

https://dspace.org/

Politics, ideology, and the invention of the 'Nguni'

Wright, John

1983-06-14
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/10254

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

WRIGHT

AFRICANA LIBRARY

POLITICS, IDEOLOGY, AND THE INVENTION OF THE 'NGUNI'

John Wright

Paper for presentation at the History, Post-graduate Seminar,

University of the Witwatersrand

14 June 1983

R.W.319

2.30 pm

Not to be cited without the author's permission

WRIGHT

UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND

AFRICAN STUDIES INSTITUTE

African Studies Seminar Paper
to be presented on Tuesday
14 June 1983.

POLITICS, IDEOLOGY, AND THE INVENTION OF THE 'NGUNI'

by John Wright

Politics, ideology, and the invention of the 'Nguni'

The word 'Nguni' is today commonly used by academics as a collective term for the black peoples who historically have inhabited the eastern regions of southern Africa from Swaziland through Zululand, Natal, the Transkei and the Ciskei to the eastern Cape. These peoples are conventionally distinguished by language and culture from the Thonga peoples of the coastlands further to the north, and the Sotho peoples of the interior plateau to the west and north-west. Use of Nguni in this extended sense is now so well entrenched in the literature on southern African ethnography, linguistics, and history as probably to make the term irremovable, but, from a historical perspective, it is important to note that it is only within the last half-century that this usage has become current. Previously, the peoples now designated as Nguni had been variously labelled as Zulu, or Xhosa, or Kaffirs, or Zulu-Kaffirs, while Nguni itself had been a non-literary term used by the black peoples of south-east Africa in a number of more restricted senses. Nowhere among these peoples was Nguni used in a generic sense.

The purpose of this paper is to trace the historical process by which the modern literary usage of Nguni became established. It is divided into three parts. In the first, the various historically known meanings of Nguni are identified. In the second, an explanation is suggested as to why specifically one of these meanings was appropriated by academics from the 1930s onward. In the third, an explanation is put forward as to how and why this particular meaning had developed in the first place.

1. The historical usages of Nguni

The earliest known documented usage of Nguni dates from 1589, when survivors of the Sao Thomé, which had sunk off the coast of what is now northern Zululand, found that the region where they made their landfall was known as the country of 'Virangune' or 'Viragune'.[1] This

word was regarded by Bryant as a rendering of 'baNguni'.[2] Junod considered that it was not a Bantu word,[3] but present-day opinion would support Bryant's gloss.[4] The survivors of the Sao Thomé apparently gave 'Virangune/Viragune' as the name of what the accounts of their experiences call a kingdom, although, as Hedges points out, another party of shipwreck survivors who traversed the region further inland in 1593 found no such polity in existence. Hedges argues that the word is likely to have applied to 'early residents of lower areas of Zululand' rather than to a specific political unit.[5] Either way, the point to note is that in 1589 the use of Nguni as a designation seems to have been confined to part of the Zululand coast and its immediate hinterland. To the north and south, according to the recorded accounts of the Sao Thomé party, were other 'kingdoms' with quite different names.[6]

The next recorded use of Nguni that the present writer has been able to find is in the papers of Henry Francis Fynn, who, as is well known, operated as a hunter and trader at Port Natal from 1824 to 1834. In a fragmentary note written in or after 1832, he records that the west wind was known as the wind of the 'Abangoonie'.[7] By whom it was so called he does not specify, but presumably it was by the peoples of the region, extending from Port Natal to the Mpondo country, where Fynn concentrated his operations and where he established a number of homesteads for his African adherents. In this case the reference to the 'Abangoonie' would be to the Xhosa peoples who lived to the south-west. Certainly this was one of the meanings which the word Nguni had acquired, in Natal colony at least, by the middle of the 19th century, for in the first edition of his Zulu-English Dictionary, published in 1861, Colenso gives Nguni specifically as 'Another name for the Amaxosa'.[8] This definition was retained through to the third edition, published in 1878.[9] Kropf's Kaffir-English Dictionary, first published in 1899, also gives the locative form ebunguni as 'in the West; westward',[10] and in the first decade of the 20th century several of James Stuart's

informatns used Nguni to designate the Xhosa.[11] It was used exclusively in this sense by Soga in his classic work, The South-eastern Bantu, published in 1930. 'The term Ebu-Nguni,' he wrote, 'is used by Natives of Natal to indicate the country of the Abe-Nguni or Xosas, which lies west of Natal...'.[12]

The meagreness of the evidence in the sources cited above makes it difficult to specify with any confidence the geographical regions in which, during the period surveyed, Nguni was used to denote the Xhosa peoples. Tentatively, though, it can be suggested that this usage was current predominantly in the region from Natal colony southward, as distinct from the Zulu kingdom and areas neighbouring it to the west and north. As argued above, Fynn's note on the meaning of 'Abangoonie' probably reflects observations he made during his travels in southern Natal and the Mpondo country. Colenso's Dictionary was based on linguistic research conducted primarily in Natal colony, where, apart from a five-week trip to the Zulu kingdom in 1859, he resided continuously during the period when he was preparing this work.[13] Kropf spent 49 years as a missionary among Xhosa-speakers before the publication of his Dictionary.[14] Of those of Stuart's informants whose statements have been published in the first three volumes of the James Stuart Archive, and who used Nguni as a term for the Xhosa, it is significant that all seven had spent all or most of their lives in Natal or the territories to the south.[15] In Soga's usage, as exemplified in the passage cited above, 'Natal' frequently denotes the region south of the Thukela, as distinct from Zululand to the north.

In the Zulu kingdom, by contrast, a quite different meaning of Nguni seems to have existed for most of the 19th century. According to evidence given to Stuart by Magidigidi kaNobebe in 1905, a number of the lineages incorporated into the Zulu kingdom by Shaka had been accustomed to designate themselves as abaNguni until the king reserved the term, in its personalized form, Mnguni, as one of his own address-names.[16] It is highly likely that the

designation Nguni would thenceforth have been applied exclusively to the Zulu ruling lineage, possibly together with those others, like the Qwabe, that could incontestably claim a close genealogical relationship to it. On the basis of admittedly skimpy evidence, the term does not seem to have been used within the kingdom as a designation for its inhabitants generally. Colenso makes no mention of it: if it had been so used, so acute a student of language would presumably have included this meaning in his Dictionary definition of the word. In similar negative vein, Colenso's protégé, the philologist Wilhelm Bleek, who in 1856 spent three or four months in the Zulu kingdom studying the language, makes no mention of the term Nguni in his published account of his travels.[17] Bryant, who lived and worked both south and north of the Thukela in the years before the publication of his Dictionary in 1905, commented in that work that Nguni was a name adopted only occasionally by the 'Zulu-Kafirs', that is, the inhabitants of Zululand and Natal.[18]

In the Zulu kingdom, then, Nguni had a meaning quite different from the sense in which it was widely used in the regions to the south. At the same time, yet another meaning seems to have existed for much of the 19th century in the territories to the west and north of the kingdom. Presumably by extension from Nguni as an appellation of the ruling Zulu lineage, the Sotho peoples to the west and the Thonga to the north seem to have used the word to designate the inhabitants of the Zulu kingdom generally, together with peoples who culturally and linguistically were closely related to them. Thompson records that in the 1830s Dr Andrew Smith, who led an official expedition from the Cape into the highveld regions in 1834-5, used the word 'Abingoni' to refer generally to the peoples who lived east of the Drakensberg escarpment.[19] Without further details as to the context of this usage, it is difficult to accept Thompson's assertion that Smith employed Nguni 'in precisely the same sense as it was used later by Bryant and modern scholars'

More likely is that Smith noted the same kind of usage as Arbousset and Daumas recorded in the same area a few years later. According to these authors, the Sotho of the highveld usually used 'Bakoni', the Sotho form of 'Abanguni', to refer to the 'Zulas', a term which the authors used to designate the peoples both of the Zulu kingdom and of the newly formed offshoot Ndebele kingdom. Occasionally, it seems, the Sotho extended the meaning of the term to include 'all the Caffers which they knew'.[20] A similar usage seems to have been prevalent in the Thonga country, where, Bryant recorded in 1905, Nguni designated 'a Zulu-Kafir'.[21]

In sum, during the 19th century there appear to have been three regionally distinct meanings of Nguni. South of the Thukela, the term designated primarily the Xhosa peoples. North of the Thukela, in the Zulu kingdom, it designated the dominant Zulu clan and closely related clans, to the exclusion of the great majority of the clans that had been incorporated into the kingdom. Among the Sotho and Thonga, the word designated the people of the Zulu kingdom as a whole.

By the early years of the 20th century, at the latest, these regional distinctions of meaning appear to have been breaking down. Though, as indicated above, a number of the informants interviewed by Stuart in Natal at this time still used Nguni to mean specifically the Xhosa, in the usage of others the term was now being applied to certain clans living north of the Thukela in what had until 1879 been the Zulu kingdom. Yet others of his informants used it in both senses. The clans most commonly designated as Nguni were the Zulu and the related Qwabe;[22] others were the Biyela, Chunu, Langa, Magwaza, Mthethwa, Ndwandwe, Nzimela, and Zungu.[23] Certain others - the Hlubi and the Thuli - were mentioned specifically as not being Nguni.[24] But opinion was by no means unanimous on which clans could legitimately be regarded as Nguni, and which not: the Zulu, Mthethwa, and Ndwandwe, given as Nguni by some informants, were described specifically as not Nguni by others.[25]

In effect, in Natal and Zululand, the meaning of Nguni was by now being extended to include peoples to whom it had not previously been applied. This extension of meaning was reflected in a number of linguistic and historical works that appeared at this time. In the fourth edition of Colenso's Dictionary, revised by his daughter Harriette and published in 1905, the original definition of Nguni was broadened to read 'Another name for the amaXosa, Qwabe, Zulu, and other kindred tribes'.[26] Where, in the historical introduction to his Dictionary of 1905, Bryant had used the then common terms 'Kaffirs' and 'Zulus' to designate the African peoples of Natal and Zululand generally, in a series of historical articles that appeared in 1910-13 in the newspaper Izindaba Zabantu he was beginning to use instead the word Nguni, usually in compound forms like 'Zulu-Nguni' and 'Tonga-Nguni'.[27] The first work unreservedly to use Nguni as a generic term was Magema Fuze's Abantu Abamnyama, which appeared in 1922, although it had apparently been completed at least twenty years earlier. In this work Fuze used Nguni to denote the African peoples who had populated Zululand-Natal and also the regions to the south.[28]

In the first two decades of the 20th century, then, the modern meaning of Nguni was beginning to gain currency among certain writers in Natal. At this stage it was by no means a generally used term, however. To take three well-known works of the period, it did not appear in Gibson's The Story of the Zulus (first published in 1903), in Stuart's History of the Zulu Rebellion (1913), or in Faye's Zulu References (1923).[29] It was not until the publication in 1929 of Bryant's now classic Olden Times in Zululand and Natal, sub-titled 'Earlier political history of the eastern-Nguni clans', that Nguni as a generic term began to become firmly established in scholarly usage. More than half a century later, this is still the standard work on its subject, and more than any other single work it has served to popularize use of the term Nguni to denote the peoples of the

area from Swaziland to the eastern Cape. Bryant adopted the term, he explained, 'because abaNguni was the name by which, in times gone by, these peoples generically distinguished themselves from the other two types around them', i.e. the Sotho and the Thonga.[30] No proof of this assertion was offered, and in the light of the arguments put forward above it represents a substantial oversimplification, even a distortion, of the historical picture. This was also the opinion of one, at least, of Bryant's contemporaries, the Government Ethnologist, N.J. van Warmelo. Writing in 1935, he commented,

> ...though not commonly heard, the tribal name abeNguni occurs, also as isithakazelo (Mnguni), far and wide wherever tribes of 'Nguni' stock are encountered, but exactly what people were originally designated thereby is to my mind still a matter of uncertainty, notwithstanding the conviction of a few authors that they have fathomed the problem.[31]

The usage of Nguni as a generic term, he continued, 'by no means coincides with the original content of the native tribal name abeNguni'.[32]

Evidence that older, more restricted meanings of Nguni were still current in African usage when Olden Times was published exists in at least two contemporary works. In his Zulu Dictionary of 1923 R.C.A. Samuelson indicates that the term was still one applied specifically to the Zulu clan,[33] and the statement of Soga cited above (p. 3) suggests that Nguni was being used by people in Natal as late as 1930 as a designation for the Xhosa. But among contemporary academics neither these nor Van Warmelo's points seem to have counted for much against Bryant's assertion, based, as it appeared to be, on the massive and evident scholarship that had gone into the preparation of Olden Times. After the publication of this work, the usage of Nguni as a generic term in place of various combinations of 'Kaffir', 'Zulu', and 'Xhosa' quickly gained academic respectability. It was used by Doke as a

linguistic term in a major review of the literature on the southern Bantu languages published in 1933, and as an ethnic term by Schapera in a survey of the ethnographic literature on southern Africa published in 1934.[34] In the latter year Schapera introduced the word to a wider readership in using it in the first comprehensive academic survey to be published on 'the native problem' in South Africa.[35] Two years later it appeared for the first time in an ethnographic monograph, Krige's well-known The Social System of the Zulu.[36]

By the mid-1930s Nguni was also beginning to receive semi-official sanction as an ethnic label. In spite of his reservations about its validity as a generic term, Van Warmelo was prepared to incorporate it into his well-known Preliminary Survey of the Bantu Tribes of South Africa, published in 1935, as a designation for one of the five 'divisions' which he recognized among the country's Bantu-speaking peoples. Though 'used in an entirely arbitrary sense', he explained, the term had already 'received the sanction of several years' usage in scientific literature'.[37] As he went on,

> The main reason for its adoption lies in the absence of any other name that would be equally suitable. However valid the arguments, therefore, that might be adduced against its use as a collective term, these will probably have to yield to this necessity.

Although he continued to express serious doubts about the usefulness of the versions of Nguni history (presumably Bryant's and Soga's) then current, Van Warmelo was himself prepared to use Nguni as a generic term without reservation in his contribution to The Bantu-speaking Tribes of South Africa, an influential composite ethnography edited by Schapera and published in 1937.[38]

With the appearance of this latter work, the modern literary meaning of Nguni may be fairly said to have become established in academic and official ethnographic and linguistic usage. The questions arise why it was this particular meaning of Nguni, to the exclusion of its other meanings, that so became accepted, and why it was absorbed into academic usage so rapidly and with relatively little criticism. At one level of explanation it could be argued that Nguni became established as a generic term simply because most academic anthropologists in South Africa were willing to see an apparently scientific designation replace the by then anachronistic and offensive 'Zulu-Kafir'. From this point of view the introduction of Nguni into academic discourse posed no problems: it was simply a new and historically acceptable name for one of the two broad groupings of African peoples in South Africa that had for a century been recognized as geographically and linguistically differentiated, that is, the 'Zulu-Kafir' or 'Zulu-Xhosa', and the 'Basuto-Bechuana'.[39] It could similarly be argued that the parallel absorption of Nguni into official usage was the result of the establishment in 1910 of a unified Department of Native Affairs in place of the four pre-existing colonial departments, with the use of a system of generic nomenclature reflecting the needs of a centralized, as against regionally based, administration.

The approach embodied in arguments of this kind is essentially an ahistorical one, with limited powers of explanation. On the one hand it takes no account of the particular circumstances within which anthropology as a profession was established in South Africa in the 1920s and 1930s. On the other, it fails to recognize that in South Africa (and presumably elsewhere) changes in established ethnic terminology have often reflected shifts in basic socio-political relationships. (One need only think of the political contexts within which usage has changed from Kaffir to Native to Bantu to Black.) The answers to the questions posed above need to be

looked for not simply in terms of the volition of a handful of anthropologists but in a consideration of the historical conditions within which the works mentioned in the preceding paragraphs were produced. It is to this issue that the second part of this paper is addressed.

2. The academic appropriation of Nguni

Students of the post-World War I era of South African history are generally agreed that it was a period when a number of deep-seated changes were taking place in the structure of South African society. While there is considerable debate about the precise nature of these changes, there seems to be a broad consensus on two points germane to the argument being developed in this paper.[40]

Firstly, that from World War I onward, the political, economic, and ideological domination that imperial mining capital had exercised in the sub-continent since the early years of the century was increasingly being challenged by the emergence of a South African national bourgeoisie (there is as yet no clear agreement about its composition), in alliance with important sections of the white working class. In her seminal work on the history of capitalist ideologies in South Africa in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, Belinda Bozzoli argues that at the ideological level the emergence of this national bourgeoisie was associated with the propagation of what was in effect a new notion of 'development'.[41] Where, in the 1890s and 1900s the 'organic intellectuals' of mining capital had been leaders in ideological innovation, by the 1920s their capacity to generate new approaches to the new problems that by then were facing capital in South Africa had dried up. Where, previously, mining capital had been actively concerned to restructure South African society in its own interests, now, with its objective largely achieved, 'ideologies were not being created through the media of mining capital as much as regurgitated; while social structures were not being "engineered" as much as lubricated'.[42] From this time on, in Bozzoli's view, it was increasingly

those intellectuals who spole for the rising national bourgeoisie, with manufacturing interests in the van, who concerned themselves with producing new ideological guidelines for the capitalist class as a whole.

This shift in the locus of ideological leadership led to a new emphasis on 'development' via industrialization. For the first time in South Africa, the idea began to be extensively and effectively propagated that local industrial growth was a desirable objective. Where imperial mining interests had generally opposed the development of a protected heavy industry in South Africa, on the grounds that the mines could import capital goods more cheaply than they would be able to buy them locally, local manufacturers, in alliance with important sections of commerce and agriculture, were increasingly pressing for the expansion of South African industry behind a barrier of tariff protection. From the time of World War I onward, Bozzoli argues, manufacturing interests and their allies, from a position of growing strength, were expanding their 'ideological network' to propagate what she felicitously calls 'scientific South Africanism'.[43] The nub of their case was that planned industrialization would be for the common good, and would be the solution to South Africa's growing list of social 'problems' - the native problem, the race problem, the poor white problem, the problem of rising worker unrest. In effect, 'a developmental, scientific, and planning-oriented ideology' was being articulated.[44]

The second point is that in the post-World War I period, the domination of capital as a whole was increasingly being threatened by the expansion of an urbanized and, on occasion, militant black working class, potentially in alliance with radicalized elements of the emergent black petty bourgeoisie. In effect, the whole system of control of African labour established in the states and colonies of South Africa in the late 19th and early 20th centuries was threatening to break down under the impact of a massive influx of Africans from the rural reserves to the urban areas, the growth of African worker organization, and the increasingly insistent - if still sporadic - demands

on the part of representatives of the African petty bourgeoisie for more political rights.

After the coming to power of the Pact government in 1924, one of the state's lines of response to these developments was to begin revamping the whole system of African administration through a deliberate policy of 'retribalization', as Marian Lacey has put it. In terms of this policy, the administrative system, which at that time still to a large extent reflected the different policies of the four pre-Union states, was to be centralized, strengthened, and made uniform. The assimilation of Africans into an industrializing society was as far as possible to be halted, 'surplus' African in the towns (though not on white-owned farms) were to be pushed back into the reserves, and a system of control in the reserves through 'traditional' African authorities was to be resuscitated, with emphasis on ethnic and cultural separatism.[45]

The contention of this paper is that the penetration of the ideologies outlined above - those associated with development planning and with retribalization - into the sphere of public debate was a necessary pre-condition for the sudden growth of support, both private and official, for applied research into African cultures and languages that took place in South Africa during the 1920s. Ethnographic and linguistic research in South Africa was nothing new, but for the most part it had been in the hands of untrained non-professionals. From early in the century voices in South Africa had called for the state to fund a more scientific kind of enquiry into the 'native problem',[46] but it was not until after World War I that governments began to respond to these pressures. It is no accident that in this period funds were made available for the establishment of the first departments of what would now be called African studies at South African universities, at Cape Town in 1920, and at Witwatersrand in 1923, with a department of volkekunde following at Stellenbosch in the late 1920s.[47]

Nor is it an accident that the journal Bantu Studies (later African Studies) was founded in 1921 in Johannesburg, as a 'clearing agency' (in the words of the first editor, J.D. Rheinallt Jones) for scientific research into the ethnography and languages of Africans in southern Africa;[48] nor that the South African Institute of Race Relations was established, with private funding, in 1929, in part, at least, as a research body.[49]

The liberal academics who staffed these institutions (with the exception of Stellenbosch) made quite clear that their researches were to a significant extent motivated by a profound unease about the future of 'white civilization' in South Africa, and a firm belief in the ultimate practical value of scientific ethnographic and linguistic research in aiding the improvement of 'race relations'. Thus in the first issue of Bantu Studies, the newly appointed professor of social anthropology and head of the School of African Life and Languages at the University of Cape Town, A.R. Radcliffe-Brown, could write,

> In Africa...social anthropology is a subject not of merely scientific or academic interest, but of immense practical importance. The one great problem on which the future welfare of South Africa depends is that of finding some social and political system in which the natives and the whites may live together without conflict; and the successful solution of that problem would certainly seem to require a thorough knowledge of the native civilisation between which and our own we need to establish some sort of harmonious relation. [50]

In an article significantly entitled 'The need of a scientific basis for South African native policy', Rheinallt Jones expressed very similar sentiments:

> A definite responsibility rests upon scientific workers in the fields of anthropological and psychological research to collect the data from which general principles may be deduced to guide

> the country in the adoption of a sound policy in race relationships. [51]

These intellectuals were quite explicit that one of the main aims of ethnographic and linguistic research was to influence, at least indirectly, those whites who were involved on a day-to-day basis in shaping the lives of Africans. The study of African beliefs and customs, Radcliffe Brown wrote in 1923,

> can afford great help to the missionary or public servant who is engaged in dealing with the practical problems of the adjustment of the native civilization to the new conditions that have resulted from our occupation of the country. [52]

The mining industry, too, 'would benefit by the increased expert knowledge of native questions' that would follow from research of this sort, Rheinallt Jones told the Chamber of Mines in 1922.[53]

At much the same time that liberal academics were beginning to involve themselves in scientific ethnographic research, mainly through the state-funded universities, the state itself was beginning to participate more directly in research of this sort. The coming to power of the Hertzog government in 1924 gave impetus to this process. In 1925 the Department of Native Affairs set up its own ethnological section, with the aim of promoting scientific research into African ethnography and linguistics in order to obtain information which, it was felt, 'was likely to prove of the greatest assistance in the smooth and harmonious administration of tribal affairs and in the prevention of friction'.[54] The following year the government began to make funds available for academic research into African life and languages, and set up an Advisory Committee on African Studies, whose members were drawn mainly from the universities, to supervise this work.[55] Though as a result of economic depression these funds fell away in 1930, the government's

willingness to finance ethnographic research was an indication that it acknowledged its potential usefulness to the state.

By the later 1920s, then, a body of professional anthropologists to a greater or lesser extent committed to 'practically' oriented research had been provided with an institutional base in South Africa. It seems to have been taken entirely for granted by them and by their sponsors, official and unofficial, that the primary unit of their investigations would be the 'tribe', that is, a group of people which was seen as occupying a specific territory under the political authority of a chief, as being economically more or less self-sufficient, and as being more or less united by ties of kinship, culture, and language. The history of the concept of the 'tribe' in western thought is badly in need of study, but certainly the main tenets of the notion of the bounded tribe as outlined above had been central to British anthropological thought since at least the later 19th century,[56] and its unquestioning deployment by British-trained South African anthropologists in the 1920s and 1930s comes as no surprise. It is easily understandable, too, that for Afrikaner volkekundiges, with their emphasis on the historical centrality of the volk in human affairs, the ethnic group should represent the primary social unit.[57]

But this uncritical acceptance of the concept of the tribe by South African anthropologists cannot be explained simply in terms of their intellectual predispositions. The point needs to be stressed that for anthropologists and volkekundiges alike there was in the 1920s and 1930s a positive disincentive for producing critical examinations of the concept, in that anthropology/volkekunde as a socially subsidized profession had come into existence, partly at least, to provide socially useful information on cultures that had long been perceived in administrative circles as tribally based. In this context, the continued existence of the notion of the tribe was central to the further expansion or at the very least, the

continued existence, of the profession.

To expand on this point, a useful parallel can be drawn between the social contexts within which South African and British anthropologists were operating at this time. Before World War I, anthropological organizations in Britain had not been particularly successful in obtaining public or private funding, primarily, Stauder argues, because the historically and speculatively oriented anthropology of the time seemed of little possible use to colonial administrators, missionaries, and traders.[58] After World War I, however, the nature both of British colonial administration and British anthropology changed in directions that brought about a convergence of their respective interests. On the one hand, the period saw the emergence of structural-functionalist anthropology, which rejected the obsession with origins and speculative history which characterized the established evolutionary and diffusionist anthropology, and proposed in its place an approach that sought rather to establish the workings of social 'systems' in a synchronic context. On the other, British colonial governments in Africa were seeking to integrate what they saw as traditional political institutions into their systems of administration, in order to reduce expenditure and as far as possible to avoid direct coercion of the indigenous peoples. The establishment of 'indirect rule', as it was called, required some knowledge on the part of the authorities as to how traditional institutions functioned, knowledge which anthropologists in the field were well placed to provide. Anthropology was now able to recommend itself as of some practical use in colonial administration, with the result that by the late 1920s and early 1930s its practitioners in the British empire were receiving substantial public and private funding, and it was expanding as a profession.[59]

With the existance of the profession depending, in part at least, on the maintenance of the relationship which it had established with a colonial system which emphasized the tribe as the natural unit of administration,[60] it

is hardly surprising that, however critical they might sometimes be of the way in which colonial authority was exercised,[61] British anthropologists did not seek to undermine the assumptions on which it was based. This is not to argue that they consciously avoided doing so; rather, that the ideological context within which they operated served to orient their critical faculties in a way which made for the existence of an intellectual blindspot as far as questioning the notion of the tribe was concerned. And as far as South African anthropologists were concerned, the particular ideological context within which their profession had come into being would have served to make this feature of their thinking even more marked.

This section of the paper has attempted to delineate some of the more significant features of the intellectual climate in which Bryant's Olden Times was written and published. The contention here is that it appeared just at a time when there was coming into existence an academic and administrative readership that was likely to be receptive to its main arguments and assumptions. From the professional anthropologist's point of view there could be no doubt that it was a thoroughly scholarly and scientific piece of work. From the administrator's point of view, it could be seen as potentially useful in the formulation and implementation of the 'new' native policy in Natal-Zululand. It is significant that publication of Olden Times was funded (to what extent is not made clear) by the Hertzog government,[62] and certainly one contemporary reviewer, J.Y. Gibson, himself an ex-magistrate from Natal, was in no doubt about its 'practical' usefulness. Bryant's book, he commented, 'cannot but be of great service to those charged with native administration.... It is worthy of careful study by those who would acquire an understanding of the present-day "Native Question"'.[63]

From the point of view both of academics and administrators, a further recommendation was that Olden Times was cast firmly in terms of tribal histories. It was based, therefore, on a principle that was at once fully

comprehensible and acceptable to both categories of readers. And for both it had the further merit of proposing an apparently authentic term, Nguni, for one of the major groupings, until then without a scientific designation, in the system of 'South African Bantu classification' (to use Hammond Tooke's term) the development of which was then regarded as a research priority.[64] Though individuals like Van Warmelo might express reservations about the validity of Nguni as a generic term, such objections were in the end subordinated to the socio-political need for the creation of a comprehensive tribal taxonomy.

The continued existence, in fact the reinforcing, of a system of administration which emphasized African 'tribal' divisions was presumably one of the major structural reasons why the word Nguni survived so long as a collective term without being called into question. It was not until the later 1960s that some scholars began critically to re-examine its validity. In an investigation of what they recognized as the Nguni 'problem', Marks and Atmore commented,

> '...the latter day inclusive use of the term Nguni may do much to distort the past. Recently historians have used the term rather freely of the peoples in the Natal-Zululand area, in an attempt to avoid the anachronistic "Zulu" for the pre-Shakan period. In fact, it may be masking as great or even greater anachronism. ...it should probably be used to designate only a few of the large numbers of peoples to whom it is now applied'.[65]

In similar vein, Marks argued that

> This all-inclusive term with its connotation of timeless homogeneity may well be the first obstacle in the way of our understanding the origins of the layers of people that make up the present day Nguni.[66]

Though Marks and Atmore were well aware that in the 19th and early 20th

centuries the meaning of Nguni had varied over time and space, they were not primarily concerned to develop a historical explanation of this phenomenon. In so far as they touched on the emergence of Nguni as a collective term, they attributed it to 'white intervention or invention', particularly on the part of Bryant.[67] While agents like Bryant were of course directly instrumental in creating the modern meaning of Nguni, this line of argument does not go far enough. It does not make the point that what these agents were doing in effect was appropriating and transforming, for their own particular purposes and within a specific historical context, a concept previously used in a number of different ways for a number of different purposes within certain of the African societies of south-east Africa. In the third and final section of this paper an explanation will be suggested as to how and why this concept had come to be amenable to academic appropriation in the first place.

3. Nguni in African Ideology

As noted in section 1 of this paper, Nguni seems to have been used in the late 16th century to designate certain peoples living on the coast north of the Mfolozi river. There is no evidence available as to how the term was used in the two succeeding centuries. Then, in the Zulu kingdom that emerged in the early 19th century the form Mnguni came to be reserved by Shaka as a designation for the Zulu monarchy. David Hedges has put forward some suggestive comments as to why this happened; as they constitute a useful starting point for a historical explanation of the emergence of the modern usage of Nguni, they will be looked at here in some detail.

At a time that by implication was well before the 19th century, the term Nguni, Hedges suggests, had come to connote 'great antiquity and extensive political authority'.[68] The reasons for this are now lost to history, but it seems clear that at least by Shaka's time Nguni/Mnguni had become 'a sobriquet of leadership and an expression of profound salutation...in praise of

authority'.[69] The word may have had social significance in that 'it described attributes of political authority per se';[70] in any case its adoption by Shaka and his successors may well 'have derived from the need of succeeding royal families to associate themselves with the ancient inhabitants'.[71] As Hedges puts it, 'nineteenth century usage does reflect the contemporary ideological requirements: reinforcing social dominance by appeal to historical primacy'.[72]

On the basis of statements made by certain of Stuart's informants, Hedges argues that the 'ancient inhabitants' were probably what he calls lowlanders as distinct from the up-country peoples of the region north of the Thukela.[73] The particular statements that he cites do not actually substantiate his case: as will emerge below, they may well reflect, rather, a desire on the part of lowlanders living in the early 20th century to be regarded as Nguni. But there is evidence in the Stuart collection that lends support to his main point: that Nguni carried with it associations of ancient residence in the land. 'The abaNguni do not refer to ever having descended from the north; they say they originated here, i.e. in Zululand,' Baleni kaSilwana told Stuart.[74] 'The name Nguni appears to have been applicable to some anciently resident people,' commented Magidigidi kaNobebe.[75] Distinct from the supposedly indigenous Nguni peoples were the Ntungwa, who were generally regarded in tradition as immigrant peoples from 'the north' or from 'up-country'.[76] As Hedges argues, these traditions of migration should not be taken too literally,[77] but the point that emerges from them is that the Ntungwa seem to have been regarded as of lesser status by those who, by the early 20th century at least, were calling themselves Nguni. By these latter the word Ntungwa/Mntungwa was sometimes used as an insult.[78]

The argument here is that the appropriation of Mnguni as an appellation of the Zulu kings, and Nguni as a designation of the ruling Zulu lineage, was consciously initiated by Shaka and the Zulu royal house as a means of legitimizing the lineage's newly achieved political dominance. As the

upstart head of a potentially highly unstable conquest state, Shaka would have been deeply concerned not only to maintain control over the means of physical coercion at his disposal, as has so often been stressed in the literature, but also to develop and propagate an official ideology that portrayed the Zulu royal house to its subjects as 'natural' rulers of the kingdom by right of seniority. This line of argument cannot be developed in detail here;[79] what follows is a series of points aimed at demonstrating that the reworking of the meaning of Nguni was not an isolated phenomenon.

The appropriation of Nguni/Mnguni, with its connotations of historical primacy, was only one example of official manipulation of the usage of address-forms to strengthen the Zulu claim to political legitimacy. A similar case was Shaka's reservation of the designation Mntwana, meaning 'prince', for himself alone. As the word umntwana also means child, when using it in the latter sense people throughout the kingdom had to substitute for it the hlonipha (formal avoidance) word ingese.[80] In addition, Shaka took over a range of salutations previously used by other lineages - 'Ndabezitha!' from, variously, the Chunu, Khumalo, or Mbatha; 'Bayede!' from the Cele, Mthethwa, or Ndwandwe; 'Gumede!' from the Qwabe.[81] At the same time he was concerned to suppress use of the insulting address-name Lufenulwenja or Lobololwenja, literally dog's penis, which had previously been applied to the Zulu clan in the days of its insignificance.[82]

The importance of symbolic naming in the development of a Zulu ideology of state is further illustrated by Shaka's manipulation of ethnic terminology to typecast as social inferiors certain of the peoples subject to his rule. Particularly, it seems, this applied to peoples on the geographical peripheries of the kingdom who for one reason or another had not been fully incorporated into the body politic.[83] In the emergent official ideology, certain features of the cultures and dialects of these 'marginal' peoples were stressed as symbols which marked them off as at once different from, and inferior to,

the peoples of the kingdom's 'core', and derogatory new names, or derogatory new meanings of old names, were applied to them. Thus the partially 'Sothoized' peoples on the north-western borders of the kingdom, like the Hlubi, were called iziYendane, 'the tassles of hair', after their particular manner of doing their hair, or izinGadanqunu, 'those who run about naked', after the nature of their dress.[84] The Tsonga peoples to the north were known as the amaNhlwenga, or destitute persons,[85] while those peoples in the south-eastern border regions of the kingdom who spoke tekeza dialects became known contemptuously as Lala, 'those who sleep (ukulala) with their fingers up their anuses'. The name may have existed before Shaka's time, but, according to several sources, it was during his reign that it became widely used.[86] South of the Thukela, the remnant clans of the region became known by the insulting name of iNyakeni, which probably derives from inyaka, a 'commoner' in the derogatory sense, or a 'thoroughly indolent person'.[87] The peoples of southern Natal, who were noted for their practice of facial scarification, became known derogatively as the amaZosha, the face-slitters.[88]

Though very little is known about the history of ideology in the Zulu kingdom, it seems safe to assume that Shaka's successors would have been concerned to propagate as thoroughly as circumstances would allow the official ideologies developed during his reign. It is well documented that the Zulu ruling lineage worked to enforce linguistic and cultural conformity in the core region of the kingdom, with non-Zulu patterns of speech and behaviour being officially discouraged in favour of Zulu ones.[89] It would follow that a high degree of ideological conformity would have been enforced as well, with, among other things, non-Zulu lineages being prevented from contesting the ruling lineage's claim to historical primacy. During the lifetime of the kingdom, then, prohibitions on the appropriation of Nguni by non-Zulu would have been maintained.

It would not have been until the overthrow of the Zulu monarchy in 1879,

and the collapse of established structures of authority in the civil wars of the 1880s, that such official prohibitions would have fallen away. One consequence was the re-assertion of pre-Shakan usages of certain terms. An explicit statement to this effect is Ndukwana's comment that the opprobrious term Lubololwenja, which had been suppressed by Shaka, reappeared as a designation for the Zulu after the death of Cetshwayo.[90] Clearly its usage had never completely died out among the peoples subordinated to Zulu authority.

Nor had knowledge died out that the Zulu claim to Nguni descent was spurious. This is made clear in statements recorded by Stuart from several of his informants in 1904-5: 'Zulu and Qwabe are spoken of by outsiders as amaNtungwa'; 'The Zulu are not abaNguni, for they did not originally use this term in respect of themselves'; 'The amaNtungwa (the Zulus, Qwabes, and Cunus) have a keen desire to speak of themselves as abaNguni...'; '...the Qwabes and Zulus, who are really amaNtungwa, speak of themselves nowadays as abeNguni'.[91]

If usages of this kind were reappearing in Zululand (as it now was) in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, it is likely that long-standing claims to Nguni descent on the part of certain non-Zulu lineages would also have begun re-surfacing. At the same time, entirely new claims may well have been invented by lineages seeking to prove their antiquity of residence in the region. But it would not have been simply the disappearance of an inhibiting political authority which allowed for this process; it would also have been actively stimulated by the undermining of lineage-based systems of social relationships that was beginning in Zululand and Natal in these years. Under the impact of devastating civil wars in Zululand in the 1880s, socio-ecological disasters in both Zululand and Natal in the 1890s, and a particularly aggressive settler colonialism in Natal from the 1890s and in Zululand from the early 1900s, 'traditional' African societies in the region were beginning to disintegrate. Loss of land and livestock, a rapid increase in the emigration of able-bodied men, changes in family structure, and pressures from the colonial administration

all served to undermine the established patterns of authority and ideology that held these societies together. For lineage leaders struggling at once to maintain their standing in their own communities, and groping to find a degree of security for these communities in the new colonial order, the claiming of Nguni descent would possibly have represented one means of attempting to shore up their crumbling authority.

Authorities on oral tradition in Africa seem agreed that in a lineage-based community the view of the past 'officially' sanctioned by its leaders is continually, if often unconsciously, reworked in order to harmonize with changes in the leaders perceptions of where the community's political interests lie. At times of social crisis the process of manipulating the past in order to legitimize the decisions of the leadership will often become more deliberate. Typically, traditions of origin and chiefly genealogies will be among the first elements of the remembered past to be recast in politically suitable form.[93] Very little has yet been written specifically on the effects which the imposition of colonial rule, particularly of direct settler rule, had on the reformulation of African communities' views of their own past, but a recent study by Henige of the effects of what he calls 'culture contact' on African oral traditions provides some useful pointers. Henige argues that the establishment of 'indirect rule' in British colonial Africa brought about an increased concern on the part of colonial administrators with issues regarding 'paramountcy, seniority, succession, boundaries, and the like'.[94] Presumably this concern would have been even more marked among their African subjects. In Natal and Zululand, in the conditions of the 1890s and 1900s, it is highly likely that similar issues were regarded as of crucial importance by leaders of disintegrating lineages. Ability to demonstrate genealogical seniority and historical primacy would certainly have carried weight with the colonial administration in its appointing of chiefs and headmen, and may also have done so in its allocating of shrinking African land resources. This could well have been a time when lineage histories

were more or less consciously being revamped in order to underpin real or fictitious claims to historical primacy, and when claims to Nguni descent would have been proliferating.

It would follow, then, that the numerous - and often conflicting - claims to Nguni descent that were recorded by Stuart in the early years of the 20th century were largely of recent origin. Evidence in support of the contention that the late 19th century saw the beginnings of a conscious recasting of traditional histories among the peoples of Natal-Zululand comes from Bryant's investigations into the genealogy of the Zulu royal house. Writing in Olden Times in 1929, he noted that the genealogies recorded by Colenso, Grout, and Callaway in the third quarter of the 19th century had a maximum of four names in the line of chiefs before Shaka, and that these versions were consonant with information he had himself obtained after he had begun his researches in 1883. Subsequent to this date, however (i.e. in the late 19th and early 20th centuries), numbers of 'modern accretions' had been made to the list of Zulu ancestral rulers.[95]

Though the name Mnguni was not one of the 'accretions' that had crept into the variants of the Zulu royal geneaology recorded by Bryant in Olden Times,[96] information given by one of Stuart's informants indicates that attempts were being made by the early 20th century in some circles, presumably Zulu royalist ones, to incorporate it into the list of remembered Zulu chiefs.[97] Certainly the old Zulu royal usage of Nguni had not died out at this time. R.C.A. Samuelson, who had close links with the Zulu royal house, fixed this usage in print in his King Cetywayo Zulu Dictionary, published in 1923. In this work he gave as one of his definitions of umNguni, an ancient; a person belonging to an ancient stock', and wrote of the plural form, Abanguni, 'the Zulus have this appellation in consequence of their tribe being the oldest native tribe from which the others have sprung'.[98] In his autobiography, Long, Long Ago, published in 1929, Samuelson recorded what can be seen as

another elaboration of the royal myth of origin in his note that 'the first two known kings of the Zulus, uMdhlani and uMalandela, are known by the Zulus and called by them the "Abanguni"'.[99]

Though Bryant, as indicated above, was sensitive to the genealogical manipulations that were being conducted at the very time when he was engaged in his linguistic and historical research, he seems to have had no overall conception of their historical causes. If he did, it did not extend to an appreciation that the meanings of terms like Nguni were also historically rooted, and therefore liable to change. What did become clear to him as his work progressed was that Nguni could no longer be regarded simply as a 'name by which the Tongas call a Zulu-Kafir', as he had written in his Dictionary of 1905.[100] Rather, it was a designation of apparently great antiquity, to which numbers of different lineages in Zululand laid claim, and also one which numbers of Africans in Natal applied to the Xhosa peoples to the south. For a scholar working in an evolutionist and diffusionist tradition that focussed on the origins and migrations of non-European peoples and cultures, the temptation to use it as a generic term for peoples of apparently common descent seems eventually to have proved irresistible.

Bryant, then, did not so much invent the modern usage of Nguni as put his own particular gloss on a usage which he had encountered among Africans in Natal and Zululand from the early 20th century onward, and convey this reworked meaning to a readership of academics and administrators which, for historically explicable reasons, was particularly receptive to it. What neither he nor his contemporaries realized was that, far from being of ancient vintage, the senses in which Nguni was used by Africans in Natal and Zululand in the early 20th century were a product of recent history. And far from being a 'neutral' ethnic designation, the word in fact carried a heavy ideological loading.

As appropriated by South African scholars and administrators for their own specific purposes in the 1920s and 1930s, and as used in academic circles for

the past fifty years, Nguni remains a politically loaded term. Objectively its main ideological function appears to be to impose a primordial ethnic unity on the African peoples of the eastern seaboard of South Africa, and thus allow them collectively to be portrayed by their European-descended rulers as descendants of recent immigrants, with no more historically established rights to the region's resources than the offspring of immigrants from Europe. It helps conceal the conclusion which recent research into the archaeology and oral traditions of the region clearly points to - that the historically known African societies of the region emerged locally from long-established ancestral communities of diverse origins and of heterogeneous cultures and languages. As a generic ethnic label, then, it has no historical validity. While it remains useful as a linguistic label - Nguni languages, Nguni-speaking peoples - as a designation for historically existing peoples it needs to be altogether discarded.

Notes

[1]Accounts of the wreck of the Sao Thomé are to be found in G.M. Theal, ed., Records of South-eastern Africa (henceforth RSEA), vol. 2 (London, 1898; repr. Cape Town, 1964), pp. 188-224; and in C.R. Boxer, ed., The Tragic History of the Sea 1589-1622 (Cambridge, 1959), pp. 54-104. Both are translations from the Portuguese account, first published in 1736, written by the historian Diogo do Couto in 1611. Couto's account was compiled from information obtained from survivors of the Sao Thomé. A closely similar account, possibly derived from Couto's manuscript, was published in 1674 in the third volume of Manuel de Faria e Sousa's Asia Portuguesa. An English translation of Sousa's Spanish appears in G.M. Theal, ed., RSEA, vol. 1, pp. 33-5. The word 'Virangune' was used by Sousa (RSEA, vol. 1, p. 34), and 'Viragune' by Couto (RSEA, vol. 2, p. 199; Boxer, Tragic History, pp. 70-1).

[2]A.T. Bryant, Olden Times in Zululand and Natal (London, 1929), p. 289; A.T. Bryant, The Zulu People (Pietermaritzburg, 1949), pp. 12-13.

[3]H.A. Junod, 'The condition of the natives of south-east Africa in the sixteenth century, according to early Portuguese documents', S.A. Jnl. of Science, vol. 10 (1913), p. 148.

[4]D.W. Hedges, 'Trade and politics in southern Mozambique and Zululand in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries', unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1978, p. 105.

[5]Ibid.

[6]Do Couto in Boxer, Tragic History, pp. 70-1, and in RSEA, vol. 2, p. 199.

[7]H.F. Fynn Papers, Notes, file 29 (Natal Archives). The note is undated, but the paper on which it is written is watermarked March 1832.

[8]J.W. Colenso, Zulu-English Dictionary (Pietermaritzburg, 1861), p. 334.

[9]J.W. Colenso, Zulu-English Dictionary, 3rd ed., (Pietermaritzburg, n.d., 1878?), p. 338.

[10]A. Kropf, A Kaffir-English Dictionary (Lovedale, 1899), p. 255.

[11]C. de B. Webb & J.B. Wright, eds., The James Stuart Archive (henceforth JSA), vol. 1 (Pmburg, 1976), p. 98; vol. 2 (Pmburg, 1979), pp. 115, 116, 117; vol. 3 (Pmburg, 1982), pp. 45, 76, 134, 225.

[12]J.H. Soga, The South-eastern Bantu (Johannesburg, 1930), p. 82.

[13]An account of Colenso's visit to the Zulu kingdom appears in his 'First steps of the Zulu mission' (London, 1860; repr. in J.W. Colenso, Bringing Forth Light, ed., R. Edgecombe, Pietermaritzburg, 1982), pp. 43-144.

[14] Dictionary of S.A. Biography, vol. 1 (Cape Town, 1968), pp. 443-4.

[15] See note 11 above.

[16] JSA, vol. 2, p. 97.

[17] W.H.I. Bleek, The Natal Diaries of Dr W.H.I. Bleek 1855-1856, ed. O.H. Spohr (Cape Town, 1965).

[18] A.T. Bryant, A Zulu-English Dictionary (Pietermaritzburg, 1905), p. 430.

[19] L. Thompson, Survival in Two Worlds: Moshoeshoe of Lesotho 1786-1870 (Oxford, 1975), p. 333.

[20] T. Arbousset & F. Daumas, Narrative of an Exploratory Tour to the North-east of the Cape of Good Hope (Cape Town, 1846; repr. Cape Town, 1968), pp. 133-4, 271.

[21] Bryant, Dictionary, p. 430.

[22] On the Zulu as Nguni see JSA, vol. 1, pp. 29, 335; vol. 2, pp. 28, 60, 254; vol. 3, p. 42. On the Qwabe see JSA, vol. 1, p. 118; vol. 2, pp. 28, 60, 117, 254; vol. 3, pp. 42, 45, 225, 262, 263.

[23] The Biyela are given as Nguni in JSA, vol. 3, p. 42; the Chunu in vol. 2, p. 60, vol. 3, pp. 42, 263; the Langa in vol. 3, p. 42; the Magwaza in vol. 3, p. 42; the Mthethwa in vol. 2, p. 28; the Ntombela in vol. 3, p. 42; the Nzimela in vol. 2, p. 280; the Zungu in vol. 2, p. 104.

[24] The Hlubi in JSA, vol. 2, p. 15; the Thuli in vol. 2, p. 282.

[25] The Zulu in JSA, vol. 2, p. 117, vol. 3, pp. 262, 263; the Mthethwa in vol. 3, p. 76; the Ndwandwe in vol. 1, p. 345.

[26] J.W. Colenso, Zulu-English Dictionary, 4th ed. (Pietermaritzburg, 1905), p. 395.

[27] These articles appeared in Izindaba Zabantu from the preliminary issue of 17 October 1910 to the issue of 15 March 1913. They were subsequently republished under the collective title A History of the Zulu and Neighbouring Tribes (Cape Town, 1964).

[28] M.M. Fuze, Abantu Abamnyama Lapa Bavela Ngakona (Pietermaritzburg, 1922). An English translation by H.C. Lugg, edited by A.T. Cope, was published in Pietermaritzburg in 1979 under the title The Black People and Whence They Came.

[29] J.Y. Gibson, The Story of the Zulus (Pietermaritzburg, 1903); J. Stuart, A History of the Zulu Rebellion 1906 (London, 1913); C. Faye, Zulu References (Pietermaritzburg, 1923).

[30] Bryant, Olden Times, p. 4.

[31] N.J. van Warmelo, A Preliminary Survey of the Bantu Tribes of South Africa (Pretoria, 1935), p. 59.

[32]Ibid.

[33]R.C.A. Samuelson, King Cetywayo Zulu Dictionary (Durban, 1923) pp. 316, 864.

[34]C.M. Doke, 'A preliminary investigation into the state of the native languages of South Africa', Bantu Studies, vol. 7 (1933), pp. 1-98; I. Schapera, 'The present state and future development of ethnographical research in South Africa', Bantu Studies, vol. 8 (1934), pp. 219-342.

[35]I. Schapera, 'The old Bantu culture', in I. Schapera, ed., Western Civilization and the Natives of South Africa (London, 1934), pp. 3-36.

[36]E.J. Krige, The Social System of the Zulus (London, 1936), pp. 3-6.

[37]Van Warmelo, Survey, p. 59.

[38]N.J. van Warmelo, 'Grouping and ethnic history', in I. Schapera, ed., The Bantu-speaking Tribes of South Africa (Cape Town, 1937), pp. 45-6, 48-50.

[39]See for example A. Smith, Andrew Smith's Journal of His Expedition into the Interior of South Africa 1834-36, ed. W.F. Lye (Cape Town, 1975), p. 20n.

[40]The discussion that follows draws especially on M. Legassick, 'South Africa: forced labor, industrialization, and racial differentiation', in R. Harris, ed, The Political Economy of Africa (New York, 1975), pp. 244-56; R. Davies et al., 'Class struggle and the periodization of the state in South Africa', Review of African Political Economy, no. 7 (1976), pp. 4-13; R. Davies, Capital, State and White Labour in South Africa 1900-60 (Brighton, 1979), chs. 4 & 5; B. Bozzoli, The Political Nature of a Ruling Class: Capital and Ideology in South Africa 1890-1933 (London, 1981), chs. 3-5; M. Lacey, Working for Boroko (Johannesburg, 1981), passim.

[41]Bozzoli, Political Nature, esp. chs. 3 & 4.

[42]Ibid., pp. 9-10.

[43]Ibid., pp. 158 ff.

[44]Ibid., p. 164.

[45]Lacey, Working for Boroko, pp. 67 ff, 84 ff.

[46]See for instance H. Junod, 'The best means of preserving the traditions and customs of the various South African native races', Report of the S.A. Association for the Advancement of Science, 1907, pp. 141-59; H.L. Jameson, 'An ethnographic bureau for South Africa', ibid., pp. 160-7; W.A. Norton, 'The need and value of academic study of native philology and ethnology', S.A. Jnl. of Science, vol. 14 (1917-18), pp. 194-200.

[47] E.A. Walker, The South African College and the University of Cape Town, 1829-1929 (Cape Town, 1929), pp. 106-7; N.J. van der Merwe, 'African studies', in A. Lennox-Short & D. Welsh, ed., UCT at 150: Reflections (Cape Town, 1979), p. 62; B.K. Murray, Wits: the Early Years (Johannesburg, 1982), pp. 125, 137; J.S. Sharp, 'The roots and development of volkekunde in South Africa', Jnl. Southern African Studies, vol. 8 (1980-1), p. 29.

[48] Editorial in Bantu Studies, vol. 1, no. 1 (October 1921), p. 2.

[49] P. Rich, 'The South African Institute of Race Relations and the debate on "race relations", 1929-1958', African Studies, vol. 40 (1981), pp. 14-16.

[50] A. Radcliffe-Brown, 'Some problems of Bantu sociology', Bantu Studies, vol. 1 (1921-22), p. 38.

[51] J.D. Rheinallt Jones, 'The need of a scientific basis for South African native policy', S.A. Jnl. of Science, vol. 23 (1926), p. 91.

[52] A.R. Radcliffe-Brown, 'The methods of ethnology and social anthropology', S.A. Jnl. of Science, vol. 20 (1923), pp. 142-3.

[53] Cited in Murray, Wits: the Early Years, p. 137.

[54] H. Rogers, Native Administration in the Union of South Africa (Johannesburg, 1933), pp. 250-1. Significantly, this work was published as a special number of Bantu Studies.

[55] Schapera, 'Ethnographical research', Bantu Studies, vol. 8 (1934), pp. 227-8.

[56] R. Thornton, 'Evolution, salvation and history in the rise of the ethnographic monograph in southern Africa 1860-1920', Social Dynamics, vol. 6 (1980), pp. 14-23.

[57] Sharp, 'Volkekunde', Jnl. Southern African Studies, vol. 8 (1980-1), pp. 16-36.

[58] J. Stauder, 'The "relevance of anthropology to colonialism and imperialism', Race & Class, vol. 16 (1974-5), pp. 30-2. See also S. Feuchtwang, 'The colonial formation of British social anthropology', in T. Asad, ed., Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter (London, 1973), pp. 73-84.

[59] Stauder, 'The "relevance" of anthropology', pp. 32-8; Feuchtwang, 'Colonial formation', pp. 84-6.

[60] See Feuchtwang, 'Colonial formation', pp. 89-90.

[61] W. James, 'The anthropologist as reluctant imperialist', in Asad, ed., Anthropology, pp. 41-69.

[62] Bryant, Olden Times, p. xii.

[63] J.Y. Gibson, review of A.T. Bryant's Olden Times in Bantu Studies, vol. 4 (1930), p. 140.

[64] W.D. Hammond-Tooke, 'The present state of Cape Nguni ethnographic studies', in Ethnological and Linguistic Studies in Honour of N.J. van Warmelo (Dept. of Bantu Administration and Development, Pretoria, 1969), p. 81. See also Schapera, 'Ethnographical research', Bantu Studies, vol. 8 (1934), p. 248.

[65] S. Marks & A. Atmore, 'The problem of the Nguni: an examination of the ethnic and linguistic situation in South Africa before the Mfecane', in D. Dalby, ed., Language and History in Africa (New York, 1970), p. 120.

[66] S. Marks, 'The traditions of the Natal "Nguni": a second look at the work of A.T. Bryant', in L. Thompson, ed., African Societies in Southern Africa (London, 1969), p. 126.

[67] Marks & Atmore, 'The problem of the Nguni', p. 125.

[68] Hedges, 'Trade and politics', p. 255.

[69] Ibid., pp. 256-7.

[70] Ibid., p. 257.

[71] Ibid.

[72] Ibid.

[73] Ibid., p. 256.

[74] JSA, vol. 1, p. 29.

[75] JSA, vol. 2, p. 87.

[76] JSA, vol. 1, pp. 29, 126; vol. 2, pp. 45, 46, 119, 203, 280-1; vol. 3, pp. 105, 134, 150, 211, 213, 259, 263.

[77] Hedges, 'Trade and politics', p. 23.

[78] JSA, vol. 2, pp. 72, 119, 168, 254, 280; vol. 3, p. 264.

[79] The development and function of state ideology in northern Nguni-speaking polities in the pre-Shakan and Shakan periods is currently being investigated by Carolyn Hamilton of the University of the Witwatersrand.

[80] JSA, vol. 3, p. 86.

[81] For Ndabezitha see JSA, vol. 1, pp. 104, 174-5, 199, 292, 298; vol. 2, p. 254; vol. 3, p. 146. Cf. Bryant, Dictionary, p. 410; Bryant, Olden Times, pp. 221-2. For Bavede see JSA, vol. 1, p. 104; vol. 2, pp. 53, 76, 79. For Gumede see JSA, vol. 3, p. 243.

[82] JSA, vol. 1, pp. 104, 174, 208; vol. 2, pp. 12, 254; vol. 3, p. 146. Cf. Bryant, Olden Times, pp. 13, 221-2, 369-70; Fuze, Black People, p. 43.

[83] My thanks to Carolyn Hamilton for discussion on this point. See also her unpublished seminar paper, 'The amaLala in Natal, 1750-1826' (University of the Witwatersrand, 1982).

[84] JSA, vol. 2, pp. 20, 21, 96, 277; Bryant Olden Times, pp. 147, 181, 281.

[85] JSA, vol. 1, pp. 24, 63, 342; vol. 2, p. 254; Samuelson, Dictionary, p. 188; Bryant, Olden Times, p. 280.

[86] JSA, vol. 1, p. 118; vol. 2, pp. 54, 55, 130, 254; vol. 3, pp. 150, 158; Bryant, Dictionary, p. 26*.

[87] JSA, vol. 1, p.118; vol. 2, p. 55; vol. 3, p. 227; Colenso, Dictionary, 4th ed., p. 431; Bryant, Dictionary, pp. 462, 469.

[88] JSA, vol. 1, p. 118; vol. 2, pp. 12, 113, 119; Bryant, Olden Times, p. 501.

[89] JSA, vol. 2, pp. 70, 97; Bleek, Natal Diaries, p. 76; J.L. Döhne, A Zulu-Kafir Dictionary (Cape Town, 1857), p. xv; Van Warmelo, Survey, p. 70.

[90] JSA, vol. 1, p. 202.

[91] Respectively in JSA, vol. 1, p. 104; vol. 3, p. 263; vol. 2, p. 97; vol. 2, p. 281.

[92] See S. Marks, Reluctant Rebellion (Oxford, 1970), chs. 1-6, 12; C. Bundy, The Rise and Fall of the South African Peasantry (London, 1979), pp. 183-92; J. Guy, 'The destruction and reconstruction of Zulu society', in S. Marks & R. Rathbone, eds., Industrialisation And Social Change in South Africa (London, 1982), ch. 6.

[93] See for example J. Vansina, Oral Tradition (Harmondsworth, 1973), chs. 4, 5; J.C. Miller, 'Listening for the African past', in J.C. Miller, ed., The African Past Speaks (Folkestone, 1980), ch. 1; D.P. Henige, The Chronology of Oral Tradition (Oxford, 1974), ch. 1.

[94] D. Henige, 'Truths yet unborn? Oral tradition as a casualty of culture contact', Jnl. Afr. History, vol. 23 (1982), p. 405.

[95] Bryant, Olden Times, p. 34.

[96] On pp. 32-3.

[97] JSA, vol. 3, p. 225.

[98] Samuelson, Dictionary, p. 316.

[99] R.C.A. Samuelson, Long, Long Ago (Durban, 1929), p. 390.

[100] On p. 430.

Africana Library

William Cullen Library

Wits University

SOLOMON,V

SPIEGER,A

STACEY,S

STADLER,A.W

STARFIELD,J

STARFIELD,J

STEADMAN,I

STEIN,M

STEINBERG,C

STEINBERG,J

STEPHNEY,I

STEWART,P

SUTTNER,R

SWILLING,M

SWILLING,M

TATHAM,K

TAYAL,

TEMGOUA,A.P