

## Hegemony and domination in South African drama in the Mid-20<sup>th</sup> Century: 1940-1960

*Owen Seda<sup>1</sup> and Mziwoxolo Sirayi<sup>2</sup>*

### **Abstract**

*Studies in the evolution and development of post-colonial African cultural and dramatic forms have provided a range of interesting insights into the permutations of hybridization, accommodation and resistance that have characterised African drama since the advent of colonialism. As numerous and varied as these insights have been, most of them fall within the ambits of post-colonial theory in that they interrogate some of the ways by which African drama has sought to challenge or to accommodate the dominant discourses of Western drama and theatre. This paper extends existing discourses of post-colonial African theatre, combining these with the theory of hegemony in order to demonstrate the unexplored intersections between African language drama, European language drama and the racially and culturally divisive policies of apartheid South Africa during the mid-20<sup>th</sup> Century. It analyses these developments as the continuation of a tripartite struggle for hegemony and domination between intrusive colonialist discourses, apartheid racial and cultural policies and the resilience of African dramatic forms. The central argument of the paper is that the continued existence of African language drama at the periphery of South African drama scholarship today is a direct result of a combination of the work of white liberal institutions and the consolidation of apartheid racial and cultural policies after 1948.*

**Key words:** South African theatre, contemporary performance, cultural discourse, tutelage, hegemony, domination, resistance, hybridity

---

<sup>1</sup> Senior Lecturer, Faculty of the Arts, Tshwane University of Technology, Republic of South Africa. -mail: [sedao@tut.ac.za](mailto:sedao@tut.ac.za)

<sup>2</sup> Professor, Faculty of Arts, Tshwane University of Technology, Republic of South Africa. E-mail: [serayim@tut.ac.za](mailto:serayim@tut.ac.za)

## Introduction

Of all the crimes of colonialism, there is no worse than the attempt to make us believe we had no indigenous culture of our own, or that what we did have was worthless - something we should be ashamed of rather than a source of pride.

—Julius Nyerere

Julius Nyerere's comment on Africa's relationship with the West since the advent of the colonial encounter is reflective of the kind of thinking that has engendered an impressive body of writing in the humanities. This is a body of writing which ranges from drama, theatre and literature and their attendant criticisms, to philosophy and numerous other branches of the social sciences. As Mudimbe (1988) observes, the construction of 'Otherness' in Western scholarship has been an enterprise in the construction of "primitive" and "savage" Africa and the rest of the world (p. 20). Mudimbe goes on to say that haunted by their denigrated past, African elites were constantly eager to abandon their past in order to adopt what was foreign (Western) because they considered it to be more 'modern' and 'civilized'. As a result, African intellectuals (have) continued to define their world and their world view in terms of Western epistemological standards.

Mudimbe makes yet another significant observation when he points out that it was the West's aggressive aspiration to establish its epistemological power and hegemony as a means to achieve social, political and cultural control of Africa and other parts of the world, which resulted in the politics and discourses of 'Otherness' and ideologies of alterity. These were later depicted in such movements as negritude, the Back to Africa, black consciousness, and *ubuntu* among others in Africa and other parts of the world occupied by the black African Diasporas. At a political level, these movements included Mobutu's "authenticité", Nkrumah's "consciencism", Moi's "nyayoism", Nyerere's "ujamaa" and Kaunda's "humanism". This is of course not to deny the fact that in some instances these various movements became no more than a convenient and cynical ploy in the hands of Africa's founding fathers through which they sought to hold political office in perpetuity and to obfuscate the patent pitfalls and failures of the post-colonial state.

In light of the above, this article attempts to trace the evolution, history and development of contemporary written African drama in South Africa to show how this drama was not only influenced by colonial and apartheid hegemonies, but also how it attempted to contest and to challenge these influences. The paper traces the forces of hegemony and domination that led to the relegation of Black South African drama to the periphery of South African cultural discourse after 1948, as well the contestation that led to its resilience.

The paper focuses on the history of contemporary South African drama written in African languages. It posits that a close analysis of the evolution and development of contemporary written drama in South Africa negates simplistic readings of cultural encounters, domination and annihilation. Rather, it argues for a more nuanced reading, which acknowledges the magnitude of the range of forces working against the resilient efforts of African drama to contest and to resist the hegemonic domination of apartheid influences, and how this drama was eventually pushed to the periphery of studies of South African drama written in African languages after 1948. We concur with Bhekizizwe Peterson's observation that at the onset of the colonial encounter in South Africa, "The political relationship between missions and their African congregations was consequently not univocal but, at the best of times, was shot through with complex instances of contestation" (Peterson 2000: 65). We also agree with his observations that African fluency in English (did) not necessarily equate to an identity crisis or cultural betrayal and that "the ability of

English to cohere into monologic linguistic registers predestined to signify meanings inherently European” (ibid: p. 65) (was) often overestimated. This is particularly true when this issue is examined within the context of the subsequent decision by South Africa’s liberation movements to adopt English as a form of resistance to the balkanizing imperative of Bantustan compartmentalisations of Black people on the basis of language and ethnicity. English was subsequently adopted and exalted as a vehicle of expression through which black people could achieve a sense of pan-ethnic unity. The paper is not so much about the content of the plays, but the language politics and the overarching frameworks governing the circumstances of the production of these plays.

### **Struggles for hegemony and domination in early South African drama**

In spite of considerable outputs in African language drama in the period between 1940 and 1960, the apparent marginalisation of Black South African drama written in African languages during period in question and beyond, is indicative of what Marc Stoddart (2007) refers to as the intersection between ideology, hegemony and discourse. With the onset of the colonialism, the English language gradually acquired a dominant status among coloniser and colonised alike as the language of educational instruction, commerce and industrial production. Ideology, hegemony and discourse often act together to determine the social production of knowledge and to perpetuate inequitable relations of power (Stoddart 2007). Stoddart also observes that throughout history, the consent of society to systematic inequity and oppressive social forms of production has always been secured through the dissemination of knowledge.

Sirayi (2012) argues that although South Africa witnessed tremendous outputs in African language drama in the 1940’s, 50’s and 60’s such as Franz’s *Maaberone* (1940), Matlala’s *Tshukudu* (1941), Mocoancoeng’s *Tseleng ya Bophelo* (1947), and Khaketla’s *Moshoeshe le baruti* (1947)\*, these plays largely remained on the periphery of South Africa’s dramatic *oeuvre*. They remained marginal and localised in that even though they appealed to large African language speaking and reading populations, they were written, published and performed at local mission stations and not actively propagated to the much wider South African reading public. Except for Benedict W. Vilakazi’s (1945) PhD thesis in oral and written literature in South Africa’s Nguni languages, drama that was published and produced at mission stations was hardly ever the focus or subject of widespread or serious academic research. Rather, what seems to have gained prominence and caught the attention of researchers and academics was the works in English produced by African mission schools, and later, university-educated graduates who collaborated with white liberals in the artistically hyperactive urban areas, especially in Johannesburg and on the Rand. As Peterson (2000) observes, after all these were periods during which Africans who were converting to Christianity were seduced by the social power of English, especially within the context where white missionaries were only interested in indigenous orthographies to the extent that they could be used to facilitate the Christianizing mission and the preservation of ostensibly pristine African cultures (p. 67).

A case in point was the work of Es’kia Mphahlele who, as Kavanagh (1985) describes, became a schoolmaster at Orlando High School in Soweto in 1945, where he introduced drama with the encouragement of Norah Taylor (who later became the director of the African Music and Drama Association AMDA, the drama school of the Union of South African Artists). Kavanagh (1985) further outlines how, as part of the power and hegemony of the discourses of European language drama, Mphahlele was instrumental in forming the Syndicate of African Artists “in order

to bring serious music and arts to the people who [at that time] were not allowed to go to white theatres or concert halls” (1985: 47). It was in keeping with the power and hegemony of the discourses of English language drama that Mphahlele’s Syndicate performed Oscar Wilde’s *Lady Windermere’s Fan* first written in 1893, as an English country domestic comedy, various scenes from Shakespeare as well as adaptations from Charles Dickens to the total exclusion of African language plays such as some of the ones cited above, whose themes would have probably found much greater resonance with the majority of South African Blacks at the time.

It can be argued that, as part of the educated African elite, Mphahlele was more committed to the development and propagation of English language drama rather than African language plays written and published at that time. The cultural work of Mphahlele and others is an example of what Masolo viewed as the case of the African intellectual “pull[ing] away from the masses, [having been rendered] victim as well as agent of his own alienation” (1994: 183). Following Mudimbe (1988) we argue that Mphahlele may be viewed as a symbol of early African elitism because, having internalized Eurocentric discourses of colonialism, African elites were haunted by their denigrated past and were constantly eager to abandon their past in order to adopt what is foreign (Western) which they considered to be ‘modern’ and ‘civilized’. Although some earlier writers of African drama such as Herbert Dhlomo were quoted by the print press at that time expressing an awareness for “the power and beauty of our mother tongue” (1944), they too were skeptical about the use of African languages in literature, being of the view that such languages were anachronistic as a result of the way their social standing had been systematically denigrated by the colonialists and their missionary agents. That notwithstanding, there is no doubt that these early writers were also aware of the post-colonial writer’s capacity to appropriate European languages and adapt them into “vehicles or receptacles for our poetic images, depicted as we see and conceive [them]” (Vilakazi 1938: 7-8). However, in this paper we argue that by encouraging the adoption of the English language and its stylistic qualities and genres, these writers became unwitting accomplices in the historical marginalisation of African language drama, in spite of some of their best intentions.

One of the prominent centres for the propagation of Eurocentric dramatic outputs involving collaborative efforts between educated African elites and their white liberal counterparts during this period was the Bantu Men’s Social Centre which was established in 1924. The Bantu Men’s Social Centre was located in the city of Johannesburg. David Coplan (1985) writes that one of the main purposes of the establishment of the Bantu Men’s Social Centre was to forestall any potential alliances, political or otherwise, between the educated African middle class and the peasant and working classes. White liberals behind the establishment of the Bantu Men’s Social Centre evidently proceeded from a combination of Marxian and the Frankfurt School’s theories of culture where social power could be seen to operate through the cultural realm of society. It was envisaged that culture and entertainment could serve as the principal means by which white liberals could easily co-opt the educated African middle class into adopting a less militant approach to the racial and political inequities of apartheid, eventually leading to reform rather than to violent revolution. That way, the harshness and injustices of segregation could be softened while simultaneously the African middle class was convinced that advancement could come through co-option and gradual Westernization (Coplan 1985).

The efforts of white liberals at the Bantu Men’s Social Centre may also be read and understood against Antonio Gramsci’s (1971) concept of hegemony where social systems are said to work through commonsensical and mundane activities such as those connected with work, school, the family, the church and a variety of other cultural activities in order to acquire and secure

the consent of the dominated. It was through the propagation of such hegemonic cultural activities directed by white liberals at the Bantu Men's Social Centre that co-option and consent were used in order to integrate the Blacks into an inherently unjust social network of oppressive and subordinating discourses. Perhaps the close association between Es'kia Mphahlele and his mentor Norah Taylor also serves as an example of the sort of tutelage which testifies to the operation of Gramscian hegemonic strategies of co-option and subordination in the systematic marginalisation of drama in African languages in South Africa during in the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. For instance Norah Taylor believed in English as "the language of the world, indeed the most important language in the world, [she called] it the language of the sky and the sea quite apart from the land" (cited in Sirayi 2012: 107). Norah Taylor's efforts to inculcate the superiority of the English language among Black South Africans were supported by other teachers of English speech and drama such as Herbert and Finney (*Rand Daily Mail, The Star, The Natal Mercury*, cited in Sirayi 2012).

Es'kia Mphahlele became one of the greatest luminaries of African drama at that time. However, even by his own admission, Mphahlele was hostile to the use of African languages in his writings and demonstrated his bias in favour of the English language when he wrote that:

A personal experience at this point may throw some light on some aspect of English teaching. Those of us who learned English before the new order set in were taught by dedicated teachers in mission institutions. That dedication and the open learning environment we enjoyed served to inspire us to read widely and expose ourselves to the ring of words of good literature brought to our sensibilities [...] English was the functional study without which we could not enter other thoroughfares of learning i.e. the other disciplines. We needed this key to education, oh how desperately we needed and wanted it (1984: 101).

Notwithstanding the self-evident efforts by some prominent educated African elites such as Es'kia Mphahlele's Syndicate of African Artists and others at the Bantu Men's Social Centre to be co-opted into the use of the European language and its attendant dramatic traditions and discourses, there is evidence of a concerted effort by writers of African languages drama not to be pushed into oblivion. Drama in African languages did not relent and succumb to the English language imperative. On the contrary, the 1950's and 60's witnessed a considerable surge and revival in the production of plays written in African languages. This was fuelled in part by the desire by African playwrights to foreground Africanist themes through drama as well as a demand by publishers to produce African language drama for the education sector. Sirayi (2012) states that some of these plays included Kgatle's *Se weleng dilo godimo* (1952), Mofokeng's *Senkantana* (1952), Segwe's *Sebabetsane* (1957), Jolobe's *Amathunzi obomi* (1957), Mmango's *uDike Nocikizwa* (1958), Makawala's *Kgasane* (1958), Zondi's *Ukufa kukaShaka* (1960), Baloyi's *Xaka* (1960), Maumela's *Tshililo* (1961), Mathiva's *Mabalanganye* (1961), Moshapela's *Lieepeepe* (1963), Ngani's *Umkhonto kaTshiwo* (1964), Lesoro's *Tau ya ha Zulu* (1964) and Marivate's *Xilovekelo* (1965)\*.

While the above list is by no means exhaustive, it demonstrates the resilience on the part of South African drama written in African languages; African drama was not to be easily obliterated by the English language imperative and the prestige and propagation that came with it. However, despite its evident proliferation in the mid-20<sup>th</sup> Century, drama in African languages was neither studied nor included in the university curriculum of South African drama programmes. Apartheid language policies and the balkanization of black South African people according ethnicity ensured that drama written in African languages was never a serious subject of research or academic

enquiry. This exclusion testifies to the manner by which ideology is a function of discourse where language can be mobilized to reinforce systems of social power (Hunt and Purvis 1993).

While drama in African languages was relegated to the mission-run school system, Europhone drama written in English continued to occupy, and to consolidate its hegemonic position in the urban centres of South Africa such as Johannesburg and in the university system. As Kavanagh (1985) observes, European drama was propagated through the multi-racial and commercialised activities of organizations such as Mphahlele's Syndicate of African Artists, Ian Bernardt's Dramateers and the Bareti Players whose first production was William Shakespeare's *Comedy of Errors*. It was also during the same period that Athol Fugard partnered with Lewis Nkosi, Nat Nakasa and Bloke Modisane to produce *No Good Friday* in 1958. The hegemonic propagation of Euro-centric discursive traditions in South African drama was also complemented, in the black townships of South Africa, by the efforts of Finney, who organized an African drama festival in Soweto that was meant to promote and to encourage English drama among African school pupils, including in those instances where the plays so produced were drawn from African oral traditions and were presented to African school audiences.

Between 1952 and 1953 the Union of South African Artists, in collaboration with AMDA, produced a number of plays in English; among those were *King Kong*, *Sikalo*, *Sponono*, *Back in your own Backyard*, *Emperor Jones* and *King of the Dark Chamber*. The association between AMDA and the Union of South African Artists led to the emergence of a theatre workshop and drama school in Johannesburg, which was aimed at the advancement of Africans (Kavanagh, 1985). These developments also led to the establishment of the Rehearsal Room at Dorkay House in 1961 with Athol Fugard's *The Blood Knot* becoming the Rehearsal Room's first production. As Kavanagh (1985) observes, Dorkay House located in Johannesburg became a venue for a small group of African elites and white liberals who were committed to the development of 'prestigious African drama' which meant African drama built around European models and performed in the English language for a small group of middle class audiences. Among popular productions produced at Dorkay House were plays by Athol Fugard and Gibson Kente.

So pervasive was the threat posed by the hegemonic discourses of English language drama as propagated by the Union of South African Artists that within the context of the historical political and cultural rivalry between Afrikaans speaking and English speaking white South Africa, the Afrikaner Nationalist government began to view the collaboration between Africans and English speaking whites as a potential threat to Afrikaner culture. Kavanagh (1985) observes that it was also partly as a result of this that the Afrikaner Nationalist government reacted by promulgating the Native Laws Amendment Act (1952), the Native Urban Areas Act (1955) the Publications and Entertainment Act, and the Group Areas Act (1963), all of which were meant to enforce the separation of races more stringently. However, mission produced African language drama, even if it involved inter-racial collaboration, was never at issue. Viewed against Antonio Gramsci's theory of hegemony, these laws were used as a coercive mechanism designed to achieve social power for the apartheid state. These were more overtly coercive instruments which contrasted with the strategies used by Anglophone white liberals who used co-option and common-sense acceptance of hegemonic social values espoused and propagated by the ruling elites. The series of laws enacted by the Afrikaner Nationalist government achieved the effect of constraining and inhibiting the ability of Whites and Blacks to associate or collaborate outside working hours or socially regulated working relationships. These laws also banned Black audiences from attending public performances in designated white areas and Black performers from presenting performances to mixed audiences.

Meanwhile, the promulgation of the Native Laws Amendment Act, the Native Urban Areas Act, the Publications and Entertainment Act and the Group Areas Act by the apartheid state is indicative of the different approaches that were adopted by white hegemonic interests in safeguarding their cultural turf on the South African dramatic landscape. Whereas English speaking white hegemonic interests sought to achieve domination through persuasive consent, Afrikaner nationalists were more inclined to achieve control through coercive state apparatuses. While the propagation of English language drama among Black elites was designed to achieve social power through the cultural realm of society, the laws of the apartheid state were more coercive.

The almost single-minded focus on the propagation and development of English language drama by middle class elites to the near total exclusion of South African drama written in African languages (save for mission produced drama) led to fragmentation in the development of South African drama in the period between 1950 and 1960. Although African language drama developed among mission educated African writers, this drama went largely unnoticed by the white liberals and their Black middle class counterparts who operated from the metropolitan centres of South Africa. Both AMDA and the Union of South African Artists never included drama written in African languages in their programmes. Neither were studies in African language drama included in South African university drama programmes.

Yet the promulgation of harsher apartheid laws designed to enforce more stringent racial and cultural separation between 1952 and 1963 played a part, albeit an ironic one, in the struggle against the hegemony and domination of English drama in South African theatre between 1940 and 1960. This is because as the apartheid laws rendered it more difficult for the different races to collaborate, the Africans began to work more independently and realised that they had been exploited by their white liberal partners (Kavanagh 1985, Orkin 1991). Notwithstanding their continued preference for English language drama, the forced separation brought about by the new apartheid laws made it possible for Black artists to begin to work more independently and to rely on their own initiative to produce increasingly syncretic forms of drama.

The preference for English as the medium of dramatic communication undermined drama written in African languages during the period under analysis. Politically, there was a deliberate bias against the provenance of African languages as a tool of liberation. For instance, not only did Es'kia Mphahlele, who was a notable academic and writer of the time, routinely disparage African languages, he also argued that the English language was a unifying force against oppression, and that it was good for nation building (cited in Ngugi 1987). Through its newsletter *Abantu/Batho* the African National Congress (ANC) also argued that African languages could easily become a tool of division whose potential to mobilise the people could not be exploited without placing the central political struggle at risk. The ANC, a supposedly broad-based liberation movement also adopted a quasi-elitist approach to language use during the anti-apartheid struggle. This is corroborated by ben-Jochannan (1986) who also levels a charge of linguistic elitism at the African National Congress when he says that in the ANC during the 1950's if one could not speak English one was considered to be a nobody and, in his view, this meant the majority of black South Africans.

By the 1960's the hegemonic control and domination of South African drama by the English language was subsequently consolidated by the establishment of a considerable number of university drama departments in South Africa. From an initial figure of only four drama departments, the total number of departments of drama had risen to nine by the mid-1960's (Sirayi 2012). In 1969 the apartheid state became involved in cultural research through the establishment

of the Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC). This was an organisation that was meant to promote and support research in the Humanities and culture in South Africa (Hauptfleisch 1997). However, in spite of their considerable contribution to cultural and drama research, none of the nine drama departments in existence in South Africa by the mid 1960's, including the Human Sciences Research Council, supported research on indigenous forms of drama or on South African drama written in African languages, although the latter's publication and production was burgeoning significantly. This neglect contributed to the systemic marginalisation of South African drama written in African languages and cultural expression; this is still characteristic of South African drama studies today.

### Conclusion

This paper has attempted to demonstrate the interplay between hegemony and domination in South African drama between 1940 and 1960. The two concepts have been examined in so far as they relate to the systemic marginalisation of South African drama written in African languages sometimes intentionally and sometimes unwittingly during the period under focus.

While there is demonstrable evidence of considerable dramatic outputs written in a myriad of indigenous South African languages in the period between 1940 and 1960, there is no doubt that this drama was relegated to the periphery of mainstream drama studies and practice perhaps not least because, as Peterson avers, African languages may have been viewed by some of their potential users as languages that were "ossified in the service of a primordial racial identity" (2000: 71). We have therefore argued that having realised the potential for African language writing to be harnessed into the nefarious colonial project, the decision by some of the prominent writers of that time to write in the language of the colonialists did in fact contribute, albeit unwittingly, to the marginalisation of African writing during the 50s and 60s, given the privileged position English enjoyed as the language of conquest. The paper has also argued that the marginalisation of writing in African languages may therefore be viewed as having resulted from the latter's struggle against the hegemonic and dominant forces within the racialised cultural politics of South Africa.

Because of the residual effects of this long history of cultural hegemony and domination in the discourses of South African cultural production, South African drama written in African languages is still engaged in on-going struggles to re-position itself within the mainstream of contemporary South African cultural practices and academic inquiry. Despite the numerous plays published and produced in African languages since the apartheid years as demonstrated above, and the syncretic influence that indigenous African performance forms have exerted on contemporary South African theatre, African language plays and indigenous African performance forms are still invisible in the mainstream academic enquiry and the curriculum of South African universities, more than two decades after the demise of apartheid.

*\*The dates in brackets for all the plays cited here indicate the year when the plays were written and not necessarily the date of publication as indicated in the reference list.*

### References

- Baloyi S.J. (1958). *Xaka*. Johannesburg: Afrikaanse Pers Booksellers.  
 Balme, C. (1999). *Decolonizing the Stage: Theatrical Syncretism and the Post-colonial Stage*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.



- ben-Jochannan, Y. (1986). The Nile valley civilization and the spread of African culture. Retrieved November 27, 2014 from <http://www.google.com1986>.
- Chinyowa, K. (1994). *Innovation in Shona Written Drama*. MPhil Thesis, University of Zimbabwe, (Unpublished).
- Chivandikwa, N. (2010). Ndenglishing & shonglishing the stage: reconceptualising and reinterpreting bilingualism in Zimbabwean theatre. In K. C. Monaka, O. Seda, S. E. Ellece & J. McAllister (eds) *Mapping Africa in the English Speaking World: Issues in Language & Literature*, (105-116). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishers.
- Coplan, D. (1985). *In Township Tonight! South Africa's Black City Music and Theatre* Johannesburg: Ravan Press.
- Crow, B and Banfield, C. (1996). *Introduction to Post-colonial Theatre*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dhlomo, H.I.E. (1944). *Ilanga lase Natal*. Natal, April 8.
- Fleishmann, M (1989). Workshop theatre as oppositional form. Paper presented at an international conference on *Theatre & Politics in South Africa*, Bad Boll, Germany 13 December.
- Franz G.H. (1971). *Maaberone*. Cape Town: Via Afrika.
- Fugard A. (1993) *The Townships Plays*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci* Translated by J. A. Buttigieg. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Gunner, L (1994) (ed.). *Politics and Performance: Theatre, Poetry & Song in Southern Africa* Johannesburg: Wits University Press.
- Hauptfleisch, T. (1997) *Theatre & Society in South Africa: Reflections through a Fractured Mirror*. Johannesburg: Van Schaik.
- Hiddleston, J. (2009). *Understanding Postcolonialism*. Stocksfield London: Acumen Books.
- Horn, A. (1986). South African theatre: ideology and rebellion. *Research in African Literatures* 17(2): 211-233.
- Hunt, A. and T. Purvis. (1993). Discourse, ideology, discourse, ideology, discourse, ideology ... *British Journal of Sociology*, 44: 473-499.
- Jolobe J.R. (1974). *Amathunzi Obomi*. Johannesburg: Educum.
- Kaarsholm, P. (1994). Mental colonization or catharsis? Theatre, democracy and cultural struggle from Rhodesia to Zimbabwe. In L. Gunner (ed.), *Politics & Performance: Theatre, Poetry & Song in Southern Africa* (225-251). Johannesburg: Wits University Press.
- Kavanagh, R.M. (1985). *Theatre and Cultural Struggle in South Africa*. London: Zed Books.
- Kgatle, I.P. (1951). *Se Weleng Dilo Godimo*. Johannesburg: Educum.
- Khaketla, B.M. (1954.) *Moshoeshoe le Baruti*. Basutoland: Morija Sesuto Book Depot.
- Kerr, D. (1995). *African Popular Theatre*. London: James Currey & Heinemann.
- Lesoro, A.S. (1964). *Tau ya ha Zulu*. Johannesburg: Bona Press.
- Marivate, C. (1968). *Jim Xilovokelo, hi Cornelius Marivate*. Johannesburg: Van Schaik.
- Masolo, D. (1994). *African Philosophy in Search of Identity*. Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press & Edinburgh University Press.
- Matlala, E. (1980). *Tsukudu*. Johannesburg: Juta.
- Maumela, F.N. (1973). *Tshililo*. Johannesburg, Van Schaik.
- Mathiva, M.E.R. (1961). *Mabalanganye*. Johannesburg: APB Publishers.
- Mbughuni, L.A. (1974). *The Cultural Policy of the Republic of Tanzania*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Mmango, A.M. (1982). *Udike noCikizwa*. Johannesburg: Educum.

- Mocoancoeng, J.G. (1979). *Tseleng Ya Bophelo: Le Dithothokiso Tse Ntjha*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.
- Mofokeng, S.M. (1952). *Senkatana*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.
- Mphahlele, E. (1984). Prometheus in chains: The fate of English in South Africa. *English Academy Review*, 2, 89-104.
- Mudimbe, V.Y. (1988). *The Invention of Africa*. Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Ngani, M.A.P. (1983). *Umkhonto kaTshiwo*. Johannesburg: Educum.
- Obafemi, O. (1994). Identity and social contexts of cultural transfer in Black drama. In E. Breitingner (ed.), *Theatre & Performance in Africa*. (30-44). Bayreuth: Bayreuth African Studies.
- Okgabue, O. (2009). *Culture and Identity in African and Caribbean Theatre* London: Adonis & Abbey.
- Olaniyan, T. (1995). *Scars of Conquest: Masks of Resistance: The Invention of Cultural Identities in African, African-American and Caribbean Drama*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Orkin, M. (1991). *Drama and the South African State*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Peters, J.S. (1995). Intercultural performance, theatre anthropology and the imperialist critique: Identities, inheritances and neo-orthodoxies. In J.E. Gainor (ed.), *Imperialism and Theatre: Essays on World Theatre, Drama & Performance*. (199-213). London & New York: Routledge.
- Peterson, B. (2000). *Monarchs, Missionaries and African Intellectuals: African Theatre and the Unmaking of Colonial Marginality*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.
- Rotimi, O. (1974). Interview with Ola Rotimi. In B. Lindfors (ed.), *Dem Say: Interviews with Eight Nigerian Writers*. (57-68). Austin Texas: African and Afro-American Studies Research Centre.
- Seda, O. and M. Sirayi. (2015). Intrusive hegemonies and localised identities in early South African drama and theatre: 1880-1930. *SAJAL: The South African Journal of Language & Literature* 35(1), 131-137.
- Segwe, F.M. (1951). *Sebabetsane*. Johannesburg: Educum.
- Sirayi, M. (2012). *South African Drama and Theatre from Pre-colonial Times to the 1990's: an Alternative Reading*. Bloomington: Xlibris.
- Stoddart M. (2007). Ideology, hegemony, discourse: A critical review of theories of knowledge and power. *Social Thought and Research* 28, 191-225.
- Vilakazi B.W. (1938). The conception and development of poetry in Zulu. *Bantu Studies* 12, 105-134.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1945). *The Oral and Written Literature in Nguni*. Unpublished PhD thesis. Johannesburg: University of the Witwatersrand.
- Wilde, O. (1964). *Lady Windermere's Fan*. London: Methuen Educational Books.
- Zondi E. (1960) *Ukufa KukaShaka*. Johannesburg: Witswatersrand University Press.