INTRODUCTION

Tribute and trade were important features in most pre-colonial kingdoms in Zambia. Though the existence of pre-colonial kingdoms depended on different political and structural factors, tribute and trade played important roles as forms of social and economic transactions respectively. The origins, existence, expansion and even decline of pre-colonial Zambian kingdoms are closely linked to tribute and trade. For example, Harry Langworthy attributes Undi’s power and prosperity to “the control of ivory tribute and its sale to the Portuguese”, and argues on the decline of Undi’s kingdom that the Portuguese and tributary chiefs:

... weakened Undi’s economic power by denying him tribute and the monopoly of trade, thus lessening his political authority and making the component parts of the kingdom both less dependent on Undi and less able to withstand external threats.

In the same line, Andrew Roberts relates tribute to chieftainship by arguing that:

... in receiving tribute a chief commonly made some payments in return; such ‘reciprocal’ exchange was one of the most important means of circulating scarce commodities such as salt, ironwork or foreign cloth.

As such, tribute and trade are perceived to have been connected to kingship because of their reciprocal and redistributive attributes. Kings or chiefs as
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2 Langworthy, Zambia Before 1890, pp. 55-60.
holders of political power did not only receive tribute, but returned or reciprocated such tribute with gifts, making tribute a form of social exchange. Kings also had to redistribute goods obtained after trade, because to maintain power, component parts of a kingdom had to be kept in a dependent state. In fact, the difference between tribute and trade dwindle because the explanations of tribute portray it more like a barter system as valuables returned are in exchange of goods received; while the explanations on trade portray kings like middlemen trading only in order to have goods to compensate subjects for their loyalty.

Literate observers, missionaries, explorers, and historians have documented the history of Mwata Kazembe’s kingdom from the time the Lunda of Kazembe left Mwata Yamvo’s Kingdom, crossing the Luapula River at Chabuka with the help of the sister to Chief Matanda, to their conquests and establishment of a Lunda kingdom on the lower Luapula. This historiographical study of Mwata Kazembe’s Lunda kingdom focused on examining how scholars have written and interpreted the nature and role of tribute and trade in the establishment and existence of the kingdom up to 1890. Emphasis was on the nature of historical explanations that connect tribute and trade to power in Mwata Kazembe’s Kingdom.

A brief review of literature on Mwata Kazembe’s Kingdom reflected the importance of tribute and trade in the eastern Lunda Kingdom. Langworthy
has argued that the “power of the Lunda Kingdom of Kazembe depended on the monopoly of tribute and trade which Mwata Kazembe held.”

In the same line, Ian Cunnison writing on Mwata Kazembe and the Arabs argued that Mwata Kazembe “reserved for himself a monopoly in the trade of ivory and alone disposed of slaves.”

In a more recent study of Mwata Kazembe’s Kingdom by Giacomo Macola, the argument of Mwata Kazembe’s monopolisation of trade has been maintained that:

Commoners were generally prevented ‘under the penalty of death’ from bartering foodstuffs with foreign visitors since all exchanges with the latter had to pass through either the ruling king or his representative.

The associating of tribute and trade to political authority cannot be missed. The theoretical basis for connecting tribute and trade to power is found in the principles of reciprocity and redistribution. Reciprocity is the giving of respect or obligations in return for valuables received. That is, the king giving back some return ‘gifts’ to the giver of the tribute as a recognition of the giver and to guarantee the continued receiving of tribute. Redistribution took place when valuables accumulated by the king were redistributed to the citizenry as a guarantee for its obedience and was not only a sign of
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4 Langworthy, Zambia Before 1890, p. 40.
collective action within a kingdom but was also a measure in the equal
distribution of scarce commodities to places they were needed most.⁷ As
Andrew Roberts argued, “the courts of chiefs [served] as centres for
redistributing the varied tribute levied from their subjects.”⁸

Clearly, reciprocity and redistribution have diffused into history from the
culture experts like ethnographers, cultural anthropologists or sociologists
who see reciprocity and redistribution as the basis of a political structure.
Bronislaw Malinowski wrote, for example, that when a chief received
tribute, services and assistance from his subjects, he had to repay them.⁹
Mauss also argued that trade in primitive societies consisted “not so much in
economic transactions as in reciprocal gifts”,¹⁰ such that beneficiaries needed
to give counter gifts because “to accept something from someone is to accept
something of his spiritual essence.”¹¹ This is reiterated by Roberts, who
when writing on pre-colonial trade in Zambia argued that “in fact, much
exchange of goods was not, strictly speaking trade at all since it was organised by

⁷ Harold K. Schneider, Economic Man: The Anthropology Of Economics (London: Macmillan,
Publications, 1974), p. 188.
⁹ Bronislaw Malinowski, Crime And Custom In A Savage Society (London: Routledge & Kegan
¹⁰ See Claude Levi-Strauss, The Elementary Structures Of Kinship. Trans. James Harle Bell and
political authorities rather than by people with purely economic motives.”12 Simply put, tribute and trade in pre-colonial kingdoms were a “primitive way of achieving the peace that in civilised society is secured by the state.”13

Following the footsteps of other social scientists, historians explain tribute and trade as tools by which African kingdoms achieved stability and expansion while the loss of tribute and trade meant instability and the decline of kingdoms. Thus, Christopher St. John argues that the central figure in tribute and trade transactions was the Mwata because as “among the Lunda, corridor chiefs distributed gifts as well as received them and thus provided some focus of trade”14 while Macola discusses redistribution as a tool for strengthening Mwata Kazembe’s power and argues that:

Most exotic goods constituted a capital which the king [Mwata Kazembe] spent with a view of strengthening links of political subordination and patronage [and that] the king’s redistributive networks extended well beyond the lower Luapula valley and thus reinforced the centripetal effects of institutions of peripheral rule.15

For David Gordon, political control in the peripheries was facilitated by enforcement through governors who ensured the “payment of tribute and
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recognition of his [Kazembe’s] rule.” 16 The Lunda royal history also mentions tribute as when, for example, after conquest a conquered chief was told “uli mwana wandi, konse nkayaikala ukalaleta fyonse nkafwaya.”17 Meaning, ‘you are my child, wherever I will go and settle, you will bring whatever I will need.’

While this study does not reject the historian’s use of concepts and methodologies that are developed and used in other fields of study, it questions the extent to which theories in other fields of study can be used whilst maintaining the historical value of any research. The basis of the study was the assumption that in order for history to be rational, explanation in history should not just be inferential, but also about what happened, why, how, when and relating events that explain historical change.

Thus, questions that were grappled with in this historiographical study of tribute and trade included questions like: how adequate are historical explanations that use tribute and trade in explaining pre-colonial authority in African kingdoms; were tribute and trade necessary conditions for the existence of pre-colonial kingdoms; and what role did tribute and trade play

in pre-colonial state formation, expansion, maintenance and decline? When applied to pre-colonial Kazembe’s kingdom, these questions present historians with the “difficulty of grasping the inter-relatedness of every dimension of human experience” in their endeavour to formulate complete causal explanations of historical change because the data available does not exhaust every facet of Lunda life. While ‘total’ pre-colonial Lunda history seems to be a far-fetched idea, a compartmentalised conception of history that emphasises certain aspects of social, economic and political history should at least be a fair presentation of available data.

Because dependency of kings and kingdoms on tribute and trade in most cases implies reciprocity and redistribution, it was deemed important to examine whether the principles of reciprocity and redistribution are abused in explanations of historical change in Mwata Kazembe’s kingdom. To what extent, it was asked, can the pre-colonial leader like the Mwata be equated to the state and its dynamics, and how were components of human existence in Kazembe’s Kingdom connected to enable historians present a fair picture of the kingdom?

An historiographical survey of Mwata Kazembe’s kingdom showed that it is a common trend to explain the power of Mwata Kazembe by arguing his ‘monopolisation’ of tribute and trade to the extent of putting the Mwata at the centre of the tribute-trade nexus. Thus, directly and indirectly, the reciprocal and redistributive aspects of tribute and trade have been emphasised. Did Mwata Kazembe monopolise tribute and trade; was he under obligation to reciprocate the tribute received from subjects; and to what extent did redistribution take place to overshadow individual entrepreneurship as a means of subsistence?

If value is placed on the monopolisation of tribute and trade, contradictions in the historical conception of political authority arise: the role of the Mwata is reduced to that of a middleman who was expected to get goods for the tribute he received by trading and channelling returns to subordinates; and reciprocity and redistribution as argued are an antithesis to the existence, possession and maintenance of power, especially when one notes that monopolisation implies absolute power. Thus, the product from using tribute and trade to substantiate political authority in pre-colonial Mwata Kazembe’s kingdom is blurred by an unclear definition of roles, the nature of political authority, private entrepreneurship, and the very existence of the kingdom.
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The basic arguments in this historiographical study are that Mwata Kazembe’s kingdom was not so primitive for tribute and trade to be reduced to reciprocal and redistributive networks; that there is not enough evidence to argue that Mwata Kazembe monopolised tribute and trade; that the evidence about life in Mwata Kazembe’s kingdom is limited in scope; and that some control over tribute and trade was a feature in the exercise of power and not a cause of it.

HISTORICAL EXPLANATION

Since questions arising from connecting tribute and trade to power intimated the need for clarity in historical explanations, the discussion in this study lay within the debates of causal analysis and the nature of historical explanation. Under the ‘covering law theory’ expounded by Karl R. Popper and Carl G. Hempel, ‘what is explained’ must be deduced from ‘what explains it’ such that the statement connecting the “initial conditions with [what is being explained must] be a universal law (Popper) or universal hypothesis (Hempel).”21 Hempel further outlines three types of historical explanations: first, Hempel argues that there are nomological explanations whose aim is to demonstrate that what is explained “resulted from certain

antecedent and perhaps concomitant conditions”; then there are genetic explanations that aim to demonstrate the main “stages in a sequence of events which led up to the given phenomenon”; and finally Hempel outlines ‘explanations by motivating reasons’ as explanations in “terms of the underlying rationale, which include … the ends the agent sought to attain and the alternative courses of action he believed to be open to him.”

On the other hand, W. H Walsh arguing that explanation is a deductive process revolving around “something expressible in general terms,” outlines the colligating theory where the Historian:

… first looks for certain dominant concepts or leading ideas by which to illuminate historical facts; trace connections between those ideas; then show how the detailed facts become intelligible in constructing a significant narrative of the events of the period in question.

While Popper and Hempel are (without their modifications) followers of Hume and the empiricists who argue that explanation is done by “relating one event, the explicandum, to another event or set of events which cause or condition it”, the general views about historical explanation affirms the
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deterministic nature of history in that historical change is believed to have causes and not to happen through chance.

However, it should be noted that this study holds that there are no ‘general’ truths or laws in history because historical facts are singular. That is, history should be customised to specific environments as this will help historians in avoiding producing a history that is “probabilistic in character.” For example, when historians discuss tribute and trade and relate it to power, they must identify statistical regularities but for pre-colonial Mwata Kazembe’s Lunda history, “fallacies of statistical sampling are likely to occur because of insufficient data.”

This study does not subscribe to one definition of historical explanation but supports the deterministic view of history and demonstrates that the logical connection between ‘what is explained’ and ‘what explains it’ is a necessary and sufficient condition for explaining historical events and processes. Necessary because if there is no possibility of connecting what is explained (power) and what explains it (tribute and trade), then the resulting explanation is false; sufficient in the sense that explanations have to demonstrate that tribute and trade explain power. In other words,

explanation in history should not simply be correlation but must also be demonstrated.

THE PROBLEM

“The function of an explanation is to resolve puzzlement of some kind”,\textsuperscript{30} writes William Dray, and clearly the puzzle which this study set out to resolve was the attribution of tribute and trade to power in Mwata Kazembe’s Lunda kingdom. Pre-colonial history of the kingdom of Mwata Kazembe has been written with a modified form of ‘diffusionism’ not just because its complexity demands reliance on concepts and methodologies developed and used in other fields of study but also because the nature of its sources deem it so. The effect of ‘diffusionism’ on historical writing is seen mostly in historical explanations because the connection between historical evidence and explanation becomes vague.

OBJECTIVES

Generally, this study is an historiographical study of Mwata Kazembe’s pre-colonial kingdom while the specific objectives of the study were:

i. To examine the way historians explain the role of tribute in Mwata Kazembe’s kingdom;

ii. To analyse the historical interpretations of the role of trade in the development and maintenance of the Lunda kingdom of Mwata Kazembe;

iii. To examine the nature of explanations that use tribute and trade to explain power in Mwata Kazembe’s kingdom before 1890.

RATIONALE

Revisionist Zambian historians have not been thorough in their review of the writing of Zambian history and thus most historians still hold on to the ‘traditional’ perception and way of doing and writing history while pupils and students still learn a history with ‘unrevised’ historical concepts and methods of explanation. Thus, this study re-examined works on the kingdom of Mwata Kazembe and their use of tribute and trade as historical evidence to explain pre-colonial dynamics of power. As a study about pre-colonial historical causal analysis and processual explanation, this study is a contribution to Zambian philosophy of history and historiography in general.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The focus of this study is on tribute and trade vis-à-vis the existence of the kingdom of Mwata Kazembe. Since history is not static, the history of Kazembe’s kingdom was taken as a historical process with historical change
evident in the rise, expansion and ‘decline’ of the kingdom. While the power of the Mwata was seen from the maintenance of stability in the kingdom and control over tributaries and traders, tribute and trade entailed (respectively) no need for reciprocity and redistribution, and the king was not the sole trader or receiver of tribute. As such, the importance of tribute was not in the reciprocal overtures of the Mwata and his power was not solely dependent on his ability to trade and redistribute returns. The basic conception of historical explanation for this study was that it should demonstrate how power was connected to tribute and trade.

METHODOLOGY AND SOURCES

For this study, textual analysis was the major method of analysing secondary and primary data. Although historiography mostly involves analysing secondary data, some major sources used by historians writing the history of Mwata Kazembe’s kingdom were scrutinized to express and simplify the author’s historiographical views; and to show the basis of historical explanations and interpretations that connect tribute and trade to power in the works of different historians overtime.

Since source criticism played an important role in the analysis of data in this dissertation, a cautionary discussion of the sources that historians use when writing the history of the kingdom of Mwata Kazembe is necessary lest the
information in these sources be seen as absolute. The uniqueness of the 
historiography of Mwata Kazembe’s kingdom lies not only in the fact that its 
history has been recorded by literate observers from as early as 1798 (about 
sixty years after its establishment); but also in the fact that there is a thin line 
in the nature of information between its oral traditions and recorded 
information. To embark on a historiographical study of Mwata Kazembe’s 
kingdom is to embark on a review of edited translations and ‘hearsay’ from 
silent informants such that writing from written sources or oral history is 
like writing from secondary sources.

One thing worthy taking note of is the point that European literate observers 
did not fully understand the language spoken by the Lunda. Thus, the 
information they received and recorded was not complete and not ‘fully’ 
translated. In some cases they did not even understand the official language 
used by the Mwata and his officials when discussing important issues. For 
example, Gamitto learnt only two words for water and fire, and lamented 
that “during the six months that the Portuguese expedition remained in 
Lunda, not a single member could understand the [Kampokolo] language.”

31 While the Portuguese had access to the Mwata’s court, they did not 
understand the language used at the court. This situation becomes even 
more complicated for English readers of Portuguese diaries as they receive

31 A.C.P. Gamitto, King Kazembe And The Marave, Chewa, Bisa, Bemba, Lunda And Other Peoples 
these recorded Portuguese ‘translations’ through yet another translation into English. While translations cannot be dismissed as historical sources, some implications for history and historiography cannot be overlooked.

Beatrix Heintze has argued that it is important to consider if the translation is:

... (a) an “old” translation of an old text (that is, a translation dating from the distant past of a work belonging to the same epoch); (b) a “modern” translation of an old text or (c) a modern translation of a modern “modern text.”

Texts on Mwata Kazembe’s kingdom range from old translations to modern translations and so any one using these texts is faced with a wide range of challenges. For example, it is important to examine the conditions under which the text was translated, to whom it was addressed, who were involved in its publication and the prevailing attitudes when the text was made. For example, not only did Gamitto decipher what he had written using ‘substandard ink’ “ten or eleven years previously”, but his ‘sponsor’, the viscount de Sa’da Bandeira also examined the manuscript and “took upon himself the laborious task of editing the work.” Information that was consciously or mistakenly left out will never be known.
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33 Gamitto, King Kazembe, vol. 1, pp. 22-23.
We cannot owe it entirely to Ian Cunnison for calling R.F. Burton’s translation of *The Lands Of Cazembe* slipshod because Burton was ‘modest’ enough to confess:

I must own to having taken *certain liberties* with the earlier part of my text. The whole would hardly bear translation on account of the many repetitions in a work evidently not prepared for publication, the triteness of the ideas, the diffuseness of the language, and the prodigious lengthiness of the sentences. In many parts *the order of narration has been changed*. An abridgement is therefore offered to the reader, but it is one of words, not of sense ....

What can or cannot bear translation, only Burton knew and the nature of liberties taken with the documents are not fully disclosed. What was left out when long sentences were shortened and the order of translation changed can only be told by individuals with access to the original Portuguese version of Lacerda’s journey.

Again, Burton’s philological attainments did not always ‘crown’ his translation with success while the timing of the translation (1873, the year Dr. Livingstone died) shows that most likely the translation was meant to show that Livingstone’s information about Mwata Kazembe was nothing new. This is because the translation was elicited by “the interest excited by

---

the letters of Dr. Livingstone concerning the country of the Cazembe and neighbouring regions of Central Africa.”^37

The view that Burton’s translation was done to undo Livingstone’s work also holds when one considers the rivalry between Burton and Livingstone reflected in their different views on Africa and Africans. Livingstone, who was in favour of the ‘humane’ representation of Africans was on the side of the ethnological Society of London while Burton, who had set up the Anthropological Society with James Hunt in 1863, “believed that black Africans were an inferior race, completely unrelated to Caucasians, and were suited to slavery.”^38

Another translation found in Burton’s *The Lands Of Cazembe*, by B.A. Beadle is the Pombeiro’s or bondsmen’s (Pedro Joao Batista and Anastacio Francisco) record of their journey on foot from Angola to Mozambique. The discrepancies in Batista’s diaries range from dates, time, measurements, and quantities of goods exchanged or used to discrepancies in general information. While these inconsistencies make reading Batista’s records like reading ‘forged’ documents written with a tinge of heroism, the overall
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effect is on the writing of history because the historian ends up choosing what to use from the records.

For example, it is not easy to ascertain the date the Pombeiros stated their journey. In Tete, the Pombeiros said they had started their journey from Casanje at the end of November 1802 but were detained by chief Bomba up to 1805.\(^ {39} \) However, the letter from their master which they presented at Tete was signed November 1804.\(^ {40} \) Furthermore, this letter does not mention the Pombeiros detention at Bomba, it was not written in reference to any earlier letter or with knowledge of the detention; and it just gives the picture that the Pombeiros were starting off in 1804. Again, considering it took only 22 days from Casanje to chief Bomba and the Pombeiros could only “advise their master at the starting place that he might send some goods” for the chief to let them go in 1805,\(^ {41} \) their master’s letter written in November 1804 could only have been sent in 1805 when the Pombeiros were able to communicate with their master. As a result, the historian has two years for the start of the Pombeiros journey-1802 and 1804.

\(^ {39} \) Burton, *The Lands Of Cazembe*, p. 199.
\(^ {41} \) Burton, *The Lands Of Cazembe*, p. 199.
The information from 1802(1804) up to May 1806 is very scanty because the Pombeiros only started to record their journey on Sunday, 22nd May 1806 when they started off from Mwata Yamvo for the kingdom of Mwata Kazembe. They were detained for 16 days at the farm of their guide who was performing his rituals for the journey and Batista recorded that they started off from their Guide’s place on Wednesday, 8th June 1806.\footnote{Burton, The Lands Of Cazembe, p. 169.} The problem of dating comes in when one reads Batista’s summary of the journey in which he wrote that after 16 days at their guide’s home, they started off on Tuesday, seventh July. If we take ‘July’ either as a translation or printing error and insert Tuesday, seventh June, it reduces their stay at the farm by a day which will still affect the structure and information in Batista’s itinerary. It should be noted also that between 1802 and 1811, 7th July was only a Tuesday in 1804 or 1810. A summary of the inconsistencies in the information in the Pombeiro’s records has been attached as an Appendix.

I have drawn the reader’s attention to the fact that early writers on Mwata Kazembe were not Lunda, an observation holding true even about most modern writers of Lunda history. This is not to argue that non-Lunda cannot write Lunda history but rather to illustrate the consequences for Lunda history. One consequence for this orientation is that translations proliferate
the problem of semantic non-equivalence. For example, even for a modern writer like Gordon, the Shila praise of “Nachituti uwaobwele Uluunda” becomes “Nachituti who invited the Lunda to stay.” 43 The semantic distortion is certain because to ‘ask for Lunda help’ is not equivalent to ‘inviting the Lunda to stay.’

Another example can be given from Gamitto’s journal which Burton dismissed as adding little to what was observed by Lacerda44 and translated by Cunnison who removed “inconsistencies from Gamitto’s orthography of native terms.”45 However, Marwick has demonstrated that such attempts misfire and argues in one instance:

Whatever the value of z maybe in portuguese, Gamitto’s original renderings of ombeza and mwene-zico are to a speaker of English or Nyanja closer to their modern forms (ku ombeza, “to divine” and mwini dziko, “proprietor [of] country, territorial chief”) than are Cunnison’s ombesha and mwene-shiko.46

However, even if translation flaws were to be overcome, it should be remembered that Gamitto’s record is not an ordinary diary but more like a book written with commentaries. That is, the record of Gamitto was written with afore knowledge and so it is not original. For example, when Gamitto writes of a ruler of “whom I shall say more later”; or of the parasols that

43 Gordon, Nachituti’s Gift, p. 10.
44 Burton, The Lands Of Cazembe, p. 10.
“they were to prove disastrous to the expedition, as will appear”; or of a wooden pillow given to them by Mwata Kazembe that “when I wanted to return to Europe I asked the commandant for it but unfortunately it had been stolen”; or of “various pieces of information to which I shall refer later”; and after procuring some provisions that “we cannot buy slaves because we do not want to aggravate the evil we are trying to cure”\(^47\) (when they evidently traded in slaves with the Mwata)- what it intimates is that Gamitto is writing in 1842 (mostly from memory) and not in 1831 to 1832 when he was in Mwata Kazembe’s kingdom.

While the records of Dr. Livingstone escape the translation problem not entirely, they fall prey to much editing. Livingstone’s life and work has received more commentaries mostly because he was a ‘celebrity’ explorer, and some can still mistake him for a missionary as did Donald Turnbull, who wrote that Livingstone “tried to stop wicked traders from capturing slaves. He worked so hard that he often felt tired and ill.”\(^48\) James Macnair’s edited *Livingstone’s Travels*\(^49\) for example, may have been inspired by his regard for Livingstone as a ‘Scottish national hero’ and the need to restore

\(^{47}\) Gamitto, *King Kazembe*, vol. 2, pp. 31, 53, 80, 92 and 106.
him in his place in the Scottish heritage, as much as the horror of the state of Livingstone’s birth place.\textsuperscript{50}

Again, Horace Waller’s hagiography of his friend, \textit{Livingstone’s Last Journals} which serves as a basic document on Livingstone in Mwata Kazembe’s kingdom is a work “assiduously expunged[of anything thought to] create an impression of the explorer as less than a manly muscular Christian.”\textsuperscript{51} Livingstone may have been determined to outsmart Burton,\textsuperscript{52} sometimes dismissing him as having awful ideas;\textsuperscript{53} and he was so consistently “on the side of the Ethnologicals”\textsuperscript{54} in his description of even African women as fine, pretty, having ‘European features’, and once describing the Mwata’s queen as having “a pleasant European countenance … and would be admired anywhere.”\textsuperscript{55} The consequence for his disposition was that his writings rarely reveal the ‘barbaric’ side of the Mwata, whose conduct satisfied him, as much as do the Portuguese records.\textsuperscript{56} This is not to suggest that Portuguese descriptions were accurate, but it is to alert the readers to issues of objectivity in early European writings on the kingdom of Mwata Kazembe.

\textsuperscript{50} Pettitt, \textit{Dr. Livingstone}, p. 56.
\textsuperscript{51} Pettitt, \textit{Dr. Livingstone}, p. 52.
\textsuperscript{52} Pettitt, \textit{Dr. Livingstone}, p. 44.
\textsuperscript{53} Horace Waller, \textit{Livingstone’s Last Journals} (London: John Murray, 1874), vol. 1, p. 279.
\textsuperscript{54} Pettitt, \textit{Dr. Livingstone}, p. 43.
\textsuperscript{55} Waller, \textit{Livingstone’s Last Journals}, vol. 1, p. 251, 252, and 302.
\textsuperscript{56} Waller, \textit{Livingstone’s Last Journals}, vol. 1, p. 295.
This brief discussion of some writings on Mwata Kazembe and his Lunda kingdom is meant to show that the records available are not ‘uncomplicated’ collections. Even the Lunda royal history has been shown to be among many other things:

A missionary influenced adaptation of an old royal tradition, a political weapon to be brought to bear on a situation of enhanced interethnic competition, a bulwark against the social tension which threatened the stability of Kazembe in the middle colonial period.57

Are edited sources and translations useless as sources of history? The complications briefly hinted are a call on historians to be critical of their sources. The problem of “translation history are warning signs which save us from an overhasty and uncritical use of such books [which] occasionally facilitate a negative selection.”58

DISSESSATION DESIGN

This dissertation has been divided into three chapters; the first chapter discusses the historiography of tribute and the way historians explain the nature and role of tribute in the kingdom of Mwata Kazembe; the second chapter discusses the historiography of trade and examines the way historians explain the nature of trade in Mwata Kazembe’s kingdom; while

the third and last chapter discusses the concept of power and how historians explain power using the concepts of tribute and trade. The third chapter also synthesises the implications of historical explanations discussed in the entire dissertation.