

**‘Behind the Back of a Declarative History’: Acts of Erasure in Leon De Kock’s (1996) *Civilising Barbarians: Missionary Narrative and African Response in Nineteenth Century South Africa***

**Mastin Prinsloo**

**Department of Adult Education, University of Cape Town**

**(published in *English Academy Review*, 15, 32-41)**

*There is no document of culture which is not at the same time a document of barbarism.* (Walter Benjamin 1987, 233)

**Blood and ink**

What is apartheid’s pedigree? Are its roots in the anti-liberalism of Boer frontiersman who sought to deny the emergence of a common society? Was it the product of the mineral revolution of the late 19th and 20th centuries, with capital’s need for a large, cheap and disposable labour supply? Or do these roots lie further back? Leon De Kock’s (1996) book adds its voice to recent scholarship which firmly shifts apartheid’s roots back to the colonial period, to British imperial and settler expansion in the Cape, in particular.<sup>1</sup> He is concerned to show the worms of cultural xenophobia and racism at the heart of ‘Cape liberalism’, through a study of the ‘civilising mission’ that was discursively dominant in the second half of the 19th century. *Civilising Barbarians* starts from the premise that white colonial domination in South Africa was won by ‘blood and ink’- colonial subjugation was both coercive and discursive. De Kock draws on the revisionist histories of Jeff Peires, Colin Bundy, Shula Marks and others to outline ‘the blood’, and the book’s attention is on the discursive, the embedding of a Victorian English in the colonial context as the language of civilisation and progress, and on missionary-driven efforts to ‘*inscribe* in “barbarous” Africans the precepts of a largely Protestant, Western modernity’ (2). His project, as he describes it, is to analyse the ‘**narrative** forms by which African subjectivity in the 19th century was remade’ (2) by Protestant missionaries against the background of coercive military and cultural warfare that characterised the imposition of the colonial order. As a literary person ‘doing history’, with a difference, his argument is with those scholars working in English and literary studies who continue to regard the English language as being on the side of the angels in the turbulence of the 19th and 20th centuries in South Africa. (Guy Butler is the supreme embodiment of this tradition for De Kock.)

De Kock opens with an elaborate location of his study as being shaped by post-colonialism ('the overhaul and deconstruction of Western representations of the non-western world' in Said's words (5)) and post-structuralism, in its multiple forms. He cites and reviews selected argument from most of the bigger names, starting from Said and Spivak and including Rorty, Foucault, Derrida and Saussure, as well as historians and literary theorists who carry those influences. JM Coetzee, Franz Fanon and Jean and John Comaroff are used to help him outline a particularly African and South African theme in the study of colonialism and the missionaries. Having lined up the post-s on his side, however, and having endorsed the post-modern stresses on indeterminacy, contingency, 'history from below', distrust of both grand narratives of historical process and 'monocausal explanations', he somewhat paradoxically goes on to make a case which treats the 'civilising discourse' as a master narrative which is dominant, determining and hegemonic. This sits somewhat uneasily with post-colonial concerns to disaggregate dominant traditions and reclaim subjugated knowledge. *Civilising Barbarians* runs up against the post-colonialist's problems with the complexities that exist in separating domination from subordination and acts of resistance from those of collusion. Despite his extended, self-conscious elaboration on these dilemmas, he doesn't quite manage to get all his balls up in the air at once.

### **Great Divides**

De Kock's key move, which he outlines in his second chapter and develops in later chapters, is to show that 19th century missionary discourse in the Cape was 'suffocatingly repetitious' in its insistence on the Manichean binary polarities of British culture and African barbarism (civilisation, positivity, virtue, industriousness, on the one hand, and barbarism, negativity, absence, sloth, sensuousness and evil, on the other). This binary scheme of representation, he argues, was internalised and reproduced by the missionaries' Black pupils even as it was resisted by them: their identification with the model of Victorian civilisation shows traces of ambivalence, opposition and subversion, but they are not able to escape identifying with their teachers' commitment to 'civilisation' and 'progress'. He demonstrates, repeatedly, the civilisation/barbarism dualities at work in the texts he examines, and goes on to argue that 19th century missionary writers were impelled by this overall scheme of representation into narrative forms where they could only achieve comedic, romantic or tragic resolution of their concerns: the characters either rise, (to civilised nobility) fall, (to brutish barbarity) or remain

objects of ridicule (buffoons with the outward show of civilisation). But they never escape those obsessive, oscillating binarisms.

Concerned to show the totalising impact of this representative framework, and how its outcome is that of 'textually imposed identities', De Kock cites the Comaroff's attention to the hegemonic (and Said's related concern with 'general lines of force') to support his argument as to the dominating and determining effects of the 'civilising' discourse, and, through association, of the English language itself.

the vehicle of the 'Victorian world mission' was an English which bore terrible certainties and was seldom tolerant of alterity. It was a language of closure and myopia... (30)

Missionaries, he argues, were concerned with remaking the forms of culture they encountered in precise and certain terms. 'Their particular role was to saturate the mission fields with signifiers of Western subjectivity' (54), and English was the master code, 'the ultimate fount of civilised life from which Africans were invited to drink'. (3)

In chapter three, De Kock zooms in on the 'discursive order' of the Lovedale Institute in the Eastern Cape, as an important exemplar of missionary influence. He draws, in particular, on the published writings of James Stewart, principal of Lovedale from 1870, during its most influential period, to show the 'savage civility' in his views of Africans, their culture and their educational and religious needs: Typical of Stewart's writings are his views of African social life as comprising 'gross superstitions', 'idle habits' and 'coarse vices', the 'habits of sloth and idleness', and their hoped-for resolution through Christian religious conversion, through educational upliftment by 'enlightened, benevolent and earnest men' and through the 'countless, nameless influences for good derived from continual friendly intercourse between the natives and a ... community of civilised and Christian men'. (92) Common metaphors in Stewart's writings are those of Africans as children, and civilisation as a 'race' where 'the African' is a starter and Europeans 'have been running hard in it for a thousand years at least' (89). Supporting this discursive order of European cultural arrogance, De Kock says, was 'a regimented, hierarchical order of material disciplinary practices which was designed to combat the 'idleness' of the African (74)' and he quotes, for example, from the journal of a Lovedale teacher who worked under Stewart to show the hierarchical 'militaristic emphasis' which characterised dining arrangements and the organisation of daily work and study routine.(74-6).

Chapter four studies examples of ‘selected public expression by African colonial subjects themselves’ (107), Lovedale’s star pupils, mostly, particularly John Tengo Jabavu and his newspaper, *Imvo Zabantsundu*, the first Black-owned and run newspaper in South Africa, as well as the writings and speeches of Tengo’s friend and contemporary, Elijah Makiwane, particularly his public engagements with Stewart’s notions of ‘Civilisation’ as a race between cultures. Sol Plaatje’s opinion on the Cape franchise is quoted along the way as being “‘the most liberal, logical, just and humane’ system of voting because it had recognised that, ‘socially and politically, the Bantu people are in their teens’” (112). De Kock is concerned to show that the ‘civilising mission’ is reproduced in the writings of these figures of the Black elite, but that it is also ‘mimicked’ - ‘internalised, re-appropriated and subtly undermined within the constraints of colonial orthodoxy’ (24).

Chapter five makes an unexpected turn into repeating the analysis of the broad frame of the ‘civilising mission’, this time through brief reviews of the journals of David Livingstone and Robert Moffat in particular, as well as writings on and by Tiyo Soga, the first ‘fully civilised’ and ‘Christianised’ Black convert and, very briefly, John Knox Bokwe’s account of Ntsikana’s conversion to Christianity (143). De Kock justifies his choice of Moffat and Livingstone for critical scrutiny in that they ‘set the tone’, ‘as the acknowledged monarchs’ for other, less conspicuously grand works on missionary endeavour and heroism, though it remains unclear how much of the substantial volume of 19th South African missionary writings De Kock has actually studied. Subjected to his deconstructive literary analysis which again shows the binaries of civilisation and barbarism at work, they are seen to be limited writers and less-than-grand personalities. Moffat’s textual efforts are described as a ‘mediocre fusion of biography and romance’, a self-serving adventure story and De Kock on occasion pictures him in ‘buffoon’ mode, in a curious mirror-image of the narrative strategies that he is criticising:

Reading against the grain, one imagines an overdressed, sunstruck missionary in the 1820s among people who could only have seen Moffat as a curious, marginal spectacle. Perhaps they did not realise the consequences of his strange colloquies with himself or his equally incomprehensible habit of playing a fiddle in an African semi-desert. (151)

Livingstone’s book is seen as an influential and heroic assertion of the benign importance of imperialist expansion in Africa, the bringing of Christianity and commerce to light up the darkness.

Tiyo Soga is presented as a figure of 'agonism', fully identifying with the 'civilising mission' - 'A Model Kafir' in his biographer's words, wracked with religious doubt in his private writings and a Xhosa nationalist and loyalist in his Xhosa writings. De Kock uses Spivak's concept of 'subject effect' to explain these complexities - 'in regarding subjectivity via discourse, one does not encounter full "consciousness"... that which *seems to operate as a subject* may be part of an immense discontinuous network of texts.' (177) Such an analysis would have been more credible, however, if Moffat and Livingstone, for example, were also considered as 'subject effects' rather than unified, if deluded subjects. In fact, it would have been most useful to consider their distinctive assertions and actions as reflecting shifts and emphases in the wider discourse of humanitarian evangelism, and its links with the secular ideologies of free trade and utilitarian liberalism (See Keegan, 1996:77). De Kock also neglects the wider framing of Moffat's and Livingstone's books. In a way they were fundraising documents, much like most of the published missionary writing of the time - 'their overwhelming burden was to demonstrate the need for missionary work. The darker the picture of African barbarism, the more necessary the work of the missionaries'.(E Berman 1975:7)

### **Text and context: the situated reception of discourse**

The analysis in *Civilising Barbarians* of the literary form of missionary writings is the stuff of an interesting study, but De Kock stretches limited resources of conceptualisation and research too far. It is not his project to closely examine the cultural processes, translations and encodings that were implicit in the daily organisation of activities on the mission stations, in the schools, and in the lives of both black and white missionaries. As a result De Kock tends to exaggerate the determining effect of **form** - in particular, the narrative form of published, public, missionary discourse. To read off processes of identity formation from such representational forms, is to misread text as if it were synonymous with cultural process.

Despite his major preoccupation with identity-construction, De Kock's analytical identification of the Manichean binarisms at work in the 'civilising discourse' does not constitute an explanation of the complexities related to the reception of those cultural messages. At the point of reception, already coded signs intersect with the deep semantic codes that are already in place and take on distinctive dimensions. This is the point where the Comaroffs' go further than De Kock:

Money and commodities, literacy and Christendom challenged local symbols, threatening to convert them into a universal currency. But precisely because the cross, the book, and the coin were such saturated signs, they were variously and ingeniously redeployed to bear a host of new meanings as non-Western peoples... fashioned their own visions of modernity.’(J. and J. Comaroff, 1992:5)

And other social practices besides formal texts have semiotic structure - they are mediums and carry meaning the way that language does: The Comaroffs refer to the ‘welter of domestic detail and small-scale civilities’ and ‘the mundane and routine elements of everyday encounters and exchanges .. (in) the constitution of complex social fields, that build hegemonies, that work thorough-going social transformations behind the back of a declarative, heroic history.’ (1992:5). De Kock is unable to get behind the back of that declarative history, despite his often substantial effort.

When he does look at reports of daily practices and routines, De Kock’s inclination is to stress the coercive rather than the co-optive forces at play in institutions like Lovedale (as if surveillance and discipline were necessarily brutal **in form**). The appeal of ‘the subtle glamour of Lovedale’, the ‘old school tie’ attachments of its graduates, is briefly passed over in his stress on the ‘regimented, hierarchical order of material disciplinary practices which was designed to combat the idleness of the African’(74). His evidence is that of the most formal of rituals, notably details of the hierarchical and militaristic dining arrangements. But such rituals of hierarchy and station would be common to elite public schools in England at the time, as well. Lovedale sources reveal a more interactive, attentive and intimate process, in addition to that which De Kock identifies at Lovedale. For example, Gaitskell’s account of Jane Waterston, who was James Stewart’s co-worker, in charge of the girl’s school at Lovedale (and later the first woman doctor in Cape Town), draws attention to the close interest Waterston took in the marital intentions of the most promising pupils among both her boys and girls being trained by Dr James Stewart for teaching and the ministry. She wrote to Stewart in his absence in Britain,

.. In special I have been struck with the increased manliness of Mpambani [Mzimba] and Elijah [Makiwane];<sup>2</sup> Seeing this the thought has struck me also that if we wish to retain the *confidence* and respect of these fellows, we would not ignore their manhood... (115)

Of Makiwane’s engagement to Maggie Majiza, Waterston wrote:

When I see her face all alight with intelligence and feeling, I know what an amount of brain and natural refinement she has got. I cannot but feel pleased that Elijah with all his deep feeling and sensitiveness, has got one so well able to understand and appreciate him as Maggie is (116).

Waterston's letters to Stewart are of a different genre of writing to the public rehearsals of the missionary discourse that De Kock concentrates on, but no less important because of that. They illustrate an important point about the working of hegemony which is underplayed in *Civilising Barbarians*, namely that, as Gaitskell argues,

the consent of the governed which is crucial to the exercise of hegemony is the 'result of a kind of bargaining' in which some account is taken of the interests and tendencies of the dominated group. Gaitskell, 111

I would like to give further attention, below, to this argument and to related points where I differed with De Kock's reading on the role and impact of the 'civilising mission'.

### **Humanitarian evangelism**

I found it disappointing that De Kock doesn't give an adequate genealogy of the particular strains of the 'civilising discourse' that his missionaries carry. For example, he claims that their thinking was 'severely circumscribed by the more general belief that Africans were an inferior race, based on erroneous but nevertheless scholarly theories of physical causes of inferiority.' (40) This misidentifies the specificity and legacy of the humanitarian discourse, and its varying appeal.

As Keegan skilfully sums it up, based on a closer reading of the social and discursive roots of the tradition from which De Kock's missionaries (all of them Scottish) draw:

Missionary ideology was specifically shaped by Scottish Enlightenment thinking on the organic evolution of societies according to uniform laws of cultural development towards a common goal, of which European civilisation was the ultimate expression. Although scientific racism was also a product of Enlightenment thought, mission ideology (contrary to scientific racism) held that all people belonged to the same order of humanity, and shared a natural propensity to embrace civilisation once they were brought to a state of divine revelation and realisation. (91, Keegan, 1996)

While such a view discounted cultural difference, and was horribly Eurocentric, it was not racist in conception or intention. That particular missionaries displayed evidence of racist thought is not proof that the enterprise was racist in conception. The humanitarians, led by Dr John Philips, campaigned from the 1820s for political rights for all in the Cape because they were sure that people had to be free to grow into a state of civilised and industrious godliness. The missionary, wrote Philip, 'sees in every man a partaker of his own nature, and a brother of his own species'. John Ross, one of James Stewart's predecessors at Lovedale, was an ally of Philip's in the 1830s, when he fought to reverse the British militaristic expansion that was underway, driven by settler hunger for land. According to Keegan, Philip 'shared the belief of others of his class background that indigenous peoples in southern Africa were in no way

morally inferior to Europeans (in fact he claimed that many were morally superior to white colonists); and insisted that if they imbibed evangelical Christianity and its associated literature, culture and values, they were as capable of achieving solid prosperity as were the artisans and yeomen of his native Scotland' (1996:90,91).

The preceding generation of London Missionary Society missionaries to Philip (and Stewart) included TJ Van der Kemp and James Read, who unlike subsequent generations of missionaries did not conflate the experience of Christian conversion with the process of acculturation. Van der Kemp

had little time for such 'civilisation' and self-consciously 'went native', living in very humble circumstances, and tolerating a lifestyle among converts which differed little from that of other Khoi. He married a 14-year-old slave girl whose freedom he had purchased. Other early missionaries also took indigenous partners, and distanced themselves from the colonial social order. For them as for Van der Kemp, the Christian community thrived best when least infected by contact with the false Christianity of metropolitan civilisation. (1996:83,4)

Van der Kemp was the leading figure among the missionaries of the early 19th century and the influence of such people is an important part of the missionary story, on which De Kock hardly touches. They were substantial influences in the emergence of 'Hottentot', 'Griqua' and 'Coloured' identity, in the western, eastern and northern Cape, as well as in the mobilising of anti-colonial resistance in the following decades. Peires refers to the 'new and revolutionary brand of Christianity' that was introduced to the Xhosa by the Khoi rebels, mission products all of them, who fought at their side against the British under Sir Harry Smith in the bloody and bitter 'War of Mlanjeni' (1850-3).(Peires, 1989:135)<sup>3</sup>

The missionaries that followed, including Moffat, Philips and later Stewart were more attuned to middle-class prejudices and perceptions than Van der Kemp and Read were, but even amongst them there were differing degrees of compliance with colonial government and settler sentiment. Indeed, the missionaries that De Kock focuses on were really just one generation, and only one of several distinct missionary strands. Besides, it was precisely through Lovedale's willingness to train (a select few) of their Black converts to the highest degree, including periods spent in Britain for the very best, that there was space for an assertive Black church leadership to grow. The Catholics, for example, explained their immunity from secessionist breakaways, in comparison to the Protestants, in that they were careful to train Black converts for only the lower levels of service. (Sundkler, 1948)

Racist comment is more apparent in the writings of Stewart than his earlier colleagues, and it is evident that humanitarian thought was, by the 1840s and 1850s becoming overlaid with

racial sentiment (Keegan, 1996:128), but it is just as likely that people such as Jabavu and Makiwane had read the writings of the earlier missionaries such as Philip. Rather than ‘agonistic’ subversion of the missionary message, in fact, they were consciously recalling its fundamentals in their public debates with Stewart, as I go on to discuss.

### **‘Equal rights for all civilised men’: Hybridity or agonism?**

A key argument in *Civilising Barbarians* is that by configuring Black identities within the master narrative of the ‘civilising mission’, the missionaries were engaged in a ‘classic act of erasure, in which subjects are constituted (textually objectified) and effaced (given meaning in terms of a misrecognition, and a transcoding, of difference) as they are reconfigured in language’ (143). De Kock’s narrative can, in turn, be seen to be operating its own forms of exclusion.

When presenting Jabavu and Makiwane as locked in and ‘mimicking’ the master discourse of civilisation De Kock identifies no other discursive resources for them. He relies too heavily on Foucault’s concept of ‘agonism’<sup>4</sup>, to give the impression that the mission-trained class of Black South Africans were the oppressed in a domination/subordination binary contest, where the only game in town was the ‘civilising mission’. However, it is evident that both narratives of Xhosa cultural identity and African nationalism were in the air and influential (Nelson Mandela’s autobiography makes the same point about his time at Healdtown), and that even the most ‘westernised’ of missionary-trained ministers and journalists retained their social identities as Xhosas and Africans. While they subscribed fully to the ‘civilising’ ideal (Jabavu’s political credo was ‘Equal Rights for All Civilised Men’) they continued to sustain key aspects of Xhosa cultural identity, including circumcision and lobola for themselves and their children. Higgs’ biography of Tengo Jabavu’s son argues that had Tengo Jabavu not been circumcised, he could not have achieved the prominence he did in the eastern Cape in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (C. Higgs, 1997:54,55). But there is no doubt that Jabavu identified with the evangelical mission and its ‘civilising’ discourse. His son reminisced about his father’s enthusiasm:

His joy was irrepressible as he surveyed the Transkei villages (around Tsomo, in 1902) then almost destitute of all signs of heathendom, where but a decade before every other individual flourished the red blanket and red ochre, the emblems of heathenism’ (1997:58).

The belief in ‘progress’, was a melding of nationalist aspirations with the evolutionist and assimilationist ideology of humanitarian evangelical discourse.<sup>5</sup>

De Kock deals at some length in chapter four with Makiwane's apparently subversive retort to Stewart's numerous statements that 'in the race of nations' the Xhosa were several centuries behind the Europeans. While acknowledging that the English are a greater nation than the Xhosa (Kafir), because they have possessed Christianity and civilisation so much longer, Makiwane undermines the conclusion that every Englishman is automatically culturally superior to every Xhosa, or that the Xhosa will take as long as the English took to attain civilisation. '(N)otwithstanding the 2 000 years of Christianity or civilisation', he wrote, 'there were individuals even in the higher callings to whom some Kafirs may be compared without fear'(118). While De Kock sees this as subversive of the missionary discourse, I have illustrated, above, that such sentiments were not incompatible with earlier evangelical humanist thought, and not far from what Philip had already written.

There is little sense of how culture is negotiated in De Kock's analysis, how the 'civilising discourse' is received by persons themselves already materially and discursively located, and subject to other influences, as well. Shula Marks summed it up: The hegemonic political ideology among the *kholwa* was not

simply the invention or imposition of the imperial or colonial ruling class: ...For this new class of property-owning and aspiring *kholwa*, the moral imperatives of the 19th-century bourgeois liberalism and the attack on 'traditionalism' both resonated with their own interests and experience and provided a language of resistance (1986:69).

In illustration, both Rhodes and Jabavu held to the same slogan: 'Equal rights for all civilised men' but for Rhodes that meant only 'white' men.

De Kock sees this larger process too, as where he notes that '.. the master narrative of 'civilisation' with its teleology of ultimate fairness and equal justice in a British constitutional system was used strategically, rhetorically and tactically in the process of a very material and *political* struggle (123). But his overall concern with reading off processes of identity construction from an analysis of narrative form does not co-exist easily with such attention to contextual and contingent detail.

### **The great divides of oral and literate cultures**

Following Benedict Anderson, De Kock gives importance to literacy (print capitalism) in its impact on mission-trained Xhosa-speaking people in the Eastern Cape: 'Literacy was at the core of colonisation in South Africa' (64), and goes on to represent it as something of a relentless, context-independent, perception-altering technology. He follows the 'Great Divide' theorists of literacy and cultural change such as Jack Goody, whom he quotes, and

sees literacy as impacting upon people living in a previously 'oral culture' in predictable ways such as facilitating 'a transformation in cognitive procedures by which knowledge could be more easily reified' (65), whereas in 'oral culture' 'symbols are regarded with great seriousness', whatever that might mean. Such a move, however, is a problematic reification of literacy itself. Goody's stress on the 'great divide' between literate and oral cultures is an extension of exactly that conceptual division between the 'primitive' and the 'modern', an act of erasure where 'oral culture' is the negative 'Other' (however romanticised) of the West. This, of course, is the sin of which De Kock accuses the missionaries, and it is precisely this allocation of broad cultural attributes to societies on the basis of their identities as 'oral' or 'literate' cultures that has been identified as a problematic extension of the now disreputable binaries of primitive/civilised. (See B Street, 1993; R Finnegan, 1973; M Prinsloo and M Breier, 1996)

To sum up, De Kock finds it useful to see the missionaries' students as 'having recently emerged from an oral culture' and to stress the perception-altering impact of 'the book' - such a move, however, is to present a social technology (literacy) as a uniform determinant, and to reinvokethe rhetoric of a 'great divide' between modernity and tradition. The result, though this is clearly not his intention, is an elision of the hybrid character of contemporary African identities.

## **Conclusion**

In conclusion to this review essay, a more searching and subtle genealogy was called for, to justify De Kock's chosen focus on selected texts and on the Lovedale institute, as representatives of a universal missionary discourse and practice in colonial South Africa. De Kock's concern with a particular feature of the narrative form of selected missionary texts (the civilisation/barbarism duality) tends towards a reductionist history and a mono-causal account of humanitarian evangelism, though he tries hard to avoid this. He deals with a transitory and fluid state of affairs in a definitive way, but the complex legacy of the 'civilising mission' resists such treatment and eludes him at key points, as I have outlined above.

## **References**

Benjamin, Walter., 1987. 'Eduard Fuchs: Collector and Historian'. In *The Essential Frankfurt School Reader*. Dandrew Arato and Eike Gebhardt (eds). New York: Continuum.

Berman, Edward. 1975. *African Reactions to Missionary Education*, New York: Teacher's College, Columbia University.

Comaroffs, Jean and John. 1992. *Ethnography and the Historical Imagination*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Finnegan, Ruth. 1977. *Literacy and Orality*, Oxford, Blackwell.

Gaitskell, Deborah. 1994. In Dagmar Engels and Shula Marks, (eds) *Contesting Colonial Hegemony: State and Society in Africa and India*. London: British Academy Press

Higgs, Catherine. 1997. *The Ghost of Equality: The Public Lives of DDT Jabavu of South Africa, 1885-1959*, Cape Town: David Philip.

Keegan, Timothy. 1996. *Colonial South Africa and the Origins of the Racial Order*, Cape Town: David Philip.

Marks, Shula. 1986. *The Ambiguities of Dependence in South Africa: Class, Nationalism and the State in Twentieth-Century Natal*. Johannesburg: Ravan.

Moeti, Moitsadi Thoane. 1981. 'Ethiopianism: Separatist Roots of an African Nationalism in South Africa'. PhD, Syracuse University.

Prinsloo, Mastin and Breier, Mignonne (eds). *The Social Uses of Literacy: Theory and Practice in Contemporary South Africa*. Johannesburg: Sached Books.

Sundkler Bengt. 1948. *Bantu Prophets in SA*. London: Butterworth

Street, Brian (ed). 1993. *Cross-Cultural Approaches to Literacy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---

<sup>1</sup> Most notably, Timothy Keegan, (1996).

<sup>2</sup> Both later became Free Church of Scotland ministers and feature in De Kock's account as important examples of Lovedale graduates. Mzimba was to start a breakaway church and his secession was to 'leave a scar upon (Stewart's) heart that I believe he felt each day until he died' (Sundkler, 1948:61).

<sup>3</sup> Peires quote a letter by a Khoi leader this displays a millenarian perspective:

Trust, therefore, in the Lord (whose character is known to be unfriendly to injustice), and undertake your work, and he will give us prosperity - a work for your mother-land and freedom, for it is now the time, yea, the appointed time and no other. (J. Peires, 1989:135)

<sup>4</sup> Whereby "submission to power also contains obduracy, expressed not in face-to-face confrontation but in "permanent provocation" (36)

<sup>5</sup> Narratives of national and cultural identity were clearly forcefully around, and the 'civilising discourse' had to meet these in producing new, hybridised identities. In a letter to Stewart, dated July 3 1899, an ex-pupil, Maqubela wrote his mentor:

---

Mzimba had forgotten that the great friends of the Africans in this country are the missionaries, and that the Africans appear to be misled by the word *Uhlanga* (nation) and when that word is used they become stupefied and loose (sic) all senses of reasoning' (Stewart Papers, Jagger Library, Cape Town, 1899, quoted in Moeti, 1981:174-5)