mouth (i.e., I am extremely sorry.)]

With response to Mmadiatheng's above persuasive statements, all go out of Mamello's bedroom into the kitchen; where they come into Radihlaba's company. To his surprise Radihlaba realises that Mmadiatheng is accompanied by the three other characters, Mamello, Kakatjhelana and Qhobela. Now that all the nocturnal visitors are together in the kitchen with Mmadiatheng; Mamello addresses them in the following verbal interaction:

“Mme Mmadiatheng, le lona bontate, ke kopa hore le mphe sebaka sa ho bua ho fihlela ke qeta puo ya ka. Hang ka mora moo ke tla be ke kena tseleng hape ho ya batla tjako kaekae. Ke ne ke hopotse ho tsohella tsela hoseng, empa ke fumana ho ntokela ho tsamaya le hara masiu tjena hobane, le ha ke ne ke fihla mona, ke ne ke ntse ke tsamaya hara mafifi. Le ntate enwa a ka mpakela.” (O supa Radihlaba) (Act IX: scene ii)

[Mother Mmadiatheng, and you fathers, I appeal to you for giving me an opportunity for speaking until I complete my talk. Immediately thereafter I will get onto the road once more for seeking a sojourn somewhere else. I had thought of waking up early for the road tomorrow, but I find it befitting for me to travel during this night because, even as I arrived

here, I was travelling through the darkness. Even this father can vouch for me. (She points at Radihlaba)]

In the light of the deceit she was fed about Mamello's being Qhobela's niece; Mmadiatheng attempts to persuade Mamello to change her attitude and behaviour, saying, "Hao Mamello ngwanaka, malomao o tla reng jwale haele mona o se o ngala le hara masiu tjee?" (Act IX: scene ii) [Please Mamello my child, what will your uncle say now that you even sulk in the nights like this?] Since Mamello is intent on exposing these characters for what they really are, she refutes Mmadiatheng's seeming understanding that Qhobela is her uncle and says:

"Mme Mmadiatheng, ntate enwa ha se malome (O supa Qhobela) Hantlentle, ke motjhaufa wa ka. Ke bile ka mo dumela, e le ha a ne a mpoella hore mona tulong ena, hore motho wa mosadi a fumane mosebetsi, o tlameha ho ba kgarebe ya motho ya nang le matla a ho fana ka mosebetsi pele." (Act IX: scene ii)

[Mother Mmadiatheng, this father is not my uncle (She points at Qhobela) In reality, he is my lover. I ended up accepting his proposal, as he was telling me that at this place, for a female person to obtain a job, she has to first be a girlfriend to someone with such powers to offer a job.]

Indeed, Mamello's revelation of the truth surrounding the present relations between herself and Qhobela is quite persuasive for people to change their attitudes and behaviours. Clearly her persuasive goal is for them to change such character dispositions that cause pain to the other sex – as women find themselves forced to gallivant with these men for satisfying their male egos and superiority. But it would seem that, for Radihlaba, the act of buying jobs through submission to men's demands is not the real reason behind the prevailing decadence in the village – as he poses this question: "Jwale mohatsaka Mosidi yena mosebetsi o tla o fuwa neng hoba le yena ke phofu ya kweta sena se Qhobela? Kapa yena o se a nenwa hoba e se e le kgaba le ileng?" (Act IX: scene ii) [Then when is my wife, Mosidi, going to be offered a job as she is also the victim of this criminal called Qhobela? Or is she now being shunned because she is already regarded as an aged one?] Even though Radihlaba might be asking this as a genuine question concerning job-finding; for Mmadiatheng, Radihlaba is driving his persuasive goal of poking Qhobela and cause the two of them to fight over Mosidi. Sensibly therefore, Mmadiatheng scolds Radihlaba, saying: "Hao Radihlaba hle, a ko butle. Nna ha ke rate ha le ka lwanela mona ha ka." (Act IX: scene ii) [No Radihlaba please, take it easy! I do not want you people to fight here at my home.]

Mmadiatheng's foregoing ridicule over Radihlaba apparently works as a persuasive attempt for Mamello to once more take over – as she had initially asked all these characters to allow her to speak her mind to the end without any interruption. She therefore continues her talk as follows:

“Enwa yena he, (O supa Kakatjhelana) ke sera se seholo sa enwa (O supa Qhobela). Motseng mona ba nkelana metjhaufa. Ke bile ka lelekwa ha ntate enwa (O supa Radihlaba), e le ha mohatsa hae, ya neng a ikutswa le enwa (O supa Qhobela hape), a se a nkane le enwa (O supa Kakatjhelana), ka mora ho belaela hore nna ke se ke thetsane le enwa (O supa Qhobela hape). Taba tsena kaofela di nkgopotsa mantswe ao nkileng ka a phetelwa ke ntate enwa (O supa Radihlaba), ha ke ne ke teana le yena mane kgorong ya motse, e le motho ya palehong, a balehela manyofonyofo a kang ona ana. Kajeno ke a makala ha ke mmona a se a kgutletse hona manyofonyofong ana ao a neng a re o a a balehela. Ebile ke buile ho lekane.” (Act IX: scene ii)

[This one then, (She points at Kakatjhelana) is a great enemy of this one (She points at Qhobela). In this village they deprive each other of lovers. I was even expelled from this father's home (She points at Radihlaba), as his wife, who was secretly gallivanting with this father (She points at Qhobela again), was now involved with this one (She points at Kakatjhelana), after suspecting that I was already taken up with this one (She points at Qhobela again). All these matters remind me of some words that were related to me by this father (She points at Radihlaba), when I met him there at the village summit, as someone that was on the run, running away from the same decadences as these ones. Today I am surprised to realise that he has come back to the same bad disorders that he claimed to flee from. And I have spoken enough.]

Indeed, there is no need to go into the other verbal interactions among all these characters; as Mamello's above persuasive communicative approach and expressions have successfully achieved her persuasive goal of fighting against this decadence by exposing all those who are involved in it. It therefore astonishes but little for all of these characters to explain the reasons behind their individual and collective attitudes and behaviours that have culminated into the present exposure and therefore loss of faces. Finally, these characters make individual promises of changing their bad attitudes and behaviours for the better. Even Qhobela promises that from today on he is going to adopt change – for he is aware that he has been the source of pain for all the husbands of the women he has been gallivanting with.

Finally, he asks for forgiveness from Radihlaba for gallivanting with his wife, Mosidi – as he had always deceived himself that the former was ignorant of that fact. In summary, all end up with knowledge and awareness that these seemingly unnecessary affairs hardly remain secrets; as most people deceive themselves that such is the situation.

CHAPTER 5

THE ANALYSIS OF SELECTED DRAMA TEXTS FROM 2000 TO 2006

5.1 INTRODUCTION

In this section I analyse the 2000 - 2006 selected drama texts, with an aim of discovering the issues that the characters of the period grapple with, and how they persuade each/one another in their endeavours for inducing a change of behaviours, beliefs or attitudes in various situations. The first of the two selected drama texts that I deal with in this chapter is Ramakau's *Ha le fahloe habeli* and the second one is *Leholimo la phetloa*.

5.2 HA LE FAHLOE HABELI

In *Ha le fahloe habeli* Ramakau grapples with issues that seem to worry him about the rate at which girls leave school and get into marriage prematurely. To make it worse, these girls usually elope with uneducated miners that only boast about the high salaries they earn in the mining industry – with nothing to fall back on when the mining industry shrinks and closes down some mines – and consequently leaving those miners jobless. This study is therefore going to analyse some persuasive strategies applied by the characters in this drama text for motivating others, and themselves sometimes, into changing their attitudes, beliefs and behaviours.

Ha le fahloe habeli has twenty characters altogether; including the following principal ones:

Litšabako/'Matšepo: The girl that leaves education and goes into marriage;

Senamele and **'Malitšabako:** Father and mother of Litšabako;

Mofammere: Litšabako's husband;

Khabele and **'Matsietso/'Mamofammere:** Father and mother of Mofammere; and

'Malerumo and **'Matšepe:** Women at Setlai's village.

It would seem that this drama text is set somewhere in the rural areas of Lesotho; where people's attitudes, behaviours and beliefs vary in matters concerning education and the wellbeing of the people. Whereas some people consider education as an important aspect that enables one to have access in self-development and national prosperity; there are those who consider it a waste of time – especially those who work/ed in the South African mines. For the latter category, and those who believe in their lifestyle and benefited in it, sending a child to school, especially a girl, is a waste of time. This kind of thinking seems to emerge from the fact that the mining sector started improving miners' salaries in the 1970s; as the Lesotho Government established a deferred pay fund for Lesotho miners. It follows therefore that the people who have negative views towards education would persuade some girls to

get married to these miners, for financial gain – while, on the contrary, those who believed in the power of education, would apply some conflicting kind of persuasion – that their girls stick to education and think of marriage later.

In the light of the foregoing situation, Ramakau's drama text opens up with an ensuing conflict between two families; one geared towards educating its daughter, while the other cares but little about education. The setting indicates that Khabele, Mofammere's father, is sitting in front of his house, eating some papa and chicken, when there arrives Senamele in fury; and without even greeting Khabele, says, "He monna Khabele! Ua bona ke u joetse! U imamele hantle monn'a heso. Ngoan'a ka o kae?" (Act I: scene i) [Hi you man Khabele! You see let me tell you! You should listen to yourself very well my fellow man. Where is my child?] In response, Khabele attempts to persuade Senamele to take it easy, but Senamele interrupts him, saying, "Se ke ua re ke ee butle. Ha kea tla bapala le uena 'na mona. Mphe ngon'a ka monna. U sebetse hakaakang?" (Senamele o tsamaea a furalla, a ronta ke khalefo.) (Act I: scene i) [Do not say that I should take it easy. I have not come here to play with you man. Give me my child man. How can you be so bold? (Senamele moves and makes about-turns with fury.)]

Unquestionably, Senamele has lost his child, the loss which, it would seem, had something to do with Khabele; possibly that is what motivates him to refrain from listening to Khabele's pleadings for him to take it easy. It would therefore be correct for one to assume that Senamele applies fury as an attempt at persuading Khabele to reveal the whereabouts of his child. From there on the following verbal exchanges are employed as persuasive actions between Senamele and Khabele:

Khabele: Litaba lia buisanoa le hoja ke bona u fihla u se u halefile hakana. [Matters are to be discussed even though you arrive already so furious.]

Senamele: Khabele! Khabele! (Oa mo atamela, o mo supa ka monoana, o tsokotsa monoana o supang mahlong a Khabele.) Ua tseba keng? U tla ... u tla nkenya tsietsing. (Mosali oa Khabele o tsoa ka tlung a ntse a sihletsa tjale thekeng.) Mphe ngoan'a ka hle monna pele ke tlola molao. U moikhantši e mokaaka'ng? [Khabele! Khabele! (He comes closer to him, points a finger at him, and shakes the finger that is pointing at Khabele's eyes.) You know what? You will ... you will put me into danger. (Khabele's wife comes out of the house while working on something hidden in the shawl along the waist.) Give me my child man please, before I trespass the law. Are you such an arrogant man?]

'Matsietso: Ona joale ha se mokhoa oa ho sebetse litaba. Hoo e seng eka ntate Khabele ha se monna e mong. [Now this is not the way of working out matters. So much that it seems father Khabele is not another man.]

Senamele: Thola uena! (O khorohela ho eena a ntšitse mahlo linameng.) Mosali ka mese e leshome! Ke tla u tlotlolla hamphehali haholo. U tloaele monna enoa oa hao hampe, e seng 'na. Ha ke kenoe ke basali ka tšeeng 'na. [You shut up! (He rushes towards her with starring eyes.) A woman with ten dresses! I shall terribly embarrass you. You should get accustomed with this husband of yours, not me. As for me women do not get into my drawers.]

'Matsietso: (O checha hanyenyane a itšoere thekeng, a ntse a suma ka linko.) Joale u rata ho nkotla? [(She retreats a little while holding herself on the waist, heavily exhaling through the nose.) Now you want to hit me?]

Senamele: Le joale, ehlile ke tla u metletsa ha u ntloaela. (Act I: scene i) [It is so, indeed I shall hit you if you get accustomed to me.]

Whereas one might have been wondering about the matter that has contributed towards this strife all along; now Senamele turns towards Khabele once more and the crux of the matter emerges as he directs the following questions to him:

“Ak'u mpoelle monna Khabele, ha ngoana oa hao a shobelisitse ngoana oa ka, na ke toka hore matsatsi a be a be mabeli 'na mong'a ngoana ke sa tsebe letho? Haufi moo ha Lenka moo u sa nkeng letsatsi ha u palame pere? Khele monna? Ebe ha u potlake ua re ke batlele ha hao? Joale ebe ke ntse ke tloma, ke ea koa le koa, uena u ntse u patile ngoana oa ka moo ha hao? Motho e moholo joaloka uena oa litaba?”
(Act I: scene i)

[Please tell me man Khabele, when your child has caused my child to elope with him, is it fare that two days even go by while I the owner of the child know nothing? So near at Lenka's where you do not even take a day when riding a horse? Khele man? And you do not hurry up and say that I should direct my search towards your home? And now I have to grow stupidly about, going to and fro, while you keep on hiding my child here at your home? Such a grown up person of matters?]

Indeed Senamele has reason enough to be so furious with Khabele; for it is clearly spelt out in the foregoing questions that two days have passed since the latter's son has caused the former's daughter to elope with him – yet the latter seems to have not even cared to take action and inform the former accordingly. Nonetheless, up to this juncture Senamele has failed to apply upfront persuasion for Khabele to reflect on and change his attitude and behaviour. Indubitably, Senamele's primary goal is to provoke Khabele and cause him to release his daughter without any waste of time. That is why he initially fails to apply any sort of upfront persuasive action with Khabele. It would seem therefore that Senamele's persuasive plan has been that of coercing Khabele into releasing his daughter without any

form of upfront persuasion. In any case, the foregoing questions that he poses towards Khabele form the base of persuasive action for Khabele to reflect and respond accordingly.

But in response, Khabele fails to address himself to the ensuing questions; and pleads for forgiveness, saying, “Thupa shapa fatše bo! Le bahlalefi ba re phoso e tsamaea le mohatisi.” (Act I: scene i) [Let the stick beat the ground please! Even the wise ones say that to err is human.] Apparently, Khabele’s employment of the proverbial expressions, ‘thupa shapa fatše’ and ‘phoso e tsamaea le mohatisi,’ is meant for an attempt at persuading Senamele to calm down and forgive him; as he accepts that he has erred by failing to inform him accordingly and timely. As one might have expected, for Senamele, Khabele’s pleadings for forgiveness and accepting his own action as human error infuriates him worse; for he now considers Khabele’s response as some display of arrogance. Further, for Senamele, Khabele is an arrogant man with no shame for his attitude and behaviour – as he purposely makes irritating mistakes and relies on the foregoing pleadings. It then comes not as surprise that he even strikes Khabele on the chest with his finger; as a sign of anger and seeming intention to hit him, or challenge him into some form of retaliation.

Furthermore, Senamele pronounces his main concern and attempts to persuade Khabele to understand his plight in these words, “Na ke lete thojane masiu a mabeli, ke se ke be ka bo hlotha ke nahana ka thata.” (Act I: scene i) [I watch with initiated girl for two nights, never catching any sleep as I think deeply.] The employment of the foregoing idiomatic expression, ‘ho leta thojane,’ emanates from a situation in which girl initiates come off the initiation school; whereby some relatives would stay throughout the night with them, “ho fihlela hosasa ha tsatsi le tla chaba” [till morning at sunrise], according to Sekese (1988:15). It would then follow that, for Senamele to have been in that situation for two full days/nights has been overpowering. Further still, in an attempt at persuading Khabele to compare and contrast his (Khabele’s) situation with his plight (Senamele’s); Senamele says:

“Uena u thakhalle hamonate, u khakhathise mahanana a rorang mororo oa therekere ana, joale ‘na ke sotlehe. Ke mathe ke tlale le metse ke batla ngoana eo e ka ‘nang eaba o retluoe. Uena u pharame hamonate, ebe u ntse u nyofa namanyana tse nkhang tsena ha hao mona.” (O khotla sekotlolo ka molamu, namanyana li pulukana fatše mane.) (Act I: scene i)

[You enjoyably stretch out your legs, while you repeatedly beat these nose chambers of yours that roar like a tractor, whereas I am troubled. I run around through the villages looking for a child that might have been murdered. You enjoy sitting at ease, and continue eating greedily these smelling pieces of meat here at your home. (He

strikes the dish with a fighting stick, and pieces of meat get soiled there on the ground.)]

Realizably, the foregoing comparisons and contrasts between Khabele's situation and Senamele's plight persuade one to identify with Senamele – as he has spent two sleepless nights, busily searching all over for a girl that he at times even thought that she were murdered. As Khabele's present situation in which Senamele finds him here suggests, he is at ease and enjoying his meal; while Senamele is in agony for losing his daughter for two full days without any information from Khabele as the father to the man who has caused the elopement in question. One would tend to presume that, had Senamele not come to look for her here, Khabele might not even bother himself about taking the initiative to go and inform Senamele accordingly – which marks him as a rather insensitive and arrogant character in these circumstances. In the light of this understanding, one regards Senamele's fury as justifiable; even as he applies the following stinging expressions as may be observed above, 'Uena u thakhalla hamonate, u khakhathisa mahanana a rorang mororo oa therekere ana,' and 'uena u pharame ... u ntse u nyofa namanyana tse nkhang tsena ...'

It would therefore seem that Senamele's secondary goal at this juncture is to provoke Khabele into losing temper and fight, if he dares; for he realises that his primary goal for coming over to Khabele's home, as was indicated earlier above, is rather hard to achieve. In line with this view, one may dare say that Senamele's action of striking Khabele's dish with his fighting stick is applied as an action of defiance and coercive attempt for the latter to take action; either of defending himself or bringing the eloped girl to the father in hunt. Testimony to this assumption emerges in the following persuasive verbal exchanges between Khabele and Senamele:

Khabele: (Oa ema ekare o tla iphetetsa, o qamaka samokana eka o batla se ka otlang le eena.) Hona joale ke tlolo ea molao ntate Senamele. [(He stands up as if to retaliate, looks around as if looking for something to hit back with too.) Now this is transgression of law father Senamele.]

Senamele: Ha u cha u qhome. U ntse u re ntat'ao Senamele? Ke ngoana oa ka enoa eo qhene-marapo ena ea hao e nyalang e nyalolla, e tlang e mo hohobisa mona ha hao. Ebile! Ke utloa u ntena ho feta khopo tsa khoho. Butle! Ke tla u ruta hore ke Senamele, ha ke 'Masenamele. (O phopholetsa lipokotho o ntša mollo, oa lelala, oa tloeba.) Ke tla chesa ntho e kang ntloan'a 'Mamasianoke ena u tl'u ntsebe hore kea tšepahala. (O tloeba hape. H'a isa letsoho marulelong Khabele oa o bulula a o tima.) (Act I: scene i) [If you get burned you should jump up. You keep on saying your father Senamele? It is my child that this here tight-belts of yours who gets in and out of marriage, comes causing her to creep here at your

home. And! I feel that you disgust me more than chicken ribs. Wait! I shall teach you that I am Senamele, and not Mother-of-Senamele. (He searches the pockets, looks up, and lights.) I am going to burn this thing that looks like a hammerhead's nest so that you should know that I am trustworthy. (He lights again. When he stretches the hand towards the roof Khabele blows it out.)]

At this moment, 'Matsietso runs towards Motlalepula's home to call for assistance, saying, "Ntate Motlalepula! Ntate Motlalepula thusa! Koeta ke sena se chesa ntlo ea ka." (Act I: scene i) [Father Motlalepula! Father Motlalepula help! Here is a criminal burning my house.] It would appear that 'Matsietso's foregoing outcry is meant for persuading Motlalepula to come and help with an understanding that he is to deal with a criminal; as contained in 'Koeta ke sena se chesa ntlo ea ka.' It then comes not as surprise that the first words Motlalepula says when he arrives at the supposed scene of crime that he has quickly run to are, "Butle bo ntate, u futuhela batho malapeng a bona molato ke'ng?" (Act I: scene i) [Please take it easy father, why attack people at their homes?] As he says these words, Motlalepula gets in between Senamele and Khabele; seemingly with the aim of persuading the so-called criminal to change his attitude and behaviour. Since Senamele appears to be intent on coercing Khabele to release his daughter without any persuasive negotiations with him; he strikes Khabele with the fighting stick; causing him a gaping wound.

Needless to say, Senamele has applied pure coercion against Khabele. Even so, this coercive action seems not to have produced the desired results; for Khabele hardly takes action to bring out Litšabako out of the house as Senamele tends to hope. Then, as if to instill more fear into Khabele, Senamele boastfully quips as follows: "Khale ke u joetsa hore ke tla u natha. (O akhela kobo lehetleng oa ikonka.) Ha ke chesa mehotsoana ee ea hao u tima mollo oa ka, empa u tella hakaale-kaale. Nka loana hore ho sale lefufuru la ka feela hona joale." (Act I: scene i) [I have long been telling you that I shall hit you. (He throws his blanket over the shoulder and struts around.) As I burn these travellers' shelters of yours you blow off my match, and yet you are so much spiteful. I can fight so much that only my bristle would remain right now.] Even as Motlalepula pleads with him to curb his anger, as it will cause him to continue trespassing the law; Senamele hardly responds to such pleadings; rather he calls out Litšabako and instructs her to come out of the house, saying, "Tsoa pele ke bontša mekhoha ea ka eo u e tsebang. Tsoa! Tsoa Litšabako!" (Act I: scene i) [Come out before I demonstrate my behaviour that you know. Come out! Come out Litšabako!]

Ultimately, Litšabako comes out wearing the newly wed daughter-in-law's garments. Though he might be appreciating his daughter's positive response to his call for coming out; Senamele appears to be disgusted by the sight of her wearing these garments; as realizable in his quip, "Ke'ng ntho tseo u li apereng tsee uena? U tla li hlobola ho se tjee. Moo u eang

ke sekolong. U rutehile u tla u metla-metla mona kamora' koata ena hoba u rata lichelete haholo." (Act I: scene i) [What are these things that you are wearing you? You will peel them off as matters will no more remain as they are now. Where you are going is to school. You are educated yet you come here stupidly running after this uncultured guy because you are so fond of monies.] Indeed, it would seem that Litšabako has agreed to elope with an uneducated man with the reputation of marrying a series of women, one after the other; not for the sake of love itself, but was persuaded by the possession of monies he is said to have. In other words, she has had hopes of enjoying Mofammere's financial status.

Obviously, Litšabako has now come out of the house, not due to any form of upfront persuasion from her father; but due to his coercive means. One even wonders whether or not she would have otherwise come out of the house; had Senamele applied any form of upfront persuasive attempts. Since Senamele's primary goal was to come and retrieve his daughter from this place without applying any upfront persuasive means with Khabele; one might dare say that his coercive means were guaranteed to achieve his goal without failure; as he now goes home with his daughter. As Motlalepula, 'Matsietso and Khabele are now standing agape at the door post; Senamele gets an opportunity to once more address himself to Khabele, saying, "U phuthe Ramootleng eno oa hao uena Khabele. Haeso ke mane ha Setlai 'na, ke tla mo ruta moo letsatsi le hlahang h'a ka ba a pheta a ea nka ngoana enoa, enoa, o ea sekolong Junifesthi, mh! Ua tseba Junifesthi uena ha u le tjee? O ea Roma – koana, ha Maama. U 'mamele. Litšabako o pasitse kamporichi ke u joetse. Ha se koata." Then he addresses Litšabako, saying, "Ha re ee uena!" (Oa mo chofa.) (Act I: scene i) [You should collect that Ramootleng of yours you Khabele. My home is there at Setlai's me, I shall teach him where the sun rises if he dares repeat to once more take this child of mine, this one, is going to school at the University, eh! Do you know the University you as you are like this? She is going to Roma – there, at Maama's. You should listen to me. Litšabako has passed Cambridge let me tell you. She is not uncultured.] [Let us go you! (He pushes her.)]

Even if up to this moment it has not been clear why Senamele decided to employ coercive means for retrieving his daughter from this elopement with Mofammere; it now becomes very clear what his problems are in connection with this marriage. In accordance with his final address to Khabele above, it is significant that, whereas Khabele's son is an uneducated and uncultured man who keeps on marrying one woman after the other; Senamele's daughter has just successfully gone through her Cambridge Overseas school certificate and therefore eligible for University education. It would therefore also suggest that whereas Mofammere is a man that works in the mines and experienced in luring women into marriage through his financial wellbeing; Litšabako is an inexperienced young girl with possibly no idea of the kind of life she gets herself into. It would therefore seem that Senamele realises that he has duty

to protect his daughter against this exploitation by 'Ramootleng,' as he has just called him, by all possible means; including coercion, if it has to come to that.

It is interesting to observe the kind of persuasive exchanges employed by Senamele and Litšabako on the way home. Since it is a rather long way to walk from ha Lenka to ha Setlai, father and daughter rest at a well near the road, and engage in the following verbal persuasive exchanges:

Senamele: Ha re robe monakeli pel'a seliba mona. Ke ntse ke e-na le lipabi ka mojarong oa ka ka mona. Feela e-re ke noe pele, ke felile ke lenyora. (O inamela ka selibeng oa noa.) Lipabi tsela tsa ka li kae? [Let us take rest here at the well. I still have some roasted maize meals in that luggage of mine. But let me drink first, I am dying with thirst. (He bows into the well and drinks.) Where are those roasted maize meals of mine?]

Litšabako: Le 'na ke nyoriloe. (Oa inama oa noa.) [I am also thirsty. (She bows and drinks.)]

Senamele: U hle u noe 'ona metsi ano. Ha e le lipabi tsena tsa ka u ke ke be ua li bona. (O li lochetsa ka hanong.) Ke rata u lape joaloka 'na. Ha ke e-s'o je haesale e le maobane, ke touta hore na ebe ke tla u fumana. Ak'u bone maoto a ka! A ruruhile ke ho phaila. [You should drink just that water. As for these roasted maize meals of mine you shall never see. (He swallows them all.) I want you to be as hungry as I am. I have never eaten since yesterday, being worried as to whether I will find you. Just look at my feet! They are swollen due to roaming.]

Litšabako: Ntate ha ke re u fihlile u se u halefile, joale re ne re tla u ngoathela joang? Le nama e ne e le ngata mono nka be ke u ... [Father since you arrived already in fury, how could we have served you some food? Even the meat was plenty there I could have ...]

Senamele: Nama! Ha ke e batle le ho e batla nama ea likatana tse shobang ngoan'a ka mane le ntle le ho buisana le 'na. Ha u bone ha ke ile ka e qhalla koaa Khabele a ntse a e ja? Ha ke li batle le lijonyana tsa bona. (Act I: scene ii) [Meat! I do not even want the meat of those rags that bind my child over there without even talking to me. Don't you see that is why I spilled it there while Khabele was still eating? I do not even want their food.]

In summary, the foregoing verbal exchanges between Senamele and Litšabako have some persuasive attempts in which both father and daughter apply some strategies for the other to change their attitudes, behaviours and beliefs. For example, Senamele persuades Litšabako to rest with him so that they may also use this moment for drinking some water. Before he drinks, Senamele remarks about the hunger that has been gnawing at him for two days – seemingly in an attempt at persuading Litšabako to be aware of the pain and suffering she has caused him, due to her act of eloping with Mofammere unceremoniously. Further, Senamele shows Litšabako his swollen feet and indicates to her that this swelling has been

the result of his roaming for two days in search of her; once more apparently in an endeavour to persuade her to stop her unbecoming behaviour that causes him so much painful suffering. Even as Litšabako bows into the well to drink, Senamele quips that she should end at drinking that water, as he is not prepared to share his roasted maize meals with her – in this case trying to persuade her to share the same suffering he has experienced up to now; including this painful hunger. In general, Senamele's persuasive communication with Litšabako is meant for her changing her attitude and behaviour of running after monies; rather than pursuing education.

Whereas one might expect Litšabako to show some remorse in her being the source of her father's sufferings; she retorts that Senamele had given them no opportunity to serve him with food; and adds that there was also plenty meat in the house. While one might assume that her purpose in her retort is to counter-persuade Senamele to change his behaviour and attitude in this matter; the mention of meat being plenty sparks Senamele's anger. In this way Litšabako's remark leads him into indicating as to how much he hates that family and their meat, adding that it is the reason behind his striking Khabele's dish and the spillage of that meat. In other words, Senamele indicates to his daughter that since Khabele's family has wronged him so much by not even informing him about the elopement of her to their family; he hates them to an extent that he dares not even eat their food, no matter how hungry he may be.

Since Litšabako seems not to understand the reasons why her father hates even those people's food; Senamele lectures her as follows in an endeavour at persuading her to wise up and change her attitude and behaviour:

“Ho na le ntho eo u sa e hlokomeleng ka potso tse na tsa hao tse ngata. U ngoana e monyenyanane haholo ea e-s'ong ho ithute bophelo ba lenyalo la kajeno. Lona bana le hlahlile mahlo, le baleha lithuto, haholo le matha kamora' lichelete le sa lemohe moo taba ena ea lichelete e isang teng. Ho monate kajeno ha hlakana-hlooana sena se ntse se u betlela meno empa hosasa, ke phela kapa ke shoele, u tla hopola taba tse na tseo ke ntseng ke li bua tse na.” (Act I: scene ii)

[There is something that you are not aware of with these numerous questions of yours. You are a very small child that has not yet learned about today's marriage life. You children have your eyes out, running away from education, mostly running after monies without realizing where this matter of monies takes you to. It is enjoyable today as this lunatic keeps on showing his teeth for you yet tomorrow, whether I shall be living or dead, you will remember this issues that I am discussing.]

It would seem that even though Senamele's above persuasive communication with Litšabako is meant for her to realise the danger that she is likely to experience in life, if she continues behaving in this strain; for Litšabako the whole matter did not warrant him to fight; as she asks, "Na ke hoo u ka bang ua loana ntate?" (Act I: scene ii) [But is it so much that you can even fight father?] In contrast with Litšabako's view above, Senamele responds in this manner, "Ke ntse ke bontša hore u ngoana, u phela ka ho joetsoa. Mamele 'na. Hona joale ha nka u botsa hore na mosali oa Mofammere oa pele o kae, u tla sitoa ho nkaraba. Na ua tseba?" (Act I: scene ii) [I still indicate to you that you are a child, you depend on being informed. Listen to me. Right now if I were to ask you where Mofammere's first wife is, you will not be able to answer me. Do you know?] Needless to say, Litšabako has no answer to this question; for she is still a school going child with no information in matters of this kind. All she can say in response is, "Ache!" (Act I: scene ii) [an interjection indicating one's tight corner]

Capitalizing on Litšabako's uninformed position, Senamele lectures her more, so that she may be persuaded to change her behaviour; stressing the following points to prove to her that her elopement with men of Mofammere's caliber portends danger for her future, indicating to her that:

- Mofammere is older than her by a big margin of many years;
- Mofammere has cast off his wife;
- The very wife in question was a good person;
- She was also a respecting person even to her in-laws;
- She worked very hard and performed all family chores correctly; and
- Due to Mofammere's bad behaviour and his continuous beatings;
- She was forced to run away from his home;
- He (Senamele) even struck Khabele as a sign of disgust for his failure to discuss the matter with the parents of that woman; and therefore
- In essence, Mofammere is still married to that woman in question; even though he has caused Litšabako to elope with him.

In short, all these points that Senamele has just drawn up for Litšabako are meant for an action to persuade her to refrain from associating with the likes of Mofammere and his family; for she may end up experiencing the same repercussions through which Mofammere's wife has gone; and find herself with no alternative but to pull herself out of that marriage. While one would expect Litšabako to be positively persuaded by the foregoing lecture; this is not

the case with her. Instead, she retorts that Mofammere told her that the wife in question was a bad person with bad behaviour. As might be expected, this retort infuriates Senamele; for it clearly illustrates his daughter's naivety in matters concerning marital relations; and the attitude of Mofammere's kind to cast blame upon the character that might not even have the opportunity to defend itself.

In line with that blame casting; Senamele cautions Litšabako that the same blame will be used as her name in a few days time; if she goes back to that marriage. In order for her to be clearly persuaded into refraining from associating with Mofammere's types anymore; Senamele tells Litšabako that such is the style of cruel and sadistic individuals who always point their fingers at the innocent person; as a way of hiding their own by far despicable actions. In order for Litšabako to clearly understand how such people operate, and to persuade her to wise up; Senamele poses the question, "Tsa hae o tla u joetsa tsona neng?" (Act I: scene ii) [When is he going to tell you his own actions/issues?] Instead of answering the question above, Litšabako responds as follows: "Empa ntate le 'm'e, le bona baa mo pakela hore ..." (Act I: scene ii) [But father and mother, also support him that ...]

In the light of Litšabako's unfinished statement above, it would seem that Senamele's fury has been sparked up somehow; for he interrupts her saying:

"Ema hona moo. Ua tseba ke u joetse Litšabako ... nka! (O lokisa molamu.) Nka u arola hloonyana ena, ua fella hona nahathothe mona. 'M'ao le ntat'ao ke bafe? (O khitla fatše ka molamu.) U na le 'm'ao le ntat'ao ha Lenka koa? U se ke be ua ntšenyha maikutlo. Nka u fetohela hampe haholo hona joale" (Act I: scene ii)

[Stop right there. You know what I tell you Litšabako ... I can! (He prepares the fighting stick.) I can cut this small head of your into half, so that you end up here in the wilderness. Who are your mother and father? (He strikes the ground with the fighting stick.) Do you have your mother and father there at Lenka's? Please do not spoil my feelings. I can badly turn against you right now.]

Needless to say, Senamele's fury has been sparked by Litšabako's reference to 'Matsietso and Khabele as 'ntate le 'm'e,' which, in essence indicates that she already regards them as her mother and father (i.e., her in-laws). In this way it would seem that she is intent on getting married to Mofammere; regardless of Senamele's coercive and persuasive attempts for her to change her attitude and behaviour. It therefore comes not as surprise that Senamele even threatens to cut her head into half and leave her for dead in the wilderness. He seemingly understands that his coercive and persuasive actions in this matter might end up being futile; as she already considers herself as a daughter-in-law to that family.

As one might have expected, Litšabako pleads for forgiveness, but does not end there. Rather, she quips in this form, “U ntšoarele ntate ke ne ke nahana hore tlhompho eo u nkholisitseng ka eona ke tšoanetse ho e sebelisa hohle moo ke leng teng.” (Act I: scene ii) [Please forgive me father I thought that the respect with which you brought me up was meant for me to use everywhere I am.] Seemingly, Senamele considers Litšabako’s above statement as registering her defiance against him; for he responds in the following manner:

“Hona ha se tlhompho ke ho nyamoleha. Ha ke thetsoe ka fura la ntja, ha ke ngoana. U nahana hore nka u tsoala ua khutla ua ba le maele a fetang a ka? Ha u na ho nthoka mahloan’a naketsana ngoan’aka. Hantle u bolela hore malume a ‘ntate’ le ‘m’e’ ee ea ha ke a utloe hore na a bolela’ng? Ha ‘na ke ntse ke u bontša mabaka, uena u leletse feela ho bontša hore u nts’u tla ‘ne u ee hona selomong sane seo ke ntseng ke u thiba hore u se oele ho sona.” (Act I: scene ii)

[This is not respect but evil doing without shame. I am not to be deceived with a fat of a dog, I am not a child. You think I can bear you and then you turn back possessing more wisdom than mine? You cannot play fool of me my child. By the way do you want to say that the sounds of these ‘ntate’ and ‘m’e’ of yours are not clear to me what they mean? While I am busy showing you reasons, you merely lift up your eyes to indicate that you are still going to go to that very precipice to which I try to stop you from falling over.]

Indubitably, Senamele’s display of wisdom here has unearthed deep intentions of Litšabako. First and foremost, Senamele employs diction and idiomatic expressions above for Litšabako to change her behaviour of believing in Mofammere and his family. The idea of ‘ho nyamoleha’ presupposes that Litšabako has malicious intentions of deceiving Senamele without shame, while she intends going against his inspirations about her future. In order to make her realise that he is aware of her deep intentions; Senamele makes reference to ‘fura la ntja,’ thus showing her the hollowness in her lying – in this case persuading her to be realistic of actual life; rather than being a mere believer in deceit. Finally, Senamele gives Litšabako a warning that he foresees her intentions of going back to the same ‘selomo’ against his lectures of real life.

As for Litšabako, she can hardly respond to the above persuasive analysis of her quips. All she says in response is merely “Che ntate” (Act I: scene ii) [No father], without any supportive argument towards her denial; which functions as a clear indication that her father has analysed her statement correctly. Not surprisingly, Senamele strikes her with his elbow, seemingly as a persuasive attempt for her to be realistic of the fact that he has the ability and wisdom enough to decipher her quips and discover their deeper meanings. In an attempt at

disputing her negation and persuading her to end whatever pretence she may have aimed at; Senamele plays around with words as follows: “Ke che! Che ea ntho-’ngoe? Ho cheoa linonyana moo?” (Act I: scene ii) [I should ensnare! Ensnare of what? Are birds being ensnared here?]

In the light of the above word play, Senamele repeats his analysis of the sounding of ‘ntate’ and ‘m’e’ as pronounced by Litšabako above and says:

“Ha u tšoanetse hore u re ntate Khabele kapa ‘m’e ‘Mamofammere, ha u rialo hoba ka tsela e poteletseng u rata ho mpontša hore batho bana u ba nkile e le bo-matsal’ao. Batho bohle bao eseng ‘na le ‘Malitšabako, bona u re ntate ‘Nyeo, ‘m’e ‘Mannyeo. Hona joale u senya puo ea ka eo ke nahanang hore ke ea bohlokoa ha ke re lenyalo la kajeno ha le batle ho tateloa le ho fofonkeloa. Letsatsi le letsatsi, tsatsi le chabang le le likelang, ho thoe Maseru mane ‘Maseterata o ntse a ketletsaka manyalo a obu-obu tse kang uena tjena tse nang le bo-’m’a tsona le bo-ntat’a tsona hohle mona.” (Act I: scene ii)

[When you are supposed to say father Khabele or mother ‘Mamofammere, you do not say so because in a hidden manner you want to show me that you regard these people as your in-laws. All the people besides me and ‘Malitšabako, to them you say father so-and-so or mother so-and-so. Right now you spoil my talk that I think is of importance when I say that today’s marriage deserves no rushing into and untimely getting into. Day by day, everyday that rises and sets, it is said that there in Maseru the Magistrate keeps on cutting off marriages of dupes such you who have their mothers and fathers all over the place.]

Indeed Senamele has correctly analysed Litšabako’s expressions. One might even tend to suspect that given a chance she is still going to run after Mofammere again; as she already regards his parents as her in-laws. Upon realizing the extent to which her father can positively analyse her expressions, Litšabako pleads for forgiveness, saying, “Oele! Ke se ke soabile ntate hle.” (Act I: scene ii) [Oh! I am already sorry father please.] In line with Senamele’s analysis of her expressions above, Litšabako now realises that her father has a full comprehension of her feelings and intentions concerning her elopement with Mofammere; which makes her feel embarrassed and forced to plead for forgiveness, as her above statement indicates.

But, be that as it may, Senamele is not easily persuaded by such pleadings. For him, Litšabako is a liar that deserves to be properly lectured in matters affecting today’s marriages that usually turn sour as time goes by. Indicating that her Cambridge certificate has merely

struck the surface of today's life issues, Senamele turns himself into a self-made lecturer, and delivers the following lecture:

“Ke ne ke u hlaha thusong hore mona hae kapa metseng, basali ba siea banna ba tlola terata. Ke bane mek'huk'hung ea Africa-Boroa koana. Maseru mane, 'Maseterata sekere o tšoere se mona se khaolang liketane, ho khaola manyalo ana a sekajeno. Ke bua ka manyalo a masoeu e seng boitheri bo kang bona ba hao le bo-Mofammere. 'Ona a masoeu ao, ke 'ona a pongoang le selemo se e-s'o fele. Ka mabaka ana, 'na ke ne ke re u rutehe, e tle e re lenyalo ha le u bapala phupe ka lefe, ebe u na le sesireletso, sesireletso sa thuto. (Oa ema o sheba morali ka mahlong a sa panye.) Ke thuto hobane ha sekatana se u bapala, se u ptjatlanya mane, thuto e tla sala e le monna oa hao. E tla sala e le tšimo ea hao e chaeang, e bile e tla sala e le nku ea hau ea boea le khomo e u lemelang, tsena tseo kajeno re seng re se na tsona. Thuto ea hao e tla ba morafu oo ereng koata ha e u lahla, ebe u sala u iphelisa ka oona. Ke supa Molimo ka menoana ea ka e 'meli ngoan'a ka, thuto ... thuto.” (O rialo a supile holimo ka meno e 'meli.) (Act I: scene ii)

[I was hereby trying to come to your assistance that here at home or in the villages, wives leave husbands and skip the fence. There they are at the shanties of South Africa. There in Maseru, the Magistrate holds among scissors that which cuts chains, to sever these today's marriages. I refer to white marriages not these self-planned ones of you and the Mofammers. Those very white ones, they are the ones that get severed even before the year ends. For these reasons, I would suggest that you become educated, so that when marriage plays some tricks for you (deceives you) you have some protection, educational protection. (He stands and stares into the eyes of the daughter without winking.) It is education because when the rag plays a fool of you, casting you far off there, education will remain as your husband. It will remain as your fertile field, and will remain as your wool-producing sheep and a bovine that ploughs for you, these that we no longer possess. Your education will be a mine that when the uncultured one casts you off, then you remain sustaining yourself through it. I point to God with my two fingers my child, education ... education. (He says so pointing the sky with his two fingers.)]

Needless to say, Senamele's lecture above is quite persuasive; as he makes reference to well known facts affecting today's marriages. In addition, he employs in it vivid images of how today's marriages are severed, that 'Maseru mane 'Maseterata sekere o tšoere se mona se khaolang liketane.' In this way, Senamele concretises the act of the magistrate performing divorces by applying the known to describe the unknown, so that this vivid image may be clear for Litšabako, and persuade her to adopt change of behaviour and attitude. In order for

her to regard this situation as a serious matter, Senamele makes reference to the notoriety of the planned white marriages that get severed within a year; thus apparently attempting to persuade Litšabako to imagine the extent to which these unplanned ones such as hers with Mofammere would culminate into. Further, Senamele puts his emphasis on the aspect of her being educated by staring into her eyes, so that she may see the depth of his convictions about education – apparently aiming at using this action as a strategy for persuading her to adhere to education and refrain from running into these unplanned early marriages.

In the light of the above intentions, Senamele employs metaphorical and pastoral image of 'lenyalo le u bapala pupe ka lefe' as a vivid image of the familiar to explain the unfamiliar aspect – thus attempting to persuade his daughter to understand that marriage has the notoriety of playing tricks with people that rushed into it without thought and proper planning. The idiomatic expression, 'ho bapala pupe ka lefe' derives its origin from the pastoral games in which players hide a certain object in one hand and challenges the opponent to guess the hand in which such an object is hidden; while the challenger plays certain tricks for dissuading the opponent. Senamele therefore uses this idiomatic expression for persuading Litšabako to realise that today's marriages are no different from that kind of game; for they are full of unexpected trickery.

Furthermore, Senamele makes reference to a man of Mofammere's kind as 'sekatana,' once more as a strategy for persuading Litšabako to notice that such men, who may be boasting about their monies today, may end up deteriorating into mere rags, when they have lost their jobs in the mining sector. Seemingly his persuasive aim is to make reference to education as 'sesireletso,' under which an educated person finds solace in times of strife; especially for one whose husband has cast her off. Further still, Senamele employs other concrete pastoral images that for him are no different from education; such as 'thuto e tla ba monna oa hao,' 'tšimo ea hao e chaeang,' 'nku ea hao ea boea' and 'khomo e u lemelang.' Indubitably, Senamele applies these metaphoric entities for persuading Litšabako to clearly observe that education is her guarantor that is similar to these possessions mentioned above; thus giving her an assurance that education will sustain her throughout her life. As if the above metaphoric representations were not enough for Litšabako to be sufficiently persuaded to adhere to education, rather than rushing into unplanned marriages, Senamele puts education in the category of a mining industry – seemingly to illustrate to her that education is about the biggest industry she should put her trust in. When he finally points his two fingers to the skies and pronounces that he is pointing at God as an entity that would vouch for him in this lecture, one might conclude that this is a persuasive strategy he employs for Litšabako to afford this matter all the seriousness it deserves.

Apparently, Litšabako has been mesmerised by this whole lecture; such that all she can say in response is, “Ke mametse ntate.” (Act I: scene ii) [I am listening father.] As for Senamele, her listening should be associated with understanding and a deep thought over these matters about which he has given her the lecture. Since he hereby persuades her to pursue education, Senamele informs her that, though he is uneducated himself, he is aware of the dire need for one to pursue education for self-sustenance. In order for her to understand the extent of concern he has for her, Senamele further cautions her that since today’s marriage is full of uncertainties, it might be better for him to let her experience it; saying, “Ha ke rata nka u tlohela ua ka ua kena ka seboping ua utloa.” (Act I: scene ii) [If I like I can let you go into the incubator and have the feel of it.] In line with his persuasive strategies that he has been using in his lecture, it would seem that Senamele’s reference to ‘sebopi’ is meant for persuading Litšabako to appreciate the action of forcing her out of this unplanned marriage even before it frustrates her.

In the light of the ensuing persuasion by her father, Litšabako is seemingly tired. As her persuasive measure for her father to stop walking so as to have some rest, she suggests that her feet are painful. It would appear that Litšabako’s suggestion that her feet are paining her functions as another kind of persuasion for her father to register his own complaint against her – that she is a rather inconsiderate and selfish girl that cares but little for his suffering as he has been walking over the two last days. As a persuasive measure for her to refrain from selfishness, he says to her, “U ithata u le mong ngoan’aka. Ha ke ne ke le uena nka be ke itse, ‘Ntate ekaba maoto a hao a opa ho joang?’” (Act I: scene ii) [You are selfish my child. If I were you I would have said, ‘By the way father how painful are your feet?'] Instead of responding to what her father has just said above, Litšabako suggests that they are about to reach home; and that she will warm up some water for fomenting her father’s feet. In this way, she persuades her father to rest assured that she will calm his feet by treating them accordingly when they arrive home. Rather than merely showing appreciation of the daughter’s suggestive offer of calming his feet; Senamele quips, “U ke u bone hore na ke mang ea neng a tla sala a ntlhokomela ka metsi ha u se u lelerile le motho ea khopo hakana, ebile u ile lapeng le fosahetseng hakana.” (Act I: scene ii) [Just imagine who would take care of me with water when you have loitered with such a cruel person, and having gone to such a wrong family.]

Needless to say, Senamele’s foregoing statement is meant for persuading his daughter to regard Mofammere as a cruel man that is capable of causing her harm in future; should she allow him to cause her to elope with him again. In addition, his reference to Mofammere’s family as a wrong one also works as a persuasive attempt for her to regard that family as such and stay away from it – in which case she would be in a position to continue schooling

for her future's sake. At this moment, as if by design, father and daughter meet Potlaki, a home fellow from their village; and the following verbal exchanges ensue:

Potlaki: Helang banna! U mo fumane kae motho oa Molimo? [Hullo guys! Where do you find her you God's person?]

Senamele: Ha Lenka koana. [There at Lenka's.]

Potlaki: Ngoana tooe! U sehloho hakaakang u mathisang ntat'ao hakale? [You child! How cruel are you to cause your father to run around so much?]

Senamele: Bana matsatsing a morao tjena ha ba na mohau ho batsoali ba bona ntate. (Act I: scene ii) [The modern days children have no mercy towards their parents, father.]

Indubitably, Potlaki wonders where Senamele found his daughter, as this is the third day since she disappeared; and he has feelings of pity for him; that is why he addresses Senamele as 'motho oa Molimo,' the reference which in Sesotho would normally be employed as a statement of sympathy and empathy. It therefore surprises one but little that he even addresses Litšabako with wonderment for the cruelty she has engaged in causing her father so much roaming about in her search. Apparently, Potlaki's remark in his address to Litšabako is meant for persuading her to consider her action as that of cruelty that she must never repeat; for it has caused her father much of unnecessary suffering. Since Senamele has so far proved himself as an analytic individual; his final remark above might also be regarded as a persuasive action for Litšabako to change her attitude and behaviour that might be described as an act of cruelty against parents.

Now that Litšabako has arrived home, it is of interest to observe how she interacts with her mother, 'Malitšabako; as they hereby exchange the following communicative expressions:

'Malitšabako: Ua fihla Matsoa-a-ikela. (O phumula sekotlolo ka fatuku, oa se beha o sheba Litšabako.) Ha u arabe? U ne u ile kae kajeno moo u sa re joetseng ra lumellana joaloka mehla? [There you arrive Matsoa-a-ikela (one that goes away as one wants.) (She wipes the dish with a cloth, puts it away and looks at Litšabako.) Don't you reply? Where had you gone to today that you do not tell us so as to agree as usual?]

Litšabako: Ke hoba ke ne ke nahana hore ntate o u boleletse. [It is because I had thought that father had informed you.]

'Malitšabako: U tsebe 'na ke ee ke rate hore ngoana a bue tseo a li entseng, e seng ke utloe litaba tsa hae ka motho e mong. Bua! U re u tsoa kae Litšabako? U nts'u sena meno? Ha ke bapale! [You should know that I prefer that a child divulges what she has done, not to hear about her matters from someone else. Speak up! Where do you say you come from Litšabako? You show your teeth? I am not playing!]

Litšabako: 'Na ke ee ke utloe u re ha u batle ho lula le mafetoa. Joale ke bona le nthohothelloa joalokaha eka ke entse mohlolo. [I have usually heard you say that you do not want to live with old maids. Now I realise that you are insistent on me as if I have performed a miracle.]

'Malitšabako: Hantle u lilemo li kae Litšabako? [By the way how old are you Litšabako?]

Litšabako: Li leshome le metso e tšeletseng. [I am sixteen years old.]

'Malitšabako: Joale u bona u se u lekane ho nyaloa? Toeba e kale ka uena Litšabako ha e sa batla lithuto, e se e batla ho nyaloa? (Act I: scene iii) [Do you now regard yourself as ready for marriage? A small mouse of your sise Litšabako no more wants education, but wants to get married?]

Basing oneself on the above communicative exchanges between mother and daughter, it becomes clear that Litšabako's disappearance from her home was a point of worry for her mother too – as Litšabako usually informs the parents of her movements. In the light of that understanding, 'Malitšabako calls her 'Matsoa-a-ikela' to signify the fact that this time she has acted like someone that is free to act as she pleases; thus seemingly attempting to persuade her to realise that she has misbehaved. In addition, it would also seem that 'Malitšabako's act of wiping a dish with a cloth is a symbolic persuasive action for Litšabako to realise that her behaviour of eloping with an uncultured miner is bad, such that she needs to be cleansed. Additionally still, 'Malitšabako confronts her daughter with the above questions concerning where she had gone to as an attempt at persuading her to divulge the whole information herself; that is why she ends up by using the remark, 'Ha ke bapale,' to signify the seriousness of this matter.

But then, instead of answering her mother's question, Litšabako divulges new information; that her mother has usually pronounced herself that she hates living with old maids; which may be regarded as the reason behind her eloping with Mofammere; for her mother's reference to old maids might have been suggestive and persuasive enough for her to quickly get married to whoever proposed to her. To prove the point that such a statement has usually been made by her, 'Malitšabako does not refute it; rather she inquires after Litšabako's age – seemingly as a persuasive measure for the daughter to be conscious of the fact that even so, her age is not congruent with that of the man she eloped with. Be that as it may, one can dare say that Litšabako's action of eloping with Mofammere at this early age of sixteen has somehow been instigated by her mother's above insinuating statement. Nonetheless, 'Malitšabako's final questions above are centered on Litšabako's age and education; which might be regarded as persuasive action for Litšabako to be considerate of her age as congruent with education – rather than eloping with some married men who are by far older than her.

With an effort to ignore her mother's final questions above; and seemingly intending to persuade her mother to stop accusing her further; Litšabako quips as follows: "Ha esale ke omanngoa litsela tsena. Ebe le hae moo ke tla komeloa ho se ho se mohau?" (Act I: scene iii) [I have continuously been scolded all over the way. Does it mean that even here at home I shall be grumbled against without mercy?] Like someone that has been waiting for this kind of retort from Litšabako, 'Malitšabako furiously responds to this aspect of lack of mercy as follows:

"Ao! Ha re na mohau? Uena u mohau haholo ha e le mona re robala re sa u bone! Ke oona mohau oa hao Litšabako? (Litšabako h'a arabe. 'M'ae o mo patlatsa liropeng mona ka bohale.) Bua Litšabako! Se k'a bopa joaloka poho e fata lengope tjena. Bua! Ke tloha ke u tšoara, ke u soepheletsa nokana tsena hona joale. Litšabako, ntat'ao o kene tsietsing e tšabehang hona joale ka lebaka la hao. Hosasa hona ho sang ntat'ao o il'o lefa mane khotla. O mpoletse hore o batile motho mane moo le tsoang. U sele ebile u ntse u e-sa ho ea pele u re ha re na mohau. Ke tla u poma lelengoana le se nang khoele lena." (Act I: scene iii)

[Indeed! We have no mercy? You are quite merciful that we go to sleep without seeing you? Is that your mercy Litšabako? (Litšabako does not reply. Her mother strikes her on the thighs with an open hand.) Speak up Litšabako! Stop sulking like a bull digging a donga like this. Speak up! I might even hold you, and pinch these small hips right now. Litšabako, your father has got into a terrible danger right now because of you. This very coming tomorrow, your father is going to pay there at the khotla. He has told me that he has struck someone there where you come from. You are silly and you even continue becoming silly, you say that we lack mercy. I shall cut off this stringless minute tongue of yours.]

In the light of the above verbal exchanges centered on mercy or lack of it, 'Malitšabako's retort is quite vitriolic against her daughter's accusation of their lack of mercy. For her, Litšabako dares not talk of their lack of mercy, for her action of eloping with Mofammere has tortured them spiritually, physically and otherwise, as parents. It is seemingly in line with this situation that she becomes furious with her daughter upon pronouncing that they lack mercy; that she is now engaged in reprimanding her and persuading her to change her attitude and behaviour concerning her action. When the daughter fails to respond to her demands for her to speak up, 'Malitšabako resorts to threats and coercive means; seemingly as her kind of persuasive action for inducing her daughter to speak up and answer for herself; since the concept of mercy apparently bears different connotations for her and Litšabako. It would then seem that for both Senamele and 'Malitšabako threats and coercion are their trusted means

of changing someone's attitude, behaviour or belief – as opposed to upfront persuasive applications for motivating one to adopt the desired change.

As a continuation of this application of threats and coercion, 'Malitšabako then instructs Litšabako to go with her into the living house where she suggests for Litšabako to go and take off those clothes she has come back wearing from Mofammere's home, saying:

“Ha re ee ka heising ka mane u e'o hlobola mese e u ronang ena. U s'u bile u tenne mese eo u e fumaneng mola? U tla e tsola. Sekolong ke moo u eang. Na Litšabako ua tseba hore monna eo oa hao o ne a nyetse, joale o tebetse mosali? U ipona u le motle haholo, joale a keke a u tebela uena. U khasetsa mollong. Ha re ee. (Oa tsamaea, h'a hetla, Litšabako o ntse a lutse fatše, oa rura o fihla a ntša jesi ea Litšabako ka hlooho.) Ua mpelaetsa Litšabako. Hlobola jesi ena. (Ho hlaha lebanta le sephara le tlameng mose.) Lokolla le lona lebanta lena ke bone. Ke qala ho belaela joale, ha ho ngoana ea ka fetohang hang tjena, le tsole!” (O rutla lebanta hampe feela, o hlahloba morali ka mahlo.) (Act I: scene iii)

[Let us go there into the living room so that you take off these dresses that do not suit you. You have even dressed up in the dresses that you found there? You will take them off. To school that is where you are going. Are you aware Litšabako that that husband of yours had married, and he sent away the wife? You consider yourself as quite beautiful, that he cannot expel you. You are crawling towards fire. Let us go. (She goes, when she looks back, Litšabako is still sitting down, she springs and takes off Litšabako's jersey through the head.) You make me suspicious Litšabako. Take off this jersey. (There appears a broad belt that is binding the dress.) Unfasten this belt so that I may see. I now begin to be suspicious, there is no child that can adopt such a rapid change, take it off!” (She pulls out the belt roughly, and examines the daughter with her eyes.)]

Once more, it is important to realise that 'Malitšabako's communicative expressions above are similar to those pronounced by Senamele earlier on as they were on their way home with Litšabako. In other words, she also reiterates Senamele's words that Mofammere has a wife that he expelled; and if Litšabako hopes to find solace in Mofammere's hands, then she is about to get herself burned by the kind of fire she presently seems to crawl towards. Nonetheless, the only element of difference on this issue lies in the fact that, whereas Senamele elaborated on why and how that wife departed from that home, 'Malitšabako does not go into those details. Another main similarity of the two parents' persuasive words concerning Litšabako's education is their already drawn up conclusion that, to school is where she is going. In this way, they have already made some decision about this matter

without any form of upfront persuasion with Litšabako. The final similarity observable in their expressions is their remarks about the dresses supplied by Mofammere's family to Litšabako; and they have both reached the decision for Litšabako to remove those dresses and wear her girlish ones – and they seem to have no compromise on that aspect too.

As for Litšabako, her apparent stubbornness towards her mother is quite phenomenal – for she has never demonstrated it against Senamele. One wonders therefore where this kind of behaviour emanates; as it is realizable in her verbal exchanges with her mother, coupled with her refusal to answer her mother's questions and her instructions for her to go into the 'heisi' for taking off the so-called unbecoming dresses she is wearing. Nonetheless, one may dare say that seemingly her stubbornness is employed as an attempt at persuading her mother to realise that she somehow contributed towards her daughter's eloping into marriage prematurely; as she used to pass the remarks that she hates living with 'mafetoa', as was shown earlier above. Besides, it would also appear that the broad belt that she has fastened over her dress is used as a persuasive action for hiding something she dares not reveal to the parents – whatever it is nobody knows. In line with this understanding, it comes not as astonishment that her mother begins to be suspicious that something is fishy; for she is not used to this sudden change of behaviour displayed by her daughter. That is why the mother forcefully persuades the daughter to peel off her clothes; as she feels that she has to examine her physical state at this point, as has been seen above. Finally, one observes that there hardly exist any upfront persuasive verbal exchanges between these two characters; except for coercion and threats coming from the mother.

Since Litšabako is a young girl of only sixteen years of age, one wonders whether or not there are other external influences towards her behaviour of eloping with by far older and married men of Mofammere's caliber. It therefore becomes interesting for this study to examine and analyse some verbal communicative exchanges between/among other characters that feature in this dramatic text; such as 'Malerumo and 'Matšepe, as regard Litšabako's present state. As observed in this dramatic text, 'Malerumo arrives at 'Matšepe's home where they engage in some verbal exchanges that do not involve Litšabako; though they culminate into discussing her behaviour, and eventually reveal the above two characters' contribution towards her eloping with Mofammere. Having discussed some issues that only indicate their close relationship in certain matters as friends, 'Malerumo proposes to leave; whereupon 'Matšepe persuades her to stay awhile, saying, "Pele u tsamaea, u utloile'ng ka nonyana ela ea rona holimo moo?" (Act II: scene i) [Before you go, what have you heard about that bird of ours up there?]

Since 'Matšepe hereby makes reference to their bird, as if they own one; it becomes clear that these two characters have something in common that they dare not just divulge.

Actually, 'Matšepe applies a metaphoric pastoral reference, 'nonyana ela ea rona' as a persuasive action for 'Malerumo to reveal and discuss any pieces of news that she may have heard in connection with someone they have supposedly been plotting together. In the Sesotho context, the reference to 'nonyana ela ea rona' presupposes a situation in which someone has been plotted against; such that some snares are organised for her/him to fall into unawares. In line with this observation, one would then suggest that these two women must have had a hand in plotting, organizing and persuading Litšabako to elope with Mofammere. In short, these two characters seem to be the instigators of Litšabako's leaving schooling and running into this unplanned marriage with someone who is said to be uncultured and older than her by many years.

Interestingly, 'Malerumo reacts to 'Matšepe's question as follows: "Jonna! Jonna! (O lula hape.) Ua tl'a nkhopotsa. Ka batla ke phutla mehasoana ea ka ke sa u bolella litaba! Mh! 'Mannyeo, ba re o teng, ntat'ae o mo latile ka mabifi a mabe haholo." (Act II: scene i) [Poor me! Poor me! (She sits down again.) You have so much reminded me. I nearly softly slapped my old cloths without relating the news to you! Mh! Mother-of-so-and-so, they say that she is around, her father brought her back with terrible anger.] Unquestionably, one of the main reasons for 'Malerumo to visit 'Matšepe was for her intention to relate this piece of news to her co-plotter; possibly with a persuasive goal for them to think of an appropriate action to take in persuading Litšabako, their bird, to once more defy her parents and go back to the same elopement. It would therefore suggest that, for them, this is an important meeting for working on new strategies for persuading their bird to go back into the snare.

It therefore makes sense for 'Matšepe to inquire as to whether or not Litšabako was forced to take off those dresses she wore as a newly wed woman in Mofammere's family – for, if that be so, then it would suggest that her parents are intent on Litšabako's going back for her studies here after. Indeed, 'Malerumo employs sarcasm to retort to that question, saying, "Mannyeo ba re o bokopa o tšoana le morali enoa oa ka Motšelisi." (Act II: scene i) [Mother-of-so-and-so they say that she is as stumpy as this daughter of mine Motšelisi.] In this case, 'Malerumo downplays Litšabako's present state by applying some pastoral metaphor, 'o bokopa,' the expression which is usually used with reference to animals, such as dogs for instance. Seemingly, she employs this expression as a persuasive strategy for her co-plotter to think of tactics they might employ for persuading 'their bird' to elope again. In line with this persuasive attempt, 'Matšepe responds in this manner, "Batho ba na le meleko mokhotsi. Oee! Batho ba buselitse motho ea tsoang ha hae meseng e mekhutšoanyane?" (Act II: scene i) [People have witchcraft my friend. Oh! People have caused someone from her own marital family back to the short dresses?]

In the light of pursuing her persuasive endeavours for 'Matšepe to think of some tactics or strategies for dissuading Litšabako against education; 'Malerumo supports the former by indicating that Litšabako's parents want to educate their daughter. At this juncture, 'Matšepe somehow responds in accordance with 'Malerumo's persuasive attempts by saying:

“Na ke bona ba hloka boeletsu ka mokhoa o mong. Hona ke ho tlotlolla ngoana enoa oa bona. Feela Mofammere le eena ke sephoqo, ekare h'a shobelisa motho eaba o 'meha lapeng moo, h'a e'o mo pata hole koaa khoeli tse peli?” (Act II: scene i)

[I realise that they need a different advice. This is to embarrass this child of theirs. But Mofammere is also a fool, as he causes one to elope he puts her there at home, instead of hiding her far off there for two months?]

Now there emerge some conspiratorial persuasive suggestions from 'Matšepe, in accordance with 'Malerumo's endeavours for her to advance some ideas. First, 'Matšepe's statement above suggests that it is important for them to advise Senamele and his wife against sending their daughter to school; as it is embarrassing for Litšabako to go back to her girlish dresses after that elopement. Second, she poses a rhetorical question that is loaded with apparent persuasive implications for 'Malerumo to suggest to Mofammere – that is, persuade him to once more elope with Litšabako; but this time to ensure that they go far away and hide for two full months before the revelation of their whereabouts may be divulged. In the light of 'Matšepe's foregoing persuasive suggestions, 'Malerumo agrees with her; yet adds some information pertaining to their plotting Litšabako's elopement in these words:

“Ho bonahala u sa ka ua mo rupela hantle. Ha ke batle ntho esele ena ha e ka ruteha bana ba bo-rona ba felle hona 'High School' moo. Ke utloa Mofammere e le sephoqo se tšabehang.” (Act II: scene i)

[It seems that you did not lecture him correctly. I do not want this rubbish to become educated while our siblings end up right there at High School level. I feel that Mofammere is an utter fool.]

Needless to say, the behavioural outcomes related to the above displays by 'Malerumo and 'Matšepe are those of response-shaping processes, according to Miller (as presented by Dillard and Pfau, 2002:7). Since Litšabako's parents have erred by once more dressing her with her girlish dresses after eloping, they have to be advised otherwise; according to these persuasive conspiratorial verbal exchanges. In addition, since Matšepe failed to lecture Mofammere correctly, he now has to be persuaded to re-elope with Litšabako to a far away place where they will have to spend at least two months to ensure that she may not be found; the two conspirators seem to agree upon.

Upon realizing that 'Malerumo somehow blames her for her failure in lecturing Mofammere accordingly, 'Matšepe attempts to defend Mofammere, that he never anticipated this kind of outcome. Further, she makes an about-turn response by suggesting that 'Malerumo was supposed to have done the lecture herself on Mofammere; thus attempting to persuade her to formulate some strategies that Mofammere now has to employ in the second attempt at eloping with Litšabako. In response, 'Malerumo challenges 'Matšepe as to whether this is the end of her persuasive strategies concerning this subject; and from there on the following persuasive verbal exchanges between the co-plotters ensue:

'Matšepe: Hei Mokhotsi! Ha u ile ua leka letsoho u se ee habeli. U tloha u tšoaroa. [Hallo friend! When you have tried a hand you should not go twice. You might be caught.]

'Malerumo: U tla 'ne u khothaleitse ka bohlae hore ngoanana enoa a thobe. Ke nyatsa ha ngoanana enoa a ka hloloa ho nyaloa eaba o ithuta ho feta bo-'Mapere. He! Rona re ka tšehoa ke batho. [You will continue encouraging wisely that this girl should slip away. I hate the failure for this girl to get married, such that she becomes more educated than the likes of 'Mapere. Eh! We can become the laughing stock for the people.]

'Matšepe: Jonna oee! Re ka kena moo re sa tsebeng. [Poor me! We can get into an unknown situation.]

'Malerumo: O ntekile hampe. Le eona C.O.S.C. ena a ka be a sa e pasa ka hlopha sa pele hoja a se ke a penyetsa ngoan'eso a ne a re oa mo nyala lemong se fetileng. [She has terribly angered me. She would not have passed even this C.O.S.C. with first class if she had not sulked against my brother as he wanted to marry her last year.]

'Matšepe: Se fetileng? (Act II: scene i) [Last year?]

Indubitably, the plot of dissuading Litšabako from education, and driving her into marriage, has been a long-term plan with the two conspirators, as the above verbal exchanges indicate. In the light of the above communicative exchanges, this plotting started last year when 'Malerumo's brother was possibly persuaded by 'Malerumo herself to propose marriage to Litšabako. In addition, the motive behind this continuing conspiracy between the two villains emerges as mere jealousy against Litšabako's becoming educated; while the siblings of the two villains are possibly not geared towards becoming educated. It follows, therefore, that since these two have a common persuasive goal – that of derailing Litšabako from education by persuading her to get married to the uncultured miners – the best action for them is to strive at making more persuasive attempts to achieve their goal.

In a persuasive attempt at signifying their unity in the plot to once more divert Litšabako from education, the two conspirators insist on creating yet other persuasive strategies to be applied against her. As if by coincidence, there appears Litšabako heading to the well – thus

giving the co-plotters an opportunity to act and bombard her with more persuasive communicative expressions that might ensure her of another attempt at once more eloping with Mofammere. Seemingly, ‘Malerumo’s part at this juncture is that of master-planner; for she persuades ‘Matšepe to go and apply her persuasive tactics with their ‘bird;’ as she offers the following instructions for her co-plotter to take action:

“Tsam’o likella le eena ka selibeng khotsi. Molimo le ‘na nako e se e ntšihile. U hle u toboketse taba ea lichelete tsa Mofammere ‘m’e ‘Mannyeo. Ha ho selope se seng. Ntja e le tjee, e tla kakamala e ahlame selope se e qhautse. U se ke ua etsa liphoso. Ebile ha ke sa ea le toropong. Ke tla boetse ke u bona kamora’ tinare re tl’o li otl’a.”
(‘Matšepe o roala nkho o tšetšemella sedibeng. Teng o fumana Litšabako a ntse a hlatsoa nkho.) (Act II: scene i)

[Go and disappear with her at the well friend. God I am also late for time. You should stress the matter of Mofammere’s monies you Mother-of-so-and-so. There is no other fish hook. A dog as this is, it will be proud and gape so as for the fish hook to snatch it away. You should not make mistakes. And I am no more going to town. I shall once more see you after lunch so as to chat. (‘Matšepe puts a bucket on her head and runs noiselessly towards the well. There she finds Litšabako washing a bucket.)]

In accordance with ‘Malerumo’s strategic plans above, it is clear that the outstanding one is that of stressing Mofammere’s monies as an action for Litšabako to be easily persuaded – a sure bait for hooking in their ‘nonyana,’ according to ‘Malerumo. Since this pair of women has resulted from their unity in dissuading Litšabako from pursuing education; it makes sense that ‘Malerumo even suggests that she is no more going to town as was her original plan – she wants to ensure that ‘Matšepe makes no mistakes this time, it seems.

Interestingly, at the well, ‘Matšepe and Litšabako exchange the following communicative expressions:

‘Matšepe: Ausi Tšabi! [Sister Tšabi!]

Litšabako: Lumela ausi ‘Matšepe. [Good morning sister ‘Matšepe.]

‘Matšepe: Tšabi ‘Mannyeo ho ile hoa senyeha kae na haeka u se u le tjee? [Tšabi Mother-of-so-and-so where did the problem arise as you are already like this?]

Litšabako: He ua se ke ua mpolaisa ka batho motho oa Molimo. (‘Matšepe o beha emere fatše, Litšabako o tlohela ho hlatsoa ea hae.) [Hallo you have so much caused people to kill me you person of God. (‘Matšepe puts the bucket down, Litšabako stops washing hers.)]

‘Matšepe: Joang na Tšabi? [How now Tšabi?]

Litšabako: Joang 'nake. Ha ke je litheohelang mane lapeng. Ba nkomotela hore ke utloe. Le joale tsebe ha li tlale. Taba ke hore na ke tlohela sekolo ke lelekisa manyalo a batho ba lahlileng basali ke re 'na ke tla tsoelella? Taba eo ea ntja 'me ha ke phomole. (Act II: scene i)
[How dear one. I eat no food that goes down easily there at home. They insult me so much that I should feel it. And indeed ears never fill up. The issue is whether I leave schooling and chase marriages of people that have expelled their wives and think that I am going to stay on? That issue is gnawing at me and I never get peace.]

In the light of the foregoing communicative interactions, one observes that 'Matšepe employs endearment as her first strategy for Litšabako to identify with her; as she greets her by calling her 'Tšabi,' instead of 'Litšabako.' Obviously, 'Matšepe's endearment approach is meant for establishing rapport with her target; thus rendering her gullible for whatever persuasive talk the persuader has in store for her. In line with this observation, it comes not as surprise that in her response to 'Matšepe's first question above, Litšabako addresses her as 'motho oa Molimo' to illustrate her high regard for the persuader. Once more as a persuasive strategy for Litšabako to open up and relate the whole story to her, 'Matšepe employs the same endearment address of 'Tšabi' in her second question – thus insuring the naivety of her target. Indeed Litšabako's response indicates her gullibility to the persuader's persuasive attempts; as she in response addresses her as 'nake' for signifying her full identity with the persuader. As might be expected, from hence forth Litšabako delves into the way her parents have continuously been reprimanding her over her behaviour as has been observed above; and ends up by indicating the extent to which this whole matter gives her no peace of mind.

Seemingly, Litšabako's relating the matter to 'Matšepe has worked as some motivation for the latter to apply her persuasive communicative interaction in an attempt to change her target from the state of worry to that of taking the matter easy by saying:

“U sa le monyenane, ha u e-s'o li bone. U botse rona ausi. Ha ho motsoali ea ka u lumellang ka ntho e kalo-kalo mahala. Ekakhona u tsoe tlas'a mafika a tšabehang a mathata. Joale uena ha u qala u re khacha-khacha u s'u re bu! U bile u khathala matla. Mosali ke ntho e tiisetsang mathata. Ak'u ee butle ka ho khathala matla mosali.” (Act II: scene i)

[You are still young, and have not seen them yet. You should ask us sister. There is no parent that can allow you about such a great thing just like that. You will have to go through under very fearful rocks of difficulties. And now just as you begin to make a slide move you fall off. You even resign to your fate. A woman is an entity that endures difficulties. Please do not lose hope woman.]

Capitalizing on Litšabako's gullibility, 'Matšepe now promotes herself into an expert in matters of this kind, and indicates to her target that her worries are due to her inexperience, as she is still a young woman. When she says to Litšabako, 'U botse rona ausi,' one realises that 'Matšepe hereby attempts to invite her target to adopt an understanding that, as persuader, she is the all-knowing self-made lecturer in these issues. Further, she demonstrates her knowledge and experience by assuring Litšabako that no parent would merely allow his/her child to go into such great situations without somehow grappling with the matter – seemingly to ensure her that hers is a normal case after all. Furthermore, in order for Litšabako to regard her position as normal, and nothing to cause her any dismay; 'Matšepe applies a pastoral image by making reference to a woman who has to go through under very fearful rocks. In this way, she attempts to persuade Litšabako to regard her own position as a light one, as compared to going through under those rocks in question. Further still, 'Matšepe augments her persuasive references by showing her target that, as a woman, she has to refrain from resigning to her fate; for she is meant to endure difficulties womanly; thus attempting to make her see the need for her to persist in eloping with Mofammere again.

Indubitably, Litšabako is wise enough to see that her persuader could purposely be geared towards derailing her off her education and push her into the difficulties that are foreseen by her parents; as she says, "Feela e se ke eaba ua ntihele ausi 'Matšepe." (Act II: scene i) [But I hope you are not pushing me over the cliff sister 'Matšepe.] In the light of her display as an expert in these matters, 'Matšepe pretends to be angry with Litšabako about this seeming disbelief in her expertise; saying, "Oho! E re ke u tlohele. Haeba keletso ke ho lihela e re ke u tlohele he." (Act II: scene i) [O! Let me leave you. If an advice is to get one into trouble then let me leave you alone.] In this way, 'Matšepe attempts to employ sulking as a strategic action for her target to change her mind about doubting her seeming advice; so as to make her adopt the behaviour she hereby attempts to persuade the target to change into. To signify her sulkiness, the persuader even takes her bucket and washes it – thus pretending to be prepared to really leave the target alone – apparently hoping for Litšabako to change her attitude as she anticipates.

But it would seem that Litšabako is not yet convinced that indeed 'Matšepe is positively helping her out of this situation; for she now communicatively explains herself in the following words:

"Ke tlameha ho bapisa keletso ena ea hao le ea batsoali ba ka. Ba buile ntho e tšoanang empa ba arohane ba se 'moho. Ntate o itse na ha abuti Mofammere a lahlile mosali oa hae na 'na ke hopola hore o tla mpoloka? 'M'e eena a re na ke ipona ke le motle haholo, ka hona abuti Mofammere o tla mpoloka? Taba eo e nkene

haholo hore ke itlhahlobe, ebile ke etse ntho eo ke inahanetseng eona.” (Act II: scene i)

[I must compare and contrast your advice with that of my parents. They have spoken the same thing yet at separate places. Father said since brother Mofammere has expelled his wife, do I hope for him to nurture me? Mother herself said that since I consider myself so beautiful, and as such do I hope for brother Mofammere to nurture me? That issue has caused me a lot of thought to examine myself, and act over something that I have thought properly about.]

As if in an effort to adhere to ‘Malerumo’s advice for her to ensure that she makes no mistake, ‘Matšepe reiterates her words of sulkiness and attempts to change Litšako’s analysis of this issue by employing the following lengthy lecture styled communicative approach:

“Ke ntho ena ke reng ke u tlohele, hoba ha ke rate u tle u lle ka ‘na ebe u re ke u lihetse ha lenyalo le u tsietsa. Maobeng ha u tsamaea, u ile ua nyonyoba ua fumana Mofammere ha ka mane. Litaba tsa lona tseo le li qalileng ha ka mane, ke le file monyetla oohle, tsa hola ho fihlela mona, ke ntse ke le pata hore ho se be ea le sitisang; le fihletse qeto ke le teng. Ke ‘na ea neng a mametse ha Mofammere a re mosali eo oa hae ea lutseng le eena hakhutšoanyane, o ne a le likhathatso a mo luba kelello mehla ena. Joale o qeteletse a feletsoe ke boiphapanyo. Ke lumela hore u qeteletse u amohetse ho tsamaea le Mofammere hobane u tseba hantle, le ‘na ke tseba hantle hore ha u motho ea khathatsang, ea ke keng a phelisana hantle le batho ba bang. Ke ne ke tseba ke bile ke utloisisa hore ha ho ntho e tla u qabanya le moshanyana ea u ratang hakana. Ha ke ne ke se na tšepo, nka be ke kothalelitse motsoalle eno oa ka ngoanana e mong. Banana ba bangata motseng mona ba neng ba ka thabela ho phela le motho ea sepache se kokomohileng joaloka enoa, ea bukana li palo li holimo joaloka enoa. Empa le teng ha u koenehela litaba tsa hao le mahlohonolo a hao re ke ke ra u tsekisa.” (Act II: scene i)

[That is why I say that I should leave you alone, for I would not like you to complain about me and say that I pushed you over the cliff as the marriage life embarrasses you. Three days ago when you left, you walked slightly and found Mofammere there at my place. Your issues that you started there at my home, as I had given you all the opportunity, they developed up to here, as I continued hiding you so that no one would distract you; you reached a conclusion in my presence. It was I who was listening as Mofammere said that his wife who stayed with him for only a short time, was troublesome and mixing up his mind daily. He eventually ended up losing patience. I believe that you ended up agreeing to go with

Mofammere because you knew well, as I also knew well that you are not a troublesome person that might not live well with other people. I knew and understood that there is nothing that might put you at loggerheads with a small boy that has so much love for you. If I were not hopeful, I could have exhorted for that friend of mine some other girl. There are many girls in this village that would have loved to live with a person with such bursting purse such as this one, with bank accounts of such high figures. But then if you renege from your issues and your blessings we may not quarrel with you.]

In the light of the above persuasive lecture given by 'Matšepe to Litšabako, it becomes clear that the secondary goal of the former here is that of bombarding her target with almost all the facts and events surrounding this issue – seemingly to ensure that her target may decide never to renege from their organised marriage for her. In the above lecture therefore, she employs the following strategies for attempting to change the target's seeming identification with her parents:

- Pretends to be disgusted with Litšabako and suggests to leave her alone, apparently to create the target's eagerness to listen to her lecture;
- Indicates to Litšabako that her act of 'ho nyonyoba' (like a cat) was a clear sign that she enjoyed the idea of meeting Mofammere in secrecy, as some preparation for their final elopement;
- Reminds Litšabako that all the opportunity for her to be in secrecy with Mofammere at her home was an act that was meant for them to eventually be husband and wife – thus seemingly showing the target the importance of this matter to be kept as was planned;
- Assures Litšabako of the fairness of the whole arrangement – as it was done in her presence as the organiser, and therefore seemingly with no hidden agenda;
- Persuades Litšabako to regard the expelled Mofammere's wife as a troublesome one that deserved such an expulsion;
- Invites Litšabako to regard herself as a character with no such troublesome behaviour as was with Mofammere's expelled wife, and therefore with no possibilities of her finding herself in the same situation;
- Makes reference to Mofammere as 'moshanyana ea u ratang hakana' for Litšabako to regard him as a loving young man that is unlikely to ever quarrel with her in any way;

- Ensures Litšabako that her choice was based on all her qualities, as compared with all other girls who would have not hesitated to be married by such a rich character with bursting purse and good savings in the bank; and
- Comments that if she were to renege, Litšabako would have not only reneged from her former commitment but would also be losing the blessings of being married by such a character.

But as was indicated earlier above, Litšabako is not just a push-over, or an easily convinced character. Having listened to the above lecture by 'Matšepe, she right away responds to her persuader's last point of departure; saying:

“Ke mahlohonolo, empa le teng chelete ea Mofammere e ka 'na ea mphonyoha neng kapa neng. Chelete ea fela ha motho a felloa ke mosebetsi. Mosebetsi oa merafo oa fela, batho ba fokotsoa ka bongata matsatsing ana. H'a ka fokotsoa? Hape h'a ka shoa 'na ke sa itšoarele ke ee ke etse joang? 'Na ke utloa keletso ea batsoali ka tlhoko hore thuto ea ka e molemo haholo hoba ha bothata bo hlaha ka ho monna oa ka 'na nka tseba ho bo koala ka thuto ea ka.” (Act II: scene i)

[They are blessings, but even then Mofammere's money may slip out of my grip at any time. Money gets depleted as someone loses his/her job. The work at mining industry gets depleted; people are reduced in big numbers these days. What about if he is lessened? And again if he can die while I have no hold on anything what might I do? I carefully listen to parents' advice that my education is very much worthy because if some difficulty emerges on the side of the husband, I may solve that by employing my education.]

In the light of the above Litšabako's argument, one observes that she hereby applies her parents' persuasion to counter-persuade 'Matšepe's. By employing her parents' persuasion to adhere to education as a means of safeguarding herself against odd times; Litšabako applies self-persuasion for motivating her persuader to weigh the issues in reference above and adopt her present behaviour and belief that she has adopted from her parents. In this case, one might draw some conclusion that Litšabako has positively been persuaded by her father's persuasive talk on the issue of education; as was seen earlier in this section.

In line with this understanding, one can observe that even 'Matšepe has just been positively persuaded by Litšabako's foregoing analysis of the situation; for she comments on her analysis in these words, “U nahana hantle, empa re le bo-'Matšepe re le tjena ha se ntho tseo re itubang ka tsona tseno.” (Act II: scene i) [You thought well, but even us as the 'Matšepe's as we are those are not things that we worry ourselves about.] Indeed, 'Matšepe has no reason to harbour those issues pronounced by Litšabako above; for hers is to ensure that the target is persuaded enough to once more elope with Mofammere for the reasons

they have already put across with 'Malerumo earlier in this section. Having said this much, 'Matšepe laughs; and then applies other persuasive verbal exchanges for Litšabako to change her demonstrated belief and behaviour; saying:

“Ao 'Manyeo! Ho bonahala ba hlile ba u fasetsa linoha ee? E re ke u joetse mokhotsinyana oa ka. Motho oa merafo ha a e-shoa a le mosebetsing u tla fumana chelete e ngata ea litsiane tsa hae. U tla phela bophelo bohle ba hao ka eona ha u na ho ba tsietsing. Haeba u na le bana morao tjena ba ea rutoa ho fihlela ha ba le lilemo li 21. Joale u ka 'na tšosoa moo? Nka u fa mohlala oa batho ba bangata, bomalimabe ke hore u mpa u ke ke ua ba tseba hoba motsaneng ona oa rona ha re na ba seng ba kile ba hlaheloa ke ntho e tjena. Ha e le tabeng ea ho fokotsoa teng, ao che! Ha re tsebe, feela motho o fokotsoa ka mabaka. Joale ha ke bone eka Mofammere ke motho oa masaoana. Le teng 'na ke ntse ke re ho ho uena ho khetha tsela.” (Act II: scene i)

[Oh Mother-of-so-and-so! It seems that they actually bound some snakes for you eh? Let me tell you small friend of mine. When a miner dies on duty you will get plenty of his compensatory money. You will live all your life without any trouble. If you have some children lately they are educated until they reach the age of 21. Now how can you allow yourself to be frightened? I can give you examples of many people, unfortunately you may not know them as in this small village of ours there aren't any that have experienced such a situation. As for being lessened, oh no! We don't know, but a human being gets lessened through reasons. But I do not foresee Mofammere as a playful somebody. Even then I say that it is up to you to choose the way.]

Since Litšabako has demonstrated this clear understanding of the reasons behind her parents' putting emphasis on education; 'Matšepe seemingly has to apply other strategies for attempting to persuade her otherwise. As has just been seen above, 'Matšepe downplays Litšabako's educational vision by indicating that for her and those of her kind, such issues that worry Litšabako have no place in their list of worries – thus relegating them to non-issues that need to be cast off. Secondly, 'Matšepe addresses Litšabako as “'Manyeo!’ as a persuasive tactic for her to realise that at the present stage she has to regard herself as someone's mother – since she has experienced womanly relationships with Mofammere by virtue of their eloping together and spending some days as his wife. Thirdly, she employs a metaphoric reference to comment on the way Litšabako's parents attempted to persuade her to refrain from running after this unorganised marriage – by making an allusion that 'ba hlile ba u fasetsa linoha ee?' In this case, 'Matšepe refers to the pieces of advice given by Litšabako's parents as mere threats; as this reference originates from a situation where monkeys are threatened with dead snakes so that they may be scared and run away from

the fields and localities where they cause havoc by spoiling some maize and other foodstuff for people.

As has been seen above, 'Matšepe's other strategic plan is that of addressing Litšabako as 'mokhotsinyana oa ka,' seemingly for once more relegating her inferior; in an attempt at persuading her to realise that all her views are those of an inexperienced young girl that still needs a lot of telling from her present persuader. In addition, 'Matšepe's outlining of the set up and practices applied in the mining industry are meant for Litšabako to cast off the worries and remain assured that whatever happens to Mofammere and his mining job; she is on the safe side and assured of sustenance throughout her life. Additionally still, 'Matšepe's final statement above is meant for Litšabako to be aware that the choice is in her hands for either chasing education or once more eloping with Mofammere. In this way, it would seem that Matšepe is determined to apply upfront persuasion as a means through which she hopes to change Litšabako's attitude and belief in this matter.

In the light of 'Matšepe's above upfront persuasion, Litšabako has apparently been positively persuaded to act in accordance with her persuader's plan and action; for she accepts the proposal, saying, "Kea utloa. Empa ke bona e se e le ho llela lebese le qhalaneng." (Act II: scene i) [I hear. But I regard it as some crying over spilled milk.] In an effort at illustrating her point, Litšabako even makes reference to the way her father caused some raucousness in Mofammere's home as he forced her to come back home with him; and indicates her hopelessness in being ever once more accepted by that family.

Indubitably, this is the moment for which 'Matšepe has been hoping; for it now becomes clear that Litšabako has been successfully persuaded to consider eloping with Mofammere once more. Capitalizing on this state of affairs, 'Matšepe assures Litšabako that everything depends on her willingness and love for Mofammere; and Mofammere in the same vein. Further, she assures her target that while the parents will be busily engaged with one another; she and Mofammere will be living together as husband and wife; and that finally the parents will have to resign to their fate and leave them alone. In order to ensure that Litšabako becomes fully positively persuaded, 'Matšepe once more addresses her as 'Tšabi'; holds her hand and says, "Ha se uena u le mong ea etsoang tjena ke batsoali. 'Na ke ne ke fete har'a mathata a tjena, ka latoa, ka thoba ba ba ba ntela. Le uena ba tla u tela ha u ka ikhutlella teng." (Act II: scene i) [You are not alone that is treated like this by parents. I passed through the same difficulties; I was fetched, and ran away until they gave up on me. They will also give up on you if you go back there.] Needless to say, 'Matšepe applies this endearment approach as an action for galvanizing her persuasive action and ensure that Litšabako changes her attitude and behaviour of doubting the idea of re-eloping with Mofammere.

Furthermore, she compares Litšabako's case to her own as a persuasive measure for appearing as a symbol of first-hand experience in matters of this kind. By so doing, it would seem that she hereby applies conviction as her persuasion for positive results that she has been driving her goal towards. Further still, in order to demonstrate to Litšabako that she is an experienced figure in these matters, 'Matšepe assures her that, should she go back there, her parents will also give up on her. Even as Litšabako counter- indicates that no one would like to sustain the same injury that was inflicted on Mofammere's father; 'Matšepe still relegates that as a minor issue; as it may not be easy for Senamele to repeat such an action.

Indeed Litšabako has been successfully persuaded to once more elope with Mofammere; for when 'Matšepe asks her what she has to say to Mofammere, Litšabako says that she should tell him that she will be expecting him. In order to demonstrate her seriousness in this matter, Litšabako even mentions the time of 09.00 in the night as the appropriate time for Mofammere's arrival. In addition, she even suggests for Mofammere to whistle for her at that moment; though she cautions 'Matšepe to make him aware that he should not dare come closer to her home, as the dogs are quite furious there. Now that she is positive that her persuasive attempt has been successful, 'Matšepe now applies fear factor as an action intended for ensuring that Litšabako dares not renege from this final intent she has demonstrated. She says to her target: "Ho lokile. Ntho ea hore u tene mose o molelele, u khutle u o tsole e ka u otsa. E ka u tšela senyopotsi." (Act II: scene i) [It is alright. The act of wearing a long dress, and come back to take it off can harm you. It can pour some misfortune over you.]

Even so, Litšabako retorts in this manner to her persuader's foregoing fear factor applications, "Tsamaea u ee haeno 'Mannyeo, ke il'o kena shosholong uena u lutse hamonate ha hao koana." (Act II: scene i) [Go to your home Mother-of-so-and-so, I am going to get into trouble while you shall be sitting comfortably there at your home.] Apparently, Litšabako's foregoing statement works as a persuasive measure for 'Matšepe to apply another persuasive tactic for ensuring that the target does not get out of the seemingly successful snare, as she says, "U haufi u e-ja oa keboleloa joaloka 'na ngoan'a ka." (Act II: scene i) [You are close to eating the already peeled one like me my child (i.e., a good thing without having worked for it; see Mabile and Dieterlen, 1985:122). In this way, 'Matšepe's persuasive action is that of making reference to herself for Litšabako to regard her as an all-knowing source of experience in these matters – thus ensuring success in her persuasive attempts. In short, she is applying what some would call the dangling of a carrot for enticing the target into the snare.

Going back to the fact that Senamele struck Khabele with a fighting stick to force him to release Litšabako; it becomes interesting to observe how this matter is taken by the chief at

ha Lenka; for indeed what Senamele has done is against the law. It is early in the morning when the chief's announcer (Souru) makes the following announcement in the village, shouting for all to hear and gather at the meeting place:

“Oee! Oee!

Thola u mamele, jo!

He thola u mamele boo!

Oa ntaela morena.

Utloang boo! O re ke re,

Uena ntate,

Uena 'm'e,

Le e'o ba teng ka moreneng hosasa.

Le e'o ba teng ka moreneng hosasa, joo!

O re taba li teng, aoo!

Taba li teng le e'o imamella, Hei boo!

Ea se nang litsebe a se ke be a re Souru h'a mo joetsa.

Hee, le uena ka Sekhutlong kamoo,

U tle u re ha ua utloa!”

(Act II: scene ii)

[Fie! Fie!

Be silent and listen, alas!

Hallo be silent and listen please!

The chief instructs me.

Please hear! He says that I must say,

You father,

You mother,

You go and present yourself at the chief's place tomorrow.

You go and be present at the chief's place tomorrow, Alas!

He says there are issues, fie!

Issues are there for you to listen to, Hallo please!

Whoever has no ears should not say Souru did not tell him/her.

Hallo, even you there in the Gorge,

You dare not say you did not hear!]

This announcement is quite interesting; for it captures everyone's attention by virtue of the persuasive strategies applied by the announcer himself, as observed above. First and foremost, the announcer employs interjections as an attempt at attracting the attention of all

the listeners. For example, the interjection 'Oee!' is usually employed in situations that call for pain and suffering; and as such, becomes attractive to all listeners to hear what the whole announcement is about. It therefore makes more sense for the announcer to even repeat the same interjection for emphasis sake; thus ensuring that all his listeners are persuaded into paying their full attention to the ensuing announcement.

Second, when he pleads for people to listen, the announcer ends up with another interjection, 'jo', as if something painful has happened in the village for people to go and hear about. In this case, he once more attempts to persuade his listeners to pay more attention. As if that is not enough, he repeats the plea for people to listen by starting off with another interjection, 'he', unquestionably to augment the emphasis he has just made on the same plea above; concluding that statement with the plea 'boo!' to signify the importance of the call for them to pay more attention and fulfil the required behaviour.

Further, the announcer clearly pronounces it that what he is about to announce to the listeners is not his own affair but that which has been instructed by the chief, saying, 'Oa ntaela morena.' This way, all his listeners are persuaded into paying more attention; as they understand that there might be something very important for the chief to announce to them; as the chief is the man in charge of the whole village. Furthermore, when the announcer pronounces, 'utloang boo!' all the listeners are persuaded into listening carefully to the subject of the ensuing matter. He then delves into the kind of people the chief is in need of as 'uena ntate' and 'uena 'm'e' to signify that the meeting is for all adults in the village, and not for children. It would then follow therefore that the matter in question is a serious one that calls not for children; thus attempting to persuade all adults to regard this as an important matter that requires their presence and attention. Further still, the announcer informs the listeners that they have to present themselves at the chief's place the following day; as a persuasive measure for them to observe that the meeting is urgent. Though the aspect of time is ignored here, the people are bound to know, since they probably know the time at which they usually gather for matters of this kind.

In addition, when he rounds up his announcement, Souru reveals that there are issues to be discussed; and for people to be persuaded to gather in big numbers, he once more applies the interjections such as 'aoo!' 'hei boo!' and 'hee'; seemingly in a persuasive endeavour for all to once more regard the matter as a sensitive one that needs their full attention. Additionally, he pronounces that whoever fails to hear his announcement should not blame him, but her/himself for having no ears enough to hear this announcement – thus apparently persuading them to even spread the message among themselves if need be – even for those who are right in the gorge to be properly informed. As might be expected, a voice from one small boy appears; saying, "Hele uena monna, u re ha re na litsebe?" (Act II: scene ii) [Hi you

man, do you say that we have no ears?'] Apparently, this voice is meant for taunting the announcer into reacting to the situation mirthfully or otherwise; but with no bad intentions, except as an attempt at persuading him to cause some laughter among members of the community – thus creating some comic relief as a persuasive measure for attending the said gathering.

Though Senamele demonstrated some pride in striking Khabele with a fighting stick on the day of retrieving Litšabako – as was signified by his sauntering around proudly – he is now fearful that he might be found guilty of not only harming Khabele on that day, but even regarded as a conceited man that arrogantly defied chief Lenka by failing to report to him on that day about his search for his daughter. In the light of that fear, it comes not as surprise that he now has paid a visit to one traditional diviner, Mphaufele, for persuading him to supply him with some herbal assistance for winning the case against Khabele and the chief. In order to persuade Mphaufele to consider his case as a serious one, Senamele refers to it as “bokuli ba ka.” (Act II: scene iii) [my sickness] In addition, Senamele suggests to Mphaufele that he would like this matter to remain a secret between the two of them only, as some witches may destroy his case – thus seemingly persuading the traditional diviner to take measures that ensure that no witches may spoil his intentions.

Realizing the intention of Senamele’s statement, Mphaufele assures him as follows: “Baloi bona ha ho ea ka bang a bapalla Mphaufele le hanyenyane feela. Empa he pinyane ea motho ke pinyane ea hae. O tla re utloe haeba u khotsofetse.” (Act II: scene iii) [As for witches there is none that may even slightly dare play around Mphaufele.] In the light of Senamele’s fear, Mphaufele’s statement above seems to function as a persuasive attempt for rubbing off Senamele’s fears that his herbal supplies might be spoiled by the witches. In addition, Mphaufele’s above quip is meant for persuading Senamele to put all the trust in him as his herbalist consultant. Thus assured of safety from the witches, Senamele puts down his case as follows:

“Joale he, taba li mpe ngoan’a ‘m’e. Ho lankane, seo morena a mpitsetsang sona ke sena. O re morena oa Limapong mane, morena Lenka, o mo romeletse ka leqosa la hae eena morena Setlai Sethabathaba mona, a nthomelle ke e’o araba tseo ke li entseng mane.” (Act II: scene iii)

[Now then, matters are bad my mother’s child. It is terrible, that which the chief calls me for is this. He says that the chief of there at Limapong, chief Lenka, has sent him through his messenger the same chief Setlai Sethabathaba here, that he should send me there to answer those that I performed there.]

In order for Mphaufele to identify with him, and seemingly to persuade him to apply brotherly approach in assisting him with his herbal concoctions, Senamele addresses Mphaufele as 'ngoan'a 'm'e' above. In the light of that brotherly address and Senamele's explanation of his situation above, Mphaufele employs some persuasive attempt for Senamele to have all trust in him as a versatile herbalist; saying:

“Taba tsa balimo, nyenyeletso ea balimo e kena haboima ka hloohong ha motho a sa robala. U tsebe balimo bona ba se bile ba ntse ba mpontša hore na ke tle ke nke eng le eng haeba u batla ho sebetsoa. (Oa tsitlana hape, o tiisa hlooho ka mahlakoreng a mabeli, Senamele o thotse o mo shebile.) Tsoela pele.” (O mamela taba tsa Senamele a koetse mahlo.) (Act II: scene iii)

[Issues of the gods, ancestral inspiration enters heavily in one's head if one has not slept. You should know that the ancestors are already showing me what and what I should take if you want me to perform for you. (He bares his teeth once more, tightly holds onto his head on both sides, Senamele is silently looking at him.) Go ahead. (He listens to Senamele's matters with his eyes closed.)]

In the light of Senamele's persuasion for Mphaufele to perform for him as a brother would, Mphaufele's communicative statements above seem to be meant for Senamele to observe and trust in the performances of the ancestors for solving his yet unannounced case. For example, his announcement that the ancestor's inspiration enters uneasily into one who did not sleep seems to be aimed at persuading Senamele to bear with him for whatever shortcomings that might erupt from the present interaction – as he should have slept over the matter before he performs accordingly, he seems to say. But in contradiction to his former statement, Mphaufele states that the ancestors are already informing him about what to use in the performance, should Senamele wish to be performed for. Ultimately, Mphaufele bares his teeth, seemingly to signify the difficulty he alluded to about ancestral inspiration. When he finally listens to Senamele's case with his eyes closed; one might consider Mphaufele's action as a persuasive attempt for the former to put his trust in the powers of the ancestors; and therefore, believe that his case will be judged accordingly.

In the light of the above understanding, it comes not as surprise that Senamele relates his story without any form of hesitation in this manner:

“Ke ile ka khakhatha Khabele hona motseng ha Lenka mane. Joale hosasa ho thoe ke e'o araba eona nyeoe eo ea ho bata Khabele. Eka kamorao ho moo ke tla ea araba ea ho loana motseng oa Lenka ke sa re letho ha ke fihla hona motseng moo. Joale leng'osa le romeletsoe hore le tl'o tsebisa morena oa ka joale, eena a nthomelle ho ea araba ena ea ho bata Khabele ea seng a phalletse moreneng. Joale

maikemisetso a ka ke hore u qhale nyeoe ena ntate.” (Mphaufele o tutubetse sefahleho sona se lebile holimo, ho thola motsotsoana. O bula mahlo o a ntša linameng joaloka motho ea lorang.) (Act II: scene iii)

[I repeatedly beat Khabele right there at Lenka’s village. Now I have been asked to go there tomorrow and answer that same case of striking Khabele with a fighting stick. It would seem that there after I shall go and answer that case of fighting at Lenka’s village without saying anything when I arrived at that village. Now the messenger has been sent to come and inform my chief so that he may send me to go and answer this one of striking Khabele that has run to the chief’s place. Now my intention is for you to cast off this case father. (Mphaufele has his eyes closed while the face is towards the sky and there is silence for a moment. He opens his eyes and stares them like someone dreaming.)]

Seemingly, Senamele applies exaggeration in an attempt at persuading Mphaufele to consider his case as a very serious one that needs the latter’s attention – as he says ‘Ke ile ka khakhatha Khabele ...’ above; for he only struck him but once with his fighting stick. Though Senamele uses this exaggeration in order to drive his persuasive goal; the same exaggeration might end up as a boomerang when Mphaufele pronounces his price for performing the protective assistance in question. The other persuasive attempt Senamele applies is that of informing Mphaufele that he is liable to answer two cases – thus exaggerating his situation to call for Mphaufele’s pity, aimed at the hope that the herbalist will reduce his price. In the like manner, this very mention of two cases to answer might also function as persuasive instances for Mphaufele to put up a high price for his herbal performance. Finally, when Senamele pronounces his persuasive goal as ‘hore u qhale nyeoe ena ntate’, it becomes clear that he puts all his trust in Mphaufele for routing such a case. It would also seem that by his addressing the herbalist doctor as ‘ntate’ here is meant for attempting to persuade him to work on this case as a father would for his son – that is, in a fatherly manner, so to say.

As for Mphaufele, his listening to Senamele’s case with closed eyes might be seen as some persuasive attempt at making the latter to realise that whatever performance outcome he comes up with should be regarded as ancestral inspiration. Further, when he opens up his eyes and stares them ‘joaloka motho ea lorang’ it would seem that Mphaufele applies it as a tactic for attempting to persuade Senamele into believing that he has all along been keeping his eyes shut in order to consult his ancestors for assistance in this matter. In line with this persuasive goal, Mphaufele merely asks Senamele whether that is all the performance he is asking for; seemingly as a persuasive measure for the latter to add more requests, if any. In response, Senamele says, “Ke qetile morena. Qhala ntho ena haeba u ka etsa.” (Act II: scene iii) [I am through chief. Rout this thing if you can.] Since Mphaufele is not a ‘morena’

but a herbalist, Senamele's addressing him as such may be viewed as a persuasive attempt at demonstrating to the herbalist the high regard with which he bestows upon him in matters of this kind – and therefore appealing for Mphaufele to perform in accordance with a chief in protecting his own servant – as he hereby clearly spells out his persuasive goal.

In the light of the above view, Mphaufele now endeavours to persuade Senamele to retain the above demonstrated high regard for him – by stating that, “Taba ena e mphokolla haholo. Ha se taba ntho ena.” (Act II: scene iii) [This matter is too minor for me. This is no matter.] In other words, Mphaufele degrades this matter inferior so as to attempt at persuading Senamele to regard him as an expert in herbal operations of this nature. Having attempted to persuade Senamele as above, Mphaufele continues his interactive response by saying:

“Feela he, ere ke tla qala ke sebetse, ke ee ke batle tefo ea ka e tsoe pele hoba ke jeoe ke felile. Ke ea ne ke etsa hore motho a hlole nyeoe ea popota mona, eo a neng a ke ke a e hlola ha e se ka Mphaufele enoa, (oa itšupa, o itšupa sefubeng,) enoa. Empa ha ke se ke tšoanetse ho fumana patala ea ka, ebe motho oa qala joale, ‘Hoa e-cha hoa tima, hoa e-cha, hoa tima.’” (Act II: scene iii)

[But now, so as to start performing, I usually ask for my payment first, for I have been consumed and am finished. I have been performing so that someone wins a gigantic case here, that he/she might not have won it were it not for this Mphaufele, (he points at himself, he points at his own chest,) this one. But when I am supposed to get my payment, the person in question now starts, ‘There the fire burns, there it extinguishes, there it burns, there it extinguishes.’]

In addition, in order for Senamele to be persuaded at starting off with payment before the herbal operation in question, Mphaufele mentions the importance of producing his payment first – by advancing his reason as that of ‘ke jeoe ke fedile,’ as seen above. It would seem that Mphaufele's employment of the above expression is meant for persuading Senamele to realise that those who do not pay prior to the required performance usually consume at the fabric of the herbalist; and as such, he is no more prepared to perform any operation without the patient's advancement of the payment. Additionally, Mphaufele makes reference to his assistance in making someone to win ‘nyeoe ea popota’ as a demonstrative persuasion for Senamele to realise that even people with such serious cases fail to pay accordingly after the whole operation. In this way, the herbalist is cautioning Senamele that, if those with such serious cases fail to pay, it might be worse for his case that has just been relegated minor above.

In order for Senamele to remain with clear understanding that such cases have been won due to his powers in nullifying them; Mphaufele speaks and points at his own chest as a

persuasive action for Senamele to gain full trust in him as a powerful and capable herbalist. Additionally still, Mphaufele mimics those who beat about the bush when they have to pay by their making reference to the fire that repeatedly burns and extinguishes; in essence showing him that when that time comes, such people clutch at senseless issues to evade payment. Needless to say, this is a persuasive action for assuring Senamele that he is also likely to behave in the same manner; would his case be dealt with prior to advancing his payment.

As might be anticipated, Senamele retorts that he is not that kind of person; whereupon Mphaufele interrupts him and lays out his case as follows:

“Senamele butle hle monna. Ke bua ntho eo ke e tsebang, uena u ntse u ithoka feela tjena. O ile a etsa’ng Ramosoeu? A ntse a ithothokisa botšephehi joaloka uena tjena. Ka etsa hore a hlole nyeoe e mpe ea ho utsoa linku tsa morena ka meraka ka koana.” (Act II: scene iii)

[Senamele wait a minute please man. I speak about what I know, you are merely praising yourself. What did Ramosoeu do? He had been self-praising trustworthiness just as you do. I ensured that he won that bad case of his stealing the chief’s sheep there in the ranches.]

In the light of the above presentation by Mphaufele, it becomes clear that he hereby employs a known example as a persuasive attempt for Senamele to realise that he is talking about facts, and not mere suppositions. In short, Mphaufele employs the foregoing example as a testimony, or conviction for supporting his case; and therefore persuading Senamele to observe that unless he pays the price before the operation, there is nothing that he may perform as herbalist. Besides, Mphaufele brings into play this testimony so as to convince Senamele about his powers and ability in performing these matters. It therefore comes not as surprise that Senamele marvels at Mphaufele’s expertise by posing the question: “Ke uena ea ileng a phutsisa nyeoe eo ea Ramosoeu?” (Act II: scene iii) [So it is you that routed that case of Ramosoeu?]

Indeed, Mphaufele now gets an opportunity to prove himself to his client that he is a versatile consultant; and persuades him to go through the proposed performance without any doubt that his problem will be dully solved here. He strikes his own chest with a fist to apply conviction for Senamele that he is indeed the one that put Ramosoeu’s case to rout; saying: “Ha ho poho peli ngakeng tsa nokeng ena ea Makhaleng, ho e nyolosa le ho e theosa. Poho ke Mphaufele feela mona.” (Act II: scene iii) [There is no second bull among the doctors along this Makhaleng river, be it upward or downward bound. The bull is only Mphaufele here.] Even though Mphaufele does not directly answer Senamele’s question, his self-praise is tantamount to answering it by confirming his unchallenged expertise above as the only

'poho' along the borders of Makhaleng. In short, Mphaufele hereby persuades his client to put all trust in him as consultant and pay up so that he can perform for him accordingly.

But as opposed to the foregoing self-praise, in the same vein Mphaufele proposes his wishful thinking; saying, "Hoja ke tseba ho otla ka letolo, nka be se ke hotelitse Ramosoeru le mahlaananyana a hae mpanyana tsena." (Act II: scene iii) [If I knew how to strike with lightning, I would have already set alight Ramosoeru and his emissaries on these small stomachs of theirs.] Though by so saying Mphaufele attempts to persuade Senamele to gain full conviction about his operations; one realises that his foregoing statement backfires as a self-contradiction for himself as self-praised versatile doctor along the borders of Makhaleng. Yet it becomes interesting to observe how Senamele responds to the herbalist's self-praise; as he drives his goal of being assisted in his problem by a truly versatile herbalist. Senamele says, "U re'ng na Mphaufele oa Ngaka Matsetsele?" (Act II: scene iii) [What do you say now Mphaufele the Versatile Doctor?] Obviously Mphaufele feels flattered by Senamele's comment – as he smiles to signify his appreciation of being flattered by his seeming client. As a follow-up to the smile, Mphaufele delves more into self-acclaim that:

"Na ha ke sa le mocholoko ke mokoma. Hore u tle u mpona hantle, ha ke hloke hore u 'ne u metla-metle ebe u re u batla lipaki. Ba itse u ee le bopaki? He monna! U li siee haeba u na le tsona. Thupa tseo ke tla u fa tsona ha u il'ona kena ka khotla ka mane ke bopaki, li feletse. 'Na ha ke bapale ntate Senamele. Ke motjoli-moholo motjoposela. Ntho e 'ngoe le e 'ngoe ea 'mamela. Le batho bana nka ba lebisana moo ke ratang ba utloa ka 'na feela. Empa he re lumellane ka patala joale ke tla u sebeletsa." (Act II: scene iii)

[I am no more a doctor-learner but a professional. So as to see me well, I do not need you to stupidly run around saying that you are looking for witnesses. Did they say that you should take with you some witnesses? Hi man! You should leave them behind even if you have them. The sticks that I shall give you as you go and enter the court are testimony, they are complete. As for me I do not play, father Senamele. I am versatile-herd the saunterer. Everything listens to me. I can even drive these people to wherever I like and they will respond accordingly. But then let us agree on the price and I shall perform for you.]

Unquestionably, Mphaufele relies much in his action of self-embellishment as a persuasive measure for Senamele to put his full trust in him as a versatile herbalist that is geared towards rescuing him from the present seeming danger. Apparently as a persuasive attempt for Senamele to cast off any doubts as to whether or not he is indeed a versatile doctor, Mphaufele even dares him to stop stupidly running around in search of some witnesses. Rather, he promises him that the sticks he is going to supply Senamele with are a testimony

to themselves. Ironically though, when Mphaufele tells Senamele that 'Ntho e 'ngoe le e 'ngoe ea 'mamela,' one realises the contradiction embodied in that statement; for he has just pronounced himself that he has no control over lightening above. As if Senamele had registered his doubt, Mphaufele goes further to assure him that he is not one who plays around.

Furthermore, he employs alliteration in his self-embellishment that, 'Ke motjoli-moholo motjoposela.' According to Ebewo (1997:40), alliteration is a "device used in poetry to create effect of music, emphasis, or ornamentation. This involves the repetition of initial identical consonant sounds in two or more words in a line of a poem." In this way, Mphaufele hereby attempts to persuade Senamele to regard him as a versatile herbalist that can never fail to perform in accordance with the client's requirements in the prevailing situation. In an attempt at cementing his seeming success in persuading Senamele to have full belief in him; Mphaufele even makes wishful thinking statement that he can even control the movement of people and make them perform as he likes – thus capitalizing upon the gullibility of Senamele at this point in time by even saying highly unreasonable statements. Then Mphaufele finally proposes for Senamele and himself to agree on the price so that he may start performing; in this case indicating that he is aware that Senamele is successfully persuaded to belief in him as an able doctor that is going to assist him accordingly.

In an effort at persuading Mphaufele to regard him as a rich enough client that is capable of paying any price; Senamele pronounces himself as follows, "Tsatsi lena ha le likela, u be u le mane ha ka ke u fe patala ea hao. Ha ke malapane ea kang Ramosoeu ntate Mphaufele 'na." (Act II: scene iii) [At sunset today, you should present yourself there at my home so that I can offer you your price. I am not a poor guy like Ramosoeu father Mphaufele me.] Thus persuaded to regard his client as an able-bodied person that is prepared to pay the price on this very day of consultancy; Mphaufele makes an attempt at persuading the client to consider him as a compassionate herbalist doctor, and says:

"Ha ke na ho u hanyapetsa hoba re batho ba bapelaneng ka khaho leha bo-Ramohlongoana ba rona ba arohane. Joale tefo ea ka e nyenyane haholo. Poli tse peli ea katapere le e tšehali. Ena ea katapere, re tla be re tl'o e hlaba mantsiboea."
(Act II: scene iii)

[I am not going to overcharge you as we are neighbours, even though our Headmen are separated. Now my price is a very small one. Two goats: one castrated and a female one. As for the castrated one, we shall even slaughter it tonight.]

But then one wonders whether or not Mphaufele's charge is indeed a light one for solving Senamele's case – or has he been persuaded into charging him two goats because of

Senamele's own boasting that he is not a 'malapane' like Ramosoeru? I personally regard this as an exorbitant charge, especially as he even gives the following instructions to Senamele:

“U se ke be ua ja nama ea eona, ebe ke u fa nyooko ea eona, ke re bosiu ka khitla, u tle u nyolohele mahaheng mane, u fihle u khumame u bope matsoho, u shebe Bochabela koana. Ha khoho ea pele e re koekoelekoe! Ebe u nka phoshoana ena u e tsoaka le nyooko ena ea poli kahar'a lengeta. Ebe u hasa koana le koana, e 'ngoe u e mome u re 'phooa! Ha e'o likela koana le beng ba eona!' Joale u phete mantsoe ana: 'Nyeoe ena ea Khabele e bole joaloka mahe a liruha.' Ebe u tsetela lengetana lena fatše hona ka lehaheng ka mono. Ha u theoha u lepelle feela u se ke be ua hetla, u be u re chobe ka tlung. Joale he re utloane, (Senamele o ntse a oma ka hlooho ho bontša ho amohela taba tsa ngaka.) U tla fumana thupa e tla qetella tsohle tsohle. Eona u tla e lahlela ka hanong hang ha ho thoe u eme u itšireletse.” (Act II: scene iii)

[You should not eat its meat, then I give you its gall, I say right at the mid of the night, you should go up there to the caves, then kneel down and put your hands together, facing the east. When the first cock says koekoelekoe! Then take this powder and mix it with this gall of the goat inside a piece of broken pot. Then you spread the mixture all around, but keep one in your mouth and then say 'phooa! Let it go and disappear that far with its owners.' Then repeat these words: 'This case of Khabele should decay like rotten eggs.' Then you bury this piece of a broken pot right there in the cave. When you go down from there you should just go straight down without looking back, until you enter the house. Now then we have agreed, (Senamele keeps bowing as a sign that he agrees to the doctor's instructions.) You will get a stick that will conclude everything. As for it, you will throw it into the mouth just as you are asked to stand up and defend yourself.]

Significantly, what makes Mphaufele's charge to seem so exorbitant is the fact that, though one of the goats is to be slaughtered the same night; Senamele is restricted from partaking of its meat; but to use its gall as herbal mixture. Further, Mphaufele's instructions are clear, yet they are not easy for one to perform to the letter. For example, it is not easy for one to remain in the cave, kneeling down and with hands put together until the cock crows, staying in constancy through out the given period. Furthermore, the stick that Senamele is instructed to throw into his mouth as he is about to defend himself might hamper his speech ability and fluency in court. In the light of these handicaps, one may rightly observe that Mphaufele is putting them as some persuasive attempt for Senamele to regard him as knowledgeable doctor with tough instructions to perform. For that matter, one is bound to conclude that all these instructions highlight that Mphaufele is a fake herbalist doctor that Senamele should not trust for the required performance. In essence, these instructions should function as

persuasive reasons for Senamele to quit this organised contract between himself and Mphaufele.

Like someone who realises the cumbersome implications of Mphaufele's instructions; Senamele responds in the following manner for his consultant to realise the problems he might come across as he performs as instructed: "Mh! Mh! Ke u mametse ka tlhoko." (Act II: scene iii) [Mh! Mh! (interjections.) I am listening to you with care.] Seemingly with an idea that Senamele might start doubting the genuineness of his performance instructions, Mphaufele applies another persuasive communication for Senamele to remain assured that performing as instructed will result into winning the case against him. He says:

"U be bohlale, ho se be motho ea ka u bonang hore u momme letho. Ha u e moma, u hoeshetse ka bohlale u re: 'Moferefere, ferekanya Khabele, a pote a be 'ne a itoantše nyeoeng ena.' Joale u tla bona. Leha ho ka ba ha thoe oa cha a ke ke be a e hlola nyeoe eno. Nka li tjeba tsa ea le metsi." (Act II: scene iii)

[You should be clever, there should be nobody realizing that you are keeping something in your mouth. As you put it in, you whisper with discernment and say: 'Confusion, confuse Khabele, so that he raves and ends up fighting against himself in this case.' Now you will see. Even if it may be said that he is burning he can never win that case. I can throw them (herbal mixtures) off and they go with the water.]

Indubitably, Mphaufele's instructions are likely to cause some impairment on Senamele's speech activity in court, and he is aware of it. It would then seem that his aim at cautioning Senamele against being noticed by anybody as he puts a stick into his mouth is a persuasive attempt for the latter never to blame him when something goes wrong during the course of putting something into the mouth and talking while such an object is still kept there. In the light of this view, one may rightly conclude that Mphaufele's vow that he can throw off his herbal mixtures if they fail is another attempt at persuading Senamele to have high regard for him in this matter and trust that success is ensured. It then seems to make sense that Senamele says the following in response: "Poli tse peli ha se letho ho 'na mona. Ke mpa ke ne nka thaba haholo ha u ne u ka re ke u lefe linku kaha poli li se li batla li mphella." (Act II: scene iii) [Two goats is nothing here to me. I would otherwise be much happier were you to ask me to pay with sheep since goats seem to be diminishing for me.]

Needless to say, Senamele's foregoing pronouncement is a persuasive action, measure for Mphaufele to realise that the former is a rich man that is ready to pay the price as agreed upon. On the other hand, Senamele's preparedness to pay the price may be viewed as a persuasive attempt for Mphaufele to go ahead in organizing the required performance with an assurance that his charge will be honoured; though he hereby suggests some other

preferences. In the light of the foregoing preferences indicated by Senamele, Mphaufele hereby uses counter-persuasion to change his client's attitude towards the payment for this herbal operation as follows:

“Ehlile ho joalo, empa rona lingaka maamong a tjena re sebelisa nyooko ea poli haholo le mohlehlo oa eona. Lebaka ke hore poli ke ngaka ntate. E ja setlama se seng le se seng. Joale maling a eona ho lutse litlakala tse thata. Joale nku ea khetha e itjella seboku feela.” (Act II: scene iii)

[Indeed it is so, but we doctors in situations such as these we mostly use the bile of a goat and its suet. The reason is that a goat is a doctor, father. It eats every shrub. As such, in its blood there exist strong kinds of medicines. But the sheep is choosy and eats only the grass *Anthistiria imberbis* (see Mabile and Dieterlen, 1985:393.)]

As may be observed in Mphaufele's submission above, he agrees with Senamele's suggestion, yet gives him reasons behind his choice of goats rather than sheep; as illustrated. By so doing, Mphaufele employs upfront persuasion for Senamele to respond to this issue with conviction that the doctor's preference is the correct one for this performance against the ensuing case. Needless to say, Senamele's attitude quickly changes, as he even invites Mphaufele to accompany him to his home, saying, “Leha u ka thola ntate ke se ke utluile. U qetile litaba ekaba ke llela khang. Ebe re ka ea, kaha lintho li se li tla oroha ke tle ke tsebe ho u neha patala ea hao?” (Act II: scene iii) [Even if you may be silent father I have already heard. You have completed the issues and I would be crying for strive. Can we go, since the animals are about to return home so that I may be able to give you your payment?]

Indeed, Mphaufele's persuasive attempts at shaping Senamele's attitude in this matter have been successful; and, as may be observed in his following reaction, he even goes a step further to exploit his gullible client more:

“Nka thaba haholo hoba ua utloa mosebetsi o mongata hona joale. U tlile u se u nkhatisa masep'a manamane, joale sebaka se se se lekane motinyane feela. Joale re hle re phahamele marole. Be! (O itšoara hloohong o sheba fatše.) Ho na le ntho eo ke e lebalang ... sekantšo. U lokela ho khantšetsa tšebetso ena ka liranta tse hlano. Ua tseba joale tšebetso e ipapisitseng le balimo e tsamaea ka katleho ha e khantšelitsoe.” (Act II: scene iii)

[I can be very happy because you are aware that there is a lot of work right now. You came already causing me to trample over the calves' dung, even now the space is just enough for the Grass warbler (i.e., there is very little room or space left; see Mabile and Dieterlen 1985:301.) We therefore have to rise above dusts. Oh! (He holds onto his head and looks down.) There is something that I forget ... offering presented to a diviner. You have to give

an offering for this performance with five rand. As you know the operation that is alongside the ancestors goes successfully if the diviner's offering has been presented.]

In line with the foregoing verbal reaction by Mphaufele, it becomes clear that he hereby formulates some persuasive reasons behind his charge for the ensuing operation. First, he proposes that the work is overpowering; especially as Senamele has come with a high speed demand. As a persuasive attempt for his client to realise the extent of the speed in question, Mphaufele, secondly employs an idiomatic expression, 'ho hatisa motho masepan'a manamane.' [to cause one to trample over the calves' dung.] Since this idiomatic expression is derived from a war situation – where victors terribly overpower their victims – it may be correctly regarded as Mphaufele's persuasive strategy for Senamele to understand that the diviner has been forced to charge this seemingly exorbitant price. It is for this reason therefore that Mphaufele even suggests that now 'sebaka se se se lekane motinyane feela;' thus applying a proverbial expression to amplify his persuasion for Senamele to accept all his suggestions and charges with a positive mood.

As if that is not enough, Mphaufele yet applies another idiomatic expression for employing speed in their performances by indicating to his client that, 'Joale re hle re phahamele marole.' Seemingly, this strategy is used by Mphaufele as another persuasive endeavour for Senamele to be more gullible to any form of persuasion that Mphaufele has in store for him. Unsurprisingly, as Mphaufele claims to have forgotten to mention the five rand offering for the diviner, Senamele wastes no time but searches himself and offers it in the form of loose change. Even though he quips that the money he offers to Mphaufele was meant for buying some paraffin for the family; Senamele willingly offers it and self- surmises that, "ha le fete khomo le je motho." (Act II: scene iii) [A cow cannot be spared instead of a man.] According to Mokitimi (1997:3) this proverb means that, "A fine must be paid to get a man out of trouble." It follows therefore that Senamele considers his action of paying out this fine, instead of the paraffin required by his family, as justifiable enough for taking him out of the seemingly impending trouble.

Since it appears that Mphaufele's persuasive goal is presently to gain as much as possible from Senamele through his gullibility – the two goats and the R5.00 – he instructs Senamele to drop the money into his divine bones' bag, instead of taking it by hand from his client. Mphaufele's persuasive aim here is apparently that of creating more trust into Senamele as a diviner and regard him as quite a versatile one; as he says, "Se ka mpha ka letsohong. E tšele ka mona. (O bula selata se tšetseng litaola, Senamele o e akhela kateng.) E, ho etsua tjena hoba ha se ea rona ke ea balimo. Ha re ee ke e'o lata lipoli re tl'o tsoelapele he. (Ba theohela ha Senamele.) [Don't give it into the hand. Drop it into here. (He opens the divine bones' bag, Senamele drops it into it.) Yes, this is how it is done because it is not ours but for

the gods. Let us go so that I fetch the goats and then we can proceed.] Needless to say, Mphaufele's plan for Senamele to drop the money into the divine bones' bag is a persuasive plan for the latter to gain some belief that the whole charge is not from him as an individual being per se, but as gods' representative in solving the ensuing problem.

It would then be a matter of interest for one to observe the way this case evolves in court and how it finally culminates. Interestingly, Senamele has been accompanied by Mphaufele to the village court at ha Lenka; though they have ensured that they are hardly seen together. As one might expect, Mphaufele's dress is glamorously ornamented for signifying his status as a divine doctor – seemingly to impress and persuade Senamele into believing in the power of his charms as a versatile diviner. As a matter of practice, all stand up as the chief enters, and sit down in order to listen to whatever the chief has in store for them. As might be expected, the chief opens his speech by greeting all the assembled people in this form: “Bo-ntate le bo-’m’e, banna le basali ba motse oa Lenka, kea le lumelisa.” (Act II: scene iv) [Fathers and mothers, men and women of Lenka,s village, I greet you.] Clearly, this form of address and the greeting function as persuasive attempts at establishing rapport – for all to relax and listen to the piece of news that the chief has to deliver for his people on this special meeting.

Further, seemingly in an attempt at persuading all to pay attentive listening and observe the difference in status prevailing here; the chief clears his throat and pushes his trousers higher up his belly. Then he delivers his speech in the following manner:

“Ke lakatsa ho qala ka ho leboha morena Setlai ka ho sebelisana le ‘na ka hore a romelle motho oa hae, Senamele, ke eno, hore a tl’o araba litaba tseo a li entseng hona kahar’a motse ona oa ka. Bang le se ntse le li utloile, bang le bone ka mahlo, bang mohlomong ha le tsebe letho. (O sheba ka lehlakoreng la moqosi o thetha mpa e kholo ena ka matsoho, o nts’a khoelehetsa lebanta khafetsa.) Ho bile le qaka kahar’a motse oona ona oa ka, moo ‘na ke sa tsebisoang letho, eaba mali a ea tšoloha. Ha se bile ha se ‘na ea tla le manollela taba tsena. Beng ba tsona ba teng, ha e ke e anyesa ka mokukutoana ‘m’a (sic) eona a ntse a le teng. Khabele, ke uena molli, a k’u ... a k’u behe taba tsa hao.” (Act II: scene iv)

[I would like to start by extending my thanks to chief Setlai for working together with me by sending his person, Senamele, there he is, so that he may come and answer matters that he caused right here in this village of mine. Some of you have already heard them, others have witnessed them, and yet others possibly know nothing. (He looks towards the side of the complainant and works on this big stomach of his to set it right with his hands, while he continues pushing his belt higher up.) There has been a trouble in this very village of mine, whereby I was never informed of anything, and resulted into the spillage of blood. It is not

even I that is going to reveal these matters to you. Their owners are present, and it never suckles by a stuffed skin of a calf while its mother exists. Khabele, you are the complainant, please ... please submit your case.]

In the light of the fact that the accused is Senamele from chief Setlai's village in this case, one might correctly assume that chief Lenka thanks chief Setlai in an attempt at persuading the gathering to realise that the whole matter for this day is centered on his subject, Senamele. It is therefore proper for chief Lenka to even point at the accused as one that is liable for answering the matters that have resulted into today's gathering. In line with this understanding, this revelation can be rightly regarded as a persuasive attempt for all present to carefully listen to the verbal exchanges from both the accused and complainant; and prepare themselves for interacting with either side where need arises – as is the usual practice in the village courts. Even as morena Lenka indicates that some individuals in the gathering might have heard, witnessed the trouble in question, or have no clue about this case; it would seem that he is actually persuading the gathering to interact in accordance with any of the positions he hereby spells out for them.

In addition, when morena Lenka emphasises the point of never having been consulted in his village, it appears as if he is already persuading the gathering to take sides in this case and regard Senamele as an arrogant man that deserves some disciplinary action for his failure to inform the chief accordingly when he entered the village. Additionally, when he looks at the side of the complainant and works on his stomach while he continues pushing his belt higher; it would seem that Lenka's whole action is meant for persuading Khabele in particular to realise that he might have been to blame for the matters that ensued at his home on the day of the strive. On such basis, chief Lenka hereby possibly accuses Khabele of his failure to inform him as the chief accordingly prior to Senamele's coming into the village in search of his daughter – that his son has caused Senamele's daughter to elope with him.

In the light of morena Lenka's seeming accusations above, Khabele stands up and relates the story of Mofammere's elopement with Senamele's daughter. In this submission Khabele indicates that though he did not know the girl that his son caused to elope with; he knew her father very well. Further, he relates that he became ill the following day. Furthermore, he intimates that, "joaloka motho oa Mosotho, ke ile ka hopola hore ke rome motho ho ea lata nku ea koae ka motebong ke tsebe ho tla fa ngoana enoa koae." (Act II: scene iv) [like a Mosotho person, I thought of sending someone to go and fetch a sheep for slaughter with the purpose of welcoming this child in my home.] In line with Khabele's above submission, it would seem that he is already attempting to persuade chief Lenka to side with him for his failure to inform Senamele timely about the elopement in question.

On the other hand, at this juncture Mphaufele is observed standing up and quickly sitting down again; while casting an eye as a communicative signal of some kind. On the basis of his promise for routing this case for Senamele's sake; Mphaufele's present reaction can be regarded as a persuasive attempt for Senamele to realise that there is an opportunity for this case to be thrown out of the court. It therefore comes not as astonishment that Senamele reacts to Mphaufele's above action by smiling into his blanket; possibly in agreement with his diviner that Khabele has already erred somehow in his presentation of this case. As if with reaction to these seeming signal exchanges between Mphaufele and Senamele; Khabele even poses the following question to morena Lenka: "U 'mametse morena oa ka?" (Act II: scene iv) [Are you listening to me my chief?] Apparently, Khabele poses this question to the chief as he realises that he might have erred in his submission; and therefore attempting to persuade the chief to identify with him in this situation and find some reasonableness in his failure to inform both the chief and Senamele about the elopement.

It would appear that morena Lenka is aware of Khabele's persuasive endeavours to win him to his side; for he responds to Khabele's foregoing question in this manner: "Bua taba tsa hao monna, ke 'na ea itseng ba u qhemetse?" (Act II: scene iv) [Speak up your matters man, am I the one that said that they should strike you?] Needless to say, morena Lenka's foregoing response to Khabele's question is a counter-persuasive reaction that is meant for Khabele to speak up and relate his story without asking for the chief to side with him. It would also seem that the gathered people are also aware of Khabele's intentions in asking the chief the above quoted question; for they also react by saying, "Bua taba tsa hao Khabele khaohana le morena." (Act II: scene iv) [Speak up your matters Khabele and leave the chief alone.] In this way the gathering reiterate the chief's reaction in an attempt at persuading Khabele to stick to his part of relating the matter without asking for anyone to side with him.

Thus redirected towards relating his matter, Khabele delves into the matter in these words:

"Ha ke tsoele pele he. Ha ke se ke file ngoetsi koae tsatsing leo, ho e-sa ke ile ka tsoha ke hlapohetsoe ke utloa hore nka palama pere joale ka ea bolella ntate Senamele. Ke mona moo e reng ha ke sa re ke fumana masheleshelenyana a hoseng, ebang monna enoa Senamele o se a fihla. Ke bile ke lutse kantle lapeng mane. H'a qala a fihla, 'Ua bona keng Khabele, ua bona ke u joetse!'" (Khabele u etsisa Senamele h'a fihla ho eena maoba, o tšoantšisetsa ho Senamele. Senamele o mo tonela mahlo o batla ho mo raohela.) (Act II: scene iv)

[Let me continue then. When I had already given the daughter-in-law the welcome sheep on that day, in the morning I woke up feeling better so that I might ride a horse and now go and inform father Senamele. It is at this moment that as I was getting some breakfast this man

Senamele immediately arrives. I was even sitting outside there at home. Immediately he arrives, 'You see what Khabele, you see that I tell you!' (Khabele mimics Senamele when he came to him yesterday-but-one, mimicking towards Senamele. Senamele stares at him as if to attack him.)]

Indubitably, Khabele endeavours to persuade the chief and the whole gathering to side with him on this case; that is why he among other things suggests that he had fallen ill, so that he could not go and inform Senamele accordingly about this matter that concerned his daughter. Even as he mentions that he first of all offered a sheep slaughter for welcoming the daughter-in-law as a member of his family; it becomes clear that his aim is to persuade the gathering that he acted in good faith and never meant any harm to Senamele. Further, when he mentions that Senamele arrived at his home as he was partaking of some breakfast in preparation to go and consult him; that information might still be analysed as a persuasive measure for the chief and the whole gathering to regard his actions as normal and not to have caused Senamele to attack him as he did. Furthermore, when Khabele mimics Senamele and even performs towards Senamele himself; that action might be regarded as a persuasive exercise for all to consider Senamele as an arrogant individual who goes about attacking people without any form of provocation.

In accordance with court procedures, the chief reprimands Khabele against pointing a finger at Senamele in these words, "Se k'a supa motho ka monoana ka khotla ntate 'nyeo. Haeso ke kae?" (Act II: scene iv) [Do not point a finger at someone you father-of-so-and-so. Where is my home?] This chief's reprimand is meant for persuading Khabele to refrain from behaving as he has just done; for people might even wonder where he comes from, as the chief says, 'Haeso ke kae?' to signify that Khabele's action may only be excusable to a foreigner that is not accustomed with local court procedures. In the light of the chief's reprimand, the gathering is even persuaded to reprimand Khabele from looking towards the accused while presenting a case against him – saying, "Se k'a 'na sheba ka ho motho enoa ha u bua monna. Ke khotla mona." (Act II: scene iv) [Stop looking towards this person as you talk man. It is at court here.] To highlight the fact that he is agreeable to people's persuasive reprimand; Khabele retorts that, "Ke utloile bo. Hao!" (Act II: scene iv) [I have heard please. Indeed!]

Upon realizing Khabele's defensive attitude, the chief instructs him to continue his presentation of the matter in these words: "Tsoela pele monna Khabele mesebetsi e mengata ha rea shebana le manyofonyofo ana a lona feela." (Act II: scene iv) [Go on Khabele man there are numerous works and we are not only concerned with these bad affairs of yours.] Obviously, the chief's reference to these matters as 'manyofonyofo' is a persuasive attempt for all to realise that matters of this sort are unnecessary; as they could

have been avoided by the concerned individuals' taking responsible actions, as was indicated earlier above. In the light of this understanding, Khabele agrees with the chief by saying, "Ua bolela morena." (Act II: scene iv) [You are correct chief.] In continuation of his presentation of the matter, Khabele then puts it as follows:

"Joale he, ke leke ho bua le ntate Senamele ea seng a sa re re lumele le mosali enoa oa ka ha re ntse re lutse le eena kantle mono. O fihla a se a hlahlile mahlo, bohale ba hae eka ba noha ena eo ho thoeng ke lehoeere ha e batla ho loma motho. 'Na, 'Hela ntate Senamele, butle, taba lia buisanoa.' Khele! Joale ka mo baka materebe. 'Mphe ngoan'a ka Khabele pele ke u bolaela hona makhooeng mona.' (Senamele o sheba Khabele ka ho latola seo a se buang leha a sa re letho.) Ke boele ke leke hore ke buisana le eena hore a theole moea re buisane. Ke bile ke re, ngoana ke tla mo nyala. Li se ntse li kentse maoto; re buisane. A bela haholo Senamele joale, eaka ke mo rohakile. Ke ha a rutla mollo pokothong, a tloeba, a re o hotetsa rontabolenyana eno ea ka. Ao! Ke bulule mollo ona ke o time. A bontše hore o tla mpata, a tšoele letsoho ho itokisetsa ho nthekhetsa, ke cheche. Mosali oa ka a bokolla a hlaba mokhosi." (Act II: scene iv)

[Now then, I tried talking with father Senamele that does not even say good morning to us as we were sitting there outside with this wife of mine. He arrives already with digging eyes, his fury as tantamount to that of the snake called adder when it wants to bite somebody. I, 'Hi father Senamele, wait, matters are discussed.' Khele! (interjection of astonishment) Then I inflated his fury. 'Give me my child Khabele before I kill you right here at the white man's land.' (Senamele looks at Khabele with denial of what he is saying yet silent.) I then tried to once more speak with him to calm his spirit so that we talk. I was even saying, as for the child I shall marry her. They have already put in their feet; so we have to talk. Senamele's fury then rose to the boiling point, as if I had insulted him. Then he drew some matches from his pocket, and lit, saying that he was burning that small round house of mine. Alas! I blew out the fire and extinguished it. He then showed that he was going to strike me, and spat into his hand in preparation for striking me violently, and I reversed. My wife wailed and called people's attention.]

As may be observed in Khabele's presentation of the matter above, he applies a number of persuasive strategies for influencing the verdict of this case, that:

- He tried to speak with Senamele, even as he did not greet him and his wife – as he lies that they were sitting there together – apparently with an aim for Senamele to appear as an arrogant character with pre-planned violent intentions;

- Senamele arrived already with digging eyes to indicate his violent intentions – once more Khabele attempting to persuade the gathering to regard Senamele as a troublemaker that deserves to be punished accordingly;
- Senamele's fury was similar to that of an adder as it is about to strike a person – seemingly Khabele hereby applies a simile in order to persuade all members of the gathering to view Senamele as no different from that violent snake – and therefore charge him deservedly;
- Senamele was not ready for any form of negotiations, even as Khabele asked for discussing the issues and admitted guilt – obviously Khabele once more attempts to persuade the jury to side with him and regard Senamele as an uncultured character that lacks reasoning power;
- Senamele even threatened to kill him there at 'makhooeng' – thus employing lying as a strategy for the jury to think the worst of Senamele, and persuade them to identify with him as they regard Senamele as a murderer;
- Even as he proposed to marry the girl, Senamele became more furious – once more employing lying aspect to paint Senamele black so that the jury may deal with him harshly;
- 'Eaka ke mo rohakile,' thus applying hyperbole for persuading the gathering to imagine the extent of fury in which Senamele was, even as Khabele tried to plead with him for negotiations;
- Senamele wanted to burn 'rontabolenyana eno ea ka;' thus relegating his round house as inferior for people to feel pity for him as a poor man that Senamele was out to destroy – in this case Khabele invites sympathy and empathy as persuasive strategies for all to side with him in this situation;
- Senamele wanted 'ho mpata' and 'ho nthekhetsa;' thus Khabele employs diction for emphasizing Senamele's violent intentions of causing him bodily harm – as a persuasive attempt for the jury to regard Senamele as a ruthless character; and finally
- 'Mosali a bokolla a hlaba mokhosi;' as an indication of the extent to which Senamele caused him and his wife some fright – thus Khabele calls for the jury to regard Senamele as a character that deserves to be found guilty of causing post-traumatic stress for his family.

It is therefore not astonishing for the people to react in these words: "Utloang banna, Khili! Khili! (Basali ba opa liatla.) Ee hle basali hle!" (Act II: scene iv) [Listen guys, Khili! Khili!

(interjection of astonishment) (Women clap their hands) No please women please!] Significantly, people have been successfully persuaded by Khabele's presentation to identify with him and regard him as a victim that deserves to be compensated for his suffering in this case. In the light of the above interjections and remarks of sympathy and empathy; Khabele carries on reporting the matter in this form:

“Ke mona moo a ileng a rutla thutsoana ea mollo hape a soka a re: ‘U tl’u k’u leke hape u time mollo ona. Ke tla u pshatla hata lena.’ A tloeba. Ka o tima. A memela kobo, ka qala ho hlokomela hore motho enoa o tlike a se a ntse a itokiselitse ntoa hoba o ne a le likhopo feela a sa apara leha e le hentsoana ea kahare. Ebe Motlalepula o tla a se a phalletse. Ke eena eo, ka bophoqo bona ba hae, a ileng a ema kapele ho ‘na hore motho enoa a fumane mokhoa oa ho ‘ntša kotsi. Ke tseba ho itšireletsa ‘na, ha ke motho oa ho batoa ke monna e mong feela-feela tjena.” (Act II: scene iv)

[It is then that he pulled out another match stick and threatened saying: ‘You dare once more extinguish this match. I shall break this skull of yours.’ He then struck. I blew it off. He stripped off his blanket, and then I began to realise that this person has come already prepared for fighting as he was bare and not wearing even a mere vest. Then Motlalepula came running to help. There he is, for this stupidity of his, he stood in front of me so that this person might get an opportunity to injure me. I personally know how to defend myself I am not a person that might be struck by another man just like that.]

Even though Khabele has this time refrained from lying in the above presentation; he eventually somehow derails from merely reporting his case as it ensued on that day. Rather he makes mention of a possible fact that Senamele was not even wearing a mere vest on his upper body; seemingly to once more attempt to persuade the jury to regard Senamele as a character that came over to his home as already geared towards causing him some bodily harm. In this way, Khabele is building his case by embellishing Senamele's behaviour as that of a savage that deserves nothing else but to be disciplined. Further, with an aspiration for embellishing the events pertaining to this particular case; Khabele even goes to an extent of defying his own witness and protector during that strife in question – by relegating him a fool that caused him the injury he sustained. It would seem that Khabele's intention in alluding to Motlalepula's intervention as that of a fool is a persuasive endeavour for saving his own face – for he might be embarrassed of the fact that he was beaten by Senamele right in front of his own wife – and was unable to defend himself accordingly. It therefore comes not as surprise that he furthermore adds an unnecessary embellishment that he is capable of defending himself against any assailant – thus grabbing at almost anything with persuasive attempt at saving his own face.

Contrary to Khabele's seeming intentions and expectations about people's reactions as he has just embellished his plight as seen above; Matampi (Morena Lenka's chief advisor) now passes the following remark: "O se a u hlantholotse hloho ena ka kolitšana. Lula fatše haeba u qetile. Thoko tse na tsa hao li tla re hlola." (Khabele o lula fatše.) (Act II: scene iv) [He has already uncombed you with a fighting stick. These praise poems of yours are going to overpower us. Sit down if you have finished. (Khabele sits down.)] Needless to say, Khabele has over-embellished his report in an attempt at saving his face; and the whole exercise has reverberated against his intentions – thus causing him self-embarrassment by defiling his face. Testimony of the foregoing is in his sitting down without saying a word, as Matampi instructs him to do so if his report is over.

Now that Khabele has just completed his submission concerning the matter in question; it is interesting to observe how Senamele responds to all the accusations laid down so far. Calling for Senamele's attention, the chief asks him whether he has heard Khabele's presentation; whereupon Senamele turns around, giving his back to the gathering, and throws a thick piece of stick into his mouth. In accordance with his diviner's instructions, Senamele whispers the following words as a persuasive measure for the root in his mouth to perform as the diviner suggested: "Moferefere, ferekanya Khabele, a pote, a be 'ne a itoantše nyeoeng ena." (Act II: scene iv) [Trouble, confuse Khabele, so that he raves, and end up contradicting himself in this case.] Obviously, the chief has been observing Senamele as he has been performing as indicated above; for he registers his surprise in these words, "Helang banna! Ebe re tla tlameha ho qhaneha lipitsi ho ea lata Senamele hore a tl'o araba taba tsee tsa hae?" (Act II: scene iv) [Hallo guys! Are we supposed to saddle some horses for fetching Senamele so as to come and answer these matters of his?]

Needless to say, the foregoing chief's remark is meant for persuading the jury and the whole gathering to realise that Senamele has up to this moment failed to respond to the call accordingly – as he has been busy with the above-mentioned performances. On the other hand, the chief remarks in this way for persuading Senamele himself to realise that his sideline performances have been seen and regarded as a waste of time for the court. It would seem that Senamele is even now oblivious of the chief's remark and concern; for until the chief calls him by his name once more, Senamele is busily performing as instructed by his diviner. Senamele then jumps up like one that has been in a trance; and replies, "Molena!" (Act II: scene iv) – seemingly attempting to say 'morena!' [chief!] Upon realizing that Senamele has his head twisted, as his mouth is still in the blanket; the chief addresses him as follows:

“U sothile molala joaloka pere ea reisisi e hola tjee molato ke’ng? Taba tsena ke tsa hao. U tloetse ho etsa tlolo tsa molao, joale ha u lokela ho araba lia u makatsa?” (Act II: scene iv)

[You have twisted your neck like a race horse in this form what is the matter? These are your matters. You are used to contravening the law, and now as you have to answer they surprise you?]

Whereas the above chief’s verbal intervention may be regarded as a persuasive attempt for Senamele to come to terms with his status as the accused in this case; for Matampi, the main concern is how Senamele speaks at this point. He therefore asks Senamele the following question, as an endeavour at persuading him to speak properly: “O ntse a re molena-molena! U momme tapole e chesang monna? Ha u sa tseba ho re morena, u nts’u re molena?” (Act II: scene iv) [He keeps on saying molena-molena! Is your mouth filled with a hot potato man? You do not anymore know how to say morena, you keep saying molena?]

Contrary to Senamele’s expectations, the matters seem to turn against him; as he now becomes the centre of ridicule for his filling his mouth with the diviner’s root that somehow impedes his speech fluency. Even as Matampi asks him to respond to the ensuing accusation, Senamele demonstrates his speech impediment further in this form, “Mh! Kea utloa molena. Ho shile ho jalo. Tje ling ke tjona tje ling ha she tjona hohang.” (Act II: scene iv) Were he not experiencing this speech impediment, Senamele’s above response would be, ‘Mh! Kea utloa morena. Ho hlile ho joalo. Tse ling ke tsona tse ling ha se tsona hohang.’ [Mh! I hear chief. It is indeed so. Some are correct others are not correct at all.]

In the light of Senamele’s speech impediment above, the chief is perplexed, and resultantly poses the following question to the men’s side in this court; as a persuasive attempt for them to help resolve this problem: “Na banna motho eo le ntse le utloa hore na o bua joang?” (Act II: scene iv) [Do you guys hear how this person is talking?] In response to the chief’s persuasive question above, men answer that, “O momme. E, ehlile.” (Act II: scene iv) [He has kept something in his mouth. Yes, it is so.] In addition, Souru adds his testimony as follows, “Motho enoa kea mo tseba. O ntse a sa bue tjena.” (Act II: scene iv) [I know this person. He does not usually talk like this.] As might be expected, the chief is now persuaded to instruct Senamele to perform in this way, “Tšoela ntho eo u e mommeng monna heso. E tšoele!” (Act II: scene iv) [Spit out the object you are keeping in your mouth my home man. Spit it out!] Since persuasion is incremental; this instruction works as a persuasive action for the people to also shout at Senamele and boo at him in the following interactions:

Sechaba: Tšoela – tšoele! [**People:** Spit out – spit out!]

Basali: U jella morena litlhare? Monna eo kea fopotlehileng hakaakang? Tšoela – tšoela – tšoela! (O Kenya molomo ka kobong oa tšoela.) [**Women:** You eat herbal medicines for the chief? How embarrassingly foolish is this man? Spit out – spit out – spit out! (He puts his mouth into the blanket and spits out.)]

Banna: Oa baloi – oa baloi! (Act II: scene iv) [**Men:** Of the witches – of the witches!]

Apparently satisfied with the people's reactions in dealing with Senamele's present situation, the chief interacts with him in this way, "Oela litabeng oa moreneng. (Morena oa mo etsisa.) Tje e leng tjona le tje eseng tjona ke life?" (Sechaba sea tšeha.) (Act II: scene iv) [Fall into the matters you of the chief. (The chief mimics him.) ... (People laugh.)] Realizing that he has become an object of ridicule, Senamele now explains in this manner, apparently to save his own face:

"Tseo e leng tsona ke hore Khabele ke moikhantši. U kile ua bona kae, morena motho ea bolokang ngoana oa motho oa moroetsana ha hae matsatsi a mabeli ebe h'a nahane hore motho eo o tsietsing ea hore nangoana eo o retliloe, kapa o koetsetsoe, lintho tsa morao oo li tšosa hakale? Joale ..." (Act II: scene iv)

[The correct ones are that Khabele is a proud person. Where have you ever seen, chief, a person that keeps someone's big daughter at his home for two days without thinking that such a person is experiencing a problem of whether that child is murdered, or has been abducted, since today's things are so much frightening? Now ...]

In the light of Khabele's submission concerning his complain about Senamele's behaviour, it is apparent that Senamele hereby fails to respond accordingly. As may be observed, he now seemingly directs his question to the chief; possibly as a persuasive action for the chief to identify with him and attempt to share his experience and feelings that caused him to approach Khabele as he did on the day in question. With that understanding, the chief interrupts Senamele by asking him whether he, as the chief, is supposed to answer that question. Seemingly, the chief's question functions as a persuasive measure for Matampi to interact with Senamele and question him in this fashion:

"Ntate Senamele, ntate Senamele! Na u motho ea kileng a kena ka khotla? U fapana le ho araba taba tsa Khabele, u hloma morena lipotso? E se e le nako ea lipotso ee? Haeno mola ho etsoa ntho tse hlabisang lihlong hakaakang?" (Act II: scene iv)

[Father Senamele, father Senamele! Are you a person that ever entered the court? You refrain from answering Khabele's matters and pose questions at the chief? Is this time for questions? Are such embarrassing things done there at your home village?]

It would appear that Senamele realises that indeed his action of posing the question at the chief is improper; for he merely answers that his is not a question that deserves to be answered. Needless to say, Senamele's statement functions as a persuasive interaction for Matampi to engage this verbal exchange, "Ke ea bohlanga haeba ha e arajoe. Se ke ua e botsa mona. U tšeroe ke lefu la poone. Araba ntate." (Act II: scene iv) [It is of madness if it deserves no answer. Don't ask it here. You are suffering from pellagra. Answer father.] Now that Matampi has ridiculed him and caused him to appear as a lunatic above, Senamele finally addresses the matters related to Khabele's accusation; saying:

"Ke tlile mona maoba ke tliš'o lata ngoana oa ka, eo ke utloileng ka hlokoana la tsela hore o mona. Taba ea ka e kholo e ne e le hore Khabele a mphe ngoana oa ka. Ke ne ke sa rera ho loana joalokaha a re ho se apare hempe hoa ka e ne e le sesupo sa hore ke tliš'o mo futuhela. Joale 'na ha ke e-s'o bone motho ea khobileng sebete sa hae joaloka monna enoa Khabele." (Oa mo sheba.) (Act II: scene iv)

[I came here yesterday-but-one to fetch my child, that I have heard from the hearsay that she is here. My main issue was for Khabele to give me my child. I had not planned to fight as he says that my not wearing a shirt was an indication that I had come to attack. Now I have never seen a person that has crushed his liver as much as this man Khabele. (He looks at him.)]

It would appear that so far Senamele has not said much in connection with answering Khabele's accusations. Rather he ends up his presentation by marveling at the boldness of Khabele, before he looks at him; the action to which the court regards as non-procedural. In the light of that action being regarded as non-procedural, it functions as persuasive action for Papakhaee (one of the chief's headmen) to reprimand Senamele against it; saying, "Sheba koana. Se k'a sheba motho joalo ka khotla." (Act II: scene iv) [Look that way. Don't look at a person like that in court.] Incrementally as persuasion tends to be, the people support Papakhaee's reprimand by quipping as follows: "Mh! Ua bolela Papakhaee. H'a shebe koana. O batile motho enoa." (Act II: scene iv) [Mh! You are correct Papakhaee. Let him look that way. He has struck this person.] It is important to realise that, though Papakhaee's reprimand seems to be meant for cautioning Senamele about court procedure; the people hereby take advantage of this moment to demonstrate their support for Khabele in this case in the reminder that Senamele has struck him.

Interestingly, Senamele takes the people's verbal reaction personally; and as if it was meant for persuading him to say why and how he struck Khabele; he goes out of his way and responds as follows:

“Ke ‘nete hape morena hore ke mo batile, ka molamu oa ka ke ona. Empa ke susumelitsoe ke eena ka ho potapota ha ke re a mphe ngoana oa ka. Ebile a felehetsa ka ho re ke ee moo ke eang, kapa ha ke cha ke qhome.” (Act II: scene iv)

[It is again true that I struck him, with my fighting stick here it is. But I was instigated by him for dilly-dallying as I asked him to give me my child. In addition he said that I should go where ever I can, or if I feel burning I can jump up.]

Even if Senamele had been planning to tell the truth all along; it would now seem that he has decided to apply some lying as a persuasive measure for the chief and his jury to change their attitude and behaviour of regarding him as a trouble maker – for, his final statement above is far from the truth. It therefore surprises but little for ‘Matsietso to find herself persuaded by this lying to react out of tune and verbally intervene in this way, “Hee! (O phasoloha joalo a opa liatla.) Leshano le joalo ha le e-s’o be teng Israeleng. Ke ne ke le teng. Monna enoa o leshano. O phela ka leshano.” (Act II: scene iv) [Hallo! (She excitedly speaks that way as she claps her hands.) Such lying has never been seen in Israel. I was present. This man is lying. He lives through lying.]

Though ‘Matsietso’s out of tune reaction above might be meant for persuading the chief and the jury to realise that Senamele has now started lying; it now reverberates as a persuasive endeavour for the chief to scold and ridicule her in this manner, “Thola mosali tooe! Ha se selibeng mona. Ke mang ea u lokolotseng ho bua?” (Act II: scene iv) [Shut up you woman. This place is not at the well. Who has given you freedom to speak?]

Interestingly, the chief’s ridicule against ‘Matsietso functions as persuasion for Senamele to divert from his path of reacting against Khabele’s submission; and instead says, “Bee! Eena mosatsana eo he, le maoba o ne a ntse a bua tsona linyontša tsena. Ke eena ea neng a nkhalafise haholo. Haeba a hlola monna oa hae, kapa a mo jesitse phehla, ‘na ha kea e-ja.” (Act II: scene iv) [Pshaw! That very little woman, even yesterday-but-one she was speaking these very despicable things. She is the one that infuriated me worse. If she overpowers her husband, or has fed him the herb for calming him down, I have not eaten it.] Indeed, if Senamele’s purpose in saying the above verbal interaction was to change the chief and the jury’s attitude toward him in this case; his reaction has instead worked as an anti-persuasion – as Matampi now condemns him in this way:

“Ebe re tla u thiba ho fihlela neng? Morena ‘na ke tla felloa ke boiphapanyo joale tjena. Mona ha se ha Setlai, ke ha Lenka. Monna enoa h’a na ho tella morena, a kene har’a motse mona a sollise bonatla ba hae mona. H’a na ho tšolla mali hohle mona moo a tsamaeang a sa natse molao. H’a na ho qetela ka ho tlolisa lekhotla lena mahlo holimo ka tsela e tjena.” (Act II: scene iv)

[For how long shall we be restricting you? Chief, I shall be losing my patience now. Here is not at Setlai's, it is at Lenka's. This man shall not look down upon the chief, enter here into the village and roam about with his valour. He is not going to spill blood all over wherever he walks without regarding the law. He is not going to end up by over looking this court in this way.]

As if Matampi's verbal intervention above was meant as a persuasive action for the chief to also caution and ridicule Senamele; the chief intervenes by saying:

“Bea butle hle monna, Matampi. Enoa o tloha a tsoa kahar'a khotla lena tšeanyana ena e re tee! H'a e-s'o ithute hore ho se hlomphe molao ho ha Setlai mane ha ho na ho tla re tena hakana mona. U bue litaba monna u tlohele ho sena meno a kang ekhe ana. U qetella u re u re bata kaofela hoba re jele ...” (Act II: scene iv)

[Take it easy man, Matampi. This one might end up going out of this court with these small drawers of his completely wet! He has not yet learnt that failure to observe the law is a thing of there at Setlai's village and it is not going to disgust us so much here. You should speak up the matters man and stop baring these harrow-like teeth. You might even end up saying that you strike us all because we have eaten ...]

In the light of the above chief's intervention; it would now seem that he is also as disgusted with Senamele as Matampi is – and is persuaded by Matampi's verbal intervention to add his own as well. Whereas Matampi's concern above is centered on Senamele's disregard of the law and court procedures; including his roaming about as one that boasts of valour – the chief's intervention emphasises threats against Senamele. For example his reference of Senamele's drawers becoming completely wet implies a situation in which Senamele might find himself being beaten up to an extent that he would wet his drawers, as a sign of the suffering he is likely to incur. Further, when the chief addresses Senamele and cautions him about addressing the matters – ending up with reference to the same Senamele's teeth as 'meno a kang ekhe ana' – it becomes clear that he now employs ridicule plus threats against Senamele. Seemingly, Senamele is aware of the chief's attitude at this point; for even before the chief completes his final statement, Senamele interrupts him by pleading as follows: “Che bo morena. Nke ke ka re le jele ntho e joalo. Ha e hate ka boea makoala re none.” (Act II: scene iv) [No please chief. I cannot say that you have eaten such a thing. Let it tread with wool so that we cowards may become fat.]

Obviously, Senamele interrupts the chief as above in response to the ridicule and threats meted by the chief against him. In other words the ridicule and threats applied by the chief above have functioned as persuasion for Senamele to plead as he has just done. When he employs the proverb, 'Ha e hate ka boea makoala re none,' Senamele hereby attempts to

persuade the chief and his jury to change their attitude and behaviour against him – for he seemingly knows that their threats are likely to materialise into action against him. But it would seem that the chief has already drawn some conclusions against Senamele; as he says, “U lekoala uena? Ha ke re makoala ke banna ba ha ka moo bao u ba qhemetsakang kamoo u ratang?” (Act II: scene iv) [Are you a coward you? Isn't it true that the cowards are the men here in my village that you tumble over them as you like?] In the light of his words above, one might correctly assume that the chief has come to this case with already preconceived attitude against Senamele; as his final statement indicates. In other words, he already seems judgemental in this case – though it might have been instigated by Senamele's verbal behaviour as seen above.

Apparently, Senamele observes this chief's attitude that might materialise into action against him; for he once more pleads for excuse, saying, “Oee bo morena!” (Act II: scene iv) [Fie please chief!] Considering his plea for an excuse as enough, Senamele once more delves into the matter in response to Khabele's accusations against him; saying:

“Ha ke boele boitšireletsong ba ka, ke rata hore ho hlake hore, taba eo Khabele a e buang ea hore ke fihlile ke se ke le mahlo a mafubelu ho mo futuhela, ha ho joalo. Ke leshano le letala moren'a ka le lekhotla la hao. Hoja leshano lea tšollisa, Khabele a ka be a tšolotse a tlatsetse phula tsena. Ke mo batile hoba o ne a eme morero oa ka pele oa ho tla lata ngoana oa ka eo mororobela ona oa hae oa leqheku o mo sihisitseng sekolo koana. Hape lona qheku lena la hae le na le mosali mona. Rea tseba. Ke nkile nako ke mo rapela hore a ntše ngoan'a ka ka tlung, a hana. Ke ha ke tla re kea se chesa ruthanyana seno sa hae, e le hore ngoana oa ka a tsoe ka mono. Ha ke na ngoana ea nyaloang sethepu, 'na ntat'ae ke lula le 'Malitšabako feela. Ha ke setlokotsebe moren'a ka joaloka ha ho boleloa. Ke menngoe. Ke qetile morena.”
(Oa lula.) (Act II: scene iv)

[Let me go back to my defense, I want it to be clear that, the issue that Khabele speaks that I arrived already red-eyed to attack him, is not so. It is a green lie my chief and your jury. If a lie were a purgative, Khabele would have purged and filled up all these vales. I struck him because he had marred my intention of coming to fetch my child that this gigantic old son of his has caused her to leave school there. In addition, this old son of his has a wife here. We know. I took time praying him to bring out that child of mine, and he refused. That is when I said that I was going to burn that birdlike small house of his, so that my child comes out of there. I do not have a child that gets into polygamous marriage, while I her father am merely living with 'Malitšabako. I am not an audacious person as it is said my chief. I have been invited. I am through chief. (He sits down.)]

In accordance with Senamele's defense above, it is important to realise that he refutes Khabele's statement that he arrived already with predetermined plan to attack him. Yet his refusal is not substantiated, except for saying that it is a green lie that might have caused Khabele to purge all over the vales, had it been a purgative. For me, this reference to 'hoja leshano lea tšollisa ...' is to be seen as defamation of character, and as such, I consider it as a persuasive statement for the chief and his jury to ultimately act in accordance with the already pronounced or similar threats against Senamele. Nonetheless, Senamele's idea of accusing Khabele's son for causing his daughter to abandon school and elope with him is to be regarded as a persuasive point for the chief and his jury to change part of their attitudes towards regarding Senamele as an audacious person that roams villages with valour; as was described earlier.

In addition, Khabele's son is known to be older by far than Senamele's daughter; and as such, the chief and the jury are likely to be persuaded enough to identify with Senamele in this respect – more especially in consideration of the fact that Khabele's son is known to have been married to a woman he has merely expelled, not divorced. In view of all the foregoing points, the chief and the jury might be persuaded to identify with Senamele and lower his charge – were he to be found guilty as charged. On the other hand, Senamele has erred so much in his defense that he might have unintentionally invited counter-persuasion against himself – so much that the chief and the jury might harbour some attitude to impose a charge that may even seem overpowering for him.

As a character that is seemingly used to addressing matters of this kind, the chief now gives an opportunity for the gathering to question the complainant; saying, "Le ikutloetse he sechaba sa Limapong ha Lenka. Botsang moqosi lipotso haeba le na le tsona." (Act II: scene iv) [You have then heard for yourselves people of Limapong at Lenka's. Ask questions to the complainant if you have any.] Though the chief is used to running these matters, it would seem that he has this time skipped an important aspect concerning the running of a case of this nature. Souru is therefore persuaded by the chief's error to question him whether the complainant and the accused have any witnesses – thus suggesting to the chief that such witnesses should be called in to give their own verdict; if they do exist. Indeed, Khabele points at Motlalepula and his wife as his witnesses – whereupon the chief retorts that, "Mosali oa hao e ke ke ya e-ba paki ea hao. Lona le tsamaea ka molao ofe na?" (Act II: scene iv) [Your wife cannot be your witness. By what regulation do you go?]

Seemingly, the chief's above intervention functions as a persuasive attempt for the gathering to air their views on this matter; as they remark: "Tloha, motho o pakeloa ke batho ba sa amaneng le eena. U tsoa kae re ke re ee?" (Act II: scene iv) [Get away, a person is witnessed for by people that do not relate with him/her. Where do you come from so that we

can also go?] Since this aspect of witnesses is important in any case; one would have expected it to have been addressed right at the inception of this case – so that the affected witnesses might have been asked to remain outside until they are called in. Be that as it may, it is only now that Souru persuades the chief to remove Motlalepula from the court; and even before the chief can say anything Motlalepula, through self-persuasion, goes out. Seemingly in the light of his having been persuaded by the diviner to leave out witnesses; Senamele pronounces that he has none.

Since the floor has been opened for all to pose questions to the complainant, Souru starts in this manner, “Joale kea botsa. Ke u etsetsa potso, ntate Khabele. Na, na, na ke ‘nete hore mora oa hao o shobelisitse morali oa Senamele?” (Act II: scene iv) [Now I ask. I ask you a question, father Senamele. Is it, is it, is it true that your son has caused the daughter of Senamele to elope with him?] Khabele answers that it is so – and from there on the following questions and answers ensue:

Souru: Na, na ke utloa hantle hore u qetile matsatsi a mabeli u sa etsetse Senamele molaetsa hore na a batlele kae? [Do I, do I hear well that you spent two days without sending a message for Senamele as to where he should search?]

Khabele: Moo ke se ke ile ka itlhalosa oeso. [There I have already explained myself my brother.]

Sechaba: Araba potso eo Khabele! Kapa ea u hlola? [Answer that question Khabele! Or does it overpower you?]

Khabele: Mabaka kea tšetlehile, morena u ‘namolele. Mpotse potso e ‘ngoe ntate. [I have supplied reasons, chief protect me. Ask me another question sir.]

Souru: (O honothela fatše.) Ho bonahala hore ha ua tlalehela mong’a ngoana. Joale u ne u lebeletse hore ha mong’a ngoana a iphumanela ngoana oa hae ha hao, a shebane joang le uena? [(He grumbles in a low tone.) It appears that you did not inform the owner of the child. Now how did you expect the owner of the child to look at you when he discovered his child at your home?]

Khabele: Hantle. (Mphaufele o robela Senamele leihlo, oa bososela, o oma ka hlooho butle-butle.) [Rightly. (Mphaufele breaks an eye at Senamele, he smiles, and nods his head slowly.)]

Souru: Ke boela fatše morena. (Act II: scene iv) [I sit down again chief.]

In line with the above questions and answers, it is obvious that Khabele erred by failing to inform Senamele about the whereabouts of his daughter; though he now refuses to answer Souru’s question on that issue. The people are therefore persuaded by Khabele’s denial to

answer the question that they even shout for him to answer that question. But it would seem that Khabele is determined not to answer that question directly – as he intimates that he has already submitted reasons to that effect. In line with Khabele’s denial in answering the question directly, one might correctly assume that he has self- decided to refrain from so doing; with the understanding that any answer he gives might function as a persuasive attempt for Souru and others to ask more related questions that may persuade the chief and his jury to form a negative attitude against him. In addition, even as Souru puts it to him that it would seem that he has failed to inform Senamele accordingly – and poses the question as to how he expected Senamele to react – Khabele merely answers with one word, as seen above. It therefore, comes not as surprise that Souru is demotivated from questioning Khabele further.

Seemingly, the chief is satisfied with Souru’s questions towards Khabele; as he offers an opportunity for other people to ask more questions, if any. Before he may ask his questions, Matampi yawns and stretches himself; apparently to signify the tiredness this case has induced in him for its duration. Then he introduces his intervention as follows: “Taba tse na tseo re li buang morena ke bona eka li chitja. Mohlomong ke ile ka eba litsebe ha li ntse li buuo. Ha ke utloe hore na Khabele u belaela ka’ng.” (Act II: scene iv) [These matters that we are discussing chief seem to me as if they are round. It is possible that I lost some hearing as they were being discussed. I fail to understand what Khabele is complaining about.] Having stated his situation above, Matampi now poses the following questions towards Khabele: “Ntate Khabele, hantle u re u belaela ka’ng? U buile taba tse ngata. Ha e le hore u nyatsa hoba senamele o ile a hana ho theola moea, kapa u nyatsa hore Senamele o ile a leka ho chesa ntlo ea hao, kapa u mo qosa hoba a u batile? Hlakisa.” (Act II: scene iv) [Father Khabele, what exactly are you complaining about? You have talked about many things. Are you against Senamele’s failure to calm his spirit, or you are complaining about his trying to burn your house, or you accuse him of striking you? Clarify?]

Instead of clarifying his matters as requested by Matampi above, Khabele responds in this manner:

“Morena, Matampi haeba o lula ka litsebe, ‘na nke ke ka kopa ho phetapheta lifela. Empa ke tla iketsisa ke phete. (Mphaufele u otlala Senamele ka leihlo oa bososela.) Ke itse, ke qosa Senamele ka ho mphutuhela ha ka a etsa teko ea ho nchesetsa ntlo a bile a qetella ka ho mpata leqeba lena leo le le bonang.” (Oa le supa.) (Act II: scene iv)

[Chief, if Matampi sits with the ears I cannot afford to repeat the songs. But I shall feign to do so and repeat. (Mphaufele strikes Senamele with an eye and smiles.) I have said, I accuse

Senamele of attacking me at my home, making an attempt at burning my house and end up by striking me into this resultant wound that you see. (He points at it.)]

As may be observed, this is the first time Khabele clearly puts up his case in front of this court. Matampi is therefore persuaded by Khabele's present submission into stating the way the latter formerly presented his case in this court, saying, "Ha ua rialo, u itse u qala hojana, ua re u itse Senamele a theole moea a hana. A leka ho chesa ntlo ea hao. A u bata ka lebaka la sehole se Motlalepula, eaba u fella moo." (Act II: scene iv) [You did not say so, you said that you start a bit far off, you said that you asked Senamele to calm down but he refused. He tried to burn your house. He then struck you because of the fool called Motlalepula, you ended there.] Seemingly, Khabele realises that he had formerly failed to put up his case as he has just done now; yet he deviates from responding to that observation. He instead poses a question to Matampi as follows, "Joale ka uena motho h'a chesa ntlo ea motho, e re ha motho eo a mo thiba eba ua 'mata, na motho ea joalo o tsamaea ka molao?" (Act II: scene iv) [Now according to you when a person burns someone else's house, and as that person stops him he strikes him, is such a person going in accordance with the law?]

Needless to say, Khabele's above question is irrelevant; as it is not even for him to pose questions at the prosecutor. It is therefore understandable for Matampi to be persuaded by Khabele's question to remark in this manner: "Ke bona eka qeba lena le ntse le u isitse le mailili. Joale ha u lemohe hore na lekhotla hana le file mang sebaka sa ho botsa la fa mang sebaka sa ho araba." (Act II: scene iv) [It seems that this wound has caused you to remain in giddiness. Now you fail to realise who the court has given a chance for questioning and who for answering.] Factual as Matampi's statement might be, for the chief, both Khabele and Matampi are engaged in a seeming comic relief that somehow deteriorates into mere chatting.

It therefore makes sense that the chief reprimands them by saying, "Tlohelang ho qoqa banna." (Act II: scene iv) [Stop chatting guys.] Hereafter, Matampi questions Khabele as to whether or not such strife between himself and Senamele would have ensued without his having instigated it as Senamele pointed out. Rather than answering Matampi's question, Khabele somehow adopts defensive reaction, saying, "Matampi ua bona monna, khelek'h, khelek'h." (Oa rabaraba.) (Act II: scene iv) [Matampi you see man, khelek'h, khelek'h (interjection). (He roams around.)]

Seemingly, Khabele's roaming around in circular form above has functioned as persuasion for the chief to rebuke him as follows:

"Ema nqa e le 'ngoe Khabele. Le uena u se u lahlehetsoe ke kelello? Ke khotla mona. Haeba u tella lekhotla lena, ke tla u sebeta. Le batane le tšoana kea bona.

Araba potso tse na haeba u batla re sebetse. Kapa potso ee e boima?" (Act II: scene iv)

[Stand still Khabele. Have you lost your sense too? It is at court here. If you undermine this court, I will work you up. It seems that you struck at each other being the same. Answer these questions if you want us to perform. Or is this question difficult?]

In the light of the chief's intervention above, Khabele is persuaded to plead for forgiveness in these words, "Ntšoarele morena. Ke utloa Matampi a nkhalafisa hobane o batla ho ntšoarisa phupe. Ke ntse ke mo araba empa o ntse a khutlekhutlela potsong e le 'ngoe ka mantsoe a sa tšoaneng. Kapa ke akhente?" (Act II: scene iv) [Excuse me chief. I feel angered by Matampi because he wants to confuse me. I have been answering him but he keeps on coming back to the same question in different words. Or is he an advocate?] It would seem that Matampi is aware that Khabele is out of line according to the above verbal reaction; even as he ends up questioning the chief. Matampi is therefore persuaded by Khabele's verbal behaviour above to respond in these words, "Khabele oa itlhantša morena. Hantle o leka ho re ntša seporong joale." (Act II: scene iv) [Khabele is maddening himself chief. In fact he is attempting to derail us now.] Upon observing that indeed Khabele refrains from answering Matampi's questions, Souru intervenes in a persuasive endeavour to provide some clarification; saying:

"Matampi o re na u ka be u na le leqeba lena hoja ha ua ka ua itulela matsatsi-tsatsi le ngoana oa Senamele nta'ae le ba habo ba qhanehile lipere ba nyolosa ba theosa ba sa fumane ngoana oa bona? Hele!" (Act II: scene iv)

[Matampi is asking whether you would have sustained this wound had you not merely been sitting for days on end with Senamele's child while her father and relatives saddle horses and go up and down without finding their child? Hele!]

At this juncture, Matampi is persuaded to agree with Souru that such is the essence of his question; and makes an appeal for Khabele to answer his question. But then it would appear that Khabele is intent on dodging questions; for he simply says, "Lenyalo ke ntho e teng morena ..." (Act II: scene iv) [Marriage is an existing thing chief ...] Even though Khabele seemingly says the foregoing in an attempt at persuading the chief to side with him on the issue of marriage; his quip appears to have achieved the opposite, as the chief intervenes verbally that, "Ha re battle manyalo ana a hao, re batla u arabe, e kapa che, 'finiche en tlelarr!" (Act II: scene iv) [We do not want these marriages of yours we want you to answer, yes or no, 'finished and complete.'] But for Khabele the chief has joined forces with Matampi and Souru in overpowering him and bombarding him with questions that drive him towards a position that might end up putting him in a dire position; as may be realised in:

“Oee ke kopa hore le se ke la nkhatella morena. (...) ‘Na karabo ea ka ke hore ha ngoana eo ke neng ke sa mo roma a se a nkentse molatong, tšoanelo ke hore ho buisanoe. Ke seo ke ileng ka re ntate Senamele re se etse h’a fihla a halefile.” (Act II: scene iv)

[For shame I plead that you do not overpower me chief. (...) As for me my answer is that when a child that I had not sent has already put me into difficulty, the right thing to do is to discuss the matter. That is what I asked father Senamele for us to do when he arrived already furious.]

Indubitably, Khabele even now refrains from directly answering Matampi’s question, even as it has been so clearly explained for him. In the light of this situation, Matampi drives Khabele towards a position where he might be forced to answer the question; by asking him what his reaction would be if he were in Senamele’s situation. As if this is what Khabele has since been waiting for, he answers in these words, “Ke ne ke tla mo botsa hore na o patetse’ng ngoan’a ka. Ebe oa hlalosa. Ha ke sa khotsofale, morena o teng, joale ke mo qose ka ho koetela ngoana oa ka. E seng ke mo lematse.” (Act II: scene iv) [I would ask him why he has been hiding my child. Then he would explain. If I am not satisfied, the chief exists, then I would charge him of kidnapping my child. Not to injure him.] Seemingly, Khabele’s submission above is suggestive of his failure to report to Senamele accordingly as an act similar to that of kidnapping. Resultantly, Matampi is self-persuaded to stop asking anymore questions.

Since Khabele has surmised that had it not been for Motlalepula’s stupidity he would not have been struck by Senamele; it would be interesting to listen to Motlalepula’s verdict at this juncture. In line with his being named as Khabele’s only witness, Motlalepula is asked by the chief whether or not he is Khabele’s witness. In response, he pronounces himself as Khabele’s witness; though he only came to the scene when he was called in by ‘Mamofammere to come and help – claiming that someone was attempting to burn down her house. Since he had not witnessed any other instances preceding the striking of Khabele by Senamele; Motlalepula’s verdict only begins at that particular moment. Upon realizing this state of affairs, the chief brings in the aspect of Motlalepula’s causing Khabele to sustain the wound through his stupidity – as suggested earlier by the complainant himself; and says:

“Hantle u paki ea Khabele joang ha ke utloile hantle ka tsebe tsa ka tse peli a re u batiloe ka lebaka la bophoqo ba hao? Na u utloa hore le uena oa u qosa hore a ka be a sa batoa hoja e se ka uena? E leng hore le uena u ne u ntse u le morerong?” (Khabele o tona mahlo.) (Act II: scene iv)

[By the way how do you become Khabele's witness as I heard well with my two ears as he mentioned that he was struck due to your stupidity? Do you hear that he accuses you as well that he would not have been struck if it were not for your stupidity? In other words you are also of the same plan? (Khabele stares his eyes.)]

As if hearing this for the first time, Khabele attempts to defend himself, saying, "Ke itse ka booa, eseng o ne a na le morero mo ..." (Act II: scene iv) [I said through stupidity, not that he has a plan in ...] attempting to stop Khabele from going further in trying to save his own face; the chief says, "Khutsa Khabele! Ke mang ea u lumeletseng ho bua! Be!" (Khabele oa khutsa ka ho soaba.) (Act II: scene iv) [Keep silent Khabele! Who has allowed you to speak? Pshaw! (Khabele keeps mum with humiliation.)] It would appear that the idea of being simultaneously accused of causing harm to Khabele through his stupidity has worked as a persuasive attempt for Motlalepula to also take a responsive action geared towards saving his own face too; as he says:

"Na ke ne ke namola. Joale ha a sa thibe, a ahlame, ntsintsi e tsoa e kena, a ntse a bona hore motho o halefile, h'a mo tlerile ha se molato oa ka. O ne a lokela hore ebe o ile a thiba kapa a checha. Taba eo ke e pakang ke hore Senamele o tšolotse mali a mohlalefi enoa ea reng 'na ke sethoto.'" (Act II: scene iv)

[I was intervening. And then if he does not protect himself, merely gaping, a fly coming out and inside, as he notices that the person is angry, if he has struck him it is not my fault. He was supposed to have parried or reversed. The issue that I hereby provide verdict for is that Senamele has spilled the blood of this wise person that says that I am a fool.]

Having thus responded and saved his own face as above; Motlalepula is instructed by the chief to take a seat; as it is now the court opportunity to pose questions at Senamele, the accused. Since Senamele has pronounced that he has no witnesses, people are given a chance to pose their questions at him right away. As might be expected, the first question is asked by one of the chief's headmen, Papakhaee; saying, "Na u ile ua pota moreneng ho itlaleha le ho kopa maqosa a morena hore a e'o u batlisa?" (Act II: scene iv) [Did you go via the chief's place to report yourself and get his messengers to assist you in the search?] Instead of answering this question directly as asked, Senamele advances that he had decided to report himself at the chief's place after ascertaining himself that his daughter was at Khabele's home – thus attempting to persuade the chief and the jury to change their attitude against him in this matter. As an indication of their support that Senamele has to answer the question as it comes; men shout that the question is correct and deserves to be answered accordingly. In a persuasive attempt for Senamele to observe the importance of

directly answering the question as it comes, Matampi even adds that, “Karabo ke ‘e,’ kapa ‘che’ ntate ‘nyeo.” (Act II: scene iv) [The answer is ‘yes,’ or ‘no’ father so-and-so.]

Needless to say, Senamele has now been successfully persuaded to answer directly – for he answers that he never performed accordingly; as he was intending to find the truth of the matter first. Further, he states that he indeed found the evidence. As a follow-up to his previous question, Papakhaee furthermore inquires from Senamele whether he then followed the steps as just mentioned above or not. In a persuasive attempt to save his own face once more; Senamele answers as follows:

“Che morena oa ka, ha kea ka ka ea hobane Khabele o ile a ntšusumetsa ho otlala ka la pholo-khoaba, a ntšusumetsa hore ke etse qeto ea hore khang ea monna e khaoloa ke letlaka.” (Act II: scene iv)

[No my chief, I did not go because Khabele forced me to take the short way; forced me to take the final decision that a man’s quarrel is cut off by the vulture.]

Obviously, Senamele hereby employs idiomatic (ho otlala ka la pholo-khoaba) and proverbial (khang ea monna e khaoloa ke letlaka) expressions in an endeavour at persuading the chief and the jury to identify with him, change their attitudes and behaviours; and regard him as having been forced by Senamele to act as he did. Since the above-quoted idiomatic and proverbial expressions need some clarifications for all to understand the extent to which Senamele found himself forced into applying them; Papakhaee asks him, “H’a etsa joang?” (Act II: scene iv) [As he did what?] In this way Papakhaee is driving his persuasive goal of making Senamele explain himself clearly; so that all concerned understand exactly how he was persuaded by Khabele to behave as he did. But it would seem that for Senamele this is not the case; as he says:

“He banna ke bona eka ke tla felloa ke boiphapanyo joale. Ke ntse ke bolela hore Khabele o ne a hana ho mpha ngoana oa ka. Ha ke re a mphe ngoana oa ka o re ke ee moo ke eang. Ebile a hana feela leha ke kena ka tlung. Ke ka lebaka lena ke neng ke hotetsa ntlo ena ea hae hore joale ngoana enoa oa ka a tsoe.” (Act II: scene iv)

[Hallo guys it seems that I shall lose patience now. I have been saying that Khabele was refusing to give me my child. When I ask him to give me my child he says that I should go wherever I like. He even refused to allow me to go into the house. It is through this reason that I was lighting this house of his so that this child of mine should come out.]

In the light of the above submission by Senamele, Papakhaee tends to agree with him; though he hereby clarifies certain issues pertaining to legal practice for Senamele to be in the light, as he says:

“Ke lumellana le uena hore u lokela ho batla ngoana, empa motho h’a kena har’a motse oo a utloetseng ho oona, o ee a pote moreneng, a bile a nkile lengolo la morena oa hae le kopang morena eo a eang ho eena hore a batlisoe, o utloetse moo ha hae. Joale ke re na uena u ile ua latela molao ka tsela ena na?” (Act II: scene iv)

[I agree with you that you should look for a child, but a person for him to enter the village in which he has been informed about, usually goes via the chief’s place, already in possession of a letter from his own chief that requests that chief to whom he goes to assist in the search, as he has learned from the hearsay. Now I am asking whether or not you followed the procedure by going through this way?]

Indeed, Papakhaee’s clarification is persuasive enough for anybody concerned to answer the question without any difficulty. But that is not the case with Senamele, as he responds in these words: “Ntate ‘nyeo, Khabele enoa oa molotsana, oa moloji o ne a tla pata ngoana enoa oa ka ha ke ntse ke khera kea moreneng koana.” (Act II: scene iv) [Father so-and-so, this Khabele of sorcerer, of a witch would hide this child of mine while I madly run about towards the chief’s place there.] Clearly Senamele’s foregoing response is full of malice; and as such, it denotes him as a malicious character that is prone to fighting. It therefore surprises but little that in reaction to it Papakhaee is persuaded to reprimand Senamele in the following words:

“Ua loana joale? Ebile ke bona mahlo a hao a tlerefala, kannete ua ntšosa. Morena u ‘ne u re sireletse. Ke tsoela pele hoba ha kea khotsofala. Joale hana molao oa Lerotholi o re’ng ka tšollo ea mali?” (Act II: scene iv)

[Now you are fighting? I even realise that your eyes are becoming red, indeed you frighten me. Chief please continue to protect us. I continue as I am not satisfied. Now what does Lerotholi’s law say about blood spillage?]

Thus persuaded by the final question above to respond, Senamele answers that the spillage of blood is against the law of Lerotholi; yet he goes further to attempt to save his own face by saying, “... empa ‘na mona ke ne ke itšireletsa ho sehanyata sena se koetelakang bana ba batho ka mora enoa oa sona ea tellang. Joale motho h’a futuheloa oa itšireletsa. Ke ne ke batla ho nka ngoana oa ka. Joale Khabele eaba o re ke ee moo ke ratang, ngoana nke ke ka ‘mona.” (Khabele o ema a halefile.) (Act II: scene iv) [... but as for me here I was defending myself from this big and stout person that abducts people’s children with this son of his that undermines people. Now when a person is attacked he/she defends him/herself. I wanted to take away my child. Then Khabele said that I should go wherever I want, as I cannot see the child. (Khabele stands up with fury.)] Seemingly, Senamele is engaging himself in some issues that are irrelevant to Papakhaee’s question above. Even his reference to Khabele as

sehanyata denotes that he is employing persuasive means for saving his own face from the present embarrassment he finds himself in. Worse still, he employs lying as a persuasive measure for saving his face – so that his striking Khabele at his home may be considered as an act of defense as he hereby spells it out.

It therefore comes not as surprise that Khabele gets out of his way and reacts as seen above; he has been persuaded by Senamele's lying to react as he has done above. It would then seem clear that Khabele's action is also meant for saving his own face that appears to be tarnished by Senamele above; and further aimed at persuading the chief and the jury to regard Senamele as someone that is out to tell lies as a means of self-defense. In order to fulfill his purpose of falsifying Senamele, Khabele says, "Oee! Oee! Butle ka likei tseha tsa hao Senamele. U tseba ho li betla likei monna oa heso." (Act II: scene iv) [For shame! For shame! Slow down with these yoke keys of yours Senamele. You are good at crafting yoke keys my home man.] It would seem that Khabele applies the idiomatic expression 'ho betla likei' in reference to Senamele's lying as a persuasive attempt for all present to realise that the latter's statements are full of crafted lies that may be intended for dissuading the chief and the jury in this case. By so doing, Khabele appears to be attempting to persuade the jury to disregard such crafted lies.

But since Khabele has spoken out of place; men boo him, saying, "Lula fatše Khabele. Se ka arabisa motho morena a sa u lumella." (Act II: scene iv) [Sit down Khabele. Don't cross question someone without the chief's permission.] Now as if she is Khabele's spokesperson in this situation, 'Mamofammere stands up and says, "Bo-ntate le se ke la hatella ntate Khabele. Monna enoa ea meno a malelele o leshano. Khabele ha esale a mo rapela, h'a e-s'o fetise lentsoe la tlhapa." (Act II: scene iv) [Fathers please do not oppress father Khabele. This long toothed man is lying. Khabele has since been pleading with him, he has never uttered a word of insult.] Indeed a number of relevant questions to the legal procedure are asked as persuasive attempt for them to be answered by Senamele accordingly. Finally, Papakhaee inquires from Senamele whether his action of striking Khabele was based on legal procedure; thus attempting to indicate to the accused that his action was in contravention of the law. But rather than regarding his action as legally nonprocedural, Senamele makes the following long presentation in an attempt at saving his own face and persuading the chief and the jury to regard his action as motivated by Khabele's reaction, saying:

"E, hoba 'na ke menngoe. Motho ea memmeng tšollo ea mali ke Khabele. Nkabe ke sa mo bata hoja a se ke a romella khaupane sena sa hae ho ea koatolaka ngoana ea ntseng a kena sekolo oa ka. Kea bona hore potsonyana tseha tsa hao monna Papakhaee li reretsoe polelo e sehloho e reng sepa-leholo ke la molata, la mong'a

motse lona ke kotokoane. Khabele ha le 'motse ka thata hore na ke molao hore a boloke ngoan'a ka matsatsi-tsatsi ha hae a sa ntsebise. Ha le 'motse hore na ke molao hore ha mora oa hae a rata ngoana oa ka ebe o mo nka feela. Eena le bona a ntse a nepile. Setlokotsebe ke 'na ha ke tseka ngoana oa ka ea hapiloeng ka likhoka." (Act II: scene iv)

[Yes, because I have been invited. The person that has invited the blood spillage is Khabele. I could not have struck him if he had not sent this motherless son of his to go and abduct the school attending child of mine. I realise that these small questions of yours are meant for a very cruel sentence that says that the big faeces is that of a foreigner, that of a local is very little or unnoticed. You do not ask Khabele seriously whether it is in accordance with the law that he keeps my child for days on end at his home without informing me. You do not ask him whether it is legal that when his son is in love with my child he merely takes her. As for him you find him correct. The troublemaker is I as I quarrel over my child that has been captured by force.]

Indubitably, Senamele's submission above is persuasive enough for the chief and the jury to realise that they have indeed not questioned Khabele deeply enough to accommodate the issues in this presentation. In other words, their questions on him were rather light – supposedly because he is a local one that was attacked by a foreigner at his home. Indeed, Mokitimi (1997:26) puts it well in defining the proverb alluded to by Senamele above that "If an evil thing is done by a foreigner, it is very bad but if it is done by a local person, it is not so bad." It would then seem that Senamele's employment of this proverb has been persuasive enough for Papakhaee to stop asking him any more questions; but merely say, "Ao, che moren'a ka ke botsitse." (Act II: scene iv) [Fie, no my chief I have questioned.] Additionally, the chief once more asks Senamele who he said was his witness; to which Senamele answers that he said that he has none – as his matters are straight forward, he says. As if to strengthen his above submission, Senamele in addition says:

"Le eena Khabele ke paki le tlomotsejana seno sa hae sa mosali se ntseng se ntlhapaola hona kahar'a lekhota. Ke Khabele ea boletseng phatlalatsa mona hore o ne a sa ntse a ikonka pele, a fa ngoan'a ka likoae 'na le eena re sa lumellana, a sa mpoelle le hore ngoana oa ka o teng ha hae." (Act II: scene iv)

[Even Khabele is the witness with that small audacious wife of his that has been insulting me right here in court. It is Khabele that has stated that he was still sauntering first, giving my child welcoming meats while I and he have not come to any agreement, without even telling me that my child is present at his home.]

No doubt, Senamele's above final verbal interaction has persuaded the chief to consult his jury for the judgement on this case; for he asks people to give an opportunity to the court for making a ruling. Now that the chief and his jury are left alone in the court, he asks the jury how they consider this case – by so asking, he makes a persuasive attempt for them to give their views about an appropriate judgement. Consequently, Papakhaee quips as follows:

“Ha ho na le litaba mona. Motho enoa Senamele taba tsa hae li ne li le ntle o li sentse ka boeena. Khabele o entse ntho eo motho oa Mosotho a ke keng a e etsa. O phoso ka ho se phalle hang ha bana ba fihla ba shobelisane ho ea tsebisa babo mosetsana.” (Act II: scene iv)

[There are no issues here. This person, Senamele, his issues were good but he spoiled them personally. Khabele has done what a Mosotho person would not do. He is wrong by failing to immediately take action when the children arrived in elopement to go and inform the girl's parents.]

In line with Papakhaee's above view, it is clear that had Senamele been eloquent enough in his presentation; this case would possibly be judged to his favour. But because of his failure in presentation, the jury might be persuaded to give a different judgement that might be in Khabele's favour as the complainant. In an attempt at persuading others to see it as Papakhaee has analysed it above; and also to persuade the chief and the jury to regard Senamele as guilty as charged; Matampi surmises as follows:

“Ho hlile ho joalo. Empa Senamele o hlile o molato. Tlolo ea pele ea molao eo a e entseng ke ho kena kahar'a motse ka mona a se na lengolo leo a batlisoang ka lona, ebe o loana ha morena e mong. Ea bobeli ebe o bata motho, a tšolla mali. Leha a se a entse joalo ha ho moo a itlalehang, o tsoa a phola, a sa re letho ho morena.” (Act II: scene iv)

[It is indeed so. But Senamele is actually guilty. The first contravention of the law that he performed is that of coming into the village without a letter for assisting him in the search, then he fights at another chief's place. The second one is that of striking a person, spilling blood. Even as he has so performed he does not report himself, he coolly goes out, without saying anything to the chief.]

It would seem that Matampi's persuasive statement for finding Senamele guilty as charged has successfully affected the chief; for he quips as follows: “Ua bolela Matampi. Hantle potso tsa Papakhaee ke li ratile. Le eena o ipone hore o ka thoko ho molao. E reng khotla le boele.” (Act II: scene iv) [You are right Matampi. In fact I have liked Papakhaee's questions. Even he himself has realised that he is outside the law. Reconvene the court.] Indubitably, the chief and his jury have agreed to find Senamele guilty as charged; yet it would seem that

the actual penalty is solely answerable to the chief himself. Had it not been so, one would expect him to discuss it with his jury so as to determine its appropriateness. Once more people assemble in the court to listen to the verdict.

Apparently, the chief has undergone some self-persuasion in setting the verdict that he deems appropriate against Senamele; as he penalises Senamele a beast as payment for arrogantly entering his village without any form of consultation; coupled with his attacking and wounding Khabele as has been seen already. Since he also regards Khabele as guilty of failing to inform Senamele timely about this matter; the chief informs Senamele that it is for him to take up the matter with Khabele – as it appears that he did not want to pursue that from the onset.

Indeed the whole verdict has not only shocked Senamele, but has also persuaded him to take it up with Mphaufele, for the failure of his divine herbal concoctions. Not surprisingly, Senamele requests Mphaufele to remain with him in court as everyone else goes out and confronts him in these words: “Ha re utloane ntate Mphaufele. Mphe poli tsa ka tse peli. U se ke be ua mpha metasallana. Li khutle li le joalo.” (Act II: scene iv) [Let us understand each other father Mphaufele. Give me my two goats. You should not give me lean ones. They should return as they are.] It would seem that it is fair for Senamele to ask Mphaufele for the retrieval of his two goats – as matters have not ended the way Mphaufele had vowed they would go. Yet in response to Senamele’s persuasive demand for his animals; Mphaufele asks, “Hobaneng?” (Act II: scene iv) [Why?] Apparently Mphaufele fails to understand the reasons behind Senamele’s demand. In line with Mphaufele’s foregoing question, he and Senamele engage in the following persuasive verbal exchanges:

Senamele: Mphaufele, ha ke batle hore u ‘ne u botse lipotso tse se nang kelello, ebile ha ho ntho eo re ka bang ra e buisana ‘na le uena ntle le hore u khutlise lipoli tsa ka. [Mphaufele, I do not want you to ask any insensible questions, and there is nothing we can discuss besides your returning my goats.]

Mphaufele: Eo ha se tsela eo lingaka li sebetsang ka eona. Haholo ha motho a fosa litaelo tsa bona ka boomo. [That is not the way in which doctors operate; especially when a person purposely fails to adhere to their instructions.]

Senamele: Taelo life? U se ke ua bua joalo monna. U itse ke e’o kokomala mahaheng mane bosiu, ke etse mehlolohlolo. Ke entse. Ua re ke mome likoqo tsena tsa hau tse litšila. Ke entse. Joale u batla’ng? (Act II: scene iv) [What instructions? You should not talk like that man. You said that I should go and couch down there at the caves in the night, and perform different miracles. I performed. You then said that I should keep in my mouth these dirty stumps of yours. I did. Now what do you want?]

In the light of the above verbal interactions between Senamele and Mphaufele, it would seem that there is enough persuasive reasonableness for the latter to give back the two goats to the former – for indeed matters have failed to materialise as the divine herbalist doctor had verbally guaranteed. It would therefore be quite interesting to listen to Mphaufele’s version in response; and find out how well he applies persuasion for Senamele to change his attitude and behaviour regarding this matter. In response to Senamele’s above interaction, Mphaufele surmises in the following manner:

“Na ke ne ke itse u mome litlhare tsee ka bophogo ebe batho baa u bona? U qalile ua sotha molala joaloka pere ea reisi e hola, batho ba ba ba belaela hore na ha u eme ua araba ke’ng. Sebakeng sa ho beha moriana tlas’a leleme u bue hantle, u iqalipile ka moriana ona eaba u ntse u re molena – molena. Joale ba u eelloa ba u phoqa ba re u o tšoele. Ua o tšoela, joale u ne u lebeletse eng ha tlakala eo ese ese ka hanong hore e firifanye baahloli le baqosi?” (Act II: scene iv)

[Had I said that you should keep those herbal stuffs in your mouth so stupidly that people see you? You started twisting your neck as a race horse bolting, such that people even suspected why you could not stand up and answer. Instead of placing the medicines under the tongue so as to speak correctly, you gagged yourself with this medicine and ended up saying molena – molena. Now they noticed you and rebuked you saying that you should spit out. You spat it out, and what did you expect as the herbal stuff was no more in the mouth so as to confuse the jury and complainants?]

According to Mphaufele’s above response, it becomes evident that Senamele has somehow erred in his applications of the stuff with which he was provided. One even remembers that on the day on which the two characters came to an agreement upon the use of these herbs; Mphaufele warned Senamele against stupid application of the concoctions in question. But once in court, Senamele was observed behaving exactly as Mphaufele hereby reminds him. Importantly, even the chief asked the gathering as to whether horses had to be saddled as persuasive attempt for going to fetch Senamele for answering the accusation leveled at his person. To make it worse, the chief even joked about Senamele’s verbal impairment; due to the herbal stump with which he had gagged himself. Unless Senamele comes up with a persuasive enough counter-persuasion, Mphaufele’s above submission seems to be strong enough for the former to resign to his fate in relation to this matter up to this juncture.

Interestingly, Senamele responds by applying abusive words, insults and threats against Mphaufele – thus registering his shortcoming in persuading the latter to change his attitude and agree in returning his goats; saying:

“U taoa hampe kea bona. U nts’u re ke mome mangana aa a hao a se nang thuso aa u re ke litlhare? Tlisa poli tsa ka monna pele ke u palimola. Re tla bolaeana ‘na le uena. U tloetse ho ja batho sekatana tooe. U itse ke se tle le lipaki tsa ka athe u re nyeoe e tl’o ntlhola, u tsebe ho bolela bohole ba ka? Tlisa ntate ‘nyeo. Bosiu bo sele ke bo shebile mahaheng mane.” (Act II: scene iv)

[You terribly get drunk I see you. You keep saying that I should fill my mouth with these useless warm herbs of yours saying that they are medicines? Bring my goats man before I strike you. You and I shall kill each other. You are accustomed to cheating people you rag. You said that I should not bring my witnesses whereas you wanted the case to overpower me, so that you may tell about my stupidity? Bring father so-and-so. The night waned off as I was starring there at the caves.]

As may be observed, Senamele has only a few persuasive statements in the above interaction against Mphaufele. For example, he correctly accuses Mphaufele of forbidding him to bring his witnesses – that being the aspect that might have come to his assistance in court. As for other accusations he hereby levels against Mphaufele might not stand a test in the court of law; as he erred by not paying attention to his performances in court.

Nonetheless, it would seem that Senamele’s threats have worked on Mphaufele’s mind; as he poses some questions and utters threats against Senamele in return; saying, “Ke tla u sebeletsa ka likobong joaloka korosetina u tle u tsebe hore ke Mphaufele, ha ke moshanyana.” (Act II: scene iv) [I shall work you up in the blankets like an accordion so that you should know that I am Mphaufele, I am not a small boy.] It is important to note the application of the idiomatic expression, ‘ho sebeletsa motho ka likobong’ above. This expression is applied by Mphaufele as a persuasive threat for Senamele to refrain from demanding the return of his goats – as it means to deal against the opponent by using subversive actions against him/her – which in this case might be interpreted as the use of witchcraft against Senamele. In addition, Mphaufele applies the simile, ‘joaloka korosetina’, as a persuasive figure of speech meant for Senamele to clearly imagine the subversive operations intended against him by Mphaufele. Be that as it may, Senamele seems not to have been affected by such a threat; as observed in the following response:

“Tsam’u potela koana! Soka! (O akha matsoho.) Ha re fihla hae u tlise poli tsa ka. Ho seng joalo u batle batho ba tla u kata bosiu le motšhare. Hohle moo u eang leha u ea mohlabaeng ba u kate hoba ke tla u bolaea. U tla hlalabatsa tetsoana tse kang tsa phooko ea mariha tsena.” (Act II: scene iv)

[Go and vanish round there! Get off! (He throws the hands.) When we arrive home you should bring my goats. Otherwise you should seek some people that will guard you day and

night. Wherever you go even when you go to the toilet they should guard you because I am going to kill you. You will fully expose this male goat-like small beard.]

Whereas it might have been expected that Mphaufele's threats would affect him negatively, Senamele regards those as empty threats which may have no effect on him. Testimony of such feelings is embodied in the above response meted against Mphaufele. Even as Senamele has applied so much threatening against Mphaufele; the latter also seems determined to defy the former; saying, "Mahala lo! Mahala lo!" (Act II: scene iv) [Never so! Never so!] Seemingly with full determination, Senamele reacts with more persuasive threats, saying, "Ha re li behe malatsa. U tla bona." (Ba arohana ba tsokelana matsoho.) (Act II: scene iv) [Let us leave them for now. You will see. (They part ways wagging hands at each other.)]

In accordance with the way matters ensued in chief Lenka's court, one would hardly expect Khabele to ever take action towards establishing some marital relations with Senamele. But it would seem that it is not to be so; for Souru, Khabele's messenger, arrives at Senamele's home, driving a bovine that he presents as persuasive offer from Khabele, who requests to take Litšabako as Mofammere's wife. As might be expected, Senamele becomes agitated, to an extent that, with defiance, he burns the clothes that Litšabako came back home dressed in on the day of her retrieval from Khabele's home. In addition, Senamele even quips as follows:

"U bolelle Khabele hore ha ke je litali 'na Senamele. Ke li hlabela ba li jang feela. Ke itse ha ke nyallane le eena 'na. Ngoana enoa oa ka Junifese the e mo emetse Roma ha Maama koana. Ha ke na ngoana ea nyaloang ke Mofammere ea ntseng a nyala a nyalolla. Hoja o romme motho e mong eo e seng motsoalle oa ka joaloka uena, lerumo lena la ka le ka be le tloha boroko, e le hore kajeno ke hle ke etse molato o shoetseng. A qetele ho roma batho ho 'na mona. Ebile ke ntse ke bapala, e re khomo ena eona ke hle ke e hlabe a tl'o lata lihoapa tsa eona mona." (O kena ka tlung a potlakile a halefile.) (Act II: scene v)

[You should tell Khabele that I, Senamele, eat no rats. I only prick them for those who eat them. I have said that I do not go into marital relations with him. The University is waiting for this child of mine there at ha Maama. I have no child that gets married to Mofammere that gets in and out of marriage. If he had sent another person that is not a friend of mine as you, this spear of mine would lose slumber, so that today I commit a perfect guilt. He should send people here to me for the last time. In fact I am playing; let me slaughter this bovine so that he comes to fetch its biltongs here. (He rushes into the house with agitation.)]

Indubitably, Senamele is not persuaded by the bovine that is offered to him for establishing marital relations with Khabele. Besides, he does not even attempt to counter-persuade Souru in any upfront manner. Rather, he pronounces himself as a non-rats eater – thus signifying that he regards Khabele’s action of attempting to establish marital relations with him as nonsensical – since Khabele seems to relegate him a poor man that might be bought off through a bovine offer. In addition, Senamele informs Souru that he has reasons for hating Khabele’s attempt at establishing marital relations with him. First, his aim is to send his child to the University for further education. Second, he would not like to see his child married to Mofammere, as he is infamous of getting in and out of marriages.

Further, Senamele employs threats – that if Khabele had sent anybody else who was not a friend to him as Souru is, his spear that has seemingly been in slumber for some time would be used to prick that messenger. Furthermore, as an indication that his are not mere threats, Senamele threatens to kill the bovine that has just been presented to him as relations establishment offer; and agitatedly rushes into his house to get the spear in question. Since ‘Malitšabako knows his character very well as his wife, she encourages Souru to flee; saying, “U sa eme Souru? Khanna khomo ena u e lelekise u balehe. (...) ‘Na ha ke batle ho bona masisa-pelo ha ka mona. Nyamela!” (Act II: scene v) [Are you still waiting Souru? Drive this bovine and chase it away. (...) I don’t want to see tragedies here at my home. Vanish!] Indeed Souru wastes no time but performs as persuaded by ‘Malitšabako – such that when Senamele comes out of the house with a raised spear, Souru has vanished with the bovine.

In the light of the fact that Litšabako was last seen at the well as ‘Matšepe seemed to have succeeded in changing her attitude towards schooling as her parents desired her to; it interests me to observe how they now interact with ‘Matšepe once more. This time ‘Matšepe arrives at Litšabako’s home and they interact in the following manner:

‘Matšepe: Lumela ausi Litšabako. [Good morning sister Litšabako.]

Litšabako: Pota le koano se ka ‘na hoelehetsa u le thoko mono. (Act II: scene vi) [Come via here and don’t shout from that far.]

Without any waste of time, Matšepe comes over and tells Litšabako the extent to which she is afraid of the latter’s parents; as they might end up suspecting that she is the one that derails the latter from schooling and organises her elopement with Mofammere. Further, ‘Matšepe makes an attempt at persuading Litšabako towards eloping with Mofammere again; saying:

“Homme ke ntse ke bua le Mofammere hore a ntsetse thuto ea hao pele ha le se le lula le eena. H’a na le bothata. O itse eena o na le chelete ea ho u ruta ho fihlela moo uena u ratang.” (Act II: scene vi)

[And I have been speaking with Mofammere that he assists you to advance in your education when you are already living together. He actually has no problem. He said that he has money for educating you up to whatever level you prefer.]

As may be observed, 'Matšepe is aware that Litšabako's parents are intent on educating their daughter further; as she has had a good pass at the Cambridge level – which is the reason behind their discouraging her to rush into this unplanned marriage with Mofammere. She therefore applies this aspect of education as a persuasive action for Litšabako to change her attitude of aligning with her parents on that issue; by possibly lying to her that Mofammere is prepared to cater for the education of the former.

In order to win Litšabako to her side, 'Matšepe also applies deceit as persuasive conviction by quipping that Mofammere even said that he has enough money for upgrading Litšabako's standard of education. Seemingly, Litšabako is still interested in once more eloping with Mofammere; as she inquires, "Joale maemo ke afe?" (Act II: scene vi) [And what is the situation?] As 'Matšepe registers her fright concerning Litšabako's parents; Litšabako quickly assures her that her parents have gone to the fields, and that she is the only one remaining at home – seemingly persuading 'Matšepe to feel at home and free enough to tell her more about Mofammere.

Thus assured of the absence of Litšabako's parents; 'Matšepe now employs more of her prowess in her persuasive villainous exercise to reinforce Litšabako's attitude towards eloping with Mofammere again; saying:

"Mannyeo rona ha re batle hore e tle e re ha u nyamela mona re palameloe lipere, ho thoe rea tseba. Joale he, ho se senye nako, ke teane le Mofammere, ra lokisa maqheka. Mofammere o itse bosiung bona le tsamaee, ke be ke mo ele le karabo ea hao. Ke ne ke se ke le tsietsing ea hore na ke tla teana le uena joang. Le joale ke ne ke se ke tllil'o iphetisa mona hona ho bona hore na nka u tatisetsa molaetsa joang. Ke lehlohonolo ha e le mona ke u fumana u le mong tjena, maru a sa thiba. E be u bona joang?" (Act II: scene vi)

[Mother-of-so-and-so we don't want horses to be mounted for us as you vanish, being accused of knowing. Now then, without waste of time, I have met Mofammere, and we worked on the strategies. Mofammere has said that you should go this night, and that I should bring your response. I was already experiencing the problem of how I was going to meet you. And now I was coming to pass via here so as to see how I may speed up the message for you. It is a luck that I have found you alone, with no clouds overcast. And how do you think?]

In the light of 'Matšepe's foregoing persuasive verbal interaction, one realises that she already insinuates that Litšabako is prepared to elope with Mofammere once more; as embodied in 'ha u nyamela mona.' Besides, she assures her target that she and Mofammere have already applied some strategies for tonight's mission geared towards the planned elopement. Further, as a persuasive action for Litšabako to regard the matter as an urgent one; 'Matšepe indicates her purpose of passing by as 'ho u tatisetsa molaetsa.' Furthermore, she remarks that her finding Litšabako alone is a sign of luck – thus seemingly attempting to persuade Litšabako to regard the whole matter of eloping with Mofammere once more as an important one that she dares not lose.

Even as Litšabako appears to be rather doubtful about this elopement; 'Matšepe employs another persuasive tactic to drive her goal of winning the target to perform according to plan; saying, "Litšabako se ka phoqa ngoana e mong hle 'mannyeo! Molato e se e le eng joale?" (Act II: scene vi) [Litšabako please do not disappoint another child mother-of-so-and-so. What is wrong now?] It would seem that her reference to Mofammere as 'ngoana e mong' is applied as a persuasive endeavour for her target to realise that she and Mofammere are befitting each other; as if both of them are still youngsters. As a persuasive response for showing her persuader the reasons behind her skepticism in this matter; Litšabako asks her whether she has heard about what happened the previous day but one.

Upon learning that her persuader knows nothing about such happenings, Litšabako relates the incident that caused Souru to chase the bovine in flight; as was discussed earlier in this analysis. As a counter-persuasion, Litšabako even adds that: "Le teng, ke bona hore ke tlameha ho ea sekolong, ke tloha ke teana le mafika tseleng ke be ke tšabe le ho tla ho batsoali ba ka ha li se li nqhalile." (Act II: scene vi) [And then, I realise that I have to go to school, for I might meet with some rocks on the way and end up fearing to come to my parents when they have routed me.] As might be expected, 'Matšepe is rather disturbed by Litšabako's foregoing statement of her skepticism; as well as her apparent desire for schooling. In response, she makes a seeming agreement with her target, in an attempt at creating an impression that she also shares the same feelings with her; and says:

"Koana ua bolela le 'na ha ke rate ho u bona u le tsietsing. Hee! 'nake! Thaba eona ha ho e se nang moepa. Empa hang hoba le ba nyamelle le ne le tla itsetela ho fihlela ha lebelo la ho u batla le felile. 'Me he, chelete eona e ne e tla bapala bana. Le bona batsoali ba hao ba ne ba tla itšola hore na ba ne ba ntse ba u kalakatisa hobane'ng. Ba ne ba tla bona ka a mang matsatsi u ba buketsa ka bokhothokhotho bo tšabehang. Joale ke ipotsa hore na sekolo se thusa'ng hoba Mofammere o amohela ntho e fetang hole tali ena e amoheloang ke barutehi. Joale u tla khutlisoa ke'ng?" (Act II: scene vi)

[You are truly right as I also don't want to see you in danger. Hee! sister! As for a mountain there is none that has no ascent. But once you have disappeared from them you would bury yourselves until the agility of looking for you diminishes. And then, as for the money it would be children's play. Even your parents would regret why they have been pursuing you. They would see you on certain days strike them with plenty money. Now I ask myself what use schooling serves as Mofammere earns by far more than this rat earned by the learned people. So what shall cause you to return?]

In relation with her verbal interaction above, 'Matšepe initially pretends to be in agreement with Litšabako – thus disarming her counter-persuasive intentions in this matter. Second, she addresses her as 'nake' as an endearment persuasive measure for the target to identify with her and regard her persuasive attempts as based on sisterly love. Third, 'Matšepe makes an allusion at the similarity of life with the climbing of a mountain by indicating to her target that, like any mountain, life has ups and downs such as the target is likely to experience. In this way, this persuader strives to appear as an experienced someone that Litšabako might feel bound to rely on and change her attitude towards schooling; and opt for once more eloping with Mofammere. Fourth, she indirectly persuades Litšabako to go into a longtime hiding with Mofammere so that her parents may tire off from looking for her – thus assuring her that by the time they appear, the parents will have no more interest in interfering with them in any way.

Fifth, 'Matšepe stresses pecuniary considerations in which Litšabako is likely to find herself – thus applying it as an almost sure technique for winning her target and induce her into changing her attitude as desired by her and Mofammere. Sixth, and finally, she employs Rank's model of the *intensify/downplay scheme*, according to De Wet (1988:40-1), which states that "persuaders normally use two major tactics to achieve their aims: they either intensify certain features of their product, service, ideology or candidate, or they downplay certain aspects" (De Wet, 1988:40.) She downplays education by comparing Mofammere's high salary with that of the learned people that earn a mere 'tali' that is by far incompatible with their education. By downplaying education while at the same time intensifying Mofammere's financial status; 'Matšepe ensures Litšabako that she will be comfortably happy as she will be enjoying Mofammere's good salary – even though she will have forfeited her own education.

In the light of the above mentioned persuasive techniques applied by 'Matšepe; Litšabako counter- says, "E, kea utloa. Feela li pele li morao. Ha batho ba eletsa, re tšoanetse ho shebisana keletso eo, esere ra itelela ha re se re entse manganga." (Act II: scene vi) [Yes, I hear. But (affairs) are forward, they are backward. When people advise, we have to consider that piece of advice, so that we may not regret when we have been stubborn.] Indeed

Litšabako's foregoing response is powerful; for no one can guarantee the extent to which she might enjoy the said monies that Mofammere has, and for how long. Yet since she is intent on successfully persuading her to change her attitude and behaviour by eloping with Mofammere; 'Matšepe yet bombards Litšabako with more persuasive talk; saying:

“Le ‘na ke ntse ke sa qobelle, kea eletsa. Uena u se u tla ikhethela. Ha u ea sekolong, u ee u tseba hore le mosebetsi u tla u fumana ka thata. A makae majunifesithi a qetileng a ntseng a nyolosa a theosa ho se mesebetsi? Le teng ha u batla ho khasa har’a maruo a teke hang-hang, u se tšabe letho ho ea le Mofammere.”
(Act II: scene vi)

[Even I do not force matters, I am advising. You will make a choice. If you go to school, you go with the knowledge that you will get a job with difficulty. How many are the University graduates that still go up and down looking for jobs? And then if you want to crawl in the midst of pecuniary riches at once, don't be afraid of going with Mofammere.]

Needless to say, 'Matšepe's above interaction denotes her as a skilled upfront persuader that is likely to succeed in changing her target's attitude and behaviour in this persuasive process. Firstly, she clears her position as that of someone who is not forcing matters but advising; adding that it is for Litšabako to choose the right way. Secondly, she provides her target with advice that, should she decide to go for schooling, she should bear it in mind that finding a job might be problematic for her. Thirdly, she gives Litšabako some food for thought as she asks her about the number of University graduates who roam streets without any jobs – thus making her think twice before she makes any conclusions regarding this matter.

Finally, as her main strategic point for attempting to persuade her target successfully; 'Matšepe once more employs monetary reflections by ensuring her target of 'ho khasa har'a maruo a teke hang-hang' – thus causing Litšabako to compare and contrast the aspect of swimming in riches against that of being educated and yet jobless. Indubitably, Litšabako has been successfully persuaded – as reflected in her final words in response to her persuader's question: “Joale a tl'o u lata bosiuung bona boo, hakere?” [Now he should come and fetch you this very night, right?] In response Litšabako says “E. Feela a hlokomele lintja. A bone o tla ho se ho robotsoe. Ke tla leka hore ke ‘ne ke hlahe kante, lintja li tle li se ke tsa ba tsosa.”
(Act II: scene vi) [Yes. But he should be aware of the dogs. He should ensure that he comes when people have already gone to sleep. I shall try to continually be going out, so that the dogs might not awaken them.]

As Litšabako has just promised 'Matšepe that she shall be on the lookout for Mofammere's arrival at her home; it becomes interesting to observe her performance during her waiting for

this elopement. Indeed as her parents have already gone to sleep, Litšabako is sitting outside as her father comes out of the house – seemingly in waiting for Mofammere’s arrival to fetch her. Upon noticing an indistinct dark object patched at the front of the daughter’s sleeping house; Senamele asks, “Ntho e ntšo ee ke’ng? U motho?” (Litšabako o qhomela holimo.) (Act II: scene vii) [What is this black thing? Are you a person? (Litšabako jumps up.)] In response she says, “Ke ‘na.” (Act II: scene vii) [It is I.] Seemingly, Senamele had not thought that the black figure that had patched itself on the ground were Litšabako; for he asks her, “U etsa’ng moo ha u lutse kantle tjee?” (Act II: scene vii) [What are you doing here as you sit outside like this?] It would seem that Litšabako had not heard her father coming out of his sleeping house – that is why she jumps up with fright when she hears him asking as he has just done. It therefore comes not as astonishment that she stutters as follows in an attempt to change her father’s attitude of surprise to that of calming down: “Kea etsa, kea ... kea fora-fora, hore ke hlatse. Joale ke ne ke re ke mpe ke hahloe ke moea mohlomong ho chesa haholo ka tlung.” (Act II: scene vii) [I am, I ... I am dizzy, I feel like vomiting. And now I was trying to get some fresh air as it seems too hot indoors.] Apparently, Senamele believes the persuasive lies he is told by Litšabako; for even when she claims that she now feels better after he shocked her, he advises her to take hloenya (herb) somewhere on the shelves and chew it for medicinal purposes.

Replying that “Ke tla e nka ntate,” (Act II: scene vii) [I shall take it father], Litšabako quickly goes back into her sleeping section; as her father also goes back into his – thus attempting to cause her father to believe that she is indeed dizzy. Once Senamele has gone back into the house, Litšabako goes out again and engages herself in a soliloquy as self-persuasion; saying:

“Molimo! (...) Ka tla ka ba sebetse. Ntate h’a ka hlaha hape ke tla re’ng joale? Ausi ‘Matšepe joale motho eo oa hae h’a fihle ke’ng? Ha nka ba ka khutlela ka tlung h’a sa tla mpona. Leha nka ba ka utloa mokhoathatsa nke be ka tsoa. Teng ha ntja tsena li ka mo hobola ke se ke le ka tlung, nke be ka tsoa hoba li tla be li tsositse ntate. (Ntja e ‘ngoe e re habo! Ea bobeli le eona – habo!) Bamohloile, Bamohloile! Ke eo moo a tlang le teng.” (Oa mo khahlanyetsa o ntse a tsoka matsoho, a be a hoalatse majoe a betse lintja ka ‘ona.) (Act II: scene vii)

[God! (...) I have become so daring. If father were to peep out again what would I say? If I go back into the house he will never see me again. Even if I hear a slight noise I cannot come out. Then if these dogs may bark at him when I am already in the house, I cannot come out because they will have woken up father. (One dog says habo! The second one also – habo!) Bamohloile, Bamohloile! There he comes. (She goes to meet him halfway as she agitates her hands, and even collects some stones for throwing them at the dogs.)]

Obviously, 'Matšepe's persuasion for attempting to change Litšabako's attitude and behaviour has not functioned as a formative one; rather it has worked as some kind of reinforcement of what the target already harboured in herself. Testimony of this conclusion is embodied in Litšabako's behaviour of keeping a nocturnal watch for Mofammere's arrival; and worse still, that she even goes to meet him halfway. When she complains about Mofammere's delay; and then rushes into the house to collect some items she carries with herself; the whole exercise signifies her full intent and preparedness to elope with Mofammere the rich guy; rather than going to school as her parents have been pleading with her.

Since Litšabako's parents have been intent on sending her to school for further education at the University; their realization of her once more eloping with Mofammere strikes some pain in their hearts; as embodied in these verbal exchanges:

'Malitšabako: Ekaba ngoana eo o ntenela'ng? (Senamele oa hlaha.) [But how can this child disgust me so much? (Senamele peeps in.)]

Senamele: Le ntse le re'ng? Litšabako h'a eo? [What are you saying? Is Litšabako not there?]

'Malitšabako: Litšabako ke eo o ile, o nkile le kobo eane e ncha. Ehlile o shobetse hape. [There Litšabako has gone, she has even taken that new blanket. Indeed she has eloped again.]

Senamele: Ha ke sa mo batla ha ka mona. A ele ruri. Meetlo o tla e etsetsoa ke bo-'mankhane. Le likhomo tsa hae ha ke li hloke. Nka hloma lerumo pelong ea motho ea ka 'nang a tla a lema-lema ha ka mona a nenesitse likhomo a re o mpha tsona. O tla nkhopola letsatsi le liketse. (Act II: scene vii) [I do not want her here at my home any more. She should go for ever. As for customs she will be performed for by the bats. I do not even need her cattle. I can stick a spear at someone's heart that might come stupidly running to here at my home lightly holding some cattle and claiming to give them to me. She will remember me when the sun has set.]

Obviously, whereas 'Malitšabako only registers her disgust at the elopement of Litšabako above; Senamele goes beyond that by:

- verbally disowning her and wishing for her to go for good;
- announcing that he will never perform any customs for her;
- pronouncing his intent never to accept the marriage cattle for her;
- vowing to pin with his spear anybody that may bring such cattle to him; and finally

- predicting Litšabako's painful life with Mofammere.

In the light of Senamele's above utterances, 'Malitšabako airs her views and feelings as follows:

"Moiketsi h'a lleloe, etsoe manganga a ja mong'a 'ona. Ke mpa ke le bohloko feela ka tšenyō ea chelete e mo rutileng. Bana ba ka ho se tsebe ke lebote kapa lefu la khoho e eeng e bitsoe hamonate ka poone, athe poone eo ke selope se il'o e kenya matsohong a babolai. Re rutile sera sa rona ka boitelo, ra senyeheloa. Ke sena kajeno se re leboha tjena. Metsotso o tla e llela ho se tjee, 'me lebese le tla be le qhalane. Ho tla tšoana le mohla morena Jesu a behang lipoli ka letsohong le letšehali. Litšabako le tla mo chesa lenyalo le khopo lena la hae. O tla lakatsa eka taba li ka chechisoa. Feela ho ke ke be hoa etsahala. O mametse lira tsa ka ha li mo lahla, ho fapana le rona ha re mo betlela tsela ea bokamoso ba ho iphelisa ha lenyalo lena le phoqang la kajeno le ka mo lahla tseleng ea bophelo. (O qhela meokho sefahlehong.) Ho tsoala ho sehloho hoba nka be ke sa itjese pelo ka ngoana ea nkhopametseng hakana." (Act II: vii)

[A self-made person is never cried for, since obstinacy consumes the owner. I am only at pains for the waste of money spent on her education. My children, ignorance is the mother of stupidity or death of a chicken that is usually nicely called by means of maise offer, whereas that maise is the trap that is going to put it into the hands of killers. We have educated our enemy with commitment, and expenditure. Here it is today thanking us this way. As for wasted time she will cry for as it will not be like this; since the milk will have been spilled. It will be like the day the Lord Jesus put the goats on the left hand. As for Litšabako this cruel marriage of hers will burn her. She will wish that matters were to be reversed. But that will not happen. She has hearkened to my enemies as they dissuaded her, as opposed to us as we sharpen for her tomorrow's way of self-sustenance even if this disappointing marriage might throw her off the life direction. (She removes tears from her face.) Giving birth is cruel as I would not be causing myself this heartache for this child that has been so brutal to me.]

As opposed to Senamele's self-persuasion of Litšabako's rejection as seen above; 'Malitšabako employs a different song above – that of a dirge, as she seems to wail over the elopement of Litšabako – where she refers to Litšabako as:

- a self-made person that deserves no crying for – as obstinacy consumes the owner – thus persuading herself and her family that since Litšabako has been forewarned, she should not be cried for when matters turn against her;
- someone that has stupidly run after the snare that is meant for destroying her – just like a chicken that is usually ensnared with maise for calling it to slaughter – in this

case applying a simile as persuasion for her family to learn from Litšabako's behaviour and avoid it;

- a child that has caused them the expenditure of educating her, only to end up destroying that whole commitment by eloping with an uncultured man that is infamous of getting in and out of marriages – seemingly persuading her children to despise that behaviour;
- a child that is likely to experience painful life in future – yet likely to find no solace of any sort, as it will not be easy for her to relive the wasted life – thus apparently persuading the family to refrain from behaving similarly;
- a negligent child that might have to be separated from others, in the same way goats are separated from the sheep, according to the biblical allusion concerning Jesus Christ – apparently persuading the family to realise that Litšabako's behaviour marks her as an outcast that may be compared with goats in contrast with sheep for their meekness;
- a child that might wish for reversing the matters – as the cruel marriage she has hereby run into will disappoint her in future – thus persuading her children to avoid that kind of behaviour; and finally
- a child that she might only cry over for the sake of having given birth to her – for otherwise she were to stop feeling for her, had she not been her own child that she has biologically brought into this world – accordingly regretting the fact that she gave birth to a child that has now seemingly turned her back against her through the deceit she followed.

In line with the foregoing dirge sung by 'Malitšabako, Senamele reacts by indicating that he does not think that Litšabako has been dissuaded, except that she has had her eyes stared and persuaded by her cruel heart for the early marriages. In addition, Senamele intimates that, had Litšabako been correctly persuaded into adhering to education and go for marriage later; then she would have been convinced enough that education is more important than this unplanned early marriage. Otherwise, she is cruel, he says. It would seem that Senamele's analysis of Litšabako's behaviour hereby functions as persuasive attempt for 'Malitšabako to relate her suspicions in this way:

“Hela, ‘na ke ntse ke belaela hore hona motseng mona mok’hoba o teng. Metsamao eo motho e mong a ntšebetseng eona ea lehehle lena le ‘Matšepe a nang le eona le Mofammere e hlile ea mpelaetsa hore o teng, o kentse letsoho tabeng ena ea Litšabako.” (Act II: scene vii)

[Hallo, I still suspect that right here in the village there is something finicky. Some behaviours that were secretly related to me that this talkative 'Matšepe has with Mofammere cause me some suspicion that she is involved; she has put a hand in this affair of Litšabako.]

Significantly, Senamele has never suspected anything about this matter being instigated by the likes of 'Matšepe; for he reacts by saying, "Litšabako o tloaelane le machuchutha aa? Nka mo bolaea, Molimo ea mpopileng." (Act II: scene vii) [Is Litšabako accustomed to these harlots? I can kill her, by God that has created me!] Even as Senamele's above vow, that he can kill his daughter for her being accustomed to the likes of 'Matšepe, is meant for persuading 'Malitšabako to regard her as a corrupted girl; the latter attempts to make him change his attitude towards that reference. She says, "Ua 'molaea a le kae? Hona joale le ho mo batla u tla be u itšokolisa. O tla mo pata hore re batle re be re re tšo." (Act II: scene vii) [Where will she be for you to kill her? Right now even to look for her you will be troubling yourself. He will hide her so much that we shall hunt and say darkness (i.e., till we lose hope.)]

Apparently Senamele is now persuaded by his wife's interaction above to believe in the possibilities that 'Matšepe has been the villainous actor in this episode; for he relates to her the way he found Litšabako sitting down outside last night. He states that he now realises that such was a moment at which the villain, 'Matšepe, was out to collect Litšabako for Mofammere. He puts it as "Matšepe h'a tlil'o latela Mofammere phofu ena ea hae." (Act II: scene vii) ['Matšepe as she had come to fetch for Mofammere this victim of hers.] Indeed Litšabako has been 'Matšepe's phofu of destruction all along; as she was even referred to by the same 'Matšepe and 'Maleruo as 'nonyana eane ea rona,' as was seen earlier. As if this kind of realization was meant to be self-persuasive endeavour for himself to develop hatred against the villainous character in question, Senamele quips, "Banna ha ke 'matle mosali enoa oa Kapoko. O khopo ho feta sekele. Ke eena mong'a taba tsena." (Act II: scene vii) [Guys I hate this wife of Kapoko. She is more crooked than a sickle. She is the owner of these affairs.]

In the light of Senamele's above reference to 'Matšepe as more crooked than a sickle; it becomes interesting for one to observe the way she interacts with other women in the same vicinity. As it is common for villagers in the rural areas to let their chicken loiter freely in the village; 'Matšepe is seen throwing stones at the next door neighbour's chickens that have entered her vegetable yard; saying the following words in the process: "Ke tla li roba, ke li bolae kaofela. Ha ke molisan'a likhoho 'na." (Act III: scene i) [I shall break them, and kill them all. I am not a chickens' shepherd myself.] Needless to say, 'Matšepe's behaviour above, coupled with her verbal interaction, marks her as cruel as Senamele has described

her above. Whereas she were to address the chickens' owner in connection with these chickens, she throws stones at them with an intent to kill them – as she claims that she is not a chickens' shepherd. It would seem that she has even succeeded to break one of the chickens; as the following verbal exchanges ensue between herself and Motsirapa, the owner of the chickens:

Motsirapa: Khoho eo ea ka u e robela'ng? [What for do you break that chicken of mine?]

'Matšepe: Ho neng ke re u fase meketa ee ea hao? [For how long have I been saying that you should bind these lean chickens of yours?]

Motsirapa: Fariki ea hao e fatile moroho oa ka kaofela maobane a matšonyana ana. Ebe ke hoba 'na ke le sephoqo ha ke sa e nehela ka lintja tsee tsa ka hore li e senye letlalo? [Your pig has uprooted all my vegetables a mere yesterday. Is it because I am a fool that I did not give it to the dogs so that they should tear its skin?]

'Matšepe: Ua rata 'm'e. [You like it mother.]

Motsirapa: Ehlile ua bolela, kea rata, hoba ke leka ka mekhoha eohle hore boahisani ba rona ebe ba khotso. Empa uena ha ho mohla u ka sebetsang litaba hore li ise khotsong. [Indeed you are right, I like it, because I try by all means that our neighbourliness be a peaceful one. But as for you there is not one single day on which you work out matters so as to drive them towards establishing some peace.]

'Matšepe: Ha ke qekise boahisane ka meroho ena ea ka 'mannyeo. (Act III: scene i) [I do not flatter neighbourhood with these vegetables of mine mother-of-so-and-so.]

In line with the above verbal exchanges between 'Matšepe and Motsirapa, it is clear that the former is a cruel and self-centered woman that cares but very little about other characters. Instead of talking to Motsirapa about the way her chickens cause destruction at her vegetable garden; 'Matšepe opts for breaking and killing those chickens – yet her pig has just recently caused a lot of vegetable damage in Motsirapa's garden; it is indicated. From there on, the two women exchange heated verbal interactions in which Motsirapa even indicates to 'Matšepe that she is going to take the matter to court – especially that the latter even threatens the former about spreading some poisonous stuff on her vegetables for killing the chickens.

In an endeavour at persuading 'Matšepe to realise the extent of her seriousness in taking her to court, Motsirapa says:

“U tla e qoqa khoeli e holimo ena. U nthohaka ha ke re ha ke u senyelitse re bue, e seng u bolae phoofolo tsa ka? U lebetse hore ke uena ea faneng ka ngoana oa

Senamele? Mh! Lapeng ha ngoan'a 'nake moo u lebetse hore na u lumella lintho life?" (Act III: scene i)

[You will chat about this up there month. You insult me as I persuade you that we should talk as I have caused damage to your stuff, rather than killing my animals? You have forgotten that it is you that has given away Senamele's child? Mh! Here at my nephew's home you forget what things you welcome?]

Whereas one might have thought that 'Matšepe would be ashamed of herself upon the foregoing revelation; for her that is not to be so. As a sign of her cruelty and lack of respect for elderly people; she retorts in these words: "Sokola koata ea leqheku. Ha ke re re ne re le babeli ha re fana ka eena. Uena u ne u bile u le forose. Ha u bone ha u li tseba hakaale?" (Act III: scene i) [Try hard you uncultured old person. By the way we were two when we gave her away. You were even the leader. Don't you see that is why you know them so much?] In an attempt at persuading 'Matšepe to realise her cruelty; Motsirapa reiterates Senamele's words, saying, "U khopo. U mona." (Act III: scene i) [You are cruel. You are jealous.] Seemingly with an intention to embarrass Motsirapa; 'Matšepe retorts: "Ho feta mang? Joaloka uena ausi ee." (Act III: scene i) [More than whom? Just like you sister it is.] As a persuasive measure for her target to realise the importance of taking this matter over to the court, Motsirapa gives 'Matšepe an anathema; saying:

"U fetelle, le bochuchutha bona ba hao bo hloe mekoalaba. Monna enoa oa hao ke sono. Ke hona a tla utloa litaba tsa hao khotla mane. Ke tla li ntša kaofela le hore na ngoana enoa oa Senamele o ntšitsoe ke mang har'a motse mona, enoa eo e leng sono hoba h'a tsebe mesebetsi ea hao le banna bana bao u ntseng u matha le bona. U noha 'mannyeo re u joetse. Feela monna oa hao o tliil'o u tseba kajeno lena." (Act III: scene i)

[Do more harm, even this prostitution of yours should go up the alps. It is a shame with this husband of yours. He will only hear about your matters there at the court. I shall reveal them all even as by whom Senamele's child has been taken out of this village; this one who is in shame as he does not know your works with these men that you run around with. You are a snake mother-of-so-and-so we should tell you. But your husband is going to know you today.]

It would seem that 'Matšepe now realises that matters might be worse at court; and she suggests to pay off Motsirapa's chicken, saying, "Hoja ra khaotsa khoho eno ea hao ke tla e lefa." (Act III: scene i) [It would be wise for us to leave them as I am going to pay that chicken of yours.] Apparently, Motsirapa is determined to go ahead with a court case; as she says:

“Ha ke hloke tefo ea hao. Hoo ke ho batlang ke hore u e’o bua mahlapa ao u nthohakileng ka ‘ona ho mofumahali le basali ba hae. Ea bobeli ke il’o nya matsete ‘ohle a tseo re li boneng hae mona ha ngoana enoa oa khaitsele ea ka a le sieo. Ha ke na ho siea leha ele letho la tsona.” (Act III: scene i)

[I do not need your payment. What I need is for you to go and say out the insults you have been throwing at me to the chieftainess and her women. Secondly, I am going to divulge all that we observe here at my brother’s child when he is away. I shall omit but nothing of them.]

Whereas one might think that ‘Matšepe would be ashamed of herself and plead for forgiveness from Motsirapa; this is not the case with her, for she responds to Motsirapa’s above threats by saying, “U tla sala le eena ha ke re.” (Act III: scene i) [You will then remain with him.] While ‘Matšepe’s foregoing utterance might have been meant for attempting to persuade Motsirapa to change her attitude at this juncture; for Motsirapa, ‘Matšepe will be in a danger of losing all the benefits of her present marriage; as she says, “O tla be a u khaupile. U tla fihla heno koana bo tsoile bohlahana bona. Limenyemenye tsena tseo u qalang le ho li bona u tla li ja moo u tsebang.” (Act III: scene i) [He will have cut off your benefits. You will arrive there at your home with none of this seeming cleverness. These niceties that you even start seeing you will consume where you know.] Needless to say, this time ‘Matšepe’s attitude changes completely; as observed in her final statement, “Ha e hate ka boea bo rakhali!” (Act III: scene i) [Let it tread with wool please aunt (i.e., please act gently.)] Seemingly as a persuasive measure for signifying her intent in taking this matter to court; Motsirapa simply responds by say, “Khotla koana!” (Act III: scene i) [There at court!]

As Litšabako has since eloped with Mofammere, it becomes interesting to find out how she enjoys her husband’s money; as was promised by ‘Matšepe when she recruited her deceitfully. One of her friends, Puleng, arrives at her present home, where it is revealed in their conversation that Litšabako has now been in this marriage for two full years. As the two ladies exchange experiences about schooling, it emerges that Puleng is now in second year at the University; which would be the case with Litšabako – had she not rushed into an elopement with Mofammere. Seemingly as a persuasive attempt for Litšabako to reveal how the family life is treating her; Puleng tells Litšabako that she experiences hardships in the second year; to an extent that she even remembers their high school days as they used to work together successfully. In response to Puleng’s persuasive reminder, Litšabako divulges the following information: “Mannyeo rona e se e le litsietsi feela mona tseo ke sa boneng hantle.” (Act III: scene ii) [Mother-of-so-and-so, for us there are only distresses and I do not even see well.]

It would seem that this revelation comes as a shock to Puleng; for she makes a persuasive attempt for her friend to reveal more by exclaiming, “Ao!” (Act III: scene ii) [What!] In response, Litšabako tells her that it is so. Apparently as a persuasive attempt at assuring Puleng that her schooling is more beneficial than her present marriage involvement; Litšabako remarks as follows: “Ha u iketle! Na ekaba nka hlola ke sa bona hore na ho ntse ho etsua eng ha nka khutlela sekolong basali?” (Act III: scene ii) [You are so happy! Would I ever realise what is being done were I to go back to school guys?] Clearly, Litšabako’s envies Puleng for her being adherent to schooling; and, though it is not clearly stated in her question, she cherishes the idea of going back to school. It would then appear that she not only envies Puleng, but attempts to persuade her to stick to education, rather than running into any unplanned marriage as she has so done by eloping with Mofammere.

In response, Puleng reinforces her friend’s desire by incrementally persuading her as follows: “Hantle! He ‘Mannyeo! Ha u ne u re theola hakaale, u bona eka kelello eo e se e ile kae?” (Act III: scene ii) [Rightly! Hallow Mother-of-so-and-so! As you used to overpower us so much, where do you think that intelligence has gone to?] Even though Litšabako seems to doubt her own expertise in educational performance, it becomes evident that her running into this unplanned early marriage has caused her more harm than good, if any. In self-persuasion, she reminisces in this lamentation: “Empa kea utloa hore kea ngongoreha joale ke sehloho seo ke iketselitseng sona.” (Act III: scene ii) [But I feel that I am now dissatisfied with the punishment I have applied upon myself.] Though Litšabako hereby registers self-pity, it would also seem that she is by implication attempting to also persuade Puleng to refrain from following in her footsteps.

In the light of Litšabako’s above lamentation; as a friend in need, Puleng encourages her as follows:

“Kelello ea hao kajeno e leotsehile ho feta. Ha esitana batho ba baholo ba qetileng lilemo ba se sekolong ba ntse ba tsoeella? Bo-ntate le bo-’m’e ba lekanang le ntate Senamele ba teng ka mane baa re theola, re hula ka thata ke bona.” (Act III: scene ii)

[Your intelligence is now more sharpened. How about the mature people that have spent years away from school still overpower us? Fathers and mothers of father Senamele’s age are present in there and they overpower us, we struggle heavily because of them.]

Apparently, Litšabako has nothing to comment on concerning Puleng’s above intervention; for she now digresses to issues of drunkenness among the mature people in the University. Even so, Puleng informs her friend that the very youngsters of her age are the ones that sometimes waste their time on liquor; while the mature ones are quite serious about their education. Needless to say, Puleng’s pronouncement that the youngsters are the ones that

spent their time in the drinking spots functions as a persuasive means for Litšabako to attempt to give advice to the former to refrain from the drunken behaviour. She says,

“E se ke mpe eaba u se u khahluoe Skuizza hle, ua nketsisa ke ileng ka khahloa ke manyalo joale e le mona a ntsielitse! Molimo ntho eo ke e tšoereng!” (Act III: scene ii)

[Please let it not happen that you are attracted Skuizza, by imitating me as I was attracted by marriages that have now put me in difficulties! My God, the thing that I am handling!]

In the light of Litšabako's above persuasive advice to Puleng; coupled with her exclamation about the thing that she is handling; the latter becomes more shocked to learn that the former is really in a bad situation regarding the ensuing marriage. With a persuasive mood, Puleng reacts in this manner, “Ee bo! Ha esale u ntse u pheta-pheta ntho ena. Ho se ho etsahala joang na Skuizza?” (Act III: scene ii) [No please! You have since been repeatedly saying this thing. What is happening now Squizza?] reminiscing over the state of her marriage, Litšabako quips in this manner:

“Skuizza taba li mphetohetse; Ke bile ke rata ho teana le bo-'Matšepe ba ileng ba nkemella hore ebe ke mona. Ka ho rata ntho tse kholo ka tla ke metla-metla manyalong mona.” (Act III: scene ii)

[Skuizza, matters have turned against me; I even want to meet the likes of 'Matšepe that continuously encouraged me to be in the present situation. Due to my liking big things I stupidly came running into these marriages.]

Thus remarking on her stupidity by running into these unplanned marriages, Litšabako discourages Puleng to behave in the like manner. Indicating her friend's discouragement, Puleng even remarks that the foregoing persuasive talk might be meant for frightening her likes to ever enter into the married life. With reference to Puleng's remark, Litšabako reiterates the idea of frightening the likes of Puleng to refrain from falling into what she calls stupid marriages like the one she has already fallen into. In order to stress her persuasive talk against unplanned marriages, Litšabako quips that marriage is enjoyable to those who have been lucky enough to be involved into good marriages. As an emphasis for persuading Puleng and her likes to be ware of the unplanned marriages, Litšabako remarks as follows:

“Ha u ka ba malimabe joaloka 'na tjena u tsebe u tsietsing. Ke lula le motho ea sa ntšepeng ho hang 'mannyeo. Ha u s'u utloe bohloko ba ha ho se motho eo u ka buang le eena oa ntate kapa abuti, ebe ha u ka bua le eena u se u le motho ea sa tšepahaleng ho hang.” (Act 111: scene ii)

[If you can be as unfortunate as I am you should know that you are in danger. I live with someone who does not trust me at all, mother of so-and-so. You have never experienced the

pain of being suspected of whatever male person you talk to, that if you talk to such a person you are completely untrustworthy.]

Needless to say, this kind of persuasive talk seemingly shocks Puleng, the persuadee, such that she remarks: “Ee bo Skuizza!” (Act 111: scene ii) [No indeed Skuizza!] As she remarks with the above statement, Puleng’s face even shows surprise and wonderment; thus indicating that her friend’s persuasive style of frightening her has positively functioned as intended.

Now that she has achieved this persuasive style of shocking Puleng, Litšabako relates that she can only encourage one to run into these unplanned marriages if she deeply hates such a person; and encourage such a person to abandon her studies and rush into those kinds of marriages – as she believes that such kind of encouragement is tantamount to Satanism. Further, Litšabako explains that, for her, Satanism is closely related to jealousy and cruelty – in which case the person who influences one to abandon education and run into the unplanned marriages leads the culprit into hell. Rounding up her persuasion for Puleng to refrain from such inducements, she says:

“Kahoo ha ke rata motho nke ke ka mo khothaletsa hore a siee lithuto, a siee mofuthu oa lelapa labo, a siee bocha ba hae boo e leng kanana a be a siee le metsoalle ea hae, a tl’o koaloha ka seboping sa ho se buisane le batho tjena. ‘Mannyeo ke utloile, ha ke Lechankana. Joale u ‘mamele Skuizza ke u tsoele khomo.” (Act 111: scene ii)

[For that matter, when I like a person I cannot encourage her/him to abandon studies, abandon the warmth of her/his family, abandon her/his youthfulness that is a canon and even abandon her/his friends, and end up being locked up into this oven of not talking to other people in this manner. Mother-of-so-and-so, I have felt it, I am not a Shangaan. Now listen to me Skuizza as I give out a beast to you (i.e. as I give you a free advice).]

As an indication of her being positively persuaded, Puleng registers her surprise by merely exclaiming: “Hee!” [What!]. Now that Puleng shows surprise and interest in the whole affair, Litšabako relates her background stories that demonstrate the sufferings she experience in this unplanned marriage she is in. Among others, she relates to Puleng her being denied the right and freedom to greet and talk to almost every man she meets anywhere, including Mofammere’s friends; for the suspicion that she might be having an affair with such men. As she notices that Puleng realises the bitterness and painful relationship she has unwittingly put herself into, Litšabako warns her against being derailed from her direction, saying, “U nkutloe ha ke re ho uena, u se mamele motho h’a u khelosa tseleng ea bophelo, ua re u mathela manyalo.” (Act 111: scene ii) [You should listen to me when I say to you, never listen to anyone who misguides you from the life direction, encouraging you to rush into marriages.]

Although for Puleng it were better if Litšabako had already born a child in this marriage, for Litšabako this would not be the case, for she would be bound by custom to stick to this painful marriage that she now aims to quit, she says. Further, Litšabako ensures her friend of the fact that she stands a chance to quit this marriage, as no dowry has been paid for her; including the fact that even the church minister refused to solemnise this kind of marriage, since her parents have not been involved in its organization. Furthermore, she relates the incidence of her father's chasing the messenger that had been sent to him recognizing this unplanned marriage as an official one. Further still, Litšabako informs and assures Puleng that she is about to quit and be free from this marriage; as she hopes and trusts that her father will accept her back as an unfaithful child. Finally, Litšabako indicates to Puleng that she is thankful to her father for refusing to accept the dowry cattle that were to be sent to him for this marriage – for had he accepted that offer, this kind of marriage would not be ended in any way; since a Sesotho customary marriage is never brought to an end.

Since she has thus far persuaded Puleng to refrain from any marriage into which she may be encouraged to rush, Litšabako ensures her that opting out of this marriage will not be a problem for her – for there is nothing that officially binds her to it. In this way, one might say that Litšabako has managed to give advice to Puleng against rushing into any kind of unplanned marriage. Besides, she has also persuaded her to realise that there is yet an ample chance for herself to free herself from this marriage that has caused her so much pain up to now. Possibly with an endeavour at persuading Puleng to grab as much money as she may if she finds herself in this kind of marriage, Litšabako states it to her that she is going to grab as much money as she manages before she opts out of this marriage.

At this juncture, Mofammere arrives, and with reluctance, greets Puleng and ignores the aspect of asking after her health, in accordance with the Sesotho custom and practice. Mofammere's attitude towards Puleng immediately functions as a persuasive action for her to quit this place; as she realises that there is no peace and tranquility prevailing between husband and wife in this family. As one might expect, Puleng's departure creates an opportunity for Mofammere to complain about her visit to Litšabako. Though Litšabako has introduced her as her friend from their girlish days, for Mofammere, Puleng has come as a messenger for gossip or some kind of bad influence. Without any kind of attempt at persuading Litšabako to stop seeing Puleng as her friend, he instructs her to cut off their friendship. Even as Litšabako argues against this idea, Mofammere threatens her with a thorough beating. Needless to say, Mofammere lacks any form of upfront persuasive engagement. Rather, he employs coercion as some force and control against Litšabako – as he says, "Ke ee be ke tla u khabutla joale. Ke tla u khitlopa hore u khathale." (Act 111: scene

ii) [That is why I usually beat you to nobody's business. I shall pummel you to thorough tiredness.]

Obviously, this is coercion at its worst, especially as it is revealed that beating Litšabako by Mofammere is a common business. Whereas one might have thought that Litšabako would stop her upfront persuasive talk with Mofammere, due to these coercive threats, this is not the case with her. She continues her argument that she might stop seeing her friends if Mofammere may stop seeing other women, such as 'Matšepo and others that he always frequents. She even employs the persuasive strategy of downplaying Mofammere's threats by saying, "Ao! Motholuo oa hao 'nake. U mo khabutle hoba h'a na matla. Uena u khabutle enoa ea senang mang oee. U khitlope joalokaha u bolela." (Act 111: scene ii) [Alas! Shame, your lost-and-found one! Beat her to nobody's business as she has no power. You should beat to nobody's business this one who has absolutely no relative. You should pummel as you say.]

Having downplayed Mofammere's threats as shown above, Litšabako forewarns Mofammere that his day is coming, as he has usually been harassing and beating her over nothing – to an extent that he would even beat her over unfounded suspicions that she was gallivanting with other men. To round up her warning, Litšabako says the following words with fury: "He u ntenne nnyeo!" (Act 111: scene ii) [You have indeed disgusted me, you so-and-so!] In this way it becomes clear that she now takes the initiative to defy Mofammere and retaliate to his threats and insinuations. Understandably, Litšabako has now decided to employ threats and forewarnings as persuasive strategies for calling Mofammere to order.

As if what she has just said to Mofammere was not enough to put him to order, Litšabako pronounces her disappointment and regret for having been lured into this kind of marriage with evil monies; while her parents were doing all in their power to make her pursue her studies for a fruitful future. Seemingly with a purpose to poke Mofammere and persuade him to take a decisive action, she says the following words that are not directly addressed to anybody in particular: "E malimabe chelete ena eo ke tlileng ke metla-metla kamora' eona le ntate-moholo ea mokanakana." (Act 111: scene ii) [It is an unfortunate money this one after which I stupidly came running, with an old man such as this one.] Seemingly these words not only stupefy Mofammere, but also surprise him, as this is the first time he has been directly challenged by Litšabako.

At this juncture, all Mofammere can do is to laugh at her expression, supposedly as a persuasive action that is calculated for ridiculing her. As one might expect, Litšabako reacts to Mofammere's laughter by indicating that she is to blame for her own behaviour, as she was supposed to have hearkened to her parents' instructions to continue her education and

refrain from engaging herself into these unfortunate marriages. In her counter-persuasive reaction, Litšabako calls herself a 'popoiki' (dummy) that was stupid enough to follow the concubines of the likes of 'Matšepe's misguiding that has now resulted into sharing the same unfortunate monies with the same 'Matšepe, as 'Matšepe now seems to be the share-holder in the same marriage.

Needless to say, Litšabako's aside has functioned as some persuasive challenge for Mofammere to respond, whereupon he instructs the former to stop the whole discussion; and even asks her after the monies in reference. Apparently his intervention works as a challenge for Litšabako to respond as follows:

“Ho tseba uena ho mpheta. Ke uena ea ka li phetang. U se ke ua mpotela ka lipotsonyana tsena tsa hao. U re ekaba litaba tseo u li etsang mola moo u reng ke bohoeng ba hao ha ke li tsebe? Litaba ha li timanoe ese bohobe abuti.” (Act 111: scene ii)

[You know better than me. You are the one who can relate them. Stop raving at me with these mini questions of yours. Do you think that the affairs you do there where you pronounce that it is at your in-laws are unknown to me? Affairs are not deprived of as bread brother.]

As might be expected, Mofammere now reacts to Litšabako's above response with surprise and disbelief, saying, “Matšepo, 'Matšepo! U re kea u potela? Na ua nthohaka ngoana tooe?” (Act 111: scene ii) ['Matšepo, 'Matšepo! You say that I rave at you! Do you really insult me you child?'] Seemingly determined to defy Mofammere further, Litšabako now pours her persuasive anger over Mofammere, saying:

“Ke u hlomphile ho lekane. Ua nkhakhatha mona, feela ha u tsebe hore na ke sentse eng. Tsatsing lena he u ntenne ka ho soabisa motsoalle oa ka e mokana a nchaketse, ebe u nahana hore ho na le litaba tse litšila tseo a li tlisitseng. Ha u sa iphapanya le hore a mpe a tsamae, joale ebe u sala u nkhakhatha ka mokhoa oa hao?” (Act 111: scene ii)

[I have respected you enough. You beat me repeatedly, yet you do not know the wrong I have done. Indeed this day you have disgusted me by embarrassing such a great friend of mine that has visited me, by thinking that there are filthy affairs that she has carried over. You do not even exercise patience until she has left, then you start beating me repeatedly as is your style.]

Not surprisingly, since he is not a man of upright persuasion, Mofammere employs threats and promises to beat Litšabako. To his surprise, the latter challenges him to action by using an Nguni expression, saying, “Hosa!” (Act 111: scene ii) (Come!) Since beating up his wife is

a usual phenomenon, Mofammere does not hesitate to grab a whip and approaches Litšabako – whereupon she defends herself by grabbing at the same whip. Even as Mofammere downplays her action as ‘ho fopotleha,’ [to act foolishly] Litšabako retaliates by also downplaying his masculinity, calling him Monyammere instead of Mofammere – thus infuriating him worse than before. As the struggle for grabbing at the whip ensues, Litšabako manages to pull it out of Mofammere’s hand and throws it away. The struggle then develops into some kind of man-to-man fight, ending up with Litšabako on top of Mofammere, thus forcing the latter to plead for mercy – whereupon she promises to release him only if he behaved himself, saying:

“Ke tla u hatoha ha u itšoere hantle. Ho neng u nteteka e sale ke fihla moo. Ke tla – u – tlenya le ‘na. Ke – k - - ke tsoetsoe le ‘na. Ha ke mo – tholuo oa hao.” (Act 111: scene ii)

[I shall get off you when you have started behaving yourself. For how long have you been repeatedly beating me since my arrival here! I – I shall crush you too. I – I have been born too. I am not your lo – lost-and-found one.]

Clearly, the state of power between husband and wife has changed – the commonly known masculine power has now been transferred from Mofammere to Litšabako, as she presently seems to control the situation. In short, she has grabbed Mofammere’s coercive behaviour and hereby applies it as an active style of forcing the perpetrator into submission. Even as Mofammere threatens to kill her when he becomes free from the present situation, Litšabako continues defying him and assures him that she will sit on him till he becomes as flat as a lizard’s head. As if her above threat is not enough, she defies him further by telling him that she is no more the same oppressed woman that she has always been up to now.

Significantly, Mofammere is feeling the pressure of being under his wife’s physical oppression, such that he may only plead, “Ntlohele ‘Matšepo,” [Leave me alone ‘Matšepo.] In response, Litšabako gives him the following assurance: “Le - ho - leka. Ha u s’u tsoe nkane.” (Act 111: scene ii) [Not by a long shot. You have not yet let off your dictatorship.] Obviously, Litšabako hereby employs coercive means as a persuasive endeavour for changing Mofammere’s attitude and behaviour of non-employment of upfront persuasion with her. Finally, she lets go of the tired Mofammere and runs away, leaving him behind as he struggles to regain his power. It therefore comes not as surprise that after the struggle Mofammere roams about the village, looking for her all over; apparently with an intention to regain his lost masculinity through coercion once more. In an effort to regain his masculinity and dictatorship, Mofammere applies self-persuasion, saying, “Malapeng ana ... Le beng ba teng baa tseba hore ha ke shapa mosali ha ho motho ea ka nkemang pele.” (Act 111: scene

ii) [In these homesteads ... Even their owners know that when I whip a woman, no one may try to stop me.]

It would seem that Mofammere has now learned a lesson not to coerce and force his masculinity over Litšabako anymore. This is realizable where she says the following words about Mofammere to 'Mantipe, a friend of hers in the village:

“He motho o ntšotlile enoa! O ntenne ho feta khopo tsa khoho. Poulelo ena eo ho seng motho ea sa e tsebeng motseng mona e entse hore ke qhashohe joaloka lemao ha le utloa boima ba kobo e kolobileng.” (Act 111: scene iii)

[Indeed this person has tortured me so much! He has disgusted me more than chicken ribs. This jealousy that has become common knowledge in this village has caused me to rapture as a pin experiencing the weight of a rain-trenched blanket.]

Litšabako's employment of the metaphoric language above, 'ho feta khopo tsa khoho,' and 'joaloka lemao ha le utloa boima ba kobo e kolobileng,' functions as self-persuasive action for herself to never be submissive to Mofammere's torture and oppression anymore. In other words, she feels that she has now come to the end of her endurance of any form of exploitation. To prove this point, she tells 'Mantipe that, "Bohlanya ntja bona ba hae nkeke ka bo kopa." (Act 111: scene iii) [I can never anymore bear this dog-like madness of his.] Further, Litšabako assures 'Mantipe that Mofammere would no more dare exercise any more torture on her; and she further relates the incidence of her retaliation against Mofammere's torture in these words:

“A ka 'na a etsa. Ntho tsena ha li tsejoe. Feela nkile ka choabola sebanteu seo a na beng a nkahlola ka sona ka se betsetsa koana. Ka beha ka fatše ka hatella. Ha ke re le matla h'a eo. Ka kotsomala hore a be a re 'm'e nkhathe.” (Act 111: scene iii)

[He may do so. These matters are never known. But I once snatched the whip that he was using for beating me and threw it away. I then put him under and overpowered him. Is it not true that he does not even have power? I remained on top of him until he said, 'please get off me mother.']

Realizing 'Mantipe's worry over this matter, Litšabako assures her that she had no alternative but to venture into self-emancipation from the oppression and torture she always received from Mofammere, saying: “Ka itela. Ntja ha u e otlala ho feta tekanyo, e tla u senela. Qetellong ea qetello ke hore e tla u loma.” (Act 111: scene iii) [I plucked up courage. If you hit a dog more than enough, it will bear its teeth against you. Finally, such a dog will bite you.] In this way, it would seem that Litšabako relates a dog situation as a way of making her friend understand her endurance of Mofammere's torture over her, to an extent that she had no alternative but to ultimately defend herself for self-emancipation. In other words, Litšabako

hereby assures her friend that, had Mofammere not gone beyond human endurance, she might have not had the power and determination to take it into her own hands to free herself from his exploitation and torture.

Even as 'Mantipe expresses her fear that Mofammere might still beat Litšabako, the latter once more assures her:

“Ho mpolaea teng setsong ke ha Molapo, kapa hona ho nkotla... Ebile ke se ke inahanne ka taba ena. Ke tla lokoloha ho tloha hona joale. Khale le benya ke ntse ke fetlama. Ke tla tloaela batho ke sa tšabe motho.... Hajoale ke shebile hore hona joale a etse phoso e le 'ngoe feela. Le tla khaoha lesela.” (Act 111: scene iii)

[As for killing me, the elbow is at Molapo's, or even beating me.... And I have already cogitated over this matter. I shall be free from now on. For a long time it has been lightening as I have been throwing myself down. I shall get accustomed to people without any fear.... As for now I am waiting for him to make just one mistake. The cloth will rapture.]

Though she hereby addresses herself to 'Mantipe, Litšabako presently seems to be engaged in self-persuasion, for she takes a vow that Mofammere's days of torture and exploitation are over with her. She even pronounces her intent not to have whatever fear of his criticism against her associating with people she might be accustomed to, as he has always expressed his disapproval of her connecting with anybody at all. It then comes not as surprise that she engages herself in the following soliloquy once they part ways with 'Mantipe:

“Molimo ntate, ke tla tšoarora ke lefu la pelo lenyalong lena...ekaba ke ntja haeba nka phehella joalokaha ke mameletse likomotelo tse senang motheo tsena, ho khahloloa, ho tebeloa pel'a batho, ho aroloa le batsoali le mehaeso hore ke phele joaloka noha. Ngoana ea lehlasoa e ne e le motho. Ke tla latela. Ho lihlong. Batho ba motse ke tla tšaba ho talimana le bona. Empa ntho lia etsahala, li fete. Le 'na boitlontlollo boo ke bo entseng bo tla feta. Nako e sa le teng le sekolo ke ntse ke lumela hore se ke ke sa ntlhola ha feela ke kopile tšoarelo ho ntate le 'm'e.” (Act 111: scene iii)

[God father, I shall suffer from heart attach in this marriage.... I would be a dog if I were to continue as I have been bearing these unfounded bad talks, to be beaten, to be expelled from the people, to be separated from parents and relatives so that I should live like a snake. The prodigal son was a human being. I shall follow. It is embarrassing. As for neighbours I will be afraid of meeting them. But matters do happen and pass. In the like manner, the self-embarrassment I have created will pass. There is still time, even for schooling I still maintain that it cannot be a problem for me, as long as I have asked for forgiveness from father and mother.]

Needless to say, the above soliloquy reveals Litšabako's self-persuasion and intent to end her sufferings under the present marriage. Though she is aware of the disgrace and embarrassment she is going to put herself into, she prepares herself to accept the painful outcome. She compares herself to the biblical prodigal son that eventually approached his father for forgiveness in order to regain his rightful place and status in his family after spending his money with some concubines. It would then seem that her application of the biblical allusion is meant for deepening her determination to plug up courage and end her present sufferings under this existing marriage with the oppressive and exploitative Mofammere; and finally face up her parents and amend her ways for meaningful life.

Incidentally, at Senamele's home 'Malitšabako busily engages herself in persuading her husband to forgive Litšabako and accept her into the family, saying: "Mautla a tla sotla ngoan'aka. Hao ntat'a Litšabako, motho oa Molimo, ha u sa hauha?" (Act 111: scene v) [The devil has indeed tortured my child. Please, Litšabako's father, God's person, can't you have mercy?] First and foremost, she makes reference to Mofammere as 'Mautla' [Satan], apparently as a strategy for persuading Senamele to regard him as the devil incarnate that lured Litšabako into the hell he had already prepared for her – thus creating the impression that Litšabako is a mere mortal that hardly had enough power to resist the devil's spell.

Second, 'Malitšabako hereby appeals to parental bondage that binds the two of them together as parents to Litšabako, who deserves their mercy and forgiveness under the present circumstances. Third, she hereby calls Senamele 'motho oa Molimo' as a persuasive measure for him to be aware of his situational relation with God, the Father that is reputed to be merciful to His underlings, in accordance with biblical teachings. In this way, therefore, she appeals to his subconscious mind to perform in this matter as God would in the prevailing situation. Fourth, she appeals for her husband's mercy with persuasive intention for him to disregard every aspect of Litšabako's misguided behaviour and apply mercy, as 'motho oa Molimo.'

Even as Senamale counter-argues that since Litšabako has been stubborn and cruel enough to put herself into the prevailing situation – thus deserving no forgiveness – 'Malitšabako once more appeals to his mercy:

"Hao ntate! Ha u ka mpa ua hauha; molemong oa ka e se e se oa ntho ena e entseng lintho ka kelello e tutubetseng hakana. Oee! Ntate, ebe motlopotlo oa ho tsoala o ka ba ho mang ha e se pele ho motho oa mosali?" (Act 111: scene v)

[Oh father! Can't you please be merciful; for my sake and not necessarily for this thing that has so stupidly acted? Please! Father, where else can parental love emanate unless initially from the woman?]

Evidently, 'Malitšabako makes reference to her daughter as 'ntho ena e entseng lintho...' as a persuasive strategy for Senamele to realise that Litšabako has erred in this matter due to her status of naivety, with no intention for displeasing her parents. It would then appear that her persuasive appeal is for Senamele to regard his daughter's misbehaviour as an act of ignorance, naivety and insensitivity that deserves forgiveness. As might be expected, Senamele counter- argues that Litšabako has violated every aspect of his warnings by continually running after Mofammere – adding that, "O hanne ha ke mo tšola" (Act 111: scene v) [She has refused my offer of taking her out of the fire.] Although in agreement with him on that issue, 'Malitšabako yet adds:

"Feela ke utloisisa hore bana ba rona ba etsa lintho ka ho se utloisisi. Ba ikhanneloa ke bonyenyane. Hona joale tsatsi le chabile. Ha u ka fihla ua re le tle hae, a ke ke a 'na a tsilatsila, o tla u sala morao." (Act 111: scene v)

[But I understand that our children behave in certain ways due to their lack of understanding. They are only driven by their youthfulness. As for now the sun has shined. If you can arrive and ask her to go with you, she will not hesitate, she will merely follow you.]

Even though he partially agrees with 'Malitšabako that Litšabako has had painful experience in this marriage – such that she may not hesitate to come home with him – Senamele counter- argues that she still has to be left in that position – so that she might never again venture into such misbehaviour. In an effort to apply yet more persuasion for Senamele to be considerate of her feelings and inclinations, 'Malitšabako says, "O mpile a oela marabeng a sa hlokomela ke bongoana. Hauha ntate hle, le sekolong a tl'o ea leha a sentse nako ea hae." (Act 111: scene v) [She merely fell upon the webs without realizing them due to childhood. Be pitiful please father, so that she might go to school, even though she has wasted her time!]

Needless to say, 'Malitšabako has become Litšabako's self-appointed spokesperson – and she hereby applies her persuasive skills for changing Senamele's negative attitude into positive considerations – for Litšabako to be given an opportunity to pursue her education again. First and foremost, she once more emphasises the point of Litšabako's naivety that let her fall upon the webs that were already set for her by Mofammere the devil incarnate. Since Senamele's main reason for getting his daughter out of this unplanned marriage was for her to continue with her studies; it would seem that 'Malitšabako hereby brings up this point as a persuasive tactic for Senamele's change of behaviour and attitude. It then comes not as surprise that Senamele responds to 'Malitšabako's persuasive point by saying: "Tsamaea u eo mo lata, a ee sekolong, haeba se teng kolo se tla nka motho ea mekhoa e mebe hakana."

(Act 111: scene v) [Go and fetch her, so that she goes to school, if there exists a school that will accept a person with such bad behaviour.]

Seemingly, the idea of fetching Litšabako is positively considered by Senamele at this point in time – though he is rather skeptical about her chances of being admitted into any form of education. Though ‘Malitšabako’s plea has all along been for him to go and fetch Litšabako, Senamele agrees with the idea; yet he now urges her to perform the act herself. Apparently, he sees no chances for himself to perform this act – as he has already been accused of causing strife in that village. As if by providence divine, Mphaufele arrives at this moment and intervenes by indicating that he could be of assistance by using lightning to kill Mofammere.

As might be expected, ‘Malitšabako makes use of this moment by requesting Mphaufele to perform that act as best as he can – as long as that action will retrieve her daughter. Indeed, Mphaufele promises to perform as requested, saying:

“Ke tla sebetša ‘m’e, ke tla li loma hore motho a be a khotse. Joale le mphe feela poli tse peli tse ntšo tse senang ‘mala. E ‘ngoe e be e tšehali e ‘ngoe e be e tona. Le tla bona hore na ha ke koebela ke etsa joang.” (Act 111: scene v)

[I shall work mother, I shall bite them (medicinal plants) so much that someone will watch with surprise. All you do is to give me only two entirely black goats. One should be a female, another one a male. You will see what I do when I swagger.]

As may be observed above, Mphaufele employs self-praise as a persuasive strategy for both Senamele and ‘Malitšabako to entirely believe in his magical prowess in matters of this kind. Though in essence he would also like Litšabako to return and continue her studies, Senamele pronounces his seemingly negative idea about the proposed performance – and to register his opposition, he goes out of the house, as a strategy for ‘Malitšabako and Mphaufele to reach an agreement on their own. As a persuasive action for ‘Malitšabako to give him reigns for performing the magical act, Mphaufele looks at her and inquires whether or not he should act accordingly. Apparently, ‘Malitšabako has a clear understanding of Senamele’s action of leaving her alone with Mphaufele – it is for her to persuade Mphaufele to perform as he has just promised. It therefore comes as no surprise for her to promise Mphaufele that:

“Ntat’a Litšabako o tla u lefa hle ntate Mphaufele. Ho feta mono ke tla ea llela khaitšeli ea ka hore a mphe patala ea hao. Letsoele le antšitseng ha se papali.” (Act 111: scene v)

[Litšabako's father will pay you please, father Mphaufele. Otherwise I shall go and plead with my brother to give me your pay. The breast that has suckled is no child's play (meaning that a mother's plea for her child is always hearkened to).]

Convincingly, Mphaufele is positively persuaded by 'Malitšabako's above assurances of paying him; especially as she reassures him that 'Letsoele le antšitseng ha se papali;' for he merely says, "Ho lokile 'm'e." (Act 111: scene v) [It is alright mother.] He then goes out, as a sign that he is prepared to perform as he has promised.

It would seem that Mphaufele's promise of using lightning for killing Mofammere has just been a way of speaking; not necessarily to use lightning as such, but anything that damages Mofammere, so that Litšabako may have no alternative but to go back to her parents' home. Since he has managed to convince 'Malitšabako to perform accordingly, it hardly comes as surprise that he encourages Phau to pretend to be going to work – while his intention is to come back home to discover his wife's gallivanting with other men. As a persuasive tactic for Phau, 'Malerumo's husband, to perform as he desires, Mphaufele says to him:

“Taba tsa kajeno li thata. Ka mohlomong ke tloha ke leleka motho oa ha Lenka mane eo ke bonang a kene banna ba motse ona ka tšeeng ho feta banna ba lilala bao nkileng ka ba bona. Joale ere ha ke qeta ho mo bata ke mo leleka, ebe ha u fihla ua nqosa kapa ua nkhakhatha, u re ke ne ke ntse ke tseka mosali oa hao. Joale ke sa tla araba ka hore'ng?” (Act 111: scene vi)

[Today's issues are complicated. I might venture to chase away someone from Lenka's village there, who I consider to have entered this village men's drawers worse than any vagabonds that I have ever seen. Then when I have just struck him and chased him away, you arrive and accuse me or beat me repeatedly, accusing me of fighting over your wife. Then how am I going to respond to that?]

Mphaufele hereby makes reference to Phau as if by mere example, yet it would seem that, in essence, he is directly persuading Phau to examine his own situation. Unsurprisingly, Phau even poses the following rhetorical question – supposedly as an indication that he has been positively persuaded to act accordingly: “E seng 'na ke hle ke khutle banna?” (Act 111: scene vi) [Is it not better for me to actually go back guys?] Possibly with an intention to mislead Mphaufele and Soufele about his intentions, Phau even remarks as follows: “Re fihla mateanong a litsela joale. Re tla li bua; bese ke eane e tla ntšiea. Ere ke je ka sekaja e tle se ke ea fihla setopong mane ke sa le hole.” (Act 111: scene vi) [We are now at the cross roads. We shall discuss; there is the bus and it will leave me. Let me run fast so that it may not

leave me behind.] Having said the above words, Phau suddenly runs fast to the bus stop – thus misleading the two men towards thinking that he is indeed going back to the mines.

Coincidentally, 'Matšepe has accommodated her friends, 'Malerumo and Mofammere at her house. Even though it seems a usual thing for the threesome to spend time together here at her place, where they consume some liquor after the departure of the women's husbands; this time 'Matšepe is rather worried. She even attempts to expel both Mofammere and his woman friend, 'Malerumo, from her place – but to no avail. As if through her sixth sense, 'Matšepe's worries ultimately turn into reality; as Phau, 'Malerumo's husband, arrives at the scene to find the threesome enjoying themselves together – as they have assumed that he has gone to work as usual. As the threesome are busily engaged in their drinking spree, they are baffled by a persuasive knock at the door, followed by a powerful voice, saying, "Koko! Koko ka mona!" (Act 111: scene vii) [Knock! Tap in here!]

As might be expected, this persuasive knock frightens the threesome to a freezing point – as they clearly recognise the voice as that of Phau – who is supposed to have gone back to the mines. Even before the threesome can get out of their slumber, Phau opens the door and gets in, only to find them frozen with fear – each of them petrified to one place. As he looks at them with furious eyes, the threesome becomes persuaded into more fear and astonishment – thus gaining an opportunity for repeatedly hitting them with his fighting stick. As hues, cries and pleadings for mercy resulting from the beatings become louder and louder, villagers are persuaded into coming to the threesome's assistance. To everyone's surprise, even Mofammere, the man who is infamously known for hearkening to no pleadings whenever he beats up his wives, pleads for mercy, crying:

“Ntate ke u sitetsoe, ntšoarele hle moholo oa ka. Ke tla u lefa haholo. Ntšoarele hle ngoaneso. Ke hlapetse letšeing hle ntate.” (Act 111: scene vii)

[Father, I have wronged you, please have mercy on me my senior one! I shall pay you abundantly! Please pardon me my brother! I swear never to repeat this act please father!]

As may be realised, all Mofammere's pleadings above are meant for persuading Phau to be merciful and end the beatings he applies to him. In an endeavour to soften Phau's heart for mercy, he even calls him 'ntate.' In this way, Mofammere hereby applies patriarchal reference to Phau as a persuasive strategy for the latter to identify with him and bestow upon him fatherly considerations in this matter of life and death. In addition, Mofammere's offer to pay Phau abundantly may be regarded as some persuasive tactic for creating in the latter's mind, some desire for money or any other form of payment, thus buying him off to stop the present punishment applied on his person. Additionally still, Mofammere refers to Phau as 'ngoaneso' as persuasive attempt for the latter to have brotherly considerations and apply

mercy upon him. Finally, Mofammere employs an idiomatic expression, 'ho hlapela letšeong,' as a persuasive assurance to Phau that, like one that washes one's dirt in a cold falls for indicating affliction, he will never in his life ever err as he has just done against him.

It would seem that Mofammere's pleas for mercy have been hearkened to by Phau, as the latter now turns away from him and starts beating his wife with a whip. As a wife would react to her husband's beatings, 'Malerumo cries for mercy, saying: "Jo! Jo ra shoa ra le bona oee! Re hauhele hle aubuti Phau! Jo oee!" (Act 111: scene vii) [Alas! Alas for witnessing our death! Please be pitiful to us brother Phau! Alas! poor me!] As any woman under similar circumstances might do, 'Malerumo hereby employs a usual women's call for mercy. Nonetheless, unlike Mofammere, who only cries for the persecutor to have mercy on him; 'Malerumo's pleas are more persuasive for Phau to stop beating them, as she turns herself into a spokesperson for the threesome, as may be observed in her pleas above. It therefore surprises but little for one to realise that her appeals for mercy have positively truck persuasive considerations for Phau to cease the beatings, as he says: "Kea le phomolela." (Act 111: scene vii) [I am taking a break for you guys.]

Since the idea of taking a break suggests that the performance is still going to continue; the village men who have gathered around now take it into their own hands to plead with Phau to stop the beatings: "Butle mor'a Mokoena, u se u ba tšoere." (Act 111: scene vii) [Take it easy son of Mokoena, you have already caught them.] Significantly, the men's pleas have been persuasive enough for Phau to stop the punishment he has been applying upon the threesome – as he now goes out of the house without saying a word. As would be expected, the villagers now have an opportunity to give their first aid assistance to the threesome, and only begin to identify the man that has sustained the injuries through Phau's poundings. Only then do they begin to identify the man as Mofammere, the supposed son-in-law to Senamele, their co-villager. The following persuasive remarks are passed in the process:

Soufele: Batho ba Molimo ke bosiu, empa re tlameha ho isa motho enoa moreneng a re itsetse banna re mo bofeng pereng a ee ha habo. [God's people it is in the night, but we are bound to take this person to the chief's place so that he calls the men for assisting us in binding him to the horse and take him to his home.]

Banna: Ha habo ke kae motho eo? [Where is this person's home?]

Soufele: Ke mokhoenyana oa Senamele motho enoa. Ha le mo bone? [This is Senamele's son-in-law. Don't you realise him?]

Banna: Banna! Ho se hlomphe metse ea batho ho tjee? Ke hore motho eo o tlil'o ipolaisa ka motho tjee bitsong la bohloahloaeli bo ba bona feela? (Act 111: scene vii) [Guys! does failure

to respect other people's villages come to this? So this person has caused this guy to injure him like this due to mere gallivanting?]

Looking at the above verbal exchanges from the villagers, one realises that each speaker applies some persuasive strategy of some sort for changing the addressee's beliefs and attitudes. For example, Soufele's initial plea is meant for persuading his co-villagers to realise the importance of taking the matter to the chief; and to make them identify with his beliefs, he calls them 'batho ba Molimo;' seemingly for them to remember the spiritual teachings that encourage people to be of assistance to one another. Secondly, he makes them aware that he also realises the fact that it is already in the night; yet they all have an obligation to meet the chief and gain his assistance for conveying the injured man to his own home for safety.

Thirdly, the men who ask about the home of the injured man might be asking that question with some persuasive intent for all to identify this injured man – possibly to create among those present the impression that Senamele was indeed right to have endeavoured to retrieve his daughter from the home of this man after he had eloped with her. Fourthly, with persuasive intent for all to rebuke whoever might be following Mofammere's footsteps in the village; the men refer to this happenstance as emanating from disrespect that seems to be prevailing in many Lesotho villages. Finally, the same men suggest that Mofammere has sustained his injuries due to gallivanting and nothing else – thus sending a message for the likes of Mofammere to refrain from gallivanting in all its forms.

Once more as a persuasive measure for all present to refrain from misbehaving as the threesome have, 'Matsirapa says:

“Bana beso e tla ka re tšeha batho ha ba le litsietsing. Oee! Ho neneng re bua? Ho neneng re eletsa? Jonna bachaa! Motse oa bola oa re phere! Ka ntate ka Ralulalula.”
(Act 111: scene vii)

[My fellow people, it will seem as though we laugh at people when they are in difficulties. Please! For how long have we been speaking? Alas the youth! The village has become rotten to the fullest! I bet by my father, by ralulalula!]

Needless to say, 'Matsirapa has had times when, as an aunt to 'Matšepe, she would reprimand her for gallivanting and allowing herself to be misused by her friends at her home. Apparently, 'Matšepe would not listen to her – rather, she would call her names and defy her for attempting to persuade her to change for the better. Unsurprisingly therefore, 'Matšepe says the following in her wailings:

“Morena Molimo, ka tla ka iteka ka ho thusa ‘Malerumo ntoeng eo a e loantšang ngoan’a ntate Senamele. Ekaba ke ne ke jeoa ke’ng? Bana beso ke ne ke e-cha ke tšola’ng? Ichu oee! Ntloheleng. Bohloko bo moo!” (Act 111:scene vii)

[Almighty God, I have indeed wronged myself by assisting ‘Malerumo in the war she has put up against Mr Senamele’s child. By the way what got into me? My fellow people what affair did I have in the whole thing? Oh the pain! Leave me alone. The pain I feel here!]

It would seem that ‘Matšepe hereby expresses here regret for having put a hand into the matter that did not concern her; not only as a mere regret, but as an attempt at persuading those around her to avoid similar situations – for they might fall into the same problem into which she presently finds herself. It is apparent that she even makes a call for God’s assistance in this respect as persuasive measure for those around her to pray to Him that He helps them to fight against such behaviour; especially as she only gained pain and embarrassment from her actions. Even as she asks those around her to leave her alone; it would seem that her persuasive message is that, since she never listened to anybody’s piece of advice – she hardly deserves anybody’s pity.

When she finally appears to be addressing nobody in particular but herself; it becomes clear that she regards herself as a lonesome individual that deserves nobody’s sympathy or empathy. She therefore tells all around her to stop sympathizing with her in this situation; as she is entirely to blame for her own actions. She says:

“Ekaba ke tla ea kae? Jo ka le bona oee! Kapoko h’a na ho rata le ho utloa. Ho neng ke re ‘Malerumo le Raqhoe eo oa hae oa bokhopo ba tsoe ka ntlong ea Kapoko, eba baa hana? A ‘na eloa!” (Act 111: scene vii)

[By the way where will I go? Alas here I see my death! Kapoko will not even want to hear about it. For how long have I been asking ‘Malerumo and this cruel Old Monkey of hers to get out of Kapoko’s house, to what they refused? What a wonder for me!]

Clearly, ‘Matšepe’s above wailing is meant for asking all those around her to refrain from her kind of misbehaviour; as they are likely to end up in this way, should they not avoid her behaviour. When she finally wails in self-pity in ‘A ‘na eloa!’ above, one is persuaded into realizing that whoever happens to fall into this kind of problem is likely going to end as a lone piece of humanity like her.

As for Mofammere, he has seemingly been in such pain that he has hardly said a word. It is only when he has been taken to his parents at home that he starts wailing in this form: “Mh! Mh! Ichuu!” (Act 111: scene viii) [Oh! Oh! It’s painful!] Even as Khabele is trying to obtain some information concerning Mofammere’s injuries, the latter keeps wailing with pain; possibly as a persuasive measure for attracting his parents’ sympathy. Soufele ventures into

giving the information to Khabele, only to be interrupted by 'Matsietso's wailings and verbal interventions – such as, “Oho Molimo! E ne ere Senamele a bolela a re o tla bolaea ngoana eo oa ka? Oho!” (Act 111: scene viii) [Oh God! Is it as Senamele once said that he was going to kill this child of mine? Oh no!] Not surprisingly, Khabele rebukes her and asks her to go into the house, rather than interrupting the reporter and come up with unfounded conclusions.

In a way, Khabele's intervention for 'Matsietso to go back into the house functions as persuasion for Soufele to continue with his report; and he says:

“Ehlile ua nepa ntate ha u re 'm'e a se ke a le ebisa litsebe. Le 'na joale ke sitoa ho pheta litaba tsa Morena Setlai ke lentsoe lena la pele, empa le tlang hakana. Ke ne mpa ke re: ntate litaba li thata. Empa ha li se li etsahetse, li etsahetse. Le ho leka ho li pota pota, re ntse re sheba koana le koana, ha ho thuso. Molemo ke hore re li bue feela, hoba ha esale lekunutu.” (Act 111: scene viii)

[Indeed you are correct father when you say that mother should not disturb your listening ability. I now also fail to relate Chief Setlai's matters due to this first word, but that which is so much erring. I was only saying: father, matters are tough. But as they have already taken place, they have happened. Even beating about the bush, looking this way and that way, is of no use. The important thing is to just discuss them, since it is no more a secret.]

Needless to say, these are persuasive enough words for Khabele to listen carefully to the report about the injury sustained by his son, who has not been saying anything up to now – except asking for some water. Even if 'Matsietso was not prepared to listen to any form of information contrary to her own conviction, she now must be positively persuaded enough to listen to the reporter as he delivers it. The fact that the matter in question 'ha esale lekunutu,' as clearly put by the reporter above, is persuasive enough for all around to pay their full attention as the information is being delivered. As a sign that he has been fully persuaded by Soufele's words for listening attentively; Khabele urges him to continue with the report, saying:

“Bua ntate, re hlile re thehile litsebe hore re utloe hore na ngoana enoa oa ka o hlaha kotsi tse mpe hakana a le hokae, le hona ka mabaka afe.” (Act 111: scene viii)

[Speak up father we are really listening carefully so that we hear about the source of the injuries sustained by this child of mine, as to where the incidence took place and under what circumstances.]

Without any waste of time, Soufele relates the whole story; only to be once more interrupted by 'Matsietso with her wailings. As may be expected, Khabele intervenes again for her to

keep mum – thus persuading the reporter to continue with his report. Ending up his report, Soufele mentions to Khabele that

“Morena Setlai o itse ngoan’a hao ke enoa, ‘me a lebelle khato ea molao joale ho tloha h’a tsoa sepetlele feela a folile.” (Act 111: scene viii)

[Chief Setlai has said that there is your child, and he should expect a legal action now after he has come out of hospital and well again.]

It would appear that for Khabele, this is already a court case, as he inquires about the person that has caused an injury on the other – thus inviting Soufele to respond that this is not a court case yet. In addition, Soufele says the following to Khabele initially, and second to his fellow men:

“Empa ke lumela hore motho le motho o lokela ho iphutha. Ho tanakela malapa a batho ka tsela ena ho baka tsona tseno. Banna ba heso, bosiu boa sa, ha re e-s’o bo hlothe. Tšoarang lipere, re khutle.” (Act 111: scene viii)

[But I believe that every person has to collect themselves. To fool around other people’s families causes these very things. My fellow men, the night is getting young, we have not even winked. Hold your horses, let us go back.]

As may be observed, Soufele’s above talk to Khabele functions as a persuasive attempt for the latter to be considerate of the burning issue here – that this incidence has been caused by Mofammere’s irresponsibility and disregard for other men’s integrity. When he addresses himself to his fellow men, it would seem that he puts it to them that they should waste no other minute with Khabele – as he seems to be out of line by prematurely venturing into court procedures that hardly concern them as their chief’s messengers. It therefore comes not as surprise that in response, his fellow men say the following to one another, “Ha re eeng. Re phethile thomo ea rona. Ke hona a sa tla lefa enoa motho.” (Act 111: scene viii) [Let us go. We have fulfilled our undertaking. This guy is still going to pay a lot.] As a word of finality, Soufele forewarns Khabele that:

“Mosali oa motho ke khomo tse tharo ntate. Le tsebe le ho nyala h’a e-s’o nyalle Senamele. Feela Phau o tla mo lefisa khomo tse tharo. Le ha ho kaba ha thoe ke morui.” (Act 111: scene viii)

First and foremost, Soufele hereby addresses Khabele with the initial sentence; and further addresses himself to other people around him – yet all the expressions are meant as direct and indirect persuasion for Khabele to be conscious of the problem his son, Mofammere, has put himself into by vilifying Phau’s home. At this juncture there arrives ‘Matšepo/Litšabako, as she has been called over by Khabele. As a persuasive measure for Khabele to explain to

her what she has been called for, she inquires, “Ntate ke tlile pitsong ea hao ea bosiu bo bokana.” (Act 111: scene viii) [Father, I have fulfilled your call by coming over even though it is right in the night.] In response, Khabele points at Mofammere, and informs her that he has sustained some injuries. Apparently, Litšabako never had any expectations of seeing Mofammere here, as he has supposedly gone back to work early enough during the day. Otherwise, she would think that he must have sustained these injuries from a car accident, or something.

With this understanding, she asks the following question with surprise, thus asking for some information concerning Mofammere’s present state: “Ke abuti Mofammere eo? O entse joang? Koloji e ba phethotse h’a khutlela mosebetsing? Jonna oee!” (Act 111: scene viii) [Is this brother Mofammere? What has happened to him? Has a vehicle overturned with them while he was going back to work? Alas, poor me!] Seemingly, ‘Matšepo’s above questions, as well as her wailing, are employed as persuasive demand for a clear explanation of the situation in which Mofammere is. Instead of getting the answers she so desperately demands, no answer is immediately forthcoming. It would then appear that the parents find it rather difficult for them to relate the story as it is to ‘Matšepo; for she looks around for some answers to her questions, yet there is some hesitation. Ultimately, Khabele ventures to inform her by beating about the bush, saying: “Ke masoabi ‘Matšepo, ngoan’a ka, hoba taba ha e le tjena motho u se u ipotsa hore na u ee u qale kae.” (Act 111: scene viii) [I am sorry ‘Matšepo, my child, because when a matter is like this one hardly knows what to say.]

For the addressee, Khabele’s above statement relative to her questions functions as persuasive attempt for her to respond as follows, “U se ke ua ba masoabi ntate; U bue feela.” (Act 111: scene viii) [Do not be sorry father. Just speak out.] It appears that Khabele still finds it difficult for him to reveal the whole information to ‘Matšepo, for he asks Motlalepula to perform that act, saying:

“E, banna! Abuti Motlalepula, ebe u ka manollela ngoana eo oa hao hore na ebe bomalimabe ba eo monna oa hae ebile bofe?” (Act 111: scene viii)

[Eh, guys! Brother Motlalepula, is it possible for you to reveal for this child of yours what misfortune befell this husband of hers?]

As may be observed, Khabele seems to have no courage enough to reveal to his daughter-in-law how Mofammere sustained the present injuries. Rather, in his attempt at persuading Motlalepula to perform that act of delivering the information to ‘Matšepo – he employs aspects of family relations, calling him ‘abuti’, and asking him to ‘manollela ngoana eo oa hao.’ In this way it would seem that his idea is to create in ‘Matšepo’s mind that Motlalepula, as brother to him, and father to her, has the right to inform her accordingly. Additionally,

Khabele refers to Mofammere's situation as 'bomalimabe,' thus attempting to instill in 'Matšepo's mind that what befell Mofammere has simply been a misfortune that would befall any other man/person. In this way, Khabele is hereby applying this tactic as a measure for attempting to make 'Matšepo insensitive of the seriousness of this occasion.

On the other hand, in response to Khabele's request for him to reveal the matter to 'Matšepo, Motlalepula addresses her as 'nkhono' (grandmother), seemingly to create in her mind the understanding that, as 'nkhono', she is to accept this matter with a mature person's ability and suppress her personal feelings and inclinations. In addition, he says to her, "Leha ebile e le boima ho uena, re u kopa hore u khobe matšoafo, u e nke sesali." (Act 111: scene viii) [Even though this is a heavy matter, we ask you to cool down, and accept it womanly.] In an endeavour for softening 'Matšepo's mind and change her attitude towards this matter – Motlalepula puts it in these words: "O bonahala ka bofokoli ba botho a ile a thellela lapeng la motho mane haeno." (Act 111: scene viii) [Due to the weakness of human nature, it would seem that this husband of yours slipped into someone else's home over there in your home village.]

But alas, rather than softening 'Matšepo's feelings and inclinations towards Mofammere's behaviour, she is infuriated, to an extent that she starts strolling out, fuming with anger and disgust. Seemingly, 'Matšepo behaves in this manner due to the way Motlalepula chooses to present this matter to her. Rather than simply putting the matter just as it was reported by Soufele to Khabele earlier, Motlalepula appears to turn himself into Mofammere's spokesperson by even referring to the latter's misbehaviour as human nature. Realizing the extent of 'Matšepo's anger, Motlalepula pleads with her to cool down; using the following expressions in an attempt at persuading her to change her attitude and behaviour:

"Matšepo, u se ke ua mphoqa ngoan'a ngoan'eso. Khutla. Lula fatše. Ke itse u tseba ho iphpanya. Ha ke reke sefahleho sa hao." (Act 111: scene viii)

['Matšepo, do not disappoint me my brother's child. Come back. Sit down. I have said that you have the capacity for enduring painful situations. I am not buying your face.]

In response to this persuasive talk, 'Matšepo comes back to her seat; but not before she intensely looks at Mofammere's face and frowning at him. She then claps her hands, seemingly as a persuasive measure for indicating her surprise and disgust. Apparently, one woman among the crowd realises the state of anger and revulsion in 'Matšepo, and endeavours at persuading her to calm down and reconsider her present situation as similar to what other women have experienced in their marriages, saying:

“Iphapanye ngoan’a Senamele. Iphapanye Mokoena. Ha re le basali re le tjena re fetile mathateng ‘ona a tjena. Ba bang le a fetang ana. ... Qenehela monna enoa oa hao o mo ise ngakeng.” (Act 111: scene viii)

[Be patient Senamele’s child. Be patient Mokoena. As women in the state in which we are we have passed through the same difficulties. For some, even in worse states.... Be pitiful for this husband of yours and take him to the doctor.]

Apparently, the woman who has just addressed herself to ‘Matšepo hereby attempts to make her realise that many women are bearing similar pain; yet they bear the sufferings patiently, with some hope that their husbands will change their attitude and behaviour one day. Whereas one might expect ‘Matšepo to be persuaded into changing her attitude and behaviour; she counter- explains how she has been so stupid as to run after a married man that is infamous of ditching off his wives; and worse still, now notoriously known for his gallivanting with numerous concubines all over. Worse still, she explains how Mofammere usually molests her for nothing – ending up her talk with, “Kajeno o ntlontlotse ea ho qetela. He! Basali! O otluoe haeso?” (Act 111: scene viii) [Today he has embarrassed me for finality. What! Guys! He has been beaten at my home village?]

It would appear that ‘Matšepo cannot tolerate it any more for some family members to turn themselves into Mofammere’s spokespeople; as she directly addresses herself to Mofammere; and the following exchanges ensue:

‘Matšepo: Abuti Mofammere o otluoe ha mang? [Brother Mofammere at whose home were you beaten?]

Mofammere: Mh! Ichuu! Ke ha ‘Matšepe. [Eh! Oh, the pain! It is at ‘Matšepe’s.]

‘Matšepo: A u fumana abuti Kapoko, a u totlotsa joale ha hae? (Act III: scene viii) [Then brother Kapoko found you, and he therefore struck you at his place?]

Whereas one might expect Mofammere to reply to his wife’s questions, to everybody’s surprise, Khabele intervenes by once more becoming his son’s spokesperson – explaining how liquor drinking was the source of the trouble that befell Mofammere. As might be expected, ‘Matšepe’s attitude changes with immediacy, as she interrupts Khabele and tells him how furious his attempt at clarifying the point angers her – especially as Mofammere never invited him to come and be his spokesperson in this matter. Even as Khabele ultimately agrees with her on stopping the aspect of being Mofammere’s spokesperson; ‘Matšepo asks for forgiveness for speaking as she has just done to him – and further asks Mofammere to explain himself, and the following verbal exchanges ensue:

‘Matšepo: Abuti Mofammere a k’u phete hore na u tsoile kotsi tsena joang. Haeba u batla ‘na le uena re tsitsise metheo ea rona ea khotso. [Brother Mofammere, please relate how you sustained these injuries; if you want me and you to re-establish our peace relations.]

Mofammere: ‘Matše-po, ayi – ichu! Ke ko-pa u ntš—tšoarele. [‘Matše-po, oh – the pain! I ask for for-giveness.]

‘Matšepo: Hoja ua bua hore na tšoarello u e kopa holim’a eng? Ke’ng eo u e entseng? [It would be better for you to say what you are asking for forgiveness on! What have you done?]

Mofammere: Ke ile - - ka pot-a le ha Se---tla-i. Ka bo-tho ka fapohela ichuu! Ntšehetse - ka mo---samo nta--- (...) Mh! Mhhh! U behelle bo---hareng. (...) He --- ke. Athe, e tla re ha ke qe---ta ho ke---na ha ‘Ma---tše---pe, ebe --- ‘Male---rumo oa ke---na. Mhhh! Sh--w--u! Ba ile ba nqo---bella ho noa k’hotho tseo, mh, b’---neng ba li reki---le. Phau a ke---na re otl---mh!(Act III: scene viii) [I went - - via Se---tla-i’s village. As it is hum-an I also turned around oh the pain! Support me - with a pi---lo fat--- (...) Oh! Ohhh! Put it at the ce---nter. (...) Al---right. And immediately I entered ‘Ma---tše---pe’s house, then --- ‘Male---rumo also entered. Ohhh! Good---ne---s! They for---ced me to drink those quarts, oh, tha’ they had bou---ght. Phau then ent---ered bea--- us oh!]

It would seem that Mofammere hereby speaks to ‘Matšepo in this form as a persuasive attempt for her to apply her pity and mercy for him under the present situation that apparently embarrasses him so much. Contrary to his expectations, ‘Matšepo seems hardly impressed by his way of speaking at this moment. Rather, she inquires:

“Abuti Mofammere, ha ke u khutlela setopong mola tlaase, u nthetsa u re u ea Makhooeng u boese ua nyenyelepa ka khoroana tsa matsa ua lopalla ho ea ha Setlai koaa? Ak’u bone na u khelohile ho le hokae.” (Act 111: scene viii)

[Brother Mofammere, when I parted with you down there at the bus stop, deceiving me that you were going to the mines, you once more deceitfully took dubious ways towards Setlai’s village over there? Just look at how far you turned off.]

In an attempt at persuading ‘Matšepo to change her attitude of fury in this matter, Mofammere starts off by wailing, and then pleads for forgiveness from her, saying: “Mhhh! Ke i---tse u ntšoa---rele hle mo-tho oa Mo-li-mo.” (Act 111: scene viii) [Ohhh! I h---ave as---ked for your forgiveness please, G-od’s per-son.] Needless to say, Mofammere refers to his wife as God’s person above in an endeavour for persuading her to regard herself as such; and apply mercy and forgiveness to him. Contrary to his expectations, ‘Matšepo retorts: “Ke tla u tšoarela hoba le uena u tseba ho tšoarela haholo. Hoja ebe ke ebe ke entse letho batho ba Molimo.” (Act 111: scene viii) [I will forgive you since you are also good at that. It would be better if I were accused of something I actually did, God’s people.] No doubt, ‘Matšepo defies

the idea of forgiving in an attempt at persuading Mofammere and all gathered here to realise the cruelty he has always applied against her for nothing. In a counter-persuasive mood, 'Matšepo even addresses those gathered around as 'batho ba Molimo' in an attempt at inviting them to also weigh the matters and decide on whether or not Mofammere deserves any form of forgiveness.

Not surprisingly, even before Mofammere may respond to 'Matšepo's quips, and persuade her to change her attitude towards this request, Khabele once more turns himself into his son's spokes-person, saying: "Tšoarelo ke eona ntho e kholo ngoan'a ka. Ke thabile ha u re u tšoarela monna enoa oa hao." (Act 111: scene viii) [Forgiveness is actually an important thing my child. I am happy that you say that you forgive this husband of yours.] It would appear that Khabele's above words are meant for attempting to persuade 'Matšepo to perform as he suggests; without asking any more questions. Contrary to Khabele's intentions, 'Matšepo gather's anger at his interventions; and she responds to his statement by saying:

"Ntate ha u ka mpha sebaka! Ke tla hloka boiphapanyo joale. U itse u qala ho mpoella litaba ua hloleha. Ua bua taba tse sa tšoaneng le tseo ho qaliloeng ka tsona mona hoba uena ho na le ntho eo u e haeletsang ka ngoana enoa oa hao. 'Na u ntlhotse. Joale u ke ke ua 'namolela hoba ha ke na ba heso." (Act 111: scene viii)

[Father, will you please give me a chance! I shall now lose temper. You tried to relate the news to me and you failed. You instead related the piece of news that is not in concert with those that were being engaged at the beginning, simply because you have something to hide about this child of yours. As for me you have beaten me. Now you may not protect me because I have no relatives.]

Having driven Mofammere into a corner where he agrees that he is on the wrong; 'Matšepo reveals to all who are gathered here that Mofammere has always fought her over nothing throughout their three years marriage. In addition, 'Matšepo asks the men to take the injured Mofammere to the nearest road; so that he may be taken to the hospital. As a persuasive measure for the gathering to understand the depth of her pain; as well as her intent to vacate Mofammere's home; she asks the men to come with her to collect some money for surgical assistance, including all his belongings, ending with:

"Kea tsamaea, ke khutlela bofutsaneng ba ntate ba Senamele, ke siee morui enoa oa lichelete le 'm'e 'Malerumo le 'Matšepe ba ntjeleng lirethe ke le ngoana e mokana. Ke ba lakaletsa bophelo bo monate bo se nang matšoenyeho a ho belaelloa. Ke chele ke utloile. Ke re ke utloile ke se Lechankana." (Act 111: scene viii)

[I am going, going back to the poverty of Senamele, my father; and leave this rich man with lots of money with mother 'Malerumo and 'Matšepo that have back bitten me in this childish state of mine. I wish them good life with no difficulties of experiencing suspicion. I have burned and have felt it. I say I have felt it though I am not a Shangaan.]

Having said this much, 'Matšepo goes out; whereupon she leaves the gathering to discuss her situation and intention to quit this marriage with Mofammere. As might be expected, the gathering engages itself into persuasive discussions for Mofammere's parents to work towards building peace and tranquility between the family of Senamele and Khabele – the main persuasive point being Motlalepula's suggestion that 'Matšepo/Litšabako's parents be beseeched for peace' sake. Even as the men are about to take Mofammere closer to the road; Khabele volunteers to go and bar 'Matšepo from taking his son's belongings – saying:

“Butleng. Ke lokela hore, ha le isa motho enoa pel'a likoloi koana, 'na ke sehe sekaja ho ea bona hore tekatse lena ha le nke lintho tsa ngoan'a ka.” (Act 111: scene viii)

[Wait! I must make sure that, while you take this person closer to the roads there, I quickly run to ensure that this concubine does not take my child's belongings.]

Needless to say, Khabele hereby refers to Litšabako as a concubine with an intention of persuading the gathering to regard her as such. It would then seem that his aim is to attempt to change anyone's attitude and belief that she has been experiencing hardships in her marriage with Mofammere. As such, one might guess that Khabele hereby creates animosity among those who might express some pity and side with Litšabako. In this way, it might not be wrong for one to conclude that Khabele's main intention is to vilify Litšabako in the eyes of those who have gathered here, and persuade them to regard her as a concubine that deserves no pity from them. Even though Mofammere persuades Khabele to beg 'Matšepo for forgiveness; the latter counter- indicates that he is not going to do that; since the former has failed to achieve such an aspect.

In the meantime, 'Matšepo is busily engaged in a soliloquy that reflects her deep intentions concerning Mofammere's money that is kept in her custody. She self- reveals the following plans:

“Nka senya batho bana. Chelete ena eo ke itseng ba tl'o e nka e ka ba senya. Ke tla ba fa feela ea hore ba mo ise ngakeng. Kete tsena tse hlano, le bukana ena, ke ea ka kaha mosaeni oa pele ke 'na ho eona mona. Kete tsena tse mashome a mabeli ke tla ikisa sekolong ka tsona. Ntate le 'm'e ke tla ba kopa feela hore ba be mohau ho mpoloka ha bona.” (Act 111: scene viii)

[I would spoil these people. This money that I have asked them to come and collect can spoil them. I shall only give them that which is enough for taking him to a doctor. As for this five

thousand maluti (Lesotho money equivalent to rand), and this savings book, it is mine because I am the first signatory in it. I shall spend this twenty thousand maluti on my schooling. As for father and mother, I shall ask them to please be merciful to me and keep me at their home.]

As might be expected, when Khabele arrives at 'Matšepo's house to collect the money in question; the latter gives him three hundred maluti, as the supposed money for taking Mofammere to a doctor in Maseru. Not surprisingly, Khabele inquires whether or not that is all the money available in her possession – thus attempting to change 'Matšepo's possible intention of taking all the money with her; as she has threatened to leave for her parents' home. Since she has self-made her mind to take all the money in her possession with her; 'Matšepo convinces Khabele that the remainder will come to her assistance as she leaves. Further, she even lies to Khabele that Mofammere has a savings book that he carries along with him as he goes to work, which he might have possibly lost in the scuffle.

As she realises that Khabele is determined to get hold of the savings book with substantive figures; 'Matšepo persuades him to go, making him aware that his continuous delay through haggling might result into a failure to get the transport that has to take Mofammere to Maseru:

“Ke bona eka koloi li tla u siea, ebe ngoan'a hao oa shoa. Bukana eo a buang ka eona o tseba hantle hore ha nke be ke ntše le sente ho eona h'a le sieo. H'a khutla sepetlele, o tla mphumana ke ntse ke mo emetse hore a tl'o mpha kamoo a ka mphang, ke tsebe ho itsamaela ke mo siea le bao a ikhethetseng ho sala le bona.”
(Act 111: scene viii)

[It looks like the vehicles are going to leave you behind, resulting into your son's death. As for the savings book that you hereby make reference to, he knows very well that I never withdraw even a sent from it while he is away. When he comes back from the hospital he shall find me waiting for him, so that he may give me whatever amount he intends to, so that I might go and leave him with those that he has chosen to stay with.]

Seemingly with further persuasive attempt at convincing Khabele that she has no intentions of going back to her home while Mofammere is away – 'Matšepo says:

“Ha kea holisoa ka bosholu. Hoo nke keng ka ho etsa ke ho isa Mofammere ngakeng. Ke lakatsa hore ebe 'Malerumo le 'Matšepo ba mo isang ngakeng. H'a khutlile re tla tla buisana litaba, a sale le bona. Joale 'na ke mo suthela le bona, a tle a tsebe le ho nyala ka likhomo kaha 'na ha kea ntšetsoa letho ha ke re? Ke lebaka lena ke sotlehileng hakana.” (Act 111: scene viii)

[I have not been brought up through theft. What I am not prepared to do is to take Mofammere to the doctor. I wish that it could be ‘Malerumo and ‘Matšepe that take him to the doctor. When he comes back we shall discuss the issue, so that he stays with them. Then I give space for him and them, so that he might produce some cattle dowry for them, since I have not been provided with anything – isn’t it so? That is the reason why I have been so much suffering.]

It would appear that ‘Matšepo has succeeded in employing conviction as a strategy for dissuading Khabele from haggling with her over Mofammere’s money. Unsurprisingly therefore, Khabele pronounces himself that he has now been answered; and rushes for the bus stop with the purpose of taking his son to the doctor. Meanwhile, ‘Matšepo engages herself into a soliloquy, as she persuades and prepares herself for the departure to her parents’ home. It is revealed in her soliloquy that it only dawns to her that ‘Malerumo and ‘Matšepe have been her long time villains – with intentions for dissuading her from the educational future that her parents were so eager to provide for her. This lonesome moment provides ‘Matšepo with enough time and ability to organise herself for departure, as well as organizing strategies for carrying her luggage when she leaves. Though she has just persuaded Khabele to believe in her that she is going to wait for Mofammere to come back from the hospital before she might take off to her home; she now uses this moment for putting all her belongings into order. As an attempt into self-persuasion for hating ‘Malerumo and ‘Matšepe, ‘Matšepo says:

“Ha ke batle ‘Matšepe pel’a ka ho hang. Ha e le ‘Malerumo eena o se a ntse a tseba hore ke mo nyonya le seriti. Leha ba ntenne hakana hoba khale ba ja chelete ea monna enoa oa bona, ba nthusitse haholo hoba taba tsa ka li tla boela malulong tsa hore ke ee sekolong, Roma, moo metsoalle ea ka e leng teng. Khotso ea pelo ea ka kea e utloa le pele ke tsoa kahar’a ntlo ena e ileng ea mphuthella matšoenyeho ka nako e telele hakana. Molimo a nthuse batsoali ba ka bao ke ba tlotlolseng hakana ba mpe ba nkamohele. Molimo, ekaba ntate o tla re’ng?” (Act 111: scene viii)

[I totally hate to see ‘Matšepe next to me. As for ‘Malerumo, she knows that I detest even her shadow. Even though they have disgusted me so much for consuming the money of this husband of theirs for so long, they have assisted me a lot, for my matters will now come to some settlement for continuing with my schooling, at Roma, the place where my friends sojourn. I feel the peace of my heart even before I go out of this house that collected some sufferings for me in such a long time. May God help me to be welcomed by my parents after embarrassing them so much! Oh God, what will my father say?]

As if by providence divine, a friend of 'Matšepo by the name of 'Mantipe arrives. After a long discussion and some persuasion for assistance in carrying her load, 'Matšepo enjoys the assistance of this friend of hers. Ultimately, 'Matšepo even expresses her disgust by denouncing her marriage name, 'Matšepo, and persuades her friend to once more call her Litšabako, saying:

“Le 'Matšepo ena eo u ntseng u e bitsa ha ke sa e hloka. Ke boetse ke Litšabako. Hobane ke furalle monyako oane feela, e ile eaba ke se ke ba Litšabako. Ha ke batle le peni ea motho ea ntseng a re mosali oa Mofammere.” (Act 111: scene viii)

[I even hate this 'Matšepo name that you continue calling me with. I am once more Litšabako. The moment I gave my back to that door, I immediately became Litšabako once more. I do not even appreciate a cent of someone calling me the wife of Mofammere.]

Significantly, 'Mantipe has been successfully persuaded by 'Matšepo to be once more called by her maiden name, Litšabako; for in their discussions the former says, “Tšepa morena Molimo 'Matšepo 'nake... Oh! Hana u itse ke re Litšabako? Re tla u chakela Litšabako 'nake.” (Act 111: scene viii) [Put your trust in God dear 'Matšepo... Oh! By the way, you said that I should call you Litšabako. We shall pay you a visit dear Litšabako.] As a sign of appreciation for being called with her maiden name again; Litšabako responds to 'Mantipe's above commend by saying, “Ua mpitsa hamonate he joale. Tsela-tšoeu ha u boela mane moo ke betselitseng lejoe.” (Act 111: scene viii) [You have nicely called me now. Let the road shine for you as you go back to that village where I have already thrown a stone.]

Finally, as she enters her home village, Litšabako meets 'Matšepo, whereupon they engage themselves in the following verbal exchanges:

'Matšepo: Lumela bo ausi. [Good morning please sister.]

Litšabako: Phooa! Phooa!(O tšoele mathe.) Ha u soabe le ho soaba oa mautla tooe? Ua ho tsoha u rahile mabota! sebolu sela sa hao ha u e'o lumelisa sona ke'ng? Ha ke batle puo ea hao. U nkenya lihelong ke sa tsebe, u re ke tlotlolle batsoali ba ka athe ua tseba hore monna eo ke oa hao le 'Malerumo?

'Matšepo: Ke malimabe. Ntšoarele hle ke ne ke sa tsebe hore...

Litšabako: U sa tsebe eng? Sokola ngoan'a ntlo ea makote! Tsamaea u e'o bolella 'Malerumo hore monna eane eo le nkapoletseng eena kajeno ke mo khutliselitse ho lona. Le e'o mo oka. Phooa! Ba ho tsoha le shoele ting! (Ba arohana ka litsela, Litšabako oa likela.) (Act 111: scene viii) [Not knowing what! Work hard you child of the soil blocks! Go and tell 'Malerumo that the man that you had given to me as second-hand has been brought back to

you by me today. You should go and take him. Spew! How I wish you could wake up dead! (They take separate directions, Litšabako vanishes.)]

Needless to say, Litšabako's persuasive verbal exchanges directed to 'Matšepe above have had an impact on the latter – as indicated in the following soliloquy by the same 'Matšepe:

“Ha ke hopola Tiabolosi enoa eo ho thoeng ke 'Malerumo ke utloa hantle re ka 'na ra bolaeana. Ke boleletse batho baa hakae hore re arohaneng, a ntse a sataletse? Oee! Ee hle basali hle. Ke maoma ke tjee ka masaoana? Hoja nkile ka itšoara joaloka basali ba bang, na nka be ke le matlokotsing aa? Ke tla balehela ho mang ha Kapoko a ka fihla moo? Jonna bocha oee! Jonna menate oee! 'Malerumo ha ke mo batle. Haeba o ne a hloile Litšabako, ke utloa hore lehloeo la ka ho eena le feta 'ohle mahloeo. Ha ke ba hloke le Mofammere eno oa hae. Ba malimabe batho. Feela ke ne ke kenoe ke'ng? Ke ne ke hloka eng Kapoko a tšabana le 'na hakaale? Ke phehisitse 'Malerumo, ka hlaba khora ka sefea-maeba.” (Act 111: scene viii)

[When I remember this devil called 'Malerumo I feel that we might kill each other. For how long have I told these guys that we should part ways, yet she stubbornly resisted? Oh! No guys, no! I sustain these wounds over nonsensical things? Had I behaved like other women, would I have been in these calamities? To whom shall I run if Kapoko can arrive here? Alas the youthfulness! Alas the pleasures! I hate 'Malerumo. If she had hated Litšabako, I feel that my hatred to her overpowers all hatreds. I do not need her and that Mofammere of hers. What an unfortunate couple! But what had come into me? What did I lack, as Kapoko takes so much care over me? I have joined 'Malerumo, and have invited troubles for myself.]

No doubt, the above soliloquy is a clear demonstration that 'Matšepe has been positively persuaded by Litšabako to realise the extent to which her friendliness with 'Malerumo and Mofammere has caused her troubles. As an indication that she presently identifies herself with Litšabako; she refers to 'Malerumo as some kind of 'Tiabolosi' that deserves to die. In addition, she now begins to realise that her actions of gallivanting with 'Malerumo and Mofammere have caused her dearly; as she feels threatened by possible arrival of Kapoko – the husband that loves her dearly and takes so much care of her. The whole soliloquy is therefore to be regarded as some self-persuasion for her to undergo a change of behaviour and attitude before it is too late.

Finally, it is important to realise that, like a burned child, Litšabako also cries over wasted time for schooling. In addition, she regrets that she wasted her time, not with someone of her age and caliber, but an older man who is infamous of ill-treating his wives – to an extent that they all end up running away from his torture. Additionally, Litšabako self-realises that “Ihlo ha le fahloe habeli,” (Act 111: scene ix) [Once beaten twice shy,] which is an indication that

she is now prepared to go back to her education and forget about these unplanned marriages that end up by causing unsettling pain to those who rush into them blindly. It therefore becomes quite encouraging to hear her final expression that, “Ke hlapetse letšeoaneng” (Act 111: scene ix) [I swear!]

5.3 LEHOLIMO LA PHETLOA

As was indicated in the introduction above, the second drama text I hereby analyse is Lesupi’s *Leholimo la phetloa*. This drama text involves mainly two characters, ’Mamoroesi, a widow whose late husband, Mosiuoa, was involved in fatal car accident; and Morapeli, the late Mosiuoa’s younger brother. It would appear that the conflict ensued between the two characters after Mosiuoa’s death. Apparently, Morapeli pins the death of his late brother on ’Mamoroesi, basing his argument on witchcraft. As a persuasive ploy, Morapeli has confronted ’Mamoroesi with his accusation, and has further spread his opinion to a number of the villagers, including Morena Mopeli, the local chief that seems to be susceptible to Morapeli’s persuasive ploy.

At the inception of the play, ’Mamoroesi and her friend, ’Malebohang, are engaged in some persuasive discussion concerning the former’s plight of having been accused of being responsible for the accidental death of her husband. It would appear that this interaction between the two women takes place some time after the burial of the late Mosiuoa; as ’Mamoroesi informs ’Malebohang that the pain of being accused of killing Mosiuoa has now subsided – as opposed to the earlier days when she used to spend sleepless nights due to that accusation. As a persuasive goal for ’Mamoroesi to relate the matter in detail to her friend, as well as for ’Malebohang to corroborate it with matters she has heard, the former says:

“Lefu lena la monna oa ka le litaba. Kea kopa hle! Mpolelle tseo u li utloileng le ’na ke tla u bolella masisapelo ao ke sa tsoa feta ho ’ona. Kea tseba hore ha u oa tla hotla thonkha maqeba a ka, empa ho mpatela litaba ha ho na ho nthusa.” (Act I: scene i)

[This death of my husband is replete with matters. I beg you please! Tell me about the matters that you have heard and I will also inform you of some griefs through which I have just passed. I know that you have not come here to hurt my wounds, yet keeping matters away from me is of no use.]

Obviously ’Mamoroesi’s above request for ’Malebohang to divulge some information for her has whetted the latter’s appetite for also gaining information from the former about the same matter. Testimony to the foregoing is contained in ’Malebohang’s persuasive response that, “Hm! Roesi ngoaneso, u tseba hantle hore kamehla ha motho a shoetsoe ke monna, e ba e se e le eena ea ’molaileng. Ho...ho bua ’nete, ho tletse har’a motse mona hore ke uena ea

lohileng mano hore monna oa hao a shoe. Ke ne ke rapela hore taba ena e se fihle litsebang tsa hau u sa utloile bohloko tjena. Ke Makalla ha u se u tseba.” (Act I: scene i) [Hm! Roesi my sister, you know very well that whenever someone has lost a husband, the blame is cast on her for killing that husband. To...to speak the truth, it has become a common talk in this village that you are the instigator of your husband’s death. I was praying for you not to hear about this matter while you are still experiencing this mourning like this. I am surprised that you already know about it.] As a persuasive action for ’Malebohang to relax and divulge as much information as she might have, ’Mamoroesi informs her that right on the day of Mosiuoa’s death, she was confronted with the accusation that she had killed him.

No doubt, ’Malebohang’s desire for hearing more of this matter has been positively stimulated by ’Mamoroesi’s revelation of the confrontation in question above. Since persuasion is said to be incremental, in response to ’Mamoroesi’s information, she makes a persuasive remark that leaves ’Mamoroesi with no alternative but to reveal more information concerning this matter, saying, “U bohata uena! E le mang ea sehloho eo? He, bophelo na bo boima!” (Act I: scene i) [You are fabricating? Who could be that cruel? Indeed, life has become so difficult!] Needless to say, ’Malebohang’s question above leaves ’Mamoroesi with no alternative but to relate the story to the former as a persuasive action for her to change whatever attitude and belief she might have had, and adopt the understanding that all that she might have heard are mere fabrications. First, she wipes off some tears welling down her face, and asks ’Malebohang whether or not she knows Morapeli, the younger brother to the late Mosiuoa. ’Malebohang answers in the positive, thus encouraging her friend to go straight into the matter and relate the issues to her.

Thus encouraged to relate the story, ’Mamoroesi divulges an information surrounding Morapeli’s claim – that two weeks before the accident, Morapeli and his wife, ’Masechaba, had paid them a visit; whereupon, some jokes were passed among the two couples. Since Mosiuoa was known for his joviality, he jokingly pronounced that he was going to Mokhotlong the following day; thus motivating ’Mamoroesi to also jokingly say that she was going to accompany him in that journey; the joke which ended up causing jovial laughter among them all. Seemingly, ’Mamoroesi relates, Mosiuoa’s joking spree was stimulated by this laughter – as he once more jokingly pronounced that he would not accept his wife’s accompaniment, as he was intent on finding for himself a young slim girl that was not as fat as his wife. Even this was taken as a joke, as all laughed; the laughter that worked as a persuasive plan for herself (’Mamoroesi) to also pass a joke, saying, “...ke tla phethola koloi eo ka tlali mothoana, ba shoe le kharebe eo e bapallang monneng oa ka.” (Act I: scene i) [...I shall overturn that vehicle with lightening, so that he dies with that girlfriend of his that trifles with my husband.]

To conclude her story, 'Mamoroesi informs 'Malebohang that these jokes were enjoyable – testimony of which was that everyone was engaged in laughter.

Once more 'Mamoroesi wipes off the tears that are welling down her face; and this action apparently functions as a persuasive action for 'Malebohang to change her belief in the spread out accusation and as she begins to believe in the former's story. Not astonishingly therefore, 'Malebohang's tears also begin to well in her eyes; which works as a testimony that she has been painfully moved by this revelation of the source of Morapeli's accusations. As a means of persuading her friend that she entirely believes her and identifies with her in this situation, 'Malebohang says, "Ache! E seng re mpe re emise hona moo? Re tla bua taba ena ha u se u le betere 'nake." (Act I: scene i) [No! Is it not better for us to stop right here? We shall discuss this issue when you are better my sister.] It might appear that for 'Mamoroesi, it were better for them to continue discussing this issue now, as she hereby informs her friend that she usually ends up feeling better every time after discussing the matter – especially as she interacts with someone that sympathises with her. As a continuation of the same story, 'Mamoroesi informs 'Malebohang that after all had laughed at the said jokes, 'Masechaba, Morapeli's wife, asked Mosiuoa whether he was indeed going to Mokhotlong – to which Mosiuoa replied that he was merely joking as a persuasive action to poke his wife, so that they might realise the extent to which their love goes.

Seemingly, 'Mamoroesi's final statement above has worked as some persuasive action for 'Malebohang to express her wonderment, saying, "Banabeso! E le hore joale ho tla joang hore u netoe ka mali matsohong?" (Act I: scene i) [Oh my siblings! If that be so then how comes that your hands are smeared with blood like this?] Needless to say, 'Malebohang's foregoing wonderment and question function as persuasive attempt for 'Mamoroesi to give information that might be of assistance in their endeavour to get to the depth of the ensuing matter. In response therefore, 'Mamoroesi informs 'Malebohang that it was after two weeks when Mosiuoa and his colleagues were involved in a car accident as they were on their way to Maseru. Further, she informs 'Malebohang that the accident resulted in the death of both the driver and Mosiuoa, as they were both on the front seat; while those in the back seat sustained bad injuries. As a persuasive measure to register her dismay after hearing this part of the story, 'Malebohang quips as follows, "'Mamoroesi, u ile oa ba molomo o mobe hakaakang ngoana tooe?" (Act I: scene i) ['Mamoroesi, what a bad mouth you had you child?]

In line with 'Malebohang's persuasive remark for her to continue with the story, 'Mamoroesi informs her that Morapeli confronted her with the accusation the same day, as he came to report the death of Mosiuoa to her by saying, "'Mamoroesi, e sebelitse tlali-mothoana ea hao." (Act I: scene i) ['Mamoroesi, your lightning has functioned.] Apparently as a

persuasive action for expressing her own identification with 'Mamoroesi in the plight she is involved in, 'Malebohang loudly wails, and pleads for 'Mamoroesi to please stop telling her all these painful matters. Even as 'Malebohang continues wailing, 'Mamoroesi turns herself into some kind of a comforter for 'Malebohang, and says, "Tšeliseha hle 'nake! Tsena ke linyane. Ke hona ke tla u phetela likholo." (Act I: scene i) [Please be consoled my sister! These are minor issues. I am still going to relate yet some gigantic matters to you.] In line with 'Mamoroesi's final communicative interactions above, it becomes clear that she is an agonised woman that seemingly has no one to run to and divulge the painful matters gnawing at the fabric of her mind. It then becomes quite understandable that she even ends up by turning herself into her friend's comforter; while in essence one would expect her friend, 'Malebohang, to console her in this dire situation.

Incidentally, Morapeli and 'Masechaba, are at home, where they engage themselves into some communicative exchanges regarding the former's view that 'Mamoroesi has had a hand in Mosiuoa's fatal car accident. In an attempt at persuading 'Masechaba to support him in his seeming conviction, Morapeli quips as follows:

"Enoa ngoanana o tla ntseba hantle. Ke tla 'montša hore Mosiuoa ke ngoan'a 'm'e e seng oa 'mangoane. O sebetse sa ho lefa lingaka hore li bolae ngoaneso! O tla ntseba hantle." (Act I: scene ii)

[This girl is going to know me well. I am going to show her that Mosiuoa is my mother's son and not of my aunt. She has the audacity of paying some doctors for killing my brother! She is going to know me well!]

Whereas one might have thought that Morapeli and 'Masechaba are of the same opinion and belief in this matter, it is hereby revealed that such is not the case. This realization emanates from the way 'Masechaba reacts to Morapeli's quips above. While Morapeli's verbal interaction above seems to be some persuasive plan for 'Masechaba to share his beliefs and behaviour in this matter – as he even calls 'Mamoroesi 'ngoanana' that will know him properly, and further pronounces his seeming fabrication that she has had the audacity for paying doctors for murdering his brother – his persuasion with 'Masechaba fails to materialise as intended. 'Masechaba retorts in the following words:

"Ua tseba ntate, ke ne ke emetse hore moea oa hao u tsitse kamora' lefu lena. Haele hantle moratuo, ke ntse ke lomahantse meno hore 'Mamoroesi ha a na seabo lefung la Mosiuoa. Motaung, u molumeli hle! Hobaneng ha u lumella mohopolo oo ho busa pelo ea hau?" (Act I: scene ii)

[You know father, I have been waiting for your soul to settle after this death. In fact my love, I still maintain the conviction that 'Mamoroesi has no hand in Mosiuoa's death. Motaung, you are a Christian please! Why do you allow that thought to rule your heart?]

Indubitably, 'Masechaba's above counter-persuasion is intended for functioning as an action for Morapeli to reconsider and change his attitude, belief, and behaviour regarding the issue in question. But alas, instead of engaging himself in some persuasive interaction for 'Masechaba to change her own attitude, belief, and behaviour, Morapeli employs fury as coercion for 'Masechaba to refrain from banding words with him, and shouts at her, in these words: "Bona mona mosali, re ne re e-na le uena ha moleko ono oa moloji o re o tla bolaea Mosiuoa ka lefu la koloi. Ke leshano?" (Act I: scene ii) [Look here you woman, we were together with you when that devil of witch pronounced that she was going to kill Mosiuoa by means of a car accident. Am I lying?] In contrast with Morapeli's attitude of applying fury and coercion against her, 'Masechaba keeps cool and collected and counter-reminds Morapeli that on a number of occasions they have together been visiting the late Mosiuoa's family; whereupon Morapeli himself would always remark about that couple's ever joking behaviour; ending her persuasive action with the question: "Ha u sheba ngoana eo oa motho a ka ipolaela monna ea neng a mo sebeletsa hakaale?" (Act I: scene ii) [Do you really consider this someone's child as one who could personally murder the husband that was so much working for her?]

Even as she so much attempts to counter persuade Morapeli as shown above, 'Masechaba's intervention achieves no change of behaviour from the target, but a reversal – as he argues that the very aspect of Mosiuoa's working hard for 'Mamoroesi has actually been the source of her intentions to murder him. Further, Morapeli surmises that 'Masechaba speaks as she does through ignorance, of what, he does not say. Furthermore, Morapeli promises his wife that within no time the truth will emerge about that witch. Further still, he passes a warning as a persuasive plan for 'Masechaba to support him in this seeming conflict; and promises her that she will be sorry when such truth emerges – and ends up with an unsupported statement that: "Mamoroesi o noele mali a ngoan'a 'm'e." (Act I: scene ii) ['Mamoroesi has drunk the blood of my mother's child.] Since 'Masechaba's initial counter persuasion with Morapeli was the registering of her conviction that 'Mamoroesi is innocent from all the blemishes that Morapeli has since been smearing over her; it makes a lot of sense when she now responds to Morapeli's above intervention by saying:

"U se u buile ntho e kholo ha u re 'nete e tla hlahella. 'Na moratuo, ke rata hore u tsebe moo ke emeng. Leha u sheba 'Mamoroesi, u bona motho ea ntseng a fella likobong. Hobaneng ha a sa none haeba ruri thato ea hae e phethahetse?" (Act I: scene ii)

[You have spoken a great thing when you say that the truth will emerge. As for me my love, I want you to be knowledgeable about my stand. Even when you look at 'Mamoroesi, you witness someone that is getting thinner and thinner. Why is she not getting fat if her wish has been fulfilled?]

Needless to say, 'Masechaba's above communicative intervention is persuasive enough for Morapeli to be considerate and possibly change his attitude and behaviour concerning the matter in question. In connection with the emergence of the truth they both make reference to, one feels eager to ultimately observe the kind of truth it is going to be, when it finally comes out – as one of this couple is bound to swallow their words on such a judgement day. One observes, though, that whereas Morapeli seems to base his argument on nothing else but suppositions, 'Masechaba is able to pronounce her conviction and support it accordingly.

Incidentally, Morapeli and 'Masechaba's verbal interaction is cut short by the arrival of one 'Malitaba, who is seemingly 'Masechaba's acquaintance. Morapeli goes out, leaving the two women alone – thus somehow creating for them an opportunity to discuss their own issues without any form of interference. First and foremost, 'Malitaba greets 'Masechaba and asks after her health, as a persuasive plan for establishing rapport and in preparation for interacting in accordance with whatever she has come here for. In her response concerning her state of health, 'Masechaba quips as follows: “Re itsohetse; haese mathata a bophelo bona. He ho ba mosali! Ache! Hoja ke ne nka tsoaloa hape, ke ne ke tla kopa Molimo hore ke be monna.” (Act I: scene ii) [We are somehow alright; besides the problems of this life. Hallow to be a woman! No! If I were to be born again, I would ask God to make me a man.] Without question, 'Masechaba hereby registers her deep feelings concerning the way women are ill-treated by men; and she invites 'Malitaba to share the burden of womanhood with her – possibly in preparation for the latter to align with her in whatever matters she is about to verbally interact about with her. Otherwise the former's persuasive intention is to whet the latter's appetite for engaging with her the communicative debate she is about to engage in. On the other hand, 'Masechaba's wishful thinking of being reborn as a man registers her realization of the way women endure suffering under men, and therefore wishes for God to turn the tables, it would seem.

While one might have expected 'Malitaba to right away agree with 'Masechaba's way of seeing things, that is not to be so with the former. She laughs at her host and remarks that since her host is so comfortable in marriage, she sees no reason for her to complain. Further, the latter relates the problems she is making reference to, seemingly with a persuasive attempt for them to share ideas as women. With a persuasive aim for 'Malitaba to pay full attention and share ideas with her in this matter, 'Masechaba offers her some porridge before she relates her source of worry. She surmises in the following words:

“Mathata ke a ka le ntat’a Sechaba. Ha ho ntho e bohloko joalokaha u bona moratuo oa hau a utloile bohloko. Lefu la Mosiuoa le kentse moea o mobe ho ntate. O lumela hantle hore ’Mamoroesi o bolaile monna oa hae. ’Malitaba ‘nake, ’Mamoroesi a ka bolaea monna oa hae a mo tsekisa eng?” (Act I: scene ii)

[The problems are mine and Sechaba’s father. There is nothing more painful than viewing the suffering experienced by your loved one. The death of Mosiuoa has instilled a bad spirit into father. He is fully convinced that ’Mamoroesi has murdered her husband. ’Malitaba my sister, for what reason would ’Mamoroesi murder her husband?]

Apparently, ’Masechaba’s persuasive goal here is for ’Malitaba to share her pain and view this matter in accordance with her belief and attitude. Her consideration of the gender inequality drives her persuasive goal for ’Malitaba to share the same view, since she is also a woman, and therefore susceptible to the same suffering. For her, Mosiuoa’s death has instilled the bad spirit into Morapeli, thus rendering him vulnerable to hatred and unreasonableness towards ’Mamoroesi as a woman; in congruence with herself as a woman that vouches for ’Mamoroesi’s innocence in this matter. When she finally poses the above question to ’Malitaba, one realises her intention of driving her persuasive goal of pleading with her for aligning herself with these sufferings that are geared towards women by men – simply because they are women, she seems to say. Indeed for ’Masechaba there is hardly any motivation for ’Mamoroesi to have concocted the death of the husband that was working so hard for her.

Surprisingly, instead of supporting her persuader by sharing the same belief, behaviour, attitude and conviction, ’Malitaba mockingly downplays her persuader’s attempts for her to team up with her, and says: “Efela u sa le ngoana ’Masechaba. Ba bolaeang banna ba ngotsoe liphatleng? Tlohela ho emela ngoanana ea ikhohomosang eno. Kamehla ha ho e-na le mosi, u n’o tsebe hore mollo o teng.” (Act I: scene ii) [You are indeed still a child ’Masechaba. Are those who murder husbands written on the foreheads? Stop vouching for that arrogant girl. Whenever there is some smoke, you should know that there is fire.] Seemingly, ’Malitaba’s presence here has been organised, possibly by Morapeli, as a persuasive ploy for dissuading ’Masechaba from her own beliefs, behaviours and convictions. It therefore hardly surprises one that ’Malitaba immediately downplays ’Masechaba’s persuasive attempts in this mocking fashion. To signify the suspicion that this meeting has been organised between Morapeli and ’Malitaba, immediately after the latter’s remark, the former comes back in, sits down and ends up being the center of attraction for ’Malitaba’s counter persuasive actions. The following verbal exchanges among the three characters now ensue as in this fashion:

'Malitaba: (O bua a shebile Morapeli) 'Na ke mosali. Ke tseba ho teba ha pelo ea mosali. Morao tjena basali re meharo haholo. Ha re sheba litekana tseo motho u li fumanang ha monna a se a iketse, re hloleha ho itšoara. Re matha lingaka hore ngoana' motho a shoe. Ha a se a shoele, re sale re tloatloatsa mafura re itjella chelete eo. (Oa bososela) [(She speaks facing Morapeli) I am a woman. I know the depth of a woman's heart. Of late we women are very much gluttonous. When we look at the small money that we receive when a husband has already gone, we fail to restrain ourselves. We run towards doctors so that someone's child dies. When he is already dead, we remain cracking fats and consume that money. (She smiles)]

Morapeli: (O phutholla sefahleho) Ke qala ho u utloa u bua 'nete haesale ke u tseba. Ke ntse ke re u holetse bosaoana, athe che, u holetse 'nete. Mohlomong ha ho buoa uena, mohatsa'ka o tla buleha mahlo. [(He relaxes his face.) This is the first time I hear you telling the truth since I have known you. I have been thinking that you have grown up for vanities, whereas no, you have grown up for truth. Maybe when it is you that speaks my wife's eyes will open up.]

'Malitaba: Oa tseba abuti Morapeli, ha u se na pelo e mpe joaloka 'Masechaba, u thatafalloa ho lumela hore motho, sebopuo sa Molimo, se ka tšolla mali. Rona bo-'Malitaba khale re bona meleko. Mosali enoa oa ngoan'eno o rata chelete. Bakhotsi ba hae ba re o fumane qubuhali ho tsoa mosebetsing oa monna. [You know what brother Morapeli, if you are not cruel just as 'Masechaba is not, it becomes difficult for you to believe that a human being, the creation of God, can spill blood. We, the likes of 'Malitaba, have for a long time been witnessing some temptations. This wife of your brother loves money. Her friends say that she has received a huge heap from the husband's workplace.]

Morapeli: (O ema ka maoto, o rotola mahlo) U reng na 'Malitaba? U e utloa neng taba ee? Ka Molimo 'Mamoroesi o tla ntseba. [(Morapeli stands up, and makes big eyes.) What are you actually saying 'Malitaba? When did you hear of this matter? By God 'Mamoroesi will know me!]

'Masechaba: (O tšoara monna mahetleng) Ntate oe! Ntate, khoba matšoafo hle! Se ke oa potlakela litaba. (O retelehela ho 'Malitaba) 'Malitaba oe. Na u bona kotsi ea leleme? Se bue litaba tseo u se nang bopaki ba tsona. Bona hore na ntate o se ... [(Holds the husband over the shoulders) Please father! Father crush the lungs please (cool down)! Do not rush into the matters. (She turns towards 'Malitaba) Please 'Malitaba, do you see the danger of the tongue? Don't talk about the affairs whose evidence you lack. Look at how father is ...]

Morapeli: Ntlohele uena! 'Malitaba, u re ho thoe ngoanana eo o fumane chelete? O e fumane neng? (Act I: scene ii) [Leave me alone you! 'Malitaba, when do you say that this girl received the money?]

In accordance with the above verbal interactions, it becomes clear that Morapeli and 'Malitaba hereby perform a teamwork business as a persuasive ploy for driving the goal of winning 'Masechaba to their side – where they attempt to persuade her to change her belief and behaviour in connection with the subject in question. It is therefore not shocking to see 'Malitaba fomenting the above fabrications as a means of achieving their persuasive goal, as co-plotters with Morapeli, the mastermind in this conspiracy. When 'Malitaba pronounces a seeming lie that 'Mamoroesi has already received 'qubuhali' of money from the husband's workplace; adding that she was even seen at the bank in Hlotse to bank the money – it becomes apparent that this has been their conspiratorial plot to vilify 'Mamoroesi's image and assassinate her character in the eyes of 'Masechaba. Otherwise how else would she have known about the amount of the money that 'Mamoroesi received, one might ask. Observably, all these concoctions of the truth are meant for, not only reinforcing Morapeli's already existing beliefs, but also as formative persuasion for changing 'Masechaba's opposing beliefs and behaviours concerning the matter in question.

One might then draw a conclusion that this whole verbal interaction above has been rehearsed by these co-plotters, as a persuasive means of driving their intended goal as shown above. Its performance here in 'Masechaba's house is therefore used as a two-sided weapon – as both 'Mamoroesi's character assassination and some conviction for 'Masechaba to adopt the intended change, as indicated above. In line with this understanding, it makes sense for Morapeli in his conclusion of this verbal interaction to address 'Malitaba, saying, "O nthusitse. Ha ke na ho ntša lebitso la hao. Le tla ntšoa ke mokhotsi enoa oa hao. (Act I: scene ii) [You have assisted me. I shall not reveal your name. It will be revealed by this friend of yours.] Indeed 'Malitaba has apparently assisted Morapeli in fomenting and rehearsing this communicative interaction, and finally for staging it here in the audience view of 'Masechaba, as their persuasive target.

In the light of the foregoing performance, it hardly surprises one to observe 'Malitaba visiting 'Mamoroesi at the latter's home – apparently to investigate and secure her fabrications, then store the findings as some persuasive conviction for 'Masechaba, their main persuadee. Interestingly, upon entering 'Mamoroesi's house, 'Malitaba observes that there exists a heap of some sacks of flour. She immediately becomes excited and hopes to use that evidence as some conviction that indeed 'Mamoroesi has a big supply of some stuff delivered from her late husband's workplace. Seemingly with that hope in mind, she jokingly inquires as to whether 'Mamoroesi is going to hold a wedding ceremony for the under-aged Moroese,

'Mamoroesi's daughter, by buying so much flour. To her disappointment, 'Mamoroesi informs her that the flour has been kept there by the late Mosiuoa's co-workers for safety keeping – as their vehicle is at the local garage for repairs.

As might be expected, 'Malitaba does not completely lose hope of finding some testimony to her fabrications, as persuasive conviction to be employed against 'Masechaba and those who might share the same beliefs and attitudes as the latter holds. She then inquires whether or not 'Mamoroesi has received some money as consolation from the late Mosiuoa's workplace. Once more she draws a blank, as she is informed by her target that no such monies may be forthcoming – as Mosiuoa did not die on the duty but on a private journey to Maseru. Consequently, through dismay emanating from her failure to secure some testimony to support her lies and insinuations; 'Malitaba bids 'Mamoroesi farewell and goes away in a low spirit. Resultantly, 'Mamoroesi is left alone in her house, and she engages herself in the following persuasive soliloquy to analyse her own situation:

“Ke hore 'Malitaba leha a se a le moputsoa tje, o ntse a le leleme? O ntekelang hakaale! 'Nete ke hore ntate Mosiuoa o ne a hlola a re ke hlokomele mosali enoa. O ne a sa mo rate. Hobaneng ha a mpotsa hore na ke fumane chelete? Le haeba ke ne ke e fumane, na ke tlamehile ho bolella motse oo kaofela? Hee! Lefu le nkileng monna oa ka, kea le tšaba. Empa, ke tla ba matla. Ha ke na ho inehela. Ha ke re fara! U tlameha a romiloe ke Morapeli hore a tlo 'nyanya leleme. Ke tla phelela 'nete. (O sheba holimo marulelong) Molimo oa ka, u be seikokotlelo le qhoboseane ea ka. U nthuse Ntate ho hlola ba ntoantšang.” (Act I: scene iii)

[Even though 'Malitaba has become so grey, she is still a liar? Why does she irritate me so much? In fact father Mosiuoa usually cautioned me to be ware of that woman. He did not like her. Why does she ask me whether I have received the money? Hee! I am afraid of the death that has taken away my husband. But I shall be strong. I shall never give up. I have no doubt! She must have been sent by Morapeli to come and suckle my tongue. I shall live for truth. (She looks up at the ceiling) My God, please be my walking stick and my fortress. Please help me Father to overcome those who are fighting against me!]

In line with 'Mamoroesi's above soliloquy, it becomes clear that she is aware of 'Malitaba's intentions for visiting her as she has just done – that she was here to propel the persuasive goal of suckling her tongue about the prevailing problem the former has with Morapeli. It then also becomes crystal clear to her that Mosiuoa never liked 'Malitaba due to her being such an incorrigible liar. In addition, 'Mamoroesi hereby grapples with the possible persuasive reason for 'Malitaba's persuasive action of coming over to inquire about the supposed

compensation money in question. Needless to say, 'Mamoroesi's guess is as good as mine – that 'Malitaba is used by Morapeli to assist him in his fight against the former. It then makes sense that at this stage in her soliloquy, 'Mamoroesi looks up towards the heavens and pleads for God's assistance in the ensuing war that seems to be concocted by Morapeli and 'Malitaba; as conspirators who are seem quite intent on destroying her. Since she hereby self- puts all her trust in God as her 'seikokotlelo' and 'qhobosheane' – one is bound to realise that 'Mamoroesi is more than prepared to team up with God and engage herself in this war against Morapeli and all his associates-in-war.

Incidentally, Morapeli arrives at Morena Mopeli's kraal, wearing an old blanket, possibly as a persuasive attempt for Morena Mopeli to regard him as an agonised man that needs his immediate assistance. Since Morapeli is not accustomed to paying a visit to the chief's kraal, Morena Mopeli immediately suspects that his is a worrying motivation. Not astonishingly therefore, Mopeli verbally addresses him as follows: "Kea tseba hore lona bo-Morapeli ha le se le tlile koano, ho se ho e-na le seboko. Ha ho mohla le keng le fapohle koano le tšoare tse monate. Re u thusa ka eng monna?" (Act II: scene i) [I know that you the Morapelis as you have come here, there is some kind of weeping. There is never a time when you make a turn here when you are in possession of nice and tasty stuff. What can we assist you with man?] Possibly with some persuasive aim of launching his primary goal of fighting against 'Mamoroesi, Morapeli responds to Mopeli's verbal interaction above by blatantly putting it that: "Lefu la Mosiuoa ke lefu la matsoho morena. Ka bomalimabe o bolailoe ke mosali oa hae." (Act II: scene i) [Mosiuoa's death is a man-caused one chief. Unfortunately he has been murdered by his own wife.]

Not surprisingly therefore, all those who are present at the chief's kraal make loud remarks with wonder – as it is well known that Mosiuoa was involved in a car accident in which he was not the only passenger in it, but with other people. In consideration of the foregoing fact, Mopeli poses the following questions in an attempt at persuading Morapeli to clear up his accusations: "Na monna u ikutloa hantle hore na u reng? Ha ke ea fuoa tlaleho ea hore eo moholoane oa hau o phethohile ka koloi?" (Act II: scene i) [Man, do you clearly hear what you are saying? Was I not given the report that your elder brother was involved in a car accident?] In response to Mopeli's questions above, Morapeli agrees with the chief, but adds that jokingly Mosiuoa's wife announced to him and his wife, 'Masechaba, that she was going to employ lightning for killing Mosiuoa. Further, Morapeli tells Mopeli that it was only after two weeks that Mosiuoa died of car accident. Seemingly, Mopeli's accusation is not convincing, especially when he reports that 'Mamoroesi's announcement was done jokingly. Yet, as if motivated by some kind of co-plotting against 'Mamoroesi with Morapeli, Setloboko,

one of Mopeli's advisors, poses the following questions, seemingly in an endeavour to push his persuasive goal of casting a blame on and finding fault with 'Mamoroesi:

"Khele! Monna Morapeli, ua thola ka taba e kale-kale molato? U ne u emetse hore mosali eo a bolae motho e mong hape motseng moo? Na u oa utloa hore ho ameha bophelo ba motho moo?" (Act II: scene i)

[Khele! Man Morapeli, you have been silent about such a gigantic issue, why? Were you waiting for this woman to murder someone else in this village? Do you really understand that a human being's life is affected here?]

In response to Setloboko's questions, Morapeli reveals that he was initially overpowered by his brother's untimely death. Further he instigates that he was still collecting some evidence. Whereas one were to expect the chief and his advisors to inquire whether Morapeli has now collected enough evidence to support his claims, Mopeli say, "Ho ne ho se bopaki bo hlokahalang. U sa tsoa re mosali eo o buile ho uena mahlong hore o tla bolaea mofu. U ne u sa batla eng?" (Act II: scene i) [There was no evidence needed. You have just said that that woman said it directly to you that she was going to kill your late brother. What else were you looking for?] Basing oneself on Mopeli's intervention above, one feels bound to suspect that he is possibly one of Morapeli's co-planners in concocting reasons geared towards 'Mamoroesi's character assassination. In line with that view, one might draw a conclusion that Mopeli's above intervention is a persuasive plan for Morapeli to take action against 'Mamoroesi without any fear for lack of evidence – thus reinforcing Morapeli's belief and attitude about the matter in question.

Additionally, it would seem that Mopeli's assurance for Morapeli to go no further in seeking some evidence is in fulfillment of teamwork persuasive plan. Testimony to this assumption emanates from Setloboko's revelation that his wife and 'Malitaba were once engaged in verbal interaction in which it emerged that 'Mamoroesi never shed any tear on the day of the late Mosiuoa's funeral; nor did she even endeavour to wail in pretense. It becomes apparent that Morapeli is persuaded by Mopeli and Setloboko's verbal interventions above to react as follows: "Ho fapana lingaka monghali. Mohlomong ngaka eo a neng a ile ho eona e ile ea re a se ke a tšolla mookho." (Act II: scene i) [The difference lies with the doctors my lord. Maybe the doctor that she had consulted had instructed her never to shed any tear.] Clearly, these are insinuations that are employed as persuasive goal for all present to identify with Morapeli, Mopeli and Setloboko, to consider 'Mamoroesi as a woman who is so cruel as to kill her own husband by means of witchcraft, as has been claimed by Morapeli, the perpetrator of this whole fracas.

Like someone who has always been poised at finding fault with 'Mamoroesi, Mopeli now pronounces his unilateral decision – though he pretends to put the whole matter in front of his advisors to come up with their views, and says:

“Banna ba heso, qakahali ke ena. Re thusa Morapeli joang? Nke ke ka boloka mosali ea tjena ka har'a motse ona oa ntate. Leha ho le joalo, ke tla lokela ho bitsa mosali eo le eena a tlo ipuella.” (Act II: scene i)

[My fellow men, here is a very difficult affair. How do we assist Morapeli? I cannot keep this kind of a woman in this village of my father. Even so, I will have to call that woman so that she may also answer for herself.]

Needless to say, even though Mopeli finally suggests that he also has to summon that woman for answering for herself; his way of handling this case bears one-sided connotations that are reflected in his verbal interventions. For example, he has already drawn a conclusion that they must give assistance to Morapeli – as if Morapeli is in danger of some sort. In addition, he makes a pronouncement that he cannot keep this kind of woman in this village of his father – yet he has not even taken action to investigate and find related facts or issues pertaining to this matter. In essence, Mopeli seems to even forget that 'Mamoroesi is presently a widow that would normally look up to him as the chief and father figure that is bound to protect women of her kind in situations such as this very one in which he seems to have been so successfully persuaded into identifying himself with the accuser. Additionally, even his final utterance that he will have to call 'Mamoroesi to come and answer for herself appears to be an afterthought – for that was actually supposed to be his point of departure in this case; were he a truthful chief of all his people, and one who never takes sides with some individuals that present unsubstantiated accusations.

Indeed Mopeli has succumbed to Morapeli's persuasive plan for destroying 'Mamoroesi. Some evidence in support of this observation also lies in Mopeli's further response to Morapeli's seemingly unreasonable request for the chief to allow him to take Moroesi, 'Mamoroesi's small daughter, away from her mother. Morapeli requests that this separation of mother and child be treated as an urgent issue that requires an immediate attention. Further, as a persuasive ploy for Mopeli to align himself with the foregoing request, Morapeli fabricates a story, that since everyone knows that “mloi o potlakela ho ruta ngoana boloi,” (Act II: scene i) [a witch hurries into teaching witchcraft to a child] he is “tsietsing ka Moroesi.” (Act II: scene i) [in distress about Moroesi.] Furthermore, Morapeli initially levels the relational ground as a persuasive plan for winning the chief to side with him even more, saying, “Moroesi ke mali a ka, ke ngoana moholoane.” (Act II: scene i) [Moroesi is my blood, she is my elder brother's child.] Indubitably, Morapeli uses this persuasive ploy for his listeners,

especially the chief, to come to an agreement with him that, as younger brother to the late Mosiuoa, he is indeed an agonised man that through brotherly care and love has duty to protect Moroesi against the impending witchcraft in question.

Further still he delves into his main persuasive tactic to ensure the achievement of his desired goal, and says: “Ke lorile Mosiuoa a ntšoare ka letsoho. O ne a sa bue, o ne a lla a shebile Moroesi.” (Act II: scene i) [I dreamed of Mosiuoa holding my hand. He was not talking, he was crying, keeping his eyes on Moroesi.] Obviously, Morapeli relates this dream with calculated intention of using it (the dream) as a strategy for convincing Mopeli and his advisors that this is indeed a matter of urgency that needs an immediate attention. Finally, Morapeli capitalises on the dream aspect and employs another persuasive tactic for successfully achieving his goal and pronounces his request in these words:

“Ntate, ke kopa u mphe lenqosa le eang le 'na ha 'Mamoroesi hore ke mpe ke pholose ngoana. Kea itlama morena'ka. Le hoja ke le kojoana li mahetleng, ke tla holisa ngoana eo oa ngoaneso. Morena'ka!” (Act II: scene i)

[Father, I ask you to give me a messenger that will accompany me to 'Mamoroesi's home so that I might save the child. I hereby make a vow my chief. Even though I am wearing these worn out blankets, I shall bring up that child of my brother. My chief!]

It is important to observe that Morapeli puts forth this final part of his request while the chief and his advisors have not even had a chance to respond to his reason for aiming at the separation of 'Mamoroesi and her small daughter. Be that as it may, one would expect Mopeli, as the village chief, to apply democracy in this matter by calling upon the accused mother, or else to postpone the case to another day; should there be reason enough for him to so. But this is not the case with Mopeli. He initially asks what his advisors' views are; yet in the same breath he takes his unilateral decision, saying:

“Banna ba heso, le se lebale hore ke leetong. Taba ena e telele. Qeto ea ka ke ena, uena Mohau; qhaneha lipere re tsamaee. Setloboko, e-ea le monna enoa, le bolelle mosali eo hore ke re a lokolle ngoana eo hona joale. Hosasa hoseng a be a le mona. Le uena Morapeli ke u batla mona.” (Act II: scene i)

[My country men, do not forget that I am poised for a journey. This matter is long. My conclusion is this: you Mohau, saddle the horses so that we go. Setloboko, accompany this man and tell that woman that I instruct her to release that child right now. Tomorrow morning she should be here. You too Morapeli I want you here.]

Needless to say, by pronouncing this unilateral decision of an instruction for 'Mamoroesi to release her small girl; Mopeli has ebbed from the sublime to the ridiculous – for as the chief, he was to protect 'Mamoroesi, as a widow that is still mourning her husband's untimely

death. In addition, Mopeli is to be regarded as a coercer; as his instructions are for 'Mamoroesi to be told that she has to release the child with immediate effect – and hardly makes any suggestion for persuading her to comply. Further, Mopeli may be regarded as an unfeeling and undemocratic chief that has turned himself into a mere tool of destruction by Morapeli, his conspiratorial ally. Otherwise, this unilateral decision he hereby undertakes denotes him as a one-sided, oppressive and sexist chief that considers himself as the autocratic figure among his people. Indeed, this final judgement that precedes both an inquiry and a court case is to be seen as a testimony in support of the point made earlier above; that Mopeli is both Morapeli's tool of destruction and conspirator in this war between the latter and 'Mamoroesi.

It then comes not as astonishment for Morapeli to merrily thank the chief by employing a poetic chant as an attempt at propelling his own persuasive plan of hitting 'Mamoroesi where it hurts a mother most – separating her with her only child, and a small one for that matter. No doubt this is going to be a painful experience for 'Mamoroesi, as Moroesei still needs her mother's love and nurturing. Here goes the chant that is aimed at pampering Mopeli, with an aim of persuading him to fully align himself with Morapeli, the chanter of the poem:

“Qhaneha Mopeli o ee pejana
 Qhaneha u eo batla bohale
 Ke tla loana morena'ka, ke tla hloekisa motse!
 Ba tla baleha baloi, ba tla tšaba Mopeli
 U morena Mopeli, ha u morenana
 Ntoanele ngoana'khosi ea ka!
 Ntoanele ke fumane mali a ngoaneso
 Ntoanele, ke Mosotho ke tla tankisa.
 Halaaala Mopeli, Halaaala!” (Act II: scene i)
 [Saddle up Mopeli and go further on
 Saddle up and go and seek intelligence
 I shall fight, my chief; I shall clean up the village!
 Witches will flee, they will fear Mopeli
 You are a chief Mopeli, you are not a minor chief
 Fight for me my chief's child!
 Fight for me so that I receive my brother's blood
 Fight for me, I am a Mosotho I shall express gratitude.
 Hurrah Mopeli! Hail!]

This poetic chant says it all. When Morapeli says, 'Qhaneha Mopeli o ee pejana,' it becomes clear that this statement is employed as his persuasive attempt for encouraging Mopeli to

continue in this behaviour of assisting him in this matter by disregarding any legal procedures whatsoever. The aspect of 'ho qhaneha' is hereby emphasised as a persuasive goal of oppressing 'Mamoroesi by saddling her as one were to saddle their horse without any human feelings and inclinations, it would seem. Since Mopeli appears to be in concert with Morapeli in the strive for hurting 'Mamoroesi; the initial line repetition pattern in the three penultimate lines of the word 'Ntoanele' emphasises and presupposes a situation where one fights one's war by means obtaining personal assistance from the powers-that-be. It therefore appears as a persuasive plan for encouraging Mopeli to insistently engage himself as Morapeli's ally in the ensuing struggle. In other words, Morapeli hereby emphatically persuades Mopeli to apply all tactics in his power to assist him as his co-conspirator in this fight against their culprit, 'Mamoroesi.

Another factor that needs one's observation in this poetic chant is diction; that is, the choice of words that Morapeli employs for demonstrating his persuasive plan for Mopeli to go further into affording him the required assistance. For example, the phrase 'o ee pejana' is well chosen for persuading Mopeli to continue with his oppression wherever it may be required by Morapeli. On the other hand, 'u eo batla bohale' appears to encourage Mopeli to seek knowledge in order for him to employ it in this matter concerning Morapeli and 'Mamoroesi. It would seem that Morapeli is aware that for Mopeli to oppress 'Mamoroesi without affording her an opportunity to answer for herself is a mistake that needs clever rectification – that is why he hereby encourages the same Mopeli to go and seek some intelligence, so as not to err in future. Finally when Morapeli says 'Halaala Mopeli Halaala!' that is to be regarded as the final spoil calculated at persuading Mopeli to regard himself as a great chief with powers to do whatever he likes with his subjects.

Ultimately Setloboko and Morapeli arrive at 'Mamoroesi's home, where they find her together with 'Malebohang, her friend, sitting outside in the sunshine. As if the two women have wronged him somehow, Setloboko greets them in a scolding voice, saying, "Lumelang bo-'m'e!" (Act II: scene ii) [Good afternoon mothers!] Since this scolding kind of greeting is uncommon among the Basotho, or any other nationalities for that matter; Setloboko's above greeting might be regarded as some persuasive attempt for their culprit, 'Mamoroesi, to realise that the two men have not come here for any peaceful communication; and therefore persuading her to be ready to perform in accordance with their intentions. Nonetheless, the two women return the greeting in the usual friendly manner, disregarding Setloboko's behaviour. As for Morapeli, he offers no greeting at all; seemingly as a persuasive demonstration that it is not for him to establish rapport with his enemies – for he now seems to consider the two ladies as such. As a persuasive measure for the visitors to communicate and divulge the issue that has brought them here, 'Mamoroesi invites the two men to go into

the house, which they do. Consequently, 'Malebohang decides to leave, seemingly as persuasion for the men to divulge their matter at ease.

As might be expected, once inside the house, Morapeli informs 'Mamoroesi that he and Setloboko, the chief's messenger, are here to deliver the chief's message that she should report herself at the chief's kraal the following day. In an effort to induce fear in 'Mamoroesi about the reason behind her being summoned, Morapeli explains that he has laid an accusation against her – "Ka lebaka la seo u tsebang hantle hore u se entse ka Mosiuoa," he says. (Act II: scene ii) [As you know what you have done to Mosiuoa.] Though she seems rather frightened, 'Mamoroesi plucks up courage and asks Morapeli whether he is still intent on accusing her of murdering her husband. Without even waiting for Morapeli to respond to 'Mamoroesi's question, Setloboko demonstrates for the accused the position he plays in this matter, that of being Morapeli's ally in the conspiracy concocted for her destruction. He says, "Mosali, nyoe e ke ea hosasa. Ha re ea tla nyeoeng mona. Bua Morapeli monna ke bosiu. 'Na ha ke batle ho shoa ke siea bana ba ka." (Act II: scene ii) [Woman, the case is for tomorrow. We have not come for a case here. Speak up Morapeli man, it is late! I do not want to die and leave my children.] Needless to say, Setloboko's stand as the chief's messenger is quite clear – he and the chief are in concert into torturing 'Mamoroesi – as his above verbal intervention spells it all; especially when he says that he does not want to die and leave his children. Such a statement is replete with suggestive persuasive attempts for the accused to realise that she is already considered as guilty in this matter, even before it is presented in court.

In response to Setloboko's final statement above, Morapeli now delves into the matter that has caused the two of them to be here. Initially he inquires about the whereabouts of Moroesi, seemingly as a persuasive attempt to drive his goal of separating the mother and the child. Even as 'Mamoroesi tells him where the small girl has gone for playing, and offers to go and fetch her, Morapeli cuts her short, and says, "Che, ke tla 'mona. Taba ea ho qetela, eo e leng ea bohlokoahali, ke hore ke tliho lata Moroesi." (Act II: scene ii) [No, I shall see her. The last issue, which is very important, is that I have come to fetch Moroesi.] At this juncture, one can imagine the surprise and fear that engulf 'Mamoroesi when hearing Morapeli's pronouncement. As might be expected, 'Mamoroesi responds to this information with surprise, and employs interrogation as a persuasive attempt for getting some clarification concerning Morapeli's statement, and says, "U lata Moroesi? U mo isa kae?" (Act II: scene ii) [You fetch Moroesi? Where are you taking her to?]

Like someone with no convincing reasons for his intentions and actions, Morapeli grabs at an un-thought of insinuation, seemingly as a plan for frightening, confusing and inducing 'Mamoroesi into a submissive position. He says:

“Ke laetsoe ke mofu ntata’e ho mo tlosa ho uena pele u mo roesa seroto sa boloi. U sale hantle. Ke tla mo nka hona mane ha ’Malerole. Tse ngata u tla li utloa hosasa moreneng.” (Act II: scene ii)

[I have been instructed by his late father to take her away from you before you can cap her with the witches’ basket (i.e., before you train her in witchcraft.) Stay well. I will take her right there at ’Malerole’s home. You will hear numerous ones there at the chief’s kraal.]

It is anybody’s imagination how ’Mamoroesi is to react to Morapeli’s foregoing verbal interactions. She puts her hands over her head and wails, saying:

“Molimo oa likhutsana le bahlolohali, ntšireletse hle ntate. Morapeli u ntsekisa eng? U ne u bona kae moo mosali a tsekisoang ngoana oa hae? Ntate Setloboko, ha ke na molato lefung la ntate Mosiuoa. Se nkeng Moroosi hle!” (Act II: scene ii)

[God of orphans and widows, please protect me father! Morapeli, over what do you quarrel with me? Where have you ever seen a woman being forced to separate with her child? Father Setloboko, I have no hand in the death of father Mosiuoa. Please do not take away Moroosi!]

Indeed, this action of forcing a mother to separate with her child, especially a small one like Moroosi, is unheard of. To make it worse, the forced separation of ’Mamoroesi with her small daughter is baseless; as it is supposedly centered on mere whims and dreams. But for Morapeli, all ’Mamoroesi’s above verbal interventions are to be made at the chief’s kraal; that is why he ignores those interventions by merely saying, “U sale hantle. Re tla kopana khotla. Ha re ee Setloboko.” (Act II: scene ii) [You remain well. We shall meet at the court. Let us go Setloboko.] In the light of the above verbal exchanges and actions between the two co-plotters and ’Mamoroesi, it becomes explicit that these two men have concocted and possibly rehearsed their approach in connection with ’Mamoroesi. That is why Setloboko ignores ’Mamoroesi’s pleas by not uttering a single word, while Morapeli, on the other hand threateningly assures her that they shall meet at the chief’s kraal; and further instructs Setloboko to go with him.

Thus observing her lonesome position, ’Mamoroesi goes out running and calling at her daughter: “Moroosi! Moroosi oe! Moroosi!” (Act II: scene ii) [Moroosi! Moroosi please! Moroosi!] Needless to say, ’Mamoroesi’s above loud calls are meant for persuading Moroosi to realise the urgency of coming over to her mother; especially as such calls are mingled with ’Mamoroesi’s wailings. Indeed, Moroosi immediately responds to the urgency of the matter by answering the call by means of running towards her mother; who through tears whispers for her to refuse to go with Morapeli; seemingly employing it as a persuasive attempt for

Moroesi to refuse to go and cause a scene in the village. Since Moroesi is still a small child that hardly understands matters of this sort, she poses the following questions for persuading her mother to explain about the present situation that seems fearful: “M’e, u llela eng? Ke eng ‘m’e?” (Act II: scene ii) [Mother, why are you crying? What is it mother?]

It would seem that both Morapeli and Setloboko have been persuaded by ‘Mamoroesi’s wailings to fear that they are going to be exposed as villains who apply coercion and molest her by unlawfully taking her daughter away without her permission. It therefore makes sense that they rush to the scene of mother-daughter intersection, where Setloboko addresses ‘Mamoroesi as follows:

“Mosali, se re bakele mahlo a batho! U hlotsoe ho lla ha monna oa hau a shoele ke hona u llang hona joale? Ha re tšabe ho u tlontlolla rona. Haeba u nyelisa taelo ea morena Mopeli ea hore u re fe ngoana, ke tla u hasa ka lesoai ke u joetse.” (Act II: scene ii)

[Woman, do not expose us in the eyes of the people. You failed to cry when your husband had died and you only start now. We are not afraid of embarrassing you. If you despise chief Mopeli’s order for you to give us the child, I shall sprinkle you with a whip I tell you!]

Obviously, Setloboko was not expecting ‘Mamoroesi to behave as she has just done, since he had used scolding greeting, seemingly with a persuasive plan for ‘Mamoroesi and her friend to start shivering and refrain from taking any step to bar them from their intention of taking Moroesi away as organised. Even though he hereby employs threats and coercion for ‘Mamoroesi to perform as they demand; as opposed to upfront persuasion – deep down Setloboko fears the possible response of the villagers who might come to ‘Mamoroesi’s emancipation from this harassment. Seemingly, Morapeli also shares the same feelings and fear that is expressed by Setloboko; that is why he no more ventures to address himself to ‘Mamoroesi, but pleads with Moroesi as follows: “Moroesi, tloho re tsamaee ngoana’ka. Ke tla u bolella tsohle ha re fihla lapeng.” (Act II: scene ii) [Moroesi let us go my child. I will tell you everything when we arrive at home.] Since Moroesi has been persuaded by her mother to refuse to go with Morapeli and his companion; it is not surprising for her to respond to her uncle this way, “Che, che rangoane. Ke sala le ‘m’e. Ha ke tsamaee. ‘M’e o bua a le mong ha ke le sieo.” (Act II: scene ii) [No, no uncle. I stay with mother. I am not going. Mother speaks alone when I am not around.]

Without any waste of time, Moroesi addresses herself to her mother in an endeavour to assure and persuade her to remain steadfast in her behaviour of refusing to let Morapeli and his companion take her away. But as if with a second thought, ‘Mamoroesi wipes off her

tears and persuades Moroesi to go, in these words: “Moroesi, tsamaea ausi. Tsamaea le rangoane. Ha ho letho le lebe.” (Act II: scene ii) [Moroesi go sister! Go with uncle. There is nothing wrong.] As observed above, in order for Moroesi to change her mind and agree to go with the two men; ‘Mamoroesi addresses her as ‘ausi,’ seemingly with a persuasive goal of applying endearment and encouragement for the daughter to regard herself as a grown up girl that may stand the test of this treatment upon her. In addition, ‘Mamoroesi encourages the daughter to go with ‘rangoane,’ and assures her that ‘ha ho letho le lebe,’ apparently as a persuasive plan for Moroesi to regard the associative relations between herself and Morapeli; and therefore remain with some certainty that there are no bad or harmful intentions harboured by the conspirators in question.

Resultantly, Morapeli, Setloboko and Moroesi go together; thus affording ‘Mamoroesi an opportunity for cogitating over this matter and self- decide on the appropriate action she might have to employ for safeguarding her daughter and herself against the ensuing war. She therefore engages herself in the following rather lengthy soliloquy:

“Na hoo ke ‘nete kapa empa e le toro feela! E re ke itsipe. E. Ke ‘nete. Taba ea hore ke moloi, ke bolaile monna, kajeno ke ‘nete. Bona matlotlosiea. Ramaseli, romela manyeloi a hau e tlo ba lipaki tsa ka. Be! E re ke kene ka tlung! Na ke ntse ke nka hantle ka hloohong? Moroesi o kae? Ba mo isa hokae? Che, ke ngoana. Kaha ho thoe ke moloi, ba tla ‘maballa. Empa ... kea tšaba. Ha ke na ho robala ke le mong. Moroesi, Moroesi, Moroesi ha a eo! Ba nkile Moroesi. Empa ... Empa o tla khutla. O tla khutla hobane ha kea bolaea ntat’ae. Ke ntse ke mo rata le kajeno. Hm! Ha ke na ho robala ke le mong; ke na le tšabo eo ke sa khoneng ho e hlola. Na Morapeli ha a na ho khutla bosiu a tlo mpolaea? E re ke mathele ha ‘Malebohang ke eo mo kopa hore a mpe a re Lehohang a tlo robala le ‘na.” (O koala lemati, oa tsamaea) (Act II: scene ii)

[Is this really true or is it a mere dream? Let me pinch myself! Yes. It is true. The matter of my being relegated a witch, that I have murdered my husband, is true today. Look at the groups of people standing around! Father-of-light, send your angels so that they may be my witnesses. Oh! Let me go into the house! Do I still take well in the mind? Where is Moroesi? Where are they taking her to? No, she is a mere child. Since they say that I am a witch, they shall safeguard her. But ... but I am afraid. I am not going to sleep alone. Moroesi, Moroesi, Moroesi is not here! They have taken away Moroesi. But ... but she will come back. She will come back because I have not murdered her father. I still love him even today. Hm! I am not going to sleep alone; I am so full of fear that I cannot overpower it. Is Morapeli not going to come back in the

night to kill me? Let me run towards 'Malebohang's home and ask her to please let Lebohang come and sleep with me. (She closes the door, and goes away)]

As has been shown above, 'Mamoroesi has employed this soliloquy as a persuasive means of examining the situation in which she is, as regard the matter in question. Seemingly, today's happenings have taken her by such surprise and shock that she can hardly believe that it is true. That is why she self- tells herself to pinch herself, so as to be assured that she is not dreaming but facing the reality of her being separated from her only small daughter by Morapeli and his companion. Even though she might have thought that the accusation leveled by Morapeli against her for bewitching the late Mosiuoa was a mere talk; she now clearly realises that it is a serious one, now that even the chief has rallied himself with Morapeli to even take Moroesi away from her. Apparently, she also realises that she is alone in the struggle to clear up her name and fight for justice to prevail. Understandably therefore, she makes a call to God to send his angels over so that they might at least witness her plight, and hopefully come to her assistance in this overpowering struggle. Even as she puts her hopes in God's hands, 'Mamoroesi becomes conscious of the fact that Moroesi is indeed gone; and therefore begins to wonder whether or not she is going to be safe in the hands of Morapeli and his colleagues in conspiracy. Nonetheless, as a persuasive goal for resting her worries, she gives herself an assurance that, since Moroesi is only a child, they will spare her and even let her come back safely to her. As her self-persuasion to remain assured that her daughter is not going to be harmed, 'Mamoroesi even consoles herself of the fact that she has not murdered Moroesi's father – as she still loves him even today, as she puts it.

In the light of that self- assurance that Moroesi will be safe, 'Mamoroesi now begins to harbour some worry and fear about her own safety. Since Morapeli has been purporting this accusation against her for some time now; 'Mamoroesi fears that he may come back in the night and kill her. Although she initially puts her trust in God's salvation from these teething problems, 'Mamoroesi now develops some fear for her safety. She therefore self- tells herself to approach her friend, 'Malebohang and seek the company of Lebohang, 'Malebohang's son, for sleeping with her this night. Obviously, her persuasive goal here is for Lebohang to be a witness, should Morapeli endeavour to come and kill her in the night. Even as she closes the door and goes, one sympathises and empathises with her; for she seemingly has no where to run at this juncture, for even the chief and his chief advisor have teamed up with Morapeli in the struggle for her character assassination.

Later this very night, Morapeli and Setloboko arrive at the former's home, together with Moroesi. Since it is uncommon for Moroesi to be here this late, 'Masechaba asks Setloboko about this matter, saying, "Ho etsahala eng na ntate Setloboko?" (Act II: scene iii) [What is happening please father Setloboko?] Instead of answering 'Masechaba's persuasive

question for him to clarify the prevailing situation; Setloboko addresses himself to Morapeli, saying, “Bolella mosali oa hao litaba ke tsoe ke tsamaea. Ke bosiu monna.” (Act II: scene iii) [Relate the news to your wife so that I go. It is late in the night man.] Whereas one were to expect Morapeli to relate the story of Moroesi’s presence here, this is not the case with him. Rather he verbally interacts with Setloboko, seemingly with a persuasive attempt for self-praise aimed at showing off that he is a versatile man who has power to team up with the chief to achieve his goal. He then says:

“Se tšohe ueso. U ka ‘na oa tsamaea. Ke mokokolope o molelele, monna ea tšajoang ke marena le bafo. Ke tla sala ke e hlanaka. Ke ha ka mona. Ea hau karolo u e phethile.” (Act II: scene iii)

[Do not be afraid my brother. You may go. I am a versatile tall man, a man that is feared by the chiefs and the commoners. I will stay fighting it. This is my home. As for your part you have performed it.]

As was shown above, Morapeli is not only showing off, but also indirectly informs his wife, ‘Masechaba, that he commands power and respect, to an extent that he even teams up with chiefs and their subjects, such as Mopeli and Setloboko, to achieve his persuasive goal. In this case, he is pushing his persuasive goal of taking ‘Mamoroesi to task, basing his case on his own insinuations that she has had a hand in the untimely death of the late Mosiuoa. It would seem that Setloboko does not like this self-praise by Morapeli, for his only response is for reminding Morapeli that they shall meet at the chief’s kraal tomorrow; and goes out. It may also be possible that among others, Setloboko is sensitive of Morapeli’s statement above that he is feared by chiefs and their subjects. In the light of that statement, Setloboko might be hurt, for indeed he has acted like Morapeli’s mere push-over in this matter. Significantly, when Morapeli propels his goal of demonstrating his power over Setloboko, saying, ‘Ea hau karolo u e phethile’ above, it appears as though the latter was used as a mere tool of destruction. It therefore makes sense that Setloboko goes without waiting for his master, Morapeli, to relate the story.

Since her questions concerning Moroesi’s presence here have not been answered, ‘Masechaba insists on being informed accordingly. In response to her persuasion, Morapeli puts it in these words:

“Kaha u mpontšitse hore Mosiuoa e ne e se oa heno, ha ke sa batla ho u tsebisa letho leo ke le etsang. Ka Moroesi teng, ke tla u bolella. Ke mo latile ho ‘m’ae hore a tlo lula le rona. Ha ke batle hore le eena a tlo fetoha moloi. Haeba o ne a se a roesitsoe seroto, ke tla mo rosa sona.” (Act II: scene iii)

[Since you have shown me that Mosiuoa was never your brother, I do not want to tell you anything that I do. As for Moroesi, I shall tell you. I have fetched her from her mother so that she may come and stay with us. I do not want her to also turn into a witch. If she had already been introduced into wearing a basket on her head, I shall take it off her head.]

In accordance with his demonstration and self-praise for his versatility above, it makes sense for Morapeli to verbally interact with 'Masechaba in the above manner. Since he has just praised himself as a versatile robust man that is feared by both the chiefs and their subjects; Morapeli now seems to impress it upon his wife that there is no need for him to liaise with her in his persuasive plans and actions aimed at achieving his goal – as he is now backed by chiefs and their subjects. Seemingly with a persuasive attempt at creating fear and despondency for 'Masechaba to never interfere with him in his operations towards achieving his goal – he even insinuates that she never regarded the late Mosiuoa as her brethren. Nonetheless, as for Moroesi's position, he responds to 'Masechaba's question by revealing his intentions and the persuasive goal behind his actions, as seen in his verbal interaction above. In this way, Morapeli appears to be intent on his persuasive mission to use all means available to him for destroying 'Mamoroesi. Be that as it may, when he announces that if Moroesi 'o ne a se a roesitsoe seroto, ke tla mo rosa sona,' one wonders whether Morapeli has any means in achieving that, or he is just waffling for propelling his persuasive goal of torturing 'Mamoroesi to the end.

In the light of the above observation, it is not shocking for 'Masechaba to be so baffled that she stands up and registers her astonishment in the following words:

“He! He! He! Molimo oa khotso! U sehloho hakaakang monna tooe? U sotlelang ngoana e monyenyanane hakaale? Sechaba ha u ka bua le ntatao? Kea tiea kea hlapanya ho teng ntho e kholo eo u e batlang 'Mamoroesi. Ha u re o bolaile ngoaneno, ha u bue 'nete. U ne u ntse u emetse ntho e ka hlahang hore u mo fumane. Kajeno teng, u tla mpoelle 'nete. Ha u sa mpoelle 'nete, le ho khutlisa ngoana enoa oa motho, ke tsoha ke e-ea haeso hoseng ka matjeke.” (Act II: scene iii)

[He! He! He! God of peace! How cruel you are you man? Why do you torture such a small child? Sechaba can't you please talk with your father? I seriously swear that there is something great that you want from 'Mamoroesi! When you say that she has murdered your brother, you are not telling the truth. You have been waiting for something to happen so that you may get her. As for today, you are going to tell me the truth. If you do not tell the truth, and fail to return this someone's child, I shall wake up and go to my home very early in the morning.]

In the first place, 'Masechaba registers her shock and calls for 'Molimo oa khotso,' to witness this shocking situation and possibly intervene by changing the cruel heart of Morapeli. In addition, she poses the question 'O sehloho hakaakang monna tooe?' as a persuasive attempt for Morapeli to reconsider his plans and actions, so that he might change his attitude and behaviour. Seemingly, what baffles 'Masechaba even more is the fact that Moroosi is a small child that is not supposed to undergo this kind of torture. Since she has been pleading with Morapeli from the early stages of his latest behaviour, and to no avail; 'Masechaba then pleads with Sechaba to talk to his father to adopt some change of behaviour and attitude in this matter. Seemingly unaware that she has just pleaded with Sechaba to intervene and speak with his father about this matter; 'Masechaba, as an agonised woman, continues with her persuasive analysis of Morapeli's attitude and behaviour regarding 'Mamoroosi. Since this whole matter fails to make sense, she then vows that Morapeli has a hidden agenda with regard to the way he treats 'Mamoroosi – thus driving her persuasive goal for Morapeli to divulge the hidden agenda in question. Not astonishingly, as a persuasive goal for Morapeli to ensure that he changes his beliefs and attitude completely, 'Masechaba ends her analysis of the situation by threatening him of deserting him – unless he reveals the secret and take Moroosi back to her mother.

As if unaffected by his wife's persuasive actions as indicated above, Morapeli leaves out all other aspects of 'Masechaba's persuasive attempts for him to change as asked; and downplays her threat, saying: "U ea haeno; u oa lula, tseo ha li re letho ho 'na. Toka eona ke tla e emela." (Act II: scene iii) [You go to your home, you stay, it does not matter to me. As for justice, I shall stand for it.] Obviously, Morapeli downplays 'Masechaba's threats for deserting him as a persuasive goal for her to desist from persuading him to change his behaviour and attitude in this matter. Even though deep down he knows that his accusations against 'Mamoroosi are baseless; Morapeli makes reference to his behaviour as an act of practising justice – that is why he says, 'Toka eona ke tla e emela.' It would appear that Morapeli fails to understand the meaning of justice. It therefore makes sense for 'Masechaba to pass a remark that Morapeli is indeed deep; and now applies gentleness as a persuasive strategy for Morapeli to align with her in this matter. She says:

"Ntate, ntate hle tlohela moferefere ona oo u ntseng u o etsa! Na u oa bona hore re se re lula re loana kamehla ke taba ee ea Mosiuoa? Hona ha u nka ngoana ea leng haufi-ufi le 'm'ae hakaale, na ke ho mo rata? Bona kamoo a llang ka teng. Ntate, hauhela ngoana hle. U fetolelang pelo ea hau ea lejoe?" (Act II: scene iii)

[Father, father please stop this trouble that you have been causing! Are you aware that we continually fight over this matter of Mosiuoa? And if you take away a child that is so closely associated with its mother so much, does that signify your love for her?

Look at how she cries! Father, please be merciful to the child! Why do you turn your heart into that of a stone?]

In the first place, 'Masechaba asks her husband to consider his actions as a means of fermenting trouble; and therefore requests for him to stop it, since it has even started affecting their family relations; such that they keep on quarreling on daily basis. In addition, she employs yet another persuasive plan, of bringing Moroesi's suffering into perspective – questioning whether Morapeli considers his action as an act of love for the child. Further, 'Masechaba points at Moroesi and makes him conscious of the way she is painfully crying. Furthermore, 'Masechaba pleads with Morapeli to be compassionate towards Moroesi and refrain from turning his own heart into a stone one by pretending to be unfeeling for Moroesi's suffering. But now it is clear that Morapeli is not prepared to enter into any persuasive verbal discussion with his wife; as he responds to 'Masechaba's persuasive attempts by saying, "E re ke eo robala pele u nthohaka ho feta mona." (Act II: scene iii) [Let me go and sleep before you insult me more than now.] Then he stands up with an intention of going out; but 'Masechaba is insistent on her persuasive trials for Morapeli to be considerate of the torture he hereby applies upon the small Moroesi; and she therefore stops him, and continues her persuasive verbal interventions as follows:

"Morena oa ka, ntate Morapeli, ho etsahetse eng ka uena? U batla eng? U lumela hore ke mpe ke khutlele heso ho e-na le hore u khutlisetse lesea lee habo lona? Bona hle monn'a ka, ha ke nyatse ngoana hohang. Ke mpa ke mo utloela bohloko. O ratana haholo le 'm'ae. Mo shebe hle ntate. Mo utloele bohloko." (Act II: scene iii)

[My lord, father Morapeli, what has happened with you? What do you want You agree that I rather go back to my home instead of taking this infant back to its home? Please realise my husband, I am altogether not against the child. I only feel pity for her. She is very close to her mother. Look at her please father! Be pitiful for her.]

Basing oneself on 'Masechaba's above persuasive interventions, one would expect Morapeli to change his attitude and be reasonable enough to take Moroesi back to her mother. Otherwise, one might have hoped for him to adopt some counter-persuasive action against 'Masechaba, so as to achieve his goal. But that is not to be so with Morapeli. Instead, he pushes 'Masechaba away and further accuses her of her hatred towards Moroesi. As if that was not enough, Morapeli invites Moroesi to go and sleep with him; whereupon the small girl retorts that she is going to sleep with her aunt, 'Masechaba. He then goes out, while 'Masechaba remains cuddling up Moroesi for consoling and comforting her; thus assuring Moroesi of safety in her aunt's hands.

Incidentally, at the chief's kraal, Morapeli and other men, including Mopeli, the chief, are awaiting 'Mamoroesi to arrive; in accordance with Mopeli's instructions for her to report herself here. Apparently as a persuasive aim for Morapeli to realise that he may or not win the impending case against 'Mamoroesi, Mopeli asks him whether he is satisfied; and further cautions him of the possibility that 'Mamoroesi may win the case – whereupon he (Morapeli) will be forced to bring back her child and pay some dividends for character assassination. In response to Mopeli's question and forewarning, Morapeli answers that the chief is correct. Further, he inquires from the chief how much he has to pay as gratitude for what the chief has done for him up to now. Needless to say, Morapeli's question functions as a persuasive plan for the chief to continue his already seeming conspiracy with him against 'Mamoroesi. As an attempt at counter-persuading Morapeli against the idea of offerings, Mopeli cautions him that this is not time yet for paying those dividends; as the case is not over yet – thus asking Morapeli to be steady and wait for the final judgement. Observably, Mopeli is keen to accept some incentives; though he would rather they come at the end of the case.

As these men at khotla continue with their verbal exchanges regarding this case, it eventually emerges that Morapeli had told Setloboko that he was prepared to pay the dividends even before the case – apparently as a persuasive assurance that he obtains the chief's support in this case. In the light of this revelation, Mohau, one of the chief's advisors at the khotla, airs his views that for him, it looks like they have already passed judgement even before the case is officially presented at this khotla. In addition he makes reference to the fact that 'Mamoroesi has already been forced to separate with her small daughter – yet the case is only to be tabled today. Finally, he questions the chief and the other men whether this is not an error. As may be realised Mohau's interventions are meant as persuasive means of driving his goal of seeing justice prevail in the chief's khotla. Resultantly, Mopeli retorts that he has just said 'haeba a se na molato, ngoana o tla boela ho eena' as has been seen above.

Apparently in an effort to galvanise his own position as a shareholder in the spoils emanating from the twisting of this case towards Morapeli's success; Setloboko downplays Mohau's persuasive interventions, and says:

“Oa tseba 'na ha ke rate makoala Mohau? Kapa u se u tšepisitsoe ho ea kena lieteng tsa mofu? Haeba ho joalo monna, toka eona e tla 'ne e sebetse. Haesale re tšoara taba ena, u ntse u emela mosali enoa. Monna, u oa mpelaetsa.” (Act II: scene iv)

[Do you know that I do not like cowards Mohau? Or have you been promised to go and get into the shoes of the late? If it is so man, justice will still prevail. Since we

started discussing this issue, you have been supporting this woman. Man, you make me suspicious.]

Clearly, for Setloboko, Mohau is acting like a coward, since his interventions are calculated as persuasive means of offering justice and nothing else – as opposed to the conspiratorial behaviour of himself (Setloboko) with Mopeli and Morapeli in their attempt at finding fault with their culprit, ‘Mamoroesi the widow – even before the case is officially tabled. In addition, Setloboko even questions Mohau whether he has been promised to get into the late Mosiuoa’s shoes; thus suggesting that Mohau is buying ‘Mamoroesi’s face. Additionally still, Setloboko reiterates Morapeli’s view of justice by indicating that if that be so, justice will still prevail. In this way, though Setloboko hereby tries to counter-persuade Mohau so as to win him to their side; he in fact clearly spells out his position as Morapeli’s tool of destruction – that is why he sings the latter’s song in a parochial fashion. Indeed, Mohau may be seen to be siding with ‘Mamoroesi, only for the fact that he wants to see justice prevailing; yet for Setloboko and his colleagues in conspiracy, theirs is the true justice, or else they have lost the meaning of the word ‘justice.’

Eventually, ‘Mamoroesi arrives at Khotla. Interestingly, even before he presents the case for ‘Mamoroesi, Mopeli quips thus: “Ha re sa senya nako e fetang eo uena u e sentseng. Ho na le linyeoe tse tharo kamora ena ea hau.” (Act II: scene iv) [We are not going to waste any time that is more than the one you have wasted. There are three other cases after this one of yours.] It is apparent that Mopeli’s reference to the aspect of ‘Mamoroesi’s waste of time is calculated as a persuasive action for registering his disgust with her; thus clearly signifying his position in the ensuing conspiracy. Besides, this statement seems to be geared towards casting a blame on ‘Mamoroesi; so that she may nurse some guilty conscience and lose focus of the ensuing case that so much needs her attention for counter-persuasive purposes.

Nonetheless, in a cool fashion, ‘Mamoroesi sits down and verbally interacts with the chief as follows: “Kea leboha morena. Ke se ke tlile pitsong ea hau ntate. Ke masoabi haele mona ke liehile ho fihla.” (Act II: scene iv) [Thank you chief. I have come for your summon father. I am sorry that I delayed to arrive.] In accordance with ‘Mamoroesi’s verbal reaction against Mopeli’s introductory remarks; she seems prepared to answer any questions that might be asked in connection with this case. Whereas one might expect Mopeli to lay out the case for ‘Mamoroesi’s clear grasp, the chief puts it as follows:

“Ha ke na ho qapolla taba ena ea qoso ea enoa ngoan’eno. Leha ho le joalo, Morapeli o u qosa ka polao ea ngoana’bo, eo e leng monna oa hau. Na u tseba letho ka lefu la monna oa hau le ka etsang hore Morapeli a re u nkha lefotha?” (Act II: scene iv)

[I am not going to elaborate on this matter of your brethren's accusation. Even so, Morapeli accuses you of the murder of his brother, that who is your husband. Do you know anything about the death of your husband that might have caused Morapeli to suspect you of that?]

In accordance with Mopeli's presentation of this case above, one wonders why he is saying that he is not going to elaborate on the issue; and one begins to suspect that he does that as a persuasive goal for catching 'Mamoroesi off guard; so that she fails to understand the nuances of the case. Besides, his question as to whether 'Mamoroesi knows anything that might have caused Morapeli to suspect her of having a hand in that death is irrelevant; and seems to be employed as a persuasive plan for placing 'Mamoroesi at an off guard position and err in her interactions. In reality, this question is somehow prematurely asked; as it is asked even before the accused might start hackling at the aspects of the case in question. In addition, in accordance with court procedures that some of us have been witnessing, Mopeli should have asked the accused whether she is guilty or not; so that the cross questioning might come at its right time.

Nevertheless, 'Mamoroesi responds as follows in an effort to counter-persuade Mopeli in his premature cross questioning:

"Morena oa ka, monna oa ka o hlokahetse kotsing ea koloi. Kamor'a moo, enoa ngoan'eso haesale a bua hore ke 'na ea bolaileng mofu. Empa, ke re ho uena morena, ha ke ea bolaea monna oa ka." (Act II: scene iv)

[My lord, my husband was involved in a fatal car accident. There after, this brother of mine has been saying that I am the one that murdered the late. But, I say to you my chief I have not killed my husband.]

Once more, Mopeli continues his line of cross examination prematurely. He follows the accused's responses by questioning her about the reason/s that caused Morapeli to accuse her of murdering her husband. Needless to say, even this is an irrelevant or misdirected question – it is not to be directed at the accused but the complainant himself. Resultantly, this whole cross examination begins to spread among the conspirators, as Setloboko also interacts by posing his own questions as well. Even though Mopeli rebukes Setloboko for posing his questions out of tune; it becomes clear that he welcomes the latter's cross examination – as he even persuades 'Mamoroesi to answer that same question: "Na o ka araba potso eo ea Setloboko 'm'e?" (Act II: scene iv) [Can you answer that question by Setloboko mother?] With all the cross examination directed at the person of 'Mamoroesi as seen above, and more hereafter; it is anybody's guess how this case ends up – as Morapeli

is questioned last, when 'Mamoroesi has been affected by this cross examination to a point of crying.

As a matter of fact, only two questions are directed at Morapeli. The first one is, "Uena Morapeli, hobaneng ha u ne u sa nahane hore mosali eo u ne a mpa a soasa?" (Act II: scene iv) [You Morapeli, why did you not think that this woman was merely joking?] Obviously, this question is meant for driving Morapeli towards his point of fomenting a story that befits his accusing 'Mamoroesi of her husband's death – since the accused has so clarified her own position. In response, Morapeli brings a new perspective into the matter by fabricating the story as follows:

"Morena, ha ke qeta ho fumana pii, ke ile ka ea tsebisa enoa mohatsa ngoan'eso. Ke ne ke tsamaea le rakhali. U ka 'mitsa morena ha u batla bopaki. 'Mamoroesi ha a ka ba a bontša ho nyaroha ha a utloa ka lefu la Mosiuoa. O ile a thola, a inama. Ha ho le mookho oo a ileng a o tšolla sefahlehong sa hae. Kapele-pele ke ile ka hopola mantsoe ane a hae ha a re: 'Ke tla phethola koloi eo ea lona ka tlali mothoana.' Kea leboha morena." (Act II: scene iv)

[Chief, after receiving the death report, I went to inform this wife of my brother. I was accompanied by my paternal aunt. You can call her chief if you want some evidence. 'Mamoroesi did not show a sign of shock as she learned about the death of Mosiuoa. She remained silent, and bowed. There was not even a drop of tear she spilled onto her face. I immediately remembered those words of hers when she said: 'I shall cause that car of yours to capsize by employing lightening.' I thank you chief.]

In the light of Morapeli's above submission, the chief suggests that the evidence is not enough; and further inquires about any other witness of the above-reported submission. By so asking, it would seem that Mopeli's aim is to create the impression that he is not taking sides in this matter. In response, Morapeli says, "Paki e 'ngoe ea ka ke 'Malitaba. Eka o tseba le ngaka e batliloeng ho phetha mosebetsi ona." (Act II: scene iv) [My other witness is 'Malitaba. It would seem that she even knows the concerned doctor for this operation.] In the like manner, Mopeli asks 'Mamoroesi whether she has any witnesses. In answer, 'Mamoroesi indicates that she has no witness; as all she tells is the whole truth and nothing else. Further, she tells the chief that it is true that she did not immediately shed a tear when Morapeli informed her of her husband's death; as she could hardly believe the information – yet it dawned to her that it was true after Morapeli's departure. As a result, she only started crying bitterly thereafter; as the message was only then settling into her mind.

Basing himself on 'Mamoroesi's above information, Mopeli now takes it into his hands to ridicule her, emphasizing the following points: That

- it is now clear that 'Mamoroesi is a very bad person – as she does not refute any of Morapeli's statements above;
- she confirms Morapeli's statement that she boastfully declared that she was going to kill somebody;
- within no time the same person in question got killed; and
- when informed of the same death – she showed no sign of shock, but merely looked down.

On this basis, Mopeli now employs a persuasive condemnation and advice for the accused, in these words: "Mosali tooe, u litšila! U mobe! Ke u eletsa hore u lumele molato e le hore kotlo ea hao e tle e se be boima. Ha u ntse u thatafalitse pelo ea hau, le ea ka e tla thatafala. Ke sa u fa sebaka." (Act II: scene iv) [You woman, you are filthy! You are bad! I advise you to make an admission of guilt so that your penalty may not be heavy. As long as you harden your heart, mine will also harden up. I give you a chance for now.] Clearly, Mopeli's rebukes, condemnations, and so-called advice are manipulations aimed for driving their conspiratorial goal of finding 'Mamoroesi guilty as charged – so as to share the spoils that might come forth there after. Indeed, basing oneself on Morapeli's repeated persuasive encouragements and requests for Mopeli to assist him; one might have assumed that the latter was going to end this case by finding 'Mamoroesi guilty as charged.

Since 'Mamoroesi has all along been pleading her innocence in this matter; this moment of being rebuked, condemned and manipulatively encouraged to plead guilty as charged gives her the shudders, and she interacts in these words: "Morena oa ka, leha u ka oa re ke bue ha lekholo, ke tla 'ne ke re ho uena ntate, ha kea bolaea monna oa ka. Leha u ka nkahlola, u tla nkahlola ka seo ke sa se etsang. Morena ke ..." (Act II: scene iv) [My lord, even if you may ask me to speak hundred fold, I will continue saying to you father, I have not murdered my husband. Even if you charge me, you will charge me for what I have not done. Chief, I ...] Seemingly as a persuasive attempt for cutting 'Mamoroesi short in her interaction that is likely to change many people's behaviours, beliefs and attitudes in this matter – Setloboko interrupts her, and intervenes in these words:

"O ntšoarele moren'a ka. Mona re senya nako ea rona feela. Mosali enoa o molato. E re a le molato, ke moikaketsi oa moikhohomosi. Leqitolo la mosali! Ha u sa eme ka maoto ntate, Morapeli o tla latela. Uena u reng Mohau? Haesale nyoe e ena e qala, u ntse u khutsitse. Maikutlo a hau ke afe?" (Act II: scene iv)

[Please pardon me my lord! Here we are merely wasting our time. This woman is guilty. Even as guilty as she is, she is a proud and conceited person. An untrustworthy woman! If you do

not stand on your feet father, Morapeli is next. What do you say Mohau? You have since the beginning of this case been silent. What are your views?]

Considering the fact that Mopeli has afforded 'Mamoroesi the opportunity to respond to his persuasive endeavours for her to plead guilty as charged; Setloboko's interventions leave a lot to be desired. For example, one wonders why he takes it into his own hands to interrupt 'Mamoroesi as she is about to clearly state her case in defence. In the light of this intervention one is bound to suspect that Setloboko senses a situation in which the accused is likely to verbally interact enough to change behaviours and attitudes of some or all of the members of the jury. It then comes as no astonishment that, in addition, Setloboko in the same vein directs the foregoing question to Mohau – apparently as a persuasive aim for the latter to air his views before the accused may delve deeper in her defensive submission. Upon realizing the trend that this case is taking, the chief intervenes, saying, “Le se le qosana e le lona joale?” (Act II: scene iv) [Are you now personally accusing each other?] Obviously, this intervention by Mopeli is a persuasive attempt for his advisors to refrain from this style of blaming each/one another in this case – as that action might end up in dividing them into opposing sectors: those who side with the chief and his co-conspirators, against those who want fairness and justice to prevail in this controversial case.

In the light of the above interactive verbal exchanges, Mopeli takes his unilateral decision to send 'Mamoroesi out, encouraging her to go into the house and be with other women there; so that they, as a jury, may secretly interact and solve this case for finality. It would appear that Mopeli now pretends to apply justice by following some procedure in judging this case; as he also instructs Morapeli to go to the cattle kraal, in order to afford them some opportunity to come up with the verdict. Now that both the complainant and the accused have gone off; Mohau uses this minute for his persuasive goal of changing the trend towards which the case seems to have taken. He verbally interacts in this manner:

“Morena, le uena Setloboko monna'heso, ruri ke bona bopaki ba hore 'Mamoroesi o bolaile monna bo fokola haholo. Ke bona e ka Morapeli o ntse a e-na le seo a se koetletseng mosali enoa. Haeba le bona hantle, rona re se re fetohile thebe eo Morapeli a itširelelitseng ka eona ha a ntse a fenetha phofu ena ea hae. Oho hle moren'a ka, sheba taba ena ka leihlo le nchocho. Ho seng joalo re tla e tlaila.” (Act II: scene iv)

[My lord, and you Setloboko my country man, indeed I find the evidence that supports the idea that 'Mamoroesi has killed her husband quite flimsy. I suspect that Morapeli has a hidden agenda against this woman. If you look at it carefully, we have turned ourselves into a shield with which Morapeli covers himself with while he continues

strangling this prey of his. Oh please my lord, look at this matter with a sharp eye. Otherwise we shall make an error of judgement.]

Pointless to say, Mohau's verbal intervention above would be persuasive enough for all the interactants to change their behaviours and attitudes in their approach of this matter – were they not in conspiratorial behaviour with Morapeli, the mastermind of the whole plot. Infact, one might dare say that the so-called evidence is not only slim but non-existent; for even Morapeli's so called witnesses have not even been brought in to perform accordingly; as even Mopeli's inquiry about them apparently came as a second thought, in the middle or towards the end of his cross examination of the accused. In addition, whereas 'Mamoroesi has been so thoroughly cross examined by the self-made prosecutor, Mopeli; Morapeli has only been asked to spell out the source of his suspicion and who his other witness was. In the light of the foregoing observation, one realises that even the verdict the chief and his advisors are here to work on is bound to fail in the test of court procedures.

Apparently as an indication that he is not prepared to listen to Mohau's reasoning and persuasive attempts for them to look into this matter with caution; Mopeli grabs at an irrelevant point and reiterates Setloboko's earlier accusation that Mohau is a coward. Further, he accuses Mohau of delaying the process by taking them back to reconsider their stand in this matter. Finally, as if there was any evidence presented in this court at all; Mopeli inquires whether Mohau is not satisfied with the evidence that was given in this court from the beginning of the process. responding to Mopeli's question, Mohau answers in the affirmative that he is indeed not satisfied with the evidence. In support of his dissatisfaction, Mohau suggests that it were better if 'Malitaba were to be called in, since Morapeli has told this court that she is his witness. In addition, Mohau once more points out that the so-called evidence of 'Mamoroesi's joking statements, prior to Mosiuoa's accidental death, is quite flimsy. Then as he begins to bring up his second point, Setloboko interrupts him and engages the following verbal intervention:

“U ntšoarele morena ha ke kena Mohau hanong. Mohau monna'heso, hase qalo monna a eeng a rate mosali oa mohlolohali. Leha u ka oa mo rata ha lekholo, hlonepha lekhlotla lena. Se ke oa re qobella ho ea ka leeme leha u bona hore moqosuo a u molato. Tsa lerato la lona tsona ha li re ame hohang.” (Act II: scene iv)

[You will excuse me chief for interrupting Mohau. Mohau my country man, it is not the first time a man falls in love with a widow. Even if you love her hundred fold, respect this court. Do not force us to be bias even as you realise that the accused is guilty. We are not concerned with matters of your love at all.]

In line with Mopeli and Setloboko's verbal interventions against Mohau above, it becomes very clear that the two are in concert on their intent to function as Morapeli's emissaries in his mission of 'Mamoroesi's character assassination and torture. For example, they both have called Mohau a coward for his stance against the injustice they appear to perform against the accused. Secondly, Mopeli does not even reprimand Setloboko about his behaviour of verbally attacking Mohau and slandering him as he has just done above. Nonetheless, in defence of his character, and as counter-persuasion concerning Setloboko's insinuations and slander; Mohau verbally presents his persuasive view for the chief to reconsider and change his attitude and behaviour towards this case, saying:

“Tsoela pele ho nketselisa le ho ntlhaba ka mantsoe. Uena morena oa ka, ke bua maikutlo a ka a ho qetela. Morapeli o etseletsa 'Mamoroesi. 'Na ke re re ke re chechisetse nyeoe ena hosasa. Lipaki li tle 'ne li fane ka bopaki ba tsona. Ka ntate ka Lebakeng, 'nete e tla hlahela ea hore Morapeli o mpa a thabela ho tšela letsoai leqebeng le ahlameng.” (Act II: scene iv)

[Go on calming and piercing me with words. You my chief, I am saying my final views. Morapeli is slandering 'Mamoroesi. I suggest that we postpone this case to tomorrow; so that witnesses might give their evidences. I bet by my father, Lebakeng, truth will emerge, that Morapeli merely enjoys pouring some salt onto the already gaping wound.]

In the light of Mohau's verbal intervention above, it is a matter of grave import for one to realise that Mopeli has been successfully persuaded to change his attitude and behaviour of regarding the accused as a filthy woman that deserves to be found guilty as charged. Significantly, one of the most persuasive statements for engineering change of attitudes and behaviours as contained in Mohau's above verbal intervention is the image of 'ho tšela letsoai leqebeng le ahlameng.' This imagery causes one to flinch as one envisages the pain induced upon the victim in such an act – as it is seemingly the case with 'Mamoroesi at this point in time. Testimony to Mopeli's change of behaviour and attitude signifies itself in the following persuasive intervention by him, as both judge and prosecutor in this case: “Mohlomong u oa bolela monna. Ke etsa qeto ea hore nyeoe ena e chechisetsoe bekeng e tlang. Setloboko, bitsa batho bao ba tsebisoe hore nyeoe e tla lula ka Labone. “ (Act II: scene iv) [Maybe you are correct man. I make the final decision that this case be postponed to next week. Setloboko, call in those people so that they may be informed that the case will resume on Thursday.] Seemingly, Setloboko is also persuaded to change his attitude and behaviour; for he hereby merely says to Mopeli, “Ke teng morena,” (Act II: scene iv) [It is alright chief] and goes out to call in the concerned people.

Incidentally, Morapeli and Setloboko are together and discussing; whereupon the former reveals the reasons behind his attitude and behaviour towards his victim, 'Mamoroesi, in these words:

“Uena oa thaka, ha u bone merero ea ka. Ha ke tloha mona ke ea hona ho morena. Ke ilo mo tšella poone a e kome. Kamorao ho moo ho tla be ho felile. Setloboko, a nke ke u phetlele sefuba sa ka. U ne u lumela hore ke balehisa Moroosi e le kannete?” (Act III: scene i)

[You my age mate do not realise my plans. When I leave this place, I go directly to the chief. I am going to pour for him some maise so that he may swallow it. There after everything will be alright. Setloboko, let me open my chest for you. Did you believe that I retrieve Moroosi truthfully?]

In accordance with Morapeli's above verbal interaction, it becomes clear that his aim is that of motivating Mopeli to constantly align with him in this war that he weilds against 'Mamoroesi – as his reference to his pouring some maise for the chief presupposes an act of bribing. As the image of 'ho tšela poone' would suggest, Morapeli's intention is to give Mopeli something, possibly some money or any item of importance, as bribery for the latter to perform as the former wills. It would follow therefore that Morapeli's main persuasive strategy is to induce incentives to ensure that characters of Mopeli's calibre share his attitude, behaviour and belief in dealing with the ensuing matter. One might therefore guess that even the retrieval of Moroosi from her mother was never based on what Morapeli purported; but as a scheme between himself and Mopeli to hurt 'Mamoroesi.

In addition, Morapeli reveals his secret of Moroosi's retrieval from her mother as that of using the small girl as his source of financial income in the near future – as Mosiuoa once informed the former that he had created an investment for her – the investment that is to benefit her when she reaches the age of twelve, he says. Since this is a secret that not even 'Mamoroesi is in the knowledge of; he plans to enrich himself with the benefits accrued from that very investment – as he plans to expel Moroosi from his family thereafter. In line with these motivational revelations, it makes sense that Mopeli, in concert with Morapeli's persuasive goal, pronounced that he can never keep women of 'Mamoroesi's kind in his father's village. Possibly, he had already been offered an incentive by Morapeli as persuasive tactic for the chief to align himself with the master planner's attitude and behaviour.

As the drama unfolds itself further, Mohau comes into perspective, as he engages himself in a soliloquy. Since he was never satisfied with Mopeli's attitude and behaviour against 'Mamoroesi; it makes sense that Mohau's soliloquy is with reference to the same woman. The following are some of the issues Mohau addresses in this soliloquy:

“Haele hore ke tlohele mosali enoa oa motho hore a chekeloe lebitla, kea hana. Leha ba ka nthohaka, ke tla tsitlalla ‘me ke eme le eena. Mosali oa ka ... o ne a hlola a re kaha ke rata toka, matona a mang ha a na ho nthata. Ke tla lokela ho ea ha ‘Mamoroesi ke eo mo fa boeletsu. Ruri ho bohloko ho bona ngoana e monyenyanane tjena a ntse a isoa holimo le tlase.” (Act III: scene ii)

[As for leaving this person’s wife so that a grave is dug for her, I refuse. Even if they insult me, I shall insist and stand together with her. My wife ... used to say that since I venerate justice, other chief’s advisors will not like me. I will have to go to ‘Mamoroesi’s place and give her some advice. Indeed it is painful to see such a small child being tortured up and down like this.]

In the light of the above self-persuasive verbal expressions selected from Mohau’s soliloquy, it becomes clear what his intentions and convictions are in relation to the matter in question. First and foremost, Mohau is determined to side with ‘Mamoroesi in this matter; as he realises that this whole fracas is employed as a manipulative plan to nail down ‘Mamoroesi; which for him is tantamount to digging a grave for her. As a self-motivation for holding steadfastly onto his present attitude and behaviour, Mohau pronounces his intent to resist whatever insults his colleagues direct towards him; for he clearly believes that Morapeli has a hidden agenda for fighting against ‘Mamoroesi as he does. Since his aim is to see justice performed, and nothing else, Mohau even recalls his wife’s cautioning that other chief’s advisors are not going to like him – as Setloboko has so far demonstrated. Nonetheless, in order for him to drive his persuasive goal of emancipating ‘Mamoroesi from this looming danger; he registers his determination to go and advise ‘Mamoroesi to take an appeal; should this local court find her guilty.

Not surprisingly, consequently Mohau arrives at ‘Mamoroesi’s home to fulfil his purpose of advising the latter accordingly. As a persuasive attempt for ‘Mamoroesi to put her trust into him and listen carefully to his advice; Mohau begins by telling the latter that for everyone that loves justice, it is very clear that she is innocent. In addition, he divulges the purpose of his visit as that of advising her; as he is aware that Morapeli has brewed a fight against her. First and foremost, he advises her to hold steadfastly onto her position of refusing to plead guilty. It would seem that Mohau realises that ‘Mamoroesi is now successfully persuaded to listen carefully to his pieces of advice. As a result, he now delves into the main subject with a persuasive measure for propelling his goal for justice to prevail in this situation. He says:

“Ke u eletsu hore haeba nyeoe ena e ka ea u hlola lekhotleng lena la rona, u nke boipiletso. Ha u etsu joalo, nyeoe ena e tla ea lekhotleng le leholo mane Tsikoane. Kea u tiisetse, ha e fihla moo, toka e tla sebetsa.” (Act III: scene ii)

[I advise you that if this case overpowers you here at the local court, you take the appeal. By so doing, this case will be transferred to the district court there at Tsikoane. I assure you, when you arrive there, justice will prevail.]

Apparently, Mohau wants to ensure himself that 'Mamoroesi is successfully persuaded into putting her trust in the aspect of taking the appeal, as he asks her the following question: "Na u 'mametse hantle?" (Act III: scene ii) [Are you listening well to me?] For 'Mamoroesi, this is like a dream to her; as she verbally interjects that she never thought that there was one person who identified with her in this struggle. But alas! Even as Mohau bids her goodnight, Morapeli, 'Masechaba, Sechaba and Moroese arrive – whereupon Morapeli grabs this moment to accuse Mohau of having an affair with 'Mamoroesi. He says, "Mohau, u sehloho hakaakang? Abuti ha e-s'o bole le ho bola lebitleng, u se u ntse u e-ja mofufutso oa phatla ea hae?" (Act III: scene ii) [Mohau, how cruel are you? My brother has not even become rotten in the grave, yet you are already consuming the sweat of his forehead?] Obviously, Morapeli's accusation is unfounded, especially when he has no evidence to that effect. It would then follow that this moment has come handy to him; as he capitalises on it for pushing his manipulative goal of finding fault with both 'Mamoroesi and Mohau – in fulfilment of his primary goal of vilifying 'Mamoroesi's character in all ways possible and have her expelled from this village.

It then hardly surprises one that Morapeli turns to 'Masechaba and presses her to air her views in this situation, saying, "Bua 'Masechaba. Bua! U ile ua reng ha ke re ke nka Moroese? Bona se etsahalang kajeno! Ke mosali ea ka holisang ngoana eo ea tje? Bua 'Masechaba!" (Act III: scene ii) [Speak up 'Masechaba! Speak up! What did you say when I said that I was taking Moroese away? Is this the kind of woman who can bring up a child?] Significantly, 'Masechaba has been successfully persuaded by Morapeli's condemnation of Mohau and 'Mamoroesi's togetherness; to an extent that, in response, she finds herself saying, "Ntate, ke hlotsoe! Ruri u ntlhotse." (Act III: scene ii) [Father, I have been defeated! Indeed you have beaten me!] Then she faces 'Mamoroesi and says, "'Mamoroesi ngoan'eso molato ke eng ha u itsoara tje?" (Act III: scene ii) ['Mamoroesi my sister what is the reason behind your behaving this way?] Then 'Masechaba faces Morapeli and says, "Ntate Morapeli, u ntsoarele." (Act III: scene ii) [Father Morapeli, forgive me.]

On the basis of the above verbal interactions, it becomes obvious that, although 'Masechaba was originally on the side of 'Mamoroesi; now she has been formatively manipulated by Morapeli's insinuations to change her attitude, behaviour and belief in 'Mamoroesi's innocence. Nonetheless, after all has been said and done, 'Mamoroesi is left alone with her small Moroese; as the latter has been brought back here for her mother to take her to the doctor – as Moroese feigned illness in order to come back home. Now that 'Mamoroesi is left

alone with her daughter, she now uses this moment to verbally interact with her daughter; seemingly with an intention to propel her persuasive goal of identifying the kind of sickness consuming her. With tears building up in her eyes 'Mamoroesi interacts in the following manner:

“Moroesi lehakoe la pelo ea ka, molato ke eng 'm'e? Bolella 'na moratuo oa hau haeba ho e-na le phoso hle. Hopola Moroesi, ke u rata ho feta batho bohle lefatšeng. U lebaka le etsang hore ebe ke ntse ke phela. Ha e ne e se ka uena, nka be ke se ke ipolaile. Molato ke eng ngoana'ka?” (Act III: scene ii)

[Moroesi my heart's pearl, what is the matter mother? Tell it to me your beloved one if there is a problem please! Remember Moroesi, I love you more than all the people in the world. You are the reason why I am still alive. Were it not for you, I would have already committed suicide. What is the matter my child?]

As may be noticed in 'Mamoroesi's above interaction, she applies various persuasive strategies to achieve her goal. First and foremost, she addresses Moroesi as 'lehakoe la pelo ea ka,' as 'm'e,' and 'moratuo oa hao' at the same time; apparently with calculated persuasive goal for Moroesi to realise the importance of their relationship as mother and child who must confide in each other. Second, 'Mamoroesi makes a reminder to Moroesi that she loves her more than all the people in the world – supposedly as a persuasive assurance for Moroesi to realise that, as they are the only two members of this family alive; her mother's love is immeasurable towards her – and therefore they have to stick together in all circumstances. Third, 'Mamoroesi cautions Moroesi of her (Moroesi) being the source of life for her mother – for as an agonised woman she would have committed suicide. This final part of this verbal interaction presupposes that the two have to take care of each other and ensure that they keep no secrets from each for sustaining their lives.

In order to signify her being successfully persuaded by her mother to divulge her sickness to her; Moroesi informs her mother that she is not ill, but, through Sechaba's persuasion she initially employed crying, and later feigned illness so that she would be brought back to her mother. In addition, Moroesi informs her mother that through Sechaba she learned that her mother was innocent; and not a witch as Morapeli has been purporting. Indeed, this information affects 'Mamoroesi emotionally; thus causing tears to once more build up in her eyes, as she says: “Leholimo la pele la phetloa! Ke ne ke le tsietsing ke re ngoana oa ka o tla kholoa hore ke 'molaetse ntat'ae. Khanya ke eo e hlaha ka Sechaba hore a u bontše hore ha ke na mali matsohong.” (Act III: scene ii) [There the first sky is opened! I was in difficulty thinking that my child would believe that I murdered her father. There the light is revealed by Sechaba as he shows you that I am innocent.]

Obviously, 'Mamoroesi's declarations above function as persuasive attempt for Moroesi to remain assured that her mother is indeed innocent; and that Morapeli has merely been slandering her, for what reason, nobody knows. It is then not shocking that in the court of law at Hlotse; people are made to listen to a tape in which Moroesi testifies for her mother's innocence – as she has taken the appeal in accordance with Mohau's advice. To signify that 'Mamoroesi is innocent, the judge then finally pronounces that Moroesi's testimony is enough – as he passes the following judgement:

“Uena morapeli, o bile mohlakofatsi oa mohlolohali enoa. Ho e-na le ho sala u mo hlokometse 'moho le ngoana oa hae, u iphetotse mohlorigi oa hae. Seo u neng u se shebile ke ho mo thusa ho ja mafa a moholoane oa hau. U motho ea soto haholo. Ho tloha hona joale u se hlole u beha leoto la hau ha mosali enoa. Ngoana oa hae a khutlele ho eena hang hang. Ha ho molao o lumelang hore ngoana e monyenane hakaana a arohanngoe le 'm'ae. Ha ho ka etsahala hore u bonoe ha hae, u tla lokeloa ke teronko. Leha ho le joalo, haeba u sa khotsofala, u ka boela oa ipiletsa. Na u batla ho nka boipiletso?” (Act IV: scene iii)

[You Morapeli, you have been the tormentor of this widow. Instead of taking care of her together with her child, you turned yourself into her persecutor. What you were looking for is to assist her in consuming the legacies of your brother. You are a very miserable person. As from now on you should never put your foot at the home of this woman. Her child should be returned to her with immediate effect. There is no law that permits separation of such a small child from its mother. If it can happen that you are seen at her home, you will be fit for the gaol. Even so, if you are not satisfied, you are free to take the appeal. Do you want to take the appeal?]

In the light of the above judgement in which Morapeli is found guilty of tormenting the widow, 'Mamoroesi, for selfish intents and purposes; it comes as no astonishment for Morapeli to refrain from taking the appeal – even as the judge offers him an opportunity to do so. Seemingly, Morapeli has learned a hard lesson to never go about slandering people that he considers vulnerable to his torturous actions. One might even guess that he considers himself quite lucky that the judge has not fined him for 'Mamoroesi's slandering and character assassination. In addition, it would have served Morapeli right for the judge to have fined him against all the expenses that 'Mamoroesi might have incurred in the running of this case. Nevertheless, this is a moment for all those that share the same attitudes, behaviours and believes with Morapeli to be ware; as they might find themselves learning the hard way as Morapeli has just done. As for those who were involved in this conspiracy with Morapeli, such as Mopeli, Setloboko, and 'Malitaba, they have to apply all effort in their power to desist from such attitudes and behaviours, lest they also learn the hard way in future. In fact, one

might even dare say that Mopeli deserved to be punished for assisting Morapeli in his torture against 'Mamoroesi – for as the chief of the village, Mopeli was supposed to protect the widows and the children.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

6.1 INTRODUCTION

The objective of this study was to examine persuasion in the selected Sesotho drama texts published in South Africa and Lesotho from 1981 to 2006. Since the selection of these drama texts was based on the following three periods: 1981 to 1989, 1990 to 1999 and 2000 to 2006, it would be necessary to observe how the literary characters of the drama texts achieve, or fail to achieve their goals through persuasion. The attention of the study was to find out whether or not characters in their persuasive attempts have employed upfront persuasion and/or some of its sister aspects: coercion, manipulation, propaganda or any other aspect associated with persuasion.

6.2 OBSERVATIONS IN CHAPTER 3

Chapter 3 of this study analysed Mosuhli's *Le ka nketsang* and Mokoena's *Mpowane*. I shall make my observations about *Le ka nketsang*, and follow with *Mpowane*.

6.2.1 *Le ka nketsang*

Regardless of the fact that there are many characters in *Le ka nketsang*, this study centred on the analysis on the main characters: Rankakata, Kesentseng, Bafedile and Mmasebueng – though other characters were brought into perspective wherever the issues they deal with were relative to the main characters; as was highlighted in the analysis. What can be observed from the beginning of the drama text *Le ka nketsang*, is that Rankakata distinguishes himself as a coercer; while his wife, Kesentseng, and daughter, Bafedile, display upfront persuasion in attempts to change Rankakata's attitude and behaviour against members of his family and those associated with it. For example, Rankakata's initial address towards Bafedile is that of shouting at her and calling her names – which clearly distinguishes him as a person who hardly employs any upfront persuasion to instill some change of attitude, belief, behaviour or opinion in Bafedile. When in response to his name-calling Bafedile indicates to her mother that her father always behaves in that negative manner towards her, it becomes evident that this is Rankakata's coercive means of forcing individuals to act in accordance with his own desires and intentions.

Further, Rankakata applies some upfront persuasion – seemingly as strategies for boosting his own egoistic attitude. It is a strategy aimed to instilling fear in them whenever they oppose him. Rankakata's behaviour against family stems from his extramarital involvement with Mmasebueng. It would seem, therefore, that his attitude and behaviour of coercing them function as some means of maintaining his affair with Mmasebueng, as his paramour. It

follows also that Mmasebueng works hard to ensure that this relationship with Rankakata is sustained; or worse still, it develops into her becoming his second wife. She therefore works hard at manipulating him into applying hostility and vindictiveness against Kesentseng and Bafedile.

Also, what can be observed in the analysis of *Le ka nketsang*, is that Mmasebueng goes to the extent of manipulating Rankakata into bewitching Kesentseng so that she should die. In this way, Mmasebueng drives her selfish goal. She wants to become his wife without any form of disturbance from Kesentseng. She achieves her objective because Kesentseng dies as a result of Mmasebueng's witchcraft – and her death opens some inroads into establishing permanent relationship between Mmasebueng and Rankakata. They become husband and wife. It is important to realise that another of Mmasebueng's manipulative goal has been for Rankakata to cease Bafedile's education – that being an aspect resulting from mere jealousy against Bafedile's progress. Even so, Bafedile continued her education because of Kesentseng's support for her to pursue that goal. Now that Kesentseng has died, and Mmasebueng has been promoted by Rankakata into the status of being his wife – she now takes advantage of the situation and applies further manipulation for Rankakata to stop the young girl's education. Even though Rankakata initially succumbs to Bafedile's persuasion for him to allow her to continue her studies; ultimately Mmasebueng manipulates both Bafedile and Rankakata against education.

As a result of daily manipulations applied by Mmasebueng against Rankakata for stopping Bafedile from schooling; Bafedile ends up committing suicide. Obviously, Rankakata only now realises he has somehow been the instigator of his daughter's suicidal death – for he failed to hearken to all persuasive attempts from his wife and friends to cut off the affair he had established with Mmasebueng. Instead of adopting some persuasive interaction with his persuasive advisors, Rankakata has been infamous of his response: "O ka nketsang?" [What can you do to me?]. In the light of the above analysis, Rankakata ends up being a lone individual – as this incident marks the moment of truth, a reminiscent irony – for he has stubbornly maintained his coercion and vindictiveness against the late Kesentseng, the late Bafedile, and other members of the community that rendered him some persuasive attempts for him to change his personality disposition.

Since he has been impervious to any form of persuasive attempts for him to change for the better; Rankakata now becomes aware of his losses: of Kesentseng, Bafedile, and the relatives that he never wanted to see. Only at this final moment does he realise the extent to which he allowed himself to be bullied, coerced and manipulated by Mmasebueng into destroying his own family. Worse still, he now becomes aware of the fact that he has had nothing to gain through his extramarital relations with Mmasebueng, but utter destruction. To

make it worse, he ultimately took a decision to take her as the surrogate wife – thus making Bafedile susceptible to her verbal insinuations that culminated into her death. Now she stands to gain full control over his belongings as surrogate wife. Rankakata is therefore a tragic hero that has through self-deceit, -induced arrogance and –vindictiveness fell off from the sublime to ridicule. In this situation, all those around him sympathise and empathise with him; as he has initiated the repercussions he now experiences. It then marks this moment as the moment of truth for him – as he now humbles himself in front of all those gathered at his daughter’s funeral and asks for forgiveness. As a final stroke of self humiliation, he requests his co-inhabitants to remain guarding his animals and other belongings, while he goes out on a journey meant for seeking his relatives.

6.2.2 *Mpowane*

Mokoena’s *Mpowane* opens with the source of worry prevailing in the family of Hlakahlothwane – the issue of the seeming barrenness of their daughter-in-law, Mmaboitshwaro. For that matter, Hlakahlothwane and his wife, Mmakgaeng are even intent on taking it into their own hands to seek for traditional herbal assistance from the traditional doctors. Since their son, Habai, and his wife, Mmaboitshwaro, regard themselves as a modern couple, they consider the idea of consulting herbal doctors as outdated and unnecessary. Obviously this becomes the bone of contention between Hlakahlothwane and the young couple. As has been shown in the analysis, a conflict ensues between Hlakahlothwane and Habai; and results into Habai’s sustaining a wound that has been caused by Hlakahlothwane’s striking him with a fighting stick.

It would appear that, while Mmakgaeng, Habai and Mmaboitshwaro rely on the application of upfront persuasion, this is not the case with Hlakahlothwane. For him, Habai and Mmaboitshwaro, as son and daughter-in-law, need to be simply informed of his decision on any matter, especially this critical one. It therefore makes sense for him to employ coercion against them; so that they might eventually observe his seniority and regard him as master in matters of this kind. Although Habai feels so agitated by his father’s reaction that he even nurses feelings of avenging himself that is not to be so, in accordance with Mmakgaeng. She cautions Habai that he dares not turn himself into a small frog that imitates the big one; lest it ruptures its own stomach. Indeed Habai hearkens to his mother’s pieces of advice and goes home with Mmaboitshwaro; as she promises him that in time his feelings of agitation will be healed and render him susceptible to his father’s persuasion.

Later on when the herbalist doctor has been called in to assist; the whole family, including Hlakahlothwane himself are highly disappointed – as they discover that this doctor has only managed to rob them of their money without any seeming assistance. At this juncture, one

might dare say that the whole family shares the blame of putting their trust in the herbalist doctor; while modern doctors who might diagnose the source of the seeming barrenness are available. Yet one notices that at least the agreement of consulting this doctor was through upfront persuasive endeavours – though Hlakahlothwane might have instigated some threats here and there to sustain his authority in the family. What is good about this apparent robbery by the herbal doctor is that it has functioned as a persuasive drive for Habai and his wife to seek modern medical assistance. As has been observed, it is this modern medical assistance that eventually made it possible for Mmaboitshwaro to conceive and finally be blessed with the birth of a baby boy.

Since this young couple has taken time before it is blessed with an offspring, it shocks but little for Habai to even lose his sense and comes near to rupturing one of his veins through uncontrollable joviality. Even as he has recuperated from this attack that nearly caused him a big problem; Habai still shows signs of being overly so merry that he hardly makes sense in his language – such that he even suggests numerous names he might give to his newly born son. Seemingly he has forgotten that the aspect of naming the first born child among the Basotho is dependent on its grandfather, or grandmother, if the grandfather is late. That is why Mmakgaeng reminds him of this obligation as he and Nkokoto drive home to deliver the good news to Hlakahlothwane. In the like manner, Hlakahlothwane also becomes merry in learning about the birth of the baby boy – the indication of which is in his naming and totemic chanting as shown at the end of the analysis of *Mpowane*. For that reason, such style of naming becomes highly significant – as the infant is seemingly pampered and wished to live up to the expectations of the persuasive chant that afforded its name. It then follows that this totemic referencing as some naming action is highly appreciated by all concerned; as it is also employed as a persuasive drive for them to accept the name and regard themselves as party to that naming. As a result therefore, all members of the family are in a formative way successfully persuaded into accepting the name and all that surrounds it.

In *Mpowane* the main issue appears to be that of traditionalism versus modernity; as Hlakahlothwane and Mmakgaeng belong to the former concept, while Habai and Mmaboitshwaro live and operate in accordance with modern days beliefs and attitudes. This line of demarcation therefore causes some conflicts between members of these opposing periods – as has been observed in this text. While for Hlakahlothwane and Mmakgaeng the solution towards rectifying the seeming problem of barrenness may be reached through traditional doctors' herbal solutions; for Habai and Mmaboitshwaro, including their friends, Nkokoto and his wife, the solution resides in the modern surgeries. Due to this conflict of ideas and approaches, it makes sense for Hlakahlothwane to use coercion for his children to

come to agreement with him – whereas, contrary to that, they believe in upfront persuasive interactions as steps towards the achievement of intended goal/s.

6.3 OBSERVATIONS IN CHAPTER 4

As was indicated in the first chapter, Chapter 4 encapsulates section 2, where the analyses of Mahalefele's *Bana ba khomo tsa batho* and Maboya's *Tsiketsing sa qomatsi* are dealt with.

6.3.1 *Bana ba khomo tsa batho*

In the drama text, *Bana ba khomo tsa batho* readers are confronted with a meeting that involves 'Malefilo and her son and daughter-in-law, Lefilo and 'Mamorongoe, to discuss the issues concerning the state of Lefilo's sister that has run away from her husband to seek refuge at her home of birth. As was illustrated at the beginning of this text analysis, 'Malefilo has called this meeting in which she acts as chairperson with an intent at persuading Lefilo and 'Mamorongoe to allow 'Mamohau to stay here at her birth home with her two children that she has taken home with her: Mohau and Mojabeng. Although 'Malefilo through verbal interaction attempts to entrench the position she takes by allowing 'Mamohau to sojourn with them here at her original home – Lefilo counter- indicates the problems they are about to experience in due course. In order for all to identify with him in his considerations, he points out that since 'Mamohau's children are children of people's cattle; their sojourning here would cause problems that he spells out, as seen at the beginning of the analysis of the text.

Yet for 'Malefilo, since she has already made her mind for 'Mamohau and her two children to live here, she pleads for them to be considered as her own children that might be treated as Lefilo's siblings. As Lefilo questions this suggestion further, the three characters come to an agreement that 'Mamohau should go away as she suggests; though for 'Malefilo she would rather leave Mojabeng with her so that the little girl might afford her some assistance in her daily chores. Resultantly 'Mamohau goes away with Mohau to seek a job somewhere in the low lands; as this present setting is in the maloti lands of Lesotho. Significantly, 'Mamohau's children are children of the people into whose family she has been married – as they produced marriage cattle for her. That is why Lefilo has successfully persuaded his mother never to consider the children as his siblings; for there would emerge some customary problems in due course.

As the drama unfolds, 'Mamohau and Mohau end up being employed by Khongoana of Mokoallong; for assisting him in the fields, especially with the reaping of the corn. On the other hand, Mohau renders his assistance by manning the cattle for Khongoana. In due course Khongoana persuades to pay Mohau with one young cow per year; and that is highly appreciated by both Mohau and his mother. Concerning 'Mamohau, Khongoana originally

makes a persuasive offer for buying her some clothes so that she may first of all feel at home and not regard herself as a renegade that is merely out here to work for the master. Ultimately, Khongoana proposes love to 'Mamohau by laying out his proposition and leave her with an ultimatum for her to either take it or leave. By employing this strategy, Khongoana is indirectly coercing her into accepting the proposal – for otherwise 'Mamohau would be faced with her status of being a renegade that has to once more traverse the lands in need of a new job – as she would most likely have to vacate Khongoana's home. It would seem that Khongoana's leaving 'Mamohau after the proposal is employed as a persuasive/coercive strategy for her to cogitate over the proposal. In this way, 'Mamohau is placed in a conducive position for employing a soliloquy for analyzing her situation and decide whether she would rather face exit or become the proposer's wife/mistress.

Finding herself in no position to refuse this offer that guarantees her enjoyable and peaceful life here at Khongoana's home; 'Mamohau leaves herself with no alternative but to accept the proposal in question. Resulting from this new status of 'Mamohau in Khongoana's home, a baby boy is born by 'Mamohau. As a sign of appreciation, Khongoana even names the infant after his own late father, Khomo that sustained the same name. In order to persuade 'Mamohau to regard herself as his wife and not just a mistress, Khongoana even promises her that all his cattle will bear the infants earmark as a sign that they will be his inheritance. Besides this, Khongoana makes other promises that guarantee 'Mamohau's position of semi-husband and –wife.

Eventually 'Mamohau regards herself as Khongoana's wife, as she performs and enjoys all the activities and rights that go with that status. But now trouble for her emerges as Lefilo and Mohau have been sent by Mosolotsoana's family to come and collect her for attending her husband's funeral. Since she now regards herself as no more belonging to Mosolotsoana's family – by virtue of the fact that she has even born Khongoana a son that is to inherit Khongoana's legacy. Though she initially refutes her late husband by wailing that she will never even wear the mourning cloth for the same man – Khongoana assures her that she will have to perform accordingly; as she is those people's wife towards whom some cattle have been offered. Ultimately Khongoana even puts it to her that he now orders her to go and, in addition, advises her to take enough clothing, as her stay at her marital home might be lengthy. Of course, though Khongoana starts by applying upfront persuasion with her, when he eventually orders her to go, he applies coercion – for he even informs her that she may not run around without performing the rites for her late husband; as he is the one that flattened her breast for her.

As might be expected, 'Mamohau eventually goes with Lefilo and Mohau, together with Khomo, since he is also 'ngwana oa khomo tsa batho,' as the title of the text stands. At her

marital home 'Mamohau finds people already expecting her arrival in order to perform the burial rites accordingly. Another important aspect that has to be brought into perspective here is that of bringing with her the young boy, Khomo; who is also treated and afforded the rites through which all members of this family go. In this way, the family of Mosolotsoana clearly understands that no matter what a married woman may do; the children that she might bear with whatever man belong to the family that produced some cattle for her. Indeed these are issues of tradition versus modernism – as, unlike in modernism, in tradition there is no such a thing as divorce. That is why an emphasis is even made that as long as the family that produced the cattle knows where the woman has run to, the children she bears while in that far away place might be collected and once at home be treated in the same way as those who were born in the cattle produced family.

6.3.2 *Tsiketsing sa qomatsi*

As has been shown already, *Tsiketsing sa qomatsi* is centered on the prevailing decadence experienced by the community of its namesake. It has been observed in the analysis that the people in Tsiketsingsaqomatsi are indulging themselves in some antisocial behaviour that eventually disgusts other characters and force them to run away from this situation. Even that as it may, those who run away in an effort to seek refuge somewhere else come back eventually, as they discover that such behaviour is almost all over.

Right at the inception of the drama, it is revealed that Radihlaba is on the run; as he explains to Mamello that people's behaviour here causes a lot of pain to someone's heart. Yet to other characters' surprise, he comes back on the third day of his departure – thus signifying the fact that antisocial behaviour is prevalent all over. As has been observed in the analysis, for a female person to get a job in this area is a difficult achievement; unless such a female is prepared to offer herself sexually to the high ranking officer/s at the job seeking place. It is for this matter that Mosidi takes it into her own hands to promise Mamello that she is going to teach her the aspects of 'bosadi' as a way towards versatile lifestyle. Further, Mosidi introduces Mamello to Kakatjhelana as a persuasive gesture for the first step towards ensuring her (Mamello) a position in the place at which Kakatjhelana is working. Furthermore, Mosidi not only promises, but actually takes Mamello to that place where Kakatjhelana and his friend, Qhobela hold high positions – and therefore infamously regarded as professionals in female job offerings.

Whereas one might have expected Mamello to easily obtain a job here, as promised by Mosidi, to her dismay, she finds out that it is not as easy as all that – for Qhobela suddenly pretends to be angry with Mosidi for entering his office without knocking. In addition, he accuses her of failure to introduce Mamello; yet he hardly gives her time to even respond to

his accusations. As if that is not enough, Kakatjhelana's trial at intervening is turned away by Qhobela, accusing his friend of colluding with Mosidi in their mission to teach Mamello their bad behaviour. As if his harshness and unreasonableness were not enough, Qhobela, through the same pretence of anger, expels all these other characters and instructs them to go and wait in Kakatjhelana's office until he might call Mamello – when he has listened to himself, he says.

Needless to say, this whole fracas displayed by Qhobela here is far away from upfront persuasive engagement. Rather, it may rightly be regarded as coercion, as Qhobela appears to hold a more senior position here at work than Kakatjhelana. In the light of that observation, one might rightly analyse his verbal interaction as mere display of vindictiveness calculated at driving his goal of displaying his powers for Mamello to see – in preparation for exploiting her and misusing her during job hunting period she is engaged in. Besides, Qhobela's expulsion of Kakatjhelana in the same bundle with Mamello and Mosidi is a clear display of how far his powers can go; as he even has the audacity to say that he might call Mamello when he has already listened to himself. Even this action might be analysed as some coercive intent to drive his goal of applying suspense for creating desperation over Mamello – so that when he eventually calls her in she might be ready to offer herself for the intended misuse he has in his mind. When Mamello has eventually gone into his office, Qhobela goes into Kakatjhelana's office and instructs Mosidi to go away, mentioning to her that he is still going to busy himself with Mamello. In this way Qhobela employs malice against his paramour, Mosidi, as some coercive attempt for her to be disgusted and hopefully turn herself to the condemned Kakatjhelana – as she and him share the same pain of being victimised and sent off in that fashion.

As might be expected, Kakatjhelana and Mosidi resultantly strike an agreement for forming some secret affair in retaliation to Qhobela's harsh treatment applied towards them. In the light of this affair formation, and her suspicion that Mamello has already struck some relationship with Qhobela, Mosidi expels the former from her home – disregarding the fact that she had offered such refuge to Mamello out of her own volition. It has been observed in the analysis that Qhobela keeps on promising to offer a job to Mamello – possibly to drive her towards a situation where through desperation she will willingly offer her services to him as he might demand. Since any postponement has to somehow come to an end; Qhobela finally applies upfront persuasion as he drives his goal of making her his other concubine. When Mamello has succumbed to his persuasive attempt by accepting his proposal; Qhobela further persuades her to accept his offer of organizing her some accommodation first – apparently as a guarantee that she will always be available for his demands for her services to him.

Now that Mamello has been accommodated at Mmadiatheng's place; where she has been introduced as a niece to Qhobela himself – to Mmadiatheng's surprise, Qhobela is exposed as a liar, as his arrival adds more to the love triangle analysed in this text. As if by some planning of a kind, all the characters in this drama text, except Mosidi, converge at Mmadiatheng's place for similar but different goals. Initially, Kakatjhelana arrives in fulfillment of his agreement with Mamello to meet here. In no time Radihlaba also arrives as Mmadiatheng's visitor; only to be followed hereafter by Qhobela, who has come to see either Mmadiatheng or Mamello, or even both – as they both share him as a man/boy friend; even though Mmadiatheng regards him as Mamello's maternal uncle. Mamello takes advantage of this situation to expose them for what they are, ridicule them for their antisocial behaviour, and finally correct them by persuading them to change their attitudes, behaviours and opinions – as has been analysed towards the end of this drama text.

Since all these characters accept their blames as exposed, and even accept the correction leveled to them by Mamello; one may not be wrong to conclude that the theme of this drama text is that of condemning the corruption prevailing in this period. It would appear that, though this text isolates Tsiketsingsaqomatsi as the centre of this prevailing corruption – this is a phenomenon that might be experienced in most, if not all, the African countries. It follows therefore that for Mamello to take it into her hands and expose, ridicule and correct these characters in the way she has done presupposes that this sickness can be uprooted. By so doing, our societies would be healed from this seeming scourge.

6.4 OBSERVATIONS IN CHAPTER 5

Chapter 5 comprised the analysis of Ramakau's *Ha le fahloe habeli* and Lesupi's *Leholimo la phetloa*.

6.4.1 *Ha le fahloe habeli*

In *Ha le fahloe habeli*, the issue dealt with is the tendency of some girls to run away from school and rush into the unplanned marriages that end up disappointing them; as the men they have run after disappoint them in various ways. As has been shown in the analysis of the same text, some village women who bear the notoriety of gallivanting with some rich miners have taken it into their hands to persuade/manipulate these school girls by enticing them into these marriages. To make it worse, these miners that are said to be rich, have not been to school, or alternatively, they have ended their education at the lower level. Resultantly, such marriages hardly last – for these miners are usually engaged more in gallivanting with some concubines at the expense of their wives.

In line with this common practice, two women in the names of 'Malerumo and 'Matšepe go out of their way to manipulate and or persuade one young school girl, Litšabako, to leave

schooling and elope with Mofammere. In order for Litšabako to be successfully persuaded into adopting the change that is targeted by the two women, 'Matšepe initially works at befriending the young girl. Once that has been achieved, she then applies her manipulation by showing the young girl the benefits of eloping with this Mofammere that has already expelled his first wife. It therefore astonishes but little that Senamele, Litšabako's father is, at the inception of the drama seen at Khabele's home – where he employs fury as coercive strategy for retrieving his daughter from Khabele's home, as Litšabako has already spent two days in this home after eloping with Mofammere. Throughout Senamele's verbal interaction with Khabele, there is never a moment of upfront persuasion applied by him with Khabele. To make it worse, he ends up attempting to burn down Khabele's house; the action which ultimately coerces Khabele into blowing out the match that Senamele has lit. As if this action of blowing out his match was part of his plans for driving his goal of retrieving Litšabako from this home, Senamele strikes Khabele on the head with his fighting stick.

As the analysis has indicated, Senamele manages to retrieve his daughter by applying these coercive means – for Litšabako finds herself forced by her father's behaviour to come out and accompany her father homeward bound. Spelling out his intentions in behaving as he has just done, Senamele spells it out that to school is where Litšabako is going. Indeed finally father and daughter arrive home after a lot of persuasive talk on the way to home. Whereas Senamele cautions his daughter of the danger she is jumping into; for the daughter, Mofammere's parents are already her own, as she even refers to them as "m'e le ntate." In that way, it becomes clear that Senamele's coercive means have not worked for his daughter to adopt any change envisaged by her father and mother. Indeed it becomes clear that coercive means hardly have any effect to induce some change of behaviour; be it formative, some form of reinforcement or conversion.

Not astonishingly therefore, Litšabako keeps on inviting the likes of 'Matšepe to manipulate her more on daily basis; where they entice her by the mention of the monies Mofammere is reputed to have. Were Litšabako not only a young girl of sixteen years of age, one would see no form of manipulation in 'Matšepe's persuasive means she applies for propelling her goal of winning the former to a situation where she finds herself once more eloping with Mofammere. But as the former is that young, with naivety and insensitivity, all the latter's persuasive efforts, upfront as they may seem, fall off as mere manipulations. It therefore not surprises one to see the young girl once more, out of her own volition, arrange for Mofammere to come and elope with her in the middle of the night. When ultimately Mofammere beats her up for nothing, and keeps on gallivanting with the likes of 'Malerumo and 'Matšepe, one stops short of blaming the young girl for her failure to hearken her parents' pieces of advice and considers her as the victim of manipulation and deceit.

Be that as it may, when eventually Litšabako gets tired of Mofammere's vindictiveness and other manipulations, one showers her with praises for her encouragement to retaliate and even tilts the scales by sitting on Mofammere until he pleads for mercy. As might be expected, hereafter Mofammere dares not beat or use any other means of victimization over Litšabako; thus proving that Mofammere has now lost that masculine power that he always employed against Litšabako.

Finally, Mofammere's cheating by gallivanting with 'Malerumo and 'Matšepe whenever their husbands have just gone back to the mines comes to an end. As might be anticipated all along, this moment marks the final straw for Litšabako to take it into her hands to cut the tethers of her so-called marital relations with Mofammere. When she takes with her Mofammere's monies and the savings books; with an aim of using them for paying for her school fees; it becomes clear that Litšabako has now reached the end of her endurance to bear any victimization in this marriage. It therefore not astonishes us to see her collecting all her belongings as she leaves Mofammere's home for good. No doubt the aim of the text's teaching is for the young school girls to be ware of the manipulators who are likely to derail them from their education, and drive them towards these unplanned and premature marriages that end up catastrophically for most girls who jump into them without thought. It is highly encouraging therefore that Litšabako tells herself that 'Ihlo ha le fahloe habeli,' which translates into 'Once beaten twice shy,' and 'Ke hlapetse letšeoaneng' as she swears never to repeat the same action.

6.4.2 *Leholimo la phetloa*

Lesupi's *Leholimo la phetloa* is the final selected drama text for this study. From the inception of the play, 'Mamoroesi is tormented by Morapeli, accusing her of the murder of her late husband, Mosiuoa. As it were, Morapeli bases his accusations on witchcraft – as he capitalises on the joke 'Mamoroesi once passed at her home, as Morapeli and his wife, 'Masechaba had paid them a visit. In this joke, it is revealed, 'Mamoroesi had responded to Mosiuoa's flatteringly saying that he was going to be accompanied by a young girl as he was making some preparations for going to Mokhotlong. It would appear that 'Mamoroesi also jokingly said that she would use 'tlalimothoana' against Mosiuoa and the girl in question. In the light of the foregoing information, it would appear that Morapeli, through deceitful means, has teamed up with the likes of Morena Mopeli, the village chief and Setloboko, his head advisor, against 'Mamoroesi. Not surprisingly therefore, Morapeli arrives at the chief's kraal and reports to Mopeli that he lays a case against 'Mamoroesi for murdering his brother, the late Mosiuoa, who apparently died in a car accident that took place some two weeks after the joke in question.

Without any shame, Morapeli even goes further to plead with the chief for allowing him to take Moroesi, 'Mamoroesi's small girl, away from her mother; feigning the reason that he removes her away so as to stop 'Mamoroesi from teaching her some witchcraft. As an indication that Mopeli and Setloboko are in concert with Morapeli in his manipulative actions against 'Mamoroesi, without even attempting to summon the accused, Mopeli instructs Setloboko to accompany Morapeli on his way to the retrieval of Moroesi from her mother. Indeed Setloboko and Morapeli arrive at their victim's home and inform her of their intention that has been blessed by Mopeli himself. It goes without saying that no properly thinking person would have expected something like this to happen to any mother and child – especially a widow that is still mourning the untimely death of her husband. But alas, the two conspirators hardly feel anything for their shocked and wailing victim of torture and manipulation. They actually take Moroesi away, even in the midst of her crying for being with her mother that is forced to remain alone in her small daughter's absence.

As if the coercive action of taking Moroesi away from her mother summarily was not enough, at the chief's kraal the following day, 'Mamoroesi is condemned and ridiculed by the chief himself – apparently forgetting that his paramount duty as chief is to protect, among others, widows and small children. Ultimately Mopeli and Setloboko find their victim guilty as charged; whereupon Mohau verbally interacts by indicating that Morapeli is culminating 'Mamoroesi, and he misuses the chief and his jury as shields that protect him as he continues slaughtering his victim. Resultantly the case is postponed to the following week. On this second sitting, once more 'Mamoroesi is found guilty as charged. But since Mohau had taken it into his hands to advise her to take the appeal, should she be found guilty by Mopeli's court; she takes the appeal towards the Hlotse local court. Indeed at this court all accusations leveled at the person of 'Mamoroesi are found to be mere fabrications, manipulations and coercive actions against a widow and her small child that are supposed to be protected.

It follows therefore that the chief and his conspirators lose their credibility as representatives of law and order in the village. But as for Morapeli, he is found to be a cruel and malicious individual who had bad intentions of consuming Mosiuoa's legacy illegally; that instead of protecting 'Mamoroesi against enemies he has turned himself into enemy number one by victimizing her with provocation. Further, the case ends with Morapeli being instructed to never put his foot at 'Mamoroesi's home; lest he invites jail for himself. As a testimony that he had no case besides his conspiracy with the chief and Setloboko, Morapeli even shies away from taking the appeal, even as the judge encourages him to do so.

Indeed Morapeli and his likes must have learned the hard way; for they seem to have thought that since she is a mere widow, 'Mamoroesi would not even think, never mind dare,

of taking the appeal when they manipulatively and coercively found her guilty as charged. Needless to say, this play has been used as some demonstration in which the Lesotho widows are tormented by the people who are supposed to protect them, once their husbands die. The children also suffer the same pain under their supposed relatives, be they orphans or otherwise.

6.5 CONCLUDING REMARKS

What is generally clearer about the pattern of persuasion in the drama texts of the literary periods identified in this study is that almost all characters employ persuasion to a certain extent in their persuasive attempts to change others' attitudes, behaviours, beliefs or opinions. Even those characters that emerge as coercers, manipulators, propagandists or otherwise, do use other forms of persuasion to achieve their intended goals.

REFERENCES

- Abrams, M.H. 1993. *A glossary of literary terms*. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace.
- Allen, M. & Preiss, R.W. (eds). 1998. *Persuasion: advances through meta-analysis*. New Jersey: Hampton Press. Inc.
- Bettinghaus, E.P. 1968. *Persuasive communication*. New York, Chicago: Holt, Reinehart and Winston Inc.
- Bibele*. 1961. Cape Town: Bible Society of South Africa.
- Bluem, A.W. (ed). 1971. *Persuasion: the theory and practice of manipulative communication*. Toronto: Saunders; Ontario: Don Mills.
- Bochhers T.A. 2001. *Persuasion in the media age*. Boston: McGraw-Hill
- Bohner, G. & Wanke, M. 2002. *Attitudes and attitude change*. East Sussex: Psychology Press Ltd.
- Cooper, M. & Nothstine, W.L. 1992. *Power persuasion: moving an ancient art into the media age*. Greenwood: Educational Vide Group.
- De Turck, M.A. 2002. Persuasive effects of product warning labels. In: Dillard, J.P. & Pfau, M. (eds). *The persuasion handbook: theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- De Wet, J.C. 1988. *The art of persuasive communication*. Cape Town; Welton and Johannesburg: Juta & Co Ltd.
- Dillard, J.P. 1990a. Primary and secondary goals in interpersonal influence. In: Cody, M.J. & McLaughlin, M.L. (eds). *Psychology of tactical communication*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Dillard, J.P. 1990b. A goal-drivel model of interpersonal influence. In: Dillard, J.P. (eds). *Seeking compliance: the production of interpersonal influence messages*. Scottsdale: Gorsuch Scarisbrick.
- Dillard, J.P. 1998. The role of affect in communication, biology, and social relationships. In: Anderson, P.A. & Guerrero, L.K. (eds). *Handbook of communication and emotion*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Dillard, J.P. 2004. The Goals-Plans-Action model of interpersonal influence. In: Seiter J.S. & Gass, R.H. (eds). *Perspectives on persuasion, social influence, and compliance gaining*. Boston; New York; San Francisco: Pearson Education, Inc.

- Dillard, J.P. & Marshall, L.J. 2003. Persuasion as a social skill. In: Greene, J.O. & Burleson, B.R. (eds). *Handbook of communication and social interaction skills*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Dillard, J.P. & Meijnders, A. (2002). Persuasion and the structure of effect. In: Dillard, J.P. & Pfau, M. (eds). *The persuasion handbook: theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Eagleton, T. 1996. *Literary theory*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Ebewo, P. 1997. *A handbook of literary and critical terms for African students*. Roma: NUL Publishing House.
- Finn, S.M.; Weich, H.M. & Rensburg, R.S. 1983. *Professional persuasion*. Durban: Butterworth Publishers (Pty) Ltd.
- Fowler, R. 1973. *A dictionary of modern literary terms*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Gass, R.H. & Seiter, J.S. 2004. *Persuasion, social influence, and compliance gaining*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon/Longman.
- Hlalele, B. 2005. *Sethantšo sa Sesotho*. Maseru: Longman Lesotho.
- Hosman, L. A. 2002. Language and persuasion. In: Dillard, J.P. & Pfau, M. (eds). *The persuasion handbook: theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Jefferson, A. & Robey, D. 1986. *Modern literary theory*. London: Jefferson and Robey.
- Johnston, D.D. 1994. *The art and science of persuasion*. Madison: William C. Brown.
- Kassan L. D. 1999. *Second opinion: sixty psychotherapy patients evaluate their therapists*. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson Press.
- Larson, C.U. 1995. *Persuasion, reception and responsibility*. Belmont, Albany: Wordsworth Publishers.
- Lesupi, M. 2005. *Leholimo la phetloa*. Maseru: Longman Lesotho.
- Mabille, A. & Dieterlen, H. 1985. *Sesuto-English Dictionary*. Morija: Morija Sesuto Book Depot.
- Maboya, P.S. 1993. *Tsiketsing sa qomatsi*. Cape Town: Vivlia Publishers and Booksellers.
- Mahalefele, M. 1990. *Bana ba khomo tsa batho*. Maseru: Macmillan Lesotho.
- Masiea, R. J. R. 1988. *Lephoma-ntlo*. Pietermaritzburg: Shuter & Shooter.

- Matšela, F.Z.A. & Moletsane, R.I.M. 1999. *Maele a Sesotho le mekhoha ea ho a ruta*. Roma: NUL Publishing House.
- Metts, S. & Grohskopf, E. 2003. Impression management: goals, strategies, and skills. In: Greene, J.O. & Burleson, B.R. (eds). *Handbook of communication and social interaction skills*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Mokitimi, M. 1997. *The voice of the people: proverbs of the Basotho*. Pretoria: Unisa Press; Acra: Asempa Publishers; Ibadan: Daystar Press; Lewisten: Edwin Mellen Press.
- Mokoena, V.K. 1988. *Mpowane*. Pretoria: J L Van Schaik.
- Mongeau, P.A. 2000. Another look at fear-arousing persuasive appeals. In: Allen, M. & Preiss, R.W. (eds). *Persuasion: advances through meta-analysis*. Cresskill: Hampton.
- Mosuhli, M. 1989. *Le ka nketsang?* Johannesburg: Educum Publishers.
- Mulholland, J. 1984. *Handbook of persuasive tactics*. Routledge: New York.
- Nabi, R.L. 2002. Discrete emotions and persuasion. In: Dillard, J.P. & Pfau, M. (eds). *The persuasion handbook: theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- O'Donnell, V. & Kable, J. 1992. *Persuasion: an interactive-dependency approach*. New York: Random House.
- O'Keefe, D.J. 1990. *Persuasion: theory and research*. Newbury Park, London, New Delhi: SAGE Publications.
- O'Keefe, D.J. 2002a. *Persuasion: theory and research*. London: SAGE Publishers.
- O'Keefe, D.J. 2002b. Guilt as a mechanism of persuasion. In: Dillard, J.P. & Pfau, M. (eds). *The persuasion handbook: theory and practice*. Thousand oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Perloff, R.M. 2003. *the dynamics of persuasion*. New Jersey, London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Pretorius, W.J. 1989. *Aspects of Northern Sotho poetry*. Pretoria: Via Afrika.
- Ramakau, N. 2004. *Ha le fahloe habeli*. Maseru: Longman Lesotho.
- Reardon, K.K. 1991. *Persuasion in practice*. Newbury Park, London, New Delhi: SAGE Publications.
- Salovey, P. & Schneider, T. R. 2002. Message framing in the prevention and early detection of illness. In: Dillard, J.P. & Pfau, M. (eds.). *The persuasion handbook: theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

- Seiter, J.S. & Gass, R.H. (eds.). 2005. *Perspectives on persuasion, social influence, and compliance gaining*. Boston: Pearson A& B.
- Sekese, A. 1981. *Mekhoa le maele a Basotho*. Morija: Morija Sesuto Book Deoit.
- Simons, H.W. 2001. *Persuasion in society*. Boston, New York, San Francisco, Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Sopory, P. & Dillard, J. P. 2002. Figurative language and persuasion. In: Dillard, J.P. & Pfau, M. (eds). *The persuasion handbook: theory and practice*. Thousand oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Styan, J.L. 2000. *Drama: a guide to the study of plays*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Van der Poll, J.P.D. 1981. *Studies in Sesotho Drama*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Stellenbosch: University of Stellenbosch.
- Wellek, R. & Warren, A. 1963. *Theory of literature*. London: Penguin Group.
- Wilson, S.R. 2002. *Seeking and resisting compliance: why people say what they do when trying to influence others*. Thousand oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Wilson, S.R. & Sabee. C.M. 2003. Explicating communicative competence as a theoretical term. In: Greene, J.O. & Burlison, B.R. (eds.). *Handbook of communication and social interaction skills*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Witte, K. 1993. Message and conceptual confounds in fear appeals: the role of threat, fear and efficacy. *Southern Communication Journal*. 58. 147-155.
- Witte, K. & Allen, M. 2000. A meta-analysis of fear appeals: implications for effective public health campaigns. *Health Education and Behaviour*. 27:591-615.