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Abstract

This study refutes the argument that the settlements on hills by the Shona of pre-colonial Zimbabwe were determined by the need for defence, because defence presupposes incessant wars which imperialists have used via similar arguments to colonise Africa. This study argues that environmental, health and agrarian factors were more important determinants to most settlements than defence or incessant wars.

Introduction

Settlement studies continue to generate interest in history much as it does in other areas of academic pursuit, such as archeology and geography. From the onset it is important to point out that site locations are not random developments, but a result of clear choices and decisions by the people concerned. And in almost all cases, these locations are not a function of one variable, but of several related variables which tend to reflect on the people’s perception of their environment, ecology, and culture.

P. Daniel and M. Hopkins (1979) for example, hold the view that the choice of certain locations over others is dependent upon levels of skill and technology available to the people at the time. Similar views are expressed by I. Pikirayi (2001) who regards settlement dynamics as the material correlate of a broader technological and societal view of the landscape. M. Chisholm (1966) points out that defendable sites, good pastures, arable land and woodlands were the sites most favoured by early settlers. It is clear that in both historical and geographical perspectives, settlements have indeed taken place in areas perceived to be advantageous to would be settlers. It is in this regard that this study focuses on why pre-colonial Shona settlers in Zimbabwe favoured locating their settlements on hill sites.
The peopling of the Zimbabwean plateau by the ‘Bantu’ - to whom the Shona are a linguistic group took place in the years since the first millennium A.D. The term Bantu is here used to refer to a group of people who shared a related language with the root ‘ntu’ to refer to a person who moved into the Zimbabwean plateau from the north across the Zambezi river. They arrived on the plateau in waves and the Shona seem to have been among the later arrivals. Until the Nguni and white incursions in the 1830s and 1890s respectively, the Shona had become the most dominant group on the plateau. In all this, Alpers (1968) argues however that the Shona had a peaceful co-existence with their predecessors. The Shona firmed themselves by building ‘dzimba dzemabwe’ (stone buildings) on hills. From their ‘seats’ in the hills, they created the powerful pre-colonial states of Great Zimbabwe, Torwa, Mutapa and Changamire or Rozvi.

Thus the Zimbabwean plateau covered the area that today is known as Zimbabwe. In the north, the Zambezi River bound the plateau while in the south, the Limpopo River was the boundary; in the west, it extended into the Kalahari Desert and in the east, the Indian Ocean was often the boundary, especially during the reign of the Mutapas; the altitude of the plateau average above 3000 feet. Hence, the entire plateau was dominated by granite outcrops and inter-spaced kopjes which created an ideal condition for the hill settlements of the period as granite rock gave rise to sandy soils ranging from relatively infertile to fertile sandy loams, and rains tended to be more reliable in the eastern highlands of the plateau as compared to the other parts of the plateau, especially those in the west.

**The Tradition of Hill Settlements**

When the Shona moved to occupy the Zimbabwean plateau during the early years of the Early Iron Age, it was not in the hills but rather in the river valleys that they settled. It was only as time passed that settlement on hilltops started to appear in addition to the extensively settled areas at the base of the hills. Beach (1980), for example holds that hill settlements started to emerge towards the end of the Early Iron Age. However, controversy surrounds area settlements such as Gokomere (A.D. 180) and Ziwa (A.D. 300) located in the south central and east of the plateau respectively, believed to have been the work of non-Shona ‘Bantu’ groups that preceded the Shona to the plateau. In this regard, the Shona appear to have continued with the tradition of hill settlements already set in motion by earlier ‘Bantu’ groups. Even as that may be the case, the Shona soon established a strong tradition of hill settlements on the plateau.

Hill settlements however, marked a transition in the historical development of the Shona people. I. Pikirayi (2001) for example, sees in hill settlements the emergence of a new complex dimension in the political and economic organisation of the Shona people. He associates hill settlements with the emerging of an elite African ruling class on the Zimbabwe plateau, and once settlement occurred at Gokomere and Ziwa, hill settlements in pre-colonial Zimbabwe acquired a valence and momentum of their own.
By the 7th century settlements had spread to many parts of the plateau to include settlements in the Matopos area at Zhizo hill as well as Leopard’s Kopje (Ntabazingwe) and Manyanga (Ntabazikamambo) in the west of the plateau. These hill settlements formed the early phase of Zimbabwe’s pre-colonial hill settlements, and they are commonly referred to as the Gokomere phase.

The settlers from Leopard’s Kopje included the Shona who soon spread their tradition of hill settlements into the region of the plateau’s Shashe-Limpopo basin in the south. One such community initially settled at Bambandyanalo hill but later at Mapungubwe at the confluence of the Shashe and Limpopo rivers in the border area of modern Zimbabwe and South Africa. Thus, the Mapungubwe hill appears to have been settled for 70 years (A.D. 1220-1290) while the southern terrace below appears to have been cultivated for 260 years (A.D. 1030-1290). And the settlement at Mapungubwe itself represented the first expression of the Great Zimbabwe phase of Shona stone buildings in the hills in which the Shona soon established more settlements in the vicinity and further north.

Conversantly, within the Mapungubwe orbit were other hill settlements at Mapela and Mmamgwa, and thus the south hill settlements continued to the north and by the 13th century and appeared at Mateke, Malumba, Chivowa, Gumanye and Great Zimbabwe which latter became the most notable of the hill settlements north of Mapungubwe. And in this regard, Matenga (1998) has noted that there were up to 250 other such settlements built on the plateau by the 17th century. Although he further noted that similar but fewer settlements were also found in Botswana, Mozambique and the Northern province of South Africa.

With the fall of Great Zimbabwe during the 15th century, a new phase of hill settlements known as the Khami phase (A.D. 1450-1640) came into being. In the west of the plateau, it was mainly represented by hill settlements at Khami, Danamombe (Dhlodhlo), Nhandare (Naletale) and Manyanga (Ntabazikamambo). These settlements were also linked with the Torwa state and its successor, the Changamire/Rozwi state, and in the north and northeast, the Khami phase was represented by hill settlements at Chesvingo, Nhunguza, Ruanga, Zvengombe and Tsindi. These hill sites were closely associated with the Mutapa state. And additionally, the Nyanga hill settlement and its associated terraces appear to have been initially settled by Sena speaking people who were later conquered by the Manyika (Shona) in the 18th century. And as a result, the tradition of hill settlements continued until the subjugation of the Shona by the Europeans in 1890.
Hill Settlements and the Defense Motif

They (the Shona) are warlike men...they carry spears and bows, and the iron arrowheads they have are long and finely pointed. 

With the Masai, it was not merely that they attacked strangers; throughout the nineteenth century they fought almost continuously among themselves. Thus the whole region of Kenya highlands was in a perpetual state of unrest.

The view of African people as a warring people was popular among early Europeans, thus Africans were portrayed not merely as barbaric, but also as cannibalistic-always engaged in wars in which they were killing or being killed. This myth about the warlike Africans gave rise to views that hill settlements in pre-colonial Africa were meant for defence purposes. And interestingly, the European mentality was imbued by the need to justify colonialism and portray imperialism as having come in handy to save the weak African from imminent extinction by the more powerful. Thus notions have been held that at the time of British colonisation of the Zimbabwe plateau in 1890, the Shona were found living among inaccessible rocks of granite koppies as a result of fear of the Ndebele. In expressing views sympathetic to the British colonisers, A.J. Wills (1985) wrote that the Shona were, “friendly enough to the Europeans, as they well might be, and anxious for protection from the dreaded Ndebele, from whose imp a visitation was daily expected.” However, what A.J Wills forgot in passing his comments was the fact that the tradition of hill settlements among the Shona long outlived the coming of the Ndebele to the plateau in about 1839, a tradition that outlived the coming of the Portuguese to the plateau in the 15th century, and not to mention the British who only arrived on the plateau in the late 19th century.

Much of the defence motif has centred on the largest of the Shona hill settlements at Great Zimbabwe. Commenting on the part of the settlement called the Acropolis, A.J. Wills opined that the hill complex was, “doubtless originally occupied for defence...” Another historian, D. Wilson also argued that Great Zimbabwe was, “the tribal centre which could be easily defended.” Yet another scholar, S.I.G. Mudenge also argued in favour of defence at the settlement when he said, “to argue that the rulers of these stone structures were so powerful that they had no conceivable enemy to threaten them is not to prove that the stone structures were built without defence in mind or that there were indeed no deterrent to potential rebels and invaders.” He went on to argue that the history of the Mutapa state, “shows that, even without the presence of the Portuguese in the region, rebels and invaders were not in short supply in south-east and central Africa.” D.N. Beach gave a similar argument to Mudenge by arguing that the walls of Great Zimbabwe were meant to be offensive and not defensive. He thus saw the settlement as serving a military purpose.
The above arguments are however, pregnant with weaknesses as they are premised on the fact
that the dwellers of Great Zimbabwe were constantly under attack or threat of attack. While
admitting that wars did take place on the plateau, such wars however seem not to have been a
major factor prior to the coming of the Portuguese in the 15th century. In fact, by taking sides in
Shona politics, the Portuguese increased tension and civil wars on the plateau.

One of the strongest critics of the defence motif was P.S Garlake. He argued that the architecture
of Great Zimbabwe was not defensive since the entrances to the centre were unprotected by outer
works to protect the inhabitants against spears, bows and arrows from the enemy. More
importantly, he commented that weapons found at Great Zimbabwe were “simply minor personal
accoutrements probably used more in hunting than in warfare.” Also the aesthetic nature of the
walls, which included the chevron and herring decorations, portrayed a life full of ostentation
and the pursuit of pleasure on the hills. Again, it can be argued that the collapse of Great
Zimbabwe was not due to warfare. The settlement has not been linked to any massacres. The
bones found at the settlement have all been associated with animals that the inhabitants ate for
meat. There is also no evidence to indicate destruction to the walls as a result of civil strife. More
importantly, it would remain a riddle to understand why both the victors and the vanquished
decided to leave the place if a civil strife had taken place at the centre. At least one would have
expected the victorious part to remain in control of the settlement. Inhabitants must therefore,
have left in response to other causes mainly those associated with the depletion of resources.

The writers seek to conclude by pointing out that the arguments about defence to hill settlements
are Eurocentric and that such arguments are not confined to Zimbabwe. Similar arguments were
put forward in Kenya where, F.N Owako for example argued that the settlement by the Akamba
people on the Mbooni hills prior to the country’s colonisation by the British was due to the
Akamba’s fear of the ‘warlike’ Masai people. Owako argued that it was only after the
establishment of British rule and the subsequent removal of the Masai menace that the Akamba
began to move down the hills to settle in the lowland areas. Thus, in Kenya, as well as in
Zimbabwe, the justification to colonisation was based on the false reason to defend the ‘weak’
groups (that is, the Masai and the Shona respectively,) against possible extermination by ‘warrior
groups’ like the Ndebele in Zimbabwe.

Hill settlements: A Fresh Approach

Agriculture was ranked high among the economic activities of the Shona traditional society. It
was an activity in which, people – whether as herders, hunters, traders or miners took time to
engage in for purposes of food security. The need to improve food production attracted
innovative farmers to settle in hills where the physical properties of the soils together with the
micro-environments of the hills provided better opportunities for higher crop yields. Hills also
provided better health conditions to people and their livestock.

Largely speaking, farming in Zimbabwe was a valley side activity. Valley agriculture however tended to have natural disadvantages. Sandy soils predominated large sections of the plateau and in view of traditional agriculture where artificial fertilizers were largely unknown, it was only in the first few years following the slash and burn of vegetation that better yields could be obtained.\textsuperscript{30} Outbursts of torrential rain in the country’s savanna type climate also affected yields by washing away the fertile topsoil.\textsuperscript{31}

Some farmers in Zimbabwe soon realised however, that soil tended to be more fertile on the hills and their immediate surroundings. Decaying tree leaves together with other vegetable matter added to the soil fertility. Equipped with the technique of hillside terracing, innovative farmers soon realised that they could increase the available area of steep fertile agricultural land on the hills.\textsuperscript{32} Extensive terracing for example took place at Mapela and Nyanga hill settlements.

Besides the issue of soils, climate played an important part in the plateau’s agriculture. Two extreme climatic conditions existed in the plateau. On one extreme were the semi-dry conditions, which existed especially in the western parts of the plateau.\textsuperscript{33} On the other extreme were conditions of very wet weather that existed in the plateau’s eastern Highlands area. The extremes of weather contributed to hill settlements in their special but different ways.

In the semi-dry areas of the plateau, hills attracted framers through their damp mists (as a result of localised relief rainfall), which kept soil moisture high for plant growth.\textsuperscript{34} Birmingham noted for example, that the countrysides around Great Zimbabwe was dry, but the hill and its adjacent valley attracted adequate moisture largely in the form of damp mists.\textsuperscript{35} The conditions at Great Zimbabwe attracted farmers from as early as the 4\textsuperscript{th} century A.D.\textsuperscript{36} Hill settlements at Mapungubwe and Mapela (in the drier south western parts of the plateau) seem to have grown out of similar conditions. The two were located in areas where the inhabitants would take advantage of good pastures for livestock while farming on the misty hills.

In the extreme wet conditions of the plateau, hill settlements emerged in response to attempts by the people to counter the devastating effects on crop production of soil erosion and the leaching of soil nutrients.\textsuperscript{37} Many lowland areas in the wetter areas of the plateau quickly turned in marshlands thereby making them less hospitable. In view of the cultivation of traditional crops such as millet, sorghum and rapoko that tended not to do well in poorly drained areas, farmers realised that soil erosion could be prevented through advanced terracing techniques. They thus took advantage of the fertile and well-drained soils on the hills to increase crop production. It was for this reason that the Manyika people (who are a linguistic group of the Shona) settled in the Nyanga Mountain in the plateau’s Eastern Highlands region.\textsuperscript{38} Extensive terraces were developed in these mountain areas.\textsuperscript{39}
Hill settlements for purposes of agriculture were not limited to Zimbabwe. Such settlements took place in other parts of pre-colonial Africa, for example in Kenya and Tanzania. Contrary to F. Owako’s views about hill settlements in Kenya being for defence purposes, C. Ehret argued that the settlements on mount Kilimanjaro, mount Kenya, the Pare Mountains and the Usambara range in the time since the 11th century A.D. were largely for agricultural purposes. P.T.Zeleza also points out that the Kamba and Taita of Kenya were attracted to the Mbooni and Taita hills, respectively because the hill environment had varied vegetation, many natural resources and tended to attract rain that often passed over the surrounding plains. These communities were engaged in intensive agriculture through terracing on the hills.

The impact of climate induced environmental conditions in pre-colonial Zimbabwe was however not just limited to matters about agriculture. The impact also determined where people settled as a result of prevailing health conditions. In the years of average or slightly above average rainfall, lowland valley areas became problematic as areas of settlement since many of them became uncomfortably soggy or turned into marshy lands and swamps. The pole and dagga huts (with earth floors) became damp and made life difficult for the people. Thus, at Great Zimbabwe for example, people avoided the marshy areas of the valley and built their huts starting from the drier parts of the same valley up to the hill. Livestock, which was generally cherished by the Shona, risked contracting diseases such as the disease of the hoof as pens turned into muddy pools of dung during the rain season. There was thus the need to place settlements and cattle pens in areas such as hills where the drainage system was good.

The greatest disadvantage of settlements in the lowland areas was mosquitoes. Long before the arrival of Europeans, Africans had managed to establish the link between mosquitoes and swamps and that mosquitoes were responsible for spreading malaria. In this regard, the indigenous African knowledge system was far ahead that of the westerners who, when they came to Africa could not immediately establish the link between mosquitoes, swamps and the spread of malaria. Many early Europeans to Africa simply believed that malaria was caused by poisonous air rising from the swamps. It was only later in the 19th century that the Europeans awakened to the fact that malaria was spread by mosquitoes living in the swamps. Hill settlements were well positioned to curb the spread of malaria by reducing the breading places for mosquitoes as a result of the good drainage systems of the areas.

The threat of tsetse flies o livestock, especially cattle, was another determinant factor for hill settlements. Cattle though not the real mainstay of the economy (as shall be argued) were a status symbol especially for the people who owned them in conjunction to being renowned crop farmers. P.S. Garlake commented that due to the threat of tsetse flies to cattle, most of Zimbabwe’s stone buildings on hills were sited along the edge of the country’s plateau in areas away from tsetse fly belts. Such hill settlements thus kept cattle free from the danger of trypanosomiasis.
On a more general assessment, hill settlements were also the outcome of a host of other advantages. Areas in and around hills teemed with wildlife that supplemented the meat requirements of the people. The destruction of vegetation through slash and burn in the valley areas could also have made hills more ideal as areas of settlement as people could easily get firewood from the slashed trees.

Once the locational advantages of hills were identified as noted above, hill settlement became the major force for socio-economic and political transformation on the plateau. Through their prosperity resulting from their successes in agriculture, hill dwellers led a more sedentary life. Whereas in the valley areas settlements continued to change in line with the demands of shifting cultivation, settlements on hills were different. Agriculture on hills was a form of intensive farming aimed at producing more food on small pieces of land. Constant change of settlements became difficult for hill dwellers, as their large crop outputs would create problems of transportation. Thus, while pastoralists could easily change residential areas by simply driving their livestock to new locations, crop farmers on the hills could not do the same because unlike livestock, crops could not be driven about to new locations.

The status of hills as centres of prosperity was commented on by D. Birmingham who posits that at Mapela, “the whole hill was entirely terraced for gardens, for houses, and for defence against jealous neighbours in the dry lands.” Thus, hill prosperity was such that it created envy among some members of society. Defence in the case of Mapela was not the original factor for hill location, but the result of jealous neighbours following successes in agriculture on the hill settlement.

As centres of success, hill settlements attracted many people. Successful farmers known in Shona as hurudza were able to attract many wives. Some of the wives could be obtained as pawns given in exchange for grain by distressed families in times of drought. The system of giving away women as pawns known in Shona, as kuzvarira was quite prevalent in Shona traditional society. Women as well as the children that they bore added to family labour for agriculture. Ploughs were still largely unknown and land preparation, which included the digging of the land and the preparation for seed holes, largely depended on human labour. The hurudza were privileged persons who would use their grain to acquire more livestock and material things like hoes and axes from the blacksmiths. It is in this regard that the present writers postulate the view that agriculture more than livestock was the mainstay of the economy. Cattle, even though they provided the much-needed meat, milk and were used to pay roora (bride price) were no substitute for hunger in years of poor harvests.
It was from the hills that those who excelled in terms of prosperity acquired leadership positions in society. Ever since the successes of settlements at Mapungubwe and Mapela, hills acquired a new status as ‘seats’ of royalty. The rulers of pre-colonial Zimbabwean states of Great Zimbabwe, Mutapa and Rozwi all associated themselves with settlements on hills. The hills of Great Zimbabwe, Khami, Danamombe and Manyanga were all associated with rulers of pre-colonial Zimbabwe. The rulers took advantage of the resources at their disposal, including human labour, to build more elaborate houses on the summit of hills. The commoners, out of reverence to their kings and lack of adequate resources tended to restrict their settlements to the lower levels of the hills.

Other than the drive towards political stratification in society, hill settlements, through their prosperity and large concentrations of people, which in the case of Great Zimbabwe got to 11000 people prior to its collapse in the 15th century, became major attractions of trade. In this regard, it was not as some scholars have argued that trade led to the growth of hill settlements but vice-versa. The argument that trade led to hill settlements tended to put the cart before the horse. Hill settlements provided opportunities for lucrative business to traders. The centres spared the traders the hustles of having to move from place to place with their wares in search for markets. Traders linking the plateau with the Indian Ocean coast also directed their trade routes through hill centres for provisions.

Religious issues were not spared from the impact of hill settlements. Again in this regard, hill settlements did not take place in response to hills being shrines but rather to people creating shrines out of the hills on which they had settled. D.N. beach for example, comments that there was no evidence that a religious shrine existed at Great Zimbabwe before people moved to settle at the centre. It was, however as society became more complex that divine intervention was sought which led people, usually those regarded as mediums to assume a more important role in society. Such mediums often became advisors to the rulers on the hills. Society thus, accorded space on the hills for the mediums to do their work.

In the final analysis, it can be argued that hill settlements in pre-colonial Zimbabwe rose and fell largely in response to issues about food production, the changes in the environmental base and to matters about health. When the environmental base gave in as a result of pressure from over-use, people were bound to leave the depleted centres for areas where resources were still good. At Great Zimbabwe for example, the threat of starvation and diseases forced people to leave the centre. It is for this reason that these writers argue that issues about defence were largely peripheral in motivating people to stay on hills. Hill settlements continued to take place even in the years of prolonged peace.
**Conclusion**

Ideas that seek to explain hill settlements in pre-colonial Zimbabwe using the defence motif are largely untenable. Defence implies wars and a high degree of unsettled life through insecurity. The growth of centres such as Mapungubwe, Mapela, Great Zimbabwe and Khami into major residential and commercial centres could not have been possible had the plateau been torn by civil strife over the years. Hill settlements clearly showed the awareness of the local people in taping the locational advantages of their different and varied environments. The settlements also showed the people’s ability to tame seemingly inhospitable but rich areas of the hills into hospitable areas for settlement and agriculture through terracing; and also demonstrated people’s awareness of issues about health when they avoided settling in the mosquito ridden swampy areas within the valleys. While it is true that any society has its own political problems, it however, would not be correct to view pre-colonial Zimbabwe as having been characterised by wars. The plateau enjoyed peace for most of the time, hence civil wars only worsened in the years since the 16th century as a result of Portuguese attempts to colonise the plateau through their subsequent interference in the internal politics of the area.
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