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Abstract

Writing history in the African context demands commitment; it must be contextual and integrally related to the mission of Christianity. This necessitates a reconsideration of historiography. The ‘old’ historiography was premised on the positive value accorded to missions and missionaries as well as a positive view of colonialism. The ‘new’ approach is eclectic and focuses on dispossessed communities. It predates the arrival of Western European civilisation and focuses on ‘black’ experience. All of this necessitates a consideration of ideology which has both positive and negative aspects.

1 INTRODUCTION

History could be a certain type of memory that evokes liberative power, not mere knowledge of the past but one that is commitment. It should lead people to the truth of their condition in a scientific manner, not violated by cant or propaganda … The history of Christianity in modern Africa can best be perceived by examining her faithfulness in mission. African scholarship must reflect on the urgent issues of the day. (Kalu 2004:1)

Kalu makes this statement in the context of a situation in which responsible scholarship cannot ignore the dire state of the African continent at the present time – one that is dominated by ‘life-threatening conditions’ – intense poverty, militarisation, famine, war and HIV/AIDS. Any serious attempt at writing history which is relevant must be contextual. He also makes it clear that the history and mission of Christianity in Africa cannot be separated and treated independently of each other (cf Gundani 2003:2).

The ultimate value of contextualisation for us is that it is in the very particularity of its interpretation in specific situations that the gospel achieves a universal application or, as Jean Comaroff (1985:13) has
demonstrated on a more practical level with regard to the rise of local
movements, eg Zionist Christianity among the Tshidi: “they are specific
responses to a structural predicament to many Third World peoples”.
There was a time when this was determined by the mindset and
presuppositions of those who wrote mission history, ie missionaries
themselves or, at least, white people. However, there has been a
recent call for this situation to be redressed (Maluleke 1989, 1995) as
can be seen when we consider problems of historiography.

2 THE PROBLEM OF HISTORIOGRAPHY

The basic problem we face with earlier approaches to historiography is
that they conform to the criticism of having been written by one group
of people about other groups. It is a truism that “the history of theology
and the church, too, was predominantly written by the victors at the
expense of the losers along dogmatic or political lines” (Kung 1994:153
cf Groome 1980:19 n.39; Ntantala 1992:116). This summarises the
traditional western concept of history “which concentrates on
particular people and processes founded in the distinction between
‘reality’, the material occurrence of events, and ‘representation’, the
terms in which the story is told and acted on” (Comaroff & Comaroff
1991:34). We shall, therefore attempt to distinguish the characteristics
of earlier and more recent approaches to historiography.

2.1 The ‘old’ historiography

Mission histories are criticised for failing to take adequate account of
contemporary social forces. They are predominantly positive in their
assessment of missions which are lauded as harbingers of western
values and a positive view of colonialism (Du Plessis 1911:264-5). For Du
Plessis (1911:26), “Christianity and civilisation were so integrated that
they were confused: Civilisation when divorced from vital [ie Christian
cf 1911:261] religion is utterly powerless to lift the heathen out of the
state of depredation into which he has sunk.” He (Du Plessis 1911:viii)
considered his work to be the “first attempt to place the establishment
and growth of Christian Missions in South Africa in their true historical
setting”. This is rather astonishing in that he offers little critical reflection
on the social, economic and political situation in which mission history
occurs; further it is his assertion that:

Contemporary mission history and Cape history find a point of
meeting in the year of grace 1910. Mission history and Cape
history have always been associated in the closest possible
way. In South Africa ... they form ... two streams which unite
and commingle. (Du Plessis 1911:vii- viii)
While the intention is praiseworthy, the history which follows hardly does justice to the expressed aim. In fact, mission history is presented as history which is different from general history which often only provides a backdrop to Christian happenings. This is common to many similar works of the twentieth century (cf Cochrane 1987:4-6). Mostert (1992:42) claims that such works are influenced by the work of Theal, whose work was “flawed by raw and vigorously explicit colonial prejudices”.

Maluleke (1989:13) argues strongly that none of these approaches takes the experience of blacks seriously and all of them are, therefore, seriously flawed. This leads us to the problem of documentary or other evidence, since these works constitute the major sources which have emanated from white church historical documents and which have determined the history which we have available to us. Much of this comes from the hands of missionaries themselves and was influenced by various factors such as the needs and wishes of the missionary societies and the hagiographical style of much of the writing (which may be a response to publicity and fund-raising demands in the sending countries and societies). However, “in order to paint saintly portraits of missionaries, the indigenous peoples, namely the objects of missionary activities, had to be painted in devilish colours” (1989:13).

Unfortunately, these studies were not set in the wider context of what was happening in society at the time and they reflect a ‘culture-bound’ situation. Such literature considers the culture and society of the people studied as having been static prior to the arrival of the missionaries. Maluleke (1995:235) challenges this assumption: “Dynamic African culture beckons us, offering itself as a source of theology, even as it is ‘concealed everywhere’”. The missionaries reflect a dominant western imperialist cultural background. And so we can agree with the Comaroffs’ (1991:83; cf Maluleke 1995:190, 1996:23) assertion, “Mission biography, more often than not, was mission ideology personified”, ie the history of priest heroes.

While Verkuyl (in Maluleke 1989:17) reflects a more positive approach in referring to the contribution of blacks in every aspect of the missionary enterprise, for the most part these contributors remain nameless persons who lived in the shade of the main missionary protagonists (cf Maluleke 1995:22). They were consequently damnatio memoria [obliterated from memory]. It is also important to note that, while missionaries project their views as being objective, we must remember that all theological and historical thought is formed as the result of our own context, subjective experience and ideological perspective – and missionaries were no exception.
In this respect, the missionaries are often covered by a ‘let-out clause’ which suggests that because they were time conditioned souls they were not altogether responsible for their actions, but were themselves at the mercy of uncontrollable forces. They were “in an advantaged position in an expanding political economy increasingly characterised by a capitalist hegemony” (Cochrane 1987:37). Both Saayman and Cochrane (1987: 37) seem to deny any deliberate intent on the part of the missionaries and attribute only noble motives to them. However, in terms of the objectives of their mission, they cannot avoid total responsibility for the consequences of their involvement. They were in the field as agents of change and some (eg John Philip & Bishop Colenso), to a degree did do significant deeds. Saayman (1994:12), points to missionaries’ greater culpability since they aimed at ‘colonising the mind’ through education. But the missionaries, compared with the colonists and settlers, did transfer vernacular languages into written form.

This concurs with Maluleke’s (1995:190) view that mission Christianity is “the story of the missionaries and their activities”. It is “the blend of Christianity that Swiss missionaries sought to establish amongst the Vatsonga (Shangaan) peoples” (1995:3). “something which benevolent white people do to ‘backward’ black people” (Kritzinger 1995:1 in Maluleke 1995:4). This has resulted in “a serious historiographical imbalance, (subtle) ideological distortion and a missiological disempowerment of the Vatsongo”, ie blacks (Maluleke1995:190). He criticises the avoidance of socio-economic factors in the writings of the foremost scholars of Tsonga culture, citing issues such as migrant labour, social change, industrialisation, politics, colonialism, negotiation and trading (Maluleke 1995:193). He concludes that this is a frequent problem in mission historiography and quotes Harries (1983, 1994), who has demonstrated how “these multi-faceted incursions into the lives of the Vatsonga were not the monopoly of missionary activities”. “Other ‘agents of change’, notably industrialisation and increasing White political domination were concurrently at work” (Maluleke 1995:201). Maluleke (1995:21) critiques “the narrow ‘salvation history’ in missionary literature”, in relation to the origins of Christian mission which emphasises the specific role of white missionaries, in this case Creux and Berthold, and virtually ignores other participants, eg women and blacks and the Paris Evangelical Society. The prejudice is quite clear:

Mission history ... tends to present a narrow ‘golden thread’ of these events that are regarded as ‘salvific’, thereby excluding large chunks of happenings and information considered to be outside the salvific realm. In reality, the latter is seldom excluded in totality. Rather, functional reference is periodically made in order to clarify and
emphasise aspects of the ‘salvific’ story. In this way indigenous contribution is underplayed even as it is acknowledged. (Maluleke1995:22)

Quoting from the situation in the Evangelical Presbyterian Church in South Africa, the former Swiss Mission, Maluleke notes that, after 112 years of written Xitsonga, there exist few black assessments of mission work, little is available in written form that is critical of missionaries, possibly because publishing was under their control; after all, they were considered to be the experts. Maluleke (1995:28) comments:

In this prevailing situation the vernacular writer’s ability to confront and evaluate important socio, political, religious and even moral issues in his/her writings was seriously curtailed.

The same could be said of the work of Lovedale Press of the Scottish Mission which has a longer and more distinguished history.

But, more than this, the missionaries’ role had repercussions beyond the sphere of the narrowly religious. In reducing the language to written form the missionaries, either consciously or unconsciously, contributed to the development of ethnic homogenity, social cohesion and linguistic uniformity and all of this was to have political, social, economic and theological implications. The common factor in each case appears to have been the presence of missionaries.

It is now generally agreed that mission history must be subject, as never before, to critical interpretation as an alternative to the hagiographical style which dominated the scene for a considerable period. Cochrane (1987:39, 40) claims that there is a need for “solid social criticism radically opposed to the church”, otherwise “the church is most likely to reflect rather than illuminate its historical context”. The focus of more recent historiographical study has been the objects rather than the subjects of mission, ie black people themselves.

2.2 The ‘new’ historiography

An emerging concept in mission history is the importance of the history of the oppressed as a corrective to that of ‘Conquerors or Servants of God?’ “We require a proper comprehension of the changes in history in the broad sweep beyond matters of private conflict, personal idiosyncrasies or individual decisions” (Cochrane 1987:38). Cochrane (1987:40) believes that this is difficult “in the very nature of oppression” and because we need to examine the processes by which society is changed. He therefore advocates a radical critical approach to historiography which expresses commitment rather than neutrality.
This is a view that is consistent with those of black theologians. In such a
historiography there is a great need for a dynamic approach to
political-economic theory. The dominance of capitalism is not to be
assumed as the deterministic result of colonialism. Rather, it
emerged because of specific struggles connected to
colonial conquest and capital penetration in the region, itself
driven in particular directions through confrontation with the
traditional societies it encountered, their use of opportunities,
and their resistance to total incorporation over long periods
of time. Moreover, it is now clearer just how diamond and
gold discoveries affected industrialisation, labour policies and
legislative decisions in general, and how capital itself was
restructured in the process. Finally, at every point one
observes the fruitfulness of analysing events in respect of class
relations and the modes of production and reproduction
which underlie them. (Cochrane 1987:44)

From another perspective, Mostert (1992) argues that a new brand of
historiography which challenged the basis of western historiography
emerged in the 1920s and 1930s. This constituted a call for an African
historiography and Braudel, who became its spokesperson, attempted
to elucidate the social and economic forces which “submerged history ...
virtually unsuspected either by its observers or its participants ...
those underlying currents, often noiseless, whose direction can only be
discerned by watching them over long periods of time” (in Mostert

The matter of race became an important factor in studies following the
Second World War. The Leakeys:

made the quest for origins a quest to understand the
fundamental nature of humanness: the common bonds of all
humanity, what early humans were, the way they lived, the
dominant instincts they possessed, whether of aggression, as
several popular works in the 1960s suggested, or of
collaboration and social harmony. (Mostert 1992:45)

This approach completely undermines the classical approach to
historiography as is seeks to establish origins a considerable time pre-
1652. However, it faced a serious problem in that there was
no easy recourse to forgotten corners of documentation ...
no archival resources to offer fresh insight and information.
The African history that was sought was all ‘submerged’, and
the forces and influences that affected its peoples through
distant ages entirely ‘noiseless’. (Mostert 1992:47)
This field of study now draws upon the insights of numerous disciplines and presents history as a ‘field compassing field’ (Harvey 1966:55). Cochrane (1987:219-220 following Ebeling 1978:78) asserts that: “in church history [and the same can be said of mission history] the high role of non-theological factors in shaping doctrine and practice is unavoidably clear ... Thus the very fact of the human nature of the Christian community drives it towards taking sociological and other data seriously, for theological reasons”.

The same is true of missiology as an eclectic discipline:

Although basically theological in nature, missiology, as we understand it today, is unable to deal with its theological concerns without the aid of other disciplines, both theological and secular. Missiology is multidisciplinary in character and holistic in approach. (Luzbetak 1988:14)

Mostert’s (1992:48) reference to “civilisation and the material development of urban human societies” in the so-called ‘prehistoric’ period confirms that civilisation existed in Africa prior to the advent of western civilisation there. For the Tswana, it was ‘social facts’ that created a particular human world and their ‘history’ (Comaroff & Comaroff 1991:34). Kalu (1988:19 in Maluleke 1995:47) confirms this:

The story begins among African communities which had viable structures for existence. It delineates the permeation of Christian influences, values and structures and the varieties of the reactions, however ambiguous, of the communities to the Christian change agent.

The study of mission history, with reference to the study of Christianity in Africa, particularly South Africa, also requires a new approach to mission historiography, “a more honest and more critical review of the theoretical and socio-theological assumptions out of which the South African church as it is today, in its fragmented state, has been formed” (Maluleke 1989:103). It requires that we take serious account of black experience, ie that we examine history from the ‘underside’ of the poor and the marginalised, which is the ongoing experience of ordinary people. We also need to re-evaluate the formative missionary assumptions that laid the basis for South African Christianity.

For the Comaroffs (1991:11), the study of Christianity in Africa ‘is part and parcel of the historical anthropology of colonialism and consciousness, culture and power; of an anthropology concerned at once with the coloniser and the colonised, the structure and the agency!’ However, it is not only because we have little information
concerning blacks that a new historiographical approach is necessary. The missionaries’ own writings “do not yield a sufficient analytic account of the complex social forces of which they themselves are products”.

The profound forces that motivated them, and the varied vehicles of their awareness, emerge not so much from the content of those stories as from their poetics; that is, from their unselfconscious play on signs and symbols, their structures and silences, their implicit references. (Comaroff & Comaroff 1991:35, 36)

In dealing with the lack of written sources, the Comaroffs (1991:35) uncovered a corpus of ‘unconventional evidence’ which includes praise poems, initiation songs, expressed by “their bodies and their homes, in their puns, jokes and irreverencies”. They also uncover “a discernible Tswana commentary on these events [encounters with imperial colonialism], spoken less in the narrative voice than in the symbolism of gesture, action and reaction and in the expressive manipulation of language” (Comaroff & Comaroff 1991:6 in Maluleke 1995:23). So they advocate an inclusive approach to historiographical research.

Maluleke (1995:44, 45) reaches similar conclusions regarding the role of black people in mission. He expresses the need to remove prejudice from the use of local sources and elevate these sources to the same level as already accepted resources; in addition, he says, there is a need to take secular history and cultural situations seriously. In challenging some of Kalu’s assumptions about blacks’ attempts at historical writing, he claims that:

a lack of conscious and overt reflection on historiography does not necessarily mean an absence of historiographical awareness and bias. Most of these works are pregnant with interpretation. But their issues of significance are not always what I or Kalu would perceive to be issues of significance. Kalu’s well-meaning caution can very easily ‘dismiss’ valuable primary texts written by indigenous people in the vernacular. (Maluleke 1995:45, 46)

This brings us to Maluleke’s particular contribution to a new approach to historiography. Concerned about the onesidedness of the ‘old’ approach to historiography in which the writings of the missionaries predominate, he proposes a ‘sideways’ shift towards the use of vernacular literature as a legitimate primary resource for missiological study in order to develop an indigenous commentary on mission Christianity. In adopting this approach, he goes somewhat beyond the
important work of the Comaroffs. Reacting against the dominance of western literary sources compared with the poverty of local commentaries he says, “The emergence of empirical research, particularly in missiology, with an emphasis on oral sources has been a welcome deviation from the tyranny of books and archives” (Maluleke 1995:37) and constitutes “a fundamental and radical break with the hegemony of Western missionary sources” (Maluleke 1995:226). The purpose of this is to “intensify the trading and initiating processes between missionary Christianity and local culture” (Maluleke 1995:6). This critique serves an apologetic purpose in response to ‘missionary Christianity’ which the “Western missionaries have brought to plant in the Third World in general” (Maluleke 1995:1 n.3).

Using these sources, according to Maluleke (1995:235), provides us with another genre of data “the ‘silences’ [which] are as important as the utterances”. According to Mosala (1994:147):

> The relevant question is how to interpret the eloquence with which the poor are silent and the absence through which they are present in the pages of the Bible. It is in struggling with these silences and absences that a new and creative reappropriation of the liberation of the gospel takes place.

The response of the objects of mission, ie black people, necessitates our listening “to the silences as well as the pronouncements” (Maluleke 1995:42). The Comaroffs (1991:37) refer to the “‘subtexts’ that the black members of the petit-bourgeoisie employ in reaction to the missionaries which can be appropriated through accounts of ‘irrational’ behaviour, his mockery or his resistance”. This sometimes ‘silent sullen resistance’ (Comaroff & Comaroff 1991:xii) is in accord with the African response of silence as a sign of dissent.

To a degree, what has gone before suggests our dependence on a ‘revisionist’ approach to historiography which, in its most recent development, tends to focus on the functional linkages between capital and racial discrimination, to reconceptualise, re-theorise, re-analyse South African society and history in terms of class, capitalism and exploitation; to develop a class analysis of South Africa, and of the racial system in particular (Southey 1989:7). ‘Revisionism’ involves a variety of approaches and methodologies in order to formulate a history of peoples and communities. It is about the “interaction and evolution of class and non-class factors in South African common consciousness” (Southey 1989:8), focussing on the colonial period and embracing issues such as ideology, consciousness and culture. In the field of mission history, revisionism has been critical of Christian mission (Hofmeyer & Pillay 1994: Foreword).
Maluleke (1995:25) claims that his approach is both subversive and ideological because it critiques the traditional missionary approach. Its data are not just complementary to the writings of missionaries but are, in themselves, a primary source and critique. He argues for a subversive approach to mission history as a counterbalance to the ideological approach which only uses missionary sources, the use of which he does not reject because: “Missionary discourse is also a form of response, interpretation and negotiation. It should, therefore, neither be regarded with total awe nor avoided like the plague.” However:

until we give ideological issues the serious attention they deserve, we will continue to distort and cloud the issues even as we endeavour to ‘correct’ and create a ‘balance’ ... The choice of vernacular sources achieves the two purposes of (a) increasing the variety of sources and approaches to missiology and (b) effecting the ideological choice of elevating an indigenous voice over and above ‘foreign’ voices. (Maluleke 1995:228)

This is important in that the missionaries were ‘ideological captives’ of the imperialist cause but also “important agents of Western capitalism” (Comaroff & Comaroff 1991:8).

This emphasis is important because recent historiographical study has tended to concentrate on the politico-economic impact of missionary activity to the detriment of culture, symbolism and ideology (Maluleke 1995:8).

3 THE ROLE OF IDEOLOGY

Costas (1982:121) derives his definition of ideology from the conviction that Christianity cannot exist independently of political involvement. For him, political ideology involves “a vision of the future, a coherent interpretation of reality, and a programmatic line of action conducive to the reorganisation of society”. Ideology performs a positive function because it offers faith a ‘historical rationality’ (Costas 1982:122) that requires flexibility in thought and action. This understanding of history has both positive and negative aspects: a critical consciousness is vital in order to avoid a support of the civil order that degenerates into idolatry. Costas (1982:76) quotes Jenson in this regard: “evangelical religion becomes in truth the comfort of the oppressors and the opiate of the oppressed”, though we also have to take seriously Bredekamp and Ross’s (1995:2) view that, from the 1830s in South Africa, “Christianity has provided many of its African adherents with the strength to confront the many injustices they have suffered”. Such a growing awareness enables the church to call the social order into question rather than support it uncritically.
Without this consciousness, the Tswana, for example, entered

A process by which the ‘savages’ of colonialism are ushered, by earnest Protestant evangelists, into the revelation of their own misery, are promised salvation by self discovery, and civilisation, and are drawn into a conversation with the culture of modern capitalism – only to find themselves enmeshed … in its order of signs and values, interests and passions, wants and needs. (Comaroff & Comaroff 1991:xii)

Cochrane (1987:168ff) draws on Fierro’s (1977) three broad uses of the term ‘ideology’ in order to highlight the exact nature of the church’s responses to political-economic developments. Fierro’s first level in which ideology is a consciously held ‘system of representation’ involves adopting a ‘critical distance’ (cf Kobia 2003:166) from the dominant ideology which prevails. The second level is unconscious and is conditioned by the material, socioeconomic basis of society (Fierro 1977:244). Comaroff’s (1985:5 reflecting Bourdieu 1977:188, 94) comment is apposite here: “ideology is most effective when it remains interred in habit and hence ‘has no need of words’ … [It is] ‘beyond the grasp of consciousness’”. The third level involves a conscious attempt to legitimate a specific dominant class and is not amenable to self-critical change.

An example of ideology serving the labour needs of the South African situation is offered in terms of agriculture and industry by the practice of removing people from their traditional lifestyles in order to be educated for the place they were to occupy in society. This was done on the basis that Christianity was the point from which civilisation develops. This led to a move from integration to segregation on the pretext that blacks should be shielded from the worst excesses of white society, eg alcohol abuse. This leaves us wondering why they were thus removed from all that was ‘good’ in white society, ie:

The social values of bourgeois ideology could be internalised as human qualities. Hence discipline, generosity, respect, loyalty and ownership, to name but a few, became the virtues of individual personality embodied in self-control, self-denial, self-esteem, self-sacrifice, and self-possession, the basic tenets of classic liberalism. (Comaroff & Comaroff 1991:62)

In general, “church views were most commonly shaped by a position of dominance or at least dependency on the dominant”, ie a bourgeois, capitalist society. Comaroff (1985:10) agrees “[f]or the ideological forms of nineteenth century Protestantism were derivative
of British industrial capitalism, projecting its values of individualism, spiritual democracy, and rational self-improvement through labour”.

The church’s implicit support of bourgeois ideology was determined by its pietistic theology and appeal to the conscience of the individual, ie for conversion, whereas concern for the state of society is a matter for the politician. The defence and propagation of the faith and its relation to the dominant ideology comes from a particular point of view of mission and evangelism, ie “the gospel separated from the historical and material context of the people addressed. It produced as a result an uncritical self-justifying enthusiasm” (Cochrane 1987:156). Sadly, the churches were unable to explain their commitment to the dominant structures despite resistance from the very blacks they claimed to support.

This was the result of a number of factors – their close ties to white society, imperial church relations, eg with the Anglican communion, cultural supremacy with its European roots, internal church structures which were still dominated from Europe, and a basic aversion to reflecting on and acting as the result of conditions and conflicts in black society. Protestant Evangelicalism, born in the Victorian era, reigned supreme and promoted the values of responsibility and restraint, personal piety and family religion and had little common ground with blacks’ option for resistance.

During the 1920s, requests to tackle the socioeconomic problems went largely unheeded so much so that it could be said of the Christian Council that “the transformation of individual men and women continued to be central to the gospel preached in South Africa, but the transformation of the world which so deeply shaped these men and women remained at best an addendum to the task of the churches” (Cochrane 1987:160). It is a sad indictment of church ideology that it could be said of it, “the Church showed its colours firmly nailed to the mast of capitalism and bourgeois ideology” (Cochrane 1987:160). Missionaries looked on themselves as “the conscience of the settlers and the protectors of the ‘natives’” (De Gruchy 1979:13). The church’s ultimate cop-out was that the future was God’s problem. It is instructive to note, however, that the oppressed also operate from an ideological base which aims at overturning the prevailing relationships of domination and subservience, as can be seen in the response of, for example, those who formed African Initiated Churches (AICs).

Thus far, we can see that, despite a positive definition of ideology having been offered (cf Saayman 1991:8-9), the church operated predominantly at levels two and three of Fierro’s broad uses of the term. By and large, it became and remained captivated by the
ideology of its sending bodies and cultures ie Western European. There is a deep issue of faith here which is ideologically based and is related to the reality of the context. We agree with Villa-Vicencio that:

Idea critique involves theological commitment ... self critique and a continuing socio-political analysis of society .... [for] an enabling and motivating theology of liberation which is drawn by an eschatological lure will render it dissatisfied with any tentative political solution or utopia this side of the Kingdom of God. In this sense, theology is to be an ongoing theology of liberation, renewal and change.

4 CONCLUSION

The contextualisation of the history of mission and of Christian communities allows and enables people to create their own mission and Christian history but it must be pursued in its relationship to the wider context in which it evolves, ie in relation to a complex social, economic, cultural and theological reality. Ideological concerns are influential in the writing of history of any kind and operate at several levels of consciousness. The history of our faith in its many expressions is an aspect of general human history and is integral to it. Both history and religion are vital for a clear understanding of both past and present in South Africa.
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ENDNOTES

1 Part of this paper was given at a post-graduate seminar in the Dept. of Church history, University of South Africa on 10 September 2004.
2 This corresponds to Fierro’s second ideological level of [un]awareness; see below section 1.2.
3 HA & HP Junod.
4 Tsonga Presbyterian Church renamed the Evangelical Presbyterian Church in South Africa in 1982.
5 Beginning with the Rev John Bennie arriving in South Africa in 1824, bringing with him a printing press.
7 Perhaps due to the death of written and other sources.
8 Cf Kalu’s assertion in the opening quotation of this article.
9 In 1652, Van Riebeeck established a settlement at the Cape on behalf of the Dutch East India Company.